

146. You do not think, then, that in some of the small schools there should be no difference in salary?—No.

147. What in your opinion should be the minimum salary of a teacher, male and female?—If the teacher is just appointed an assistant I think a living-wage—say, about £75 a year—should be paid. If the teacher was a married man, however, that would not be a living-wage.

148. In what respect do you think there should be a differentiation in the syllabus for smaller schools?—I think less should be required.

149. If asked to revise the syllabus for the small country schools, what subjects would you eliminate?—History, some of the geography, and some of the grammar.

150. For what size of school, then, would you differentiate the syllabus?—For those under sole teachers.

151. Would you approve of a reduction being made in the master's salary through the appointment of a sewing-mistress?—That entirely depends on the rate at which the master's salary is fixed.

152. Say the salary is £75, would you agree to that being interfered with?—Certainly not.

153. Supposing the capitation grant were increased and the Boards had thereby power to increase the salaries, would you still advocate a colonial scale?—Certainly.

154. By reason of its certainty?—Yes.

155. Can you tell me whether any of the country school-buildings would require to be altered or enlarged to enable an amended scale of staffing to be given effect to?—Not so far as I am aware.

156. Do you experience here any difficulty in getting teachers of ability to go out into the country schools?—Yes, I think so.

157. Do the lady teachers suffer serious inconvenience by taking positions in the country schools?—I think there is a very general disinclination to accept such positions, although when they have once done so many prefer the country work.

158. Do lady teachers suffer hardships in any of these country districts?—I think so.

159. Can you give any instance of the hardships suffered by these ladies?—Yes, I could give one or two, but not before a mixed audience.

160. They are so bad?—One particularly.

161. Are these cases of hardships exceptional or frequent?—Exceptional.

162. Do you consider that in the fixing of a colonial scale of salaries for these country schools the inconvenience that the teachers suffer should be taken into consideration?—Certainly.

163. What do you think the amount of sick-pay allowance should be?—I think a teacher who has been seven or eight years in the service should be entitled to a month's allowance.

164. What would be the allowance for every subsequent year of service?—It is very difficult to fix an arbitrary standard at once. I should say a teacher who has put in twelve or fifteen years' service might be entitled to three months' pay.

165. Have you heard complaints made by teachers of the rate of allowances paid to them when sick or to their representatives after death?—No, I have not heard any complaints.

166. *Mr. Luke.*] Have you ever known Committees make the mistake of confounding the figures in a certificate?—Yes.

167. You are a member of the Auckland University Council?—Yes.

168. Do you not think that your position as a Master of Arts and member of that Council is a good thing from the point of view of the profession?—Certainly.

169. Do you think if the assistant teachers throughout the colony were paid on the highest scale at present in existence that it would be a good thing for the colony?—Certainly.

F. H. BROWN, First Assistant, Newton East School, examined.

Mr. Brown: I represent the first assistants of Auckland, who are very strongly in favour of a colonial scale, on the following grounds: namely, that the salaries paid to us in Auckland compare very unfavourably with the salaries paid in many of the other education districts, and that the salaries are not sufficient for the work done. I have had a very varied experience in country schools. I have been in charge of half-time schools, schools with an average of 20, and schools with an average up to 80 or 90. I have also been three years as first assistant in Newton East, and I consider that the work done by the assistants in Auckland is heavier than that done in any of my previous positions. Again, the salary paid to us is not sufficient to meet the cost of family expenses. I have five children, and I find my salary of £190 is too small; and to make ends meet I do all my own kitchen-gardening, otherwise I should be in debt. Many of my fellow-assistants eke out their salaries by "coaching." Another point is that at the present time our salaries are fixed at grades of 100 on average attendance. The first assistant's salary in a school of 500 is a certain amount, and does not increase until 600 is reached. During the measles epidemic in 1889, because the attendance dropped below 500, the first assistant suffered a reduction of £25 from his salary.

170. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] Have you studied the Otago rate of pay sufficiently to know whether it would suit you or not?—The salaries paid in Otago a year or two back were very much better than ours are at present.

171. I suppose it is not your desire to see any of the salaries in the colony brought down to make an average with low salaries?—Certainly not.

172. If the £4 capitation is not sufficient you think the Government should vote more?—I think education deserves higher payment than it receives at the present time.

173. Do you think assistant teachers, if married, should, in common with head-teachers, receive house allowance?—If they pay us a sufficient salary I shall be content without it.

174. *Mr. Davidson.*] What is the average attendance at your school?—Between 600 and 700.

175. What are your duties as first assistant?—I have charge of the Sixth Standard, and am required to give instruction to the pupil-teachers a certain part of the time.

176. Are you paid for instructing the pupil-teachers?—No.
177. Does the Auckland Board consider it part of your duties to instruct pupil-teachers?—I think so.
178. Is it laid down by regulation?—It is in the hands of the headmaster, and he can make his own arrangements with assistants, I believe.
179. Are headmasters paid any allowance or bonus for instructing pupil-teachers?—No.
180. If the salary paid for your position were raised to £240, would that meet with your approval?—Certainly.
181. Do you think a teacher occupying your position would be fairly well paid at £240?—I think so.
182. How many pupils do you consider a teacher in sole charge of a school with all standards should be expected to teach?—35 to 40.
183. Do you think country teachers prefer the extra strain of teaching, say, 45 and getting fair salaries to having a more liberal staff and a not so liberal salary?—If I was a country teacher I should take the more liberal salary.
184. Are you in favour of giving a retiring-allowance to those teachers who have grown old in the service?—I am.
185. Do you consider it advisable to adopt a superannuation scheme whilst there are thirteen Boards existing, each making its own scale of staffs and salaries?—No, I do not think so.
186. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Do you know whether the teachers you represent are favourable to the Inspectors being placed under a central department?—No.
187. Do the Inspectors work hand-in-hand with teachers in promoting the interests of teachers?—I think so.
188. Then, the teachers would not work detrimentally to the Inspectors if the Inspectors thought it was to their advantage to come under the central department?—No.
189. *Mr. Weston.*] What in your opinion should be the minimum salary for a male and female teacher in a school of, say, 40?—I should say, £175 a year and a house.
190. Do the teachers generally consider that in computing the salaries of teachers of country schools and assistant masters and mistresses in towns house allowance should be taken into consideration?—Most certainly in reference to country teachers, and, I think, also in the case of assistants.
191. Do you think pupil-teachers can be properly taught in small country schools?—No; because the whole of the headmaster's school time is occupied in looking after the several classes.
192. What is your opinion in regard to the syllabus for small country schools?—It is overcrowded.
193. What subjects, speaking generally, would you delete from the syllabus of small country schools?—History, a considerable part of the grammar and geography, and in the general syllabus a considerable part of the Sixth Standard arithmetic.
194. Have you and the teachers generally considered the question of sick pay and allowances to the representatives of deceased teachers?—No; the subject has not been fully gone into by the first assistants.
195. Are you able to express an opinion on behalf of the teachers as to the allowance that should be made in each of these cases?—I am not.
196. Do you advocate any allowance?—Certainly.
197. What in your opinion would be a fair rate of allowance in the case of sickness and in the case of death?—I have not given the subject enough consideration to properly answer the question.
198. You are so satisfied with your present position that you have not given a thought to that question?—Certainly not.

J. D. McNAUGHTON, Drury School, Representing the Small Schools, examined.

Mr. McNaughton.] One apparent anomaly in the first proposed scale to which a number of us object is that a head-teacher in a larger country school of under 75, with a D2 certificate, can only earn £173 8s., whereas a teacher of a lower grade, with a D3, can earn a salary of £220 in the position of assistant. Country teachers object to proposed scales requiring certificate higher than D to qualify for certain positions. As a rule, they have not the opportunity of acquiring a university degree. In the proposed scale we consider the proposal to deduct £10 for sewing-mistress from the salaries of head-teachers of schools under 40 would act very injuriously. The appointment of the sewing-mistress rests with the head-teacher, and it would doubtless lead to his getting into conflict with local authorities. We consider that a classification scheme is inseparable from a salary scheme; that our present salaries are insufficient; and that they have been so in the past, and are more so now, owing to the increase in the cost of living, although a general advance has taken place in the salaries of other classes of workers. In schools of under 40 where the whole of the standards are taught, instead of an assistant at 40 we consider that a third-year pupil-teacher should be appointed from, say, 36.

199. *Mr. Davidson.*] What has been your teaching experience?—Fifteen years—as pupil-teacher and teacher of schools, with roll-numbers from 20 to 70.

200. What is your present position?—Teacher of a school with an average attendance of 50.

201. What is your staff?—One pupil-teacher.

202. Under the suggested scale what would be the staffing of your school?—An assistant mistress.

203. Would you prefer to have an assistant mistress who would take the responsibility of the infants and Standards I. and II. rather than a pupil-teacher?—Yes; in my case the pupil-teacher is a qualified assistant, *i.e.*, she has a certificate.

204. Practically, the Auckland Board is giving a teacher the position and salary of a pupil-teacher when really she is an assistant?—Yes.

205. Do you think that is a right thing to do? Would you not rather have a qualified assistant doing the work and receiving the salary of an assistant?—For her sake, yes. In my case it would not affect the actual work done, although, no doubt, she would do better work if paid a better salary.

206. You are not giving her instruction in the art of teaching or for examination?—No.

207. If your suggestion were carried out that a pupil-teacher instead of an assistant should be appointed at 36 you would have to train that pupil-teacher in the art of teaching and prepare her for her examinations, would you not?—Yes.

208. Would you not prefer to teach an additional 4 children and at 40 get the assistance of a qualified assistant rather than take a pupil-teacher to whom you would have to give instruction?—Certainly.

209. Then, I take it you prefer the colonial scale which does that?—Yes.

210. Are you satisfied with the salaries for head-teachers in the second proposed scale with the exception of the deduction for sewing-mistresses?—On the whole, yes.

211. The salary suggested for infant mistresses is very much larger than that provided by the Auckland scale: do you think that an improvement and likely to bring into the service more highly qualified women?—Yes; but I think it is likely to have a reactionary effect.

212. In what way?—Many of our smaller schools are staffed by ladies who have gone into remote country districts and are induced to remain there by the relatively higher salaries. If these assistant-mistress-ships are increased in value there would be greater competition for them. You would have in schools from 75 to 100 in average attendance lady teachers more willing to occupy the position of assistant mistress than that of sole teacher in a remote country school.

213. Do you not think that would be a good thing, inasmuch as it would give a more highly trained set of mistresses in these schools than at present?—Yes; but it would have a bad effect on the small country schools.

214. *Mr. Stewart.*] You referred to the question of friction arising out of the appointment of sewing-mistresses: you infer that the headmaster will have the appointment of the sewing-mistress? The note says that the teacher's wife shall have the preference.

215. But the Board, of course, has the appointing?—They have the confirmation of the appointment, and I take it that if the teacher's wife is suitable the Board would be compelled to appoint her.

216. Does the half-day exclusion in the computation of the average attendance adequately meet the difficulty?—No.

217. Would the suggestion of a three-fifths or two-thirds exclusion be an improvement?—I think so.

218. It would prevent undue fluctuation of salaries?—Yes.

219. And the country teachers, do you think, would be in favour of the altered conditions?—Yes.

220. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Do you think the proposed scale of allowance for pupil-teachers is sufficient?—I think in many cases where they have to go into remote country districts it is not sufficient to enable them to pay their way.

221. Do you consider that head-teachers should receive payment for instructing pupil-teachers?—Yes; I think a bonus should be paid on the pupil-teachers passing.

222. A bonus of a certain sum if the pupil-teacher passes, and half that if he fails?—I think so.

223. What do you consider would be a fair salary for a teacher in your position?—I consider that a fully qualified teacher in charge of a school should receive not less than £200 per annum.

224. *Mr. Weston.*] Irrespective of size?—I think the man should be paid, and not the school.

225. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Do you approve of teachers being paid according to the certificate they hold?—No.

226. Do you think that assistance at 36 tends to lighten the teacher's work?—Yes, materially, if the pupil-teacher has had some experience.

227. What salary are you getting?—About £150.

228. And your pupil-teacher?—I believe, £45.

229. According to the No. 1 scale your salary would be £159 and the mistress's £80, and by the amended scale your salary would be £170 and that of the mistress £90: do you think that the adoption of this suggested scale would on the whole materially benefit the country teachers in Auckland?—Yes.

230. Are the country teachers in favour of the proposed deduction being made by way of penalty if they do not hold the minimum certificate?—They are very much opposed to it.

231. *Mr. Weston.*] Do you think there should be any differentiation in the syllabus for the country schools?—Not in pass-subjects. I think in schools with a sole teacher that the syllabus might be relieved of science, history, and grammar, the latter by being curtailed considerably.

232. Are you satisfied with your position as a country-school teacher?—No; I consider my present salary is not sufficient to make provision for myself and family, and the chances of promotion are not evident. I also think that the work required by the syllabus is too great to be overtaken by country schools. I refer, of course, to the additional subjects.

233. Have you taught any pupil-teachers?—Yes.

234. Are you able to give pupil-teachers the time and attention they ought to receive at your hands?—No. Our regulations require us to set apart a certain amount of time during the day for instructing pupil-teachers. That is practically impossible where a teacher has charge of four or five classes.

235. Do you think that there should be a time-limit to a pupil-teacher's duties in a school—that they should have so many hours teaching-work and the rest reserved for private study?—That is impracticable, I think, for they are required for the supervision of class-work. The staffing would not allow it in the country districts.

236. *The Chairman.*] Have you a house at your school?—Yes.

237. What is it worth?—Houses from a renting point of view are practically valueless in Drury.

238. Are the Saturday classes for pupil-teachers in Auckland doing good?—Yes; they are a great help.

239. Do you approve of the proposal to take capitation by units?—Yes; it would be an improvement as compared with the present method.

240. Have you a sewing-mistress in your school?—The pupil-teacher does the work of sewing-mistress.

JAMES ARMSTRONG, Headmaster, Devonport School, examined.

Mr. Armstrong: I am asked to come on behalf of the headmasters of the city and suburban schools, and I have also been requested to represent the case of the second assistants before you. With your permission I will read the following statement of the headmasters of the city and suburban schools: "We, the undersigned headmasters of schools under the Auckland Education Board, respectfully ask you to consider the raising of the maximum salary provided for in the proposed colonial scale. Under that scale, as issued, no headmaster in the Auckland District would receive a salary of more than £349 per annum. We respectfully submit that in a district in which nearly eight hundred teachers (of whom 353 are in responsible charge of schools) are employed, we may reasonably ask that a few prizes of greater value than those proposed may be offered. We may remind the Commission that until September in last year the Auckland Board of Education paid at a rate which made at least seven of the largest schools worth upwards of £350, the two largest being worth over £400. Retrenchment then took place, and the scale adopted is still in force, although by the distribution of the bonus voted by the Government salaries have been reinstated at practically the former rate. This is fair evidence that that rate is not considered excessive by either Board or department. The proposed colonial scale will further reduce the higher salaries even below the scale to which they have been reduced by the Board. It appears to us to be cruel to lower the salaries of the department's oldest and most experienced servants save for the most pressing reason. Could it be shown that the state of the colony's finances demands retrenchment we should be willing to submit to such reduction as might be deemed necessary. But such is not the case. In almost every calling wages are being increased, and in our own district assistants and many country teachers are to receive a well-merited increase. In addition to this, the cost of living is now considerably greater than it was two or three years ago; yet, though the finances of the colony are in a flourishing condition, some of us are threatened with a reduction in salary that will not only materially alter our own circumstances, but will seriously affect the prospects of our children. Many of us, moreover, relying on the maintenance of the scale under which we were appointed, have incurred pecuniary responsibilities from which it is impossible for us now to withdraw. We would further point out that it is the maximum salary offered that influences candidates for the teaching profession. Other callings offer far greater prizes than does ours; hence many of our clever boys who would otherwise enter our ranks are diverted into other walks of life, and the colony is the loser. In conclusion, we respectfully submit that we hail with satisfaction the improvements proposed in the salaries of hitherto underpaid teachers, and should have been perfectly content had our own salaries been left as they originally were. But we think it a real grievance that in a scheme which was intended for the better payment of the teaching profession generally the most experienced and responsible servants of the Board should receive as their share a substantial reduction in salary." I might say that this letter was written under the supposition that the salary as stated in the scheme represents the actual salary that teachers would get, and we were not aware that anything was being done in the matter of house allowance. I may say that it is the general opinion of headmasters that if house allowance was made that we should consider the loss in the salaries from a different point of view, but if no house allowance is made we feel that our salaries have been very considerably and substantially reduced, as pointed out in that letter.

241. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] In the last report of the department your salary is stated at £342: what is it now?—£324.

242. Why were you reduced?—No reason was given.

243. What is the average attendance at your school?—500 to 530.

244. Under the suggested scale what would you get?—£319.

245. What is the present staffing of your school?—Six assistants and six pupil-teachers.

246. What do you think would be the effect on the teaching profession of the colony if the staffing remained as liberal as in Auckland and the salaries were materially increased?—A good effect.

247. Do you think the standard of the teaching profession in this district might be raised by a more liberal scale of salaries being paid?—Undoubtedly.

248. Do you think it would induce a brighter class of youths to enter the service?—I think so.

249. Do you agree with the statement that the average woman is not physically fit to cope with the work of the Fourth and higher standards?—Yes.

250. *Mr. Stewart.*] With regard to the proposal in the suggested scale before the Commission are you in favour of the alternation of male and female teachers as proposed?—No.

251. Do you think it would be better to classify the male teachers as first, second, and third male assistants, and the females as first, second, and third female assistants?—I approve of that.
252. What is your opinion of the present system of the classification of teachers?—I think it is very unsatisfactory.
253. In what way?—In the first place, although I would give every possible consideration to those who have obtained degrees and willingly see them obtain a bonus, at the same time I think it is unnecessary that the degrees should be regarded in the certificate. I also think that the Inspector's marks 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 is a most clumsy way of expressing the Inspector's opinion of the efficiency of a teacher.
254. Do you think there should be twenty-five grades of teachers as at present?—No, most decidedly.
255. Would you prefer to see a small general reduction on teachers' salaries and have that certificate line left out?—I would have no objection to it.
256. Do you consider the half-day attendance sufficient allowance to meet the case of epidemics and wet days in computing the average attendance?—No; I advocate two-thirds.
257. Would you tell the Commission how many days in your school in the past two years the exemption has altered the working-average?—So far as I can remember, four times, but I think that number would also answer the question if you said seven years.
258. Does the exemption really affect the case of epidemics?—No.
259. And consequently the Boards have been losing large sums of money through having to make allowance for epidemics?—Yes.
260. *Mr. Stewart.*] You have examined the scale and noticed the maximum salary set down against any head-teacher?—Yes.
261. The opinion of the Institute is that it is not a high enough maximum?—Yes; I am speaking for the headmasters.
262. Would not the £50 house allowance change their opinions?—Yes, I think so, if it was assured.
263. With regard to the question of a superannuation scheme, do you think that in the public interests it is necessary to retire teachers from the service, say, at the age of sixty or sixty-five?—I think that opinion is universal among teachers.
264. Could a contributing scheme be arranged whilst we have thirteen different scales in operation throughout the colony?—No, it could not.
265. If a colonial scale was in operation, do you think that such a scheme could be established?—I think it could and that it should.
266. With regard to the question of multiplication of small schools, you as a teacher have had a great deal of experience, have you not?—Yes, I have had a good deal of experience, but have not been in many country schools.
267. You were headmaster at Kawakawa?—Yes.
268. Do you think that small schools have been unnecessarily multiplied?—Yes, notably in such a place as Hamilton.
269. Do you know the district of Pokeno?—No; I have heard that the schools are considerably multiplied.
270. Do you know the district of Flat Bush?—Yes.
271. You were headmaster at Otahuhu?—Yes.
272. Flat Bush is an adjacent district, is it not?—Yes.
273. Is it a fact that there was a central school there for some time?—Yes.
274. What happened to it?—It was closed.
275. What became of the pupils attending that school?—I am not in a position to say.
276. Are there two schools now where formerly there was one?—Yes.
277. Do you think one central school better than two small ones?—Yes.
278. Do you know the district of Mangere at all?—Yes.
279. Do you know the position of two schools there?—Yes.
280. Do you think that dividing the Mangere district into two schools within two miles of each other is a wise proceeding?—I could not criticize the wisdom of that state of things; it was, no doubt, in accordance with the wishes of the people. I think one school could easily do the work of the two.
281. Do you know anything of the American system of conveyance of children to a central school, a system carried out also in Australia?—No, I do not.
282. Do you think that in the Education District of Auckland it would be possible to lessen the number of small schools by conveying the children from extremes of districts to a central school?—I dare say it would be possible; I have not considered the matter.
283. You know the districts of Chelsea and Northcote, do you not?—Yes.
284. Would it be possible to have a central school there and a means of conveyance for the children?—I should hardly be inclined to favour it. Of course, I have not had time to consider the matter, and I should like to do so.
285. In the Auckland Provincial District is there any payment made for the tuition of pupil-teachers?—No; it is part of the headmaster's duties.
286. He is remunerated, of course, for the tuition, within the salary paid him for his headmastership of the school?—Yes, I presume so.
287. Are you aware that in some districts of the colony special payment is made for the instruction of pupil-teachers?—Yes.
288. Which do you think would be the better plan, so far as the payment of pupil-teachers is concerned—to include the duties of the instruction of pupil-teachers within the salaries paid to the headmasters of schools, or to rate them with lower salaries and pay them a certain sum of

money on the number of pupil-teachers passing their examinations?—I think it better to include the payment of pupil-teachers within the salaries paid to the headmasters.

289. Do you think that the fact of payment for instruction of pupil-teachers being included within the salaries in that manner would in any way interfere with the due performance of a master's duties in instructing pupil-teachers?—Undoubtedly not.

290. You believe that a teacher would conscientiously endeavour to discharge that duty without the incentive of special reward?—Yes, discharge the duties as conscientiously as can be.

291. Do you believe in the differentiation of the syllabus in regard to different-sized schools?—Yes, I do; I do not believe in making the standard pass any different. I think in country schools the work of what are called class-subjects and additional subjects should be distinctly lightened.

292. Do you believe in the standard pass?—That is another question; I mean so long as the standard pass is in existence.

293. You think it would be possible to improve the education by having fewer subjects?—Yes.

294. You think that fewer subjects handled in a thorough manner better than many handled in an indifferent manner?—Yes.

295. Then, you believe in the differentiation of the syllabus for different classes of schools?—Yes.

296. Something has been said this morning in reference to the treatment of teachers during sickness: do you consider in your district that this question is on a satisfactory basis?—I hardly think it is.

297. Will you indicate to the Commission in what direction it is unsatisfactory?—Like the president of the Institute, I have not gone into the question in a way that would warrant me in giving an authoritative statement. I think there is a certain amount of uncertainty about the consideration a sick teacher would meet with.

298. Are you aware if there is any rule or regulation, or are applications treated separately or individually?—There is no regulation; they are treated separately.

299. Do you think it would be a more wise proceeding to have a separate rule or regulation in reference to the matter?—Yes.

300. Do you think it would be an advantage to the District of Auckland, and also the District of Wellington, if training-colleges were established?—Yes.

301. Out of what funds would you propose to carry on the training-colleges?—That is hardly a question for teachers to give judgment upon. I think if a fund was secured for the carrying-on of training-colleges they would undoubtedly be of great advantage.

302. You would not advocate that the funds for them should come out of the ordinary maintenance funds?—No.

303. Why not?—I have not considered the question.

304. Does it not practically mean that if training-colleges were established they would be established out of the maintenance funds, and that they would be a further distress on the general finances and on the payment of teachers?—Yes.

305. You are aware that some years ago a special grant was made by the House for training-colleges?—Yes.

306. Is that the proper course for the House to take—to consider the question?—Yes; to have a special grant for training-colleges, and not interfere with the ordinary maintenance funds.

307. Speaking of male pupil-teachers, do you think at the present juncture you would advise parents in the Auckland District to allow their boys to enter the profession?—No; I have had no need to offer that advice, however, for they never allow their sons the opportunity. In seven years I have only had one boy enter the teaching profession.

308. Do you think that is a desirable state of affairs?—No.

309. What do you put it down to?—Want of inducement for the boys to enter.

310. The uncertainty with regard to future remuneration?—Yes, that would affect the advice that a teacher would give, no doubt. The boys are hardly aware of that phase of the question though they feel that there is a want of inducement.

311. In the matter of a colonial scale you consider that it would be safer to trust to the vote of the House each year?—Yes.

312. Practically, there is a vote of the House every year now?—I believe so.

313. *Mr. Luke.*] In reference to a remark you made as to the shortening of the syllabus in country schools, would that make any difference to the education of the children?—No.

314. Do you not think that children attending small country schools should receive as good instruction as the children attending town schools?—Yes; I think they would receive better instruction if less was tried, because more would be achieved.

315. What is your opinion as to equal pay for equal work in the matter of male and female teachers?—As a general principle, I think a male teacher should get more than a female teacher, and I may say that is generally the opinion among the lady teachers to whom I have spoken on the matter; of course, up to a certain point.

316. You have studied the two suggested scales put forward?—I have examined them.

317. Do you approve of the principle in No. 1 scale of the payment of capitation by units rather than by leaps of 5 or 10 in attendance?—I am hardly prepared to express a definite opinion as to which is the better method of the two. I have not studied the matter.

318. *Mr. Hogben* points out that in the suggested alternative scale through the staffing being reduced there will be enough money to pay the assistant teachers up to the highest scale paid throughout the colony: you are of the opinion that that would be desirable?—Yes, I am.

319. You do not think that the teachers in the Auckland District receive adequate remuneration for the work they perform?—No; I think all the assistant teachers require higher salaries, and perhaps more than any of the female assistants.

320. In regard to the Saturday classes for pupil-teachers, do you know anything of the work done?—I know a little indirectly.

321. Is it satisfactory?—Yes, and a very great help.

322. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] With regard to the question of equal pay for equal work, is it not a fact that a female teacher can as efficiently as a male teacher manage a small country school of an attendance of from 25 to 30?—Yes.

323. Then, would you not consider that she should receive equal pay with a male teacher?—I think the idea is good theoretically. As a matter of fact, I think some of the male teachers of those schools are married men, and it would be impossible to ask a teacher who is married to live on the same salary as is paid to an unmarried teacher.

324. Then, you would advocate giving a bonus on matrimony?—Yes.

325. What is the average attendance at your school?—From 500 to 530.

326. Your attendance is on the increase?—No; it increases at certain times of the year, but decreases towards Christmas.

327. According to the last report your average was 492: it has increased since then?—That is a misleading number; it was actually over 500.

328. How many pupils have you in Standard VII.?—Only 1 or 2 at the present time; sometimes I have 30.

329. Do you group Standards VI. and VII.?—Yes.

330. Who takes charge of them?—The first assistant.

331. A male?—Yes.

332. How many pupils have you in Standard V.?—87.

333. Who takes charge of that class?—The second assistant—a male.

334. You have two male assistants?—Yes.

335. How many pupils have you in Standard IV.?—80.

336. Who has charge of the standard?—The first female assistant.

337. What salary does she receive?—£75 a year.

338. Has she any assistance?—A pupil-teacher.

339. Regularly?—Yes; and the second assistant has the same assistance.

340. How many pupils have you in Standard III.?—78.

341. Does a female assistant manage that class unaided?—No; she gets partial assistance during the greater part of the day.

342. How many pupils in Standard II.?—75, under the charge of a fourth-year pupil-teacher.

343. At what salary?—£55, including £10 allowance for board, &c.

344. Do you consider that a fair remuneration?—No, I do not.

345. How many pupils in Standard I.?—75, under the charge of a female assistant.

346. Does she receive any assistance?—She gets all the assistance I am able to give.

347. What is her salary?—£70.

348. How many have you in the preparatory classes?—160.

349. You have a mistress and two pupil-teachers for that class?—Yes.

350. Did you compare the staffing under the proposed scale with the staffing at present obtaining in your school?—I did not compare it very exactly; I understand it is very much the same.

351. There is a preponderance of females in your school?—Yes.

352. Both in regard to assistant teachers and pupil-teachers?—I do not think more than in any other large school.

353. How many assistants have you altogether?—Six.

354. How many are females?—Four.

355. How many pupil-teachers have you?—Six.

356. How many of them are females?—Five.

357. Do you not consider that is too much of a preponderance of the female element?—I would like one more of the opposite sex.

358. Do you consider that a female teacher can efficiently manage Standard IV.?—No; in my case it is exceptional.

359. Do you consider it would be advisable to have a third male assistant to take charge of Standard IV.?—Yes, in a large school.

360. What is the maximum attendance in a school to be taught efficiently without duplication of the classes?—I do not split my classes up, and I have nearly 600 on the roll.

361. Then, you consider 600 about the type of school in which organization can be efficiently maintained, and in a school of a greater attendance the classes would have to be duplicated?—Yes, though in large schools you would have a greater number of assistants, and so be able to divide the classes with advantage and have better results.

362. Do you find, on looking at the suggested scale, that the teachers as a whole will benefit in this district?—Yes, the teachers as a whole; but the headmasters of the larger schools would not benefit.

363. What salary would you receive according to the suggested scale?—£319.

364. And you would get a residence?—There is nothing to tell me that; if I was sure of it I should be satisfied.

365. Do you find as a whole that the head-teachers approve of a colonial scale?—The head-teachers of the larger schools to whom I have spoken naturally spoke about the manner in which it would affect them, and, of course, it was not satisfactory. With regard to the scheme as a whole, they considered it would do great good if adopted, and especially in the case of hitherto underpaid country teachers.

366. In the Auckland District are residences provided for the head-teachers?—In most of the country schools; there are 113 schools without residences.

367. Is there any allowance made to a master who may be in the unfortunate position of having been appointed to a school that has not a residence?—There is no house allowance; the head-teachers are paid on the average attendance, and if there be a residence so much the better, but it is simply a happy accident.

368. *Mr. Lethbridge.*] Has the Institute gone into the matter of the Board's incidental expenses?—No, not so far as I am aware.

369. *Mr. Weston.*] You read from a paper that the teachers would have been satisfied but for recent reductions?—Not the teachers, but the head-teachers of the city and suburban schools.

370. What about the country schools?—I was not speaking for them.

371. Do you know anything of them?—Yes, I know a good deal.

372. Would the teachers in the country schools have had reason to be satisfied with the salaries allotted them but for the recent reductions by your Board?—No.

373. Then, the country teachers are dissatisfied?—Yes.

374. And were dissatisfied before the recent scale was in operation?—Yes.

375. The teachers of the larger schools were not dissatisfied?—Not until the Board made the recent reductions; if the salaries had remained as they were nine months ago we would not have been dissatisfied.

376. I think you stated that the fewer the subjects embraced by the syllabus the better would be the results achieved by the children?—Yes, in small country schools.

377. Would not the same remark apply to the town schools?—Yes I think the syllabus is overcrowded.

378. In what respect do you think it is overcrowded?—There are so many subjects at present that they cannot be taught in a thorough and efficient manner, I think.

379. You think that the syllabus should be purged of some of the subjects?—Yes, undoubtedly.

380. You stated that pupil-teachers were very often in charge of classes, did you not?—Large classes, yes.

381. Do you think that is in the slightest degree to be justified?—No, except in cases of necessity.

382. Why do you consider it is not to be justified?—For the reason that a pupil-teacher has not the authority or the experience necessary to take charge of a large class.

383. Did you consider the physical and mental condition of the teacher when you made that remark?—Yes.

384. Apart altogether from the benefit the children may derive from the instruction of a pupil-teacher, do you not think it is unfair to the pupil-teacher to exact so much from him?—Yes.

385. Does it not keep a male or female pupil-teacher back in their own preparatory training?—Yes.

386. You think, then, the whole system is radically bad?—The system of putting a pupil-teacher in charge of a large class, yes.

387. Have you thought upon the subject of dividing a pupil-teacher's time between teaching and his or her own instruction?—Yes.

388. What is your opinion?—Theoretically, I think it is the proper thing if the Board was able to support the schools so as to allow us to send our pupil-teachers away in order to receive instruction.

389. Do you think it would be a wise plan to allow a pupil-teacher to teach for half a day and allow the rest of the day for private instruction?—Some authorities think that it is the proper thing. I think, myself, it would be going a little too far. I think the Board's rule is a wise one—*i.e.*, that certain pupil-teachers must only teach a certain number of hours a day.

390. In regard to teachers' salaries, do you mean that if the Government kept open a school that the teachers would receive adequate remuneration irrespective of the capitation grant?—It is rather an awkward question to express an opinion upon, but I should say, yes.

391. In regard to increased staffing, can you give an instance where the addition to the staffing would have necessitated additions to some of the country schools?—No, I cannot.

392. Do you consider that the present system of instructing pupil-teachers is efficient?—No; the present system of head-teachers instructing them after school-hours is unsatisfactory, both to the head-teachers and pupil-teachers alike.

393. *Mr. Hogben.*] In regard to the differentiation of the syllabus to which you alluded, do you think that in the case of large schools too many subjects are expected to be taught in the several standards?—Yes.

394. You said you thought the syllabus should be purged of some of the subjects?—Yes.

395. You do not mean by that that those subjects should be cut out of the syllabus altogether?—With the exception of history; I would cut out history altogether.

396. That is your opinion?—Yes, and the opinion of a good many others to whom I have spoken on the matter. The idea is not to underrate the value of the subject, but that it cannot be taught in the time.

397. Would it not be better to allow a choice of subjects?—Yes.

398. Rather than cut out subjects?—Yes.

399. You would prefer to see the choice allowed—some schools to take some subjects, and some to take others?—Yes.

400. It would satisfy the needs of different districts, you think?—Yes.

401. And it would satisfy the aptitude of different teachers?—Yes.

402. In the case of smaller schools with a sole teacher, how many classes would a sole teacher have to look after, including standard classes and preparatory classes?—In some unassisted schools nine classes—six standards and three primer classes.

403. A head-teacher could scarcely reduce the number of classes to five, and certainly not to less?—That is so.

404. Even if you allowed a choice of subjects in the syllabus in the large schools, to produce the same mental results you would require to allow a smaller number of subjects in a school with a sole teacher?—Yes.

405. You would not put those in the subjects which are now called pass-subjects, but in the class-subjects?—Yes.

406. In regard to the question of salaries of head-teachers, what do you mean by the head-teachers suffering: is it solely on account of the house allowance—if the question of house allowance was definitely assured to them the head-teachers in question would not be dissatisfied?—I think not.

407. On page 3 of the suggested scale there is mention of house allowance I presume you saw it?—Yes; but we do not gather from that that house allowance would be assured to us.

408. You mean that if there was no house allowance you would substantially suffer?—Yes, very substantially; we should be reduced—after a reduction.

409. If there was reasonable house allowance given, from £20 to £50, in the case of small and large schools, would they substantially suffer then?—No; I think most of them would be satisfied, though there might be still one or two cases of reduction.

410. Can you tell me a case in which there would be a reduction?—I fancy in the case of two or three of the larger schools in Auckland, though I could not say authoritatively.

411. Will you name one of the larger schools?—The Wellesley Street School.

412. What is the average attendance at that school?—716.

413. Is there any house allowance in a school like that?—No.

414. Under the proposed scale what would be the salary?—£357, I presume.

415. And if £50 was added for house allowance it would amount to—how much?—£407.

416. Then, with reasonable house allowance, such as other Boards give in the case of Wellington, Dunedin, or North Canterbury, the head-teachers in this district would not suffer much?—Well, I was considering the salaries that obtained here six months ago, when the head-teachers received considerably more. I believe the teachers, as a class, will be satisfied.

417. You say “six months ago”?—Six or nine months.

418. Still, under the suggested scale they would be in a better position than they are in now?—Yes, very much.

419. Your first male assistant gets £175, and under the proposed scale would get £210?—Yes.

420. Your second male assistant gets now £100, and under the proposed scale would get £120?—Yes. The second male assistants asked me to lay their case before the Commission; they consider that the salaries they receive, in proportion to the salaries paid to first assistants, are inadequate, when taking into consideration the work they do, and they want to bring that point out.

421. Supposing we raised them, as the alternative scale proposes to do, to £175, would they be in a substantially better position?—Yes, more than they had hoped for, I think.

422. In the staffing under the proposed scale you would gain an assistant and lose a pupil-teacher?—Yes. To be absolutely correct I should explain that one of those whom I call a pupil-teacher is called officially a junior assistant, but it is the same thing practically.

423. You think the substitution of an assistant for a pupil-teacher a great advantage?—Yes.

424. What salary does your infant mistress receive?—At present £100.

425. Do you think that is a sufficient salary to pay an infant mistress?—No. On the other hand, my first lady assistant gets £75 a year, and I consider that her work is worth the same remuneration as the work of the infant mistress. I think the £25 difference in the salaries is too much, and that there should be no difference.

426. You would raise them both?—Yes. I would bring the infant mistresses' salaries up, but not give them as large a salary as is contemplated.

427. Do you not consider the position of infant mistress an important one?—I do; but justice compels me to draw attention to the fact that female teachers doing standard work have a very great strain upon them, and it takes a great deal out of them. Infant mistresses dismiss their classes earlier in the forenoon and the afternoon; they have no written work to correct, and not such strain in the matter of discipline; and they have no hard study at night worth speaking of. On the other hand, lady assistants taking standard classes have frequently to remain till half-past 5 correcting exercise-books and drawing-books, &c. This work is strictly attended to, for I am of the opinion that there is no more conscientious profession in the world than that of the teacher, and I have frequently seen my own assistant remain behind doing work in the manner I stated for a salary of £75 a year.

428. You think it is very desirable to get in the infant-room a woman of originality, and one up to date in kindergarten-work methods?—Yes.

429. I suppose the organization of the infant-room is left very largely in her hands?—Yes.

430. I presume she has to do a great deal of the thinking-work connected with the organization of the infant-room?—I do not think the “thinking” part of it is a great strain on her.

431. I presume you pay for skill, do you not?—Yes. I should be very sorry to be thought to underrate the skill of a properly qualified infant mistress; but I think all the organization an infant mistress has to do is to pick out the children who are fit to go into the next primer class.

432. Does she not discriminate as to what pupil-teacher shall go into a certain room?—Yes; she with the headmaster.

433. You would not be averse to giving equal salaries to an infant mistress and the first assistant mistress in a school with an attendance over 600?—I would be willing to do that; in that case I should like also to see that the infant mistress was a thoroughly qualified person. We

have very few real infant mistresses in the Auckland District; most of them are in the positions they hold by chance or hazard. I think the headmasters have picked out the most suitable, and put them in their positions.

434. *Mr. Davidson.*] Does the infant mistress in the large schools in Auckland not take charge of the sewing?—No; the lady teacher for each class takes the sewing, as a rule.

435. Is she not responsible for the general supervision of the sewing?—No.

436. *Mr. Weston.*] Should not a lady who has exhibited special aptitude for infant-teaching be always kept as infant mistress?—Certainly, I think they should be carefully picked out.

437. *The Chairman.*] Do you think that the infant mistresses that you have in this district are generally unfit for the work they have to perform?—No; and that would be a question the Inspector would answer better.

438. Am I to infer that you think at present the quality of the infant mistresses in this district is unsatisfactory or inferior?—I think, on the whole, through the force of circumstances, the best and most suitable of teachers in that respect have not been found.

439. What has become of them?—They are there, but so far they have not been found.

440. Where are they to be found?—Well, for example, at the present time I have a girl teaching in my school whom I think will make an excellent infant mistress, but who will be lost as an assistant mistress.

441. I understood you to say that the weak point in your schools is that the infant mistresses are unequal to the work?—I do not mean to imply that at all. What I said was that if such high salaries were to be paid them a high standard should be set up.

442. Then, do you think the salaries proposed to be paid to infant mistresses are unnecessarily high?—In the case of a thoroughly skilled infant mistress being appointed I do not think the salary would be unnecessarily high; but, at the same time, I think if infant mistresses are put into those positions in a haphazard manner the salaries would be too high.

443. Do you think if better salaries were offered a better class of infant mistresses would offer their services?—Yes; and they would take more trouble to qualify themselves.

444. Do you think they have the opportunities to qualify themselves now?—No.

445. I understood you to say that a female assistant in a large school, generally speaking, should be paid a salary more than is paid to an infant mistress?—Yes.

446. Do you not think that the breaking-in work an infant mistress has to do requires as much ability as some of the work of an assistant mistress?—No.

447. If you had two before you, an infant mistress and an assistant mistress, whom would you choose for the infant department?—I think the superiority of one person over another must be reckoned on ability to perform certain kind of work: one might be superior for standard work, but, on the other hand, the other might be superior for the work of the infant department.

448. You do believe there are real infant mistresses to be found in the Auckland Education District?—Yes, and very excellent ones.

449. You say you think that the Fourth Standard and upwards should be under the charge of male teachers?—Yes, except under exceptional circumstances. I recognise there are cases in which female teachers are able to take any standard.

450. You are also of opinion that female teachers are quite able to take charge of the lower standards?—Yes; I think they are better adapted for the lower standards.

451. Would you like to see a hard-and-fast rule applied in that respect?—Not altogether. If I had an exceptionally good female teacher who was able to do Standard IV. work well, I should like to be able to put her there; but, on the other hand, that would not prevent me from advocating that the third male assistant should be appointed in large schools, because the chances would be that the male teacher, in the matter of discipline and control, would be better able to manage Standard IV.

452. In the same manner, if you had a good male teacher whom you thought adapted to take charge of Standard III. you would not like to be compelled to put a female teacher in that standard?—No.

453. I understood you to say that you thought teachers should be retired at the age of sixty or sixty-five: do you know of any teachers in this district who have reached that age?—Yes, I know of some.

454. Have you known any who have broken down at sixty?—Yes.

455. From old age or illness?—From overwork.

456. If their work had been lightened I presume they would have been following their occupation still?—Yes, I daresay; but, of course, it depends a great deal on the man himself.

457. Would you prescribe a rigid term at which a man must leave his situation or position in life?—I do not think I would.

458. Do you consider it desirable that there should be a maximum size for schools?—No; it never occurred to me that there should be.

459. You do not see any disadvantage in allowing them to greatly increase?—No, I cannot see any disadvantage.

460. How many children in a school do you think a headmaster is capable of exercising effective supervision over?—I have seen supervision exercised over 1,000.

461. But do you think that supervision could be effective: do you think the headmaster, no matter how capable he may have been, could individualise those children and form an opinion as to the education being imparted to them from day to day?—He had an assistant under him—a highly paid lady assistant—whose business it was to take charge of the lower classes, and to exercise supervision in conjunction with him.

462. But could he possibly take an interest in the children of that school, and exercise an efficient supervision over them, so as to be able to individualise them, and bring himself into daily

contact with them one by one?—He could not individualise them below a certain standard, and I do not think it would be necessary that he should do so if he had a capable assistant.

463. Do you not think it is desirable that the headmaster should watch the individual progress of every child in his school?—Yes; down to a certain point I think so, but, further, I think it is unnecessary.

464. You are of opinion that the system of primary education does not become inefficient when a headmaster has to depend on his assistants, and is not able to devote attention to each of the children in his school?—I would not say that, and I do not advocate that the headmaster should not depend in these cases on an assistant; below Standard III. or Standard II. I think he would necessarily have, in such a very large school as we are considering, to leave much to a skilled lady assistant.

465. With regard to training pupil-teachers, I think the question has been put to you whether you approve of a headmaster receiving a reduced salary and escaping the work of training his pupil-teachers: do you think it reasonable that the headmaster should be paid a bonus for the training of his pupil-teachers?—Yes, I do, if he trains them.

466. I suppose you approve of a colonial scale?—Undoubtedly, we all do.

467. In your opinion, would it improve the positions of the teachers throughout the colony?—Yes.

468. Do you think the adoption of a colonial scale would lead to improved efficiency in the schools?—Indirectly it would; nothing can be worse for teachers than to undertake work to which they should give their whole mind when they are in constant doubt as to what their salaries may be three months hence.

469. In that respect do you think teachers would be safer under the Department of Education than under the Education Boards?—Yes, I do.

470. You think there would be less chance of fluctuation of the payment of salaries?—Yes.

471. You do not think the tendency would be a retrograde one?—I hope not; I do not see why it should.

472. If you do away with the capitation system, and bad times come upon the colony, is there not just as much likelihood of the Government reducing the amounts as the Boards?—Yes, I agree with that; but at the present time, if the prospects are as favourable as they appear to be in the colonies, I think we should take advantage of them.

A. TAYLOR, Headmaster of the Northcote School, examined.

Mr. Taylor: Speaking on behalf of the headmasters of schools with an average attendance up to 330, I find that the majority of them, with myself, approve of the first scale submitted by the Inspector-General, on account of the extra staffing it proposes to give them. I might point out that at the present time a school with an attendance of some 300 odd pupils is under great difficulties in so far as the matter of staffing is concerned, for the head-teacher, as a rule, has to conduct Standards V., VI., and VII., and consequently has very little time to exercise in supervision. I myself have recently taught Standards IV., V., and VI., each with an average attendance of 66 pupils, and I must say I consider that amount of work too great a strain on the teacher.

473. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] Do you prefer that the Government should have absolute power in fixing the teachers' salaries rather than the Education Boards?—Yes, I do.

474. You are of opinion that there would be less likelihood of the Government reducing teachers' salaries than the Education Boards?—Yes, I think there would be less likelihood of any sudden alteration.

475. Do you think, if the other sums for maintenance were fixed, that there would be less chance of the Boards fluctuating in the matter of salaries?—Yes, I do.

476. If the Government fixed the allowances for maintenance as well as the salaries, do you think that would be more satisfactory?—Yes, I do.

477. Regarding the question of promotion, how do you think that should be carried out?—I certainly think that the Boards and the Committees should have some voice in the matter of the promotion of teachers.

478. That is as it is at present; but it is unsatisfactory in some respects, is it not?—I cannot see any other possible solution.

479. Do you believe that salaries should be paid on the average attendance, the roll-number, or the two-thirds attendance?—On the two-thirds attendance.

480. Have you thought out any plan at all in connection with the question of a superannuation allowance for teachers?—No; I think it is rather a difficult question.

481. Do you approve of a superannuation allowance for teachers?—Yes.

482. Do you think it is impossible to carry such a scheme out?—I think it would be possible if a colonial scheme was in operation.

483. Do you not think that the teachers might have taken into consideration that question of a superannuation scheme, seeing that this Commission is taking evidence here on the advisability or otherwise of introducing a colonial scale of staff and salaries, and that they should have given the Commission some idea of their views on the question?—Yes, I think we might have done so.

484. *Mr. Davidson.*] What is the average attendance of your school?—From 240 to 250.

485. Yours is one of the schools of the group between 200 and 250 in average attendance?—Yes.

486. What has been your teaching experience?—I was second assistant for one year in a large school, and first assistant for six years, afterwards being appointed to my present position.

487. Did you serve an apprenticeship as a pupil-teacher?—No.

488. Were you ever in charge of a small school?—Yes, with an average attendance a little over 100.

489. You approve of a colonial scale of staff and salaries?—Yes.
490. Your chief reason is that a colonial scale would be liable to less fluctuation in the matter of paying salaries and the staffing of schools?—Yes.
491. When you said that in reply to a former question I suppose you meant that it would be less liable to fluctuation if it were fixed by statute?—Yes.
492. Do you know that the scale of salaries allowed in Victoria is fixed by Act of Parliament?—No, I do not.
493. Then, you do not know also that in Victoria during the last sixteen years there has not been more than one change in their scale?—No.
494. What is your staffing allowed in the school you have?—I may say that on Monday next a change takes place in my staffing, and I get the services of a male assistant.
495. Why?—For the reason that mine is a rapidly increasing school in average attendance, increasing sometimes by 20 in one quarter.
496. Your staffing does not change every quarter?—Sometimes, if there is an increase in average attendance exceeding 25.
497. Do you mean to say that your Board has a regulation allowing for an increase quarterly in the staffing?—Yes, if the average attendance warrants it.
498. Do you not require to maintain an average attendance for two consecutive quarters before your staff is either increased or decreased?—No.
499. How is your staff distributed?—The first assistant, the infant mistress, has charge of the infants and Standard I.
500. How many pupils in average attendance?—I think there are 130 on the roll.
501. Then, probably about 115 in average attendance?—Yes, no doubt.
502. Has the infant mistress a third-year pupil-teacher to assist her the whole time?—Yes.
503. What standards has your next assistant charge of?—Standards III. and IV.
504. What is the average attendance approximately?—About 70, I should say.
505. Your second assistant is a female teacher also?—Yes; she has the help of a first-year pupil-teacher.
506. What about Standard II.?—That standard is in charge of a fourth-year pupil-teacher.
507. What is the average attendance?—Something like 30.
508. You take charge of Standards V., VI., and VII.?—Yes.
509. Under the proposed scale what would be your gain so far as staffing is concerned?—We should gain an extra assistant according to the proposed scale No. 1, and lose a pupil-teacher.
510. You would prefer an assistant to a pupil-teacher, and consider it a distinct advantage over your present staffing?—Yes, certainly.
511. *Mr. Stewart.*] With reference to the question of security in the matter of salaries: supposing Parliament during the last two or three years had reduced the capitation grant from £3 15s. to £3 10s., what effect would it have on the salaries of teachers in this district, or in any other district?—It would, of course, mean a reduction in the salaries.
512. Then, the present system is liable to two sources of reduction—reduction in consequence of capitation, and possible reduction from new scales being introduced by Education Boards?—Yes.
513. If you had a statutory scale you feel that it would give you much more security?—Yes, I am quite sure of it.
514. Do you think that the American system of conveyance of children to a central school, if applied in your district, would work satisfactorily—that is to say, could you work your district with one central school?—I do not think the greater part of my district is any too wide.
515. There is the Chelsea, Birkenhead, and Northcote in your district?—Yes.
516. How far is Helyer's Creek from you?—Something like three miles.
517. How far is Chelsea?—I suppose, about two miles.
518. And Birkenhead?—About a mile and a quarter.
519. Then, if your school, Northcote, be taken as a fixed position for the district, the positions of the other places would be—Birkenhead about a mile and a quarter, Chelsea two miles, and Helyer's Creek three miles from you?—Yes.
520. Have you a school at Chelsea?—No; it was closed some time ago.
521. You do not think there would be any difficulty in working that district with one central school?—I think not.
522. Are the roads good?—Yes.
523. Then, it would be practicable to convey the children to one central school?—Yes.
524. *Mr. Luke.*] What is the reason of the attendance at the Northcote School increasing so rapidly: is it because it is a popular school, or because the population in the district is increasing?—The population is increasing.
525. It is not drawing from the ranks of other schools?—No.
526. You have no school at Birkenhead?—No.
527. Have you ever given any thought to the question of incidental expenses, or what is called the School Fund: do you experience any difficulty in finding money for the upkeep of the schools, &c.?—Not recently.
528. You do not have to resort to entertainments, concerts, or anything of that sort to augment the funds of the School Committees?—No, we do not. As the schools increase in attendance the extra capitation necessarily means an extra grant to the School Committees.
529. You instruct your pupil-teachers?—Yes.
530. Do they attend the Saturday classes held here?—Yes.
531. Do you think the Saturday classes, in the absence of a normal school or training-college, do good work in that direction?—Yes.

532. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] How long have you been in the employment of the Auckland Education Board?—Nearly fifteen years.

533. During that time how many new scales for the payment of teachers' salaries have been adopted?—I cannot say. We seem to have had a great number that have been promised, but they have never come to anything.

534. Was the general tendency, so far as you remember, to increase or diminish?—I never remember a tendency to increase.

535. Do you not consider that, once a colonial scale was adopted by Parliament for the payment of teachers' salaries, the £4 or £3 15s. capitation grant would entirely disappear, and Parliament would vote a lump sum for the payment of teachers' salaries, in the same manner as it votes a sum to pay the servants in any other branch of the Civil Service?—If it were so I think it would be a very good plan.

536. With regard to the matter of incidental expenses, do you consider that the Government or department should lay down what incidental allowances should be paid to Education Boards, exclusive of teachers' salaries, but just so-much per head capitation by way of meeting incidentals, and that the Boards should allocate it as they think fit?—Yes, I do, certainly.

537. What salary are you receiving at the present time?—£236.

538. What salary would you receive under the suggested scale—the No. 2 scale?—I believe, £260.

539. What staff is there in your school?—Two assistants and three pupil-teachers.

540. Five besides yourself?—Yes.

541. How many of them are females?—They are all females except one first-year pupil-teacher.

542. Do you find that female teachers do the work as efficiently as male teachers in schools other than large country schools, and large classes in the town schools?—Yes, I think so, with the exception of Standards IV., V., and VI.

543. Then, with those exceptions, would you favour an equality in the salary to male and female teachers for equal services rendered?—In the majority of cases I would not.

544. Why the distinction?—I think the physical strain involved in teaching Standards IV., V., and VI. is very great; but at the same time I see no reason why, if a female teacher is strong physically, and the headmaster prefers to put her in charge of Standard IV., V., or VI., she should not receive the same salary as a male assistant.

545. With regard to a sole teacher in a small country school with an average attendance of about 25, do you consider that if a female teacher can as efficiently teach such a school as a male teacher she should receive an equal salary?—Yes, in that case.

546. Then, you consider that both male and female teachers should be paid an equal salary up to a certain point?—Yes.

547. With regard to the payment of teachers on capitation, do you consider that their salaries should be based on the attendance for one preceding quarter or on four preceding quarters—a yearly average instead of a quarterly average?—That is a question on which there is a good deal of difference of opinion. In a district fairly settled the yearly average might be safely calculated, but in a progressive district, with a fluctuating population, there is a wonderful difference in the last and first quarter.

548. *Mr. Weston.*] Do you or the teachers generally read the annual report of the Minister of Education?—No, I think not.

549. In your opinion, what should be the minimum salary fixed under your Board?—£75.

550. For male and female teachers alike?—Yes, in small country schools.

551. You consider that would be sufficient?—Yes.

552. In regard to the head and infant mistresses, your experience has been chiefly confined to large schools?—Yes.

553. Do you consider that there should be any difference made in the positions of a head and an infant mistress?—Such a state of things never came under my notice.

554. What is your opinion on the subject?—There are assistant mistresses, in my opinion, who have very much more arduous work than infant mistresses, the physical strain on them being greater.

555. Do you think there should be any difference in their salaries?—I do not think so.

556. Have you thought anything about the question of sick-pay for teachers?—I have not thought very much about it, though I have often wondered what they would receive if away sick.

557. Do the teachers not discuss the question among themselves with a view to its ventilation?—Not very much.

558. What is the general feeling of teachers on the subject?—I think there is an opinion that some defined rule should be laid down and adhered to.

559. As a matter of fact, there is no rule?—No.

560. Have the teachers as a body considered the question of compassionate allowance to the representatives of a deceased teacher?—The teachers individually have spoken about it, and consider that some allowance should be made. As a body, I do not know whether the Institute has considered it.

561. Have you any side-schools here for infants, and, perhaps, for First and Second Standards?—No, we have none.

562. What is your opinion respecting the treatment of pupil-teachers and their instruction?—I think the staff of assistants should be increased. I have pupil-teachers in charge of classes where, I am of opinion, it would be better to have assistants.

563. Is that practice detrimental to the children in that school and to the pupil-teachers?—Yes, I think so.

564. Why do you think it is detrimental to the pupil-teachers?—I think they are at that particular age when the arduous work and the constant standing all day is too much for them; they might stand it better at the age of twenty-two or twenty-three, but not, as at present, from seventeen to eighteen.

565. Do you think it will prejudicially affect them in the acquisition of knowledge, theoretical and practical?—Yes; I think they get tired of it.

566. Have you ever known pupil-teachers in this district to break down?—I have known them to be ill, suffering from a kind of nervous prostration.

567. What is your opinion in regard to the difficulty in obtaining male pupil-teachers?—I think the difficulty is through the parents a good deal, who debar their sons in many cases from becoming pupil-teachers owing to insufficient inducement being held out.

568. Do you think the disposition of the boys in the matter of hard, grinding work has anything to do with it?—It may have something to do with it; I think the work does not present a very inviting aspect.

Miss E. SHREWSBURY, M.A., Lady Assistant at Wellesley Street School, examined.

Miss Shrewsbury: Speaking of the proposed colonial scale in a general way, I think it is the opinion of all the lady assistants—and I speak for myself also—that the introduction of it would be desirable. Our chief reason for wishing for the introduction of a colonial scale of salaries, first of all, is that in the Auckland Education District we are not at all satisfied with the present scale, nor have we ever yet been satisfied with any scale that the Board has seen fit to introduce. We think the adoption of a colonial scale will give us a feeling of security, and allay the present feeling of unrest that exists among us, and at the same time will enable us to do our work greater justice. We think, on the broad principles of justice and fairness, that the teachers all over the colony should be paid according to the same scale. As regards the proposed scale that we have seen, we think that the female assistants should start on some minimum or living wage, and that an increase of the salary should follow with additional service and increased ability, the latter being shown by Inspectors' marks and reports; particularly should the length of service count. For certain extra subjects, like drawing and singing, we are of opinion that a bonus should be given. Of course, under the regulations of our Board there is a paragraph stating that consideration should be given to teachers, in regard to salaries, who can teach these extra subjects I mentioned, but I have not heard of any teacher who has received that consideration. We are, very many of us, also of opinion that there should be a bonus on the higher certificates. With regard to that portion of the scale that deals with the payment of male and female assistants, I think the majority of us have come to the conclusion that the difference between the salaries of male and female teachers is inevitable; but at the same time we think all scales we have seen so far make too great a difference between the respective rates of pay. We consider that, at the very outside, the difference should not be more than 10 per cent. or 20 per cent. Then, with regard to the salaries paid to an infant teacher and a standard teacher, in this respect we also think there should not be so great a difference. A standard teacher has to display just as much ability, though we recognise, of course, that an infant teacher has to show special ability; I do not mean to say that the infant teacher should be paid less, but what I think is that the standard teacher should be brought up to the level of the infant teacher. Another thing I notice on looking through the scale is that it proposes to introduce alternative staffing, male and female, but we do not approve of that; certainly I have not had very great opportunities of getting information from many of the lady teachers, but those to whom I have spoken think it is not worked on a right basis. We think there should be double staffing—first male teacher, first female teacher; second male teacher, second female teacher; and so on. We consider this would have a good effect in the matter of paying salaries between male teachers and female teachers, as the difference need not then be so great. Looking at it also from the point of view of advantage to the school, it is likely to have a good effect if the children are trained to look upon female teachers as ranking the same as male teachers; for we consider it a bad thing for the first lady assistant to be looked upon by the children as below the first male assistant.

569. *Mr. Stewart.*] What certificate do you hold?—A1.

570. How long have you been teaching?—Sixteen years and a few months.

571. What class are you teaching at Wellesley Street School?—Standard VII.

572. What degree do you hold?—M.A. with first-class honours.

573. What salary do you receive at the present time?—£100.

574. Is that the highest salary you have ever received?—Yes; and I had to apply two or three times to get that.

575. What standard did you have last year?—Standard VI.

576. And the year before that?—Standard VI.

577. And before that again?—Standards VI. and VII.

578. Going back another year?—Standards V., VI., and VII.

579. What average number of pupils did you have in Standard VI. last year?—About 40; at times there were 60 or 70, but the average would be about 40.

580. What is the average number of pupils you have in Standard VII. at the present time?—30.

581. You take part in the instruction of pupil-teachers?—Yes, and have done so for years.

582. You take the pupil-teachers' class in mathematics on Saturday mornings?—Yes.

583. You get extra payment for that, of course?—Yes.

584. What did your extra payment amount to last year for taking the Saturday morning class in mathematics?—£30.

585. What has your payment amounted to this year, up to the end of the March quarter?—My engagement was dated from the 1st February, and for the first quarter of this year I have received only £5.

586. Did you know that you would have the month of January deducted?—No, I did not know that; if I had been aware of it at first I should not have been willing to accept the appointment. My engagement was dated, as I say, the 1st February, instead of, as I thought, the 1st January, and I lost through that a month's salary.

587. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] In comparing the suggested scale so far as the staffing is concerned, will it make any difference in your school?—I really do not know.

588. What is your average attendance?—Nearly 700 for this quarter.

589. Do you consider that when female teachers perform the same work as male teachers, and as efficiently, that they should receive the same salary, or as nearly as possible the same salary?—As a matter of justice, yes.

590. Have you had any experience in a country school?—No; the smallest school I have been in was from 300 to 400 in average attendance.

591. Do you consider that a female teacher in a large town school could as efficiently teach Standard IV., with an average of 65 or 70 pupils, as could a male?—I think it is a matter of temperament; some men could and some men could not; and in the same manner some women could and some could not. I have seen every bit as good work done in the Fourth and Fifth Standards by female teachers as was ever accomplished by male teachers.

592. You consider that the headmaster of a school should have freedom of organization in the school, as he thinks fit?—Yes, that has always been the case at the Wellesley Street School.

593. Have you compared the suggested scale of salaries with that which is paid in the Wellesley Street School?—Yes.

594. In regard to staffing, how does it compare, favourably or otherwise?—With that alternative scale, male and female, it affects the assistants in our school, male and female downwards, prejudicially.

595. With regard to the certificate you hold, is there any system of promotion adopted by the Auckland Board by which you could be promoted into one of the other town schools?—I do not know whether there is any system of promotion, I have found it impossible to get promotion in my own school.

596. When vacancies occur in your school do they call for applications?—No; two vacancies were occasioned some years ago, and no applications were called for them.

597. Does the Teachers' Institute not take up matters of that sort?—Yes; we asked the Institute to take the matter up.

598. Are there facilities given for exchange of teachers from one part of the education district to another?—I have not heard of any facilities.

599. *Mr. Hogben.*] You stated that in the Wellesley Street School there would be a lowering of salaries for some of the assistants, according to the proposed scale?—Yes.

600. Did you refer to the first proposed scale?—Yes; I have not seen any other. [Alternative scale handed to witness.] I may say I am being paid considerably above the Auckland scale.

601. According to the Auckland scale, what would the first assistant male teacher receive in a school of the size of Wellesley Street?—I think he is paid according to average attendance; I believe his salary is £190.

602. What salary would he receive under the proposed scale?—Under the first proposed scale £280, and under the second £245, I think.

603. What does the second assistant male get under the Auckland scale?—I do not know.

604. There is a third assistant under the Auckland scale, who presumably from the low salary must be a female: is that so?—Yes; in the Wellesley Street School we have first assistant lady, and second assistant lady also; the third assistant's salary would be £95.

605. What would the fourth assistant male get?—£100.

606. What would the fifth assistant get?—£85; that is my position if I were paid according to the scale.

607. What would the sixth assistant get?—£70.

608. And the seventh assistant?—£65.

609. The money saved on salaries by the less liberal staffing, according to the alternative scale, will raise the salaries of assistants here up to the highest level obtaining throughout the colony; do you think the lady teachers in Auckland would feel satisfied with that position?—Yes, I think so.

610. In regard to a bonus for certificates, which you said you thought should be granted, do you not think, in any proper system of appointments, that high certificates carry due weight when teachers are appointed to vacancies?—I do not doubt that, but I do not think they carry an increase of salary. When I spoke of a bonus for certificates I was thinking more of the letter than the figure.

611. You also spoke of a bonus being given for the tuition of extra subjects: would that not, again, if it were granted, tend to make teachers' salaries unequal?—I consider that the teacher, would be doing extra work, and as a consequence should receive extra remuneration. Take singing, for example.

612. Do you think it is harder to teach singing than a good many other subjects?—Well, it is harder to teach singing, for instance, than to give a transcription lesson.

613. Would it be harder than teaching composition?—No; easier.

614. Then, why give more to a teacher who teaches singing than one who teaches composition?—Singing is an outside subject, and such a teacher would need to spend more on herself in order to be able to undertake the tuition of singing.

615. If that training was provided by the Boards in Board schools, would there be any reason then for the granting of a bonus?—Yes, I think so, to a certain extent.

616. In the case of a teacher taking a class in arithmetic, is it fair to give a teacher of drawing a bonus over the teacher of arithmetic?—I look upon drawing and singing as extra subjects.

617. Have you thought out any system of bonuses for these extra subjects?—I think a teacher should receive so-much a year—£5 or £10 a year, say—as special extra payment for these extra subjects.

618. But you have not thought out a system of bonuses for extra subjects?—No.

619. *The Chairman.*] I understand your school is a mixed one?—Yes.

620. Are the boys and girls taught separately?—It depends on the size of the class.

621. Take the Seventh Standard, which is the highest Standard, I suppose, in your school; do you have both boys and girls?—Yes.

622. As far as education is concerned, I suppose you have charge of the most important work that is done in the school?—I should not altogether like to say that.

623. You have been raised by degrees—I mean, you have had charge of Standards III., IV., V., VI., and VII.?—Yes.

624. Which standard has the assistant above you charge of?—There are two lady assistants above me, four teachers altogether, but they are in charge of lower standards; three of them receive higher salaries. The two lady assistants have charge of Standards I. and V. respectively.

625. Do those teachers in charge of Standards IV. and V. receive considerably more salary than you do?—Not considerably more; the lady assistant just above me gets the same salary, and the lady assistant above her in turn gets £20 more. I think one of the male assistants gets more than double the salary paid me.

626. If you had the opportunity, do you think you could fill the position of the male assistant who you say is receiving a salary double what is paid you?—I should not at all mind trying, if the headmaster would allow me; I have done much of the work of a first assistant.

627. Did you ever have charge of Standard III.?—Yes; it was the first standard I took charge of.

628. Leaving out the question of salary altogether, and assuming you were offered the choice of taking charge of either Standard III. or Standard VII., which would you prefer?—I should look upon Standard III. as being in some respects the easier, but not so pleasant. I like teaching the elder children because the work is more interesting, though it is no uncommon thing for me to have to correct papers from 7 o'clock till 12 o'clock at night.

629. You think that the difference between male and female teachers in the matter of teaching is one of temperament?—Yes, I do.

MONDAY, 3RD JUNE, 1901.

W. R. C. WALKER, B.A., First Assistant of the Wellesley Street School, representing the First Assistants of Auckland, examined.

Mr. Walker: I appear on behalf of the first assistants of the Auckland Education District. I am first assistant of the Wellesley Street School. I hold the B.A. degree and B1 certificate. The comments that I should like to make before the Commission are in reference to the scale under which the first assistant masters of Auckland are paid. It will be seen that the first assistant in a school of from 600 to 700 in attendance receives a salary of £190; in a school of 500 to 600, £175; 400 to 500, £150; 300 to 400, £140; 200 to 300, £120, the latter being the school with lowest average attendance at which a first assistant male is introduced. This scale has been in force for about three years; but, even so, it has not been adhered to, at any rate, in one case that I could mention. When this scale came into operation the Board reduced a gentleman I know of £10, and at the same time a gentleman with a lower certificate in a school with a lower average attendance received an additional £10 above the scale. Before this scale came into operation things were in a very much more haphazard state than at present; we then had the anomaly of a first assistant, a man with a degree, getting a salary of £160 a year, while a man with a D certificate in a school with a lesser average attendance received £180. In referring again to this scale I should like to point out that under it the first assistant masters in the Auckland Education District are receiving salaries ranging from 10 per cent. to 25 per cent. lower than what obtains in the South, and we are unable to say why this should be so. We do the same work as assistant masters in the South; we hold, in some cases, higher certificates; and in order to eke out an existence it amounts to this: that in the Auckland District many of the first assistants, and not only first assistants, but other assistants, have to add to their salaries by coaching after hours, work which is detrimental to their health, and also to their duties as teachers. In some cases—in the case of my own school, for instance—the Board requires the same certificate from the first assistant as they require from the headmaster. The appointment I now hold was advertised, and applications were invited from teachers having D1, C2, or higher certificates, for the first-assistantship. For the headmastership of the same school, a few months previous, the Board advertised and invited applications from headmasters holding D1 or higher. I can quote another case: In the case of an appointment made recently to the Beresford Street School, for the first-assistantship the same certificate was required as in the case of the headmaster. Thus you will see that even the Board recognises that high qualifications are required from the first assistant. In some cases the first assistant has even a higher certificate than the headmaster, though, of course, the Board does not require that. In Auckland a first assistant has to be prepared at a moment's notice to take up the work of the headmaster during his temporary absence, and there are very few assistants in this district who have not at some time or other had to do this. I am now acting as temporary headmaster of the Wellesley Street School during the absence of Mr. Stewart on this Commission,

Then, again, the first assistant has to assist the headmaster in the tuition of pupil-teachers. The first assistant has also to take up and supervise the discipline of boys out of school. If there is anything in the shape of a cadet corps he is called upon to go to work in connection with it; he has also to assist in athletics, or, at any rate, he looks upon such things as his duty. With regard to drill, several of our assistant masters have commissions as officers in Volunteer companies, and now this craze for cadet corps is on, the assistant masters will have to qualify for the rank of sergeant. We feel, if the salaries were made higher for the assistant masters, the effect would be to induce successful country teachers to come into the town schools in order to take up these positions, and that they would be looked upon as permanencies, rather than as stepping-stones. At the present time these positions, as you can imagine, carrying such low salaries, are looked upon now simply as stepping-stones for something higher. Assistant masters at present are not satisfied with their positions, simply because they see they have no hope of getting better appointments elsewhere. If a better state of things came about, which would give them added security, they would be content with their positions, and do better work in them, knowing that they had something to look forward to. In conclusion, I might say that the first assistants, and, indeed, other assistants, here are strongly in favour of a colonial scale of staff and salaries.

630. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] Your present salary is £200, according to the report of the Education Department, is it not?—It is down to £190 at present.

631. The attendance at your school is over 700?—No, it is not over 700.

632. Are you aware that in the Union Street School, in Dunedin, with an average attendance of 200 pupils less, the first assistant master receives a salary of £240?—Yes, I noticed that.

633. The salaries in other schools range from 10 to 20 per cent. higher?—Yes.

634. If a colonial scale of salaries is established, and the capitation grant of £4 is not sufficient for a colonial basis of equal payment—that is, if it is not enough to work up to the highest standard—do you wish to see those teachers who are now paid reasonably high salaries pulled down in order to provide for those receiving lesser salaries?—No.

635. You say that distinctly?—Yes.

636. You want to see this scale approximating the highest standard of payments in New Zealand?—Yes.

637. You do not wish to see any of the salaries brought down?—No, I do not.

638. With regard to the staffing, would you prefer to teach a smaller number of pupils and receive a lower salary, or a larger number of pupils and a higher salary? Take 40, for instance?—I should prefer to teach 40 at the low salary that is paid rather than take a lesser number at a corresponding decreased salary.

639. If you had charge of 40 unaided, would you consider that the children received justice?—Yes; I should consider they would be efficiently taught.

640. *Mr. Davidson.*] What has been your teaching experience?—I have been teaching fifteen years. I had one year in the Auckland Training-college, and four years in country service. I was second assistant for about one year, and have been first assistant eight years.

641. You did not serve an apprenticeship as a pupil-teacher?—No.

642. You stated you have had experience as a country teacher?—Yes.

643. You notice that under the alternative scale assistance is granted a sole teacher when the average attendance reaches 40?—Yes.

644. In your opinion, what form should that first assistance take?—A first-rate third-year female pupil-teacher.

645. A headmaster would, I assume, have to instruct that pupil-teacher in the art of teaching, and prepare her for examinations?—Yes.

646. That would entail a considerable amount of work on the headmaster?—Yes.

647. Do you think it would not be better to adopt the suggested scale, and appoint an infant mistress, as she is called, to take charge of Standards I. or II. and the infants when the average attendance reaches 40?—Yes, if it could be arranged.

648. Do you think it better to appoint an assistant mistress in that grade of school rather than a pupil-teacher?—Yes.

649. Do you think a sole teacher can efficiently manage and teach up to an attendance of 40?—Yes.

650. *Mr. Stewart.*] You know the assistant masters of this district?—Yes.

651. Are they satisfied with the present state of affairs?—No.

652. They feel they have no security?—Yes, no security whatever.

653. You received your appointment at a given salary: what was the salary?—£200.

654. Were the terms of your appointment in writing?—Yes.

655. Those terms have not been kept?—No; about two years ago I was reduced to £190.

656. There was no stipulation as to that in the terms of your engagement?—No.

657. Have you any legal remedy on that point?—I understand I have, but I do not like to apply a legal remedy.

658. You want the Commission to understand that your position is so insecure that, though you had a written engagement, it was not adhered to, and the terms of it were broken?—Yes, in my case.

659. With regard to assistants generally, have you ever heard any one of them say he or she was not desirous of the adoption of a colonial scale?—Not one; they are all strongly in favour of it.

660. Did you ever hold any position that brought you into contact with a large number of country teachers?—Yes; I was for some time secretary of the Educational Institute here, and in that capacity met a great many teachers.

661. What is the membership of the Auckland Branch at the present time?—300 or over.

662. Have you any doubt as to the position taken up by the vast majority of teachers in this district?—No doubt whatever.

663. You have spoken about the anomalies of the appointments of assistants: do you think, if a fair average rate of pay was fixed by the Commission, that the assistants in Auckland would be prepared to accept the findings of the Commission?—Yes, I think so.

664. Are there many female teachers in the school in which at present you are employed?—Eight lady assistants.

665. You know other female assistants throughout the Auckland District?—Yes, a good many.

666. Have they expressed an opinion to the Institute as to the advisability or otherwise of the adoption of a colonial scale?—Yes; not only to the Institute, but to myself personally, they have expressed a desire for a colonial scale most emphatically.

667. *Mr. Luke.*] When you were appointed first assistant of the Wellesley Street School, was the average attendance over 700?—No; below 700. This scale, which is supposed at present to obtain at Auckland, would entitle the first assistant to a salary of £200, but the two quarters previous to my taking up the position the average attendance was below 700.

668. What amount of bonus did you get from the Government?—£7 10s. for the quarter ending March.

669. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Have you compared the staffing that obtains in Otago in schools of the size of the Wellesley Street School with the staffing in that school?—I have not compared it; I have simply looked at the salaries.

670. Do you not consider that the Auckland schools are overstaffed?—I do not consider that the Wellesley Street School is overstaffed, or the Nelson Street School.

671. I suppose you recognise the fact that when the staffing is so much more liberal the natural consequence is that the rate of pay cannot be as liberal?—Yes, distinctly. Of course, we have many small country schools, and that is why the town-school teachers are paid on such a low scale.

672. Do you consider a teacher unaided in a country school, with all standards, can efficiently teach up to 45 of an average attendance?—I think 45 too high; I should say 40.

673. You would not infer that the teaching in Southland is inefficient where a sole teacher teaches up to 45 with all standards?—No, I would not.

674. You think it stands to reason that where the assistance is not so liberal as in Auckland they can afford to pay higher salaries?—Yes.

675. In fact, I suppose, in regard to the Auckland scale, the teachers do not exactly know what scale they are being paid under?—The first assistants recognise they are being paid under a certain scale, but I do not think the lady assistants know exactly.

676. Is it not very often a matter of contract between the teachers and the Education Board as to what the Board will pay the teachers, and as to what they in return can get from the teachers?—The Board has to pay according to the scale.

677. *Mr. Hill.*] How many pupils have you in the standard class you now teach?—There are 56 on the roll; the average is 50 or 51.

678. Is that a higher average than you have been accustomed to teach?—No; previously I had charge of the Fifth Standard, and I started the year with 120 pupils, boys and girls; then I was assisted, now I am not.

679. Do you think a standard class like yours, with an average of 50 pupils, is easier to teach than a small school with an average attendance of 40 or 45 and all standards?—No, I do not.

680. You think your standard class is harder to teach, and that it requires more skill?—Yes, in the handling of children.

681. Supposing you, with your skill, were transferred to a small school of 45, such as I mentioned, do you think you could manage it?—Yes; I consider, more efficiently than my present standard.

682. You think 40 should be the maximum number for a sole teacher in a country school?—Yes, I think 40 quite high enough.

683. Do you think a female teacher could manage a school with an average attendance of 30?—Yes.

684. Do you think it would be advisable, in the interests of education, to put a female teacher in charge of such a school, or in charge of a school with an attendance below 30?—Yes; female teachers manage that class of schools very efficiently.

685. You think a well-trained male teacher could manage a school with an attendance between 40 and 45 successfully?—Yes.

686. If you were needing assistance, what form would you prefer it to take, a pupil-teacher or a junior assistant?—I should much prefer a junior assistant; but, failing that, a third-year pupil-teacher.

687. You mean by a third-year pupil-teacher one who has had some experience in school-work?—Yes.

688. You think that an early training in the case of those who are going to become teachers is desirable?—Yes, most decidedly.

689. Do you think they should be trained before taking up work in the schools?—If possible; but, of course, the best training is the practical training received in the school under the proper supervision of an efficient teacher.

690. Do you think it is desirable to take a young person from the Sixth Standard and put that young person to teach in a school without having had previous training?—No, it is not desirable.

691. You think that young persons should have proper training, or, rather, previous training in technical work under an efficient and skilled teacher?—Yes, it would be a decided advantage.

692. You think such a plan would be beneficial in the interests of education?—Yes, I am sure of it.

693. Will you suggest what you think a fair salary to pay to a first assistant in a school like yours?—£240 or £250.

694. Have you made any comparison as to the cost of living in the various towns?—I have had experience in the cost of living simply through travelling round.

695. I am told this is a specially cheap city to live in: is that so?—Not being a married man, I cannot say definitely.

696. You cannot express an opinion as to whether Auckland is a cheaper town to live in than, say, Napier or Nelson?—In the matter of house-rent I may say that Auckland is very much cheaper compared with Wellington.

697. Suppose there was a generalised scale adopted, I assume a master getting £250 here would be better off relatively than a master receiving the same salary—*i.e.*, £250—in Wellington?—Yes, to some extent.

698. Would you suggest that a differentiated scale should obtain?—No, I would not differentiate the scale; I think the cost of house-rent in Wellington is compensated by the cheapness of other necessaries of life; I understand groceries and household necessities are cheaper in Wellington than in Auckland.

699. Do you think a good plan would be that a first assistant master in a large town school should receive the same salary as the headmaster in a certain class of school—say, a third-, fourth-, or fifth-class school?—I think the principle is a good one; but I would not rate the assistant's status so low. In Auckland, for instance, we do not know our status compared with the headmasters of schools. First assistants cannot get their names submitted for positions in fairly good schools in the Auckland District. We do not know why, and we would like to know our status.

700. Assume all the schools were placed in ten classes, would you approve of the first assistants in the highest class of school being equal to the headmasters in the eighth-class of school—that is, next to the top but two?—Yes.

701. You are of opinion that the first assistant is as qualified to conduct a school as is the headmaster?—Yes.

702. Do you find from your experience that the assistant mistresses are well qualified to teach the upper standard classes?—No, I do not think so. For instance, infant mistresses, I think, would be lost as standard mistresses.

703. Would not that remark apply to assistant masters? Could an assistant master take any standard?—Yes; he would be well qualified.

704. Do you not think that adaptation takes place in a great many cases?—I do not think that contention holds so much in the case of men.

705. Is there no distinction in the training of the various standards?—I do not think so, not a great deal.

706. Supposing the headmaster of your school required you to take Standard II., would you object?—I would not object, of course, to what the headmaster thought fit, but I should consider my talent would be wasted. Of course, I consider I am equally qualified to teach Standard II. as Standard VI.

707. You are of opinion that the headmaster has the right to place you or any assistant in such a position as he may think fit?—Yes.

708. Supposing he had a specially qualified mistress, do you think he would be entitled to put her in charge of Standard VI. if he thought fit?—He would be entitled to do anything he pleased.

709. Supposing she performed the duties in as satisfactory manner as the assistant master, would you suggest she should receive less remuneration?—No.

710. You think she should receive the same remuneration as the assistant master?—I would hardly go so far as that. The question of supply and demand comes in. In the case of an assistant mistress and an assistant master the latter has a higher status in the school.

711. Assume that a female assistant does the same work as the assistant master, say, in connection with Standard IV., should she not receive the same salary?—As close to it as possible; there should not be a great difference.

712. *Mr. Weston.*] What are your complaints in respect to the present methods of payments?—My complaint is that we have no feeling of security.

713. Is that the only ground of complaint?—I do not see why we should be paid on a lower scale than other districts, notably in the South.

714. Would not that difficulty, in your opinion, be removed if the Board's allowance was increased?—No, I do not think so.

715. Why not?—Because our experience in the past does not justify me in saying so. We do not know how the Board will allocate the money.

716. You have no confidence whatever in the Boards of Education?—I have very little.

717. You think the Board exercises its power arbitrarily, and therefore you are all dissatisfied?—Thoroughly dissatisfied.

718. I understood you to say that you had no chance of promotion—that in connection with appointments for higher positions your name and other names were not sent up?—That is so.

719. Do you think a colonial scale of staff and salaries would improve your position in that respect?—I should conclude so; that it would embrace a colonial scale of promotion.

720. Then, you advocate a colonial scale of staff and salaries because you think a colonial scale of promotion would be inevitable?—Yes; I think one would be in correlation to the other.

721. If there was no scale of promotion, would you disapprove of a colonial scale of staff and salaries?—No.

722. Do you mean, if there is a scale of promotion, that if you filled a certain position, and there was a vacancy that had to be filled from that position, you would get the appointment irrespective of your qualifications?—No, I do not mean that.

723. Then, what would be the use of a scale of promotion; your particular status would count for little?—I would depend upon my qualifications; I suppose the scale would be based on qualifications.

724. Do you mean to say that with a scale of promotion the Boards of Education would be debarred from taking the special circumstances into consideration?—No.

725. You do not think that would very materially discount the value of your ideal system of promotion?—I do not think so.

726. You said you thought a colonial scale would naturally operate all over the colony?—I think it would.

727. Do not the circumstances of each provincial and educational district differ?—I do not think they differ to a very great extent.

728. Do they differ at all?—Yes.

729. In what respect?—I think in some of the poorest-paid districts the anomaly is that the cost of living is higher than in other districts.

730. You do not think, such being the case, that the Boards of Education should have latitude to increase or decrease salaries?—I do not think they would take the opportunity of using any latitude.

731. Do you speak from your own experience as it is confined to the Auckland Education District, or from experience obtained throughout the colonies?—My experience of the Auckland Education District.

732. What experience have you had in other districts?—I have had no teaching experience at all; the experience is from what I have read.

733. Do you not think, those circumstances should be taken into account?—I do not see how they can be; I think it would complicate matters.

734. Do you think that, if the circumstances of each district are to be lost sight of, a colonial scale would operate fair and equitably to all teachers of the colony: assume the circumstances to be different, because you have admitted to some extent they are?—I do not think the circumstances are so very different, and I think the colonial scale would be fairer, because the Boards of Education do not recognise the cost of living in different districts.

735. You speak of the conduct of the Board in Auckland, knowledge gained from your experience?—I am taking the cost of living in Auckland as compared with other districts, and I find the teachers in the districts where the cost of living is higher are worse paid than in districts where the cost of living is not so high.

736. With regard to female teachers in small schools, do you or do you not consider females are better adapted for teaching in our small schools than males?—No, I do not. I consider a female teacher can efficiently teach a small school, but I do not consider she is better adapted to do so than a male.

737. Do you not think that in the small country schools, where the children may be young and not so well favoured as children in the large centres, that a woman would not be able to sympathize with and impart instruction to the children better than a man?—She would do very well, but not better than a man.

738. I suppose a small country school with all standards is rather difficult to teach?—I have taught such a school myself, and found no difficulty.

739. I do not mean to say that it would be difficult to impart instruction to the children; but would not the numerous classes be difficult for a sole teacher to undertake?—No.

740. If a sole-teacher school in a country district be not difficult, then how many children could such a teacher in that class of school fairly take?—About an average of 40 for a male.

741. You think justice would be done?—Yes.

742. You would not go up to 45?—Yes, you might go up to 45; but I think it is a little too far; I think 40 better.

743. In your opinion, what should be the minimum salary paid to teachers under your Board?—£80 a year.

744. For male and female alike, or would you make a difference between them?—No, no difference; I think £80 a year quite little enough.

745. What sized school, in your opinion, should carry a salary of £80 a year?—Schools of an average attendance of 15 and under 20.

746. Do we understand you to say that £80 should be a sufficient salary for a school of an average attendance of 20?—No, I should not say 20; say an average of 15 or 16.

747. In regard to pupil-teacher teaching, do you think it is effective?—Under proper supervision a first-year pupil-teacher can take certain subjects, do correcting-work, and so on, but could not manage large classes.

748. What do you think a first-, second-, and third-year pupil-teacher should be limited to in the work of a town school?—Such a pupil-teacher should be under an assistant, and assist that class-teacher in the matter of corrections and giving dictation.

749. In the town schools would there be a guarantee that the pupil-teacher's marking and instruction would be corrected by the assistant teacher over that pupil-teacher?—Yes.

750. Is there absolutely complete supervision?—There is.

751. Do you think it is advantageous to the children and to the pupil-teacher alike that the present system of keeping a pupil-teacher at work during the day should be continued?—Under the present system in Auckland a first-year pupil-teacher teaches four hours a day; that is fair. But the Board has another regulation, which says that the head-teacher shall instruct the pupil-teacher after hours; that is very unfair indeed, both to the headmaster and the pupil-teacher.

752. Does that apply throughout the pupil-teacher's term?—Yes.
753. As a matter of fact, I presume that you are of the opinion that pupil-teacher teaching should be kept within narrow bounds?—Yes.
754. *Mr. Luke.*] You are in charge of the Wellesley Street School *pro tem.*?—Yes.
755. What extra assistance have you?—I have an assistant.
756. A relieving-teacher?—Yes, a relieving-teacher classified D2.
757. *Mr. Hogben.*] I understand that the two chief reasons you gave for supporting a colonial scale were the insecurity of the salaries and the inequality of the salaries paid in different districts at the present time?—Yes.
758. In examination by Mr. Weston you also mentioned the question of promotion of teachers?—Yes.
759. The insecurity, as I understand it, is the feeling of uncertainty as to what teachers' salaries will be for any given period in the future—what salary each individual teacher will be paid?—Yes.
760. The inequality connotes the fact that a teacher in one district doing the same work as a teacher in another district is paid a less salary?—Yes.
761. Are not those questions quite distinct from the question of promotion?—Yes.
762. If those questions were got rid of, you would be rid of two out of three of your objections?—Yes.
763. They would be got rid of without touching the question of promotion?—Yes.
764. It is not inevitable that a promotion scheme should be attached to a colonial scale?—No, it is not bound to follow.
765. With regard to the certificates, a certificate consists of two parts—the letter and the figure—does it not?—Yes.
766. The figure includes two elements?—Yes; length of service and efficiency.
767. Who gives the estimate of efficiency?—The Chief Inspector.
768. So that the certificate, if properly awarded, should include such an estimate of efficiency as the Boards would take into account?—Yes.
769. You are not aware that the Inspectors, in giving that estimate, exclude any of the qualifications that make an efficient teacher?—I think most of them look more at the results.
770. In your opinion, they should be allowed to take everything into account except moral influence and qualifications?—Yes.
771. You do not know of any way in which you could classify moral qualifications?—No.
772. All the qualifications it would be possible to classify you would expect to find in a certificate?—Yes.
773. *Mr. Weston.*] A man's aptitude for a particular position, whether he would be adapted to town or country life, would be taken into consideration by Boards when filling a particular vacancy?—Yes; I think those particular considerations should be taken into account.
774. *Mr. Hogben.*] That would be an argument in favour of local appointment of teachers, would it not?—Yes, provided those making the appointments could see the applicants. My opinion is that the Inspectors should have more to do with the appointment of teachers, as they meet the teachers and know what they are like.
775. The advice of the Inspectors would be valuable to the Boards?—Yes.
776. You say that the circumstances differ in different districts, and you stated that you thought that notwithstanding a colonial scale of payment was fairer than the existing scales?—Yes.
777. Are you aware that it is stated that in Westland the cost of living is somewhat higher than it is in Auckland or Canterbury?—Yes.
778. Some of those districts are the most prosperous?—Yes.
779. I presume there are out-of-the-way districts in the Auckland Provincial District where the cost of living is high?—Yes.
780. Have you compared the salaries paid on the West Coast and in these other out-of-the-way places with the salaries paid in Otago and Canterbury?—Yes.
781. Are the Boards able to pay higher salaries in Westland and these other out-of-the-way places than in Otago?—They do not do it.
782. Is not the cost of small schools very much greater per head than the cost of large schools?—Yes, very much; I know of one case where the cost is £6 or £7 per head.
783. Is the number of small schools in Auckland, compared with the number of small schools in other districts, large?—Yes.
784. Suppose the Auckland Board received an increased capitation grant, would they be able to pay as high salaries?—No, they would not be in a position to do it.
785. Then, merely an increased capitation grant would not enable the Boards to pay equal salaries all over the colony?—No.
786. Such reasons would lead you to be in favour of a colonial scale?—Yes.
787. You say you were appointed in writing by the Auckland Education Board at a salary of £200 a year?—Yes.
788. Was that not on the understanding that your salary would fall in accordance with the scale of the Board?—It did not say so.
789. Do you not enter the service of the Board subject to the Board's regulations?—Yes.
790. Is that scale not one of the Board's regulations?—No; it was not in force then; it was latent or lying dormant.
791. Have you any reason to suppose that the Board's scale was latent?—It was understood so.
792. By whom?—By all.

793. And the Board passed a resolution rescinding it?—No; but it was looked upon as a dead-letter by assistants.

794. *The Chairman.*] I suppose the reason you favour a colonial scale is because you wish to see the salaries on a uniform basis throughout the colony?—Yes.

795. Have you resided in other parts of the colony?—No, I have not.

796. You are aware that the cost of living is very different in one part of the colony from that in another?—Yes.

797. And that it sometimes varies in the same district?—Yes.

798. In such cases does the Board make any difference in the payment of salaries?—None whatever.

799. If the salaries were made uniform, do you think there would be any danger of the best class of teachers gravitating from places where the cost of living is high to places where the cost of living is comparatively low—where rents are low and where the necessaries of life are cheaper?—There might be a tendency that way, but I think it would be controlled by the department making appointments.

800. It is not proposed that the department should make the appointments: what do you mean by that statement?—I mean the Boards making the appointments.

801. You think it would be impossible, then, for the Boards to make appointments to rectify that difficulty, and you think the difficulty would still remain?—Yes.

802. I would like to ascertain from you definitely if you do not think, in all probability, if salaries were paid on a uniform basis throughout New Zealand, the best class of teachers would gravitate to the districts where they could live at the least expense?—Yes.

803. Do you not think the cost of living has a great deal to do with the determination of people as to where they shall reside?—No; I think the matter of climate affects them more than the question of cost of living.

804. Has the Board here altered its scale of salaries very frequently?—There was no assistant masters' scale until a few years ago.

805. I understood you to say that the Board does not pay sufficient attention to the recommendations of Inspectors?—It is a private opinion. I say that I consider Inspectors should have more to do in the matter of appointments of teachers.

806. Does not the Board consult the Inspectors when making appointments?—I have heard it does not.

807. It is only a matter of hearsay?—Yes.

808. Do you know what process is adopted by other Boards?—No.

809. You speak of the Board with which you are acquainted?—Yes.

810. With regard to the work of an assistant master in a large town school, a class master, and the work of a sole teacher in a moderate-sized county school, do you think there is a considerable difference?—I think the work of the assistant master in a town school is more arduous than the work of a master in a country school. I know the headmasters of moderate-sized country schools can get away punctually when the school closes, but assistant masters in town schools have very often to stop on until 5 o'clock correcting work, and at the same time very often have to take work home.

811. You have been in charge of a country school?—Yes, with an average attendance of about 30.

812. Did you teach all the standards?—Yes, up to and including the Sixth Standard.

813. Then, you have a good idea of the work to be performed by a sole male teacher in that class of school?—Yes.

814. If you had the choice of a country school with an average attendance of 30 children against the present position you are occupying, and the salary was the same in each case, which position would you prefer, after weighing everything in the balance, such as the social advantages, &c., to be gained in town?—For some reasons I should prefer my present position, and for other reasons I would prefer the country appointment.

815. I want your decided answer as to which appointment you would choose, all things being equal in the matter of salary?—I believe I would take the country school.

816. Is your salary much more now than you would be receiving in charge of such a country school?—Yes; I think the salary in a country school of that size would be about £160.

817. I presume, in that case, country teachers would prefer to become assistants in the town?—I presume so.

818. You think that, the duties of a teacher of a moderate-sized school being less arduous than the duties of a town assistant in a large school, he should not be entitled to the same salary?—I do not think the sole teacher of a school of an average attendance of 40 is entitled to the same salary as an assistant in a school with an average attendance of 600.

819. Then, what is likely to be the effect in the country if there is a difference in the salaries: do you think the country will get the same quality of teachers as the town? Is it not natural—is it not inevitable—that if town assistants receive larger salaries the best class of country teachers will flock to positions in the towns?—Yes.

820. In the interests of the country families, is it not desirable that the salaries of the country teachers should be raised to the level of those paid to assistants in town?—Yes; I would like to see my own raised too. I might point out that the country teachers get a house.

821. If you had a house would you still be of opinion, if you had the choice of the two positions I put to you, that the country position would be the best of the two?—I say the salary would be just as good.

822. The salary being as good, do you think that the country situation is preferable to that of the assistant in town?—Yes.

823. You are decided on that point?—Yes.

824. Do you think the appointment of teachers should be left in the hands of Boards, or should be vested in the central department?—The Board of Education, acting for the Inspectors—that is—taking the Inspectors' opinions—are better qualified to make the appointments.

825. You say that the impression is that the Boards do not take the Inspectors' opinions?—That is the opinion.

826. Under those circumstances, do you think the teachers would be more satisfied to be under the hands of the central department than under the administration of the Boards, with reference to promotion and appointments?—Yes, that is the opinion.

827. You think it is a wide prevailing opinion among teachers?—Yes.

HUGH CAMPBELL examined.

Mr. Campbell: I have been asked to come here this morning and express my views on the general question. It appears to me there are three points which are of principal importance: First, that there should be equal pay for equal work; secondly, that there should be certainty of emolument; and, thirdly, that there should be sufficiency of emolument. With regard to equality of payment, I think on that depends the satisfaction with which those in the employ of the Education Board discharge their duties. If some are being treated better than others it naturally tends to create a feeling of unrest and dissatisfaction. With regard to certainty of emolument, I mean that there should be a fixed scale for young men entering upon the pursuit of teaching as their calling in life; that they should have before them fairly defined ideas of what their prospects are. As to sufficiency of emolument, it should be sufficient not only to maintain them in the teaching profession, but to keep up that method of life and social standing which the pursuit of education involves. It appears to me that the pursuit of every profession largely depends upon the position which may be attained by the best young men entering the profession; and, in regard to the teaching profession, unless you offer suitable inducements to young men to enter upon, and not only enter upon but to continue in the profession, the teaching profession will be degraded below that high rank which it is entitled to hold. I myself hold very strongly that the teaching profession is one of the most noble of all professions. Of course, it is impossible that every teacher in the profession should have a high salary; but I take it there ought to be a certain proportion of positions in the profession to which ambitious men may attain. It is not necessary that there should be a very large proportion of them, because in every walk of life there is only a small proportion who attain to what are called the prizes of the profession. I think it is as important that the teaching profession should offer sufficient number of prizes as any other profession. I have not had time to go into the details of salaries.

828. *Mr. Mackenzie.]* You say "equal pay for equal work": do you mean that if a female teacher—and we had the case of Miss Shrewsbury before us—takes the Seventh Standard, and performs the work as well as a male teacher would, you would pay her the same salary as you would allot to a male teacher?—No, I do not think so, for this reason: that I assume a female teacher does not have the responsibility of teaching boys.

829. But I am speaking of a mixed school where boys and girls are taught?—Then, in that case, I say she should receive the same salary.

830. You would apply that right throughout the service?—Yes.

831. If given precisely the same work?—Yes.

832. Would you make no difference whatever in payment to a married male teacher?—I do not think so.

833. With regard to sufficiency of emolument, I suppose you have not gone into the details of it?—No.

834. You have not considered the number of small schools, and how they should be handled?—No, I cannot say I have.

835. Have you considered the question of a minimum wage?—No.

836. Or the question of a superannuation scheme for teachers?—I do not believe in superannuation at all; I think the salaries should be adequate enough to allow teachers to provide for their old age.

837. If the £4 capitation grant which is suggested as the basis be not sufficient to give sufficiency of emolument to all, are you of opinion that the Government should be approached for a higher grant?—Undoubtedly.

838. *Mr. Davidson.]* What has been your experience in the administration of the Education Act?—Very little further than this.

839. Did you ever hold a position on a School Committee, or as member of an Education Board?—No.

840. You dealt with three heads—the quality of pay, certainty of emolument, and sufficiency of emolument?—Yes.

841. I interpreted your meaning on the first head to be that, instead of there being thirteen different scales of payment throughout the colony, there should be one uniform scale, and that a man occupying a certain grade or position in Otago should be paid at the same rate as a teacher holding a similar position in Auckland, or any other district?—Yes; I used the word "teacher." Whether it be a female or a male, I do not care.

842. You approve of a uniform scale of payment for the teachers of the colony?—I do, certainly.

843. Do you think that if the uniform colonial scale were brought into force by Act of Parliament it would insure a greater certainty of emolument than the present method of having thirteen different scales for the thirteen educational districts of the colony?—I certainly think a colonial scale very much preferable to the present piecemeal mode of payment.

844. Is it your opinion that at the present time the best class of boys are not entering the profession?—Yes; and I may say that the best class of young men do not stay in the teaching profession; if they can get out of it they do.

845. Why?—They measure their strength as they grow older, and they ascertain they would do better in another profession other than the teaching profession.

846. In your opinion, the salaries at the present time are inadequate?—Yes; I think the highest salaries at the present time are inadequate.

847. You are also of opinion that the present inadequacy of payment is not only causing the best class of boys not to enter the profession, but also is causing dissatisfaction and unrest among those already in the profession?—I believe that to be the tendency, but I cannot answer positively.

848. *Mr. Luke.*] Have you any experience of the boys that have left the public schools in Auckland, and have passed through your office?—Yes, a good number of boys have passed through my hands.

849. Do you think, on the whole, they have received the foundation of a pretty good education in the public schools in Auckland?—Yes; the boys who have come into my office from the Grammar School have shown much more rapid advancement in the matter of their studies than the boys from the public schools; the Grammar School boys pass their examinations in a shorter time, I have noticed.

850. Would not some of the lads you speak of have been in the public schools first, and have won district scholarships, thus graduating from the public schools to the Grammar School?—I do not think so.

851. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Do you consider that the average age of the teachers in the Auckland District is increasing?—My acquaintance among the teachers is not extensive.

852. Would you favour a superannuation scheme or retiring-allowance among teachers who have grown old in the service?—No, for the reasons I stated before.

853. I think you will admit that the salaries being paid to the teachers at the present time precludes them making any provision for their old age?—Yes; I think it is impossible for them to make any provision unless they live in a manner which most of us would not like to live in.

854. *Mr. Hill.*] You are aware that the cost of living varies very materially in different districts?—I do not think it does.

855. You think a man in Nelson or Hokitika, for example, could live as cheaply as in Auckland?—Yes, I do, for I have lived in Nelson.

856. *Mr. Weston.*] You have simply given expression to what you consider to be the ethical side of the question?—Yes, entirely.

857. You are unable to give me any information in regard to the incidental expenses of schools here?—I cannot furnish that information.

858. You stated just now that boys from the State schools passed through your office, and that they were not altogether of equal attainment with the boys from the high schools?—Yes.

859. Do you think the introduction of what is called technical education, and a consequent removal from the present syllabus of some of the subjects, would intensify that difference?—I do not think it would. It would depend on the course of education in the schools. I think there are some subjects which are comparatively useless, and to which a great deal of time is given.

860. What subjects do you particularly allude to?—I think, seeing the papers shown to me by my young friends, that English grammar and geography are subjects to which a great deal of time is unnecessarily given. My opinion is that there is no English grammar at all; it is not a subject that can be taught systematically, like, for instance, the grammar of Greek or Latin.

861. If, on the other hand, the boys in the secondary schools are better qualified, would it not follow that the elimination of the subjects from the syllabus of the primary schools, and confining the education to reading, writing, and arithmetic, would intensify the evil that you referred to?—I think not. I think you want to teach the children habits of thinking rather than to "stuff" them with a great many facts which are practically of no use to them, and facts which can be acquired at any moment by turning up a dictionary or encyclopedia.

862. Then, in what consists the value of sending boys to the grammar schools instead of to the primary schools?—I think a boy should be well grounded in English literature and history; I am not in favour of foreign languages being studied in this colony at all. If a boy is well taught in mathematics, when he enters upon the work of life, no matter what profession he follows, he is far more likely to make progress than if "stuffed" with educational facts.

863. *The Chairman.*] You consider that teachers who occupy positions at the head of the profession are not sufficiently remunerated?—Yes.

864. You think it would help our system of primary education if the prizes of the profession were better than they are now?—Yes, I think so. I think the best way would be, if possible, to let the primary merge into the secondary, so that the teachers who are to commence in the primary schools will have an opportunity of taking positions in the secondary schools.

865. Do you consider it desirable, in order that our schools should be efficiently worked, that a maximum attendance should be fixed for the size of schools?—I think it is almost impossible for you to say how many children can be efficiently taught in one school, under one master, with the assistance of assistant masters.

866. You would be in favour of letting the city schools grow to any size circumstances may permit?—I have no opinion by which I can come to any conclusion.

867. With regard to the prizes of the profession, you said you did not think they should be so numerous?—Yes; they are not numerous in any walk of life.

868. Do you not think the prizes in the teaching profession at the present time are good?—I understand that the highest salary in the Auckland Education District is £350; I do not think that is a prize at all.

869. Do you consider that men should require huge salaries for teaching in primary schools?—I do not think that men with huge salaries are required for teaching infant-schools; but I am of the opinion that there should be positions to which a man can look forward to, and for which he can show his fitness to discharge the highest functions.

870. Then, if prizes were established, do you think that the holders should have a vested interest for life in those prizes?—No.

871. How would you remove them and make room for others?—I do not think it is a matter of difficulty; it is a matter of detail to which I have not devoted my attention.

872. Do you think it would help an ambitious and talented teacher to see other teachers enjoying salaries which he could not hope to secure?—No; but I do not think that is so.

873. Would you periodically change those high positions?—I certainly would not; I do not think it is good for the country that teachers should be changed too often.

874. You would not prescribe an age-limit at which teachers should retire from the service?—No; I think such a proposal is the greatest rubbish.

875. You do not think that teachers at the age of sixty or sixty-five are incapable of following their profession?—No, I do not; of course, some men may be—it depends on the individual.

876. For the same class of work you say you would not differentiate the salaries between married male teachers and single female teachers?—No; probably I would give preference to the married men.

877. Would you give preference to a bachelor over a female teacher?—I do not see reason for preference in a case of that sort.

878. With regard to young people that you have had acquaintance with, was it owing to their superior education that you found them better students and more successful in life?—Yes, I think so.

879. That would indicate that we might give superior education in our primary schools?—Yes; I think that in the primary schools education is not given as it should be, or is not as useful as it should be. As I indicated, I think some subjects should be dropped and others taken up.

880. You would prefer to see the children taught habits of study?—Yes; habits of thinking and reasoning.

881. Are you in favour of having our system of secondary education so grafted on to primary education that the children of the people, poor and wealthy alike, should have equal opportunities?—Yes; I do not mean to say that every boy and girl should have a high education, but that they should have equal chances.

W. M. McINTOSH, Headmaster of the Onehunga School, examined.

Mr. McIntosh: I am in favour of a colonial scale: (a) We will get equal pay for equal work; (b) our rate of pay will be more secure, and not subject to alteration, as at present. I do not approve altogether of the proposed colonial scale, or of the alternative scale. The full scale reduces the salaries of all headmasters in charge of schools having an average of over 300 pupils. As the school increases in size the reduction in salary is greater or more marked. As an example of this, a school with an average of 390 is worth, under the Auckland Board's original scale, £311. By the suggested scale it is worth £295, a reduction of £16. A school of 450 is worth £330; by the suggested scale it is worth £307, a reduction of £23. A school of 750 is worth £420; by the suggested scale £361, a reduction of £59. When the extra grant was given, which is now paid as a bonus, it was intended by the Government that it should be used for the reinstatement of those salaries reduced by the respective Boards, and to increase the salaries of underpaid teachers. Another objection is the fact that a school with an average of 200 is worth £252, whilst a school of 450 is worth only £307. This means that a master of the latter class of school is responsible for the education of 250 more children than that of the former, at an increased remuneration of £55 only. I object to the increased staff as set forth in the colonial scheme if it means that it entails a reduction in salaries. In the alternative scale of staff the staffing compares favourably with the present staffing of the Auckland schools. I give some examples. In a school with an average of 61 to 90 the staff is the same, one assistant; in a school of 90 to 120 the same, one assistant and one pupil-teacher; in a school of 150 the same, one assistant and two pupil-teachers. In a school of 156 to 200 there are two assistants and two pupil-teachers, which is the same as in the suggested scale. In a school of 201 to 240 there are two assistants and three pupil-teachers, whereas in the proposed scale there are three assistants and two pupil-teachers, the assistant being in place of a pupil-teacher, which is a gain. In a school of 241 to 285 there are three assistants and three pupil-teachers, the same as in the proposed scale. In a school of 286 to 325 there are three assistants and four pupil-teachers, whereas in the suggested scale there are four assistants and three pupil-teachers, being a gain for an assistant for a pupil-teacher. I have been in charge of four or five different grades of schools having averages from 30 to 460, and during that time have had no complaints from my staff as to their inability to cope with the work. With few exceptions, I do not approve of female teachers receiving the same salaries as males for the same work; but I consider 20 per cent. less than the salaries paid to males too great a reduction, for the following reasons: They have not the responsibilities of men. As a rule, they cannot control upper-standard boys in large classes. They cannot stand the strain and worry of teaching as well as a male. They do not, as a rule, make a life occupation of teaching. With regard to the teaching of pupil-teachers, teachers under the Auckland Board are required to train and instruct their pupil-teachers out of school-hours without remuneration. I consider the system of the training and the employment of pupil-teachers a bad one. In reference to the payment for average attendance, the present system of payment of salaries is obviously unfair. Instead of allowing all attendances on half-days when the attendance is less than half the roll-number not to count in the average attendance, it would be much more equitable to allow a deduction of two-thirds or three-fourths of

the roll-number. It would be better still to take the highest attendance on any one day during the quarter. In my school on only five days in four years has the attendance been less than half the roll-number. I consider most of our assistant teachers are underpaid, also a number of teachers of small schools. In my opinion, first male assistants should get a salary equal to three-fifths of the salary paid to the headmaster. Thus, in a school worth £300 a year the first assistant would get £180; the second male assistant would get a salary equal to two-thirds of the salary paid to the first assistant, £120. In conclusion, in no other service in the colony have the salaries of old servants in the higher positions been reduced to add to the salaries of those who have been but a short time employed. Mr. Justice Cooper, in his evidence before the Commission, said that the teaching profession was the most important and responsible in the State, and that it should be upheld by getting the best teachers and paying them salaries that would encourage the most suitable young people to enter the profession. I certainly think the social status of teachers should be upheld by paying them salaries in keeping with the position. It would never do to go back to the days of Goldsmith's village schoolmaster. With reference to pensions to teachers, I consider there should be a pension scheme—2½ per cent., 5 per cent., and 7 per cent. off salaries. I believe our Board has some form of retiring-allowance for teachers; but there is one provision in this retiring-allowance which, in my opinion, spoils it, and that is that before a teacher could claim the allowance he would have to prove to the Board that he was practically without means of living. This encourages teachers to be thriftless. I might just show a comparison of the salaries of headmasters and first assistants. A headmaster in Auckland with an average of 450 receives £308; in Otago with an average of 424 he receives £364 11s. 3d.; in Port Chalmers with an average of 451 the headmaster receives £305; in North Canterbury with an average of 402 he receives £330; and in Hawke's Bay with an average of 482 £347 17s. A first assistant with an average of 450, in Auckland receives £150, in Otago £242, in Port Chalmers £220, in North Canterbury £165, and in Hawke's Bay £235 1s. House-rent should be added to the salaries. Teachers could then pay rent for the houses of the Board, or for others if the Board had not built one in the district. Teachers could then get houses to suit them. With reference to teachers' certificates, there should be a first grade and a second grade. I do not approve of bonuses on certificates. Committees choose D1 men. I have been asked by a country teacher to say that when he was in charge of two half-time schools he was allowed £20 a year extra for teaching on Saturdays; but when his salary reached £150 the £20 was not allowed. He also wished me to say that he paid house-rent for seven years and a half on a salary of £150.

882. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] I understand you wish to see our better class of salaries maintained throughout the colony?—Yes.

883. *Mr. Davidson.*] What has been your teaching experience?—I have been teaching for twenty years. I taught in a country school with an average attendance of about 35, and I taught a school at Epsom with an average attendance of 75, and which afterwards increased to 200.

884. You have noticed the proposed alternative scale?—Yes.

885. With regard to the staffing, do you approve of the first assistance to a sole teacher in a school of an attendance of 40 taking the form of a mistress?—I do not think it is necessary. I think such staffing is too liberal for a school of from 40 to 45 in attendance.

886. What staffing, then, would you suggest?—An ex-pupil-teacher with a certificate, or a junior assistant; if the scale would not allow that, a second- or third-year pupil-teacher.

887. You would prefer the term "junior assistant"?—Yes.

888. What salary would you suggest she would receive?—Well, at the present time I have a pupil-teacher whom I am about to lose. She is going into the country shortly, and I asked her what she would consider a fair salary to receive, and after consideration she said £60 a year.

889. Do you think a woman who has spent perhaps five years or more in hard study, and in preparing herself for the duties of a teacher, who has completed her course and obtained her certificate, and who goes into the country, probably away from home, having to provide herself with board and lodgings, and to keep up the appearance her position demands, is adequately paid by a salary of £60 a year?—Well, I should say £60 or £70 a year; I am not particular to £10.

890. In your opinion, the suggested salary of £90 is too high?—Yes; I think £70, at the outside, is sufficient.

891. What is the highest average attendance you think a sole teacher can efficiently manage in a school with all standards?—I should say the average competent male teacher could manage 45, though it would mean night-work as well.

892. Forty-five would be the limit?—Yes.

893. Do you not think that is somewhat too high?—No. Speaking from my own experience, the last country school I had I taught up to the Sixth Standard with three primer classes, and the average attendance was 36.

894. What is the average attendance in your school at present?—About 470; for the last quarter, 460.

895. Your school is of that grade between 400 and 500?—Yes.

896. What is your salary?—£308. Of course, I had a bonus, which brought it up to £327.

897. I understood your salary was £330?—That was under the scale of 1896; at the present time my salary is £308.

898. What is the salary of your first assistant male teacher?—£150.

899. What is the salary of your infant mistress, or the lady assistant in charge of the infant department?—£95.

900. What is the salary of your second male assistant?—I have no second male assistant.

901. Are you satisfied with the staffing of your school?—Yes, except in regard to pupil-teachers.

902. Have you compared the salary you are at present receiving with the salaries paid to headmasters of schools of a similar size in Otago?—Yes.

903. In a school of from 450 to 500 in Otago what is the salary paid to the headmaster?—£305.

904. What would the first male assistant in such a school in Otago receive?—At the Port Chalmers School I think the first male assistant receives £220.

905. An increase of £70 over what is paid to your first assistant?—Yes.

906. Did you also notice that the infant mistress in such a school in Otago would receive a salary of £140?—No, I have not noticed that.

907. If a colonial scale would materially raise the salaries of assistants, both male and female, throughout the Auckland Education District, and at the same time only slightly reduce the salaries paid to headmasters, would you be in favour of its adoption?—I do not think it necessary to reduce any of the salaries of headmasters, and it seems to me to be going upon the principle of robbing Peter to pay Paul. Our Board reduced our salaries in order to increase the salaries of country teachers, and I maintain it should not have done that.

908. If the salaries of assistants and headmasters in Auckland were raised to the level obtaining in Otago, would you approve of that?—Yes, if it could be done with the increase of capitation of 5s. per head.

909. Do you think these changes would be less frequent under a colonial scale, seeing that you have had so many changes in the matter of different scales?—Certainly I do.

910. You would not object, though, if a slight reduction in the headmasters' salaries was compensated by the stability of the assistants' salaries?—I think all the salaries should be increased *pro rata*.

911. *Mr. Luke.*] You have studied the alternative scale?—Yes.

912. If the assistants' salaries in the Auckland Education District were raised to the highest level obtaining throughout the colony, you are of opinion that it would be a decided advantage?—Yes.

913. You think the assistants in the Onehunga School are not paid adequately?—I think they are wretchedly paid.

914. Have you a residence attached to the school?—Yes, I have a house and 2 acres of land; the house is only a six-roomed house with a scullery.

915. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] How many assistants have you in your school?—Five.

916. How many of them are females?—Four.

917. How many pupil-teachers have you?—Five.

918. How many of them are females?—Four.

919. How do you account for the fact that the large preponderance of the teachers in the town schools in Auckland are females: is preference given to them by the Boards?—I do not think so. It is the question of cheapness. I do not think there is sufficient inducement for males to take up the teaching profession.

920. Do you consider that 10 per cent. is a sufficient difference in the salaries paid to male and female teachers?—Yes, I think 10 or 15 per cent.; 20 per cent., I think, is too high.

921. Do you consider that if female teachers were remunerated in the same manner as male teachers it would tend to a lesser number of female teachers being appointed?—I cannot say; in some instances there are female teachers far better than male teachers, but I think male teachers can stand the strain of teaching better than female teachers, as a rule. In this instance I might mention that I have two lady teachers in my school whom I would not change for any male teachers I know of.

922. Do you consider a female assistant can teach up to and including the Fourth Standard as efficiently as can a male teacher?—I think a number can, but the majority cannot. It is not want of ability on their part, but I think they cannot maintain the discipline.

923. *Mr. Hill.*] You instruct the pupil-teachers?—Yes.

924. Do you make any arrangement with the teachers of your staff to give you help?—Yes; the Board allows us to delegate some of the work to the assistants, and in that manner we divide the labour.

925. All the assistants?—Yes.

926. Do you make the assistants also responsible for their technical training, as well as their ordinary mental training?—No.

927. You place a pupil-teacher under an assistant teacher?—Yes, in the ordinary work of the school.

928. Has the assistant the right to require that pupil-teacher to prepare notes of lessons before an object-lesson is given in the school?—Yes.

929. You require and you supervise the notes kept to show that the work has been duly carried out?—Yes; and we have a rule that pupil-teachers have to give lessons on school method once a fortnight before me.

930. Are you the only teacher present, or are all the teachers on the staff present?—Only the class-teacher and myself.

931. Regarding house allowance: supposing you have a house in connection with your school, and you find it too small, would not your Board, on application, allow you to let that house and rent another?—There is no provision that I am aware of to that effect.

932. In the matter of certificates, you think a B1 and an A1 should be done away with?—I do not think they are necessary.

933. Do you think it would be advisable to adopt a certificate, and to recognise two grades only—first and second?—Yes; but I have not gone very carefully into the matter.

934. You think those high certificates are not necessary in the case of the ordinary primary school?—I do not think they are.

935. You think a man with D1 classification equal to the work in any of the primary schools of the colony?—Yes.

936. How do you judge your teachers—by their literary classification or by their skill?—By their skill.

937. In the matter of salaries paid to male and female teachers, would you suggest that your female teachers should receive the same salary as your assistant masters receive, provided they do exactly the same work?—From a sentimental point of view, yes.

938. If the proposed colonial scale were operative it would benefit your assistants?—Yes.

939. Would it benefit you in regard to staffing?—Yes; we would receive an extra male assistant.

940. In so far as your salary is concerned, the proposed scale would not benefit you if adopted?—No; it would reduce me £23.

941. You would not mind making that sacrifice for the benefit of your school?—Certainly not.

G. SQUIRRELL, Chairman of the Auckland City Schools Committee, examined.

Mr. Squirrel: I desire to give a few particulars in connection with the five city schools. Those particulars I have in tabulated form, and I will hand them in. [Exhibit 66.] My opinion as a layman on this question may not be worth much, but it is this: that I have advocated a colonial scale ever since I had any intimacy with educational matters in Auckland. The knowledge that teachers of the same status are receiving better salaries in other parts of the colony, while the money to pay both is coming from the same source, cannot be very gratifying to a conscientious man. Nothing, to my mind, can so unsettle a person as the knowledge that his income is liable to fluctuation through no fault of his own, and is dependent on the finances of the Board which employs him, or the whim of some members of that Board, who, through motives of economy or other reasons, may propose a reduced scale. Let the salary be adequate to the services rendered, for I believe the profession of a teacher is the noblest work man or woman can be engaged in; and let them feel that, so long as they perform their duties to the satisfaction of their numerous masters, their income is fixed according to a scale that will not be altered unless colonial finances suffer such reverses that they, in common with all, will suffer. We have, as a Committee, had to lose some teachers, who have been lured by the higher rates paid elsewhere, and that others are waiting similar opportunity is no secret. The only objection I can see in the proposed scale is the proposed reduction of the higher salaries now paid. I do not consider that a qualified and successful head-teacher who is called upon to organize and conduct a school of 700 pupils is overpaid at the present rate. We have four head-teachers under our Committee who would be affected by the proposed scale, and I can assure you that they earn their salary, and that we should deplore any reduction being made to them. To do so is simply taking away the "plums" of the profession that younger men look forward to and strive to obtain, not only in this but in other walks of life, and to take them away will probably debar good men from entering the ranks in the future. The average number of pupils per class-teacher in our five schools is 69, and per teacher 47, and we express our gratification at the proposed change in the scale of staff, and confidently hope it will be carried into effect, thus enabling teachers to give that individual attention to their pupils that they at present find to be impossible. We are decidedly of opinion that too great a percentage of females are employed in the service. The reason given is that the existing scale of salaries does not hold out sufficient inducements for young men to remain in it. Figures disclose a great preponderance of females over male teachers employed in the Auckland District. Out of a total number of 789 teachers, 325 are males and 464 females; and if we deduct those of both sexes who are head or sole teachers the figures are still more disproportionate, being 83 males and 353 females. Our experience is that, with the present scale of staff, female teachers frequently break down through overwork. If the question of the overloaded syllabus can be mentioned, I would say that we have repeatedly during the past few years endeavoured to have it reduced. Our Inspectors and teachers are with us in the opinion that we are attempting to teach far too much, and that, given a less number of subjects, better results would be obtained. The deletion from the syllabus of history, the higher branches of arithmetic, and geography would, we contend, make it more suitable to the needs of primary schools.

942. *Mr. Mackenzie*.] I gather from what you say that you do not wish to see the salaries in any part of New Zealand reduced?—No.

943. If the vote of £4 capitation is not sufficient to bring all the salaries in New Zealand up to the level of some of the highest that are now obtained, would you be in favour of reducing any of the higher ones, so as to bring all to some general average?—No; I think the vote should be increased if £4 is not sufficient to equalise all without reducing any.

944. Do you think the present system of appointment of teachers is satisfactory?—No; the Board and Committee very often clash in the appointment of a teacher, and sometimes feeling is displayed on the part of the Committee, who do not think the Board has sent in the names of all those eligible.

945. Does the Board exclude the names of eligible men who wish to apply, and sometimes send names of men not so qualified?—I do not think they send the names of ineligible men, but I know that men who have wished their names sent on have not had them so sent on.

946. Eligible men?—Yes.

947. Have you any suggestions to make regarding a system of promotion that you think possible?—No; only a general rule that if an assistant master in a school proves worthy of promotion, and a vacancy occurs in that school, that that school and its Committee should have the benefit of his services, and that he should be promoted and his services retained.

948. Do you not think that the total want of prospect of promotion has as much to do with the dissatisfaction of teachers as inadequate salary?—Decidedly.

949. It is your opinion, then, that the question of promotion should be taken up as earnestly as the question of staffing and salary?—Yes.

950. *Mr. Davidson.*] How long have you been connected with the School Committee in Auckland?—Five years.

951. Is there but one Committee for the whole of the city?—The city district embraces five schools.

952. Do you know any other city in the colony where the same system prevails?—I presume that the large centres will all be in a similar position.

953. Do you know that Dunedin, for instance, has a School Committee for each city school?—No.

954. Do you think it would be an advantage to the city, and education in the city, if that were the case in Auckland?—I do not think so.

955. You think the system obtaining here has its advantages?—Yes.

956. In electing members for the Education Board your city School Committee have only the same voting-power as the Committee of a single school in a remote part of the district?—Yes; that is a grievance we have. We have asked for an amendment of the Act for the past three years.

957. If the five schools had nine members each instead of nine for the five, as at present, you would have forty-five votes for Education Boards elections instead of nine: would not that be an advantage to the city?—In that respect it would be.

958. Can you account for the great preponderance of female assistants over males in the Auckland District?—I think, in the first place, that more females offer their services for the profession than males; and, in the second place, I think that the Board, being hampered in their finance, have naturally had to adopt the cheaper labour.

959. You think the Board gives preference to female labour on account of its cheapness?—They are compelled to do so, I think.

960. Do you not think that the headmaster of a school of 400 in a suburban district who has proved himself competent, efficient, and successful has a greater right to be promoted to the headmastership of a large city school than the man who has not yet proved himself capable in charge of a suburban school: would not the better way be to promote the assistant to the charge of the suburban school, and promote the headmaster of the suburban school to the headmastership of the city school when a vacancy occurs?—That is the system that prevails at the present time in the Auckland District, I understand.

961. You do not mean to say that that is the invariable form of promotion?—Not invariable.

962. Do you not think it would be more just that the master of a medium-sized school should step up into the position of headmaster of a first-class school, and the first assistant of the large school should step into the headmastership of the medium-sized school?—That would be the fairer form of promotion.

963. *Mr. Stewart.*] Do you think that teachers of the Auckland District are satisfied with the way things are going?—No.

964. Are the teachers dissatisfied?—Yes.

965. Have they had any reasons during the last few years to dread alterations from time to time in their salaries?—Yes.

966. How has that arisen?—By schemes being proposed by members of the Board for alterations in the scale of salaries.

967. I believe a very large saving is made every year on the city schools?—Yes.

968. Do you think that a larger saving is actually made than ought to be in the administration of city schools?—I am of opinion that a higher scale of salaries should be paid to the assistants, and if that were brought into force more money would be absorbed.

969. Are you satisfied with the maintenance allowance?—Yes, we find it ample for our wants.

970. *Mr. Gūlfedder.*] How long has this system of having one Committee for the Auckland schools been in vogue?—A long time.

971. What is the practice usually followed in this district with regard to making appointments?—The Board make a selection first, the number varying, and they send them on to the Committee to deal with.

972. What is the usual number sent on?—They send us a fair proportion of the names.

973. You have an opportunity of selecting?—Yes.

974. With regard to the transfer of teachers, do the Board adopt the system of transferring teachers from one part of the educational district to another?—Yes.

975. Do you experience any difficulty in obtaining duly trained teachers, seeing that the Normal School is closed?—Yes.

976. Would you favour the re-establishment of the Training-college by the Board, providing that the whole expense and cost of the College be borne by the department?—Decidedly.

977. Is the difficulty in obtaining the services of male pupil-teachers due to the inadequacy of payment?—That is the general opinion of the teaching staff.

978. What becomes of the pupil-teachers when they have finished their pupil-teacher course: are they simply sent about their business if there is no appointment for them?—I think the Board terminate their services if they have no further use for them.

979. Have you residences for teachers in town schools?—No.

980. Do you give them house allowance?—No; it is supposed to be embraced in the salary.

981. *Mr. Hill.*] You think that teachers should be promoted in the same school?—I qualify that by saying that promotion of assistants should take place in a school. I would not say that a first assistant should be promoted to be headmaster over the heads of more eligible men from outside.

982. Do you think that teachers with certificates from the central department, and living in other districts, should have a chance of applying for vacancies in the Auckland District?—Yes. I should like to see teachers here from all parts of the colony.

983. You think that your schools at the present time are understaffed?—Decidedly.

984. Then, of course, your teachers are overworked?—Yes.

985. Who work hardest, from your experience—men or women—if you take into consideration the money they receive?—The women, most decidedly, being physically weaker than men to stand the strain.

986. Does it often come under your notice as Chairman to approve of leave of absence to women in your schools?—Yes.

987. Is the proportion greater than in the case of men?—Yes.

988. What is your opinion as to the giving of salaries to women and men who are called upon to do the same kind of work?—I think, up to a certain point the salaries should be equal. An infant mistress, whom I consider one of the most important teachers in the school, should receive a high remuneration; but for the bulk of female teachers, who leave the service after gaining experience, I think a lower salary would be adequate.

989. A lower salary because they get married?—Because of their liability to leave the service.

990. Do you think that should hinder them from getting the same amount of salary as a man if they are called upon to do the same actual work?—I do not think I would equalise the salaries all through.

991. Is it not a fact that if a teacher has been properly trained he should be able to teach all kinds of children, so far as the primary school is concerned?—Yes.

992. Then, do you think that a teacher who teaches little ones, and is able to teach older pupils, should get a higher salary than one who teaches older pupils and is able to teach infants—you think a teacher should be paid commensurate with the work she is called upon to do?—Yes.

993. And that females and males called upon to do the same work should be paid the same salary?—No; the responsibilities of men and women are not the same.

994. Supposing we have an appointment which can be filled equally well by a man or a woman, and the woman will do the work for two-thirds of the salary a man would get, which would you appoint?—I would appoint the man.

995. Has that been the rule followed here?—The Board has not the supply of male assistants to give us. The cheaper labour is employed necessarily.

996. *Mr. Weston.*] You are not satisfied with educational matters in this district?—No.

997. You are dissatisfied with the administration of the Board?—Yes; but we believe that the Board is not able to do better.

998. Why cannot they do better—want of ability?—No, want of means.

999. Do they dole out the money, in your opinion, justly and equitably to the teaching class?—I believe they do.

1000. All the salaries are fixed, then, upon an equitable basis?—No, not on an equitable basis.

1001. If not fixed upon an equitable basis, how can they be doing justice?—They are fixed on a scale according to the funds available.

1002. Given a certain income, are they doling that out equitably to all the teachers of this district?—Yes.

1003. So that the teachers have no grounds for complaint against the Board?—No.

1004. And if Mr. Justice Cooper was severe on the management of the Board, he was unjust and unfair to the Board?—I do not remember what Mr. Justice Cooper said.

1005. *Mr. Hogben.*] You spoke of the reductions in salaries of headmasters: did you mean that the proposed colonial scale would reduce the salaries of any of your headmasters?—I understand so.

1006. Would you tell the Commission to which school that applies?—I understand that our four large schools would suffer a reduction.

1007. Take the Wellesley Street School, 757 children: what would be the salary payable under the proposed scale for that school?—£372; my reading of this has been wrong.

1008. Wellesley Street suffers a loss of £8; Napier Street, £15; Beresford Street, £11; and Nelson Street, £6 8s., by the proposed scale; but that is supposing that there is no house allowance, and it is only by bringing in the question of no house allowance that the headmasters of these schools suffer. If house allowance were added to this colonial scale they would gain considerably?—Yes.

1009. Did you notice the remarks in the memorandum accompanying the suggested scale regarding house allowance?—Yes; but as there was no house allowance to teachers in our schools we did not take much interest in that phase of the question.

1010. If the Commission were to recommend that the question of house-allowance be part of the scheme, and that a house-allowance be granted where there is no house connected with a school, that would solve the difficulty so far as Auckland is concerned?—Yes.

1011. What is your opinion regarding the expediency of house allowance?—I think it is wrong in the town and suburbs. I think it should only obtain in the country districts, where accommodation is likely to be scarce.

1012. You are aware that in different parts of the colony a good many of the town schools are already provided with residences?—Yes.

1013. Would it not make the salaries still unequal if you gave no house allowance in one case and in another case gave the same salary and a house?—The salaries would be unequal.

1014. Do you see any other way out of it than by giving a house allowance where there is no house?—Either that or abolish the house allowance to town schools.

1015. But there are houses?—Get rid of them, then, or charge rent.

1016. In that case you would have to add something to the salaries to make up for the loss of the house to the teachers?—Yes, I suppose so. I think the salary should be a matter quite apart from the question of the house accommodation.

1017. You would not advocate that a teacher in one place should get a salary and a house, and in another place a teacher get a salary without a house?—Not at all.

1018. *The Chairman.*] Do you think that the children in the Auckland schools are receiving a fair primary education?—Yes and no. They are receiving a fair education, but too much is attempted.

1019. Could you point out the subjects which exhibit a marked weakness?—I have often noticed the Inspectors in their report saying that the common subjects—reading, writing, and dictation—are weak; and our opinion is that if the higher branches of arithmetic and geography were abolished, and history altogether taken away from the syllabus, more time would be devoted to the instruction in the weak subjects.

1020. Do you think that weakness is due in any way to the staff?—No.

1021. Do you think the teaching staff is competent for the work they are asked to do?—On the whole they are.

1022. You said that female teachers are liable to break down physically: is that due to the selection that is made originally of individuals to follow this profession?—No; it is pure over-work.

1023. It is a want of mental stamina, then, that renders this employment not very suitable for ladies?—Not want of it, but too great a demand upon it.

1024. You say there is too great a preponderance of lady teachers: what would you do? Would you undertake the task of sending female teachers about their business, and putting males in their stead?—Yes, in a great many cases.

1025. Would you provide them with any other employment?—I do not know that that employment is required or is necessary for a great many of them. We prefer a preponderance of males to females among teachers.

1026. Are your male assistants equal to the work, do you think?—Yes.

1027. Have you formed any opinion as to the difference in salary that should be paid to a headmaster and a first male assistant?—No; but I think that the first assistant of a large school—take our Wellesley Street School, for instance—should receive about half of what the headmaster is receiving.

Miss NEWMAN, representing the Infants' Mistresses, examined.

Miss Newman: I have to say at the outset that we are very glad to have a colonial scale to criticize at all. The scheme proposed recognises the importance of infant-work and its demands on the teacher, and it almost seems that it is hardly necessary for us to say anything; but we feel that the infant-teacher holds a rather different position to other teachers. She is really the head of a department. That department includes very often half the school, and in large schools comprises one-third of the roll-number. The infant mistress is responsible not only for her own work, but for that of the pupil-teachers under her. Then, the infant-teacher has a peculiarly responsible position, because the children spend more of their school-life under her than under any other individual teacher—about one-third, or three years, of their time at school is spent under the infant-mistress. That three years either makes or mars the whole of the child's school course. In the case of infant-teachers a natural fitness is required, and that makes the supply scarcer than of other teachers, which in itself entitles them to a higher salary. In Auckland the teachers of infant departments have been paid much less than in the southern districts. In one of our largest schools in Auckland the infant-teacher receives £95, and in a southern school a teacher in the same position, with the same number of pupils, receives from £130 to £160. I think infant-teachers deserve special attention from those framing a scale of salaries. There is one thing in connection with the proposed scale, referring to women teachers as a whole, that I would like to refer to. As I read the scale, a women teacher may hold the same position continuously for years, and receive no increase in her pay. Her work may increase, and yet her pay be unaltered. I do not see any provision in the new scheme to alter that. Another thing about the position of the woman teacher in the scheme before me is that her position is alternative with that of the masters, which implies that her position is inferior to that of the man.

1028. *Mr. Davidson.*] What has been your teaching experience?—I have been a teacher for about twelve years. I have been infant mistress for about five years; previous to that I taught standards, and previous to that I taught infants,

1029. Did you serve an apprenticeship as a pupil-teacher?—Yes.

1030. What is your present position?—First assistant in a school of 240. I am practically infant-teacher, but the name of my position is that of first assistant.

1031. What are your duties?—I have charge of the infants and Standard I.

1032. What is the average attendance in your class?—About 120.

1033. What assistance have you?—A third-year pupil-teacher.

1034. For that what do you receive?—£85, and it has been the same for five years. I started with 60 pupils and now I have 138, and my salary has not increased with my work.

1035. Under the suggested scale what would your salary be?—Under the first proposed scale £105, and under the alternative £120.

1036. Do you recognise that the work of an infant mistress in any school is very important?—Yes.

1037. Are you satisfied with the proposed increase in your salary?—Yes.

1038. You stated that many of the assistants in city and suburban schools get no increase of salary?—Yes.

1039. Do you not think that often arises from the fact that they refuse or do not care to take position in country districts?—There are teachers I know who have never been offered any other position.

1040. But you do not think they would hesitate before they would accept an increase of £20 or £30 to go into the country?—Some of them would take it, and some of them would not; but £100 in the country would not be much promotion to a teacher who had been getting £85 in the town.

1041. Why not?—Expenses are greater in the country—particularly for a woman.

1042. You do not think that ladies consider the social advantages of the city, and would prefer to accept a lower salary in the city than take a higher salary and go to a country district?—Possibly.

1043. You recognise that the suggested change in staffing would create a much higher number of vacancies for infant mistresses throughout the colony than now exist?—Yes.

1044. *Mr. Stewart.*] As a matter of fact, does not the dislike of many of our lady teachers to go to the country arise from the fact that they would have to live away from home?—In many cases, yes.

1045. Are the lady teachers in this district satisfied with the state of affairs?—No.

1046. Would you say they were not satisfied simply, or what would you say?—I would say they were very indignant about many things.

1047. Are the lady assistants in favour of a colonial scale?—They are indeed.

1048. They would not be satisfied with any other settlement than a colonial scale?—No.

1049. *Mr. Hill.*] What certificate do you hold?—D2.

1050. Were you specially trained as an infant mistress or as a teacher?—I was not specially trained as an infant mistress.

1051. What special qualification do you hold for acting as an infant mistress?—I have no special certificate for special work.

1052. Do you wish to call yourself an infant mistress?—Yes, in virtue of the work I do.

1053. Does the headmaster of the school in which you are engaged take any part in the management of your department?—None at all.

1054. Does he never examine your work?—He examines Standard I. every quarter.

1055. Does he never see what is the character of the work you are doing in the preparatory classes?—No.

1056. Does he supervise the construction of your time-table?—The time-table has been amended by me from time to time while I have been there. I consulted him regarding the alterations I proposed to make.

1057. You recognise he might examine your department if he chose?—Yes.

1058. And do you recognise that if he thought it better he might substitute another lady in your place?—I have never thought of that.

1059. Would you object, supposing he put another in your place whom he thought better than you: would you be willing to go to another class?—If he did not alter my position I would not mind changing the work.

1060. You would be perfectly willing to take Standard III. so long as your salary was maintained?—Yes.

1061. It is not so much a question of name as a question of salary?—If he were to ask me to take any work in the school I would not object so long as it did not lower my salary.

1062. *Mr. Weston.*] Are the lady teachers indignant because they consider that the male teachers are overpaid and that the women are underpaid, or do they think that both male and female teachers, high and low, are alike underpaid?—Yes; they think that all teachers are underpaid, and they think that the women's positions should be open, like the men's, for application. At present female vacancies are not advertised.

1063. I think, as a matter of fact, you were trained in the Onehunga School as an infant mistress?—Yes.

1064. How long was that for?—Three years, or something like that.

1065. Although you hold no special certificate as an infant mistress, yet your experience leads you to conclude that you are a qualified infant mistress?—Yes.

1066. What is the average age of pupils in your class?—From five to eight years; there are nearly 50 over eight.

1067. Do you think that with one pupil-teacher you are able to do justice to those children?—I do not.

1068. Do you think you should have the assistance of a qualified teacher?—I do.

1069. As well as a pupil-teacher?—I think either another assistant or perhaps two pupil-teachers could do the work.

1070. Do you think that you, as mistress of that class, just now are able to do justice to a pupil-teacher?—No; there is so much work to do in connection with the class.

1071. It means that the girl has to work unduly hard after school-hours, and that her health and prospects alike may probably suffer: is that what you mean?—Yes.

1072. Have you in your school sufficient accommodation in the one room for that number of children?—No.

1073. So that you are working under great disadvantages?—Very great.

1074. Have you worked under like disadvantages in other schools?—I have, in Onehunga.

1075. You say that you approve of a colonial scale: would it not meet the case if the Board of Education gave you a sufficient salary—would you then be satisfied with the Board's control?—No.

1076. Why not?—Because I think that the salaries throughout the whole colony should be the same. I do not think that teachers in one district should be differently paid to those in another district.

1077. If you could live more cheaply than another lady could live in another district, would your sense of justice and honour not lead you to the conclusion that the other young lady should get more than you?—Yes, naturally she would receive more.

1078. You think that the lady less favourably situated should get more pay: would not the same principle apply to the unfortunate married man who had a wife and children to support—living in a less favourably situated place? Should he not receive more favourable consideration than another more favourably situated?—The payment of all labour is governed by those laws.

1079. Well, then, what becomes of a colonial scale?—You have not satisfied me that it is easier to live in one place than another.

1080. Do you believe, as a young lady of considerable experience and knowledge, in a pupil-teacher teaching?—I do not think that pupil-teachers can do much real teaching.

1081. In large schools like your own, have you the time to properly supervise the work that your pupil-teacher does?—I have not.

1082. So that, in every way, the school and staff suffer by existing arrangements?—Yes.

1083. *Mr. Hogben.*] Are you aware that in one district in New Zealand some of the assistant mistresses in small schools are getting salaries ranging from £48 to £72?—I am not.

1084. Do you know the Nelson District, or anything about it?—I do not.

1085. Have you any reason to suppose that it is more expensive to live in Auckland than in Nelson, or *vice versa*?—I have no reason to think it is more expensive to live in one place than another.

1086. There is no reason then, as far as you are aware, why the Nelson teachers should be paid so low a salary?—I think it would be very unjust.

1087. And you think it would be unjust that in Grey or Westland, where living is more expensive, a teacher should be paid very much less than in Auckland, Canterbury, or Otago?—I think it would be very unjust.

1088. You understand perfectly well, from the nature of things, that it is mainly in these small districts that the Boards are, to a great extent, compelled to pay low salaries?—Yes.

1089. That, then, would be another reason in favour of a colonial scale?—Yes.

1090. *The Chairman.*] Do you know the reason why there is a larger proportion of lady teachers in the town than in the country?—Lady teachers prefer the town because most of them have their homes there.

1091. Supposing they took charge of small schools in the country?—I know some who would like to go to the country.

1092. Would they advance their pay by going to the country?—Not to any great extent.

1093. When young men go to the country do they receive more than lady teachers?—Yes.

1094. Do you think lady teachers are just as competent to take charge of schools up to 20 as are male teachers?—Yes.

1095. Can you give me any reason why there should be such a great difference in the salaries paid to men and women?—I know of no reason except that they wish to offer greater inducements to the men to go into the country,

1096. Then, it cannot be laid to the charge of the Board that they are discouraging the men in the service?—No.

1097. Do you find the work very hard?—It is very trying.

1098. Have you known any lady teachers in town break down through illness?—Yes.

1099. Have you known any male teachers break down?—I do not recollect any one just now.

1100. Have you had experience in class-work?—I have taught Standard IV.

1101. Is the work in Standard IV. as arduous as the work you are performing as infant mistress?—I think they can hardly be compared.

1102. Which is the more important?—The infant-room.

1103. Then, you consider an infant mistress requires to be mentally and otherwise stronger than an ordinary class assistant?—I do.

1104. Are you of opinion that the higher standards should be reserved exclusively for males?—I have known lady teachers teach the upper standards with very great efficiency. I do not think males could have taught them better.

1105. Do you think a male could teach the infant-class as efficiently as a woman?—I do not.

GEORGE LARGE, Waiuku, examined.

Mr. Large: Under the proposed scale I lose from £9 8s. to £7 per annum. In the winter quarters I would gain £3 12s., and in the summer quarters I would lose £9 12s.; that would make a difference of £6. By the amended scale I would lose £3. I do not come as the accredited representative of any teachers, but I have spoken to as many as I could of those who teach around me, and one man, who lives five or six miles away, expressed himself as opposed to the £10 reduction for a sewing-mistress. I have compared the two scales right from the beginning, and I see that in some cases by the new scale the teacher would gain, and in other cases he would lose.

1106. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] What minimum wage do you think a male teacher should receive in a country district?—I do not think a married country teacher could possibly live on less than £150.

1107. Then, would you begin all schools at that with an attendance of 20?—No; I mean that if a teacher was a married man, and if he had an average of 10, I would give him not less than £150 a year.

1108. What minimum salary would you fix for a man, married or single, with a school of 30 children?—I would not make it a question of school.

1109. You would fix the minimum at what?—For married men not less than £150.

1110. Would you make any difference between the salaries of married and single men?—That is a question I have not considered.

1111. Can you tell me what you think a teacher should begin at?—A single man could not live very well on under £120.

1112. You would give a married man £150, and a single man £120?—Yes, if in charge of a school.

1113. What would you pay a female teacher?—£100.

1114. *Mr. Davidson.*] What has been your experience?—One month on probation, sole teacher for eighteen months, and headmaster from that time.

1115. What is the lowest average attendance you have had as headmaster of a school?—19.

1116. Have you ever been a pupil-teacher?—No.

1117. Nor a student in a training-college?—No.

1118. And you now occupy the position of headmaster of a school between 55 and 63?—Yes.

1119. What is the staff of the school?—According to the Board's scale I have one pupil-teacher; but, as a matter of fact, I have one girl who has completed her apprenticeship as a pupil-teacher.

1120. She is doing the work of an assistant?—Yes.

1121. You do not give her any instruction for examinations?—I did before she passed her examinations, and up to the present time I carefully supervise the work she does.

1122. What salary does she receive?—She was getting £50 up to the end of March, and now she is getting £55.

1123. What are her duties?—She teaches the infants and the First, Second, and Third Standards.

1124. You teach the rest of the school?—Yes.

1125. What is the average attendance in your department?—About 29.

1126. And in the department of the assistant?—34.

1127. This teacher is doing the work of an infant mistress, is a fully certificated teacher, and is receiving £55 a year: do you think that is adequate pay for the work she does?—I do not think so.

1128. What is the highest average you think a sole teacher can undertake?—35.

1129. If you had the choice of teaching on to 40, instead of 36, and then putting on a fully trained infant mistress, who would take the responsibility of training and teaching the lower part of the school, do you not think that staffing would be better than having a pupil-teacher at 36?—Yes.

1130. You prefer the suggested staffing to that obtaining in Auckland?—Yes.

1131. What is your present salary?—It fluctuates between £160 and £135.

1132. And the average attendance?—In the winter 55, and in summer 63.

1133. What would be your salary according to the alternative scale?—£183 for 63.

1134. Besides approving of the staffing according to this suggested scale, you would have a considerable increase in salary?—Yes, according to the alternative scale.

1135. At the same time you object to the deduction for a sewing-mistress?—Yes.

1136. *Mr. Stewart.*] Are we to understand that the figures quoted by you in your evidence in chief are in error?—Yes, inasmuch as I said I would lose £6 8s. All the figures I quoted were calculated on the first scale of Mr. Hogben's. By the alternative scale my position is greatly improved.

1137. You do not approve of the first scale altogether, but you do approve of the second scale?—Yes, most decidedly.

1138. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] How long is it since you were in a country school with an average attendance of 30 or 40?—Twelve years and a half.

1139. Do you consider that, with the freedom of classification and grading that exists in these small schools in the country, it is possible for a teacher to teach up to 45 children without any extra assistance?—No.

1140. How do you account for teachers down South teaching up to 45, and, according to the Inspectors, doing so efficiently?—I cannot account for it; but there may be a difference of which I am not aware.

1141. You realise that when schools have liberal staffs they cannot have the same liberal salaries that would otherwise obtain?—Quite so.

1142. It is also evident that if good salaries are given the best teachers will be attracted?—Yes.

1143. And, consequently, when the best teachers are attracted to the district where the salaries are highest, the other districts cannot possibly do such good work?—No.

1144. *Mr. Hill.*] Do you think that the Education Board would be justified in establishing a school with an average attendance of 1, and paying the same salary as to a school of an average attendance of 10?—No, certainly not.

1145. Would you suggest, in the case of schools below 30, that a lady teacher should be placed in charge?—Circumstances alter cases very much, but experienced teachers consider that in small schools of 20 and under lady teachers are more successful than male teachers. There are, however, places too remote and too far away, and where accommodation is too rough for a lady to live.

1146. Do you think a schoolmaster is judged by the certificates he holds, or by the results he produces in his school?—By the results.

1147. Do you not think it would be better, then, to call a man a certificated teacher, and let skill do its own work in the matter of promotion?—That has been my opinion almost since I had any knowledge on which to form an opinion.

1148. Are you aware that that has been the practice in England?—I am not.

1149. *Mr. Weston.*] I think you told us that you could only manage a school up to 35 children?—Yes; when the number exceeds that the work is more difficult to overtake.

1150. *Mr. Hogben.*] Your original statement was based, I understand, on the first proposed scheme?—Yes, on the original scheme.

1151. What is the salary by the alternative scale for a school of 65?—£175.

1152. What is the salary for a school of 63?—£183.

1153. What is the lowest salary for your school that you would receive under the Auckland scale?—£150.

1154. And the highest?—£175.

1155. You will not lose at all on the alternative scale?—No.

1156. Do you think it is better that increases should be made by units rather than by such large differences as would involve an increase in the attendance of 15 for one unit?—Yes, I certainly think that is a splendid feature of the new scale.

1157. Would it not be better and fairer to calculate the average attendance for a longer period, such as one year, than for so short a period as a quarter?—I believe it would. In my own case I believe that would give me a fixed salary of £175 a year.

VINCENT EDWARD RICE, Secretary and Treasurer of the Auckland Board, examined.

Mr. Rice: I have occupied the position of secretary to the Auckland Education Board for nearly twenty-five years. For ten years previously I was an officer of the Auckland Provincial Government, and held the position of Chief Clerk to the Superintendent of the Province up to the time of the abolition of provinces in 1876. I have thus acquired, through official correspondence, a large acquaintance with the circumstances and needs of the country districts of the province. The Auckland Education District is the largest of any in the colony. Its area is over twenty thousand square miles. A glance at the map will show its extent as compared with other districts. From the very first beginning of the Board's administration a large and increasing demand has arisen for the establishment of schools in remote and sparsely settled localities. For many years the Board has had to set up and maintain schools in great numbers at a cost altogether disproportionate to the capitation grant earned by the average attendance at such schools. As long ago as 1879 (July) the Board represented to Government the unfairness of providing for primary education in such cases by a uniform capitation allowance per head of attendance, and Government were then asked to devise a scheme whereby a minimum salary of £120 could be offered to the sole teacher of a country school. In each subsequent annual report the Board has not failed to give prominence to this special difficulty in carrying on the system here. I would like to add that the question of salary is not the only point to be considered. A teacher going to some of the remote places in newly formed settlements has often to endure a considerable amount of hardship as regards food and accommodation. Born and bred amid the comforts of a town life, he or she has to rough it to a greater or less extent; and, although the pioneer settlers of the country districts are, as a rule, most kind and hospitable, the teacher feels the lack of intercourse with other teachers, and privacy for study is often out of the question. Mr. Luke, who has been a member of the Board continuously for twenty-three years, can corroborate my statement that the Board has consistently endeavoured to place the means of education within the reach of all, and to encourage the pioneers of settlement, by establishing and maintaining schools wherever a few children are located beyond the means of access to any existing school. To do this, with the limited means at disposal, it has been necessary to fix a lower scale of remuneration than that which could be afforded if the same number of children could be gathered into fewer schools for instruction. Of late years there has been a considerable removal of population from one district to another, and separate schools have been necessarily brought into existence, with little or no addition to the total number for whom capitation is payable. This has had the effect of gradually diminishing the income of several head-teachers in the older districts. The rapid development of the goldfields at different centres has also contributed to the increase in the number of schools, besides adding to the cost of building. The present number of schools is 392, of which fifty-eight are half-time. The number of teachers of all ranks (exclusive of sewing-teachers) is about eight hundred. The normal average attendance is about 24,000. The total roll-number is about 29,000. In one-fourth of the number of schools the average is less than 20. As an approximate estimate, I should say that there are only sixty-five schools in which the income earned by average attendance is sufficient to cover the cost of maintenance. The surplus earned by these sixty-five schools goes to provide funds for maintaining the remaining 327 schools in the district. Coming to the question of salaries, I will speak separately of each class: Head-teachers: Within the past twenty-five years the scale of salaries has been revised three or four times by the Board, always with an upward tendency, except as regards the latest revision, of which I will speak later. I mean that each revision has resulted in the pecuniary benefit of the head-teachers. As regards schools of less than 15 average, there have been ups and downs. Attempts have been made to throw such schools upon a strict capitation basis of £3 15s. or £4, and to call upon the residents to make up the salary. But experience proved that these were the very cases in which the residents—themselves undergoing the hardships of a struggling country life—could not afford to give pecuniary aid towards the maintenance of their schools. Very considerable difficulty was experienced in getting teachers to go out and undertake such work; and that difficulty was only partly removed by a resolution moved by Mr. Luke in 1892, and adopted by the Board, fixing £70 as a minimum salary to any certificated teacher in sole

charge. The latest scale—known as Dr. McArthur's, and brought into operation in October, 1900—aimed at improving the pay of teachers of the smaller schools, whose salaries were thereby increased by an aggregate of about £800 a year. Towards the increased expenditure a sum of about £718 was obtained by reducing the scale of salaries of forty-two head-teachers in charge of schools above 100 average attendance, it being stipulated that, if the capitation grant should be increased to £4, their salaries should be restored to the previously existing scale. (With the consent of the Minister, that promise has been carried out in the distribution of the vote for additions for the March quarter). With the exception just named, head-teachers have not suffered loss by variation of the scale of their salaries. But the fluctuation of salaries (through reduced attendance) has been a cause of anxiety and trouble to many. If a head-teacher is to do his duty faithfully and fearlessly he should be protected as far as possible against the uncertainty as to what his salary for next quarter will be. Besides the causes of weather and sickness, there are other preventible reasons which contribute to a decrease of salary. Ill-formed roads, employment of children at work, truancy of children, children being kept at home through pique or indifference on the part of the parent: these are matters which help to create a want of certainty as regards salary which ought not to be. An inequality exists in the matter of residences. There are in this district 137 schools (not including any under 15 average) which are as yet unprovided with residences. The Board has not been in a position to grant allowances in lieu of residence. The Board has again and again appealed in vain to Government for a special grant to build residences. In any scale of salaries, whether colonial or local, the question of residences is a most important factor. Mention should be made of the teachers of half-time schools. Their salaries are calculated upon the joint average of the two schools, for which full capitation is paid by Government, and most of them teach six days a week, receiving an additional allowance of £15 or £20 up to but not beyond a maximum of £150 in all. There appear to be a few cases in which the maximum should be increased. Assistant teachers: Within the period above named the salaries of assistants have undergone a decrease. For example, the first assistant masters used to receive a maximum of £250. When the capitation grant was reduced from £4 5s. to £4, and afterwards to £3 15s., these salaries were brought down to a maximum of £225, and thence to a maximum of £200. I do not mean that the individual teachers themselves were reduced; they were absorbed into other positions, and their successors were appointed at a lower salary. For many years the rank and file of assistants were paid according to classification and service, £80 being the minimum of a male, £60 that of a female, and £120 the maximum of a female assistant. Various attempts were made from time to time to bring into operation a definite scale for the payment of assistants. But the proposed scales were not favourably received, and they were withdrawn by the Government. Other attempts were made without success to frame an acceptable and practicable scale. These draft scales proposed to regulate the salaries of assistants according to size of school, position in school, and classification of teacher, a substantial bonus being proposed for those holding certificates of the letters A, B, C, and D. However, no scale was adopted. The salaries of assistants continued to be adjusted from time to time, according to promotion of certificate solely, up to a limit of £100 a year for females and £200 for males. About the end of 1897 Mr. Luke brought forward a scale for the payment of assistants, which was adopted by the Board (with some modification—*e.g.*, excluding a proposed bonus for certificates of A, B, and C), and was made to apply to assistants appointed from January, 1898. That is the scale now printed as in force. Existing salaries in excess of the scale were not reduced; but those which were below the scale were raised. This scale gave immediate increases to the extent of about £700 a year. I ought to have mentioned that prior to this the salaries of first assistant masters were dealt with by the adoption of the present printed scale in November, 1896. This scale was expressly declared to be "prospective, and not to interfere with existing arrangements." This scale has been applied regularly to all assistant masters appointed since January, 1897. Up to March, 1899, no special provision was made for the remuneration of infant mistresses. Mr. Bagnall (the present Chairman of the Board) introduced the present printed scale for this purpose, which was adopted by the Board, with the same proviso as before—*viz.*, that no existing higher salary should be reduced during the present tenure of the appointment. It may be repeated that the cost of providing for the maintenance of so many small schools has precluded the Board from framing a higher scale for the payment of assistants, male and female. Pupil-teachers: Prior to 1897 the salaries of pupil-teachers were: First year—males £30, females £20; second year—males £40, females £30; third year—males £50, females £40; ex-pupil-teachers (certificated)—males £55, females £45. In each case an allowance was made of £10 a year to those living away from home. In framing new regulations for the employment of pupil-teachers the Board was met by an objection from the Minister to any difference of pay between the sexes. It was impossible to meet the cost of bringing up the females to the males. The scale adopted in the new regulations was as follows: First year, £20; second year, £25; third year, £35; fourth year, £45; with an allowance of £10 to those living away from home. The Board has found it necessary to increase the allowance in remote or expensive districts to £20. In this district pupil-teachers are not dispensed with at the termination of their apprenticeship. Those taken on under the old regulations are retained for a period of three years above and beyond the three-years term of their apprenticeship, and employment (in town or country) is given them either as sole teachers or as assistants. Most of them receive such appointments before the end of their six years, and few (if any) have to wait more than a month or two for re-employment. The number of such ex-pupil-teachers has been thus reduced since December, 1899, from ninety-five to twenty-five. Pupil-teachers taken on under the new regulations (February, 1897) are indentured for three years and a half. The Board at its last meeting resolved to continue for six months longer the services of fifty-four whose term of indentures had expired. It should be made known that, of the number of pupil-teachers and junior assistants (counted as pupil-teachers) employed by the Board, no fewer than fifty are

certificated teachers, so that the staffing of the schools in which pupil-teachers so largely preponderate is really stronger than appears on paper. In regard to the preponderance of female pupil-teachers over male, the lower salary introduced in 1897 may have tended to cause males to refrain from entering the teaching profession, but I think the real cause is to be found in the increased prosperity of trades and other openings in life. In spite of all, the proportion of male teachers, although too low, is surely and steadily increasing, and it may be mentioned that the entries for the annual examination of candidates (which have just closed) give a total of thirty-five males, as compared with ninety-eight females. Retiring-allowances: The Board has adopted a scheme for the payment of an allowance ranging from three months' to six months' salary to teachers retiring from the service through ill-health or physical incapacity. Absence of teachers: Leave of absence on account of illness carries at least a month's full salary. Afterwards each case is dealt with on its merits. It cannot be said that the provision made by the Board is other than most liberal. Allowances to School Committees: The scale of allowances to Committees does not represent the whole amount devoted to the repair of buildings and premises. Two foremen carpenters are constantly employed, who go about as required (under direction of the architect) to effect necessary repairs. Grants are also constantly being voted to Committees for special repairs and improvements, or for the purchase of apparatus. These grants are distinct from the ordinary school-fund allowance set forth in the Board's regulations.

1158. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] How do you find the half-time schools—satisfactory?—They are mostly reported, on the whole, as satisfactory. There are some districts where the half-time schools are preferred by the parents, as giving them an opportunity of employing their children on the farms,

1159. What numbers attend these schools?—There are some half-time schools with as many as 30 in attendance, but generally the number is about 15.

1160. Do the people in the district where there are 30 children attending a half-time school not ask for a full-time school?—In one of them an application has just come in for a full-time school. Objection is generally taken to a half-time school before it is established, but afterwards the residents are generally satisfied.

1161. And the results, as far as the pupils are concerned, how do they compare with full-time schools?—I think the Inspectors should speak on that. The Inspectors tell me that very good work is done in the half-time schools. This year a junior scholarship was obtained by a pupil from a half-time school.

1162. Have you adopted the principle of driving pupils to central schools, and so obviating the necessity of establishing a number of smaller schools?—No.

1163. You stated that during the past twenty-five years the tendency had been to increase the salary of the headmasters and reduce that of the assistants: can you tell me why that is so?—I cannot say why the Board did it.

1164. You give no opinion on it?—I think it was simply because of the overflowing supply of assistants.

1165. Had you not as good a supply of head-teachers as of assistants?—Most of our schools are in the country, and it has been necessary to make the position of the teacher in the country as high as possible in order to encourage the teachers to go from town to the country. Most of the assistants are employed in the town, and there are many teachers who prefer to stay in town at a small salary rather than go into the country.

1166. What is your opinion as to the relative salary that should be paid to the first assistant teacher as compared with the head-teacher of a town school?—From a half to two-thirds of that paid to the head-teacher. By that means the positions would be filled by men who had had experience in charge of large country schools.

1167. You have established a retiring-allowance for teachers leaving the service?—Yes; leaving the service through sickness, ill-health, or old age.

1168. What happens when a teacher gets leave of absence?—Full salary is paid for the first month, and after that each case is dealt with on its merits, and in most cases liberally. I will give two recent instances. In one case the head-teacher of a large country school fell ill during the summer holidays, contracting typhoid fever. His salary was paid in full for January, February, and March. He died in March, and the Board voted his widow three months' salary as in April. The second case was that of a pupil-teacher in a town school who was taken ill immediately after the school reopened. His salary has been paid in full for February, March, April, and May, and will be paid in full for June also.

1169. What allowance did you pay to the Rev. Mr. Coates previous to his last illness?—It would amount to a large sum. There is no teacher in the service who has had longer leave of absence at different times than Mr. Coates.

1170. Could you give me the amount approximately?—Mr. Coates's service began in May, 1879, when he was a teacher in the country. In 1883 he had three months' leave of absence through illness on full pay. In 1895 he was absent for two months, and there were several extended absences from time to time. Altogether his absences on full pay, previous to his last illness, will come to about one year.

1171. *Mr. Davidson.*] Do you consider that the main reason why salaries are lower in this district for certain classes of teachers than in other parts of the colony is due to the fact that you have so many small schools—so many schools that are not payable?—Yes; I said so.

1172. Have you compared the salaries paid to head-teachers in Auckland with those paid for similar positions in other districts?—I have looked at a few isolated cases.

1173. Do you think that the Auckland head-teachers' salaries compare at all favourably with those paid in other districts in the colony?—I believe that the salaries of head-teachers of large schools do compare favourably, but the salaries of head-teachers of smaller schools are lower in Auckland.

1174. Can you give any other reason than that given to Mr. Mackenzie as to why the salaries of assistants should be so much lower in Auckland than in other districts?—I have stated also as a reason that the Board has not enough money.

1175. Do you think it is fair that under a national system of education teachers in different districts, holding similar qualifications, and doing the same kind of work, should be paid at different rates?—I think it is desirable that there should be uniformity in the payment of teachers throughout the colony.

1176. Do you think that under any other capitation system on the same lines as that obtaining in the colony at the present time it would be possible, unless a uniform or colonial scale of salary were introduced?—With a liberal increase of the capitation grant.

1177. Under any capitation grant, could you have a uniform scale of salaries so long as the Boards were allowed to frame their own scales?—I think uniformity could not be obtained, but a liberal scale could be given by increasing the capitation grant.

1178. Do you consider that it is desirable that there should be a uniform scale of staffing and a uniform scale of salary for the colony?—I have said that I consider that in a national system of education there should be uniformity of salaries.

1179. Have you considered the suggested scale of salaries submitted to the Commission by the Inspector-General?—I have not exhaustively considered it, but I have looked through it.

1180. What is your opinion as to the suggested salaries for the various positions?—I think that the salaries for the schools between 15 and 19 are too small.

1181. What is the minimum suggested salary for a school of 15?—£80.

1182. And the maximum?—£100.

1183. Do you consider that too small?—Yes.

1184. What is your opinion as to the proposed salaries for the higher grades of schools?—I have formed no opinion. I merely heard yesterday in evidence that they were about the same. I have not worked them out myself.

1185. Do you think they are fairly liberal from 40 to 65?—Not so liberal as the Board's present scale.

1186. What is the Board's present scale for a school with an average attendance of 65?—£175, and nearly always a house as well.

1187. Here it is £185—the alternative scale?—Oh, yes, that scale is evidently higher.

1188. Then, schools from 90 to 120, the salary varies from £210 to £225: in your opinion, is that sufficient?—I should be glad to see that increased. It is higher than is paid in Auckland.

1189. Would you look at the salaries paid to infant mistresses in schools from 40 to 65? The suggested salary is £90: what is your opinion as to that?—I think it is satisfactory.

1190. Then, in schools from 65 to 90 the suggested salary is £100: what is the salary in Auckland?—The highest salary in the Board's scale is £95, and the lowest £70.

1191. In your opinion, is the salary of £100 ample?—Of course, £100 is better than £95; but to say it is ample is another thing. The scale would better the position of the Auckland assistant teachers very much.

1192. It appeared from the evidence given by a witness the other day that the Board had treated one of the most highly cultivated teachers in a shabby way—I refer to Miss Shrewsbury, who, it was stated, had £2 10s. taken off her salary: would you like an opportunity of explaining that?—I did not happen to be in the room, and therefore did not know what the witness said; but I will tell you the facts of the case. Miss Shrewsbury was one of the teachers engaged by the Board to instruct pupil-teachers, the engagement being terminable by three months' notice. For a long time the Board considered the doing-away with the Saturday classes, and finally, in September, 1900, the Board decided to notify the four teachers of the classes that their engagements would end at the end of the year—that was, three months after the notice was given. That notification was conveyed to the four teachers. No further action was taken until the Board's first meeting in February, when the Board decided to carry on the classes—reopening the mathematics and Latin classes, and leaving the other two classes to be reopened afterwards. Miss Shrewsbury was the teacher of mathematics. The four teachers were offered re-engagement, but the French and science masters had in the meantime accepted appointments in Christchurch and Dunedin respectively. The Board advertised for those two vacancies, and on the 19th February at a special meeting made appointments. The allowances of these teachers are paid in one quarterly abstract. When the time came for the preparation of the abstract the instruction given was that the salary of the teachers of Latin and mathematics was to begin as from the 1st February, and the salary of the other two from the date of their appointment, 19th February.

1193. Miss Shrewsbury's reappointment dated from the 1st February?—It was made on the 6th February, but was dated from the 1st.

1194. Did she carry out precisely the same duties as the previous year?—So far as I know, there was no change in the duties.

1195. Did Miss Shrewsbury ever apply for the January salary?—I never heard of her applying for it.

1196. You admit, I suppose, that she would have a legal right to claim for the January salary even if her engagement terminated on the 31st December?—No, I do not. Had payment been made for the January month the auditor might have disallowed it. When an officer's salary is increased the auditor looks at the minute-book to see the date on which the increase was authorised.

1197. *Mr. Stewart.*] Did Miss Shrewsbury perform any less work for the quarter ending 31st March, 1901, than she did for the quarter ending March, 1900, or March, 1899?—So far as I know, she did not.

1198. The position simply is this: that for the previous two years she received £7 10s. for what she was paid £5 on this occasion?—I think the first class was started on the 9th February.

1199. In examination you spoke of what you thought should be the proportion of the salary of the first assistant to the salary of the headmaster, and your answer was one-half to two-thirds. The assistant masters in their evidence have suggested that the proportion should be three-fifths: is that your opinion also?—Somewhere about that.

1200. With regard to this scheme of retiring-allowances, and allowances to teachers when sick, what was the date of its adoption?—The scheme, as a resolution, was adopted only a few months ago, but it has been the practice of the Board for many years past.

1201. You have told the Commission that the frequent fluctuation of salaries has created dissatisfaction among the teachers; but is it not a fact that it has not been a question of the number of scales actually enforced that has caused the unrest among the Auckland teachers so much as the frequent discussion at the Board's meetings of proposed scales during the last seven years, so many of which have been put into effect?—I should say probably it is; but I also say that the Auckland teachers have cried out before they were hurt, or before they were likely to be hurt. Some of the schemes were so palpably impracticable that they could not possibly come into force.

1202. What teachers have generally been sent to the small schools—14 to 19—in the Auckland District—teachers who have been in the service for a long time, or young men who have just come out of their apprenticeship?—They are young men and young women who have certificates, and have shown during their pupil-teacher course their aptitude for promotion.

1203. They are practically teachers commencing their careers—just out of their indentures?—Most of them have had no other experience than that of a pupil-teacher.

1204. Then, we may take it that that is the stage at which they expect lower salaries than at any other stage of their employment?—Yes, I think so.

1205. So that the objection urged against these salaries not being high enough has to be considered along with the fact that the salaries are for young people, and for young people only?—I think, from that point the salaries should be improved.

1206. Can you tell what relative proportion the amount paid in salaries bears to the amount paid in incidentals?—I can state what it was during 1900. In 1900 the capitation for teachers' salaries was £3 4s. 1d., and the grants to School Committees entered as incidental expenses was 6s. 2d. per head.

1207. What other grants were made?—That includes all such grants except those coming under the building grant.

1208. The charge for the carpenters comes under the building grant?—Yes.

1209. You spoke of the scale put into operation on the 1st September, by which the teachers of forty-two schools were reduced: do you think that that leaves sufficient number of prizes to induce the best candidates to enter the profession?—I think not.

1210. You have seen in this proposed colonial scale of salaries a suggestion with regard to house allowance: I think that suggestion is in accord with the recommendations of your Board from time to time, making the house allowance a charge on the building grant?—I do not know that the Board ever suggested that. The Board asked for money to put up the buildings themselves.

1211. What is your opinion as to the recommendation?—I think it is very reasonable that the house allowance should be made a charge on the building grant.

1212. This scale—especially the alternative scale—would materially benefit the country teachers more than any other class?—I have already stated that I do not consider the salaries for the smaller country schools are high enough in this scale; but it would benefit those teachers.

1213. What is your opinion as to the number of small schools in the district: do you think a system of conveyance of children to central schools could be adopted?—The cases that we could deal with in that way could be counted on the fingers of one hand. I can at present only think of one, but there might be two or three others.

1214. Has your Board transferred any money from the Maintenance Account to the Building Account during the last two or three years?—No.

1215. Could you tell me when the Board abandoned that practice?—After the interview with Mr. Reeves, when he was Minister of Education.

1216. What amount had been transferred up to that time?—£10,000. That was, I think, prior to 1890.

1217. It has never obtained from that time till now?—No.

1218. *Mr. Luke.*] From your knowledge of educational matters here for a number of years, can you say if it is a fact that when the provinces were abolished the Auckland Education District began with really no money at all: it had no endowments, and had to start from the beginning, and get money from the Government?—So far as I know, the only money for building schools at all in the Auckland District was a sum of £5,000 or £10,000 handed over from the sale of what was the old Supreme Court site, now the City Hall.

1219. Mr. Walker, a teacher of the Wellesley Street School, dealt with an injustice that had been done him in not getting a salary of £200 when he was appointed to the position at that salary: do you know anything about that?—The position was advertised with a stated salary of £200 a year. Mr. Walker was appointed, and he was notified that he was appointed at a salary at the rate of £200 a year. These words were added: "Your appointment is subject to the provisions of the Act and to the regulations of the Board." The scale which I refer to in my statement was adopted by the Board to apply to all appointments made subsequent to 1896. Mr. Walker was appointed in June, 1897, and thereby came under that scale.

1220. A great deal has been said about a superannuation fund for teachers: do you recollect, many years ago, when a Pensions Bill was brought into the House how that Bill was received by the Auckland teachers?—The teachers could not agree, and that virtually threw it out.

1221. The Board of Education approved of the Bill, and recommended that it should be made a statute as soon as possible?—Yes.

1222. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Do you consider that the Auckland Board has been rather liberal in the staffing of its schools?—Judged by its present scale, I should think not.

1223. According to the present staffing, does it take the teachers all their time to overtake their work?—I am never in the schools, and therefore I cannot answer that question. I can only say that we are often asked for another teacher, and whenever any one is away a message is sent in for some one to be sent to take his place.

1224. Do you consider that too many small schools have been established in this district?—I think there have been instances where schools have been established that might have been done without.

1225. I suppose a good deal of pressure is brought to bear on the Board to establish these schools in outlying places?—I do not think so. I think every application is referred to the Inspector, who visits the district and sends in an impartial report.

1226. I suppose the Board would experience considerable difficulty if they propose to close any of these small schools already opened?—Yes; some have been already closed.

1227. You do not think it would be well that the department should stipulate that there should be a minimum number of pupils for the opening of a school?—I think that would act very cruelly in some districts. It would enable our Board to compete almost with Otago in the payment of teachers.

1228. Do the Auckland Board give preference to female teachers because their salaries are lower?—The Board, I think, has never refused an application from an eligible male teacher.

1229. Do the Committees give a preference to females in recommending teachers?—Committees of country schools as a rule wish to have a male teacher.

1230. Do you not think that there are more pupil-teachers in the Auckland District than it is judicious to employ?—Certainly.

1231. Would you favour the substitution of an assistant teacher for two pupil-teachers where practicable?—In the larger schools, certainly.

1232. In regard to the cost of living, would you consider it practicable to differentiate between the salaries paid to teachers living in districts where the cost of living is exceptionally high and those paid where the cost of living is only normal?—That seems to be one of the objections to a colonial scale.

1233. Is it not possible that in the same education district the cost of living may differ very considerably?—It is quite possible.

1234. Does the Auckland Board differentiate in any way?—No, beyond that some districts have houses, others have not. Of course, it is done to a small extent in regard to the allowances to junior teachers living away from home. The allowance in that case is increased from £10 to £20.

1235. Do you require four years' service from your pupil-teachers, or only three?—Three and a half.

1236. I think employment is found for them when their apprenticeship is over?—Up to the present time, yes.

1237. Do you not think it would be better if we had a uniform examination of pupil-teachers for the whole colony instead of each Board fixing its own examination?—I do not altogether think so. That would entail all the examinations being held at the same time, and I think that the differing circumstances of the various education districts make it convenient that the examinations should be held at different times.

1238. Would not the same apply to the teachers' examinations, E and D?—It does. Already they have been altered once or twice, and even now the examination interferes with the teachers' vacation.

1239. Do you consider that the salary proposed to be paid to pupil-teachers in this scale is adequate?—£20 is quite adequate for a pupil-teacher living in his own home, but if away from home it is not enough.

1240. Do you consider that the allowance to School Committees is sufficient?—The only complaints we hear are from districts where schools have been built at a time when there was a large population there. The attendance, owing to the removals from the district, has gone down, and accordingly the grant for cleaning purposes has gone down, but the large school-building remains.

1241. Are you in favour of a wide difference in the payments to male and female teachers, or a small difference, or are you in favour of equal payment where the work is just as efficiently performed by females as it would be done by males?—I say at once that the work done by male and female teachers cannot under any circumstances be regarded as the same. But I do say that if the salaries of males and females were equalised the ultimate effect would be to drive the females out of the service.

1242. Do you think that the difference in the salary should be made not so much on account of the service rendered, but on account of the responsibility rendered to the State by males in comparison with females?—In the first place, the female teacher has, as a rule, to support only herself, whilst, as a rule, the male teacher has to support others who are dependent upon him.

1243. Is it your experience here that a large proportion of the female teachers leave the service through getting married?—A goodly number, according to whether the times are good or bad.

1244. There are always a large proportion of them who do not look to the profession as their profession through life?—Apparently not.

1245. Have you experienced any difficulty in getting trained teachers since the Normal School has been closed?—Since the Normal School has been closed the Board has employed teachers

trained in the rough-and-ready way in the schools in the district. Hardly any trained teachers from the outside have entered the service.

1246. Do you think that training-colleges should be established in the four centres and maintained by the Government?—I am doubtful as to training-colleges altogether; but, if established, I think the cost ought to be borne by the Government.

1247. Have you separate scholarships for the town and country scholars?—Yes.

1248. Do you think that the adoption of a colonial scale of staffs and salaries would tend in any way to diminish the power and influence of the Education Boards?—I do not see why it should.

1249. *Mr. Hill.*] Can you tell what the amount of profit is from the sixty-five paying schools?—I could not tell that without a calculation being made; but I may say that I referred to schools of which the average attendance is over 75.

1250. Do you know the cost of maintenance per head of the schools outside the sixty-five large schools?—The cost per head of teachers' salaries alone in the 290 schools outside that limit was £4 7s. 2d. In some of the smallest schools the cost per head for teachers' salaries was as high as £8, or even £10.

1251. Do you consider that your sixty-five paying schools are fully staffed?—No. There is a class of school in which I think there might, with advantage, be another teacher. It is the school between 200 and 400 in average attendance, in which the headmaster has to do a considerable amount of class-teaching. There, I think, more help should be given.

1252. Do you consider that the teachers in these sixty-five schools are well paid?—It would be absurd for me to say I consider they are all well paid. I think some of the salaries are adequate and others are too low. In fact, the Board has recognised that all these twenty-five years.

1253. Do you think the capitation allowance of £4 5s. was too large to carry on the schools efficiently?—Certainly not.

1254. What salaries did the headmasters in your larger schools receive—higher or lower than now?—I cannot answer that at this time without turning up the reports. The assistants certainly were paid higher.

1255. Supposing the Government made a grant of 5s. capitation to the Board for the benefit of teachers, could you suggest what teachers would be benefited?—I think that as the forty-two head-teachers of the larger schools had their salaries reduced in order to benefit the teachers of the smaller schools they should be placed back in the position they formerly occupied. That is the first thing. Then I think a further increase should be made to the salaries of the teachers of the smaller schools, and then I think there should be a well-proportioned improvement in the salaries of the assistant teachers.

1256. Now, assuming that the capitation was 10s., thus bringing it back to the old sum of £4 5s., would it enable the Board to pay salaries as high as ever were paid by the Board?—Certainly.

1257. Notwithstanding the creation of the small schools?—I think it would.

1258. Is the proposed colonial scale better or worse than the scale of your Board?—I have not studied it sufficiently, but there is one thing in the scale that I would like to point out as being unduly high. The junior assistant for a school is put down at a salary of £80. I think that salary is unnecessarily high; and I would like to see £10 or £15 taken off and added to the teachers of the smaller country schools.

1259. What do you understand by "junior assistant"?—The Board has, I think, about a dozen teachers who are neither pupil-teachers nor full assistants.

1260. Have they certificates?—Most of them have.

1261. Have they received training as pupil-teachers?—Yes.

1262. Could your Board, with 5s. extra, supply as generous a scale as the proposed colonial scale?—I doubt it.

1263. In your evidence you spoke of the disadvantage which teachers in the country have as compared with teachers in the town: is that disadvantage not compensated for by the residence?—It does to some extent; but the man is still in the country, and is debarred from the advantages of town life.

1264. Do you approve of the department fixing the scale?—If it is a good scale I do not think it matters who fixes it.

1265. Have you any means for continuing the training of you pupil-teachers after they have completed their apprenticeship?—None whatever; but the Board is taking steps to put up a model school which will give ex-pupil-teachers an opportunity of seeing for themselves the teaching of a school under a sole teacher before going to take charge of a country school.

1266. I notice in the work that is set for the preparation of pupil-teachers there is no provision for any work in school-management?—Oh, yes, there is—in the programme of examination of pupil-teachers.

1267. You are satisfied with the amounts offered for pupil-teachers in the proposed scale?—No.

1268. Would you suggest the direction in which an improvement might take place?—I think an improvement might be made by increasing the allowance to pupil-teachers when obliged to live away from home.

1269. You do not object to the amounts to be paid in salary?—No.

1270. Do you think that the penalising of fifth-year pupil-teachers by giving them the salary of a third-year pupil-teacher is a desirable proposal to make?—Certainly not.

1271. Do many of your pupil-teachers obtain certificates before the completion of their apprenticeship?—Yes.

1272. Do you limit the appointment of teachers to those from your own schools, or do you bring in any from outside?—A few have been brought in.

1273. Within the last few years?—Not many within the last few years.

1274. *Mr. Smith.*] What attendance do you think there should be before capitation is allowed on a school?—10.

1275. If the number fell to less than 10 do you think the district should be deprived of teaching?—No; I think travelling teachers could be appointed, each to visit, say, three schools.

1276. Of the 239 pupil-teachers you had last year what percentage would require to live away from home?—I think the number was about fifty.

1277. Is it not rather an exception for them to live away from home?—No; the number is over a hundred.

1278. *Mr. Lethbridge.*] How low must the attendance fall before the Board closes up a school?—I have known it to fall down to 5 before the school was closed.

1279. Some one told me of a place—Kerikeri, I think it was—where there were a number of children, and the school was standing empty?—I do not know of any place where that is the case.

1280. Do you think that your Board has been able to give a fair education to most of the children in this district?—Certainly; it has reached further than could have been expected of it.

1281. Do you find any difficulty with the building grant?—We have not got half enough, and we find the greatest difficulty in persuading the department that this is a newly settled district.

1282. Do you think that 11s. 3d. will pay your incidental expenses?—I would not like to commit myself to that. It might just now; but in three months' time the circumstances might be different, and it might not suffice.

1283. *Mr. Weston.*] What do you think about centralising the Inspectors at Wellington?—I think, in theory, it seems the right thing to do; but it must be remembered that the Inspectors are really the eyes of the Board, and no Board can afford to part with its eyes if it is to do its work intelligently.

1284. What is your method of dealing with the relieving of sick teachers?—The Auckland Board employs several relieving-teachers. Last year fifteen such teachers were employed in this district, the salaries amounting to £1,400.

1285. Are special teachers appointed for that work, or do you appoint such teachers as may be temporarily out of employment?—The latter mostly.

1286. With regard to the syllabus, do you think there should be a differentiation for the town and country schools?—It seems to me that a country school taught by one teacher is unable to overtake all the subjects on the syllabus, and I do not think that the Inspectors expect it.

1287. Do you think it is a matter of justice that children in the country should be penalised thereby, simply because circumstances have compelled them to attend these country schools?—I think the country children should receive an education equal in every respect to the town children.

1288. Extreme facilities in the country schools should be given, if necessary, to enable the children to receive an education equal to that given in the town schools?—Yes.

1289. You told us just now that there were many suggested alterations in your scales during the last few years: why were there so many?—I think because of the frequent changes in the *personnel* of the Board. I think that new members came in with a desire to put things on a better basis, and each tried his hand on a scale.

1290. And were all the members of the Board prepared to give way to any person who moved a resolution in that direction?—I make it a rule never to express my opinion on the opinions or actions of the members of the Board.

1291. If a colonial scale were framed each Board would naturally have to send its monthly returns to Wellington, would it not?—That would be a matter, I think, for the department to answer; not for me.

1292. Would not that necessarily arise?—It might be done by inspection, on behalf of the department, of the Board's pay-list.

1293. Some provision would have to be made?—Yes.

1294. That would mean a certain amount of extra work in the Government office and in the office of the Board of Education?—Certainly, in the Board of Education office.

1295. Would not there be an amount of uncertainty as to what would be required—say, in regard to either a reduction or an addition to the monthly pay-sheet, by reason of altered circumstances?—I understand you mean that the Board would be in a state of uncertainty as to how much of the capitation would be required for the teachers—certainly.

1296. Naturally, it would follow that at the end of a year the Government would be under or over the amount they had estimated for the teachers' salaries during that year?—It is not possible that they could hit the exact amount, of course.

1297. What is your opinion in respect to a colonial scale, always assuming that a certain amount be voted by Parliament for the maintenance of our schools throughout the colony?—The general advantage in a colonial scale seems to me to be that it should be fixed—either that it could not be varied, or that it would require some legislative action to vary it.

1298. Would it not be better for the various Boards to assess the salaries, and in so doing to regard all the circumstances of their districts and schools?—I think, if you had a sufficient sum voted for capitation, it could satisfy all the teachers in the district.

1299. Would it not be better in the long-run that the Board of Education should frame its own salaries?—I think it would be safer for the Board's finance.

1300. Do you think it would be as safe for the teachers as a colonial scale?—I have pointed out that the *personnel* of the Board changes very rapidly, and there may be variations in the scale; and I think there would be less likelihood of variations in the scale if it were a colonial scale.

1301. The circumstances of the various provincial districts are not always the same?—Certainly.

1302. Do you think, in face of that, that a colonial scale would be just to all the teachers of the colony?—I think it is on that point that the teachers partly desire a colonial scale; and I think it would be a good thing to let it be tried.

1303. The cost of living—the cost of house-rent, medical and professional services, and so on—is not the same throughout the colony? There are variations in each district? You admit that?—Generally, yes.

1304. Admitting that, do you think that a colonial scale of salary would be just to all the teachers throughout the colony?—No scale could avoid pressing unequally on some teachers.

1305. It would be apt, then, to work inequitably in some instances?—For the reasons you have stated, yes.

1306. What in your opinion should be the minimum salary of a teacher, either male or female, in your schools?—I have already said that I considered £120 should be the salary aimed at for the teacher in charge of a small country school.

1307. Would that be for male or female?—Male.

1308. Well, then, in the small country school, do you think there should be any difference between the salary of a male and female teacher?—I do not think there need be.

1309. Up to what number of children, then, do you think the salary of a male and female should be equal in amount?—To about 25.

1310. And I need scarcely ask you whether you think ladies are more suitable than males for teachers of our small schools?—Infinitely more suitable.

1311. What is your method of payment of teachers?—Once a month. Either by the teacher, if in town, calling at the office of the Board, or by the payment of the cheque in to the bank to the teacher's credit; by remitting by post-office order, the cost of the order being charged to the teacher; or, which is more frequently followed, by posting to the teacher a crossed cheque, accompanied by a filled-in receipt and an addressed envelope.

1312. Your teachers are paid without reference to the School Committees?—Yes.

1313. Your incidentals last year amounted to 6s. 2d.: were you satisfied with the sufficiency of that sum?—Of course, you must take one year with another. I think 6s. 6d. may be stated as satisfactory.

1314. What did your expenditure embrace?—Allowances to School Committees for cleaning, school stationery, minor repairs, and fuel.

1315. Did that include caretaking?—There are no caretakers' residences in Auckland.

1316. I suppose you have to pay cleaners: did that 6s. 3d. include that item?—Yes, it included the cleaning of the schools.

1317. Are the country schools kept clean, nicely equipped, and everything in perfect order?—I do not know that the cleaning is perfectly satisfactory.

1318. And I presume that to keep the school well cleaned and scrubbed, &c., is a costly business?—In the early days it used to be done by the children, under the direction of the teacher.

1319. If the schools were kept clean and in first-class order, would 6s. 6d. be enough?—A great deal more labour could be spent in cleaning schools, no doubt. There is not sufficient in the 6s. 6d. to keep the grounds in such order as they should be.

1320. Have your incidentals been augmented by concerts and private subscriptions?—A little is done in that way; but concerts are generally for some special purpose, such as the purchase of a flag-staff, and not for expenditure on repairs.

1321. Why, in your opinion, should a young boy or girl learning the profession as a pupil-teacher receive such liberal pay as is proposed, and as has been given?—I think it is desirable to attract to the profession the best of our young people, and, if possible, those who have received something of a secondary education as well.

1322. A boy apprenticed to a blacksmith does not get much pay to learn his business, and a boy going into a lawyer's office does not get much pay to learn his profession?—I suppose not.

1323. Why should a pupil-teacher learning his profession expect to receive the pay that he or she has received, and the pay he or she is likely to receive under the proposed scale?—I do not compare the profession of teaching with that of a blacksmith or a lawyer.

1324. Why?—Because you want the best boys for the purpose.

1325. And do you not want the same thing for every profession?—You do for all.

1326. If a boy or girl has a taste for teaching, and desires to make it his or her profession, why should he or she expect to receive considerable remuneration while learning?—I can only say that I presume the reason is that they consider it part of the Government service.

1327. Is there, as a matter of fact, any real reason why pupil-teachers should be so liberally dealt with?—I do not consider that pupil-teachers are unduly liberally dealt with by the scale. In this district pupil-teachers are doing a great deal of work.

1328. Are these pupil-teachers doing too much work, in their own interests?—Certainly.

1329. Is the employment of pupil-teachers in the number that you employ them fair and just to the children of the schools?—I think the Board would gladly avoid it if they could.

1330. Are the pupil-teachers in your district, in your opinion, sufficiently taught, both academically and in the training department?—I do not think there is adequate provision; but I am strongly of opinion that, if possible, pupil-teachers should receive some secondary education before they come into the service.

1331. If they received secondary education, would they not necessarily have to go through some training department?—I would like to see them come from the grammar school, having received one or two years' secondary education there before coming to us.

1332. Have you any acquaintance with the training department of Canterbury?—Twenty years ago I saw it.

1333. Do you know the principle?—Yes.

1334. Knowing that, do you approve it?—It is training with theory and practice combined—yes.

1335. Do you think it advisable that some institution should be established in the various centres to enable pupil-teachers to combine theory and practice, more especially if candidates for employment go through the secondary schools?—Yes. I understand that the training-college exists for those who have gone through their course, and not for those who are entering on it.

1336. *Mr. Hogben.*] Will you furnish the Commission with a statement of the expenditure of the Board for the three years 1898, 1899, and 1900 on such items of administration as are payable out of the capitation grant?—Yes.

1337. It has been suggested that one way of attempting to solve this question might be by giving the Boards increased capitation and leaving to them the power to draw up the scale; do you think that the five districts, Taranaki, Marlborough, Nelson, Grey, and Westland, could construct any scale at all resembling in liberality the proposed colonial scale, which would be higher than any one existing in the colony, or even any fairly liberal scale, such as North Canterbury and Otago?—I do not think so.

1338. It is not even possible for Auckland, as you are aware?—I do not think it is.

1339. Supposing there was a further increase of capitation beyond the 5s., would it not mean that the Boards with a comparatively small number of small schools—Boards whose jurisdiction is over districts that have been settled for a long time—by that extra increase of capitation would be able to do more?—Yes; but I would point out that it would enable them to lay aside some little money for buildings. They need not spend it all on salaries, although they would have the opportunity of doing it.

1340. Would there not be a tendency to spend all the money they got?—I know one district that stored it up, and transferred £10,000 to the Building Fund.

1341. It has been suggested that there are different circumstances in different districts—such as cost of living: do you think in districts where the cost of living is greatest they are in a position at present to pay the highest salaries?—Not necessarily. Westland is a district where the cost of living would be high.

1342. Is it not the case that districts where the cost of living is high are districts where the population is scattered?—The cost of living is not necessarily high. In this district the cost of living is less, possibly, in places most isolated.

1343. To a certain extent it would be so?—Yes.

1344. Has the Auckland Board ever attempted to adjust its scale to the cost of living in the various parts of the district?—No.

1345. Do you think it a practicable thing to attempt to do so?—No.

1346. Is the cost of living in the same district always the same?—No.

1447. The argument of the variation of the cost of living applies to almost any scale you draw up?—It applies to any part of one district compared with another part of the same district.

1348. So that it cannot be regarded as fatal to a colonial scale, as it is common to all scales?—That is so.

1349. In the making of payments, supposing a colonial scale were adopted, it would be necessary for the Boards to send in a claim for salaries. They have to make out salary-sheets like that now in accordance with their own scales?—Yes.

1350. The only difference in this case would be that it would be a calculation in accordance with the colonial scale?—Yes.

1351. Would more work be entailed by the colonial scale?—Yes.

1352. Why?—The Board will have to satisfy the department every month, or every quarter, that a certain sum is payable to its teachers. In this district we would begin to write an abstract, and it would be out of date by the time we got to the end of it, and by the time it reached Wellington the abstract would not be in operation. That is what I chiefly refer to. By the time the money came back we would want something else, because the conditions would have changed.

1353. Would not the same thing happen, to a certain extent, on the capitation we pay you quarter by quarter?—No. The pay-list for two months is never the same, but the capitation remains the same for three months.

1354. If you sent copies of the sheets up to the department, would they not constitute the claim?—Yes; but it would involve considerable adjustment.

1355. They are simply adjustments you would make yourself?—That is quite true.

1356. Do you think the work would have to be done over twice?—The work need not be done twice, because I suppose anything we underclaimed in April we would add to the May claim.

1357. With regard to the necessity for adjustment, do you not think it would be better to base all the claims of the salaries on a year's average and not on a quarter's average?—It would save a good deal of trouble in many ways, but I think individual teachers would experience a little hardship. In a fast-rising district, say, at the end of the first quarter the teacher would feel he was an injured person if he had to continue for nine months at a low rate of pay. What the Board does is to pay the teacher at the end of his first quarter on the average earned by the quarter.

1358. There would have to be provision for certain cases of sudden rise and sudden fall?—Yes.

1359. *The Chairman.*] Are the teachers paid promptly?—Yes.

1360. Do you think they would be paid more promptly under the proposed system?—I suppose the Board would continue to pay, but when the Board would get the claim allowed by the Government I do not know. I do not think the Board under any circumstances would allow the teachers to suffer. The earliest time on which the Board could claim for May would be the 20th May, and it would be impossible for the voucher for that amount to be made out and the money reach here as soon as under the present circumstances.

1361. *Mr. Weston.*] Do you know if there is a truant school in Chapel Street?—It is not called a truant school; it is a school grown out of an institution established for truants.

1362. What of the staffing in that school: is it a liberal staffing, or is the work heavy for the teachers?—In that school an extra assistant is allowed beyond the scale.

1363. Are the teachers in that school harder worked than the teachers in other schools?—I am not aware that such is the case.

1364. Do you know the teacher who has the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Standards—a Miss Hill?—I know Miss Hill.

1365. She teaches the three standards: what is her salary?—I am not sure whether it is £75 a year or £70.

1366. Do you think that a salary or £75 a year for a person filling that position is sufficient salary?—No, I do not.

1367. What salary do you think she should receive?—I think it should be increased to £80 a year.

1368. Would £80 be sufficient then?—Well, I should like to see a higher salary paid her.

1369. Then, what would be a fair salary for teaching those three standards?—Nearer £90 or £100 a year.

1370. In the preparation of this scale, do you think attention should be given to this case?—Yes; of course, there are precisely other cases of the same sort.

TUESDAY, 4TH JUNE, 1901.

L. J. BAGNALL, Chairman of the Board of Education, examined.

1371. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] You are in favour of a colonial scale?—I do not see any objection to it from the Boards' point of view.

1372. Do you think the money could be better distributed by the Board than by the department?—Yes.

1373. Do you think the present system of appointment of teachers is satisfactory?—I do not think it is entirely satisfactory.

1374. Do you think the School Committees have too much power, or too little power?—It depends on the point of view. If you look at it from the point of view of the promotion and proper appointment of teachers, I think the Committees have too much power.

1375. Do you not think that in the establishment of a colonial scale there should be considered the question of the propriety of a system of promotion and classification?—Yes, I think so.

1376. Do you think the half-time schools are a success?—Yes, I think they are necessary in this district and that the work has been fairly satisfactory; in some instances the reports show, where children have passed the standards, that the work is quite up to the average of the full-time schools.

1377. *Mr. Davidson.*] I would like to know from you if you think the teachers in this district are fully satisfied with the salaries paid to them?—I do not think they are, according to what they say, though when vacancies occur there are a great many applicants.

1378. Have you compared the salaries paid to the assistant teachers in Auckland with the salaries paid to teachers holding similar positions in other districts?—Yes, in a general way.

1379. If you take the position of a first male assistant in Auckland and compare the salary paid him with the salary paid an assistant holding a similar position in Otago you find probably a difference of £50 or £60 in favour of the Otago teachers: do you think it fair that a man with equal qualifications, and doing exactly the same work, should be paid so much less?—No, I do not; I think the salaries paid to first assistants are too high even in Auckland.

1380. Do you think the importance of the position of a first male assistant in a school of 600 in attendance does not warrant his receiving a salary of, say, £240?—I do not think so.

1381. Do you not look upon a first male assistant in such a school as occupying a very important and responsible position?—If you judge by the work he does, as compared with the work of the second assistant, no.

1382. Do you not look upon him as a deputy headmaster, who, in the event of the headmaster leaving his position without much notice, would be at once able to take up the headmaster's duties?—He might be able to do so for a short time; I do not think we should contemplate the headmaster being absent.

1383. It is sometimes necessary that a headmaster should leave his duties for a shorter or longer period: do you not think it is wise to have a man as the first assistant master capable of taking up the duties of the headmaster?—No, I do not think so; we have it on record here that a first assistant master was receiving a salary of £200 a year for teaching 27 boys in the Sixth Standard.

1384. Do you not think that, in a case of that sort, it is the fault of the organization of the school and the distribution of the staff?—I do not know that I can give an opinion on that. Speaking generally, and as far as my knowledge goes, I think the second assistants in schools do far harder work than the first assistants.

1385. Do you think the second male assistants in the large schools are very poorly paid?—Yes, they are underpaid.

1386. You pay your teachers in Auckland according to a scale of salary drawn up by the Board, or the Board's officials?—Yes; drawn up by the Board.

1387. The money is received from the department direct, and is distributed by the Board according to its scale?—That is so.

1388. If a uniform scale was drawn up by this Commission and adopted by Parliament, would you not still have the right to distribute the money exactly as you do now, only according to a uniform scale instead of your own special scale?—Yes, as I understand it.

1389. It would not interfere with or curtail the powers of the Board in the matter of the payment of teachers' salaries?—No, not so far as the payment in the scale was concerned; but the Board might think that the scale was not a necessity.

1390. Do you not think we should have a uniform scale of salaries rather than thirteen different scales, such as at present obtain in the colony?—Theoretically, I suppose so; practically, I do not think it would be found to work out satisfactorily.

1391. Why not?—In this district, with regard to the smaller positions, we find that female assistants will remain in Auckland at a salary of £45 a year rather than take a similar position in the country at £70 a year; if you pay the same rate for the same work you will not get teachers to go into the country to take up those positions.

1392. According to this suggested alternative scale, the assistants in the country schools will be paid at a very much higher rate than now, thus making the positions more attractive. In a school between 40 and 90 in average attendance the staffing should be a headmaster and infant mistress. The salary of the infant mistress in a school of 40 to 65 would be £90; in a school of 65 to 90, £100; whereas in the town an assistant low down on the staff would receive from £80 to £85. What is your opinion of that?—If you pay the lowest on the scale £80 or £85 you would not get any one to take the country position at £100.

1393. You think they prefer to remain in town on account of the social and other advantages of city life?—I can only suppose so; I have not friends in the positions. My experience as a member of the Board shows it is difficult to get a female assistant to go into the country.

1394. The reason is not that the salaries are considered so much as the disadvantages?—Yes.

1395. A uniform scale of staff and salaries for the colony would tend to make the positions in the country districts, either of sole teacher or assistant teacher, more attractive, and somewhat remedy the evil you complain of, in so far as it raises the present salaries?—I do not think the proposed scale for the smaller schools is sufficient, especially for the male teachers.

1396. You say you have compared the salaries obtaining in different districts: take a school of an average attendance of 40, the minimum salary would be £160 and the maximum £185—that is considerably better than the salaries paid in Auckland at the present time for similar positions, is it not?—Yes, about £10 a year better. I think a man in charge of a school with 65 children is in a far more responsible position than the first assistant in any of the town schools; he has the responsibility of the whole school, while the assistant master has only the responsibility of the class.

1397. Do you not think that a teacher with an attendance of 65 in a country school would have what would be termed a "rosy" time, seeing that the infant department and lower classes would be taken out of his hands, and he would probably only have an average attendance of about 27, including Standard III. and upwards; and also considering the fact that the salary suggested here is as high, if not higher, than is paid in any part of the colony at the present time?—Schools from 65 in attendance downwards are the most difficult to fill. I do not think people who live in the country should be compelled to take inferior teachers because low salaries are fixed for positions of that kind.

1398. The staffing is more liberal, the salaries are much more liberal, and consequently a better class of teachers is attracted: you approve of that principle?—Yes.

1399. *Mr. Stewart.*] Do you think that the suggested scale is preferable to the one now in vogue under the Auckland Board?—Yes, so far as the treatment of headmasters is concerned. I do not agree with it as far as the first assistants are concerned.

1400. You think the salaries of the first assistants are too high?—Yes; the persons who get into those positions will not go into the country, but remain in town till they get head-masterships, and, so far as my opinion goes, I think they have a very easy time of it.

1401. You do not think the adoption of a colonial scale and the payment of teachers through the Board would be in any way derogatory to the Board, or deprive it of any of its power or influence?—I do not think so, provided sufficient money is obtained. I think the capitation system is unfair to the Auckland District.

1402. In that case a colonial scale would be much better for the Board itself?—Yes.

1403. *Mr. Luke.*] Mr. Rice mentioned the large number of small schools that had to be provided in the Auckland Education District: do you not think that in building these schools the Auckland Board has done a great deal towards promoting settlement in these outlying districts?—Yes. My experience has been that the Board has met in a very liberal way the demands of the settlers in those districts; and since I have been a member of the Board I do not think any case has been refused where there were a sufficient number of children to warrant the establishment of a school, whether aided or properly constituted.

1404. In regard to the question of incidentals, do you think that the allowances made to School Committees for incidental expenses are sufficient?—I think they are fairly sufficient; I think the difficulty found is in carrying on the very small schools.

1405. It is sometimes deemed expedient to augment funds by getting up concerts and entertainments, for the purpose of keeping the school buildings and ground in repairs: do you think that state of affairs is desirable?—For improving the grounds, and so forth, I think a little help is desirable.

1406. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Do you consider that a colonial scale of staff and salaries adopted by Parliament will have more stability about it than a scale brought into existence by any one of the thirteen Education Boards?—Yes, so far as the salaries are concerned, I suppose so.

1407. Do you consider that salaries should be paid on the average attendance of one quarter, or on the basis of the average attendance for four quarters, so that at the beginning of the year a teacher would know the whole salary he or she would receive for the full period of a year?—I do not think it is very material. I think the teachers would prefer the quarterly average to the annual average basis. It would practically come to the same thing.

1408. You are in favour, as far as possible, of giving fair salaries to country teachers, seeing that there are two-thirds of the schools of the colony with an average attendance of less than 50 pupils?—Yes; for it seems to me that in the country they have to put up with one class of schools, while in the towns they have the advantage of the secondary schools.

1409. Are you in favour of bursaries, exhibitions, and scholarships, whereby the brighter pupils attending the primary schools, the children of the poorer classes, might attend the secondary schools, and continue their higher education in the universities?—Yes.

1410. In the event of a scale of salaries being introduced that will in a few instances prejudicially affect the salaries of some of the teachers, would you postpone its operation in those schools until vacancies occur—that is to say, not make it retrospective?—I think that is a fair thing. It is the practice of this Board.

1411. Do you think that the Legislature should define what the powers and functions of School Committees and Education Boards should be respecting the appointment of teachers?—I think it would be an advantage if their powers were clearly defined.

1412. With regard to the introduction of a colonial scale, you think it would be difficult to introduce a scale that would be equally applicable in every district, on account of the local varying circumstances?—Yes.

1413. With regard to the establishment of small schools, do you find they are a serious drain on the finances of the Auckland Education Board?—Yes.

1414. Do you consider that the Government, out of, say, the amount voted, should subsidise the Boards independently of the ordinary vote, in order to encourage land settlement by providing schools for the children of the pioneer settlers, and giving them facilities for education?—Yes, I think the Government should; it is a matter for consideration as to what fund they take it out of.

1415. *Mr. Hill.*—From your knowledge of local authorities, do you think, supposing we were empowered by Act to give voluntary contributions towards the fostering of education in the respective districts, that such contributions would be likely to be granted?—I do not think local bodies would make grants towards education, if they were able, from local revenue; the revenue is now too small for what they have to do.

1416. In regard to male and female teachers taking country positions, do you find that female teachers are willing to take up those positions as readily as the males?—Not to the same extent; male teachers are more willing to go into the country than female teachers.

1417. Do they get larger salaries than female teachers?—We generally make a difference.

1418. Supposing you offered female teachers the same salaries as you pay males, do you think that would make any difference?—I do not think so. I can quite sympathize with the female teachers who do not want to go into the country districts; the drawbacks and difficulties are so great.

1419. Do you think there should be a closer approximation in the salaries paid to assistant teachers?—Yes, I do. I think there is too great a difference in the salaries paid to assistants at the present time.

1420. You apply the word “assistant” to both male and female teachers, I assume?—Yes. I do not approve of so many female teachers as we have in this district.

1421. Suppose a colonial scale was adopted, would you approve of the choice of male and female teachers being left in the hands of Education Boards rather than stereotyping it, as set forth in the scale?—Yes.

1422. That is, to enable the Boards to adapt the staffing of the schools to the respective needs of the district or districts?—Yes, that is so.

1423. The same staffing would not always apply in the different centres?—No.

1424. Would your Board prefer a colonial scale of salaries rather than receive 5s. extra capitation grant for distribution?—Speaking for myself, I think we would prefer a colonial scale which would give us more money: it is a question of money with us.

1425. Supposing you were offered an extra 10s.?—Then, we would take the 10s.; I do not think a colonial scale of salaries or an increase of 10s. would give us more than was necessary.

1426. Do you think that 11s. 3d. per head, plus £250, would suffice for the needs of your Board?—I could hardly say off-hand.

1427. I suppose you find certain new conditions always arising in your district that call for an expenditure not anticipated by the Board here?—Yes.

1428. Will not the limitation of functions in the matter of staffing and salaries materially affect the influence of your Board as the highest authority on primary education in this district?—I do not think it will affect us very much; it will to a certain extent, no doubt.

1429. Your Board does not object to it?—I do not think so. Personally, I think the proposal to increase the number of assistants is much better than the plan we are working under at the present time—*i.e.*, with so many pupil-teachers.

1430. You do not object to a colonial scale so long as it will improve the condition of things in this district?—No.

1431. Do you think that, in the case of teachers who are forced to retire from the service through old age or sickness, some power should be left in the hands of your Board to recommend some

gratuity?—I think it would be better to have some properly arranged system of retiring-allowance, rather than it should be left to a settlement of individual cases.

1432. As Chairman of the Board, will you make a suggestion as to the direction your views take?—I think a proposal to have a scheme that would give an allowance by way of insurance, or by a fund to teachers, in the case of death or inability to carry on through sickness, would be better than leaving it to the fancy of the Boards, which might be too generous or, on the other hand, might not be generous enough.

1433. You think a scheme of superannuation would be preferable?—Yes.

1434. Do you think that the teachers would be willing that a certain amount should be deducted from their salaries for the purpose of establishing such a scheme?—I am not at all sure that the teachers would favour such a scheme; a great many would, but I could not speak for the whole of them.

1435. *The Chairman.*] Have you had much difficulty in getting vacancies filled in this district?—No; we always have a fair number of applicants.

1436. For what positions do you receive the greatest number of applications?—For headmasterships in schools; positions carrying a salary of over £200.

1437. Do you get as many applications for country vacancies as for town vacancies?—No; the country vacancies are harder to fill. The applications for these vacancies are more limited than in the case of vacancies in the towns.

1438. Is there any difference in the standard of quality of teachers who apply for situations in the towns and those who apply for situations in the country?—Sometimes we have the same teacher applying for both positions.

1439. Do you get equally efficient teachers to apply for both positions?—The more qualified teachers, as a rule, do not apply to go into the country.

1440. In regard to vacancies carrying salaries of over £200 a year, you say you get plenty of applications for positions of that kind?—Yes; we advertise. The other day for a situation of that sort we received thirty-eight applications; that was at Tauranga.

1441. Were they chiefly applications from the Auckland District?—Yes; there were only two outside applications, and they were received too late.

1442. Was that for an assistantship position?—No; a headmastership.

1443. In view of the facts you have mentioned, some of the salaries paid in this district are very inadequate when compared to others?—Yes, I have indicated that in this district such a state of things applies, particularly to that class of schools with an average attendance of 60, and under; they are very underpaid.

1444. You think they require building up?—Yes, I do.

1445. Do you think any great cruelty would ensue if positions carrying salaries of from £200 to £250 and upwards were left alone and the smaller salaries built up?—No, I do not think so; I think there should be good salaries paid in the larger schools; I do not believe in cutting salaries down.

1446. I suppose the teachers in the larger schools, and who receive salaries of over £200, complain, like others, that they are not paid sufficiently?—Yes, I think some of them do.

1447. Do you think that if they were paid half as much again that that complaint would disappear?—It should do so; still, I doubt that it would disappear altogether. One of the greatest causes of complaint in this district has been the question of teachers' residences—the fact that some are provided and some are not. The scale of salaries is the same; it works unfairly in some instances.

1448. What is your opinion about residences and house allowance: do you think the question of such should be included in the scale or not—should some have house allowance and others none?—I think in the case of a married man in charge of a school, if there is no residence, he should receive house allowance.

1449. If teachers were allowed to provide their own residences out of the salaries paid them, do you think it would remove inequalities and grievances that exist?—That was tried in Auckland and there was very much grumbling at having to pay rent. I think it would be more satisfactory to pay a salary and give a house in. It should be at least taken into account.

1450. Would that not involve the construction of a great number of houses that might afterwards become a burden to look after?—Yes; we have some cases at the present time where the houses are not occupied; not very many though. At all events, where there is no house provided, house allowance should be paid.

1451. It is stated that there is a feeling of dissatisfaction and unrest among the teachers in Auckland: is it because they have lost confidence in the administration of their Board?—I do not think that there is a great feeling of unrest among the Auckland teachers; I think it is very much magnified.

1452. Has the Board made many changes in its scale of salaries?—No, very few; and what changes have been made have been in the direction of increasing the salaries, except in October last, when some of them were reduced and others were raised.

1453. Those who were reduced have only suffered the reduction for three months?—Yes.

1454. What was the object of the alteration: was it made with a view of improving the weak salaries at the expense of the strong ones; in other words, deducting from the larger salaries to add to the smaller ones?—Yes; about £700 was deducted and about £800 was added to those in receipt of low salaries. We had instances of married men in schools receiving only £80 a year.

1455. Then, I suppose you do not think that any serious injustice was done to the teaching profession in this district?—No; though I was sorry we were compelled to make this particular reduction.

1456. I suppose I can assume that the Board has not been apathetic in regard to the treatment of teachers in this district, seeing that they have done the best they could with the money available?—Yes; I think the Board has been most careful of the interests of the teachers.

1457. When vacancies occur are applications invariably invited?—Always for the larger schools carrying salaries from £140 or £150 upwards.

1458. How are the vacancies filled in connection with the smaller schools?—The names of teachers who are considered suitable for the position are gone over, and a list drawn out and submitted to the Inspector, and he recommends whom he thinks most suitable for the position. If there are three or four names they are sent to the Committee; these are deemed the most suitable and the most deserving of promotion.

1459. In that case must the teachers apply, or do you simply select any teacher whom you may think fit?—Very often they apply themselves if they know there is a vacancy. In every case notes are sent to them asking if they wish to have their names sent up.

1460. Then, the Committee makes a selection and the Board confirms it?—Yes.

1461. Does the Board reserve to itself the right of rejecting the selection at any time?—Yes, if the Committees select from other than the names sent up by the Board.

1462. In the case of the better class of vacancies, where you receive applications, does the Board deal with the applications or the Committee?—The Board deals with them in the first instance, after consultation with the Inspector or Inspectors, and then recommends such names to be sent up to the Committee as they think proper.

1463. Do you send a complete list of the applicants' names to the Committee?—Not as a rule; just a certain number.

1464. The Committee is allowed to make the final selection?—Yes.

1465. Have you heard any complaints of dissatisfaction regarding this mode of making appointments?—Yes, sometimes; teachers are sometimes dissatisfied that their names are not included among those forwarded; and the Committees, on the other hand, often complain that the name of the person they want is not sent.

1466. Do you know whether the teachers are in the habit of canvassing members of Committees in order to secure promotion?—No; but I do not think that is the case; the Board discourages anything of that nature.

1467. Do you not think it would be better if the Board made the appointments itself?—Yes, I think, generally speaking, it would be better.

1468. Does your Board ever make transfers from one school to another—that is, supposing the attendance in a certain school falls, and the teacher's salary is larger than the Board can afford to pay for the size of the school; in such a case would the Board arrange for a transfer?—We find that is a very difficult thing to do. Committees object very strongly to such a course. The Committees of the larger schools think that all vacancies of that kind should be advertised, and so do the teachers. We have had repeated protests from the Teachers' Institute for not advertising certain positions.

1469. Assuming that a colonial scale of salaries is agreed upon, and passed by Parliament, do you think that the teachers in districts where the cost of living is comparatively high will be satisfied to receive the same salaries and no more than teachers in other localities where the cost of living is less?—I think that will cause a great deal of dissatisfaction.

1470. You think there would be an outcry from the teachers?—Yes. I think it is the weak point in the colonial scale.

1471. While there may be an equality of pay, there is not likely to be an equality of sacrifice?—That is so.

1472. Do you think that a hard-and-fast colonial scale in a country like New Zealand, where the climate and other conditions are so different, would be likely to prove a bigger success than other administration?—I do not think so.

1473. The conditions are always varying, you say?—Yes.

1474. You do not think that those conditions will be met by a colonial scale such as is proposed?—No, I do not think so.

1475. If considerably more money in the shape of an increased capitation grant was given—say, 10s. *per capita*—to the Education Board, do you think that the claims of the teachers would be fully satisfied?—I believe so—for the Auckland District, at any rate.

1476. And you think you would have enough money for Committees' incidental expenses?—Yes, I think so.

D. PETRIE, M.A., Chief Inspector to the Education Board, examined.

Mr. Petrie: I think the scale of salaries proposed in this suggested scheme does not provide sufficient remuneration for the teachers of the larger schools. The best class of young men will not be attracted into the ranks of the teaching profession unless better prizes are offered. I am decidedly of the opinion that the remuneration given to the headmasters of the larger schools should be considerably increased. I also think that the scale of payments for first assistants is out of all proportion with the work they do, when compared with the work of certain other teachers and the remuneration they receive. In a school with an average attendance of from 570 to 600 the average number of pupils per unit of staff is 39; suppose a first assistant teaches 39, it is proposed he should be paid £220. Now, I consider that a headmaster who teaches a school of 35 pupils, with all standards, has much more arduous and difficult work to perform than has the first assistant I mentioned; yet the pay of the one—the head-teacher of the small school of 35—is more than one-third less than the pay of the other, though the work of the former requires a greater degree of skill. Touching the lower assistants in the larger schools, I think it would be a good plan to equalise their payment. Any headmaster knows that he may have a second assistant who cannot be put in the position a

second assistant should take, and he may have to put a fifth assistant to do the work of the second assistant; indeed, you will hardly find a large school in which the lower assistants are not in some cases doing the work of the higher assistants. In recommending to the Commission the advisability of adopting nearly equal salaries in the case of the lower assistants in the larger schools, I think it should especially apply to the lower three assistants; I would not put them on an equality, but would reduce very greatly the differences which exist at the present time. With regard to pupil-teachers, in my opinion schools with an average attendance of from 35 to 50 are the class of schools in which a young pupil-teacher can be most efficiently and effectively employed. I would rather see every such school staffed with a headmaster and a pupil-teacher than with a headmaster and an assistant teacher, for I think it would be more economical, and practically as efficient. Schools with attendances of from 35 to 50 are usually small buildings of one room—in some cases perhaps only half the size of this room we are in; and I do not think it would be wise, nor in the interests of the children's education, to have two teachers, one a head-teacher and the other an assistant teacher, working in the same room, where they would make a great deal of noise that would mar the efficiency of the instruction. I do not think they would pull together so well as a head-teacher and a pupil-teacher, and this opinion is shared by several of my colleagues to whom I have spoken on the subject. With regard to the position of the infant mistress, I am afraid that perhaps I do not quite understand the intention of this scale as to the duties and position of this member of the staff. I take it that an infant mistress would differ from an ordinary assistant in some manner, probably by being placed in authority over some of the other assistants. I think that is a very undesirable feature to introduce into the management of a school; it is setting up a sort of *quasi*-head-teacher under the responsible head-teacher. I think it is unnecessary to apply to her the title of infant mistress; if she is paid and treated as other assistant teachers it will answer all cases in all schools. The plan of alternating male and female teachers in the scale is no doubt introduced for economical reasons—I cannot imagine any other reasons that can be adduced in support of the proposal. It is certain that Standards IV., V., and VI., in the great majority of cases, are much more efficiently taught by males than by females, and therefore it is very desirable that these standards should be taught in future by male teachers. If male and female assistants are to alternate it means that the female assistant will often be set to do the work of a lower assistant, while a lower assistant will be placed above her, doing much higher work; that seems to me a very objectionable arrangement. If a second male teacher is required I should make him second male assistant, and the third male, third male assistant, and so on. With regard to the proposed increase of staff, I think the staffing is very liberal, especially in the larger schools, from 300 in attendance upwards. An undue increase of the staff will in some cases lead to considerable difficulty. We have in the Auckland District schools conducted in a single schoolroom with attendances of 120, or at least over 100, and the staffing in a school of over 100 in attendance, according to the proposed scale, consists of four members. It would be the height of absurdity to have four teachers in one room.

Mr. Hogben: I might point out that there are three under the alternative scale.

Mr. Petrie: I have not had time to study the alternative scale. I think that in many of the schools in Auckland, and in the other district with which I am acquainted—Otago—it would be needful to enlarge the schoolrooms and subdivide them, in order to avoid the friction caused by two or three teachers working in the same room. It will be a matter for special inquiry to learn how far this difficulty will arise, but that it will arise in some cases I am sure; whether it will arise widely I cannot say offhand. I think that the salaries proposed to be paid to female teachers under the scale are altogether beyond what both the Treasury and the community can afford to pay for their services. I should fix the maximum salary for female teachers at £150—a fair maximum salary for any position a woman could fill in any of the public schools of the colony. We can afford to pay female teachers the same remuneration as they would get in other positions; and if we do that it seems to me we are doing justice to them. I think if a comparison is made it will be found that very few women in other positions in life gain such salaries as are here proposed. The reason for paying female teachers so much less than male teachers arises out of the nature and aims of female life, and the fact that headmasters are generally married men who have to bring up families, so that we must make their permanent positions such as they can look forward to with satisfaction and certainty for the future. If we are going to spend a large portion of the salary fund in the payment of high salaries to female teachers, I think the income of the married teachers will be reduced to such an extent that they will be unable to look forward to a position of comfort, such as they should have the right to. I think, in fixing the salaries of female teachers, there should be a reasonable gradation between the minimum and the maximum. I do not know how far the proposed scale of staffing will lead to the separation of boys and girls for instruction in the larger schools. I think it is a very good thing in every way to have boys and girls taught together, even in the upper standards in the large schools, for the common school-life does a great deal of good, and I am convinced it tends to minimise the evil that is likely to crop up if we separate them. The proposal to deduct from the head-teachers of schools with an average attendance between 19 and 35 £10 for a sewing-mistress seems to me a little unjust. Special provision should be made for that post. I do not think it is always wise that the headmaster's wife should be preferred for the position. I am sure a headmaster would generally be consulting his own interest if he said to his wife, "I prefer that you should not take this position of sewing-mistress." With regard to rent allowance, of course rent allowance cannot form part of a scale of salaries, but it seems to me that a rent allowance is a necessary supplement to this scheme. The reason why residences should be provided for teachers is principally because teachers could not get suitable houses convenient to the schools in the great majority of cases, and especially in the case of country schools do I think it imperative that dwellinghouses should be provided for head-teachers. Of

course, in the towns and cities houses can be rented easily. As a matter of fact, throughout the colony, probably three-fourths, certainly two-thirds, of the headmasters of schools are already provided with dwellinghouses, and in the interval, until dwellinghouses are provided for the remainder, I think they should be given a rent allowance; nothing else would meet the case.

1477. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] Regarding the question of teachers' residences in the towns, would it not be just as well to give an extra allowance to provide house-rent, instead of erecting houses where there are no houses at the present time?—I think it does not matter which is done, so long as they have a house allowance failing a house.

1478. Do you not think it often occurs that in the case of a married man with a large family he will want a large house, and at other times the teacher may be a bachelor?—Yes, that is a real difficulty. It often happens that in the case of a man with a large family it is, for this reason, inconvenient to move him, even to a better position.

1479. Do you favour a colonial scale of salaries?—Yes; it would secure more completely a uniform payment for the same service, and for that reason I prefer it.

1480. Do you think that the Inspectors should be under the control of the central department?—I prefer not to answer that question.

1481. You may have noticed from returns that the grades of teachers have been increased in some parts of the colony to a greater extent than in other parts. In Nelson, Grey, Westland, and Wellington, for instance, they have been increased from 28 to 32 per cent: how many have been increased in this provincial district within the last twelve months—increasing the promotion of teachers from class to class?—I am not in a position to say positively; I do not think there are more than twenty or thirty promotions a year in this district.

1482. In Otago I see only one teacher was promoted in 1898, and one in Canterbury in 1900: if a colonial scale is adopted, might not these increases or promotions in regard to teachers weigh unduly in favour of teachers in districts where such promotions are more easily obtained?—Yes, it might be so. I think the difficulty of securing equitable promotion in different districts is an ineradicable evil of the system.

1483. The point I wish to ask is, should the department make arrangements to enable teachers to obtain C certificates by taking examinations for Class C in sections?—Yes; I should not object to that. I think that a reasonable proposal.

1484. Would that not be a great aid to country teachers?—Yes, I think it would be.

1485. Regarding the half-time schools you have here, are the results from those half-time schools nearly as good as the results from the full-time schools?—We have a large number of half-time schools in which the results are quite as good; but, on the other hand, we have a considerable number in which the results are not so good; it depends on the teacher carrying on the school. I am satisfied that the working of half-time schools involves no hardship in sparsely settled rural districts; if pupils are to be kept away from school for a part of their time they may be kept away on the days the half-time schools are closed, and after all put in the same number of attendances as they would have made had the schools been full time. I think that up to an average of 18 or 20 pupils in each school half-time schools may be worked in a satisfactory manner in this district on the six half-days during which each is open.

1486. Do the teachers take exception to working six days?—I am not sufficiently in the confidence of the teachers to say; I have never heard of any complaints. I am sure it involves hardships at times in the case of lady teachers, though sometimes a teacher in a very quiet district may rather welcome some regular work on Saturdays.

1487. Have you itinerant teachers in this provincial district?—Two or three.

1488. You are aware that in some of the educational districts of New Zealand there are a great number of schools established for the benefit of a very few children?—Yes.

1489. Do you think it would be possible to extend the principle of itinerant teachers?—No, I do not think so.

1490. Say, in the case of schools established for 3, 4, or 5 children, as in the Sounds?—There are very few cases like that in Auckland, so far as my knowledge allows me to say.

1491. *Mr. Davidson.*] You will notice in the first proposed scale that the first assistance proposed to be granted to a teacher is in a school with an average attendance of 36, and in the alternative scale the attendance must reach 40 before the assistance is granted?—Yes.

1492. In your opinion, is a sole teacher capable of managing efficiently a school up to 40 in average attendance?—No; it is a question of degree. I think a teacher who has 35 pupils with all standards has a fair school to manage. With 5 or 6 in each class, 40 would be about the average. I think such a number might be taught by one teacher, and I recommended the Board of Education here to adopt that scale; on the other hand, I am of the opinion that if assistance can be afforded at 35 it should be given.

1493. From your experience you know that assistance is not given in Otago until the attendance reaches 50?—Yes; but I believe a monitor is allowed.

1494. A monitor is allowed between 40 and 50; so that the staffing under the suggested scale is more liberal than that which is allowed in Otago, is it not?—Yes.

1495. You are of the opinion that a pupil-teacher should be appointed in schools between 35 and 50 in average attendance?—Yes.

1496. Do you prefer that the assistance should take the form of a pupil-teacher between 35 and 50, rather than the form of a certificated assistant between 40 and 90?—I think it would be better to retain 36 as the number at which assistance should be allowed, and from 37 to 50 to add a pupil-teacher; thereafter the best staffing would be a headmaster and an assistant teacher.

1497. Do you not think that there are too many pupil-teachers employed?—I have no doubt there are at the present time.

1498. If you could get rid of the necessity of appointing pupil-teachers in schools between 35 and 50 you would diminish the number of pupil-teachers by a very large extent; but if you did not

do so, seeing that there are 238 schools in the colony with an average attendance between 35 and 50, it would mean a very large increase of pupil-teachers, would it not?—Yes, that would necessarily mean an increase in the number of pupil-teachers in smaller schools; but it would be balanced, I think, by the remodelling of the pupil-teacher staff allowed in the higher classes of schools; a majority of them would be attached to one type of school.

1499. Would you appoint a first-year pupil-teacher to such schools?—Yes, after some practice, and if they were approved by persons competent to judge.

1500. If the available funds would admit of the appointment of an assistant teacher at 40, do you not think that a teacher would prefer to teach an increased number, say 4 or 5, and have a certificated teacher to help him, rather than have the tuition and instruction of a pupil-teacher in addition to his ordinary work?—As I said before, I cannot answer for teachers' preferences; I think the teachers should be asked that question. I know that when it was proposed to make a sole teacher teach 40 pupils, as against the old maximum of 35 pupils, the teachers brought a great deal of pressure to bear on the Auckland Board to fix the number at 35; that evidently shows their predilection. I cannot answer the question in any other way.

1501. Do you not consider that the first male assistant should be looked upon as a deputy headmaster?—No, I do not. I think the cases in which the headmaster would be absent would be emergency cases, would be rare, and to provide a constant substitute for these cases seems to me to be unnecessary.

1502. Do you think the salaries paid to the first male assistants are too high?—I do not object to the salaries paid them on the score of their being too high; I say they are too high relatively to the salaries paid to other teachers who do equally hard and important work. I should like to see the salaries of these other teachers increased in proportion. I consider the second male assistant's work, and the demands made on him, are little inferior to the work of and the demands made on the first male assistant.

1503. Do you find that the best class of boys are willing to enter the teaching profession?—I am sorry to say that we do not find the best class of boys willing to become pupil-teachers.

1504. What, in your opinion, is the cause of that?—I have no doubt there are many contributing causes. There are schools from which we get a number of promising boys, and in those schools the work of a teacher is looked up to and respected; but in many other schools I do not think that is the case. From the latter we get few male candidates. No doubt the chances of rising to better positions if they become successful are fewer than in other employments and professions.

1505. You object to the term "infant mistress" being applied to the first female assistant in schools where assistants are employed?—Not so much to the term as to the implied position; introducing her at this particular stage in the scale seems to me to be creating a sort of second head-teacher's position, or a parallel position; that she should be specially placed in authority over other assistants is, I think, undesirable.

1506. I understand that you object to the alternating of male and female assistants?—Except economical reasons, I see nothing to recommend the proposal.

1507. You are of opinion that in large schools where Standards IV., V., and VI. average an attendance of 60 and over, those standards should be in charge of male teachers?—As a rule, yes. I have seen women who manage these classes very efficiently, but they are rare.

1508. Do you think that the average woman is physically incapable of managing such large classes?—I should like to say that both in Otago and here I have met with but a limited number of female teachers who could manage those classes successfully. I am of the opinion that the average female teacher cannot.

1509. Do you not think that an exceptional woman would suffer in health on account of the strain?—We have applications for leave of absence on account of illness from them at times.

1510. In what class of schools do you consider the staffing is too liberal?—I think you might say in schools with an attendance of from 300 upwards. I should not object to this staffing provided it fits the school-buildings now provided; I should, however, object to it if it involved the reconstruction of school-buildings, and I think it quite possible that in some cases it would involve reconstruction.

1511. Do you consider that the small schools having an attendance of under 30 should be in charge of female teachers, where the district is suitable for the employment of a female teacher?—I do not think there is any particular reason for preferring female to male teachers in such schools, except, perhaps, the one ground of economy.

1512. *Mr. Stewart.*] Do you think, as time goes on, a very large number of teachers become incapacitated through age, and are thus rendered unfit to carry on school-work?—No doubt that is the case.

1513. Do you think those cases cause difficulty to the Boards under which the teachers work?—Yes; in certain cases.

1513. You think that tendency is becoming greater every year?—I think so.

1514. Do you think, in the public interest, that there should be some contributing system arranged, by means of which these teachers could be removed from their schools when they became too old?—Yes; I think that is very desirable.

1515. That would be impossible, would it not, under the present system of payment by different scales throughout the colony?—I do not know; it may be impossible, on the ground that Committees have to be consulted. I do not think the different payments obtaining in different parts of the colony need make it impossible.

1516. Do you not think it impossible with thirteen different scales of payment?—Such a state of things might make the initial difficulties greater.

1517. Supposing we had a colonial scale, it would be easier for the Government to arrange a contributing scheme, would it not?—Yes.

1518. The actuarial difficulties would be easier dealt with?—Yes.

1519. Do you think that the teachers in this district are satisfied with the present state of affairs in regard to remuneration?—I really am not able to say.

1520. The teachers have not complained to you?—I have never heard complaints; it is quite possible they may be dissatisfied without my hearing of it.

1521. Do you think that there are too many small schools in this provincial district?—I do not think so. When I came to the Auckland District I understood there was an undue multiplication of schools; but I am of the opinion that that evil is not more prevalent here than in Otago. There are not more than three or four cases in which the schools are more numerous than need be.

1522. Do you think there are special difficulties in overtaking settlement?—A special difficulty is that the very small schools form an unusually high proportion of the total number of schools, and the difficulty in that way is very grave.

1523. Do you think that increasing settlement must lead to an increasing number of small schools?—Yes. I should say that the number of small schools to be provided every year would be about eight or ten for some time to come; the number has not been quite so great as that in the past two years.

1524. In point of fact, you think that a colonial scale would have the indirect result of compelling the colony to face the question of education as its settlement extended?—Yes; and it would be an advantage too.

1525. *Mr. Luke.*] You are in favour of a colonial scale?—I think it would be a just thing in the interests of the teachers of the colony.

1526. Do you think it would improve the financial condition of the Auckland Education District?—I am not sure of that; I feel it would improve the position of the teachers under the Auckland Education Board.

1527. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Do you find that in the small country schools the female teachers do the work just as efficiently as the male teachers in similar types of schools?—Yes; on the whole, that is so.

1528. Do you also find that in the lower classes, up to Standard IV., and possibly including Standard IV., that female teachers can discharge their duties as efficiently as male teachers?—Yes; in those positions female teachers do quite as well as male teachers, and sometimes better. Of course, it must be borne in mind that the male teachers occupying the positions to which you refer are inexperienced when compared with the female teachers.

1529. In those cases would you favour equal payment to female teachers—that is, pay them the same salaries as males are paid, seeing that they do as good work?—No, I would not. I think the male is the head of the family, and a woman is not; at least, as soon as she becomes the head of the family she is practically unfit to be a teacher.

1530. Then, you base your conclusions rather on the responsibility that the male has to bear in society?—Yes, on social reasons, not reasons of efficiency as a teacher at all.

1531. I think you alleged that females could not in other walks and avocations of life command the same salaries as they could in schools—or, at all events, not greater?—What I meant was that we should give them equal and perhaps better salaries than they would be able to secure in other walks of life.

1532. That is looking on the teaching profession as more lucrative than dressmaking, millinery, or work in the Telephone Exchange?—Yes; at dressmaking I suppose they would not get more than 17s. 6d. or £1 per week.

1533. Are there not dressmakers in Auckland earning £6 a week?—It becomes an art then.

1534. With regard to the minimum certificates required in the proposed or suggested scale, do you consider that those suggested minimum certificates are too high?—No, I do not. The rebate proposed to be taken off is not very high, and I look upon it as a stimulus to teachers; if they fail, the fine is nothing very serious.

1535. Do you consider, judging from your long and varied experience, that the syllabus requires too much work on the part of country teachers?—Yes, I think the syllabus is overcrowded from the point of view of every class of school.

1536. Would you favour differentiation in the work required as between town and country schools?—No, I should not favour introducing a different standard of work; I would favour introducing a difference in the extent of study, though I think the standard of work should be the same in both cases.

1537. *Mr. Hill.*] Do you approve of the classification of teachers as set forth in the scale?—I have not considered the matter fully; it is a point I have somewhat overlooked. As long as there is a moderate fine imposed, I think it is desirable to keep the classification for different positions as high as may be.

1538. Do you approve of the present mode of classifying teachers?—I think it could be improved.

1539. Do you find, for example, that A1 and B1 men are better than C1 or D1 men in the control of schools?—It is hard to say; we have so few A1 and B1 men that it is difficult to make a comparison. My feeling is that efficiency in teaching, after a certain width of education is secured, should override other considerations; after a certain point, say rank C, technical skill should count for more than distinction by examination.

1540. The ordinary literary qualifications of men possessing a D certificate, you think, are ample, even for the large schools here?—I think it is desirable that for the large schools there should be head-teachers of Class C.

1541. Is it absolutely necessary?—As I said, expecting a high classification will act as a stimulus. To obtain a school of an attendance of 300, a teacher need not necessarily

have a C certificate; but he will be fined if he has not, and therefore it is an incentive for him to work up and obtain the required certificate.

1542. Should not a matter like that be left to the judgment of the Education Boards?—It might create difficulties at times to lay down a hard-and-fast rule, and would sometimes exclude very desirable candidates; I have had experience of that in this district.

1543. What is your idea, your opinion, as to the desirability of the assistants in large schools taking part in the instruction of the pupil-teachers of that school?—I think it is desirable and very fair.

1544. Suppose such was required under a colonial scale, do you think it would be a fair proceeding that instruction for the pupil-teachers should be required from them in the same manner as instruction for the children is required, and that the remuneration for the work would come in as part of their salaries?—I should not say it is desirable to require all the assistants to give that instruction; I think those assistants might give help who are fitted to do so.

1545. The headmaster, naturally being responsible, would give the subject best fitted for a certain teacher?—Yes.

1546. Do you think that plan would work well in this district?—Yes, it works now in this district.

1547. What do you think should be the maximum size of a public school on the average?—From 750 to 800, I should say.

1548. Why would you go as high as that?—Because I think an efficient headmaster could effectively supervise such a school. The larger a school the greater the economy in management.

1549. Do you not think the classes would duplicate before that number was reached?—No doubt.

1550. Then would it not be better to draw a line before the duplication commences?—I do not see any objection to duplicating classes at certain stages. Even in smaller schools than those with an attendance of 700 or 800 duplication is often necessary.

1551. According to that there is no objection to those large schools in Christchurch where the sexes are separated. Do you approve of that principle?—No.

1552. That is done in consequence of the duplication?—No doubt.

1553. You spoke of the staffing in a school between 35 and 50, and in your opinion you suggested a pupil-teacher would be better than an assistant. Do you mean an ex-pupil-teacher?—No; I mean an ordinary pupil-teacher.

1554. One to be trained by the head-teacher?—Yes.

1555. Would you place a first-year pupil-teacher to render help in such a school as that?—Yes, I would. I do not see why a pupil-teacher should not give very useful assistance in such a school.

1556. To take 20 children below Standard II.?—I would not allow a pupil-teacher to be told off to take exclusively any particular class of that kind. The pupil-teacher would take part in the teaching of the lower classes mainly, and in the routine work. The head-teacher would take a share in teaching them as well.

1557. Would you have a male teacher in such a school?—I would not object to a male teacher in that class of school.

1558. And a female pupil-teacher?—Yes; I do not see any disadvantage.

1559. You think such an arrangement would work well?—It has worked well in the past, and I do not despair of its working in the future.

1560. Suppose in schools with an attendance below 35, a regulation was made to the effect that female teachers should be employed, in your opinion would that be an advantage or a disadvantage?—I think it would be foolishness to lay down any rule of that kind; the selection for an appointment would depend largely on circumstances.

1561. Would you limit small country schools to female teachers?—Certainly not. There are many districts where it would be unfair to send female teachers—rough, out-of-the-way, roadless districts—and young men should be sent there on that account.

1562. Do the residents in those districts give any aid to the schools?—Yes; there are certain schools with a capitation grant of £4 or £5 paid by the Board, and the people find the teacher, and supplement the salary, at all events in theory.

1563. Then you would not limit the control of those small schools to female teachers?—No; I do not think it would be advisable to make a rule that female teachers only should have the control of schools with an attendance below 25. No doubt in the majority of cases female teachers do get those schools.

1564. Supposing you sent a female teacher to take charge of a school where formerly a male teacher had been in charge, do you think the female should receive the same salary as the male was getting, or a smaller salary?—I think she should receive nearly an equal salary. In cases of that kind I think the salaries of female teachers may be more justly approximated to those of males than in any other cases that you could mention.

1565. Would you expect the same results from that female teacher as you would from the male?—Yes.

1566. Then why should she not receive the same salary if that is the case?—I have already explained that the reasons rest on social and family considerations.

1567. *Mr. Weston.*] How many buildings in your district do you think would have either to be enlarged or altered upon the introduction of such a scheme as is suggested?—I really am not able to answer that question off-hand. I am of the opinion that it would be necessary to make alterations in a good many cases. This Board's policy once was to have large class-rooms, capable

of holding 80 children; and it would be impossible to have three teachers working efficiently together in that one room. In small schools, if an assistant was granted at 35, we should need to put up another room in many cases. I think it is undesirable that even two teachers should be teaching side by side.

1568. Do you think that too many pupil-teachers are employed in this district?—I have no doubt it is so throughout the colony.

1569. Do you think that not alone are the children attending the school prejudiced, but that the pupil-teachers are also prejudiced by their daily work in the schools?—The hardest lot of any teacher under this Board is that of the pupil-teacher. I should like to see their work lightened, and also to see them better paid than they are at the present time.

1570. Do you think that pupil-teachers' time should be divided between study and practice?—I should like to see their work restricted to four hours teaching each day, and the rest of their time made available for study.

1571. You say that you think pupil-teachers should be better paid?—Well, I think perhaps they are fairly paid; they are rather over-worked than under-paid.

1572. It has been urged that pupil-teachers should receive higher payment; has it occurred to you that they are learning a profession, and that the moderate pay they receive might be held sufficient?—Yes.

1573. It has occurred to you?—Yes, if they are placed in efficient schools they learn a good deal, or should do. Their training is a real supplement to their payment.

1574. In regard to the difficulty in obtaining boys as pupil-teachers, do you think that the hard grind that a pupil-teacher undertakes enters into the consideration of a boy when he rejects pupil-teaching?—I doubt if boys actually realise this as a man would; still something operates on the mind of the boy, and it may as well be that as anything else. I think the disposition of young lads towards the teaching profession depends upon the impression made upon them by the head-teacher of the school at which they have been trained; if the impression the boy has of the head-master be a favourable one, he is more likely to take up the teaching profession, but if, on the other hand, it be unfavourable, then he will not think of entering it.

1575. Do you think there should be a differentiation of the syllabus as regards the country schools?—Yes; I think the course of study in the country schools should not be so extensive.

1575A. You mean to say that some of the subjects should be eliminated?—That, in part; I think relief could also be given by adopting a simpler course.

1576. I suppose if manual instruction be embodied in the syllabus, a very material alteration will have to be made?—Yes.

1577. Do you think that a material alteration in the present subjects, to introduce technical and manual instruction, would be an advantage to the colony as a whole?—I can only offer a theoretical opinion, and my theoretical view of the case is this: the utility and educational value of manual training are at the present time not proved.

1578. With regard to relieving-teachers, is there any necessity in this district, so far as you are aware, for appointing special relieving-teachers? On the other hand, are there enough teachers awaiting employment to take up relieving work?—Yes, I think there is need in a district like this to keep a small number of relieving-teachers—two or three. We sometimes need additional relieving-teachers to provide for emergencies that could not be overtaken by two permanent relieving-teachers. I think we could constantly employ two or three extra. In this district we have very frequent applications for leave of absence owing to ill-health. Doctors are very acute now-a-days in detecting symptoms of ill-health, and prompt in advising change of scene, &c. It is partly due to the enervating climate, I suppose. We have no reserve of unemployed teachers to fall back on for relieving work.

1579. Then, the more relieving-teachers you have the more applications you also receive for leave of absence?—That may be so.

1580. Do you think that pupil-teachers in this district should receive a sound and efficient education in order to qualify themselves for the positions they may be called upon to fill?—I think there should be some means provided for their further education, and for improving their professional skill, such as the establishment of a training-college.

1581. What action do you think the Government should take in the matter?—They should establish a suitably equipped training-college.

1582. *Mr. Hogben.*] In regard to the question of the utility of manual training, I think you said your opinion was mainly based on theory?—I did say so.

1583. Did you read the report of the Irish Commission?—I read the final report, not the full report; the final report does not contain the evidence.

1584. You are aware that they took the evidence of a large number of witnesses, and sent their own Commissioners to visit different countries where manual and technical instruction was adopted?—Yes; the names of the witnesses examined are mentioned in the report; that is all that I know.

1585. The fifth volume?—I suppose so.

1586. You are aware that their report, though drawn up in many terms, is distinctly in favour of the adoption of manual training?—Yes. The highest authorities in England, so far as I am aware, express uncertainty about the value and organization of manual training, and point out that without co-ordination it is of little use—manual and technical training without co-ordination.

1587. But those remarks of yours you would not apply *with* co-ordination?—No; whether manual training is deserving of wholesale adoption is a point I feel very doubtful about.

1588. You propose to introduce a pupil-teacher as the first assistance a head-teacher should get; in what schools do you think a pupil-teacher should get the best training—in large or small schools?—With an efficient head-teacher I think a pupil-teacher would get as good a training in a small school as in a large school.

1589. Do you think that the head-teacher of a small school could spare the time to supervise a pupil-teacher?—It would not take up much time. I hardly know what special supervision a pupil-teacher would want; he watches the headmaster and picks up the methods he sees applied—it is mainly a matter of imitation. He would have instruction on method chiefly outside teaching hours.

1590. Do you think it is in the interests of the children that you should give the first help to the head-teacher in the form of a pupil-teacher?—I do not think the children would seriously suffer by it. As I said before, there would be friction caused by two teachers talking one against the other in a small room—that is an assistant teacher and a head-teacher—and that friction, I think, would be lessened in the case of a pupil-teacher and a head-teacher.

1591. If the State was prepared to grant an extra amount to alter the school buildings do you not think, in that case, it would be better to have an assistant?—It would then depend on the quality of the assistant; we have many inexperienced assistants who do not do any better work than pupil-teachers. The assistants in such schools would be of the lowest class, and receive the minimum pay.

1592. On the average are not assistants better?—I do not think they would do much better work in country schools; the average assistant in a small school is not much better than a pupil-teacher; of course there are cases where assistants are better.

1593. Would a salary of £90 a year secure a good assistant?—Perhaps. I think it is better to employ pupil-teachers in schools of that class than in larger schools. Control is easier; the classes are much smaller and more easily managed. There is much routine work that they never do well.

1594. *The Chairman.*] From what you have just stated you are of the opinion that the sudden transition from a small school with one teacher to a school with virtually two teachers would be somewhat undesirable?—If there were two rooms it would not be undesirable.

1595. Do you think it would add materially to the cost of education?—Yes, I do not think the gain in efficiency would be equal to the enhanced cost.

1596. If you had to pay out of your own pocket would you be likely to introduce an innovation of that kind; would you place an assistant teacher in a school, in addition to the head-teacher, when that school could be well managed by a head-teacher and a pupil-teacher?—No, I would not.

1597. You think it would very materially increase the cost of education in those small schools?—Yes.

1598. Taking that question from another point of view: do you think it would be fair to our country children who are capable of becoming efficient teachers that they should be prevented from entering those schools in the localities where they were resident, in the capacity of pupil-teachers?—I do not think that is a desirable thing.

1599. Are they introduced as pupil-teachers in the same schools in which they are taught?—It is a rare occurrence; it happens occasionally; I think it is an undesirable procedure.

1600. Do they find employment in schools in reach of their homes?—In many cases they do; in other cases, of course, it is not so.

1601. Are the ranks of your pupil-teachers augmented to any great extent from the children in the country?—A considerable proportion of pupil-teacher candidates hail from the country; I should say more than a third, perhaps a half.

1602. In what class of schools do those pupil-teachers obtain employment?—In the small schools chiefly.

1603. If a system was rigidly adhered to of preventing pupil-teachers from entering those country schools as they do now, do you think you would be able to get pupil-teachers from the country as at present: would their parents be in a position to send their sons into the towns to receive their education as pupil-teachers?—Yes; I think the parents in the country districts would be willing to send their children to town as pupil-teachers; the pupil-teachers would get a subsidy of £10 in addition to their salary.

1604. Provided that there were openings for them?—Yes; there are occasional openings for them.

1605. Do you think that by appointing assistants in these cases where the country schools are growing in numbers, instead of appointing pupil-teachers, you would be shutting the gate against pupil-teachers, and not only that, but at the same time largely increasing the cost of education?—Yes; to a certain extent that is so.

1606. You have been asked a question about the qualifications of the average female teacher, and the qualifications of the average male teacher?—That is so; I say a male teacher is better able to manage the higher classes of the larger schools than a female teacher. It is a question of government to a large extent, and then a man can better exercise a little insinuation of terror.

1607. Is there not government by kindness also?—Yes.

1608. You think the control exercised by a woman is inferior to that of a man?—I think in the case of big boys that is true.

1609. We have been told it is a question of temperament, is that so?—It is a question of temperament and aptitude. I think male teachers are better in the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Standards, and female teachers in the lower standards.

1610. Which do you think is the more important—the breaking in of the infants to educational work, or the training of the children as they grow older?—I do not like to make invidious comparisons; the work of pupils in the two highest standards is, I think, much more important for education than that at the lower stages.

1611. Which is the more arduous work in the primary schools?—The teaching of the higher classes is, in most respects, the more arduous, though I do not think we can draw a very sharp distinction.

1612. I think you said you found female teachers break down under the strain involved in teaching the higher standards?—Yes, that is so.

1613. Have you found males break down?—Not nearly so often as females.

1614. Are you aware that females break down in other kinds of employment—for instance, seamstresses and tailoresses?—I have no idea as to that, and cannot make a comparison.

1615. On the whole, do you think the occupation of a teacher is better adapted for a male than a female, or should there be a certain amount of employment for each?—Up to Standard III. in the larger schools I think the work is suitable for females, and here they do work as good as, or better than, males. For the heads of the larger schools men are much preferable to women.

1616. What is your opinion of small country schools of an attendance of from 14 to 20? Is a male or a female better in that class of school?—I think a female can do as good work there as a man.

1617. Do you approve of the salary of £70 for females and £130 for males?—I think in schools of that kind the salaries should be more on a level, more equal.

1618. Have you found anomalies existing in the schools, such as a teacher doing the best and highest work and receiving anything but the best pay?—Yes, anomalies of that kind exist here; in many cases there had been no distinction in the positions of assistants.

1619. How do you think abuses of that nature can be rectified, supposing you have a teacher doing Sixth and Seventh Standard work, and receiving a very inadequate salary?—I think a teacher should be paid according to the work done, and the fixing of teachers' ranks on the school staff should be equitably revised.

1619A. Who is responsible for the abuses I have mentioned, assuming they exist?—I suppose the Boards of Education; they appoint new assistants, and do not sufficiently consider the staff-rank of assistants already in the schools. Many of these anomalies have arisen from transfers that circumstances had made desirable. A teacher of high rank, when transferred, usually got a corresponding rank or as near such as might be. Most of the anomalies are due to this cause.

RICHARD HOBBS, Ex-member of the Auckland Education Board, examined.

Mr. Hobbs: I was a member of the Board under the denominational system, thirty-five or thirty-six years ago. Since that time, I have been a member of the Board of Education in Auckland at different times. I was also Chairman of the Board in 1889 and 1890. You will see I have had good opportunity of getting an insight into the working of the Auckland Board of Education. I should like to say that the continual introduction of various scales and salaries by different members of the Board, who seem to think it their province when they become members to introduce a new scale, causes great unrest among the teachers, and, to my mind, is very detrimental to the cause of education. I have opposed the introduction of so many, and I opposed the last one introduced by Dr. McArthur. I consider that, if the Government had consented to grant us the increased capitation grant, which we applied for on more than one occasion, we should have been able to do something to meet the exigencies of the Auckland Education District. In passing, I may say that there are those who do not appear to realise the extent of settlement that is going on, and the continual demands made on the Auckland Board. It is not very long ago that we had a pressing wire from the Premier, urging the establishment of a school at the Tunnel in the King-country, which the Board at once agreed to. This was when I was Chairman of the Board. I think, without any doubt, that what you call a "colonial scale" would be very desirable indeed for the Colony of New Zealand. I take a great interest in education, because I feel that the hope of the future of this country lies in the education imparted to the children, and education is not a matter in which we should be cheeseparating. If there is a matter we should be liberal in, it is in the matter of education. I do not see that there is any difficulty about the necessary grants; the Premier's salary is raised, Cabinet Ministers' salaries are raised, the honorarium of members of Parliament was increased, and a bonus added, while the Treasurer boasts of a large surplus, so surely there is no difficulty about money. There should be a very liberal grant made to the Boards of Education in order that they may carry out the functions allotted to them. It has been very hard for us to apply to the department, and to be told there were no funds, and that certain matters would be "considered." At the same time I think a colonial scale would be very inequitable if all head-teachers were not placed on the same footing, and allotted a fixed sum, according to the size of their schools, as house allowance. I do not see how you can grant one man house allowance or a house, and not do so in the case of another man. In connection with the Onehunga School there is a good house for the head-teacher, and grounds out of which a man could almost get his living. The same is true at Epsom. Immediately adjoining is another school district with no house allowance. I think such a state of affairs monstrous; it is not equitable, and I hope the Commission will note it and endeavour to remedy the evil. To tell us that it may be arranged by and by is simply putting the matter off, and I think such a matter should be dealt with at the time of the arrangement of a colonial scale. I have heard remarks to-day about pupil-teachers that would almost indicate that pupil-teachers were well paid. I think it would be well to inquire what cadets in other branches of the Civil Service receive in the way of salary, and then the difficulty we have in getting boys to enter the teaching profession would be understood. Young people have applied to us for positions, but have been taken from us owing to letters coming from the Treasury, the Railway, and the Post and Telegraph, and the Customs Departments, where the young people start at £65 a year, with an annual increase. No wonder, then, that young people leave the teaching profession, or fight shy of it, when they are allowed only £20 or £30 a year. I believe a colonial scale will do away with those heart-burnings, and I think the House will be prepared to deal liberally with the question of education.

1620. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] Are you satisfied with the half-time school system?—As a convenient arrangement I am perfectly satisfied with it.

1621. You wish to see the salaries of teachers brought up and not levelled down?—Yes; I think it was a mistake to reduce the salaries of the best and head-teachers in our large schools. I think if they all received house allowance it would compensate them, and that such an arrangement would be fairly equitable.

OLIVER MAYS, Chairman of the Devonport School Committee.

Mr. Mays: I have been twenty years Chairman of one of the largest School Committees in Auckland, and I am an old teacher myself. With reference to a colonial scale of salaries, I think it is desirable for teachers: First, because continual uncertainty as to salaries exercises a prejudicial effect on teachers; secondly, because it is manifestly just that teachers should receive the same rate of pay throughout the colony. I regret to learn that the proposed colonial scale will reduce the salaries of headmasters of large schools. This I think both unnecessary and unfair to the Board's most experienced and responsible servants. If house allowance were added to these salaries, the proposed scale would be more satisfactory. I think the headmaster of a large school such as Devonport, with an average attendance of over 500, should receive a salary of £350 a year at least.

NEW PLYMOUTH.

THURSDAY, 6TH JUNE, 1901.

D. McALLUM, Chairman of the Taranaki Education Board, examined.

Mr. McAllum: First of all, I wish to say that I am in favour of this colonial scale of salaries for the teachers, or, what would suit the Taranaki District better, a graduated capitation scheme, so as to place this education district on a similar footing with the other education districts of the colony. If the department were to introduce a colonial scheme of salaries the amount proposed for administrative purposes—11s. 3d. *per capita*—would not be sufficient for this Board. A balance-sheet has been prepared, details of which will be submitted to you later on, showing how that would come out. Under the proposal of 11s. 3d. *per capita* this Board would lose nearly £700 on what it has at the present time, and, as compared with other districts, teachers in Taranaki are underpaid. They do not receive sufficient remuneration for the services rendered. The inducement offered for promising material is not good enough to bring them forward; and that might be emphasized by the fact that when any vacancies occur in our district we receive very few applications indeed to supply those vacancies. I may say I am not altogether in favour of equal pay to male and female teachers. We find here that in the matter of illness females are a greater expense to the Board than are males; they can live cheaper than males can; and, further, they frequently get married, and by these marriages the schools are disorganized, and the pupils thrown back in their lessons. The Board some time ago, recognising the difficulty of getting the best boys to come forward as teachers, proposed to award them a higher salary, but unfortunately the department put its foot down and stopped it.

1. *Mr. Mackenzie*.] Do you think the Inspectors ought to be under the Board or under the Government?—I think they ought to be under the Government.

2. Have you any half-time schools here?—No.

3. Have you any provision for sick allowance?—The Board always allows teachers who have been in the Board's service twelve months one month's salary when away through illness.

4. Have you seen the scales that are being discussed by the Commission?—I have not seen the second one.

5. In the readjustment of our educational system, I take it it is your wish that the system should be built up to the level of the best-paid system in the colony?—Certainly.

6. Even although that may exceed the £4 capitation grant within which we are supposed to work?—Yes.

7. I also take it as your opinion that if the £4 is not quite sufficient to bring the salaries up to the best you do not wish to see the better paid reduced?—Certainly not.

8. Do you consider the work of a first assistant in a town school as difficult as that of a teacher of a country school with, say, 40 or 45?—Certainly I do.

9. And you think they should be paid about alike?—Yes, I think so.

10. Have you any system of promotion of teachers here?—No; everything is submitted to the School Committees. They select, the Board confirms.

11. Do you not think that some system whereby colonial promotion might be carried on might be considered?—Yes; when I say we have no scheme of promotion here, I should perhaps say that it has been done here, but with great difficulty.

12. What increase of incidental allowance would you require?—I would not like to say.

13. You say you would lose £700: is your present allowance sufficient?—No, if we take into consideration the Building Fund. It would take £500 to repaint our buildings, and we have very few school residences indeed in the district. In one case a teacher who has six children has to live in three rooms partitioned off from the school.

14. Do you approve of so much canvassing by teachers?—I personally oppose anything like that.

15. *Mr. Davidson*.] Do you not think that if a colonial scale of salaries were introduced, and the salaries of the small schools of Taranaki brought up to the highest grade now paid in any part of the colony, that would be better than a capitation grant?—If the amount *per capita* were higher we would be satisfied.

16. Have you worked out the amount you would receive for incidental expenses *plus* the £250, and showing, as you state, a loss of £700?—The total receipts would come to £2,268 19s. 10d., against which we would have an expenditure of £2,962 15s., leaving a deficit of £693 15s. 2d.

17. Would you be in favour of establishing training-colleges and a system of scholarships whereby your pupil-teachers could receive training?—Certainly I should.

18. If such a system were carried out, the item “£216, training of pupil-teachers,” would be saved to your Board?—There might be a few of the items saved, but in making up our computation we took our expenditure for last year.

19. Then, again, where you have no house provided for the teacher I understand you make a house allowance?—Yes.

20. If the Commission suggested an arrangement to provide for that item by a separate vote, that also would save to your Board £256?—Yes.

21. So that the loss would be very much smaller to the Board if these items could be saved?—Yes; but still we have been very cheeseparing in the past. We should spend £500 now on actually urgent works.

22. Of course, you know that painting would come out of the building grant, and would have nothing to do with the 11s. 3d.?—Yes.

23. You consider the salaries paid in this district altogether inadequate for the services rendered, and not sufficient to induce the best class of boys to enter the service?—Yes.

24. When vacancies occur in the service do you get applications from outside the district?—Yes, a few.

25. Do applicants from other districts receive appointments in Taranaki?—There is an applications committee, and the very best of the applicants are picked out and dealt with.

26. *Mr. Stewart.*] You are not at all in favour, I presume, of the great discrepancy that exists in the payment of teachers throughout New Zealand?—No.

27. Have you thought how the discrepancies arise—what is the main cause of them?—I have not been able to come to any satisfactory conclusion about it.

28. You suggested there should be a differential capitation grant: do you think, supposing there was a differential capitation grant, that that would remove the anomalies in payments?—I think it would do a good deal towards it in this district, where the schools are so scattered and the attendance below the paying-mark.

29. But do not differences arise, not so much through financial complications as from the fact that there are thirteen different Boards drawing up thirteen different scales of payment?—That might be.

30. You say you have a great number of small and non-paying schools?—Yes.

31. Are they likely to increase in number as settlement goes on?—There is no doubt about that.

32. So that the capitation grant this year may not do for your requirements next year?—I do not know that it would change so rapidly as that.

33. Under a colonial scale there would be a fixed salary attached to a school of a given size, and if you had more of that class of school your means would rise in proportion?—So far as the teachers are concerned, we consider a colonial scale best for them; but it is for administrative purposes that we are looking at it.

34. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] How long have you been Chairman of this Board?—About two years.

35. Do you find, taken as a whole, that the salaries of the teachers in the Taranaki District are too low?—Yes, decidedly.

36. You have not had an opportunity of comparing the suggested scale with the scale that obtains in Taranaki?—No; I have not seen it yet.

37. You have not the same difficulty in securing the services of female teachers as you have in getting males, especially in the smaller districts?—No.

38. Is there a considerable preponderance of female teachers in the service of the Board?—Speaking from memory, I think yes.

39. Does the Board give the preference to female teachers so that they may teach sewing, play the piano or church-organ?—I do not think they do.

40. I suppose there is a considerable number of schools to which no residence is attached?—That is true.

41. With regard to pupil-teachers, do you not consider there are too many pupil-teachers, comparatively speaking, in the service of the Taranaki Board?—If we have fewer pupil-teachers we will have fewer teachers coming on.

42. With regard to the smaller schools, is it possible or practicable in any part of the district to convey pupils to a central school?—Most of them are conveyed on horseback, and you cannot well get any better form of locomotion. As many as three of them ride one horse at one time.

43. Do you not consider it would be more economical if you could do away with the side-school for the infants in New Plymouth?—Both the main and side schools at New Plymouth and Stratford are filled to their utmost capacity.

44. Has your Board had to entrench on the salaries fund for building purposes?—No.

45. Respecting the adoption of a colonial scale, do you consider the power of the Board would be diminished by the adoption of a scale laid down by the department?—No, I do not think so.

46. *Mr. Hill.*] With reference to the discrepancies existing in the wages paid to teachers doing the same kind of work, do you think that the same exist in other callings? For instance, do you think that a draper's assistant in New Plymouth would be paid the same amount as a draper's assistant in Wellington or Dunedin?—I do not know. I have no more idea than the man in the moon on such a question as that. I think perhaps labour is dearer here than in other parts of the colony.

47. Would you expect the same wage to exist throughout the colony for the same class of work, say, in the case of teachers?—Yes; I think they ought to have the same wage throughout the colony, because it is the same class of work.

48. Do you not think that there are differences in the cost of living in the various parts of the colony?—Yes; and I think teachers in some parts ought to be paid more than in others because of the hardships they have to put up with.

49. Suppose a number of teachers held the same class of certificate, would you suggest that they should get the same rate of wage?—That is rather a difficult question. The man with the best power of imparting his knowledge to the children should get the highest salary.

50. Do you select your men on that principle?—If we know them personally it weighs with the selection committee. We require men with the best powers of teaching irrespective of classification.

51. Do you find that the money which you give to the various School Committees is sufficient for the Committees to maintain the various schools?—I think every meeting of the Board we waste several hours fighting over the question of the insufficient grant to School Committees. If it was not for the labours of the settlers these schools would go to wreck and ruin in no time.

52. Do you find it necessary to pay any of the maintenance allowance in to the Building Fund?—Not to my knowledge.

53. You have between three and four thousand children: what do you think of the merging of your district with, say, that of Wanganui: do you think it would be better for this district?—I do not know that the people would oppose it; but I think they would find the district too large to manage.

54. Do you recognise that the colonial scale would limit the functions of your Board?—It might; but no doubt many Education Boards would be very willing to have their functions taken over by the Government.

55. *Mr. Smith.*] You referred to a certain number of schools that were not paying?—Yes; the majority of our schools cost more than the capitation earned.

56. Do you know what average attendance is required to make a school payable?—About 40 or 45.

57. *Mr. Lethbridge.*] Have you any aided schools in the district?—There are two at present, and one will be dropped in a very short time.

58. *Mr. Weston.*] I think you favoured the location of the Inspectors at Wellington?—I said I thought they would be better under Government control.

59. Why do you think they should be under the control of the General Government?—Because in this way they could be changed from one district to another. It would give greater satisfaction to the parents and the Committees in the various districts.

60. How many Inspectors have you?—One.

61. In a district where there are two or three Inspectors, would not the Inspectors be able to change about, and take the schools alternately?—Yes.

62. Would that in any way alter the view you have just taken?—It might.

63. I suppose, as a matter of fact, that you take counsel with your Inspector in the matter of appointments, and so forth?—Well, hardly. Whatever applications come to the Board are placed before the teachers' selection committee. That committee goes through the testimonials and other matters, and picks out the very best to lay before the Board.

64. Do you limit the number?—No. The best are selected by the Board and sent on to the committee for their selection, and we confirm their selection.

65. Have you any theory for the removal of the difficulty of getting male pupil-teachers?—Yes; we offered a larger salary.

66. Is that the only method you have thought of by which to meet it?—Yes; at present.

67. Do you think that the appointment of pupil-teachers is an advantage or a disadvantage in a school?—I think it is an advantage. It is like an apprenticeship in any other trade.

68. Do you think that boy-teachers are capable of imparting efficient instruction to the pupils in the school?—I think, to the junior classes they are quite capable of doing so.

69. Would you favour handing over a class in a school to a pupil-teacher?—Certainly.

70. Without any supervision?—We always have them under the supervision of a teacher. They are practically in the same room with the assistant.

71. The pupil-teacher is under the supervision of the teacher in charge of that class?—Yes.

72. Can pupil-teachers in your district receive sufficient instruction to become good and efficient teachers afterwards?—The pupil-teachers of our own training that we have been able to advance have given us the best results of any teachers in Taranaki.

73. Then, do you require a training-school?—It would be an advantage if we had a training-school; it would save us a good deal of worry and expense, and possibly bring on the pupil-teachers better.

74. Then, you think that a pupil-teacher in a small school cannot qualify himself to become a certificated master?—That is our experience to a certain extent.

75. Would you tell me what, in your opinion, should be the minimum salary for male and female teachers in your schools?—I would rather not answer that question, but leave it to the experts. I should say £75.

76. What is the minimum paid now?—£50.

77. Are you able to find the required number of teachers readily under your present scale of payment?—No; we have great difficulty in getting teachers, especially for the small schools.

78. Has this Board received complaints from teachers as to the smallness of their pay?—I do not know that we have; but I think it is just because they knew it was no use complaining.

79. You said that the circumstances of the various districts and the rate of living should be taken into consideration in allotting salaries: then, I presume it would follow that, if the circumstances of Canterbury, for instance, were different to those of Taranaki, these different circumstances would be taken into account in assessing salaries?—Yes,

80. If that be so, what becomes of a colonial scale?—I was thinking about the administrative expenses: you are referring to salaries.

81. You advocate a colonial scale, do you not?—I am in favour of it.

82. You tell me that in assessing the salaries the circumstances of the various educational districts should be considered—that is to say, in one district where the expense of living is higher you would probably give the teacher there more than you would give the teacher in a district where the circumstances were favourable to cheap living?—No, I did not mean that. I was referring more to the difficulty of getting to the schools. On account of not having residences attached to many of the schools, teachers have to lodge wherever they can get accommodation, and this means a considerable expense for travelling over the bad roads.

83. Do you think the circumstances of the various districts should be considered in the assessing of salaries?—I am in favour of a colonial scale to teachers; but, as far as the amount *per capita* to the Board is concerned, that ought to be taken into consideration.

84. The circumstances of Otago, Canterbury, Wellington, Wanganui, Taranaki, Auckland, and Hawke's Bay may differ: do you think such differences should be taken into consideration when the salaries are assessed?—I should say so. It is a matter for the Commission to decide. I think the teachers should be paid the same throughout New Zealand.

85. If in the payment of salaries there be a differential scale, you cannot have a colonial scale or uniform scale, can you?—I cannot express an opinion on that.

86. For what purposes are the incidental allowances granted to the various School Committees?—For cleaning and maintaining in good order the school and grounds and fences, and for doing petty repairs.

87. Can you form an opinion from the complaints you have received as to the additional sum your Board should pay to the several Committees?—I should say, double the amount we already pay—viz., £1,060.

88. Is it a fact that in the country schools there is very irregular attendance by the children?—There must be, especially in the winter months, on account of the bad roads and the distance the children have to travel.

89. But does not the nature of the dairy industry preclude many children from attending regularly during the school-hours?—It has a bearing on it; but during the summer months, when dairying is in full swing, the attendance is fairly good.

90. Is it not true, also, that a number of children from force of circumstances are employed hunting up and milking cows, and come to school in a state of fatigue?—Yes. I think many of them are late in their attendance. There is no doubt about it that they are fatigued when they start their duties, and are not in a fit state to receive tuition.

91. If that is so, then you say that the children are receiving the full benefit of our national education system?—I do not think they are in that case. What we must consider is that people must live first and get their education afterwards.

92. What do you pay your Board members for travelling-expenses?—Actual travelling-expenses.

93. How often does the Board meet?—Every second Wednesday—about twenty-six meetings in the year.

94. Is that not rather many meetings for this district?—It takes us all our time.

95. Have you a Building Committee?—No; but we have a Finance Committee, and that practically means the same.

96. What do you mean by your building-allowance being insufficient?—We cannot maintain our buildings.

97. Do you mean that you have not enough money to build sufficient schools, or to keep the schools in order?—If the amount of money received were devoted to repairs and painting it might be sufficient, but if we have to build a new school out of it it would run away with it all at one time.

98. It must follow that unless the ordinary capitation grant for incidentals be increased your buildings cannot be maintained and Government property must deteriorate?—That is so.

99. Supposing an alteration in the staffing required an assistant in some of the schools that are now taught single-handed, would alterations or additions to some of the schools become necessary?—I think, very probably it would be so.

100. I suppose the single-handed schools are no larger than are required for present purposes?—That is so.

101. What do you advocate in regard to first assistant teachers: do you think they should receive higher salaries than they are paid now?—Yes, I think so.

102. Do you think that the first-assistant's liability to be called upon to fill the position of headmaster in case of emergency should be taken into account in assessing the salary?—Yes, I think so.

103. You do not think that the cases of emergency are so infrequent as to make it unnecessary that they should be taken into consideration?—I do not think so.

104. Does your Board advocate the employment of female teachers, and not male teachers, in small schools?—Generally, I think there might be a leaning in that direction.

105. Do you consider that the small schools would be better in charge of females than males?—I think so.

106. Up to what size of schools?—20 to 25.

107. Has your Board ever considered the number of children that could be efficiently taught by one teacher?—Yes; I think they consider generally it should not be more than 40 in a class.

108. Does your Board favour the leaving of the school to one teacher up to 40, or have you advocated either a monitor or a pupil-teacher to act with that teacher?—We give a pupil-teacher when the attendance is over 40.

109. Is it thought by your Inspector, and the teachers generally, that a teacher can conduct schools up to 40?—I think so.

110. Does the Board think that one teacher can manage all the standards up to 40?—Yes.

111. After 40, do you consider there should be an assistant with the master?—Personally I do.

112. Do you think that your scale deals fairly with the relative positions of masters and mistresses—in other words, do you think that the male and female teachers receive justly proportionate pay?—I think so.

113. Do you approve of the master of a small school being mulcted in the price of a sewing-mistress?—Certainly not.

114. What is your practice here: when a master is in sole charge of a school, do you mulct him in the cost of a sewing-mistress?—No.

115. *Mr. Hogben.*] In the influence of local circumstances on salaries that you refer to, was the matter of the expense incurred by the teacher in travelling over bad roads from his lodging or residence to the school included?—That is one of the circumstances.

116. Supposing, on the recommendation of the Commission, Boards were provided with enough money to provide residences or house allowance sufficient to overcome that difficulty, the local circumstances would cease to be an operative cause?—So far as the financial aspect is concerned; but you must take into account that the teachers are more or less affected by the bad state of the roads. If money were given us to build residences it would get over the difficulty at once.

117. I suppose in some parts of the district groceries are harder to get than in New Plymouth?—Yes; in some places it is almost impossible to get them at all.

118. Do you think it is practicable to devise a scale to pay according to the price of necessities in the various districts?—No.

119. You said the department stopped the Board from giving higher salaries to the male pupil-teachers: do you not think it would be more correct to say that the department stopped the Board from giving lower salaries to female pupil-teachers?—No.

120. You raised the salaries of the male pupil-teachers, but did not the Minister ask that the salaries of the females should be raised to those of the males?—That might be; but the object we sought to obtain was lost if we did that.

121. Are you aware that with a district high school on the numbers as at present you would receive £104 per annum under the special grant?—I am not thoroughly aware as to how it would result.

122. If the amount is approximately that, it would meet your charge of £21?—Yes, I should say so.

123. Your remarks with respect to capitation I take to apply to the money available for the general expenses of the Board after salaries are paid?—That is so.

124. *The Chairman.*] You think it would be better if the Inspectors were under the department?—Yes.

125. Is that because there would be an advantage in moving them from district to district?—I think that whatever dissatisfaction is existing among Committees or parents just now might be done away with, and I think it would be fairer for the Inspectors.

126. Do you think it would be an improvement to have the Inspectors made irresponsible so far as the Boards or the parents were concerned?—I have not considered it in that way.

127. Do you not think it would be more unpleasant to the Inspector himself?—My own idea was that it would be just as well that the Inspectors should be interchangeable, and it could be done possibly by agreement between the Boards.

128. Do you not think it would be better, after all, to keep the Inspectors under your control?—I think, under those circumstances, it would be better to do so.

129. Do you know how many salaries there are over £200 under your Board?—Three or four.

130. And how many salaries are there over £150 and under £200?—I think, about nine.

131. Then, nearly the whole of your schools are manned by teachers with salaries under £150?—Yes.

132. Do you think that that is a fair salary for a competent teacher, who has spent years in acquiring his position, and who has to live in a country district where the cost of provisions is considerable?—I think a teacher ought to be paid £3 a week, at any rate.

GEORGE W. POTTS, representing the Taranaki Educational Institute, examined.

Mr. Potts: I am headmaster of the Bell Block School, and am representing the local branch of the Educational Institute. I approve of the colonial scale of salaries. The only point, I think, that I find several teachers have complained of in the proposed scale is as to the payment of junior teachers and second masters in two of the big schools; otherwise the scale seems to meet with approval throughout the district.

133. Have you seen the second scheme?—No.

134. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] Would you favour the centralisation of Inspectors?—Yes. I do not think that one district should be inspected year after year by the same Inspectors.

135. *Mr. Davidson.*] What has been your teaching experience?—About thirty years; from the very smallest school up to schools of about 100.

136. According to this second suggested scale, the assistance given to a sole teacher is at 40, and the assistance takes the form of a certificated mistress?—I think it should be lower. I think it is almost impossible for any teacher to do justice to a school of 40.

137. Do you know that in Southland and Otago a sole teacher has to teach up to 50?—Yes; but I do not think it can be altogether satisfactory.

138. And do you know that the same thing occurs in Victoria and the other Australian States?—I have heard so.

139. At what average attendance do you think the assistance should come in?—At 35.

140. Suppose you had a school of 35, what part of that school would under the control of the mistress?—Generally speaking, I suppose the infants and Standards I. and II. if all classes were represented.

141. If you were to take the infants and Standards I. and II. from a school having an average attendance of 35 you would probably leave 15 pupils for the master: do you think that the teaching-power would not be too great in such a school?—The upper classes would take up the time. A teacher might as easily teach 50 as the 15.

142. At the present time in Taranaki a sole teacher teachers up to 40, does he not?—Yes.

143. He receives a very much lower rate of pay than a teacher occupying a similar position in Otago, Southland, and other parts of the colony?—Yes.

144. Would you prefer to teach 3 or 4 more children and receive higher pay than receive assistance and a lower rate of pay?—Personally, I would rather receive the lower rate of pay and teach a lower number and have assistance. I think 40 children could be taught, but I do not think they could be taught to give thorough satisfaction.

145. What is the form of assistance you would suggest?—Certainly not a pupil-teacher, for I think a pupil-teacher is at a great disadvantage in being brought up in a small school like that. They cannot be properly supervised.

146. Do you consider that two certificated teachers should be placed in charge of a school having an average attendance not greater than 35?—It seems large, but I would approve of it.

147. Have you ever considered the desirability of placing in such a school not a raw pupil-teacher commencing his first year, but, say, a third-year pupil-teacher?—I think that might do as well as a certificated teacher.

148. From 35 to 60, would you suggest, instead of a mistress, as proposed in the scale, a pupil-teacher of the third year?—I think a third-year pupil-teacher up to 55 might meet the requirements.

149. Have you considered the desirability of appointing to such schools neither a pupil-teacher nor a certificated mistress, but a monitor who has passed through the school as a pupil, giving a salary of, say, £12 a year, and not to be considered as qualifying for a teacher?—I think that such a monitor would be quite as efficient as a first- or second-year pupil-teacher.

150. Do you think there are too many pupil-teachers in this district?—Decidedly.

151. Do your pupil-teachers find places readily after the completion of their course?—I think that most of them have found positions so far, but many of them leave the service after finishing their course. Many of them have no intention of going on.

152. Then, the training as teachers is practically wasted on such?—Yes.

153. Would you, then, approve of the suggestion of having a monitor between 30 and 40, and then bring in a certificated mistress?—I think that would meet all the requirements—I think it is a very good suggestion.

154. *Mr. Stewart.*] May we take the opinions you have expressed as your own, or as those of the class of teachers you represent?—I think, as far as I know, my opinions represent the teachers of the district.

155. Are we to distinctly understand that your teachers are unanimous in approving of a colonial scale in the abstract?—I never met one who did not think it was necessary.

156. Have you ever lived in any other provincial district?—Yes.

157. From your experience, do you think that the varying cost of living is sufficiently great in the different districts to be taken into consideration in forming a basis of payment of teachers?—I think the difference is counterbalanced in so many ways that it would be impossible to take it into consideration.

158. You were speaking to the point at which assistance should be given—whether at 35 or 40: would it not very much depend on how the 5 extra children were distributed among the classes?—Yes.

159. In these schools, say, from 35 to 40, or 35 to 45, do you think that all the classes would be represented?—In my case they always have been, except twice.

160. Do you not think, then, you are pushing the argument too far when you say it would not be in the interests of the school that the assistance should not come in till 40; one extra pupil in four or five of the classes, would that materially cripple you in the conduct of the school?—It would make a very great difference in the working of the school if an extra class were involved.

161. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] With regard to the centralisation of Inspectors, are you aware that at the recent conference of Inspectors a resolution was carried in favour of centralisation?—I have seen it stated.

162. You consider, then, that if the Inspectors were placed under the central department it would lead to uniformity of inspection and examination, and also of assignment of marks so as to enable teachers to get higher certificates on some regular principle?—I think it would lead to greater uniformity in examination.

163. With regard to bringing in the assistance at 35, I suppose you are aware that when the staff is over-liberal the salaries will not be so liberal as they otherwise would be?—I am not speaking for the Institute in this particular case; but I consider it the hardest school to teach, and I would rather take a lower salary and have assistance.

164. With regard to the syllabus, do you consider that we should differentiate in the country schools?—Certainly.

165. Do you consider that 50 per cent. is too low for the operation of the working-average?—I think it is too low, and, except in very small schools, it is very seldom that the average goes below half.

166. Do you consider it should be raised?—I think three-fifths would be a very fair number to raise it to.

167. Do you approve of a sole male teacher being required to pay £10 a year out of his salary for a sewing-mistress?—There is a certain amount of fairness in it, and I suppose it is put in to encourage the appointment of females to very small schools; that is how I read it.

168. The sewing-mistress is of no assistance to the teacher in the school?—No.

169. Do you favour a fine or penalty being imposed on any teacher who does not hold the requisite certificate?—I regarded the 5 per cent., and so on, not as a fine on the teacher not holding the certificate, but as a bonus to those holding the certificate.

170. Supposing, then, this scale is adopted, and we require for the Stratford School, with an attendance of 313, a headmaster with a certificate of C1, and the occupant of the position only holds a D1, do you consider that in a case of that kind the headmaster should be fined 1 per cent.?—I have not heard any objections made to that part of the scale. So far as the Institute is concerned, we have not discussed that point.

171. Do you approve of capitation to teachers being increased per unit?—Yes; most strongly.

172. Is the house allowance of 4s. 6d. per week, given in Taranaki, sufficient?—I suppose in some of the country districts it is nearly equivalent to the rent of a house.

173. *Mr. Hill.*] What is your average attendance?—44 or 45.

174. What is your staffing?—A female pupil-teacher.

175. Do you find that staffing satisfactory?—No. I do not find that I can do justice to the pupil-teacher in the way of supervising her work.

176. What work do you intrust her to do?—The infant class, the First Standard, and most of the Second Standard.

177. How many pupils have you above Standard II.?—An average of about 25.

178. Is your time-table arranged with a view to merging as much as possible?—Yes; but I do not find it satisfactory.

179. Which standards are merged?—The Fifth and Sixth especially.

180. Suppose the regulation for the staffing of small schools was so arranged that all schools up to 30 or 35 were to be placed under a mistress, and between 35 and 45 under a master, with a view of giving better salaries to the master in one case, and good salaries to the mistress in the other, do you think such an arrangement would be a wise course to adopt?—I do not think so, because of the variations in attendance. My school varies as much as 10 in a quarter.

181. Does your school vary in a sufficient manner to warrant the withdrawal of the master on the lines of attendance suggested?—Our pupil-teacher was appointed on those lines, but in my case the pupil-teacher was allowed to remain.

182. Do you think that the certificates B and A are essential to teachers of the public schools of the colony?—No; but I think that having something to gain gives a stimulus to teachers to continue their work.

183. Supposing certificates were done away with altogether from the proposed scale, would it debar teachers from applying?—No, certainly not.

184. Under such circumstances, what do you think a teacher applying for a position would do?—He would send in his best qualifications.

185. Who would be judge of the qualifications?—The Board.

186. So that the certificate is not necessary for this scale?—No.

187. Do you think, then, that a teacher should be punished because he is not in the possession of a degree?—It seems hard that he should.

188. *Mr. Weston.*] What do you think should be the minimum salary for a teacher—male and female—in our schools?—£100.

189. Do you think the same minimum should be given to each sex?—I do not think it would exactly "pan out" as some people imagine; I do not think it would be altogether to the benefit of the female teachers.

190. Now, then, which do you think would be the best—a lady teacher or a male teacher—for the small schools, say, up to 25?—I do not think there is any particular choice, provided they are of equal ability.

191. Do you think that the general run of pupil-teachers are competent to impart instruction in our schools?—I do not think so. I think many of them are very indifferent.

192. Would it be to the advantage of a district that a pupil-teacher trained in a small school, and taking his certificate, should receive an appointment as teacher in one of the small schools?—It depends altogether on the pupil-teacher. I know splendid teachers who have never been out of a small school.

193. Do you think that a training-school should be established in this district?—It would be a great advantage to the district.

194. Do you think that the children in our smaller schools are able to cope with the children in the larger schools in the matter of scholarships?—Not on equal terms.

195. Does your Board give the children of the country schools the benefit of a year in the scholarship examinations?—No allowance is made.

196. What system of promotion would you yourself, as a teacher of experience, advocate?—I cannot see anything that is fairer than promotion by Inspector's marks.

197. *Mr. Hogben.*] You suggested £100 as a minimum salary for a teacher: were you referring to a head-teacher or an assistant?—To a sole teacher. I think an assistant in a town school might begin with a lower salary.

198. It has been suggested that there should be a modification of the syllabus in the direction of requiring fewer subjects in schools with a sole teacher: would that relieve the pressure that there is at present in such schools?—I think it would.

199. Do you think it would be possible to so choose the subjects of the syllabus that the number of classes in the small schools might be brought below six?—You must have six at the very least.

200. Is it not a fact that in the manual instruction it is generally required that there should be fewer pupils per teacher than in the more mechanical method?—I think, if you are going to bring in manual instruction into the primary schools you must have fewer pupils per teacher.

THURSDAY, 7TH JUNE, 1901.

W. E. SPENCER, M.A., B.Sc., Inspector of Schools, examined.

Mr. Spencer: Whatever scheme may be carried, the result, I am satisfied, is going to be of the greatest benefit to the whole colony, and particularly to Taranaki. I refer to this district, as it is classed as one of the smaller districts. We find the greatest difficulty in inducing promising lads to enter the teaching profession; in fact, labourers are as well paid as the majority of teachers in the profession, and artisans are better paid. The lowness of the salaries paid causes constant changes, tending to decreased efficiency in school-work; not only that, but we are sometimes met with this fact: we must either close a school or appoint a teacher whom we know to be inefficient and incompetent to carry on the work; that has practically been the position in a few cases here. Moreover, the tendency is for the weaker class of teachers to be driven into the smaller, and therefore weaker, districts. This difficulty has cropped up because we cannot afford to pay for the services of a good teacher, and even the inefficient teacher may give a *quid pro quo* for the amount he receives. For equivalent responsibility and equivalent work a good teacher here should receive the same salary as is paid to a teacher doing similar work in another district; but it is not so—such a teacher here will receive £40 a year less. If good salaries are paid, and thereby good teachers obtained, the status of the teachers and the general efficiency of the district will be raised. With regard to the staffing laid down in the proposed scheme, and also in the alternative scheme, there may be somewhat of a difficulty so far as this district is concerned. There may be some such difficulty in carrying it out owing to the scarcity of assistants. I consider that a school with an attendance between 40 and 50, with a first-year pupil-teacher, is the hardest class of school to work; with a third-year pupil-teacher it is not so difficult. The proposal, under the suggested scale, the alternative scale, to introduce an assistant at 40 is certainly a great relief to the teacher in that class of schools; our scale does not give an assistant till an attendance of 70 is reached. In reality, however, the staffing in our schools is not so meagre as it would appear, because generally our fifth-year pupil-teachers are appointed to schools of an attendance of 56, so that in schools with that average attendance there would be really a head-teacher and an ex-pupil-teacher—one who has passed through his or her term of apprenticeship, and is really as good as an assistant. Under the proposed staffing we would be benefited. Our staffing as at present is as follows: Sixty-six head-teachers, four male assistants, and fourteen female assistants, and thirty-six pupil-teachers, plus a cadet; there is one extra assistant for the Stratford District High School. The proposed scale would still give sixty-six head-teachers, but an increase of three male assistants, seventeen female assistants, and a falling-off of nineteen pupil-teachers. These increases go chiefly towards relieving the work in the hardest class of schools—the hardest then become the easiest. I think we should have difficulty in getting these extra assistants unless increased inducements were held out. With regard to schools with an attendance of 40, of course the average attendance varies considerably, and constant changes in the staff are likely to be made, for these are the schools in which we are constantly appointing or removing a pupil-teacher, and the same would hold in the case of the assistant. Generally, a school with an attendance of 40 is a country school in a settled district, and there is not much prospect of getting a large permanent increase, so that in this way I see a little difficulty. With regard to mistresses, I think they require a little more assistance than is proposed to be given at present, especially if kindergarten work, requiring close supervision, is taken up, for I think 30 pupils sufficient for a teacher. I think also that the syllabus requires modification—that alternative schemes should be brought forward. Why should not the teacher be allowed to choose that particular line of subjects which that teacher may be particularly adapted to teach? The teachers would then be able to satisfactorily instruct the children in the subjects they (the teachers) were strong in. All our teachers may not be capable of manual work. Reverting to kindergarten work again, I think some provision should be made for teaching children under five years of age. In regard to certificates, I think the jump from E5 to E2 too great; in schools of from 19 to 35 I think a teacher with E3 may do very good work. I think a great deal might be done in the way of improving the method of making appointments, for, as far as the Board is concerned, they wish to see the best teachers appointed; and classification frequently depends on the district in which a teacher is working. In schools of from 19 to 35 in average attendance I think E3 teachers perform very satisfactory work indeed. With regard to the increases in salaries, sixty-three teachers here get increases, and three are reduced. The increases are as follows: Under £10, five; under £20, five; under £30, twenty-three; under £40, twenty-one; under £50, eight; under £60, one. Looking at these increases, I am satisfied that they are well allocated, and that the increases are in the schools that are the hardest to teach. These increases do not include house allowance, fees for the instruction of pupil-teachers, or payment to sewing-teachers. I said the increases are very fair ones generally. There are no aided schools here; and of teachers receiving under £100 we have thirteen, while previously there were thirty-three teachers. Furthermore, this scheme embraces what I consider has put Otago and other districts on such a satisfactory footing—namely, the system of bonuses. This method of deduction in the suggested scale I consider to be an excellent idea, and they are very fairly paid. One per cent. is taken off for each class and 4 per cent. for each

division; I think the latter deduction recognises that teaching skill is of greater importance than literary ability, though, of course, literary ability should not be neglected. With regard to a superannuation scheme, I think that no scheme of paying salaries should be brought forward unless sufficient provision is made for superannuation. With regard to the payment of teachers' salaries, there is the effect of epidemics to be taken into consideration. This district, in common with other districts, has been visited by epidemics, and as a result the salaries of the teachers have fallen, though at the same time their work has been really increased; they have to teach the same subjects over and over again, entailing on the teachers considerable worry. I think that difficulty might be met by the percentage of exemptions in computing the working-average, or else by paying on the average attendance of the previous quarter. With regard to the salaries paid to the assistants, I am not so satisfied with the scheme. In this district there are seventeen assistants, eleven of whom receive increases amounting to £257 3s., while the other six are decreased to the extent of £115 in the three large schools. The salary of one second assistant would be reduced by £50; another assistant would lose £30. With one exception, all decreases are in schools of an attendance over 300. However, I understand, from an explanation given by the Inspector-General, that this difficulty is practically overcome by the alternative scheme. I should like to remark that the first and second male assistants in a large school are really the backbone of the school, and next to them comes the infant mistress, whose work is extremely important. She has charge of the groundwork of the school, and the First, Second, and Third Standards suffer considerably if her work be not good. The work of the infant mistress is as important as that of the first and second male assistants. With regard to the payment of pupil-teachers, I think an excellent proposal is brought forward in the suggested scheme, and one that I would like to have seen adopted by this Board, but it was impossible to do so on account of lack of funds. I refer to the allowance made to pupil-teachers when living away from home. I am inclined to think that the salary of £20 for a first-year pupil-teacher is too low. I should like to see classes in school-management included in technical instruction, and grants made to them, as far as the pupil-teachers are concerned. If technical work is taught in separate classes we should not neglect the very groundwork, the skill in teaching. The more the pupil-teachers are improved the more also are the teachers improved generally, and that is a point I should like to urge—there should be lectures in school-management and grants made for them. Speaking of the difficulty of getting male pupil-teachers, in this district we have thirty-three pupil-teachers at present, only seven of whom are males. Regarding the 11s. 3d. capitation grant, it really perpetuates an error made by the present capitation grant, for neither is the cost of instruction nor the cost of administration *per capita* invariable; they are not dependent on the numbers taught in a district, and the cost of administration must depend upon the distribution of pupils. If all the children in this district were collected in a few schools the grant would be sufficient. £250, *plus* 11s. 3d., will not meet present expenses, and will allow for no extension in many directions that may be desirable and urgent. In this matter Boards require a living-wage as well as individuals. Payment should be on a sliding-scale. To speak of equal payment for equal work in the cases of male and female teachers sounds very well. In schools with an attendance of 25, male and female teachers do equally good work; possibly females do better—it depends entirely on the teacher. When it comes to schools of an average attendance over 25, as sole teacher I think male teachers are better. Female teachers are not so good in the higher standards in large schools; they are not able to discharge the work of Standards V., VI., and VII. in the same manner as male teachers. Then, again, male teachers are practically employed permanently, while female teachers are not; and the cost of production of a male teacher is less than the cost of production of a female teacher. In the last two years twenty-two teachers left our service, and of these only five were male teachers—and they were not the best; the other seventeen were female teachers, and some of the best teachers we had. Of these seventeen teachers, six got married, nine left the service altogether, and the other two have been lost sight of. Of sixteen pupil-teachers who have finished their apprenticeship in the last six years—four males and twelve females—the four males are still in our employ, but eight of the females have left. Thus you will see we have retained only one-third of the female pupil-teachers we have trained. Statistics will show that female teachers are very frequently ill. During the last two years we had eighteen cases for absence on sick-leave, and fifteen of these were female teachers. In regard to the other three, I think two of them were teachers who were absent through accidents, and we thus had only one male teacher absent on account of sickness. We have forty schools that were worked at a loss last year, and twenty-five were worked at a gain. Only ten out of the twenty-five were worked at a profit of £50 or over. Speaking of side-schools, I may say we have only one side-school here. The Courtenay Street School is not a side-school, it is the infant department of the central school. I think it is desirable that the infants should be separated from the large schools; in my opinion, it is advisable to give them shorter lessons and more frequent intervals. In conclusion, I might say that I recognise that it is much easier to criticize than to create, and therefore I feel considerable diffidence in criticizing the proposed scale. I think the outcome, whether that scale is carried as it is or in a modified form, will be of the greatest advantage to this district, and to other districts similarly situated, and it will tend to allay the justifiable discontent that exists among our teachers, who at the present time are receiving inadequate pay for the services they render. Besides this, it will raise the status of the teachers all round.

201. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] What educational districts are you acquainted with?—I have been in Otago, and I was inspecting in Wanganui about four years.

202. I see you dealt somewhat fully with the importance of the positions of the first and second male assistants, but you did not allude much to the positions of head-teachers of country schools: at what point would you consider the work of a head-teacher of a country school is equal to that of a first male assistant in a town school?—It is rather a difficult question to answer off-hand; but I should say, in a country school with an attendance between 60 and 70.

203. You consider that a head-teacher in charge of a school with an attendance of 60 or 70 should receive a salary equivalent to the salary paid to the first assistant in a large town school?—I think that is the logical reasoning.

204. I suppose you are aware your Board does not pay anything like an equal salary under such circumstances?—Yes.

205. You consider that in respect to those salaries there is too great a disparity?—Yes.

206. You consider that the work of a head-teacher in a country school of 60 or 70 pupils is quite as arduous and responsible as the work of a first male assistant in a large town school?—Yes; a teacher may be fitted for the work of a first assistant in a town school, but to take charge of a country school requires organizing abilities that he may lack. In a school of 90 pupils, with a head-teacher, an assistant, and a pupil-teacher, the man who can control and work that school efficiently is a very good man.

207. Your choice in the selection of teachers is limited just now?—Yes.

208. Are you satisfied with the staffing under the proposed scale?—I think so; though if the scale were carried into effect there would be an increased demand for assistants throughout the colony, and there might be a difficulty in reducing the number of pupil-teachers.

209. If you offer higher salaries will you not have a larger number of applications from outside educational districts?—Yes.

210. Do you give outside teachers equal chances, in the matter of appointments, with teachers in your own district?—Yes; but, all things being equal, I think preference should be given to the teachers within our own district.

211. You raise the figures and the classification of teachers by an increase of marks?—Yes.

212. How many teachers do you think have been raised during the past twelve months?—I could not say; probably fifteen.

213. Are you aware that during the year 1898, in Otago, only one teacher was increased, and in 1899 only four?—I am not aware of it.

214. On the face of it, would it not appear that there are more increases given in the smaller education districts?—No, I do not think such is the case; of course, sometimes bigger increases may be given in certain districts.

215. Teachers are allowed to take three subjects to rise in degree: would you be in favour of raising those subjects and allow them to be taken yearly—say, in two years?—I hardly think so; though it is not a question I have given much thought to, as it concerns university authorities.

216. Have you thought out any plan of superannuation: do you think that under the alternative scheme teachers could afford to pay something out of their salaries towards a superannuation fund?—Yes, I think so.

217. In the matter of promotions, do you think a better system could be devised?—I am satisfied the difficulty comes in through having two appointing bodies. A Board may go through a list of applicants, carefully considering the qualifications of each of the candidates, and send the names on to the Committee, but the Committee may choose the bottom name on the list.

218. Do you think that is a bad system?—I should like to see a limited number of names sent on to Committees.

219. Have you thought out any system whereby a teacher may have some hope of promotion by reason of merit?—As far as this Board is concerned, appointments do go on merit.

220. Do the Committee have the right to select an appointee subject to the Board's confirmation?—Yes.

221. What do you consider should be the minimum wage fixed for male and female teachers in schools of, say, an average attendance of 25 pupils?—I am satisfied with the scale payment; I should say not less than £90.

222. In such a school would you pay a male and a female the same salary?—I think so, for, as I said, they do equally good work; of course, we get so few chances to put good male teachers in this class of school.

223. Do you think a good male teacher in a school of 20 pupils would do better than a female teacher, assuming they held the same certificates?—Yes, I think so.

224. What percentage of difference would you make in the payment of male and female teachers?—I do not know; I should not like to express it as a percentage.

225. Would you make a differentiation in the payments to married and single teachers?—No.

226. Where the country is open and the roads are good, would you be inclined to extend the area of compulsory attendance beyond two miles?—Yes; of course, there is the question of facilities. Generally, where the roads are good, I should extend the area half a mile, making it two miles and a half.

227. Would you increase the number of attendances?—Yes; but an attendance should be defined, which it is not at present.

228. You wish to see the remuneration of teachers built up to the highest standard obtaining in the country at the present time?—Yes, if the country can stand it.

229. If the £4 capitation grant was not sufficient, do you think the Government should be asked to go beyond that in order to bring the salaries up to the highest level paid in the colony at the present time?—I do not know what the highest standard is, but I think a certain reduction might have to take place in the higher centres.

230. Do you mean a reduction in the salaries paid in the larger centres?—Yes, though it may appear a little inconsistent to say so.

231. You say there is not sufficient inducement to induce bright lads to enter the teaching profession?—Yes.

232. Then, do you not think your proposal would still act against them—*i.e.*, do you think, in the face of that, that it would be wise to reduce the highest salaries?—I merely meant it was necessary to equalise the salaries all round.

233. Then, on reconsidering your question, are you still of the opinion that you would reduce the higher salaries?—If it is the alternative between unequal salaries and lowering them to bring about equality, by all means let us have equality.

234. *Mr. Davidson.*] Do you approve of the proposed capitation grant of £5 a head to all schools having an average attendance under 14 pupils?—I do not see any other way in which to work those small schools.

235. Taking the first group of schools under the alternative scale, with an average attendance from 14 to 19, have you noticed that the salary ranges from £80 to £100?—Yes.

236. That is the minimum salary?—Yes.

237. And those proposed salaries are the same for both sexes?—Yes.

238. Do you consider that is a fair thing?—Yes, I consider that it is a very fair thing.

239. And only after the standard of a living-wage is reached would you differentiate the salaries paid to male and female teachers?—Yes.

240. You consider that a salary of £100 is a living-wage?—Yes.

241. And beyond that wage you think it is just and fair that a difference should be made in the salaries paid to male and female teachers?—I think so.

242. What is your opinion as to the introduction of a certificated mistress when the average attendance of a school reaches 40?—I think it is highly desirable, and that it will make a school of that class very easy to work.

243. You think that is the best form of assistance that could be given at that stage?—Yes, for it means that at times the average attendance of such a school would be considerably over 40.

244. You consider that to strengthen the staff in that manner would be in the direction of increased efficiency in the management and working of the school?—Certainly, I do.

245. I understand you to say that you are perfectly satisfied with the suggested salaries, that they are fairly liberal, and a considerable increase on the salaries paid in this district at the present time?—Yes, that is so; sixty-six of our teachers get increases.

246. I understand that the number of pupil-teachers in your district would be reduced by nineteen: do you think that is desirable in the interests of education?—Yes; we do not think it will be detrimental to the interests of this district if we gain in certificated assistants.

247. You gain seventeen certificated teachers in their place?—Yes.

248. Do you think it is better for the schools that you should have more assistant teachers than pupil-teachers?—Undoubtedly.

249. Have you considered the question of the required certificate for the various grades of schools?—Yes.

250. Looking at the first grade, with an average attendance between 14 and 19 pupils, the required certificate is E5: do you not think it would be better to make that certificate E4?—No, I do not think so; it depends on how marks are assigned.

251. Taking the next grade, do you not think an E2 is too high?—Yes; I would suggest an E3.

252. And the next grade, 35 to 75, D2 is required: what would you suggest?—I think an E2 would be sufficient.

253. And the next grade again, 75 to 100: does not D1 appear somewhat high?—Yes; I think D2 or E1 would be sufficient.

254. Taking that group of schools with an attendance ranging from 250 to 600, do you not think C1 for a headmaster is somewhat high?—Yes, I think it is for that class of schools.

255. Do you not think C1 high enough for any grade of primary schools?—Yes, I think so.

256. You do not think B1 is too high a classification for the highest grade of schools?—No, I do not think so.

257. Would you penalise a man holding a C1 certificate when a B1 is required?—I do not look upon them as deductions; I look upon them as bonuses deducted instead of added; it is a question of subtraction instead of addition.

258. Have you many country teachers in Taranaki holding a C certificate or higher certificate?—Three or four.

259. Do you think opportunity should be given to country-school teachers to obtain a C certificate by taking one subject annually?—Yes.

260. You think every possible encouragement should be given to male and female country teachers to obtain a C certificate?—Yes.

261. And, considering the amount of work involved, you think they should be allowed to take one subject at a time?—Yes.

262. Have you considered the staffing in the largest of your schools?—Yes.

263. On the whole, you strongly approve of a uniform scale of the staff and salaries for the schools throughout the colony?—Yes.

264. Supposing Inspectors were placed under the central department, would it not be possible to have such regulations that, although Inspectors were paid by the department and under the control of the department, they would be available to the Boards as at present, in order that the Boards might obtain from the Inspectors the advice they would be able to give upon educational subjects under consideration?—It would depend, of course, on the regulations framed by the department.

265. *Mr. Stewart.*] Putting aside the interests of the teachers altogether, are you of opinion that the adoption of a colonial scale would be a public benefit?—Yes, if a colonial scale of salaries means added remuneration for the important work a teacher has to do.

266. You are also of the opinion that the staffing in the suggested scheme, which is laid on the table for our consideration, is a great improvement on your present system of staffing?—Yes, a great improvement.

267. Do you think it would be a wise thing to calculate the average of the school per annum instead of per quarter?—I think it would mean greater stability to do so.

268. Which do you think the more difficult to obtain in a teacher—special fitness in order to carry on large classes in schools, or to organize and conduct a moderately sized country school?—It depends on the teacher.

269. Yes; but which do you think is the rarer gift—special fitness in the organization and management of a large class in a town school or conducting a medium-sized country school?—Well, of course, it is a question of quality and not quantity. One man requires a certain qualification, and another something else. I think it is more difficult, however, to obtain a man with the qualifications necessary in the organization of a school.

270. *Mr. Luke.*] Are you sole Inspector for this educational district?—Yes.

271. With reference to the cost of living in different educational districts in the colony, do you think that difference should be a factor in determining a colonial scale?—No, I do not; I think it is only in the matter of house-rent that there is any great variation.

272. In the matter of appointments, does the Taranaki Education Board send a certain number of names to the Committees to choose from?—No; there is no fixed number.

273. Do you not think it would be better that a minimum number should be sent—say, three, four, or five names—and that the Committee should keep to them?—Yes, I think so.

274. Have you any aided schools in this district?—No; and we have no definite regulations in regard to them. We have a side-school.

275. Do you find half-time schools answer here?—We have none. There is only the question of cheapness to recommend them.

276. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Are the school-buildings in this district adapted for increased staffing—for example, country schools with an attendance of from 30 to 50, and with a head-teacher and an assistant, are the buildings sufficiently large to enable these two teachers to carry on the work satisfactorily?—Most of them are sufficiently large, up to an attendance of 50.

277. With regard to the centralisation of the inspectorate, I suppose you are aware a resolution was carried at the Inspectors' Conference favouring that movement?—Yes.

278. Do you consider that the suggested salaries to be paid to pupil-teachers are ample?—Yes, with the exception of the salary of a first-year pupil-teacher. I think £20 is too little, and would suggest £25.

279. £25, and an allowance of £10 when away from home?—Yes; I think the introduction of an allowance such as that is a very good point in the scheme.

280. Do you think the extra increase of capitation amounting to 5s. *per capita* would prove of any material advantage in a district like Taranaki?—It would give us about £800 more; it is not anything like equal to what is proposed under the scale.

281. A colonial scale would prove far more beneficial than the extra grant of 5s. *per head*?—Yes, very much more beneficial.

282. *Mr. Hill.*] What is the staffing of your main school?—Since I was there I think there has been an alteration.

283. So far as you know, who was in charge of Standard VI., a male or female teacher?—Last year a female teacher.

284. Who had charge of Standard V.?—A male teacher.

285. And Standard IV.?—A male teacher.

286. Standard III.?—A female teacher.

287. Standard II.?—Two pupil-teachers, I think.

288. Standard I.?—Pupil-teachers.

289. Have you only four assistant teachers at that school?—The infant department is in charge of a mistress.

290. You consider her really as being an assistant?—Yes—first female assistant.

291. What is the attendance of the school?—I think the average attendance for the last quarter was 483.

292. Was that staffing arranged by the headmaster, and did it meet with your approval?—It was not satisfactory to either the headmaster or myself, but, owing to the exigencies in regard to the size of the standards, there was no help for it.

293. How many pupils were there in Standard VI.?—20 to 25.

294. And how many in Standard V.?—40 to 50.

295. What certificate did the female teacher hold?—D1.

296. As she was in charge of Standard VI., what salary did she receive?—I could not say exactly; I think it would be £110; last year it was £105.

297. What salary did the assistant master in charge of Standard V. receive?—£200.

298. What certificate did he hold?—D2.

299. The female teacher in charge of Standard VI. was classed higher than the male teacher in charge of Standard V., though she received very much less salary?—Yes; she was the third female assistant; she was only put in charge of Standard VI. in a case of emergency, not as a regular thing.

300. You recognise that the headmaster had the right to remove teachers from class to class, according to his judgment, and to meet exigencies that might arise?—Yes. The arrangement he made in regard to this female assistant was not one he would approve of as a regular thing. It was the size of the classes and the size of the class-rooms that brought about such an abnormal arrangement.

301. Which do you consider the most important standard in the school?—Standard VI.

302. Do you think that the headmaster put the female teacher in charge of that standard, knowing that she could not do the work?—That is hardly a fair question to ask.

303. Do you not think there should be a closer approximation in the salaries of the teachers?—Not under these conditions. The infant mistress should get a close approximation to the salary of the second male assistant or the first female assistant.

304. You mean to say that in regard to salaries there should be a closer approximation between the first assistant mistress and the first assistant master?—Well, yes; with the balance in favour of the first assistant male teacher.

305. And the same thing to apply in the case of the second and third male and female assistants?—I put the first assistant female on the same footing as the second male assistant in schools like we have up to an attendance of 400; possibly she should be paid a shade higher than the second male assistant.

306. Going back to a school with an average attendance of 50, do you think that the head-teacher of such a school should get a salary equal to the salary paid to a first assistant master in a large town school?—Speaking roughly, I think the head-teacher of a school with an average attendance of about 70 should be on the same footing as a first assistant male in a school with an attendance of about 400 or 500; perhaps I should speak in regard to our own schools.

307. Do you find that female teachers in small schools carry out their duties and perform their work as efficiently as would male teachers?—Yes, up to a certain point.

308. In schools, say, with an attendance up to 25, is that so?—Yes.

309. Would you suggest, in the construction of a scale, that females, as far as possible, should be employed in schools with an average attendance below 30?—No.

310. Why not?—Because it means so many changes; there would be a constant change from a male to a female, and from a female to a male.

311. You would assume a School Committee or Board would change a teacher who has given satisfaction, because the attendance reached a certain number?—If not, I do not see any points in making such a scheme, because it can be done now; if a school gets too heavy for a female teacher she can be shifted, and a male teacher appointed. I would limit by the capacity of the teacher; if a female teacher is capable of carrying on a school of 60, let her do so.

312. What is the limit at which assistance would be given?—When the attendance reaches 40.

313. Would you allow a male or a female to take charge of a school up to 40?—I would give assistance at 40, whether a male or female was in charge of the school.

314. Under such conditions, would you pay a female teacher the same salary as a male teacher?—No.

315. Why not, if you require the same standard of work from each?—I would not give the same salary after the standard of a living-wage is reached, for reasons previously stated.

316. What do you call a living-wage?—What a man can live on, in the ordinary sense of the term, with ordinary comfort.

317. If you differentiate in the salaries, would not women be appointed to those schools as the cheaper article?—I do not think so; we always try to get the best teacher.

318. Do you approve of the present mode of classifying teachers?—Yes.

319. Do you think that the A men and the B men are the best teachers?—Other things being equal, I think they are better.

320. In the selection of teachers do you prefer mental attainments or technical skill?—I prefer technical skill.

321. I suppose you are aware that there is only one class of certificate issued in England?—No, I am not.

322. Do you not think one class of certificate would be preferable in New Zealand?—No.

323. You think that the present system is the better one?—I do.

324. *Mr. Smith.*] Have you any idea as to the difference in the cost of living in your district—the percentage between the highest and the lowest?—No; I do not think there is a great difference. There are compensating advantages in the town, and *vice versa*.

325. Would the difference be as much as 5 per cent., do you think?—Not if a free house were provided.

326. In regard to giving marks for proficiency in teachers, do you ever give a highest number of marks—speaking in regard to your district—to a teacher who has never had charge of a school?—Yes, if I am satisfied that he is capable of taking charge of a school.

327. *Mr. Weston.*] I think you said you would give a teacher any number of pupils, so long as he or she could manage them efficiently?—When I said that I was referring to a sole teacher in a small country school.

328. That being so, do you not think it is a circumstance that we should take into consideration when we are asked to form a hard-and-fast scale for the colony, which would render it absolutely necessary to appoint an assistant in schools when the attendance reaches 40?—No, I think not.

329. Then, if that be not a circumstance, are you wise in your remark that you would allow a teacher 60 pupils if he or she were competent to manage them?—In a country school of 40, at which point an assistant should be appointed, I do not for one moment mean that the teacher in charge of the school should continue with the increased attendance and not get assistance.

330. I understood you to say that if a teacher could carry on efficiently with 60 pupils you would not disturb that teacher by giving assistance?—No, I do not mean that.

331. If you had meant that, would you not have cut away the bottom of the colonial scale?—Yes, I admit that.

332. I think I understood you to say that in the Central School here the First and Second Standards are taught by pupil-teachers?—Yes.

333. Do you think that is a sound principle?—No.

334. Then, why is it pursued in that particular school?—It does not obtain now, and was done only once in six years, owing, as I said, to the exigencies of the class-rooms and the size of the standards.

335. You do not advocate leaving classes in the hands of pupil-teachers?—No.

336. Do I understand that many of the male pupil-teachers are leaving the service?—That is not so; within the last four years four boys completed their course of apprenticeship, and not one of them has left our service.

337. Does that same remark apply to the female teachers?—No; two-thirds of them have left our service—eight out of twelve.

338. Do you think that pupil-teachers in the schools are overworked?—No, I do not think so, though they are hard-worked.

339. Have they time for study?—Not during school-hours.

340. Do you consider that pupil-teachers should be allowed to study after school-hours?—Yes; I believe in a certain amount of night-work.

341. How would you divide the day?—Let the pupil-teachers work four hours a day. The instruction given them by the head-teacher is out of school-hours; I should like it to be given in school-hours.

342. In regard to certificates, do you think that the highest certificates should be expected from teachers who apply for the higher positions?—Yes.

343. Do you believe in the introduction of manual and technical instruction in the primary schools?—I believe in manual only, and technical perhaps in the higher schools. I think manual instruction is as necessary to the children as reading, writing, and arithmetic; it is the training of the hand, not so much that you are going to fit them for any department in life.

344. If you eliminate subjects from the syllabus, will not the children be deprived of acquiring knowledge upon some subjects that must of necessity be useful to them?—I do not think so, and I am of the opinion that manual instruction is going to be of the greatest use to them.

345. Do you think that manual and technical instruction should be encouraged by elimination from the syllabus of other subjects?—No, not by elimination.

346. Do you think that pupil-teachers in the schools in your district can be thoroughly trained for the profession?—Yes; I think they are receiving very good instruction.

347. Are they receiving such instruction as will enable them to become good teachers?—Yes; though it may be improved.

348. How may it be improved?—As I suggested before, by a grant for school-management; by Saturday lectures, given by some one well qualified.

349. Are there ladies and gentlemen in this district who by training and education are qualified to impart that knowledge?—Yes.

350. Could you safely say, then, that a training-school would be unnecessary in this district?—No; I do not say that, by any means.

351. *The Chairman.*] You would not object to a university?—No, certainly not.

352. *Mr. Weston.*] Do you think that the present system of education, *plus* the instruction you say could be given in this district to pupil-teachers, would enable those pupil-teachers to stand side by side with pupil-teachers trained in Canterbury or Otago, where there are special training-schools?—I think there is a very close approximation in their work.

353. Are not relieving-teachers required for this district?—We have no permanent relieving-teachers.

354. What is your system of appointing teachers to take the place of those who may be away sick?—We practically take any one available.

355. Do you find that sufficient: why have you no relieving staff?—It is a question of expense.

356. Would you advocate the establishment of more training-colleges in New Zealand?—Yes.

357. *Mr. Hogben.*] Did I understand you to say that you thought there would be a difficulty under the proposed colonial scale in obtaining the additional assistants who would be required?—It seems to me so. Where are the four hundred assistants to come from?

358. You are aware that there are a certain number of efficient teachers out of employment?—Yes.

359. Would it meet your point if four years were allowed for transition from the old system to the new?—I think it perhaps would be inexpedient to fix any time-limit.

360. Would it not be fair to allow Boards four years in which to work into the system?—Yes, I think it would; in fact, I should be inclined to say five, because you can never foresee everything.

361. Would you say five years as the extreme limit?—Yes.

362. I think I understood you to say that no scheme should be brought forward unless accompanied by a superannuation scheme?—I think I said that no scheme would be complete without the introduction also of a superannuation scheme.

363. Would you put a colonial scale of salaries first in the logical order?—Yes.

364. First in importance and logical order?—Yes.

365. You think a uniform scale should be followed by a superannuation scheme?—Yes, I think so, very strongly; I think Inspectors should be included also.

366. I suppose you think such a scheme would be easier if a colonial scale of salaries was first drawn up?—Yes.

367. Would you be in favour of a simplification of the certificates, a smaller number of classes and a smaller number of divisions than at present?—No; I think the present system has answered admirably.

368. With regard to relieving-teachers: if Boards were to pay relieving-teachers, would that not meet the exigencies of sick-leave?—Yes.

369. Would you be in a position to say how many relieving-teachers would be required in this district on the average?—I think an analysis of the amount of sick-leave granted would show how many relieving-teachers would be required.

370. With regard to Boards' expenses, you are of opinion that a graduated scale would suit best, or, at all events, would suit the Board in this district?—Yes, I think so.

371. Referring again to certificates, do you think it would be an advantage to leave the question of certificates out of the scale altogether?—No; I think it would be a distinct disadvantage.

372. I simply mean leaving them out of the scale; I do not mean that there should be no certificates?—I understand; but I think one of the best points in the scheme is the cognisance taken of certificates. For this reason it is a system of bonuses and an encouragement for teachers to improve their status.

373. *The Chairman.*] If you had two applications for an important position, one holding an A certificate and with high literary attainments but very little experience in school-management, and the other holding a D certificate and with considerable experience in teaching and in school-management, which of the two would you appoint?—The teacher holding the D certificate.

374. That is to say, you would give preference to an experienced teacher with a low certificate over a university man with a high certificate but no practical experience?—Yes.

375. Do you think it is desirable to introduce an innovation that would beyond the remotest doubt place the older, experienced, and most competent teachers at a serious disadvantage in applying for situations, by penalising them on account of deficiencies in their certificates?—I do not think it would place them at a disadvantage. Although a certain certificate is required, it does not follow that the holder of that certificate will get the appointment. A Board will consider the best teacher for that position, and will put his or her name at the top of the list to be forwarded to Committees.

376. Does not the Board generally consider the letter as well as the figure: would the Board not place a teacher holding a B1 certificate before a teacher holding a C1, in the matter of an appointment?—Yes.

377. Do not teachers holding D1 certificates predominate in our schools, and do they not hold the best positions also?—Yes; but, though their certificates may be D1, there are many men with the very highest qualifications.

378. I understand you do not attach so much importance, after all, to the literary qualification?—Of course, the best teacher is the skilled teacher.

379. You do not mean to say for a moment that we require university professors to teach primary education in the Sixth and Seventh Standards, and in the small country schools?—No, of course not.

380. Then, you put literary attainments in the background, and place experience and skill to the fore?—Yes.

381. With regard to the system of education in this district, do you think it is fairly satisfactory?—Satisfactory in this way: that I think it has improved.

382. Do you think the proposed increase in capitation of 5s. per head will be sufficient for the proposed staffing of the schools in this district?—No.

383. Do you think it could be done on an increased capitation allowance of £1?—Yes, I believe it could.

384. Do you think that you have too many small schools in this district—that they have increased materially of late years?—Yes; I think they have considerably, though I think there are only two cases where the schools could be done away with, and even then it would entail great hardship on a number of children.

385. Does the Board consult you, or make any inquiry into the necessities of different localities?—I do not know always what is done; there is a committee to inquire into these things.

386. Are you consulted yourself, or expected to furnish a report?—Not always; in some cases I may not know anything of what is going on.

387. With regard to the average attendance, what class of schools generally suffers through irregularity of the children—the town or country schools?—The country schools, owing to bad roads.

388. Do you think the improvement of the roads would be better than the employment of a Truant Inspector?—I think you need a Truant Inspector as well as good roads.

389. It is proposed to reduce the number of pupil-teachers not only in this district, but throughout the colony, in order to increase salaries: do you think that will be an advantage?—If there is no scarcity of assistants to fill the positions, then I think it would be an advantage to decrease the number of pupil-teachers.

390. Is the supply of pupil-teachers large enough to insure plenty of applications for vacancies?—Not in this district.

391. Would not the reduction of pupil-teachers in your district have an injurious effect on the schools?—No; I think that would be counterbalanced by an increase of salaries.

392. Do you think it would be judicious to reduce the number of pupil-teachers throughout the colony in order to increase the salaries of our adult teachers?—No; but if we are producing a supply of pupil-teachers for whom we cannot find employment, then we are wasting four years of the best part of their lives; and, as I said, I do not think a reduction in the number of pupil-teachers would have an injurious effect upon the district, because the increased salary would induce more applications.

393. Do you get a supply of good material for pupil-teachers?—Yes.

394. Do you think there could be an improvement in the material supplied?—Yes.

395. What is your opinion as to the reason many of the pupil-teachers—female pupil-teachers—leave the profession?—To get married, I suppose.

396. Is that invariably the case?—During the last two years, out of seventeen female teachers, six left to get married, nine left the service altogether, and I think two of them are still teaching.
397. Supposing they had fair and reasonable opportunities of earning large salaries, the same as male teachers, do you think they would have left the profession?—Yes, I think so.
398. Have you any difficulty in filling positions carrying a salary of £150 a year and upwards?—No.
399. Do you think there is a danger of female labour competing for those positions?—No, I do not think so.
400. If equal pay for equal work prevailed, and no difference whatever was made between the sexes, in the matter of employment, do you think any injury would arise to male teachers—married men with families?—Yes, I think so.
401. In what way?—It would injure the chances of married male teachers with families if women were paid equally well, because there would be greater competition and less chances of employment.
402. Would it not be more harmful in the other direction—that is to say, if women were paid inferior salaries, would not the paymasters employ the cheaper labour, with detrimental results to married male teachers?—No, I do not think so.
403. Is it not in accordance with human nature that cheap labour is preferred?—I think the Boards would consider the best applications apart from the question of cheapness.
404. Would Committees prefer single women to married men with families, some of whom would augment the school-attendance?—Very often the female teacher is preferred.
405. Have you ever known a case where a female teacher under such conditions was preferred?—A number of them.
406. Where the man was equally capable with the woman so far as educational qualifications were concerned?—Yes.
407. Have such cases happened in this district?—Yes.

FRIDAY, 7TH JUNE, 1901.

P. S. WHITCOMBE, Secretary of the Taranaki Education Board, examined.

408. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] Do you think it necessary to have twenty-six meetings of your Board every year?—I believe it is to keep the work properly up.
409. Has your Chairman not authority to do a good deal of work on his own responsibility?—No.
410. But does he not dismiss a teacher for bad conduct?—No.
411. Nor fill vacancies on his own motion?—Temporary vacancies, he does.
412. *Mr. Davidson.*] You pay your teachers according to a scale drawn up by your Board?—Yes.
413. If you were to receive the money from the department in the same way, but to pay teachers according to a uniform scale, would it in any way weaken the control of the Board over its teachers?—I do not think it would weaken the control of the Board.
414. Have you seen the suggested colonial scale?—Yes.
415. In your opinion, would that tend to improve the position of teachers materially in this district?—Yes.
416. Then, you approve of the colonial scale of staffing and salaries?—Yes.
417. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Have you compared the suggested scale with the scale that obtains in this district?—To a certain extent I have.
418. Does it materially benefit the teachers of the Taranaki District?—I think, in every case except assistant teachers.
419. Did you compare the salaries paid to assistants in North Canterbury or Otago?—No.
420. Supposing the suggested scale made provision for the payment of assistants in Taranaki on a scale equal to that paid for North Canterbury or Otago, would that benefit Taranaki?—Yes, I think so, for the teachers of these districts are better paid than those of Taranaki.
421. Do you experience difficulty in filling up vacancies in small schools?—Yes.
422. Do teachers leave Taranaki?—I have heard of a few assistants going away, but no others.
423. Is there a tendency on the part of the teachers to gravitate towards the town?—Yes; to get tuition.
424. Do you find that those who do get into the towns take advantage of that opportunity to improve their certificate?—Yes, in some cases I have known it done; but there are so few opportunities of getting into town.
425. Does your Board give facilities for transferring teachers from one part of the district to another?—Very poor facilities; I think in that respect an improvement is necessary.
426. Are you aware that in other districts facilities are given for transfer?—No, I have not heard that.
427. It would give a better opportunity for promotion if we had a colonial scale, and it were laid down that one education district might transfer to another district in the event of teachers desiring a transfer?—Yes, I think so. There is a difficulty at present, because Committees have so much say in the matter of promotions.
428. Do you think it should be defined by the Legislature what the functions of the Board and the Committees should be in the appointment of teachers?—Yes; but I do not think Committees should have any say in the appointment of teachers.
429. Do you consider that the minimum certificate as laid down in this suggested scale is too high?—I do not feel myself competent to give an opinion.

430. With regard to certificates, does your Board give preference to those candidates or applicants for positions who have the highest certificates?—All things being equal, I think so; but an endeavour is always made to find out all about a teacher's success in previous positions before making an appointment.

431. All things being equal, you think that preference should be given to the highest certificate?—Yes.

432. Would you favour a scheme of superannuation for teachers who have grown old in the service?—Yes.

433. With regard to the payment of female teachers in the Taranaki District, you do not give the same salaries as to male teachers?—No.

434. If you did give the same salaries, would it not to a great extent lead to the exclusion of female applicants? Do you not give females the preference now for pecuniary reasons?—I do not think so. I think, in all the smaller schools, males and females should receive the same salaries up to a certain limit.

435. Do you consider that a female teacher can teach up to the Fourth Standard as efficiently as a male teacher?—I have no experience that would enable me to decide.

436. With regard to the separation of the sexes in the larger schools, do you favour or oppose the separation which takes place in Wellington and some parts of Canterbury?—No; I think things work very comfortably as they are.

437. Would you support a system whereby the brighter pupils in our primary schools might, by bursaries, exhibitions, and scholarships, be enabled to pass through the secondary schools and universities, so that the brightest pupils of the poorest parents might get the fullest benefit of the education system?—Yes.

438. *Mr. Hill.*] Do you pay your salaries through the School Committees or direct?—Direct.

439. Under the proposed colonial scale, would the gross amount payable to teachers in Taranaki be higher or lower than the gross amount you pay now?—In the case of the Central School it would be lower, or just about the same.

440. Is not the staffing more generous than your staffing at the present time?—I think it makes a difference of one.

441. Supposing other districts were to suffer for the sake of your district, would you approve of the scheme then?—I should, if I considered that according to that scale fair salaries were paid, and if in other districts the salaries were too high. It would be no hardship in their case to be reduced to the level of the colonial scale, which I consider a fair one.

442. Do you think that the amount of 11s. 3d. will be sufficient for you, district for maintenance?—No, I do not think it would be. It should be worked on a sliding-scale, and on the number of schools in the district—the largest district getting, say, 10s., and the smallest district so much more.

443. *Mr. Hogben.*] Will you furnish the Commission with a statement of the expenditure of your Board for the three years 1898, 1899, and 1900, of all such items of administration as are payable out of the capitation grant?—Yes.

444. I think you said that the proposed colonial scale would not benefit some of the assistant teachers. I do not know whether you are aware that in laying the alternative scheme before the Commission I suggested that the amount saved by the more reduced staffing could be devoted to raising the salaries of all assistants, male and female, in all the schools throughout the colony, to the highest existing scale?—I was not aware of that.

445. Teachers here would be satisfied if they were brought up to the level of the Otago scale?—Yes.

446. *The Chairman.*] Have you any reason to believe that you have an inferior class of teachers in Taranaki to those in other parts of New Zealand where the salaries are better?—No.

447. Assuming that you allow the central department to become the paymaster, and that the Boards are allowed to retain the privilege of making appointments, and also of making schools where they think them to be necessary, do you think conflict between the Board and the central department could possibly be avoided at times?—The central department by making the colonial scale would do away with the Board's function as paymaster.

448. Do you think that the colony will be able to stand the strain of the increased expenditure on education?—I have not heard it suggested that there will be any disturbance or friction over the increased salaries.

449. Are there good grounds why the Board should not be the distributing body?—It will be the distributing body.

450. Is there any reason for having a colonial scale of staffs and salaries? Is there not stronger reason why the teachers themselves should be placed under, and appointments made from, the central department?—No; because I think the Boards know the requirements of the various districts.

451. Do you believe in the central body having control of the Inspectors?—No; I think the Inspector gets a knowledge of one district, and I think it is to the interest of that district to retain him.

452. Do you think that a colonial scale is as much demanded as better pay for teachers, particularly for those in charge of small schools?—It would not do for one district to be able to pay teachers higher salaries than another district can pay, and a colonial scale does away with that.

453. Outside the profession, have you heard any demand for a colonial scale?—No.

454. Is there a demand on the part of parents that there should be a colonial scale?—I have not heard of their taking much interest in the salaries of teachers.

E. G. ALLSWORTH, Member of the Taranaki Education Board, examined.

Mr. Allsworth: I may say that it is quite a truism in Taranaki that every one is in favour of a colonial scale, for the reason that within Taranaki we have been so starved that anything that will improve the position of teachers will find favour not only with teachers, but with the whole community. But when we come to deal with the question of framing a colonial scale it opens up a large question, and one in which I see greater difficulties than I anticipated since hearing the evidence yesterday. I take it that the difficulty we are anxious to deal with is to increase the pay of our teachers—or, rather, to equalise the pay of our teachers—and at the same time not increase the colonial expenditure. Whether we can do that or not is a question, I take it, that this Commission will have to decide. If we had plenty of money the thing is as easy as possible. In Taranaki we have a certain sum of money placed before us, and we have to give our salaries in accordance with it. We are in the unfortunate position of having, perhaps, fewer large schools than any other district in New Zealand, and a large number of small ones; and we have to divide this money with what we believe to be as near a sense of justice as we can arrive at. At the same time our teachers, who we consider are as good as any teachers in any other part of the colony, are largely handicapped. It appears to me that the departmental view is to secure efficiency at the lowest possible cost consistent with the grant of a living-wage. From the teachers' standpoint it is important that they shall have freedom of promotion, security of position, and equal pay for equal work. Another important feature, I think, is that there should be a superannuation scheme. I am strongly in favour of both Inspectors and teachers being placed under the department. I think that would do away with a great deal of the friction that at present exists, and lead to greater efficiency in the work. It would free both teachers and Inspectors from a great many difficulties they have to labour under at the present time, not because of any desire on the part of the local authorities to hamper them, but from want of knowledge of the technical duties of their position. I think there should be some provision for locally trained pupil-teachers. I should oppose any system that would lead to children of other districts coming into Taranaki, thus debarring any pupils of our schools from becoming teachers and rising in the profession. One difficulty we find here is the cost of the present system. I do not think that one-third of the teachers who start their pupil-teacher course really become teachers. When you consider that it takes four years to complete a pupil-teacher's course you will see that the finished article is very expensive. I am at a loss to know how the cost of training pupil-teachers can be cheapened, while at the same time maintaining efficiency, unless a colonial scale giving greater inducements to teachers is established. A great deal has been said about the cost of living and the difficulty of adjusting a colonial scale to the conditions in different parts of the colony. I do not think the Commission need trouble about that, for the reason that in Taranaki the cost of living varies more than in any other part of New Zealand. We had teachers out in the east of Stratford last winter to whom it cost £20 a ton to get in provisions, and the people were living on fern-roots, so we were told. The position is similar to that of the Post Office, Telegraph, and Railway Offices. If a man is fortunate enough to be transferred to a place where the cost of living is low, he has a good time; and if he is sent to a place where the cost of living is high, he suffers accordingly. It appears to me that in confining your efforts to the question of teachers' salaries the Commission and the Government are simply scratching the surface. What appears to me to be necessary is that the whole of our education system should be gone into, and revolutionised from top to bottom. A great deal of unnecessary expense is involved on this coast by the overlapping of the education districts, which could be more economically worked if the boundaries were readjusted. That would be advantageous both to Taranaki and to Wanganui. I am extremely doubtful whether, under such a scheme as I have in my mind, Education Boards could be continued; but I think there might be brought into operation possibly a modified system of Boards and Committees. In addition to the question of boundaries, there is another very important question that wants to be gone into, and that is the question of higher education. High schools are competing with primary schools, and a waste of money is going on. That ought to be looked into and remedied. I think, if a Council of Education could be instituted, consisting partly of elected members and partly of nominated members, it would be a great advantage to the Minister in dealing with the question of education, and would take away a great deal of the friction at present existing.

455. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] Would it help you, do you think, if you were united with Wanganui?—I am afraid the district then would be too large.

456. Would the Council of Education that you suggest be a sort of colonial council from all parts of the colony, or elected from any part?—I should say, elected from all parts of the colony.

457. A kind of colonial Advisory Board of Education?—Yes.

458. Do you think that under central control teachers could be better handled than by the Boards: do you think the department would have that local knowledge which is essential?—That would depend on the nature of the Boards or Committees selected to supply the department with information.

459. You say you would not like to see your pupil-teachers displaced by others, but under this colonial scale do you not think that the question of locality would largely become a thing of the past?—Not so far as affording an opportunity for any pupil of the district to become a pupil-teacher.

460. Do you think it is necessary for your Board to have twenty-six meetings in the year?—I do not think so; I have tried to reduce the number, but have been unsuccessful.

461. Have you thought out any system of promotion that would be fairly just to teachers?—The only way to do it, that I can see, is to place teachers under a central authority, and let them

work out a system of promotion. Personally, I am opposed to the present system of letters and figures in the certificates, and I think that promotion should be made on teaching ability.

462. *Mr. Davidson.*] I understand you to say that under any national system of education we should have a uniform colonial scale of staffing: what scale of staffing would you propose?—That is very difficult to answer, because there are sometimes local circumstances which prevent adherence to a strict rule.

463. If the schools of the colony were staffed on a scale according to average attendance, would there be any more difficulty in staffing them according to a uniform scale?—Yes; in carrying out a colonial scheme I do not think there could be allowed the same amount of latitude that is now allowed.

464. Under properly drawn-up regulations, could not just as much latitude be allowed as under any other scale?—I think it could be, and that is where I think the Council of Education would be useful.

465. But if this Commission were to suggest a colonial scale of staffing and formulate regulations that would allow as much latitude as is now allowed under local scales, would that not meet the case?—It should do.

466. Teachers, you think, working under a national education system should be paid according to a colonial scale of salary?—Yes.

467. Do you note that the Commission is bound to formulate a scheme within a capitation grant of £4?—Well, that only increases its difficulties.

468. If the children in this district had an opportunity, after completing their pupil-teachership course, of entering training schools or colleges, would they not be placed on an equally advantageous footing with those of the larger districts?—I suppose so.

469. You think that the whole system of education wants revolutionising and reforming; but do you not think that that would be made much more possible by a uniform system of salaries?—I think that would make it much easier.

470. Would you be surprised to learn that a great many teachers have expressed a desire to remain under the control of the Boards so long as they get a uniform scale of staffing and salary?—I am not aware of that; but I should say that that refers to districts where they are more highly paid at present.

471. Do you not think that, if the colony were divided into education districts of a proper size, the local authorities would be in a better position to carry out any scheme of promotion than the central department?—That, of course, would depend very greatly on the system under which they were working.

472. If a colonial scheme were framed, and the administration of it put in the hands of the Boards, do you not think that would be preferable to its being administered by the central department?—I do not see what they would be able to do. They would be tied down, and only able to proceed in a certain direction; and it appears to me that the department could carry out the system with less expense to the country.

473. *Mr. Stewart.*] Do you think that your teachers are satisfied with the present position of affairs in regard to salaries?—No.

474. Do you think it is a good thing for any body of public servants to be in a state of unrest and dissatisfaction?—It is a very bad thing.

475. Do you know of any other colony that has not a colonial scale of payment?—I do not know of one.

476. Is there any body of public servants in the colony that has not a colonial scale of payment?—Not that I am aware of.

477. Do you think there is any real difficulty in the way of the teachers having a colonial scale of payment?—I do not think there ought to be any difficulty.

478. Do you think it would be a good thing for the education of your district if the number of women teachers were to be increased, and, perhaps, the service ultimately be almost entirely officered by women?—I can hardly go that length, but I think that women make most efficient teachers for small schools. In very large schools I think it is preferable to have men for officers.

479. Do you think the general tendency throughout the colony is to drive males out of the profession?—I think if you were to adopt equal payment of the sexes you would drive the females out of the profession.

480. You are of opinion that, whatever change should be made, there should be a colonial scale of staffs and salaries?—Yes.

481. *Mr. Luke.*] You mentioned the question of boundaries: do you not think there might be some arrangement whereby the boundaries of Taranaki and Wanganui could be altered?—I do not know how it could be done, but it would be desirable.

482. You think that the question of public education is one of the most important matters that can come under the consideration of any body of men?—I think it is the most important colonial question any one could deal with.

483. If £4 per head is not sufficient, do you think an extra vote, if asked for and granted by the House of Representatives, would be money well spent?—Money is not well spent when it is unnecessary. If the same ends can be achieved with the expenditure of less money I think it is desirable to reduce it, and I would not like to fix any sum. I should like to see the Commission's powers enlarged to enable it to go into the whole question and see if any extra expenditure is needed.

484. It is for that reason that you favour teachers and Inspectors being placed under the control of the department—you think there would be less expense?—No, not altogether; I think it would be for the greater efficiency of the education service.

485. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] With regard to the capitation allowance of £3 15s.; do you not consider,

if the Legislature adopted a colonial scale of salaries, that this capitation would disappear, and that Parliament would only have to vote each year a lump sum for salaries?—Yes, I suppose so.

486. At present the capitation allowance is £3 15s., and it is proposed to raise that to £4; but if a colonial scale of salary is adopted, payment must be made in accordance with that scale independent of capitation?—Certainly.

487. And, consequently, Parliament each year will have to vote a lump sum?—Yes.

488. *Mr. Hill.*] I assume you think if there is to be an increase in the amount of money payable for education it must come out of taxation?—I intended to convey the meaning that I think there is enough money being spent on education in New Zealand now if we had reorganization.

489. It follows, then, that some of the districts get more than their fair share?—I would not like to say that. I think there is money being wasted by the overlapping of districts, as I pointed out in the case of Taranaki and Wanganui.

490. You think it is a question of organization that would improve the condition in such a way that a great deal of money would be saved?—Yes, I think so—the whole system from top to bottom, primary, secondary, and university.

491. You are aware that a colonial scale of staffing has to be made on a basis of a net capitation of £3 8s. 9d.?—I believe that is the present condition, but there is no reason why that should continue.

492. Then, with regard to the 11s. 3d. that is to be expended by the Education Boards on administration and allowances to School Committees, do you not think that the central department could administer that fund just as well as Education Boards?—Quite.

493. If they could administer it quite as efficiently, and they could administer the £3 8s. 9d., it follows, in your opinion, that Education Boards are useless?—I think they would be under the proposed alteration.

494. Then, would you increase the powers of the School Committees under such circumstances?—Yes; I think that is the direction in which we would have to go.

495. From your experience, do you think that School Committees could select teachers adapted for their special needs with equal judgment to that manifested by the Boards in the past?—I think so. If the Committee's powers were enlarged you would get better men on the Committee.

496. And you think that the extinction of Education Boards is desirable?—I think it is inevitable.

497. Would you suggest that the County Council or Road Boards should have the management of education?—There are so many other questions to be considered. A man might be an excellent man for a County Council and yet not be at all a desirable man from an educational point of view. I think that for educational purposes we should have men specially elected to advise the department, and I should not favour the control of education being handed over to Road Boards or County Councils.

498. Would you suggest that special bodies should be elected to control education in each county?—I do not think you should have county boundaries, which in many cases are not at all convenient.

499. You think that the maintenance of schools should be provided by the central Government?—Yes.

500. Has your Board ever considered the bringing-in of pupil-teachers, on the completion of their four years' apprenticeship, to a special school in the town to be trained?—We have considered it, but the difficulty has been the question of funds.

501. On the completion of the engagement of a pupil-teacher, what is generally done?—We adopt a system of what is known as fifth-year pupil-teachers. We debar them from remaining in the school in which they were trained, and we send them away practically as junior assistants in another school for the express purpose of giving them experience.

502. You think that that provides them with training such as your Board is desirous they should obtain?—I do not think it is satisfactory, but it is the best we can do.

503. If the Government gave a grant for the purpose of providing for the special training of pupil-teachers in the district, would your Board favour that in preference to sending the pupil-teachers, after finishing their course, to Wellington or some other district?—Yes.

504. *Mr. Lethbridge.*] I see you pay your Committees of schools above 100 4s. 6d. per pupil; Wanganui pays 3s. 9d.: do your Committees find that sufficient?—No; they are always complaining. We have schemes by which we give them assistance on the pound-for-pound basis up to £12 10s., for shelter-sheds, &c., and we find we have to do that to a considerable extent. The Committees raise very large sums in this district.

505. Do you find the building grant sufficient for your requirements?—It is altogether inadequate. We have had to face the question not only of providing new schools, but that of enlarging old ones.

506. Are you keeping the present schools in proper repair?—Not as we should do. We are making application to the Government for a sum which runs into £15,000 for urgent work.

507. In regard to the district boundaries, it must happen, no matter where the boundaries are, that the duties of adjoining Boards will clash?—Yes; but I think the circumstances here are exceptional. I know the education districts fairly well, and I know of none where the boundaries are so improperly made.

508. *Mr. Weston.*] I suppose you would not complain if, so long as the colony continued the present system of education, the teachers received fair remuneration, irrespective of any capitation allowance?—Quite so.

509. At the same time you think that the expense of education should not be increased?—I think there is enough money spent on education, considering the size of the population.

510. You also think that the present system should be revised?—Yes.
511. In what respect would you revise it—would you reduce the syllabus or reduce the number of schools?—I do not think we can reduce the number of schools very largely. There are a few cases where we could.
512. Then, any revision would have to be in the shape of the syllabus?—I do not know that that would affect the question of cost.
513. If we are not to affect the question of cost by decreasing the number of teachers, how are we to revise the present system with a view to economy?—The question of syllabus is a question of the efficiency of a teacher to overtake the work demanded.
514. What shape would the revision take, then?—I would do away with the present system of high schools, and I would bring the whole education system into line, so that a pupil would go step by step right through to the university, and do away with the multiplicity of control. In Taranaki there are three or four Education Boards whose duties could be undertaken by one body. I refer to the High School Board, Education Board, and School Commissioners.
515. Do you approve of the subjects that are taught in our primary schools, or do you think an improvement could be effected in the selection of other subjects?—I do not think that materially affects the question of salaries.
516. I think you said you did not care whether there was a colonial scale so long as you could get sufficient money for your own requirements?—Not quite that. What I think I implied was, first and foremost, that any scale would be acceptable in Taranaki that would improve the position of affairs locally; but I went on to say that the mere question of salaries to teachers in the primary schools was only one part of a very large question.
517. Supposing, for instance, the Government provided sufficient money to give reasonable remuneration to teachers, would the administration by the Boards as at present meet with your approval?—If the scheme could be so organized that the Boards could work efficiently, I presume there would be no alteration; but it appears to me that in carrying out a colonial scheme the powers of Boards would be cut down to such an extent that they would be too expensive a luxury to retain.
518. That weighs with you against the formation of a colonial scale?—Not at all; I think that should give place to a colonial scale.
519. Have I interpreted your views aright when I say that with you this is a question of money?—Not at all; I emphatically deny that. Instead of increasing the expenditure, the whole system of education throughout the colony should be reorganized, when, I think, the present funds would be sufficient.
520. To bring that about what reforms would you suggest?—I take it that is a matter for the Commission to deal with; but I will give you one instance. I would do away with the various Boards in this district, and accordingly reduce the cost of education.
521. Do you mean that under any circumstances the colony must strive to prevent the increase in the amount voted for education?—No.
522. Do you object to an increase in the education vote?—I do not object if it is found to be necessary after the whole system has been overhauled.
523. You talk about handing over the teaching staff to the Education Department in Wellington: do you ever have any cases of urgency in the matter of supplying teachers?—Yes; occasionally in cases of illness, and so on.
524. Do you not think that these emergency cases could be dealt with more speedily than by the central department?—No; the department would have the telegraph and railways. We sometimes have to close a school for want of a teacher.
525. Do you think the local Committee should have any control over the teacher?—The Committee should have the power of making recommendations to the department.
526. Is not the irregular attendance of some schools attributable to a large extent to the butter industry?—Not altogether.
527. To what else, then?—To bad roads.
528. The butter industry has something to do with it?—I would not say that. If it were not for the butter industry we could not keep some of our schools open, because the children are now enabled to come to school in the milk-carts.
529. Indirectly, if not directly, the butter industry is the cause of the irregular attendance?—No; I do not agree with that. But for the butter industry the children would not be there.
530. But for the butter industry there would not be bad roads?—It might affect the roads to some extent.
531. Can anything be done, in your opinion, to secure for the children in this district the benefit of our schools?—I do not know what could be done.
532. Do not these children have to milk cows before coming to school?—Yes.
533. Do they not arrive considerably after the opening of the school?—Yes.
534. Do they get to the school in all cases with minds properly attuned to receive instruction?—They are very much handicapped from that standpoint. But remember that, were it not for the fact that the school is there, they would get no education at all.
535. Have you studied the reports from the other education districts?—Yes; I generally read them.
536. Have you seen anything in those reports to suggest that the entire education system would be better controlled and administered by the General Government than under the Board?—Yes.
537. What have you seen?—I think it would tend to more general efficiency, and in many ways would be an improvement on the present system.
538. Do you think that pupil-teachers are fairly well educated in this district?—I think their education compares very favourably with that given in other districts.

539. *The Chairman.*] Assuming that the Education Boards and School Committees are all swept away, you do not propose to dispense with councils of advice?—No; I think it is desirable to have some body.

540. How would you suggest that that body should be elected—on a broad or on a restricted franchise?—I would be in favour of making the franchise as broad as possible.

541. Would you build up the small salaries by reducing the larger ones in any part of the colony?—I do not think there is much room for reduction.

542. Do you think the larger salaries ought to be increased?—In some cases.

543. In every case?—No; in some cases I think they are fairly well paid.

544. What is your opinion: do you think teachers would be happier under the Board or under the central department?—I am not a teacher myself, but if I were I would prefer to be under the central department.

545. Do you think that the teachers would have their position improved, or that their chances of promotion would be materially improved, if instead of being under the Education Board they were placed under an elective body such as you suggest, elected by the whole of the people in the same way as members of the House of Representatives are elected?—I think so.

546. Do you not think that the changes in public opinion would affect them?—No.

547. Would not the better-paid class of teachers have something to fear if that were brought about?—No.

H. DEMPSEY, representing the Taranaki Educational Institute, and Headmaster of the New Plymouth Central School, examined.

548. *Mr. Weston.*] You hail from Canterbury, I think?—Yes.

549. What is the size of your school?—Between 480 and 500.

550. Are your pupil-teachers doing more work than you think they should do?—Yes, I think they are.

551. Would you advocate half a day for tuition and half a day for instruction and study?—Something of that kind.

552. Do you think that the pupil-teachers here, in the matter of education, receive similar advantages to pupil-teachers residing in Otago and Canterbury?—Of course, they do not, not having a training-college.

553. Then, it simply comes to this: that by-and-by they will labour under the disadvantage of having their applications for work laid side by side with applications coming from the larger centres?—Yes.

554. Although treating the matter as a colonial one, pupil-teachers here, then, can scarcely expect to receive the positions that more qualified pupil-teachers would aspire to?—Quite so.

555. Do you think that the pupil-teachers in your district, in the matter of scholarships, have the same advantages as they have in the larger centres?—I think so.

556. Are the children in your country schools allowed a year in age?—No.

557. Do you think they should be allowed that year?—I do not know. I find sometimes that country children take scholarships quite as easily as town children.

558. What are your views on the question of a colonial scale?—There has been no difference of opinion in Taranaki since I came here. All teachers are in favour of a colonial scale, as also are the public and business-men.

559. Would you give me, very briefly, your reasons for favouring a colonial scale of staffing and salaries?—We cannot expect to get the best class of teachers here, and there is always the feeling that they are doing as good work as teachers in similar positions in other districts, and receiving less salary. That causes dissatisfaction.

560. Do you think, on public grounds, apart altogether from the teachers' interests in the matter, that it will be for the good of the colony?—Yes. It is the children that really suffer if we do not get a good class of teachers.

561. But if the Boards were supplied with the requisite money to deal fairly with the teachers, why not leave them with their own scales?—Because I think it is better for the teachers to have the scale uniform all over the colony. I do not think, if left to themselves, that the Boards would adopt the same scale all over the colony.

562. There are times when the circumstances of a place might require elasticity in the matter of appointments?—No, I do not think so.

563. What is your opinion, and the opinion of teachers generally, upon the question of being under the Education Department rather than under the Board?—I do not know that there is any feeling that they should not be under the Board.

564. What is your own feeling?—Personally, I would prefer to be under the Board.

565. Do you see any disadvantage from being under the department?—There might be political influence; then, of course, there are local circumstances, and, of course, the Board know best the positions a teacher is most suited for.

566. Is there any difficulty here about relieving-teachers?—Yes; we have none. There ought to be relieving-teachers in every district.

567. Are there always enough teachers out of employment to fill up casual vacancies?—Not to fill them satisfactorily.

568. Do you think that the teachers trained in Taranaki will be more or less inferior to the teachers in other districts?—They ought to be inferior, because as pupil-teachers they are not receiving the same training as in the larger districts.

569. What suggestion can you make with a view to securing a complete training for the pupil-teachers in Taranaki?—I cannot suggest any, except having training centres established.

570. Would you advocate special grants from the Government, or would you advocate scholarships? What course would you adopt yourself with the view of giving the boys and girls here advantages equal to those obtainable in other places?—I think I would advocate a grant from the Government for special training.

571. Do you think the size of this district would warrant such an expenditure on the part of the Government?—Yes.

572. Seeing that a colonial scale could not be fully brought into operation under four years, have you considered the possibility of the circumstances of the colony and the attitude of Parliament changing during that period?—Yes; it has been considered, and we are prepared to take the risk.

573. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] Could you tell at what point teachers in country schools should be paid the same salary as first assistant teachers in town schools?—I have not considered that matter, and could not give an opinion straight off. I should say, however, at an average attendance of 175, or thereabouts.

574. What do you think should be the minimum salary?—£100 for males and £80 for females.

575. Do you think that a central Board would have the same knowledge regarding the requirements of education districts that Education Boards possess?—No, I do not think it is possible that they could have the same knowledge.

576. You would not reduce the powers of Education Boards?—No, I would not.

577. Do you think that the contemplated increases would enable teachers to give something towards a superannuation fund?—Yes; I think it might enable them to give something towards it.

578. *Mr. Davidson.*] Do you think that a fully equipped training-college should be established in Taranaki?—No; something similar to what is established in Napier.

579. Do you approve of fully equipped training-colleges being established in the four principal centres, the pupil-teachers being awarded scholarships to provide for their remaining in one of these colleges? Would that not meet with the requirements of any district in the colony?—Yes; my previous answer did not contemplate the establishment of these colleges in the four centres.

580. Do you know that in Victoria a pupil-teacher in the remotest portion of the colony may win a scholarship, and, immediately after completing his course, be transferred to a central college to receive training as a teacher?—I was not aware of that.

581. In addition to the training in the college, would you favour the granting of scholarships to the students of the training-college?—Yes, certainly.

582. Do you think the allotment to pupil-teachers of scholarships granting them attendance at the training-college would be better than establishing a training-school such as you suggest in this district?—Yes.

583. Do you favour the diminution of the number of pupil-teachers as far as possible, and their places being taken by assistants?—Yes, to a certain extent.

584. Have you considered how your school would be affected by the scale?—Under the original scale the main school would suffer so far as the assistants were concerned.

585. What is the staffing of your school now?—An infant mistress, first assistant master, second assistant master, first assistant mistress, second assistant mistress, and six pupil-teachers—five adult teachers besides the head-teacher.

586. Do you believe in the alternation of the sexes?—Not in every case. In my own school the first and second assistants should be males.

587. If the scheme were made so elastic as to leave the Boards the right to say whether or not the second assistant should be a male or female, do you think that would be an improvement?—Yes.

588. You think, at any rate, that in a school above a certain average of attendance the first assistant should be a male teacher?—Certainly.

589. In your opinion, do you think that a woman can successfully manage the Fourth, Fifth, or Sixth Standard classes, having an attendance of 60?—The average woman cannot; physically she is incapable of overtaking the work of those classes.

590. *Mr. Stewart.*] Speaking for the teachers of the Taranaki District, you say they are very dissatisfied with the present state of affairs?—Yes.

591. Do you consider that a colonial scheme of payment is the only way of rectifying those matters of which they complain?—Yes.

592. They are strongly in favour of it?—Yes.

593. Do you think that the difference in the cost of living is such as to require to be taken into account in the making of a colonial scale?—I do not.

594. Do you think it practicable to take it into account?—I think it would be unwise to do so.

595. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Have you compared the scale of salaries paid in a school in Otago with that paid in a school of the same average attendance under the Taranaki Board?—Yes; the comparison is altogether in favour of Otago.

596. With regard to the loss of £10 incurred by the country teacher to give an allowance to the sewing-mistress, do you think a teacher should lose this £10?—I think a male teacher should not be in charge of a school of that size.

597. Is the sewing-mistress any assistance to the teacher?—None whatever; his work is the same altogether outside the sewing.

598. Do you favour the centralisation in Wellington of the Inspectors?—I think I do.

599. Do you favour a scheme of superannuation?—Yes.

600. *Mr. Hill.*] I suppose you feel yourself competent to take, if necessary, a school of much larger size than the one you have?—Yes.

601. Are you aware that in England there is only one class of certificate?—No.

602. Do you think, if there was only one class of certificate in, say, two or three grades, it would be quite sufficient under our present regulations?—That is not a matter I have thought about at all.

603. Is it necessary for primary schools to have graduates as their teachers?—Certainly not. I have had graduates who have been the greatest of failures.

604. *Mr. Hogben.*] You understand, with regard to the certificates, that the very fact that it is proposed to make a deduction from those who hold lower certificates shows that the holders of such lower certificates are not debarred?—Yes.

605. You understand that the limitation of the bringing into operation of the scheme is to enable the Boards to bring their staffing more or less into line with the staffing of the scale?—I understand that.

606. Would you be in favour of allowing the replacing of two pupil-teachers by one assistant where the circumstances of the school seem to require it?—Yes.

607. Or by replacing one junior and one pupil teacher by some stronger assistant?—Yes.

608. Do you think that a certain amount of elasticity in that direction would be sufficient to meet the varying requirements of the staffing of the schools of the colony?—Yes, I believe it would.

WANGANUI.

MONDAY, 10TH JUNE, 1901.

Mr. G. S. BRIDGE, Chairman of the Wanganui Education Board, examined.

Mr. Bridge : I may say I object to a colonial scale of staffs and salaries altogether. I do not think it is at all advisable to have the system of education centralised. In a country like ours we should retain local self-government as far as possible, and I am afraid that should education be put entirely into the hands of a central department we should find very often that political influence would interfere with appointments and the government of the schools. Then, if we had a colonial scheme of staffing we should have to be continually referring to the central department for alterations in the staffing that might be required to meet the circumstances of different schools. There are some schools that might be run perhaps with a much larger staff of assistants than is laid down by the scale, and fewer pupil-teachers, whilst other schools might require more pupil-teachers and fewer assistants. I think that Boards, in consultation with their Inspectors and Committees, would be far better judges of the circumstances of individual schools than any central department could possibly be. The Government, by basing on a capitation of £4 per head the scale of salaries to be framed by the Commission, has admitted at the outset that the capitation grant of £3 15s. has not been sufficient, and I may say that had a sufficient capitation grant been given there would never have been the present outcry for a colonial scale of staffs and salaries. The Boards have not had sufficient money to properly carry on their work. A few years ago a conference met in Wellington, and recommended that an extra 5s. should be given, but that recommendation was never given effect to. To give £4 capitation is not the right way of meeting the difficulty. I think a sliding-scale would meet the difficulty far better. Take the large districts, such as Otago and North Canterbury: They are districts that have a number of large schools, and all of us who know anything about the working of the Education Act are aware that the large schools have to keep the small schools, and wherever a district has very few large schools the small schools have to suffer. In Otago and North Canterbury it is possible that £4 capitation per head would be sufficient; but in districts such as Marlborough and Taranaki, where there is not any considerable number of large schools, £4 per head would not satisfy the requirements. In place of that fixed sum, there should be a sliding-scale ranging, I think, from, say, £3 15s. per head for the larger districts up to £5 per head for the districts with few large schools. I think that would enable sufficient salaries to be paid to teachers, and at the same time give a sufficiency of staffing. I should like to bring before the Commission the necessity of giving to the Boards power to exchange teachers. Under the present Act a Board cannot move a teacher in any way without first consulting the Committee, and that consultation has to be a *bonâ fide* one. Several cases have occurred in our district where teachers have been unsatisfactory. We know they can do good work if they like, but for some reason they fail to produce good results. It would be of advantage to the schools if we had it in our power to say to such teachers, "As your work is not satisfactory, we shall move you to a school with a smaller salary. It depends on your own efforts whether in the future you get a larger school or are not retained in the service." We are, however, obliged to consult the Committees, and unless we can find that the teacher is so bad that we can dismiss him, and uphold our dismissal if it comes before the Teachers' Appeal Court, we have to keep the teacher on to the detriment of the school. I think we ought to have power without consultation with the Committee to remove teachers. We have had several instances where it ought to have been done, but the Committees have stood in the way. Then, we are not getting enough for building purposes. In this district a large increase of settlement is going on, and the Government supplies us with money to build schools, but will not give us money for residences. I have brought the matter before the Government time after time, and urged the necessity for a grant for the provision of residences; but when our application for the building grant is received our residences are struck out, and we merely get money for the erection of schools. I think that the residence is as necessary as the school, for the teacher must have a place in which to live. I approve of the proposal of the Inspector-General that the first aid that shall be given to a school shall be an assistant mistress. I think it is a great mistake when the first aid given to a school is a pupil-

teacher. By giving the assistance of a teacher a little more advanced than a fourth-year pupil-teacher, at, say, £80 a year, you are giving some substantial help to the teacher of the school. I think pupil-teachers should be trained, as far as possible, in the large schools when there is no training-school available. It would be a very good idea in some of these large schools if there were classes formed to represent a small country school. This would be good training for the pupil-teachers, and more truly fit them to take charge of a country school when out of their apprenticeship. In one of the schools in Wanganui this has been done on the suggestion of the head-teacher. I notice in the Inspector-General's proposal that a certain class of certificate is required for a school of a certain size, and that should the teacher not hold that certificate a deduction is made from his salary, but that if the teacher holds a higher certificate than that required no addition is made to his salary. I fail to see any fairness in that. If the teacher is competent to do the work, why should any reduction be made? Personally, I think that the Wanganui Board's system of payment is the better one. We pay a salary for the school, and we give a bonus for the certificate, which is an inducement to teachers to raise their certificate. I observe, too, that the Inspector-General recommends that the same salary be given for male and female pupil-teachers. I think the male pupil-teacher should get the higher salary. We want to induce young men to enter the profession, and we must give them a proportionately higher salary. Again, we have very often to send male pupil-teachers out to schools to which we could not send a female teacher. On this account, although, perhaps, nominally they do the same work, still there ought to be a higher salary given to boys than to girls. The recommendation of Mr. Hogben for assistants is not a good one. I think the assistants' salaries are much too low.

Mr. Weston: Are you speaking of the original scale or the amended scale?

Mr. Bridge: It is an alternative scale, not an amended scale. The alternative scale is very little different. We have two very clear instances in our district. In Marton, with an average attendance of 205, we have a first assistant master. I understand by the proposed scale that the first assistant shall be a mistress; therefore the present first assistant at Marton will be the second assistant, and his salary will be reduced from £160 to £95; and even if he were first assistant his salary under the original proposal would be £118 16s. Another instance I will give you is the case of the Terrace End School, where the attendance is 206. The first assistant there is a male, and at present he receives £165 a year. As first assistant under the proposed scheme his salary would be £120, and as second assistant he would get £90. I can give several other instances. Take the case of the Wanganui Boys' School: The first assistant there now has £190; under the Inspector-General's proposal he would have £168. I may explain how I have arrived at these figures. I have not taken the salary of the assistant master at the rate set down in the proposed colonial scale of staffs and salaries, but I have taken into consideration the certificates that these masters hold, and then adapted their salary to the requirements of the scale. The first assistant at the Wanganui Boys' School holds an E1 certificate, whereas by the proposed scale a D2 is required, and consequently a deduction of £1 per cent. is made. The second assistant is better off; he holds a D1 certificate, and we give him £160. The Inspector-General's scheme gives him £170. I should like to point out another anomaly that is manifest in the scale originally proposed. The Commission will remember that a deduction of 20 per cent. is to be made in the case of teachers holding no certificate. A teacher up to 14, whether certificated or not, receives £5 per head. From 15 to 17 that teacher will get less salary than if the attendance were only 14. That must have been an oversight in preparing this proposed scale. There is another proposal that seems rather unreasonable. Why should a man in a school of from 19 to 35 have £10 taken off his salary to pay for a sewing-mistress? If you deduct from one class of teachers for the purpose of paying the sewing-mistress, why not do so all along the line for the same purpose? Then, there does not seem to be any reason why the certificate for the infant mistress should be one division higher than for the assistant mistress. If the proposal was to give the infant mistress a higher salary I could understand the reason for the higher certificate, but the salary of these teachers is the same. I think that the proposed scale for the payment of teachers in the small schools is a fair one. Boards in the past have not been in a position to pay the teachers of small schools as large salaries as they should have been paid. I think the salaries ought to be fair living salaries, and I have no doubt that if the Boards had had the means at their hand they would have raised them. I do not think, however, that there is any reason for raising the salaries of the larger schools to the extent proposed. It seems to me that they have been raised to the disadvantage of the assistant teachers. It is proposed to raise the salaries of teachers of large schools above those at present in existence in Wanganui, which I think are very fair ones. We give a salary, and also a bonus. In comparing these salaries, I have had difficulty with regard to the second, third, and fourth assistants, because I do not know what certificate is to be required; but we always give a certificate bonus, and our salary in some cases, without the certificate bonus at all, is above that proposed to be given by the Inspector-General. I think that the certificates required are in some cases too high. The Inspector-General suggests that an E2 is necessary for a school of from 19 to 35. The certificate depends on length of service, and therefore an E2 must have had a long experience of teaching, and it is rather unreasonable to place such an experienced teacher in charge of such a small school. I think if an E4 had been suggested it would have been quite sufficient. I understand, of course, that an E4 might be appointed, but in that case £4 per cent. for each division would be deducted from the salary. D2 is required for the next grade, and I think D3 is sufficient. I do not think that D1 should be required as early as 75 to 100. It might go on to 225 or 250 before a D1 was demanded, and then on to 420 before a C1 was asked for. There is no allowance made for instructing pupil-teachers. It may be said that that is the duty of the head-teacher; but we give these teachers a salary for doing the teaching of the school, and for work connected with the school, not for teaching pupil-teachers, certainly. It

might happen that there are two head-teachers occupying schools of the same size. One man might have two or three pupil-teachers to instruct, and the other might have none; consequently one teacher would do considerably more work for the same money than the other. I think that where a master or a mistress has to instruct pupil-teachers it is only right that he or she should be paid for so doing. The Inspector-General recommends £5 a year more for the salary of pupil-teachers than our Board allows. Our salary is not satisfactory to the Board, but we had to fix it in accordance with our finance. We revised our scale the other day and sent it down for the approval of the Government. The salaries of our male pupil-teachers were made higher than those of the females, and it was objected to. We had to bring the boys down to the level of the female teachers, as we had not enough money to raise the females up to the level of the boys. Instead of raising the salaries of pupil-teachers, the lodging-allowance should be increased. In living at home a pupil-teacher is a long way better off with £20 a year than with £30 a year away from home. If that £5 was taken from the salary and added to lodging-allowance, and instead of making it, for the respective years, £10, £10, £5, and £5, it was made £17, £14, £11, and £8—as the salary rises decreasing the lodging-allowance—it would, in my opinion, be a better arrangement. Now, dealing with the capitation grant, it is proposed to give the Boards for administrative purposes 11s. 3d. That is altogether inadequate. It cost us very nearly 10s. 8d. per head last year for our departmental expenses, and in that sum there is no allowance for what we have to pay for relieving-teachers. It merely includes office salaries, departmental, inspection, truancy, school funds, training of teachers, examination of pupil-teachers, &c. 11s. 3d. will only give us 7d. more than that, and is not sufficient to enable us to give more to our School Committees. I think that the Board requires, instead of 11s 3d., about 14s. or 15s. I think that some different arrangement might be made about teachers' certificates. I think the present system of raising certificates by length of service is very misleading, for the reason that you are unable to get rid of unsatisfactory teachers. If a teacher is not bad enough to warrant notice of dismissal he has to be kept on, and simply from length of service rises in grades of certificate. Any one not knowing anything of the past of that teacher would think that he was competent, whereas he might be a very incompetent teacher. The division should be raised more for ability to teach than for length of service. I think also that power should be given to the department, on the recommendation of the Inspector, to reduce a man's certificate if he is not doing the quality of work that he has been doing in the past.

1. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] In Palmerston North you have three schools; would it not have been possible to have had one school, or not more than two schools, to do the work of the three?—I do not know. My own opinion is that Terrace and Central Schools would have been sufficient.

2. Do you think it necessary to have three schools in Wanganui?—Under present circumstances it is. You must remember that these schools have been in Wanganui ever since the Education Act has been in force, and if we were to put all those schools together, and make one central school of them, we would have to build an entirely new set of school-buildings.

3. What is your opinion in regard to separate schools for boys and girls?—I believe in mixed schools. In them boys get civilised by association with the girls, and the girls lose a large amount of that namby-pambyism that they acquire when associating only with their own sex.

4. Have you any half-time schools?—Only two.

5. You have not thought of the principle of conveying children to schools and so doing away with some of the small schools?—In place of establishing a school in a district in the Manawatu, we tried to make arrangements with a coach to convey the children to a school already established, but we could not make the necessary arrangements.

6. The settlers themselves would not take it up?—No; they wanted the school there. As far as possible, we never establish a school within four miles of another school.

7. Do you not think that the lack of prospect of promotion has been a reasonable grievance on the part of teachers?—I think one grievance has been that most of the Boards seem to conserve their positions for their own teachers. There is very little interchange of teachers between Boards. I think, possibly, one reason why teachers want a colonial scale of staffs and salaries is that the profession should be recognised as a whole, and that there should be a more ready interchange of teachers between educational districts.

8. What I referred to was the inability of the Boards to promote teachers?—I think that might have something to do with it.

9. Do you find that when vacancies occur in the larger schools it is very seldom that a country teacher succeeds in obtaining the appointment?—We have so very few vacancies in them—those holding positions there stick to them like limpets.

10. Does the country teacher not get out of the range of the public eye?—I think there is a tendency on the part of Committees to select some one whom they know.

11. *Mr. Davidson.*] Do you think we can really claim to have a national system of education when we have thirteen different scales of staffing and payment in the colony?—I do not see that that affects the question. The system of education is the syllabus of education that is given.

12. Do you not think that the staffing of the schools and the salaries of the teachers are as important a part of the system as the syllabus?—Possibly; but, as I said, there would be no difficulty about the salary if the Government would give us the money that is necessary, and the present inquiry is based on 5s. more than we have had in the past.

13. You object to a uniform scale of staffing and a uniform rate of pay to the teachers of the colony?—Yes. I object to the control of the education system by the central department. If the department had the right to interfere they might seriously interfere with the work of the Boards.

14. Suppose sufficient elasticity is allowed; that the Boards are allowed to place either a male or a female teacher in a position; that they retain complete freedom in the placing of the sexes on

their staffs; and that they are allowed the privilege of putting on two pupil-teachers instead of an assistant, or *vice versa*: would that meet the difficulty?—Yes, as far as the staffing is concerned. But, if there is to be a colonial scale of payment adopted, then the Boards would have nothing to do with financing that, and the whole control of payment would be taken out of their hands. The Board would simply be the medium through which salaries are paid.

15. The disadvantage that has existed amongst teachers throughout the colony has been caused, I think, mainly through inequality of salaries paid in various education districts?—That may be more apparent than real. £200 a year here may go further than £200 in Auckland or Dunedin.

16. Do you find the right class of boys is entering the service in sufficient numbers in Wanganui?—We are not getting a sufficient number of them; the inducements—salary and future prospects—are not sufficient.

17. Do you not think, then, that there would be less dissatisfaction and more chances of promotion and transfer from district to district if we had a uniform scale of salary, as is the case in the Railway and Postal Departments?—I do not know. From what I have heard of the Railway Department the scheme is not pronounced a success. Incidentally, I have heard that the railway classification is not any more successful than our present teachers' system.

18. Do you think that where pupil-teachers are necessary in the smaller schools they should not be raw pupil-teachers, but in their second or third year, and transferred from a larger school?—Yes.

19. Do you know that the bonus system was tried in Otago and found a failure?—Possibly. It has not been a failure in Wanganui.

20. Do you not think that we have a sufficient supply of certificated teachers without employing uncertificated teachers for schools under 14?—I think we have; but still we have to provide for all contingencies.

21. If you could afford to give such salaries as are suggested in the scale—from £80 in schools of 15 up to £120 for schools of 20—would you have the same difficulty in getting ex-pupil-teachers to apply for those schools?—No, I do not think so.

22. Could you state how much the training of teachers costs you?—£200. I can give you the figures for our incidental expenses, if you like.

23. What does house allowance come to?—£564 9s. 7d.

24. Rent?—£30 approximately.

25. What was your total expense for incidentals?—£4,745 17s. 6d.

26. If the training of teachers were provided for, as a number of Education Boards think it should be, by the central department, that would relieve you of an expenditure of £200?—Yes.

27. Then, again, if house allowance was provided for by the Building Fund, that would relieve you of £594 in rent and house allowance?—Yes.

28. So that that would make available a sum of about £800?—Yes.

29. In that case your finance would be considerably relieved?—To a great extent. I should not like to say it would completely relieve them, for the £800 would only mean about another 2s. per head.

30. You have five relieving-teachers in this district: does not that seem rather a large number for such a small district as Wanganui?—Sometimes we have more. At the present time we have five relieving-teachers and two temporarily appointed.

31. What provision have you in the way of salaries for sick-leave?—Under the regulations teachers are not entitled to any salary for sick-leave. All applications come up at the Board's meeting, and we make an allowance not exceeding one month in the year.

32. Did you deduct from the £445 received by relieving-teachers the amount you do not pay to teachers absent on sick-leave?—I could not tell what that amounted to. The salary of the relieving-teacher is charged to the school in which he or she is relieving. It would not be an impossibility, but it would be a great labour, to prepare a full statement. There cannot be much saving, because our teachers are not absent more than one month in the year as a rule.

33. You suggested that teachers' certificates might be reduced: do you not think that would be placing too much power in the hands of Inspectors?—I do not think so. If an Inspector can be trusted to recommend the raising of a teacher he should be trusted to recommend the reduction.

34. *Mr. Stewart.*] Do you not think that the anomalies that now exist would still be likely to obtain with a differentiated capitation?—Of course; because you have got thirteen Boards, which would have their own ideas of staffing and salaries, and it is not likely that they would all have the same.

35. Do you think Boards are competent bodies to say what should or should not be the staffing of the schools?—I should think so, after consulting with their Inspectors. I do not see why either the central department, or even a Royal Commission, should be better able to state what the staff should be than the Inspectors.

36. But we have the advantage of receiving evidence throughout the colony—evidence of men viewing the matter from varying standpoints: does not that give the Commission an advantage?—Yes; but it does not follow that their report will be a correct one any more than the individual opinion of a member of a Board.

37. It is more likely to be a correct one?—I do not like to say so. I would like to point out that a certain amount of previous experience is required in order to judge the value of testimony.

38. Have you calculated the total amount that your Board will receive in salary and incidental expenses under the proposed scale?—No.

39. You are aware that the second scheme is more liberal than the first?—In some respects it is. It is more liberal to some of the higher schools, to which they have applied money which it

appears to me should have been devoted to the lower staffs. I do not say that the salaries proposed to be given to these teachers are too high, but high salaries are given to the head-teachers at the expense of the assistant teachers. I understand from Mr. Hogben, however, that that is not so.

40. How many of your schools have an average of over 330?—Five.

41. Then, all but five schools would come under the alternative scheme which is in evidence?—Yes.

42. You said the cost of living might vary very considerably: does the cost of living vary in your own district?—Yes; I think a man in Palmerston, say, would be able to live more cheaply than a man in Eltham.

43. Does your board differentiate the salaries so as to meet the question of the cost of living?—No.

44. Yet you suggest to the Commission that they should differentiate their scale?—No; I did not say anything of the kind. I was speaking more particularly of the different localities of a district. I said that the cost of living in Auckland might be different from what it is in Wanganui, Dunedin, or any other part of the colony.

45. Is there any evidence that it costs more to live in one part of your district than in another?—I do not think I said it cost more to live in Wanganui. It is a well-known fact that in a town like Auckland provisions, and clothing especially, can be bought more cheaply than in a town like Wanganui or Palmerston. At least, that is my opinion.

46. You are quite clear upon the advisability of charging house allowance against the Building Fund?—Yes.

47. You said that, in your opinion, there would have been no reason for this demand for a colonial scale if the Board had been sufficiently provided with money by the department?—Yes.

48. Do you think that there is the stability about the scale drawn up by a Board that there would be with one drawn up by Act of Parliament?—I think so. Our scale has been in force for a large number of years.

49. At what notice could the Board vary it?—The regulation could be altered by giving a month's notice, and the alteration of salaries would come into effect at the expiration of three months after notice had been given to the teachers.

50. Do you not think that want of stability is also a cause of dissatisfaction amongst teachers?—No.

51. What would approximately be the maximum length of your district?—Two hundred and fifty or three hundred miles.

52. *Mr. Luke.*] You say you are not in favour of a colonial scale of staffs and salaries: do you not think that it would be advisable to have some means by which a teacher might be transferred, either at his own wish or in the interests of education, from, say, Dunedin or North Canterbury to Auckland or Wanganui?—I do not know. A teacher removing from one district to another has to consider how much he will have to pay for house-rent and cost of living, and the same salary in one place might not mean the same as the same salary in another place.

53. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] How long have you been Chairman of this Board?—Three years, I think.

54. You say there has been very little alteration of the scale of staffs and salaries in the Wanganui district?—Very little.

55. You made a reduction, did you not, the year before last?—In October, 1899. That was the second alteration.

56. Was the other reduction in 1893?—I cannot remember the date. I was a member of the committee of the Board appointed to revise the scale of salaries.

57. The alterations so far have gone in the direction of decreasing instead of increasing the salaries of teachers?—The last one did.

58. Did not the first one also?—I do not think it did.

59. Do you consider the scale you have drawn up a good one?—Yes, considering the amount of money we had at our disposal.

60. Your scale does not agree with any one of the other twelve scales in the colony?—It does not follow from that that ours is not as good as any in the colony.

61. If the Wanganui Board were relieved of this function of drawing up the scale of staffs and salaries, would its power and influence grow any the less?—I think it would.

62. Do you consider that political influence is as bad as local influence?—I stated that I thought the appointment of teachers should not be in the hands of Committees at all, but in the hands of the Boards, the members of which are free from local influence.

63. Do you not consider that there are too many aided schools in the Wanganui District?—No. I think when settlers go out into the back country, out of the reach of schools, it would be cruelty to keep their children for years without education simply because it was impossible to get 20 or 25 children together to constitute a full school.

64. Do you not think that if Parliament laid it down that schools were not to be established except with a certain number of pupils that it would take off a certain amount of the pressure that is now brought to bear to establish these aided schools?—I do not know.

65. With regard to incidental expenses, I notice in your balance-sheet of the year before last a considerable item is "Expenses of Education Board members": is that for attending meetings?—Attending meetings and going on special committees of inquiry.

66. Could the Inspectors not perform that latter function?—No; the Board consider that the proper people to hold inquiries as to the validity of School Committees' elections, &c., are members of the Board.

67. Do you consider that the Inspectors should be placed under the central department, so as to secure uniformity of inspection?—No.

68. Would not it save your Board about £700 a year if such were the case?—It might save that, but the Government would have to pay it. It would save our Board a good deal more than £700.

69. Apart from that point, do you not consider that to secure uniformity of examination throughout the colony it would be advisable if the Inspectors were under the central department?—Uniformity might be obtained by more frequent conferences of Inspectors. The Inspectors' services are required for more than the inspection of schools. Their personal knowledge of the teachers is very valuable. An Inspector may know that a teacher is admirably adapted for one school, and yet not be fitted for another school of the same size.

70. What can you do, seeing that the Committee has the selection?—Quite so; but we might not send on this particular name.

71. Do you consider, then, that the powers of the Board and the Committee should be defined by the Legislature?—I think that the power of removal of teachers should be placed solely in the hands of the Board.

72. What do you mean when you refer to payment of capitation on a sliding scale?—Payment ranging from, say, £3 15s. to £5 per head.

73. Do you advocate that female teachers should get the same salary as males?—No.

74. Do you consider that they should get the same up to a certain limit?—That is a very vague expression. Up to a certain limit I would say "Yes," but a male teacher, I think requires a higher salary than a female. In most cases a male teacher takes up the profession as his life's work; in many cases the female teacher takes it up until she goes out of the profession; but even if she is not married a female teacher has only herself to support, whilst a male teacher has to support a wife and family.

75. Do you consider that the system of paying bonuses on certificate works well in Wanganui?—I think so.

76. Supposing a teacher fell out with the Inspector, and the Inspector, to punish him, recommended a reduction?—We do not employ that kind of Inspector.

77. Are you in favour of a superannuation scheme?—No; I think that everybody ought to be paid a salary which will enable him to save. I do not think teachers should be superannuated any more than a sawmiller.

78. Would you favour the establishment of training-colleges in the four large centres, and the establishment of collegiate classes in the smaller centres, in order to enable teachers to get efficient training?—We are practically doing that now. We have in Wanganui and Palmerston North classes for the training of teachers in the direction of gaining their certificates. As a matter of fact, a great many teachers get their certificates before they are out of their time.

79. Do you think that the salaries of pupil-teachers should be higher?—No; I do not think that the salary proposed is too low, but I think that the lodging-allowance is too low. To my mind £10 does not represent the difference between living at home and living away from home.

[Owing to a sudden family bereavement Mr. Bridge's evidence was not completed.]

Dr. J. SMYTH, Inspector of Schools, examined.

Dr. Smyth: I have not been long appointed to my present position, and for a number of years prior to this I was out of New Zealand, consequently there are many questions of detail upon which both teachers and members of the Board are far more competent to speak. Any statement I make will deal more with questions of principle and questions of government. The first matter I would like to speak upon is the question—though it may not lie within your province—that very much concerns the well-being of teachers: I refer to the question of the training of primary-school teachers. As far as I am aware, no money has been set apart for the training of primary-school teachers, and I would urge that a certain sum should be devoted to that purpose. I would even go further, and advocate—though this matter may not be within the scope of the Commission also—the same thing in regard to the teachers in the secondary schools. The system of training of pupil-teachers is not carried out in an efficient manner, such as it should be, and the best means are not adopted. Take any type of school you like—say, from 90 to 120 in attendance, where a first pupil-teacher would be granted: that pupil-teacher will, in all probability, work for three or four years in charge of the Second or Third Standard, and after that is perhaps sent to take charge of a school without having received any training in organization, in managing three or four classes, in drawing up a time-table, or in such other work he may be called upon to perform, and consequently he will be one, two, or three years in learning how to properly handle the school he has been put in charge of. Take, also, a pupil-teacher trained in a very large school: for one or two years that pupil-teacher has to do only a kind of supervision—marking exercise-books, and so on; assisting in reading, writing, and drawing lessons, afterwards managing part of a class or a lower class. He teaches that class for perhaps one or two years, and is then sent out again to take charge of a school. If you want the teacher to be trained to do the work he should have some supplementary means of receiving training. Inspectors, of course, expect teachers to give instruction in the subjects in the syllabus in an efficient manner, and, that being the case, the country should see that teachers are properly trained to do so. With this in view, I am in favour of establishing one or more training-colleges—I do not say how many—where pupil-teachers could be sent to receive the advantages of a university education under men who had a wide outlook or had wider views in regard to the teaching profession than most of the masters have. If it is not possible to send all our pupil-teachers to a training-college, some other means should be provided in the different districts in the way of model schools. There should be a model school in connection with all large schools, and a pupil-teacher be put in charge of that model school during the last six months of his career. Then, when he is sent forth to take charge of a

school, he will know something of organization. As soon as a pupil-teacher is sent from the training-college it is a good thing to put him on probation for a year or two, and the salary should not be the maximum put down for that grade. After one or two years, on the Inspector seeing that the pupil-teacher is competent, his salary should then be raised to the maximum. I think Inspectors should have the power to recommend to the department, as Mr. Bridge advocated this morning, that teachers should be lowered in status as well as raised. After all, this is only advocating what is in the interests of all true teachers. The teacher who does his or her work conscientiously should know that his services will be rewarded, and, again, in the case of the teacher who has not been doing satisfactory work for perhaps some years, I think it is in the interests of education that such a teacher should be made to feel it. Regarding the transference of teachers, it is doubtful what is the interpretation of the Act on that matter, but, so far as I understand it, the Boards have not the power at the present time to transfer. It seems to me, judging from the experience I have had, that it would be a very good thing if the Boards, so long as they remain, had the power to transfer, always, of course, acting on the advice of the Inspectors. There are times when a good teacher may happen to go into a district and for some reason or another that teacher may not suit; he may fall out with the Committee, or there may be other reasons, and as a consequence that teacher does not do as good work as he has been in the habit of doing. There is no doubt that it would be in the very best interests of that teacher, and, indeed, in the interests of all concerned, if the Board had the power to transfer that teacher, on the recommendation of the Inspector, to another district. Take another type of teacher—take the teacher who has charge of a small country school, and who is doing fairly good work: his school may grow in attendance, an industry may happen to spring up in the district, causing an influx of population, and the attendance of the school goes up as much again. The teacher may not be able to manage that school, though he was able to manage the smaller school. What is the Inspector or the Board to do? The Inspector goes to the school, but the teacher may not be doing such bad work as to enable the Inspector to report that his work is very bad, although he knows he is not the right man in the right place; and though he may have assistants under him doing good work, still he is not doing the work of the higher standards that should be done, and which is in the educational interests of the children attending his school. I am opposed to absolute power being placed in the hands of Inspectors—everything should be done on clear evidence, and, if necessary, there should be the right to the Court of appeal. I am sure it would be in the best interests of education if such power was invested in the hands of Education Boards, just as much as I think it would be if Boards had the power to appoint. With many other points in the suggested scales I am in accord. I favour the alternative scheme more than the first suggested scheme, particularly so far as the salaries of assistants are concerned, and the introduction of an assistant when the average attendance of a school reaches 40, instead of 35, as in the first scale. Probably, had I been asked my opinion in the drawing-up of the scale I should have put it at 45, more particularly seeing that teachers' salaries are raised all along the line. I notice that the question of appointing relieving-teachers has not been considered in either of the scales.

80. *Mr. Davidson.*] You stated that you approved of the suggested alternative scale in so far as it introduced a certificated mistress when the average attendance reaches 40, instead of 35?—Yes, I do.

81. You notice that the suggested salary to be paid to the infant mistress, or certificated female assistant, between the grade of 40 and 65 is £95?—Yes.

82. I think I understood you to mean from your remarks that pupil-teachers who had passed through their apprenticeship successfully, and had been appointed to a school, should receive a somewhat lower salary than the maximum?—That is so.

83. Suppose a female teacher who had successfully passed through her apprenticeship was appointed as mistress in a school with an attendance of between 40 and 50, would you make another grade there, and would you suggest that her salary should be £80 instead of £90?—No; I should recommend putting a teacher on probation for the first two years.

84. What salary would you suggest should be paid?—In the case of a female teacher, £75; in the case of a male teacher, £85.

85. But there would not be a male teacher in that particular position?—Yes, I understand that.

86. You know, as an Inspector, that a school with an average attendance between 40 and 50, and with two certificated teachers, would be a very easy one to manage?—Yes, that is so.

87. What I wish to make clear is, would it not be better to make another grade between 40 and 50 carrying a salary of £80 instead of £90, as it is in the scale?—Such a proposal was not in my thoughts when I spoke. You could appoint mistresses to small schools between 40 or 50 in attendance, and they might remain there for a period of years. As I said before, let their salaries be below the maximum for the first two years, and then bring them up to the maximum.

88. You mean that, in the event of the Inspector's reports being satisfactory, their salaries should be increased to the maximum?—Yes, that is my idea.

89. What is your opinion as to the requirement of minimum certificates for the various grades of schools—in fact, the requirements at all: do you think that the principle is a good one, or do you think that the positions should be thrown open, no particular certificates being demanded in any grade of school?—No; I would be rather in favour of laying down that a certain certificate should be required for a certain school, as in the scale, always leaving it open, of course, that a teacher who does not possess the required certificate may yet receive the appointment if deemed satisfactory in other respects.

90. *Mr. Stewart.*] Are you in favour of a colonial scale of staff and salaries?—I am.

91. You think it is in the best interests of all?—Yes.

92. I believe you have lived in more than one education district?—Yes.
93. Do you think that the circumstances prevailing in different education districts are such as to involve different scales of staffs?—I should say, No.
94. Do you think it would be a satisfactory solution of the difficulty if, instead of a colonial scale of salaries, we had a varying scale of capitation?—That is a question I have not gone sufficiently into, and I do not know whether it would be a satisfactory solution of the difficulty.
95. I understand you believe Inspectors should have the power to reduce teachers' certificates: might that not mean that one Inspector would perhaps hold an entirely different view from another Inspector as to when reductions on certificates should be made?—I might answer that question by asking if Inspectors are all of the same opinion on the question of raising teachers' certificates.
96. Do you not think there should be a consultation between two Inspectors at least, in regard to such matters?—As a matter of fact, most of the Education Boards in the colony have two Inspectors, and, of course, there is always a consultation between them. The department may not act on the recommendations of the Inspectors.
97. The department must act on the recommendations of the Inspector to raise certificates?—Yes; but certain limitations could be laid down before disrating.
98. You think there should be limitations?—Yes.
99. You think there should be limitations in regard to disrating?—Probably so.
100. Do you think it is possible for us to consider the matter of a colonial scale of staff or a colonial scale of salaries without considering the question of there being a residence attached to schools?—I think the question of a residence should be taken into consideration.
101. You have seen the scale, of course, and have noticed the provision for making it a charge against the building fund: do you approve of that?—Yes.
102. Do you think that the duty of instructing pupil-teachers should be in the hands of head-teachers, who should be paid a sufficient salary for the instruction given, or that they, the head-teachers, should be paid by the results of pupil-teachers' examinations?—I do not think it so much matters if you pay a head-teacher a sufficiently large salary.
103. We have heard a good deal about the variation in the cost of living in the different provincial districts: what is your opinion in regard to the matter?—The difference has never been so very great in my own particular case. I may point out, however, that I have always moved upwards, and that my salary was correspondingly increased, so that perhaps I am not in the best position to judge.
104. You think that your increased means may have blinded you to increased cost?—Possibly so; I have not been removed to expensive districts where the cost of living is high.
105. Do you know of those districts?—No; I have heard that Wellington is very expensive to live in.
106. You cannot give your opinions as evidence in that respect?—No.
107. *Mr. Luke.*] I understand your opinion is that the instruction given to pupil-teachers by headmasters is not enough?—Not enough to train them for the work they are afterwards called on to do.
108. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Have you compared the suggested scale, in regard to salaries, with the scale of salaries paid by the Wanganui Board?—Yes, I have compared the first scale; the second one has been in my hands only a few days.
109. How does the first scale compare with the Wanganui scale?—For schools up to 50 or 60 in attendance the salaries under the suggested scale are better than the salaries under the Wanganui Board's scale; for schools between 60 and 140 in attendance the Wanganui Board pays a better salary.
110. Including the bonus on certificates?—Yes.
111. How does it compare in regard to the staffing?—The staffing is very much the same in one way. The Wanganui Board has no fixed mode of staffing; occasionally the Board gives pupil-teachers and occasionally assistants.
112. Does the Board not adhere rigidly to its scale?—The Board adheres rigidly to it, if you can understand me. It gives a pupil-teacher for 35 pupils, a junior assistant for 45, or an assistant for 60, and it lies with the Board which form the assistance shall take.
113. Do you consider that in any scheme a certain amount of elasticity should be allowed to the Boards to meet exceptional circumstances of that sort?—I do not know; it might be as well. I believe, in most scales there should be a certain amount of room left.
114. Do you consider there should be a differentiation in the standard of work required in a country school in which all standards are represented, and where the teacher is unaided, as compared with a large fully staffed town school?—Yes.
115. With regard to the reduction on certificates, do you find that the system of granting bonuses on certificates works well in this district?—I have not been long enough in the district to have gained experience to answer the question, but from what I gather from the Chairman of the Board I should say it does work well.
116. You are not aware of any other district in which that system is adopted at the present time?—No, I do not know of any other district.
117. With regard to the salaries paid to female teachers, do you consider that they should receive the same remuneration as male teachers provided they do their work as efficiently?—No; I am opposed to equal payments.
118. On what grounds?—It depends on the principle you go upon. The question is whether the State should act on the principle of equal pay for equal work, or, as it is called, equal pay for equal burdens. My contention is that the State should pay on the latter principle.
119. Would you differentiate according to the cost of living in different districts?—I do not think that this is necessary.

120. Do you consider that the difference between the salaries paid to male teachers and female teachers should be minimised as far as possible? In Southland the difference is 10 per cent., and in Wanganui it is 25 per cent.: do you not consider that 25 per cent. is too much of a difference?—I have not gone into the figures sufficiently to answer that question.

121. Do you consider that the salary paid to a teacher should be based on the average attendance for the preceding quarter or on the four preceding quarters?—I should say, on the four quarters; but it remains an open question as to whether salaries should be paid on the average attendance at all.

122. Do you think, then, that salaries should be paid on the highest attendance or a percentage of the roll-number?—I have not gone into that principle; I think it would be fairer to pay on the roll-number.

123. Do you consider that for the operation of the working-average 50 per cent. of the roll number is too low? Should it be three-fifths, three-quarters, or two-thirds?—I have not considered that 50 per cent. is too low.

124. Do you consider there should be uniformity of examination for pupil-teachers throughout the colony?—Yes.

125. Regarding a superannuation scheme: did you say you were in favour of a scheme of superannuation?—I did not say so; but if there is any class of servants in the colony deserving of a pension, then I say the teachers deserve it.

126. Do female teachers preponderate in the Wanganui Education District?—I fancy they do.

127. According to the report of 1899, are you aware that they are in the minority?—Yes.

128. Do you consider that the percentage of pupil-teachers in this district is too high?—Yes. If the proposed scale came into force it would reduce the pupil-teachers here by one-half.

129. With regard to the pupil-teacher system in the Wanganui District, there is not much provision made for the employment of pupil-teachers after they have served their apprenticeship, is there?—They are allowed to remain in the schools.

130. You have no expectation of finding positions for all the pupil-teachers you have in the service at the present time?—So long as we do not appoint any new ones, then, of course, those we have at the present time will fill the vacancies that arise. The ex-pupil-teachers will remain on and fill the vacancies which occur in the teachers' ranks.

131. With regard to the unification of the system, do you believe in granting bursaries, exhibitions, and scholarships, in order that the brighter children of the primary schools, children of the poorer classes, should be encouraged to attend the secondary schools, and afterwards the university?—Yes; I consider that is the duty of the State.

132. You give liberal scholarships under the Wanganui Board?—Yes.

133. Do you find that the pupils avail themselves of those scholarships?—Yes.

134. *Mr. Hill.*] Are you aware what the present system of education is in England?—No.

135. Do you know anything of the classification adopted by the Education Boards in England in regard to teachers?—No.

136. Do you know anything of the method that is adopted in the Australian States?—Victoria is the only one I am at all acquainted with.

137. You are aware that the system of education there is centralised?—Yes.

138. And that in England it is not?—Not in the same sense.

139. You are aware that the Education Department in England recognises that it should supervise the issue of certificates?—Yes.

140. They simply examine the teachers for certificates?—Yes.

141. And, so long as a teacher is certificated, it is open for that teacher to apply for any situation in the country?—Yes.

142. You recognise, then, that our system in New Zealand is not a centralised one in the same sense as it is in Australia?—Yes.

143. The teachers are directly under the Minister of Education?—Yes.

144. And they are paid their salaries by the Education Department without any intervening authority?—Yes.

145. Here in New Zealand there are Boards established, and they have control of the money—that is, the £3 15s. capitation grant is paid by Act to the Boards for special purposes?—Yes.

146. In your opinion, which would be the better system for New Zealand—a centralised system such as is recognised in the Australian States, or the free system such as is adopted in England, where School Boards exist, and where a teacher who is certificated is open to apply for any situation that may be available?—I prefer the open system; I am opposed to the system of centralisation such as exists in Victoria.

147. You think that the system prevailing at present of establishing Education Boards is to be preferred?—Yes.

148. Do you think that, so long as a teacher is certificated, it should be open and competent for that teacher to apply for any situation that may be available?—Yes.

149. Competent for the teacher to apply for any situation available in a certain education district, or would you recognise the right of applying for any situation in the colony?—Yes; the right to apply for any situation in the colony.

150. Do you think the teacher's certificate should carry that right?—Yes.

151. In the matter of classification of teachers, do you think that, all things being equal—that is, in the matter of certificates—it would not be better to leave out the question of certificates altogether where Education Boards have control?—That is practically what I answered before.

152. You are not satisfied with the present system of certification of teachers?—I do not know that I said that.

153. Does it follow that C1 men are better than D1 men?—No, it does not.
154. Does it follow that a D1 man is better than an E1 man as a teacher?—On the whole, I should say it does.
155. In what way?—Well, I should say the man who is not able to take a D certificate must have a defect somewhere.
156. Does it follow that he is a weak teacher?—In the main, I think it does for certain classes of schools.
157. What is the necessity for the grade of certificates being defined for any class of school?—I should say, to encourage teachers to improve their certificates.
158. Will not competition do without such a requirement if the teachers are aware that there are certain things obtainable?—Probably; but I think the aim, or the ideal, should be always laid down.
159. Would you recommend that there should be promotion according to classification—that is, when a man gets a C certificate he should be entitled to be promoted should a vacancy occur? Yes. Of course, it depends in whose hands the power of promotion is; if you gave the power of promotion to Boards, and the man was an efficient teacher, the Board would promote him.
160. Do you not think that such a system of classification would tend to make D1 men suffer?—I do not think so; there might be instances, of course, where a D1 man might suffer.
161. Do you not think that School Committees, having teachers in their schools of lower classification than is required, would grumble?—No, so long as the teachers were doing their duty.
162. You do not think such a system of classification would injuriously affect the interests of teachers in the service of Boards at the present time?—I do not think so.
163. Do you know anything of the working of training-colleges in this colony?—I know the Training-college in Dunedin.
164. Is it a college for the training of teachers or the instruction of teachers, in the main?—I should say it was for both—in the main, for the instruction of teachers.
165. Do these colleges come up to your idea of what training-colleges should be?—No, my idea goes somewhat further; I think they should be better staffed. I saw the Training-college in Melbourne towards the end of last year, and I would like to see training-colleges established here on the same principle: a competent instructor for kindergarten work, for drawing, for science, for the giving of object-lessons, and for the training of teachers; at the head of all an enthusiast—a man deeply versed in all educational movements, and acquainted with all the great educational reforms of the past. The wider outlook he had the better.
166. You refer to the skilled training of teachers?—Their technical training.
167. Especially technical training?—Yes.
168. And what of literary attainments?—You must have the two going hand-in-hand.
169. Do you object to a pupil who has passed Standard VI. being employed as a pupil-teacher?—No.
170. Do you think it is desirable?—I think it would be more desirable if the Government could sweep away the pupil-teacher system.
171. If you could arrange matters so that a pupil-teacher should have at least passed an examination equal to the matriculation before entering, do you think it would be desirable?—No; I should not lay down such a high standard.
172. What age would you require a candidate for pupil-teachership to be?—If you are going to keep the pupil-teacher system, I should say let it be the Sixth Standard, as at present.
173. Do you think it would be desirable to put into a school a junior assistant instead of a pupil-teacher?—Yes.
174. I assume you mean the junior assistant to be an ex-pupil-teacher: would an ex-pupil-teacher meet your requirements in that case as a junior assistant?—Yes.
175. You said that a pupil-teacher, when transferred to another school, had to contend with difficulties in the matter of school-management, drawing up time-tables, &c.: do you not think that, instead of having a young pupil-teacher like that, it would be better to have a matriculated student, and put that student into one of the town schools for training before sending him into the country—let him be trained for, say, twelve months in the art of school-management, &c.?—It depends on the individual, and whether the twelve months would be as good as the four or five years.
176. You think that the ex-pupil-teacher would be preferable?—It depends on the individual again, and the training-college.
177. I refer to a training-school, and not a training-college?—If the student got the training it is probable he would be the better; on the other hand, I do not think that one year would give him that particular skill that a pupil-teacher would acquire in four or five years. If the Government could provide for all the pupil-teachers, I should say the pupil-teachers should go to the training-colleges at the university centres.
178. I suppose you find that your female assistants, as far as you have had experience of them, work well in the schools?—Yes.
179. Are they fairly classed as teachers?—They are fairly efficient teachers, yes.
180. Do you find that the system of giving bonuses acts as an incentive to them to work?—I am not sufficiently long here to say.
181. As to payments on average attendance, you are aware that the capitation grant is paid to Education Boards for average attendance?—Yes.
182. Do you think that a fairer plan would be to pay on the number present in a school rather than on the average attendance?—It is a point I have not gone into carefully enough to answer. I think, on the whole, it would be fairer to pay on the number that had been present at the school.

TUESDAY, 11TH JUNE, 1901.

Dr. SMYTH'S examination continued.

183. *Mr. Hill.*] What is your opinion as to the right of the Education Board to transfer teachers without reference to School Committees?—I should like to see the power vested in the Board.

184. Do you think that would be beneficial to the promotion of education in your district?—That is my opinion.

185. Do you find sometimes that even a good teacher seems unadapted to a particular district?—I have not enough experience to say; I am only judging from the experience of others. Since I came here I have found teachers who are doing good work in some districts, whilst in other districts they have not done such good work.

186. Suppose an Inspector reported that the difficulties of a teacher were such as to make it desirable that there should be a change, would you give the right to remove him absolutely to the Education Board of the district?—Yes. But the Inspector would have to be apprised of all the facts.

187. He would supply the facts?—Yes, he would.

188. Do you not think that if certification, classification, and transferring were entirely in the hands of the central department the difficulties would be minimised?—That, of course, is granted.

189. You think that centralisation of the teachers would be better?—I do not say so; but if you wish me to tell you how the teachers from one end of the colony to the other could be most easily (I do not say best) worked, I say that the central department can do it more easily than the Education Board.

190. Centralisation would minimise the difficulties relating to the removal of teachers?—Yes.

191. *Mr. Smith.*] Are there five relieving-teachers permanently engaged in this district?—Yes. They are engaged, when not relieving, at one of our larger schools. I think we have two in Palmerston, two in Wanganui, and one in Hawera.

192. They are extra members of the staff of these schools?—Yes.

193. And they have a fixed salary?—So I understand, and they can be moved at a moment's notice.

194. *Mr. Weston.*] You advocated, I think, the power of removal and transfer being given to the Boards?—Yes, I did.

195. I suppose the logical outcome of that would mean that you would advocate the appointment of teachers by the Board without reference to the Committees?—That is so.

196. Do you think that pupil-teachers in this district receive sufficient instruction?—My answer depends on the point of view. If you mean to ask me if the teachers do their duty by the pupil-teachers, I say in the main they do; if you ask me if they are properly equipped for the duties the syllabus requires of them, I say No.

197. Do you think it is right for pupil-teachers to be employed during the whole of a school-day?—I should say, No; but the pupil-teacher system being what it is, and the practical exigencies of the profession being what they are, as far as I can see, they have to be employed the whole day.

198. What proportion of the school-day do you think should be given to teaching, and what part should be devoted to study by the pupil-teacher?—If it were possible, half-and-half would probably be preferable.

199. Do you think that pupil-teachers passing in this district could stand side by side with teachers trained as pupil-teachers, and afterwards in the Training-school at Christchurch?—I should say, No.

200. Then, if we are to have a colonial scale of staffs and salaries, is it not necessary that steps should be taken to equalise the value of the pupil-teachers throughout the colony?—That is exactly my position.

201. That is the logical outcome of it?—That is so.

202. Do you not think, then, that steps should be taken by the Government to see that all pupil-teachers in the colony have equal advantages?—I do.

203. You are acquainted, I presume, with the school-buildings of this district?—I know a little about them; I have been in a number of them.

204. If the Inspector-General's scale were adopted, do you think an outlay in the alteration of the school-buildings would become necessary?—In a number of them it would. If the alternative scheme were adopted two teachers would manage a school up to an average of 90. We have one or two schools in our district with three rooms and an average of 80, but no two rooms would hold all the pupils.

205. Would your remarks apply to many schools in your district?—There is this to be said: We have a number of schools built for 60 pupils with one room, and two teachers work there now. The difference is, however, that now a master and a pupil-teacher work in the room, but under the amended scale it will be probably a master and mistress.

206. And, therefore, accommodation that would have sufficed for a master and a pupil-teacher might prove insufficient for two teachers?—That is so.

207. Do you think that a month's pay is sufficient for a teacher on sick-leave, and more especially in the case of a teacher of long standing?—No, I do not.

208. What, in your opinion, should the sick-allowance be?—Individual cases may differ. One teacher may be absent three months; another two months. I should say you should have a sliding system applicable to the time a teacher is absent.

209. Except in the case where the absent teacher is of very recent appointment, do you think a month's pay is sufficiently liberal?—Not if absent from the school for a longer period of time.

210. What do you think would be a fair amount to pay to a teacher's widow upon his death?—I have not thought of it at all.

211. You advocate a colonial scale of salaries: do you not think that if the Board were in a position to pay fair and equitable salaries, it would be better for that matter to be left entirely with the Board?—Do you mean fair and equitable for Otago, Canterbury, or Wanganui, or do you mean it is possible to have fair and equitable salaries for the colony?

212. In the formation of a scale, would it not be fair and equitable for a Board to take into consideration the circumstances of its particular district?—If the Auckland Board can make a scale that would be just and equitable for the huge territory over which it has control, it seems to me to be just as easy to have a scheme for the whole of the colony.

213. You stand hard and fast by the colonial scale of salaries?—I stand by it.

214. Then, if you think there should be a fixed scale of staffs and salaries, why did you say yesterday that you thought there should be a certain amount of elasticity in the scale of staffing—because directly you introduce elasticity it seems to me you must more or less depart from a particular scale?—I suppose the question is whether it be more or less.

215. Once you allow latitude in the number of children a teacher should teach, there is a departure from the scale of staffing?—Yes, but only within certain defined limits.

216. Is there not still discretion left with the Board in its staffing?—Yes; but if you wish to stretch the point much further and say, would I rather hold by giving this, or fall back on the rigid system, I would rather fall back on the rigid system.

217. If a national system is to be introduced, and if that national system must necessarily involve rigidity as against elasticity, would you stand by rigidity?—Yes.

218. I do not, of course, understand you to say that it must necessarily be rigid?—That is so.

219. *Mr. Hogben.*] You were present at the conference of Inspectors this year?—Yes.

220. I presume, in regard to staffing, that it would be your opinion that the Inspectors are the expert advisers of the Board?—Yes.

221. Do you remember that this resolution was carried: "That it is desirable that there should be a uniform scale of staffs for the colony"?—Yes.

222. That, of course, you would not take to exclude a certain amount of elasticity?—Certainly not.

223. Supposing there was a uniform scale of staffing introduced for the colony, would such elasticity as is indicated by this be sufficient—that two pupil-teachers might be replaced by one assistant?—I might, under certain circumstances, say Yes to that—so long as it is understood that the system was not too widely departed from.

224. Only within certain limits?—Yes; I would not allow all the pupil-teachers to be replaced by assistants.

225. One senior assistant to replace one junior assistant and one pupil-teacher?—Yes.

226. And suppose in a school under 400 only one such change was allowed to take place, and in a school over 400 only two such changes were allowed to take place, would that be a sufficient safeguard?—Yes, I should agree to that.

227. Although you have not quite made up your mind as to the limits that might be allowed, these appear to you to be possible working limits?—Yes.

228. Now, would you go further than that: would you allow discretion to a Board to change the rule by which a qualified assistant is the first addition to the staff when a school ceases to be under the charge of a sole teacher?—No, I would not go that length.

229. Then, there are certain limits on which your mind is already firmly made up?—Yes, that is so.

230. With regard to the question of sick-leave: if the Boards had means granted to them to provide for a certain number of relieving-teachers, then the payment of the teachers who were absent would proceed without disturbance of the scale of staffs and salaries?—That is so.

231. According to the scale of the Wanganui Board, what would be the salary payable to the first assistant in the Wanganui Boys' School?—£190, I understand it to be: that is, of course, counting his bonus—£160 salary *plus* £30 bonus.

232. What certificate has he?—E1.

233. Supposing he had a D3, what would he get?—£5 less.

234. Or an E2?—£5 less.

235. If he had a D1 he would get £5 more?—Yes.

236. He gets practically £5 taken off, because he has E1 instead of D1?—That is so.

237. That is really more than 2½ per cent.?—Yes.

238. That is a larger deduction than is recognised in the suggested scale?—Yes, if you look at it in that way.

239. Is it not practically the same whether you add the bonus to the lower scale or make deductions from the higher?—That is so.

240. Would you be in favour of taking out of the suggested scale all these deductions, and leaving the certificates to have their own weight in the appointment of teachers?—I should rather allow them to remain in some such way as at present.

241. *The Chairman.*] Do you consider we have not a national system of education in New Zealand at present?—That depends on the meaning given to the term "national"; we have one syllabus and one Education Act, but we have not one scale of salaries right through, nor one scale of staffing right through; pupil-teachers are trained differently in different parts, and there are different examinations for pupil-teachers. Some Boards afford training for their pupil-teachers by sending them to a training-college. I do not think that while these differences exist we can say we have a national system. It is national as far as it goes.

242. You think there must be uniformity to make it national?—Yes.

243. Do you require uniformity in every detail to constitute a national system?—We must have greater uniformity than we have before we could call our system national.

244. Do you think it necessary to a national system of education that we should have training-schools and universities in every educational centre?—No; but similar opportunities must be given to teachers.

245. Have you formed an opinion as to which of the schemes before the Commission should be adopted?—I prefer the alternative.

246. In your own district would that lead to any material alteration in the staffing: would there be a reduction or an increase?—In a number of schools the staffing would remain just as at present, but on the whole the staffing would be increased.

247. Do you think a further improvement would not be made by again reducing the staffing, and so giving an additional increase in the salaries?—I would not wish to go very much further in that direction. It might, however, be advisable to give the first assistance at 45 instead of 40.

248. If a colonial scheme of salaries is adopted, do you not think it will lead to the abolition of the capitation system altogether?—Probably it will.

249. With regard to appointments: if there is a colonial scale of salaries adopted, do you not think appointments should be left to the department solely?—No, I do not think so.

250. I think the Inspectors passed a resolution in favour of placing themselves under the department: does not their generous instinct go as far as the teachers also?—That question was not discussed at all.

251. If the capitation system is abolished, do you think there is any security that the scale will be continued from year to year?—I do not see any reason why it should not be continued.

252. Do you see any probability of its continuance?—I should say the probability is that it would continue.

253. *Mr. Hill.*] Do you want, in your schools, uniformity or adaptation to operate so far as actual teaching is concerned?—Adaptability.

254. You do not want teachers throughout the district to have the very same subjects to teach?—There are certain subjects that I think essential to be taught in every school, but subjects such as object-lessons and science the teacher should be allowed to assert his individuality in.

255. *Mr. Weston.*] Speaking logically, is not the idea of a colonial scale of staffs and salaries a matter quite outside and beyond the Education Act?—I suppose I should say, Yes, if we understand each other aright.

256. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] Have you noticed in the youth of New Zealand a very marked cockney accent?—No, I have not.

257. Have you noticed this kind of accent in the colony: "On a trine, sime as mine . . . and a plite of best mixed biscuits and extravagance in cike"?—I have heard of there being not only here in New Zealand, but also in Victoria, an accent of that kind, but I have not come across it myself.

258. You have not noticed it in this education district?—I have not only not noticed it here, but I have not noticed it anywhere else.

259. Do you not think that teachers might not be conscious of it?—It may be so.

260. Of course, if children go to other parts of the world, such as England, I suppose you are aware that it is a great drawback to them to have such an accent?—That is so.

261. Would you consider that we have a national system of surveying carried on in this country?—I am not enough acquainted with it to know.

262. In all countries where you have varying conditions, such as we have here, there are bound to be differences?—For a time.

263. Do you not think that the man who, owing to climatic conditions in Otago, can efficiently teach 45 children should get a higher wage than the man in the North, who, for the same reason, cannot teach more than 35?—Certainly not; because, as long as he is doing as much as he is able to do, he is doing as much as the man in Otago.

264. Then, it is not by results you are going to pay, but by the capacity of the person to do work?—No; I took you on your statement as to climatic conditions. I do not myself agree that there are those climatic conditions.

265. Do you not consider that the discontent of teachers has arisen from the lack of the prospect of promotion, as well as from the reductions they have suffered at the hands of the Education Boards?—That is probably so.

266. Do you think that the Education Boards, with the money at their disposal, have not done as much as they possibly could for the teachers under their control?—As far as I know them, they have.

267. Do you think, then, that the same sum of money in the hands of the Government, and distributed by the central authority, would have secured greater satisfaction to the teachers?—It would have made them more and more alike.

268. You wish, of course, to see salaries paid up to the level of the highest scale existing in the colony?—Exactly.

269. And if a £4 grant is not sufficient you would be in favour of a larger grant being given?—Yes.

270. It is not your desire to see salaries brought down at all?—No.

Mr. GEORGE GRANT, Headmaster, College Street School, Palmerston North, examined

Mr. Grant: With regard to myself, I have been nearly twenty years in the service of this Board as a teacher in charge of schools ranging from 35 to 350, and I am bound to admit that until quite recently there was very general satisfaction with the salaries throughout the district. Two years ago the Board, finding itself with a deficit, notified that an all-round reduction of 5 per cent. on salaries was to be made; that payment for the instruction of pupil-teachers was to cease;

that house allowance would be abolished; and that Truant Officers were to be dispensed with. At a meeting of teachers held immediately after this notice was issued it was decided to submit to the Board a proposal that the reduction should be on salaries only, and on a graduated scale. We recognised that it would be extremely hard on teachers with low salaries if 5 per cent. were taken from them, and we proposed that, on salaries under £100, 2½ per cent. should be deducted; under £150, 3¼ per cent.; £200, 5 per cent.; and £250 and upwards, 6¼ per cent. The saving to be effected by that means just about met what was required by the Board, and the Board accepted the suggested graduated reductions. To this hour we are paid on the old scale, with an entry on our pay schedules that a reduction at such-and-such a rate is taken off. But there has never been, to my knowledge, anything like satisfaction with the staffing of the schools; and, thanks to the existence of the Teachers' Institute, by which we have gained knowledge of the conditions prevailing in other districts, we have found increasing cause for dissatisfaction with the staffing. The first evil I wish to refer to is with regard to the pupil-teachers. We have pupil-teachers ranging from those who are mere beginners to those who have served four years' apprenticeship, *plus* two or three years after pupil-teachership has closed; and it is quite a frequent thing that there will be withdrawn from the staff of a school a pupil-teacher of a very high degree of fitness, and substituted for him, as if his power were equal, a mere beginner. Now, head-teachers feel that pupil-teachers should be graded, and not held all alike responsible for a certain number of pupils on the roll. While one pupil-teacher may control 30 children without difficulty, and be a very valuable member of the school staff, another may require, practically, the head-teacher's presence and assistance all day long. In this district there are most unaccountable transfers of teachers. I heard a young lady boast the other day that she had just entered her sixth school this year—a pupil-teacher in ordinary service. Another difficulty that we experience is this: Every assistant teacher, whether first, second, third, or fourth, is held accountable for 60 pupils. There is an intermediate stage recognised by this Board, which is a very valuable one—that of the so-called junior assistant. When a pupil-teacher has continued in the service with satisfaction to the Board for two or three years after finishing his pupil-teachership, and has not yet obtained an assistantship, the rank of junior assistant is given; and he is held responsible for 45 pupils. Otherwise all assistant teachers are supposed to have under their care 60 pupils; but I know of no way of organizing a school by which a fair distribution of pupils to assistants can be made in such a manner. My own method would be to give sections of different standards to each assistant, and allow the assistants to conduct these sections as if they were teaching small country schools. This, however, is merely a theory, and has not been reduced to practice. My difficulty is that in a school of 300 and upwards the first assistant is usually intrusted with the Fifth Standard, which, in such a school, has rarely more than 40 pupils; whereas the lowest grade of assistant is placed in charge of Standard I. or Standard II., and will have in such a school 60 to 80 pupils. As a matter of fact, we have been able to keep our schools going only by throwing upon the infant-teacher an excessive number of pupils. Therefore the present scale of staffing would have been impossible in a district like Wanganui—that is, impossible to get anything like satisfactory results—without adopting the vicious system of employing unpaid cadets. That is to say, pupils who desire to enter the service are recognised as part of the school staff, and, while not regarded as responsible for any of the pupils, they have practically to do pupil-teacher work. In addition to that, the employment of monitors and monitresses has been introduced, and children have been drawn from their class-work to assist in the management of sections of the lower classes. The assistants themselves, under such conditions, become dissatisfied. While salaries fluctuate with the general roll-number, there is no fluctuation with the class roll-number of that particular assistant. If a teacher who taught 30 had to be paid on the number taught, one cause of complaint might be removed. In view of these things, I may say that all the teachers in this district who know the position have consistently, for years past, advocated a colonial scale of staffs and salaries. The teachers in this district, generally speaking, advocate—perhaps not so universally as a colonial scale—centralisation, and the abolition of Board control. The reason for that is that, under the administration of the Board, transfers which are necessary are almost unattainable. In all the years in which I have been in the Board's service I know of only two cases in which teachers have been able to effect an exchange, and in both cases the transfer was truly beneficial, and was attended with eminently satisfactory results. If a system of transfer were adopted, in many cases, instead of long-continued wrangling between teachers and Committees, teachers and Boards, or teachers and Inspectors, the difficulty would be solved immediately. My branch of the Institute has passed a resolution that any colonial scheme is essentially incomplete and practically inoperative that does not place under the control of the central department the power of transfer, promotion, removal, and dismissal of teachers. Now, we hold that a colonial scale, to be generally acceptable, should be characterized by a simple grouping of schools for salary purposes—that is to say, instead of grouping them into small sections, as is done in the proposed schemes, schools should be grouped into aided schools (which must be treated as exceptional), and then grades of 20 to 75, 75 to 150, 150 to 250, 250 to 350, and so on. Instead of the shorter steps of 20 or 30 between grade and grade, the interval should be very much enlarged. The reason is that in a small school a teacher is really working up to the full limit of his or her strength, even if the school has only 30 pupils, and in a country district the personality of a teacher is of very great importance. A teacher of 50 children in a country school has a much more important position than an assistant with 50 children in a town school. Under the London School Board, schools are grouped by hundreds for salaries (*vide* Code of Regulations, page 131.) In Edinburgh it is the same. In the Scotch provincial districts it is by 75 at a time. I regard the proposal to give a *per capita* allowance as a very objectionable one. It will certainly spread among teachers a most unhappy spirit of rivalry—to increase their roll-number—and I think it will do much to break up the present *esprit de corps* among the body

of teachers. Another objection is that it gives to the quarrelsome parent a means of inflicting a direct injury on the teacher with whom that parent may choose to quarrel, for the taking-away of one child from a school is felt by a corresponding decrease in salary. In small country schools where a capitation allowance of £5 is to be given it is a grave wrong to young teachers to place the temptation in their path to increase their roll-number by unfair means. Young teachers, realising that their almost inadequate salary will be increased by £5 by reason of their average attendance increasing one unit, are surely under a temptation that they should not be subjected to—to falsify their registers. I make those remarks with the greatest diffidence, for the reason that it seems to throw an imputation on the character of teachers, I only wish to point it out as a possible danger. We are all dissatisfied with the fluctuations that ensue from the varying results of paying salaries on quarterly returns. The eccentric climate of New Zealand, the succession of epidemics, and other ills which we have suffered have caused serious losses to teachers. I can cite the case of a teacher who, to allay a local scare, kept his school open while diphtheria was raging in his district, and by his heroism suffered a loss of £30 a year in salary, and of two members of his staff; while another man who simply locked up his school, and had a three-months spell, was unaffected either in salary or in staff. I would suggest that the best possible basis on which salaries might be computed should be the actual number present on the day of the annual examination. We recognise that as the high-water mark of attendance. We are required to show in the schedules the number of attendances made by each pupil. I should be disposed to eliminate all who had not made twenty half-day attendances. Then there would be given the real efficient strength of the school on the day of the Inspector's visit. All along I have been an advocate for the superannuation of teachers. Some of the members of the Commission will remember that on two occasions I submitted to the Government Actuary, through the Institute, superannuation schemes. The last scheme, which was based on the Police and Post Office schemes of the Home-country, was rejected by the Government Actuary solely on the ground that the benefits proposed exceeded the funds provided. I would advocate compulsory deductions from teachers' salaries—with forfeiture in case of dismissal—and a subsidy of £1 for £1 by the Government. Instead of having a fixed salary for a position there should be some elasticity. Nothing eats the heart out of a teacher so much as to remain at a standstill and work on year after year without an increase in salary, or any hope of an increase. It is desirable that changes of teachers should be as infrequent as possible, but if a teacher has been in the service nine or ten years without an increase of salary that teacher is apt to lose heart. I should therefore have a minimum salary for every position, with regular increases of £5 a year for every year of satisfactory service, in the case of male teachers, and £4 a year in the case of female teachers, in all grades. After they had continued in the service a certain number of years they would reach the maximum salaries of their grades. A teacher, when he had reached years of maturity, would then feel himself as far advanced in the matter of salary as he could hope for, and would enter into that quiet content which characterizes most men when they get up in years. Another matter I should like to refer to is house-rent. In the Palmerston district, where we have three schools with an attendance each of from 250 to 400 pupils, no residences are provided by this Board. The Board pays £20 a year house allowance, but not one of us could find a house suitable to live in—in Palmerston, at all events—for less than £45 a year. When we approached the Board on this matter, instancing the fact that the headmaster of the Wanganui Boys' School was paid £40, they threatened to reduce him from £40 to £20, and but for a vigorous protest on his part would have done so. The Board then said to us that they would build us houses. I think we are all owners of the residences we live in, and to turn us out and compel us to live in the buildings they would erect for us would be a very great hardship indeed. I think a *pro rata* allowance for house-rent would be an equitable arrangement. With regard to sick-leave, I think that the frequency of absence of some teachers is a very grave evil. There are some teachers who are practically chronic invalids, and they require a week or ten days off with most disturbing frequency. This is especially so in the case of female teachers, and I urge that this fact should be a grave disqualification in regard to the employment of female teachers. Provision should, however, be made for cases of grave illness probably induced by excessive strain put on the teacher, with the result that that teacher may for three or six months be unfit for duty. I can think of several such cases in this district. I would suggest, as a fair provision for sick-leave, that not oftener than once in five years a teacher should be allowed three months' absence on sick-leave on full pay, and, if necessary, an additional three months on half-pay, and in cases of longer absence forfeiture of salary. Minor illnesses should be dealt with as they arise. This, I think, would do a great deal to minimise the frequency of applications for sick-leave. Of course, the Board insists on a medical certificate being given in all cases, but medical certificates unfortunately in this country, as we all know, can be practically obtained for anything. I was very much pleased that the Chief Inspector in this district suggested that, whatever scheme of staffing we adopted, provision should be made for allowing as an alternative, an assistant teacher for two pupil-teachers, and *vive versa*. Two pupil-teachers are sometimes better than one assistant, on account of the peculiar arrangement of some of the school-buildings, no matter how capable that assistant may be. I would deprecate the term "infant mistress." It suggests divided authority, or, rather, it suggests to the head-teacher that he is practically exempted from all responsibility with regard to his infant department. I think that a head-teacher should never be encouraged to believe that he has less responsibility for the younger pupils in the lower classes than he has for the older pupils in the upper classes, and I would suggest that the word "teacher" should be substituted for "mistress." The designation should be "infant teacher" rather than "infant mistress." My own experience and observation go to show that it is not the long-experienced lady teacher who is best fitted to take charge of infants. The very "cream" of an infant-teacher's work is got between twenty and thirty years of age. After that they lose vitality. Women cease to progress at an earlier age than men. Again, women are much inferior in initiative, and they

are strangely deficient in powers of endurance as compared with men. Therefore when you are fixing the proposed salary to an infant-teacher the fact that she must or should be a lady between twenty and thirty years of age should be taken into account. Of course, I know that in this colony there are striking exceptions to what I have just stated. Some women could not be anything else but infant-teachers, so specially endowed are they for the work. The only injustice in salaries we have been able to lay our finger upon in the two scales is that proposed to be done to the first male assistants. Why is it that in the larger schools—I mean schools of 300 in attendance and upwards—the first male assistants are to be treated in a most ungenerous fashion? Just such a teacher is the best that can be found for one of the larger country schools, and he has duties that make him more than a mere class-teacher. He is the lieutenant in command, and his personality counts for much in the school. He has nearly always to take charge of the boys in matters such as drill and playground exercises. I strongly deprecate the present system of choosing pupil-teachers. A difficulty has always been found in getting boys to become pupil-teachers, and I have not, so far, seen what I believe to be the true explanation of the difficulty. I believe that boys are so constituted that they cannot come straight from their standard classes to take charge of half a dozen children learning the A. B. C. In five minutes a girl can do it. The power of control comes to her instinctively, and girls are eager to do the work. If a Standard VII. boy be put in charge of a lower class (who is manly in every respect) he looks very much out of place, and has the feeling that there is something ludicrous about it. I am certain that that has something to do with the unwillingness of boys to become pupil-teachers, and I should get over the difficulty by a different method of choosing pupil-teachers. Let those who aspire to be teachers be reported on by the head-teacher or the Inspector, and let it be the rule that they shall not handle a class until they have passed an examination equal to that required for an E certificate. They would then be about seventeen or eighteen years of age, and they should be then required to take a three-years probationship, and have an annual examination in school method and management. At present young teachers seem to regard the possibilities of wriggling through their professional examinations with a minimum of preparation rather than the thorough fitting of themselves for their calling. They seem to regard school method and all that appertains to their professional studies as being of minor importance. Until we have a degree of pedagogy we shall not have professional training made anything like complete. One other point I wish to refer to is that I think that Standard VII. pupils should be dealt with in an exceptional manner, and not be included in the average attendance at all. In this district we require from Standard VII. pupils Latin, algebra, and Euclid—that is, in schools with an average attendance of 250; and two things are happening—both evil—under this requirement, which is compulsory. First of all, a teacher doing that sort of work devotes far too much time to it, to the detriment of the rest of his classes; or another teacher, who regards the demand for such work as unfair, performs it in the most perfunctory manner, and there is a make-believe method of working going on in the schools. Teachers should be encouraged to entice Standard VII. pupils to remain in the schools as long as possible, for they are valuable in every sense. I think that if teachers were paid some special rate for their instruction, and they were kept out of the average attendance, it would be a great advantage. I strongly deprecate the proposal to give Inspectors the power of lowering teachers' classification. There are thousands of ways of penalising a teacher other than by branding him forever—for I regard it as that—as having deteriorated in fitness for his work. I would certainly resign my position and take to some other calling if, under any circumstances, an Inspector treated me in that manner. We teachers are emphatically of the opinion that we have not a national system of education at the present time, and we have this opinion forced upon us continually. In a colony like this the conditions of our lives should be made, as far as educational attainments are concerned, as nearly uniform as possible. But at present the work done in different standards in different districts varies. In some districts it is inferior to the work done in other districts. It is a delusion to imagine that the best work is done in the large schools. The best-taught children are those in schools with an attendance of from 40 to 100 pupils.

271. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] You think that the teaching administered in the North is not so good as the teaching in the South, do you?—I once dared at a teachers' meeting to instance where the diversity was very marked, and naturally a very vigorous protest came from that district which I instanced.

272. Would you consider it as an indication of more efficient teaching if a lad who had passed the Fifth Standard in Otago was sent to a Wellington school and was there found to be fit for Standard VI. : would you consider it as an indication of more efficient teaching being given in the South?—I was so severely "mauled" on one occasion I instanced that I am almost afraid to give an opinion.

273. At all events, you think there is a difference in some districts?—Yes, a very marked difference.

274. Do you not think that if there has been a difference in the work of the teachers in some of the districts the work is an equivalent for the salaries paid them?—I think that the difference in salaries has not been the cause of the difference in the work performed. I think it has been entirely the different interpretation put upon the syllabus by Inspectors in their own education districts.

275. I understand that you consider that a female teacher is pretty well worn out at thirty years of age?—She has attained her best, I think, at that period.

276. Do you not think that she should be paid a better salary during the years she is most efficient if her powers are exhausted sooner than a male teacher's?—I have seen so much waste in training female teachers that at the present time, in this district, I think they are paid very fair salaries.

277. There is a difference of 25 per cent. between the salaries paid to male and female teachers in this district, is there not?—Yes.

278. Do you think that is too great a disparity?—No, I do not think it is. I think the average female teacher is very likely to become a selfish person, spending all she earns upon herself, having no claims upon her.

279. Regarding a superannuation scheme for teachers: I was glad to hear you say—at least, I took it as such—that so-much should be deducted compulsorily from the salaries of teachers under the contemplated scheme of payments: do you think it is within the capacity of the teachers to make contributions towards a superannuation fund?—We have discovered our ability to bear the deduction that was made upon us two years ago.

280. You do not think it would be a hardship to ask the teachers to bear a reduction from their increased salaries under the proposed scale?—No.

281. At what age do you think a teacher should be retired?—Well, I do not think that many of the teachers would agree with me. I consider that a male teacher has reached his best at forty-five years of age, and from forty-five to sixty or sixty-five he should be allowed to taper off.

282. At what age would you retire an Inspector?—I have not the experience to say.

283. Are you in favour of a colonial scale?—Emphatically so.

284. Do you think that the Inspectors should be colonial officers or Board officers?—Colonial officers under the control of the central department.

285. If that was so, what functions would you give to the Boards—or would you consider that Boards were unnecessary?—I have very great difficulty in answering that question. It seems to me that Boards would still have the direct administration of affairs within their own education districts.

286. What administration would Boards have if they had not the appointment of teachers?—You are supposing that I am advocating the appointment of teachers by the central department also?

287. Yes; what is your opinion then?—As a natural sequence of that, I would take it that there would be the abolition of Boards.

288. Have you thought of the question of a Board for the North Island and one for the South Island?—In the event of the “wiping-out” of Education Boards, I would intrust some of the administration to Borough Councils, County Councils, and other local bodies.

289. Do you think that Borough Councils and County Councils are specially qualified for the work?—The work would become part of their duties.

290. Have you had any experience of Borough Councils and County Councils? Are the members who compose those bodies giants of intellect: would you intrust your fate to them?—I am supposing that the promotion and transfer of teachers has been taken over by the central department. I do not know the functions of Education Boards outside the controlling of teachers.

291. Surely you know something of the functions of Education Boards after working under them? You say that you do not know the functions of Boards outside of the appointment of teachers?—That is so; perhaps a little thought would enable me to answer you—*e.g.*, the erection and maintenance of buildings.

292. Do you suggest the centralising of those functions which you mention because you think that Boards have not done their work well in the past?—There have been grave inequalities which tend to denationalise our education system.

293. Is it not a fact that Boards have continued the existing principles from the provincial days?—I cannot speak as to that.

294. You will not hold fast to the statement you made that Boards created the inequalities you spoke of?—They have at least perpetuated them.

295. If the Education Boards had the money to distribute that these schemes contemplate, do you think that the Boards could not distribute the money as well as the central department?—I think not.

296. Why?—For the reason that they would be constantly attempting to adapt the means at their disposal to local conditions.

297. Would that be a bad principle?—Well, the local conditions might be purely imaginary.

298. You stated just now that the Boards might adapt their means to local conditions: I understand you mean actual local conditions and not imaginary ones?—I think that local conditions should not be allowed to destroy the uniformity of the system as a whole.

299. Do not local conditions enter into all systems of administration?—No doubt.

300. Then, do you think it is wrong that they should enter into the question of the payment of teachers and the administration of the system of education?—I think, in that matter, the immediate effect would be to cause grave inequality.

301. You mean that at the present time inequalities exist?—Yes.

302. Have those inequalities not arisen from the fact that the Government has not given the different Boards the means to carry out their functions in such a manner as to prevent those complications?—Yes.

303. Then, if the Government has been the primary cause of the inability of the Boards to do otherwise than they have done, is it not unjust to blame the Boards?—I do not blame the members of the Boards.

304. I speak of the Boards, and want your opinion?—The system of Board administration is to blame.

305. I want to know this: If the Government has not given the Boards means to do otherwise than has been done, is it the fault of the Boards or the fault of the Government?—It is the fault of the Boards' system of administration.

306. How can that be so if the Boards have not had the means of doing otherwise than has been done?—Because the Boards have created such school districts as should not exist.

307. The Boards did not create the districts; the Government did so. I want a direct answer

to my former question, as to whether the fault is the Government's or the Boards' ?—I do not mean to throw the responsibility on the Boards.

308. If the Boards reduced salaries fourteen years ago, was that not for the reason that the Government reduced the amount of capitation grant by 5s. *per capita*, and altered the payments from the roll attendance to the average attendance?—Yes.

309. Was that not the cause of grave dissatisfaction on the part of the teachers?—Yes.

310. Then, was it the fault of the Government or the fault of the Boards?—The fault of the Government.

311. Very well; you admit it was the fault of the Government, and that it was the cause of grave dissatisfaction, and yet you ask for the whole of certain powers to be placed in the hands of the Government?—Yes.

312. Does that not appear to be illogical?—No.

313. You say that the motion that you read from your Institute recommended that powers should be placed in the hands of the central department for promotion, removal, and dismissal of teachers?—Yes, that is so.

314. That is the view of the teachers?—Yes.

315. That the central authority should have the whole power of promotion, transfer, removal, and dismissal?—Yes.

316. What do you think the view of the public should be on that: do you think that the parents should have no say whatever in the appointment of a teacher, seeing their children are perhaps to receive education from that particular teacher?—I am quite prepared to say that the condition of things which has existed hitherto—

317. I am not speaking as to the conditions that existed hitherto. You say that the teachers want the whole of certain powers placed in the hands of the central department: I ask—contingent upon that—if you think the people would be content to have no voice in the matter?—I think the people would accept appointments made by the central department finally, although perhaps they would not at first prefer it to the Boards.

318. If such a trouble existed in the exchange of a teacher from one district to another, subject even now to consultation—for I think you stated that consultation was a drawback—if such trouble now exists after consultation, do you think it is likely to cease altogether if Boards have no voice in the matter at all?—Yes, I am sure it would. As soon as a teacher is chosen by a School Committee, almost invariably there rises up in that district a protest against the choice—another candidate has his own body of supporters.

319. Not invariably surely?—Well, frequently. If a teacher goes to a district with the knowledge that the majority of the residents have been opposed to his appointment, it is a very grave disadvantage to that teacher.

320. What do you think the minimum salary for a teacher should be in a school that the teacher may have complete charge of?—I think, in this country, that no male teacher should be paid less than £150 a year.

321. And what is the minimum salary you would fix for a female teacher under similar circumstances?—£100.

322. Is it not a fact that in a small school, say, of 25 in attendance a female teacher is required to first of all possess as high qualifications, to bring out the same results, and be altogether as well adapted for the charge of a school of that sort as a male teacher?—Yes.

323. Then, do you not think that a difference of £50 in salary is somewhat unreasonable?—Personally, I cannot conceive—I have never known—any woman in charge of such a school doing equal work to that which a male teacher would do.

324. In a school of 20 pupils in attendance have you not known the work of a female to be equal to that of a male?—Schools of from 20 to 45 in average attendance are the schools women would have to work as teachers in charge.

325. I am speaking of schools of 20 in average attendance?—I can recall instances of women teachers being in charge of small schools in this district, but when the children reached the Fourth Standard they had to ride five or six miles to attend another school.

326. Referring once more to the appointment of teachers by a central authority, do you not think it might become a question of political influence—the appointment of teachers through the Government?—It has not struck me.

327. Do you not know that all Governments—I do not refer to the present Government—have been largely influenced in the matter of appointments by political supporters—appointments to certain high positions, even in the Police, for instance, and in the Railway Department?—Probably; I have not followed the matter closely to know that it is an actual fact.

328. Would you be surprised to know that it is an actual fact—that supporters can get appointments for friends, and other supporters, when otherwise they would not get appointments?—I think such influences as you suggest would be at a minimum in the Education Department.

329. You do not think that political influence would be brought to bear in the matter of appointments?—I am not afraid of it.

330. Do you think that the wants of a district would be quickly attended to by sending to the central department?—Yes.

331. Have you had anything to do with the needs of people in districts to obtain a post-office or a mail-service?—No.

332. Would you believe that it takes sometimes two years to get a very necessary post-office opened in a district?—Inefficiency in one department does not necessitate inefficiency in another.

333. How long do you think it took to get a railway-siding where absolutely required: would you believe that it has taken six years to get that done?—I know where one has been wanted for twenty years, and it is not there yet.

334. Do you think that in a back bush district—say, a settlement of twenty people—if a railway-siding was wanted, actually required, and they could not get it for six years or twenty years, that if that settlement of people wanted a school established they would get the school any quicker than the railway-siding?—My objection is that Education Boards have been too susceptible to influence that has been brought to bear on them to open schools of convenience.

335. They have attended too closely to the wants of the people, you think?—The tendency has been in every education district in New Zealand to create schools of convenience.

336. Has that been the case in Otago?—I know of at least two schools built in Otago that were not required.

337. Is that the fault of the Government or the Boards?—I have no opinion to express on the matter. It is a matter of supposition.

338. No, it is not; you said that you knew of a certain railway-siding that had not been granted, though it had been wanted for twenty years: I ask you whether, if there was a school in the same district, and the people required a teacher, they would be likely to get the teacher any more quickly from the Education Department than the people requiring the siding were likely to get it from the Railway Department?—If it was a real necessity, I should say that they would receive what they required as readily from the department as from an Education Board.

339. And that might be in twenty years' time, as in the case of the siding?—Yes; but the people were evidently able to get on without the siding.

340. And might they not be able to get on without the school?—Yes.

341. You stated that two schools were built in Otago that were not required: what are the names of those schools?—One was Glenledi and the other was at Round Hill. There was another, I think, at Adam's Flat.

342. Glenledi was never closed down, was it?—I think it was.

343. Was the school not necessary when it was built?—I am not speaking as to that matter.

344. Then, your argument falls to the ground that schools were built that were not required, does it not?—There was no other school within two miles, which fact, no doubt, was in favour of the creation of these schools I have mentioned.

345. The question is, Was Glenledi required?—I am not sufficiently acquainted with the district to say so.

346. Then, if you do not know the requirements of districts, surely it is wrong of you to say that schools were built which were not required. You instanced Glenledi as one in point, and afterwards stated that you did not know whether the needs of the district required its erection?—I take it that it could not have been required, seeing that while it was still a new building it was standing unoccupied.

347. How many years was it open and used before being closed?—I do not know.

348. Might not the fact of its being closed arise through the children attending the school having grown up and the school being no longer required?—No, I do not think so.

349. Are you aware that that school is not closed, and has not been closed for many years?—No.

350. You do not approve of the *per capita* grant?—No.

351. You do not believe in paying on the average attendance?—No.

352. You think it is unfair to the teachers, on the grounds that parents who might have a spite against a teacher would perhaps keep their children away from school, and by decreasing the average attendance lower the salary of the teacher; also that climatic conditions might affect a teacher's average attendance?—Yes, that is quite true.

353. Are the present salaries sufficient to induce bright boys to enter the teaching profession?—I do not think the salaries have anything to do with the question.

354. You quoted the London system of grouping schools; but do you think that system would apply here?—Yes.

355. How many children do you think a teacher should be intrusted with in order to teach them efficiently?—It depends upon the teacher's grade. I should say not more than 40.

356. How many would a teacher of Standards IV., V., or VI. be able to manage?—45.

357. A male or a female teacher?—A male teacher should have charge of the upper standards, and only in very exceptional cases would I put a female teacher in charge of the higher standards.

358. Your suggestion, as I understood, that women's salaries should be stopped when they are away through illness causes one to think that you almost infer their absence from their duties is not caused through illness: is it not an undue reflection on women?—I wish to say so with caution, of course.

359. Regarding the question of house-rent, do you not think it would be better to give teachers a house allowance rather than give them a house, except in the case of country teachers?—Yes.

360. You pleaded better consideration for the assistant teachers: do you not think something should be done for assistants in towns in the matter of house allowance?—Married male assistants, I think, should be granted house allowance.

361. Another thing you stated was in connection with payment on average attendance to teachers, and in this connection you considered that young teachers might be tempted to falsify their school registers?—Yes, that view of the matter struck me as a possible temptation and danger.

362. Has not your experience, or discoveries in that way, shown that it would be probably elder teachers rather than young teachers who would be subjected to the temptation?—I can recall only two cases.

363. Were they young or old teachers?—Teachers of small schools.

364. Yes; but I want to know their ages, approximately?—Certainly they were both under thirty-five years of age.

365. Then, they were not very young teachers?—No.
366. *Mr. Davidson.*] In appearing before this Commission, whom do you represent?—The teachers of the Palmerston North division of the New Zealand Educational Institute.
367. You do not represent the Wanganui Branch of the New Zealand Educational Institute?—The Palmerston section.
368. Could you tell the Commission the number of members in the section?—I do not know at the present time; the secretary is here, and he will be able to tell you.
369. Approximately, how many would there be?—About twenty.
370. You have attended the Council meetings of the New Zealand Educational Institute on several occasions, and, of course, you are aware that representative teachers from every education district in the colony were present?—Yes.
371. Have you ever on any occasion heard the question of centralising our educational system discussed at those Council meetings?—Yes, in various connections.
372. Can you state where, or when?—At Nelson in the first instance, and afterwards at Christchurch.
373. Was there a vote taken on the question?—I am speaking entirely from memory; I have not the report of the proceedings.
374. You would remember if a vote was taken, and the result of that vote, would you not?—I cannot speak from memory.
375. *Mr. Stewart.*] In your opinion, is there general satisfaction among the teachers of the colony at the present time as regards the staffing of schools and more particularly the salaries paid?—There is general dissatisfaction.
376. If a uniform scale of staffing and a uniform scale of salaries was adopted, do you think that would tend to remove the existing dissatisfaction?—It would do very much to allay it.
377. Do you think that the very great inequalities in regard to the salaries paid at the present time has been the principal cause of the dissatisfaction?—In this particular district inequality in regard to staffing has been felt more than the inequality in regard to the salaries.
378. If the inequalities were removed the dissatisfaction would be removed?—Yes.
379. If the teachers of the colony were satisfied on these particular points—of staff and salary—do you not think it would tend to the stability of the Boards rather than to the abolition of the Boards?—There would still remain the difficulty that we as teachers all feel. I refer to the removal, transfer, and appointment of teachers.
380. If you can make the teachers of the colony satisfied by giving them a colonial scale, there is less likelihood of the abolition of Boards, is there not?—There would still remain the dissatisfaction concerning the almost impossibility of passing from one district to another, or passing from one school to another.
381. Would there not be greater possibility of passing from school to school or district to district, if the inequalities in salaries were removed?—Hitherto the Boards have made it impossible for a teacher from another education district to gain a footing anywhere outside his own district.
382. May not a teacher leaving one district for another, perhaps obliged to do so for health's sake, have to be content with a lower salary in the district to which he removes?—I think that is so.
383. You are strongly in favour of a colonial scale for the teachers of the colony because you think it would remove the present existing inequalities?—Yes.
384. *Mr. Luke.*] How many years have you been teaching?—Eighteen years.
385. During those eighteen years have you recognised the good work and the disinterested work done by Education Boards?—Yes, very much indeed.
386. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] You say that the teachers whom you represent are all in favour of a colonial scale?—As far as I have been able to ascertain their requirements, they are.
387. Did they pass a resolution to that effect?—Yes.
388. Did they discuss the advisability of differentiating between the work expected from a country teacher—sole teacher—with all standards in his school, and the work that might be expected from a teacher in a large town school that is fully staffed?—The question was discussed incidentally, but not to result in any resolution being passed.
389. What is your opinion on the subject?—That the duties required of the average sole teacher in charge of a country school are much more exacting than those required from a class-teacher, an assistant teacher, in a large town school.
390. Should not a lower standard of work be expected from a country school with all standards than what might be expected from a town school, for example, in such subjects as history, science, and other subjects of a kindred nature that cannot be so efficiently taught; or should a teacher, as far as the class-subjects are concerned, have an alternative?—The teacher should certainly have an alternative on account of the impossibility of giving full attention to certain exceptional subjects.
391. You recognise that Inspectors are the advisers and executive officers of Education Boards, and that anomalies nevertheless exist in the different education districts owing to the diversity of opinions held by the various Inspectors: would it not tend to a uniformity of inspection and examination if Inspectors were placed under the control of the central department?—I think it would.
392. If the cost of the inspectorate was defrayed by the General Government, instead of having to come to a great extent out of the funds of the Boards, there would be more money at the disposal of the Boards for incidental expenses, would there not?—Presumably, yes. I think the grant at present made for inspection purposes is a mere quota of the total cost.
393. The cost of the inspectorate in this district is about £1,000, and the Government allowance only £300: is that so?—Yes.

394. Do you find that teachers leave the service of the Wanganui Board owing to the small remuneration they receive at the hands of the Board?—No.

395. Have you not experienced that in other education districts?—No.

396. Do you consider that the Legislature should define the functions of Committees and Education Boards in the matter of appointments of teachers?—Clearly, yes. This has been a cause of constant dispute, and has introduced very great diversity of method throughout the colony.

397. Do you think that increases to teachers' salaries should be by grades or by units?—Emphatically, by grades.

398. I think that one of the reasons you have against the payment by units was that there might be a tendency on the part of the teachers to falsify their registers?—It is a conceivable evil.

399. Would that evil not be intensified in the case of payment by grades? Suppose a teacher's attendance reached 98 or 99, would it not be a temptation for the teacher to strain his attendance to a point at which he would receive a difference of £25 rather than by a unit for the sake of perhaps 12s.?—Yes; with this difference: such a case as you are supposing would be a very unusual one, whereas the other applies to every teacher throughout the colony.

400. If Inspectors were placed under the control of the central department, and had general instructions to watch very closely any attempt on the part of a teacher to falsify his register, it would preclude any such attempts?—I do not say that danger exists at the present time; it simply struck me as a possible temptation to teachers.

401. With regard to teaching the extra subjects in Standard VII., do you consider that in the case of a school such as yours, where there are a number in the Seventh Standard willing to be taught secondary subjects, that the same remuneration should be given by the department as is given in the case of a district high school?—Yes, if the work is satisfactory.

402. One of the reasons, I believe, why you support the adoption of a colonial scale is to have equal pay for equal work in each education district?—Yes.

403. In practice, there would not be equal pay on account of the difference in the cost of living, would there?—I think the range of the difference in the cost of living in this colony is very narrow.

404. You consider, then, that the difficulty would be no more marked in the case of teachers than what it is in the case of railway servants or officials of the Postal Department?—I think it would be the same all round.

405. Do you consider that the percentage of the working-average is too low?—One becomes so accustomed to 50 per cent.—I have not thought the matter out.

406. I suppose it does not affect schools of the size of yours?—It affects country schools much more.

407. Have the teachers whom you represent expressed any opinion on that subject?—They have sent a special representative from the country to give evidence on that point.

408. Do you consider that teachers should be paid on the highest attendance or on the roll-number?—It strikes me that the most equitable way is the number of pupils actually present on the day of the examination.

409. Would you pay, for the following year, on the total number present on that day?—Yes.

410. Do you find that the Wanganui Board entrenches on the maintenance fund for the purposes of erecting and maintaining buildings?—I do not know of any case in recent years; it did actually happen some years ago.

411. What about house allowance: does not house allowance come out of the maintenance fund?—I do not know the working of the finances of the Board; I am assured by those who know, it is so.

412. If residences were erected the cost would come out of the building grant?—Yes.

413. Do you consider that the Wanganui Board employs an excessive number of pupil-teachers?—Yes.

414. With regard to the teaching of sewing, what provision is made for that in Wanganui?—There is no special provision made. The female teachers take charge of the sewing.

415. Is preference given to female teachers in country schools on account of their ability to teach sewing?—I have not heard so.

416. In the event of there being a male teacher in charge of a country school, you do not know of any provision being made for the tuition of sewing?—I think, on application being made to the Board, a special grant is made.

417. Do you find that candidates for positions under this Board holding the highest certificates are, as a rule, appointed?—No, that is not so.

418. Do you know of canvassing taking place on the part of applicants—the canvassing of School Committees, seeing that it lies in their hands to recommend applicants?—That system has been penalised to the extent of having the applicant disqualified.

419. By whom?—By the Board.

420. Do you know of any case in which a candidate was so disqualified?—No. That regulation came into existence only recently.

421. In reply to Mr. Mackenzie, I think you stated there would be a danger of political influence operating in the event of teachers' appointments taking place?—Mr. Mackenzie suggested that, but I said I did not think it would be so.

422. Do you consider, even if political influence did come into operation, that it would be any worse than the influence brought to bear on Committees by the personal canvass of a candidate or his friends?—I should think not; I am not at all afraid of the evil.

423. In the event of the adoption of a colonial scale of salaries—meaning, in a few cases, reductions—do you consider that those reductions should operate from the date of the introduction of the scale, or should the operation of the reductions be postponed until vacancies were made?—I should prefer the gradual transition.

424. When the Wanganui Board made a reduction in their scale they brought it into force straight away, did they not?—Yes, within three months.

425. Consequently the scale of payment that we see in the rules and regulations of the Wanganui Board is not the actual scale upon which the teachers are paid at the present time?—That is so.

426. Then, when it was stated in evidence this morning that the assistant in the Wanganui Boys' School was getting a salary of £190, or should get that, he is only receiving £182?—Yes, that is so.

427. Do you consider that the salary of a head-teacher in a small country school should be reduced by £10 to pay for the appointment of a sewing-mistress?—No; I think it is an injustice.

428. You do not consider that the salary of a head-teacher should be reduced when an assistant is brought in at 40?—No.

429. Are you aware that is the case in one education district?—No, I am not.

430. Do you favour the establishment of training-colleges in the four large centres, and also the establishment of collegiate classes for the training of ex-pupil-teachers in the smaller towns, such as Wanganui, New Plymouth, and Invercargill?—I have not thought of the former proposal; I strongly favour the establishment of training classes.

431. Would you prefer a system of granting scholarships to the ex-pupil-teachers in the smaller districts to enable them to get one or two years' training in normal schools in the larger centres?—Yes.

432. *Mr. Hill.*] You do not approve of the present mode of staffing the schools in the Wanganui District?—It is generally unsatisfactory.

433. What is the staffing of your own school?—I take charge of Standards VI. and VII. with the help of a pupil-teacher, the first assistant has Standard V., the second assistant Standard IV., the third assistant Standard III., a junior assistant Standard II., an ex-pupil-teacher Standard I., and two pupil-teachers, with a cadet, the infant classes.

434. *Mr. Weston.*] Have you no female teacher?—No mistress.

435. *Mr. Hill.*] No females in your school?—The first assistant is a male, and the other teachers, with the exception of the two pupil teachers, are female teachers. There is no mistress.

436. Do you find that female teachers are less competent than male teachers in managing classes?—Not the lower classes, but in the higher standards it is so.

437. Is there any special reason for giving those teachers the classes you enumerated?—I have found the present organization very satisfactory. My usual method when a new teacher comes into my school is to take that teacher, no matter what rank, into my class-room in order to become familiar with the methods of working the school as a whole. After six or twelve months' such experience that teacher is then given charge of the class he or she seems best adapted for.

438. Your assistant teachers are all certificated?—Yes.

439. Would you deem it your duty, if you thought it proper in the interests of your school, to put the teacher of Standard V. in charge of Standard II., for instance?—Yes; I have repeatedly changed teachers.

440. Your certificated assistants are really class-teachers?—Yes.

441. You give them no other responsibility in the preparation of school-work except the taking of standards?—The first assistant has extra duties. He occasionally supervises model lessons given by pupil-teachers, and takes charge of the boys at drill and on other special occasions.

442. Do your female assistants take any responsibility in overseeing the infant classes?—No.

443. You simply allow your assistants to take charge of their respective standard class?—The teacher in charge of Standard I. has a general oversight of the whole of the infant classes.

444. She is an ex-pupil-teacher?—Yes.

445. You do not give the certificated female assistants any responsibility in the matter of the preparation of the young children?—No.

446. Have you given the pupil-teachers any special training for the teaching of infant children?—Not for any extended period.

447. You recognise that salaries under the proposed or suggested scale are a considerable improvement on the salaries paid by your Education Board at the present time?—Yes.

448. Referring again to the training of infant children, do you not consider it essential that teachers should be trained to take charge of and control the infants?—Yes; but it would be quite impossible to put any of my female assistants in charge of the infant-room.

449. Although your teachers are certificated, and assumed to be trained teachers, they have had no training?—That is so.

450. Yet their certificates have been issued to them as testifying they are qualified to teach infant children?—Yes.

451. There is no educative process or real preparation in the matter of training, it is simply mechanical work the teachers pick up?—That is so.

452. Are you aware that at one time the Government paid a *per capita* allowance of £4 5s.?—Yes.

453. Were the teachers satisfied then?—I do not think there was any dissatisfaction expressed regarding salaries in this district.

454. The Government subsequently withdrew 10s.?—Yes.

455. Do you think the conditions in the various education districts have altered very much in the matter of demanding the opening of schools in the smaller districts?—I think that during the past twelve or thirteen years a very large number of small schools have come into existence.

456. Do you think that has been detrimental or beneficial to teachers in the matter of salaries?—Very detrimental.

457. Then, the Education Boards have been constantly placed under a growing disadvantage?—Yes.

458. You quite recognise that?—Yes.

459. Assume the same conditions existed as formerly in the matter of capitation allowance, do you not think those difficulties would be greatly obviated in the various education districts?—I think it is likely.

460. You said dissatisfaction exists among teachers?—Yes.

461. Would satisfaction ensue if the Boards were provided with the means of paying better salaries?—The inequalities in salaries are not the only grounds of dissatisfaction.

462. Do you think the teachers would receive greater consideration at the hands of a central department than at the hands of Education Boards?—I think the chief benefits of having a central department to control teachers would be the facility which would at once be given for the transfer, promotion, and removal of teachers.

463. Would the central department be likely to know more of teachers than the Education Boards do?—I think the Education Boards at the present time are almost wholly dependent on Inspectors for knowledge concerning their schools.

464. Does that imply that you simply want Inspectors to have the means of promoting teachers?—Yes; I take it that that would be so.

465. Do you find that your lady teachers are often asking for leave of absence on account of sickness?—More frequently than male assistants.

466. What is the salary paid to your first assistant master?—£195, with a bonus.

467. And to the first assistant mistress?—I think, £118.

468. Do you know their certificates?—The male assistant is C2, and the female E2.

469. How many children has your lady assistant who takes Standard IV. to teach?—At present only 48.

470. Is 48 below the average?—Standard III. has 67.

471. And a lady teacher takes that unaided?—Yes.

472. How many are there in Standard VI.?—About 30.

473. And Standard V.?—About 55.

474. Does your first assistant take Standard V. unaided?—Yes.

475. Do you think it is not more difficult to take 55 in Standard V. than 48 in Standard IV.?—Much more difficult, on account of the larger number of children, and the more difficult subjects to be taught.

476. Do you find that lady teachers maintain the discipline as well as males?—In classes of the lower grade.

477. Supposing you placed the first assistant in charge of Standard III., do you think he would produce higher results there than the mistress does?—I think not.

478. You find, of course, that the female pupil-teacher has to work just as hard as the male to get her certificate?—Yes.

479. Why, then, should you differentiate the salaries of male and female teachers?—In the first place, you can exchange the male teacher from Fifth to Third Standard, but you cannot do the other exchange.

480. In a school for girls only, are you aware that lady teachers take the standards just as efficiently as the male teachers do in the boys' schools?—It is quite possible; but they are controlling only girls: they have not mixed classes to control.

481. Do you not think that that influence which we term "womanly influence" operates a great deal in the case of training?—Not wholesomely.

482. You do not think that woman's moral influence and womanly influence operates to the benefit of boys?—I should certainly say it is inferior to the influence exercised by men over boys at that stage.

483. According to what you say, it would be better to place men in charge of unmixed schools?—Not all over. I recognise that in the lower standards females do quite as good work as the men, and exert quite as good an influence over the younger children.

484. In what way does the male influence operate in the case of the girls in the senior classes?—I think, wholesomely—more wholesomely than the female influence over the boys. I think that the upper standards even of girls' schools should be staffed by males.

485. Supposing teachers of the different sexes have the same work up to the Fourth Standard, do you think they should not get the same salary up to that stage?—Yes; not as a matter of equity, but as a matter of finance. The male teacher is available for more duties than the female teacher.

486. You expressed, this morning, the opinion that a better mode of classification of the schools should be adopted. I have before me a plan of classification of schools in which all the schools are placed in ten classes, as follows: Class 1, schools below 20; Class 2, schools between 20 and 30; Class 3, between 30 and 45; Class 4, between 45 and 75; Class 5, between 75 and 110; Class 6, between 110 and 175; Class 7, between 175 and 300; Class 8, between 300 and 500; Class 9, between 500 and 600; and Class 10, between 600 and 700. Now, the first assistant male will receive the same salary as the teacher of a school in the seventh class; the second assistant master in the same school will receive the same salary as the headmaster in a school of the sixth class; the third assistant master will receive the same salary as the principal teacher of a school of the fifth class; the fourth assistant will receive the same salary as the principal teacher of a school of the fourth class. What I want to ask you is this: Do you think, or is it your opinion, that some such lines of equality should be recognised in any generalised scheme of the staffing of schools on a colonial basis?—I thoroughly approve of the principle laid down. I think it is necessary to a colonial scheme.

487. Do you think that that principle of classification would meet with the difficulties which the present proposed classification presents in its adoption as a general scheme?—I think a weakness in the proposed scale is the dealing with male assistants as a distinctive class rather than as being equivalent in salary and status to the head-teachers of schools of lower grades.

488. Do you think that any proposed scale of payment and staffing should deal at all with the classification of teachers by certificate?—I think it would be dangerous to ignore it altogether.

489. When a vacancy takes place, should it not be right and competent for any teacher to apply for that vacancy?—I think not. I think the steps of progression should be in regular succession.

490. You want not merely that there should be a scale of payment and classification, but also that the teachers should be placed directly under the control of the central department?—Yes.

491. You hold that no one else but the central authority should have any right to deal with the question of the employment of teachers in public schools?—Yes, that is so.

492. What length of holidays are usually granted to schools in this district?—Usually five weeks in the midsummer recess, two weeks for midwinter recess, and the ordinary public holidays.

493. Do your Boards or the Committees arrange the holidays—the recess duration?—The Board in every case.

494. Are they the same throughout the whole of the education district?—Yes; with one or two exceptions, for which provision is made. Teachers are allowed to change the midwinter holidays if the annual examination is pending.

495. *Mr. Lethbridge.*] At what time do you think assistance should be given to a sole teacher?—I think, at 45.

496. And the assistance then should be a certificated teacher, I presume?—Certainly; or at least a trained pupil-teacher.

497. A pupil-teacher who has passed through the term of apprenticeship?—That is what I mean.

498. At what salary?—£80 for a male.

499. *Mr. Weston.*] Have the teachers, more especially those composing the Institute which you represent, considered all the points which have been discussed to-day before arriving at the conclusion that a colonial scale of staffs and salaries would be beneficial?—I am conscious that we have been proceeding on destructive rather than constructive lines.

500. Why is the instruction of the infants left to pupil-teachers?—Because pupil-teachers, on account of youth and inexperience, as a rule are not able to take charge of pupils in standards.

501. But do you not think that infants require special treatment in their instruction?—I do; and one of the evils of our present system is that on account of the limited staffing no choice is given us in this matter.

502. Would you not advocate the employment of a lady teacher for the baby classes?—I should strongly, but a very young lady teacher.

503. You think a young girl would be more likely to take with the children than an elderly lady?—Yes.

504. You said just now that the colonial scale would really involve central administration?—Yes; that was our decision as a local branch of the Institute.

505. *Mr. Davidson.*] How many were present at the meeting?—Ten.

506. *Mr. Weston.*] Did you consider the possibility of political and other influences coming in, either to the prejudice or to the advantage of individual teachers?—It was not considered in detail. I have heard the matter discussed by teachers informally, and generally there is little fear entertained of undue political influence being brought to bear on teachers.

507. Do you seriously think that the central administration would insure teachers in one district securing appointments in another?—I think it would.

508. Would not the district in which an appointment had to be made, or, rather, the local authority administering education in that district, advise the Government to appoint a teacher who was known to them?—I conceive that a very great probability.

509. Then, if there be that probability, where will be the direct advantage of conferring upon the central department the power of appointing teachers?—It makes possible what just now is absolutely impossible.

510. With regard to pupil-teachers, would it be within their power to attend such central training-school as might be established at Wellington?—It should be made compulsory.

511. Would you expect the Government to pay all the expenses, or do you think that the parents of pupil-teachers, speaking generally, would be in a position to send their children to Wellington for instruction?—I think as much has been carried out in other countries successfully. I consider it would be a most wholesome check on an undue number of pupil-teachers.

512. It means that we should go back to class school-teachers—in other words, that the children of poorer parents would be unable to enter into the profession?—By means of scholarships, for which all may compete, that may be made possible.

513. In that case you would require more scholarships than now, and also training-school scholarships?—I should certainly advocate the establishment of training-school scholarships.

514. You said just now that sometimes a pupil-teacher would be in six schools in the course of one year: how comes that?—It is quite unaccountable from a teacher's standpoint.

515. Is it in the power of the Board, when a pupil-teacher is taken into a school, to move that teacher *volens volens* from school to school in that way?—This Board's regulations are that when any pupil-teacher declines to remove when ordered, his refusal will be followed by summary dismissal.

516. Do you consider that a hard regulation?—I do, very.
517. In the preparation of a colonial scale, I take it that in your opinion we should ignore monitors, and that we should limit the number of pupil-teachers, both on account of their inferior teaching and on account of the sacrifices they have to make in the shape of their own instruction?—That is so.
518. You told us you favoured uniformity of instruction: do you consider that this colony, or any other colony or country, can be benefitted by dead uniformity in the instruction of the rising generation?—Up to a certain limit, I think it is absolutely necessary.
519. What limit is that?—The exit from our public schools. It is there that individual divergencies begin to operate.
520. If the Boards of Education are dispensed with, would the public have any voice whatever in the appointment of teachers?—The local public would and should have very little say concerning appointments.
521. I presume you will admit that the existing system of education has shut up a large number of schools, and that private schools are the exception, and not the rule?—That is so.
522. If there were no system of primary education, would parents not be entitled to select their own schools for their children?—That is so.
523. Seeing they are shut out from private institutions and schools, is it not right that parents should have some voice—and a considerable voice—in the carrying-on of the substituted schools—viz., our own primary schools?—I consider that the present method of allowing parents a voice in the appointment of teachers is the cause of a great deal of discord throughout the colony.
524. There are nearly three thousand teachers in New Zealand?—About that.
525. How many children are there receiving education?—About 130,000.
526. Does it not strike you that in the administration of a department comprising nearly 3,000 teachers and 130,000 children there must be a considerable amount of patronage in the hands of the Government?—Yes.
527. Then, can you, as a man of education and great thought, safely say that in that administration it is not possible that undue influence should exist to the prejudice of some and undue advantage to other teachers?—No system out of Utopia, I take it, would be free from imperfections, but we must be satisfied with the best under the circumstances.
528. How would you advise us to deal with localities where there were perhaps up to, we will say, fifteen children?—I should say that the burden of educating families so remote from centres should really fall upon the heads of those families, and should be included in the sacrifices incurred in their pioneer life.
529. How is primary education supported—from the rates of the people, is it not?—Yes.
530. Who, to a large extent, contribute to those rates indirectly and directly for the interests of the country?—Undoubtedly, the settlers.
531. Why, then, should the settlers who go out into the backwoods as pioneers for the benefit of the country at large be sacrificed in the shape of the education of their children?—Because it is impossible to include in any system such cases as an individual family, or two isolated families.
532. You do not think that special consideration should be shown by the Government of the colony to people so unfortunately yet so honourably and nobly situated?—I should do everything possible to minimise the disadvantages of their position, but from my knowledge of what is called school-training in parts such as you describe I consider it is a shadow instead of a substance. The teacher who will undertake the work is a person who will do more mischief than good.
533. Would not that class even be competent to instruct these unfortunate children in the three Rs?—It is not conferring on them all the benefits of the education system.
534. *Mr. Hogben.*] You expressed the opinion that a colonial scale entails central administration; do you mean central administration of the whole system, including the appointment and dismissal of teachers?—The resolution which I quoted in my statement was that any system of administration would be incomplete unless it conferred upon the department the power to promote, remove, transfer, or dismiss teachers.
535. Do you mean thereby that the colonial scheme fixed by statute necessarily involves central administration—that it could not exist apart from it?—It could exist apart from it, but would not cover the whole ground of the teachers' discontent.
536. Does it mean the appointment and dismissal of teachers?—It does.
537. Do you think that is desirable?—We feel it is very desirable. Whatever evils may emerge under that system, they must necessarily be less than the evils which at present obtain.
538. Do you not think that the circumstances of different schools vary: is it likely that all the schools of 30 pupils will be exactly alike all over the colony?—Sufficiently alike to make it possible to transfer a teacher from a school of 30 in one part of the colony to a school of 30 in another part of the colony.
539. Do you not recognise that there are local conditions which it is very desirable to consider in making appointments?—I think not in primary schools. It might be so in secondary schools; but I cannot conceive differences great enough to create teachers of a different type for a distinctive class of school.
540. Do you not think that local knowledge of the school and local knowledge of the candidate is very desirable on the part of the appointing body?—I think not. I believe it has led to preferences that have been highly hurtful to teachers.
541. Do you not think it would lead to much greater evils if the appointing body had no knowledge of local circumstances, and no knowledge of the candidate?—It is quite easy to conceive evils arising, but, as teachers generally, we do not fear them so much as we do those of the present.
542. I am thinking of the children?—Speaking generally, the last consideration in the selec-

tion of teachers by Committees is the welfare of the children. I believe very little consideration is given to the question whether this or that particular teacher is the best teacher from the point of view of the children's good. I do not believe it is the question at all; it is a question of patronage of a very objectionable form.

543. In your opinion, should there be no local voice in the appointment of teachers at all?—I think there should be no local voice.

544. Do you know the Victorian system?—Only from hearsay; I have not lived under it.

545. Are you aware that there is a great deal of discontent in Victoria?—I have heard recently that it is not satisfactory.

546. The system you urge has not cleared away the evils you complain of in Victoria?—It appears from hearsay that that is so.

547. If full enough powers were conferred on the Boards to appoint and, if necessary, transfer teachers without having to formally consult the Committee, would that do away with the evils you have in your mind?—Yes, it would. If that power came into operation it would meet our views entirely.

548. That would do away with the necessity for centralising?—Yes; but central control was the only way we could conceive it possible.

549. You are in favour of training-colleges?—Yes.

550. If so, you would like these colleges to be open to pupil-teachers and those likely to become teachers, whatever part of the colony they were resident in?—Quite open.

551. In such a case, whatever the method of administration, it would be necessary to provide special scholarships, or, in any case, training-school studentships, to enable them to receive that training?—Yes, to be just to all candidates.

552. So that that expenditure in connection with the training-colleges would have to be a method of administration?—I think so.

553. You say that your Board has a regulation as to the transfer of pupil-teachers: can you point me to that regulation?—It was notified by circular; I do not know that it is laid down in the printed regulations.

554. Do you share the opinion of many teachers in New Zealand that it is desirable to issue alternative syllabuses in this colony?—Outside essential subjects.

555. English composition, for instance?—I think that would be highly undesirable. I think it is essential that the elementary educational equipment of a child should be the same all over the colony.

556. You think that pass-subjects have such a character that there should be no departure from uniformity there?—The individuality of the teacher would give sufficient diversity there, I think.

557. Would not the individuality of the teacher largely affect the method of teaching arithmetic in the early stages?—It should not be allowed to do it to the extent of making any diversity in the result.

558. Yet they allow variety of method in Scotland and England in a very marked manner?—It was not noticeable when I visited the schools of Scotland a few years ago.

559. In the class-subjects, would you allow individuality?—I should allow a certain amount of individuality to operate in that region.

560. Do you not think that in agricultural districts it would be just as well to take the science-teaching from agricultural subjects—subjects which surround the children on every side?—I think it a mistake in the primary schools to attempt to localise and take on the colour of the surroundings more deeply than the children already have them.

561. All the primary course of a child is practically the beginning of his education, is it not?—That is so.

562. Then, in the object-lessons, and in the science lessons, which are extended object-lessons, would you not take the subjects from among those things that the child actually sees around him?—Undoubtedly, but not to confine them to those. All our instruction is proceeding "from the known to the unknown."

563. In that case, would there not be a departure from uniformity of instruction according to the surroundings of the child?—The individuality of the teacher and the local circumstances may operate, but that is not spoiling the uniformity of result.

564. *The Chairman.*] Do you think, if teachers were placed beyond the control of the Board, and were simply under the central department, that the dissatisfaction would disappear?—We are perhaps foolish, but we have hitherto believed that.

565. Is the teacher in any worse position than any other professional man, or tradesman?—Yes, I think so. We are controlled by an irresponsible body of men coming into office and going out of office, with very indefinite powers.

566. Do you think the Committees are irresponsible?—Yes, I think so. We know that unless there is some special grievance the election of Committees in this colony has been reduced to a farcical form.

567. Then, you have come to the conclusion that the people take no interest in education at all?—No. My opinion is that the public mind is disposed to hand over the management of the education system to experts and authorities; they do not wish to control it as it is being done at present.

568. Have you tested the public mind?—It is impossible to test it.

569. How have you formed your conclusions?—I am just judging by the lack of interest evidenced in the election of School Committees and Boards.

570. Why is it that teachers cannot get into other districts to which they wish to transfer themselves?—We do not know why; it cannot be done.

571. Why are teachers so anxious to get under a central authority?—Because there is no latitude allowed them in the matter of promotion, transfer, or removal.

572. Who is standing in their way?—The present Board administration system seems to stand in their way. The Inspector-General himself says that Boards cannot, of their own will, change a teacher unless with the approval of both Committees.

573. If you were servants of the State, do you think you could come forward and express your views in regard to your employers as you have done to-day?—I fancy no such circumstances could arise.

574. You expressed the opinion that female teachers were unsuited for the higher standards?—Yes.

575. That they are incompetent when it comes to anything beyond the Fourth Standard?—With rare exceptions.

576. Have you had any experience of our girls' schools?—Only as a visitor.

577. Do you think the system of education conducted in these schools is defective?—I do, emphatically.

578. You think the girls taught there are not equal to those taught in mixed schools, or to the boys from the boys' schools?—It depends on how much is included in the term "education." They may reach the standard subjects for passing purposes quite as well in one as the other, but the general effect of the school-life will not be so good.

579. In what way?—They are not so amenable to control.

580. If you abolished Education Boards, what would you substitute?—I am afraid that our conception of the future would end with the abolition of Education Boards.

581. Would you substitute anything in their place?—Yes; I should be disposed to establish local governing bodies.

582. What powers would you give them?—Somewhat the powers School Committees have at the present time.

583. Would you grant them funds to administer?—For buildings, emphatically, yes. They know the needs of the districts.

584. Would you give them the cleaning and the internal management of the schools?—Yes.

585. How do you think those Boards or bodies should be elected: would you place them on a broad franchise or restrict them?—I should be disposed at first blush to give them the powers of local bodies. I should confer the control of the schools in the various districts to a body that would be truly representative of those school districts.

586. Do you think that men of standing and education would accept positions on Boards of that kind, Boards of that nature, seeing that they would only have the buildings, the cleaning of windows, and so forth, to look after?—As a matter of fact, the best School Committee is composed of artisans and workmen.

587. Are not most of the present School Committees composed of artisans and workmen?—Not entirely so.

588. Is that not one of the reasons why fault is found with Committees, because they are composed of that class of people?—I think not; any cause of complaint is from the fact that the powers of School Committees are so vaguely defined, and temperament is allowed such free scope. The duties and responsibilities of Committees are very indefinite.

589. You told us that a good many female teachers, when they grow up, are, as a rule, selfish and spend everything they make on themselves, and you gave that as a reason why they should not receive the same salaries as male teachers: do you think that is really the case, that they are so selfish as you appear to think?—They have not the same obligations resting on them outside of their own needs.

590. Do you think they are more selfish in that respect than male teachers?—I do think so. The tendency of women is to become selfish.

591. You think that young women have less regard for the support and maintenance of the members of their families than young men?—I am bound to say from my observation that I think so.

592. Has your observation been extensive or limited?—I cannot answer that question.

593. Have you come into contact with many heartless female teachers who had very little regard for the support of their parents?—I have come into contact with a large number of female teachers, and the impression produced upon my mind, by their conception of their duties, their life duties, is that they readily become self-centred.

594. I want to know the actual facts: have you known cases of lady teachers neglecting those who had a claim upon them—their parents?—I do; and I know cases of lady teachers whose salaries will allow of a considerable saving, and yet who are living in a hand-to-mouth sort of way, through selfish, reckless expenditure.

595. Have you not known male teachers just the same?—Yes; but less strikingly so, and less frequently.

596. Do you mean that those faults are almost entirely confined exclusively to women?—They are more characteristic of women.

597. How so?—If you take any half-dozen male teachers, and the same number of female teachers, and find out how they are applying their earnings, I venture to say that you will find that five out of the six females are practically living entirely for themselves, while five-sixths of the males are contributing to the maintenance of some member of their individual family, or making provision for settling down in life. I do not think I have misjudged in any way, speaking from my own experience, and I think it would be a very great injustice to male teachers to put female teachers on an equal footing as to salaries.

JAMES AITKEN, B.A., Headmaster of the Wanganui Boys' District High School, President of the Wanganui Educational Institute, examined.

Mr. Aitken.] In my opinion, the greatest trouble with the majority of teachers in those matters which lie within the scope of the Commission is uncertainty. Men and women of years, experience, and culture, are not certain from one year to another, altogether apart from the efforts they may put forth, that their income will be the same in the same school. Circumstances over which the teachers, at least, and in some cases over which no one can exercise the least control operate to affect prejudicially the teacher's income. Take for example: (a) A wet season with bad roads and flooded streams; (b) the growing-up of the settlers' families, by which the school is depleted at the top, no new pupils entering the infant department; (c) parliamentary retrenchment; (d) the use by Education Boards, in districts in which settlement is rapidly proceeding, of the general fund for building purposes. Causes (a) and (b) open up the whole question of the equity of payments on average attendance. In my opinion, that is not an equitable basis; it contains too much of the element of chance. When, for example, a school is just on the borderline between a higher and a lower scale, a single shower of rain may determine a teacher's salary on the lower scale for three months. Cause (b) is one of the most vexing and tantalizing that can well be imagined. A teacher sees his school slipping away from him simply because the younger members of the families which once formed the school are gradually passing out of the standards, while no young children remain to fill their places. It is easy to see that want of money is at the bottom of all these causes. If there were plenty of funds for buildings, salaries, School Committees, &c., the fixing of a basis for disbursements would be a very simple matter. I am sure that the Commissioners have all observed that the unrest and uncertainty which are so painfully evident among teachers of our elementary schools are quite wanting in the case of the colony's secondary school staff. Why so? Because these schools are supported, not by a vote annually thrown on the floor of the House of Representatives for economists to assail and the friends of education to defend, as if it were, perchance, more or less necessary one year than another, but by incomes derived from the colony's broad acres—reserves for secondary education. Harbour Boards, Road Boards, Hospital Boards, Town Boards, Borough, City, and County Councils, all have independent incomes derived from reserves, apart from their statutory power of rating. But Education Boards, intrusted with a national function of the very first importance, have no power to strike a rate and no income from reserves. Some high schools have actually had so much money in hand that they had to invest it on mortgage, while the Education Board next door was reducing teachers' salaries from 5 to 14 per cent. Why should it be necessary to have High School Boards apart from Education Boards when in some instances they are composed of the self-same individuals? I do not advocate the transference of the reserves from the secondary to primary education—although that were not at all unreasonable. What I do contend for is that the reserves should be nationalised and their incomes used for both branches. In this way abundant funds would be available for both primary and secondary education, and the pinching and scraping which has so hampered education in the past will disappear. For the rest, I believe that we shall never have a perfect system of promotion until the teachers are in fact what they are in effect—Civil servants. I understand that the Inspectors would be glad to be so also. With that the teachers have nothing to do, unless Inspectors are made peripatetic; then teachers will cease to carry out the ideas of any one Inspector, and work by the syllabus. It is, I understand, possible that a minimum certificate shall be adopted, and a certificate under that penalised by a lower salary. It would, I think, be better to encourage high certificates by bonuses. There has been so much reduction in the past that it would be kind to go no lower. The first scheme of staffs and salaries for the suggested colonial scale, though certainly capable of improvement, shows what can be done in overcoming difficulties which were once thought insurmountable. Its weak point is the very low salaries proposed to be paid to assistants. I understand that that has been remedied in the alternative scheme. In that scheme the staffing, especially in the large schools, is very liberal. I should like to see some kind of normal-school training for pupil-teachers. When a pupil-teacher takes charge of a country school, after a short pupil-teachership of four years, he becomes stunted and undeveloped, which he would probably not do if he went in for two years' training in a training-college. More inducements must be held out to boys to enter the profession; otherwise none but the poorest intellects will come in. The cadet system, which has much to recommend it, is responsible for the very small number of boys who offer themselves here. Few boys can afford to teach a whole year without pay, at the age of fifteen, more especially when 5s. to 10s. a week can be easily obtained in other fields. Equal pay for the sexes is theoretically right, seeing that as much is expected from a lady-teacher (and usually obtained) as from a man. But it must not be forgotten that a very high percentage of female teachers have only themselves to provide for, whereas a majority of men have others than themselves to provide for, and a man's responsibilities do not cease with his marriage. The dual control of teachers by Boards and School Committees, while a good thing for teachers in some ways, notably in preventing arbitrary dismissals, sometimes operates against teachers. In that way a teacher who has not been successful in any district cannot be shifted to another district without the formality of consultation. Many years ago I advocated the abolition of the dual system, and I am still of the same opinion. If teachers were taken over by the central department it would, I admit, be desirable to retain some form of local government, more than, say, in the appointment of the Postmaster. Committee districts are too small, and their method of election too informal. Education Board districts are too large, and their election is not popular enough. An advisory board or committee, whose district would be the county, borough, or city, and whose election might be conducted by the machinery already provided for by Municipal Acts now in existence, would give local supervision sufficient, and that by a body directly amenable to democratic control. I very strenuously disapprove of the proposal to

disrate the certificates of teachers. Length of service is only an item in the raising of a teacher's classification, as the Commissioners know very well; experience, rather than mere length of time, being the ground of classification by the figure. And I hold that you can no more deprive a teacher of his experience than you can of his culture.

598. *Mr. Stewart.*] Are you in favour of a colonial scale of salaries?—Yes.

599. *Mr. Luke.*] With regard to the secondary and primary reserves, do you mean that you would like to see the primary and secondary reserves merged?—Yes.

600. You would not deprive the secondary schools of their reserves?—No; I would place them all in the hands of the authorities for both parties—both branches.

601. The secondary schools have more valuable reserves than the primary schools, have they not?—Yes.

602. *Mr. Hill.*] Are you aware that the maximum amount the Commission has available to work upon is £3 8s. 9d. a head for the payment of salaries?—I am not aware of that; at the same time, I think the Commission would be quite within their rights and powers in proposing that a larger sum should be set apart for the payment of salaries.

603. You are aware, in regard to the reserves, that there is a great deal more income derived from the primary reserves than the secondary reserves?—Yes.

604. Your point is that the revenue derived from the secondary reserves should be utilised for the pupils in the primary schools as well as for those in the secondary schools?—Yes, that is my point.

605. You would like to see scholarships given in the secondary schools: you think the revenues from the reserves should maintain the scholarship pupils?—That, among other things.

606. Where there are secondary schools established, do you think that primary school pupils, after they have passed the Sixth Standard, should be allowed to go through the secondary schools without having gained scholarships at all?—I should certainly be in favour of that.

607. And, by means of scholarships, go on from the secondary schools to the universities?—Yes, I advocate that; I advocated it years ago—a free course of tuition from the primary schools right to the threshold of the universities.

608. In order to foster the highest education, would you give special grants to teachers in country schools for teaching pupils after they had passed the Sixth Standard, over and above the salaries paid them on average attendance?—I think that should be done.

609. You think that would be beneficial, and place the country children on an equality with the town children in the matter of obtaining higher education?—That is the old Scotch system, and a very good one it is.

610. Would you suggest its adoption in this colony?—Yes.

611. You think it would be beneficial to the children of the colony?—Yes.

612. And place them all on a common basis?—Yes.

613. *Mr. Weston.*] What you really mean is that you would give the whole power which the Boards exercise at the present time over to the General Government?—No, I do not mean that altogether.

614. What powers would you leave to the Boards?—The powers of an advisory body—a board or a committee: the power of consultation with the Government in regard to the appointment of teachers.

615. That means, a consultation having been held and a difference ensuing, the Government would be the supreme power?—Yes.

616. And the whole control would be left in the hands of the Government?—No; because in the event of the advisory body showing good cause the Government should give way to it, and would do so.

617. You advocate the payment of teachers by the Government?—I do not think we shall ever have a proper system of promotion in the profession until the Government takes the matter in hand.

618. You do not think that political influence could be, either directly or indirectly, exercised to the disadvantage of teachers?—Perhaps so, but I think political influence could be eliminated.

619. Will you tell me, in your opinion, how it could be done?—I am told that Sir Henry Parkes once made a remark in Australia that he could not appoint a messenger-boy, as far as he was concerned, as he had made such stringent regulations with regard to political influence.

620. You do not think that a member of the House could have a quiet conversation with the Minister of any department and point out to him the great advantage that might ensue by appointing a particular man with certain qualifications?—Yes, of course, that could be done, I have no doubt.

621. With regard to the matter of the revenue, you stated just now that you thought the revenue from the secondary reserves should be used for both secondary and primary schools: Do you happen to know whether, at the present moment, the reserves for secondary schools are pretty well absorbed by those schools, and that there would be nothing left for the primary schools?—In some districts they have some of their reserve incomes invested on mortgage.

622. Do you know that in North Canterbury the institutions which feed on the revenue of the secondary reserves are very poorly supplied, and that they are with great difficulty carried on in some instances?—I do not know the North Canterbury district well.

623. *The Chairman.*] You think the teachers should be placed on the same footing as Civil servants?—Yes.

J. K. LAW, Headmaster, Manaia, representing the Wanganui Educational Institute, examined.

Mr. Law: I have been appointed as a representative of the Wanganui Educational Institute to appear before you and give evidence on its behalf, and therefore I am bound to give expression to its views before my own. With regard to a colonial scale of staff and salaries, I think the teachers are, without exception, in favour of such a scale. The recent deductions have led to a feeling of unrest and insecurity—teachers seem to think there is no finality to the deductions they have suffered in every district, and that in a few years time they will be called upon to make further sacrifices. They feel this very keenly, for the reason that the deductions made upon them have been made at a time when, in every other part of the colony, all classes of workers have been unusually prosperous. Teachers think that a colonial scale is fair, on the principle that equal burdens should receive equal pay; that there is no reason why a teacher who is living, let us say, in Westland should receive a very much lower rate of pay than a man who is bearing practically the same burden in Wanganui. We think that with a colonial scale of salaries there must necessarily follow a colonial scale of staffing. There are two proposals submitted to us—numbers one and two. The first proposal would have reduced the salaries of a large number of our teachers, but, at the same time, would have afforded a very fair scale of staffing; and the majority of the teachers, so far as I know from personal conversation with them, were prepared to accept that scale because they felt that it would raise the salaries and staffing of the teachers in less favoured districts. However, the second scale—the revised scale—is very much more acceptable to us, even though it provides a slightly lower scale of staffing. In regard to these scales, I would like to say that we would prefer the salaries under the revised scale and the staffing allowed under the first scale; but since we see that, in your order of reference, you are limited to a capitation grant of £4, on the whole we prefer to accept the revised scale, for the reason that we think that the reduction of salaries, as would be the case under the first scale, would very materially tend to introduce teachers of inferior grade into the profession.

624. *The Chairman.*] You understand that we are limited to a capitation grant of £4?—Yes.

625. But that it is within our power to recommend to the Government an increased grant?—Yes. We think it is very impolitic to lower the salaries of teachers, and thereby introduce an inferior class. We think—the teachers with whom I have conversed—that the staffing granted in schools of from 35 to 200 in attendance is not so liberal as it is in schools with an attendance of 200 and upwards, and that if any increase in the staffing can be made it should lie between those numbers. With regard to the centralisation of the inspectorate, this district has invariably advocated such a measure. We cannot see, if there is to be a colonial scale—if the cry is equal burdens for equal work—why the centralisation of the inspectorate should not follow. We favour the opinion that Inspectors should be periodically removed from one district to another. We favour some more systematic method in regard to the training of our teachers than at present exists. We are of the opinion that the proposed period of pupil-teachership training is too short to give pupil-teachers that training which will enable them to take up the work of assistants with success. We think it should be supplemented by a further period of training either in a training-college or in a model school; or, again, a period of probationership under the headmaster of one of the recognised better class of schools—one of the principal schools. With regard to the appointment and transfer of teachers, I think that the majority of the teachers in this district are of the opinion that the appointment of teachers should lie in the hands of Boards—that is, if the Boards are to continue. We think, however, that there should be some safeguard in placing that power in the hands of Boards. Both schools and teachers should be graded, so that a teacher of a low grade could work to a higher grade, and a teacher in a high grade could not be put into a lower grade without having the right of appeal. We think that it would be a very good thing if the power of transfer of teachers was exercised more freely at the present time. With regard to payments to the staff on the average attendance, we think it is inequitable. The lower the average becomes the heavier the burden placed on the teacher, and we think that some modification should be made whereby a teacher should be paid more in accordance with the work he or she may be called upon to perform. The teachers of this district are opposed to power being given to Inspectors to revise teachers' grades unless the evils of the want of such a power are more clearly shown than at present. We are afraid that possibly the introduction of a colonial scale might lead to the undue multiplication of small schools, because the responsibility in connection with teachers' salaries is taken off the shoulders of the Boards, and we do not believe in this chance of multiplication being given. I might point out one difficulty that struck me in connection with the proposed appointment of an assistant when the average attendance of a school passes 40—and that is, what is to be done with that school when the average falls below 40? Is the assistant teacher to be dismissed, or is the Board to have the power of transferring the assistant to another school? If the Boards have that power, and exercise it, we think that very great damage will result to the educational system, as in the case of pupil-teachers.

626. *Mr. Stewart.*] I understand that you are entirely in favour of a colonial scale?—Yes.

627. I understand you to say that one of the main reasons that guided you in favouring a colonial scale was the greater security that would result to the teachers under such a scale?—That is so.

628. I believe that the district in which you are working is a dairying one?—Yes.

629. The question has been raised before the Commission with regard to the effect of the dairying industry on the work of the teachers; can you give the Commission any information on this point?—It renders the work of the teacher much more difficult.

630. Why?—It reduces the average attendance.

631. Anything else?—To my mind it weakens the intellectual energy of the pupils.

632. How?—Through the immense strain put on the pupils to work longer hours than they are physically capable of.

633. We have heard it stated that they go to school tired out before beginning their day's work: is that so?—Yes.

634. What effect does it have on the pupils?—I have not known pupils to fall asleep myself, but other teachers have told me that such is the case.

635. I suppose your Inspectors know the conditions and report on them?—Our former Inspector knew the prevailing conditions very well, and he certainly expected the same grade of work in the north as in the south.

636. Is it within your experience that the average attendance in the north is lower than it is in the south: that is, of this district?—Yes, it is.

637. What is your average?—Last year it was 75 per cent.; during the last four or five years it has risen from 73 per cent. to 77 per cent., and then it was brought down by an epidemic.

638. I understand you to say that, speaking generally, you approve of the alternative scale?—Yes, I do.

639. You heard the evidence of Mr. Grant this morning and this afternoon with regard to teachers in this district wishing to be under the department entirely: do you agree with that evidence?—I do not.

640. Do you think the statements made by Mr. Grant adequately represent the opinions of the members of your Institute?—They may possibly represent the opinions of some of the teachers with whom he has come into contact. I do not think they had placed before them the possible evils that might arise from centralisation. For myself I have always pointed out to the teachers the serious evils which might very easily arise in that case.

641. In the northern centre of your Educational Institute—the centre that meets somewhere about Hawera—are those opinions current?—With regard to centralisation, were teachers graded and schools graded I think that such a desire would not exist.

642. You think that desire does exist at present?—Yes, among a large number of teachers I think it does; I do not say among the majority, but among a large number.

643. I believe you have very frequently been a member of the Council of the Institute?—Yes, about five times.

644. You have been a member of the Council a greater number of times than Mr. Grant, have you not?—I think Mr. Grant has been a member five or six times.

645. You come together sometimes?—Yes, sometimes.

646. Speaking from memory has this question of going under the central department ever been discussed as a practical issue before the Council?—I have no recollection of such a question being discussed at the Council meetings.

647. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Do you consider that 50 per cent., which is adopted in computing the working-average, is too low?—Yes.

648. What would you suggest in substitution?—I think that payment on the average school-roll would be more equitable.

649. What percentage of the school-roll would you take, the full school-roll, or, say, 80 per cent.?—I would take the full school-roll, because I believe the average of pupils who leave a school, and whose names remain on the roll six weeks, is very even throughout the district.

650. Did you hear the reply of a former witness who advocated the payment of teachers on the basis of the number present on an examination-day?—That opens the way to too many contingencies. I am not in favour of it; sometimes it occurs that parents have a spite against teachers—after all, human nature is a very small thing—and these parents would undoubtedly keep their children away, and thus affect the salary of a particular teacher for the whole year.

651. You think a colonial scale would have more stability than a scale drawn up as the result of a conference between Education Boards?—Yes, that is my opinion.

652. Are the members of Education Boards elected by members of the School Committees?—Yes.

653. The more a Board pays to the Committees by way of incidentals the less will be left to pay school-teachers: is that so?—Under the present school system it is so. If the Boards make large allowances by way of incidentals to the School Committees it is at the expense of the teachers.

Mr. Lethbridge: I would like to put it in evidence, Mr. Chairman, that the Wanganui Board pays less to School Committees than any other Board in New Zealand.

654. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] You consider that there is a possibility under a colonial scale of Education Boards establishing too many small schools?—I am afraid that the fact that the Boards would be no longer responsible for the payment of teachers' salaries would have a tendency in that direction.

655. Do you think that the Legislature should lay down a minimum average attendance below which a school should not be established—say an attendance of 8 or 10, or any other number?—Yes, I think that should be done; and at the same time I think they should lay down a minimum distance within which radius schools should not be established in proximity to one another.

656. With regard to giving marks for efficiency, do you consider that Inspectors should have the right of reducing teachers' certificates—the figure or the letter?—Without very great safeguards indeed I am decidedly opposed to any such proposal.

657. You heard the evidence of Dr. Smyth yesterday?—Yes, I heard a part of it; I am aware he is in favour of such a proposal.

658. *Mr. Hill.*] Would not the increased staffing which is proposed or suggested in the scale submitted to us strengthen the conditions of the schools in this district?—Certain classes of schools—yes.

659. Do you not think it is desirable to strengthen the condition of your schools, to improve them from an educational point of view?—I think it is desirable, if possible, to strengthen the staffing of certain classes of schools.

660. Then, should we not consider that question, irrespective of whether it will affect the money question at all or not?—Most emphatically, yes; but I understand you are bound down to a certain grant *per capita*.

661. Assuming it is found that the staffing in certain schools is insufficient, do you not consider that it is a most important question to contemplate the improvement of that staffing?—Yes, a most important question.

662. You are not satisfied with the present method of paying on the average attendance?—No.

663. Do you think it would be a fairer method to pay on the highest number present at all during a week?—I am not in favour of paying on the average attendance at all.

664. Is it your opinion that a teacher should have a defined salary irrespective of the attendance of the school?—My theory in regard to teachers' salaries is this: that a teacher's salary should depend on length of service, classification, and literary ability, irrespective altogether of the work that teacher may perform.

665. Do you not think a teacher should be paid according to the work he or she may be doing?—Yes, I do.

666. Do you find that your Committee has sufficient funds to provide for keeping your school in good order?—No, we have not sufficient funds.

667. Have you been in any other school in this district?—Yes; in two others.

668. Did you find the same defects existing in both those schools?—In one I did, but not in the other.

669. Do you know whether this scale of the Wanganui Board has been in operation for any length of time, so far as the amounts paid to School Committees are concerned?—Yes; the scale has been in operation for a considerable time.

670. Did you find the scale sufficient for the maintenance of certain schools?—Not for one school.

671. Were entertainments given in that school in order to provide funds for its proper maintenance?—I never have had anything to do with entertainments in order to provide funds for School Committees.

672. How do the Committees obtain sufficient funds?—The particular school I referred to was a school of about 40 pupils. The Committee had a certain method of carrying out the work in connection with that school—the cleaning, &c., which a boy did for about 1s. a week.

673. *Mr. Smith.*] You stated that you thought the establishment of small schools was detrimental to the interests of education, and that you thought small schools should not be established with an attendance below 8 or 10?—Yes, that is so.

674. What would you do in the case of families residing in out-of-the-way places who were unable to assemble together 8 or 10 children: would you grant them no education whatever?—Those people go into these out-of-the-way districts where they can take up cheap land. They do so in order to derive certain advantages, and these advantages must be secured at a cost of something to themselves.

675. Would you not give them any aid?—No.

676. *Mr. Lethbridge.*] Do you approve of the system in the Wanganui Education District of giving a capitation grant up to 20 pupils, and asking the settlers to make up the balance to a certain fixed sum?—Yes, I approve of that.

677. *Mr. Weston.*] It is true, as you say, that those people who go out into the far country districts get compensating advantages. We are, however, dealing with the children, and not the parents: do you not think that with our primary system of education we should disregard the parents, and see that every child in the colony is educated?—I think the parents, as a rule, can afford to send their children to some centre to be educated.

678. Why do we appoint Truant Officers: is it not to pick up the waifs and strays, with a view to seeing that every child in the colony is educated?—Yes, that is so.

679. Then, if we employ Truant Officers to pick up the waifs and strays in the towns and suburbs, and to give them education, why should we not render special help to the children, mark you, of parents who from circumstances are unable to give them education?—I think the question is, Do you intend to apply it to a single family?

680. That is what we want you to tell us. What, then, do you think should be done?—I do not think the State can afford them any assistance.

681. Do you not think that some effort should be made to get at every child, and give him the benefits of education?—If it can be done without too great sacrifice.

682. Then, sacrifice becomes a mere matter of degree?—Yes.

683. Do you not think you take a selfish view of the subject?—No, I think not.

684. You do not think the larger centres should make some sacrifice to supply education to the children in out-of-the-way settlements?—No.

685. Why?—Because education to those few is exceedingly costly.

G. H. ESPINER, Bunnythorpe, examined.

Mr. Espiner: I have been appointed by the members of the Palmerston North Branch of the Wanganui Educational Institute to represent the teachers of the country schools in that part of the district, and on their behalf must say that the proposed scale of staff and salaries does not commend itself to our favour on the following grounds: (1.) We are of the opinion that the scheme before us does not go to the root of the matter. A colonial scale of staff and salaries should, in our opinion, carry with it opportunities for transfer and promotion throughout the colony, and not be confined, as it practically is at present, to one education district. (2.) The proposed scale makes no definite provision for payment of instruction to pupil-teachers, but leaves it to the option of the various Boards. We think this is most unfair, both to the Boards and the

teachers. Our Board is probably one of the most liberal in the colony, but the mere pittance we receive for this part of our duty is most hardly earned. It amounts to about 1s. per hour, a sum less than what is paid to any ordinary carpenter or blacksmith. But by the proposed scale this sum, small as it is, may be withheld if the Board thinks it expedient to do so. Seeing to what straits many Boards are reduced to find ways and means for carrying out their various functions, what a temptation there must be to take advantage of expediency at the expense of the teacher. We are strongly of the opinion that all money to be paid as salaries should be so well defined and ascertainable that there shall be no possible chance of their being used for any other purpose. According to the proposed scale, a teacher with an average of 74 would receive £173 8s. per annum, and a teacher with an average of 75 would receive £174 per annum, a difference of 12s.; but the latter would be required to give five hours extra per week instructing a pupil-teacher, to say nothing about added responsibility, and this for the munificent sum of 12s. per annum. It may be argued that he gets the assistance of an extra teacher, but it is the State that receives the benefit of the extra teacher's services, not the headmaster. Whenever a school increases sufficiently to require a pupil-teacher there should, in our opinion, be added to the principal teacher's salary a sum sufficient to recompense him for the tuition and training of the said pupil-teacher. (3.) It states in the preface that an endeavour has been made to give such salaries as will attract good teachers, or, at all events, prevent the best teachers from going into other professions. Now, so far as this district is concerned, the proposed scale has a tendency in an entirely opposite direction, for out of 141 sole or principal teachers only twenty are in charge of schools with an average over 100, which by the proposed scale carries a salary of £189 per annum. Where is the inducement for a bright and intelligent youth to enter a profession where less than twenty out of 140 are receiving £200 a year? What a number of years a person must spend in his profession before he can naturally expect to be one of the fortunate twenty. On the other hand, teachers in this district in charge of schools with an average of from 75 to 135 are by the proposed scale to suffer a reduction in their salaries of more than £20 per annum. Yet you will find some of the best teachers in these schools there, simply because there is no room for them higher up. Where is the endeavour to retain them in the profession? (4.) We object to the scheme because schools of 100 are penalised for the benefit of those above and below them. Taking the figures given, we find that at present schools with an average of 20 receive from £70 to £115. The mean is £92 10s.; and it is proposed to give £120, a rise of £27 10s. Schools with an average of 100 receive from £160 to £225; the mean is £192 10s.; and it is proposed to give £189, a decrease of £3 10s. Schools with an average of 250 receive from £203 to £275. The mean is £239; and it is proposed to give £259, a rise of £20. Schools with an average of 600 receive a rise of £9 10s. above the mean. We can understand the force of a reduction in our salaries to benefit a weaker brother, but look upon it as a rank injustice to take from us to enrich those that are already in a better position than we are. Finally, we object to the scheme because it entails some drastic alterations in salaries in this district, reducing some more than 12 per cent. Out of 141 sole or principal teachers, fifty-five would be reduced sums varying from £1 to £25 per annum. The chief sufferers would be the teachers in charge of schools ranging from 75 to 135. In conclusion, I would say that we agree with the arrangement in the proposed scale for appointing an assistant rather than a pupil-teacher when the school is too large for one teacher. I hope the proposed scale will not come into force.

686. *Mr. Weston.*] Do you refer to the original scale or the amended scale?—The original scale.

687. *Mr. Stewart.*] Do the teachers whom you represent favour a colonial scale, or do they still wish the payment of salaries to remain in the hands of Boards?—They are in favour of a colonial scale, but not this proposed colonial scale.

688. I understand they are not in favour of this particular scale we have before us, but are in favour of a colonial scale?—Yes.

689. *Mr. Luke.*] You have not studied the alternative scale, I understand?—No, I have not; but from the glance I had of it I think it would be preferable and more acceptable to the teachers than the original scale.

690. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] What is the average attendance of your school?—About 109, I think.

691. What is the allowance paid just now by the Wanganui Board for the instruction of pupil-teachers?—£10.

692. Was that not reduced when the last reduction of teachers' salaries was made?—I think it was still kept in force; the reduction took a different direction altogether.

693. Was it not proposed by the Board to ask the teachers to instruct the pupil-teachers without remuneration?—Yes.

694. Was it owing to the Institute that the proposal was not carried into effect?—I presume so.

695. If the proposed alternative scale was adopted, you and your assistant mistress would considerably benefit, would you not?—Yes.

696. In the event of a colonial scale being drawn up you would not advocate its application, so far as the certificates are concerned, until new appointments were made?—No.

697. With regard to bonuses on certificates, do you favour the continuation of that system?—I think it is a good one.

698. Do you know of any other education district in which it is adopted?—No, I do not.

699. Would you favour the reduction by way of penalty in the event of a teacher not holding the required certificate as in the suggested scale?—No, I do not think so.

700. With regard to the working-average, do you think it is too low?—I think 50 per cent. is too low.

701. How does it affect your school?—Very little.

702. Supposing it were raised to 60 per cent.—that is, two-thirds—would it give you any considerable relief?—Yes, I think it would.

703. Do you think that a head-teacher or sole teacher should suffer a reduction of £10 from his salary when a sewing-mistress is appointed?—No, I do not.

704. Do you consider the remuneration of pupil-teachers is sufficient?—No, I do not.

705. *Mr. Hill.*] When the Inspector visits your school, does he judge the work on the certificate you hold or on the results of your work?—He bases his report on the work of the pupils.

706. I suppose you will admit a man must be judged by the work he can do?—It is difficult to say what a man can do.

707. If he has a school you judge by the results obtained: do you think that is a fair way?—I think a fairer way would be to judge him by his methods of training.

708. You mean the way he trains the children?—Just so.

709. Do you think it is advisable to give a special bonus for literary qualifications when they are necessary for the development of a teacher's technical skill?—Perhaps literary qualifications are not necessary.

710. From what I judge, you are not in favour of a bonus scale as it is in this suggested scale?—I am in favour of that.

711. Yet you recognise that it is apart from the work you do as a teacher?—As a teacher in a primary school, yes.

712. Do you think there is any reason why the bonus should not be the same in the case of a female as in the case of a male when they both hold the same certificate?—Yes; because I think with a man it is his life's work, while, generally speaking, with a woman it is only a small portion of her life's work.

713. Do you not think it would be a woman's life work if she were paid an equal salary?—No, I do not think so.

714. Under certain circumstances is a woman not as competent as a man?—I would not like to say.

715. Could you do without female teachers, say, in your school, for example?—With the exception of the teaching of sewing, yes.

716. Do you think a male teacher equally competent to teach the infants as a female teacher?—I think so.

717. And you would not object to a male teacher taking charge of the infants?—No, I would not.

718. You think the results would be as good as under a mistress?—Yes, provided you get the right class of male teacher.

719. *Mr. Hogben.*] Do I understand you to say that the proposed scale increases the salaries of only a few out of the total number of head-teachers?—Yes, that is so.

720. Does your remark apply also to schools under 20 in attendance?—Yes; their salaries are increased up to 45 in attendance.

721. How many schools of an attendance of 45 have you in this district?—I cannot tell you.

722. Are you aware that out of the total number of schools—143—in this district you have 72 under 35 in average attendance, or a little more than one-half?—Yes.

723. The amended scale would remove your objections by the payment of higher salaries?—Yes.

724. *The Chairman.*] You are acquainted with a good number of teachers in your district?—Yes.

725. What is the general feeling: do they wish to remain under the Boards, or to be under the control of the central department?—So far as I have heard expressions of opinion, they desire to be treated as Civil servants.

726. Is that the feeling prevailing throughout the district?—Yes, so far as I am aware.

727. Assuming the Board paid the teachers higher salaries, granted them retiring-allowances, and also took in hand the payment, transfer, and promotion of teachers, do you think that would give satisfaction?—Yes, I think it would.

728. That would redress all the teachers' grievances?—Yes, so far as they have grievances.

729. Do you think the teachers care very much as to whether they are under the control of the Board or the central department, so long as their salaries are raised, and their position improved by giving them a greater feeling of security?—I do not think they have any fault to find with the Board.

730. Do you think that they would have advantages under the central department that they have not under the Board?—Yes.

A. A. BROWNE, Secretary of the Wanganui Education Board, examined.

731. *Mr. Hill.*] You have had a long experience as secretary of this Education Board?—Yes; I have had about twenty-four years' experience.

732. What is the proportion at the present time of female teachers to male teachers: have you more male teachers than female teachers?—I could not say offhand.

733. Have you a number of female teachers in the smaller schools?—Yes.

734. Do you find from the Inspectors' reports that they give equal satisfaction to male teachers?—I think so, in the small country schools.

735. Do you find that they obtain certificates during their pupil-teachership?—Yes, some of them do.

736. Are those in charge of country schools certificated?—Yes.

737. Is provision made by your Board that female teachers shall be paid the same salaries as male teachers in those small schools?—No; the female teachers receives 75 per cent. of what is paid male teachers.

738. The Board estimates that women's needs are not equal to those of men?—Yes.

739. Yet they require the women to obtain the same certificate and perform the same work as male teachers?—Yes.

740. What is your opinion as to the salaries that should be paid under such conditions?—I should say that, if funds were available and the female teachers were as capable as male teachers, they should receive equal pay.

741. *Mr. Gutfedder.*] Has not a female teacher as much difficulty in obtaining a certificate as a male teacher?—Yes.

742. Then, do you think it is equitable that she should be paid only 75 per cent. of the salary a male teacher receives?—Speaking for myself, I should prefer to see her receive the same salary.

743. *Mr. Hogben.*] Will you furnish the Commission with a return of the expenditure of the Wanganui Education Board for the years 1898, 1899, and 1900?—Yes, I will furnish a return showing what you require.

NAPIER.

THURSDAY, 13TH JUNE, 1901.

Rev. Dr. DAVID SIDNEY, Chairman of the Hawke's Bay Education Board, examined.

Dr. Sidney: During the last two years the prospect of a national scale for teachers' salaries has engaged my attention. For some years the Board has had to supplement its expenditure by the drawing on the remains of an accumulated balance from the prosperous times. That balance has gradually been melting away, and must soon have come to an end. When that result was reached we must have recast our scale of payments, and I did not see how that was to be done in a satisfactory way without very considerable difficulty. Hence I looked forward with hope to a national scale as the most probably satisfactory relief. There have been difficulties in connection with it which I did not anticipate. To some extent these have arisen from the ambitious character of the scale itself. It makes great changes on payments to teachers. Some are increased and some are decreased. Under No. 1 colonial scale head-teachers get an increase of £805 in this district, and a new order of teachers is instituted to cost £3,200. There is a decrease of £681 on assistants. Under No. 2 scale head-teachers get an increase of £1,397, new teachers get £2,140, while assistants are reduced £1,043. It seems to me that these increases overweighted the national scale, and that the decreases on assistants are excessive. This Board paid £2 19s. of the capitation of £3 15s. on teachers' salaries, while 16s. went for School Committees, apparatus, repairs, and administration. Latterly the sum has been insufficient, as I have said. Under No. 1 scale, the new scale, £3 8s. 8d. will go for teachers' salaries in this district, and under No. 2 scale about £3 8s. 2d. I understand that under either scale 11s. 3d. will go for allowances to School Committees and administration. If 16s. was insufficient it is difficult to see how the Board can carry on with 4s. 9d. smaller amount on each pupil than was necessary before. Under No. 1 scale new teachers get 9s. 4d. per head, and head-teachers 2s. 4d. Under No. 2 scale new teachers get 6s. 3d., while head-teachers get 4s. 1d.—*i.e.*, 11s. 8d. of the £4 capitation go to the new teachers and head-teachers, and to make that possible the assistant teachers as a class have large reductions made. To me these results do not seem fitted to advance our national system of education. And yet there seems little prospect of being able to carry on our national system without a national scale of salaries. Whether the staffs proposed by the scales are excessive or not I am not prepared to offer any opinion. It requires greater expert knowledge than I possess to express any judgment on this. As Chairman of the Board, I have to ask the Commission to allow Mr. Hill to testify for it. Teachers will doubtless have their own views on this question, but Mr. Hill is the only expert the Board recognises in these matters. Neither do I care about giving any opinion of any very definite character on salaries. This, too, I consider, is work for the expert. Let the salaries be as liberal as the Commission consider the country can afford without inviting attack when the first touch of depression comes on the country. We are not to forget that Parliament once paid £4 capitation in the early history of the present Act, and reduced it to £3 15s. If the service is overburdened the danger of a similar reduction is very great. In my opinion, there should be a maximum payment beyond which there should be no increase, and all the persons employed as teachers should receive a living-wage. The relative value of the salaries of assistants should be carefully adjusted on some general principle to that of the chief teachers in a school. To me the proposals in the new scale fail to carry this out. Take the school of Napier as an illustration: The headmaster will get £410 or £420 per year, as his house-rent is £50 or £60 a year. His first male assistant will get £230, and his second male assistant £160—*i.e.*, the headmaster will get £20 or £30 per year more than these two men will obtain. This seems to me unreasonable, and not fitted to advance the education of the colony. It is much the same with other schools. Or, to make a different comparison, take the head-teacher of one of our medium-sized schools—say, 147 average—and he is to get £217 with residence under the scale No. 1, and £236 with residence under No. 2, while the first assistant of Napier will get £230 in all. Without capable men in our larger schools it will be impossible to keep them going with vigour. Similar inferences can be drawn of many others of the assistants. There should be some principle regulating the relation of salaries to secure satisfaction. Then, the young teachers who must begin at Class 5 suffer too heavily by the application of deductions on

certificates. Quite a number of them in this district lose as much as £8, £9, and £12 a year by being sent to the smaller schools. The reductions made on the older teachers do not seem to me material in view of the advantage to be gained by a spur to culture. The matter of fitting salaries for the various orders of teachers can only be properly determined by experts in the clear view of what the country considers it can afford for public-school instruction. I am chiefly concerned, however, by the bearing of the proposed finance on the work of the Board. As I have already said, our Board will be seriously crippled by the proposal of the new scale unless we receive a very considerable increase to our building grant. In the past we have received for building purposes, school furniture and apparatus very considerable amounts in addition to the building grant, and we have never been able to meet the requirements of the district, either as to buildings, repairs, or apparatus. I am aware there is a hint in the letterpress accompanying the colonial scale of some subsequent provision being made for School Committees. If this comes in addition to the 11s. 3d. assigned for management the Board might manage fairly. Personally, I have the belief that the apparatus for schools and some of the repairs of the grounds should have some connection with the teachers' salaries. This would lead to greater care of the Boards' property. If the whole that is necessary for repairs and apparatus has to come out of the building grant there will be few school-buildings erected in this district. It will not surprise me if the outcome of the present proposals should lead to frequent and perhaps irritating communication to the department by the Boards. I have also to notice that there is no defined provision in either scale for our training-school. In following the journeyings of the Commission, I observe that many Boards press for training-schools in which pupil-teachers could be brought into contact with the best methods of work before they are sent to the schools. Personally, I am in fullest sympathy with this view for both primary- and secondary-school teachers. Some years ago we in this district felt the absolute necessity of something of this kind for our young teachers, and set up with some difficulty what we call our training-school. Its work is very plainly holding out the very highest prospect for the future. On this matter Mr. Hill, our Inspector, will again prove the best person to give you a useful opinion. I may express the hope that the Inspector-General will take this school into his favourable consideration in the matter of provision. Its maintenance even in greater efficiency than it can reach with its present staff is vital to the educational advance of the district. There is one thing more which is likely to cause embarrassment to the Board—viz., the proper maintenance of our Gisborne District High School. It is carried on at present under a special constitution. The Board only pays the capitation that falls to its pupils to the salaries of the teachers. The other funds are provided by the Governors of the Gisborne High School, who have considerable endowments under their charge for secondary education. Beyond the small sum I have referred to, these Governors provide for the salaries of the master and mistress that conduct it, as well as other necessary things. The Governors of the High School had an Act passed by Parliament to enable them to do this, and they have for a number of years borne the large part of the responsibilities of the school. They also erected a very suitable room in the public-school grounds for the High School work. At the present time the School Committee of Gisborne are in correspondence with the Board to ascertain if they can be regarded as a district high school under the new Act. The Board has asked the Gisborne School Committee very carefully to consider whether or not they are prepared to give up the present constitution to obtain the other. The financial provision of the new Act will fall a long way short of the present expenditure, and will introduce other difficulties into the general staff of the school. The Board is likely to have considerable perplexity on this matter, and if it be within the province of the Commission the Board would like to have its advice. Should there be any other things which the Commissioners may wish to have from us, I am quite willing within a certain circle to reply to any questions. We are now well aware of the difficulties with which the Commission has to grapple, and express the hope that you will succeed in developing a scheme which will meet the requirements of the country.

1. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] I understand that you would like Mr. Hill to report on a number of these matters to which you refer?—Yes.

2. In some of the other education districts the Inspectors have professed to know nothing at all about the affairs and conditions of teachers: are you aware of that?—I do not think our Mr. Hill would do that.

3. Have you thought out any better method of securing promotions for teachers than the one that obtains at present?—No; it is a difficult question, and I cannot say much upon it.

4. Do you submit all the names of qualified applicants to Committees?—A committee of five go through the names and make strict inquiries as to character and position, and then submit the names we think fit to the School Committee.

5. And you appoint the one the Committee selects?—Always.

6. Have you thought what should be the minimum wage for a male or female teacher beginning with a school with an average attendance of 20?—We have made those schools dependent on the districts in which they may be established. Our lowest-paid salaries are £80 a year. I believe there are two teachers appointed at £60, female teachers—we do not appoint male teachers to schools of an average attendance of 20.

7. What do you think should be the minimum salary paid to a male teacher?—£100.

8. Is that not too low?—There are not many men in schools of that grade in this district.

9. Do you favour a colonial scale?—Yes.

10. Do you think Inspectors should be under the control of the central department?—I do not know that I should answer that question; I have hitherto opposed that on this Board.

11. You think if you lost your Inspector you would lose your guide and philosopher?—Yes.

12. Does the canvassing of Committees obtain here?—Yes.

13. Do you not think that it should be stopped?—Yes, if you are able to do so; I confess it has been completely beyond our imagination to see how it was to be done.

14. Where the roads are good, do you think it is wise to extend the area of compulsory attendance?—Yes; I think that the area should be extended to three miles in place of the two miles as at present, and to save the multiplication of so many small schools.

15. I suppose that you have not many schools within two miles of each other?—There are some, though very few.

16. *Mr. Davidson.*] You are of the opinion that, in order to make our education system a truly national one, we should have a uniform scale of staff and salaries?—I do not think it is possible to make payments on a uniform basis of the same value throughout the colony, though to get things to work well I think that there should be a national scale; what I mean is that money here, for instance, is not of the same value as in Christchurch by a good deal.

17. Do you think that the difference in the cost of living in the various education districts is so great that it should be taken into consideration in a question of this sort?—I do not see any principle by which it could be taken into consideration.

18. *Mr. Stewart.*] I think you spoke of extra amounts which you had placed to the Building Account: would you kindly say where they came from?—From an accumulated balance in our prosperous days; it has been appropriated little by little until now it has nearly all gone.

19. Did it come from the maintenance fund?—Yes; we have only the maintenance and the building fund.

20. Has your Board been in the habit of transferring money from the maintenance to the building fund?—Yes, always.

21. Have you any idea what the total amount would be likely to be?—No; though it is a considerable sum, I know.

22. Do you know to what extent you have done the same thing this year?—I think the secretary could tell you better than I could.

23. Has the question of the legality of such a procedure been raised?—No; and I do not see how it could be raised. The whole of this money was given not for the salaries alone, but to conduct the education system in this district—it was not defined for salaries.

24. You are aware, when Mr. Reeves was Minister of Education, he spoke somewhat emphatically upon such matters?—Yes; but I do not think that enters into this question.

25. What is the practice of your Board in the matter of the payment of salaries to male and female teachers?—Male teachers receive higher salaries than female teachers.

26. Are you in favour of paying them equal salaries?—No; female teachers are not able to manage the upper standards as well as male teachers, though they are all very well in charge of the infants and the First and Second Standards.

27. I presume your remarks with regard to the payment of assistants' salaries were made with regard to the first proposed scale?—In regard to both scales.

28. Do you recognise infant mistresses in this district?—In a few of the larger schools. I do not know we have ever recognised them distinctly as infant mistresses; I think they have been treated as assistants.

29. Have you any special rank on the staff for the infant mistress?—That is a question Mr. Hill would deal more fully with.

30. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] You are of opinion that female teachers are not so efficient as male teachers?—Yes.

31. How do you account for the regulation of the Hawke's Bay Board, Regulation No. 6, which says in schools with an average attendance below 80 a mistress is to be preferred?—Because we cannot get a master. Where we prefer a mistress we look at the fact that sewing is to be taught, and a master has to be provided with a sewing-mistress.

32. There is a large preponderance of female teachers in this district?—Yes.

33. Is that accounted for owing to the fact of their being cheaper?—No; it is for the reason that they are the only kind we train here.

34. I understood you to say, in reply to the first question, that Regulation 6 was adopted because you could not afford to pay salaries sufficient to secure male teachers for schools with an average attendance of less than 80?—We have a certain scale opposite each number of pupils, and these scales do not provide sufficient salaries for male teachers.

35. Do not male teachers apply when there is a vacancy?—Not for these schools.

36. Do they apply for schools with an average attendance of 70?—Yes; we send them there.

37. You say you prefer female teachers in schools up to 80 in attendance?—I do not see that matters very much; if we have suitable applicants, whether male or female, they are sent on in these cases.

38. Do you consider that the Legislature should define the functions of School Committees and School Boards respectively, with regard to the appointment of teachers, in order to avoid the conflict that very often takes places?—If you see any way of adjusting that to better purpose, well and good.

39. Do you think the adoption of a colonial scale of staff and salaries would facilitate the promotion of teachers?—Not in the least with us.

40. Is not your system a parochial system?—It is the same as the systems of other Education Boards throughout the colony, all of which are more or less parochial as a matter of necessity.

41. Do you find any complaints from the School Committees with regard to the inadequacy of the allowances made them by your Board?—Such complaints are universal.

42. I suppose your experience is the same as elsewhere—that it is hard to satisfy Committees?—Yes.

43. With regard to the question of truancy, have you a permanent Truant Inspector?—We had, but dismissed him.
44. What procedure do you adopt now?—None at all; we let the teachers do their best.
45. Did you dismiss the Truant Inspector for economical reasons, lack of funds?—No; a little dissatisfaction cropped up amongst the members of the Board through complaints coming from the teachers, and possibly from the Committees, that the money was wasted.
46. How does your system of appointing trainees in the schools work—I mean those who wish to become pupil-teachers?—We have no actual recognition of them, as a Board; it is left to School Committees, though we did recognise them in a sort of way some six or twelve months ago.
47. They get no allowance from the Board?—No.
48. How does your training department work?—It works admirably, though it is only to a large extent experimental.
49. Do you think training-colleges should be established?—Yes.
50. Are you of opinion that there are teachers leaving on account of the inadequacy of payment?—I do not know.
51. Are the teachers satisfied with the payments made to them?—I do not think you can make them satisfied.
52. In some districts the difference between the salaries paid to male and female head-teachers is 25 per cent., and in others 10 per cent.; for instance, it is 25 per cent. in Wanganui, and 10 per cent. in Southland: what do you consider would be a fair differentiation between the salaries of male and female teachers?—You need the opinion of an expert; I do not know.
53. I see you have compared the suggested scale very carefully with the scale that obtains in the Hawke's Bay District: did you find any other anomalies besides those you have pointed out?—Those I pointed out were the general index of the whole.
54. Did you notice in the alternative scale that an assistant was not brought in until the average attendance reaches 41?—Yes, that is soon enough.
55. In the first proposed scale, did you notice that an assistant was brought in when the average attendance reached 36?—Yes.
56. Were you aware that the Inspector-General, when he laid before the Commission the second proposed scale, intended to devote this £4,400 that we received for the purpose of raising the salaries of the assistants to the highest scale that there is in the colony?—I never heard of that before.
57. Would that do away with your contention?—I would like to investigate that before giving an answer.
58. Did you compare the salaries of assistants here with those in North Canterbury and Otago?—Some of our assistants have received salaries higher here than in Otago. But one or two of these cases are due to special circumstances, and these are points that I referred to when I said that if we adjusted a scale of our own we would have great difficulty in doing it.
59. With regard to candidates for positions under this Board, is preference given to those holding the highest certificates?—No; we send on the higher and the lower, provided the men are of sufficient character and skill to teach the school, and the responsibility rests with the Committee.
60. Do you consider your Board has been too liberal in the matter of aided schools?—I think we have acted with great care. There are very few aided schools in the district.
61. Do you consider that there should be some differentiation in the salaries paid to teachers in the different districts according to the cost of living?—I do not see how that could be done.
62. Would you be in favour of superannuation or retiring-allowance to those teachers who have grown old in the service?—I have not thought it out; but in these days of extreme pressure it would be a good thing for the profession and teachers. It should be partly paid for by themselves.
63. I do not suppose you think that the adoption of a colonial scale of salaries would tend to diminish the power of the Education Boards?—I do not see that it would, provided no more was done.
64. Do you not think if Inspectors were placed under the central department it would lead to greater uniformity of inspection and examination?—I doubt it.
65. Are the Inspectors not the experts to whom the Education Boards look for their information with regard to technical points in the administration of the Act?—I do not know what other Boards do, but that is the case with our Board.
66. He is the guide, philosopher, and friend of the Board?—So far as we need them, no further.
67. You consult him with regard to the fitness of teachers?—No.
68. As to the establishment of new schools?—Yes.
69. *Mr. Hill.*] Do I understand you to say that you approve of a colonial scale?—Yes.
70. Have you estimated the probable effect supposing the Government were to increase the capitation by 5s., to be expended by Education Boards on teachers' salaries: would it enable this Board to give such salaries as are suggested in the proposed scale?—I have not made any computations of that kind. I think it would enable us to restore the bonus taken away two years ago.
71. If the department takes over the functions laid down in section 39 of the Act, do you think that will strengthen the powers of the Board?—No.
72. Will it be detrimental to the efficiency of the Board?—I do not see how it would.
73. If it takes away the control of the money, do you think the Boards would lose in strength and power?—The Boards have to fix their scale, and after that the power is out of their hands.
74. It is proposed that a certain amount should be paid in capitation; that a certain sum

should be fixed by Government for salaries, leaving 11s. 3d. for the maintenance of schools to be administered by the Education Boards: if the central department can control the £3 8s. 9d., does it not follow that they could just as easily control the 11s. 3d.?—No. If they did, of course Boards would come to a dead stand.

75. What functions would remain for the Board if you take away the power of regulating the maintenance of schools in the district: would it be beneficial for education in the district?—We would require 4s. 6d. or 5s., in addition to the 11s. 3d., to carry on as now.

76. Even if the capitation was increased to the extent of 5s., it would require that amount to maintain the salaries at present paid?—No. I was referring to the carrying-on of the repairs and apparatus.

77. Supposing the department were to issue regulations to the effect that these moneys had to be provided for out of the building grant?—It could not be done. There would not be three buildings erected in this district in a year.

78. You think it is advisable to take out of the capitation allowance money for the maintenance of the schools?—My own belief is this: that all apparatus ought to be provided by teachers on capitation; it would lead to a great deal more care being taken of it.

79. Do you mean that the teachers should provide this?—I think it ought to come out of the scale.

80. Would it not likely tend to starve the schools under such conditions?—It has not done so in the past.

81. You are aware that the system in the Old Country costs really as much per head for the training of children as in New Zealand?—I expect it costs more in some cases.

82. Then, do you not think it is desirable to increase the capitation allowance?—If the country sees its way to pay the money I have no objection how much it is raised, provided you can pay the money equitably.

83. Would you suggest that something should be taken out of the Hawke's Bay allowance for the benefit of other districts?—No.

84. *Mr. Smith.*] You said that your reserve fund that you had accumulated in years past had been gradually dwindling away: do I understand you to mean that in the event of no colonial scale being set up the Hawke's Bay Board would be compelled shortly to revise their scale of salaries?—We would require to form a new scale of salaries, and to reduce our expenditure in other ways. I am afraid that salaries would have to come down too, but I could not say until I go into it.

85. *Mr. Lethbridge.*] Do you think that all the children in your district are being educated?—I think not.

86. Do you think that is a good thing?—No.

87. Do you think your Education Board is doing its duty in leaving these children uneducated?—I must not inculcate my brother members.

88. I take it you would give more aid to country schools?—I do not think I would give any further aid than we give at present. We give a school for 10 children.

89. *Mr. Hogben.*] Can you tell me the average annual amount of the expense of the Board, outside teachers' salaries and allowances, and outside of building expenditure?—Including School Committees' grants, £4,272.

90. The total of the Board's expenditure, exclusive of teachers' salaries and allowances, and inclusive of the cost of training teachers, the inspection, and district high schools, is, you say £4,272. The total of the last three items is £792, which would leave £3,480?—Yes.

91. And the number of children in the district is 6,841?—Yes.

92. That is about 10s. per head for administration?—Yes.

93. You said 16s. just now?—I was taking buildings into consideration.

94. Supposing the question of salaries was kept entirely distinct from the question of buildings, and separate provision is made for the training of teachers, and district high schools are kept distinct, £3,480 would then really be the incidental expenses of the Board: have you calculated what would be payable to the Board on the basis of £250 and 11s. 3d. per head?—Yes; it would leave a balance.

95. Is it not £4,098 that would be payable under the suggested scheme to the Board for its general expenses? Then, the Board would be £618 better off than now in respect to the general expenses?—No; £352 in the one case. The trouble here is that we vote our buildings annually, and the trouble comes in in keeping up repairs.

96. If we are going to solve the question of allowances and expenses of the Board, it is desirable to keep them distinct from the question of buildings altogether?—Some ways it would, and some ways it would not.

97. *The Chairman.*] You say that when you are appointing teachers the Board selects certain candidates and refers the applications to the Committee, and the Committee decide?—Yes.

98. Does that result generally in the appointment of the best applicant?—Not always.

99. Do you think that such a system of appointment, and virtually promotion, is fair to teachers who are working hard to obtain good positions in schools, but who may be sufficiently independent not to canvass or button-hole Committees?—I may say it is not my ideal system.

100. Which do you think the most competent tribunal to make the selection of teachers—the Committees or the Board?—The Board, unquestionably.

101. Do you not think they should hold the power of appointment in their own hands?—The Committees would not agree to it.

102. Apart from the question of salaries altogether, do you not consider that your teachers are labouring under serious grievances?—I doubt they always will be.

103. I mean with regard to the matter of appointment?—I know, and they always will. I do

not think anything is yet conceived or devised that will get rid of grievances—and just grievances.

104. Do you think it is essential to a national system of education that everything should be uniform—teachers' salaries, allowances, and everything else?—No, I do not.

105. In your opinion, is the present system of education in New Zealand a national system?—Yes; just as much as the other would be.

106. If teachers' salaries are fixed by the Legislature, and paid through the central department, will that not do away with the capitation system?—I do not think it is understood that they are to be paid through the central department. The money is to be sent to the Boards, who will pay it.

107. If once the colonial scale is adopted, do you think that the capitation basis will be continued?—I do not know that I could suggest anything better.

108. Do you think that £4 capitation will be sufficient if paid over to the Board?—The Board could then do a great deal better than it is doing now.

109. But if you had a £4 capitation would you be able to make a scale that would be fairly satisfactory?—We would reduce the few salaries, and could elevate the rest.

110. Do you draw any distinction between assistant masters and mistresses: are they differently paid one to another?—They are fairly well paid relatively.

111. Do you think the discontinuance of the bonus has any injurious effect on the teaching of the schools?—I do not think so; I think all the teachers do their duty.

112. In that case the bonus was not necessary?—It was instituted at the beginning of the Board, and it was thought a good thing.

113. Do you think the sweeping-away of Education Boards and Committees would improve the system?—I think it would ruin it.

T. TANNER, Member of the Education Board, examined.

Mr. Tanner: First, I do not think that a colonial system or scale of salaries will prove to be fair and equitable, as circumstances differ in different districts; secondly, I do not think that any reduction should be made in existing salaries, but that the additional grant of 5s. per head capitation-money (amounting to about £27,000) should be applied to increase the salaries of those teachers throughout the colony who are manifestly inadequately paid; third, the £4 a head capitation-money should be given to the Education Boards in the same way as the £3 15s. has been hitherto given, with special instructions that the additional amount be applied as indicated above; fourth, that it would be a mistake for the department to take out of hands of the Boards the payment of salaries, as it might weaken their influence with and control over the teachers, but the department should in every way strengthen the hands of the Boards, and thus increase their interest and control in educational matters.

114. *Mr. Davidson*.] Do I understand you to say that you think that, owing to varying conditions in the different districts of the colony, a satisfactory scale of salaries could not be drawn up?—I do not say that a satisfactory scale could not be drawn up, but it would involve the working-out of a great many questions, pecuniary and otherwise, and the different conditions in different districts would need going into: what would be sufficient in one district would not be sufficient in another.

115. Do you not think that the conditions in any one education district at the present time differ greatly within that district?—There is a difference between the town and the country.

116. There are thirteen different scales of salaries in the colony at the present time: do you know if any one of those thirteen Boards differentiate in any way between the salaries paid to teachers in different parts of their own district?—No.

117. Do you know if the Railway Department, for instance, takes into consideration the different conditions operating in different parts of the colony in the matter of paying their servants?—I am not aware that they do.

118. Or the Post and Telegraph Department?—I do not know.

118A. Or any of the Government Departments?—I am not aware that any Government Department made any difference in that respect.

119. Do you not think that the differences existing within one district are as great as the differences existing between different education districts?—I should not think so.

120. Would it not be in the interests of education if, instead of thirteen different scales of staff and thirteen different scales of salaries, there was a uniform scale of staffs and salaries for the whole of the schools in the colony?—It might be an advantage.

121. Do you think it would be an advantage to have a uniform scale of staff?—Yes, I think it would, for the reason that I think it would facilitate the transfer of teachers from one district to another, where, perhaps, climatic conditions might render it necessary for a teacher to leave a cold district in the south in order to get into a warmer district in the north.

122. Do you not think that a uniform scale of salaries would help in the same direction?—Yes.

123. Suppose a man, for instance, in Otago, wished, for reasons of health—a teacher holding a certain position—to get to Hawke's Bay or Auckland, as you say, if he is paid a larger salary in a certain district than he would receive for a similar position in another district, would he not hesitate to take the position, seeing that by doing so his salary would decrease?—Yes; but where the payments are *per capita* I do not suppose it would occur. The payment is everywhere on the average attendance, and if the average attendance of a school here is the same as a school in Christchurch I assume the salary would be the same.

124. Yes, under a colonial scale of salary; but you object to the scale of salary, do you not?—I understood it was the same now.

125. No; are you aware there are thirteen different scales of salary in the colony?—No; I was not aware of it.

126. Do you think it is in the interests of education that such inequalities should exist between the salaries paid to men and women doing similar work, but working in different districts?—I think that the payments on average attendance should be the same throughout the colony, and that there should not be a pecuniary inducement for a teacher in a different part of the country to throw up his engagement if there was a chance of getting a higher salary. Of course, if there was an appointment in a school with a larger attendance, and a teacher could get a higher salary through securing that school, I think that would be perfectly justifiable.

127. You think it unfair that men in some districts should receive as much as £50 per annum less than fellow-teachers holding similar positions in other districts, and endowed with the same qualifications?—Yes, *cæteris paribus*, if the cost of living is the same in both districts; that should be taken into account.

128. Seeing that no tone of the Education Boards, or any of the Government departments, take that question into account, do you not think that, in attempting to frame a colonial scale of salaries, it would be better to set that question on one side?—I think salaries should all be based on the average attendance, and let that be universal.

129. Do you not think a uniform scale of salaries would be better than thirteen different ones, as at present?—Yes, I think so.

130. *Mr. Stewart.*] In reply to Mr. Davidson, you said you thought there should be a uniform scale of salaries for the teachers of the colony: would you indicate how you think that could be done; do you think it could be done by leaving the matter entirely in the hands of Boards?—If the amount of money granted to each Board is on the average attendance of that educational district, they would have to divide their salary on the scale which ought to do equal justice to all parties.

131. The crux of the question is: who is to draw up the scale? If the Wellington Board drew up one, and the Hawke's Bay Board drew up another, who is to decide which is the best, and to define the salaries?—I suppose this Commission.

132. That would be practically a colonial scale?—Yes, practically it would be a colonial scale.

133. When you stated in your evidence in chief that you did not believe a colonial scale would work, was it not under a misapprehension as to what a colonial scale really was?—It was a misapprehension I was under as to the different conditions operating in different parts of the colony—I had no particulars of them.

134. *Mr. Luke.*] Have you studied the two scales placed before the Commission?—I have not studied them. I have read them carefully, and puzzled over them. I have not been able to understand them.

135. You quite understand they are not meant as a colonial scale?—I understood from a suggestion that there were reductions in some cases and additions in others. I could not understand these at all.

136. Do you not think, in order to keep up a national system of education in this colony, it is necessary to have a national system of staffing the schools, and also a national scale of payment to the teachers; that a teacher in Auckland should be paid the same as a teacher in Dunedin; that there should not be such a vast difference as there is now?—Yes, I think there should be that system.

137. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] With regard to the anomalies that exist—and we know it as a fact that they do exist, because we have thirteen different scales of salaries before us that exist in the various districts—do you think the additional grant of 5s. would in any way tend to remove those anomalies?—Yes, manifestly, as it would tend to enable Boards to increase salaries all round. However, I should not increase the salaries of the higher paid masters. I would not suggest an increase to any salary over £400, and I think the increases should be on salaries under £200 down to £100.

138. Who is to make the increases or the decreases?—The Education Boards. Say, increases of 7 per cent. for some, 10 per cent. for others, and 15 per cent. for others again, in order to remove inequalities.

139. But would we have any guarantee, if the power was left in the hands of the Boards, that they would do so?—No; but the money could be paid to Boards—the £4 capitation—with special instructions that teachers inadequately paid should receive an increase in salary.

140. Last session it was decided to give an extra capitation: that brought the grant up to £4 per head?—Yes.

141. It was proposed by the department to allocate it in a certain direction—say, on the basis of the scale we have before us—and a great deal of dissatisfaction cropped up between the department and the Boards. The Boards wanted to have matters their own way, did they not?—Yes; I think the Boards should not have it in their own hands, but under certain instructions from the department.

142. Will not the Government cease to pay on the capitation grant of £3 15s. or £4, and pay on the scale, and each Board will get its allowance *per capita* according to the scale, and not on the basis of the £3 15s. or £4?—I do not quite understand what you mean by the scale.

143. Supposing, for example, we adopt a colonial scale which, in the first place, says that each teacher doing similar work, no matter what part of the colony that teacher is in, shall receive a similar salary, what is your opinion?—The inequalities would come in which I thought first of in regard to the cost of living in the different districts. I think, on a further consideration of the matter, the inequalities in the cost of living in different districts would not be of such importance, as it would make the teachers feel that they were being paid relatively the same salaries, and that they were in as good a position financially; also, in regard to staff, in one part of the colony as in another, that they would not wish to move from one part of the colony to another on those grounds.

144. Do you find that there is a feeling on the part of the teachers in this district to favour such a colonial scale?—I have not heard from the teachers any expression of opinion that would warrant me in saying they are in favour of it. If it will have the effect of reducing the salaries of some of the teachers, you will find they will not be in favour of it. I am opposed to any reduction of salaries at all. I think the additional money provided by the increased capitation grant, about £27,000, would be well expended in increasing the salaries of those teachers who at the present time are inadequately paid, and that you would still have a colonial system.

145. I understand you favour giving the extra grant of 5s. to Education Boards and allowing them to draw up their own scales?—Yes, entirely to help those who are inadequately paid now, because some of the teachers are not paid salaries sufficient to live upon.

146. You realise the difficulty of drawing up a colonial scale that will not prejudicially affect one teacher or another, because there are thirteen Education Boards and thirteen scales of payment?—Yes, I did not know that the difference between the thirteen scales was so great; I thought payments were on a more general scale.

147. You heard the evidence of the Chairman of the Board, that if something was not done before long, the teachers in the Hawke's Bay district would have to suffer another reduction on account of the financial position of the Board?—I think that is merely an expression of opinion, emanating from over-caution on his part.

148. Did you not go in for reduction previously?—I am not aware that we have altered our scale ever since I have been a member of the Board. The only reduction I remember was the capitation grant being reduced from £4 to £3 15s.

149. Did you not abolish bonuses?—Yes.

150. How long ago?—Last year.

151. What was the highest bonus paid to any one teacher?—I think £10, though £20 might have been paid.

152. Were not some teachers paid £30?—I am not aware that any teachers were; they may have been, but I do not think so.

153. If a teacher said he was paid £30 I suppose you would not deny that such was the case?—Certainly not.

154. If a teacher receiving £20 or £30 as a bonus was reduced that amount, would it not be a considerable hardship to that teacher?—Of course, the bonus was for extra work—teaching after hours—and as such was extra pay.

155. Do you think that the schools are not so efficiently managed and the children so well taught since those reductions have taken place?—I would not say that at all.

156. *Mr. Hill.*] You understand that education districts to-day pay their teachers in their own way?—Yes.

157. Each district has a plan of its own—are you aware of that fact?—No, I really never entered into that question.

158. Are you not aware that each district formulates a scale of payment by which to pay its teachers?—No; I confess I thought it was a general scheme that all payments were divided by Education Boards in a similar way to our own.

159. In reality you imagined that it was a colonial scale on which the teachers were paid?—Yes, I did.

160. Are you aware how much capitation is paid to the various Education Boards on account of average attendance?—About £400,000.

161. I mean the capitation that is paid on each child?—£3 15s.

162. Are you aware that the salaries paid in the Hawke's Bay District to-day are based on the £3 15s. capitation grant?—Yes.

163. Are you aware that the capitation grant under the proposed scale is £4?—Yes.

164. Suppose this extra 5s. was paid to the Hawke's Bay Education Board, have you taken the trouble to discover whether the Board would be able to pay the salaries of teachers equal to those set forth in the suggested colonial scale?—Yes.

165. Do you think the Board could pay such salaries?—Yes.

166. Do you think the Board could maintain a staff of teachers equal to what is proposed in the colonial scale?—I am not sufficiently acquainted with the staffing under the colonial scale to answer your question.

167. Are you agreed that the standard system of education is the best that it is possible for the colony to adopt?—Yes.

168. Do you think throughout the colony the same work should be required in town and country alike?—Yes, I believe in a general standard for the colony.

169. Would you give technical education in the country as in the town?—Yes.

170. You believe in uniformity?—Yes; I see difficulties in a differentiated system.

171. You believe in uniformity in staffing the schools and educating the children for their life's work?—Yes.

172. Do you think that there are not cases in which a school having the same number of pupils might not need exactly the same kind of staffing?—No.

173. You believe in the payment of teachers on the average attendance, on the proposed capitation of £4?—Yes.

174. Suppose a colonial scale was adopted, do you think a central department, if it had the appointment of teachers, would know better how to staff, we will say, the Napier School than the Hawke's Bay Education Board?—If the department knew its business, it certainly should.

175. Might there not be local circumstances and conditions that necessitate a certain staff in order to meet those conditions in that district?—Possibly. I say that the department should take such matters into consideration.

176. Do you think that the functions of Education Boards would be thus limited?—I do not, as long as Education Boards have the payment of salaries as now.

177. You think that a colonial scale is advisable?—As I mentioned before, I think there should be an equality to that extent—that payments should be on the average attendance.

178. You think that is preferable to an increase to Education Boards of 5s. *per capita*?—Yes; I think there is something in what one of the Commissioners mentioned to me: that if the 5s. was given to Education Boards without any definite instructions the Boards might apply it, if they chose, to increase salaries already sufficiently high, and not assist those salaries that really needed it most. To prevent any danger of that, I think instructions to the Boards should be definite and imperative.

179. Suppose the 5s. was given for the express purpose of increasing teachers' salaries all round in such a manner as Boards might deem best, what then?—I think that the same difficulty would come in—some Boards might not act judiciously—they might increase the salaries that did not need any increase.

180. You think a uniform scale of payment throughout the colony would be preferable to payments to the various Education Boards, assuming that definite instructions were given in the matter?—Yes, conditionally.

181. Assume conditionally that it was spent on teachers' salaries?—If the money was spent on teachers' salaries by increasing those that were inadequate, it would be quite right.

182. If there was a regulation to say that all capitation money must be expended solely on the payment of teachers' salaries, and for no other purpose, would you suggest that there should be a local scale or an Education Board system?—If the regulation bears out that the money shall be expended in building up all salaries below, say, £250, I think that would do.

183. Do you think that the present plan of appointing teachers in the colony is satisfactory?—I do not know.

184. Do you approve of the plan of consulting School Committees in the appointment of teachers?—I do.

185. You think that plan should be maintained?—Yes.

186. Do you think that Education Boards should have the right of removing teachers from one district to another if found desirable—informing the Committees of the fact, but taking no notice of any objection they might raise?—I think the Boards should have that power, but at the same time I think they should consult the Committees.

187. *Mr. Weston.*] With regard to incidental allowance, do you find the amount Dr. Sidey stated you received sufficient for Committees' wants?—Yes, I think our Committees are satisfied—so far as Committees can be satisfied—with the allowance Boards make them.

188. You do not think the incidental allowance should be increased?—I do not say that it should not be increased; where it is necessary I think it would be a very good thing if the Boards had the power to increase the allowance, but it seems they have not the means.

189. As a matter of fact, do the Committees ask your Board for an additional allowance?—Yes; they often do.

190. Therefore, I suppose, you assume they have not enough to meet their wants?—No, I would not assume that, because they try to get the Boards to do little things for them. If the Board has not the funds they do it themselves. I think the parents of the children should help the Committees.

191. Dr. Sidey stated the incidental allowance amounted to about 16s. per head; I presume you desire that the allowance should be maintained and not reduced?—Yes; if possible.

192. I suppose you consider that the incidental allowance at present paid by the Board, amounting to 16s. per head, should be maintained, and that the teachers should receive fair salaries, whether the capitation grant exceeds the £4 or not?—Yes, decidedly; but I thought the £4 grant was a fixed one.

193. Supposing, for instance, that the Parliament of New Zealand should be prepared to vote a sum sufficient to pay teachers fair salaries, and to pay Committees a fair incidental allowance, do you think the Boards could administer the affairs of the institution as well as the Colonial Government?—Yes, I think so.

194. And therefore, perhaps, a colonial scale might not be absolutely necessary?—Yes, if you could insure all the Boards doing equal justice to their staff; I see now, without a colonial scale, it would be very difficult to do that.

195. So far as your Board is concerned, until the last reduction was made—the bonuses were removed—your teachers were satisfied with the Board's administration?—Yes.

196. If your teachers were satisfied, and would continue to be satisfied with the administration of your Board, if their salaries were increased to the old rate, why do you think the administration of other Boards would not be equally satisfactory?—I do not think it would not be satisfactory.

197. Then, do you not think a colonial scale would be really unnecessary?—No; because there is no guarantee from the other Boards that they will not make a differentiation.

198. Is not your district a very large one, running three or four hundred miles along the coast?—Yes.

199. Do you think one Inspector is enough for your district?—Hardly enough.

200. You would advocate the appointment of another?—No, an assistant; I should not advocate the appointment of a full Inspector. We are fortunate in having an Inspector in this district of unusual vigour and industry, who does a great deal of work; he works night and day, and more than a man can be reasonably expected to do.

201. I suppose it would follow that if Providence, in its wisdom, thought fit to take Mr. Hill to a better world, you might require two Inspectors?—Yes, we might. He often does two men's work.

202. From your experience here, do you think the Inspectors should remain in the service of Boards, or should they be under the control of the Central Government?—I think they are better under the control of the Boards. I think the Boards feel that Inspectors are practically a part of them, as it were, and that they can refer any questions of difficulty to the Inspectors. If Inspectors were outside the control of the Board they might think they were so far separated from the Boards as not to interest themselves in matters affecting the welfare of their districts; as, for instance, the transfer of a teacher from one district to another, or an application to open a new school in any district. In such a matter as that we immediately appeal to the Inspector of the district, for the reason that he knows so well the district, the people, and the requirements of the locality where a school is required. I look on the Inspector as a member of the Board, and we treat him as such, and we are only too glad to get his opinion, and the benefit of his information on points we would find great difficulty in deciding.

203. What is your opinion in regard to the abolition of the Boards and Committees, and leaving the control of your school in the hands of the department in Wellington?—I think that would be a fatal blow to education in this country.

204. Why?—Because it would be impossible to have the proper control under the department that we have now under the Boards and Committees over the education system. Committees are elected, in most cases, from the parents of the children who are receiving instruction, and it would be almost impossible for the central department to look after their interests in the same manner as is done by Committees and Boards.

205. Would it not be possible, in some instances, that an Inspector might say that, although the attendance of a school might warrant, through numbers, an assistant, it is not advisable to put in one; or might he not say that, although the circumstances of the school are such that although there are two or three below the number in attendance at which an assistant is given, or proposed to be given, it is advisable to give an assistant? Would you respect the Inspector's opinion in a case of that sort?—Yes.

206. Then, if your Inspector should be a local man, and if you think he should advise you to make allowances in considering the circumstances of the district, and so on—departing occasionally from the scale of staffing laid down—would it not be better to leave the whole matter of the staffing to the Boards, rather than to the Department of Education in Wellington?—I do not think the few circumstances that would arise would destroy the uniformity of the staffing.

207. You are acquainted with the pupil-teacher system?—Yes.

208. Do you think that pupil-teachers should devote the whole of their day to instructing children, or do you think their time should be divided—partly in instruction and partly in study?—Yes; I think that is the case.

209. Do you think pupil-teachers are competent to impart instruction in schools without the practical supervision of an adult teacher?—I think pupil-teachers ought to have the direct supervision of an adult teacher.

210. Do you think that pupil-teachers trained in Hawke's Bay, we will say, will be qualified to stand side by side and compete with pupil-teachers who have been educated and trained in the training-schools of Otago and North Canterbury?—I do not know anything about the training-schools you mention. I think it is a great advantage to them to be able to pass through the training-schools here.

211. What is your opinion in regard to teaching the sexes together in schools: Do you think boys and girls should be taught together, or should they be taught separately?—I think they should be taught separately. I think girls have their own peculiar traits of character, taste, and feelings; and those best qualified to teach them are members of their own sex. I think the same thing applies in the case of boys.

212. You do not think that in our schools the company of boys would tend to remove all the little idiosyncrasies that girls and young women are apt to acquire, and that the girls would—I will not say exactly civilise—naturally improve the boys?—I think the improvement is general on both sides outside the school, where the boys move with their sisters and relatives. In the schools I say it is a mere matter of study: the boys sit by themselves, and the girls sit by themselves.

213. Do you pay your teachers when they are absent through illness?—They are allowed a certain leave of absence on full pay.

214. For what length of time?—For three months, and they have to get a substitute approved by the Board.

215. At their own expense?—No, not for a certain time.

216. What time?—I think for three months. If after that time they want further leave, the substitute is provided at their own expense.

217. On the death of a teacher do you make any compassionate allowance to his relatives, and, if so, how much?—I am not aware we do.

218. Do you think, under such circumstances as I have mentioned, that a compassionate allowance should be granted?—In some cases I think it should be given; not in all. I do not think the Boards would have the means of paying compassionate allowance.

219. In what cases do you think an allowance should be paid?—In a case of very long service under the Board.

220. Do you think there should be any distinction in the payment of male and female pupil-teachers?—I think, as a rule, that men are put to the greatest expense. A male teacher may marry, and then he has the expense of a wife and family to consider.

221. What percentage of difference do you think there should be in the salaries of a lady teacher and a male teacher?—From 5 per cent. to 10 per cent.

222. Do you think that difference is sufficient?—Yes.

223. In these districts there are, of course, a number—and there must necessarily be—of

isolated settlers, especially in new districts: will you tell me what you think we should advise the Government to do in respect to the children of those settlers and their education?—When there are a certain number of children, say ten in number, the Board gives a grant in aid; the parents assist in order to bring the salary of the teacher up to a sufficiently high level to enable the teacher to live, not less than £80; the Board might pay £40 and the settlers another £40, and also find a house for the teacher to live in.

224. Do you not think that such a system practically amounts to taxing the pioneers?—Unless you have a limit, what is to prevent a family in a bush district, a family of four children, demanding that a teacher should be sent there?

225. Would you or would you not advocate the Board allowing the parents of two, three, or four children the capitation grant, upon a guarantee from the parents that the children composing the family would be educated?—Yes, but I think that would be of very little value, for they would not be able to get a teacher for the amount. The capitation grant of £4 per head on the four children would be £16—quite insufficient for a teacher.

226. Supposing they were able to make some arrangements whereby the children would be taught, do you think they—the parents—should receive the capitation allowance?—Yes; that would be on the same principle as a grant in aid.

227. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] Do you not think that Boards, with their knowledge of local affairs, could manage the affairs of their own department better than a central authority?—Yes, decidedly, in regard to appointments.

228. Do you think that the teachers here would be content to see their salaries decreased in order to build up salaries in districts where the small schools had been unduly increased?—If it could be shown that the teachers in this district were too highly paid, that might be so; but I have not thought that they were.

229. You want all salaries built up to the standard of the wage paid in this district?—Yes; I do not think that the teachers here are paid too much.

230. Reference has been made to the highly paid salaries in Otago: do you think those salaries are too high?—No, I do not.

231. So that if the capitation grant of £4 set down in the proposed scheme is not sufficient to bring up the salaries all round to the salaries obtaining in your district and in Otago, you think it would be advisable for the Government to increase that grant?—I did not understand that the grant would not be sufficient; if the grant is given on average attendance, it should be sufficient in one district as in another.

232. No; for the reason that there are so many small schools in some districts: do you understand that?—Yes, I see now; the larger schools are the sources of revenue.

233. Then, if the grant of £4 is not sufficient, would you favour an increase of that grant?—Of course it is an immense tax on the country, but as the country is launched on the system of giving free education, the country should be prepared to bear that cost, no matter what it may be.

234. You think that there should be a difference of 5 per cent. or 10 per cent. in the salaries paid to male and female teachers?—Yes.

235. Under a scale of staff and salaries, if in a school taught by a lady teacher, would you think it right that under the contemplated scale she should be removed: do you not think that, if anything is done at all, we should so frame our methods that a woman in that position should not lose her appointment?—I do not see how she would disappear.

236. If anything is adopted, should it not provide that a woman in her position should retain a school of that class—a school of about 80 pupils?—I do not see how she could be dispensed with under the new system.

237. If she required an assistant, who had to be a male, you think that female teacher should be retained?—Yes.

238. If the report of that lady's work was good?—Yes; if the Inspector reports that her work is good, she should be paid adequately for that work.

239. The next point is, would you not pay her as good a salary as if a man went into the school?—Yes, I think if she had entire control of the school, she should get the same salary as the man.

240. Are the members of the Committees good representative men of the localities?—As a rule, I think so; I think the people elect those parents who consider the interests of education as of the first importance.

241. We had evidence from an ex-clerical gentleman that the first consideration of parents in electing committeemen was not the proper education of the children, but rather the selection of a lady who could teach the pianoforte, or who was possessed of other social advantages; are your Committees like that?—No, I think our Committees have more sense.

242. You think that they consider educational affairs of the first importance?—Yes, I have always given them that credit.

243. *Mr. Hogben.*] When you say that the smaller schools—most of the smaller schools up to 60 in average attendance—do not really pay, you mean it in the sense that they are unable to meet the expenses of salaries and administration out of the capitation grant of £3 15s.?—Yes.

244. If you raised the salaries all round, or at all events if you raised the salaries of the lower paid teachers, could the expenses be met out of a capitation grant of £4?—I do not say that they could not be met; I think, with proper economy, they could.

245. If we take the proposed salary of a school of 30 pupils, that would be £140, the salary proposed for a master: the capitation on 30 pupils would be £120: that is, without the incidental expenses, it would be £20 short, would it not?—Yes.

246. If, as in this district, and especially Auckland, Wanganui, Taranaki, Marlborough, Westland, South Canterbury, and Southland, the proportion of small schools to large schools is greater

than in other districts, they will obviously have greater difficulty in paying salaries—not only in the small schools, but also in the larger schools—as high as in the better salaried districts, would they not?—Yes.

247. Take, for the sake of example, Taranaki, under the proposed scale: Assuming that the figures I give you are right, the amount for salaries would be £12,809, and for the general expenses of the Board £2,120, making a total of £14,929: the capitation grant at £4 a head would be £13,296, so that the Taranaki Education Board would be unable, by the amount of £1,633, to pay such salaries as are proposed under the colonial scheme within a £4 capitation basis for the whole of the colony, would it not?—Yes.

248. In a similar manner the Wanganui district would be deficient to the extent of £1,610; Marlborough, £1,204; Nelson, £2,497; Grey, £351; Westland, £719; Auckland, £1,156; South Canterbury, £1,007; and Southland, £2,164?—Yes.

Mr. Hill: I would like to ask the Inspector-General what would be the deficiency of the Hawke's Bay district.

Mr. Hogben: Hawke's Bay would not have any deficiency.

249. *Mr. Hogben*.] The extra capitation grant of 5s. would be sufficient for Hawke's Bay, I think, but not for the districts I have mentioned. If the proposal were to give an increased salary all over the colony, without placing the Boards in a worse financial position than at present, and without interfering with their prerogatives, would you approve of that proposal?—In the districts where the grant of £4 is not sufficient, I think that there should be an additional grant in order to make a sufficiency, and to equalise.

250. If you gave the 5s. to some of the larger districts they would have an excess above what is necessary to pay teachers, doing exactly the same work as in other parts of New Zealand, the same salaries?—Yes; I understand.

251. Then the only way in which to pay equal salaries, and to give equal facilities to Boards for meeting their own expenses is by some scale that is in proportion to the number of schools in a district and to the several classes of schools; you agree with that?—Yes.

252. That really means a colonial scale, does it not?—Yes.

253. Then, provided that none of the teachers suffer, and that no Board is placed in a worse financial position than at present, you see no objection to it?—No; that is so.

254. I am assuming that all questions relating to the appointment, dismissal, and control of teachers should be in the hands of Boards. I hold that opinion very strongly, and you do also?—Yes.

255. *The Chairman*.] You said that you considered the circumstances of living in the different districts varied a good deal?—Yes.

256. I suppose you mean by that that house-rent and commodities involved in the cost of living differed very much in one part of the colony from another?—Yes, that is so.

257. And under those circumstances you think a uniform scale of salaries would scarcely give satisfaction?—Yes, that is so; but at the same time I admit that it would be difficult for the department to differentiate with regard to salaries.

258. That is if the question of the payment of salaries is vested in the department?—Yes.

259. Do you think that Education Boards are not animated with a wish to do the best for the teachers, as for the School Committees?—I think they are animated with a wish to do the best possible; I am sure that they should be.

260. Is it in their interests to be otherwise than fair and just to the teachers of the districts?—I should imagine it is not.

261. That being the case, then, do you think that they should not be intrusted with the management of the funds that are set apart by the State for educational purposes—I mean the money for salaries, incidental allowances, maintenance of their staff?—I think it would be safer to have a general direction on matters such as those.

262. You think it would be well, from a financial aspect of the case, that those powers of Education Boards should be controlled by a central department?—I think so, on some general scheme; I do not wish any one Board to get a larger amount than another Board.

263. Do you think that in the past your Board has mismanaged the funds placed at its disposal?—No, I do not.

264. Have you any knowledge of anything such as that going on elsewhere?—No, I have only taken an interest in the district I have lived in.

265. If you are not able to say that funds have been mismanaged, how can you come to a conclusion that it would be better to have the management of the funds taken out of the hands of the Boards?—I do not say that; I say the Boards should have the management of the funds, but under certain regulations.

266. You would place the Boards under regulations?—Yes.

267. If by placing them under regulations you do away in effect with the capitation system, do you think that would result in an improvement?—I do not understand that it would do away with the capitation system; the amounts that would go to the Boards would be based on the average attendance, and Boards would have the distribution of it under certain regulations—outside of the question of the building grant.

268. Have you considered that, in the event of a scale of salaries being once adopted, it will be competent for the Legislature, in conjunction with the department, to alter that scale from time to time—every year when Parliament assembles?—Yes, I suppose so; it would not be like the laws of the Medes and Persians.

269. Supposing that an alteration was made—that it was found that the scale was working admirably, say, in Auckland, and very badly in your district—what do you think would happen?—

I think that the first thing to inquire into would be why, if it acted well in one district, it did not do so in another. There should be some reason shown.

270. There are thirteen educational districts in New Zealand: do you think it is possible to devise a scale of staff and salaries that will give satisfaction throughout the colony?—I do not know that a scale would give satisfaction; if it would do so, I think it would be fair to all districts that there should be a scale.

271. You think that regulations applying generally to the whole of the schools in the colony will be more satisfactory than simply the regulations of each Board?—The Government should give the money under some system, and the Boards would have to do the best under the circumstances.

272. If the power is taken from the Boards—the power of adjusting salaries within their own districts—would it detract from the prestige of the Boards?—No.

273. Do you think the body which appoints the teachers, transfers them, and promotes them, should also have imposed upon it the power of seeing how they are paid?—No; I think the teachers should know how they would be paid, and should not be at the caprice of any Board.

274. Do you think Boards are apt to be more capricious than the General Government?—Yes, no doubt.

275. What should make them more capricious; and why should they treat the teachers badly?—I do not say they would treat the teachers badly.

276. That is what it amounts to—you say Boards are capricious: is that opinion gained as the result of the working of the Board in Napier?—No; it is the result of my hearing there are so many different systems in the colony.

277. But is that not only hearsay?—I understand it is a fact, nevertheless; this is the point: the scales of the Boards are always subject to alteration on the part of the Boards, so that the teachers, one may say, never knew where they are. If a fixed system is laid down, every teacher would know his or her position; for instance, a master, we will say, may be a very agreeable man, and his Board may take a great interest in him, while another master, equally capable, may not be so fascinating, and, perhaps, will not get the recognition from the Board his merits deserve.

278. Do you see any advantage in a variety of scales arranged by different Boards: is there no advantage in a system of elasticity: do you believe in a rigid, cast-iron system under which no experiment can be tried?—I cannot speak as to that, but only on behalf of the teachers. In some of the education districts in this colony the teachers are inadequately paid—I mean to say as regards teachers in similar positions in other districts.

279. Do you think it is the fault of the Boards that they are not adequately paid?—If they all got the same amount of capitation as we get I do not see why their teachers should be paid less salaries than our teachers.

280. Do you think, if the other Boards got more money, they would treat their teachers in the same manner as your Board treats the teachers in this district?—I understand that why they do not do so is on account of the number of small schools.

281. Do you not think that could be rectified by altering the capitation grant on a sliding scale—giving an increased grant to the small schools—increasing the grant from £3 15s. to £5, according to the size of the schools?—Yes; in fact we have to do that now.

282. Is that not a way out of the difficulty?—Yes; that is the only way out of the difficulty.

283. If a scheme of that kind is provided you think the Education Boards would make good use of their money and pay their teachers fairly?—Yes.

284. You believe in an elastic scheme?—Yes, an elastic scheme, but at the same time a uniform scheme on some general principle laid down.

285. Who would you intrust the laying of it down to?—The department should be equal to that.

286. Suppose a Council of Education was established, consisting of delegates from the thirteen different Education Boards, and was appointed to meet once a year and devise a general scheme of staff and salaries, do you think that would be less advantageous than leaving the matter to the Government of the day?—I do not think it would be necessary to have an annual meeting of delegates, but I think a meeting of such delegates would devise a scheme and recommend it to the department, and see how it would succeed—it would be an experiment.

287. Do you think that would be preferable to throwing everything into the hands of the State?—Yes; I think it would. The men would be experienced, and it would be an advantage to them to keep together and compare notes with each other on the management of the different districts.

288. If the teachers of New Zealand generally are to have their salaries increased under any proposed scheme, is that not likely to add very materially to the cost of education?—Very likely. I think there are a great number of salaries that do not require increasing beyond a certain amount—some I would not increase at all.

289. Do you think those teachers enjoying salaries that are high, and which do not need increasing, if they are clamouring for an increase, are unreasonable?—Yes; I think they are.

289A. Would you approve of raising all salaries to the highest level to be found in any part of New Zealand—the salaries of assistants and others?—I should like to see that done if the funds would admit of it.

290. Supposing that that was done, and hard times came upon the colony, what do you think would happen then: would the teachers be safer in the hands of the Government of the day than in the hands of Boards?—The Boards would be able to do nothing unless the Government gave them the necessary funds.

291. You do not look upon the Boards as being the “buffers” between the Government and the teachers?—No.

292. You do not think the Boards would interpose if there was any outcry for retrenchment?—No; they could not do it.

293. Do you not think the Government to some extent is amenable to the demands of the Boards?—You have to so devise a scheme as to render the money Parliament votes to be distributed in the fairest way.

294. Would you be in favour of a reduction of staff in order to increase the salaries of the teachers?—No; not if the reduction of the staff would be injurious to the educational interests of the children—certainly not.

295. Well, then, who do you think should perform a correct opinion as to the size of staff necessary for your district schools?—I think that such a meeting as you suggest—a meeting of delegates from the different districts, meeting with the head of the department—would be sufficient.

296. Do you think that would be better than leaving it to the Government?—I should leave it entirely to the delegates and the Education Department, who would make the matter a special study.

297. Would you leave it to the department without any delegates at all?—I think the department would be glad to get the assistance of the delegates.

298. Do you think it would be a wise thing to intrust the department solely with that power, in the same way as the head of the Postal Department has the power to arrange his staff and make appointments?—I think that is a much more simple thing.

299. In your district does the Board make any alterations from time to time in the staffing of the schools, transferring the teachers from one class to another, or is it left to the Committees?—It is left to the headmaster; the Board looks to the headmaster to control those matters.

300. Can the headmaster, without any reference to the Board, move a teacher from one department in a school into another department, or another class?—Yes.

301. Without reference to the Board or Committee?—Yes.

302. Assuming that means disrating or not, as the case may be, can the headmaster in an arbitrary way move teachers about?—Well, yes, in this way; that if he found a teacher whom he had appointed to a certain standard was incompetent to teach that standard as it should be taught, then he would be justified in reducing that teacher to a lower standard and getting some one in his or her place.

303. If a teacher is appointed to a certain position with a certain salary, can a headmaster, without any explanation to either a Board or a Committee, take a teacher from that position and place him in a position where he would be obtaining a lower salary?—The Board would hold the headmaster responsible for the management of his school and its proper conduct, and I think it is one of those cases which should be referred by the headmaster to the Inspector; I think the Inspector, under such circumstances, after consulting with the headmaster, should advise what should be done, and whatever was done would be in accordance with the recommendations of the Inspector.

G. T. FANNIN, Secretary to the Hawke's Bay Education Board, examined.

304. *Mr. Davidson.*] If your Board paid salaries according to the scale drawn up by this Commission, do you think that would in any way weaken the control of the Board over its teachers?—I cannot say it would.

305. You know there are thirteen different scales of staffing and thirteen different scales of salaries in the colony, and you know that the inequalities in salaries paid to teachers are very great: do you think, in the interests of education, that these inequalities should exist?—It would depend very much on the circumstances under which teachers are placed—cost of living, and so on.

306. If the conditions of living were equal, do you not think that two men holding similar qualifications and positions should receive a similar rate of pay?—Certainly.

307. Under a uniform scale of staffing and a uniform scale of salary drawn up by this Commission after having visited thirteen education districts, and after having taken evidence, do you think such a scale would be in the interests of education?—I can hardly answer that question.

308. You think, however, that something should be done to remove the present inequalities?—Yes.

309. *Mr. Stewart.*] What building grant did you receive last year?—£4,574, including the special-settlement grant.

310. Did that include £700 for Kaikora?—Yes.

311. Can you tell me what you spent in building last year?—£5,234 7s. 6d.

312. Had you any credit balance to the Building Account at the beginning of the year?—The account was in debit £231 16s. 10d.

313. You had a very considerable sum—something like £1,000—additional for the building fund during that year?—We got from the school fund £835.

314. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Have you compared the suggested scale with the scale that obtains in Hawke's Bay?—The Chairman of the Education Board and myself have gone through it, and my answer would be just the same as his on the matter.

315. In the return that is sent in to the department with the salaries paid, does that include house allowance?—Yes; house allowance, bonus, and everything else.

316. Do you consider that the salaries paid to pupil-teachers are sufficiently high?—As a rule, I think so.

317. Have you any difficulty in getting male pupil-teachers?—Great difficulty.

318. Is the reason that there is so little prospect of getting positions afterwards, or is it the poor salaries that are paid?—No; I think they prefer to go into the bush.

319. What do you think should be the lowest minimum for a male and a female teacher respectively?—I should say, £80 and £100.

320. Do you find in the lowest class of country schools and the lowest class of town schools that females are as efficient as males?—The object in having female teachers in the small schools was that they can teach sewing, whereas a master would have to supply one.

321. Do females get a preference on account of being able to teach sewing?—I should say so.

322. Do you consider that up to a certain limit in the attendance of country schools females can as efficiently conduct that school as can males?—I think so.

323. Do you consider that the increase of salary paid to teachers should be based on each unit of attendance, or should the increase be made by grades?—By the unit; each individual should cause an increase.

324. *Mr. Hill.*] Is there any difference in the payment paid to male and female teachers in the smaller schools?—No.

325. Have not all teachers in Hawke's Bay always been paid an increase for every increase in attendance, both head-teachers and assistants?—Yes.

Miss J. C. BROWN, representing Women Teachers, examined.

Miss Brown: At a meeting of women teachers held in Napier on the 31st May it was resolved that two of their number—Miss Brown, first assistant mistress of the Napier Main School, and Miss Ferguson, assistant mistress of the Taradale School—should bring before the notice of the Commission the way in which the proposed colonial scale of salaries and staff would affect women teachers. The proposed scale claims to “improve the efficiency of the schools by increasing and strengthening the staff.” It is proposed to give an assistant teacher when the average attendance at a school reaches 36, and in a school with an average of over 100 to give an assistant instead of a pupil-teacher. That it would be an advantage to have all classes taught by qualified teachers is beyond question, but with the limited funds available for educational purposes the only way in which the number of assistants can be increased is by cutting down the salaries of almost all the assistant teachers. Though true men and women will not regulate their efforts by the amount of salary received, capable men and women, whose aim it always is to bring to a successful issue whatever they undertake, will naturally seek more remunerative callings. And, again, it would be very undesirable to have the schools staffed by men and women who are not persons of refinement and culture. To lower the salaries is most assuredly to introduce a commoner element into the profession. So far as Hawke's Bay is concerned, teachers have no occasion to complain of the staffing of schools. They work hard, but are not overburdened. It is because they feel that they cannot afford to have their work lessened at their own expense that they are taking this opportunity of objecting to the proposed scale. This applies, of course, to teachers in general; but it is for women in particular that our appeal is made. We think that if a woman is in charge of a small school she should receive the salary that would be paid to a man; but we do not ask that schools with an average attendance of over 65 should be given to women. Though the proposed scale claims to “increase generally the salaries paid to women, especially to those in responsible positions,” there are only three women teachers in Hawke's Bay who would receive any increase. We think that women in charge of departments, whether in small or large schools, should be paid at a rate corresponding to their responsibilities. The children in the lower department earn the capitation just as the bigger ones do, and in schools of up to 200 children fully half, sometimes more, are in the lower department. A mistress in such a school is in charge of more than half the pupils for more than half their school career. This, together with the additional duties devolving upon a mistress of teaching sewing and drill to the girls, caring for their general welfare and behaviour, preparing female pupil-teachers for their sewing examinations, and breaking in pupil-teachers and making them useful, makes the position of any first assistant mistress no sinecure; and yet under the proposed scale such a mistress would receive £95 or £100 a year. This is surely no just acknowledgment of experience and ability. We cannot understand why the salaries paid to female assistants in the larger schools should be so diverse, ranging, as they are proposed to do, from £80 to £140 in the largest school, and from £80 to £120 in schools of 750 to 780. All are class-teachers, and have similar and, as nearly as possible, equal work. Beyond a certain limit, the size of a school does not add to the work of an assistant; why, then, should it add to the salary? We do not consider that £80 a year is a living-wage for any woman away from home. We think it would be more satisfactory if the assistants in the larger schools were classified as first- and second-class assistants, and paid not less than £125 in the first class, and as nearly £100 in the second class as funds will allow. We do not ask that women teachers shall be paid as highly as men; but we do consider that a woman who makes teaching her life-work should have something more than the privilege of knowing that she is conferring a benefit upon the community to repay her for the time and trouble spent in fitting herself to hold a responsible position. One matter of importance has been overlooked in drawing up the colonial scale—viz., a system of promotion and appointment of teachers. While the final selection rests in the hands of School Committees teachers cannot get fair-play. Those who are not known to Committees have but little chance of receiving their support, though they may have done their duty and given satisfaction to the Inspectors. In conclusion, we do not consider the proposed scale confers any benefit upon women teachers.

326. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] Do you not think a lady should be on this Commission: are not women as interested as men in this matter?—Quite as much.

327. Do you not think the mothers of the colony take as much interest in education as the fathers?—Yes, and very often more.

328. Then, do you not think that in a Commission set up to consider this question there might have been a lady included?—I do not see why they should not have had a lady representative on this Commission.

329. You think £80 is not sufficient for a lady teacher?—It is not a living-wage.
330. Do you think that £100 should be the minimum wage?—Yes.
331. What would you fix as the minimum wage for men for similar work?—Up to schools of 65 I think women should get as much as men.
332. It has been contended, as against the equal payment of men and women, that there is a larger percentage of illness among women: is that your experience?—No; I have been teaching for twenty-three years, and have had very little illness.
333. You have not studied the second proposed scale?—It is very much better than the first as far as assistants are concerned.
334. Do you approve of the amended scheme?—I would say it is very much better.
335. In regard to promotions, have you thought out what would be a very good plan?—No.
336. *Mr. Davidson.*] In the first scale did you notice that the term "infant mistress" did not appear for the first female assistant until a school of 250 had been reached: do you consider that the alternative scale is an improvement in that matter?—It takes away from them the position of headmistress, and calls them infant mistress.
337. Between 40 and 50 the female would have to take the infants and Standards I. and II.: do you think it adds to the dignity of the position to call her infant mistress?—I suppose it would.
338. Do you prefer the title "infant mistress" to that of "first assistant"?—I do not think it is a matter of any consequence.
339. Have you ever been in sole charge of a school?—Never.
340. You think that men and women should be paid at the same rate until a school reaches an average attendance of 65. The salary suggested for that class of school ranges from £170 to £185: supposing that that salary obtained in such schools, and the positions were thrown open to either sex, do you think that the salary is sufficient for a man to marry upon?—I suppose a man with a salary of £185 would be able to keep a wife.
341. If those positions were thrown open to both sexes, do you think a School Committee would prefer to take a married man with his wife into the district rather than a single woman—considering that they were equally well qualified?—I could not speak for the Committees on a matter of that sort.
342. You notice that in the first suggested scale the minimum salary for an infant mistress is £80, and that the second scale raises that by £10?—Yes.
343. What is the average attendance at your school at present?—755.
344. And the salary attaching to the position of infant mistress there?—According to the new scale, £180.
345. At present?—At present I get £168; I am one of the three teachers who would be benefited by the new scale.
346. Have you compared the salaries suggested in the alternative with those under the first scheme?—Yes.
347. Did you find the second a great improvement on the first?—Yes.
348. Did you consider the staffing allowed for the various schools?—Yes.
349. Do you think the staffing is sufficient?—Yes.
350. *Mr. Stewart.*] Can you tell me which the lady teachers of Hawke's Bay prefer—the colonial scale, or to remain as at present?—The Hawke's Bay lady teachers are perfectly satisfied with what they get.
351. You have considered this from the point of view of salary?—Yes.
352. How many male pupil-teachers have you in the school?—Three, I think.
353. And how many females?—Six, I think.
354. Have you been long in the Hawke's Bay District?—Twelve years.
355. In considering the suggested scale at your meeting you went into the question of staffing?—Yes.
356. Did you consider it was satisfactory?—Yes.
357. Did you go into the question of equal pay for males and females?—Yes, up to a certain point.
358. Did you consider whether equal pay for males and females would have a good or bad effect on the prospects of female teachers?—I do not see why it should have a bad effect.
359. Did not the position occur to you that if placed on equal terms in competition it would lead to preference being given to males?—We only want equal pay up to a certain size of school.
360. *Mr. Luke.*] Have you read the Minister of Education's annual report?—Yes.
361. Have you noticed that some of the lady teachers in other districts receive not much more than half the salary you receive?—Yes.
362. Do you not think that it is advisable that lady teachers should receive the same salaries for the same work done in each education district?—Yes.
363. Supposing that could not be done except by a colonial scale, do you not think it is advisable that a colonial scale should be formulated and become law as soon as possible?—Yes, so long as it would be to the benefit of all teachers.
364. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Has the question of minimum certificates been discussed by the lady teachers?—No.
365. Were you in the service of the Board at the time the last reduction was made in the way of doing away with the bonus?—Yes.
366. Did the teachers look upon the bonus as part of their salary at the time?—Yes; but we have always understood that there was an "if" in respect to the bonus.
367. And in the event of its being taken away you had no grounds of complaint?—We made no complaint, for we knew it was always subject to the Board having the money.

368. *Mr. Hill.*] What position do you occupy at the present time in the Napier School?—At the present time I suppose I am both headmistress and infant mistress.

369. How long have you been acting as infant mistress?—Since February.

370. If you were called “mistress” would it make any difference to you?—No, I suppose not.

371. You recognise that you can be removed by the headmaster from class to class?—Yes.

372. And the head-teacher has found it necessary to move you from one class to take charge of the infants?—Yes.

373. Did you object to that change?—No.

374. Did you consider it a degradation in being put down?—I did not consider I was being put down.

375. Had you formerly done the same kind of work?—Yes, down South. I was infant-teacher until I came to Napier.

376. Supposing the headmaster put you to a higher class, would you think your status changed?—No.

377. You deem, whatever change the headmaster makes, he makes for the general well-being of the school?—Yes.

378. How many pupils do you think you could efficiently teach in Standard IV.?—I have been able to take 80 with the help of a trainee who assisted me in the work.

379. Do you think you could manage a school of 30?—Yes; I think I could manage a school of 40.

380. For a school of 30 do you think you deserve the same salary as a male would get if in charge of the school?—Certainly.

381. Do you think that the first and second assistant masters and mistresses should be paid more approximately than at the present time?—I think the first assistant master should be well paid. He has to take charge of the school if the headmaster is away.

382. Supposing the headmaster is sick and the first assistant is sick, who would take charge of the work?—I do not know.

383. Do you think that the ladies' salaries should be more approximate?—I do not think there should be such a great difference between them.

384. And do you think the third and fourth assistants should be more approximate?—Yes.

385. *Mr. Weston.*] I suppose all the young lady teachers have discussed the wisdom and propriety of having a colonial scale?—Yes.

386. And they have arrived at a conclusion upon the subject, have they not?—Yes.

387. And you are advocating a colonial scale accordingly, are you not?—I am really advocating that ladies' salaries should not be so much lower.

388. Are you, as lady-teachers' representative, advocating a colonial scale?—No, I did not come to do that. Ladies have no objection to a colonial scale so long as it does not cause the ladies to suffer.

389. All you care about is that the ladies should not suffer?—Yes; I am here to speak on their behalf.

390. So that it does not matter to you what scale there is so long as you receive proper remuneration for the work you perform?—Yes; but all over New Zealand, and not for one district only.

391. Would you have proper remuneration, then, under the colonial scale, or would you leave each Board to frame its own scale?—In that sense the colonial scale would be the better.

392. Then, after all, do you favour a colonial scale—it comes to that, does it not?—Yes.

393. Well, then, if the young ladies in counsel assembled advocate a colonial scale qualified as stated, why do you advocate a colonial scale as distinct from a scale framed by each Board in the colony?—I suppose under a colonial scale all the lady teachers in the colony in the different grades will have equal salaries.

394. Then, do you mean to say that the Boards in the colony will not be just and fair to the young ladies in the apportioning of the salaries?—We are quite satisfied that our Board is just and fair.

395. If you young ladies are satisfied with the conduct of your own Board, why should you think that the young ladies in the other districts are dissatisfied with their Boards?—I suppose we only took the case of the salaries paid under the other Boards.

396. If you are satisfied with the paternal conduct of your own Board, why think that the other Boards in the other parts of the colony will not be just and fair to their lady teachers?—I suppose it is arguing from our own standpoint; if we were under those Boards we would be inclined to petition against it.

397. I suppose you feel, therefore, that you would like to form a union to secure justice all round?—Yes.

398. So far as you are concerned, I apprehend you do not care whether you have a colonial scale or whether you do not?—For ourselves in Hawke's Bay we do not, but for the sake of our sisters elsewhere we do.

399. *The Chairman.*] In your experience, which has been extensive, in this district have you found the male teachers break down at their work?—No. There have been a few cases.

400. Because occasionally a male teacher's health breaks down, do you think they should be prevented from following the teaching profession?—No.

401. Do you think ladies should take charge of the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Standards?—I think they are quite as capable as men of doing so.

402. Do you think male teachers would be anxious to see lady teachers paid inferior salaries if they thought it would be the means of preventing their getting employment, and securing for

the lady teachers employment: do you think male teachers would be anxious to do anything that would turn them out of their present employment, and substitute women in their places?—No, I do not suppose they would.

Miss PHEBE FERGUSON, representing Women Teachers, examined.

403. *Mr. Stewart.*] Which do you think would be best for the lady teachers of the colony—to have thirteen different scales of payment under thirteen different Boards, or one uniform scale of payment for the whole colony?—One scale of payment would be much better.

404. I take it, then, you are in favour of a colonial scale of salaries?—Yes; but I do not think the proposed scale is all that is to be desired.

405. Where are you teaching?—At Taradale.

406. Are you in charge of the school?—No; there are two masters, a mistress, and three pupil-teachers.

407. What is your salary?—£96.

408. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] What is the average attendance?—About 160 for this quarter.

409. Have you noticed how the suggested amended scale would affect a school like yours?—The proposed scale would allow us to keep our assistant master, who under the present scale has got to leave, as the attendance has fallen.

410. Have the lady teachers passed a resolution in favour of the colonial scale?—No; but I think they are all in favour of one.

411. What do you consider is a fair difference between the salaries paid to male and female teachers?—I think men and women can hardly compete with one another. Certain work falls to a woman, and certain work to a man.

412. You consider that where a woman can do the work just as efficiently as a man she should get the same salary?—Yes. In the small schools where the teacher might be either a woman or a man they should get the same salary.

413. Up to what number do you think a female teacher can teach as efficiently as a man?—That depends on the teacher; we thought 65 was a fair number.

414. Is it a fact that females get the preference up to 80?—Sometimes a Committee will prefer a man to a woman.

415. Then, you do not exclude the applications of male teachers for such appointments?—No.

416. *Mr. Hill.*] You approve of the colonial scale as proposed?—No, I do not.

417. Would you prefer the colonial scale to the present system?—I think it is only fair to teachers in all districts that they should receive the same salary for the same work.

418. Throughout the colony, all the lady teachers having a department similar to your own should have equal salaries?—Yes.

419. Supposing, in order to do so, they took £10 from your salary, what would you say then?—If that is the only way of doing it, I am quite willing to make that sacrifice. I would then only get £80, which I do not think is a living-wage.

420. Given the same duties and the same responsibility, you think that the salary should be the same, whether the teacher be male or female?—Yes.

FRIDAY, 14TH JUNE, 1901.

J. D. WATSON, M.A., President of the Hawke's Bay Branch of the New Zealand Educational Institute, examined.

Mr. Watson: I am here in order to represent the Hawke's Bay Branch of the Teachers' Institute, of which I am president. I am not here to represent any particular interest or any particular faction, but the male and female teachers of Hawke's Bay. I was appointed to that position by the largest and most representative gathering of teachers, male and female, ever held, I understand, in Hawke's Bay. I think I should like to say before continuing my statement that we, as teachers, so far as the abstract principle of a colonial scale is concerned, are practically unanimous. We believe that the time has come when the tentative experience of the thirteen Boards of the colony should be gathered into one. We believe that would only be an extension of the principle which has always been adopted in our educational system in New Zealand—namely, making the less developed districts be helped by the more developed ones. Without being either an individualist or a socialist, I think this matter of education should be looked at from the point of view of the solidarity of the nation. The nation is an organism, and whatever affects one of its parts, either for good or evil, must affect the whole, and therefore the burden should be borne by the whole; we believe that is a right principle—a just principle. I might also say, not only on behalf of the teachers of the Hawke's Bay District, but on behalf of the teachers throughout New Zealand generally, that we have been actuated in this matter by no mean or selfish spirit. Although this question relating to salaries has a great social bearing, I believe that the impelling influence behind the whole movement has been not a social one, but an educational one. I believe that strongly and firmly. We knew, of course, that no colonial scale could be adopted that would affect in exactly the same manner financially every individual. Had a colonial scale done so there would have been no need for one. We knew that, even with increased capitation, there would likely occur instances of reduction as well as increases, but we believe that a colonial scale would benefit the great majority of the profession. Every provincial scale has been more or less tentative; each one was introduced to suit a set of circumstances which have more or less passed away. In Hawke's Bay, for example, I believe there may have been a time when it may have suited the circumstances of the district, and may have been a good scale for the time being; but, those circumstances having changed, that time has passed by. When I make the statement that the Hawke's Bay scale is one

of the worst in New Zealand, I do not refer to the fact that the teachers are worse paid in the Hawke's Bay District. I mean that the scale is based on a very bad principle. The tendency of the Hawke's Bay scale has been, and is now, to foster the largest class of schools at the expense of the smaller and medium country schools. In the largest school in Hawke's Bay, I find, referring to the return of 1900, that the Board spent on the largest school £2 15s. 6d. per head.

421. *Mr. Hill.*] Do you mean in salaries?—Yes; and emoluments to teachers, not including extra tuition, such as technical work—or work conducted by Mr. Anderson—I do not refer to that. In Wellington in the same year they conducted their largest school at a cost of £2 4s. 4d., in Auckland the cost was £2 11s. 1d., in Canterbury £2 8s. 9d., in Otago £2 10s. 2d.; so that you will see that Hawke's Bay's largest school is by far the most expensive school in the Colony of New Zealand.

422. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] It is not a medium-sized school?—No; it is the largest class of school. In Hawke's Bay the largest school is about 800 in attendance, sometimes a little over, and sometimes a little under. The point I wish to bring out is this: that, while the largest school in Hawke's Bay is the most expensive of the large schools of the colony, and not the cheapest in the district, the peculiar thing is this: that in every other district the largest school is the cheapest. I find that in Hawke's Bay a school of 300 costs annually £2 13s. 6d., or 2s. less than the largest school. So far as I can see, the instance I have mentioned is the only one of the kind in New Zealand. Under the proposed scale (I mean the amended proposed scale) our largest school (with an attendance of, say, 800) would lose 9s. 5d. per head, and be still better off than Wellington by 1s. 9d.; Auckland would lose 5s. per head; North Canterbury about 2s. 8d. per head; and, so far as I can make out, Otago 4s. 1d. This does not take into account the promised additions to assistants to bring them up to the Otago scale. In schools of 300 in attendance all over New Zealand there would be a gain.

423. *Mr. Hill.*] Do you mean in the cost and maintenance of the schools?—Yes; there would be no loss in schools of 300, especially in connection with the provinces I mention. I may say all these figures are taken from the last return of 1900. In schools of about 300 the gain would be—in Hawke's Bay, 6s. per head; Canterbury, 8s.; Otago, 3s. 5d.; Auckland, 7s.; and Wellington, 11s. Thus you will see Wellington would have the greatest gain. Take another class of schools—schools with an attendance of 100: There would be a gain in all those provinces except in Wellington, and, of course, the gain would be very large in Hawke's Bay, where these schools are very poorly paid.

424. *Mr. Davidson.*] Those are the medium-sized schools?—Yes. I should mention in schools of about 100 in attendance the cost in Hawke's Bay is £3 per head, Wellington, £4 3s. 5d.; Auckland, £3 3s. 3d.; Canterbury, £3 4s. 6d.; Otago, £3 10s. 2d.; while the proposed scale suggests £3 11s. for schools of that size. Therefore you will see that the gain to Hawke's Bay would be 11s., while in Otago it would be only 9d.

425. *The Chairman.*] Wellington would lose?—Yes; 12s. 5d. in those schools occupied by male teachers.

426. *Mr. Hogben.*] Is that on the Wellington scale, or on the Wellington payments?—On the payments according to the return of 1900. In schools of about 30 pupils the Hawke's Bay scale is £4 1s. 11d. In Wellington I could not make out what the payment was from the returns, as there was so much diversity; but some schools of that size (30) receive £6 per head; in Auckland, so far as I can make out, it is £4 7s. 9d. for male teachers. The figures for this class of schools are very uncertain, because it is difficult to understand the returns, there is so much difference between the salaries of male and female teachers in some districts. In Canterbury they spend £4 11s. 8d., and in Otago, which is the highest, £4 16s. 9d. The proposed scale is £4 10s. on these schools for males.

427. You are referring to the alternative scale?—Yes; I think the alternative is higher than in Otago.

428. *Mr. Stewart.*] On what basis do you calculate assistants' salaries?—On the amended scale.

429. How do you arrive at the assistants' salaries in the amended scale?—Where the amended scale says two assistants I looked at the original scale to see what the salaries of those assistants would be, and based my calculation upon that.

430. *Mr. Hill.*] I would like you to give me the proposed cost of the largest class of schools?—£2 6s. 1d. on schools like that of Napier for salaries only.

431. *Mr. Hogben.*] Are you including house allowance in your figures?—Yes; in my figures for Hawke's Bay scale. I have merely given these statistics with the view of proving one thing, and it is this: that in Hawke's Bay the tendency of our scale is to foster the largest class of school at the expense of the smaller and middle classes of schools. I use the word "foster," but I believe I should have used the word "choke," because the educational effect is a bad one. Comparing the amended scale, and taking the assistants' salaries as given in the original scale, with the exception of the infant mistress, in Hawke's Bay only one school in the district would lose, and that is the largest and most expensive school. We have two other schools of about 500 in attendance, and a school of 500 would gain about 1s. 3d. per head. Some of the teachers' salaries on that basis would be reduced, but others would be raised, and an addition to the staff in some instances would be provided. Taking the school of 800 in attendance, which is the normal strength of our school here, and taking its present staff, it gives 55 pupils to each teacher and 80 to each certificated teacher. The first assistant in that school would get £291 5s.; and the master, the head-teacher—this is the point I wish to bring out—in a school with an attendance of 300 in Hawke's Bay would get £253 15s.; this does not include a house. If we allow for a house the salaries would be practically equal; that is to say, that a first assistant in the school here gets as much as a master of a school

of 300 in attendance. Now, contrast the two positions and the requirements necessary for them. If an assistant master in a school of that size has the skill and experience necessary to manage a school of 300, then I say he is not in his right place; he is not needed there; and he should be somewhere else where he is needed. I am also of the opinion that any teacher who remains an assistant in a large school, and who never has charge of a school of his own, never perfectly learns his profession. He may be an excellent teacher, but there is a great distinction between a teacher and a schoolmaster. Contrasting those same two schools again, there are 80 pupils in the large school to each certificated teacher, and in the school of 300 there are only three certificated teachers, with 100 pupils to each. It must also be remembered that in this latter instance there cannot be one teacher for each standard, or anything like it. In the proposed scale the staffing would remain the same for that class of school—that is, the large school in Hawke's Bay—but the 300 school would receive five certificated teachers instead of three, and one pupil-teacher less. I would like to point out some facts relating to the female teachers. A fifth assistant mistress in the Napier school—the last assistant added (she ranks as eighth assistant, the lowest junior assistant—receives a salary of £96 10s., while an assistant mistress in a school with an average attendance of 100 pupils, a mistress who occupies a much more responsible position, only gets £89 10s. The proposed scale would reduce the one to £80, and increase the other to £105, a most equitable principle. The infant mistress in a school of an attendance of 126—and no one can say that that is not a very responsible position—is paid £95 10s., and this junior female assistant in the Napier school gets £1 a year more. There is more to be said in connection with these assistants. If a teacher who finishes her pupil-teachership course and gets a certificate—and it is generally teachers of that class who get appointed to these positions—if she has the "grit," and the strength, and the courage to go out to the back blocks, and to occupy one of these small schools with an average attendance of 20, where the conditions of life are unfavourable and the difficulties (as I have heard them described by Mr. Hill) are tremendous, and to be the centre of light and civilisation for the whole of such a district, that girl gets £90 a year under our present scale, while the lady who elects to stay in town and live among her friends, and walk to school with dry boots, gets £96 10s. for the lowest junior position of the school. In this connection I speak for the female teachers of Hawke's Bay. When such instances as I have pointed out occur under our scale, who can any longer speak of the glories of that scale? We have heard too much about that, and I think there are things here which would prompt me to say that, instead of being a glorious scale, it is an iniquitous one. A third assistant mistress in the Napier school, with two lady teachers and two or three male teachers holding higher positions on the staff, gets £120 a year; but the sole infant mistress in a school of 200 children only gets a salary of £110 15s. The proposed scale would reduce the one to £100, and raise the other to £120.

432. That is the first scale?—Yes.

433. *Mr. Weston.*] Do you approve of that?—Yes; I approve of reducing one in order to raise the other. We look at the educational effect of a just distribution of the money. I find that in Hawke's Bay—I am taking the whole province—the new scale would take something off the salaries of about twenty-four female teachers, so far as I can make out, and it is the junior assistants in the big schools who would lose a little.

434. You have incorporated the alternative scale with the first scale?—Yes; twenty-four females would suffer a reduction, and twenty-six would gain, and the twenty-six who would gain are the sole mistresses of country schools, and the first assistant mistresses of all schools, large and small. In this province, therefore, taking the new scale and comparing it with our own, seventy-four schools would gain, and only one school would lose. Can you wonder, then, that the teachers of Hawke's Bay are in favour of a colonial scale? There seemed to be a little difficulty among the members of the Commission with regard to understanding the position of schools here under 80 in attendance, and I would like to point out this: that in schools under 80 there is a regulation set down that female teachers are preferred. That regulation has for many years, so far as I can see, been a dead-letter—in fact, it is a dead-letter altogether. I have no doubt that in the earlier days of Hawke's Bay, when efficient male teachers were scarce, a good many of those schools were officered by females. At the present moment the tendency in Hawke's Bay is that all schools over 40 in attendance fall to a male teacher, and not a female. I might point out that of schools of that kind, between 40 and 80 in attendance, we have twenty-two at the present time, fourteen of them being controlled by men and eight by women. The certificates of the male teachers are as follows: three B2's, two D1's, four D2's, three D3's, one E2, and one E3. The eight female teachers, with one exception, were put in charge of those schools when the attendance was under 40, and the tendency for these schools is, if they increase above 40, to become officered by males if the present teacher leaves. In the last five or six years I know four or five of these schools occupied by women which have become vacant, and in each case the position was then filled by a male teacher. Now, my case for a colonial scale, in addition to the facts that I have already adduced; is based largely on the Hawke's Bay scale. As a point in favour of the introduction of a colonial scale, I have pointed out that the educational effects of this scale are bad, and that the scale is badly based; and what hope of changing it is there under a parochial system? No hope at all. There are in the Colony of New Zealand 1,492 schools under 150 in attendance, and only 153 over 150 in attendance, so that it is very clear that if teachers' positions generally are to be improved it is the positions of teachers, occupying schools under 150 in attendance. There has been a great deal said about the difficulty of getting male pupil-teachers, but I do not think it is because they are poorly paid. I believe both male and female pupil-teachers are by no means underpaid anywhere. It is not the pay that will attract them into the profession; it is the prospects they will have to look forward to in the future. To induce pupil-teachers to enter the profession by offering them large salaries would have a bad effect, and would draw the wrong class of boys. I think if you do not offer too much you will get boys of more "grit."

Those who enter the profession merely because of the inducement offered them in the way of large salaries at the beginning are not the best candidates. One would imagine that, after I have shown how poorly paid are the country schools in comparison with the large town school, the education in the country schools would be on that account deficient; but it is not so. The educational efficiency is quite as high. I believe the Hawke's Bay District, including every class of school, both large and small, is a most efficient educational district; I think the Commission have already seen evidence of that in our largest school; and I think it is my duty, as representing chiefly the interests of the small schools, to say something in regard to the efficiency of those schools to show the consideration they deserve. In some educational districts, in the case of scholarships, there is a differentiation made in the syllabus for the work of country children and town children. In this district they are all on an equal footing, large and small, so that the results may be compared in order to show the efficiency of the country schools as compared with the efficiency of the town schools. I have taken the scholarship results for the last five years. In 1896, eleven country children were placed among the first twenty, and nine town children; in 1897, ten country children and ten town children, the results being equal; in 1898, nine country children gained positions among the first twenty, and eleven town children; in 1899, there were eight country children and twelve town children; in 1900, there were fifteen country children and five town children. In order to show you that those country children were not represented by simply the schools immediately below the three largest I will give you the returns for last year. Every class of school below 500 is well represented. Two children from a school of 100 in attendance gained positions among the first twenty; two came from a school of 157, two from a school of 159, two from a school of 335, one from a small school of 26 pupils, one from a school of 65, one from a school of 66, one from a school of 116, one from a school of 140, one from a school of 100, one from a school of 290. If you take the number attending these country schools and the number attending the three town schools you will find that last year 9 out of every 1,000 country children attained that position, while in the town 2·8 out of every 1,000 attained it. Those are only the statistics for last year. Taking the average for five years, the figures for the country are fifty-three children, and for the town forty-seven children. Taking an average by a rough method, that gives the advantage on the side of the town. I work it out that the average number is 6·8 for the country out of 1,000, and 5·3 for the town. I think that speaks volumes for the efficiency of the country schools. What I maintain is that, under our present Hawke's Bay scale, that condition of affairs will never be maintained. It has never been produced by that scale, and will never be maintained by it. Unless things are altered the efficiency of the country schools in this district will decidedly deteriorate; that is my firm opinion; and it is those schools we need to try to benefit. I might give you a few more figures in regard to this matter. To raise that number of efficient country pupils it cost in salaries £4,764—that is, for one year. For the three town schools the expense was £5,363; that is to say, the town schools in the matter of scholarships cost £599 more.

435. And for less scholarships?—Yes, that is the very point. I might mention that the country children had a disadvantage, a slight disadvantage; drawing is a subject in the scholarship curriculum that carries about one-eighth of the total marks—100 out of 850. In the town school here they have the advantage of a special teacher in that subject, and yet in spite of this the country schools have been able to hold their own. Now, we country teachers like to see these special advantages to the big schools—we are not at all jealous about it. The influence of it extends to the other schools, and we believe money should be spent in giving these special advantages if it is possible to do so. But if the Hawke's Bay scale was so arranged that the assistance in the town schools were forced to go into the country schools, would not that influence be increased tenfold? That is my contention—I believe that the largest schools in every district should be the training-places for the other schools. There is one subject in connection with the matter of scholarships that I did not mention, and I would like to call the special attention of the Commission to the point. I showed that within the last five years fifty-three country children and forty-seven town children were among the first twenty in the examination for scholarships, but it does not follow that fifty-three country children got scholarships. One would expect that; but it is not the way things are done in Hawke's Bay. I believe the practice of this Board is to give their own scholarships, so far as the money will go, to the highest. A country child needs £30 and a town child £10, and the practice of this Board is to give scholarships to the highest, whether they are from the town or the country. There is, however, another class of scholarships—I refer to the Commissioners—

436. *Mr. Hogben.*] Do you mean the School Commissioners?—Yes; they prefer to give three scholarships at £10 each in the town to one scholarship at £30 in the country. I cannot see that this is on the principle of the greatest good to the greatest number; we know that the greatest benefit to the greatest number would be to encourage the brightest child. It must be some other principle that they act upon, and the only principle that I can see is this: that when £30 goes to the country it brings in a revenue to the High School in Napier of £10 in fees, and if £30 goes to the town it brings in a revenue to the High School of £30. I do not know whether that is the reason, but it seems to me to be the only one. With regard to teachers' certificates, in Hawke's Bay we strongly believe that there should be a classification of teachers and a classification of schools also; if teachers are graded there is no doubt that schools should be also graded, and we are very glad to see that principle recognised in the proposed colonial scale. I do not think we believe it is recognised in the right way; but, be that as it may, we are glad to see that it is recognised in some way. For my own part, I do not believe in penalising a teacher as is proposed in the suggested scale. I do not think it is a good system. I know men of ripe experience and training who perhaps only hold an E certificate, and I do not think it is right that they should be penalised. Instead of penalising, I think it could be done in this way: it could be made a law that in all new

appointments the appointment must be according to grade if the teachers are to be found. That would also break down the provincialism or parochialism which now prevails, and would give teachers a chance of promotion, and that without penalising old teachers. It is not legal now to appoint a non-certificated teacher where a certificated teacher is available, and I should like to see the same principle applied to the grades. That does not commit me to an approval of those grades as they stand, for we do not approve of them. I believe that the whole system of teachers' certificates is far too cumbersome, though there is one principle that needs to be retained. The certificate should embody the two sets of qualification—literary attainment and experience. In Hawke's Bay we believe that the grades of certificates should be reduced very much, certainly to not more than three or four classes. In order to secure the lowest one, no amount of literary attainment should be sufficient, and no amount of experience should give the highest one. What we say is that for the lowest class of certificates a certain amount of literary attainment, *plus* apprenticeship, should be demanded; for the second, more literary attainment, *plus* two years' experience—that is, approved experience; for a third rise, more literary attainment, *plus* more experience and skill; and these to be included in the certificates, and the certificates to be simplified in that direction. I do not say what direction the literary attainments should take, but I would like to point out that it has always proceeded in New Zealand after D, on university lines, and I think that denotes a large conception in our Act that needs development. It shows that the whole education of our country was intended to be co-ordinated, and if you proceed in giving your highest certificates on university lines, eventually, in the course of a few years, I believe the grades of schools and the grades of men would correspond, and you would have the right men ready for schools to be changed into district high schools wherever required. I think secondary education will have to be met in some way like that.

437. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] I take it you generally approve of the scale?—Certainly.

438. We were apt to think that Napier was the happy hunting-ground for teachers?—Napier might be, but Hawke's Bay is not.

439. You are still higher than some of the other education districts?—I did not say we were the lowest in the colony in the point of emolument; I said we were the worst off in the point of inequality in our scale.

440. Have you taken the amount paid in the Marlborough District?—I only took the five districts.

441. You should have said that yours was the worst scale in five-thirteenths of the school districts in New Zealand?—No; because I explained what I meant by worst—not actual salary, but actual salary compared with other salaries in the same district.

442. Do you consider that a third assistant female is equal to the first mistress in a school of 200?—No.

443. Do you not consider that the scale is inequitable to that extent?—Yes; but that was not in the scale I was referring to. That is in the scale that no one has seen.

444. If these two teachers get the same salary, do you think the scale is just?—No; I say the country ones should get more.

445. How much more?—It would be difficult to regulate that without looking into the salaries as a whole.

446. Perhaps £10 or £15 more?—Yes; there should be a distinction.

447. Do you believe in paying on the roll-number, or on the average as at present?—I believe in paying on the roll; the average is not an index of our work.

448. You are responsible for all that are on the roll?—Yes.

449. Do you think the work of a country teacher approaches that of a first assistant in a town school in value or responsibility?—I think the first assistant in a town school has a responsible position, and he ought to get a fair salary; but, considering the amount available for educational purposes, I think he should never get over £250 a year.

450. At what point in a country school would you give the same salary?—A school of 100.

451. If a woman teacher is qualified to teach 100 children, would you give her the same opportunity of securing a school at the same salary?—No; for the salary would be past the living-wage.

452. What difference would you make at that point?—Supposing a man got £200 for teaching that school, and a woman also got £200 for teaching it, the woman would be getting more than the man.

453. You say you would pay up to £250 for a male: what would you pay a female at that point?—About £180, or perhaps less. I am not sure that that is not too big. I believe that £180 is of more value to a woman than £250 to a man. Money is only of use to a person in the way it can satisfy his or her needs; and I say that a woman gets her needs better satisfied with £180 than does a man with £250—that is, on the average.

454. In the case of a woman having her parents to support, might she not then have the same responsibilities as a man?—No; for, in addition to his parents, the man might have a wife and family to support.

455. You would still retain openings in schools up to 100 for women to take headmistress-ships?—No, except under special circumstances.

456. What would the special circumstances be?—The training of girls.

457. You would not make the special circumstances the special qualifications of some women?—There are certainly some women capable; I believe that.

458. If some women are capable, is it not a wrong to them, because some are incapable, that you should debar them from these positions?—No, I do not think so.

459. Do you consider that women should be intrusted with the charge of the Fourth Fifth, and Sixth Standards in the large schools?—I believe the work is rather hard physically—I do not say mentally—for the average female.

460. Would you leave it in the hands of the head-teacher to say?—Yes, entirely.
461. You refer to the heavy charge of the Napier school as contrasted with that of Wellington: would you suggest that the scale of pay in a school like the Napier Main School should be on lines equal to that of Wellington?—No, I would not.
462. Do you not think that the teachers in the school in Wellington you quoted are wretchedly paid in the majority of instances?—I do not object to the pay of the pupil-teachers.
463. Not £20 a year for a pupil-teacher in the fourth year, and having charge of the Second or Third Standard?—Yes; but I am looking at the comparison with what others get.
464. The first assistant, £220?—Compared with the others, that is very good.
465. The second assistant, £150?—Yes; I am satisfied with that.
466. The third assistant, £125?—Yes. I think that scale is more equitable than ours, although I am not prepared to accept every point of it.
467. In point of salaries you would prefer Wellington to Hawke's Bay as a basis for the preparation of the scale?—On this principle: that it seems to give more to those holding responsible positions in comparison with those holding less responsible ones.
468. You have considered the Wellington scale?—Not in its minutiae.
469. You consider that the lack of boys joining is not so much because of the scarcity of boys as owing to the fact that the prospects are not good?—Yes.
470. Do you consider that the colonial scale of staffs and salaries will relieve parochialism?—Yes.
471. Do you think it is essential that Inspectors should be placed under the department?—I think it would be a benefit to put Inspectors under central control in order that every district might get the benefit not of two or three Inspectors, but of all the Inspectors occasionally. I think that would be beneficial to education, and have a widening effect.
472. What functions do you think you would retain for the Board?—I am not prepared to answer that. I have an undeveloped theory of my own that something is needed to take the place of Committees and Boards altogether.
473. Do you not think that the discontent on the part of the teachers is owing to the lack of prospect of promotion?—Yes.
474. Do you think the country teachers, as a rule, are nearly as well considered as the town-school teachers in the rates of pay?—No.
475. And, if a vacancy occurs in a town school, does a country teacher have the same chance of getting it as a teacher in or near the town?—No.
476. Have you thought of a superannuation scheme at all?—I believe in the principle of it.
477. Do you think that out of the salaries contemplated teachers could afford, and would be willing to contribute, something towards a superannuation fund?—I do.
478. Have you too many schools in this district?—No.
479. Can you give us what you think should be the minimum wage paid to a man or woman in a school of, say, 20?—I think the lowest living-wage for a woman should not be less than £80.
480. You think that is sufficient for a woman going out into the back blocks?—No, I do not.
481. You would say £100, then?—Yes, if it is possible.
482. Do you not think she should get it?—Yes; but many people who are getting £300 should get £600 or £700.
483. If you are going to put ladies in these outlandish or ungodly places in the back blocks, do you not think they should get more than £80 a year?—I say, for a woman £90 at the very lowest.
484. And for a man would you make much difference?—No.
485. Say, just roughly, how long you would allow men and women's salaries to run parallel: up to £150?—No; I think I would make a differentiation after £120.
486. *Mr. Davidson.*] What has been your teaching experience?—Twenty-three years.
487. What class of positions have you filled?—First as a pupil-teacher in a school of 300; then at the university for ten years, and during the whole of that time engaged in teaching, sometimes only private teaching, and in the summer months in schools—secondary and elementary; then the two years after that I spent entirely in university coaching; then I have been six years a schoolmaster in New Zealand.
488. In what class of schools have you taught in New Zealand?—I did a good amount of relieving-work. I have had experience only from 150 downwards.
489. What is the average attendance at your school at the present time?—100.
490. You have studied the suggested alternative scale?—Yes.
491. Did you notice that the first assistance suggested to be given is at 40, and that the suggested assistance is a fully qualified teacher: do you approve of that?—I think perhaps it is a little early to give a certificated assistant. I would like to see a scheme arranged under which it would be possible to transfer a pupil-teacher in the third year from a large school to complete her time in a school like that.
492. In schools from 36 to 50, would you be in favour of the assistance being in the form of a pupil-teacher who has had two years' experience in a large school?—Yes; I think it would be better to give assistance of some kind earlier than at 40.
493. Such assistance would not necessitate the alteration of the building?—No. For efficient teaching, even with 40 children and a pupil-teacher, I think two rooms are necessary.
494. Do you not think it is wise that the pupil-teacher should be under the direct supervision of the teacher?—No; I think that a pupil-teacher with some previous experience does better work very often if thrown on her or his own resources.

495. Would it not be too much to expect a pupil-teacher to teach and supervise efficiently the infants, Standards I. and II., with the headmaster not present?—I would not organize in that way.

496. How would you get over the difficulty, then?—The teacher would have to be guided very much by the ability, skill, and experience of the pupil-teacher, and would have to suit the conduct of the school to the condition of the pupil-teacher.

497. But I suppose you admit that a pupil-teacher who has been trained in a large school, and has been merely a class-teacher, or helping a class-teacher, could not go into such a school and take up the work of a room?—I admit that the average pupil-teacher could not do it.

498. It would be better, then, to have the average pupil-teacher in the room along with the head-teacher?—Yes, in many instances; although I believe that schools of that size would be the better, with two rooms for occasional use. There are circumstances in which both would be needed.

499. It would not be absolutely necessary that such schools should have two rooms?—No.

500. You noticed the change in the alternative scale where the pupil-teacher is proposed to be admitted?—At 90.

501. Do you think that is reasonable staffing?—Fairly reasonable.

502. Better than the staffing allowed in most educational districts?—Yes.

503. Much more liberal than Southland, and more liberal than Otago?—Yes.

504. I understood you to say that the salaries of head-teachers in schools of medium size were much lower in Hawke's Bay than in other districts, and much lower than the salaries suggested in this scale?—Yes.

505. I should like to prove what you say. Taking the school at Matawhero, I notice that the headmaster receives £181 13s. : is that the whole of his allowance?—Yes, counting the house. The average attendance is put down at 94; for that number he would get £165 6s. under our scale.

506. Under the suggested scale he would receive a salary of £212?—Yes.

507. Have you compared that salary with the salary paid for a school of a similar size in Otago, for instance?—Yes, but I do not remember the figures.

508. You will find that the Otago scale is very similar to the alternative scale?—Yes.

509. Take the school at Ormond—the average attendance is 76: could you tell me what is the salary, exclusive of house allowance?—The exact salary would be £157 per year.

510. And what would it be under the suggested scale?—£201.

511. Have you noticed that that suggested scale comes very closely to the scale at present paid in Wellington and Otago for the medium-sized class of schools?—Yes.

512. Do you contend that the alternative scale treats the country teachers in medium-sized schools much more fairly?—Yes.

513. And you approve of any scale that brings the salaries of the teachers of medium-sized schools in Hawke's Bay up to those paid in Wellington and Otago?—I do.

514. Did I understand you to say that you would approve of the classification of schools and positions whereby the minimum qualification for certain positions would be stated definitely, and that an applicant not possessing the minimum certificate would be ineligible?—Yes.

515. Have you noticed that such a scheme obtains at the present time in Otago?—I have not noticed that.

516. You have not noticed, for instance, that no teacher in Otago holding a lower certificate than C1 is eligible to apply for the position of headmaster of a district high school?—I knew of that instance.

517. What is your opinion as to the class of school that the average woman is capable of teaching?—Below 40.

518. You know that that is the rule of several Education Boards of the colony at the present time?—Yes.

519. In drawing up any scale, would you not approve of its being made elastic?—I do not think Education Boards or any one else should fix what a teacher has to do. I think a large school should be provided with a staff of such a kind that the male assistants would be available for all the higher standards if the headmaster wanted them.

520. Would you approve of such a proposal as this: that in fairly large schools the assistant after the infant mistress should be a male?—Yes.

521. *Mr. Stewart.*] Where was the first part of your experience gained?—In Scotland.

522. That was where you attended the university?—Yes.

523. Have you had any experience in Scotland of teaching classes of 60, 70, or 80 pupils?—I have had a class of 60, and it might have reached 70. I do not think any class that I was teaching reached 80.

524. Would it be considered a wise thing to have such large classes as 80?—I think it would be considered unwise.

525. If we have such large classes in our schools it should be met with a different method of staffing?—Yes; but I do not think it is possible with the money at the disposal of the Boards.

526. Do you not think, then, that it naturally follows that you want a very able type of man to teach these schools?—I do not think that is so. You need an able type of man to conduct a class of 80, of course. I have taught a class of 60 when I was a pupil-teacher.

527. Entirely by yourself?—Yes; I do not say it was a standard.

528. Do you not think, in schools with such large classes, the qualifications for maintaining discipline, keeping up the tone, and teaching children are somewhat rarely met with in a man?—Yes; but the same thing is applicable to all teaching experiences.

529. Do you think it is as easy to get a man to manage a school of 40 as it is to get a man to manage a class of 80 and maintain its discipline and tone?—I think it is more difficult to get a man to maintain a school of 40 than it would be to get a man to conduct a class of 60.

530. Do you think the difficulty with regard to these scales could be met by differential capitulation, and leaving the Boards to draw up their own scales?—No, I do not think so.

531. Why not?—Because if a Board under these circumstances chose to draw up a scale for a school on a basis that could be proved to be uneducational, even although they spent no more money on the school itself, there would not be the same means of reforming that school under a provincial scale as under a colonial scale.

532. Would it not also be probable that the different Boards, in drawing up these scales, would create as great anomalies as exist at present?—I think that would be so.

533. Do you think that the Commission would be wise in framing a colonial scale without reference to house allowance?—I think it would be very unwise.

534. You are of opinion, I understand from that answer, that where there is no house a house allowance should be granted?—Yes.

535. *Mr. Luke.*] You talk about scholarships regulations being prepared by the Commissioners. School Commissioners, we take it, have charge of school reserves: did you mean School Committees or School Commissioners?—I meant School Commissioners, the men who have charge of school reserves. I referred to the appropriation of money towards the scholarships.

536. *Mr. Hill.*] You think that the scales which have been in operation in Hawke's Bay are not adapted to the present needs of this district?—No, though I believe they may have been in the past.

537. I understand you approve altogether of the adapting of circumstances to the needs of the several districts?—I hardly meant that.

538. Does it not follow that if you believe in adaptation in one way you should try and generalise it by adapting the various scales to the modifying and changing circumstances of the districts?—I believe that the experience of the thirteen Boards for the last twenty-three years is sufficient to enable us to draw up a scale that would meet the needs of the whole of New Zealand.

539. If you find that the proposed scale which has been submitted by the Inspector-General is not adaptive, or does not harmonize with experience, which would you take?—The proposed scale has, I understand, been drawn up by experts, with all the experience before them of the thirteen Boards since the initiation of the Education Act.

540. And if the experience of those experts does not agree with the results as shown by the Education Boards, what then would you suggest: would you agree with the experience of the experts in preference to the experience of the Boards?—Yes.

541. They must have based it on some knowledge of the needs of the education districts?—Yes.

542. You gave us the cost of education in the largest schools in Hawke's Bay, Wellington, Otago, Auckland, and Christchurch. You itemised these, and then told us that the proposed amended scale would give to these schools £2 6s. 1d.: do you know what the average cost of these schools is that you mention?—No.

543. Are you aware that the proposed scale gives £2 6s. 1d., and the average of the others is £2 10s., and therefore in the district the average for these five which you have given is almost as much below the Hawke's Bay scale as the Hawke's Bay scale is above the others? Do you think there is any more reason to doubt the one than there is the other, if right? Do you think the £2 6s. 1d. is likely to produce more efficiency? You know the efficiency of the Main School in Napier: can you guarantee that £2 6s. 1d. will supply more or equal efficiency?—Considering the amount of salaries that is allowed by that £2 6s. 1d., and staffing, I say Yes.

544. You think that—the same standard of efficiency on the £2 6s. 1d. basis—notwithstanding that after the experience of twenty-three years the various Education Boards in New Zealand show that it costs about £2 10s. on the average?—Yes.

545. You object to the cost of the Napier school?—No; I object to the cost of it in comparison with what is spent on other schools.

546. I understood you to say that the first assistant would never get more than £250?—I said he should never get more than £250 when we have a capitulation of £4.

547. You said that the salary of a first assistant should never be more than £250, and that the headmaster of a school of 100 should get a salary equal to that?—Yes.

548. Therefore you do not think that the teachers should get the salaries at present paid?—Yes.

549. You want to reduce town teachers to increase the salaries of country teachers?—That is the principle I want recognised, but I do not want them reduced in order that country teachers may get more.

550. You said in your statement that the headmaster in a school of 100 should be equal to the first assistant in such a school?—Yes; I say that is the principle I wish to see followed out—that the first assistant should rank equal to the headmaster of a school of 100.

551. In order to do this you would bring down the salary of the first assistant to what you think ought to be paid to the master of a school of 100?—Or bring the master of the country school up to the level of the first assistant.

552. Or equalise them?—Yes.

553. You have an assistant mistress in your school?—Yes.

554. How many children is she responsible for under you?—This year she is responsible for 37, and in addition to that she is responsible for the sewing of all the girls in the school, and also, I may say, she is responsible with me for the general conduct of the girls that she does not teach.

555. How many more pupils have you to control than she has?—Some years we may be equal; this year I have about 50. There are 26 besides that are under a pupil-teacher, and I have to control that pupil-teacher.

556. What is the salary of your infant mistress?—£89 10s.
557. What is her classification?—So far as I know, E3 or E4.
558. Do you think that a mistress who is responsible for 30 or 40 children in a small country school should receive the same salary as a woman who is a specialised teacher in a large school?—I would give her more.
559. When a teacher is appointed as a class-teacher, she or he has a certificate: does that certificate imply generalised training or does it not?—It implies generalised training.
560. Does it imply that a teacher has learned how to take charge of a school?—I do not think our certificates would really involve that.
561. Does the certificate imply specialised capacity or generalised capacity?—Generalised capacity perhaps, so far as it implies any capacity at all.
562. When a teacher is appointed, say, to become a class-teacher in the Napier school, does the practice in that large school give generalised capacity or specialised capacity?—I think you misunderstood what I meant when I said generalised. I meant by that that it involved the capacity to a certain extent of doing anything that is required in a school.
563. That is, to take charge of an elementary school: that is why the certificate is issued, you will recognise that?—Yes.
564. When a teacher is in charge of a class it not only implies position generalised, but also position specialised. Now, I am going to ask you, as a special coach for teaching, does the specialised knowledge which you have in that matter give you an advantage over the generalised man—the man with general knowledge, but without experience: is it to your advantage or is it not?—All special experience is to a man's advantage.
565. You think that specialised knowledge should be paid for?—Yes; but I do not admit that the ability to teach a class in a school shows more special knowledge than it does to conduct a smaller school.
566. As to the training of teachers, what do you think: is it a wise course to take a Sixth Standard pupil straight away as a pupil-teacher?—I think it is madness to take a pupil straight from the Sixth Standard.
567. Would you suggest some plan whereby a pupil is trained in the art of school methods?—I think mental preparation is the first preparation necessary.
568. Would you then suggest their going into a school before receiving training in the art of school-work?—I think that to come into the school after matriculation would be a very good way of starting the training.
569. Do you not think it is better to undergo some kind of training in method before coming into the school?—That would be a more ideal method.
570. You do not believe in the plan of classifying teachers as at present?—I believe in some of the principles of it; but it is too complex. I believe that A and B ought to be abolished altogether.
571. Of course, literary training is essential to a teacher's life?—Yes.
572. Then, you would suggest that simply a certificate should be issued?—Yes.
573. Would you suggest that it should be made into three divisions, typifying entrance into the teaching profession, growing in the teaching profession, and the highest scale attained in the teaching profession?—Yes; but I would like to see recognition made of the literary advancement of the teacher, as well as his experience.
574. Do you not think that a man who loves his profession is always learning and educating himself?—Precisely.
575. How would you measure that preparation?—Only by examination.
576. You approve of a colonial scale?—I do.
577. Do you approve of the scale which has been suggested?—Generally, I do.
578. Do you think that the stereotyping of all the schools, varying as they do throughout this colony, could be carried out efficiently?—I do not think that is stereotyping the teachers.
579. Do not the conditions vary throughout New Zealand?—Not much.
580. Sometimes it is necessary to have a modification of the staffing in a school?—Not in a school of the same size. I think, however, that there should be provision for special schools.
581. Should the central authority have power to modify, or should that power be left with the Education Board?—I do not think we could trust the local authority.
582. You could trust the central authority?—In this way: the local authority might go on multiplying expense which would be useful in itself, but which the country could not stand.
583. If you take away the control of the salaries, staffing, and everything, except the small sum of 11s. 3d. for distribution among the Committees, what is the good of Education Boards at all?—I do not know.
584. *Mr. Smith.*] How long have you been in this district?—Seven years.
585. You say you represent the whole of the teachers in the Hawke's Bay District, male and female?—I was appointed to do so.
586. How many members are there belonging to the Institute?—About sixty.
587. Was the meeting at which you were appointed properly called?—Yes.
588. How many were present?—Thirty; which is the largest meeting of the Institute ever held in Hawke's Bay.
589. Was any one else nominated?—Another teacher was appointed to act with me.
590. What certificate do you hold?—B2.
591. *Mr. Weston.*] I think I understood you to say that you considered the allowance under the present and proposed scale alike inadequate?—No, I did not say that.
592. You agree with the proposed scale of staff in all its essentials?—Yes, generally I do; I think it is on a very sound basis.

593. Do you think that the circumstances of the colony might presently change, so as to require a revision of the scale, both in regard to staffs and salaries?—The circumstances of the colony might change in such a way that all the salaries should be increased or diminished, according to the welfare of the country; but if we had a fixed scale everything would be done equally, and there would be no disproportion between one or the other.

594. You do not think the circumstances of the various districts are such as to render necessary either a reduced or increased staff of teachers?—No, I think not; unless under special circumstances, where it was found necessary to train teachers, or have district high schools.

595. You think there may be special circumstances?—Yes.

596. Do you or do you not consider that Boards of Education would deal with such contingencies better than the General Government?—I believe that those matters might be dealt with by Boards, but they should be dealt with apart from the question of a colonial scale of staffing in our ordinary schools.

597. You think that all these circumstances might be considered, and yet we could have a colonial scale of staff?—Yes.

598. With regard to pupil-teachers, do you think that pupil-teachers in your country schools in this district receive sufficient and efficient education?—They do not.

599. In what respect should an improvement be effected?—It should be generally made in the direction of giving them means for mental training, and also in the direction of training them as teachers.

600. Do you think that pupil-teachers' time should be divided in school-hours between teaching and study?—Yes, so long as there is a pupil-teacher system in existence.

601. Do you think that the pupil-teachers trained in our country schools in this district can hereafter expect to stand side by side with children educated subsequent to their pupil-teacher's career in the training-schools of Otago and North Canterbury?—My experience of teachers whom I have known to be trained in Hawke's Bay leads me to say that they are quite on a par with any teachers I have seen in the other districts.

602. What becomes, then, of your argument just now, that they should have more mental training?—I do not mean our pupil-teachers alone; I mean all teachers.

603. You think that the pupil-teachers throughout the colony are deficient in education?—Those who have only gone through the pupil-teacher course.

604. You are evading the question as to whether pupil-teachers trained in our country schools in this district can hereafter expect to stand side by side with children educated, subsequent to their pupil-teachers' career, in the training-schools of Otago and North Canterbury?—The pupil-teachers of this district who have pushed on in the profession have, under great difficulties, taken means to get the training.

605. What means have they resorted to?—They have resorted to paying for it in a great many cases—attending classes; they, of course, receive tuition from the headmasters.

606. What classes do they attend at the present time?—In this town there are pupil-teachers paying fees to—I think—Mr. Gray. I had classes here myself last year, which pupil-teachers attended.

607. I understand, then, from your answer, you must differentiate between people who can afford to pay for tuition and those who cannot afford to pay?—Yes.

608. If you differentiate between those who can and those who cannot afford to pay for tuition, how is this colonial scale of staff to operate in regard to children who have the advantage of money, in order to be properly trained?—The colonial scale of staff only makes provision for teaching in the schools. It makes no provision for training teachers.

609. Quite true, but what I want to get at is this: under existing circumstances, will all the teachers stand on an equal footing to render a scale of staff, and salaries fair, equitable, and righteous between all the teachers of the colony?—I do not admit that they will stand on an equal footing, because there comes the question of classification. Teachers have to get certificates, and certificates involve work.

610. Is it fair, then, to expect teachers in small country schools to be able to obtain good certificates, and, if they cannot obtain them by reason of circumstances, are they to be cast out and receive no employment?—They are not cast out; I differ from you. In New Zealand I do not believe in making things too easy. I say that any young man or any young woman of grit in New Zealand, if they wish to get good opportunities for training themselves, they can find them.

611. How can pupil-teachers in the country schools, without means, expect to secure all the advantages that young men and women in more favourable circumstances are able to secure?—They are not quite so favourably situated, I know.

612. You think that, notwithstanding these matters I have just referred to, a colonial scale of staff and salaries would work fairly, equitably, and righteously throughout the colony?—Yes, I do.

613. Do you think that the management of our schools should remain in the hands of Boards, or would you recommend the abolition of Boards and place everything under the control of the central department in Wellington?—No; I have not studied that question.

614. What do you think in regard to the matter of the removal and promotion of teachers, should be done?—I do not think the conditions at present existing in regard to those matters are satisfactory.

615. And the appointment of teachers also?—Yes.

616. What would you recommend to meet those conditions?—If you had asked me that question a year ago I think I would have said the Board should have the control in the matter of appointment; in fact, I still believe they should have the power of promotion. But I have changed my mind considerably in regard to that point lately, and I think, though they should have the

power of promotion, in no case should that power be exercised without the concurrence and opinions of the Inspectors.

617. Then, you think that the appointments and promotion of teachers should be left with the Boards and Inspectors?—Yes, I think so.

618. Do you approve of the removal of teachers from one school to another when circumstances warrant it?—Yes.

619. How would you effect it?—If the Board, with advice of skilled assistance—of Inspectors—comes to the conclusion that it is for the benefit of education that such changes should be made, they should have the right to make them.

620. Would that not amount to the appointment of teachers being left to the Boards?—Yes; the Boards acting with the Inspectors.

621. You would disregard the Committees altogether?—Not altogether.

622. How would you qualify it?—I would consult Committees, according to the Act, to this extent: that they might state any objection they had to an appointment being made, and that such objection should be considered by the Board.

623. Supposing John Brown, a teacher, does not give satisfaction to a Committee, or has been guilty of some little fault in the conduct of his school which might render a change necessary, and the Board decides to remove him to another school, and to exchange the teachers without the sanction of both Committees: would you recommend that course?—I see great difficulties in a case of that sort.

624. What would you advise me on the point I am now consulting you on?—I think the difficulty would be removed a good deal by fixing a very rigid definition of the duties of Committees.

625. I do not think that is an answer. I want to know what you would do in the matter?—I think the Board should try to meet the Committees in the matter of consultation as far as possible, and if unable to agree the Board should have its own way.

626. You mean the Board should be practically supreme in the appointment of teachers?—Yes.

627. And a Committee should have thrust upon them a teacher, who has, perhaps, been removed from another school in disgrace?—I take it no Board would do anything of that kind, acting on the advice of the Inspector.

628. What do you think of teaching the sexes together in the same standards?—I believe in it.

629. What is your opinion in regard to sick pay and a compassionate allowance?—This Board has been very liberal in that matter, and I think the general principle should be the principle adopted by this Board, which I think is a very fair one, although I cannot give you the exact details.

630. What would you think would be a fair allowance for sick teachers, and a fair compassionate allowance to representatives of deceased teachers?—I cannot see how a compassionate allowance would work; I do not think it could be done very well.

631. Do you think that a man, after serving perhaps twenty years under a Board, and who died in the service of the Board, that his widow and family should not receive any compassionate allowance?—I could not propose any such scheme, though I do not say they should not get a compassionate allowance.

632. Supposing a teacher has been in your service ten years, and then falls ill—perhaps the illness terminates fatally—what consideration do you think the Board should show, and for the purposes of this question we will assume that there are relieving-teachers to take the duties of the sick man off his hands?—I think, in a case of illness of a teacher, the teacher ought to get at least three months' leave of absence on full pay.

633. Have all these points that you have addressed us upon so very ably been considered carefully by the Institute you represent?—Yes, I think so.

634. Was there unanimity in the conclusions they arrived at on the various points?—The main point of the statement I have put before the Commission. When I put that statement in, favouring the position of country teachers as against assistants, it was carried by a majority, though there was not complete unanimity.

635. A majority of how many?—By a majority of one; but it was at a meeting where we could only get a very small representation of country teachers. The meeting was held in Napier, and the country teachers were not able to attend.

636. Is it, in your opinion, the fact that the views you have enunciated and laid before us are the views of all?—The views of the great majority of Hawke's Bay teachers.

637. Assuming the Board was placed in possession of funds to enable it to deal fairly and properly with the teachers, and assuming also that a fair and equitable scale of salaries were framed, would you still need a colonial scale?—I do not think a proper scale is possible without a colonial scale. I think the only means of removing the difficulty is to get a colonial scale.

638. You think that the members of the Commission are more capable of drawing up a colonial scale than any one Board composed of nine men; that, I think, is the point?—I do not think it is the point myself.

639. If you accepted our scale, drawn up by ten men, or the Board's scale, drawn up by nine men, where is the difference?—A colonial scale equalises the conditions for the whole of New Zealand, and puts the expense of education on an equitable basis, while it also provides more elasticity for changes, if they are found necessary.

640. Do you think there would be no elasticity in a scale framed by Boards?—I believe, conscientiously, that the principles of our scale could not possibly be changed—under our parochial system.

641. *The Chairman.*] Do you think the system of primary education in this district is satisfactory and efficient?—I think it is quite as efficient as in any other district in New Zealand.

642. You believe the salaries in this district are in many instances inadequate?—Yes.

643. Do you believe they are generally inadequate, or that special salaries need building up?—Special salaries need building up.

644. What salaries are those that need building up?—The salaries of sole teachers of schools ranging from the bottom of the scale up to schools of 200 or 300 in attendance, and also the salaries of first assistant mistresses.

645. What is the amount paid to a headmaster in this district of a school of about 300 in attendance?—£284.

646. What is your opinion in regard to that salary?—I think it is fairly adequate.

647. There is a house provided as well?—Yes.

648. So that that salary really represents over £300?—Yes,

648A. Do you think it is an adequate salary?—Yes, as things go.

649. You think there should be a difference in the salaries of male and female teachers, after they reach £120 a year?—Yes.

650. Can you give us any idea what the percentage of difference should be: whether it should be on a progressive scale?—I think on a progressive scale; that the percentage should start low, and gradually increase.

651. I think you mentioned that a woman could manage to live on £180 a year as well as a man could on £250 a year; will you explain to my satisfaction what you mean by that?—I mean that salaries are of value to the person just in proportion as they enable the person to satisfy his or her needs; and I think any woman, under our present social system in New Zealand, could satisfy her needs and aspirations more adequately on a salary of £180 than what a man could satisfy his on a salary of £250.

652. Will you inform us what those needs and aspirations are; I want you to define them?—Well, a woman with a salary of £180 a year, if her aim is to save money and provide for old age, or save money and, we will say, go travelling, could save a good deal beyond the cost of living; but a man would not be able to do so on a salary of £180; he has to fulfil his position as a man, must be allowed the means of having a wife, and fulfilling his duties as a member of the State. After providing for a wife and family he would not have much for himself.

653. Must he necessarily have a family?—He must be in a position to provide for one, at all events.

654. If he has a not a family is he a bad subject?—Not necessarily.

655. Does he fulfil his duties to the State, supposing he gets married, and has no family?—Yes, I think so. I do not say it is the duty of every married man to have a family.

656. If he wishes to provide for his old age, is there any necessity for him to get married at all?—There is a necessity to make it possible for him to get married.

657. I want to know where you draw the difference between single men and single women with regard to salary?—I mean to say that our social conditions in this world recognise this difference between the sexes. Our social condition is such that it will be against nature if we do not take into account that provision must be made for the comfortable living of a man, in order that he may have the means to provide for a wife, if he wants one, and a family, should there be one.

658. Do you know whether that phase of the question is generally taken into consideration by employers?—It certainly settles the rate of wages everywhere, and in every kind of employment. Women teachers in New Zealand, for example, are far better paid in comparison with women employed in other walks of life, while male teachers receive less than men in most positions.

659. Do you think one wrong justifies another?—It is not a wrong.

660. But assuming it is?—I have only this to say: People are inspired to work, and inspired to look for positions in order to satisfy their needs; and if women's needs are more cheaply satisfied than men's, then, I think, women get salaries equal to men, even though they are paid less—what I mean to say is, they get an equal value.

661. You think a male teacher is not fully equipped or completed for life until he is a married man with a family?—I did not say anything of the kind.

662. What would you do with bachelor teachers: would you pay them women's wages?—No.

663. Would you pay them the same wages as you would pay to married men?—Yes.

664. Why?—If you are going to mulct teachers in that way, you must do the same thing in other professions.

665. Do you think there should be a special scale for married male teachers and a special scale for unmarried teachers?—No.

666. Then, why do you advocate giving a man 50 per cent. more salary than a woman?—Well, I can only say because a man is a man and a woman is a woman.

667. If you go into an outfitter's shop, do you ask whether the article you wish to purchase is made by female labour or not?—No; but I know if I purchase an article made by female labour it does not cost so much.

668. Do you not think when a man is married he should pay for the privilege—for a home, and wife to sew on his buttons and cook his meals?—Yes, so he does.

669. Then why would you ask the State to make special provision for married men simply because they are performing their duties to the State?—I do not ask that.

670. You say you know of females being appointed to schools of over 40 in attendance?—Yes.

671. Have you heard of any female teachers, since you have been in this district, being appointed to schools with an average attendance of something like 80—schools that were previously in charge of male teachers?—No, I have not.

J. A. SMITH, B.A., Head Master of the Hastings School, examined.

Mr. Smith: I may say that I was elected by the Hawke's Bay Branch of the New Zealand Educational Institute to lay before you resolutions which were passed at a meeting at which myself and my colleague were elected. The resolutions were as follows:—(1.) The Institute affirmed the desirability of a colonial scale. (2.) They approved the scale submitted, with certain exceptions. (3.) They are of opinion that schools should be graded as well as teachers. I do not propose to offer you any opinions of my own, but shall confine myself to these points, and submit to examination.

672. *Mr. Mackenzie.]* Do you agree with what Mr. Watson stated in evidence?—I certainly do not.

673. Why do you not?—As I have not the whole list of his contentions, I cannot speak from memory.

674. Generally, you believe in the alternative scale of salaries that has been submitted by the Inspector-General?—Yes, but I disagree with the proposal to have ladies in charge of the upper standards in large schools—that is, in charge of standards higher than Standard III., for I do not think they are physically fitted for the work.

675. Would you not place the power in the hands of the head-teacher to say whether they are fitted or not?—I do not know that I would.

676. Do not some female teachers do excellent work in the standards?—Yes, but they kill themselves over it.

677. Are there not some women physically strong enough to take charge of the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Standards?—Not for any length of time. I have never seen, in all the years that I have been headmaster, a woman who could take charge of Standard IV.

678. Have you had any experience in South Canterbury or in Otago?—No.

679. Are you aware that women have done the work of the upper standards for years?—Yes.

680. And are you aware that they are still strong and robust women?—I am not aware of that.

681. What size country school would you allow a woman to be headmistress of?—A school with an attendance up to 40 or 45.

682. At what point do you consider the first assistant in a large school and the head-teacher in a country school should be paid the same salary?—The second master of a school like the Napier Boys' School is virtually equal to the headmaster of a country school. I should say the first assistant in a school of 200 should receive the same salary as the headmaster of a country school.

683. What is your opinion in regard to promotion?—When a teacher desires promotion he should apply for positions in such schools as he thinks will be promotion if he gets the appointment.

684. Do you believe in the system of promotion obtaining at present?—Not exactly. I think most Boards interpret the word "consult" too liberally. I do approve of submitting more than one name to a Committee, and if the Committee can give good reasons for the non-appointment of that teacher, another name should be sent in. I strongly disapprove of the Committees making appointments.

685. Do you think that the dissatisfaction existing in the teaching profession at the present time is solely due to the manner in which the funds have been handled by the Education Boards?—No doubt that has a good deal to do with it.

686. And in the matter of promotions also?—Yes.

687. Do you think the central authority would give greater satisfaction with the same money at their disposal?—I cannot say.

688. Are you in favour of Inspectors being under the control of a central department, or being officers of Education Boards?—They should be officers of Boards in so far as their special knowledge and experience should be at the service of the Boards. Otherwise they should be under the control of the central department.

689. The central department should have the power to transfer them from one district to another?—Yes.

690. *Mr. Davidson.]* Are you in favour of the colonial scale of staff and salaries?—Yes.

691. Do you think that it would further educational progress if, instead of thirteen different scales existing in the colony at the present time, we had a uniform scale for the colony?—Yes.

692. Apart altogether from teachers and their salaries, you think that it would be an educational advantage?—Yes, I do.

693. Do you consider where positions are suitable for women, in schools up to an attendance of 40, they should have the opportunity of filling those positions?—Yes.

694. That is to say, out of 1,675 schools, 1,040, or 62 per cent. of the schools, should be thrown open to women?—Yes.

695. Would you pay, in those schools, the same salaries to both men and women?—Yes.

696. Up to 40 in average attendance?—Yes; or up to a salary of, I should say, £100 a year, I should equalise the payments to men and women. As a matter of fact, a man is only beginning life at that stage, and his salary is not of much account.

697. You mean to say that salaries of males and females up to £100 should be equal?—Yes, or thereabouts.

698. Above that you would differentiate in the salaries for the sexes?—Yes.

699. Whether they were doing equal work or not?—Yes.

700. You consider up to £100 a living wage?—Yes.

701. Suppose, as you will find in the alternative scale, that the salary reaches £100 when the average attendance of a school reaches 19, would you pay the sexes equally there?—Yes.

702. After that you would differentiate?—Yes.

703. Do you not think that it would be better for women themselves that there should be a differentiation?—Yes; I think it would be to their advantage. Otherwise they would bring into competition with them a greater number of males.

704. You think if the salaries were equal to both men and women above £100 and the positions were thrown open for competition to the sexes, women would possibly be pushed out of the positions they now occupy?—Yes; that is my opinion.

705. While you do not wish to equalise the salaries of male and female teachers, you would, as far as possible, reduce the disparity?—Yes; that is so.

706. After a salary of £100 had been reached you would make a distinction in the salaries attached to schools having an average attendance up to 40 pupils?—Yes.

707. Do I understand you to say that in large schools, where the Fourth Standard is a heavy one, you think the average woman is physically incapable of managing that standard?—Yes, I am perfectly sure she is.

708. In the small schools, where the standard classes are not so large, a woman might take Standard IV. very well, might she not?—Yes; but it is not altogether the work of the standard. I do not think a woman capable of maintaining the same discipline as a male, and I say the physical strain is altogether too much for her. It is a very extraordinary woman who can manage such a class for one year.

709. Would you not allow some elasticity in drawing up a scale, so that exceptional women might have opportunities of filling such positions if it were thought wise to allow them?—I have already said I do not believe in it. I do not wish to stand in the way of exceptional women being paid fair salaries, but I do not change my opinion in regard to their ability to manage upper standards.

710. You will notice that in schools between 50 and 150 in attendance the salaries attached to that class of schools in Hawke's Bay are lower than in several districts of the colony: do you think these medium-sized schools have too low salaries attached to them?—Yes, I do.

711. You think that the proposed salaries under the alternative scale are fairer than those at present obtaining in Hawke's Bay?—Yes; I thought the head-teachers were getting a rise at the expense of assistants, and I was disposed to oppose the scale, but I have since learned that it is not so. I think the assistants a most deserving class of teachers, and also the head-teachers of the medium-sized schools, and I am of the opinion that they should receive consideration.

712. *Mr. Stewart.*] You are in favour of a colonial scale?—Yes.

713. That implies that you do not agree with the anomalies that at present prevail throughout New Zealand in regard to the teaching profession?—That is so.

714. Do you think there is any other method of dealing with these anomalies other than by a colonial scale?—I cannot think of any other method, though I have not given the matter much thought.

715. It has been suggested that if a differentiated capitation were given Education Boards might frame for themselves a scale which would meet the difficulties at present existing?—Yes, but we should still have thirteen different scales.

716. And consequently, you think, thirteen systems containing anomalies?—Yes.

717. I believe you have been in charge of a large school for some years?—Yes.

718. What is your experience in regard to getting suitable male assistants for responsible positions under you?—I have never had any difficulty in getting suitable male assistants.

719. Which do you think the rarer quality—an assistant teacher capable of managing a large class, or an efficient teacher of a medium-sized school of 45 or 50 in average attendance?—I cannot answer the question, for I have not had any experience in small schools.

720. You would object to giving a woman charge of a large class of 80 or 90 pupils?—Yes.

721. Do you think any teacher, a male or a female, should be put to teach 80 or 90 pupils?—No, I do not.

722. Do you think that any attempt on the part of a teacher to teach 80 or 90 children results in an educational loss to the children, in there being so many in charge of one teacher?—A skilful teacher, with the assistance of a pupil-teacher, in a class of 80 or 90, would be able to make good use of that pupil-teacher, and so obtain good results.

723. Do you think that a male teacher, with the assistance of a pupil-teacher, could really develop the educational powers of 80 or 90 children?—Yes, certainly; though, of course, not so well as if that teacher had only 30 pupils.

724. Then, the State ought to aim at the smaller number being given to the individual teacher?—Yes.

725. Have you any experience as to the comparative length of time in each year that male and female teachers are absent from their duties through sickness?—Women are absent considerably more than men.

726. Your argument, of course, is that a woman is not worth so much as a man?—Yes; it is upon that point that I base my arguments.

727. Do you not think it is sometimes wise for a woman teacher to be put in charge of a large class for a year, say: would it do her any harm?—It might not do her any harm, but it would possibly do the class harm.

728. You think that necessarily follows?—Yes.

729. Does it not sometimes arise in a large school, where you may want a male teacher to do other work, that you have to take him from his work in the upper standards, and you have no other alternative than to place a woman—for the time being, at any rate—in his place?—Yes.

730. You would not tie the hands of the headmaster in the disposal of his staff?—No; I do not see how you could tie his hands.

731. You recognise that such a principle as to tie the hands of a master in the matter of the disposal of his staff would be an extremely bad one?—Yes.

732. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Do you consider that if a colonial scale of salaries is adopted it should take effect, in respect to the salaries of teachers, immediately or by a gradual process, such as when vacancies occur?—Immediately, I think, if it could be done without upsetting the finances.

733. Have you estimated how many teachers would be prejudicially affected in the Hawke's Bay District by the introduction of such a scale?—No, I have not.

734. Are you aware that the great majority of your teachers would benefit, and that very few would be prejudicially affected, by the introduction of this scale?—Yes.

735. With regard to the payment of salaries, do you consider payments should be based on average attendance or on the roll-number?—As far as my experience goes, I should say on average attendance.

736. Have the teachers in this district expressed any opinion otherwise?—No, not to my knowledge.

737. Have they expressed any opinion as to paying on the attendance for the previous quarter or the previous four quarters?—No.

738. What is your opinion as to the working-average of 20 per cent.: do you think it is satisfactory?—The teachers have not expressed any opinion upon it. I think generally they are satisfied with the present system.

739. Do you find that the working-average gives any appreciable relief in this district; and are there many days on which the attendance is less than one-half?—In my own school it does not make much difference. How it affects bush districts I am not prepared to say, but I fancy it would give considerable relief.

740. With regard to the minimum certificates in the proposed scale, do you consider they are too high?—Yes, in some cases.

741. Where would you consider reduction should be made: do you think it should be in the small schools of 14 to 19 in average attendance?—Yes, in the schools carrying the smaller salaries. I think the salaries are low enough without penalising them.

742. You do not favour the reduction of salaries when the minimum certificate is not held?—No, I do not. That was one of the principles I was sent here to approve of—"that position should be paid, and not the teacher."

743. Was any opinion expressed with regard to the proposed reduction of £10 for a sewing-mistress?—Yes.

744. What opinion was expressed?—I received no instruction on the matter, but the general opinion was that the reduction should not be made.

745. Then, it was considered that the appointment of a sewing-mistress is no assistance to a teacher at all?—No.

746. With regard to the work done in town schools and country schools, do you believe in a differentiation of the syllabus for the work required in a small country school and a town school?—Yes; I think the country school should receive some consideration.

747. You do not consider that a lower standard should be expected in the country school in regard to pass-subjects?—No. Other branches might be dealt with a little more leniently.

748. Would a proposal to give a teacher a few alternative subjects as class-subjects in country schools meet with your approval?—Yes.

749. Do you find that teachers in this district when applying for positions in other districts are boycotted?—Yes; they are boycotted absolutely.

750. I suppose this Board retaliates?—This Board did not until recently. We had to educate it up to retaliation.

751. Do you consider that the adoption of a colonial scale, and possibly a regulation making provision for the transfer of teachers from one education district to another, will do away with the parochial system that has grown up?—I really do not know whether it will or whether it will not. I think the thing has become part and parcel of our system, and that it will take a lot of weeding-out.

752. With regard to scholarships, do you understand how it comes about that the School Commissioners have to do with scholarships?—I do not know anything about the matter. They control certain funds which are devoted to scholarships; that is all I know.

753. They do not hand it over to the Board?—No; as far as I understand from Dr. Sidey, it is not so.

754. Do you consider that the salaries of teachers should be increased by units or by grades?—By units.

755. Is that the system in Hawke's Bay?—Yes.

756. Are you in favour of a superannuation scheme or retiring-allowance for teachers?—Yes, I am very much in favour of it. I wish I could see where it was coming from.

757. Do you consider that there are too many pupil-teachers in the service of this Board?—Yes, I do.

758. I suppose you have looked through the Minister's report, which contains the salaries and staffing of schools in the education districts of the colony?—Yes.

759. Do you consider that, taken as a whole, there are too many pupil-teachers employed by the various Boards?—Yes.

760. In looking at the suggested scheme you will see that there are not so many pupil-teachers proposed?—That is so.

761. You have seven pupil-teachers?—Yes.

762. According to the suggested scale, you would only have five pupil-teachers?—Yes.

763. Do you consider that the suggested salaries proposed to be paid to pupil-teachers are sufficient?—I think so. I do not think the pupil-teacher looks so much at the commencing salary as at the prospects open to him when he has completed his term of apprenticeship.

764. With regard to the Board allowance for pupil-teachers when they are away from home, do you consider it is ample?—I have not gone into that question.

765. Do you consider that the provision made in this district for the training of ex-pupil-teachers is a good one?—Yes, I think it is an excellent one.

766. Do you favour the establishment of a training-college in the four chief centres, and also making provision for training institutions such as you have in the smaller centres?—Yes; there should be training institutions for pupil-teachers to go to. We lose good teachers through their going into training-colleges in other centres, and never coming back.

767. Do you consider that the head-teachers should be paid for instruction to pupil-teachers?—Yes, I do.

768. How many hours a day should pupil-teachers for the first year be employed in actual teaching in the schools?—We have employed them for the full hours.

769. By regulation?—Yes, by regulation. The matter for study is one for themselves.

770. Would you favour the substitution of an assistant teacher, where practicable, for two pupil-teachers in a large school?—Yes; I would sooner have an assistant than two pupil-teachers, any time.

771. Would the adoption of a colonial scale like the suggested one interfere very much with the staff of the schools in this district; and will it necessitate additions to the buildings that are already established, or partitioning any of the rooms in those school-buildings?—I do not think so. I do not think it will render additions or partitions necessary.

772. Do you consider the adoption of a colonial scale will in any way minimise the power and influence of Education Boards?—No, I do not.

773. *Mr. Hill.*] I understand you to say you agree with the principle of a colonial scale?—Yes, with the principle of it.

774. You have considered this proposed colonial scale?—Yes.

775. Do you agree with the suggestions proposed in it?—Not all of them. There are several I differ from.

776. Would you explain in what way?—In the first place, the appointment of a certificated assistant, a mistress, is the first addition to the staff in the amended scale when the attendance reaches 40 to 65.

777. You object to that?—Yes.

778. Why?—Because I think a pupil-teacher who has had a couple of years' or three years' training in a large school would, when transferred to a school with an attendance of from 40 to 65, receive very valuable experience at that school before going to a training-college, and would do as good work as a certificated mistress. I do not think a certificated mistress necessary.

779. You think a good deal of money might be saved by that system of classification?—Yes—a system by which pupil-teachers who have had two years in a large school should be transferred to one of these smaller schools before entering a training-college.

780. What salary would you suggest should be paid to that pupil-teacher living away from home—say, a third-year pupil-teacher?—From £60 to £70—the salary that the Board now pays those teachers who are sent as relieving-teachers. They find the salary the Board provides is ample.

781. What other objection have you to the scale?—I was of the opinion that the country schools were being overstaffed at the expense of assistantships in large schools, but I have been informed an amendment is in progress that will alter that.

782. You are aware that we have no evidence as to assistance or anything else in the amended scale after the attendance reaches 330?—Yes; I take it that after that it comes back to the original scale.

783. You approve of the staffing as set forth in the original scale?—Yes.

784. What is the average attendance at your school?—536.

785. I mean for the past year?—Anything from 500 to 550.

786. How many assistants have you at your school?—Five.

787. Under the proposed scale how many would you get?—Seven. I have five now, as I said, and seven pupil-teachers.

788. Your staffing, then, would be increased by the proposed scale?—Yes.

789. Have you estimated the salaries your assistants would get under the scale?—Yes; I have noticed the salaries that are set forth in the scale.

790. Are you satisfied they would be well paid?—Yes.

791. What does your first assistant receive at the present time?—£235.

792. What will he get under the proposed scale?—I cannot say; I understand these scales do not apply now.

793. What does your second assistant receive in way of salary from the Board?—£130.

794. Do you think that your school will be as well staffed?—No, I certainly do not, assuming that the salaries are greatly interfered with.

795. Do you think your school will be as efficiently staffed as it is now if the salaries under the proposed scale obtain?—No.

796. Have you any other objection to the proposed scale?—No.

797. Do you approve of the principle of classification as set forth in the proposed scale?—I do not approve of the principle of a teacher being penalised for not holding a sufficiently high certificate.

798. Do you approve of the present classification of teachers?—No; I think it is too cumbersome.

799. Do you think it is necessary in a colonial scheme of payment of salaries?—Yes, I think so, in the matter of making appointments.

800. Does it follow that because a man holds a D1 certificate he is better than a man holding a D2 certificate?—Yes, I think so.

801. You think D2 men inferior to D1 men in every way?—Yes, in ninety cases out of a hundred.

802. You think that in placing a requirement for a position it should be insisted upon?—I do not think that it follows. I say that the certificate should be retained as a guide to the appointing body.

803. Would it not be possible to appoint on the certificates before them?—If they are exactly on the same dead-level I think the appointing body would be at a disadvantage.

804. You suggest that a woman should get the same salary as a man up to an average attendance of 20?—Yes.

805. Would you approve of the same salary being paid to men and women in classes up to 30 in attendance?—I do not know that I should make any rigid demarcation about that.

806. I should like to know if you would suggest that they should get the same salary?—I do not know that I care to contradict my previous evidence.

807. *Mr. Lethbridge.*] At what time do you think a sole teacher should get assistance?—I think the assistance should be at the same average as now. I would not alter that. I would give a partly trained pupil-teacher instead of a mistress.

808. *Mr. Weston.*] A lawyer, after he has passed his examination, obtains his certificate to enable him to practise; a doctor likewise; and the doctor and lawyer take their chance of getting business: do you not think that a teacher, when he passes his examination and is licensed, should take his chance, and therefore render future certificates unnecessary?—No, I do not think the cases are on all-fours.

809. You do not think that a teacher, after being once licensed, could safely rely on his credentials as time went on?—No; I do not see where these credentials are to come from.

810. From Inspectors, teachers, and Boards?—No; I think that if they were crystallized in a higher certificate they would be of more worth to him.

811. Is it not natural with this district, as with North Canterbury, Wellington, and the other districts in the colony, that in the matter of vacancies Boards would rather appoint their own men than go out of the district?—They do so.

812. Why say, then, that the teachers are boycotted?—If they prefer their own to an outsider.

813. "Boycott" suggests that an undue practice is adopted: is the practice that now obtains in the various districts unjust, unfair, and wicked?—I do not know about wicked, but I think it is unfair and unjust.

814. And therefore people should ignore the pupil-teachers they have brought up in their districts and go outside for teachers?—No, it does not follow.

815. Then, why say they are boycotted?—Because in filling up a position of some value and emolument a better teacher from outside, and better certificated, will be set aside for an inferior teacher in the district who had sufficient influence.

816. Have you known cases where a district has gone out of its way to elect inferior teachers when teachers of better qualities from outside could have been obtained?—I could not give you instances, because I have not kept a record; but there are instances.

817. They would be few and far between?—No; as a matter of fact, teachers have practically left off applying for positions outside their own district.

818. Because Boards prefer teachers they have trained themselves to teachers they do not know?—Yes.

819. Is that not natural?—It might be.

820. Then, you are not justified in using that extravagant term "boycotting"?—The term is possibly too strong, but it was not I who used the term. It was put to me, and I merely replied to it. I noticed it at the time, but did not care to object.

821. Do you consider, with pupil-teachers teaching as they do all day, that the children in the schools receive the education they ought to get within those walls?—I do not think pupil-teachers have a great deal to do with the education of children, at any rate, until towards the end of their apprenticeship.

822. But they do work, and I presume what they do is accepted by the teacher?—Yes.

823. I presume it is impossible for a teacher to examine minutely the work a pupil-teacher does?—No; but the work of a pupil-teacher does not require much examination.

824. Do you think it is right that the babies and the First Class should be intrusted to pupil-teachers?—It is not unjust, if the pupil-teacher is nearly at the end of her apprenticeship.

825. Then, anything less than that would be unfair to the children?—Yes.

826. Do you think that justice can be done to pupil-teachers when they are employed all day long in teaching?—I know their life is a very hard one.

827. Is that doing justice to them?—No.

828. If a good class of teachers is to be trained, should not the pupil-teachers have their time divided between teaching and learning?—That is the best system, if it can be done.

829. How could it not be done?—It would want a duplicate set of pupil-teachers.

830. Apart from the question of money, you think it should be done?—Yes.

831. With a colonial scale of salaries, would it not be necessary that the pupil-teacher's time should be divided between teaching and learning?—I do not think that follows, because you have not an ideal system in other parts of the profession.

832. You do not want to work to a good standard?—Yes.

833. If pupil-teachers have not been properly taught, how can they stand side by side with teachers who have been properly taught?—I do not know of any part of the colony that gives them that course of study—half a day's work and half a day's learning.

834. Is it not right and proper that it should be done?—Yes.
835. When there is no training establishment in any district, is it not the more necessary that the pupil-teacher's time should be divided between teaching and learning?—I do not know that it is essential; it is desirable, perhaps, but everything that is desirable is not essential.
836. Will you be good enough to tell me which is the hardest class of school for a teacher to teach?—I do not know. I have not had experience in every class of school.
837. Are you able to say whether a man or woman conducting a standard has an easier task than the man who has all the standards in, say, a school of 40?—I consider the man who has charge of the standard has the heavier work. The man with all the standards may have more worry, but he has not the same physical strain.
838. How many do you think there should be in a class?—60.
839. Which man has the greatest and most irksome duty—the man with 60 in his class, or the sole teacher of a school having all the standards?—The man with a school of 40; but he has not the hardest task. It does not impose the same physical strain as does a large class.
840. If more wearisome, it must be more trying to the constitution and the nervous energy?—I do not know; but teachers who have gone from a large class to a small school do not, as a rule, complain of the extra work.
841. Do you think that scholarships in our primary schools should be increased in number?—Yes; as much as is it possible to afford.
842. Do you think, then, that the children taking the scholarships and entering the secondary schools would be better fitted to become teachers in our primary schools?—Yes.
843. Do you think that pupils from the secondary schools should require technical knowledge in a training-school, or elsewhere?—I should say, first in the primary school, and after that in the training-school.
844. You do not think that would take up too many years of their life?—No; as a matter of fact, the great majority of them follow that course now.
845. You have a young lady by the name of Hannah Percy?—We have her successor.
846. What salary is she getting—£149 10s. 6d.?—Yes.
847. Are there any other licentiates?—No. She was a very old servant of the Board, and very skilful, and the Board never insisted on her going up for a certificate.
848. Then, there is another at Wainui: do you approve of those licentiates being in the service?—That licentiate is a man, and came out from Home. I have no opinion to offer as to the principle.
849. Do you think that the power of appointing, transferring, and dismissing should be left entirely with the Board?—I think appointing should be in the hands of the Board, but not transferring.
850. Then, you think that the Committee should not be considered?—Yes, if they have information which the Board has not; but I would not leave either the appointment or the selection of a teacher in the hands of the Committee.
851. *Mr. Hogben.*] Would your first male assistant be reduced in salary if he received the same as he would under the Otago scale—£240 per annum?—No; practically he would be unchanged.
852. Would your second assistant be reduced if he received £175 per annum?—No; he would get a very substantial rise.
853. If your mistress were to get £155 would she gain?—Yes; she gets £149 now.
854. Do you consider that the proportion of pupil-teachers to adult teachers in Hawke's Bay is rather large?—Yes.
855. In a school of 205 how many adult teachers are there under the Hawke's Bay scale?—Three.
856. That gives an average of 68·3 pupils per adult teacher?—Yes.
857. Under the proposed alternative scale, take a school of 225, how many adult teachers would there be?—Four.
858. That is an average of 56·25?—Yes.
859. Take a school of 425, how many adult teachers are given by the Hawke's Bay scale?—Five.
860. That is an average of 85 pupils per adult teacher?—Yes.
861. In a school of 450 under the proposed scale how many adult teachers are allowed?—Seven.
862. That gives 64 pupils per adult teacher?—Yes.
863. Under the Hawke's Bay scale how many adult teachers are there in a school of 530?—Six.
864. That will give an average of a little over 88 pupils per adult?—Yes.
865. Take a school of 540 under the proposed scale, how many adult teachers will be allowed?—Eight.
866. That would be 67·4 pupils per adult teacher?—Yes.
867. In a school of 775 how many adult teachers are allowed by the Hawke's Bay scale?—Nine.
868. That is an average of 86 per adult teacher?—Yes.
869. Under the proposed scale what would be the allowance of teachers for a school of 760?—Ten.
870. That would be an average of 76 per adult teacher?—Yes.
871. *The Chairman.*] Are you in favour of a colonial scale?—Yes.
872. Do you think that if the salaries of the two sexes were made equal women would be likely to be pushed out of the medium-sized schools?—I think so.

873. If the salaries are made grossly unequal there is a danger of the men being pushed out?—Yes; provided you reduce below the level of other markets. It is purely a case of market in both sexes.

874. Are you in a position to say that when good vacancies occur in other districts in New Zealand a large number of applications do not travel from outside?—Applications may travel, but the persons who make them rarely travel. I will put it this way: the number of applications is greatly reduced from what it would be if the vacancies were thrown open to the whole of the colony.

875. If that is an injustice that teachers are suffering from, are you of opinion that appointments should be left to the Boards?—Yes.

876. Do you not think that one result of the colonial scale will be to take away the power of appointments from the Boards and place it in the hands of the department?—It might be like jumping out of the frying-pan into the fire.

877. Might it not make your position worse than it is?—It might.

878. You do not think a teacher should be a Civil servant?—I do not. I am not aspiring to be a Civil servant by any means.

879. But I think you said you were of opinion that the Inspectors should be under the control of the department?—Yes, so long as their special knowledge and skill is at the service of the Board they are with for the time being.

880. What benefit would be derived from that?—You get a change of Inspector, and there is not so much danger of getting into one man's groove.

881. Do you think that a change of Inspectors would be a benefit to this district?—No; I am afraid that other districts would get the benefit.

882. Then, you are asking for a thing that would be to your detriment?—Only for the time being.

883. Would it not be unpleasant for the district?—No, I do not think so. I think the Inspector would be the chief sufferer.

884. Then, you think that a man who comes fresh to the district would be in a better position to judge of the abilities of the teachers, and improve the method of conducting their schools, than a man stationed in the district for a number of years?—He would be entirely free from prejudice, and be able to judge a school without judging the teacher altogether. Of course, he would not have the same power of comparison as the man who had examined the school year by year.

J. C. WESTALL, Member of the Hawke's Bay Education Board, examined.

Mr. Westall: I am a member of the Hawke's Bay Education Board, and was formerly a teacher under the Board. With your permission I should like to make a few remarks on the status of the Board here. I should like to say that, as far as I am aware, the teachers and the members of the Board have been, and still are, and I hope in increasing ratio will be, a happy family. I think I am warranted in saying that I have personal grounds for stating that the Teachers' Institute are on good terms with the Board, and they recognise our desire to do our duty to the teachers; and we recognise the teachers' desire to do their duty to the Board. I think it has been understood hitherto that the scale of the Board has been a fair scale of payment. When I was a teacher under the Board I found out that the salary of the middle-sized schools was small, but I think you will find that the payments of the Board on our basis are very fair and very equitable—in fact, the salaries in some respects are high. But what I wanted to point out is this: If you tot up the cost of education per head of two or three schools in different districts, and make that a basis of comparative payment, you will land yourselves in a hole, because it entirely depends on the staffing of the school. The staffing being different, the cost of education cannot be estimated in that way. The question of town and country schools is a very vexed question indeed, and it is the opinion of the Board that our people below £175 were not getting a large enough salary; and when the proposed addition was granted by the Government recently, we decided that the entire amount of the increased capitation was to go to help those teachers whose salaries were below £175, and we acted on that principle and allotted the payments on that scale, and made a recommendation to the Government—a recommendation which has not been complied with, because the department had its own method of allotting it. With regard to transferring from the general fund to the building fund, I thought before I came on to the Board that something was wrong in the process; but after looking at the Education Act, and finding out how the Board's funds were allowed to be diverted, I was perfectly convinced that our position was thoroughly sound in that matter. It is our duty to find money for the school-buildings, and to keep these buildings in repair; and it is just as much our duty to do that as to pay the teachers. The only question that arises is one of adjustment. If you will look at our balance-sheet you will find that our entire capitation grant and the balance is required every year to keep things going; and if we had not had a balance from the previous year, which had been acquired in more fortunate times, we should have been bankrupt long ago. I do not agree with Dr. Sidey that it would have been necessary to reduce salaries, but I do say that our balance is a diminishing quantity; and since I came on the Board I have been impressed with the cost of running the schools in the district and keeping them in repair. Under our regulations small schools under 80 are supposed to be taken by a female, but the evidence given before would lead one to suppose that that is now a dead-letter, and that we are putting men into those schools, to the disadvantage of the ladies. As a matter of fact, the thing is the other way. Masters have put themselves into this position because they are glad to go in and take this class of school, even though they have to pay a sewing-mistress to teach the sewing. I should like to say, with regard to scholarship results, that I look on the ordinary scholarship examination as a very desirable thing, but not essential to a child's education; and I cannot even agree that, although a teacher might have a

good scholarship result one year, he must necessarily have a school in a very efficient state, or have a first-class school. The gaining of scholarships is the result of individual painstaking on the part of the pupil, and self-devotion on the part of the teacher, but is not a test of school efficiency. If you look at the number of children over the whole district who do get scholarships it is, of course, infinitesimal.

885. *Mr. Davidson.*] Are you in favour of a colonial scale of salaries and staffing?—I do not think I am qualified to give an opinion on the question of staffing; but, with regard to the scale of salaries, I should be more in favour of seeing a minimum or compulsory wage laid down, and the Boards to be allowed to increase the payments on that minimum as they thought fit.

886. Are you aware that great dissatisfaction exists in different parts of the colony amongst teachers?—I have reason to suppose that such is the case, but we do not hear anything of it in our Board.

887. As a former teacher, you are aware that very great inequalities exist in the rates of salaries in the various districts?—That is so.

888. Do you not think that the existence of these inequalities would be likely to cause dissatisfaction?—Of course, it appears to me that if a teacher was dissatisfied with the payment of his own particular district he would endeavour to get out of that district into another.

889. You know, I suppose, that it is very difficult for a teacher in one district to get into another district under present conditions?—I have every reason to suppose that that is so.

890. If the salaries in a particular district are higher than those paid to similar positions in other districts, do you not think it is natural for the best teachers to gravitate to the districts where the highest rates of salary are paid?—Yes; but, owing to the difficulty there is in getting into that district, the higher salaries simply operate for the teachers in that district.

891. Do you not think it is fair that in a national system of education equal rates of salary throughout the colony should obtain?—I am bound to agree with you.

892. Having a uniform system of classification of teachers and a uniform syllabus, do you not think it would be in the interests of education that we should have a uniform rate of pay?—I do not see why you should not make up the funds of the Boards to enable them to pay a minimum living-wage, and make up the rest out of capitation.

893. The main object of a uniform salary is to abolish the inequalities that at present exist?—I suppose that is so.

894. Could you explain any system other than a uniform scale of salary that would have that effect?—It seems to me that the great idea is to avoid interfering as much as possible with the functions of the Board. Let the Board still be responsible to the department for the management of the capitation grant, but fix a minimum wage at such intervals as you decide on, and let the Boards do the best they can as far as funds afford.

895. Do you think, if Boards were paid on a scale drawn up by this Commission, and that they received the money from the department and paid it to their teachers, that would in any way weaken the authority of the Board over its teachers?—If you put it that the Boards were to be instructed that they were to pay certain salaries for certain positions, and they were to pay out the money forwarded from the department, you would put the Boards in the position of a bank who simply had to pay out cheques. You might as well pay them cheques direct from the department. You would get uniformity in that way.

896. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Do you consider it would be preferable to give the extra capitation to the Boards, and allow them to draw up their own scale of staffs and salaries?—I am not quite sure that it would. I think you have got the chance now of fixing a minimum wage, and it would be a good thing to fix it once and for all.

897. Were you a member of the Institute when a teacher?—Yes.

898. Did these matters come before the Institute, and were they discussed at that time?—I really do not remember. The meetings were held at intervals, and the attendance was very small. I did not take any great interest in it.

899. Anyhow, you feel inclined to take the side of the Education Boards?—No; I would stick out for the right.

900. You think the Education Boards are generally right?—I think it is better to have some organization than none at all. I cannot see what is to supplant the Boards.

901. Have we any guarantee that the other twelve Boards would do the same as your Board would do in the matter of increasing the lower salaries?—I cannot say.

902. Then, there is no chance of uniformity?—It does not look like it.

903. *Mr. Hill.*] Do you think it would be possible for the Hawke's Bay Education Board to give the salaries that are proposed in the scale on a capitation basis of £4?—I cannot say; I have not gone into it.

904. You obtained your certificate in this district?—Yes.

905. Did you find any difficulty in obtaining a situation in this district?—I was first appointed as *locum tenens* at a school. After I left I got a license to teach, and then passed the matriculation examination; that gave me D, and I was appointed to a school again. I remained there for eleven years, during which time I raised myself to B1. I repeatedly tried to get into other districts, but could not; and when I left, my salary was less than when I went there.

906. The Board did not put any restriction on you getting another school?—No; but I could not get it.

907. Do you agree that the only direction in which a colonial scale should go should be the fixing of a minimum wage?—Yes; only you are going to have a system of classification right through.

908. Would you have grading?—Yes.

909. According to what?—According to time of service, and Inspector's reports or marks.

910. Do you agree with the present method of issuing certificates?—No; it is absurd. The certificates are useless for showing anything more than university status.

911. Do you think a different plan should be adopted in the method of classifying teachers?—Unquestionably.

912. *Mr. Weston.*] I understand you would leave the assessing and allocation of salaries in the hands of the Board, but that there should be some statutory enactment, or some Government regulation made, whereby the minimum salary should, under any circumstances, be fixed?—Yes; in conjunction with the department being compelled to pay to the Boards sufficient to pay this minimum salary.

913. *The Chairman.*] In your opinion, are the teachers of this district fairly well paid?—Fairly well paid in the larger schools; but in some of the smaller schools they are not fairly paid.

914. If the salaries are inadequate for certain schools, with whom does the fault lie?—I think it lies outside the classification. It lies in one way with the people content to take the lower salary; and in another way with the Government, who will not give a higher salary.

915. The fault is not in the distribution by the Board?—I think there is fault there; it might be better distributed.

916. When vacancies occur in your district have you much difficulty in obtaining teachers?—No. We have no difficulty whatever in obtaining teachers for the better class of schools, but we have for the back-block schools up-country.

917. Where the salaries are good there is plenty of competition?—Yes. It is entirely a question of salary.

JAMES HISLOP, Assistant Master of the Napier Boys' School, examined.

Mr. Hislop: I am here to represent the male assistants in this district. I may state at the beginning that any calculations I have made are based on the report for 1899, and also upon the first scheme submitted by the Inspector-General. I am informed that under the alternative scheme the assistant teachers have been provided for, and will not suffer the reduction that was first proposed, so that certain remarks I make will perhaps, in that respect, require qualification, for when our statement was prepared we had no idea of any alternate scheme. According to the 1899 report and basing our calculations upon it, we find that in Hawke's Bay twelve male assistants would stand to lose £391 2s., or on the average £32 11s. 10d., the losses varying from £19 8s. to £61 5s. In the Napier school alone, two assistants, including a female teacher, would gain £34 5s., but the remaining six assistants would lose £170 in the aggregate, and there would be a total loss in the salary in the school of £288, including the salary of the headmaster. Throughout the district six male assistants would gain a total of £79 15s.—or rather male and female assistants—and forty-one would lose a total of £737—that is to say, out of a total of forty-seven assistants only six will be benefited, while forty-one will suffer reduction. As I pointed out, twelve male assistants lose a total of £391 2s., but why should these assistants have to suffer reduction? In the past many Education Boards, evidently recognising the importance of the assistants' positions have offered very fair salaries to their assistants, and good men and women have been attracted to these positions. Now, however, they are told that the Boards have been mistaken, and that the positions they occupy and the work they do are not worth the salaries paid. This will come as a very great hardship to the assistants, the male assistants particularly, for, as I said, I speak on their behalf. They are brought face to face with retrenchment, the retrenchment being in some cases very great, the greatest amount being £61 5s., and that through no fault of their own; whereas had they not been attracted to these positions, they would probably now be holding headmasterships of fair-sized schools with the prospect of an increase in salary; and, as compared with what they will now receive as assistants, a very considerable increase. Let us take, for the sake of comparison, the position of an assistant master in a school with an attendance of 750 to 780, and that of the headmaster of a country school of, say, 150 of an average attendance—take the Havelock School, which I believe last quarter had an attendance of 147. The assistant master in the large school would receive £230 per annum, fixed. From this he would have to deduct £50 for house rent, leaving a net balance of £180. I make the deduction for rent in order to get a proper comparison, as most country schools have a teacher's residence attached. £180 is certainly not a very munificent sum for a teacher who would occupy such an important position as that of first assistant in one of the largest schools in the colony. There are five having more than 750 in attendance, according to the 1899 report. On the other hand, the headmaster of the country school would receive £219 or £237, according to the alternative scale, with a rise of 6s. or 8s. per head, and, as well, he would have a house, rent-free, receiving thus £29 or £57 more than the assistant, although he does not occupy such an important relative position. Added to this is the fact that living is cheaper in the country than in the town. I have in my mind also the case of a school of an attendance of 91, where the headmaster, according to the alternative scheme, would receive £210 and his house, and would be placed on a better footing than the assistant master of a large school. Instances have occurred in our own district where both male and female teachers have found the work in towns very heavy; they state there is no comparison between the work in the country and the work in the towns, and they were not willing to go back to the towns. I would like to compare the work in the schools I instanced: In the small school the headmaster would have two assistants and a pupil-teacher to help him; probably a little energy would raise his average to 151, and he would get another pupil-teacher, while in large schools assistants usually have from 70 to 120 pupils in the upper standards, and surely this work is heavier than that of the work of the headmaster of a small school, who probably has charge of Standards IV., V., and VI., numbering between 30 and 40 pupils. Even under present conditions many masters of country schools seem quite satisfied to remain where they are, even when a chance of increased

salary in a position in town is offered. They are convinced, I suppose, that, if they did get higher salaries, they would have to work harder, and so they preferred to remain where they were. If there is any reduction in assistants' salaries it will have the tendency to make the assistants leave the town schools for the headmasterships of country schools. The positions of assistants in large schools will thus become, in a sense, filled only temporarily. Assistants in the large schools will be juniors—men of lower grade certificates, and men of least experience—or probably men who will not be accepted for other positions. As soon as these juniors have had a little experience they will aspire to easier work and a higher salary, and so the changes will go on. In the past these positions have been filled by men of high and varied qualifications and long experience, presumably on account of the importance of the work. Men of experience are required, again, because children in towns require more managing than country children. The constant changes I have referred to, thus caused, and the less experience in the teachers in large schools cannot fail to be most prejudicial to good work. Account must be taken of the fact that the assistants have to pass through their hands a very large number of children—that is, they have practically the shaping of their future lives, the training of our future citizens, our future law-makers. In Hawke's Bay twelve male assistants have to assist in moulding the minds of 3,097 pupils out of 6,329, or, excluding the training-school, which is on a somewhat different footing, 6,113. According to the proposed scale No. 1 there has to be a very considerable increase in the attendance before there is any increase in salary. First assistant, 570 to 660, 660 to 750, 750 to 840; second assistant, 600 to 690, 690 to 780, 780 to 930. Now, I think, in all large schools the work of the assistants certainly does increase as the average attendance increases, and therefore there should be a sliding scale on a different basis. There is another point that has attracted considerable attention for some years—namely, the difficulty of getting boys to enter the profession. I, myself, know of a fair number of youths who have entered the profession, but soon found that a teacher's life was not such an easy one as they imagined, and that they were not likely to make their fortunes if they remained teachers. They are now in good positions in commercial life, earning better salaries than they were likely to have obtained as teachers; and I am sure have not the worries they would have had, if they had continued in our profession. In conclusion, I should like to state the staffing—or I should rather say the average number of pupils per teacher in the Napier school as giving an idea of the amount of work that the assistants in large schools have to perform. Our present staff is a headmaster, nine assistants—counting two juniors who fill one position—and nine pupil-teachers, making a total of nineteen. The average attendance is 778, and, according to what I have seen of the second scale, there will be a total of eighteen teachers, with an average of 41.6 pupils per teacher; if the pupil-teachers are left out of consideration, according to the second scale, there will be ten adult teachers, with an average for each teacher of 77.8 pupils.

918. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] You say that your experience is that teachers, after going to country schools from town schools, do not care to return and take up positions in the town schools?—That is so.

919. Suppose a vacancy is advertised in a town school at a salary of £80 a year, how many applications will you get for that position?—I am not in a position to judge—the applications go to the Board.

920. Suppose a vacancy in a country school at the same salary—£80 a year—was advertised, do you think there would be as many applications for that position as for the town position?—I cannot say; I am not in a position to judge.

921. Do you mean to tell me that a teacher occupying the position you do, and after the statement you made in regard to the relative positions, that you cannot say whether the number of applications would be greater in one case than another?—As far as I know, the applications are on an equality.

922. Do you not think that country teachers are very anxious to get into the towns in order to improve themselves in their studies, and, if they are married, in order to give their children better prospects of advancement?—Some of them, no doubt, may be.

923. Do you approve of the contemplated scale of salaries?—If the alternative scale treats the assistant teachers as I have been informed it proposes to do, then I approve of it.

924. According to the report here, you receive a salary of £291?—Yes; but not now.

925. Do you wish to see the salaries of assistants built up to the level—all over the colony—of the salaries paid in your school?—Yes, I should be quite satisfied to see that.

926. If the £4 capitation grant is not sufficient to build up the salaries to that level, would you be content to strike a general average to improve salaries all round?—Looking at it personally I would not be satisfied, but from a general principle I would be satisfied.

927. Do you prepare your boys for the Civil Service Examination?—No.

928. Have you thought out at what point country-school teachers should receive the same salary as what you receive?—I should say, in schools with an attendance from 250 to 300.

929. Do you consider that women should be intrusted with Standards IV., V., and VI.?—No.

930. Would you be willing that the headmaster should have the power to give women teachers Standards IV., V., and VI. if he thought she showed exceptional ability in managing these standards?—I know that our headmaster has strong views on that point, and I know he would not do so. I do not think lady teachers are physically fit to take the upper standards.

931. You are aware some are?—I think, very few.

932. Would you bar a woman teacher if she proved capable?—A headmaster has power to arrange his staff as he likes.

933. Should the scheme be sufficiently elastic to enable a woman, if she is qualified, to perform that work?—I think male teachers should do the higher work and take charge of the upper standards.

934. Would you not let the head-teacher have the right to say whether a woman is qualified for the work?—It should be left in the hands of the head-teacher.

935. Suppose you were head-teacher, would you like to have the discretionary power?—Yes, I should.

936. In schools of 45 in attendance would you pay male and female teachers equal salaries?—Yes.

937. If women are in charge of schools just now of 60 pupils, and doing the work well, would you disturb existing affairs?—No.

938. *Mr. Davidson.*] If the statement made in connection with the alternative scale—No. 2—is correct, you are satisfied with the scale?—Yes, from the statement made to me.

939. If the statement made that the salaries of assistants will be brought up to the existing level, to the scale paid in either Otago or North Canterbury, and that those few assistants receiving a higher rate of pay will not have their salaries reduced, you will be satisfied?—Yes.

940. You are in favour of a colonial scale of staff and salaries?—As a general principle, yes.

941. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Do you know any other part of the colony in which a first assistant will get the salary you are receiving?—No.

942. Do you consider you are receiving too high a salary?—No.

943. You consider the other assistants are receiving insufficient salaries?—Yes.

944. What standard have you charge of?—Standard VI.

945. How many pupils are there in the standard?—82.

946. Who has charge of Standard V.?—The third assistant master.

947. How many pupils are there in his standard?—90.

948. What is the difference between the salary he receives and the salary you receive?—£140.

949. Do you not consider that is too great a difference when he is doing practically the same work?—I do not know that he is doing the same work; if you go into details, into the interior working, you would find that I, as first assistant, have many duties to perform over and above his duties.

950. You recognise that, in order to bring the salaries of first assistants throughout the colony up to the salary you are receiving, it will entail a considerable increase of expenditure?—Yes.

951. *The Chairman.*] The other assistant master you spoke of has charge of Standard V.?—Yes, with the assistance of a pupil-teacher.

952. What is the salary paid to the pupil-teacher?—I think, £46.

953. What is the salary of the assistant master in charge of Standard V.?—£150.

Miss BURDEN, Head-teacher, Kumeroa School, examined.

954. *Mr. Davidson.*] Are you in favour of the pay to men and women being equalised, or the disparity at present existing being very much decreased?—Most certainly. It is impossible to ask for equal pay, but there is far too much difference according to the proposed scale.

955. What class of schools do you think should be thrown open at equal salary to either sex?—Speaking from experience, I think that a woman is quite capable of taking charge of a school up to 100. I think the average woman is quite capable of managing such a school.

956. Which do you think a woman would the sooner break down under—the strain of teaching and managing a class in a city school of, say, 60 or 70 pupils, or doing the work with the assistance you now have?—I am rather inclined to think she would break down sooner in the large city school; it is easier to maintain discipline in a country school than in an upper standard of a city school.

957. Suppose the schools in the colony up to 100 were thrown open to either sex, do you think that women would be preferred rather than men?—I think they would be in a great many cases. In the school I at present occupy they had a male teacher up till the time I took charge eight years ago.

958. What classes do you yourself teach?—I have 45 scholars in five classes—Standards III., IV., V., VI., and VII.

959. Who takes the primary class and Standards I. and II.?—My assistant.

960. Is the salary under the Hawke's Bay Board for that class of school the same for either sex?—Yes.

961. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Have you compared the suggested scale No. 2 with the salaries that obtain in your school just now?—Yes.

962. Do they compare favourably or otherwise?—At present the school costs the country £216. Under the alternative scale, with a male head-teacher and assistant, the cost would be £295; with a female head-teacher and assistant, under the alternative scale, the cost would be £261. I may explain that the average of my school, although I have taken it at 80, is not actually 80—it is 79. When it reaches 80 I will be entitled to a pupil-teacher.

963. The pupil-teacher does not come till you reach 91?—I meant under the Hawke's Bay scale.

964. Do you favour the suggested scheme of alternating male and female teachers in the larger schools?—Not at all. In my own case it would be rather ludicrous. I would have appointed into my school a male teacher; I would not feel inclined to give up my upper standards to an assistant, and he would have to take to teaching the babies.

965. Do you find that preference is given to female teachers in the Hawke's Bay District?—I am afraid I cannot answer that; I know very little of the applications and appointments. I have not applied for a position since I was appointed to my present school.

966. Do you think there would be any difficulty in the matter of sewing instruction in the case of male teachers being appointed to country schools?—I think they could always obtain a sewing-mistress. Certainly the instruction would not be as efficient as that given by the school-mistress.

967. *Mr. Hill.*] Would the adoption of this proposed scale benefit you very much?—No. My present salary is £156; if were a man I would get £177 under the proposed scale, but being a woman I would get £147.

968. Have you any objection to the proposed colonial scale on account of that?—If a woman is capable of taking charge of a school I do not see why, because she happens to be a woman, she should be more poorly paid than a man.

969. If a colonial scale is adopted, do you think it would affect your position: would the Committee approve your continuance in charge?—I do not think it would affect me. If the Committee had been anxious to have a man they could have had one. The appointment of a male or a female teacher is optional in schools up to 80.

970. You are aware that for your position the proposed scale would require a teacher with a D1 certificate?—Yes.

971. You know you would have to pay a certain kind of fine because you only have an E1 certificate?—Yes.

972. Do you think that ought to be?—No.

973. You think you can do your work in the school as well as a D1 could?—Yes.

974. What do you think about the proposal regarding fifth-year pupil-teachers?—It does not seem altogether just.

975. *Mr. Smith.*] A great deal has been said about the physical ability of ladies in charge of schools: may I ask how many years you have been teaching your present school?—Eight years.

976. How many months, weeks, days, or hours have you had to be away on sick-leave?—Owing to a buggy accident I was absent three weeks, and that was my first and last absence through illness in a teaching career of eighteen years.

977. How many bad reports have you had during the past eight years?—I do not remember having had one.

978. Do you consider yourself something more than a woman of average strength?—I am by no means exceptional.

979. Do you think your health is likely to suffer in the future from overstrain?—No.

980. *The Chairman.*] Are you a member of the Teachers' Institute?—Not since I went to the country.

981. Do you think that a woman should be disqualified from taking schools with over 40 of average attendance?—I see no reason why we should be disqualified.

982. Do you think they should be disqualified by the Teachers' Institute of New Zealand?—I do not think they should be disqualified if capable.

983. If capable to take charge of schools over 400?—When they have proved themselves incapable I think it is time to disqualify them.

ROBERT BOYD HOLMES, Head-teacher, Havelock, examined.

Mr. Holmes: I did intend to refer to some matters at length, but really, after the exhaustive statements made by the president of the local branch of the Institute, it is unnecessary for me to go much further than simply to say that in the main I corroborate Mr. Watson's evidence. I may say that I am secretary for the branch, and in that capacity I come into contact with teachers throughout the district from the East Cape right down to Woodville, and I have communication with them day after day; and since this colonial scale has been before the public they have thought that I should be able to give explanation in every shape and form. As far as I myself am concerned, I support the colonial scale very strongly. There are some things in it that I would like to see altered. I take first the matter of staffing. I think the staffing is largely in favour of the larger schools, though I am glad to acknowledge that it benefits, so far as this district is concerned, the class of schools to which mine belongs. For instance, I get an extra assistant, and by having an increase of 5 pupils I can retain my present number of pupil-teachers, so that I confess the staffing is a great improvement on the present Hawke's Bay scale. I take some exceptions to the scale itself. In the first place, I believe that with the £4 grant it is too liberal to give an assistant at 40 as is proposed. My idea, after twenty-seven years of experience, is that I would grant a pupil-teacher at 35, and up to 55; then when the average is 55 an assistant up to, we will say, 85; and then a pupil-teacher in addition to the assistant after that. I would also appoint a second pupil-teacher at 105, and then an assistant at 140; so that I would make use of pupil-teachers in the smaller class of schools more than in the larger, because you can understand that in a school up to medium size it is not the number of children, but the number of classes that you have to attend to, that causes the worry and it is to get over this difficulty that I would follow this course. I have drawn up a scale of staffing, and will submit it to the Commission. In calculating the average attendance I think some allowance should be made to country school. I think you will get a much higher average of children to attend in town than in the country. The dairying industry, potato-planting, and many other things take away the children a great deal more than is the case in the town. I say country children are kept at home—some justly and others unjustly—more than in the town, and a great many of them are outside the radius of the Truant Officer. It is not unusual for children to go three, four, and five miles to school. I think, therefore, in fixing the staff for country schools some consideration should be given to that question. I would also point out that in trying to make a scale I have gone on the assumption that an adult teacher is equal to two pupil-teachers. In connection with the pupil-teachers I would also suggest that they should be under the absolute control of the Board, and that the Board should have the power of removing them from school to school; and, further, that no pupil-teacher should be allowed to go through the apprenticeship without having been employed in at least two schools—a big school and a small school. I consider that the pay given to pupil-

teachers is out of all proportion to what it is proposed to give them when they become junior assistants. It is not the amount of money that any one gets to start with that really induces him to join a particular profession. It is the amount he is likely to receive in the ordinary course of events. In this district we have been in the habit of receiving money for the tuition of pupil-teachers, and our regulations say that every assistant in the school is to assist in training the pupil-teachers, but the headmaster gets all the bonus. I consider that the salaries under the colonial scale should be of such a nature as to include the training of the pupil-teachers. I do not think that any bonus should be given for training pupil-teachers, but I think that all the teachers in the school should have to assist in the instruction. I do not think it is necessary for me to say anything on the question of salaries, as the matter has been very fully dealt with. I only know that the salaries of the great bulk of the school-teachers not only in Hawke's Bay, but in New Zealand, have been anything but satisfactory or adequate. I will just give you a sample of jottings from letters sent in to me a few days ago. A teacher says, "A man who has to choose between spending money on a necessary pair of boots and a necessary expenditure for his school is in a position which bodes no good to the education of the colony. A policy of more oats will give more power. A country teacher is a power for greater good than an assistant in town. The latter is dwarfed. His influence, unless a teacher of Standards V. and VI., will be very small on the children, and he is known only to his set in the town. A country teacher has to be a leader in the place. He is looked to and known intimately by all, and as such should be a man of greater ability and character than the assistant, as his position is much more important. The calls on the country teacher are much heavier than those on the town teacher. He has to subscribe to every church, and be the promoter of every movement in the place. His time is much more fully occupied than that of the assistant. When school is over he has to turn to and cut the wood or do the garden-work. He has to keep a horse and trap, all of which mean time and expense. The assistant is usually a boarder, and he has nothing to do but his own sweet will after school-hours." That gentleman has occupied a position in and about the neighbourhood of Christchurch, and has also occupied positions in the country schools of Canterbury. I am very glad that the assistants are receiving consideration, particularly infant mistresses. I consider that of all the teachers employed as assistants, after the first assistant master, the infant mistress is the greatest power for good, and does the most effective work; and therefore I think that the infant mistress should receive every consideration under a colonial scale. There is another point I wish to bring before the notice of the Commission, and that is the allowance to School Committees. For the ten years ending the 31st March, 1901, the Committee of my school received from the Board £404 4s. Cleaning and so forth cost £175 13s.; fuel and stationery cost £70 16s. 9d.; and grants were made to the Board, or work was done that was the duty of the Board to perform, to the extent of £166 2s. 6d. If one School Committee can do that, why should not all School Committees try and do so? I place before the Commission a detailed statement.

984. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] It has been stated that teachers prefer living in the country to living in the towns: is that so?—I never heard of it until to-day.

985. Is the number of applications for positions in the country as numerous as for positions in the town?—I think there would be no comparison.

986. Do you not think that in any scale of salaries the country teachers ought to have the preference in the town appointments?—I would not go so far as that, but I should say that the applicants for every appointment should be carefully studied, and if you can get a country teacher into the town it would be well to encourage him.

987. Is it not a fact that when a man gets into a country district—?—When a man gets into the country he is done.

988. Do you not think, then, that when a man has been in the country, and when a vacancy occurs in the town, that, all things being equal, the man in the country should get the preference?—Certainly I do.

989. Do you believe in payment on the average or on the roll?—That is a point in which I differ from a good many of my brother teachers. I think, so long as the grant is so-much per head, you cannot get away from it. I think, of course, that the total number of children *bona fide* belonging to a school should have a great deal to do with the staffing and salary.

990. Whatever they work on, some consideration should be given for the attendance at country schools?—Yes.

991. Do you consider that the work of the first assistant in the Napier School is very much heavier than the work that you do?—I cannot see how it can be.

992. You would say that a man with a school of 140 should get as good a salary as the first assistant in a large school?—I should think so.

993. You do not think that a man should wait till he is headmaster of a school of 300 before he gets the same salary as a first assistant?—He would have to wait all his life for it then.

994. *Mr. Davidson.*] What is your opinion as to the first assistance a head-teacher should receive, what form of assistance, and when should it be granted?—I have submitted a scheme that I think would suit me.

995. You notice that in a school when the average attendance reaches 41 the first assistance takes the form of an assistant mistress?—Yes.

996. Do you approve of that?—I do not think it would be an economy of the grant of £4 to allow a mistress. I think a pupil-teacher who has served one or two years in a large school should be sent to take such a position.

997. Apart from the question of money, do you think, from an educational point of view, it would be wise to put an assistant mistress in a school with an attendance of 40 pupils?—No; I think it would be a waste of energy.

998. Suppose you introduced a partly trained pupil-teacher in schools between 36 and 50 in average attendance, would that meet with your approval?—Yes. My idea is to appoint an assistant in a school with an average attendance of 55 to 85, and then appoint a pupil-teacher.

999. Do you think a headmaster, an assistant mistress, and a pupil-teacher is not a sufficiently liberal staff in a school of 90, as in the suggested scale?—Yes, I would not object to that. At the same time I have to express to the Commission the view that the number of children required to secure a particular average attendance in country schools is out of proportion to the number of children in the town schools; as a rule, you do not get nearly such a high percentage in attendance, and therefore I think the number should be made as low as possible.

1000. Do you know that the required average before such a staff was allowed in Otago, until quite recently, was 110?—Yes; I know up to within recent years it was so.

1001. Recently that required attendance has been reduced to 100 in Otago, and this suggested scale lowers it still further to 90: do you not think that is fairly liberal?—Yes.

1002. What is the average attendance at your school at the present time?—About 145.

1003. And the staff?—Up to lately, a master, an infant mistress, and two pupil-teachers.

1004. You noticed in the suggested scale that at 150 in attendance the staff proposed is a headmaster, an infant mistress, an assistant master, and two pupil-teachers: would that, in your opinion, be a more efficient staff?—Yes, certainly, because an increase of 5 pupils would give me another assistant.

1005. It would be a more ideal staff than what you have at the present time?—Yes.

1006. Have you compared the suggested salary in the alternative scale with the salary you are receiving at the present time?—Yes; it was the first thing I did compare.

1007. You find it more liberal than what is paid in Hawke's Bay at the present time?—Yes; it is an increase of 25 per cent. in some cases.

1008. Are you in favour of penalising teachers who do not hold the certificates required for the various positions in the first suggested scheme?—From the point of sympathy I must say it would be very unjust.

1009. *Mr. Stewart.*] You are in favour of a colonial scale?—Well, I should think so.

1010. Do you think there should be a differentiation in the capitation grant: would it affect the question?—I think the differentiation of capitation would only accentuate the evil that has been going on.

1011. Then, I understand that the Committee allowances must have been ample?—I am not making any comment; I have only given a statement for ten years.

1012. *Mr. Lethbridge.*] What is your opinion?—I am of the opinion that two-thirds of the money would do if properly managed. There is no continuity in the work of Committees.

1013. *Mr. Stewart.*] What do you consider should be the minimum salary?—I have not considered the question of salaries very much—mostly the matter of staffing.

1014. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Have you carefully looked through the suggested scale?—Yes; through both.

1015. Do you think it equitable that a teacher in a small country school should suffer a reduction of £10 by the introduction of a sewing-mistress into the school?—I do not.

1016. Do you think the appointment of a first-year pupil-teacher is of much assistance to a head-teacher?—Well, you have to make the best of the pupil-teacher—you must appoint one some time. In our district we employ trainees not recognised by the Board; in some cases they have possibly had one or two years' work; then when they are appointed pupil-teachers they are not raw material altogether.

1017. Does the system of appointing trainees work well here?—Yes.

1018. I suppose they can pass their pupil-teacher examinations?—They are not recognised by the Board.

1019. Suppose they pass their pupil-teacher examinations while they are trainees?—They are not permitted to do so.

1020. You advocate that pupil-teachers should be solely under the Board: are they not so now?—No; Committees can object to them leaving; there is no such thing as moving them upon the advice of the Inspector. When pupil-teachers have been one or two years in the service I should like Inspectors to have the power to recommend that they should be transferred to other schools of other grades if it is found desirable.

1021. You think that the salaries paid to teachers should be based on average attendance: would you say the average for one quarter or the average for the whole year?—I think the best way would be to take the average for the year; there are epidemics and other things that would completely upset one's calculations if a quarterly average was taken.

1022. Would you support a proposal that has been submitted in other districts—that is, that salaries should be based on the attendance on examination-day—the number present on the day of the annual examination?—I think that might lead to bad habits.

1023. With regard to the percentage of the working-average, do you consider 50 per cent. high enough?—Yes, I think so. The teachers cannot expect to have everything their own way, and I think 50 per cent. is fair.

1024. Does the working-average very often come into operation in such a school as yours?—Yes, very frequently.

1025. Do you not find that the attendance present one half-day is slightly over 50 per cent.?—Yes, but we have to put up with it.

1026. Do you favour a system of paying bonuses?—I do not.

1027. Not to schools, or teachers on the certificates they hold?—No, I do not.

1028. Did the teachers suffer considerably when the bonuses were withdrawn: did they come to look on the bonuses as part and parcel of their salaries?—Decidedly.

1029. What was the amount of the highest bonus that was paid?—When I came here I got £20.

1030. Was that the highest bonus paid?—No; some of the highest-paid teachers got £30; then it went gradually down to £15, £12, £10, £9, and £6, and finally disappeared altogether.

1031. Seeing that it was a gratuity, then the teachers had no reason to complain when it was withdrawn, had they?—Well, it worked very well, and we were sorry to lose it, because we got no increase to our salaries.

1032. Would you support the substitution of an assistant teacher for two pupil-teachers in a large school?—Yes.

1033. Do the teachers in this district think the adoption of a colonial scale would minimise the powers of the Education Board?—Speaking for myself, I do not see that it can lessen the Board's powers in the least.

1034. *Mr. Hill.*] Do you think the money payable to School Committees' funds is too much?—I simply put figures before the Commission for a period of ten years, and I leave it to the Commission when the matter is under consideration to say whether the money could have been better expended in that particular district which supplied the figures. I was in conversation with a teacher the other day, who told me his late Chairman, on examining the balance-sheet, said to him: "At the end of the year what have we to show? Absolutely nothing. Most of the money is expended in undoing what our predecessors did. If a School Committee has £30 to spend it generally manages to spend £29 19s. 11½d."

1035. In regard to the cleaning and maintenance of schools: in the bush districts the cost of cleaning and looking after the schools would be much heavier, and it would be difficult to get people to do it—the circumstances would be very different to a district like your own, would they not?—I think I would get over the difficulty by getting two or three of the senior pupils to do the cleaning—I would have the school cleaned.

1036. Supposing the pupils would not do the work?—I think they would be only too happy to do it.

1037. Might not the parents object?—Well, rather than be in difficulties I would do it myself for nothing. My Committee during ten years could have managed with two-thirds of the money.

1038. Do you think the teachers of Hawke's Bay would prefer to estimate their salaries, instead of on the average attendance, on the basis of the number present during any week or month?—I have said that while grants are made on average attendance I do not see how you can very well get out of sticking to the average-attendance payment; in country schools, at any rate, a consideration should be given, owing to the smaller proportion of the roll-number in average attendance compared to schools in towns.

1039. I would like to know the opinion of the teachers in Hawke's Bay on the matter?—To be candid with you, it is a question which has never come up for consideration.

1040. What is your opinion?—As a teacher, I cannot see that you could pay on anything else than the working-average.

1041. What is your opinion as to the teacher who should be placed in charge of a school with an average attendance below 30?—I think that the Board and the School Committee should determine that question; it also depends on the salary you are going to give to that class of school. There might be certain obstreperous pupils in the school who would require the control of a male teacher. I think, all round, in schools up to 25 in attendance females would do, and after that males.

1042. Supposing a woman is placed in charge of a school, do you think she should be entitled to the same salary if she was doing the same work and in the same manner as if a male teacher was in charge of a similar school?—I think that the salaries should be differentiated after a living-wage is reached. I think the work is not the same after all.

1043. If you get work done by a female typist do you expect her to charge you at less than the folio rate?—A woman's labour is generally cheaper.

1044. You have not answered the question?—I would not expect her to; as a rule, women have monopolized those positions.

1045. Supposing a position is open—assume you want 50 children taught, and two males apply for the position and ask a salary of £150 a year, while a third applicant, a female, with the same qualification, is willing to take the position at a salary of £100: what do you think will be the result?—I think that the woman would be employed.

1046. Then, would they not lower salaries by entering into competition with males?—No, I think not; in the eternal fitness of things I think men and women fall into their respective positions.

1047. You agree with a colonial scale?—Yes.

1048. You recognise that even the suggested scale proposed by the Inspector-General is more generous than your own scale—the scale in this district?—Certainly.

1049. You think a colonial scale would be beneficial for the colony as a whole?—Yes.

1050. *Mr. Weston.*] You advocate that pupil-teachers should be transferred from one school to another: at whose expense should that be done?—It would be part of the expense of the system.

1051. A number of the pupil-teachers are the children of poorer parents: who would pay for their wants?—I think the State would pay for that.

1052. What did you mean by saying that your school was the worst paid in the colony?—I mean that the salary paid to me under the Hawke's Bay scale is about the smallest in any district in New Zealand. If my school were in Canterbury, instead of getting £190 I would get £215, and in Wellington I would get £225 or £235.

1053. Why is it that you are so badly treated?—Because of the scale of payment in this district.

1054. Do you think that teachers should be appointed by the Board, or would you advocate the appointment of teachers being made by the General Government?—I think the Board should have the appointment.

1055. Do you think that the Committees should have anything to say in the appointment, removal, and transfer of teachers?—The name of the individual appointed should be sent down to the Committee, and unless they can give a valid reason why he should not be the teacher the appointment should be made.

1056. Do you think that the whole of a pupil-teacher's time should be devoted to teaching?—No; and I also think they should be better fitted before being appointed.

1057. How can that be managed?—By raising the status and delaying appointment for another year or so.

1058. You mean to have a system of probation?—Yes.

1059. But when the child has passed through its term of apprenticeship, what further teaching do you think he or she should have to qualify him or her for the position of a teacher?—I think training-schools should be established, in which pupil-teachers should pass another year, more for the study of the principles of teaching than simply the art of teaching, and put them as far as possible into practice.

1060. I understand you to regard teaching as a science?—Decidedly I do, as well as an art.

1061. Where do you think training-schools should be established?—I think, for economy's sake, in the four large centres; but it seems a great injustice to the smaller districts that we should not have auxiliary schools there too. Yes, I think, everything considered, they should be in the smaller districts as well.

1062. Then, you would have a training-school at Napier?—I decidedly would.

1063. *The Chairman.*] Do you approve of the salaries being regulated by average or roll attendance?—By the average; I cannot see how you can get beyond the average attendance. But in fixing the colonial scale I think that the country schools should receive some consideration, because of the greater number of children that make up the average attendance than in the town schools.

1064. Can you briefly say how you would do that?—Yes; if you consider that 90 would be a fair number at which to appoint additional assistance in town, make it 85 in the country.

Mr. J. CAUGHLEY, Headmaster, Kaikora School, examined.

Mr. Caughley: I consider there is a very urgent need for the colonial scale, not only to readjust the inequalities between district and district, but also to readjust the inequalities within each district. In supporting this second scale that has been offered, I do so on the principle that wherever there is to be an addition to any salary it must come off some other salary, except to the extent that this extra 5s. of capitation will provide for any such addition. I think there is a great deal of fallacy in the belief that reduction in itself is injustice. Looking at the amount of reduction, and the number of reductions, does not give the true idea of the question. Reduction may only be allowing tardy justice. Not only is it not pleasant to make reductions, but it is also unpleasant to leave unchanged those who have been for fifteen years in a deplorable condition. I have every sympathy with that class of teacher (the assistant) who is being reduced most. Even if this question had come up a year ago, I would have looked at it this way: Teachers who hold these positions in the large schools are still as good men as they were under the old conditions; the only fault is that they are in the wrong place. This, in my opinion, is the cause of the trouble, although we must deplore the fact that some teachers are being reduced. The most radical change in this proposed scale is the relative value placed on the assistants' work in large schools as contrasted with the work of head-teachers and assistants in small and medium schools. I will support this change for various reasons, and I wish to bring out in as many places as possible the very much greater importance of a teacher's work as head of a school of 150, compared with any work done by an assistant in a large school. First, I will put it in this way: In a very large school—say, between 850 and 800—there will be at least four or five teachers with fairly high salaries, ranging from £140 to £350. Leaving out the headmaster, there will be three assistants who will get higher salaries than most of the teachers of schools of 100 under the Board's scale. Then, there is the headmaster of this large school, a man with good organizing ability and high certificate, who, instead of getting teachers under him that need his help, gets three assistant masters who are supposed to be more than equal to headmasters of small schools; so that in a large school there are practically four men fitted to be headmasters of schools of from 100 to 120. I say that is not the place where those men should be. If the headmaster of a large school is worthy of his position he does not require such men, and they are required somewhere else. Then, I would also repeat what the last witness said, that even under the new scale and arrangement of staffs there is no school in Hawke's Bay that would have a greater number of pupils per teacher than 55—that is, counting two pupil-teachers equal to one assistant. In estimating the relative value of work we have to consider that the teachers of small schools have generally to direct the efforts of four classes of children, whereas the teachers in large schools have only to take charge of one class. I would like to put it in a practical way. Let me take the subject of arithmetic, for instance: A teacher in a school of about 110 has the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Standards to teach: An hour and a quarter is allowed for that subject, which will enable the teacher to devote about twenty-five minutes to each class, for it is to be remembered that each standard is in a different stage of the subject. Now, the assistant in a large school has the whole of the hour and a quarter to devote to his one particular standard. Then, again, while this headmaster has to teach these standards, he has to look after the standards at the other

end of the room, and deal with the perplexities of other pupils. With all these claims on his skill I consider that the teacher who has to take syllabus arithmetic for three standards in an hour and a quarter has more calls on him than a teacher of one standard. If the teacher of three standards can pass his pupils at the annual examination as creditably as can the teacher of one standard in a large school, surely the latter is not so highly wrought. It has been said that some teachers who have been in large town schools, and have gone to the country, express a great objection to going back again. I made that statement myself. But the school I was in was in an abnormal state, and many of the remarks made with reference to the Napier School need to be modified on account of that. There were two schools in Napier with pupils up to Standard II., and there were 90 children in Standard VI. in the main school, 120 in the Fifth Standard, 160 in the Fourth, 150 in the Third, and only 80 or 90 in the First, so that many of the upper-standard children came from the other school. The Napier School was what might be called a top-heavy school, and more than ordinary heavy work was thrown on teachers of the upper standards. Therefore, if we condemned any scale by reference to that school, we would be calculating from an abnormal case which does not often exist. The Napier School now will have to depend on the supply of its upper standards from its own infant-school. As has been shown, under the new scale, if the staff is properly distributed, there would not be more than 55 children per teacher, and that would not be too great a strain on any teacher. Then, I would like to put it before you in another phase: In the large school the assistant master or mistress in charge of any standard has his or her class handed up from another teacher, who also has been able to devote undivided attention to that class. Very often in these small schools a class is handed on from a pupil-teacher and that makes, say, the Fourth Standard teaching a great deal more difficult to the teacher in the medium-sized school than to the teacher in the large school, for every one knows how much the work of the upper standards depends on the preparation in the lower. Then, I would put it in another light still: If the assistant mastership of a large school with a salary of £200 became vacant, and the headmaster of a school of 110 became vacant, and it was proposed to exchange these two teachers, which of the two would enter on his new work with the most confidence? The teacher who has been in charge of one class in a large school would know nothing of the organization of a school, but the head master would have very many qualifications as a class-teacher which the assistant never possessed; he would have superior power of discipline. If there is only one class in a room, all are engaged in one kind of work, and consequently there are no distracting influences, therefore it is not so hard for a teacher of one class to keep discipline as for a teacher who has to teach one class and keep order in others. I would also put the matter in another way, in order to support the present proposal to give higher pay to the infant mistress. At present I am in the happy position of having for an infant mistress a lady teacher who for some years had sole charge of a small school. I thereby get the children sent up to me out of the infant-room with a far better groundwork than if I had an assistant from a town school where she had only taught one class. This shows that her training and efficiency gained in the small school are superior to the training gained in a large school. Then, I wish to put it in this light: that it is not to the advantage of children in the higher classes of large schools that they should have these highly paid teachers. I have learned by experience that if I were to go back again to a large school like Napier I should spend a great deal less energy, and leave the pupils to do a great deal more for themselves than I did when I was in that school. A class-teacher in a large school feels bound to be helping the children all the time, whereas in the smaller school he has to give an outline of the principles on which the work is to be based, and leave the pupil to use his own intellect, and this is greatly to his pupil's benefit. So that I consider if there were not this very great preference for the class of teacher now drawn to the large schools it would be for the benefit of large schools, not to their harm. I do not hold these opinions because I am in the class of school that is going to benefit by this scale, but I point out that I actually made a change from a large to a small school when I heard a colonial scale was going to be introduced. I foresaw that if the new scale was going to be sound in principle the salary of the position I then held would in justice have to be reduced, and that the salary of the school for which I was applying would, in like justice, have to be raised. I have, therefore, demonstrated by my actions that I had faith in my opinion. There is another question I should like to refer to besides the question of salaries, and that is the matter of teachers' certificates. Instead of having so many grades of certificates as we have now, I think it would be better if the grades were reduced to four or five. We need not alter the educational attainments that would be required for each one of the five present certificates. With regard to the figure, our departmental scale says that an A5 is equal to an E1. I know which any master would choose. This anomaly is owing to the fact that changes in certificates can be made on two separate lines. When a teacher gets a certificate equal to E he should have two years of experience before he can be promoted. Reference has been made to the ease with which teachers in some districts get their certificates raised by marks from Inspectors compared with the difficulty teachers in other districts have to get such marks; but I think those who made the complaint were at fault in their calculations. They evidently took the total number of teachers in a district, the number promoted in one year, and so arrived at certain results. But in such a reckoning as this we must leave out those teachers in Grade 1, and also those who were raised the year before, for by no manipulation of the regulations can a teacher be raised by an Inspector in two successive years. I will quote to the Commission figures I have here: In Auckland, in 1900, there were 340 teachers eligible for promotion, leaving out those in Grade 1 and those who had their certificates raised the year before; of this number seventy-one were promoted, equal to about 20 per cent. In Taranaki, out of fifty-one eligible, thirteen were promoted, giving 25½ per cent. In Wanganui, out of 108 eligible, thirty-seven were promoted, or 34 per cent., making an average of 22½ per cent. for Wanganui for two years. (When I found that in two successive years there was a great difference I took a third year and found the average.) In Wellington, which seems to be the best district of all for promotion, out of eighty-three eligible nineteen were promoted, or 23 per cent.,

and in the year before 41 per cent. In Hawke's Bay, out of fifty-nine eligible, twenty-two were promoted—22½ per cent.—which is the normal rate. In Marlborough, out of twenty-six eligible, five were promoted, or 19 per cent. In Nelson, out of seventy-three eligible, one was promoted—about 1⅓ per cent.; and this is a district which I believe is quoted as a splendid place for having the certificate raised. The year before, the percentage in Nelson was 12½ per cent. In the Grey District there were twenty-one eligible and one promoted, or 4½ per cent.; the year before it was 10 per cent., and the average for the two years, 7 per cent. In North Canterbury, out of 264 eligible, thirty-nine were promoted, or 14 per cent. In Westland fourteen were eligible and three promoted, or 21½ per cent. In South Canterbury, eighty-five eligible, sixteen promoted, or 18¾ per cent. In Otago, out of 279 eligible, thirty were promoted, or 10¾ per cent.; the year before the percentage was 14. In Southland 115 were eligible, eleven promoted, or 9½ per cent. The normal percentage seems to have been about 20 per cent. The largest percentage is in Wellington, and the lowest in Nelson, Westland being about normal. In making any such reckoning it is necessary to take a fair basis, as I have done here, and not count those teachers who cannot be promoted in the year dealt with. Another instance of wrong calculation is that in preparing the *per capita* cost of teaching children in the different districts the average costs per head for five districts were quoted, and we afterwards find them added together and divided by five to give the average cost per head for those five districts. This is a fallacy; it does not give the average *per capita* cost. If, for the sake of illustration, the *per capita* cost in Westland, where there are few children, were £6 per head, and in Hawke's Bay, where there is a greater number of children, the cost were £4 a head, the average would not be £5. Here is another mistake which has been made. In the first scale the staffing is more liberal, but the salaries are not so high; in the second scale the salaries are more liberal and the staffing is less. In some of the calculations which have been made the staffing has been made on the first scale and the salaries on the second. There is another mistake I would like to correct, and that is in reference to the matter of house allowance. Some people consider that £50 is the equivalent of what a country teacher receives when he gets a house. That is not so. In the country district in which I am living I have a very nice house: it is newly built and nicely furnished, and about as good a schoolhouse as there is in the district; but I could rent one like it in the township for 10s. or 12s. a week, and I am sure that does not represent £50 a year. I might cite another house—the house of a teacher who lives a little distance from me. The total accommodation is three rooms, and no article of furniture larger than a chair can be got inside in less than twenty minutes; the roof you can quite easily touch with your hand. Does a house like that represent £50 a year? There is another matter I would like to refer to in connection with the question of house allowance. Take a school in a bush district where there is a house provided. Perhaps a girl, a young girl who has never left home before, is sent to take charge of that school. She cannot afford to keep a servant, and as a consequence has to live alone; perhaps there may not be another house within a mile of her. If she leaves the house provided for her she has to pay her board, and she gets no house allowance as an equivalent, for the Board prohibits the renting of the house to any other person. The girl has to pay for her board elsewhere, and is unable to rent her house; practically she pays rent twice. Before making the above corrections I was going to refer to the certificate necessary for the different grades of schools. I think it is a mistake that a D1 should be required for a school of an attendance of 100, when only B1 is required for a school with an attendance of 1,020. That means that a teacher, after teaching for the same period, is fit for a school of 100 or for a school of 1,020, since the only difference is literary attainment. Another popular fallacy that needs to be exploded is the idea that prevails that there is a large profit to Education Boards on the large schools in their districts—that they are the gold-mines that make up the deficiency on the smaller schools. In Hawke's Bay District, in a school with an attendance of 775, 74½ per cent. of the capitation grant is spent in salaries; in a school of 482, 77½ per cent.; in a school of 350, 65 per cent.; in a school of 290, 74 per cent.; in a school of 200, 73 per cent.; in a school of 140, 70 per cent. So that, with one exception, all schools from 150 to 775 cost more per head in salaries than a school of 140. The schools that gain most for the Boards are really not the largest schools.

1065. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] I understand that you would prefer rent allowance if you could get it rather than a house?—There is rather an objection to a rent allowance. If you give a teacher rent allowance, and there is no schoolhouse, that teacher may be sent to a district where there is no house available. If the teacher had the right to rent the Board's house I think that would be the fairest way.

1066. Is there not a risk of the house being badly treated?—Yes; but the teacher could be held responsible.

1067. Regarding the matter of teachers' certificates, are they not worked out on a ten- or four-years basis, if I remember correctly?—No, I think not; it might be so down South.

1068. You have had experience: did you leave a school down South where you were getting £198 a year for a position worth £186 a year?—Yes, and a house; really it was a rise of about £15 or £20 a year.

1069. Do you consider the work you have here more arduous and responsible than the work you left?—Yes, it taxes me more.

1070. You consider that the salary attaching to a school with 100 pupils should be a better salary than the one attached to the position you left?—Yes.

1071. Regarding the salary of a first assistant in a large school, at what point should the head-teacher in a country school receive the same salary as is paid to a first assistant in a large town school?—The first assistant here gets £280 or £290—I should say, a country school with an attendance of 150 at most.

1072. You consider, all things being equal, that positions in town schools are preferred by the country teachers?—Before I left Napier I expressed the opinion that if I got to be the first assistant in a town school I would not take the headmastership of a country school under £200 a year.

1073. Do you not consider that country teachers should get higher salaries than the town assistants in order to compensate them for the disadvantages they have to undergo?—Yes.

1074. *Mr. Stewart.*] You heard Mr. Watson's evidence?—Yes.

1075. Do you generally approve of the conclusions arrived at by that gentleman?—Yes, I do.

1076. *Mr. Hill.*] What is your opinion as to the method of training pupil-teachers?—I would have to give my opinion as based on the Hawke's Bay pupil-teachers only. I consider that they do not get proper training; too important work is thrust upon them at too early a stage in their career.

1077. Would you suggest that before a pupil-teacher is appointed he should have had some previous training?—That would not be necessary in a large school. I consider I got the best part of my training in a large school through using my eyes and ears. I think no first-year pupil-teacher should go to a small school, only second- or third-year pupil-teachers.

1078. Do you think an arrangement like that would meet the needs of a school between 35 and 75 in average attendance: where an assistant mistress is suggested in the proposed scale, would a third- or fourth-year pupil-teacher do instead of that mistress?—I think such an arrangement would meet the needs of the district, provided a third- or fourth-year pupil-teacher was appointed.

1079. You consider that the staff would be sufficient?—Yes.

1080. On the completion of the pupil-teacher's term, at the end of four years, what would you suggest should be adopted in order to complete the training of that teacher?—I would strongly urge that such pupil-teachers should be sent to a special institution, such as a training-school, in order to get a more extensive view of the work.

1081. You suggest that they should go into a training-college such as in Christchurch, or first such a training-school as we have established at Napier?—I do not consider "first" and "second" to be necessary. I think a practising-school is best. I prefer the local form to the normal school.

1082. Such a school as could be established in every educational district at a small cost?—Yes.

1083. You have had a good deal of experience in the Napier School as an assistant master: is it your opinion that that school is really too large for what you might call efficient working, without duplicating the classes?—I have considered the maximum-sized school should be one of 600 for efficient working.

1084. You think if schools were not allowed to grow beyond that size, if they were cut down to that size—the larger schools—it would be more beneficial not only to the teachers, but to the children?—Yes, I think schools get unwieldy after they reach 600 in attendance.

1085. The efficiency of such schools is not so good?—There is too much of a tendency towards what is called "spoon" teaching.

1086. *Mr. Lethbridge.*] Are the Committees in your district satisfied with the allowances made them?—I have seen School Committees' balance-sheets presented at meetings, and there was generally a balance, sometimes a handsome one; it would be exceptional if there were a deficit.

WELLINGTON.

MONDAY, 17TH JUNE, 1901.

C. WATSON, B.A., Headmaster Te Aro School, representing the Wellington Educational Institute, examined.

Mr. Watson: The Commission has been through the colony and taken a great deal of evidence, and I feel sure that you must have seen that in very many cases the work of teaching is very much underpaid. A great many peculiar anomalies have no doubt been discovered, both in staffing and salaries, and in the organization of schools. Now, we as teachers are hopeful of very great things from this Commission. We believe it to be the means of making known to the country and Parliament what is actually the state of affairs. The country never has realised its own needs in this matter. Our hope is, knowing as we do that this Commission is composed of experts—men who have been long engaged in the actual work of teaching or in the organizing of teachers—that a scheme will be laid before the House that will give adequate staffing and a proper rate of pay to teachers doing the work. This must necessarily point to much greater expenditure on education. The question arises. Is it likely to be granted? Is this country in a position to do so? We feel sure that when a democratic country like this realises that it has not an educational system such as it ought to have it will not grudge expenditure in that direction. If we want to improve our position in the matter of education, to bring ourselves, as near as our means and circumstances will admit, into line with other progressive parts of the world, we must do it by comparing ourselves not merely with the parts of the world that we know have not advanced beyond ourselves, but we must, if possible, compare ourselves with some of the best equipped. We must get what we know in the light of modern educational reading and thought to be a right system. For that reason I think it would be unwise to compare ourselves, for instance, with the Australian Colonies. They have had special difficulties to contend with, and I do not think they can claim that their educational systems have progressed as in other parts of the world. Therefore I think it is unwise for us to try to take our lead from them. As I have said, there have been special reasons that have influenced the neighbouring colonies. Ten years ago, for instance,

they went through a time of unexampled financial depression, from which they were many years recovering; but I think it is safe to say, regarding what is taking place over there now, that within a few years the neighbouring colonies will make very great changes and very great advances in their educational systems. I propose to lay before you to-day a few figures taken from the London School Board's report (Exhibit 92), showing the pay of teachers in schools of about equal size with those here. I will now ask the Commission to allow me to read the report which the Committee of the Wellington Educational Institute has drawn up on the proposed colonial scale of salaries: "Teachers of this district and teachers generally believe that the people of this colony desire to see the position of the teacher rendered as attractive as possible. In order to secure this end three reforms are necessary—a curtailed syllabus, capable of being thoroughly and satisfactorily worked, adequate staffing of schools, and adequate remuneration to competent teachers. We are hopeful that an amended curtailed syllabus will soon be issued, and it forms no part of our present business to discuss it. Evidently it is of the first importance that adequate staffing of schools should be arranged for, so that teachers will not be called upon to do what is physically beyond the power of the average teacher to undertake without undue strain. The original scheme as issued by the Inspector-General provided for a staff which no doubt was numerically inadequate. There remains the weighty question of the remuneration of those who are engaged in what, by general consent, we must consider this most important work of teaching. The rate of pay will in the long-run determine the class and calibre of the teachers in the schools. It is apparent that statements by public men, however true they may be—as to the nobility, and importance, and responsibility of the office of the teacher—will not in themselves attract the class of men and women who will be best qualified to train the youth of the community. Such men and women will evidently expect that the reward of their labour will bear some proportion to its responsibility and importance. The reputed dignity of the office will not draw to it a capable youth who realises that, during the four (or six) years of preparation, he will receive less than an apprentice to a trade, and that on the completion of his apprenticeship he will receive less salary—£50 or £70 less—than if he were a journeyman tradesman; added to this, he does not forget the uncertainties and delays in promotion, nor, if he is well informed, the frequent irritating schemes of retrenchment. Women also, it is clear, having to undergo the same preparation as men, and having duties as arduous to perform, should have possibilities of promotion, and possibilities of a career, which will draw to the work the brightest and ablest of our high-school girls. The following resolutions were arrived at by the Committee: That no colonial scale can be deemed satisfactory which does not embody a pension scheme for teachers who are retired after long service; that the Commission be asked to arrange for the separate payment for tuition of pupil-teachers; that, seeing the great majority of the schools of the colony are provided with residences, and that no account is taken of this fact in the proposed scheme, it is urgent, in order to secure an equitable colonial scale of salaries, that distinct provision be made for a reasonable house allowance when no house is provided; that £100 be the minimum salary for certificated women and £110 for men; that the rate of pay for women should bear a fair proportion to that for men; that instead of rating men and women assistants as first, second, third, fourth, fifth, &c., the men should be rated as first, second, third, &c., male assistants, and the women as first, second, and third female assistants; that the position of infant mistress should not appear in the scale until there is an infant department of 150 in average attendance; that there should not be infant-schools under separate management unless the average attendance is 250, and that no child should be retained in such school after the age of seven years; that in no school shall the average number of children per teacher exceed 40." I wish to say one or two words on these resolutions. We are strongly of opinion that there should be a pension scheme, and that tuition of pupil-teachers should be specially paid for. It is a great hardship for a teacher to have to do that out of his salary. With regard to the house allowance, looking at the scheme put in in Mr. Hogben's evidence, it would mean that every teacher of a large school in this town, if he received no house allowance, would lose from £30 to £50, except in the case of two teachers, who have larger schools. I think it is hardly likely that the Board would be able to pay house allowance out of its allowances—it would amount in this district to something like £1,600 for house allowance; in the Auckland District it would be a great deal more. Therefore we think the house allowance should be distinct. If you are to put the teachers on anything like an equality you must make a distinct provision for house allowance in every case. In fixing the minimum salary at £100 for certificated women and £110 for men, we were guided chiefly by recognition of the fact that it costs the women as much to live as the men, and in the first grades probably neither has more dependent on him or her: a man has not more dependent on him than a woman, but, on account of the fact that a large percentage of women leave the service, it seems advisable to give a little extra inducement to the men to attract them into the service. Unless something like that is done, it will happen that the men will very largely disappear from the teaching profession. With regard to the resolution about rating men and women assistants as first, second, third, &c., it is convenient in most of the larger schools—in fact, it is almost necessary—that we should have a couple of men assistants. If they take the first and second places it leaves no positions worth having for the women under any such scale as the printed one. We also find that in these large schools we require well-paid women in the standard part of the school as well as men, whereas under the scale put in in evidence the infant mistress would come in as the best-paid woman, and that would leave no woman having a fair position on the standard part of the staff. We think it would be easier and fairer, perhaps, if the staffs were arranged as we suggest in the resolution: "The position of infant mistress should not appear until there is an average of 150 in the infant department." We hold that in an ordinary school the woman in charge of the lower part of the school is something on the footing of an ordinary assistant; but a little too much attention is directed to the infant mistress's position by making the infant mistress come in in such a prominent position as she does under the scale. The effect would be to largely divert all women's attention to training

for infant work, leaving none who had specially qualified themselves for the standard work. More than that, it might lead to a little difficulty in the management of schools. The infant mistress would come in as appointed, and she would consider that as her special work; whereas where there are not separate departments the head of the school should have complete control of the staff. Putting the infant mistress in such a very decided position might lead to friction. "That there should not be separate infant-schools until the average attendance is 250": We put that in on the ground that it does not do to establish small separate schools, because they are more expensive to work. Then, perhaps, it might be advisable in certain cases—it has been so in other parts of the world—to establish a separate independent infant-school. We feel strongly that the staffing should be based on an average of 40 per teacher, and not more; and we are hoping that when we get a scheme such as is worthy of the colony the pupil-teacher will disappear as a member of the staff, very nearly or quite. It is so in the great educational districts at Home—the London schools are staffed almost throughout without pupil-teachers. The increase of expenditure would not be very great. Our hope is, then, that pupil-teachers will be reduced in number to a much greater extent than has appeared under any scale that we have yet seen. I will not detain the Commission longer, but am prepared to answer any questions.

1. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] You have not seen the alternative scale?—Up to only about 300, and as it appeared in the *Journal of Education*.

2. May I take it that you approve of it?—It is not such a scale as I hope the Commission will lay before the country.

3. As regards teachers, how do you think that scale would affect them?—As to staffing, the numbers are rather too large for teachers, and there are more pupil-teachers than I think there should be.

4. And with regard to salary?—I really cannot remember just now.

5. You know the scale of salaries that obtains in Otago?—Yes.

6. If that applied to the whole colony would it meet your wishes as to pay?—Yes, I think we should be satisfied.

7. Would 1,000 be too many in a school?—Personally, I am of the opinion that they should not be allowed to grow as large as that; but I do not think I express the opinion of my Institute in saying so.

8. You said that the minimum wage for women should be £100, and for men £110: do you not think that up to a certain point men and women should be paid alike?—The reason why we differentiate is this: you want to hold out a little extra inducement to men, because after you have trained women a great many of them leave.

9. Is it not because they do not get as much as men that they leave: if they were given £10 more would they leave?—That would keep more of them in the service, but the fact remains that a great many marry and leave.

10. If they would prefer to marry to teaching, the difference in salary would not induce them to remain?—I think not; it would to some extent, but very little.

11. You see, a woman requires the same qualifications and has to obtain the same results in a small school as a man?—We recognise that.

12. Still, you think there ought to be a difference of £10?—Yes.

13. With regard to the possibility of promotion, would you not give a woman charge of, we will say, the Fourth, Fifth, or Sixth Standards?—Very often it would be convenient to do so.

14. You would leave that at the discretion of the head-teacher?—I think the arrangement of the staff should be left entirely in the head-teacher's hands.

15. You approve of his having the right, if he sees exceptional qualifications, to give a woman charge of the Fourth, Fifth, or Sixth Standards?—Yes, certainly.

16. With regard to smaller schools, what number would you intrust to a woman to have control of, with assistants?—I would not limit the number at all.

17. Would you allow the position of head-teacher to be quite as open for women as for men, say, in a school of from 60 to 100?—Yes.

18. Higher still?—Yes, I think so; up to any point.

19. With regard to the difference of payment between men and women, what would you make it, say, in a school of 200?—In discussing the matter between ourselves, I think both men and women agreed that it would be something like fair if in the higher salaries you paid the women 75 per cent. of the men's salaries, the lower salaries about 80 per cent., and the lowest 90 per cent.; 25 per cent. difference is, I think, the amount we arrived at in regard to the higher salaries.

20. Are you in favour of paying a woman the same as a bachelor?—I do not see how you could inquire into every individual case like that.

21. Do you believe in the classification of teachers?—Not too complicated a system.

22. But you believe in a classification?—My opinion is that it should be a teacher's certificate straight out. A man who has that should be recognised by the colony as competent to take charge of a school; but he should be graded for his length of service. Any additional classification he may get in the way of degrees is to his benefit in obtaining promotion.

23. Have you thought of any method of promoting—how it is to be brought about, whether by Board or by Government?—At present I should not propose to alter the Board arrangement.

24. Is it not a fact that a teacher in a country district has not anything like the same chance of promotion as a town teacher?—In this district I think he has a better chance.

25. Take a vacancy occurring in the town: would a country teacher have an equal chance with a town teacher?—In the present temper of the Board he would have a better chance.

26. Are the teachers appointed by the Board?—Yes, but the Committees have the right of objecting.

27. Do you think, if a colonial scale were brought in, that the Inspectors should be under one authority, or remain under the Boards as at present?—Under the central authority.

28. Then, that would do away with the work of a Board?—I cannot see that.

29. If an Inspector were a colonial officer and not under the control of a Board, is it not a fact that their being deprived of his services would interfere very much with the Board's existence?—I can hardly see that. He would be there to advise them, as now.

30. With regard to a superannuation allowance, do you think teachers would be prepared to contribute in order to provide for such an allowance?—I suppose that would be necessary—that some sort of contribution should be made.

31. Do you think that a great deal of dissatisfaction exists amongst teachers regarding the management of teachers at schools?—There is an apprehension of continued reductions among them.

32. You think that a colonial scale would obviate that?—I hope so.

33. But do not the reductions really come about on account of attendance?—I suppose diminished attendance does affect salaries, but not in this district. The average has risen every year in this district.

34. It was the Government that reduced the capitation from £4 to £3 15s.?—Yes; but since that reduction there have been further reductions by the Boards.

35. In consequence of opening new schools?—Partly that.

36. Do you think that if the Government had had the expenditure of the money that has been expended by this Board they would have done better for the teachers than the Board has done?—I think it is probable.

37. Speaking from experience, you say that if the same funds had been in the hands of the Government they would have been more satisfactorily spent in connection with the schools than they have been by the Board?—I do not know that they would in the past; but we have this fear: that now the Boards have power to spend money on manual and technical instruction, that will absorb a large amount.

38. *Mr. Davidson.*] I understand that it is unsatisfactory that there should be thirteen different scales of staff and salaries under our present national system of education?—Yes, I think the teachers throughout the colony feel that.

39. Do you think that dissatisfaction exists amongst teachers owing to the great inequality at present obtaining regarding the different payments in the different districts?—No doubt there is a very bitter feeling in some districts that they are much worse off than others.

40. And, in your opinion, a colonial scale of staff and salaries would remove these inequalities, and in that way remove the dissatisfaction?—Certainly.

41. Here is a copy of the proposed alternative scale: do you notice in it that in schools of from 14 to 19 the suggested salary is the same for either sex?—Yes.

42. That is to say, that it ranges from a minimum of £75 to a maximum of £100 for schools up to 19?—Yes; we do not think that any certificated teacher should be asked to serve for £75 a year.

43. Do you think that the country can afford a larger capitation grant than £5 for schools under 14 in average attendance?—I can hardly answer as to whether the country can afford it, but you could not ask a good man to work for less salary than that.

44. Then, would you not limit the attendance at a school before you would pay £100?—That is a question for a politician rather than for me. If the country cannot afford it, then it must be done.

45. You know that in some districts there are schools with an average attendance of 2?—I do not think you can call them schools.

46. They are called schools; and if your suggested salary of £100 were granted there it would mean a cost of £50 a head?—Of course, that is impossible.

47. Then, if we are to carry out your suggestion we must limit the number of pupils that will constitute a school?—Certainly; that is all a question of colonial expenditure.

48. Do you know that in the Australian Colonies schools under a certain average attendance are called "provisional schools"?—I am not familiar with the Australian system.

49. Do you approve of the provision in this suggested scale for paying men and women equally up to £100?—Yes.

50. Do you notice that in the next grade—19 to 40—the suggested salary ranges from £120 to £160 for men, and from £102 to £144 for women?—Yes.

51. That suggested salary for women is considerably better than the salary for such grade of school in any part of the colony at the present time?—Yes, I think that is so.

52. Do you know what percentage of the schools in the colony are in the class below 40 in average attendance?—I cannot quote the figure, but I could very soon find out.

53. You are aware, probably, that about 62 per cent., or nearly a thousand schools in the colony are below 40 in average attendance?—You are more familiar with the figures than I am.

54. Suppose all schools up to 40 in average attendance were thrown open to either sex, and the salaries were equalised, do you think it would be in the interests of the women teachers to equalise salaries up to that point; or, in other words, do you not think it probable that a married man with a wife and family, perhaps, would be preferred to a single woman?—I think that in open competition that would be so.

55. Then, in the interests of women, up to that point you would reduce the disparity between the salaries, but not equalise them?—For special reasons we do not think it is advisable to equalise the salaries.

56. Then, as to the staff allowed, would you admit to the staff a thoroughly qualified assistant teacher when the average attendance reached 40?—I think that this country ought to do without pupil-teachers altogether.

57. You know that in Wellington the staff of a school between 40 and 75 consists of a head-teacher and a pupil-teacher?—Yes.

58. Do you think that staff is sufficiently liberal?—No.

59. You think that with an attendance of 75 a school is too heavy for a teacher and a pupil-teacher?—Yes.

60. Then, you prefer the suggested scale, under which a thoroughly qualified assistant would take from the headmaster the work of the infants and Standards I. and II., to the present Wellington scale?—Certainly; anything is preferable that puts an assistant in the place of a pupil-teacher.

61. Do you consider that at an average attendance of 90, three teachers—*i.e.*, a head-teacher, a mistress, and a pupil-teacher—or an average of one to 30, is sufficient?—Yes.

62. You objected to the title “infant mistress” as adding probably too much importance or dignity to the position of the woman occupying that place in the school?—I do not wish to detract from anybody’s importance, but it will lead to complications in this way: You appoint two assistants to a school—one an infant mistress. It might be found more convenient to put her to some other part of the work, and the other one in charge of the infants. I think the headmaster of the school should have full control of his staff. As to the infant mistress, I should like to remind the Commission that women are specially qualified for this work—teaching infants.

63. Do you know that in Otago the title given to the woman occupying the position provided for here is “mistress,” not “infant mistress”?—That is better.

64. And do you know that the head-teachers in Otago claim the right and exercise the right of placing the mistress or assistants in any position they think fit?—I think that is only right; the head of the school should have control.

65. So you would suggest that, instead of “infant mistress,” probably the term “mistress” would be better?—Yes; partly for the reason I have stated, and also because the present system draws the attention of women to preparing for infant work much more than it should. We want some women to look forward to taking a good position in the ordinary standard work.

66. You recognise that, now that kindergarten work, and modelling, and so on have been introduced into the infant department, the position of infant mistress is an exceedingly important one?—Yes, it is as important as any other; but we do not wish the other positions to be lost sight of.

67. It has been stated in evidence in different parts of the colony that the average woman is physically, not mentally, unfit to take charge of a large standard class in a city school above the Third Standard; that the physical strain is so great that the average woman is unable to bear it: what is your opinion on that point?—I cannot quite say I indorse that. You will find women in this district teaching boys’ classes up to the Fifth and Sixth Standards.

68. But mixed classes only?—Mixed classes of boys and girls in the Sixth Standard. I prefer to get a man for the upper classes, for the reason that outside the school he is of very great assistance in the government of a school; but I must admit that I have had the work inside the school done as well by women as men.

69. Do you not think it would be a wise provision, then, to allow such elasticity in the scale that the second or third assistant might be a female—*i.e.* that an exceptional woman may be placed there?—I think it entirely desirable.

70. Then, you would not have the alternation suggested in the scale?—We object to that.

71. You would make provision that a woman might be placed in the position?—We should like to have the staff arranged as I stated—*i.e.*, first, second, third, &c., male assistants; and first, second, &c., female assistants.

72. You know that in many large schools the women on the staff are in charge of the infants, First, Second, and Third Standards; and the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Standards are in charge of men?—If you can get the men, of course they can do the work.

73. You would approve of such a scheme as would make it possible for exceptional women to occupy exceptional positions?—Decidedly.

74. Have you heard that, according to the alternative scale, all assistants throughout the colony would be brought up to the rate paid in Otago or Canterbury, whichever was the higher?—Yes.

75. Do you approve of the assistants being paid at a much higher rate than that suggested in the first scale?—Yes, I should like to see that carried out.

76. Do you know whether the Wellington Education Board has a scale of staffing and salaries?—Yes.

77. Do you know whether or not the Board strictly adheres to its scale of salaries?—I suppose it does in making appointments; but those who have had a certain salary have very often kept it when circumstances have made it above the scale.

78. Though there is a scale in this district, the Board does not adhere to it?—Certainly not—not rigidly.

79. *Mr. Stewart.*] Do you wish the Commission to understand that, from your knowledge, the scale which is at present part of the rules and regulations of the Wellington Board is not kept to?—It is not enforced.

80. In what way is it not enforced?—New appointments are made under the scale, but, as far as I understand, there are two or three scales that have been made at different times; those appointed under one scale are still receiving payment under that scale.

81. What has been the main cause of dissatisfaction amongst teachers in the Wellington District?—We are all, as I have already answered, under great apprehensions that we shall be seriously reduced in future.

82. Why is that?—As I have said, under the Manual and Technical Instruction Act the Boards can spend, legally, as much as they like on manual and technical instruction.

83. Under the new Act?—Yes; and under the old Act too.

84. For how long have the funds been taken for manual and technical instruction?—You can get that information from the Board's officers. Our opinion is that it will be in that way that the money will be likely to go.

85. Your contention is this: that it is necessary, in the interests of primary education, that payment of teachers should be separate from the other elements of the Board's finance?—Yes, I think so.

86. Do you think that would be one effect of a colonial scale?—I hope so.

87. With regard to pupil-teachers' examinations, you say that you would like to see the disappearance of pupil-teachers altogether in the arrangement of teachers?—As a part of the staff.

88. If such a drastic measure as that were taken at once, would it not affect the supply of teachers in the future to some extent?—I would still have pupil-teachers spend part of their time in a school, but not be part of the staff. That is the plan adopted by all the best Education Boards in England.

89. Are you aware that the order of reference to this Commission distinctly limits it to the £4 capitation?—No.

90. Do you think it would be possible for this Commission to recommend such a scheme as that in the face of the order of reference?—I am afraid not.

91. How about the supply of male pupil-teachers in this district?—There are practically none, or, at any rate, a very small proportion.

92. What do you put this down to?—Mr. Webb will give you figures which seem to me to entirely account for it; those figures show that after a youth has served an apprenticeship to the teaching, and spent four or five years at it, he is worse off than if he had gone into a Government department, and the chances are he will be out of employment for a year, perhaps more, when his apprenticeship is over.

93. You think that is the sole cause?—That and the pay that he gets as a pupil-teacher. As a matter of fact, this week two young fellows who have been two or three years in this district told me that they were going out of the service.

94. With regard to infant mistresses: is it your contention that the position of first lady assistant should be the most important position—in a large school should the first lady assistant occupy the most important position of the female teachers?—Yes.

95. Do you think that the Commission should put it in this way: that the first lady assistant and the infant mistress should have an equal status in the school—at any rate, as far as pay is concerned?—I think that might be so; it is hard to deal with. I find that it about comes to that in the great Board districts at Home; the woman at the head of a large girls' department is on an equality with a woman at the head of an infant department, and I do not see why it should not be so here.

96. Is this your contention with regard to the position of an infant mistress: that if a head-teacher finds by experience that he has a teacher more adapted to the work than the infant mistress he should have the power of placing that teacher in charge?—Yes.

97. In the interests of the children, that power should be vested in the headmaster?—Yes, I think so.

98. That might cause some friction if there were any difference in the salaries?—Yes.

99. If a certain salary was attached to the infant mistress's position it might be a very inconvenient thing to give the headmaster that power?—When the infant mistress appeared as a special servant on the staff it might, perhaps, not be advisable to attempt to interchange her.

100. Is it recognised as a matter of right in your district that the first male assistant should have charge of Standard VI.?—Yes, because he is always the best-paid servant in the school.

101. Would you, as a headmaster, not have the power, under special circumstances, to say to your assistant that he should take, say, Standard IV.?—Yes, I have that power, and exercise it.

102. Then, as a matter of fact, there is no vested right?—No.

103. As a matter of principle, are the teachers thoroughly agreed upon a colonial scale?—I think so, as a whole.

104. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Have you compared the salaries under the suggested scale with the scale in the Wellington District?—Yes.

105. How do they compare—favourably or otherwise?—The men teachers would lose throughout, considerably.

106. In which case? Take your own school?—If I had no house allowance I would lose about £50.

107. Does the salary stated in the return to the Minister for the year 1900—viz., £370—embrace house allowance?—Yes, £50 house allowance.

108. Consequently your salary would otherwise be £320?—Yes.

109. Have you noticed what it would be under the suggested scale?—About £313.

110. What is the average attendance at your school?—It varies from about 490 to 530—say, 510.

111. The first assistant is getting £220: according to the scale in Otago he would get more than that?—Yes.

112. And the other teachers accordingly—*i.e.*, according to the suggested scale No. 2. Would any material alteration require to be made in the staff of your school in the event of the adoption of the suggested plan?—Not in the first case; in the second case the building would have to be altered

113. You have seven assistants and five pupil-teachers?—Yes, at present.
114. Do you consider that if the Wellington Education Board got the extra allowance of 5s. —*i.e.*, to bring the capitation from £3 15s. to £4—they would be able to pay salaries equal to those laid down in the suggested scale?—Possibly the Wellington Education Board might, but the smaller Boards could not.
115. You stated that you are in favour of a colonial scale?—Yes.
116. For the reasons that you gave?—Largely as a matter of loyalty to the teachers throughout the colony. The larger Board districts would not feel the effect as the others would.
117. You said that no scale would be complete unless provision were made for pensions: are the teachers, then, prepared to reject the suggested scale because it does not make such provision?—I do not think so.
118. For the most part your arguments were in opposition to a colonial scale. You pointed out the defects and the weaknesses of the suggested scale?—No; we are not at all opposed to a colonial scale. I was not aware that the order of reference of this Commission bound it down to dispensing only £4 capitation. We were hoping that the Commission would draw up an ideal scheme.
119. The Commission can only make a recommendation to Parliament: there is no guarantee that the recommendation we make will be adopted?—We are aware of that.
120. Do you consider that the minimum certificates required here according to the suggested scale are too high?—No; but there would have to be a discount for existing cases. I think that the percentage of reduction for those who are not up to the standard is an unwise hardship in many cases.
121. You consider that part of the proposed colonial scale should only be brought into operation when fresh appointments are made?—That is so.
122. Do you consider a teacher should lose £10 when a sewing-mistress is appointed?—Certainly not.
123. Nor that a teacher should lose a ratio of his salary when an assistant is appointed?—No.
124. I suppose you are aware that such obtains in another education district?—No, I am not.
125. With regard to pupil-teachers, do you consider that the salaries proposed to be paid to pupil-teachers according to this scale are sufficient?—No; I think they should be a little better.
126. You consider that the pupil-teachers in this district are in excess of the number that should be?—Yes.
127. Would you advocate, then, the substitution of an assistant for two pupil-teachers where practicable?—I think that should be done where practicable.
128. Do you find that in this district the female teachers largely preponderate?—In the greater number of country schools the head-teachers are men.
129. Does the Board give preference to female teachers?—The salary is less.
130. Is that the reason why the Board employs a larger number of females?—I suppose so.
131. Would preference be given to women also so that they may be able to teach sewing?—There would have to be a number of women in every case.
132. If the salaries were equalised, and this “economical” reason disappeared, would not males be appointed to vacancies which females get, and consequently fewer females be employed by the Board?—Yes, I think that would be the result.
133. What would you consider a fair differentiation between the salaries of male and female teachers?—About 75 per cent. for the higher salaries, 80 per cent. for the lower, and 90 per cent. for the lowest.
134. You mean 10 per cent. difference in the lower salaries, up to 25 per cent. in the highest salaries?—Yes.
135. With regard to pupil-teachers’ examinations, do you consider that there should be uniformity of examinations for pupil-teachers throughout the colony, instead of allowing each Board to make its own regulations?—I think it would be advisable.
136. Do you consider there should be training-colleges established in the four large centres of population, and provision made for the training of pupil-teachers in the other centres?—I think we should have to come to some arrangement of the sort.
137. You advocated that a subsidy should be paid to head-teachers for the instruction of pupil-teachers?—Where they have to do it. I should advocate that in the large centres the pupil-teachers should be taught together, as is done in this district.
138. Do you consider, then, that the system adopted in this district is working satisfactorily?—Fairly so; I think it could be made to work entirely satisfactorily.
139. How many hours a day do you consider that a pupil-teacher starting his or her career should be required to actually teach in a school?—I do not think he or she should teach more than half the week.
140. Three hours a day?—Yes, or perhaps two days and a half in the week; the other days should be devoted to study. That is the practice in many large districts in England.
141. Do you consider that male and female pupil-teachers should be paid alike?—Not quite.
142. You notice that under the suggested scale it is proposed to pay them alike?—Yes. As we say, we want some special inducement to keep men in the profession.
143. Are bonuses paid on teachers’ certificates in this district?—Yes—*i.e.*, you get better pay according to your certificates.
144. Do females participate to the same extent as males?—Yes, I suppose so, in proportion.
145. Do they not get actually the same amount of bonus on similar certificates as the males?—I am sorry to say I do not know.

146. Do you not consider that if bonuses are adopted, seeing that a female teacher has just the same examination to pass and the same work to do as a male, she should be entitled to the same amount of bonus?—Yes, I think so.

147. Do you think Inspectors should be placed under the central department?—Yes, they should.

148. You consider, I suppose, that that would lead to greater uniformity of inspection and examination?—Yes, it would certainly tend in that direction.

149. With regard to the work to be done as laid down in the syllabus, do you consider that there should be a differentiation between the work expected to be done in a country school, where the teacher is unaided, and what might be expected in a large, fully staffed town school?—Yes, certainly.

150. In which direction—not, I suppose, in the main subjects of the syllabus?—There should be more “options” in the class-subjects.

151. With regard to the maintenance fund, has the Wellington Board withdrawn maintenance funds for building purposes or for repairs of buildings?—I can hardly tell you.

152. I notice here, for example, that their receipts by way of capitation and from the Land Commissioners for the year 1899 were £45,189, whereas they only paid £39,204 in teachers' salaries?—We have looked through the Public Accounts, but cannot make head or tail of them.

153. You do not know what they did with the difference?—No.

154. With regard to side-schools, do you favour the establishment of side-schools outside the larger town schools?—I have not given much attention to that.

155. Do you favour the separation of the sexes in the larger schools?—No.

156. You consider, I suppose, that the schools can be worked much more economically when the sexes are not separated?—More economically.

157. Do you consider that the adoption of a colonial scale of staff and salaries would in any way tend to weaken the power and influence of Education Boards?—I do not see why it should. Their authority over us lies in their power of appointing and dismissing us. They would still have to pay the salaries. The only thing taken from them would be arranging the salary.

158. Do you consider that greater facilities should be given for the transfer and promotion of teachers?—Yes; I think that might be advisable, but it would be difficult to arrange under the Board's system.

159. Do you consider the working-average percentage—viz., 50 per cent.—is too low?—It hardly affects the town schools at all.

160. Do you consider that a teacher's salary should be based on the average attendance as at present, on the roll-number, or on the highest number present?—I suppose the fairest way is to take the average all round.

161. It should be based on the previous quarter's attendance—or, say, on the previous four quarters?—A half-year is perhaps the best compromise.

162. Would you favour an increase by individual units?—No; by grades.

163. You consider there would be a tendency, where you were getting near the top of a grade limit, to stuff the roll?—There would be a certain temptation; I do not think, though, that it would happen—very rarely, at any rate.

164. With regard to the alterations that have been made in the Wellington scale, I suppose they have all been more or less in the direction of reduction?—Take my own case as an example: Twenty years ago I was appointed to a school of 300 on my present salary. I have now 500, and have received a notice that my salary is above the scale.

165. *Mr. Hill.*] You are well acquainted with the scale in operation in this district?—It is rather hard to make the scale out.

166. I have a scale here called “Scale of Staffing”: are you acquainted with that scale?—Yes.

167. Do you think that the staffing proposed in that scale is sufficient?—No; there are too many pupil-teachers.

168. Is that the only defect it has?—Numerically the staffing is fair.

169. Take the case of a school between 151 and 180—“one head-teacher, one female assistant, and three pupil-teachers”: do you think you could work a school efficiently on that staff?—No; there are too many pupil-teachers.

170. Not sufficient assistants?—Certainly not.

171. Have you compared the scale to which we are now referring with the scale suggested by the Inspector-General?—Yes.

172. Which is the more favourable to the staffing of the schools?—The proposed scale.

173. Take a school of the size I have mentioned: what would be the staffing of that school under the proposed scale?—Three adults and two pupil-teachers.

174. Take a school of between 511 and 550, and make a comparison: which scale is the more favourable?—The proposed one.

175. Now, with regard to the salaries of head-teachers, have you compared the salaries proposed to be paid under the suggested scale with those paid by your Board?—Yes.

176. Take a school of from 15 to 20: would the teacher benefit under the proposed scale?—It is impossible to give you a general answer; in some cases the teachers would, and in some they would not. The teachers of the main class of country schools in this district would lose heavily.

177. The teachers of all schools up to 30 would benefit very materially?—Possibly so in the very small schools.

178. Then, all the teachers in schools of between 35 and 200 would lose?—Yes.

179. The salaries begin to approximate between that and 300. I notice that the salaries under your scale vary materially. Take the case of the Thorndon School: the headmaster gets £370,

the average attendance being 406; then at the Clyde Quay School the headmaster gets £360, the average attendance being 713; then we have your case, with an average attendance of 525 you get £370: what is the reason of these differences?—The Board pays a maximum salary when the school is over 300 in average attendance. Then, again, some of us were appointed twenty years ago, when there was a better scale in operation.

180. You mean to say that when a new scale was adopted certain teachers who had been receiving payment on a higher scale were left alone?—Yes; we were not affected.

181. That accounts, then, for the varying salaries that obtain in certain cases?—Yes, to a large extent; they have not been reduced to the new scale.

182. Your salaries, I understand, are paid on average attendance and certificates held?—Yes.

183. Do you believe in the principle of paying a man's salary on the certificate he holds instead of the work he does?—No, I do not. I have said that I think there should be a teacher's certificate.

184. And that certificate should qualify him to hold any position in the service?—There must be grades in it to express length of service, and after a certain length of service a teacher should be qualified to hold any position.

185. When a certificate is issued to the captain of a ship, does it qualify him to command a big or a little ship?—Any ship.

186. Well, then, should the certificate entitle a teacher to hold any position—to be the head of a large or small school?—I think it should say that he is a certificated teacher, and that should be sufficient.

187. Then, all things being equal, he should be able to make application for any position?—Yes.

188. I understood you to say that a woman's work in a school is equal to that of a man: has that been your experience?—I have had the upper-standard work done admirably by women.

189. You are satisfied that with proper training a woman could manage a school like a man if she were put to it?—Yes, I think so, in many cases.

190. You are aware, I suppose, that women do manage and control schools in the Old Country?—Yes.

191. There are girls' schools there in which men do not teach?—No; in the girls' departments in London there are no men teachers.

192. A woman has to pass the same examinations as a man?—Yes.

193. You said that in some cases women can do the work as well as men?—Decidedly.

194. If a woman in competition with a man does the work as well, would you give her the same salary?—No; you pay a man on the ground that he has a household to support; and you do not expect that generally in the case of women.

195. Do you not think that many women leave in consequence of being ill-paid, and are glad to get married in consequence?—I hardly think so.

196. Do you not think the women would prefer to continue teaching if they had a good salary?—No doubt, the higher the salaries the greater the tendency would be for them to stay.

197. Then, they would become more efficient and valuable to the State, would they not?—Undoubtedly.

198. Would you not, therefore, offer a woman a larger salary—say, equal to that of a man—and if the people choose to select a woman, let them do so? I am taking the case of a small school, say, up to 30 in average attendance: would you not pay a woman the same salary as a man if she were in charge of such a school—she has as much responsibility?—As far as responsibility goes, yes.

199. Does she not want to save and anticipate old age, like a man?—One objection is that it would inevitably tend to make the salary to fit a woman. If you are going to fix a salary on the basis of man's pay, I do not mind your making a woman's salary equal to a man's.

200. Suppose it were to be decided that schools below 30 were to be in the charge of women, do you think that would be a good thing for the country? If a man chose to go there he would, of course, get a woman's salary?—That is to say, you would fix the salaries attaching to those schools on a woman's rate, not a man's rate. I have no objection to their being thrown open to women at all as long as you make the rate of pay that of a man.

201. Do you suggest that men should have charge of schools of, say, from 20 to 44 in average attendance—that a scale should be provided for men?—I do not see any need to confine it to men.

202. You believe in a salary suitable for a certain position, so that women could have it as well as men?—I have no objection to positions being open to competition.

203. With regard to the control of schools, your opinion is, I understand, that the headmaster of a school should be the controller?—Yes; the headmaster or the mistress, as the case may be.

204. The headmaster should be able to distribute his staff as he thinks proper?—Yes.

205. The very fact of his being the headmaster implies that a man has a full knowledge of infant-training as well as standard work?—I suppose so.

206. You would give him full control of the staff, so that if he thought proper at any time to rearrange his staff so as to take the headmistress of the school, say, from the girls' department to take charge of the infants he could do so?—Yes.

207. The full control should be in the hands of the headmaster?—Certainly.

208. Then, under such circumstances, would not the assistants become class-teachers?—I do not quite see the drift of your question.

209. Do not your separate teachers have almost equal responsibility in your school?—Yes, nearly.

210. And the classes which they have to teach are pretty nearly equal to one another?—Yes; they vary more or less.

211. What I am after is the question of salaries: would you not approximate the assistants' salaries more closely than they are at present?—No.

212. You would still differentiate the salaries?—Yes; it is usual in all departments that as you go along you shall get to a better position.

213. But supposing the various class-teachers have equal certificates, what then? I notice that at your school you have a number of highly classed teachers: supposing they all had the same certificates, would you differentiate their salaries very much?—Take the first assistant: it is generally considered that only a man well up in reputation in the district would get the position of first assistant.

214. Yes, I can understand about the first assistant; but what about the staffing lower down? Would you approximate the salaries?—I think there should be a gradation, and that it should be a recognised thing that the higher positions should go to the more experienced or better teachers.

215. Are you satisfied with the salaries offered in the suggested scale?—No; they are discouraging for male teachers, on the whole.

216. You think some amendment is wanted in the salaries suggested?—Yes; my male staff would lose.

217. With reference to the average attendance, do you think that the teachers would prefer to be paid on the number present during any one week rather than on the average attendance?—I do not think we have ever given attention to it. I think it would not be a wise plan.

218. Give us your reason for saying so?—You may have a very large attendance some day. Your average attendance gives you a fair estimate of the number of children that a teacher generally has to teach.

219. Your staff is the same when that large attendance is present as at other times?—Yes.

220. And they are present every other day when there is a lower attendance?—Yes.

221. Do you think that, being present, and thus showing their desire to work, teachers should not suffer for the absence of the children: they have to teach the larger number when the attendance is greater than usual?—True; but, taking it all round, there is not very much difference between one day's attendance and another's. I think it is a fair way to pay—as at present.

222. If your boy went to a private school you would have to pay for him whether he attended regularly or not: so long as he attended at all you would have to pay for him?—Yes.

223. Do you not think a similar plan should operate in the public schools?—I have not given much attention to the matter.

224. You approve of a colonial scale?—Yes.

225. You approve of the principle of staffing suggested here in this proposed colonial scale?—I should like less pupil-teachers.

226. You think a system could be adopted under which there should be no pupil-teachers?—Yes.

227. *Mr. Smith.*] You said it would be better to do without pupil-teachers?—Yes.

228. Could you suggest any plan for dispensing with pupil-teachers?—More money.

229. You do not think it possible under the limits of this Commission's order of reference?—I am afraid not.

230. Is not a teacher required to prepare the whole of the children on the school-roll for examination?—Yes.

231. He has to teach the roll-number, not the average attendance?—That is so.

232. Although the average attendance may be, say, 75, he has to teach the roll-number—say, 100?—Yes.

233. You think it is a fair way of paying teachers, to pay them on the average attendance?—As I have said, I have not considered the question very seriously; but I do not see any reason to alter the opinion I expressed just now, because there would be much more temptation if the salaries were based on the maximum number.

234. Do you think it would be an improvement to raise the percentage of the working-average from 50 to 75?—I think it might be left at 50.

235. *Mr. Lethbridge.*] With reference to your Committee's allowance, does the Committee find the allowance sufficient at your school, or does it worry you to get up entertainments?—The allowance is not sufficient; we are always being bothered to get up entertainments.

236. Are the school-grounds kept fairly well?—Yes, fairly.

237. Is the school kept clean?—Yes, fairly clean. We should like to see the buildings painted and repaired oftener.

238. There are a good many small schools in your district: do you think the Board has gone too far in establishing small schools?—My opinion is that it has. Some small schools should be done without. But I am not conversant with the country districts.

239. You know that up to 15 in average attendance a school is called an aided school, and costs the Board very little?—Yes; I think the principle of carrying children to a neighbouring school might have been worked upon, perhaps, instead of building small schools.

240. Probably you do not know the roads in the back blocks?—I know there is that difficulty in some cases, but I also know of cases where the plan of carrying the children might have been very easily adopted.

241. My opinion is that it would cost more to carry children to a neighbouring school than to open a small one?—Very likely in many cases; but where there is, perhaps, a high road or a railway I think it could be done, instead of starting a small school.

242. *Mr. Hogben.*] The scale of pay for head-teachers in the Wellington District is not based strictly on average attendance, is it? It is based on two elements, is it not—the teacher's certificate and the average attendance?—Yes.

243. The larger element is the certificate?—Only in the smaller salaries.

244. I am speaking of schools under 300 more especially. The salaries payable on the classification run from £135 up to £175 for a male teacher; the salaries payable for average attendance run from £20 up to £130; so that in every case the salary payable on a certificate is greater than the amount payable on the average attendance?—I have not compared them that way.

245. What I want to get at is this: whether a system that depends so largely on the certificate—something like 60 to 80 per cent.—rather than on the attendance is capable of being kept working within a capitation grant at all. A system that does not depend for the most part on average attendance is bound to fail at some time or other if the payments are made out of the capitation grant, which does depend on average attendance?—Yes, that is so.

246. Then, the failure, sooner or later, of such a scale as the Wellington one is almost inevitable?—Yes.

247. It would be more and more expensive as the certificates rose?—Yes.

248. The Wellington Board have perceived that to some extent, apparently, for by a later regulation they have inserted a maximum salary?—Yes; but I do not know whether they did it with that view. They inserted that maximum salary in the days when they did not see any danger.

249. But it is a safeguard to a certain extent?—Yes.

250. It is obviously intended as a safeguard, and must work to some extent as a safeguard?—As I say, I do not think it came into existence as a safeguard.

251. With regard to salaries, you say that the male head-teachers would suffer generally under the proposed scale?—I have not made a comparison.

252. Take one example: what is the salary payable under the Board's scale for a school of, say, 27—I mean according to the scale, not what they are paying now?—That is what I have been doing—taking the salaries not according to the scale, but those actually paid.

253. Do you think it advisable that separate provision should be made for house allowance—separate from salaries?—Yes.

254. Do you think it would be a wise thing to pay it out of the building vote, as suggested in the proposed scale?—I can hardly say.

255. At all events, you think separate provision should be made for house allowance?—Yes.

256. Separate from a scale of staff and salaries?—Yes.

257. Otherwise in some places you could not equalise salaries in schools of the same size where in the one case there was a house and in the other there was not?—Yes.

258. Are the Inspectors at Home under the central department or under the School Boards?—Both.

259. I am speaking of the Inspectors that make the general reports?—They are His Majesty's Inspectors, under the central department.

260. But most large School Boards have their own Inspectors?—Yes, a very small number.

261. The reports that are published every year in the annual report of the Board of Education at Home, in England and Scotland, are based upon the reports of His Majesty's Inspectors?—Yes, but there is generally a report from the local Inspectors too. The report on the school by His Majesty's Inspector determines the grant.

262. Are you aware that in some cases School Boards have had the advice of His Majesty's Inspectors?—I cannot say that I am actually aware of it, but I should think it would be the case.

263. You spoke in favour of capitation by grade—the salaries being ranked according to grade, and increases according to grades and divisions, and not by unitary capitation: supposing that the attendance fell from 41 to 40, the master would lose in the one case £10, and in the other £1?—Yes.

264. And the same at every step?—Those limits, of course, are just the difficulty. On the whole, perhaps, it would be easier to go by grades than by unitary limits.

265. But do you not think it would operate very harshly sometimes when a teacher lost £10 a year through losing one pupil?—Yes, that would be so.

266. If you made steps of ten, one teacher in ten would suffer severely, and the average teacher would not gain at all?—It might be advisable, up to a certain size of school, to go by units, and then by grades.

267. When the increases become small go by grades?—Yes.

268. *The Chairman.*] According to the report of your Committee, which you read, the question of adequate staffing is considered of the first importance?—Yes.

269. Has the Committee carefully compared the staffing provided in the original scheme with the staffing proposed in this amended scale?—We have only had the amended scale for certain limits.

270. You state, in the report of the Committee, that the original scheme of staffing is numerically adequate; the new scheme considerably reduces the staffing: do you think the staffing suggested in the alternative scheme is sufficient?—It depends on the point of view from which you look at it. The staff set down in the alternative scheme is as good a staff as we have now.

271. Do you think the present staff requires strengthening?—I think so.

272. In the alternative scale, compared with the other one, the staffing is reduced in order to increase the salaries: do you think that an advantage? I am speaking with regard to the teachers' point of view, but ask you whether it would be an advantage to the schools?—If you let the salary fall you get a poorer class of teacher.

273. But do you think it is wise to reduce the staffing in order to increase the salaries?—I think, on the whole, we prefer the alternative scheme to the former. The second scale, on the whole, would be more to the advantage of the schools.

274. Then, you think that the salaries rather than the staffs require improving?—No; speaking for our own schools, in neither case would the salaries be increased.

275. We have two schemes before us, and I want to know which of the two you approve of—the one that raises the salaries or the one that increases the staffs?—I think, taking the good of the school as a whole into consideration, the second scale would be the better. Under the first the pay of the men would be considerably lower, and we should get inferior men.

276. You think the new scale is the better one of the two?—Yes; but I do not set either of them down as models. We have not seen this second scale worked out, and are talking in the dark with regard to it. It is, however, a better scale of staff than we have at present.

277. Your Committee say in their report that the minimum salary paid to males should be £110, and to females £100: is there any difference in the work that they have to do?—The reason I gave was that we thought that if men are to be secured for the service they must receive a little extra. Women leave much more frequently than men.

278. Do you know of any other profession in life where that is taken into consideration—*i.e.*, the fact that a man or woman may be liable to leave?—I think, in every trade a woman is paid less than a man.

279. But do you know that that reason influences employers?—I think so. You would not expect a man to carefully train a servant, during which time he is not much good to him, if he expects him to leave immediately after being trained.

280. But there is nothing binding, is there, upon a servant to remain in a service in learning a trade?—Nothing that I know of.

281. Do you know whether any difference is made in the public service between the pay of men and women when equal work is rendered?—I have not the figures before me.

282. Do you think that if males are paid more than females it will constitute a serious grievance, and be a source of very great irritation between young men and women in the service of the Education Board?—There is a considerable difference at present.

283. But do you not think that the whole source of complaint should be removed instead of being partially remedied?—I do not see very well how you can, under existing circumstances.

284. What is there to prevent it?—I do not mind personally, if you start on what is recognised as a fair basis for the men, and make it open competition right through.

285. Take the case of two first-class teachers—one a man and the other a woman: why should the man be paid 25 per cent. more than the woman for doing the same work?—The whole social organization is based on this: a man is supposed to keep a household, and a woman is not.

286. Take two teachers that are both single, and on equal terms: why should a man receive more than a woman?—You are taking an exceptional case; ninety male teachers out of a hundred are married.

287. But the women teachers may have sisters, mothers, &c., dependent on them?—Yes, but on the whole they are exceptions.

288. Do you think there ought to be one salary for the unmarried men and women, and another salary for those who are married?—No.

289. That is what it really comes to: would you give a married man more salary than an unmarried man?—In nearly every case the man is married.

290. Do you not think that by giving equal pay for equal work you get better work?—I have no objection to equal pay for equal work as long as it is paid on the basis on which you pay the men now. In my opinion, the tendency would be, if both were paid alike, to screw down the salaries and get the men out of the service.

291. Then, you think the men are not equal to competing with the women on fair terms in the teaching profession?—Not on the same salaries. It is the question of child-labour again, in another phase. When you allow children in trades the wages are reduced.

292. When vacancies representing salaries of £150 and upwards occur, what kind of applicants generally fill those vacancies—men or women?—Generally men.

293. But when it comes down to a matter of £120?—Mostly women.

294. Is there any lack of efficient teachers in this district for the vacancies that occur?—So far as my knowledge goes, there is a difficulty in getting junior male assistants.

295. I mean well-paid positions, where the salary is £150 and upwards: do a lot of outside applications then come in?—Perhaps so.

296. You expressed the opinion that the Inspectors should be under the central department?—Yes.

297. If they were under the central department, do you think it would be most satisfactory as far as the schools are concerned—would the inspection be better?—Personally, I should be very sorry to lose our Inspector.

298. Do you think that a new Inspector coming into a district would be likely to do as much justice to the schools and the teachers as a man who has been acquainted with them for years?—There would be a greater interchange of views.

299. You think it would be an advantage, then?—I think it would be an advantage.

300. I want to know what the object would be in placing Inspectors under a central authority and removing them from the control of the Boards: would they work harder or better under a central authority in Wellington than under the Boards?—There would be more interchange of opinion, more light brought from one district to another.

301. Do you think that the present system is defective—that we are not making good progress?—I would not say so; but we are not making the progress we might.

302. Is that the fault of the Inspectors?—No; it is hard to say exactly whose fault it is.

303. Do you think that the Board is less considerate to the teachers with regard to salary and other things than a central authority would be likely to be?—They should be under a central authority.

304. Do you think a central department would be more generous in voting you money for salaries than the Boards?—Yes.

305. Assuming that, in order to bring about a uniform scale of salaries for similar work all over New Zealand, it was necessary to reduce salaries in one district and increase them in another, do you think that would give general satisfaction?—Nobody likes to be reduced; but we recognise that, perhaps, that would be inevitable.

306. Do you not think the teachers would be likely to complain?—Of course, those who would be reduced would complain.

307. You think it would be well to make a sacrifice in one place if it were necessary to bring them all up to an equal level?—It might be necessary.

308. With regard to house allowances, I suppose you have some knowledge of the amount of house allowance made in different places: is it a fact that in one case in this district £50 is allowed for house allowance, and in another case only £10?—Yes.

309. Do you not think £10 a year rather a small house allowance?—Yes.

310. Would you be in favour of granting assistants house allowance as well as headmasters? You have assistants here in Wellington who are married men; they have to pay tolerably heavy rents: would you be in favour of paying them house allowance?—It is really all a question of salary.

311. If house allowance is paid to headmasters, should it not be paid to assistants?—In adjusting the assistants' salaries no house allowance has been paid. No assistants throughout the colony have house allowance. The position of the head-teachers is different; the majority of them have a house.

312. If the headmasters claim house allowance, why should not the assistants?—We claim that there should be a uniform salary throughout.

313. And that house allowance should be included in salary: is that it?—The salary should be fixed, so that if you have a house or not you are on the same basis.

314. Your Committee propose to rate men and women assistants separately—*i.e.*, first, second, third, &c., male assistants; and first, second, third, &c., female assistants: why is that?—It would make it easier to adjust the pay on some such scheme as this.

315. But if you are going to have satisfactory discipline in a school, do you not think that the headmaster should have control and be able to arrange his assistants irrespective of whether they are men or women?—Yes.

316. As headmaster, you would not like to be told who was to be placed in charge of the Sixth and Seventh Standards?—Certainly not.

317. If you had a good, strong, capable woman teacher, who was more competent than the male assistants, you would place her in charge of one of those standards?—Yes.

A. ERSKINE, representing Assistants, Wellington, examined.

318. *The Chairman.*] You are first assistant at the Terrace School?—Yes. As a representative of the assistants in this district, I wish to deal with the matter entirely from a male assistant's point of view. The feeling in this district amongst male assistants is that sufficient inducements are not offered by the new scale to attract men into the profession, and to keep those assistants in the profession who are at present in it.

319. Are you referring to the later scale?—No; the previous one, for the reason that I know nothing about the other one. There is nothing in the alternative scale that we can deal with at all; we know nothing of what is to be given to assistant masters under it.

Mr. Hogben: I will explain. The saving of staff in schools of under 330 effected by the alternative scale would set free sufficient money to provide for all assistants, male and female (with three or four exceptions, I think, in the colony), being paid at a rate as high as any existing scale in New Zealand.

The Chairman: Under the proposed new scale the assistants would be raised to the highest level obtaining in any district in the colony.

Mr. Hogben: Take a school with an average attendance of between 420 and 480: the first assistant would have a salary of £220, the second £170, and the third £110. The salaries run up from those figures to £250, £200, and £130.

Mr. Erskine: Of course, we have considered this matter from the point of view of the first suggested scale, not the alternative scale. I think, if that is the proposal, that assistant masters in this district will be more satisfied. One objection to the first scale was the alternation of male and female assistants, and if that is done away with one of our objections will be removed. Well, then, I propose first of all to deal with the question whether the profession would be rendered more attractive. Under the first scale it would not have been so, and especially, I think, with regard to the very first step in the case of the pupil-teacher. He would receive a salary for the first year of £20, rising by £10 a year to £50. I think that would not render the profession attractive, especially to males. In other departments of the Government service cadets, who are not supposed to be either physically, morally, or mentally more capable than those that we wish to get into the profession, have very much better prospects. The Post Office cadet, for instance, starts with £40, and in his fourth year ends with £85, getting a rise of £10 the second year, £15 the third year, and £20 in his fourth year. Then, in the case of the Government Railways, the first year the cadet gets £30, the second year £40, the third £50, and the fourth £60. I think those salaries will attract youths into those professions to the detriment of the teaching profession. Then, again, if the pupil-teacher is forced to work away from home, his lodging-allowance amounts only to £10 a year, decreasing in his third and fourth years to £5 a year. In the Railway Department the cadet gets as lodging-allowance £26 in the first year, £20 the second year, £13 the third, and £9 the fourth. The Post Office cadet gets even better; he receives £26 lodging-allowance for the first year, the same for the second year, and £13 the third year; in his fourth year he does not get any, but

he is getting a salary of £85 a year, and is not any older than the pupil-teacher, who will be receiving £50 a year. Besides that, the pupil-teacher has to pass examinations every year; the cadet does not; he has all his time to himself; he may, if he chooses, pass a shorthand examination, by which he will get three months added to his time of service, and that means something to him. Then, there was a regulation under the proposed scale which we thought would have the effect of preventing males from entering the service: at the end of four years the pupil-teacher would lose a part of his salary—he would have to go back to £40 a year. We thought that a great objection, and without a parallel as far as we knew.

Mr. Hogben: I may point out that in some copies of the proposed scale two words were omitted by the printer. It should read "if uncertificated." If a fifth-year pupil-teacher has his certificate he is not subject to reduction, nor if he moves to another school. That is how the scale should read.

Mr. Erskine: That alters the case to a great extent. I intended to go on in that line with regard to assistant masters right through. Of course, under the alternative scale the assistant master will get a better salary. The local Institute came to the conclusion that the minimum salary for male assistants should be £110 a year; they thought that was as small a salary as a male assistant could possibly live on, especially in this district. Then, with respect to the positions open to the male assistants, under the alternative scale I notice that an assistant, besides an infant mistress, would be appointed in schools of 150 average attendance. The male assistants hoped that that appointment would be a fairly good one, that it would not be an appointment carrying the minimum salary, for the male assistant in a school with an average attendance of 150 generally has important work to do. He has very often two classes, and he should be a man, I think, of some experience, some attainment, and should be of great help to the headmaster. If the first male assistant to appear on the staff should appear in a school of an average attendance of not less than 150, that would leave only sixteen schools in this district where males would be employed. We think that the first male assistant should be an experienced man, a man of a good many years' experience, of some literary attainment as well; and that a man with a D3 certificate would not be good enough for the position as proposed in the scale. A man with a D3 certificate has an experience, perhaps, of only seven or eight years, and would not be competent to fill the position. Men of very much greater experience, such as those that are holding the positions at present, should be appointed; many of them throughout the colony have had from fifteen to twenty-five years' experience, and I think they should get good salaries. The majority of them are married men, and have families to support. We think that in this district especially the male assistants should receive larger salaries, for the reason that the cost of living is much higher here than in other districts. I know of cases in Wellington of men supporting families on £150 a year, and paying one-third of that salary for rent. With regard to the proposed staffing of the schools as first, second, third, &c., male assistants, and first, second, third, &c., female assistants, the assistant masters are entirely in agreement with the proposal of the Institute.

320. *Mr. Davidson.*] What experience have you had?—Twenty years.

321. In what positions?—Entirely as assistant master, in schools ranging from 200 to 550.

322. You have never had any experience as a headmaster at any class of school?—No.

323. Did you serve an apprenticeship as a pupil-teacher?—Yes.

324. In your opinion, the right class of boy is not entering the teaching profession at the present time?—I think not. In this district very few have entered the profession at all; I have been engaged in the instruction of pupil-teachers for some years, and I do not think the appointments of male pupil-teachers have averaged two a year.

325. Do you not think that the low salaries to begin with, and the want of prospect in the future for pupil-teachers, have had a good deal to do with boys not entering the service?—I think so.

326. Then, if some satisfactory scale were introduced whereby the position of the teacher throughout the colony would be improved, that perhaps would have the effect of bringing into the profession a desirable class of boys?—It would probably do so.

327. You have noticed the alternative scale, and have heard what the Inspector-General had to say respecting it as far as assistants were concerned?—Yes; it is the first time I have heard that.

328. What is the average attendance at your school at the present time?—About 500. Last quarter of last year it was 523.

329. It will come in between 510 and 570: what is your salary at the present time?—£220.

330. Under the Otago scale in that class of school the salary of the first assistant is £240, so that if the salary of first assistant at the grade of school in which you are now employed were raised to the rate paid in Otago your position would be greatly improved?—Yes.

331. If such a scheme were adopted you would find your position and salary much improved?—Yes, according to that.

332. Do you think that if such a scheme were adopted throughout the colony the male assistants would be fairly well satisfied?—They would certainly be more satisfied than if the first scheme had been adopted.

333. Would they not be more satisfied than at present, when thirteen different scales of salary obtain throughout the colony?—I think so.

334. Have you compared the salaries of male assistants in the different districts of the colony?—Not carefully.

335. I suppose you know that the salaries paid to male assistants in Otago and North Canterbury are, on the whole, very much better than the average for the colony?—Yes; higher than in Wellington, for instance.

336. You object to the alternating of the sexes, as suggested in the first scale?—Yes.

337. If it were provided that the first assistant in schools above a certain average attendance should be a male, and that the following assistants might be either male or female, according as

the Education Board, probably under the advice of their Inspector, and after consultation with the headmaster, might decide, do you not think that would get over the objection some male assistants have to the scale?—I think I should support the proposal of our Institute, that assistants should be ranked first, second, and third male assistants, and first, second, and third females—that is, supposing there were three of each—the salaries of the assistant mistresses bearing a fair proportion to those of the men in like positions.

338. Have you any opinion to express on this point: whether the average female assistant is physically capable of managing a Fourth, Fifth, or Sixth Standard of 60 or more pupils in a large mixed school?—I think that she would find the strain very great in a year or two.

339. There are exceptional women who can do, have done, and are doing the work?—Certainly.

340. You objected to the alternating of the sexes as far as assistants were concerned: if it were provided that the second or following assistants might be of either sex, so as to make it possible for an exceptional woman to take the second position, would that not get over the difficulty you referred to?—That would be providing for an exception, and the scale, I think, should not include provision for such cases.

341. You would prefer, then, to have the male and female assistants classed as suggested by the Institute?—Yes. Of course, the second male in all large schools has to take charge of a very large upper standard.

342. Do you know at what attendance, under the Otago scale, the first male assistant comes in?—No.

343. At from 231 to 270: under this alternative scale the first place where there are two assistants on the staff is 150 to 200?—Yes.

344. That is the first grade; now there is an infant mistress in charge of the infants, and probably Standard I.?—Yes.

345. Standards II. and III. might well be taught by a female assistant: do you not think so? I have had no experience of those schools.

346. Your experience as a teacher, apart from your experience in that particular type of school, would lead you to say that the Second and Third Standards in a country school might well be in charge of a certificated woman?—That might be so. I had hoped that the next assistant would have been a man in those schools, because it leaves so very few schools in the colony in which first assistant masters will be employed at all. There are only 153 schools, I think, in the whole colony with an average attendance of 150 and over, and it is only in those schools that assistant masters will be employed, and where you will be training your future headmasters.

347. Would it not be better for the men to take sole charge of country schools rather than of classes in the instruction of which a woman might better be employed?—I think there will not be enough men to go into the country unless there are a fairly large number of assistant masters.

348. Do you think that, as a rule, the country schools are supplied from the assistant masters?—To a certain extent.

349. Are they not supplied by male pupil-teachers who have gone through their course and served probably one or two years at a training-college?—Not in this district.

350. *Mr. Stewart.*] Do the assistants of Wellington approve of a colonial scale in principle?—We do.

351. They are thoroughly in accord with it?—Yes.

352. *Mr. Luke.*] What is your certificate?—D1.

353. You think that if the provision in the alternative scale to give assistants the maximum salaries paid in any part of the colony were adopted by the Commissioners it would be satisfactory and acceptable to assistants throughout the colony?—I think so.

354. What certificate do you think a head-teacher should have in a school of, say, 350 or 400?—A very large number of the headmasters of the colony, holding the best positions, have a D1 certificate, and I think that would be a very good basis to go on.

355. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Do you represent the Teachers' Institute?—Yes.

356. Are you one of the chosen representatives?—I am.

357. Was a meeting held to select representatives?—A meeting was held to consider the matter, a Committee was appointed to draw up a report—that which was read by Mr. Watson—and that Committee selected its representatives.

358. Was their action indorsed by the Institute?—It was.

359. You said that under the suggested scale—I suppose that you were referring to No. 1—there were not attractions enough for men to join the service: is it not a fact that when a vacancy occurs for an assistant in a town school there are a very large number of applicants?—Under the present circumstances, perhaps; but the lowest salary paid in this district to the male assistant is £100, whereas under the proposed scale the lowest would have been £80.

360. With regard to pupil-teachers, do you not consider there are too many employed at the Terrace School?—Yes.

361. How many just now?—Six, I think.

362. How would the suggested scale affect the Terrace School in the matter of staffing?—Under the first scale there would have been one assistant more than at present.

363. The amended scale would reduce the number of pupil-teachers provided in the first scale by one?—Yes, I understand so.

364. Would that benefit the school: would that increase the efficiency as far as the teaching is concerned?—The assistants would be the same in number as at present, I believe. If we got another assistant the school would be benefited.

365. With regard to the salaries of pupil-teachers, you say that the suggested scale would not allow of sufficient salaries for the pupil-teachers: do you consider that the regulations of the

Wellington Board allow them sufficient salaries?—I think not. The average, I believe, is about the same as that proposed in the new scale.

366. With the exception of the fifth year, of course?—Yes.

367. Do you consider that male and female pupil-teachers should receive equal pay?—I see no reason why they should not.

368. Do you consider that we should have equal pay for equal work—that, as well as teachers in the various districts getting the same rate of pay, female teachers should get the same rate of remuneration as males for similar work?—I think not.

369. Why?—For the reasons given by Mr. Watson this morning.

370. You have no reasons other than those put forward by Mr. Watson?—I think they cover all that I could say on the matter.

371. What do you consider a fair ratio of difference between the salaries paid to male and female teachers—the same sliding-scale as that suggested by Mr. Watson?—It was proposed that a first assistant woman should receive about 75 per cent. of the salary paid to a first assistant man, and that the proportion should increase as you go down the scale.

372. With regard to small country schools, what difference would you make in the salaries paid to male and female teachers respectively?—I have not considered that matter.

373. Would you consider 10 per cent. a sufficient differentiation?—I would rather not answer that question, as I have not considered the matter.

374. If the salaries of teachers were brought up to the level of the salaries paid in Otago they would have more reason to be satisfied than under present circumstances?—Certainly.

375. I suppose that, like *Oliver Twist*, they would never be quite content?—That is human nature.

376. With regard to certificates, in some districts the Inspectors lay down a rule that an assistant teacher shall not go up to Grade 1, but must remain at Grade 2 until he has had experience as a master of a school: is that plan adopted in the Wellington District?—I think not; I am an example.

377. With regard to the appointment of teachers, is any provision made by the Wellington Board for the transfer or promotion of teachers within the district?—They promote their own teachers.

378. Supposing that you left the school that you are in, and a vacancy were thereby created, would they promote the second assistant to the position?—Not necessarily.

379. They would call for applications?—Yes.

380. I suppose they would consider the claims of the second assistant for promotion?—If he applied I suppose his case would be considered. We have had cases of second assistants being appointed to first-assistantships; it does not always occur that the second assistant at the same school is promoted to the vacancy.

381. Do you find that there is a tendency on the part of country teachers to gravitate towards the towns, or the larger centres?—I think so.

382. For what reason?—I am not a country teacher. I have heard a married man say that he wished to come into town in order that his children might attend college; there are many other similar reasons.

383. With regard to the minimum certificates required for assistants according to the suggested scale, do you agree with them? For example, a first assistant requires D3 for a school of from 75 to 100: do you consider that too high?—I think that in schools of over 300 D3 is too low.

384. But up to 300?—I have no objection to that at all. For a school of over 300 I think the certificate ought to be much higher—at any rate, D2.

385. Do you agree with D2?—Yes.

386. The assistant teachers think that under the suggested scale there would not be the increase of salaries that they consider they are entitled to, or proportionate to what would be given to other classes of teachers?—That was their grievance with regard to the first scale, but I think the male assistants in this district will be fairly well satisfied with the salaries under the alternative scale.

387. *Mr. Hill.*] Do you believe in the continuance of the pupil-teacher system as a part of the staffing of the public schools?—I think it is necessary to have some pupil-teachers, but I do not think there should be so many as are employed at present in the various districts.

388. Suppose it were possible to arrange to do without pupil-teachers, do you think it would be advisable in the interests of education?—Most decidedly.

389. Are you of opinion that in large schools the assistants, equally with the headmaster, should be required to assist in the instruction of pupil-teachers?—That is a matter I have not considered, but I do not think they should be.

390. Do you not assist in the preparation of pupil-teachers?—We have a slightly different system from other districts. All the city pupil-teachers are massed in classes, and five instructors are appointed, who take a subject each. They each give a lesson once a week.

391. Do they get special payment for that?—Yes.

392. Suppose that in the arrangement of salaries it is found necessary to require all certificated assistants to assist the headmaster in the preparation of pupil-teachers, do you consider it would be a fair thing to include payment for this special aspect of school-work in their salaries? In other words, do you think the instruction-money should be merged in the salaries paid, and that there should be no special payment?—I think there should be some allowance made for the tuition of pupil-teachers.

393. Suppose this allowance were merged in the salaries, and the scale so altered as to include such payment, do you think it would not be better than the system that obtains here?—I am hardly able to judge.

394. Do you not think that it would be better to make the certificated staff of a school responsible for the training of pupil-teachers not merely in instruction, but in the art of school-management?—Perhaps it would be advisable, but I think the system that obtains here has been fairly successful.

395. I am not assuming that the system here has not been effective; I am asking for your opinion as to the advisability of requiring the assistants to take part equally with the headmaster in the preparation of pupil-teachers?—Perhaps it would be advisable.

396. You believe in a general scheme for the payment of salaries?—I believe in a colonial scale.

397. I suppose you are aware that this proposed scale is based upon a capitation allowance of £4?—I understand so.

398. And that your salaries are to be based upon a capitation of £3 8s. 9d.?—Yes.

399. Do you think that it would be possible for your Board, assuming that it had an extra capitation allowance of 5s. to be spent wholly upon the teachers' salaries, to pay as good salaries as those laid down in the proposed scale?—I have not gone into calculations of that kind.

400. Assuming that the Board could do so, would you still be in favour of a colonial scale?—I think so.

401. Do you approve of this suggested staffing of the schools? Have you analysed the staffing at all?—I have not analysed the alternative scale at all.

402. I was going to ask you what you thought of the proposed staff of a school of, say, between 120 and 150?—That brings me back to the proposal that the extra assistant there should be a man.

403. It states here that in a school of between 120 and 150 there would be a principal teacher, an assistant—called here an infant mistress—and two pupil-teachers: do you think that that is efficient staffing for a school like that?—As far as I am able to judge, I should say it would be.

404. I understood you to say that an assistant master was required in such a school?—I misunderstood you; it is from 150 to 200 where the assistant comes in.

405. This amended scale says that there should be a principal teacher, an infant mistress, and one assistant; of course, it would follow that that assistant would be an assistant master: have you noticed what salary it is proposed to give that assistant master?—No.

406. I am going back to the first scale: in a school of from 150 to 175 the salary payable to the assistant master would be £90?—Yes.

407. Do you think that is an adequate salary?—No, I think not.

408. Suppose, however, the male assistant in a school of this kind was what we might call a junior assistant—*i.e.*, an assistant who had been certificated less than, say, three years, and was not entitled to be called a qualified assistant as we understand it: do you think that under such circumstances £90 would be sufficient?—Not for a certificated assistant.

409. Say he has been a pupil-teacher for four years; he has ended his pupil-teachership with a salary of £50 or £60, and he begins as a junior assistant in a school of this kind: do you think that £90 would be sufficient for a young fellow of that description?—I do not think so.

410. What do you think a young man—certificated—who has been teaching, and is twenty or twenty-one years of age, ought to receive?—I think the minimum should be about £110. A young man such as that would probably have to live away from home, and have to pay for board and lodging. He would have to go on with his studies, and consequently would have to pay for "coaching," and have a number of expenses in regard to books. I do not think he could live on less than £110 a year.

411. You think some encouragement should be given to a young fellow of such a type as this to go on with his studies?—Yes.

412. And you think that £110 would be a proper amount to give, instead of £90?—It would be better.

413. Are you in favour of the proposed scheme so far as the certificate classification of teachers is concerned? Do you think that the present system of classifying teachers is a good one?—There should be one certificate for teachers.

414. One certificate should be issued by the department, and that certificate should qualify the holder to compete for anything as a teacher—like a captain's certificate qualifies for a ship?—Yes; of course, when he came into competition with others his other qualifications would have to help him along.

415. Your opinion is that even a graduate should be required to get that certificate before he could teach, like an ordinary individual?—I think so.

416. He should go through the requirements, just the same as an ordinary teacher would be required to go through a graduate's course, if he desired to obtain a graduate's degree?—I think so.

417. *Mr. Hogben.*] Can you tell me of any scale in the colony that gives £100 to an assistant master at a school of 151?—I believe an assistant at Featherston gets more than that.

418. I am speaking of the scale, not what is paid?—Then, I could not say.

419. With regard to the larger schools, at the Terrace School, with an average attendance of under 500, the salary of the first assistant is £220?—Yes.

420. If the salary were placed at £230 you would get a rise of £10 a year?—Yes.

421. What salary does the second assistant master get?—£150.

422. Therefore a salary of £175 would be a rise of £25?—Yes.

423. A salary of £112 for the third assistant master would be an increase of £12?—Yes.

424. Take Clyde Quay: do you know the average there?—About 700.

425. The first assistant master gets £220: if his salary were placed at £250 he would get a rise of £30?—Yes.

426. The second assistant master gets £150: if his salary were raised to £180 it would be an increase of £30?—Yes.

427. The third assistant master gets £100: if his salary were increased to £125 it would be an increase of £25?—Yes.

428. *The Chairman.*] You think that the pupil-teachers would not be paid enough under this scale?—That is my opinion.

429. What improvement would you make: what would be a fair amount for a pupil-teacher to begin with?—I compared pupil-teachers with the Post Office and Railway cadets, and I think something between the rates paid to them would be a fair salary for a pupil-teacher.

430. Do you think there is much difference between male and female teachers in the matter of qualifications?—It depends on the work. I think that up to a certain standard, where a lady teacher can stand the strain, her work is just as good as a man's.

431. Would you be in favour of introducing any new system under which strong, or what may be termed "exceptional," lady teachers, who have qualified for the work, would be absolutely prohibited from teaching the higher standards?—I think a headmaster should have liberty to organize his staff as he thinks fit.

J. C. WEBB, First Assistant Master, Thorndon School, representing the Male Assistants, examined.

Mr. Webb: I do not wish to make a statement, but only to answer questions. *Mr. Erskine* has said, practically, all there was to be said, leaving nothing for me to add.

432. *The Chairman.*] You have heard *Mr. Erskine*: do you agree with what he has said?—Yes.

433. *Mr. Davidson.*] What has been your teaching experience?—I have been nine years in the Board's service as a public-school teacher.

434. Did you serve an apprenticeship as a pupil-teacher?—No.

435. Have you taught as headmaster at any school?—Yes; at a country school.

436. What was the average attendance there?—From 40 to 50.

437. Then, you can express an opinion on some questions that I omitted to ask *Mr. Erskine*. Do you notice that, under the alternative scale, when the attendance at a school reaches 40 the first assistance is granted, and it takes the form of a certificated assistant mistress?—Yes.

438. Do you approve of that staffing?—I think it is sufficient.

439. Would you prefer the assistance of a certificated teacher to a pupil-teacher at that stage?—I do not think it would be necessary.

440. What staff would you suggest after the average attendance reaches 40?—You have the head-teacher and an assistant mistress.

441. It has been suggested in some districts that, instead of an infant mistress, the assistance should take the form of a pupil-teacher: what is your opinion?—I think a pupil-teacher would be sufficient in a school of that size.

442. A pupil-teacher who was just beginning work as a teacher, or a pupil-teacher who had had two or three years' experience?—The latter.

443. Where would you bring in the assistant mistress or infant mistress?—At the next rise—65 to 90.

444. Do you not think that a school with an average attendance of 64—*i.e.*, a school having about 85 on the roll, and sometimes that number present—too heavy for a man with the assistance only of a pupil-teacher?—I understand your question to be, would we introduce an assistant at 65?

445. You say not until 65 is reached?—From 40 to 65 simply a pupil-teacher; the assistant to be introduced at 65.

446. What I say is this: Take a school having an average attendance of 64, the roll-number being probably 85; that school should have a staff of a master and a pupil-teacher only?—64 would be rather heavy.

447. Would you suggest that the assistance you spoke of just now—*i.e.*, a second- or third-year pupil-teacher—should be allowed in schools of, say, from 40 to 50?—Yes.

448. Then, you would have in the schools between 50 and 90 a certificated mistress in addition to the headmaster?—Yes.

449. You think that is a fairly liberal staff?—Yes.

450. From your experience as a country teacher, would you approve of the suggestion to grant the same salary to either sex in schools of from 14 to 19?—Yes.

451. Then, in this alternative scale the salaries are differentiated after £100 is reached?—My answer to that would be identical with that of *Mr. Erskine*.

452. You think that it is wise to differentiate in the salaries?—Yes.

453. Do you think that it is in the interests of women themselves that the salaries should be differentiated?—I have not considered it from that view-point at all.

454. Do you think, if the salaries were equalised and were sufficiently liberal to induce young men, probably young married men, to apply for these positions, that School Committees would in the majority of cases take the married men in preference to single ladies?—Certainly.

455. Then, to equalise salaries would not be in the interests of the women?—No.

456. Do you not think that at the present time the disparity between the salaries paid to the different sexes is too great in some districts?—Yes.

457. Then, I understand you to mean this: that in the interests of women themselves you would bring the salaries of the sexes into closer proximity—that is, you would reduce the disparity, and throw positions open to either sex?—Yes.

458. But you would not equalise the salaries?—No.

459. *Mr. Hill.*] Do you consider your work as first assistant master more difficult than your work in the country school where you were formerly engaged?—Yes.

460. In what way do you consider it more difficult?—Owing to organization. Since I have been a first assistant I have had practically three classes to teach. I have taught the Sixth and Seventh, and done scholarship-work in conjunction with the two.

461. How many pupils do you teach?—From 50 to 74; I mean, of course, in Standards VI. and VII., and the scholarship-work.

462. How many children did you have in the country?—From Standards III. to VII., not more than 28 altogether.

463. How many children were there below Standard III.?—25.

464. What help had you at that school?—One pupil-teacher.

465. You consider that your position as first assistant is far more difficult than your former position of head of the school?—Far more difficult.

466. That is, as a class-teacher?—Yes.

467. What salary did you get in the country?—£175.

468. And a house?—Yes.

469. That would be equal to about £200 a year?—About that.

470. You get £220 now?—Yes.

471. The extra £20 represents the increased work you are called upon to do?—Yes, I suppose so.

472. Do you think the £20 fairly represents it?—No.

473. What do you consider ought to be given to the first assistant in a school such as yours?—I consider that if I were paid according to the highest scale in the colony I would be paid none too highly. I understand that my salary under the alternative scale would be £240. I think that is none too ample.

474. Would that fairly represent the value of your services as first assistant?—Fairly. I might elaborate what Mr. Erskine has said in one particular: the first assistant is almost of necessity a married man.

475. What is the average attendance at the school at which you are working?—About 500. Since the fire of twelve months ago the average has fallen considerably.

476. Supposing the schools in this colony were arranged in ten classes, according to their average attendance, and it was decided that the salary paid to the first assistant in a school with the highest attendance should be equal to the salary paid to the headmaster of a school with, an attendance of say, 200, do you think such a plan would be acceptable to teachers?—There is an element entering into the question which I think should not be overlooked, and that is knowledge of organization. A first assistant, while supposed to possess that knowledge, is not frequently called upon to put it into use.

477. That is what I wanted. Do you tell me that the first assistant in a large school, say, of 600 is more capable as an organizer than the headmaster in a school of 200?—I do not think he is more capable, but as capable.

478. Then, if you think he is as capable, do you think that the plan of arranging that the salary of the first assistant in a large school shall be similar to that of the headmaster in a school with an average attendance of 200 would be acceptable and beneficial?—It depends on where you fix the numbers.

479. I am assuming that there is a classification of that sort, so that assistants in large schools should be equal to principals in smaller schools?—I see no strong objection to that. It is a matter that I have not thought out carefully.

480. The teachers have not considered such a plan as that?—As far as I am aware, they have not.

481. Are the teachers satisfied with the proposed classification in the first suggested scale?—I think the male assistants are not satisfied. They feel that D3 for an assistant in a large school is a low certificate. I may explain my own case. Since the fire at the Thorndon School twelve months ago I have been practically the headmaster of the girls' branch. Had I not had some knowledge of organization such an arrangement would have been impossible. A man with seven or eight years' experience cannot have a very wide experience of organization.

482. You think that the older a man grows the more capable he becomes as an organizer?—Certainly.

483. Do you not think there is a limit to that?—You mean that a man will at last learn the sum total?

484. Yes?—No; because education is progressive.

485. You think that really it is experience that constitutes the test of the man?—Mostly.

486. If he is experienced why do you want classification?—Simply because the longer he lives the more he knows.

487. Then, why not allow him to rise as high as he can without a certificate—I mean so long as he has Government recognition that he is a qualified teacher?—I agree with that.

488. Suppose a man and a woman were making boots, and each of them made twelve pairs of equal quality, would you expect the woman to receive lower payment than the man, just because she was a woman?—It would depend on the responsibilities of the woman outside of her employment. A man has more engagements to fulfil than a woman.

489. Do you tell me that the man ought to be paid more for twelve pairs of boots of similar quality than the woman?—Bootmaking is not teaching.

490. Let us have your answer about the boots?—I know nothing of the boot trade. I do not know the amount of skill required.

491. We will assume the boots were of equal quality: would you pay the woman at the same rate as the man?—If she were doing exactly the same work.

492. If you place a woman in a position in a school which a man has been occupying, and she does equally efficient work, would you pay her the same salary?—If she is doing the same work, yes.

493. *Mr. Hogben.*] You said that you would place pupil-teachers instead of infant mistresses in schools of from 40 to 50; there are over 140 such schools in the colony: what schools would you take the third- and fourth-year pupil-teachers that you referred to from?—I had not thought of that.

494. Would you take the 140 third- and fourth-year pupil-teachers from the larger schools?—I had not given full thought to that matter.

495. It would weaken the staffs of the big schools?—Yes.

496. You do not object to the principle of putting in a certificated mistress as the first assistance that a master gets?—No.

497. Therefore, if you saw such a danger as I have indicated you might modify the answer you gave before?—Yes.

498. As a point of staffing merely, it strengthens the staff to add a mistress rather than a pupil-teacher?—Yes.

499. *The Chairman.*] Do you consider that as first aid in a small school a pupil-teacher is sufficient?—Yes.

500. How many children do you think a master or mistress in a country school is able to teach without assistance?—I could have worked my own school with the assistance of only a monitor.

501. Up to what stage do you think you could have worked the school satisfactorily by yourself, without any assistance at all?—I had no experience of that.

502. You are not able to give information from your own knowledge of the district and the schools?—No.

503. According to this alternative scale, a mistress is added when the attendance at a school reaches 40: do you consider that when a school reaches that number another teacher in addition to the head of the school is necessary?—Not necessary.

504. Then, it follows that you think the expense of another teacher would be unnecessary?—Yes.

505. What difference in salary should there be between a female and a male assistant doing precisely the same work?—Starting at the highest salaries, the female teacher should get a salary of 75 per cent. of that paid to the male; as the salaries go down the difference should be less.

506. What kind of salaries would the 75 per cent. apply to?—I should say, start at £350 with a difference of 25 per cent., and reduce it as the salaries become lower.

507. But there are no assistants' salaries ranging anything like £350: supposing a man gets £200, what do you think would be a fair salary for a female assistant in another school doing the same work?—About £160 a year.

Miss LORIMER, M.A., Headmistress Mount Cook Girls' School, representing the Wellington Education Institute, examined.

Miss Lorimer: Mistrusting my own oratorical powers, and having a good deal to say, I have made a written statement, in which I have endeavoured not so much to criticize the colonial scale as to controvert arguments prejudicial to women's interests brought forward by certain witnesses before the Commission. (I would like to say, parenthetically, that we women have discussed in detail the proposed scale, but I understand that the first scale is practically dead, and I know little or nothing about the alternative one.) As the best-paid woman in the service, I am here to-day to speak on behalf of the women teachers of this district, and particularly of the women assistants. A perusal of the evidence hitherto elicited by the Commissioners proves that the interests of women have been looked at from a man's point of view. No woman has had a seat on the Commission, and few have come forward to give evidence. This, however, does not indicate lack of interest on their part—an interest which is growing in intensity every day. It is due partly to the fact that for most women it is a distinct ordeal to speak in public, and partly also to the fact that from their hitherto subordinate position in schools they have become to some extent dependent upon men, and shrink from taking what appears to be an antagonistic position. A point of crucial importance has been the work which they are capable of doing, and from the opinions expressed by men teachers the unthinking would gather the impression that any learning we might be able to impart was only food for babes. Now, what are the facts? Take high schools first: Have those managed by women been any less successful than those managed by men, as far as the educational standard is concerned? As far as numbers are concerned, I grant they have not been so successful; but that is due not to incapacity on the part of the heads, but to social considerations. Formerly these schools were staffed—partially, at least—with men, but now women have fitted themselves for these positions, and have superseded the men. Then, in the primary schools women can do all the infant work better than men. Men themselves concede that. They can teach girls throughout the standards. Men do not deny that. They can teach boys up to and including Standard V. They do not desire to teach Standards VI. and VII. boys in large schools, because they cannot take the games or the drill, and because they think that to make the bigger boys manly they should be taught by men, just as to make the bigger girls womanly they should be taught by women. Now, as regards the men: They are not at home in an infants' school; many of them think it beneath their dignity to teach Standards II. and III.; they cannot teach sewing; they are not so suitable for Standards VI. and VII. girls, but are better for Standards VI. and VII. boys. Any impartial judge must allow that the greater part of the work of primary schools is work which may confidently be placed in the hands of women. It is, indeed, work for which women are by nature specially fitted. Here I should like to refer to some evidence given in Dunedin. A woman representative there stated that women did not desire to teach a class higher than Standard IV. in a mixed school. That woman is the seventh teacher on the staff of a school with an average of 451. There are three women teachers above her on the staff. Possibly she has had no opportunity of trying her wings, and Standard V. seems to be a height unattainable. Having

had myself no actual experience of mixed schools, and being anxious to obtain the opinion of the headmasters of this city upon the question, I wrote to four of them, asking if they considered that women were capable of successfully managing a mixed Standard V. class. One appeared not quite to understand my question, and gave a more or less satisfactory reply. Another said he would hesitate to place a woman in charge of such a class unless the numbers were below 45, and that he preferred in that standard to separate the sexes. Yet in that school a woman has been in charge of 79 boys and girls in Standard V., has had supervision of the sewing of the schools, and of the girls' playground, and has taken not only her own drill, but that of the girls taught by the men teachers, at a salary of £90. A third master replied as follows: "In reply to your note dated the 5th instant, asking for my opinion as to whether I consider women capable of successfully managing a mixed Standard V. class, I answer most certainly in the affirmative. For some reasons I would prefer them in a school of the size of this one (average between 500 and 600)—of course, always provided the women are capable teachers. With this proviso I consider they can more fully fill the office." The fourth replied: "Speaking from experience, I may say that the best teacher I have ever had, judging by results, in Standard V. was, and is, a woman. Nor have I reason to pick out one only to prove that women are capable of taking a Fifth Standard (boys). I have had several who have proved their capability." In this last school these women have, with the exception of the drill, been doing identically the same work as the men, obtaining better results, and getting £50 or £60 a year less. Turning now to the position of women employed by the Government in other departments: They have not been so employed long enough to be able to judge of the ultimate developments, but so far, I understand, cadets, whether men or women, have been placed on an equal footing, except in the Telephone and Public Trust Departments. The reasons why a difference has been made in these two cases are that it is not desirable to employ women on night duty in connection with the telephone, and, in connection with the Public Trust, women cannot be sent about the country to examine estates. In this latter department, I may remark, two women who left the teaching profession are now earning £150 a year each. Again, seven men are employed as Inspectors of Factories—four at £200, one at £145, one at £140, and one at £110. One woman is employed at a salary of £160. The General Post Office employs girls in the non-clerical branch, doing very simple work, such as examining telegrams to see if the correct charge has been made, &c. To obtain an appointment there a girl (or boy) has only to pass the Sixth Standard, yet in eleven years the maximum salary of £120 may be reached. When we think of the difference in the examination test, and of the immense difference in the importance of the work, and remember that women teachers have been doing really good work for eighteen or twenty years, have all that time been endeavouring to keep up to date in their profession by taking instruction in drill, drawing, kindergarten work, &c., and have never been able to earn more than £90 a year, we must come to the conclusion that they are suffering great injustice at the hands of the State. As far as the men are concerned, I should be very sorry to see their salaries lowered. I hope the Government will see their way to increase them, but let it not be at the expense of the women. Personally, I do not desire that women should be paid equally well with men, but as discussion on the subject has been proceeding I have been driven further and further into sympathy with those who demand equal pay. I am aware that my position is not a logical one, but based on sentiment—a sentiment that will doubtless disappear with years, and under the influence of public opinion. I do see something in the reasons usually urged for paying women smaller salaries than men—viz., the greater obligations of men, and the loss to the State from the retirement of women teachers soon after receiving their training—but consider that far too much is made of them. Whilst acknowledging that men have greater obligations than women, I maintain that those of women should not be overlooked. I know of women in the profession receiving an insufficient salary, having to support themselves and members of their family, and having only the old-age pension to look forward to. What sadder spectacle is there than a woman too old to work, and dependent upon charity, perhaps grudgingly given? It seems to me that this new spirit of independence in women, this dislike to being a burden on their men relatives, is surely something to be admired and encouraged rather than fought against. Moreover, I am not aware that the argument that men should be paid larger salaries in order to admit of their supporting a wife and family is applied in any other work in which men and women compete. If it is admitted at all, should it not be carried to its logical conclusion, and, all other things being equal, should not the salary be proportionate to the size of the family? With regard to the other point which militates against the raising of the status of women—the fact that so many of them do not remain long in the profession—I feel that there is something in this. Not so much, however, as at first sight appears, for these women should make better mothers for the education and training they have received. I maintain also that those who remain are worthy of more adequate remuneration, and that they should suffer as little as may be for behaviour for which they are in no way responsible. To prevent injustice being done to those women who do remain in the service, who are interested in their profession, and who should be able to look forward to something like a career, there should surely be better positions open to them. From a recent report of the London School Board I have obtained the following facts: There are under the Board 371 boys' schools in which men chiefly are employed; 369 girls' schools in which no men are employed; 390 infants' schools in which, also, no men are employed; twenty-nine smaller schools, mixed, under a master, in which schools both male and female assistants are employed; thirty-eight, mixed under women, in which schools there are altogether five male assistants. The average salary for a headmaster is £337, for a headmistress £252 9s. 5d., for an infants' mistress £231 8s. 11d. The average salary of a headmistress is 75 per cent. of that of a headmaster, and the average salary of a woman assistant is 87 per cent. of that of a man assistant. In one girls' school, with an average of 460, there are no pupil-teachers employed, the lowest salary is £90, and

the highest £300. In another, with an average of 474, and a staff of fourteen, the headmistress is paid £324. When one remembers that the buying-power of money in London is much greater than here, it is evident that women are very much worse paid in New Zealand than at Home. When one observes, too, the number of responsible positions assigned to them, including inspectorships, and the subordinate positions assigned here, it is evident that their status here is much too low, and requires to be raised rather than lowered. Are the members of the London School Board all wrong in intrusting so much important work to women, and the men whose evidence before this Commission opposes such a course all right? Are all girls' schools and girls' departments to be swept away without the fathers and mothers being consulted on the subject? When parents pay for their girls to be educated it is for tuition by women they pay. If they thought it inferior they would assuredly make it their business to secure for their daughters the service of men teachers. The department, I am glad to see, desires to raise the status of infants' mistresses. These women do very important work in the teaching of the little ones and in the training of pupil-teachers. They have large responsibilities, and often very indifferent help. They practically control nearly one-third or one-fourth of the pupils on the school-roll, and, if capable, in the largest schools they do this with almost no supervision from the headmaster, who, however, draws a large part of his salary from his more or less nominal supervision of this department. But the class who in this district are suffering most, and who all over the colony are likely to suffer most, unless the Government can see its way to remedying the evil by increasing the education grant, are the women with the best brains. We encourage the brightest of our girls to go in for scholarships; they get them, proceed to the high school and the university, all this time competing successfully with boys and men. They enter the teaching profession, and find there that all the prizes are for the men. When they might hope to see the reward of their labours they find their way blocked by their sex, which up to this point has been no obstacle. The danger to them is that they are the class of women teachers who have to enter into competition with men, unless provision is made for them, as provision is made for men. I find it hard to believe that the country which had the honour of being the first to open its universities to women, and that the Government which was the first to confer the franchise upon them, can let pass this opportunity of raising the status of the women engaged in this most important work.

508. *Mr. Mackenzie.*] I assume that you are in favour of equal payment for men and women—at any rate, up to a certain standard of school?—No, I have not said that. I think the minimum salary for a woman should be £100, and I agree that the minimum salary for a man should be £110.

509. There should be that difference, even at that point?—Yes, I think so.

510. You think that a woman representative should have been on this Commission?—Yes; I think it would have encouraged more women to come forward.

511. Have you thought out any method for improving the prospects of promotion for teachers generally—of course, that includes women?—I do not know that I have. For women in this district there are really no chances of promotion worth mentioning. There are only three positions that one might call good.

512. Which are they?—My own position, the position of infant mistress at the Mount Cook School, and that of infant mistress at Te Aro.

513. Do you not consider the present system of appointing and promoting—if you might call it promoting—unsatisfactory?—I do not know that I do, though something must be wrong, seeing that some women doing good work have had to remain at the same salary for eighteen or twenty years.

514. Suppose a woman teacher has a school of 45 in a country district, what chance of promotion has that teacher unless your Board, or a Committee, select her? Her service does not count in any way?—No.

515. You think that a woman should be intrusted with Standards IV. and V.?—Yes.

516. Would you leave it at the discretion of the headmaster as to whether he should intrust the Sixth Standard to a woman?—Yes.

517. Do you believe in the separation of the sexes in schools?—I do, where possible.

518. Have you thought anything about a superannuation scheme for teachers?—Yes; I think that women should retire at fifty-five years of age.

519. On a pension?—Yes; a large one, if possible.

520. Do you think that the teachers would be prepared to contribute something themselves out of the contemplated increase of salaries?—As far as the women are concerned, we do not know what our increases are to be.

521. Have you studied the alternative scale?—It is not very definite, as far as assistants go; in fact, there is nothing in it to define the positions and salaries of women assistants.

522. *Mr. Davidson.*] Did I understand you to say that you have never taught in a mixed school?—I have not.

523. You stated that personally you do not desire equal pay for equal work for the sexes, but I suppose you do desire that the too great disparity should be reduced?—Yes.

524. If all schools in the colony having an average attendance of under 40—over a thousand altogether—were thrown open to either sex, and all assistantships at larger schools, with the exception of the first-assistantships at large mixed schools, do you think that would be treating women fairly?—I think the women would be pretty well satisfied with that.

525. Then, with regard to salaries, suppose, as you suggested, the disparity at present existing between the salaries paid to men and those paid to women was considerably reduced, do you think the salary question would be fairly well settled as far as the sole teachers at schools of under 40 are concerned?—I think so.

526. What difference would you suggest should be made in the salaries paid to assistants occupying similar positions, male and female?—When we considered this question we came to the conclusion that the first woman assistant should receive a salary of 75 per cent. of that paid to the male assistant occupying a similar position, the next 80 per cent., and the next 90 per cent., roughly speaking. The more I consider the subject the more I am inclined to still further reduce the disparity.

527. You notice that in the first scale the positions of the assistants alternated as far as the sexes were concerned?—Yes.

528. Did you approve of that?—I approved of it, inasmuch as it seemed to provide better positions for women than they had hitherto had here.

529. You stated that in Dunedin a lady gave evidence to the effect that women were unequal to the task of teaching standards above the Third?—No; I think she said above the Fourth. I understood that she said that they did not wish to teach higher standards than the Fourth.

530. Do you know that that lady referred to large classes in mixed schools?—Yes, I gathered so.

531. She said that she had been teaching all the standards in a small school: so that you qualify that statement by saying that she referred to large standards in mixed schools?—Yes.

532. Do you think the average woman is physically—we know perfectly well she is mentally—capable of standing the strain of teaching these large standards in mixed schools?—Personally, I have had no experience of this kind of work, but I do know women here who seem to be able to stand the strain well enough.

533. Then, you entirely disagree with those witnesses who have stated that these positions—*i.e.*, teaching the Fourth and higher standards in the large mixed schools—should be kept for men only?—Yes. There are women in this district who feel that they are equal to teaching Standard V. They do not desire to teach the Sixth and Seventh Standards, because they do not think it would be in the interests of the boys.

534. Then, you would approve of such a scale as would make provision for exceptional women who desired to teach, say, the Fourth or Fifth Standards, even in our large mixed schools?—Yes.

535. *Mr. Stewart.*] What is the feeling of the lady teachers of Wellington in regard to the colonial scale in principle?—If it could be proved that it would materially increase their salaries, of course they would approve of it; but at present we are in the dark with regard to the colonial scale so far as it concerns us.

536. The question I wish to put to you is this: Irrespective of any proposals that have been made, do you believe there should be a colonial scale, or do you think each individual Board should retain the right to pay according to its own scale?—I think it would give more satisfaction to the women if a colonial scale were introduced.

537. You mean to say that the women teachers of Wellington are in favour of a colonial scale in the abstract?—Yes, I think so.

538. Have you had any experience as to the comparative absences of men and women on school staffs through sickness?—No, only from hearsay. Those on my own staff have been absent very little indeed.

539. Have you any men on your staff?—No.

540. *Mr. Luke.*] From your experience as principal of a large school, do you think there is any material difference in the physical and mental strain in taking charge of the Fifth Standard and a lower standard?—Yes; I consider the Fifth the most difficult of those standards.

541. You stated that you thought there should be some difference between the salaries paid to males and females: will you tell us more particularly why you think so?—Chiefly for these two reasons: that so many women leave the service soon after receiving their training that I cannot think their services are so valuable to the State on the whole; secondly, I have a sort of sentimental feeling for the wives and children of those schoolmasters whose salaries we might be lowering.

542. *Mr. Hill.*] Is your school staffed the same by the Education Board as the mixed and boys' schools?—I think so.

543. They allow you the same staffing as for a mixed school of similar size?—Yes; I have five assistants and seven pupil-teachers.

544. Some of them hold certificates already?—Some ex-pupil-teachers—certificated teachers—are doing assistants' work at pupil-teachers' pay.

545. I notice that, according to this return, the lady teachers at your school hold higher certificates than those held by the male assistants at the Mount Cook Boys' School: is that so?—If it is in that return I suppose it is so.

546. Have you estimated the amount of money that is obtained by capitation on your school?—I made a calculation the other day, but I have forgotten the figures.

547. Your average attendance is returned at 494?—Yes.

548. And the average attendance at the Boys' School is 523?—Yes.

549. The income derived by the Board for the Boys' School is £1,961 5s., and for the Girls £1,852 10s.; whereas the salaries payable to the teachers at the Boys' School amount to £1,415, and to the teachers at the Girls' School £1,062 10s.: you are aware that the capitation per head allowed for your girls is the same as that allowed for the boys?—Yes.

550. Have you ever drawn the attention of your Board to that difference?—No.

551. Have you not felt that you were entitled to some special consideration in connection with the salaries of your girl teachers?—Oh, yes.

552. I suppose that the Inspectors expect and require as much efficiency from your staff as that at the Boys' School?—Yes; and we have the sewing as well.

553. The profit on your school—*i.e.*, the amount by which the capitation allowance exceeds the amount paid in salaries—is £790, and on the Boys' School £546?—Yes.

554. Do you not think that your staff deserves a larger sum in salaries than is paid to it?—Yes, very much larger—especially the lower assistants.
555. Here on this list is shown a lady teacher at your school with a D1 certificate; she has £90 a year: how many children has she to teach?—The number varies in different years.
556. What standard does she teach?—Standard V.
557. Two others receive £90 a year each; they have been teaching twenty years and that is all they can get: is that so?—Yes.
558. Have they never made application for a school outside?—I think, in both cases home circumstances have prevented that.
559. Then, it is really a question of home circumstances?—In both cases they have obligations which keep them here.
560. You have read over the scale suggested by the Inspector-General: would it affect you at all as the principal of that school?—I think my salary would be just about the same if that scale were adopted.
561. In what way would it affect your assistants?—That I cannot say, because, according to the scale, an infant mistress would be put into the staff, and that we do not require.
562. This proposed supplementary scale for separate boys', girls', or infants' schools would give your first assistant £175; second, £130; third, £115; fourth, £100; fifth, £85; and sixth, £80: would you be satisfied with such a scale as that?—Yes, I think so.
563. Do you think there is too wide a difference between those salaries?—Yes, between the first and second.
564. Would you approximate them more closely?—Yes.
565. What do you suggest should be given to the second assistant—£150?—I should be very glad if that salary were paid to her.
566. Do you think the position of first assistant is worth £170 or £175; and do you think £150 fair for the second assistant?—Yes, I think those two salaries fair.
567. Do you think it possible to adopt a system that would improve the staff at your school in the way of eliminating the factor of pupil-teachers?—I think that we have far too many pupil-teachers.
568. Do you think it would be possible to adopt a plan whereby, before they begin to teach, young teachers should receive previous training in the art of school-management and instruction in methods, and the reasons for their adoption?—It would be a very great help if that could be done.
569. Is not the present plan one which gives no chance to young pupil-teachers in their first year to obtain any real technical training, such as they ought to have when going into an important position as a pupil-teacher?—I believe so.
570. You believe it would greatly benefit the education given in schools in this colony if proper arrangements were made for early training?—Yes.
571. Now, assuming that you had such pupil-teachers, and it were found desirable to continue their instruction, do you think all the certificated teachers on your staff should partake in the instruction of those pupil-teachers?—No; I think the head-teacher should do it all.
572. The literary preparation and also the technical training?—I thought you meant the preparation of pupil-teachers for examinations.
573. If you increase the salaries, do you not think that, instead of paying separately for the instruction of pupil-teachers, the salaries should be deemed to include payment not merely for the instruction, but for the training of pupil-teachers? Do you not think it would tend to improve the junior division of your school?—Do you mean that they should not receive any training at a training-college?
574. Afterwards, by scholarships—I refer to their early preparation?—Yes.
575. *Mr. Lethbridge.*] We were told in Wanganui that it was a fact that five out of six lady teachers became hard and selfish, and put all the money they earned on their own backs or heads: do you think there is any truth in that? Do you know of any number of lady teachers who have parents to support?—From my experience, I should say that about half of the lady teachers help some members of their families.
576. *Mr. Hogben.*] Do you know what your salary would be under the suggested supplementary scale?—I made a rough calculation, and found that I would get possibly a pound or two more, that is, if allowed house allowance.
577. Taking your average attendance as 456, the first assistant would get £170; at present she gets £150, and the second assistant £100—a difference of £50; according to the proposed scale, the second assistant would get £125, but still there is too much difference: do you not think so?—Yes, there is too great a difference between £170 for the first assistant and £125 for the second assistant. As a matter of fact, the second assistant teaches Standard VI., and it is much harder work than Standard VII.
578. You do not give the first assistant the hardest work?—The first assistant has gone through that standard—*i.e.*, VI.
579. At present you are giving the second assistant the hardest work in the school?—I consider it the hardest.
580. The third assistant gets £90?—Yes.
581. A salary of £115 would be a considerable increase?—Yes.
582. You say you have five assistants?—Yes.
583. Is there a vacancy at your school at present?—No. I have an ex-pupil-teacher getting £50 a year and teaching Standard IV. She, I hope, will be made an assistant.
584. You had six assistants in the December quarter, did you not?—Miss Williams left about the middle of the year. She met with a serious accident. The Board paid her salary for some four or five months. Then she resigned.
585. Her place has not been filled?—No, except by a pupil-teacher.

586. The salaries proposed to be paid to all the assistants at your school by the suggested supplementary scale are higher than those that are being paid: is that not so?—Yes.

587. What is the highest salary payable under your Board's regulations to a female assistant in a mixed school?—At present, I think, not counting the infant mistress, it is only £100.

588. What is the highest salary payable to a mistress at a mixed school according to this proposed scale?—£180.

589. With regard to small schools, have you compared the salaries for mistresses under the suggested scale with the salaries paid to mistresses at present?—I know so little about small schools that I have not made any calculation.

590. *The Chairman.*] You say you think there are too many pupil-teachers?—Yes.

591. I suppose you are aware that there are a great many applications from young people?—Yes.

592. What do you think the fact of the applications being so numerous is owing to?—I think a great many girls have an idea that it is rather a superior thing to be a teacher, but later on they find out that it is harder work than they had anticipated.

593. Are the applicants generally eligible: do they comprise the clever girls?—Whilst I have been in charge of the school the applicants have included some of the girls who have taken scholarships and gone to the high school. They have also included some girls whom I thought quite unfit to be teachers.

594. Do you know whether the Board have had any difficulty in getting good, strong applicants for pupil-teacherships?—I do not think so. I have frequently heard it said of late by girls that they would prefer to get into the Telephone Exchange or other department of the Government if possible.

595. Have you ever heard of the difficulty of getting into the telephone service?—Yes.

596. Have you heard of the number of names in hand?—Some hundreds; six hundred in Christchurch alone, I think.

597. I presume that under the present method you receive payment for instructing pupil-teachers?—No; I do not instruct the pupil-teachers at all; they are taught chiefly by the first assistant masters.

598. Are the first assistant masters paid for the work?—Yes.

599. Do you think there would be equally good results if they were not paid specially for the work?—You could not expect the first assistant masters to do it unless they were specially paid for the work. I think each head-teacher ought to take his own pupil-teachers. That is the system that prevails in Canterbury; and, judging by results, there is no comparison between the two systems.

600. Do you think the same amount of attention would be devoted to those pupil-teachers, and they would be coached in a similar way for their examinations, if no special payments were made to either the headmasters or the first assistants—if it were simply a matter of duty covered by their salaries?—I think it might be advisable to allow the special payments, and, if the pupil-teachers did not pass, to pay only half-fees.

601. You admit that a difference should be made between the payment of male and female teachers for doing the same work: what difference do you think would be fair and equitable?—It is difficult to state any particular percentage, because it would depend upon the salary; but a woman should be paid from 75 per cent. to 80 per cent. of a man's salary, the disparity decreasing as you go down.

602. Is there great reluctance on the part of some of your lady assistants in the large centres, such as Wellington, to go into the country and take charge of schools there?—Yes; a much greater reluctance in Wellington than in some other districts—Canterbury, for instance. I think that is owing to the country here not being so forward as regards settlement, roads, and railways.

603. Life in the bush country is looked upon as being very rough?—Yes; I think any teacher who goes there deserves large compensation.

604. Do you think the salaries paid at the present time to the lady teachers in charge of small country schools are adequate?—I think very good salaries are being paid in the Wellington District to teachers in charge of country schools, as compared with those paid in other districts.

605. But do you think they are sufficient?—I think they are, on the whole.

SATURDAY, 22ND JUNE, 1901.

Mrs. C. A. FRANCIS, Headmistress, Mount Cook Infants' School, examined.

Mrs. Francis: I am headmistress of a separate infants' school—the Mount Cook Infants' School—and am deputed by the other mistresses of separate infant-schools to ask that our position be made clear. According to the proposed scale it would seem that we are not provided for at all. We are heads of separate schools, but it appears from the scale that we may be classed as infant mistresses or first assistant mistresses. Nothing is said in the scale about the mistresses of separate infant-schools—there is nothing to prove that our position would be assured to us. In the scale "infant mistress" appears to mean an infant mistress under a master. Now, is that so?

Mr. Stewart: I think it is perfectly clear that the words "infant mistress" in the scale apply only to mistresses who form part of the staff of an organized school, and not to those in charge of separate infants' schools.

The Chairman: Mistresses of separate schools are not provided for in the scale.

Mr. Hill: I would suggest that Mrs. Francis give her reasons why her school should be carried on separately from another school.

Mrs. Francis: I am speaking not only for myself, but also for two other separate infants' schools in the Wellington District—Te Aro and Masterton. These schools are in a different street

from the upper schools. There is a headmistress to each of them, and they are independent of any other school. We teach the kindergarten lessons, and our classes include the First Standard. Those who pass Standard I., though taught at the separate infant-schools, are not counted as passed in our schools; they are put on the roll of the upper schools, and counted to them, though the instruction has been given by us.

606. *Mr. Hill.*] Do I understand you to say that your school is counted in the official returns as forming part of the other school?—No; it is a separate school entirely. I refer to those only who have passed the First Standard.

The Chairman: These schools are entirely independent of any other school; the headmasters of the larger schools have no control whatever over them.

Mrs. Francis: These schools would have to be shut up if the proposals of the headmasters were carried out. One of their proposals is that there should be no children over seven in an infants' school. Now, 163 children out of the 445 at my school are over seven, and yet some are only in the letter class and some in the first primer. Some 45 or 50 children over seven are not in the First Standard. Now, what is the use of sending those children who do not know their letters, or who cannot read, to an upper school? You say, Why have they not learnt their letters and learnt to read? Because numbers of them do not come until they are seven or over. Are you to have infant-teachers and kindergarten-teachers at the upper schools for them? We protest against the children being sent to upper schools when there are separate infants' schools, unless they can pass the Second Infant Reader at least. These three schools are conducted by women of experience; they are women who have given their time to the teaching of young children; and, though they do not actually teach every class, every class goes through their hands every day. We have few adult teachers at these three schools: we have probationers, who are sent to our schools straight from the high school or other schools to take charge of a class. I have at my school one assistant, four probationers, and four pupil-teachers to teach an average number of nearly 400. We protest against the children being moved up because they are seven years old, irrespective of their attainments. Inspectors have written in our log-books, "These schools are a good foundation for young children, and no children should be pushed into the First Standard before they are ready." A good First Standard child, we know, passes all the standards. Then, again, the parents of the children do not care for them to be moved so long as they are progressing in the infant-school: they do not care for their little children to go among the older ones before they are obliged. As far as we can see, the only reason for the headmasters making such a proposition is to swell the numbers at their schools. I might also point out that I have sent children over eight years of age to the upper schools again and again, and have been told that they have no room for them there until after the examination. Only the other day a girl of ten was refused because they had no room for her. As the year draws on the upper school is very full, and I have to keep the children till after the examination. We suggest that if the headmasters and mistresses of the upper schools want more pupils than they have room for, let the children go when they can pass a preparatory examination. We get no credit for passing them into the Second Standard, for they are always counted to the upper schools, and must make those upper schools' passes look very well. Another point: Would a master who had his own infants' department in his own building say to the infant mistress, "That child is seven years old; whether he can read or not he must come into my school"? No, of course he would not. If the proposals of the masters were agreed to I should not have an average of 250 at my school, and it would be closed. There is another point that I wish to refer to. These separate infants' schools have been acknowledged by the Inspectors year after year to be good training-schools for young teachers. They come to us as probationers. The principal part of the time of the headmistress at these schools is spent in giving lessons to classes, not altogether for the benefit of the children, but partly for the benefit of those young pupil-teachers. These teachers stay perhaps a year, and go through all the classes; and headmasters have repeatedly said to me, "That is a good teacher that you sent me the other day." Some of them, of course, do not turn out good teachers, but that is not my fault, for sometimes I report them as incompetent to my Board, and if the Board keeps them on I cannot help it. We want our position to be plainly defined. We are headmistresses of separate schools; but we shall not be if you take all children over seven, irrespective of their abilities, out of our schools. We think that first-year pupil-teachers and probationers should not be placed in charge of a large class until they have had three months' experience at a school. I think that a first-year pupil-teacher should never have to teach more than 30 children.

607. *Mr. Davidson.*] Do you know whether the same School Committee has charge of the Mount Cook Boys', Mount Cook Girls', and Mount Cook Infants' Schools?—Yes, one Committee.

608. I notice that in the Minister's report those three schools are considered as one?—Not by the Board or the Committee. We have our own funds and our own reports.

609. What is your present staff?—One assistant, four pupil-teachers, and four probationers, besides myself.

610. You have a staff of ten, counting yourself?—Yes, ten; but we think probationers should not be counted as teachers.

611. Do you think the Board is treating you fairly by asking you to teach, and teach efficiently, such a large number of pupils with that staff?—The teachers at my school go out relieving a great deal. When I write to the Board complaining that I am understaffed they tell me they have no more teachers.

612. Do you think it is in the interests of the children that the constant changing of teachers that you have referred to should take place?—No. Ever since I have been here the staff has been changed every year. What I object to is the probationers being counted as pupil-teachers when they cannot do the work. It is unfair to the children, to the pupil-teacher, and to me.

613. You have the First Standard in what is called the Infants' School?—Yes.

614. Do you examine the children for promotion into the Second Standard?—No; the Inspector does.

615. *Mr. Stewart.*] How far is your school from the main Mount Cook School?—In the next street.

616. Would it be an eighth of a mile away?—Fully that, I should think, if not more.

617. You keep the children up to the time they pass the First Standard?—Our regulations are that children may be in the infants' schools till they are eight years old, so we teach them as far as they will go.

618. Irrespective of what standard they pass?—They never pass more than the First Standard in any school.

619. What is your salary now?—£200, and £40 house allowance.

620. Supposing your school were taken as a part of the Mount Cook School, have you calculated what salary you would receive?—No.

621. Do you understand that the question of schools of this kind is for the Board, and we have nothing to do with it?—That is what we wanted—that our position should be made clear.

622. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Is there sufficient accommodation, as far as the rooms are concerned, at your school for teaching these infants?—Seating-accommodation is provided for 480.

623. Is it not a fact that a number of the probationers or pupil-teachers are teaching in the same room?—Yes; but that does not matter, as we have the quiet lessons. We have galleries and desks.

624. Would it not be more suitable if you had assistants instead of these pupil-teachers and probationers?—I think that one assistant at an infant-school is enough; some of the girls are quite as capable of teaching the infants as an assistant.

625. Do you not consider that you have too many pupil-teachers and probationers?—I do not have enough.

626. According to the return for 1899 you had eleven pupil-teachers?—Yes; I had nearly my full staff then.

627. Are you short-handed now?—Yes.

628. Do I understand that the Board do not take sufficient notice of the representations of the head-teachers and Inspectors with regard to the staffing of the school?—I do not say or think that. I think the Board do not wish to increase the number of their pupil-teachers at present. They say they have no pupil-teachers to send me, and so they cannot send any.

629. Do you not consider that the Wellington Board employs far too many pupil-teachers—more than they can find positions for afterwards?—I am speaking with regard to my own school: I do not want more than one assistant. I think we can do our work very well with pupil-teachers.

630. Do I understand that the suggested scale of staffs and salaries would not suit a school like yours?—My school is not provided for; that is where the difficulty is.

Mr. Davidson: Mr. Chairman, there is separate provision made for such schools in a circular issued by the Inspector-General. The circular, a copy of which I have here, was put in as an exhibit. [Circular shown to witness.]

Mrs. Francis: I have not seen that circular before.

Mr. Gilfedder: There is no doubt that gets over the difficulty.

Mrs. Francis: Then, I have wasted your time and my own; but the limit of 250 will close some schools.

631. *Mr. Hill.*] You recognise yourself as the headmistress of the Mount Cook Infants' School?—Yes; I was appointed as that.

632. How many years have you been in charge?—Twenty-three.

633. Who is the headmaster of the Mount Cook Boys' School?—Mr. Hardy.

634. Does Mr. Hardy ever go to your school?—Yes, occasionally, but simply as a visitor.

635. In the departmental regulations of your Board the following appears, referring to salaries and staffing: "This shall include those teachers who are in charge of the infant department of the main school only where such infant department is carried on in a separate building, but shall nevertheless be under the supervision of the head-teacher of the main school to which it is attached, and shall include Thorndon, Newtown, Clyde Quay, and such other schools as may be hereafter placed on this list by the Board": do you think that refers to your school at all?—No; Newtown has an infants' school in its own grounds, and so has Thorndon and Clyde Quay Schools.

636. But it says "such other schools as may hereafter be placed on the list": has your school ever been placed on that list?—Never.

637. Your school is absolutely independent of control or supervision by Mr. Hardy?—Yes.

638. He would be intruding on your work if he even suggested to you as to any improvement?—He would not think of doing so.

639. You do not think the headmaster of a boys' school should suggest to a lady teacher at all?—It would be out of place for him to do so; he has no authority to do so.

640. Let us now come back to the proposed scale of the Inspector-General: suppose that you received the same amount of money under that scale that you are receiving now, do you think it would make much difference to you?—Thirty-five years' teaching and then come to be an assistant teacher! I am afraid I should have to resign.

641. But it is simply the name?—Are people's feelings nothing?

642. If you were placed in charge of the infants' department under a master, would it affect your position at all?—Yes.

643. Do you think that you could not receive a suggestion from anybody?—I think not; I think my experience of infants is far greater than that of any master who might be placed over me.

644. But there are new things coming into the world?—Every catalogue respecting kindergarten and other teaching is forwarded to me, and there is not one lesson in last year's catalogues, either new books or new lessons, that we have not employed in our school.

645. Do you think that constant changing is good for your teachers?—My teachers are never very long with me.

646. Then, so much more reason why you should centre your work on special lines of training?—You do not quite understand the kindergarten lessons. We do, say, paper-plaiting one year; perhaps the next year we do not do those lessons. The teachers have learnt them, and can give instruction when they go to another school.

647. Have you any special scheme of instruction prepared for your training?—Yes.

648. Could we see it?—Yes.

649. Do you think that the giving of special classes to probationers is a good thing for the schools?—I do not mean that; what I say is that a teacher should not come into a school and have to take charge of a class straight away. We have never had it done till lately.

650. Are they compelled to take charge of a class now, for example, when they come to you?—Yes; I have eight classes of boys and eight of girls, sixteen altogether, but we combine the two. I have now nine teachers, counting probationers.

651. You are compelled to place these probationers in charge of classes?—Yes; I go round myself, and teach the children a lesson here and there.

652. Do you feel that your staffing is sufficient?—I have not such a "big family" as I used to have.

653. The salaries of the teachers at your school amount to about £600 a year, whereas £1,400 is received on account of average attendance: do you think that your school can be carried on efficiently on your present staffing?—Not on my present staff.

654. Your staff at present is insufficient?—Yes.

655. It would be far more in the interests of your school if you had a stronger staff?—Yes; but I think the weakness of my staff is only temporary.

656. For how long have you been short-handed?—Since Christmas; up to that time my staff was as usual.

657. According to this list which I have here, you have a great number of pupil-teachers at your school at salaries of from £20 to £30?—Some of these are probationers.

658. Did you when you had your usual staff feel that it was sufficient?—Yes.

659. You think it is a very important thing to lay a good foundation?—Yes.

660. Have these probationers had any previous training when they come to you?—Very few have been moved to my school, and if they have been to other schools they have really come to my school to learn the kindergarten system only.

661. They stay with you only about twelve months?—Different times: some from the country for only a few days, being sent by Inspectors or headmasters to see the kindergarten work in my school.

662. Do you think your school sufficiently staffed under such conditions?—They would not be counted as members of the staff when they stayed for only a few days.

663. *Mr. Weston.*] You told us just now that your teaching staff was composed of pupil-teachers and probationers?—And one assistant.

664. These probationers come to you inexperienced, do they not?—Yes, from school.

665. All of them do not prove successes?—No.

666. What do you do in the school when you find one or more of the probationers incompetent?—I help them all I can myself.

667. While these probationers are incompetent, and while you are trying to improve them, do not the children in the school suffer?—I do not let them suffer more than I can help.

668. Do they or do they not suffer?—They certainly suffer in discipline.

669. What percentage of these probationers prove successes?—A large percentage; 90 per cent., if not more, prove successful.

670. In the instruction of infant children is it not necessary for the mistress to be in touch with the children, to understand their little ways, and, indeed, to know all about them?—Certainly; that is why we are there.

671. Is it possible for probationers staying there, as you say, for a week upwards to understand the children sufficiently to enable them to derive the fullest benefit from the teaching of the school?—Certainly it is; if they, the children, can take it in.

672. Do you think that, although these probationers may be there, some of them for a week only, the children can derive efficient instruction?—I never said probationers were with me for only a week; those that stay only a week are extra teachers; they are not on my staff.

673. They are extras?—Yes; they do not teach at all; they are not really teachers belonging to the school, but visiting for information in kindergarten work.

674. Taking you to your probationers proper—if I may use the term—how long do they remain with you?—As a rule, they stay till they go through the school; they learn all the different grades and classes till they have taught the First Standard, and then if they succeed they are good junior teachers.

675. How long would all that take?—It depends on how often the Board moves them; sometimes they stay six months, and sometimes two years.

676. And sometimes a week?—I had one who stayed only a few weeks—but that was because she resigned.

677. Do you think that all the children in your school have received, and are receiving, the best education that they should get under you?—Not unless I have my full staff; not under

present circumstances. But I think the Board cannot help themselves just now; they do not want to get more teachers.

678. Pupil-teachers have to study, do they not?—Yes.

679. Do you think that pupil-teachers of the age of the girls now with you should devote the whole of their day to teaching, and have to study after hours?—I think they should never be appointed till they have matriculated; that gives the girls less study when they are appointed. They can teach well if they have matriculated.

680. But if they have not matriculated do you think their time should be divided between theory and practice?—I think it is drudgery; that is what it is.

681. Do you think that their time should be divided?—I do not think we should have them at all; we have the pick of applicants who have matriculated, and why should not they be taken instead of the Sixth Standard girls?

682. Do you find that the girls are able physically to stand the racket of the daily work in your school, *plus* study?—Some can and some cannot; weak-chested girls with weak voices should never be appointed.

683. *The Chairman.*] Is any provision made for the admission of infants to the Mount Cook Boys' School or the Mount Cook Girls' School without going through yours?—They are not supposed to, but in some cases they do. If the children are bright, age is not counted by the headmaster of the Boys' School.

684. Have they any infants' classes at those two schools?—I do not know. I think they must have infants' classes, but cannot say from my own knowledge.

685. It does not appear to be optional to parents, then, whether they send their children to your school first, or one of the others—they must send the children to yours first?—I think they are always glad to do so.

686. Are you acquainted with the positions of the other separate infants' schools that you referred to? Take the one at Te Aro?—Yes; I think, from the consultation that we had, that Miss Chatwin's school must be much on the same lines as mine.

687. Is the building there near the main school?—About an eighth of a mile.

688. The principal thing that you object to is the proposal to take away the independence of the separate infants' schools?—I hold that a separate infants' school is of great assistance to an upper school.

689. How long has your Infants' School been in existence?—Twenty-three years; I came from Australia to open it, as a kindergarten expert.

690. During that time have there been any complaints about it—about the kind of work done?—I do not think so; you would not think so if you saw the reports on it from the children's parents, the headmasters, and the Inspectors.

691. Do you think any improvement in the education of the children would be brought about if the recommendations of the headmasters were carried out, and children were transferred on reaching seven years of age?—Then they would have to have infant work in their schools.

692. But do you think it would be beneficial to the children?—I am not going to say that, for doing so would acknowledge that I cannot teach them.

693. Then, you think there is no reason, as far as you are aware, for making any alteration in the existing system in the direction indicated?—The headmasters have supplied us with no reason for this recommendation.

694. Do you think it would be of benefit to the children if you kept them a little longer and taught them another standard?—We would not have room.

695. But suppose the building was enlarged?—I do not see any object in that.

696. You do not ask for it?—I do not ask to teach them beyond the First Standard; I ask that children shall not be moved to the upper schools till they have passed the Second Infants' Reader at least.

697. You say you have not a full staff at present: how many teachers are you short?—My staff should be an assistant, eight pupil-teachers, and four probationers.

698. How many have you got at present?—An assistant, four pupil-teachers, and four probationers.

699. Then, you are four pupil-teachers short?—Yes; but, as I say, it is not usual. The Board does not know quite what to do while these proposed changes are about; they do not want a number of pupil-teachers on their hands.

FRANCIS BENNETT, Headmaster Karori School, examined.

Mr. Bennett: I have been appointed to represent the masters of schools with an average attendance of from 100 to 300, and on their behalf I wish briefly to put before you our views with regard to the various questions that have been raised for our consideration. We all look with a great amount of satisfaction on the prospect of an increase in the staffing of the schools; but, as far as our schools are concerned, we are much exercised over the two schemes of salaries submitted for our consideration. I have prepared a table comparing the salaries paid to the schoolmasters whom I represent by the Wellington Education Board with the salaries under the proposed scheme, and also under the alternative scheme. I have taken the average attendances and the salaries from "Table No. 8, List of the Public Schools, December, 1899," in the Minister's report. I will take the schools in order. Mangatainoka is the first; the average attendance stated is 160; the salary paid to the headmaster £265; under the first proposed scheme it would be from £219 to £229. This does not include house allowance, as a house is provided, and would mean a loss to the headmaster of from £46 to £36. Under the alternative scale the salary would be from £237 to £252—a loss of from £28 to £13. The next is the Pahiatua School. The average attendance stated there is 228, and the salary paid £285. In this case also a house is provided. Under the proposed scale

the salary would be from £249 to £259, leaving a loss of from £36 to £26. According to the alternative scale the salary would be from £252 to £262, leaving a loss of £33 to £23. Eketahuna is the next school. The average is set down as 112, and the salary £245. Under the proposed scheme the salary would be £189 to £219, leaving a loss of from £56 to £26; under the alternative scheme the salary would be from £210 to £225, showing a loss of from £35 to £20. Carterton School: Average attendance 280, salary £275; under the proposed scale, £259 to £274, resulting in a loss of from £26 to £1. I cannot tell you what it would be under the alternative scale, as I have no data to go upon. Greytown School: Average attendance 207, salary £285; under the proposed scheme, from £229 to £249, resulting in a loss of from £56 to £36; salary under alternative scheme, from £252 to £262—loss, £33 to £23. Featherston School: Average attendance 145, salary stated £255; under proposed scale, £189 to £219, showing a loss of from £66 to £36; under alternative scheme, from £225 to £237, resulting in a loss of from £30 to £18. Upper Hutt: Average attendance 126, salary stated £235; under proposed scheme, £189 to £219—loss, from £46 to £16; under alternative scale, £225 to £237, resulting in from a loss of £10 to a gain of £2. Hutt School: Average attendance 202, salary stated £295; under proposed scale, £229 to £249, the loss being from £66 to £46, under alternative scale, £252 to £262—loss, from £43 to £33.

Mr. Stewart: It would be of great assistance if the witness would say whether a house is provided or not.

Mr. Bennett: In every instance so far a house is provided. The next school is Levin: Average attendance 125, salary stated £235; salary under proposed scheme, from £189 to £219, resulting in a loss of from £46 to £16; salary under alternative scheme, £225 to £237, resulting in a loss of £10 to a gain of £2. Johnsonville School: Average attendance 140, salary (deducting £20 for house allowance) £235; under proposed scheme, £189 to £219, resulting in a loss of from £46 to £16; salary under alternative scheme, £225 to £237, resulting in a loss of £10 to a gain of £2. Karori School: Attendance 135, salary stated £245; salary under proposed scheme, £189 to £219, the loss being from £56 to £26; salary under alternative scheme, £225 to £237, a loss of from £20 to £8.

Mr. Weston: Is the witness referring, in regard to the Wellington scale, to the salaries actually paid, or merely paper salaries?

Mr. Bennett: The salaries I am quoting are those actually paid, obtained from the return I have here. The next school I will take is Roseneath: Average attendance 105, salary stated £275, less house allowance £50, £225; salary under proposed scheme, £189 to £219, resulting in a loss of from £36 to £6; salary under alternative scheme, £210 to £225, resulting in from a loss of £15 to an even sum. Brooklyn School: Average attendance 180, salary stated £275, which, I think, includes £20 house allowance, leaving £255; the salary under the proposed scheme would be from £229 to £249, a loss of from £26 to £6; under the alternative scheme, £237 to £252, showing a loss of from £18 to £3. Kilbirnie School: Average attendance 121, salary stated £235; salary under proposed scheme, £189 to £219, the loss being from £46 to £16; under alternative scheme, £225 to £237, resulting in a loss of £10 to a gain of £2. I would now refer you to the Kaiwarra School: Average attendance 106, salary stated £290, but deducting house allowance, £30, £260; salary under proposed scheme, £189 to £219, a loss of from £71 to £41; under alternative scheme, £210 to £225, resulting in a loss of from £50 to £35. Those are all the schools that come within an average of from 100 to 300, excepting Mitchelltown, which I will not take because it has not been under a master. I would like to point out that in the proposed scale, page 2, in the table dealing with "Head or sole teacher," it is stated that the proposed salary for an average of 100 is £189, and that the present scales in New Zealand run from £160 to £225; the proposed salary of £189 is £3 10s. less than the average paid according to the various New Zealand scales.

Mr. Hogben: You cannot find the average by adding £160 to £225 and halving the total. There are a greater number of schools where the salary is nearer £160.

Mr. Bennett: Yes, that is so. After a careful study of the above comparisons, no one will wonder that we look upon the proposed change with some anxiety, nay, with some alarm, as far as our schools are concerned. Of the above-mentioned schools very few would have a remote chance of an increase, and of the three scales—i.e., the proposed scale, the alternative, and that of the Wellington Education Board—we should prefer the latter; and if we must make a choice between the proposed and the alternative scales, we should prefer the alternative. I wish to forcibly point out that the losses quoted above do not include the additional loss of the pay for the tuition of pupil-teachers, nor do they include the loss of house allowance where a residence is not provided. The loss in fees for instruction of pupil-teachers varies from £10 to £21 per annum. I am taking the staffs as set down in this Table 8. The fees allowed for the passing of the first pupil-teacher would be £10; for the second pupil-teacher, £5; and then, if the next one be a pupil-teacher, we would get £3; if a matriculated student, simply studying, say, two or three subjects, like science or school-management, £1 10s. would be allowed. House allowance amounts to £20 a year. Those items must be added to the losses already mentioned. May I further be allowed to point out that we, in common with any country or suburban head-teacher, must give pupil-teachers instruction, either before or after school-hours, for at least four hours a week. Again, most of us teach from two to four upper standards, and this compels us to correct most, if not all, the paper-work after school-hours. To do this we are almost obliged to take the work home, especially during the winter-time. If either scheme be adopted, financial arrangements many of us may have entered into will probably be interfered with. From the schools which I represent, the city headmasters will in all probability be chosen in the future. We are of the opinion that our salaries should be proportionate to theirs, as they are free from being bound to a class, and do not instruct pupil-teachers out of school-hours. Our salaries, we consider, should be much in excess of the salaries paid to first assistants at the large city schools, or the larger schools. We are also of the opinion that long and successful service should be specially rewarded. In

noting the certificate required for larger schools, we think that a D1 certificated efficient teacher is quite capable, with sufficient experience, of taking charge of the largest schools. With regard to the lowering of teachers' certificates at any time, we hold views strongly opposed to the proposition. Our experience has proved that if the following proposal were carried into effect it would be a great benefit to the schools concerned: In mixed schools of from 150, or not higher than 180, in average attendance, if the head-teacher be either a master or a mistress the first assistant should be a master.

700. *Mr. Hogben.*] No infant mistress?—There would be an infant mistress before that, or, at any rate, an assistant mistress. A high certificate, in our opinion, is not as valuable as long and efficient service, and we think that experienced teachers should not be penalised unless it can be proved that they have neglected favourable opportunities of improvement.

701. *Mr. Davidson.*] What teaching experience have you had?—Twenty-nine years.

702. What class of position have you held?—I taught for seven years in England—five years as a pupil-teacher, and two as a first assistant—and in New Zealand have been in this Board's service for the last twenty-two years. I have had charge of all classes of schools up to an average of 300, besides serving as first assistant at a Wellington City school, and in other capacities.

703. You have taught as a sole teacher in a country school?—Yes.

704. In your opinion, what is the highest average attendance a sole teacher should be asked to teach, without any assistance?—I should say 38, because in some districts the attendance varies very much on wet days and on exceptional occasions.

705. Then, your opinion coincides very nearly with that expressed in the alternative scale, where assistance is allowed at 40?—Yes.

706. What form should the assistance take?—I should advise that an experienced pupil-teacher, of, say, the third year, should be placed in a school of that sort—not a probationer.

707. From 40 to what average attendance would you advise that staffing?—From 38 to, say, 60 or 65.

708. With regard to the next grade of school, what would you recommend as the limit of that grade—65 to what number?—65 to 85 or 90.

709. Say 90. Then you approve of a fully certificated assistant being employed in that grade of schools?—Yes.

710. The suggested staffing is a head-teacher and a fully qualified assistant at from 65 to 90?—Yes.

711. What would you take as the next grade of school—90 to 120?—Yes.

712. There you would have an addition of a pupil-teacher?—Yes.

713. Then, on the whole, you approve of the suggested staff under the alternative scale?—With those variations that I have mentioned.

714. In your statement to the Commission you gave the average attendance of certain schools, the present salary, the salary under the suggested scale, and the salary under the alternative scale: have you compared the salaries at present paid with the salaries that would be paid according to the Wellington scale?—No; the salaries that I quoted are those actually paid by the Wellington Board.

715. But are they according to the Board's scale?—Yes, the scales that were in operation when the different teachers were appointed.

716. They are not paid according to the present scale?—Not all of them.

717. Take, for instance, the Hutt: the average attendance is shown as 202, and the salary paid £295?—Yes.

718. According to the Board's scale the maximum salary for any school—no matter how large—is £305?—Yes.

719. Then, is the salary paid in the case of the Hutt School according to the present scale?—No, not the present scale.

The Chairman: I think there is a greater difference than £10 between the salary of the schoolmaster at the Hutt and the maximum payable under the Board's scale.

720. *Mr. Davidson.*] Would a master receiving the maximum salary of £305 under the Board's scale receive house allowance in addition?—Yes.

721. So that instead of the difference being £10 it might be £60?—Yes.

722. Have you compared the salaries paid to the masters at the schools mentioned by you with the salaries paid in other districts to masters of schools of a similar grade?—In some cases.

723. Have you found that in any district in New Zealand the salaries for that grade of school are as high as those paid in Wellington?—Not as far as I have examined.

724. The salaries paid in Otago, for instance, are supposed to be high?—In some cases.

725. Take the first school in your list; the average attendance is 160: under the Otago scale the salary for that school would be £235?—Yes.

726. The salary under the alternative scale is higher than that paid in Otago?—Yes.

727. Take the next school; the attendance is 228; the salary paid in Otago to the master of such a school would be about £252, while under the alternative scale it would be from £252 to £262?—Yes.

728. In that instance, also, the alternative scale is higher than the Otago scale?—Yes.

729. The salary under the alternative scale for that grade of school is higher than that paid in any district in New Zealand except Wellington?—I am not able to answer that.

730. Suppose that provision were made under a scale suggested by this Commission, whereby the present masters of the schools referred to would not suffer so long as they held their positions, and at the same time the suggested scale for such schools were higher than that paid in any other part of New Zealand: would you approve of that?—I should rather approve of bringing the other districts up to the Wellington standard.

731. Do you think, then, that the other twelve districts in New Zealand are wrong in their scales of salaries, and that Wellington is right?—I should say that the Wellington Board is not paying salaries which are too high for those schools.

732. Have you compared the salaries suggested under the alternative scale for the class of school referred to with the salaries paid in the Australian States?—No, I have not any data to go upon.

733. Would you be surprised to learn that the salaries suggested under the alternative scale for that particular class of school are higher than those paid in any of the Australian Colonies, or any other district in New Zealand?—I do not know that I should be surprised.

734. Do you approve of the principle of a colonial scale of salaries?—Yes, a uniform colonial scale, with discretionary power on the part of the Boards for special cases.

735. Do you think that sufficient elasticity should be given in any scale to enable Boards to place teachers of either sex in certain positions?—Yes.

736. I think you said that you disapproved of the suggested certificates for the various classes of position?—Yes.

737. Take the first group, from 14 to 19; the certificate suggested is E5: do you approve of that?—Yes. Of course, if a person has had sufficient experience as a pupil-teacher it is possible for him or her to obtain a certificate without having had even twelve months' experience as a sole teacher.

738. Do you not think E2 somewhat high for the next grade?—Yes.

739. Would you suggest E3?—Yes, if the teachers at those schools have been pupil-teachers.

740. Take the next grade, 35 to 75: what is your opinion of the certificate suggested there—*i.e.*, D2?—It is too high.

741. Would D3 be more appropriate?—Yes.

742. You would insist on the letter D?—Not necessarily.

743. But you would prefer D3 to D2?—Yes, if D is insisted upon.

744. Do you not think the time has arrived when it would be quite possible to get teachers holding a D certificate—and a D3 for that matter—for that class of school?—Yes, possibly.

745. Then, with regard to the next grade: is D1 too high a certificate, in your opinion?—I think an E certificated teacher with sufficient experience could very well manage a school of up to 150 in average attendance—probably more.

746. Would you not suggest D2 instead of D1?—Yes, I should prefer it.

747. What is your opinion as to the certificate required for the next group of schools—250 to 600? You notice the headmaster is required to have a C1?—It is too high.

748. What would you suggest?—I consider efficient teachers of considerable experience quite capable of taking charge of the largest schools, especially old servants who have proved themselves efficient.

749. You think D1 a sufficient certificate for the master of any grade of primary school?—Under the conditions I have mentioned.

750. The first assistant at schools of above 600 is, according to the suggested scale, required to hold a B2 certificate: is not that too high?—It is certainly too high.

751. Do you approve of fines for not holding the required certificates?—A teacher should not be penalised, especially an old and efficient teacher.

752. Have you noticed the number of schools in the Wellington District having an average attendance of under 20?—No, I do not know the number.

753. There are forty according to the return I have here. What is the salary paid to the teacher of a school of between 15 and 20, according to the Wellington scale?—The maximum amount is £70.

754. Do you think that a fair salary to pay for that class of school?—It depends upon the position in which the teacher is placed; if he were placed near a centre it would not be so difficult to manage on that salary, but if he were placed back in the bush where he had to pay dearly for everything, including lodging, the salary would certainly not be enough.

755. The teachers at these schools will receive very much higher rates of pay under the suggested scale: under the scale suggested by the Inspector-General the salaries vary from £80 to £100?—Yes.

756. Compared with the Wellington scale salary of £70?—Yes.

757. Do you not think the Commission would be justified in recommending such a scale as the alternative?—Yes. I think these country teachers need considerable attention and increase of salaries.

758. Take the grade of school with an average attendance of from 20 to 25: what is the salary at present paid under the Wellington Board's scale?—£80, according to the regulations.

759. What would it be under the suggested scale?—£120 to £130.

760. Do you believe in the salary being increased per unit of attendance?—Yes.

761. It would be a considerable increase, from £80 to £120 or £130, would it not?—Yes.

762. Then, a very large number of country teachers at the smaller schools would be materially benefited by the adoption of such a scheme as that suggested by the Inspector-General?—Yes, certainly.

763. With regard to intermediate-sized schools, you gave sixteen instances where the head-teacher would suffer a reduction?—In nearly every case.

764. Not a very great reduction in some cases?—No.

765. If the present occupants of the head-teacherships of these schools were protected—that is, if they would not suffer a reduction during their occupancy of the position—and if a large number of country teachers would be materially benefited by the adoption of such a scheme as the alternative, do you not think it would be wise to adopt such a scheme?—Certainly.

766. *Mr. Stewart.*] You say you come before us as the representative of a certain class of teachers—viz., the head-teachers of schools of from 100 to 300 in average attendance?—Yes.

767. Did you have a meeting?—Yes.

768. How many were present?—There was a very large attendance of teachers. They appointed a committee to draw up a report, and gave that committee the option of appointing one out of two of the teachers, and I was selected to represent the teachers referred to.

769. Then, really, you are representing the Institute?—Yes, I am representing the interests of the Institute.

770. Setting scales on one side for the moment and dealing purely with the abstract principle, are the teachers of Wellington in favour of a colonial scale?—I think so.

771. Now, take the two proposed scales: they both advance the schools in grades—*i.e.*, they pay more to a teacher at a school of 50 than one of 30 in average attendance, and so on: do you approve of that principle?—Certainly.

772. I think you have already said that you approve of increases by units?—Yes.

773. I would like you to look at these figures which I have taken from a return by the Wellington Board. Take the Te Aro School: what is the average attendance according to that return?—504.

774. And the salary of the headmaster?—£320.

775. What is the average of the Hutt School as shown there?—207.

776. And the salary paid to the headmaster?—£295.

777. By what number does the average attendance at the Te Aro School exceed that at the Hutt?—By 297.

778. Rather more than double the attendance at the Hutt?—Yes.

779. You will notice that I have worked out some figures, including the increase per unit for those 297 pupils: how much is that increase per head?—1s. 9d. per head.

780. Then, according to the Wellington scale, as far as actual payments are concerned, the increase per unit from the 207 at the Hutt School to the 504 at Te Aro is 1s. 9d. per head: now take the first proposed scale for a moment, take a school of the size of the Hutt School—one from 225 to 250 or 175 to 225—what is the increase per unit there?—8s.

781. Then, under the proposed scale there is an increase of 8s. a unit, whereas under the payment by the Wellington Board the increase is only 1s. 9d.?—Yes.

782. Do you not think that the proposed scale is very much fairer in the amount of increase per unit than the payment by the Wellington Board?—Certainly.

783. Do you think it is right that the master of a school more than double the size of the Hutt School should receive only £25 a year more remuneration?—Certainly not.

784. It is not just?—No.

785. How many different scales have you had in this district within the last ten or twelve years?—I could not answer that question.

786. How many scales have you had in the last five years?—As far as I know, only one.

787. You told us before that the discrepancies between the salaries paid in some cases and what they should be according to the Wellington scale was the result of there being a different scale in operation when the occupants of the positions were appointed?—As far as I know, that is so.

788. Then, you have some knowledge of a change of scale?—Yes, there have been changes.

789. More than one?—I think so.

790. More than two?—Yes.

791. More than three?—Possibly.

792. Then, are these different scales in operation at the same time?—Different appointments were made under different scales.

793. Do you not think that under such an arrangement gross anomalies and unfairnesses arise?—Yes.

794. Then, under the present system of paying teachers in the Wellington Education District gross anomalies and injustices exist?—Under certain conditions.

795. Glancing at the maximum salaries payable under the Wellington scale, do you think that sufficient inducement is offered to the best class of men to enter the profession?—No.

796. You think that the maximum salary for a teacher ought to be very much larger than it is?—Yes, for city headmasters or masters of similar-sized schools.

797. Take, for example, the Clyde Quay School: the average attendance is 713; what would be the approximate salary under the proposed scale?—£405, with house allowance.

798. That is a more adequate remuneration for the highest position in the service than is paid by the Wellington Board?—Yes.

799. The teachers at the smaller schools would be much benefited by the proposed scheme?—Yes.

800. The head-teachers at the middle class of schools, in consequence of the various scales prevailing, extending over a number of years, would in some cases suffer a reduction?—Yes.

801. In the third place, the headmasters at the chief schools—the positions which form the prizes to which you all aspire—would be much better remunerated under the proposed scale?—Yes; under the conditions I have mentioned.

802. Then, do you or do you not think that some such scale as this suggested scale would be an advantage to the Wellington teachers as a whole?—With the exception of those I have pointed out in my evidence.

803. But the teachers as a whole?—Not those in the class that I represent.

804. I am not asking about any particular class: would the Wellington teachers as a whole be benefited by such a scale?—I have not calculated, but judging from a glance I should say that possibly they might.

805. You cannot answer unreservedly that they would?—No; I have not made a calculation to see whether the increase in the salaries of the teachers at the larger and smaller schools would make up for the loss that would be sustained by the teachers at the schools which I named.

806. You have already admitted that in the class of schools where a loss would be sustained by the master under the proposed scale, in consequence of the varying scales in operation in the Wellington District, great injustices and anomalies have arisen: should not these anomalies be remedied?—It all depends upon the conditions upon which these masters were appointed. If a man has been appointed under a certain scale I do not see that he should be reduced because of a lower scale coming into operation.

807. *Mr. Luke.*] Do you understand that the colonial scale and the alternative scale are merely put in as evidence by Mr. Hogben—that they do not commit the Commission at all?—Yes.

808. And that the Commission may formulate a scale altogether different from those two scales?—Yes.

809. Do you think it would be in the interests of education generally that a colonial scale of staff and salaries should be introduced instead of the varying scales now in existence?—Yes.

810. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] You said, I think, that the salaries of teachers ought, in your opinion, to be increased by units, not by grades?—Yes.

811. The increases are by grades under the Wellington Board's regulations, are they not?—Yes.

812. Is the Wellington system working satisfactorily?—I think so.

813. Then, why do you wish to alter it, in order to increase the salaries by units?—Because sometimes you might have to make a certain average for six months before you could get any increase.

814. By which system?—I mean the "grade" system. There is no stipulation that the average must last in order to get an increase by the "unit" method.

815. By "unit," do you consider that the salaries should be based on the previous year, half-year, or quarter?—It would depend upon circumstances: for instance, heavy rain coming on at dinner-time would considerably affect the attendance in the afternoon, and such attendance should not be counted: the working-average should be struck without taking days like that into consideration.

816. Do you consider the percentage of 50 for the working-average high enough?—If you take into consideration special circumstances, such as bad weather, a bazaar, or a picnic, &c., which very often interfere with the attendance at country schools.

817. Would you overcome that difficulty by raising the working-average percentage to, say, two-thirds or three-fourths?—You might do so; I would not like to say so.

818. Does the working-average benefit the schools of the size that you represent to an appreciable extent?—Not so very much.

819. If it were raised to two-thirds or three-fourths, would it?—It might; the great feature in connection with the attendance is this: that in schools of the size that I represent very often the attendance is materially affected by the circumstances I have mentioned.

820. With regard to pupil-teachers, do you consider that there are too many pupil-teachers employed in this district for the efficient working of the schools?—Yes.

821. Is there any probability of those pupil-teachers who are undergoing their apprenticeship just now finding appointments when their apprenticeship is over?—Not for many years to come.

822. Do the Wellington Board grant facilities for the transfer of teachers from one country district to another, or the promotion of teachers within the educational district?—I think so.

823. Could you give any example of transfer or exchange of head-teachers that has taken place?—Yes.

824. With or without the consent of the Committees?—With the consent of the Committees.

825. Do you find that system works satisfactorily, then?—It is very seldom made use of.

826. Do you approve of a differentiation in the work that might be expected from a country school, and that expected from a large, fully staffed town school?—Yes, certainly.

827. Would you give the teacher an alternative in selecting class-subjects?—Yes, optional subjects.

828. Do you consider that the suggested scale of staff and salaries makes sufficient provision for pupil-teachers' salaries?—In most cases, I think so.

829. With regard to the lodging-allowance, do you consider the amount set forth in the scale sufficient when a pupil-teacher has to reside away from home?—It depends on the district the pupil-teacher is sent to. At some places a pupil-teacher could not possibly live on £10 a year.

830. *Mr. Hill.*] You approve, I understand, of the principle of a colonial scale?—Yes.

831. Would the suggested scale make a great deal of difference to assistant teachers in the Wellington District? Do you think it would benefit them or not?—I think it would not benefit the head-assistants; the alternative scale would, as far as it goes. I have not any data for schools with an average of more than 330.

832. It has been stated here that under the suggested alternative scale the salaries would be raised to the standard of the highest scale in New Zealand: do you think the Wellington teachers would agree with that scale?—I should think so.

833. You will notice that under the suggested scale a certificate is required in the case of certain assistants and all principal teachers: do you think that is a good feature in any colonial scale?—No; I am opposed to the system of classification at present in force.

834. Do you know any profession outside of the teaching profession where a member of it is paid part of his salary on the diploma he holds?—No.

835. Does your Board pay part of the salary on account of a diploma?—Yes; part on the certificate and part on the attendance.

836. What are you judged by in your school-work: is it the diploma which you may hold or your skill that the Inspector judges you by?—By the results of the actual work.

837. Does that represent your skill as a teacher?—To a certain extent, taking special circumstances into consideration.

838. Do you think, if that is the case, it is advisable to pay on the diploma you hold?—To a certain extent.

839. In what way?—Under the Wellington scale so-much is paid on the certificate held, and so-much on the attendance.

840. Does it follow that a man is a better teacher because he has a D, or a C, or an A certificate?—No, certainly not.

841. What is it that a man is judged by in life—the diploma he holds or the success he achieves in the profession that he follows?—The success that he achieves in his profession.

842. What do you think he ought to be paid by?—He should be paid a minimum salary for his qualifications, and also for his length of service and experience.

843. Not upon his diploma?—No; at any rate, that should take a secondary place.

844. Has your association considered the question of placing small country schools—say, for example, those with an average attendance of less than 30—in charge of lady teachers?—Yes.

845. Do you think that lady teachers are competent to carry on such schools?—Yes.

846. Do you think they could carry them on as efficiently as men could?—It would depend on the efficiency of both; a good lady teacher would certainly be better than an inefficient man teacher.

847. Do you think it would be advisable to set apart such schools for the lady teachers?—Not exclusively.

848. You think that men should go to that class of school equally with women?—Yes; for experience in that class of school, if for nothing else.

849. A woman could do the work there equally well with a man?—Yes; on even terms.

850. Would you carry out the "even terms" in the matter of salary?—It would depend upon the position of the school—I mean with regard to being near lines of communication or near a city, &c. If a teacher is sent right back into the country districts he or she should get a good salary.

851. But I asked you whether a lady teacher at the class of school referred to should get the same salary as a man teacher at a school of the same class?—Yes.

852. You recognise, I suppose, that a woman can teach up to, say, Standard IV.?—Certainly: higher.

853. Up to the Fifth?—Yes.

854. The Sixth?—Yes.

855. Supposing that a woman is equally qualified with a man in the matter of certification, and that she can do as efficient work in the standards, how would you pay her then?—Not as high as I would pay a man.

856. Why?—For several reasons. In the first place, women are not demanding equal pay with men. I have asked many of our lady teachers, and do not find that they are demanding equal pay. Secondly, if a woman were paid the same salary as a man, keener competition would ensue, which must, in the long-run result in the breakdown of the woman; hence it would be cruel to place her in such a position. Thirdly, it is generally conceded that men have greater responsibilities than women. Fourthly, statistics prove that men adopt the profession as a life-work to a much greater extent than women. Fifthly, higher salaries for men are more likely to attract suitable boys into the profession. Sixthly, men do not break down so often as women. Seventhly, few women can control upper boys or mixed classes. Eighthly, a woman could not well take the place of the headmaster during his temporary absence. My last reason is that women teachers could not become heads of large mixed schools: married men are demanded by parents.

857. You think that a woman can teach as efficiently as a man?—In many cases.

858. You know that women teach and have control of schools in the Old Country?—Yes; the girls' schools.

859. And that they do the same amount of work as the male teachers in the boys' schools?—Yes.

860. And maintain discipline effectively?—I would not like to say so.

861. You think that if a woman were placed in charge of the Sixth Standard at a school there would be a possibility of defective discipline in that class?—It would depend to a very large extent upon the headmaster.

862. But you pay him a special salary to assist in maintaining discipline, do you not?—Yes.

863. Is it not as important that you should put a woman to control the girls in the Sixth Standard as it is to have the boys controlled by a man?—I think that a man has more power over the pupils than a woman.

864. Have you ever seen a lady teacher in charge of the Sixth Standard at a school?—I have known of one, but have not seen her at work.

865. Have you ever noticed the respect that the boys have for a lady teacher?—Yes; boys generally have respect for a lady teacher.

866. Which do you think is the most effective discipline in a school—that of force or duty?—Duty.

867. If you had to select between the discipline of force and the discipline of duty in a school, which would you prefer?—The discipline of duty.

868. Supposing you find that the discipline of duty is the form of training which the women generally adopt, do you think it is advisable that it should be carried into the boys' schools, or the discipline of force?—I think there must be a mixture of both, in all probability.

869. If the discipline of duty is not effective, it follows that there must be the discipline of force?—If the one cannot be carried out the other must.

870. You think, then, that it is necessary to debar lady teachers from taking the higher standards in the schools because they cannot control the children?—I should not debar them, because there are exceptional lady teachers who can do the work.

871. Supposing that women are required to do exactly the same amount of work as men, do you think they ought to have the same pay?—I have already stated my reasons for thinking the other way.

872. Supposing there was a vacancy in a school for, say, a teacher to instruct a higher class, and the position was thrown open to both male and female teachers, the same salary being offered: under ordinary circumstances, which do you think would be likely to be appointed—a man or a woman?—I should imagine that probably a man would be appointed.

873. In a case of that kind those having the selection would say, "We must adopt our staffing to the needs of the school"?—Yes.

874. Where do you think a woman, under ordinary circumstances, would be likely to be placed at a large city school?—Probably in the third position.

875. Do you not think it would be to the advantage of the men if in ordinary competition women were paid the same salaries?—I do not see that it would.

876. *Mr. Smith.*] Do you think it would be beneficial to the women if they were paid the same salaries as men?—No; it would be financially, but I consider the physical strain would be excessive.

877. If men and women were paid the same salaries, would it not lead to the choice by Committees of men instead of women?—Yes.

878. *Mr. Lethbridge.*] Has the allowance made to your Committee been sufficient to keep the grounds and school in proper order?—No.

879. Do you have to get up concerts to assist the Committee?—Yes.

880. Do you like that business?—I do not.

881. The Committee ought to have sufficient money allowed them to keep the grounds and school in proper order?—If possible.

882. But you would rather get up concerts than have part of your salary devoted to the purpose? You see, a capitation of so-much is allowed, and if more is to be given to the Committee to keep the grounds in order it will have to come off the teachers' salaries: would you rather get up concerts than have your salary reduced?—It would depend on the size of the reduction.

883. Has your Board appointed a Truancy Officer?—Yes.

884. Has that helped the attendance at the schools?—Yes, very considerably.

885. It has brought more children to the schools?—Yes.

886. Have you studied the Truancy Act?—Yes.

887. Do you think it might be amended in the way of increasing the distance up to which children should be forced to attend?—Yes; I think a child might well travel three miles on good roads.

888. And might attend more often during the week?—Yes, generally speaking.

889. *Mr. Weston.*] You said just now that you thought the teachers generally in the Wellington District were in favour of a colonial scale?—Yes. Under the different scales in New Zealand there are teachers doing equal work for unequal pay in the different districts, and, providing that a colonial scale would bring all up to the level of the highest-paid districts, and not reduce the class which I represent by much, we would be prepared to make a sacrifice in order to benefit the more poorly paid teachers in other districts, and those in charge of smaller schools in this district.

890. You said that you approved of a colonial scale, provided there was a discretionary power left to the Board in special cases: what do you mean by that?—There are in, I suppose, every Board's service teachers of exceptional ability, who, if a colonial scale were adopted, should certainly receive more than other teachers. Two teachers might be equally certificated, and yet one might be far more efficient than the other; because they are equally certificated it does not follow that they should be paid equally.

891. Can you tell me how these special cases could be provided for under a colonial scale?—Only by judging from their work.

892. Would you provide, then, that teachers of a standing above the rest should receive a bonus?—I do not believe in the bonus system.

893. Then, how would you provide for these special cases?—By special recommendation of the Inspector that the work of one teacher was worth more than the work of another teacher.

894. Therefore you think there should be a contingency allowance over and above a colonial scale which the various Education Boards could dispense in cases of special ability?—Ability and length of service.

895. As a matter of fact, then, you yourself do not approve of a hard-and-fast colonial scale?—No, I think not.

896. Is that the view of the Wellington teachers as a body?—As a body, we view the proposed colonial scale with favour.

897. With the modification that you have mentioned?—That is my own idea.

898. You said you did not approve of lowering certificates?—Yes.

899. If teachers are to hold certificates of competency, do you not think that, as age comes upon men, and as men's circumstances, habits, and manners change, it will be essential to reconsider a teacher's competency, and, if necessary, lower his certificate?—Not in any way.

900. Why do you not think so?—I look upon a certificate as a valuable prize gained in a man's vigorous days, and it should be his private and sole possession.

901. Provided a scheme were adopted under which teachers would be appointed and paid according to the certificates they held, would it not logically follow that as men's abilities deteriorate, so, in the interests of the school, their certificates would have to be revised, and, if necessary, lowered?—Certainly not. I do not believe in a man's certificate being lowered in any way; but if a man cannot carry out his duties efficiently in the class to which he is appointed, he might be appointed to another position at a lower salary, where his abilities would find sufficient scope.

902. Do you approve of teachers being appointed by the Boards of Education and Committees, as at present, or would you prefer the appointments to be made by the Boards of Education direct?—By the Boards direct.

903. Would you prefer appointments to be made by the General Government—that is, the Education Department—or by Boards of Education?—Boards of Education.

904. Then, you are not in favour of handing over the management of our present educational system to the General Government?—No.

905. Do you echo the sentiments of the teachers of Wellington on that point?—As far as I know, I do.

906. Are the pupil-teachers too heavily burdened, in your opinion?—Yes, I think so.

907. What method of instruction would you suggest for pupil-teachers—that is to say, literary and practical instruction?—I would suggest that there should be a probationer—not paid the same salary as a pupil-teacher—attached to each school of an average of, say, from 150 to 300, who should be free to go to any class in the school. This probationer could relieve the head-teacher when the latter was examining, and at the same time pick up a good deal of knowledge of school-management. He could also devote a certain amount of time each day to relieving the pupil-teachers in different parts of the school, and thus gradually get information, and by-and-by be appointed as a pupil-teacher.

908. What proportion of the day should be devoted by the pupil-teacher to teaching?—At present the pupil-teachers teach five hours a day, and I think four hours a day is quite sufficient.

909. Do you consider that the subjects which pupil-teachers have to take for their examinations are too numerous?—I do not think so.

910. Do you think that pupil-teachers' examinations have been too exacting?—Not as far as my experience goes.

911. What is the opinion of the Wellington teachers upon that subject?—As far as I know, that is their opinion.

912. Do you think that there are too many pupil-teachers at the various schools?—I think so; in several instances, at any rate.

913. Then, I take it from what you say that the children are not receiving due justice and consideration at the hands of the educational authorities?—They could be more efficiently taught if there were better assistance and more experienced teachers.

914. Then, would you advocate the employment of more assistant teachers, even though that might necessitate a reduction in the salaries of teachers all round in your district?—If not certificated teachers, I should advocate the employment of ex-pupil-teachers—those who have gone through their course.

915. You think the employment of ex-pupil-teachers would get over the difficulty which you have mentioned?—An ex-pupil-teacher would rise, say, from £50 to £70 or £80.

916. Is there any difficulty in this district in getting pupil-teachers?—No, except in getting male pupil-teachers.

917. Is there trouble there?—Yes; we can get scarcely any.

918. How do you think that difficulty could be got over?—By making the service more attractive.

919. In that way could that be brought about?—First of all, by fixing minimum and maximum salaries for teachers, and paying those teachers, say, after they become assistants, a fair salary, on which they could live and pay college fees, &c.

920. What, in your opinion, should be the minimum and maximum salaries that should be paid to certificated teachers in order to attract boys into the profession?—The salary of, say, a city master should run up to about £420, and the minimum be not less than from £380 to £400.

921. What should be the minimum and maximum salaries paid to country-school masters?—It would depend on the size of the school.

922. What should be the minimum salary paid to any country-school master?—The masters at the smallest schools could not expect to get a very high salary.

923. I will put the question in another way: what should be the minimum salaries paid to all certificated teachers?—That would depend upon the experience that the teacher had had. It is possible for a girl to go to a high school or college, matriculate there, and in the course of one or two years to get, say, a D certificate. With an experience of only two years that teacher should not obtain the same class of position or the same salary as a teacher of longer experience. It is possible now for a teacher with that limited experience to get the same salary as a teacher with from fifteen to twenty years' experience.

924. With reference to sick-pay and compassionate allowances in case of death, what is the opinion of the school-teachers in this district on those two subjects?—As far as sick-pay is concerned, we approve of the Board's allowances—*i.e.*, they allow full salary for one month, and after that take the circumstances into consideration as far as possible. As far as compassionate allowances are concerned, we have not given the subject any consideration; but we have always found that the Board has dealt liberally and satisfactorily with the teachers concerned.

925. *Mr. Hogben.*] Have you a copy of the Wellington Board's scale?—Yes.

926. Take the Featherston School: you gave us the average attendance as 145; the certificate of the teacher, I see, is D1—what would be the salary according to the Wellington scale?—£255 is the amount stated in this Table 8.

927. That is the amount actually paid: what would the salary of the teacher be according to the Wellington scale?—£235.

928. Then, he is paid £20 more than the scale provides for?—Yes.

929. According to the alternative scale he would be paid £235, so there would be no loss there—I mean the salary under the alternative scale would be as high as that under the Wellington Board's scale: is that not so?—£235 would be the amount that he would get under the alternative scale.

930. Then, he would receive as high a salary under the alternative scale as under the Wellington Board's scale?—Yes.

931. Take Roseneath: the average attendance is 105—what would be the salary of that teacher (who holds a B1 certificate, I see) under the Wellington scale?—£245.

932. Now take Kaiwarra: the average attendance is stated as 106, and the teacher has a C1 certificate—his salary would be £245 according to the Wellington scale?—Yes.

933. He is getting £290—£260 salary, and £30 house allowance: his salary is not in accordance with the Wellington scale, is it?—No.

934. The master at Kaiwarra gets a larger salary than he would receive if paid according to the Wellington scale?—Yes.

935. Take the Eketahuna School: the average attendance is 112; there are four more pupils than at the Kaiwarra School, but the salary paid falls back to £245—£15 less?—Yes.

936. Now take Levin: the average attendance is 125, and the salary paid £235—£10 less than that paid to the master at the Eketahuna School; the attendance is larger by 15, but the salary £10 lower?—Yes, that is so.

937. At the Brooklyn School the average attendance is 180, and the salary paid £255?—Yes.

938. Take the Hutt School: the average attendance is 202—what would be the salary of the master according to the Wellington scale?—£275.

939. And he is getting £295?—Yes.

940. £20 above the scale?—Yes.

941. Now take the Carterton School: the average attendance is stated as 280—78 more pupils than at the Hutt School—what would the salary be for the headmaster according to the Wellington scale?—£275.

942. So that for 78 more pupils the master at the Carterton School would get no increase under the Wellington scale?—That is so.

943. What amount of the salary (£275) of the master at the Carterton School depends on the certificate?—£165 for a D1 certificate.

944. And £110 depends on the average attendance, does it not?—Yes.

945. Supposing that the master of the Carterton School held a C1 certificate, what would his salary be under the Wellington scale?—£10 more—£285.

946. Then, he is fined £10 for not holding a C1 certificate?—Yes, practically.

947. The difference, under the Wellington scale, between the highest and lowest amounts dependent on certificates is £40, is it not—£175 and £135?—Yes.

948. So that a teacher might be fined as much as £40 a year on account of certificate, according to the Wellington scale?—Yes.

949. Would it be possible for a teacher to be fined as much as that under the scale which I have submitted?—I cannot answer that.

950. Have you considered what principle a scale should be based upon if the total amount available for the payment of the salaries is paid on the capitation basis? On what principle should the salaries of head-teachers and others be principally based?—Upon length and efficiency of service.

951. Could you draw up a workable scale on that basis?—I have not tried.

952. Do you mean that you think a scale should be drawn up on the basis of length and efficiency of service without relation to the size of the schools?—No; but that should be probably the first consideration.

953. Is that considered when the capitation grant is made?—I am not aware of that.

954. If a scheme of staff and salaries is based on the length and efficiency of service of the teachers, and the payment to the Boards is based on the average attendance, is it not inevitable that sooner or later such a scheme must break down financially?—Yes; but I should base it on three things—first, length and efficiency of service; second, average attendance; and, third, the certificate held.

955. If the Boards are paid on average attendance, how can they pay except on average attendance unless their scales break down?—Yes, I can see that.

956. Well, then, a Board is likely to be placed in difficulties if, in the first place, it does not pay according to its own scale; and, in the second place, if its scale is not founded principally on average attendance instead of being allowed to depend chiefly on something else?—That is so.

957. In your opinion, if the grants are paid on average attendance the scale must be founded principally on average attendance?—I would not say that the scale should be based on average attendance altogether.

958. Supposing the salary of a headmaster had to be based on length of service and efficiency, would not that imply, to prevent such a scale breaking down, a system of promotion, so that when a teacher's experience and length of service were such as to make him, so to speak, too good for a certain school he should be transferred to another school?—Yes, that is so.

959. There would have to be a system of transfer and promotion?—Yes.

960. Do you think it possible to draw up a colonial scale founded on experience and efficiency without providing for colonial promotion?—They must go together to some extent.

961. For instance, would it be possible to have such a complete system of promotion in the Wellington District? Take the sixteen schools that you represent: are there any other places for the teachers at these schools to go to if the attendance at their schools falls—I mean within the Wellington District?—Of course, they would have to wait till vacancies did occur.

962. And meantime the Board would be losing?—Yes, if it kept them up to the same salaries.

963. In fact, an area larger than the Wellington District would be required in order to provide such a system of promotion?—Yes, if promotion came when the average attendance went up, or when the increase of experience entitled a man to promotion.

964. Otherwise he would be paid a salary for which the Board would not be receiving the funds?—Just so.

965. Therefore, to make such a scheme financially sound, there ought to be a system of promotion, and it is not possible for Wellington to have such a system of promotion, because it is not large enough? Such a scheme would involve colonial promotion?—Yes.

966. And that would mean departmental appointment?—That is so.

967. There are various objections to a system of departmental appointment?—Yes.

968. For instance, the department could hardly be expected to know the exact fitness of a teacher for a position as well as the Board would know?—No, certainly not.

969. So that a scale such as the Wellington one, much as it may have to recommend it, requires a colonial system of promotion to make it financially sound, and yet there are very strong arguments against having a colonial system of promotion?—Yes.

970. Does not that suggest the expediency of reducing the Wellington scale?—Undoubtedly.

971. *The Chairman.*] I think you said that you have had a good experience of the nature of the work carried on in medium-sized schools?—Yes.

972. I would like to ask your opinion with regard to the work of a headmaster and his assistants: do you think there is any very great difference between the work of a headmaster at a school of about 300 and that of the first assistant master at the same school?—Yes, there is a great deal of difference. At such a school the headmaster must—under our Board, at any rate—be responsible for the teaching of the Sixth and Seventh Standards; he is therefore bound to his classes all day, unless by some arrangement he can get the first assistant to take such subjects as, say, singing, science, and history. If that can be done, the headmaster is free to get to the other parts of the school to aid the pupil-teachers and other assistants, if necessary, in their work. He is responsible for the planning of all the work, for the carrying-out of the instructions both of the Government and the Education Board; he has to train the pupil-teachers; he has to make periodical examinations, and thus leave his class for at least a month in the year. Besides all this, he is responsible to the Committee, the Board, and the parents of the children; and it is a very great responsibility. Whereas the assistant master usually has, say, Standard V.; probably he also takes the upper classes in singing, science, and history, and he is simply responsible for that one standard and the upper classes in connection with those subjects.

973. In schools of a larger size—say, from 400 to 500—the headmaster has still to take an active part in the work, especially of the higher standards, I presume?—No; under our Board a first assistant master is not appointed until the average attendance at a school reaches 461: that frees the headmaster from teaching a class himself. The headmaster is then free to arrange supervise, train the pupil-teachers, and very often take the classes of sick teachers, besides examining the school throughout, and being responsible for everything connected with the school; whereas the first assistant master is, in almost every case, bound to attend to probably only the Seventh Standard—he might have the Sixth and Seventh. When I was first assistant master I had the Fifth, Sixth, and Seventh Standards, but I do not think that appertains at all to Wellington schools at the present time. He has also the drill to look after, and, of course, the sports.

974. Do you know whether in any case the duty of instructing the pupil-teachers falls upon the assistant instead of the headmaster?—Yes; the first assistant masters at the city schools—or most of them—have the instruction of pupil-teachers in separate subjects on certain days in the week, and I know of one instance where the first assistant at a country school takes the pupil-teachers.

975. *Mr. Davidson.*] Are the assistant masters paid specially for that work in addition to their ordinary salaries?—Yes.

976. *The Chairman.*] In case the headmaster becomes disabled through accident or sickness, is the first assistant, as a rule, called on to perform his work? Is the assistant master competent to do it?—Yes, if he has had sufficient experience. At present it is quite possible for a man with limited experience to get into a good position on account of his holding a high certificate.

977. Is it expected of the first assistant that he will be able to perform the work of the headmaster when a necessity of the kind arises?—I think so, in the large schools.

978. I suppose he is like the first officer on a vessel—he must at times take the captain's place?—He must be the headmaster's right-hand man.

979. In a case of that kind, seeing that the work of the first assistant is so important, what do you think should be the difference between the salaries of the headmaster and the first assistant?—There should be a difference of at least £100.

980. Could you say what percentage? Do you think the first assistant should have a salary of four-fifths of the salary of the headmaster, or three-fourths, or what relative proportion?—I could not say exactly.

981. If the headmaster received £400 a year, what would be an adequate salary for the first assistant?—I should say from £230 to £240 a year. If you make the first assistants' salaries really good ones the men who occupy those positions will stay in the towns; they will keep these

good positions, and the country will thus lose their services as country masters. Not only so, but the country masters will endeavour to become first assistants in town schools.

982. Has it not been the case for years that the country teachers are very anxious to become first assistants at the city schools?—If they have not had that experience before, yes.

983. Have you known of any anxiety on the part of assistants in the city schools to go out into the country?—In some cases, for increased salary, and also for increased experience.

984. What percentage of a difference in salary should there be between the first assistant and the second assistant?—If the first assistant gets £240, I should say that the second assistant ought to get at least £185.

985. Do you think that would be a sufficient difference?—Quite enough; the second assistant should get from £185 to £200.

986. I think you said that in your opinion pupil-teachers were not receiving sufficient remuneration?—I referred to boys not being attracted into the service, possibly on account of the small salaries offered, because they can get better salaries in other callings.

987. Would you recommend a difference being made between the salary paid to a male pupil-teacher and that paid to a female pupil-teacher?—Yes, certainly.

988. What do you think would be a reasonable difference?—I think the difference in the salaries paid by the Wellington Board is giving satisfaction; or the difference between the salaries under the proposed scale would be reasonable.

989. Do you know whether the salary paid to pupil-teachers under the Wellington Board's scale is attracting male pupil-teachers?—No, it is not just now.

990. Would you recommend that the salaries of both male and female pupil-teachers be increased?—Certainly.

991. You are opposed to similar salaries being paid to males and females in the teaching profession?—I said that in the small country schools their salaries might be even.

992. What do you think would be an adequate salary for teachers in the smallest country schools?—That would be according to circumstances. If the school is within easy reach of the city, probably within reach of the teacher's home, the salary would not be expected to be so high as that paid to the teacher of a school situated twenty or thirty miles from a main road, where probably the teacher must pay £1 a week for board and put up with the best he or she can get, which is not always luxury.

993. Then, what ought to be a minimum salary for teachers of that class of school?—It would depend on the experience and the certificate of the teacher. If you sent a fifth-year pupil-teacher who has just obtained, say, his or her E certificate to a school like that in the back blocks, he or she could not expect the same salary as one who had served, say, five or ten years at teaching. There should be a difference in that way.

994. Do you think there is a large difference between the competence of the two classes of teachers you have referred to, the experienced and the inexperienced?—There should be.

995. Do you think it would be fair to send one teacher, paid a small salary, and comparatively inexperienced, to teach at one school, and then send to another similar sized school an experienced teacher with a much higher salary: do you think that would be fair to the children?—No. I consider that those country schools require special attention; they should have the very best teachers obtainable at the salaries.

996. Do you think £80 a year a fair remuneration for the teachers at the class of school I have been referring to?—I think that from £90 to £100 is as little as a teacher can really do anything on. Of course, I would go up higher than that in cases of long experience and higher certificates.

997. Do you think that a teacher in the country with between 30 and 40 children to teach without assistance should receive the same salary as a first assistant in one of the large schools?—I think not.

998. Which do you think has the more arduous and responsible duties to perform?—The teacher in the country has the more arduous work, but he or she would take a school of that kind only as a stepping-stone to something better; you would not expect a person to take a school such as that if he or she could get anything higher.

999. Do you think it is advantageous to the country schools that they should be used in this way as stepping-stones?—Certainly.

1000. Teachers should not look upon them as permanent positions, but simply as a means of getting better positions?—Yes, for this reason: that in order to be a thoroughly all-round teacher a person must have experience in all kinds of schools and in all standards. That in my experience.

1001. Do you consider that principle should be applied to the larger schools? Do you think the teachers at the larger schools should be more permanent than those at the small schools?—If possible; but the schools here are simply training-grounds for future head-teachers; as soon as a teacher has obtained sufficient experience in one of the standards he looks for something higher.

1002. They all aim at the head?—Yes.

1003. I think, from what you have stated already, that you consider the profession as a whole is underpaid at the present time?—In some cases, and especially in some districts.

1004. The Wellington District?—I have not said so; I said that we preferred the Wellington scale to either the suggested scale or the alternative.

1005. Do you think the headmasters at the city schools are fairly paid for the work they do?—I think each one is worth £400 a year, as he is at the top of the tree.

1006. Do you think the first assistants are adequately paid—most of them receive £220 a year?—I think they should not have less than £230, and should go up to £240.

1007. If the salaries were increased do you think it would lead to an improvement, either in the capabilities of the teachers or the quality of the education imparted?—I do not think so; I do not think the salary would make any difference whatever to an honourable man.

1008. Do you know from your own experience and knowledge whether, when vacancies arise in big city schools, there is any difficulty in getting suitable applicants to come forward?—No, not generally speaking; but applications for such positions as the first-assistantships are frequently put in merely for the purpose of getting the applicant's name before the Board for promotion—not that he expects to get the position which he is applying for.

1009. Do you know whether it is the case that, when vacancies of headmasterships have occurred in the Wellington District, applications pour in from the most competent headmasters in New Zealand?—I am quite aware of that; there are very few large schools that one can get in any part of New Zealand.

1010. Seeing there is such a scramble as that for headmasterships, do you think it is an indication that headmasters are not adequately paid?—It indicates that the applicants are probably getting smaller salaries than that attached to the position which they are applying for. They simply wish to better themselves.

1011. But do you not think that if the salaries paid to headmasters were insufficient the Board would occasionally find a difficulty in getting competent men to fill the positions?—I do not think so. I do not say that the salaries paid to headmasters are either meagre or poor.

1012. Then, why do you wish to improve them? Why are they inadequate?—I do not say they are inadequate.

1013. You said that £400 should be paid to the headmasters at the city schools, instead of £370: what proof is there that the smaller salary is not enough?—The headmastership of a city school is the highest position in the teaching profession, as far as teachers in active service in New Zealand are concerned, and the position is certainly worthy of that salary, because the men occupying such a position must have taught for very many years; he must be a skilful man, a good manager, and an excellent disciplinarian; and we should pay for ability and length of service as they deserve.

1014. What I wanted to get at was this: whether there is any indication whatever that £370 a year is not a sufficient salary to induce the best teaching talent in New Zealand to apply for a position?—I would not say so.

1015. But you think £400 is required?—I do not know about being required. I think that in such a profession, which is regarded probably as one of the best of the public services in New Zealand, there should be something worth aiming at.

1016. Why fix £400; why not go up to £450 or £500?—If circumstances and means would allow, I should put it up to £1,000. I heard lately of quite a young man getting £500 a year in an insurance office, and I think teachers do far more important work than insurance.

Miss MYERS, B.A., First Assistant at Roseneath School, examined.

Miss Myers: I do not wish to make a statement, but only to answer any questions that may be put to me.

1017. *Mr. Davidson.*] What is the average attendance at the Roseneath School?—From 120 to 130, I think.

1018. You occupy the position of infant mistress?—I am called "first assistant," but have charge of the infant department.

1019. What is your present salary?—£80 a year.

1020. What would it be under the suggested alternative scale?—About £110, I think.

1021. In that respect you consider the alternative scale much more satisfactory than the Wellington scale?—Yes.

1022. How long have you been teaching?—I have been in the Board's service eight years, and have had experience in a private school.

1023. What is your certificate?—B2.

1024. You hold a university degree?—Yes.

1025. In the light of your experience as a teacher, if you had your time to go over again would you enter the service of the Education Board?—Not unless there were some prizes offered.

1026. You think that the present rate of salary for positions similar to that occupied by you is altogether too low?—Yes.

1027. What is the staff at the Roseneath School?—A master and two assistant mistresses.

1028. Have you compared the two suggested scales of salaries, Nos. 1 and 2?—Yes, but not very carefully.

1029. You see that the No. 2 scale gives the title of "infant mistress" to the female assistant who teaches the infants?—Yes.

1030. Do you approve of that? Do you think it adds dignity to the position of the assistant to call her by that name?—I do not know.

1031. You are not very particular as to the name?—No.

1032. Probably you think the salary is much more important?—Yes.

1033. *Mr. Stewart.*] I suppose, Miss Myers, that you are acquainted with a good many teachers in the Wellington District?—Yes.

1034. Can you give the Commission any idea as to whether the lady teachers in the Wellington District are satisfied with the rates of payment that obtain here or not?—They are not satisfied.

1035. Have you made any comparisons, for example, between the salaries paid to lady teachers in Wellington and Otago?—Yes, some comparisons have been made.

1036. What was the result: was it in favour of the Wellington lady teachers or the Otago lady teachers?—The Otago ones, I believe.

1037. Taking the lady teachers as a whole, do they wish for a colonial scale or that the present state of affairs should continue?—It is hard to speak for others.

1038. Do you not represent the lady teachers in any way?—No.
1039. What is your own feeling in the matter?—I think a colonial scale would be better than the present state of affairs.
1040. Have you any idea as to what extent the proposed scale would benefit the women teachers of the colony?—No; I have not gone into it.
1041. Would you be surprised to learn that the proposed scale would benefit the women teachers of the colony by from 12 to 20 per cent.?—We should like to see more openings made for capable women.
1042. Do you not think that this scale would make a great many more openings?—It would make more, but I do not think they are sufficient.
1043. In what direction would you like to see openings made for women?—That, where possible, girls should be taught entirely by women.
1044. Do you believe in the separation of the sexes in the schools?—Where possible.
1045. Have you had any experience in that connection?—Not personally.
1046. Are you aware that the tendency amongst educationalists is quite in the opposite direction?—No; I thought that of late years it had been in the other direction.
1047. We may take it, I suppose, from the general bearing of your evidence, that you, and as far as you know, others, are in favour of a colonial scale of payment?—Yes.
1048. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] How long have you been at the Roseneath School?—Three years.
1049. How long is it since you obtained a University degree?—Ten years.
1050. Have you applied for other positions under the Wellington Board?—Yes.
1051. Does the Wellington Board, then, not give sufficient facilities to its own teachers to gain promotion when they deserve it—for example, have teachers from other districts been appointed to some of the positions for which you have applied?—Some that I have applied for have been given to men.
1052. Were they principally applications to take charge of schools?—Yes.
1053. Would such a staff as that set down in the proposed scale be sufficient at a school such as yours—*i.e.*, two pupil-teachers instead of an assistant?—It would mean that the Roseneath School would have to be divided into two parts.
1054. The proposed staff would not suit the building?—No.
1055. There are other schools in this district of much the same size as yours?—Yes.
1056. Do you consider that the staff you have could work the school better than a staff that did not suit the school-building so well?—Ours is rather unusual: we have an assistant instead of two pupil-teachers, because that staff suits the school better.
1057. Do you consider it is better to have an assistant, where practicable, instead of two pupil-teachers?—Yes.
1058. And that there are too many pupil-teachers in the employment of the Board?—Yes.
1059. Have you been a pupil-teacher?—Yes.
1060. Do you think the remuneration paid to pupil-teachers by the Wellington Board sufficient?—I do not think so; but the rate of payment has been altered since I was a pupil-teacher.
1061. Do you think that the salaries for pupil-teachers set forth in the proposed scale are adequate?—No.
1062. Do you consider that male and female pupil-teachers should receive the same pay?—Yes.
1063. And male and female head-teachers, up to a certain limit?—Yes, up to a certain limit.
1064. Have you been sole mistress of a country school?—No.
1065. You could not say how many you could teach unaided in a country school?—No.
1066. Which standards do you teach at the Roseneath School?—All the infants, and the First Standard. I have also charge of the sewing.
1067. Do you consider that female teachers can teach the standards up to and including the Fourth as efficiently as male teachers?—Yes.
1068. And they should receive the same remuneration up to, say, a living wage—£100 a year?—Yes.
1069. Do you favour equal pay for equal work to males and females?—Up to a certain point.
1070. What do you consider a sufficient differentiation between the salaries paid to males and females? Do you think 10 per cent. sufficient?—No, I think there should be a little more than that; but I have not given the subject much consideration.
1071. Then, with regard to bonuses on teachers' certificates, do you favour the adoption of the principle of granting bonuses on the certificates teachers may hold?—I think the salary should include everything.
1072. If you do not favour bonuses, you do not favour reductions or fines for those who do not hold minimum certificates?—No.
1073. Do the Wellington Board pay the teachers directly, or through the Committees?—Directly.
1074. Do you favour that system?—Yes.
1075. With regard to the syllabus, do you consider that it would be equitable to make a distinction between the work expected from a large town school and that expected from a small country school?—I know nothing of the working of country schools, but I should think that more might be expected from a large, fully-staffed town school than from a country school.
1076. *Mr. Hill.*] Did I understand you to say that you had had experience at a private school?—Yes.
1077. Was that before or after you served as a pupil-teacher?—After.
1078. Where were you trained as a pupil-teacher?—In Wellington.
1079. You obtained your diploma after you had finished your pupil-teachership?—Yes.

1080. You think that girls' schools should be fostered: have you any special reason for this?—I think it would be beneficial to the girls themselves.
1081. Do you think it a disadvantage to have mixed classes for the senior pupils?—Yes; I think so.
1082. Have you had any experience of mixed schools,—say among the senior classes?—Yes.
1083. Have you found the mixing of the sexes a disadvantage in the matter of instruction—I am assuming good supervision, of course: do you think the moral influences are not good?—Sometimes they are not; it depends.
1084. On what?—Largely upon the surroundings of the school.
1085. Do you not think when the boys and girls are working side by side it is an incentive to the one sex to emulate the other?—I think they work just as well when separated; they do in the high schools.
1086. But they also work together in the high schools?—They are usually separated, I think.
1087. It is a question of cost. Take the case of a large school: do you not think a large school could be carried on more economically by merging the sexes?—Yes; that is the reason why the sexes are not, as a rule, separated.
1088. Is it a question of salary—that the lady teachers should get the same salaries as male assistants at the large schools?—Not only that, but they would be given more scope.
1089. How many years have you been teaching?—Eight years in the public schools.
1090. How much of your present salary is paid on your certificate?—None.
1091. The Board does not pay lady assistants on their certificates?—No.
1092. Have you applied for promotion?—Yes.
1093. You think your present salary very small?—Yes.
1094. *Mr. Smith.*] Were you ever on the West Coast?—Yes, as a pupil of the Hokitika School.
1095. The Hokitika School is a mixed one, is it not?—Yes.
1096. Do you think there was anything of an undesirable nature in the way in which that school was carried on?—No. It is so long ago that I have forgotten.
1097. *Mr. Weston.*] I think you were trained at Canterbury College?—Yes.
1098. You are a B.A.?—Yes.
1099. What would be the advantages of a colonial scale?—The rates of pay and the staffing would be more uniform.
1100. If the teachers in the various districts were treated fairly by the Boards, do you not think that a colonial scale would not be required?—Yes, I think so.
1101. You have had the teaching of infants?—Yes.
1102. Have you made that your specialty?—No; I was placed in charge of infants without having had any previous experience of them.
1103. Do you not think that infant-teaching is a specialty?—Undoubtedly.
1104. I presume that in infant-teaching the mistress has to be very much in sympathy with the children, and to enter into all their little ways?—I should think that would be necessary in all teaching.
1105. But is it not more especially the case with infants?—Yes.
1106. Do you think that an infant class of, say, from 300 to 400 should be left to the tender mercies of one mistress, and the remainder pupil-teachers and probationers?—Considering that it is at that stage that the sparks of intelligence have to be watched for and gently fanned into a flame if their light is to illumine the whole life, I do not think that is wise.
1107. You do not think that children receive fair teaching by being left in the way I have just described?—No; I think they should have experienced teachers.
1108. Do you think that the whole of a pupil-teacher's time should be given to practical work in a school?—No.
1109. What is your idea, then, of the time pupil-teachers should teach?—I should think half their time would be quite enough, or, say, the mornings.
1110. Do you think, then, that the pupil-teachers in this district—and I may say that all we see in this district exists in other districts—are fairly treated?—They have far too much to do.
1111. Is there an undue tax imposed upon teachers in the instruction of their pupil-teachers?—It is all additional work.
1112. Do you think that the instruction of pupil-teachers should be divided between the teaching staff rather than left to the headmaster, or to an assistant under him?—In this district there is quite a different system.
1113. What is the method here?—The first assistants at the different schools take the pupil-teachers after school-hours.
1114. Do you think that lady teachers are capable physically—I do not say mentally—of taking the higher standards?—Yes, I think so.
1115. You think that the work would not be too great a strain upon them?—No.
1116. Do you think there should be any appreciable difference between the salaries paid to ladies and those paid to men—I mean when they take those higher classes?—Personally, I am willing that there should be a difference.
1117. What percentage of difference do you think this Commission should establish?—I have not gone into the matter.
1118. Do you think that pupil-teachers are paid sufficiently?—No.
1119. Why do you think they are not paid sufficiently?—Here they are expected to do the work of assistants, and pursue their studies at the same time.
1120. Assuming that pupil-teachers worked only half-time, do you think the pay would still be insufficient?—No; if they were working only half-time they should not be paid at full rates.

1121. Do you think that the payment to pupil-teachers should be higher than the payment that is usually given to, say, apprentices to various trades?—Considering that pupil-teachers have more important work to do, I think their allowance should be larger.

1122. Have we not a right to assume that the pay should be governed by the importance of the business?—Yes.

1123. Then, if that be so, you would naturally suppose that teachers would receive higher remuneration than the generality of mechanics?—Yes, certainly.

1124. Then, why should you make the payment to pupil-teachers higher proportionately than is given to apprentices to trades?—I did not know that that was so.

1125. You stated just now, I think, that women had no prizes in view?—Yes.

1126. Why do you say so?—There are no positions open to them.

1127. There are the positions of infant mistress at large schools, and, then, are there not first assistant mistresses?—Those positions are not very great prizes.

1128. Then, why is there always a sufficiency of female pupil-teachers?—I suppose there always will be; but as time goes on, and more professions are opened to women, the girls that you would like to get into the teaching profession will go into other professions, and those from a different class will come forward.

1129. Are you sure that young ladies of other walks of life—say, shorthand-writers and typewriters—receive higher pay than the young ladies in our schools at this moment?—Some of them do, I know.

1130. Are you able to speak generally?—Yes; I think it is so generally.

1131. *The Chairman.*] Have you had any experience at teaching the standards?—Yes, I have taught the Fourth Standard.

1132. At one of the large schools in the city?—Yes.

1133. Do you consider the salaries paid to the lady teachers of those standards sufficient?—No.

1134. What prospect has a lady teacher at one of the large city schools, in charge of, say, the Third or Fourth Standard, of getting her salary increased from year to year?—None whatever, so far as I know.

1135. Do you know of any lady teachers here who have been teaching standards for a number of years who are still enjoying the same salaries that they did a considerable time ago?—Yes.

1136. What is about the amount paid to female assistants of the class I have referred to?—I think £90 is the highest.

1137. What do the assistant masters receive for doing precisely the same work?—I think the lowest that is paid to an assistant master is £100.

1138. What other salaries are paid to the assistant masters?—I think the next is £150, but I am not sure about that. Then, the first assistants get £210 or £220.

1139. Do the female assistants or pupil-teachers have any opportunity of earning those salaries if they prove themselves to be highly capable?—No; I know of none that get those higher salaries.

1140. When you said that there are very few openings for female teachers, I suppose you meant that the only positions available for female teachers are those positions where, in your opinion, the salaries are low?—Excepting the position of infant mistress.

1141. £100 and under?—Yes.

1142. In your experience—which is considerable—have you known of any lady teacher being appointed to a position in a large school with a salary of, say, £150?—No.

1143. What you complain of is that there is no promotion and no improvement in salary for the female assistants and lady teachers such as there is for males?—Yes; there is provision made for the infant mistress, but she is an exception.

1144. The female assistants—standard teachers—invariably receive low salaries?—Yes.

1145. Much lower than those paid to the male assistants?—Yes.

1146. Do you know whether the Education Board throws the good positions in the schools open to both sexes?—I do not know.

1147. You see the vacancies advertised?—The advertisements generally say “first male assistant,” and so on.

1148. So that the female teachers have no opportunity of improving their positions?—When, in an advertisement, sex is not mentioned the position is generally given to a man.

1149. With regard to country schools, do you know of ladies being appointed to country schools where the salary is over £100?—I have seen some advertisements for lady teachers at salaries of over £100, but only occasionally.

1150. Can you say whether such advertisements have appeared frequently, or very rarely?—I have not noticed particularly.

MONDAY, 24TH JUNE, 1901.

MISS CRAIG, Infant Mistress, Rintoul Street School, examined.

Miss Craig: Like a former speaker, I think it would have been a good thing had there been one or two ladies on the Commission, so that matters might have been viewed from a woman's standpoint as well as from a man's. I may say at the outset that I entirely agree with a colonial scale of staff and salaries, the greatest difficulty in the matter, to my mind, being that which crops up with regard to the house allowance to head-teachers. Of the two schemes that have been submitted for our criticism I prefer the alternative scheme, because I think it is better for country teachers and infant mistresses. I think the weakest point in the scheme, so far as I am able to judge, is that it proposes to reduce the salaries of assistant masters. This would come very severely

on the second assistants of our city schools. I do not think that these men are overpaid, and I think it would be an injustice to them to decrease their salaries. I think that, notwithstanding the difficulties in the way, it would do advisable to introduce a pension scheme. For various reasons, the women in this district have decided not to ask for equal salaries to those paid to men, even where equal work is being done; but we do think that the salaries paid to us ought to bear a fair proportion to those paid to the men. That the salaries paid to women in our profession are inadequate will, I think, surely be admitted when I say that the highest-paid woman at any of our schools in New Zealand does not receive anything like so good a salary as the salaries paid to the heads of some of our dressmaking establishments in this city. I believe that the highest salary paid to any woman at any of the public schools in New Zealand is something like £270 a year, but I know of women in dressmaking establishments who are getting £7 and £8 a week. With regard to pupil-teachers, I know of two girls who left the high school last year—both matriculated students: one entered the Civil Service and commenced work at £40 a year, while the other entered the teaching profession and commenced at £20 a year. The prospects of the girl who entered the Civil Service are much brighter than those of the girl who has adopted teaching. There are several schools in our district to which the scale does not apply. In these schools there are comparatively no infants, and for that reason we would suggest that an infant mistress be not appointed until the average attendance of the infants numbers something like 150; and then we think, when the attendance does reach that number, and an infant mistress is appointed, she should not be asked to do other work in the school, but that the infants' department be understood to be her work. We would also suggest that no separate infants' schools be established until there be an average attendance of at least 250. We cannot help observing that the chances of promotion for women in the colonies are very small compared with what they are in London. In London, where there are large separate girls' and infants' schools, there are many more positions open to women, and the salaries paid there are much larger than those paid here. We think that, as the purchasing-power of money is much greater there, the salaries paid here should be equal to those paid in London. Although I am specially representing the heads of infants' departments, I would like to say that I do not think the position of infant mistress should be the only good position in a school to which women can attain, but I maintain that it is almost the most important and responsible position in the school, and one for which considerable training and experience are necessary. We all know that in the erection of buildings the foundation-work is of the most importance—in fact, that the foundation-work cannot be overestimated; and I think that, if this be true with regard to buildings, it is infinitely more so with regard to the foundation-work of our schools. I think that where the foundation-work of a school is neglected, or where a bad foundation is laid, the whole after-work of the school suffers, and the work of the standard teacher is greatly increased. Not only is the infant mistress responsible for this foundation-work, but to her the young pupil-teachers are sent, and from her they receive their first training. When it is remembered that the infant mistress has to classify and examine, that she is responsible for the discipline and teaching of fully one-third of the school, and that the work has to be accomplished not only with inexperienced teachers, but often, so far as numbers are concerned, with a very inadequate staff, I think all will bear me out when I say that her position is both an arduous and a responsible one. In view of the fact, too, that kindergarten lessons—and, indeed, all foundation-work—require a great deal more supervision than upper-school work, and that infants require more individual attention than upper-school children, I think the staffing of infants' schools ought to be more liberal. I have seen—owing, I suppose, to inexperienced staffs—work in upper schools that reflected no great credit on our infants' departments, and this, I believe, owing to imperfect supervision of their early training. I think, because so much individual attention has to be given to infants, and because so much supervision is required in connection with kindergarten-work, that the staffing of the infants' schools should be much more liberal than it now is. There is another suggestion that I would like to make with regard to pupil-teachers. I think there should be some rule by which a pupil-teacher should be expected to spend part of her pupil-teachership in an infants' department, and the other part at standard-work. I know of cases where newly-appointed teachers have been sent to an upper school and have had to remain there during the whole of their apprenticeship, and I know of other cases where pupil-teachers have been sent to an infants' department and have spent the whole of their pupil-teachership in that department. I think some arrangement should be made whereby pupil-teachers could have experience in both an infants' department and an upper school.

1151. *Mr. Davidson.*] Have you served an apprenticeship as a pupil-teacher?—Yes.

1152. What is your present position, Miss Craig?—I am the head of the infants' department at the Rintoul Street School.

1153. Have you ever taught at a small country school as sole teacher?—No; I have never been sole teacher at any school.

1154. What is your work at the Rintoul Street School?—I have charge of the infants' department and Standard I.

1155. What is the average attendance in the whole of your department, including Standard I.?—The number is 217. The attendance has greatly increased lately.

1156. What is the teaching staff in your department?—I am allowed five pupil-teachers or probationers; but for the past year I have been working with four.

1157. Do you think it would be an advantage to you to have a fully trained mistress to assist you instead of so many pupil-teachers?—There is no doubt of that. If there was at least one assistant who really understood the work, it would be a great advantage both to the children and myself.

1158. Have you noticed the suggested staffing under the alternative scale?—I have seen the alternative scale only so far as it applies to small country schools—not the extended one.

1159. Have you seen the first suggested scale?—Yes.

1160. The staffing provided in the first suggested scale is precisely similar to that in the alternative scale, with this exception, that there is one pupil-teacher less?—I do not think that it would make any very great difference to me, because it applies to the whole school—not specially to the infants' department.

1161. According to the Wellington Board's scale, there should be six adult teachers and seven pupil-teachers at such a school as yours; according to the suggested scale the staff would consist of eight adult teachers and five pupil-teachers?—Yes.

1162. If there were eight adult teachers instead of six at your school, the head-teacher would be enabled to place at the disposal of the infant mistress at least one fully qualified assistant: that would be a decided advantage, would it not?—Yes, I think so.

1163. What is your present salary?—£125 a year.

1164. That is the highest salary paid to a woman under the Wellington Board in a mixed school, is it not?—Yes, I think so.

1165. What salary would you receive under the proposed scale?—£160 a year.

1166. Then, in point of salary, the proposed scale would be a very great advantage indeed to women occupying similar positions to yours?—It would.

1167. You stated that there were not many openings for women in New Zealand as compared with London?—Yes.

1168. Do you think that a woman is capable of managing, as sole teacher, a school up to, say, an average of 40?—I should think so, decidedly.

1169. Do you know that in New Zealand there are at least a thousand of such schools?—What salary is paid?

1170. The salary under the alternative scale would range from £75 at an average attendance of 15 to £144 at 40; so that, if these thousand schools were thrown open to women, women would have a much larger number of opportunities for employment?—That would necessitate their going to the country; there would be very few town positions open to them.

1171. You admit that many of these schools would be somewhat near the towns?—Yes.

1172. Then, according to the alternative scale, an infant mistress appears at a school when the attendance reaches 41?—Yes.

1173. So that, at any rate, in the six hundred and odd schools above 40 in average attendance the positions of infant mistress would be kept solely for women?—I do not consider that the infant-mistress-ship of those schools is a very good position for a woman.

1174. You do admit that the salaries for women according to the suggested scale are a very great improvement on those paid throughout the colony at the present time?—Yes.

1175. Do you not think a position worth from, say, £120 to £180 a fairly good position?—I think it a fairly good position for the average woman, but I do not think it is anything very great for a very capable woman to look forward to.

1176. Can you compare the schools in London with the schools in New Zealand in this respect: do you know how many schools in New Zealand have an average attendance of over 500?—Very few.

1177. I suppose you admit that it would not be practicable to have three departments—*i.e.*, the girls', the boys', and the infants'—in schools having an attendance of under 500?—No, I do not think it would be possible.

1178. Then, you see that the conditions in New Zealand differ so greatly from the conditions in London that the same method of classification could not well be adopted?—Yes, I see that.

1179. You could not possibly have the special openings for women in New Zealand schools that they have in the London schools?—No.

1180. At any rate, in the 1,675 schools in New Zealand there would be at least 1,675 openings for employment for women?—I do not say that there are not positions for which women can apply. I say there are no very good openings, or very few specially good openings, for very capable women.

1181. You consider the position of infant mistress in a large mixed school an exceedingly important one?—Yes.

1182. You think that the salaries attached to that class of position should be really prizes for women?—I do. I think that women require special training and special experience before they can take such positions.

1183. Leaving out of consideration the thousand or more positions as sole teacher that would be open to women, and also leaving out of consideration those positions as infant mistress that are set apart specially for women, the majority of the assistantships are available for women, are they not?—I expect so; but, then, of course, the majority of teachers are women.

1184. I want to show that a very great many openings in the teaching profession are set aside specially for women, and that there are certain prizes, though not as many as you would like?—Yes.

1185. Is it a fact that the majority of assistants are women?—I think so.

1186. If under any scale exceptional women could occupy positions carrying a fair remuneration, that would mean prizes for women, would it not?—Yes.

1187. You consider, I understand, that provision should be made in any colonial scale for exceptional women occupying high positions on the staff of any school as assistants?—I do.

1188. *Mr. Stewart.*] I understood you to say that you thought the greatest blot on the proposed scale was that it would reduce the salaries of assistant masters?—I did, referring to the first scale.

1189. You have not heard the official statement of the Inspector-General that the salaries of assistants would not be reduced under the alternative scale, but would be increased in most cases?—I did not know that that was so.

1190. That meets your objection?—Yes.

1191. *Mr. Luke.*] I think you said that it was a pity there were not some ladies on this Commission: will you tell us why you think it a pity?—If there were one or two women on the Commission matters would be viewed more from a woman's standpoint, and it would have given greater confidence to many of the women giving evidence.

1192. You spoke about the foundation of education: did you refer solely to the infant classes, or the whole teaching of the primary schools? Do you not think the whole teaching of our primary schools is really a foundation of education?—Yes, only a foundation; but I referred specially to the work done in the infant department.

1193. You said that you did not ask that equal pay should be given to men and women for similar work: do you think the present disparity too great?—I think it is.

1194. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Whom do you represent, Miss Craig? The lady teachers?—Specially the mistresses of infant departments.

1195. Was a meeting held?—Yes; there have been several meetings of women teachers.

1196. How many were appointed representatives to give evidence before the Commission?—I was the only one, as far as I know; Miss Myers's name was added afterwards.

1197. With regard to pupil-teachers, do you think that the suggested scale provides adequate remuneration for pupil-teachers?—No. I think that, in the first place, a more careful selection of pupil-teachers should be made, and when the selection is made they should be paid better salaries than at present.

1198. Who do you think should make the selection of pupil-teachers—the Board, the headmaster, or the Committee?—I think that a Committee might be formed to make the selection, consisting of the Inspectors, headmasters, and some of the members of the Board. At one time the head-teachers had a good deal to say in the selection of pupil-teachers, and at that time I believe the selection was better than it usually is. I think there should be some standard of examination—an examination about equal to matriculation should be passed; then a candidate should be sent to a school as a probationer, and if he or she shows no evidence of ability at the end of the term of probation his or her services should be dispensed with. If, on the other hand, good reports are received from the teacher under whom the candidate is serving, he or she should be permanently appointed.

1199. You suggest that there should be an entrance examination for candidates for appointment as pupil-teachers?—Yes.

1200. The best to get the appointments?—Yes.

1201. Do you think there should be uniformity in teachers' examinations?—Yes, I think so.

1202. What provision would you suggest should be made for the training of pupil-teachers? Would you consider what you have advocated in your address sufficient—*i.e.*, removal from one school to another?—I think that pupil-teachers should receive their principal training at the hands of the teacher to whom they are intrusted, but I think there ought to be a training-college for them to go to after their pupil-teachership is over.

1203. Do you find that the pupil-teachers in the Wellington District are placed at a disadvantage through not having a training-college?—I should think that a training-college could not fail to be an advantage to teachers.

1204. Would you suggest the establishment of training-colleges in the four large centres of population—of course, there are two in existence already?—Yes, I think there should be such an institution at each of the four centres.

1205. Do you think there are too many pupil-teachers entering the service—*i.e.*, more than there is a probability of finding employment for after their apprenticeship is over?—Yes, I think there is no doubt of that.

1206. What would you suggest should be done to get over the difficulty? Would you advise their promotion to assistantships in the event of a colonial scale, such as the one suggested, coming into operation?—I think that where vacancies occur they should have the first chance, especially those who are at all capable.

1207. I think you said that you considered part of the twenty-five hours a week that pupil-teachers devote to teaching should be devoted to study?—Yes, where possible.

1208. How many hours a day would you suggest they should be engaged in actual teaching?—I think it would be better if they could be engaged half the day in actual teaching; the other half in study.

1209. I think you stated that you would support the substitution of an assistant for two pupil-teachers where practicable?—I did not say so, but I think it desirable.

1210. Have you found, from your experience in the Wellington District, that the school-buildings are suitable for making an alteration of that kind? Would it entail any considerable expenditure in adapting the school-buildings to the requirements—*i.e.*, separate class-rooms?—I do not think it would in the majority of cases; no doubt it would in some cases.

1211. In the suggested scale provision is made for the equal payment of male and female pupil-teachers: do you consider they should be paid equally?—Yes.

1212. What do you consider should be the minimum salary for male and female teachers respectively?—£100 a year for a woman and £110 for a man.

1213. You consider a differentiation of 10 per cent. sufficient in the lower salaries?—Yes, I think so.

1214. What would you consider a sufficient differentiation in the higher salaries?—A woman should receive a salary of 75 per cent. of that paid to a man when the work done is similar.

1215. The differentiation should be on a sliding scale according to the salary received?—Yes.

1216. With regard to certificates, do you consider that the minimum certificates set down in the suggested scale are too high?—I have not studied them specially with regard to country schools, but I do not think they are too high with reference to town schools.

1217. Would you approve of a proposal to impose a penalty or fine on those who do not hold the minimum certificate required?—I think it would be better if there were a teacher's certificate, all who held that certificate being eligible for any position.

1218. And not liable to any deduction?—No.

1219. You consider that the holding of a higher certificate would give a man or woman sufficient preference in obtaining an appointment?—Yes.

1220. Do you notice also a proposal in the suggested scheme for the deduction of £10 from the master's salary—in the case of small schools—when a sewing-mistress is appointed?—Yes.

1221. Do you think the lady teachers would be in favour of that?—I have not discussed that point with them; still, I do not think it should be so.

1222. What is your objection to the appointment of an infant mistress when the attendance at a school reaches 41?—I think she is not really an infant mistress then; besides teaching the infants, she has to take some standard work, so that she is not really an infant mistress.

1223. It is only the name that you take exception to?—Yes.

1224. With regard to superannuation, have the lady teachers in this district expressed any opinion with regard to retiring-allowance or superannuation?—No; but they consider that, if it were possible it would be a good thing to have something of the kind.

1225. With regard to the appointment of teachers, does the system in vogue work satisfactorily in this district, or do you think the Legislature should define the powers and functions of the School Committees and the Boards respecting the appointment of teachers better than it is defined at the present time?—I think the Board should appoint the teachers.

1226. You consider that the members of the Board have a better knowledge of the capabilities of the teachers?—I do not think it is the function of a Committee to appoint a teacher; the Committee may recommend, but I do not think it is their place to appoint.

1227. In the event of a colonial scale on something the same lines as the suggested scale coming into operation and prejudicially affecting a few individuals, would you suggest that it should not be retrospective, or, in other words, apply to those already holding positions?—I do not think that those at present holding appointments should be reduced. No reduction should, in my opinion, be made. And I think that all the really good appointments, where there are material increases in salary, should be advertised.

1228. Would the difficulty not be got over just as well if a proviso were made to the effect that no individuals should be prejudicially affected by the introduction of a colonial scale?—Yes.

1229. Do you think that the adoption of a colonial scale would in any way tend to weaken or minimise the power and influence of Education Boards?—I should not think so, because I understand that the salaries would be paid through the Boards just as at present, and that appointments would be made by them as at present.

1230. *Mr. Hill.*] I think you said that the lady teachers in the Wellington District are badly paid?—I think a great many of them are.

1231. Have you, as a ladies' association, ever drawn the attention of your Board to the fact?—We have not a ladies' association.

1232. I thought you represented that association?—No; the Educational Institute on behalf of infant mistresses.

Mr. Davidson: Might I say, Mr. Chairman, that the Educational Institute has frequently drawn the attention of the Minister to the fact.

1233. *Mr. Hill.*] I notice that the mistress at the Newtown School is classed E1, and she gets £125 a year. I also notice that the mistress at a similar school—Mount Cook Girls'—gets £150; at the Te Aro School the mistress, classed D1, gets £100; the mistress at the Terrace School, classed D1, gets £90; and so on: are those salaries according to the scale, or what is the reason for the differences?—In the Terrace School, I think, the first two assistants are masters, and the same applies to Willis Street (Te Aro) School; at the Newtown School the first three are masters, and the headmistress at that school, who gets £125, is infant mistress. At the Mount Cook Girls' School there are no infants, and it is the first assistant lady teacher who gets £150.

1234. I notice that at the Newtown School an assistant mistress, who is classed E1, comes low down on the list, and yet draws the same salary as you do: is there any reason for that?—All infant mistresses under the Board of Education are paid the same salary.

1235. Then, we can tell the infant mistresses by the fact that they get £125?—Yes.

1236. The infant mistress, then, is recognised as the principal lady assistant at the school—excepting the Mount Cook Girls' School?—There are other schools in the same position; at Willis Street, the Terrace, and Mount Cook Boys' Schools there are comparatively no infants.

1237. And at those schools the first lady assistant does not get £125 a year?—No.

1238. You are called the infant mistress at your school?—Yes.

1239. And are first lady assistant?—Yes.

1240. Would the other assistant mistress at your school be termed the second lady assistant?—Yes.

1241. Would it make any difference to you to be called the first lady assistant?—No; but I have given special attention to infant-work, and am better fitted for it than, say, Fifth or Sixth Standard work.

1242. Would your position in the school be altered by the change of title?—No; I have not the slightest fear of that.

1243. You think that in the training of pupil-teachers every female pupil-teacher should be required to go through an infants' department?—Yes, I think it advisable.

1244. How many pupil-teachers have you at present in your department?—I am supposed to have five, but at present have only four—one is away for some months on sick-leave.

1245. Do you ever have male pupil-teachers?—No; but I have known them to be sent to infants' schools.

1246. So that you cannot express an opinion as to whether they do the work in an infants' school as well as females?—I have seen them at work in an infants' school; but I think that, on the whole, girl pupil-teachers are better in the infants' department.

1247. A girl is better adapted to the training of infants?—Yes.

1248. Do you think boys should have no training in an infants' school?—I think it advisable to let them have a little time there.

1249. In order to have a complete training that training should always include some amount of work in the infants' department—that is, before these teachers are put to standard work?—I do not mind whether it is at the beginning or the end of their apprenticeship, but I think that during their apprenticeship there should be some time spent in an infants' department.

1250. I want to know as to the character of the training given to pupil-teachers in an infants' school. Assuming yourself to be the headmistress of a department and having responsible charge of the training of those pupil-teachers, would you merely put your pupil-teachers to do mechanical work, or would you explain to them the reasons why such a system, or such a plan, is pursued in the instruction of the children?—Yes, I think one should do the latter.

1251. You think that explanation, &c., should form an important part of the training of those pupil-teachers?—Yes, as far as possible.

1252. Is that done at your school?—As far as I have time to do it; but my staff is too limited for me to train them as well as I would like to do.

1253. You mean to say that your department is understaffed at the present time?—Yes.

1254. So that you are not enabled to give that training to these teachers that you would like to give?—No.

1255. Do you give criticism lessons at your school?—I give lessons to the pupils, and let the pupil-teachers listen. I also let the pupil-teachers give lessons, and point out the weak points to them afterwards.

1256. Do you think that the salaries paid to pupil-teachers are sufficient?—No. I think that the salaries ought to be higher.

1257. Would you bring the young people from the country schools for special training in the large schools, and would you send pupil-teachers from the town schools into the country during the course of their training, or would you specialise the training?—I think they should have an all-round training during their apprenticeship; they could specialise afterwards.

1258. Then, you would draw the pupil-teachers from the country with the view of giving them some special training in the larger town schools?—I think that if it were possible it would be a very good plan.

1259. And you would also send the pupil-teachers from the large town schools into the country if facilities could be provided?—Yes; but I think there would be more difficulty in that; the salaries are insufficient for them to pay their board in the country.

1260. But assuming that an allowance was made?—Many parents would object to young girls going away from home.

1261. There may be objections in that way, but if the department required it you think the plan would be beneficial?—I think it would.

1262. You approve of a colonial scale?—Yes.

1263. Why do you approve of a colonial scale? Supposing your Board could afford and cared to pay you the salary suggested in this proposed scale, would you still prefer a colonial scale?—Yes.

1264. Will you please explain why?—I think all teachers doing the same work should be paid the same salaries, and I think that if a colonial scale existed the teachers in the various districts would not be subject to reductions whenever the Boards got into financial difficulties. I think that if there were a colonial scale our salaries would be more assured, and it is only fair that those who are doing the same work should receive the same payment.

1265. You prefer the payment coming through the Government to its coming through the Education Board?—I understand that it would still come through the Board, but that the money would be ear-marked, as it were, so that it would have to be devoted to teachers' salaries.

1266. But supposing it were ear-marked in this way, that a certain proportion of the grant paid to an Education Board was required to be set apart for the payment of teachers' salaries, would you still prefer a colonial scale?—Yes; I think it would be better.

1267. Do you think a colonial scale of salaries should carry with it a colonial system of promotion from the lower to the higher schools?—No, though I do not see any reason why a teacher in one district should not have an opportunity of entering another district.

1268. But at the present time teachers have such opportunities, have they not?—Yes, I suppose they have.

1269. Supposing a colonial scale were introduced, do you not think there would be perhaps more competitors for a place than there are now?—I still think it would be better to have a colonial scale.

1270. Would you prefer to do without Education Boards altogether?—No.

1271. You think they are doing good work?—Yes; I think they are necessary in the various districts; I would not like to see them abolished.

1272. But you would like to limit their functions?—I would like to have a colonial scale.

1273. That would take away some of their functions?—Yes.

1274. Some of their powers should be taken away?—Yes.

1275. *Mr. Weston.*] You said just now, I think, that supposing a new scale were framed you would advertise afresh in cases where the salaries were increased?—Where the salaries were increased materially, not where they were increased by only a few pounds.

1276. Do you think that would be fair in its operation: would you not be turning out very good teachers on the chance of their being reappointed?—Not so long as it was provided that they should receive no appointment which was worse than the one at present held.

1277. Could a Board under the present system of appointment give any such guarantee to teachers?—I do not see why it could not.

1278. Do you not know that if teachers are exchanged, or when they are appointed, the Committees have to be consulted?—Yes.

1279. Then, how could a Board guarantee a position to a teacher when the Committee of a particular school had to be consulted?—It would be no worse than under the present system.

1280. I only asked you that question because I feared you had not thought out the matter. You were talking just now about sending pupil-teachers from school to school with a view to their acquiring experience: have you considered whether the Committees of the various schools, or, indeed, the parents of these pupil-teachers, would approve of such transmission?—The pupil-teachers have to go to whichever school they are appointed; they have no choice in the schools to which they shall go. If a pupil-teacher is appointed at one part of his or her pupil-teachership to an upper school he or she can have no objection to going to an infants' school during the other part.

1281. Is not a pupil-teacher appointed to a particular school?—Pupil-teachers have no choice in the matter.

1282. Is that so?—Yes; in Wellington.

1283. Do you think that if such an arrangement were made throughout the colony parents of pupil-teachers would approve of the arrangement?—They could decline the appointment.

1284. Do you not think that such an arbitrary arrangement as that would rather prevent good children, especially girls, coming forward as pupil-teachers?—I did not advocate town girls being sent to the country as pupil-teachers at first. I merely suggested, so that they might have a good all-round training, it would be advisable that part of the time should be spent in an upper school and part in an infants' school. As country teachers have infant-work to do they are frequently sent in from the country for a few days to city schools.

1285. In theory, I think, you are perfectly right, but could you put your theory into practice?—It is done here.

1286. With regard to employing pupil-teachers, do you consider that under your present method the best use of the school time is made in the interests of the children?—We do the very best that we possibly can, I think.

1287. If you had adult teachers rather than pupil-teachers, would better use be made of the time?—Yes, undoubtedly; a trained teacher would be better than a pupil-teacher.

1288. Therefore most is not made of the time under the present method?—It is so far as we have to do with the matter, but we are not responsible.

1289. Then, instruction by pupil-teachers is not so successful and so profitable as adult teaching?—Of course not.

1290. Do you think that pupil-teachers are able to impart instruction to young children?—I think a great deal depends on the pupil-teacher. I think that it is right to have some pupil-teachers' in the infants' department. Whilst the girls are young they have more sympathy with child nature.

1291. What proportion of adult teachers to pupil-teachers do you think should be employed?—I think that no more pupil-teachers should be appointed than there are likely to be positions for when their pupil-teachership is over.

1292. I mean with regard to infants' schools?—It depends on the size of the department, but I think that usually if there were a headmistress and one good trained teacher as an assistant the rest might be pupil-teachers—of course, not all first-year pupil-teachers.

1293. Would you make that answer general, or would you limit the number of children in regard to which such an arrangement would prove effective?—Thirty pupils ought to be the limit for each teacher in an infants' department.

1294. So that when you say that one adult teacher would be sufficient you do not mean it to apply to very large infants' departments?—No; I think there should be one adult teacher for every two pupil-teachers in an infants' department, but that does not apply throughout the school.

1295. With regard to the payment of pupil-teachers, you advocated additional payment being made to them?—Yes.

1296. You referred to the dressmaking in your remarks: do apprentices to the dressmaking receive remuneration as high as that paid to pupil-teachers?—I do not think they do; but, in my opinion, the importance of their work is not nearly so great, nor do I think that it requires such capabilities to be an apprentice to dressmaking as to teaching.

1297. You referred to the prizes in dressmaking: of course, you must expect those who are brought up to a profession to work their way into the higher positions, must you not?—What I said was that no woman in our public schools in New Zealand received anything like such good salaries as the heads of several of the dressmaking establishments in this town.

1298. Does not that apply to all businesses and professions—that some are more profitable than others, and that the prizes in any profession are few? How many Judges are there in comparison with the number of men who aspire to Judgeships?—I mean that teaching is of greater importance than dressmaking, and I cannot therefore see why a woman engaged in teaching should receive so much less than one engaged in dressmaking?

1299. *The Chairman.*] With regard to the appointment of pupil-teachers, you think that the best girls for the occupation are not selected?—Not always.

1300. Do you think the present system of selection defective?—Yes.

1301. Would you suggest any method by which it could be improved?—Most of the girls who are selected come from the public schools, or from the high schools. I think that the head-teachers under whom these girls have been educated ought to be consulted, and that when a man recommends that a teacher should be appointed he should be willing to take that teacher into his own school. I think that if such were the case he would be careful in recommending.

1302. Would there not be objections to pupils being appointed as teachers at the same school?—I think that if they had to go to a high school or college, where for two or three years they would go on with secondary work and then matriculate, the time they had been away from the school would be quite sufficient to overcome any difficulty that might arise with regard to discipline.

1303. Would you suggest that they should go through this preparatory course before going to work in the schools as pupil-teachers?—Yes.

1304. What is your opinion of the work that pupil-teachers have to perform now—I mean, at first? Is it of a very arduous character, or very light?—On the whole, I think they are expected to do too much, especially those who have not matriculated. They have four or five hours' teaching to do every day. If they could go to a school where they could teach part of the time and devote the other part to their educational work it would be infinitely better.

1305. Besides working in the schools during the day, as you state, they have other work to perform?—Yes; they have their work to prepare for the masters. Immediately after school they have to go to class; then they hurry home, and have the work to prepare for the next day.

1306. Have they any other work?—They have to prepare the lessons that they give. I do not think any teacher ought to go before a class and give a lesson without having prepared it. These pupil-teachers have not time to do so very often.

1307. Do they undergo instruction in view of their examination?—Yes; they have to attend classes, I believe, every day.

1308. Then, those girls have their time occupied not only in the school during the day, but when they ought to have their leisure?—Yes, unless they have matriculated; if they have matriculated before being appointed they have to go to classes twice or three times a week, and have the rest of the time to themselves.

1309. Take the case of a pupil-teacher who has not matriculated: have you had complaints about the work being excessive?—Yes; and I have seen teachers break down under it.

1310. Are not cases of breakdown rare?—I do not think so.

1311. Are breakdowns in health very common?—Yes, I think so.

1312. I see that the pupil-teachers at your school receive from £20 to £42 a year?—Yes.

1313. Do you think those girls could go into the country and live on such salaries as those?—They would find it very difficult.

1314. Even if their parents had no reluctance about their going into the country?—I do not see how they can live on £42 a year.

1315. If a rule of the kind were enforced—*i.e.*, compelling girls to go into the country—would it not prevent a great many eligible girls from following the teaching profession?—Yes.

1316. Take the girls that you are acquainted with: would many of them be able to go into the country and provide for themselves?—I do not think they should be expected to provide for themselves on such salaries.

1317. You made a reference to the want of lady representatives on this Commission: do you think the lady teachers of Wellington have no great confidence in the Commission?—Oh, no: I think they have every confidence in the Commission; but I think it would have been well had there been one or two ladies on it.

1318. I presume the lady teachers are of opinion that they ought to be better represented everywhere, are they not—not merely on the Commission, but, for instance, on the Education Board? Do you not think it would be advantageous to the ladies if they were represented there?—It would depend on the class of women that you got on the Board: some would do a great deal of good, and others harm.

1319. If it is desirable that there should be ladies on a Commission of this character, is it not equally desirable that there should be lady representatives on the Boards of Education?—Yes, if you got the right sort.

1320. And on the School Committees?—Yes; but I do not think there should be an isolated one—there should be more than one.

1321. Can you explain why it is that the ladies do not come forward and take their places on the Committee and the Boards—they are eligible?—I suppose it is a difficult question.

W. T. GRUNDY, Headmaster, Clyde Quay School, examined.

Mr. Grundy: I may say at once that I am strongly in support of a colonial scale of salaries, because I think that a scale that is made a colonial scale is likely to better not only the position of the teacher, but more particularly is likely to better the conditions of education in the country. The system that obtains now is, to my mind, not sufficiently national; it is too parochial. There are in the colony thirteen different Education Boards, with thirteen different systems, practically, of appointment and control and payment of teachers. It has therefore come about that teachers in certain districts find themselves very much underpaid compared with the teachers in more favoured districts. In support of that contention I should like to read a few figures comparing the salaries paid in the various districts to teachers holding similar positions. I have very carefully gone through the whole of the Minister's report bearing upon the salary question, and have drawn up a table, which I hand in [Exhibit 97], showing the salaries paid in the various districts, and at the end I have given the range of salary. I have no doubt the Commission has had a very considerable amount of information given in this direction, and therefore I shall content myself with showing the range of salary in the different districts of the colony. I find that in schools with an average attendance of from 20 to 30 the salaries vary from £88 to £165 for men, and from £74 to £145 for women—doing precisely the same work. In schools of from 30 to 50 the range of salary is from £110 to £235 for men, and for women from £85 to £168; from 50 to 70, from £134 to £225 for men—some of the masters at schools of this class getting less than some of those at schools in

the lower grade—and £130 to women ; there are very few women in charge of schools of that class. At schools of from 70 to 100, the salaries vary from £153 to £260 for men, and the salary paid to the only woman in charge of a school of this grade is £100 ; from 100 to 200 the range of salary is from £175 to £290 for men, and from £100 to £180 for women—the infants' school mistresses come in here. From 200 to 300 the range is from £202 to £300 ; there is only one instance of a woman's salary in this grade, the amount being £175. From 300 to 400 the range is from £231 to £363, there being no women now to account for. From 400 to 500 the salaries vary from £250 to £380 ; from 500 to 600, £259 to £370.

1322. *Mr. Hogben.*] Do those amounts include house allowance?—They do in some cases, but not in others ; I was unable to ascertain this in all cases. Then, again, I think the present system is defective in the matter of pupil-teachers. For instance, I find that in some districts pupil-teachers are employed to a greater extent than in others. The weakness of our system is largely due, I think, to the employment of pupil-teachers, inexperienced as many of them are, and must be for the first two or three years. In the Auckland District, out of a total of 790 teachers employed, 250 are pupil-teachers ; in North Canterbury, out of a total of 536, 129 are pupil-teachers ; in Otago, only 89 out of 511 teachers ; in Wellington, 176 pupil-teachers out of 413. The Wellington District stands distinguished as the district that employs the largest proportion of pupil-teachers ; Auckland, I think, comes next. I have not taken out the figures for the smaller districts, because it seems to me that the bulk of the pupil-teachers are employed in the four large districts, and I thought it was sufficient for comparison to take the figures for those districts. I may state also that I consider a colonial scale would practically ear-mark the Teachers' Salaries Fund. This fund has in the past been drawn upon for all and every purpose. I find, for instance, that from 1877 up to the end of 1899 no less a sum than £136,294 had been withdrawn by the Education Boards from the Maintenance Fund and placed to Building Account—*i.e.*, used in the building of schools. This must of necessity have affected the teachers' salaries ; in fact, we know that the transference of that amount of money from the Maintenance Fund has very materially crippled the finances of Boards, compelling many to reduce the teachers' salaries. I think, therefore, that that is a strong argument in favour of a colonial scale of salaries—*i.e.*, the Salaries Fund would be ear-marked and used only for the purposes for which it was intended. Then, again, in the matter of training pupil-teachers, certain Boards have practically been training teachers for the rest of the colony. In this connection I may instance the North Canterbury Board and the Otago Board. These Boards for a number of years have supported and equipped efficient training-schools, and we and other districts have had the benefit of their work, for many teachers have, from my own knowledge, come from North Canterbury particularly to take positions in this district. There is no doubt that the teachers of North Canterbury and Otago have suffered in salaries within recent years, because of the fact that those districts have been training teachers for the rest of the colony. Then, there is another direction in which funds have been applied by Education Boards, affecting very considerably the Maintenance Fund of the Boards : I refer particularly to manual and technical education. In Wellington alone during the last ten years—1889 to 1900—£11,650 13s. 9d. has been taken from the Maintenance Fund applied to the purposes of manual and technical instruction in this district. That is practically for the support of the Technical School. The amount last year was, I think, between £1,700 and £1,800. The last point I wish to refer to is in connection with women teachers. I consider that the payment of women has been very small indeed as compared with the payment of men. Of course, I can only speak of my district, but I will instance some of the salaries paid to women in very responsible positions to-day in this district. At my own school, for instance, I have a woman teacher who has been with me for a period of twelve years, who has done excellent work, and has now got to the position of first woman assistant—and, mind you, her duties are almost similar to those of the first male assistant, except that she would not be in charge of the school were I away—she has the supervision of the girls in the playground, she has the active supervision of the sewing of the school, and has charge of a fairly large Fifth Standard class. Her salary, now that she has got practically to the top of the tree, is £90 a year.

1323. *Mr. Hill.*] What is her classification?—She has an E1 certificate. I know also of a young lady who until recently—she was lucky enough to be married about the end of last year—was at a neighbouring school. She had been teaching for at least ten years, having been an ex-pupil-teacher for at least seven or eight years, doing an assistant's work. She was in charge of a very large and important class, and was paid the munificent salary of £50 a year. Now, there are a number of such instances in this district. As an actual fact, we have been multiplying pupil-teachers to such an extent that our staffs are overcrowded with them. It is a matter of cheap labour. Positions have not been made for these teachers on the permanent staff ; they have remained on as ex-pupil-teachers for years and years at a very low rate of remuneration—from £42 to £50. It was £50, but has been reduced to £42. These are my reasons, gentlemen, for strongly supporting a colonial scale.

1324. *Mr. Davidson.*] You have compared, I suppose, the two suggested scales—the first one and the alternative?—Yes.

1325. Have you noticed that the staff suggested in the alternative scale for schools having an average attendance of over 40 is a head-teacher and an assistant?—Yes.

1326. Do you consider a capable teacher can manage efficiently, without assistance, 40 children?—Yes, but not more than 40.

1327. You approve, then, of that staffing at that stage?—Yes.

1328. Do you think the first assistance given to a sole teacher should take the form of a certificated assistant teacher?—I do, for this reason : I think an inexperienced pupil-teacher is of very little use for a year or two.

1329. If it were possible to make such an arrangement as this : that a pupil-teacher, having had, say, two years' training at a fairly large school, would be sent to assist the teacher of a school

of, say, from 35 to 50, would you approve of such an arrangement?—Yes, provided the salary was sufficient for her to live on.

1330. Do you think that would be preferable to the suggested staffing—*i.e.*, a certificated teacher at 40?—It would not be preferable, but it would certainly be better than the arrangement that obtains at present.

1331. Take the next grade of school, from 40 to 90 in average attendance: the staffing suggested in the alternative scale is a headmaster and an assistant?—Yes.

1332. Is that sufficient?—Yes, I think so.

1333. The third teacher on the staff comes in at 90: do you think that a sufficient staff?—Yes.

1334. Have you considered the certificates required for the various classes of positions under the first suggested scale?—Yes.

1335. What is your opinion as to the requiring of an E2 for the teacher at a school of from 19 to 35? Do you think the certificate too high?—I think it is a little too high, considering that a teacher must spend a considerable number of years as a practical teacher before she can attain E2.

1336. Would you suggest E3 instead of E2?—Yes.

1337. Would you also suggest D3 instead of D2 for the next grade, 35 to 75?—Yes.

1338. And for the next grade D2 instead of D1?—Yes, I think that would be reasonable.

1339. What is your opinion as to requiring C1 as the certificate for the headmasters of schools of from 250 to 600?—I think that is too high. D1 would be sufficiently high.

1340. Do you consider the present method of certification of teachers' qualifications a good one?—I do not.

1341. What would you suggest in its place?—A teachers' certificate, possibly of two degrees, the higher one of the two showing length of service and experience.

1342. A good deal has been said about equal pay for equal work as far as the sexes are concerned: would you give an opinion upon that question?—I am very strongly in favour of better payment for women, as I have already stated; but I am not in favour of equal pay for equal work, for this reason particularly: that in connection with many positions it is demanded of a man that he shall be a married man; for instance, when applications are called for many positions it is well known amongst us that an unmarried man has no chance. Such being the case, I consider that a married man should be paid at least a little more than an unmarried woman.

1343. Do you think it costs the State as much to train a woman as it does to train a man for the teaching profession?—It costs more to train women, because so many of them leave the profession.

1344. But apart from that?—It costs just the same.

1345. Do you know what percentage of women as compared with men leave the profession after a short period?—Yes; I believe from 60 per cent. to 80 per cent.

1346. Have you heard that four women for every one man leave the profession a short period after completing their apprenticeship?—I saw that that statement was made in Dunedin.

1347. Then, you would give that as one reason why women should not be paid equally with men?—Yes.

1348. You think that the disparity between the salaries paid to men and those paid to women is too great?—Altogether too great.

1349. I take it, then, that you would be in favour of reducing the disparity, but not equalising the salaries?—Exactly.

1350. I should like your opinion on this point: do you consider the average woman is physically fitted to teach and control, say, a large Fourth Standard class of 50 or more at a mixed school?—I should say that the average woman teacher of this district would be able to manage a mixed class of from 45 to 50.

1351. Not up to 60?—No, not up to 60; I think the average woman should not be called upon to manage a class of anything like 60.

1352. But you admit there are exceptional women who do this work?—There are.

1353. Do you think it would be advisable, in any scheme that this Commission may draw up, to make it possible for women to occupy the positions of, say, second or third assistant on the staff of large schools?—Yes, provided that it is clearly understood that in the large schools there must be a certain number of men on the staff.

1354. Do you agree with the provision in the suggested scale where it states that there shall not be more males than females on the staff of a school?—I do not think you would get more males than females on any staff in New Zealand.

1355. Then, you approve of that suggestion?—Yes.

1356. *Mr. Stewart.*] Do you think the adoption of a colonial scale would in any way minimise the influence and control of the Boards over their teachers?—I cannot see that it would in any way.

1357. Do you think that the adoption of a colonial scale would in any way be a safeguard to the Boards' own finances?—Yes, I do.

1358. In what way?—For instance, in the matter of technical education, Boards rightly become enthusiastic in the establishment of some system of manual and technical education, and if they are not careful they pay away more money than they really can afford; but if there were a colonial scale the Salaries Fund would be ear-marked, and they would not be able to do that. It would be a protection in that way.

1359. Am I to understand from what has fallen from you in connection with manual and technical education that you are in any way opposed to the introduction of manual instruction in our schools?—No; I am strongly in support of it.

1360. Then, in what way have the funds that you said have been taken by the Wellington Board from the Maintenance Fund been expended?—Principally on the classes established in this building.

1361. Do you think it a right thing that the funds voted for the education of children of school age should be applied to those above the school age?—I do not think they should be, but I think the Board was within its rights in doing so.

1362. On what principle is the scale of salaries of your Board based?—I should have to consider a long time before I could answer that question.

1363. I have been trying to find out, but cannot, and I thought that, perhaps, you could help me?—I can only answer, like another witness, that several scales have been drawn up from time to time; that these scales have not affected teachers already in the employ of the Board; and so the matter has become very complicated.

1364. What has been your teaching experience?—Thirty-five years.

1365. In what parts of the world?—I was a teacher in Birmingham; then I was in Queensland for a period of two years, and have been here now for over twenty-one years.

1366. Did you go through a pupil-teacher's course in England?—Yes.

1367. Through a training-college?—Yes.

1368. And possess a D certificate?—I do.

1369. With regard to the appointment of pupil-teachers, we have already had it given in evidence that there is an excessive number of pupil-teachers here: has there been a tendency on the part of the Board to restore the balance of finance by employing a large number of these pupil-teachers and ex-pupil-teachers? Is that the reason?—I would prefer that you asked some official of the Board that question.

1370. Do you think that the system of appointing pupil-teachers in this district is satisfactory?—I do not.

1371. What is the system?—As indicated by Miss Craig, the system is one of appointment by the Board itself.

1372. Are not the head-teachers of the schools from which the pupil-teachers are drawn required to make confidential reports to the Board on candidates for teacherships?—No; I think the teachers, as a rule, give letters of recommendation to candidates applying; that is the utmost that is done in that direction at the present time.

1373. Is there any entrance examination?—No.

1374. When do the pupil-teachers first come up for examination?—At the end of their first year.

1375. Is any responsibility thrown on a teacher in connection with recommending a candidate for a pupil-teachership?—None whatever.

1376. Are you aware that in some districts the head-teacher at the school where the candidate has been educated is asked confidentially, "Are you prepared to recommend the appointment of this teacher to your own school"?—I believe that is so.

1377. Do you think that a wise provision?—I do.

1378. Do you find that through appointing pupil-teachers without an entrance examination you get many who are quite unable to do the literary work at the end of a year or two?—That has been found to be the case in the past.

1379. Do you think that is a desirable state of affairs?—No.

1380. You are in favour of an entrance examination?—Yes.

1381. Before a pupil-teacher is appointed, does he or she serve any probation?—A pupil-teacher is usually sent to a school for a period of a few months, and if there is no adverse report he or she is considered to be on the staff.

1382. Does not the teacher give any lesson before either of the Inspectors, and be specially reported on?—I think not.

1383. Are you aware that in some districts of the colony the following is the system: Confidential recommendation by the headmaster; probation for three months, with reports at the end of every month; a lesson given before the Inspector; then consultation between the headmaster and the Inspector, and official recommendation by the Inspector?—I think that is an excellent system; I did not know such a system was in force.

1384. Would you be prepared to recommend the adoption of such a system in Wellington?—Yes, I should.

1385. Coming back to the question of scale, I understand that your Board does not adhere to the present scale?—That is so.

1386. Do you approve of the system of giving bonuses for certificates?—No, I do not approve of the bonus system at all; everything should be included in the salary.

1387. Do you think that pupil-teachers would suffer in the care and attention given by the headmaster to their training if the remuneration for the instruction of pupil-teachers were a part of the salary as proposed by the colonial scheme?—No, I do not think so; I think that if a man is at all conscientious he will take good care that his pupil-teachers do not suffer in any way.

1388. It has been stated in evidence that unless the head-teacher received special remuneration for the instruction of pupil-teachers he might neglect them: you do not agree with that statement?—No, I do not.

1389. Does your Board consider, in determining the payment of its teachers, the differences in the cost of living in different parts of the Wellington District?—I do not think so.

1390. Would it be practicable to do so?—It would be a difficult matter.

1391. Do you think there are compensating advantages in different parts of the district—*i.e.*, other things balancing the extra cost of living in some parts?—Yes, in many cases that is so, I think.

1392. Do you think that in drawing up a colonial scale it would be practicable to take the difference in cost of living into consideration?—No, I do not.
1393. You have travelled over different parts of the colony?—Yes.
1394. Have you found any great difference in the cost of living at the different centres?—As far as I know there is not a great difference, except in regard to house-rent.
1395. Has your Board any definite scheme of promotion?—I do not think so; I do not know that it has any definite scheme.
1396. Is there an adequate supply of male pupil-teachers?—Not in this district.
1397. What do you put that down to?—On account of the precariousness of the profession, for one reason. Then, again, the inducements are not sufficient to tempt young lads to enter the profession. Were the inducements made better I believe more would enter.
1398. What class of teachers under your Board are the worst paid?—Our women teachers.
1399. I believe the teachers of this district have considered this matter very carefully within the last month or so?—Yes.
1400. Are the teachers satisfied with the present state of affairs?—They are not.
1401. Are they as a whole anything like unanimously in favour of a colonial scale?—I think that the teachers in this district are, on the whole, in favour of a colonial scale.
1402. *Mr. Luke.*] Are you familiar with the proposed alternative scale?—Fairly so.
1403. Do you think that the staffing proposed in that scale should be so arranged that the assistants should be paid at the highest rate paid in any educational district in the colony?—I hope that may be so.
1404. Would you approve of that?—Yes, I think so.
1405. You stated that the sum of £136,294 had been taken from the Maintenance Fund and placed to Building Account since 1877: does that include the whole of the colony?—Yes.
1406. Are you aware of the fact that some of that has been paid back again?—I am not.
1407. Some of it has been returned; I know that in the Auckland District that has been so?—I am very glad to hear it.
1408. With regard to pupil-teachers, are there no pupil-teachers' examinations at all here?—Yes; at the end of each year of service; but there is no entrance examination.
1409. No candidates' examination?—No.
1410. From your experience is the money that is given to the School Committee enough to keep the school grounds in order?—No, it is not enough; teachers in this district generally have to supplement the allowances to the Committees by concerts, &c.
1411. A larger amount should be given to the School Fund?—Yes, if possible, that should be increased.
1412. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Do you recognise that the more there is given to the School Committees under the present system the less there is for the teachers?—I understand that, but, still, the Committee are responsible for the carrying-on of the schools, and there should be sufficient funds.
1413. I suppose you do not feel qualified to pass an opinion on whether the 11s. 3d. is sufficient?—It is more than sufficient in the case of the Clyde Quay School; we do not get anything like it.
1414. Do you consider that teachers, as a whole, are insufficiently paid?—I do.
1415. Would the extra 5s. capitation grant, if paid to Education Boards, enable them to pay the same salaries as those suggested in the proposed scheme?—I can hardly answer that question; *Mr. Hogben*, I suppose, will be able to say whether that is so.
1416. Would it in any way tend to minimise the anomalies that exist just now?—No doubt it would.
1417. Supposing a capitation of £4 were given to the strong Boards as well as to the weak ones, would that tend to minimise the anomalies?—No; it would accentuate the difficulty.
1418. That is one of the reasons why a colonial scale is necessary?—Undoubtedly so.
1419. Have the teachers in this district expressed an opinion with regard to the centralisation of the Inspectors?—Yes.
1420. Are they in favour of it?—Yes, strongly in favour of the centralisation of the Inspectors.
1421. Are you aware that the Inspectors, in conference assembled, passed a resolution to that effect?—I am.
1422. Do the teachers themselves consider that the placing of the Inspectors under the central department would lead to uniformity of examination and inspection?—We do consider it would.
1423. You stated, in reply to a question, that you are opposed to bonuses being granted on certificates?—Yes.
1424. And, consequently, are opposed to fines being imposed on account of teachers not holding certain certificates?—Yes.
1425. With regard to the salaries paid to male and female teachers for doing similar work: supposing we differentiate to the extent of 10 per cent. in the lower salaries, should the difference increase as the salaries increase?—Yes, slightly; from 10 per cent. to 25 per cent.
1426. Do you consider that more power should be given to the Education Boards in the way of transferring and promoting teachers—*i.e.*, within a Board's own education district, and perhaps to the different Education Boards in the respective districts?—Yes, if possible.
1427. Do you consider that the adoption of a colonial scale would give facilities in that direction?—Yes.
1428. With regard to scholarships, does the Wellington Education Board give sufficient scholarships to encourage the children of poorer parents to increase their education?—One would like to see more; there is very keen competition for the scholarships that are given.

1429. Are there separate scholarships for town and country pupils?—Yes.
1430. Would you support the unification of the system by granting scholarships and exhibitions from the primary schools to the secondary schools, and from the secondary schools to the universities?—Very heartily.
1431. With regard to the appointment of teachers, do you consider that the sole power of appointment of teachers should be in the hands of the Board?—I do.
1432. And, failing that, the Legislature should define what they mean by “consulting the Committee”?—Yes, I think so.
1433. With regard to truancy, you have a Truant Inspector in the Wellington District?—Yes.
1434. Does he do much good?—Yes, considerable good.
1435. Does the Magistrate, when convictions are obtained, give costs?—There have been very few prosecutions; I cannot call to mind whether costs have been granted or not.
1436. As to the working average, do you consider 50 per cent. too low?—Yes.
1437. What would you suggest it should be raised to?—I think it might be very well raised to 60 per cent. or 65 per cent., or even 70 per cent., if the colony could afford it. I have thought over the matter, and it suggested itself to me that it would not be a bad idea to take the average for the highest quarter of the year.
1438. And pay the capitation on that?—Yes.
1439. Of course, considerable latitude would be required in the various districts?—Yes.
1440. With regard to payment on the average attendance, do you think we should take into consideration the previous quarter's average attendance, or the previous four quarters?—The previous four quarters.
1441. Do you advocate the increase of salary by units or grades?—By units.
1442. You are aware that the cost of living varies in the different districts: do you consider that it would be in any way practicable to differentiate between the salaries paid to those in the districts in which the cost of living is exceptionally high and those in the districts where it is low?—I do not think that could be very readily done; there would be great difficulties in the way. It seems to me that it is more important that the very great differences in salaries should be adjusted rather than differences in the cost of living.
1443. The salaries paid to the men in the railway and postal services are the same in different parts of the colony, though the cost of living varies?—Yes.
1444. With regard to the election of members of Education Boards, do you consider they should be elected on the popular franchise?—Yes.
1445. If such were the case, would you advocate that the Boards so elected should have the administration of the lands that are now administered by the School Commissioners?—I have not given consideration to that.
1446. With reference to the syllabus, do you consider that we should differentiate between the work expected from teachers at country schools, where they are unassisted and all standards are represented, and that expected from large, fully staffed town schools?—Certainly.
1447. In what direction?—Option should be given to teachers to choose certain class subjects.
1448. As to superannuation, have the Institute passed a resolution respecting superannuation or retiring-allowances?—Yes.
1449. What do they advocate?—We have striven earnestly to draw up a scheme, but have found ourselves quite unable to do so because we have no fund to rely on, and we cannot see that it is possible, under existing circumstances, to obtain a superannuation scheme; but we have more hope now, because we think it is more practicable to bring into operation a superannuation scheme under a colonial scale than under the existing scale.
1450. The suggested scale stipulates that the assistants shall alternate, male and female: do you consider that that is practicable, or would it be better in the larger schools if the first two assistants were males?—The latter is undoubtedly preferable.
1451. Do you approve of the proposed reduction of £10 in the salary of a male teacher at a small school when a sewing-mistress is appointed?—No.
1452. Do you consider that in this district there are too many small schools?—Yes, I think there are.
1453. Do you consider that the Legislature should lay down a minimum attendance, below which a school should not be established?—Yes, I do.
1454. In the appointment of teachers in this district, is preference given to female teachers because their labour is cheaper?—I would not like to say that.
1455. Would you suggest that provision should be made for the training of ex-pupil-teachers at some of the larger schools, such as is in vogue at Napier just now?—Yes.
1456. You consider that in those districts in which there are not normal schools the want of duly trained teachers is severely felt?—Yes, I think so.
1457. Do you think that the adoption of such a scale as the suggested one would in any way tend to weaken the power of Education Boards?—I fail to see it.
1458. You do not consider that their power is dependent on the possibility or probability of their now and again adopting a different scale?—Their power lies in the appointment and dismissal of teachers.
1459. *Mr. Hill.*] Did you state that you are a specially trained teacher?—Yes, trained in England.
1460. You have seen many changes that have taken place under the Education Boards during the twenty-one years that you have been here?—Yes.
1461. You realise that Education Boards have been required of late to carry out entirely different duties from what they did at first?—Yes.

1462. You realise that the educational demands of the colony have been materially altered?—Yes.

1463. Do you realise also that these various demands have been required to be carried out by Education Boards? Was it their duty to carry them out?—Yes; I think they were the authorities that were naturally expected to carry them out.

1464. They were expected to carry out all these educational duties?—Yes.

1465. You are aware that formerly Education Boards received a grant of £4 5s. *per capita*?—Yes.

1466. And that this was lowered to £4, and then to £3 15s.?—Yes.

1467. Notwithstanding these reductions, the Education Boards have been required to carry out these heavier and constantly increasing duties?—Yes.

1468. The demands which the Education Boards were called upon to supply were, in the first place, in connection with the towns. These having been settled, increased demands have been made from the country: you are aware of that?—Yes.

1469. Well, then, with the reduced capitation grants, has it been possible, however willing Education Boards might have been, for them to meet all the demands that have been made upon them without trenching on the salaries of teachers?—I do not think it has been possible.

1470. Then, you do not think the various Education Boards have been to blame?—In many cases—for instance, in the abstraction of funds from the Maintenance Account for building purposes—I think the Boards could not do otherwise.

1471. You are aware, I suppose, that the Education Department must have been aware of these circumstances?—The Educational Institute has constantly called the Minister's attention to the fact that money was being transferred from Maintenance to Building Account.

1472. Would you, therefore, blame the Education Boards for these troubles that have come about, or have they been due to the want of foresight on the part of the Government?—I do not know that there was want of foresight on the part of the Government. Perhaps the condition of things at that time did not enable them to do what they might have wished to do.

1473. But they have been aware of the growing needs of the country?—Yes.

1474. And that education above all things should be the first factor in the Government of a people?—Yes.

1475. That being so, if this state of affairs has really existed, ought the Education Boards to be blamed for the defects that exist?—I do not think that Education Boards should be blamed for many of them.

1476. But the lowering of salaries you recognise is the outcome of a deficiency of funds?—Exactly.

1477. And you recognise that even in your own district it is desirable to foster technical education?—Yes, but not at the expense of primary education.

1478. But you recognise that it is desirable to foster it?—Yes.

1479. And therefore any defects that may be apparent in the management simply arise from the fact that technical education, which has come into the forefront of late, has been required really to be carried on by the Education Boards?—Yes; but I do not think the Education Boards need have taken from the Salaries Fund money to establish technical schools, for instance.

1480. But, then, the department said, "That is the money out of which you have to carry out that education"—

Mr. Hogben: The department has not said anything of the kind at any time.

1481. *Mr. Hill*.] Was there not a tendency, therefore, to trench upon the Maintenance Fund of the teachers?—There has no doubt been more than a tendency; they have actually done it.

1482. To the extent of £136,000 odd?—Not all for technical education.

1483. But for that and building purposes?—They are different things.

1484. The Maintenance Fund has been trenched upon to supply the growing needs of the country?—Yes.

1485. The Education Boards had to take that money out of the Teachers' Salaries Fund?—Yes.

1486. You claim that if a colonial scale is adopted this tendency to trench upon the Maintenance Fund will not exist?—That is so.

1487. The salaries, of course, will be provided irrespective of making provision for building and technical education?—And scholarships, and so on.

1488. And the training of pupil-teachers?—Yes.

1489. All these items have been met out of funds which should have gone to pay the teachers' salaries?—Yes, they have been in the past.

1490. You think that a colonial system will obviate that difficulty?—I do.

1491. We will suppose now that a regulation were issued by the Minister of Education to the effect that a certain amount of the capitation should be ear-marked by the various Education Boards, and that a capitation sufficient to meet these growing demands for good salaries for teachers should be paid by the department, up to, say, a capitation of £4 5s.: would you then approve of a colonial scheme?—In any case I should prefer a colonial scheme.

1492. A generalised scheme is better than a specialised one?—I believe it is the only safety.

1493. You believe that a colonial scheme will be better for the teachers themselves?—I do.

1494. And better for the country?—Yes.

1495. You have had experience in England as to the plan of certification that is adopted there?—Yes.

1496. Is there not a wide difference between the method of certification of teachers that is adopted in the old country and that proposed in this scheme?—A very great difference.

1497. Do you think that a simple plan of issuing a teacher's certificate would be preferable to the present plan?—I do.

1498. Supposing that the certificate be taken in three divisions, equal, say, to the E, D, and C at the present time, do you think that would meet the present requirements of our primary schools?—I think the E certificate is rather too low; I should prefer two certificates to three.

1499. Would you call them Divisions 1 and 2?—Yes.

1500. What would you have the lower one equal to?—Equal to the present D certificate.

1501. You would not admit into the profession any one with a lower certificate than D?—No.

1502. With regard to the instruction of pupil-teachers, you are aware that under the suggested scheme no payment is made for the instruction of pupil-teachers?—Yes.

1503. It is included in the salary?—Yes.

1504. Take a school like yours, what is your opinion as to the requiring of all the certificated teachers on the staff to give instruction to these pupil-teachers?—Provided that under the scale the salaries of assistant teachers are considerably raised?

1505. Yes. Assuming that the same provision were made in the matter of the assistants as is made in the matter of the headmaster?—Then I can see no objection to it.

1506. Do you think it would strengthen the work?—I do.

1507. Do you think provision should also be made that in the training of pupil-teachers, which is of high importance in the after-lives of the children, criticism lessons should be given so as to train these teachers?—I do.

1508. As to scholarships, what is your opinion as to the claim which some have set up, that all pupils who pass Standard VI. should, if their parents are willing to make the sacrifice, have a right to go to the high schools to continue their studies?—If the country can afford it, I think it would be an excellent thing to do.

1509. Would you under such conditions foster the continuance of higher work in the smaller schools where there are ex-Sixth-Standard pupils attending, by giving a special grant to the teachers of those schools if they choose to carry on instruction in more advanced work? If you allowed children in close proximity to the high schools to go there free, would you foster secondary work in the country schools in the same way by giving an extra salary—so much per head, for example—on account of the instruction of pupils who have passed Standard VI.?—I am afraid there would be a tendency in such cases, I will not say to neglect the work of the primary part of the school, but at any rate not to give that strict attention to it that should be given.

1510. You think there would be some likelihood of their neglecting other work?—I think so; and I speak from experience. Some years ago the Masterton School was a district high school, and higher work was done in the upper classes, and it was my experience that that work did tend to interfere with the work of the school generally.

1511. Do you think that the Education Boards should have the right to remove teachers from one school district to another if they find it desirable to do so?—I do.

1512. You think it would be beneficial to the work of education?—Yes.

1513. You recognise that that would be limiting the functions of School Committees?—I do.

1514. Do you think that the functions of School Committees should be limited?—Yes, in all appointments of teachers.

1515. You are strongly of the opinion that the power of Education Boards should be limited in the way of payment of teachers' salaries?—I do not see that their power would be limited.

1516. If their power of distribution were taken away, surely their powers would be limited?—You would hardly say their powers were limited when a special grant was made for, say, scholarship purposes.

1517. Do they give it in whatever way they like?—The grant is for scholarship purposes, and only scholarship purposes.

1518. If the grants were to be "ear-marked," and so much paid for teachers' salaries, do you think that Education Boards could distribute the money as well as the central department?—I do not think Education Boards should have the power of distributing the money, except according to a colonial scale.

1519. Can you tell me of any department, in New Zealand or elsewhere, where a grant is given simply for distribution—that is, where there is an important educational body, and that body has no voice as to the method of distributing a certain amount which it passes through its hands?—I do not quite see what you mean.

1520. It is proposed under this colonial scale to simply pay the Education Boards a certain amount of money for distribution to teachers?—Yes.

1521. Can you tell me of any similar Board or authority, either in New Zealand or elsewhere, under which such a plan as this suggested is carried out?—In all the Government departments I presume the salaries are fixed—say, the Railway Department.

1522. But the department fixes its own salaries?—No; I have been present in Parliament and have heard the list of salaries for each department called out and passed.

1523. The office is only a distributing office?—Yes, that is so.

1524. *Mr. Smith.*] What in your opinion should be the smallest number of pupils for which a school should be established?—Not less than 15.

1525. Would you give no assistance to a group of children of less than 15 if they were beyond the reach of a school?—A capitation allowance might be made for them, but there should be no establishment of an actual school.

1526. Then, you approve of the provision in the proposed scale that any school of from 1 to 14 should receive a capitation grant of £5?—Yes.

1527. *Mr. Lethbridge.*] You said that there were too many small schools?—Yes.

1528. You have just said you thought that where there are 15 children a school should be established?—I said I would limit the number to 15.

1529. And not establish a school under 15?—Not under 15.

1530. Your Board does not establish a school under 15—it is an aided school?—Just so.

1531. The Board only grants the capitation, so that the small schools cost the Board comparatively nothing?—Yes.

1532. It appears to me, then, that it is not right to say the Board has established too many schools?—I mean in this way: schools have been established too near one another.

1533. You think the children in the back blocks should receive education?—Exactly; every consideration should be given them.

1534. It was stated by a teacher somewhere that the members of the Teachers' Institute have passed a resolution to the effect that the whole system of education should be centralised—that it should be under the department, and there should be no Boards and no Committees?—No such resolution has been passed by the Institute.

1535. *Mr. Hogben.*] You were asked a question with regard to the distribution of money for scholarships: is it not a fact that scholarship regulations must be approved by the Minister?—I believe that is so.

1536. You said that you think the salaries of all mistresses should be raised?—Yes.

1537. Have you compared the salaries of male and female teachers in the Wellington District, say, in schools of from 20 to 40?—I have.

1538. Eight of the male teachers in these schools are getting salaries above the proposed scale?—I was not aware of it.

1539. Do you know how many female teachers would gain under the proposed scale?—Every one of them.

1540. No; one would not. Supposing there was a fairer distribution of the money for the salaries of teachers, male and female, at every one of these schools, have you any idea whether the amount taken from the male teachers to bring them down to the average of the other male teachers in the Wellington District, or to the salaries provided in the colonial scale—they are both about the same—would bring the female teachers up?—I have not gone into that question.

1541. You have noticed that the salaries of the female teachers in these schools would be brought up considerably?—Yes.

1542. Have you noticed also that very few male teachers would suffer?—Yes.

1543. So that you do not consider it likely that the excess money now paid to the male teachers would bring the female teachers up sufficiently if divided among them?—No.

1544. The effect of the colonial scale would be to produce a fairer distribution of salaries among the most numerous class of schools in the colony—those from 20 to 40?—Yes.

1545. So that there would not be enough money to raise them, except under the colonial scale?—Yes.

1546. I suppose you would be in favour of safeguarding the interests of the present holders of office—at all events, for four years, or something like that—whatever time is allowed for bringing a colonial scale into operation?—Yes, I think it would be desirable.

1547. If that were done do you think present holders of posts would have any real ground for fear?—If that were done they would have no ground for fear.

1548. Are you aware that in the Wellington District there are twenty-two schools with an average of less than 15?—I did not know there were so many.

1549. There were more than 15 attending those schools when they were established by the Board?—Yes; they have fallen since.

1550. You would not be in favour of putting schools under any minimum in a separate class by themselves, subject to a special grant?—Yes, if that could be done.

1551. What if they fell in number?—It seems that in a colonial scale that would be difficult to arrange.

1552. I was going to ask you whether a colonial scale should not include all schools?—Yes.

1553. Otherwise a man might suffer if his school fell below the minimum you have named for a school on the colonial scale?—Yes; it is all a question of money.

1554. It is within your knowledge that schools vary a good deal?—Yes; particularly country schools.

1555. You said that you thought it would be better that salaries should be paid on the average of four quarters instead of one?—Yes.

1556. That would tend to make the salaries more steady?—Yes. Or, better still, let the salaries be paid on the average attendance of the highest quarter in the year.

1557. Assuming there was a highest quarter in any given district, and you granted the same kind of concession throughout the colony, what effect would that have on the scale? If you had the same amount of money to distribute, you would simply have to bring down the scale so-much a unit, would you not?—If the amount is paid as capitation on the highest quarter more money would be paid.

1558. It would be simply another way of asking for more money?—I suppose so.

1559. Then, would it not be the most direct way to take the safest basis for payment?—I suppose it would be.

1560. Would you take the average attendance? Is not the question rather, which is the safest basis as to the proper measure of the size of the school?—Yes.

1561. Do you think the attendance on the highest quarter of the year is the safest measure of the size of the school?—It is the safest as far as the teachers are concerned.

1562. Do you not see that it would to a large extent encourage an up and down tendency at a part of the year, and that a teacher who has to teach steadily a large average of pupils throughout the whole of the year really has as much work to do as the teacher who has to teach a larger average for one quarter and a smaller average another quarter?—Yes.

1563. Then, why should he be paid less?—It would not make such a vast difference.

1564. Yes, in some districts. Why should he be paid less? Would you bring down the scale and bring down the payment and the staff in schools where the attendance was steady to put them up where it was most unsteady?—It would be only for a limited time that it would be unsteady; for the major part of the time it would be steady. But that was only a suggestion of mine.

1565. *The Chairman.*] Do you think a colonial scale of salaries can possibly be devised that will give uniform or general satisfaction?—I believe that a colonial scale of salaries can be devised that would give general satisfaction.

1566. If that scale is arranged on the basis of capitation stated in our order of reference—that is, £4 a head—do you think teachers in every district in New Zealand will be satisfied if the salaries in some cases are modified or reduced in order that those in every instance where there are glaring inequalities may be raised to a reasonable level?—Yes; provided that the present occupants are protected, as suggested by the Inspector-General, for a period of three or four years.

1567. What effect do you think the introduction of this new system will have on the Education Boards: will it improve them in any way; will it diminish their powers, do you think; will it add to their importance or reduce it?—It does not seem to me that it will diminish their power or detract from their importance. They will still have the control of teachers and the control of education within their districts. It will simply mean the ear-marking of a sum of money for a specific purpose.

1568. But is objection not taken to the parochial system even with regard to appointments? I think in your opening statement you said the teachers of this district objected to the parochial system in connection with the making of appointments?—I do not remember that; I have no recollection of saying so.

1569. Have you not stated already that the wish of the teachers of the Wellington District is that some method should be devised by which teachers could be exchanged between different districts—that is, sent from one to another by the Education Department? And did you not go further, and say that this would get rid of the present parochial system?—No, I did not.

1570. Was no reference made to the parochial system?—That was when I first started; but it was not with regard to appointments.

1571. With regard to salaries?—Yes.

1572. Then, if the parochial system of fixed salaries is bad, is not the parochial system of making appointments also bad, or defective?—I am not prepared to speak on the question of appointments; I have not come prepared to do that, but I am prepared to speak to the question of salaries.

1573. If a colonial scale of salaries is introduced and passed by the Legislature, and the power of fixing salaries is removed from the hands of the Education Boards, do you not think that the power of making appointments must naturally follow, and be placed under the central department?—I do not see it at all.

1574. The one would not necessarily follow the other?—I do not think so.

1575. If you do away with the power which is now exercised by the Education Boards, and make it a matter that is quite immaterial to those bodies whether the expenditure on salaries is small or large, will that not very likely lead to the multiplication of schools, and to a total disregard of the necessity for fair and reasonable economy?—I think the Education Boards are composed of fair and reasonable men, and they will not, as you suggest, simply because they have not the actual control of the salary fund, unduly multiply schools.

1576. Do you think the teachers will be safer with regard to salaries if they are in the hands of a central department than in the hands of the Boards?—I hope so.

1577. Have you contemplated the method by which votes are sometimes rushed through Parliament in the early hours of the morning—it might be 3 or 4 o'clock in the morning—when the members have been sitting up for perhaps nearly twenty-fours? Do you think that would be a more satisfactory way of arranging for the payment of these men and women than the method adopted at present?—I do not anticipate that teachers' salaries will be flung on the floor of the House and discussed by members. I anticipate that there will be a grant made as at present, which will be apportioned by the central department to the teachers according to the size of the schools, and so on, and will be distributed by the Boards. I do not see that there is any such danger as you suggest.

1578. Then, do you think the scale of salaries should be passed without any discussion?—I do not suggest that.

1579. Do you not think that the expenditure on education will be very much discussed, not merely by Parliament, but by the country?—It is discussed now. The capitation grant at present is £3 15s. a head. There is proposed to be a grant of, at least, £4—possibly we may hope for £4 5s.—per head, which will enable the department to do what is proposed to be done.

1580. If the capitation were increased, as you have suggested, to, say, £4 5s., do you not think the Education Boards would be able to distribute the money in a way which would give satisfaction to their employes?—No; I think it would simply accentuate the difficulty, because the smaller districts could not possibly even then pay the salaries which would be paid in the larger districts. The larger districts would still pay larger salaries than the smaller districts, and this would be unfair.

1581. Is there no advantage in allowing each district to manage the money at its disposal?—There is; but when a series of experiments result in a decrease of salary throughout the various educational districts—and a decrease has taken place, I believe, as often as three times in as many years—the experiment is rather at the expense of the teachers.

1582. Assuming it is necessary to improve salaries, and to bring about a uniform system, what about the incidental allowances to Committees? Do you not think that they ought to be regulated

in a similar way?—I suppose they would be. There would be a special grant made for the purposes of Boards and for the purposes of School Committees.

1583. From your own knowledge of the difficulties that School Committees have to undergo in this respect, do you think that the present incidental allowances, say, in this district, are anything like sufficient?—They are not sufficient.

1584. Do you consider that a much larger expenditure is necessary in that direction?—I would not say a much larger, but a slightly larger expenditure is necessary for the good of the schools.

1585. With reference to the buildings, do you think that the schools are kept in proper repair, and that the building grant is sufficient at present to meet requirements?—No, I do not think it is.

1586. Do you think that the alterations that are now contemplated, if made, will maintain the interest that is now taken by parents generally in the appointment of Committees and members of Boards?—Yes; I think it will not interfere in any way with that interest.

1587. Is it not likely to increase the amount of State patronage that can be exercised at the expense and cost of the local institutions that have been in existence ever since the Education Act was introduced—I mean the Boards and Committees?—I do not see the contention at all.

1588. Then, you do not think the change, if made, will make any vital alteration in that respect?—I do not think so.

1589. There is one important question that has not been put to you: Do you think the method in our large schools, say, in the city here and other similar places, of having boys' and girls' schools distinct from each other would be any advantage on the present system of mixed schools?—I do not think so.

1590. Do you think it is any disadvantage?—I do not think the mixed-school system is a disadvantage.

1591. Then, do you think that the separate system is any disadvantage?—The separate system would be a distinct disadvantage, inasmuch as it would be far more expensive than the present.

1592. Is it more expensive in the case of the Mount Cook schools?—I was not referring particularly to the Mount Cook schools, but to the schools throughout the colony.

1593. I am taking these schools as an illustration: are the Mount Cook schools more expensive or less efficient than the combined schools?—No.

1594. In proportion to numbers?—As separate schools, as an actual fact, they are less expensive, because you pay women teachers less.

1595. In a case like that, where you have two separate staffs, one female and the other male, what difference would you make between the pay of the teachers?—You must understand that this is an exceptional case. There is but one girls' school in this city, and I think there is not one in Auckland, nor Christchurch, nor Dunedin; it is quite an exceptional school.

1596. But what do you think would be a fair salary for a female teacher at the girls' school, compared with the salary paid to a male teacher at the boys' school, who is doing precisely similar work?—There should not be a difference of more than 25 per cent.

1597. What difference would you make in a mixed school between the salary paid to a lady teacher and that paid to a male teacher?—That would depend upon the grade; there should not be a difference of more than 10 per cent. between the salary paid to the third male assistant and that paid to the third female assistant.

1598. *Mr. Hill.*] Would you suggest that only 75 per cent. of the capitation grant should be made by the department on account of girls?—No.

1599. You suggest that the same amount of capitation should be paid, and yet you would pay the female teacher only 75 per cent. of the salary paid to the male teacher?—Yes.

1600. *The Chairman.*] You do not believe, then, in equal pay for equal work?—I do believe in the abstract principle; but I contend that teachers are somewhat apart from the general view of things here, because it is demanded of a master in many cases that he shall be a married man before he occupies a certain position.

1601. You have seen the two proposed scales?—Yes.

1602. Do you think that the present staff in the Wellington District is sufficient?—No, not by a long way.

1603. You think it ought to be strengthened?—Yes.

1604. Of which scale would you approve with regard to the staffing?—The alternative scale.

1605. Is the staffing proposed in that scale as strong as that proposed in the original scale?—Not quite, but still I think it is strong enough, and it is as strong as can well be given under the circumstances—I am alluding, of course, to the £4 limit.

1606. Do you think that the assistants in the main schools should be drafted from the country?—If they are able to do the work, I do not see why they should not be.

1607. But, supposing the salaries are modified in such a way that the assistants in the main schools will naturally apply for situations in the country, do you not think that will be an improvement on the present system?—Yes.

T. H. GILL, M.A., LL.B., Headmaster, Newtown School, examined.

Mr. Gill: I wish to place before you, first of all, what has been done by the New Zealand Educational Institute in connection with this matter of a colonial scale of staffs and salaries. On looking over the records, I find that in 1888 a committee of the representatives of the New Zealand Educational Institute in council assembled had no recommendation to make on the subject of a colonial scale. In 1889 a resolution was passed advocating a more uniform scale of salaries; in 1890 a resolution was passed deprecating the low salaries paid in the smaller educational districts; in 1891 the resolution passed asked for a more

uniform scale of salaries; in 1892 the resolution took the same shape; in 1893 it was carried in the form of "uniform scale of salaries"; in 1894 the record is simply that the resolution was carried. Now, in 1895 the expression "staff and salaries" makes its appearance. A similar resolution was carried in 1896, 1897, 1898, 1899, 1900, and 1901—in 1899 by twenty-nine votes to three; and in 1900 unanimously. In 1901, at the beginning of the present year, the resolution was "carried with acclamation." These are the records. I make this statement as secretary of the New Zealand Educational Institute, because I have the information at my disposal, and I do not think that you have had it from anyone else. I want to make a remark or two in connection with the question of a colonial scale (I am not speaking now as the representative of the New Zealand Educational Institute, these are my own views). It seems to me that a colonial scale is necessary in the interests of the teachers themselves. I think that men and women who are doing precisely the same work under very similar conditions, and who have equal qualifications, ought to receive an equal rate of pay. Without that I think there must be dissatisfaction; and I think that some of the dissatisfaction in the colony to-day is due to the disparity between the salaries paid to men and those paid to women. Then, I think that it is in the interests of scholars that a colonial scale should be introduced. It will be generally conceded that the tendency under the present system is for the most capable men and women to be drawn into the service of the larger Boards, where the larger salaries are paid, and I cannot see that that is fair to the scholars in the smaller districts; I contend that they ought to have equal educational advantages. I consider it is in the interests of education generally that there should be a colonial scale. The only way in which we can get a really good system of education is by having a proper system of pupil-teachers, followed by a system of training in some training-college; and I am inclined to believe that we should have a very much better system if we had a uniform pupil-teacher system, with uniform training, *plus* a uniform system of college-work after the pupil-teacher's course was over. I say that with regard to a colonial scale generally. I wish to speak now with regard to the proposed colonial scale. Taken as a whole, it has certain advantages. For men, the scale for assistants in Auckland and Wellington will, on the whole, be raised, and in other smaller districts also. I think that, under this scale which is proposed, the teachers generally will be benefited. Country teachers will receive substantial assistance by having a certificated teacher to help them when the average attendance reaches 40, and the salaries will, on the whole, be generally increased. But, more particularly, it seems to me that this scale makes more adequate provision for the women teachers of the colony. I find that the women teachers of the colony may be divided roughly into two classes. First, there are the infant teachers—they may be called infant mistresses—and there are also the class teachers. I find that about the highest rates of pay are something like this, taking infant teachers first: In Wellington, £125; Otago, £155; Auckland, probably £100, but I found one or two at £120; in Canterbury, £160. There is a disparity, as you will see, of at least £35 between Wellington and Canterbury. But it is when you come to the position of class teachers—and a very large number of the women teachers of the colony are class teachers—that the greater disparity exists. I find that about the best rate of pay in Wellington for a class teacher is £100. Mr. Grundy said £90, but there is one at £100 that I know of. In Otago it is £115; in Auckland £100; in Canterbury I find that there are positions open to women—omitting altogether infant mistresses—worth up to £200. They call the women occupying these positions "departmental females." As far as I can judge women are quite as capable of doing school-work as men. For infant-work, lower standards, and middle standards of mixed schools, they are quite as capable as men, and are well able to do the whole of the work in purely girls' schools. I think if the necessity is borne in mind of having the supply of men teachers kept up in order to fill the positions of headmasters in schools of a certain size, and also assistantships in schools of a certain size, every inducement should be held out to get the best class of women to enter the teaching profession. Arrangements, too, might be made, and ought to be made, to enable women who are very strong physically, and gifted as teachers, to teach the higher classes in the mixed schools. Women teachers are well able to do the whole of the standard-work of the girls in mixed schools, if the sexes are separated, up to and including Standard IV.—and Standard V. too, when the circumstances are favourable. Under "favourable circumstances" I would include moderate size of classes, reasonable demands in the interpretation of the syllabus, suitable class-rooms, and the women themselves being physically strong; in fact, I see no reason why some women could not do the work of any mixed class up to and including Standard VII. I do not consider it is advisable that the first assistant at a large city school should be a woman, because, in the absence of a headmaster, the first assistant would naturally be called upon to do the work. Possibly, also, in very large schools it is advisable that the second assistant should be a man; but I think that in exceptional cases women might, and ought to be, allowed to occupy second assistantships. If inducements of this kind were held out, and there is room for them in the suggested scale, I believe the women teachers of the colony would receive what they have long deserved. If in a very large school, say, in one of 700 or more, an infant mistress were paid a fair remuneration, and two male assistants also received suitable salaries, I think the first female assistant, omitting the infant mistress, ought, with the supervision of the sewing, the girls' playground, and the girls' drill, to receive a salary of, at any rate, not less than £156 a year. The work that would be demanded from the first female assistant—omitting for the present the infant mistress—would give greater scope and greater opportunities to women who are now filling the position of class-teachers. As far as I can judge, this would give opportunity to two classes of women teachers—first, infant mistresses; and, second, class-teachers. There is only one thing more I wish to say—it has been mentioned more than once, but I thought I would like to say something about it—I refer to the staffing on average attendance. It seems to me that the staffing on average attendance is not fair to the staffs; I say nothing about the salaries at all. I cannot say what ought to be done in the matter, but I will

here point out that I think an injustice is done. It seems to me that some change ought to be made so that the staffing of a school would be based on something between the average attendance and the number on the roll. I would be inclined to say that it should be something from 90 to 95 per cent. of the roll-number. I could not find last year's daily register of my own school, but I found the register for the winter quarter of the year before last, and I took the weeks where, say, wet weather came in, and found how the staffing was affected by one wet day or day and a half wet. I found that in one week, taking all the days, good and bad, the average attendance was 724, and that if I omitted the wet day it went up to 765. Then I took another week ending the 16th June, and found that the average attendance was 717, and when I omitted a day or day and a half, the average went up to 759, a difference of 42. Then, for the week ending the 30th June, the average was 681, and, omitting two wet days, it went up to 750, a difference of 69. For the week ending the 26th May the average was 700, and, omitting wet days, 751, a difference of 51. For the week ending the 19th May the average was 704; omitting wet days, 739. For the week ending the 12th May, 674; omitting wet days, 716. I give these figures to show that if a school is staffed on the average attendance pure and simple, injustice is done to the children. If you take three or four days in the week when the average in a school would, say, be 800, and then if on a wet day or two wet days the average were brought down for that week or that quarter to 750, I think that the children would be taught under disadvantageous circumstances. I say nothing of the salaries of the teachers, but consider here only the interests of the scholars.

1608. *Mr. Davidson.*] You are secretary of the New Zealand Educational Institute?—Yes.

1609. You have attended the annual meetings of the Council of the Institute on frequent occasions?—Yes; consecutively, I think, for five years.

1610. At these meetings you have met representatives from every educational district in the colony?—That is so.

1611. What has been your teaching experience?—Twenty-two years and a half.

1612. Would you kindly state what positions you have filled?—I was on the relieving-staff in Victoria for a time; I filled positions in country schools there; I was afterwards assistant at Oamaru; assistant at the Caversham School in Dunedin, and headmaster of the Hokitika District High School for, I think, seven years and a half, and I have been here two years and a half.

1613. Then, your experience should enable you to answer questions on such a subject as we are considering. Do you consider there are too many pupil-teachers in several educational districts in the colony for efficient working of the schools?—Yes.

1614. Have you noted the number of pupil-teachers compared with the number of adult teachers—for instance, in Hawke's Bay?—I have not noted them minutely, but I know that the Wellington District has a very much larger proportion than Otago, which employs assistant teachers more freely.

1615. Do you know that, according to the last report of the Minister of Education, you will find that in Hawke's Bay there are ninety-four pupil-teachers, compared with 127 adult teachers?—I had not noticed that particularly.

Mr. Hill: Those figures are not correct. The ex-pupil-teachers are counted in that return.

Mr. Hogben: The return is made up from the Board's own figures, checked by the names.

1616. *Mr. Davidson.*] Have you noticed that in Otago there are only eighty-two pupil-teachers to 402 adult teachers?—Yes; I did notice that there was a very small number there compared with the adult teachers.

1617. Do you find that boys, and the right class of boys, are entering the teaching service in Wellington?—No; boys have not come forward at all, in my experience, but it is limited here to two years and a half.

1618. What is your opinion as to the reasons for their not coming forward?—There are not sufficient inducements offered.

1619. Do you think that the method of selecting pupil-teachers generally throughout the colony is a good one?—I cannot say what it is like in all the other educational districts. I know what it was like in Otago and Westland, and what it is like here.

1620. Is there an entrance examination in Wellington?—No; but I think matriculated students are preferred; however, I am not certain about that.

1621. You have had some experience in teaching small country schools?—Not in this colony, but in Victoria.

1622. Do you approve of the suggested staffing of the small schools in the alternative scale?—Yes, I do.

1623. You think that the staffing is sufficient?—Yes; but I could not speak with the same authority as if I had taught country schools under this syllabus.

1624. I notice the Wellington scale of staffing allowed for your school, when the average attendance was 719, was seven adults and ten pupil-teachers: is that correct?—I suppose it is, if it is taken from the Minister's report.

1625. The suggested staffing is ten adults and seven pupil-teachers—that is, it would give you three adults in place of three pupil-teachers: would that be a stronger and more efficient staff for your class of school?—I do not think there is any doubt about that, except, perhaps, a difficulty might come in with regard to the rooms. They have been built largely for pupil-teacher staffing.

1626. At what average attendance in a large school would it be necessary to break a standard into two divisions, mixed, or one of boys and one of girls?—That depends on the staff. I have three Fourth Standards and three Third Standards. They are broken up in such a way as to give the teachers who are the farthest up the staff—the most experienced teachers—the largest number; and, if there is one, the pupil-teacher gets the smaller number.

1627. If the school is sufficiently large to break the standards, say, into two divisions, would you break them into mixed divisions, boys and girls, classified according to efficiency, altogether apart from the question of sex, or would you prefer to separate the sexes?—I would prefer to separate the sexes.

1628. Then, do you think, in that case, the average woman teacher could take any standard, provided she had to teach girls?—I do not think there is any doubt about that.

1629. You have had some experience in a school, perhaps, having an average attendance of 200—smaller than your present school?—Yes; I was at a school where the average attendance was from 220 to 280.

1630. You have also had experience as an assistant teacher in a school of between 500 and 600?—Yes; the attendance at the Caversham School was between 600 and 650.

1631. That was a mixed school?—Yes.

1632. At such a school, when it is found impossible to break the standards into two classes, do you think the average woman is physically capable of teaching and managing successfully a large class from the Fourth Standard upwards, boys and girls?—I think that Standard IV. would be a little trying, and I do not think it is fair to ask a woman to take Standard V. in a mixed school—*i.e.*, when the classes are large.

1633. Do you not think that Standard IV., in a mixed class, having an average attendance of about 60 or 70, is too great a strain for the average woman?—I could not judge so well as if I were headmaster of the school, but I think the work would be harder than it ought to be for a woman. Upper mixed classes of that size are much too large for women teachers.

1634. Do you think the average age of teachers in the Wellington District has increased during the last three years?—I am really not prepared to answer that question.

1635. The Marlborough Education Board has sent on a recommendation from the local Institute that, pending the introduction of a superannuation scheme, teachers over sixty-five years of age who wish to retire owing to ill-health should be allowed one month's salary for each year's service: do you approve of that recommendation, presuming that the money would be paid by the Government?—I do not suppose there would be any objection to that.

1636. Do you think it would be in the interests of education if teachers over sixty-five years of age were enabled to retire in that way?—I think that at sixty-five there are some men who are quite fit for work, but I do not think this would apply to the average teacher.

1637. *Mr. Stewart.*] Which do you consider to be the worst paid class of teacher in your district?—Ex-pupil-teachers.

1638. How long does the teacher remain an ex-pupil-teacher?—Till he or she can get another position.

1639. Is it correct that there are teachers in this district who have been classed as ex-pupil-teachers for seven or eight years?—I think that is so. I believe the instance that Mr. Grundy gave was correct.

1640. What is the maximum salary paid to an ex-pupil-teacher?—It was £50, but now £42 is the highest, except in the case of those who were ex-pupil-teachers before the Board made the reduction. I think that is the difference.

1641. How long do your pupil-teachers serve as pupil-teachers before their apprenticeship expires?—Four years.

1642. Then, assuming that four years indentures have to be served, six years afterwards, at the end of ten years an ex-pupil-teacher might get £50 a year?—Yes, if he or she did not take an assistantship, but remained at the school.

1643. Are you training too many pupil-teachers for the vacancies—is the supply of pupil-teachers greater than the annual waste?—Apparently so; facts seem to point that way.

1644. You have spoken in the abstract as to a colonial scale: have you seen the alternative scale?—Yes.

1645. Would that as a whole benefit the teachers of the Wellington Province?—I have not compared it with every individual salary, and am not prepared to say.

1646. Take a school of from 15 to 20: what salary would be paid to the teacher of that school under the Wellington Board's scale?—£70.

1647. What would be paid under the proposed scale?—£80.

1648. Then, we may say that altogether the teachers at all schools of up to 20 would benefit very materially under this scale?—To the extent of £10 to £30 a year. The salaries under the alternative scale would run from £80 to £100.

1649. Do you think that is a class of school (from 15 to 20) that ought to be carefully looked after in drawing up a colonial scale?—Certainly.

1650. Take the schools of from 19 to 40: what would the teachers of those schools receive under the Wellington Board's scale?—They are classified differently; the salaries increase at every additional 5 in the attendance.

1651. Take a school with an average attendance of 30: what would the teacher receive according to the Wellington Board's scale?—£100 is the maximum.

1652. What would that teacher receive under the alternative scale?—£140.

1653. Then, the teachers at that class of school would benefit very considerably?—Yes.

1654. Schools of that class are very numerous in the Wellington Province?—Yes, I think so.

1655. Take a school with an average attendance of 35: what would the teacher of such a school receive under the Wellington Board's scale?—From £135 to £155.

1656. And under the alternative scale?—£150.

1657. Those small schools are the most numerous class in the Wellington Province?—Yes.

1658. And the teachers at them would benefit very materially under the alternative scale?—Yes.

1659. Do you consider that the maximum salary at present paid in the Wellington Province is sufficiently large to act as a stimulus to those engaged in the profession?—Not compared with other professions.

1660. Would the maximum salary under the proposed scale be of any benefit in that direction: would it act as a stimulus to the teachers of Wellington?—I certainly think so; it would be a benefit in this direction: that it would induce a better class of persons to go in for teaching, because the inducement would be higher.

1661. Do you think the system of appointment of pupil-teachers in the Wellington District a satisfactory one?—No; I should certainly like to see a change.

1662. In what direction?—The headmaster and the Inspector should both have more say in the appointment of teachers.

1663. Has the Inspector any voice at present?—I cannot say.

1664. Does he visit the school to see the candidate?—He may report to the Board, for all I know.

1665. Do the Inspectors see the candidates teach before they are employed?—They certainly have not done so at the Newtown School.

1666. Then, how does the Board know whether candidates can teach or not?—I cannot answer that question.

1667. Are any reasonable methods taken of finding out whether a candidate for a pupil-teacher-ship has teaching ability or not?—I cannot say.

1668. Do you know of any?—No.

1669. Is there any entrance examination for pupil-teachers?—No.

1670. Do you think there ought to be one?—I do; I have said before, and I still think, that matriculated candidates should have the preference.

1671. If there were an examination here, the Board might either take the matriculated examination or have an entrance examination of its own?—Yes.

1672. That would be more satisfactory?—Yes.

1673. Do you think that under the present state of affairs throughout New Zealand a teacher has sufficient security as to what his income is to be from year to year?—No.

1674. Do you think a colonial scale would give greater security?—Yes, I do.

1675. Is it your opinion that a statutory provision for teachers' salaries must have more permanence than a Board's scale?—Yes, I think so.

1676. Do you think that in drawing up a colonial scale the Commission ought to consider carefully whether a residence is attached to a school or not?—Most decidedly.

1677. You have seen a copy of the first proposed scale?—Yes.

1678. Did you see a note on page 3 with regard to house allowance?—Yes; I noticed that particularly.

1679. Do you think it a right and just thing that, where a house is not provided, the house allowance shall be made from the Building Fund, as a charge on that fund, rather than on the Incidental Fund?—Yes, because existing houses, I presume, have been erected out of the Building Fund.

1680. Have you the records of the New Zealand Educational Institute?—Yes, for all the past years.

1681. I would like you to refer to the last Nelson and Christchurch meetings, because specific statements have been made with regard to these meetings. The Christchurch one was held in 1899: will you see if there is any record of a resolution having been tabled at that meeting in reference to the abolition of Boards and the centralisation of the system?—The only resolution bearing on centralising that I can find is in reference to the Inspectors.

1682. Would you mind looking up the records of the Nelson meeting, held in 1894, I think: is there any record of a resolution having been tabled or discussed with regard to the centralisation of the whole system under the department?—No; nothing beyond the centralising of the Inspectors.

1683. Then, if it has been stated to this Commission that the Council of the Educational Institute had decided in favour of the abolition of Boards and the centralisation of the system, such evidence must have been given under a misapprehension?—I certainly think so. I can find no record of such decision having been arrived at by the Council of the Institute.

1684. *Mr. Luke.*] With reference to the question of equal pay for equal work, as far as male and female teachers are concerned, would you mind giving your views on that matter?—I suppose that theoretically no one can say that there ought to be anything but equal pay for equal work, but my position is this: Rightly or wrongly, the various Education Boards and School Committees, and, I dare say, the public of a district, prefer that men filling certain positions should be married men. Women may fill these positions and not be married; but it is expected that a man, to undertake a particular class of work, should be a married man, and therefore incur extra responsibility. I think he should receive extra remuneration for that reason. That is not the only reason that I have, but in my judgment it is a very strong one. I may say that when I left a school that I was at the man who took my position got the appointment on the understanding that he was going to be married.

1685. You do not advance as a reason why women should not receive equal pay to men that women break down sooner than men?—No, not at all.

1686. What did you mean when you referred to "a better class entering the teaching profession"?—The higher the inducements that are offered in the way of additional remuneration the better the class that will be drawn into the profession.

1687. As a rule, do not the most intellectual boys and girls enter the teaching profession now?—I would not like to say that; it would reflect on other professions; but I do not think we get the best of them.

1688. Would you interfere at all with the functions of Education Boards?—Certainly not; I see no reason for doing that.

1689. *Mr. Hill.*] Were all the educational districts represented when the New Zealand Educational Institute passed resolutions approving of a colonial scale of salaries?—Yes; every one of them. Not every year, but they certainly were at the last meeting.

1690. Were any lady representatives present?—Yes; at Timaru one lady was present. At the Wellington meeting four were present.

1691. Was it recognised that under a colonial scale men and women should receive the same salary?—I do not think that matter came forward.

1692. Do you think the Institute would be likely to approve of such a proposal?—I could not answer for the Institute as a whole.

1693. You recognise, of course, that under a colonial scale some of the education districts would suffer to a large extent?—I do not know that that is so.

1694. On a £4 capitation some districts would have a great deal more given to them than others?—Do you mean if the money is to be voted to the Boards without a colonial scale?

1695. Would each district receive £4 capitation grant under a colonial scale, the same amount as it would receive on an ordinary Education Board basis, such as the present basis?—No.

1696. Some districts would evidently lose?—Yes; those that have a large number of schools from which profit is made.

1697. It would be drawn to the smaller districts?—Yes.

1698. Have you estimated whether this district would be likely to have some money withdrawn on a £4 capitation?—No.

1699. The Institute has not considered that aspect of the question?—I have never heard it discussed.

1700. You have not taken the thirteen districts and estimated how much each one would gain or lose under the proposed scale?—No, I have not; nor have I heard any one state what the result would be.

1701. Suppose that the proposed scale were adopted with the certification here shown, do you think it would be likely to affect the interests of teachers who have lower certificates than those required under the proposed scale?—Yes.

1702. Assuming this proposed scale were adopted, and along with it there was a safeguarding for a period of four years of the interests of teachers who did not hold the required certificates, do you think that the adoption of the scale would benefit those teachers?—I would rather answer that in another way; I would rather say that I think the certificates asked for in the proposed scale are higher than is really necessary.

1703. Suppose the salary which a teacher is receiving at the present time is higher than the salary which he or she would receive under this proposed scale, do you think that it is fair to safeguard the interests of that teacher for a period of four, or five, or six years, as the case may be, in order to prevent hardship?—Yes; I think that should be done.

1704. Then, you think that all the teachers in New Zealand who would be affected for the worse by a scale of this kind should be safeguarded for a period?—I would say "No" and "Yes" to that question. It seems to me that the teachers who are above the scale might be reduced in a given time by a sliding-scale.

1705. You think that the teachers below the scale should be raised at once?—Certainly.

1706. And for how long do you think the teachers who are above the scale should remain so?—They should be brought to scale within, say, four years.

1707. And do you think that would be a fair thing to do?—I think so.

1708. You do not think an injustice would be done to teachers in cases like that?—No, not in the long-run. There must be cases of hardship under any scale.

1709. There are several Education Boards that have set their faces for a long time against the opening of small schools?—Yes.

1710. Do you think that if they are aware that Government intends to sustain those schools, and are allowed to continue the control as to the opening of such schools, they will adopt a plan such as has been adopted in some education districts—that is, of opening a school wherever there is a pupil, or two or three pupils? Is it possible that Education Boards throughout the colony will follow that plan? Do you not think they will naturally say, "The Government will maintain these schools, there is no responsibility with us, so we will open them"?—I think they have got too much sense and judgment to do anything of that kind.

1711. But if they find there are children to be educated, do you not think they will say, "The Government gives £5 capitation, so we will give these children a chance of being educated"? Do you not think they would do a thing like that?—If they thought it necessary in the interests of the district they might.

1712. Exactly. Does that not open the door for an increase of the £5 capitation which cannot be estimated? You cannot estimate how much money will be required for such schools if the power is in the hands of an Education Board, and the Government have to pay whenever the power is exercised by that Board?—Do you mean this: that if you allowed Boards to open schools for a less number of children than is provided for in this scale the Education Boards might, to some extent, paralyse the central department?

1713. Yes. There is only £4 capitation allowed, and if £5 is spent, and can be spent at the will of an Education Board, is that not likely to cause difficulty in regard to the amount available for providing for these schools?—Not any very great inconvenience.

1714. With regard to the training of pupil-teachers, you recognise that there are defects in our present system?—Certainly.

1715. And that it is advisable that some special means should be taken to improve the status of pupil-teachers?—Yes.

1716. Would you suggest any course other than the present—that is, in the first training of pupil-teachers, or the first training of probationers, if you like? Would you suggest that they should have a training anticipatory to becoming teachers in the schools—that they should be allowed to have the benefit of a special teacher, who should train them in methods, and the reasons for such methods, before they are admitted as part of the staff of a public school?—I think, if they were placed on the staff as probationers for a year, the Inspector and the headmaster of the school ought to be able to judge whether a particular boy or girl had a certain aptitude for the work.

1717. In such a case would you propose to pay them for the work they do?—I think so.

1718. What would a probationer be likely to do the first year?—Exactly the same as a pupil-teacher of the first year.

1719. Is it not a fact that many of the pupil-teachers who are sent into the schools are ill-prepared for the work they are called upon to do?—That is a great defect in the pupil-teacher system. I think it would be a good thing if we had no pupil-teacher system at all—i.e., unskilled teachers in charge of classes. If possible, it would be much better if there were only adult teachers in the schools.

1720. Has your Institute never considered such an important and vital question?—Not, I think, in that form.

1721. Have they made any suggestion at any time in respect to the employment of pupil-teachers?—They have in regard to the training of pupil-teachers. I remember the question came up in regard to the proportion of adult teachers to pupil-teachers.

1722. Will you look it up?—Yes. At the meeting of the Institute at Timaru in 1900 the record is as follows: "It was resolved that the Council affirms the need for better provision being made for the training of teachers throughout the colony." The resolution carried at the meeting in Wellington last year was as follows: "That the Council urge upon the Government the necessity of making more adequate provision for the training of teachers."

1723. What is about the percentage of average attendance at your school compared with the number on the roll?—For the last quarter the average attendance was nearly 86 per cent. of the roll-number.

1724. Now, could you tell me what was the highest number present on any day?—814 was the highest attendance out of a roll-number of 916.

1725. What was the average for that week?—774.

1726. Your average attendance that week was 774 out of 916 on the roll. Could you now tell me how many pupils were instructed during that week?—I could not tell you that; there might have been some present one day and absent another.

1727. Still, that was the highest number present?—It would not show the total number present.

1728. But the highest number present on any one day in that particular week was 814?—Yes.

1729. This 814 actually came under instruction at your school?—Yes.

1730. What I want to ask is this: assuming that your teachers are paid on a capitation allowance, do you think they ought to be paid on the 774, the average number, or on 814, the highest number present at your school under instruction at any time during the week?—I think that more important than the payment of teachers is the adequate staffing of the school. I consider the school is inadequately staffed when staffed on the average attendance. I say that in the interest of the children.

1731. But the staffing depends upon the amount available for distribution, and that amount is paid on the 774, and not on the 814?—Quite so.

1732. If you were to take the highest number present at all, week by week, for a quarter, and divide by the number of weeks in that quarter, that would give you the average of the highest number present at all at your school?—Yes, I think so.

1733. Do you think, in the interests of your school, in the interests of staffing, that your school should be staffed on the average attendance or on the average of the highest number present at all during each week of a quarter?—On the higher number. I said in my opening statement that I believed that the number on which the schools should be staffed should be from 90 to 95 per cent. of the roll-number.

1734. If capitation were paid on the higher number, would the staffing at your school be improved materially?—Yes; I showed that before.

1735. It would enable some time to be given to the training of pupil-teachers, by the appointment of more efficient teachers?—Yes.

1736. Has your Institute ever considered such a question as that?—No, I do not think it has. It has considered the question of average attendance, but I believe it was in the form of asking that certain days shall be excluded. I will read the resolution which was carried on the subject: "It was resolved, That when the attendance at any school is reduced below 70 per cent. of the roll-number during any quarter by epidemics, staff and salary be reckoned according to the same percentage of the roll as was maintained during the corresponding quarter of the previous year."

1737. I understand that your Institute fully recognises the desirability of a colonial scale?—Yes.

1738. Have they in any way suggested the desirability of a colonial system of promotion?—I think that has not been discussed at all.

1739. The question has not been discussed in any way?—No; because it would involve the abolition of the Boards.

1740. Your Institute is not in favour of the abolition of the Boards?—Not as far as I can judge.

1741. Has your Institute made any recommendation as to the abolition of School Committees?—No, I think not.

1742. Have they made any recommendation as to the granting of the right to Education Boards to remove teachers from school to school if found desirable?—I do not think that has been discussed either. I believe that the transferring of teachers within the same educational district was discussed, but I cannot say whether anything was carried or not.

1743. Do you think that all the certificated teachers on the staff of a large school should be required to assist in the training and instruction of pupil-teachers?—That should be in the hands of the headmaster.

1744. Would it not be better for different teachers to take special subjects?—That depends entirely upon circumstances. I have no doubt that the headmaster, under certain circumstances, might deem it advisable to get the assistance of certain members of his staff, but that would depend so much on circumstances that it should not be laid down as a rule that the members of the staff should help in the instruction of pupil-teachers.

1745. But if the headmaster thought it desirable?—I think he ought to be allowed to adopt the plan of getting the teachers to help in the instruction of pupil-teachers if he found it desirable.

1746. *Mr. Smith.*] Your staff at the end of 1899, according to the Minister's report, consisted of eight adults and fifteen pupil-teachers?—Yes.

1747. You said just now you thought it would be very desirable to do without pupil-teachers if possible: do you think that under the present scale you could conduct your school satisfactorily if you had one adult teacher for every two pupil-teachers?—Where I would find the greatest difficulty, if pupil-teachers were excluded, would possibly be in breaking up small classes in the infant-room for kindergarten work.

1748. The expense would be very much greater?—Yes; it would be an exceedingly expensive system.

1749. *Mr. Weston.*] I understood that you disapprove of the pupil-teacher system?—Yes; as a system.

1750. Will you kindly give me, in a few words, your reason for saying so?—As a general rule, the pupil-teachers are asked to do that class of work which is really the most difficult of all; they are asked to do it, I suppose, for the simple and obvious reason that they are able to govern and control little children, whereas they are unable to control the upper classes. If they were able to control the upper classes, the best place to put them would be higher up in the school; but, as they can manage the little children better, they are put just exactly where they ought not to be, for they have not the requisite skill to deal with little children.

1751. What you mean is this: that the infant classes require special and trained teachers to lay a good foundation for the school?—I think that goes without saying.

1752. Have the pupil-teachers sufficient time to pursue their studies to advantage under the present system?—I believe it is unjust that they should be asked to teach, and pursue their studies out of school-hours.

1753. What would you advocate, then, as a remedy for the existing evil?—I presume that the pupil-teacher system cannot be abolished yet, and, assuming it is to remain, I think the only way out of the difficulty is to ask the pupil-teachers to do a certain amount of teaching in school, the rest of the time to be devoted to their own studies.

1754. Then, I understand that you regard pupil-teaching in the higher standards as a failure?—I do not think the pupil-teachers should teach the higher standards.

1755. If pupil-teachers are not suited for the lower standards, and are not much good in the higher standards (you said they were unable to control the older children), of what use are they at all in a school?—We have to do the best we can, and we put them in the infant-room simply because they are able to do the mechanical part of the work there.

1756. Now, in regard to the training of pupil-teachers, you say that in your opinion there should be a uniform system of training them?—Yes.

1757. Do you believe in a uniform system of teaching throughout the colony?—No, certainly not; I think a great deal will depend on a man or woman's own personality.

1758. If you have a uniform system of pupil-teacher training, will you not, at all events indirectly, if not directly, contribute to a uniform system of teaching throughout the colony?—Not necessarily, unless you kill the individuality of the men and women who are doing the work.

1759. If you train teachers in one particular way, will it not follow that to a large extent the children must be trained in one system of uniformity?—No, I think not.

1760. Then, do I understand you to mean that there should not be uniformity of system throughout the colony?—Uniformity of what kind?

1761. Uniformity of methods, syllabus, style, and everything connected with teaching?—No; I certainly would not go so far as that; but I think pupil-teachers ought to have a uniform system; that there ought to be a certain entrance examination; and that there ought to be a certain literary course of study mapped out for them. That can be done with a great deal of variety.

1762. If there were pupil-teacher regulations applicable to the whole of the colony, it would be a departmental matter, would it not; the Boards would have no control at all?—Yes, they would.

1763. What control would they have?—Exactly the same as under the Inspectors just now.

1764. Do you mean that each Board should prepare its own regulations for the training and examination of pupil-teachers?—No.

1765. Then, what do you mean by a uniform system?—I mean that the regulations should be on very much the same lines as the syllabus that is laid down now for classes.

1766. Am I to understand you to mean that there should be one system of training for pupil-teachers throughout the colony?—Yes.

1767. Then, who is to establish the system—the Boards of the various districts, or the Education Department at Wellington?—It could come from the central department, and the carrying-out of it should be in the hands of the Boards and their Inspectors.

1768. Do you mean that the questions submitted to the pupil-teachers at their examinations should emanate from the central department?—I think that is done in Wellington already.

1769. You say the uniform system must emanate from Wellington: must not that tend to a dead uniformity amongst all pupil-teachers in our colony?—I do not think so.

1770. Do you believe in a uniform system of education for all the children in the colony?—Yes; uniform, but allowing room for the individual characteristics of the several teachers.

1771. If you think that pupil-teachers are a failure——?—Pardon me, I did not say that; I said they were often asked to do the class of work which they ought not to be asked to do.

1772. You said that, if you had your way, there would be no pupil-teachers?—Yes.

1773. Then, must we not infer from that that you regard pupil-teachers as a failure? What would you desire to be done to make them a success?—I should not want any at all if we could possibly staff the school with assistants.

1774. If you do not believe in pupil-teachers, how would you manufacture teachers?—By putting the candidates through a training-college.

1775. From what class would you gather the boys and girls to send them to these training-colleges?—We could have an entrance examination for the college, and those who had been through the high school would possibly form the largest number from whom the training-college would be recruited.

1776. Do you not think that if a man obtained a certificate as a teacher as a man obtains a certificate as a lawyer he should be allowed to work out his own salvation, and that the Committees and Boards should be allowed to select their own men without having regard to more than the original certificate?—I am in favour of two certificates. I would make the first one about as difficult as what is called the E certificate. I think that would be sufficient for teachers of very small schools. The other one I would make higher than the matriculation examination, so that the teacher would be able to train his own pupil-teachers up to that point.

1777. And then you would let him either go down or work up, according to his merits?—Certainly.

1778. Supposing, however, a man was valued according to his certificate, should not the opposite position be considered—that is to say, that if a man's mental powers declined he should be reduced in his certificate? For instance, if a man were paid according to his certificate, would it not be necessary to revise that certificate from time to time, so that he should be judged upon his merits?—I am not in favour of doing that.

1779. You do not think that that is the logical conclusion?—I think that if his work were unsatisfactory he would soon be shifted to another position, or lose the one he had.

1780. Do you think that if the suggested scale of staffing were adopted there would be necessity for alterations in the class-rooms at the schools?—Certainly.

1781. For instance, at your own school, would your class-rooms have to be altered?—Certainly.

1782. Would that involve much expense?—I could not tell you, but I know the school has been built largely on a pupil-teacher basis.

1783. And I suppose we may assume that if that difficulty existed at your own school it would apply to many others?—I could not tell you that.

1784. With regard to the appointment of teachers, do you approve of the Committees having a voice in the appointment, removal, and dismissal of teachers?—Yes.

1785. So that the present system of appointment you think is sufficiently good?—I would not like to say that, because it is not the same under the various Boards. The Wellington Board does not leave to the Committees the same amount of power in the choice of a teacher as some Education Boards do, where they send on a large number of names to the Committee.

1786. What system do you think should be followed in the appointment of teachers?—That is rather a large order, and I do not know that I can fill it. I should think that, at any rate, a fair amount of power in the selection and removal of teachers should be left in the hands of the Boards; I think they are the best judges. They are certainly in possession of most information in regard to the quality and character of the work.

1787. I suppose you would advocate reference being made to the Inspectors?—I think that should be done in every case.

1788. With regard to lady teachers, do you think that in small schools lady teachers should receive the same pay as male teachers?—Yes; in very small schools. The salary is so small that I think there ought to be no differentiation.

1789. What do you think should be the minimum salary for male and lady teachers?—I do not think a woman ought to be asked to work for less than £100, nor a man for less than £110.

1790. Do you think that a lady teacher would be competent to take all the standards in a country school up to 40 children?—I should think so, but I cannot judge of country-school work.

1791. What is your idea in regard to sick-pay allowance?—I think that the treatment of teachers by the Wellington Board is fairly liberal. I think that where a teacher is away he or she gets a month's full pay before a reduction takes place.

1792. And do you think that sufficient?—I think that in the long-run that is a reasonable consideration.

1793. *Mr. Hogben.*] I understood you to say that some districts would lose under this colonial scale: can you tell me which districts would lose?—I meant many teachers; I did not mean the district as a whole.

1794. The districts now are being paid capitation on a £3 15s. basis?—Yes.

1795. You do not mean that any one of them would get less under this proposed distribution than they are now getting on the £3 15s. basis?—I have not computed it, but I do not think they would.

1796. It is obvious that some would get less than £4 a head if others got more than £4?—Yes.

1797. You have not worked it out to see how much more than the £4 some would get, and how much less others would get?—No.

1798. It was hinted that the department might be placed in financial difficulties if the amount of capitation paid to small schools made the total amount exceed £4 a head throughout the colony. I suppose you understand that one way of introducing a colonial scale, if the Commission recommend any, would be that a Bill should be passed by Parliament to make that colonial scale a part of the law of the land, in the same way as the £3 15s. capitation is now the law of the land. In that case the amount that was made statutory would be payable on that statutory authority in the same way as the £3 15s. is payable now?—I should say that would be so.

1799. As a matter of fact, Parliament votes enough to pay the £3 15s. capitation?—Yes.

1800. And would vote the amount required under a colonial scale in the same way?—Yes, if a colonial scale were introduced.

1801. The only way in which Parliament could interfere with the amount would be by repealing the statute?—Yes.

1802. In that case, if Parliament voted the money, the department could not be involved in financial difficulties any more than it could now; it might underestimate what is payable now on the £3 15s. basis, might it not?—Yes.

1803. It might underestimate the amount payable under a colonial scale in the same way, might it not?—I think Mr. Hill was referring to schools of under 14, which do not come under the scale.

1804. They are under the scale. If you look at it you will see there is a note to the effect that aided schools of from 1 to 14 receive capitation at the rate of £5 a head?—Yes.

1805. Therefore the difficulty would be the same as at present; there would be no other difficulty than that which exists at the present time. It would be simply a matter of how much was estimated to be payable during the year?—Yes.

1806. Once a scale is adopted, the estimate for the year will have to be framed on the amount payable to the schools according to that scale, will it not?—Yes.

1807. Not on the £4 basis?—I understood that Mr. Hill's point was that we might have a very large number of schools drawing capitation at £5, which would take very materially from those that were drawing on an average £4 all round.

1808. But, supposing a scale were constructed on a £4 basis originally, as soon as it was adopted the £4 basis would disappear—the scale would be the basis of estimate in the future?—Does the £4 element drop out?

1809. There cannot be two elements in it; the £4 must drop out. The scale after that necessarily becomes the basis of estimate?—Yes.

1810. And therefore it is only a question of whether the scale will work too expensively or not—a question for the representatives of the people. I will put it in another way: Supposing that a colonial scale were adopted to include all schools, even the schools under 14, the department's estimate for the year of what was payable for primary education would depend simply on the number of teachers in the schools, and the scale, without any reference to the £4 capitation at all?—Yes.

1811. The amount payable then might increase, but so would the estimate increase as the number increased, so that it could not in any given year land the department in financial difficulty: as the schools increased year by year the department would increase its estimate?—I think Mr. Hill's point was that if there were a very large number of children who were drawing £5 a head, that would to an extent take away what was available for the schools above 15.

1812. But once a scale was adopted, would not the £4 basis disappear?—Then there could be no difficulty about it at all.

1813. As long as the money is provided?—Quite so.

1814. You think there should be some safeguard against the multiplication of small schools?—I think the Boards would exercise sufficient judgment in that matter.

1815. The discretion of the Boards would be a sufficient safeguard?—I think so.

1816. But do you not think there might be a temptation, on the part of some districts possibly, to elect new members of Boards who would be favourable to the multiplication of small schools, even though the present Boards might be against it?—There might be.

1817. Then, do you not think there should be a safeguard in this way: that a new school should not be established within a certain distance of one already in existence?—I think if it were necessary to introduce a safeguard it should be on the basis of distance of one school from another.

1818. What do you think of the safeguard of a minimum salary—that is to say, that if a capitation of £5 be granted the inhabitants concerned should be required to contribute towards the salary, so that it should come up to a certain standard?—I think that in some cases that might fall rather heavily on settlers, who would possibly have quite enough to do under existing circumstances to keep themselves; that is where the difficulty might come in. I recognise that the children of the struggling settlers ought to get all the advantages of education. I know very little about back-block settlements, but I can quite understand that people who are making homes for themselves, if asked to contribute towards the salary of school-teachers, would be unable to do so in many cases.

1819. What minimum salary should a teacher be paid at a very small school?—I do not think any one ought to have less than £80.

1820. Ten pupils at £5 a head would give £50: would you establish schools where the attendance was less than 10?—No; I think it would be better to have half-time schools in a great many cases.

1821. If it were not possible to establish half-time schools, would you establish schools when the attendance was lower than 10 pupils?—I have not thought it out.

1822. Mr. Hill asked you one or two questions as to calculating average attendance: does not the highest number present at all during the quarter consist of the roll-number, *minus* the number of those absent the whole quarter?—It does not present itself to me in that way. But what I asked was that the staffing should be based on from 90 to 95 per cent. of the roll-number.

1823. With regard to the training of pupil-teachers, do I understand that you would prefer that, instead of the pupil-teacher system, candidates for the teaching profession should be admitted, say, as probationers to training-colleges?—I should prefer that. At the expiration of their training-college experience they should be fully certificated teachers—juniors, if you like to call them so.

1824. You would give them some period of probation?—Yes.

1825. And with that safeguard you would prefer that system to the pupil-teacher system?—Yes.

1826. The only objection to that system that you can see is the cost?—That is all.

1827. When you say you would prefer a uniform system of training pupil-teachers, you mean by that that you would prefer to have uniform examinations for pupil-teachers at the end of their several years?—Yes.

1828. Pupil-teachers in all districts are supposed to end their term by gaining a teachers' certificate—an E or a D—are they not?—They do, I think, in a number of districts.

1829. The D and the E examinations do not vary in the different districts in the colony?—No.

1830. There is uniform examination at the end of their course?—Yes.

1831. The regulations for pupil-teachers' examinations have to be approved by the Minister as well as by the several Boards, is not that so?—Yes, I think it is.

1832. At present they originate from the Board?—Yes, instead of originating from the department.

1833. The method of examination for chemists, solicitors, and doctors is the same over all parts of the colony, is it not?—Yes.

1834. And you wish to see teachers placed in the same position?—Yes.

1835. You do not wish to see uniformity in the teaching of them?—Not at all.

1836. *The Chairman.*] If training-colleges are to be established, as has been suggested, where do you think they should be established?—In the four centres.

1837. And before pupil-teachers were placed at schools at all you think they ought to be trained there?—Yes.

1838. What term of training do you think would be required at a training-college?—At least two years.

1839. There are now a number of clever girls and boys who are in employment, some of them as probationers, some as pupil-teachers in different parts of this district; some of them are the sons and daughters of poor people, and, small as the salary is, it is a great help to the household: what effect do you think the introduction of such a system as that which you advocate would have on these families and on the schools where these pupil-teachers or probationers are doing useful work?—I would not introduce it at once; to do so would certainly involve hardship in many cases.

1840. You would introduce it by degrees?—Yes; I would not interfere with the present occupants of positions.

1841. Do you think that the children, for instance, of our settlers, some of whom are naturally quite as clever as the children found in the four large centres, would be able to take advantage of these training-colleges?—I do not see why they should not.

1842. Take the case of the working-man in the country: would he be able to support his child while that child was undergoing education in a training-college in, say, Wellington?—Yes, I think if you had a training-school system that certainly would not be an obstacle.

1843. But do you not think there would be difficulties of a pecuniary nature? Do you think that the average worker or the small settler in the country would be able to maintain his boy or girl while he or she was undergoing an apprenticeship in a training-college for two years?—In Victoria they had a training system which I went through. I received an income the first year, when I was in what was known as an "associated school," of over £100, though I was not a pupil-teacher at all. I was what was called a paid pupil in training. At the expiration of my first year I passed an examination and went on to the central training institution, Melbourne. I had to keep myself that year, but at the expiration of the two years I held a trained teacher's certificate. The remuneration I got by passing the entrance examination was sufficient to maintain me for the two years.

1844. The method you suggest is one by which the pupil-teachers, during their period of training, would be amply provided for?—Yes; it was certainly so in my case.

1845. They would do a certain amount of useful work and be remunerated in return?—Yes; in Victoria we had to teach.

1846. Now, supposing such a system were adopted, what method would you recommend for preventing such a thing as an excess in the number of teachers: you see it is stated now that there are too many pupil-teachers, which is leading to a lot of hardship: how would you limit the supply?—It could be done by competitive examination.

1847. Would you have a system of competitive examination, after the candidates have been through the training-college, and before they received their certificates?—There certainly ought to be a competitive examination, so that the best men and women may be known by the results.

1848. You think that for the teaching profession there should be a competitive examination, the same as there is for the Civil Service?—Yes.

1849. With regard to male and female teachers, do you think it would be a wise thing to introduce any system by which one particular sex only should be allowed to teach certain standards: should female teachers in a mixed school be prevented from teaching, say, the Fifth, Sixth, or Seventh Standards, if capable?—Not at all. I think that provision should be made so that where, in the judgment of the Inspector and the headmaster of the school, a particular woman is capable of doing any work in that school, she should be allowed to do it.

1850. In that case, what do you think should be the difference between the salary paid to the female and the salary paid to the male teachers?—I do not think that any woman ought to be first assistant in a mixed school, for the reason that, as I stated before, in the absence of the headmaster, the first assistant would be called upon to take his place, and it is consequently desirable that the first assistant should be a man. In large schools I think the second assistant also should be a man in most cases. At a school like my own, with an average of over 700, I should certainly say that the woman in charge of the Fifth Standard girls, with the supervision of the sewing and the playground, and the arrangement of the girls' drill, should receive a salary of certainly not less than £150 a year.

1851. You say that the Fifth Standard at your school at the present time is taught by a lady?—Half of it: the boys are taught by a man and the girls by a woman.

1852. What does the male teacher, who teaches the Fifth Standard boys at your school, receive?—£100, and the lady teacher gets £100, too.

1853. Coming to the Fourth Standard: have you two teachers there?—There are three; the Fourth is taught by two assistants and an ex-pupil-teacher.

1854. How are those two assistants paid?—One gets £90 and the other, I think, £80. I arranged the classes in such a way that the teacher who gets the larger salary has the larger number of children.

1855. Into how many classes is the Third Standard divided at your school?—Into three parts, taught by three ex-pupil-teachers.

1856. How much are they paid?—£42 a year each.

1857. Is that standard as large as the Fourth?—Not quite. The numbers in the three Fourth Standard classes are 47, 44, and 39; in the three Third Standard classes the numbers are 39, 39, and 37.

1858. I suppose that the work in the Third Standard is just about as severe as the work in the Fourth?—Not quite so hard; the children are younger, and the strain in the way of discipline is not so great. Then, in Standard IV., the demands under the syllabus are greater than in Standard III.

1859. Is there such a difference as to warrant the payment of double the salaries in the one case that are paid to the other?—No; but I could not split the Fourth into two sections, because no room would hold those sections; if the number of pupils were somewhat less, I would be able to divide the standard into two parts. The present arrangement suits the rooms and the staffing.

TUESDAY, 25TH JUNE, 1901.

CHARLES R. JOPLIN, Headmaster of the Wadestown School, examined.

Mr. Joplin: My experience as a teacher extends over a long period. I think I have been teaching since the year 1877 under the Wellington Education Board, excepting for about four years. I have visited some of the largest schools in England, and concluded that there was not much to learn from them. As to my own experience: I began as a teacher on a very small scale at the Korokoro School, about two miles from Petone. I was there nearly four years. I consider that the teacher of the present day, as compared with the teacher of twenty years ago, has a very easy time. For instance, there are now excellent text-books and notes of lessons. From Korokoro I went to the Lower Hutt, and was first assistant in that school for about fourteen months. It was easier work as first assistant there than being in charge of a country school with about 26 children. I was single when teaching at the Lower Hutt, and was receiving about £150 a year. I paid about 15s. a week for board and lodging, and had the rest as pocket-money. Subsequently I applied for the Petone School, and, being appointed, I remained for nearly five years, experiencing all the difficulties of carrying on a growing school with a minimum staff. The school grew rapidly owing to two causes—the growth of the Gear Meat Company and the Woollen Factory. One of my greatest difficulties was that, though the school grew so rapidly, the teaching staff was not increased correspondingly. It is always the growing school that is the most difficult to manage. In 1886 I resigned and went to England, returning to New Zealand in 1892. During that time I became fairly well acquainted with the English educational system. Coming out again to New Zealand in 1892 I applied to the Wellington Education Board for an appointment, and was ultimately successful, being appointed to a school at Tenui. In 1894 I was appointed to Mauriceville West, a Scandinavian settlement. That school might be called a boys' school, for out of about 75 on the roll there were only 20 girls. It is a remarkable thing about a Scandinavian settlement that most of the children are boys. I stayed there about six years, and for family reasons asked for a transfer and was appointed to the Wadestown School about three months ago. I cannot say that I was promoted. My experience leads me to the conclusion that the town schools and the town teachers are much better off than the country schools and teachers. One of the greatest defects in the New Zealand educational system is the lack of inducement to young men to enter

the teaching profession. Men teaching in the country, in the backwoods, are doing noble work for miserable pay. Now-a-days it seems to me that everything is resolving itself into a matter of £ s. d. It is the case everywhere, and with every profession. Not only has the country teacher to endure peculiar hardships, but in many cases he is cut off from communication with his fellows, and has to undergo so many peculiar disabilities that he (or she) deserves much better remuneration. All teachers so situated will be pleased that the Commission has been set up, and hope that their labours will result in placing them on a more satisfactory footing. I do not say that the country teachers have been neglected by the Education Boards. To a great extent the hardships of country teachers are unavoidable, but their salaries are quite out of keeping with the important services they render. It remains for the Commission and the Government to see if anything can be done in this important matter. The cost of living in the country—I speak from long experience—is greater than in town. Whilst at the Korokoro School I received about £130 a year, the average attendance being about 26. I was then single and found the salary sufficient; but imagine my great surprise on receiving a communication from the secretary of the Board intimating that I had been receiving a salary in excess of what I was entitled to, and so some money was deducted! I had lived up to every penny of my own, and I naturally found it rather hard to be asked to refund this money. Then, at the Lower Hutt, I got £150, and had two standards to teach. I had no Committee to bother me, no irate ladies making inquiries. Being only an assistant I had nothing to do with those things. All such trouble and responsibility usually falls upon the headmaster, and after my experience I say that assistants have comparatively little to complain of. My experience in the Old Country made me look at the educational system in New Zealand in a new light. In England (I am referring to twelve or thirteen years ago) I found that our Standard VI. was equivalent to the English Standard VII. I found, too, that the salary paid in England to teachers was not equivalent to the salary paid in New Zealand. I found, further, that the cost of living was cheaper in England than in New Zealand. As far as my observation went our Inspectors compared very favourably with the Inspectors at Home. Whilst I was managing an evening continuation school in England I noticed that one Inspector occasionally invited the teachers to his house. I do not say that that should be the rule here; but his contention was that in this way he got more into touch with the teachers, and learned more of their difficulties. During my stay in England I applied to three different Education Boards for employment, but my applications were rejected on the ground that New Zealand certificates could not be recognised in England. I mention this because I consider that steps should be taken to secure reciprocal recognition of teachers as between England and New Zealand. I thoroughly believe in the principle of equal pay for equal work. Lady teachers should certainly be better paid. Whilst at Capetown I met a young Scotch lady who had been teaching in Cape Colony, and her conversation convinced me that female teachers can hold their own fairly well, despite hardships. This lady, about twenty-six years of age, said she had been teaching in Northern Cape Colony, among the Dutch and the Kaffirs. I forget what her salary was, but I know she said that the climate was abominable, and the insects terrible. I asked her how she came to such a place, and she told me that a School Inspector had represented to her that there was a splendid opening for teachers in that country. She came on with us to New Zealand, and went to Auckland, and if the Auckland Board employed her they will have a well qualified and experienced teacher. On returning to Wellington in 1892, I could not believe that I was in the same place I had left a few years before. The city had altered so much that I thought, if Wellington had made such progress, the capitation for schools must have increased proportionately. I was disappointed to find that it was not so. Reverting to equal pay for equal work, I think the female teachers are quite entitled to equal pay when they do the same work as men. In many instances females are our educational equals. They hold University degrees, they enter the legal and the medical professions, and I find, moreover, that women have business tact such as, I am sorry to say, is not always found in men. It has been said by some witnesses that women could teach very well up to the Fourth Standard. It had also been said that that standard is the most difficult. Then, if so, surely women could take the Fifth and Sixth Standards. Then, as to the ability of lady teachers to maintain discipline, I know of lady teachers who are quite competent to take charge of boys and girls in any standard. I know of one particular instance of a lady teacher whose discipline was excellent. When I was in Wellington on two occasions, two years ago, my pupil-teacher, a young lady, took charge of the school, and, though there were boys in that school who could give her a head in height, she managed the school excellently. They say that pupil-teachers do not get married; well, we have an Inspector who is not married. Many of our male teachers are not married. I do not say that young ladies are able to look after boys in their sports, nor could men, on the other hand, superintend the girls' sewing classes. Again, women might not be able to put boys through their drill, but they can exercise a very good homely influence over children which many men cannot do. I have noticed that boys do not aspire usually to become pupil-teachers, and I can well understand that. My experience is that many colonial boys do not care for constant study. That is particularly the case in the country schools. I asked one boy the reason of this (he had been in a printing-office, and from that went in as a pupil-teacher), and he said, "I begin work preparing lessons at 7 a.m.; then I go into the school from 9 to 3; have probably an hour or two hours for recreation, and study again. It is study and work, study and work, all the time." "Why," said he, "after all, what standards do I take? I simply have up to Standard II. teaching simple addition, multiplication, and subtraction over and over again until I am tired of it." I think that is typical of the general rule. I find, too, that our boys are very independent as compared with English boys, and they are, as a rule, very precocious. The New Zealand boy is a thorough boy at heart, and a good boy at that. I find that there are many occupations or trades

which our boys prefer to the constant study that teaching demands. Boys prefer to go into an office for 10s. or 12s. a week, or to clean windows, than to teach at £20 a year, with no great prospect of advancement. It takes a boy many years to make a competency in the teaching profession. I was looking through our list of pupil-teachers the other day, and I found that out of seventy ex-pupil-teachers there were only eight males and no less than sixty-two females. Of fifth year pupil-teachers there were twenty-nine, three males and twenty-six females, the salary being £50 for males and £42 for females; of fourth year pupil-teachers there were twenty, one male and nineteen females, salary £45 for males and £36 for females. Other years showed: third, sixteen pupil-teachers, two males and fourteen females, salary £38 and £32 respectively; second year, thirteen pupil-teachers, one male and twelve females, salary £32 and £35; first year, one pupil-teacher, salary £25 (male) and £20 (female). Of probationers there are twenty, four males and sixteen females. This gives us 169 pupil-teachers, of which number only nineteen are males and no less than 150 females. I believe that in about twenty years we will have all female pupil-teachers, unless something is done to induce boys to enter the profession. I do not see why there should be any distinction between the salaries offered to the males and females. It is the levelling process in the matter of pay which is rousing opposition to the female teachers. It costs just as much for a woman to live and to complete her studies as for a man, and I fail to see why there should be any distinction made in the rate of pay. No such distinction is made in trades where equal work is done by the operatives, and why should it be done in the teaching profession? But let us look at another point. It would take a male five years probably before he got a school with, say, an average attendance of 25 or 26. It would take him another ten years before he got £150 a year, and by that time he would be about thirty years of age. One of the "plums" in the service is the headmastership of a town school, and the next best position, I think, is a first assistantship in a town.

The Chairman.] How often do those "plums" grow?

Mr. Joplin.] Well, a vacancy occurs when a headmaster dies. The hardest-worked teacher in the profession is the man with a school of from 70 to 75 children, and I will tell you why. He has a pupil-teacher under him who has the Second Standard. The master has Standard III. up to Standard VII., and he has to keep going all the subjects of these standards. He has to keep those subjects constantly in his mind, continuously running over the work, and spending half his time in a weak pupil-teachers' room to see that everything is going on all right. He has also the responsibility of meeting parents, the grievances of Committees and so on. How different the lot of the first assistant in the town school, receiving about £220 a year, with only one class to teach instead of four or five, as in a country school; besides which, he has opportunities of prosecuting his studies which the country master has not. In town the responsibility is taken off the shoulders of the assistant and put on the headmaster's. Another school, the master of which is underpaid, is the one with an average attendance of from 20 to 40. You do not get a pupil-teacher until you have an average of 41. The man with an average of 40 has to devote a great deal of his time to the work of the infant classes, and it is chiefly the infant classes which impede the work of the country master. As regards the cost of living, I find that to the suburban master rent is often a very heavy item where there is no teacher's residence. Take my own case. I was transferred from Mauriceville West to Wadestown. At Mauriceville, I received £205 a year, but on removing to Wadestown, I received £215 and £20 house allowance, making £235 in all, but £20 is not enough by any means. As a result, I stand to lose £44 a year. In the town schools they are allowed £50 a year house allowance. I recognise that one of the greatest difficulties that Boards have to contend with is to provide suitable residences for the teachers. Every teacher should be obliged to reside near his school. Another point is expense of removal. It cost me £10 to remove from Tenui to Mauriceville West, but I did not recover one penny of the expense from the Board. It cost me also £15 to remove from Mauriceville West to Wadestown, so I have £39 to make up with an increase of £10 a year. I would suggest that some provision be made for allowances to teachers when they are removing from one school to another. Referring again to the cost of living in the town and the country: I have a wife and family of six to maintain. Butter costs 1s. a lb. in Wellington, and 8d. in the country; flour costs 8s. 3d. per bag in town, and 9s. 3d. in the country; meat is about 5d. per lb. in the country, and about from 5d. to 8d. in the town. Clothing is a little cheaper in town, but as against that there is more wear and tear in town, and generally people dress better than in the country. In regard to the experiences of country teachers, I once saw an entry in a log-book by a struggling master. "What with the Government, Education Boards, Inspectors, parents, and children, I am betwixt the devil and the deep sea." My own experience of an Education Board is that, as employers, teachers could not have more considerate masters than the Wellington Board. If the Board has funds, and a teacher applies through his Committee for anything reasonable, he gets fair play. That has been my experience, and the same may be said of the Inspectors. One of the greatest demands upon the funds of Education Boards arises from the repairing of old school-buildings, and this will continue until the buildings are erected more substantially.

Mr. Luke: I thought the pay of pupil-teachers was fixed by Government regulations. I remember a case in Auckland where equal pay for the male and female pupil-teacher was insisted on. They would not approve of our regulations until we agreed to that.

Mr. Hogben: Since 1895 a policy has been adopted by which, in all cases of revision of the regulations, the pay for female pupil-teachers has been made equal to the pay for males. But this has not been allowed to interfere with regulations that have not been brought under revision.

1860. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Have you considered the suggested scale of staffs and salaries?—Yes, I have somewhat.

1861. Do you consider it an improvement on the present system?—I cannot say I think it is altogether an improvement.

1862. How many children could you teach in a country school?—I have taught 56.
1863. Efficiently?—Yes.
1864. Was the Inspector's report favourable?—Yes.
1865. How long ago was that?—About 1893 or 1894.
1866. With the system of classification in vogue, do you think you could teach that number?—Well, yes; but I do not propose doing to. Why should I when the Board allows a pupil-teacher?
1867. *The Chairman.*] If you got more pay you would consent to teach more scholars in proportion?—Yes.
1868. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Then, it is the pay which is not as good as you think it ought to be?—Yes, I think better salaries ought to be paid, though I would not say that better teachers would be secured. I know of two female teachers now willing to come into the city from the country schools for lower salaries than they are at present getting.
1869. Do you notice that there is a marked improvement for country salaries in the proposed colonial scale?—Not if the teacher is married and has a family, with insufficient house allowance. It is not an improvement in that case.
1870. Do you mean to say that the salary should depend on whether the teacher is married or not?—I do not want to discuss that. It is too wide a question.
1871. Do you consider it necessary to bring in the infant mistress at 41 instead of a pupil-teacher?—Yes, an assistant who has had experience is required in a school like that.
1872. Supposing it meant a decrease in your salary?—Ah, that is a different thing. When it touches the pocket I am just like others.
1873. You think that the work of country teachers is a good deal more arduous than that of town teachers?—Yes.
1874. Is that the reason you consider there is a reason to gravitate toward the town?—That is one reason, but the teacher also considers his family.
1875. Do you advocate substantial increases of salaries for teachers in country schools so as to induce the best class to go into the profession?—Yes.
1876. Which do you prefer—payment by grades or by units?—In a growing school I prefer units.
1877. With regard to expenses for removal: is it not a fact that you applied for a removal yourself?—Yes.
1878. You took into consideration that you would have to pay the cost of removing?—I thought some allowance would be made, as is done in Australia.
1879. You advocate equal pay for equal work?—Yes.
1880. Do females do the same work as male teachers?—Yes. As far as I know, lady teachers who are in charge of country schools do the same amount of work, except that they cannot superintend the boys' games.
1881. But do the male teachers in the country schools do that?—Well, I always do, and I know other teachers who do the same.
1882. Do you consider the present working average too low?—It does not affect me to any appreciable extent.
1883. *Mr. Hill.*] Did I understand you to say that teachers in the Old Country were not so well paid as those in New Zealand?—Yes; but I speak of fourteen years ago.
1884. Do you know what salaries the teachers in London are getting now?—No.
1885. Do you know what they are getting in Birmingham?—No.
1886. In Nottingham or Manchester?—No.
1887. I understood you to say that the standard of education in England is lower than in New Zealand?—Yes, that is relative to the Sixth Standard.
1888. Did you compare it with the average age?—No.
1889. You are not aware that the children in the Old Country pass their standards at a lower age?—No; but if they do it is because the work is easier.
1890. *Mr. Weston.*] Do you think that our pupil-teachers are receiving sufficient education?—Well, I cannot say, in a broad sense; but as I look at the work set for them by the Education Board I think they are receiving sufficient.
1891. Do you think that pupil-teachers should be working all day, the evening being employed in study?—No; I do not think any one is worth much after working all day.
1892. Do you think the sexes ought to be worked together in schools, or separately?—I do not think there is any advantage to be gained by working them separately.
1893. You would advocate the teaching of the sexes together?—Yes.
1894. What is, in your opinion, a living-wage for male and female certificated teachers in country schools: I want to know what you think should be the minimum wage?—For a young man, £100.
1895. And for a lady teacher?—The same; I believe in equal payment.
1896. Do you think lady teachers are qualified to take a school of, say, 40 children and teach all the standards?—Yes.
1897. What is your opinion in regard to sick-pay allowance?—If a man is married and has a family his household expenses go on just the same, and he should be paid accordingly.
1898. To what extent?—Full payment for a month; then, if not recovered, say, three-fourths the next month, and, say, one-half the third month. I do not see why a sick teacher should be turned adrift.
1899. What should be a compassionate allowance to the widow of a deceased teacher?—That, I think, should be allocated on the number of children she has, their age, and their earning ability.
1900. Each case should be controlled by circumstances?—Exactly.

1901. Have your schools in New Zealand been sufficiently equipped, kept clean, and in every sense provided for?—My experience is that the capitation is not sufficient; and as a result we have to get up concerts, &c., to supplement our funds.

1902. You think the incidental allowances insufficient?—Exactly.

1903. Are a sufficient number of scholarships granted by your Board?—In a growing district such as Wellington I think there ought to be two or three more scholarships. The number is not sufficient at present.

1904. Should country children have an advantage of, say, a year in age when competing against children of town schools?—Yes, I think it would be advisable; but it must not be forgotten that such a school as Masterton ranks the same as a town school.

1905. But I refer to small schools.—I do not know why the difference should be a year. If the teachers are working properly, and complying with the syllabus, I do not see why it should be necessary to give such an advantage. At Mauriceville I had three or four children whom I considered quite strong enough for scholarships, but their parents said they preferred to find work for the children at home.

1906. But do you think that, considering the circumstances of some of the small country schools, an allowance of one year should be made?—Taking everything into consideration I must say yes.

1907. *The Chairman.*] Do you think that pupils in the country schools are receiving fair treatment? Is the work of probationers such as they can easily overtake, or is it excessive?—I think that where they are teaching and studying at the same time too much is demanded of them.

1908. Have you ever known cases of young and promising pupil-teachers breaking down under the strain of brain-work?—I cannot say that I remember any such case.

1909. Have you heard complaints of the strain of work?—When first-year pupil-teachers were appointed to my school they complained about being expected to study and teach at the same time. It would be better if pupil-teachers before entering the service were required to pass some standard examination for entrance. No girl should be allowed to teach under the age of seventeen years.

1910. You think they are sent to work when too young?—Yes.

1911. Are pupil-teachers sufficiently paid in this district?—No; I do not think they are. I have three boys of my own and some girls, and none of them would enter the teaching profession as it is now.

1912. What do you think would be a fair and reasonable remuneration for pupil-teachers?—If residing at home, they ought to get £30 a year to begin with.

1913. What increase each year would you give him: would you give him a £20 increase?—No. I would pay, say, £30, £35, £42, and then £52, because by that time the teacher would be about twenty or twenty-one years of age, and would have received experience and education equivalent to an apprenticeship in a trade.

1914. Having passed their apprenticeship as pupil-teachers, do you think a preparatory course of training necessary before granting a certificate?—Yes; because while they are merely pupil-teachers, in such schools as I have had charge of, we have not had the time to give them a practical insight into the real work of teaching. With the master in one room and the pupil-teacher in another, as is now often the case, there must be a sacrifice somewhere.

1915. Now, from your long and varied experience can you say whether there is one class of teacher which you think worse paid than any others. Take, for instance, this district, town and country combined: what class of teacher ought to have a considerable advance in salary?—Well, teachers in the country with schools of an average under 100—say, from 65 to 100—ought to get at the very least £225 a year. Then, in schools of from 50 to 65 the masters should get at least £205. As regards schools having an average of 41 to 50, I do not think that any teachers ought to get less than £175. For an average below that, even aided schools, I do not think any one should get under £100.

1916. You think £100 should be the minimum fee even in the case of aided schools?—Yes. A teacher must live; and consider, too, what he sacrifices by going back far into the country, into isolated parts.

JAMES ROBERTSON, Member of the Wellington Education Board, examined.

Mr. Robertson: I have not gathered from the reports which have appeared in the newspapers whether you seek to get from witnesses what they consider to be an ideal scale of salaries for teachers, or whether you are trying to make a just proportion on a £4 basis. I thought that your duties in Wellington would have been easier, because some time ago the Teachers' Institute, when discussing the question of salaries, pointed out what they considered to be some of the injustices, and the chairman stated that the injustices were so great that those teachers in receipt of the higher salaries would be prepared to make a sacrifice in order to adjust the differences. However, I have not seen anything of such a sacrifice so far. On the contrary, every one seems to be fighting for his own end. I believe in a colonial scale of salaries if it will make the teachers more content with their lot, and I do not think that the difference of living throughout the colony is so very great but that a uniform scale could be drawn up. There would naturally be some items of expenditure greater in some respects. I read lately that a third assistant master in Wellington said it cost him £150 for house-rent. If that is true, then, to my mind, we have in the service of our Board a young man who is living beyond his means, as houses can be got for half that money. I recognise that there are certain disadvantages in connection with a colonial scale. It may be that the majority of teachers will be protected from the necessities of Boards; yet, on other hand, if a colonial scale is adopted, Boards will not be able to deal with

special cases of hardship as they have done in the past. In the Wellington Education Board we very frequently break our own regulations in order that teachers in out-districts should get better pay. Under a fixed colonial scale that would be impossible, and to that extent teachers would suffer. Another point in connection with a colonial scale is that if teachers are assured of their salaries free from any chance of reduction they cannot expect to get the same remuneration as is given to other members of the community whose incomes are fluctuating. If teachers get a colonial scale of pay, even on the present basis, they would be in a better position than they are at present. If it will tend to make teachers better, then let them have it, providing, however, that the Education Boards retain the power of making appointments. I see no objection to a colonial scale so long as the Board has the power of making appointments. I should like to throw in my lot with those country teachers who say that schools with an average attendance of 75 ought to be paid as much as the first assistant in a city school. I have always thought that the first assistant in a city school holds one of the best positions in the service. I heard a first assistant say in evidence that he had to organize in his school. Well, that seemed to me to be a reflection on his chief, the headmaster. I cannot understand why an assistant should have so much organizing. He cannot have as much as the country master with an average attendance of 75. Furthermore, the headmaster has the responsibility of classification. Perhaps the Inspector expects a higher standard of work from the first assistant of the city school than he does from the master of the country school. In the city schools, too, Committees attach a great deal of importance to the average of scholarships gained; but I might say here that the average of scholarship awards in the city schools is pretty regular. No particular school seems to preponderate in this direction. We seem to expect a first assistant to be something of a specialist in preparing candidates for these scholarships, and probably that service ought to be paid for. It is worthy of consideration, too, that the country master must be the social equal of professional men—the doctor, the clergyman, and the lawyer—and to that extent he is put to an expenditure which the assistant in the city school need not incur unless he chooses. As to the rates of pay for male and female teachers, I may say that I do not think women are equal to men as teachers. I know that equal pay is unanswerable as a proposition, but when it is applied to the teaching profession it is simply begging the question. I think the female teacher makes her boys effeminate; they get into namby-pamby kind of ways that have to be knocked out of them in the playground. Women have far more violent likes and dislikes than men, and quite 90 per cent. of the complaints as between parents and children arise from actions of female teachers. I do not think they are so capable physically either, though the Boards may be to blame for that: we, perhaps, overwork them. Then, again, the Education Boards have to keep a far larger staff of female teachers on account of sickness than would be the case if males were employed exclusively. Marriage was another important factor affecting women teachers. Marriage binds a man more securely to the Board's service, but, in the case of female teachers, it means the loss of an apprentice that the Board has been at considerable expense to train. With reference to the payment of females, I would make an exception so far as the smaller schools are concerned—say, up to 40—where the children have to travel long distances and remain in the custody of the teacher. I think the girl is the better guardian than the young man in these cases, and therefore such teachers ought to be paid at the same rate as a man. The great difference between the two sexes is that women did not seriously go into the profession as a life-long career. They rather make a convenience of it until something better turns up. I have read of a female teacher in our own service, a B.A., who said she was getting only £80 a year; but I have no hesitation in saying that if she had applied for a country school she would have had one. The whole trouble was, the girls will not go into the country if they can help it. In the event of applications being invited for a position in a town school, I could, before opening the envelope, mention the names of at least ten who would be applicants. The ten applications would be from girls in the country, but it would be the rarest thing possible to get the girl in town to apply for a country school, and, unfortunately, these girls are best fitted educationally for the service. They are the best equipped, but they will not go into the country. Humanely speaking, I do not blame them; but when you look at it from an economic and educational point of view, it proves that the females are not so valuable as men, who have less objection to going into the country. As a consequence of this, the country schools are not so well staffed as they otherwise might be. The country girl's social ideas are not so large as the city girl's. The country girls do not consider it *infra dig.* to go and live with settlers, because, as a rule, their own parents are settlers. I think Inspectors should be under the control of the department. As things are now, an Inspector does not make recommendations for changes and improvements in the style of teaching. He is frightened because he thinks the Board's funds, perhaps, will not permit the carrying-out of his recommendations, and this is particularly true with regard to making reports as to the condition of school-buildings. I say the Inspector is hampered in making his report if he knows that the Board has not the funds to give effect to his recommendations. I think that Inspectors should be removable from one place to another periodically, and I say this because I have a feeling that the quality of education throughout the colony differs very much. The variation is not indicated by the number of passes that are obtained, the percentage being fairly equal. But it seems to me that every Inspector must set up a certain ideal in his mind, and a man of a higher mental calibre will set up a higher ideal. Therefore I believe that by making Inspectors removable a better average of education will be obtained throughout the colony. Further, I think the Inspector-General should be an officer who examines schools himself. He should visit all the districts to see for himself what the general average is. If there was such an official, his annual report would be a much more valuable document than it is now. Under the present system you have in the Inspector-General's report only a review of the state of education as it appears to the local Inspectors. There is no grouping of the whole of the education of the

colony. Ever since our education system started I can remember only two really comprehensive reports upon it: one presented by Sir Robert Stout when Minister for Education, and a report prepared by Dr. Laishley for the Atkinson Government. Some of the witnesses have spoken as to the amount of capitation granted to School Committees. I, myself, think that at the present time the capitation allowance is too small, and it is becoming of even less value. With the progress of the colony—due largely to the dairy industry—settlers are becoming more independent, and many wives of settlers no longer care to undertake the duties of char-woman at the schools, and, to meet the difficulty, girls have sometimes formed working-bees after school-hours to clean and tidy-up the school. I believe that the capitation allowance for Committees would be better spent nowadays if the Board undertook the maintenance and cleaning of the schools. I am quite aware of the cost of sending men into the country for this purpose, but still I think it would be better to keep a few plumbers and carpenters here and there. I believe the Committees would readily sacrifice a certain portion of their capitation if the Boards would undertake to keep the schools in good order and repair in this way. In connection with the Inspectors, possibly one objection to their removal as I have suggested is that they would not be so well able to arrange the classification. I can quite understand that Inspectors must be familiar with a teacher's work, but I think there could very well be a reform in the present method of classification. There are certain differences that might be abolished. I have not met a man yet who could tell the value of a certificate from the numerals as used in the present form. I think such minute divisions are a mere affectation at being exact. Take the division of E5. I understand that numbers are given by the Inspectors to denote certain qualities from "excellent" to "tolerable," and so on. Now, it seems to me to be a farce to attempt to express human qualities in numbers. I do not believe in these minute divisions which, under the present method, the Inspector makes, and I think much depends upon the mood which the Inspector happens to be in at the time. With reference to certificates, I do not attach much importance to a degree, unless it has been obtained by passing through a secondary school and by keeping terms at a university. I find that degrees obtained through private or solitary study do not, as a rule, give culture. Unless such studies make a man at least a gentleman, the degree obtained has not a high value. I find that teachers are not so badly equipped in literature, but they are terribly deficient in the knowledge of men and things. If plenty of money was available it would be a splendid thing to send our teachers away on a tour as part of their training, as was at one time the custom, I believe, in Germany, where it was considered that no young man's apprenticeship was complete until he had travelled. It is not surprising if teachers who are talking to children all day long, day after day, come to regard the whole world as a lot of children.

1917. *Mr. Davidson.*] You believe in the principle of a colonial scale of salary?—Yes.

1918. I understand you to say that this Commission need not take into consideration the difference in the cost of living in drawing up a scale?—Yes, that is so.

1919. If this Commission could draw up a scale of staffing and salaries, and the Boards retained the power of transferring or dismissal, do you think that inequalities would be removed, and that the best interests of education would be served?—Yes.

1920. You think the headmaster of a school of an average of 75 should be paid as much as the first assistant in a city or suburban school?—Yes.

1921. Have you seen the alternative scale?—No.

1922. Well, the alternative scale seems to fit in with what you suggest; it is pretty nearly on the same lines?—Yes; but what I feared was that the country teachers' salaries were going to be brought down.

1923. Are you aware that, of 147 schools in the Wellington District, seventy-seven are in the grade under 35 of average attendance?—Yes.

1924. The same would apply generally throughout the colony?—Probably.

1925. It is that class of schools which should be carefully provided for?—I think the schools which require nursing are the schools with an average of from 15 to 40 or 45.

1926. In the grade of 25 to 30 the salary paid by the Wellington Board is £100, but in the suggested scale it would be raised to £130 and £140. There is, again, an improvement for the schools of from 30 to 40 averages?—Yes, I believe in those increases. The proper thing would be to treat the whole district as one large school, saving out of the large schools to support the smaller.

1927. You did not think it was the duty of the first assistant to organize?—I say it is the duty of the headmaster.

1928. Then, if the statement made is true the assistant is doing the work of the headmaster?—I say it is a reflection on his chief.

1929. Have you any idea how many female teachers the Wellington Board employs?—I say we have to employ 10 per cent. more females than if our schools were staffed by males.

1930. Of the number of females who are trained, how many leave the service?—Well, not many, because there is not a great leakage from marriage.

1931. It has been stated that, of those trained for the service, four females to every one male leave the service?—I do not know that. I repeat, however, that female teachers are not so valuable, because they do leave the service earlier than men.

1932. I understood you to say that women require sick-leave much more frequently than men, and for longer periods?—Yes; I say that women are not physically up to the work demanded of them. I think we break them down during the pupil-teachership period.

1933. Are women teachers in the Wellington District underpaid?—Yes; there is too great a discrepancy between their pay and that of the men. I think a differentiation of 10 per cent. would be sufficient.

1934. You would decrease the disparity?—Yes, exactly.

1935. Supposing Inspectors were placed under the charge of a central department, and regulations made whereby their advice on any educational question should be given to the Boards when necessary, do you think that would in any way weaken the power of the Board?—Perhaps not, so long as no other power was taken from the Board.

1936. I mean that the Board should still have the power to appoint, transfer, or remove teachers. The advice of Inspectors would be available to the Boards: would the Boards be weakened by such an arrangement?—I do not think so. It would improve the position. I think it would be better if the Inspectors were free of the Board, so as to remove the tendency which at present exists to give way to the Board. I think an Inspector would be a freer agent under the control of a department, provided the department would use judgment in making a selection.

1937. Would you make it a condition that the department must remove Inspectors periodically?—Yes.

1938. Would you limit the time of an Inspector's stay in one place to, say, three or five years?—I would say five years.

1939. What sick-allowances are given in Wellington?—We give a month on full pay.

1940. It has been suggested that, pending the introduction of some scheme of retiring-allowances for teachers, it would be advisable to provide some allowance for over sixty years of age; a month's salary for each year of service: would that be a good thing?—Yes. A teacher in our service retired of his own will, and we gave him six months.

1941. You made a suggestion about repairs to school-buildings; have you heard that such a system has been in use in other districts for some years?—No.

1942. Well, such is the case, and it has given satisfaction. Now, regarding appointments to country schools, supposing a school with an average of about 50 was vacant, would that be open to female teachers?—Yes.

1943. Do you get a fair proportion of lady applicants in such cases?—Yes.

1944. What is the experience of the Board in the matter?—It is quite a common experience for the Board to receive from a Committee the request, "We want a male teacher." One reason given is that female teachers cannot control the boys so well. At any rate, she does it in a different way; she cajoles them, and, though she gets the same result, it is done in a way that is not so good or the boy ultimately.

1945. You complain that a great many lady teachers prefer to remain in the towns?—Yes.

1946. Can you tell me the largest school you have in charge of a lady teacher?—The Girls' School at Mount Cook, Wellington.

1947. I am referring to country schools?—The highest average is something under 150.

1948. Do you think a colonial scale would be an advantage if adopted, provided the Boards retained the control and appointing of teachers?—Yes.

1949. You said you thought Inspectors would feel it rather objectionable to recommend an expenditure when they knew the Board to be short of funds?—Yes.

1950. What do you mean to imply by that?—I think the Inspectors would feel it as a loss of status to report something which they had reason to believe the Board would not do.

1951. *Mr. Luke.*] You said the social standing of a teacher in the country was different to that of the teacher in town. I would like you to explain, as that is quite new to me?—I say that the teacher in the town does not occupy relatively the same social position as the head-teacher in the country school. The latter is probably the best-educated man in the community or district. He is made a confidant, and his advice is often sought; for the uneducated man generally seeks the educated and consults him, so that in that way the country teacher holds a more important position. Like the clergyman, his conduct is under the scrutiny of the whole community, and this is but another reason why the profession is not so attractive to young men. On the other hand, the teacher in the city is to a large extent swallowed up among many.

1952. You said you did not consider the teaching given by women to be equal to that given by men: are you aware that Inspectors' reports and the testimony of parents go to show that the teaching by women in the colony is excellent—helps to mould the character and encourage chivalry and everything that is good in boys?—Yes; but I do not admit that the Inspector is the ultimate judge of education. The real result of education is found later in life.

1953. I cannot agree with you there. You said that a certain lady who told us she was receiving £80 a year might have had a country school if she had applied?—Yes; that lady is at a school at Roseneath, a suburb of Wellington. She is in one of the best schools in the district, and the Board would have been glad to have got the services of one of her type for a country school.

1954. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Does the Wellington Board recognise that too many country schools are established?—Yes.

1955. Would you favour an Inspector having power to refuse a teacher's certificate or to reduce it?—Yes.

1956. According to the Inspector's report to the Wellington Board, Inspectors are consulted in the selection of pupil-teachers: is that so?—Yes; but the power to appoint rests with the Board.

1957. Does that system work satisfactorily?—Well, it has only been in vogue about twelve months.

1958. Does the Board consult the Inspectors in regard to claims for the establishment of new school districts for outlying schools?—Yes, invariably. It is, I might say, the fault of our method that the only report the Board sees from its Inspectors is their annual report. Other periodical reports are laid on the table; but with the limited time we have we do not see them, and we do not know that we have been ignoring Inspectors' recommendations until we see the annual report.

1959. With regard to the proposed capitation, you know that we are restricted to £4 a head, and under the scale drawn up that capitation will entirely disappear?—Yes; I imagine that under a colonial scale the annual appropriation will vary. You cannot confine yourself within certain limits, and that was our trouble when the department gave us so-much, so we created anomalies in order to use up the money.

1960. With reference to the establishment of small schools, do you think the Legislature should lay down a minimum, below which schools ought not to be established? Suppose we lay down as a rule that unless the average is, say, 20, 15, or 10 a school shall not be established in which the teacher is to be paid according to this scale?—Yes; that is the present system. Where the average is less than 15 we give them all the capitation, and help them in other ways. We send them money for a room.

1961. Do you advocate that teachers should be appointed solely by the Board?—Yes, after consultation with the Committees. I think the ultimate power of appointment should rest with the Board.

1962. Is it not a fact that teachers who are known to members of School Committees are likely to be selected, irrespective of their merits?—They are frequently recommended.

1963. Is it not the case sometimes that after teachers have been recommended by the Board for appointment Committees still oppose the appointment?—Yes; but I do not find that the opposition lasts any length of time. Committeemen, as a rule, are fair-minded, and a teacher, who is worth his salt, generally lives down the opposition.

1964. What about transfers?—I do not think we transfer teachers without consultation.

1965. Do you consider a transfer is tantamount to a new appointment?—Yes.

1966. Do Boards give preference to female teachers for economic reasons?—Yes.

1967. If female teachers' salaries were raised, would preference then be given to men?—Yes, I think that would be the case ultimately.

1968. Do you consider that there should be a percentage arranged on a sliding-scale, increasing in difference according to the amount of salary paid?—Yes, something of that sort might be arranged; but I would not say that under any circumstances I would make the difference as much as 25 per cent.

1969. Have you a staff of relieving-teachers?—There are two relieving-teachers.

1970. Are they getting a regular salary?—Yes.

1971. How does that system work?—It is imperative with us in order to keep the schools staffed and to fill vacancies.

1972. Have you any difficulty in enforcing the Truancy Act in this district?—Well, I think the establishment of a Truant Officer was a mistake. I believe that he does get a number of truants in; but, on the other hand, the effect is to educate parents to know what a "half-timer" is. The parents got to know the law and then continued to take advantage of it.

1973. With regard to the proposed allowance in the suggested scale of 11s. 3d., do you consider that sufficient?—I cannot estimate that.

1974. Committees complain now that the allowance is insufficient, and we have heard that they have to supplement their funds in various ways?—Yes, that is so.

1975. Would you favour the establishment of a training-school for teachers?—That is a matter I do not know a great deal about. I can only conceive a teacher being trained for his profession among the pupils. The real training must be gained in the public schools, although I recognise the disadvantage of taking a headmaster from his work for this purpose. I would put a training-teacher in public schools, whose duty it would be to instruct pupil-teachers there. I think you have a splendid training-school in Canterbury. We have nothing like it here. If Inspectors were shifted about, then we would know all about these points.

1976. With regard to centralisation of Inspectors, you are aware that the Inspectors themselves in conference passed a resolution in favour of centralisation?—No, I was not aware of that.

1977. With regard to applications from outside this district, does the Wellington Board endeavour to promote its own teachers, and so discourage applications from outside, or does the Board place all on the same footing?—We have so many teachers of about equal merit that, in order to avoid jealousy, we have frequently to go outside; but, as a rule, we prefer to promote our own teachers when we can. If there should be an outsider head and shoulders above the others in merit we would appoint him. North Canterbury alone is turning out enough teachers to staff the whole colony.

1978. That is so; but it is hardly fair to your own teachers, is it?—That is what I say myself.

1979. Well, supposing you had a training-school?—I am not saying anything against a training-college.

1980. How long have you been a member of the Education Board?—Six years.

1981. You are not acquainted with the earlier doings of the Board?—As a School Committeeman I knew something about the Boards.

1982. How long were you a School Committeeman?—About ten or twelve years.

1983. Then, you have seen great changes in educational matters in this district?—I have not seen any changes, except perhaps the tendency towards technical instruction. Education has been rather stagnant.

1984. You mean there has been very little progress?—Yes. I cannot point to anything new. Mr. Lee introduced the teaching of science experimentally. Except as to this, drawing, and the teaching of cookery, I cannot say I have seen any change during twenty years.

1985. Are you not aware that demands upon the Boards are more numerous now?—Yes, that is so.

1986. You know that capitation is less than it was?—It is less than it was many years ago.

1987. And yet demands have increased?—Yes.
1988. You think that a colonial scale of pay is desirable in the interests of the teacher?—Yes.
1989. Would it be better for the whole body of teachers?—Yes.
1990. It is proposed to pay capitation of £4?—Yes.
1991. And out of that it is proposed that 11s. 3d. shall be reserved for distribution by Boards?—Yes.
1992. You think the functions of Boards will be minimised by the adoption of a salary scale as proposed?—I think not.
1993. Supposing that School Committees were to demand that the distribution of this 11s. 3d. should be according to scale, or that the central department should prepare a scale so that the Boards should have nothing to do with it, would that make a difference to the Boards?—I would not be in favour of granting that. The Board is continuous, whereas Committees are broken every twelve months. I think a body that is not a corporate body should not have control of buildings, for instance.
1994. Do not a number complain of not getting an equal share of the capitation?—Yes.
1995. Would they complain even if you gave them more?—I do not think so. They complain that they have too little to do.
1996. You do not think that the drawing-up of a colonial scale will limit the functions of your Board?—No; I think we are assisting you to do it.
1997. Yet you think the functions of the Board would be limited if the 11s. 3d. were to be taken away?—I would not agree to that.
1998. Do you not think the Committees could set up a claim, and say they too must be considered?—No. I do not think they have such a strong position as the teachers.
1999. Are they not very much concerned as to the character of the teachers, or as to the quality of the teachers they get?—Yes.
2000. Would you take away from the Committee the right of control in their own districts?—No. On the contrary, I would, as I have said, rather give increased responsibilities to Committees. I think Boards might consult them more fully in regard to making appointments of teachers. I would recommend reversing the present method, and send the names of all applicants to the Committees to make a first selection, the Board to have the power of confirming such selection or not. I believe this would give more satisfaction.
2001. How do you reconcile that view with what you told Mr. Gilfedder—that Boards should have the right of moving teachers from one place to another?—I said it would be more convenient for the Boards to have such right. At the present time a transfer is really a new appointment, as was proven the other day in the Nelson case.
2002. You say that women do not like going into the country: is that so?—Yes.
2003. They prefer to remain in the town, even at a lower salary?—Yes.
2004. Is it the same in the case of female pupil-teachers trained in the country?—Oh, no. Really you might say there are two staffs in the service of the Board—a country staff and a town staff. There is not the same desire on the part of city girls to go into the country as for country girls to come into town.
2005. Is not that because of the educational advantages in the town?—Yes; and the social advantages.
2006. The social or the educational, which?—Well, say, both.
2007. Suppose that some provision should be made to supply the educational needs of the pupil-teachers in the country so as to adapt their training to the peculiar needs of the country, and also some plan so as to adapt the training of the town pupil to the needs of the town: do you think that such provision would be preferable to the present system?—No; I think that would be bad at the present time. We already differentiate in scholarship-work as between town and country, and that is a recognition which I think is most deplorable. I think such a method as you suggest would intensify the evil.
2008. Do you not think that there are subjects for country children which would be better omitted, but left in for the town children?—Well, some such provision as that is being made in the technical-education system. I do not think you will get specialisation out of teachers who are expected to teach standards.
2009. You approve of a differentiation in the pay of men and women?—Yes.
2010. You do not favour separate schools for the sexes?—No, I do not; I think the establishment of a girls' school is a mistake.
2011. You think mixed schools would be far better in the interests of education?—Yes; I think the association of the sexes would be a mutual gain.
2012. Do you recognise that women can teach the Sixth Standard?—Yes; there are girls doing that work.
2013. Ought they not to get the same salary as men?—I say they do the same amount of work, but I doubt if the quality is the same.
2014. You would recognise that an equality of work should have an equality of remuneration?—Yes.
2015. You express an opinion, in your able remarks, that the Inspector-General of Schools should be required to inspect schools; I would like a little further light upon that subject: what is your general opinion?—I think I said that any one desiring to understand the educational system goes to the E.-1 report, and all that is to be seen therein is the report of local Inspectors. The general intelligence of the children, their manners, and discipline varies throughout the colony. A great deal depends upon the individual who inspects them. His opinions are embodied in the one report presented by the Inspector-General; but, apart from that, there should be a man of a philo-

sophical type of mind making one review of the state of education throughout the colony. He should be in constant touch with the various parts.

2016. Have you read a report of the Royal Commission on education in Victoria? There is a recommendation in the report on the lines you suggest?—I have not heard of that recommendation in that report.

2017. With regard to the classification of teachers, you feel that the present system is cumbersome?—I feel that it is valueless.

2018. If a man obtains a diploma in any of the professions, what is it that makes his success in life—his diploma or his skill?—His skill.

2019. The diploma merely represents a certain amount of knowledge in a certain profession or calling?—Yes.

2020. And the teacher's certificate should do the same?—Yes.

2021. Is that what you mean?—Yes. I say there should be fewer certificates, but they should express more; as, for instance, D1 ought to imply that the teacher had been previously in charge of a school. There ought to be some certificate which would indicate that the holder had had charge of a school.

2022. Really, the certificates do not tell you that the holder is a trained teacher?—No, they do not.

2023. Do you think that self-reliance is a good quality, and that it should be fostered in the public schools?—Yes.

2024. You think it is a good quality, and that teachers should encourage self-reliance as much as possible?—Yes.

2025. You are aware that many teachers in the country are very much isolated: they are unable to obtain those educational advantages which men and women in the town have?—Yes.

2026. Supposing you find a man or woman situated in this condition, and that man or woman by utilising his or her time succeeded in passing, say, the C examination, would you give credit to that teacher? Remember, the study has all been done by himself or herself: would you give him credit for trying to raise himself?—Most certainly.

2027. Now, then, is there any difference between that credit and the credit due to a graduate who at very heavy cost of his own labour and effort obtains his diploma in the university: do you not think that self-reliance is shown here?—Yes, certainly.

2028. Why do you disparage the obtaining of a diploma by solitary study?—I expressed my regret that the result of solitary study was not the same as when the student had kept terms at the university. I contend that the man that has been trained at Oxford or Cambridge has, as a rule, far more culture than the student who studies alone. As to the success of solitary study, all the more credit to those teachers who show their perseverance; but I repeat that the result is not the same. I most certainly do not disparage any such study, rather the reverse.

2029. Which do you think is the better quality—self-reliance or culture?—Self-reliance is better for the individual, perhaps, but it does not follow that he imparts that same quality to others.

2030. *Mr. Weston.*] You advocate the centralisation of Inspectors: do you not think that, while that may be excellent in theory, it would be a little difficult in practice?—It might be.

2031. In the event of the advice of an Inspector being required as to the removal or otherwise of a teacher, or as to the condition of a school, would it not take more time, and occasion more difficulty, in applying for that information if the Inspectors were located at Wellington?—But I understand there would be no difference in the location of the Inspectors, or as regards their duties.

2032. Where, in practice, would be the difference, then, compared with their present position?—Well, for one thing, I do not think they would be so dependent on the will of the wishes of the Boards. At the present time they are amenable to the Boards. I think they ought to make their recommendations irrespective of whether they were likely to be given effect to or not. It seems to me that the Government Inspector would be more independent in that respect.

2033. Do you mean to convey the impression that Inspectors are so degraded as to pander to the wishes of the Board?—Oh, no; I never knew an Inspector to pander yet; but I believe, all the same, that an Inspector likes to keep good friends with the Board.

2034. Would he not be liable, through political influence, to be worked upon?—He might pander to the particular Government in power, and that is, I think, the strongest objection that can be urged against an appointment made by the department. It would be very unfortunate if a political man, or a strong sectarian, were appointed.

2035. In order that we may thoroughly understand each other, is it your opinion that an Inspector should be located for a certain number of years in a particular district, although he might be an officer of the General Government?—Yes, that was what I suggested.

2036. If the Inspectors are to be made General Government officers, would it not be better for those gentlemen to vary their circuits, so that different districts might have the advantage of different inspections from year to year?—That is what I advocate.

2037. I understood you to say that as Inspectors grow old so they would become weak and apt to overlook faults in the teachers and in the schools: would not that apply also to Inspectors even though they were Government officers?—No; in the one case the man grows grey amongst the colleagues of his youth, in the other case he would have to distribute them all over the colony instead of in his own district.

2038. With regard to capitation, do you advocate the payment of a fair and reasonable salary to teachers of all grades and classes?—Yes.

2039. Then, I presume you regard a particular capitation grant as being quite outside the calculation of this Commission or the Government?—I would consider the money spent on this

Commission wasted if the Commission did not make a recommendation apart from considerations of what it might cost.

2040. In the past have your Board's incidental allowances to Committees been sufficient for their requirements?—No.

2041. Were they materially insufficient?—No, I would not go to that extent.

2042. Do you consider that in the past the building grant to your Board has been enough?—No, it has not; and as one result we have had to keep salaries down in order to maintain buildings.

2043. You have diverted part of your maintenance funds for building purposes?—Yes.

2044. Are your buildings now occasioning considerable outlay for actual repairs?—Yes.

2045. Are those repairs likely to increase from wear-and-tear in the immediate future?—Certainly, as the buildings grow older.

2046. What do you consider should be the minimum salary for male and female certificated teachers in your district?—I think teachers ought to be in something the same position as the tradesmen—that is to say, when a young man is out of his apprenticeship he should get 10s. a day.

2047. What, in your opinion, should be the minimum?—I would not offer a man less than £150 a year.

2048. And the same for young ladies?—No; I would give them less.

2049. What should be the difference between the two?—I think, about 10 per cent.

2050. Have you considered a very important matter in connection with our business, at any rate—namely, the possibility of the present system of education breaking down from its great cost?—No; I do not fear that for a single moment. I believe this is the one expenditure that the people think they are getting their value for.

2051. So that, whatever it costs to give teachers a fair and equitable salary, you think it should be done?—Yes.

2052. And you think Parliament will assist to that end?—This Parliament or the next will do so at the next election.

2053. With regard to certificates, if a teacher has a certificate showing that the foundation has been laid you think that would be enough to work upon?—Yes; I believe in lessening the number of certificates.

2054. If you left it in that way, then there would be no necessity for what you suggested—viz., a certificate to allege the fact that the teacher had had charge of a school?—I would lessen the number, but I would express more in the certificate.

2055. You know that a lawyer gets a certificate?—He gets an authority to practise.

2056. And with that foundation he goes his way rejoicing or not, as the case may be: should not that same principle be applied in the case of a teacher?—Yes.

2057. Then, what becomes of your suggestion that upon a certificate it should be stated whether a man had been in charge of a school: is that necessary?—Yes; I do not think you can treat the teacher exactly in the same way as the lawyer. I think there ought to be one or two classifications for teachers. A lawyer cannot be said to be in a service, and the public can go to him or not, just as they please but in the case of teachers they are limited; and have a certain work to perform. I think the teacher's capacity ought to be expressed in the form of classification.

2058. You said just now that you would like to see the Committees possess more power, and also that they should make the first selection from the applicants for appointment as teacher?—Yes.

2059. It has not occurred to you that the Boards, with the Inspectors behind them, and the reports in their possession, should be better able to lead rather than to follow the Committee?—I do not think you are discriminating between selection and appointment.

2060. With the knowledge that a Board necessarily possesses, and the records it has as to the ability of teachers; and with the Inspectors behind them, should they not be in a position to guide the Committee?—No; I think it would educate the Committees if you gave them the opportunity of making the first selection. I would try to improve their position by making their election good for, say, three years. Give them a longer experience.

2061. Do you not think local influences would be brought to bear?—Not more than at present.

2062. Supposing that the Board did not approve of the Committee's selection, there would naturally be very great trouble?—Well, there is the same conflict now.

2063. But would not the conflict be less if the Board, with all its knowledge, gave reasons for its selection?—Boards give no reasons.

2064. With regard to what you said just now about the male and female teachers, would you advocate, in the formation of a scale of staffing, that the Board should have a discretionary power to appoint either a male or a female teacher to any vacancy that might arise rather than that there should be a rigid scale requiring under certain circumstances a master and in other circumstances a mistress?—I think we have asked the cream of the country to prepare a colonial scale. Therefore you will have a fuller knowledge than Boards.

2065. I ask you whether, in your opinion, it would be better to manufacture a rigid scale providing that in certain circumstances a master or mistress should be appointed, or whether discretion should be left to a Board to appoint a master or a mistress according to the circumstances, as they think fit?—I think that would be giving Boards a greater responsibility. I do not want Boards to lose any of their responsibility. The rate of salary should be according to scale. I approve of appointments in that way.

2066. Supposing that the discretion existed, and that we might put either a male or a female into a particular school, and that we elected to appoint a female, would you give the female, in that event, the same amount of salary as would be given to a male?—No; I would not pay the position; I would pay the individual when it comes to a question of the sexes.

2067. Do you think there should be any difference in the teaching of pupil-teachers in town and those in the country?—No; I say that merely certificated teachers cannot be specialists. I would give all pupil-teachers a general training.

2068. Would it not operate in this way: that if you gave them special training in the country they might be unsuitable for positions in town schools?—That would be so.

2069. Would it be advisable to give special subjects to children who might for the moment only be living in country districts?—The whole theory of technical instruction is to train children in accordance with their surroundings.

2070. But technical instruction would come later?—I agree with you most thoroughly in that. I think it is most unfortunate that we are, as I consider, interfering with the general system of education, and altering our time-tables in favour of technical education, which cannot be properly taught in the primary schools. Such instruction as that should come afterwards—say, at continuation schools.

2071. You consider that the mind should be prepared, strengthened, tuned, and made fit to receive special knowledge?—Yes.

2072. If we are to have manual and technical instruction introduced into our schools, do you not think it would be essential to have special teachers for these special subjects, or to have our school-teachers specially instructed so as to enable them to give such teaching?—It is expecting too much of the certificated teachers to require them to do that. I am in favour of giving drawing instruction, and as much science as you can get into the child, but it must be a general training.

2073. You said just now that you could not get girls to go into the country to teach; and that, on the other hand, the country girls wish to come into the town?—Yes.

2074. Could not the evil be remedied by giving Boards the absolute power to deal with teachers, and place them where they think fit?—No; there might be another remedy.

2075. What remedy?—Well, the Boards, if firm enough, might say that refusal on the part of the teachers meant dismissal.

2076. Would it not be for the benefit of the country schools that our scale, if possible, should be so framed as to induce those teachers who have acquired useful knowledge in our town schools to migrate to the country?—Yes.

2077. Would that be beneficial to the country at large?—Yes.

2078. What is your opinion with regard to sick-pay for teachers?—The Wellington Board's arrangement is, I think, a fair thing; the Board gives a month's salary, and after that the teacher loses it, but their position is kept open for them.

2079. Suppose a teacher has been with you ten or fifteen years, and falls ill, say, for a few months, would it not be fair to give him more extended pay?—Yes, if you will recommend the House in your report to provide for that by a vote.

2080. But I want your opinion. What do you think, as between man and man, would be a fair thing in such case?—I think that some such provision should be made as prevails in the other departments of the Government service—one month in every twelve months. I think that would be a reasonable basis to go on.

2081. You would rather do that than leave the teacher to the consideration, just or unjust, of the Board?—Yes. I think the allowance ought to be fixed by regulation.

2082. In regard to compassionate allowance to widows of deceased teachers, what do you think would be fair and right?—I think a month's salary for every twelve months of service should be sufficient. It would improve the position of the teacher.

2083. Give me your honest opinion: is the existing system of working female pupil-teachers a success?—No. It takes too much out of the girls; but I expect this will always be a difficulty.

2084. Would you not advocate the appointing of adult teachers where pupil-teachers are now used if money permitted it?—I can only say that I think it would be better if all pupil-teachers started on a matriculation basis.

2085. *Mr. Hogben.*] I see by the scale paid by your Board that there is a school at Tenui at which the master gets £195 a year, and the average attendance is only 25?—That is an anomaly, in which our Board is breaking its regulations. The master ought to get £100 according to the present average, but as the attendance fell off through no fault of his own the Board did not work the sliding-scale. The same thing occurred in similar cases until the Board found that it was paying over £1,200 a year beyond the amount which the regulations provided.

2086. There is also a case at Dreyerton in which the master is getting £105, the average being 31 scholars?—Yes. I am prepared to hear of any number of such anomalies.

2087. Again, at Mauriceville and Paikakariki?—I believe those are cases in which the teachers' salary should have been advanced, but the Board could not afford to do it.

2088. Again, a teacher at Makomako is getting £135, the average being 38?—Yes.

2089. Taking all such anomalies and inequalities of pay in these schools, do you not think it would be fair to equalise the salaries?—I see no objection.

2090. That is, apart from the interests of the present occupants of the posts?—You must ignore interests such as that in preparing a permanent scale.

2091. You would not see any objection to an equalisation if for the next four years the present occupants should not be reduced, thus allowing an opportunity to transfer?—If you gave that time it would perhaps be satisfactory.

2092. Exactly the same occurs in regard to female teachers at corresponding schools. There are twenty-six of them. You think they ought to be equalised in the same way?—Yes.

2093. With regard to certificates, supposing the certificate were to be simplified to denote first or second class, would that meet your views?—Yes.

2094. Would you approve of an understanding amongst the Inspectors that the higher figure should be given to such teachers as had shown such ability as would lead Inspectors to conclude that they could take charge of a school?—No, I would not give the Inspectors that power.

2095. Who would attach the label, then?—I say, let the teacher go into the school first for experience.

2096. You would go simply on the teachers' proved performance?—Yes.

2097. And the Board should have the right to demand the certificate at any time?—Just so.

2098. You made some remarks regarding manual and technical instruction, and deprecated the giving of special technical instruction in primary schools?—Yes.

2099. But you do not extend those remarks to manual instruction in schools?—Yes, most emphatically I do. I think it is regrettable to try to give manual instruction in primary schools. To take tools into the schools is a perfect farce, and opposed to all our modern ideas. There is a lot of "buncombe" talked about hand-and-eye training.

2100. But in other countries its value is admitted. In Sweden it is recognised and made compulsory to give hand-and-eye training?—Yes; but the success (if you refer to the success of German trade) is not the result of education, but the effect of the way in which they subsidise their industries.

2101. I am speaking of the effect of mental training. Are you not aware that pupils who do handwork in schools are better than other students at their lessons?—Well, I believe that statistics prove it, but I have my doubts.

2102. It is not only statistics, but the best authorities on education in England testify to the value of manual instruction in schools. However, you have not seen this hand-and-eye training?—I have not seen a great deal of it.

2103. But you are in favour of kindergarten instruction and drawing?—Yes. I admit that drawing is splendid; but, as far as kindergarten work is concerned, it is merely to keep the children occupied—there is as much education in the making of mud-pies. I would not teach these subjects as is done now. I would give more theoretical instruction and physics. I understand you are proposing to introduce into the public schools something of what we are doing in the technical school now.

2104. That is not so?—You are going to give a boy a plane, and then show him how to make tables.

2105. No; we are going to give him certain exercises?—I say that a boy should go to school with a satchel full of books, and not a kit of tools. So long as manual instruction in the primary school does not imply the use of workshop tools in the school, then I have no quarrel with you; but directly saws and hammers are brought into school, I differ.

2106. If we can show that mental training is improved by the pupil using his hands as well as his brain, would you not approve of it?—We differ there; I do not think you can do it.

2107. You are in favour of teaching drawing in schools?—Yes.

2108. And of teaching physics and other branches of science in a practical way, each pupil making his own apparatus, and working with his own hands?—Yes.

2109. Well, that is manual instruction. Do you think that the cost of manual and technical instruction should be met out of the statutory £3 15s. capitation?—I do not think that Boards should take money which belongs to the children of a public school and spend it on persons having no connection whatever with the State education system. I am glad, too, that the Government last year gave the public auditors power to control corporate bodies in a certain manner, the result being that we found out how much we were spending on those people who had left school. We saw how much money had been diverted from the grant for primary schools to technical schools. As a matter of fact, the present Education Act is too flexible; it is simply what Boards choose to make it.

2110. *The Chairman.*] Do you think that the existing syllabus might be extended so as to provide for hand-and-eye training?—No. I think the mind should be trained in the primary school.

2111. Do you think that the education imparted to Standard VII. children ought to be extended if parents are willing and able to keep their children at school for a greater length of time?—In that case you might overlap the secondary schools.

2112. Is it not a fact that many children passing through the primary schools who would take advantage of the secondary schools are not able to reach the latter for various reasons?—I do not think there is any wide gap between the primary and secondary schools.

2113. Would you not be in favour of dovetailing the primary and secondary schools?—Oh, yes. It is a great advantage, even for the sake of a change, that the pupils should be able to go to a separate institution after the primary school.

2114. Would it not be an advantage for Boards to have control of secondary schools?—No; I think the control is better under separate bodies.

2115. But do you not see any advantage in making our secondary-educational system as much national as our primary education?—I cannot see why the high schools are not called State institutions now, seeing how heavily they are endowed by the State.

2116. They have power to charge fees?—Yes.

2117. That makes them exclusive to some extent?—Yes.

2118. Do you think that exclusiveness might be abolished if the high schools were brought under control of the Education Boards?—You can work them better by keeping them as they are now.

2119. The reason I put the question is this: You seem to have a notion that the money proposed to be devoted to manual and technical instruction is not likely to be productive of the very highest results: do you not think that if that money were applied to the teaching of book-keeping, chemistry, shorthand- and type-writing, science and electricity in our ordinary day-schools, a great advantage would result?—I am not sure that it would. I do not think the time-table would admit

of teaching book-keeping, for instance. I do not believe in giving instruction as applied to particular industries, or occupations, in the primary schools.

2120. But a knowledge of book-keeping is so valuable and useful to every one?—Well, I doubt if the school period is long enough to permit teaching shorthand and book-keeping. A greater amount of time ought to be given to ordinary writing. Too often Inspectors are mere collegians, who do not look at what is going on round about them. As one result of this we have a style of writing (upright) taught which generally ends in a back-hand style. I was on a Committee and we took one of these copy-books to two or three heads of departments in the Government Buildings, and they said, "We would not have such writing here," nor would merchants permit it in their ledgers. Yet that style is being taught because the Inspectors say it is in vogue somewhere. [*Mr. Hogben*: It is being used in the public service now.] With regard to the scholarship questions, I think that the Inspectors of one district ought to prepare the questions for some other district than his own. I have an uneasy feeling that those schools which are examined immediately before the scholarship examination come out best, because the clever coaches observe the drift of the Inspector's thoughts.

2121. Have you known instances of country-school children winning scholarships and yet their parents were not in a position to allow the winners to take advantage of their award?—Yes, because the parents were unable to afford the expense. The scholarship allowance of £35 is not sufficient for children living away from home. Even the amount (£10) given in the city is not enough. It merely covers fees, and, with necessary expenses of books, a poor man cannot afford to send his boy even to Wellington College.

2122. Reference has been made to the Wellington Education Board being unable to adhere to its regulations in connection with the payment of salaries?—Yes.

2123. As to the large salary paid to the teacher at Tenui (£195), do you know anything of the circumstances of that teacher?—Yes. It is rather a bad case. He has been a very long time in the service. There are certain peculiarities about the case which would make it a hardship to cut down the salary. This is one of those cases which, under a fixed scale, Boards will have no power to deal with in a special way, and the teacher must be the sufferer.

2124. Where salaries are lower than they should be in the cases already referred to, is it due to any fault of the teachers?—No.

2125. Has the decreased attendance arisen from any circumstances over which the teacher has control?—No; and no effort on his part would have made any appreciable difference in the attendance.

2126. Has the Board endeavoured from time to time to find positions for these teachers?—Yes.

2127. If the Board adhered strictly to its regulations, would not some teachers be placed in such a position that they would be unable to maintain themselves?—Yes, that is so.

2128. The fact is that in this district, at all events, the Board has been unable to find situations for its deserving and experienced teachers?—Yes; and through not having power to make transfers.

2129. Would a colonial scale as now proposed improve matters?—I do not think a colonial scale is going to give all that is expected of it, but if teachers like a trial it is all right.

2130. If a colonial scale is adopted, and the fluctuations which we have witnessed in the Wellington District should continue, and schools now in a prosperous condition become worse, what will be the condition of teachers presently?—They will become worse off. If a colonial scale had been in existence in the Wellington District during the last five years teachers would have been in a worse position than they are now. They would have suffered, for instance, by the drop in the birth-rate. A colonial scale will dry up all our sympathies as far as Boards are concerned.

2131. As to the assistants in the city schools, you say lady assistants are very reluctant to go into the country: what about male assistants?—They go more readily into the country.

2132. When vacancies for first assistants occur in the city schools, whence do you generally get the bulk of the applicants?—From the country.

2133. Do the applicants include headmasters in the country?—Yes. It is beginning to be thought that only headmasters of country schools need apply for first-assistantships.

2134. Has that a beneficial or prejudicial effect on the country schools?—It has the effect of taking the best men from the country into the city.

2135. What you mean is this: that the country is really becoming a training-ground for assistants for the city?—Yes.

2136. Is it not advisable that large schools should be the training-ground for the small schools in the country?—Yes.

2137. Would it not be an advantage to young teachers if they were to be placed in the town schools to obtain a training before being appointed to the country?—Yes.

2138. You think it would be advantageous if the salaries of headmasters and mistresses in the country schools were raised, and the larger salaries of the town assistants were correspondingly reduced?—Yes, on the £4 basis. I do not think the town assistant gets too much, except, perhaps, as compared with the amounts paid to the country masters.

2139. Then there would be more room for the female teachers?—Yes, if better inducement were offered for positions in the country they would go there.

2140. If the ladies were paid more adequately as mistresses in the country schools you would have more teachers offering for the country from the city?—Yes.

WEDNESDAY, 26TH JUNE, 1901.

J. J. PILKINGTON, Headmaster of the Porirua School, examined.

Mr. Pilkington: In the first place, I wish to state I object to the minute classification of the proposed colonial scale in regard to the payment of teachers' salaries. I quite recognise it is a necessity, so far as the staffing of schools is concerned, but I do not think it is necessary to follow that minute classification so far, at least, as the payment to head-teachers of schools is concerned. I think that the system of the old Board classification is much more dignified, where they proceeded by 25's or so up to schools of 200, then from 200 to 300, 300 to 500, and so on. It does not seem to me necessary to make twelve distinct classes for twenty-six schools. For schools of 510 up to 1,020 there are twelve distinct classes—that is, there are only twenty-six schools of this class, and it gives an average of one class to every two teachers. That seems to carry the science of classification too far; and, while I say that I recognise it is necessary to have some method of classifying schools, still this is too minute a classification. A man who is capable of taking charge of a school of 200 children presumably is capable of taking charge of 250 or 300; if he is capable of taking charge of 500, then, presumably, he is capable of taking charge of 550, or 600, or 700. I object to the principle of what I call the "floating capitation"—that is to say, payment *per capita*: for every child who goes into a school it means an increase in salary, and a corresponding decrease for every child leaving the school. Such a system as that does not place the teacher at all in a dignified position—his thoughts are constantly occupied as to whether he will gain or lose a few shillings in salary. Supposing a teacher takes an unusual interest in the attendance of a child—it is not so likely to occur in the towns, but it is likely to occur in the country—it would place it in the power of parents to say that he was trying to increase his average attendance in order to obtain a corresponding increase in salary. At present we in the country have a sort of borderland, from which it is quite as easy to attend one school as another. At the present time we let the scholars go to whatever school they choose, but the introduction of such a scheme as this will lead to ill-feeling between many teachers, for the reason that they will be led to "cater," perhaps unwittingly, perhaps unwillingly, for the attendance of children at their respective schools. This would reintroduce the vicious system of payment by results, only the evil would be intensified, for under the old system we had to teach the child something when he came to our school; under this system all that is required is his presence. In the towns I think the effect would be worse, for I believe there would spring up a science of attracting children from one school to another. I live in a district that is peculiarly liable to be affected in this way; I have a school on one side of me three miles away, and another on the other side of me about eight miles away, but between that school and my school there lies a village which has no school at all. I refer to the fishing-village of Paremata. There are a considerable number of children there, who can attend the Porirua School, to which they have easy access by train, or they can go to the other school at Pahautanui, which the Board helps them to reach by subsidised coach-service. We teachers in these schools have had no difference of feeling, we live in perfect harmony; but if my salary or the salaries of those other teachers were likely to be affected by the attendance of, say, fifteen children that good-feeling would no longer exist between us. Therefore I may say at once that I should very much prefer to live under the old government of the Boards. I do not believe that in any place in the world there is a more satisfied body of teachers than those living under the controlling authority of the Wellington Education Board. I am quite sure that a colonial scale of salaries would interfere with this kindly and patriarchal government. I cannot see how it is possible that the members of the Board can take that deep interest they have always taken in this most important business of arranging teachers' salaries, and paying them, transferring them, altering this, that, and the other, and looking after the teachers in all their little troubles, is taken away from them. Under a colonial scale it seems to me that the Board's interests will be very much diminished; they will not take the same interest in the teachers. I think under colonial administration it will throw them open—I do not say that they will fall into the temptation—to all sorts of influences; for instance, in the opening of neighbouring schools they may permit influences to be brought to bear upon them to open schools that should not be opened. Politicians and other people will button-hole this friend and that friend on the Board and say, "It will make no difference to you whether you open such and such a school or not; you will not have to pay the salary; it will do good to us, and will not hurt you, so let us have the school." Such pressure has been listened to before in a slight degree, and under more difficult circumstances; but under a colonial scale I think that the circumstances are made much more easy for them, and they will be more amenable to such pressure. Whatever derogates the responsibility of Boards must of necessity derogate the quality of its members, and men of the calibre and character we have at the present time on Boards will not continue to offer themselves for office if their powers and responsibilities are taken away from them. I should like to say something about how this scheme has been brought forward. If I am wrong I hope to be corrected. I, as a member of the New Zealand Educational Institute, have seen the beginnings of the scheme, the early workings of it, and the whole thing brought to its present state of advancement. The arguments that have always been used were these: "As a matter of fairness to your fellow-teachers who are more poorly paid, we call upon you to sacrifice a little from your salaries in order to help your poorer-paid *confrères*"; and I may say I have seen these arguments carried on at meetings of the Institute almost to the verge of tears. We knew that if a colonial scheme was carried we should suffer, but our consciences were soothed, and we were told that any reductions we suffered would go to help our comrades who were suffering. Now, I find that under the colonial scale I would lose £40 a year out of a not too large salary; but instead of its going to help my poorer-paid brethren in Taranaki or Westland it is going into the pockets of my richer brethren in the town—men who are

highly paid by our own Board and who have never asked for, nor looked for, any advance in salary. I did not expect the salaries of better-paid men to be advanced to my detriment, to see myself suffering a reduction of 20 per cent. while they get an increase of 20 per cent. I think they should lose a little with me, and that they might have contributed £40 in the same way as it is proposed I should; but instead of it going to the better-class salaries it should go to those who are more poorly paid. Instead of this they are tacking £40 on to the salaries of the better-paid teachers in the towns, men who are receiving the highest salaries at the present time, and who will further benefit to the extent I have mentioned under the proposed scale. I do not say that no advancement is made in the salaries of the poorer-paid teachers, for they will benefit somewhat. Recognising, or fearing possibly, that a scheme of some sort will be carried, I can only say to you that it will press upon us who are losing so much very heavily, and we in Wellington, holding a certain class of school, seem to be the hardest hit of any in the colony. I see no one who is losing very much; I see advances all along the line. We have based our expenditure for the future under the impression that the salaries we are at present receiving, or something very near them, will be secured to us, and if you take a fifth of it away from us it is impossible for us to meet our engagements. I heard yesterday—I had not heard before—that there is a disposition on the part of the framers of the scheme to hold out the hope that no salaries will be reduced for the present—that something like four years' grace and warning will be given; but what might happen during those four years? All sorts of things might happen: these schools the Education Board may be asked to build will be built, and our salaries knocked out of tune and time. What security have we that in four years' time we will be able to claim the same salary as now? We have no security at all. Still, I shall be pleased to get an assurance that these salaries will not be so reduced until the expiry of four years. It was said yesterday by a member of the Education Board that the appointment of teachers should rest more in the hands of Committees. I think that would be a disastrous step—I take exactly the opposite idea. He thought the initiative should spring from the Committee and the veto from the Board; but I think the initiative should spring from the Inspector, the confirmation from the Board, and the power of final acceptance from the Committee; that the Committee should not decline an appointee unless they are able to show that they have very good cause. That gentleman does not know country School Committees like I know them, or he would recognise that it is a very wrong power to propose to put into their hands. Taking the prospects of teachers in New Zealand and comparing those prospects with the prospects of teachers in other countries I find that 82 per cent. of the schools in this colony are schools under 80 in attendance, and that the head-teachers of these schools will be receiving under £200 a year, leaving 18 per cent. to earn £200 a year and over. Now, in England, 20 per cent. of the head-teachers, male and female, are earning £200 a year and over, and if you take the male teachers alone of England 30 per cent. of them are earning £200 a year and over. In addition to this—this is the most important and vital point: vital indeed to the poorly-paid schoolmaster—they have a pension fund behind them. They have not to look forward to the providing of a sufficiency for their old age as the teacher who has no such prospect has to do. Now, I hold that it would be much better, if we were younger men, for us to "pull up our stakes" here and go home to England. I think we would have a much better chance of being among the 30 per cent. there than among the 18 per cent. here. I may say I am referring to the alternative scale, and I speak more from a Wellington point of view. There is a question I have not seen touched upon yet: what will the large schools be still further getting under the new regulations, "The Manual and Technical Instruction Act, 1900," which has just been issued from the Education Department, and distributed to the schools within the last week.

Mr. Hogben: They were issued in January.

Mr. Pilkington: We did not receive them until last week. It seems to me under these regulations the large schools will still have a very big pull over the smaller ones. We cannot expect, with our very few children who have passed Standard V., to take more than a few shillings, or pounds at the most—a £5-note would probably cover a small school. They will be able to make very large calls under these regulations in the large schools. They allow, I believe, as much as 15s. per head to be demanded from the paying authority. Who will get the money? Whether it will be the local authority of the school, the Board, the headmaster, or the class-teachers, I do not know. I do not know who the receiving authority is. I understand from the Inspector-General it will not affect the salaries of teachers in the slightest degree. I am sorry to see that there is a disposition in the proposed scheme to accept Class D certificate as being quite sufficient for the position of a teacher; and I think that is a great mistake—stamping the D certificate as being the desirable standard of education for the schoolmasters of the colony. This seems to me a shortsighted and uneducational policy—I might almost say an illiterate policy. I should like to have seen under the scheme something like the present Education Boards have under their schemes, of giving some slight encouragement to teachers of all classes to pursue their studies and to endeavour to raise their literary status. The Class D certificate must be recognised as a very low one, and I think it would be certainly desirable to encourage teachers to take a higher certificate, and lead them on step by step until they attain the highest certificate that is possible. It is a very poor aim, I think, to say to the country that the schools shall be officered by Class D men. Of course, it is not the case in all schools that they would be governed by men holding Class D, but, as set forth in the scale, it is practically an incentive to teachers not to attempt to raise their certificates beyond Class D. I am quite aware that Class C1 is laid down as the necessary qualification for schools of 250 in attendance; of such schools there are less than ninety in the colony to be officered by men with the classification of C. I am taking the Class D certificate as sufficient for the teachers of over fifteen hundred schools, and Class C the classification for about eighty or ninety that remain. Going back again to the early beginnings of this scheme and how we teachers of Wellington were induced to support it, I would like to say that the scheme proposed never would have been what

it is had the Teachers' Institute of New Zealand been really representative of the teachers of New Zealand. The Teachers' Institute of New Zealand represents the big teachers of New Zealand and not the small ones in any way; I shall be challenged on this point I know. It will be told me, and the lists of the different members will be shown me, in order that I may see that a majority of country members are members of the Institute in different parts of the colony. I say that makes no difference; those who make our laws and control our policy are not the country teachers, who are never properly represented. I will take the Council of the Institute in 1898, and I find that out of thirty-two to represent New Zealand only three represented the smaller schools, and the smaller schools comprise 85½ per cent. of the schools of the colony.

2141. *Mr. Hill.*] What is the average attendance of the schools comprising 85½ per cent. of the total number?—85½ per cent. of the schools of the colony are schools of less than 100 children. I have not said that salaries are too large in New Zealand; I have only said that the big salaries should not have been increased as long as there were very much smaller salaries being reduced; and, to show you the tendency that exists in the Old Country to pay teachers liberally, I will quote the scale of the Glasgow School Board. The Glasgow School Board has in its employment seventy heads of schools; six receive £200 and under £250, fifteen receive £250 and under £300, fourteen receive £300 and under £350, six receive £350 and under £400, seventeen receive £400 and under £450, six receive £450 and under £500, while six receive £500. The total amount of the salaries is £24,563, or an average of £315 18s.

2142. *Mr. Davidson.*] Can you give us the highest and lowest average attendance of those schools?—No; they are presumably large schools.

Mr. Hogben: I might point out that the average attendance of these schools is, I think, about 615.

Mr. Pilkington: The question of irregularity of attendance has cropped up; that is a great source of loss, so far as the salaries of the teachers in New Zealand are concerned, and also to the income of Education Boards. In New Zealand we have given a premium to bad attendance by saying to parents, you can keep your child away for two days in each week. In Europe the attendance regulations are very strict, and the police have not only authority to go to a school and look at the books in order to take the names of the children who have been absent only two days in a month, but they have the power, if they meet an unhappy child in the street, and think that child should be at school, to take the child to the schoolmaster and enforce attendance. Most minute instructions in this respect are given to the police in Holland. The question of technical education is going to loom very large in the schools. I think before we launched on this policy, which I hold to be very largely a policy of imitation—and not very far-seeing imitation at that—of the conditions that exist in other countries—conditions that are very different from those surrounding ourselves—that a Commission should have been appointed to inquire how far desirable it is for a country like ours to imitate that policy. This country, which is exporting three-quarters of its food material, proposes to imitate the conditions existing in the country which is importing more than half of it; this seems to me to be utterly absurd. We are proposing to enter upon a scheme of technical instruction in our schools—I am speaking only of the primary schools of the colony; I do not say that technical schools should not be established in our towns for our own local requirements, but to think that a system of technical education is going to make a country like New Zealand grow into a big exporting country seems to me to be ridiculous. It is very silly for a country existing practically on its natural resources to imitate in our primary schools the system of education adopted in countries that live on their manufactures. The two fundamental essentials of a manufacturing country are iron and coal. Have we got either of them? I do not think we need bother about other countries beating us in the race of exports and manufactures. I think that question should be threshed out before endeavouring to force technical education in the primary schools of the colony. Scholarships are doing a good deal of harm in the country schools; we have only one or two children who are likely to compete for scholarships, and as long as the scholarship system exists parents are urging us, in a direct or indirect way, to let their children enter into competition. In order to do that you have to drag the whole upper part of the school at the heels of these two or three scholarship candidates, up to a standard for which the class as a whole is unfit. If the subjects for scholarship examinations were exactly the same as for the standards, there would not be any great amount of harm done, but such is not the case. There is no doubt in my own mind that this system of scholarship examination is doing a great deal of harm in both the town schools and the country schools. With your permission, sir, I should like to quote from a speech of Sir Henry Craik, in November, 1900. He says: "Above and beyond any system of codes and of organization there was an element of danger in a false public judgment of the work of the school. Payment by results might be a mistake; but was the department the only sinner in this respect? Was not public judgment apt to be unduly biassed by immediate tangible results, forgetful that the training of the school was a slow process, of which the results might not tell till after years? Did it not sometimes err in giving and withholding the payment of its approbation by immediate results? Had we not for the last fifty years in our schools, in our universities, in judging the opening careers of our young men, given too much weight to competition, to the often flimsy and unsubstantial verdict of competitive examination, to the pitting of school against school, and of boy against boy, by the results of competitive examinations? Was it not possible that another generation may say that this had gone too far—that it was beneath the dignity of a great school to chronicle successes, and that many a fine career had been nipped in the bud by the evanescent results of a prize competition. They could not end them, they could not abolish competition. They could not run counter to a prevailing instinct, but at least they might beware of exaggerating its weight. They might doubt whether the physical prowess of the whole community was best increased by an insane effort to beat the record rather than by quietly

and steadily developing all in some simple physical exercises that might make them enduring and patient of toil, healthy and active, rather than fit to vie with professional athletes. So also with mental gymnastics, might they not throw away an immense amount of sound and serviceable material fit to serve their country by labelling them at the outset of their career with a mark which might very inadequately represent the intrinsic value of the metal that is stamped? Might they not, above all, in their public schools steal them away from the service of those who needed them most, and mask as a preserver of those who required least from them? A great statesman had pointed out the danger of public effort being gradually diverted from those who needed it most to those who needed it least. Let them beware of this mistake, and, while they said nothing against a healthy and wholesome rivalry, either in the schoolroom or in the playground, let them beware least they earn ridicule and condemnation of posterity by testing all training by a Chinese elaboration of competition with its inevitably deadening results." Those words should be well considered, so far as the question of scholarships is concerned. I notice a circular was sent out by the department a short time ago, within the last two or three weeks, asking us to name those children in our schools who had passed Standard VI., and how many of them would have proceeded to higher education if such were made free to them. I replied in my own case that four or five in my school would have proceeded to higher education, had they the means. I think that would be a better way of settling this difficulty; let them have a higher standard, but not a competitive one of child against child.

2143. *Mr. Davidson.*] Were you trained as a pupil-teacher?—No.

2144. What experience have you had as a teacher?—I started in England in the capacity of assistant master in a grammar school; I was probably about one year there. I came to New Zealand, and joined the Wellington Education Board in January, 1875, first of all being assistant master in the Thorndon School. Afterwards I proceeded to a country school, with an average attendance of about 50; from there I went to a growing town school, with an average attendance of from 300 to 400.

2145. As headmaster?—Yes; from there again I went to a small country school, averaging 30 pupils; to another averaging 40 pupils; and, lastly, to my present position in the Porirua School, with an average of from 50 to 60.

2146. What is your certificate?—C1.

2147. What is your present average attendance?—For the last quarter, 59.

2148. In your evidence-in-chief I understood you to say that you objected to the minute classification of schools: will you explain, I do not quite understand you?—I thought that a scheme of classifying schools, like the Wellington Education Board does, would be a more dignified classification than a system which gives twelve classifications for twenty-six schools—better for the purposes of payment, that is.

2149. As a matter of fact, have you noticed that the classification of schools under the first suggested scale gives only three classes?—As far as certificates required for the various classes.

2150. You object to the payment of teachers by units instead of by grades?—Yes, I object to the payment by units; I do not see the necessity for all these classifications.

2151. You prefer that teachers should remain under the authority of Education Boards rather than be placed under the authority of a central department: do you think that by having one scale of staff for the colony, and also one scale of salaries, instead of thirteen as at the present time, it will take away from the Education Boards their authority over teachers?—Yes, that is my opinion.

2152. How do the Boards of the colony now pay their teachers; from whom do they get the money?—Presumably from the Government

2153. Would it not be sent direct from the department, and paid out by the Boards under any colonial scale?—It would be paid according to a scheme which a Board may devise, and which a Board would have the privilege of altering from time to time as it thought fit.

2154. Do you think there should be thirteen different scales of staffs and salaries: do you think it is in the interests of the teachers?—Yes; that the teachers should have a patriarchal body looking after their interests and in close touch with them.

2155. What has caused the dissatisfaction: is it not the grave inequalities which exist among teachers doing the same work and possessed of the same qualifications?—Yes, presumably.

2156. Would it not be in the interests of education that this dissatisfaction should, as far as possible, be removed?—Yes, but it is a question of how to remove it.

2157. If the anomalies and inequalities that are causing dissatisfaction were removed, do you not think it would be a good thing?—Yes, to those who are suffering from the anomalies and inequalities I dare say it would be a good thing.

2158. Do you think that under a national system of education men and women holding equal qualifications and performing equal duties should be paid the same salaries?—I know it is a question of abstract justice that they should be, but I am not aware of any country where they are paid the same.

2159. Not where teachers holding the same qualifications and doing the same work are paid under a colonial scale?—Possibly, in the Australian Colonies, they may be.

2160. In Queensland, New South Wales, South Australia, Canada, and France, is it not the case?—I should say it was most unlikely in Canada.

2161. I am not referring to the schools; teachers are paid under a uniform scale in the countries I have mentioned, are they not?—Yes, I presume so.

2162. If a satisfactory scale could be drawn up, do I understand you approve of the principle, and that you disapprove of the suggested scales?—No, that is not so; I hold that teachers would be much better looked after, and that you have a less, if I may use the expression, cast-iron treatment under a local Board than under Government administration.

2163. If you were teaching a school with an average attendance of 59, as you are now, on one side of the Waitaki River, and a man on the other side was teaching a similar school but was receiving £50 more than you in salary, would you consider that a fair system?—I should consider it was a very unhappy one, and that the system should be altered to enable us to receive equal salaries.

2164. How could you alter the conditions without altering the districts or bringing in a uniform scale?—I presume sufficient money could be voted to the Boards to enable them to pay sufficient salaries.

2165. If you pay under a capitation grant, the varying conditions in the different districts would remain, would they not? You could not increase the large schools in a district like Marlborough as, for instance, in a district like Wellington?—No, of course not.

2166. Then, would not the best teachers gravitate into the districts where the highest salaries were being paid?—They would do that under any scheme. I do not see that a colonial scale will alter that.

2167. Out of 1,675 schools in the colony, how many of them are under 35 in average attendance?—I think about seven hundred.

2168. No; there are 942, are there not?—No, I think not.

2169. Not according to the departmental return of the Minister of Education?—This return I have does not include the aided schools; probably yours does, and you are right.

2170. Then, you admit that a very large percentage of the schools of the colony are under 35 in average attendance?—A very large number indeed; more than one-third, I think.

2171. If, in the districts where the salaries now paid are so very low, particularly in that class of school, a uniform scale for the colony was adopted, would the teachers of these small schools where they are badly paid gravitate into the districts where they would, under a uniform scale, be receiving better salaries and equal salaries?—I do not think we can recognise districts; they would gravitate from the more poorly paid schools to the highly paid ones.

2172. There are seven hundred odd schools between 14 and 35 in average attendance, are there not?—Yes.

2173. That is a very large percentage indeed of the schools of the colony?—Yes; a little over one-third.

2174. If you took those schools only, at the present time great inequalities exist in the salaries paid in the different districts?—Yes.

2175. In the districts that are now able to pay fair salaries for such schools, they must expect to get an inferior type of teacher to the class of teacher they are able to get in districts where they pay better salaries?—Yes, that would follow, probably.

2176. Then, it is unfair, seeing that the ratepayers in the smaller districts of the colony pay for education in the same manner as ratepayers in the larger districts, while their children are taught by an inferior type of teacher?—I do not see how it affects the argument. You are asking the Government to come to your assistance in one way, and I am asking the Government in another way to do so.

2177. Could you suggest anything other than a uniform scale of salaries which would remove these inequalities?—Yes; I could suggest a Government grant.

2178. Altogether apart from the capitation grant?—It might or might not be apart from the capitation grant; I think we are the only body of servants dealt with on a capitation grant.

2179. You would suggest that this Commission should not be bound as they are by a £4 capitation grant, in making suggestions?—I did not know that it was the limited scope of the Commission's business—then it is only a matter of distribution.

2180. What is your salary at the present time?—£215.

2181. Have you compared that salary with the salary paid for a similar school in the other districts of the colony?—Yes.

2182. Could you tell the Commission how it compares with those salaries—take Auckland if you like—a school of 59 in attendance there?—I am aware that in all the other districts, those I have studied, that the Wellington salary paid for that class of school is very much higher, speaking generally.

2183. Do you know the number of schools in the Wellington District: are there not 147?—Probably.

2184. How many are there under 20 in average attendance—are there not forty?—My return gives the total number as 126, and eighteen under 20.

2185. How many between 20 and 35?—Eighteen, I think. I am not able to give you the exact figures.

2186. Is it not a fact that more than half the schools in the Wellington District are in the class under 35 in average attendance—seventy-seven out of 147 under 35 in average attendance?—I presume so.

2187. Taking the Wellington Board's regulations, I find that schools from 15 to 20 in attendance receive £70 a year as the maximum salary: do you think that is a fair salary for that class of school?—There is something to be said for it and something to be said against it: in the first place, that class of school is the stepping-stone for the male or female teacher who likes to go into the country; in the second place, it forms a sort of "letting-down ground" for men who have passed their prime, and who are no longer competent to teach the larger schools.

2188. Do you think £70 is a sufficient salary?—I would not like to say that it is a sufficient salary. As I said, there is something to be said for it.

2189. Take the next grade—20 to 25—the salary is £80: what is your opinion as to that salary for a sole teacher?—I think it is very low.

2190. The next grade—25 to 30—the salary is £100: have you taught in a school with an average attendance of 30?—Yes.

2191. What would be the roll-number, approximately?—Very little under 40.
2192. A man would have to teach 40 pupils, in all standards, in a primary school?—Yes.
2193. And for that the Wellington Education Board gives him £100 a year?—Yes.
2194. What is the number in your school?—About 75.
2195. And the average attendance is?—59.
2196. What standards do you teach?—From Standard III. upwards.
2197. What is the average attendance in those classes, approximately?—Between 30 and 35.
2198. I would like to compare the salaries paid to men in similar positions. A man gets rid of Standards I. and II. and the infants—what might be termed the drudgery—to a man, at any rate, and he is teaching 35 of an average in the standard classes, for which he receives a salary of £215 a year; whereas a man under the Wellington Board with an average attendance of 30 in the whole of the standards, of the primary classes, gets less than half: do you think that is fair?—There is no justice in human affairs.
2199. Do you consider that the Wellington scale deals fairly with the teachers when in a school with an average attendance of 30, and a sole teacher taking the whole of the primary classes and receiving a salary of £100 a year; whereas a man in a school of 59 pupils, and teaching the same number, but exclusive of Standards I. and II. and the infants, is paid twice as much?—It is no use asking me questions like that, because people are not paid according to the pupils they actually teach; the schools are classified.
2200. Do you think that is a fairly graduated scale, when a man receives more than twice as much as a man in sole charge of a school with an average attendance of 30?—My contention is that you do not make a fair comparison—you must compare that with higher schools, and the answer will come out. I do not say that difference in salary should exist.
2201. You think that the Wellington Board scale does not deal fairly with that type of teacher?—I do not think it deals very liberally with him. In schools not very much bigger three or four times as much is paid, and the duties of the headmaster are certainly very much lighter.
2202. I think you said you compared the salaries paid to a school having an average attendance of 59 with those paid in other districts of the colony, and also in other colonies in Australasia?—So far as other districts in the colony are concerned, I am aware that we are paid at a higher rate.
2203. What would be the salary for a school of 59 in Otago, where salaries are said to be very liberal, under the suggested scale?—£192, I think.
2204. Otago is said to be a district in which the teachers are very well paid; in fact, Otago has been held up frequently as a district where teachers are very highly paid: is it not so?—I do not know as to that.
2205. Would you be surprised to hear that it has been stated before the Commission on frequent occasions that the Otago teachers are very highly paid?—It might refer to their very highly paid men.
2206. It is not so. You stated that the New Zealand Educational Institute was not representative of the teachers of the colony, I think?—It is not in its deliberations, and the conclusions it arrives at at the annual council meetings.
2207. Take the year 1898: could you give the names of the representatives of the small schools?—Miss Sangster, Miss Sunley, and Mr. Warburton.
2208. Are those the only three?—These are the only ones I could trace.
- Mr. Davidson*: I fancy I was a representative also that year, and came from a school under 100 in attendance; if you inadvertently made a mistake in one case, probably you may have made one in another, and I simply wish to bring that point out.
2209. *Mr. Stewart*.] What is the staffing of your school?—An ex-pupil-teacher, a female.
2210. How long has she been out of her pupil-teachership?—Two or three years.
2211. Practically, to all intents and purposes, she is an assistant teacher?—Yes.
2212. What salary is she receiving at the present time?—£42 a year.
2213. Are you aware what an assistant teacher would receive in that class of school under the proposed alternative scale?—I think, £90.
2214. An increase of?—£48.
2215. So that, taking the total of the salaries paid to the two teachers in your school, instead of there being a decrease there would be a gain—the combined salaries would amount to more in the aggregate?—Yes, slightly more.
2216. Do you think that the female teachers under the Wellington Board scale are adequately remunerated?—No, especially in the case of ex-pupil-teachers.
2217. In the case of your assistant her salary would be more than doubled?—Yes.
2218. Do you think that is an act of justice?—It is no use talking “justice” to me, Mr. Stewart, after what I have told you.
2219. Your assistant gets £42 under the present scale; under the alternative scale her salary would be doubled: I wish to know whether you consider that is an act of justice?—Since you press me for my opinion, I consider that at the present time she is very hardly dealt with.
2220. Do you not think that, in the interests of a very large class of teachers, it is really necessary that there should be some revival of the scale of payment to women teachers, no matter what authority that revival emanates from?—Yes; of course, the lady teachers, and other teachers too, have recognised that, and they have made representations in the proper quarter to have that state of things altered, and I think there is every prospect of there being an alteration.
2221. I think I understood you to say that you had, at some time or other, expressed yourself in favour of a colonial scale: did you ever vote for the motion?—I cannot recollect.
2222. Did you ever vote against it?—I cannot say as to that.
2223. Were you present at the meeting of Wellington teachers that was held recently in order to consider this scale?—Yes.

2224. You took part in the proceedings?—Yes.

2225. At that meeting did you express any views similar to those you have expressed in evidence here?—I expressed very hostile opinions against this proposed scale.

2226. You are opposed to the principle of the colonial scale?—Yes.

2227. You stated in evidence that the Council of the New Zealand Educational Institute was not representative of the country teachers?—Not fairly representative.

2228. You do not happen to know the *personnel* of the Council this year?—No; I was away in the country.

2229. You are not aware that nearly one-half is composed of teachers of middle-sized and small schools?—I am extremely surprised to hear it.

2230. With regard to your status, you are not officially representative of the teachers of these small schools?—No; I am one who is quite in sympathy with the class.

2231. Do you think that witnesses who came before the Commission in, say, Blenheim, representatives of the Marlborough District, are country representatives, those representing small schools?—Marlborough has not many large schools.

2232. Do you think those witnesses would be representing the interests of the smaller schools?—I stated that the Council was not a thoroughly representative one.

2233. With regard to the method in which the representatives of the Council are elected, does that not secure proper representation of the country small schools?—No.

2234. Not if provision is made for country teachers to record their votes?—No; they cannot attend meetings of the Institute.

2235. They can vote by ballot or post?—It is the choice of two evils; a country teacher has no chance of getting one of his own class to represent him.

2236. Why not?—Because the difficulties of getting them to attend meetings are too great.

2237. Would not a country teacher be able to be nominated by post?—They would not take the trouble; there is no cohesion among the country teachers in the matter.

2238. How many large schools are there in the colony over 300 in attendance?—Seventy-six, I think I said.

2239. Do you think the votes from those schools could overpower the votes from other schools?—It depends on how many representatives they have at the conference.

2240. To whom do you refer as "they"?—The big schools.

2241. You admit that by far the largest proportion of the smaller schools in Wellington would be much benefited by the introduction of the alternative scale?—Yes; the salaries would be increased; the apparent monetary advantage would be greater: whether the ultimate benefit would be as great as now I am not prepared to say.

2242. Taking the teachers of Wellington as a whole—every teacher in the employ of the Board—would they or would they not be benefited by the scale submitted in evidence to the Commission?—I suppose there would be an increase all round in the money paid out to them.

2243. You stated you are not officially representative of the schools?—Yes.

2244. You are giving evidence as a private witness?—Yes; I am not an official representative.

2245. In your evidence-in-chief you made a statement like this—I took it down as it fell from your lips: "Instead of this, 'they' are tacking," &c. To whom do you refer as "they"?—I stated that £40 or £50 had been tacked on to the salaries of the higher-paid town masters. Assuming that scale is the scale of the Institute, then I mean the leaders of the Institute have benefited by the introduction of the scale.

Mr. Hogben stated that no one had knowledge of the scale, nor had it been made public until he had submitted it to the Commission and laid it on the table.

2246. *Mr. Stewart.*] You also stated that arguments had been carried on to the verge of tears, and that the feelings of the teachers had been worked upon?—Since the scale was instituted we have been recommended to fall in with it.

2247. Then, I may assume that I have removed from your mind misunderstandings and wrong impressions in reference to what you thought had been the action of a certain section of teachers?—You have removed the impression from my mind, or the impression has been removed, that the Inspector-General had consulted you in some respects as to whether the scheme would be an acceptable one or not.

2248. I have shown that a portion of your evidence has been given under a misconception?—No; if the scale was not before the Institute prior to the sitting of this Commission, it has been since.

2249. With regard to schools with an average attendance of from 15 to 20, did I understand you to say that they were suitable for teachers, men who had grown old and infirm?—I mean men who are not up to the strain of the active work demanded in the teaching of a large school.

2250. You think these smaller schools are a refuge for these teachers?—Yes.

2251. Do you not think that the country districts should receive efficient teachers and efficient education?—I know many things that should be done, but that are not done; I am not arguing on the question of abstract justice.

2252. If good and efficient teachers can be provided for these schools, do you not think the Commission should try and get them?—I do not know what the Commission should do, or should not do.

2253. If you were a parent living in one of those country districts, would you not wish the school to be officered by a good and efficient teacher?—I think the schools in those districts are manned by good teachers. The question is more one of individual tuition than class tuition: you can sit by the side of a pupil and guide his or her hand if you choose.

2254. You say you have charge of Standard III. and up to Standard VII.?—Yes.

2255. How many children have you to teach in those standards?—I would like to consult my book before answering—I should say from 28 to 35.

2256. Then the average would be about 32?—Yes.
2257. Take 32 from your average attendance for the whole school of 59 and it leaves?—27.
2258. Twenty-seven pupils for your assistant to teach?—Yes.
2259. Do you not think she is receiving far too inadequate a salary for teaching that number of children?—Yes, I have said so.
2260. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] You are not a representative of the teachers?—Schools of our class have no representative, and could not get one.
2261. Did the Institute meet and select representatives to give evidence before the Commission?—Yes.
2262. You were not selected?—Yes, I was.
2263. By the Institute?—Yes.
2264. Were you present at the meeting?—Yes.
2265. How many were present in all?—I cannot tell you; it was one of the largest meetings I have seen held.
2266. Were there twenty present?—I should say many more: probably forty or fifty.
2267. Have you been an active member of the Institute for any length of time?—Yes.
2268. With regard to these questions of adopting a colonial scale, you have not taken sufficient interest in the matter to know how you voted or whether you voted at all?—It is many years ago since I voted as a member of the Council. I have been always under the impression that in Wellington we stood to lose considerably by the adoption of a colonial scale, and, if I did vote for it, I did so simply as a matter of abstract justice to the poorer-paid teachers in the outlying districts, and we were all prepared to sacrifice something.
2269. Nevertheless the motion was carried by a majority in favour of the adoption of a colonial scale; was the motion not carried at the local meeting to support a colonial scale?—I cannot recollect whether a vote was taken.
2270. Will you say a vote was not taken?—No, I will not say that.
2271. You are not taking sufficient interest in the affairs of the Institute to remember whether such important matters of that nature were discussed or not?—If you told me the meeting that you refer to I might remember.
2272. A meeting held a few weeks ago; however, with regard to the payments by grades instead of by units, are you aware that in the case of the majority of Boards in this colony teachers are paid by units and not by grades?—I was not aware of it.
2273. You would not deny that such is the case if it was stated so?—No, certainly not.
2274. In your opinion, are these Boards making a mistake when they adopt the system of payment by units instead of by grades?—I should say any Board that adopted the method of payment of teachers by units instead of by grades was not adopting the best method of payment.
2275. In regard to your statement as to influence and pressure being brought to bear on Boards in order to establish aided schools, do you consider such influences would be intensified if a colonial scale of salaries was adopted?—Yes.
2276. In what way?—The Boards, not having control of their own funds, will take less interest in that which passes merely through their hands to pay to others than if they had the money to do with as they wished.
2277. Suppose there was a stipulation that no school should be established below a certain number in attendance, would not Boards then be able to resist that pressure?—Stipulations are easily got round; I think Boards should use their discretion.
2278. Is it not a fact that in some districts Boards are more liberal in the establishment of small schools than what they are in others?—I object to the use of the word "liberal"; they are more foolish in building the schools, I admit.
2279. Suppose the Otago Board was as liberal as the Taranaki or Wellington Board, would Otago be able to pay the same salaries as are paid at the present time?—It naturally follows, the more small schools there are established in a district the less will be the salaries paid in that district.
2280. With regard to Boards: you consider that men of intellectual calibre would not seek seats on Education Boards in the event of a colonial scale being adopted?—I said the more you diminished Boards' responsibilities the more it would lead to their deterioration.
2281. How often does the Wellington Board require to draw up a new scale of salaries? I infer from your reply that, if the responsibility of drawing up a scale of salaries is withdrawn from Education Boards, men of intellectual calibre would not be inclined to come forward and take seats on the Boards?—I said it must lead to deterioration.
2282. What is the difference between thirteen Boards drawing up a scale of salaries and the Legislature drawing up a scale which is to be adopted by the thirteen Boards, if the money comes from the Government and the Boards allocate it: how will it lessen their power or influence?—If the Boards' administration of funds—take any body of men—is cut down from a £4 basis, with all privileges, to a basis of 11s. 3d., with the possibility of further reductions, the tendency of the Boards would be towards deterioration.
2283. You think that the Boards should be allowed to trench on the maintenance fund for building purposes?—I do not see that follows.
2284. Supposing, for example, that a colonial scale drawn up and adopted by the Legislature is exactly identical with the scale of the Wellington Board, or the scales of the thirteen Boards in the colony, what difference will it make?—In the first place, it is a misconception; in the second place, the Wellington Board might wish to alter their scale to-morrow in order to suit varying circumstances.
2285. Are there likely to be exceptionally varying circumstances in Wellington any more than in other districts?—I am not called upon to prophesy what will happen in Wellington. The

Wellington Board finds now that it has an excess of ex-pupil-teachers, and it must take steps to find an outlet for them. That might necessitate the recasting of their scale to-morrow.

2286. You do not wish to infer that the Wellington Board, or any other Board, has funds other than provided by the Government?—No.

2287. Your opposition, I gather, to a colonial scale is because in cases such as yours the teachers would lose a considerable sum of money: is your policy not, after all, a “breeches-pocket” one: you would not be so hostile to a colonial scale if your salary was increased?—No doubt, if you offered me an increase in salary such as some gentlemen in the service of the Board are getting, it might smooth my acceptance to a colonial scale, but I would still prefer to be under the Board’s jurisdiction.

2288. *The Chairman.*] You are satisfied with the scale of the Wellington Board?—I am more than satisfied.

2289. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] With regard to the appointment of teachers, do you consider such appointments should be in the hands of Boards irrespective of Committees?—I did not say so.

2290. What did you say?—I said that the initiative should spring from the Inspectors, confirmation from the Boards, and refusal or acceptance from the local Committee.

2291. Supposing the teacher elected is a stranger, how can the opposition spring from the Committee?—I mean to say that the local Committee should show reason to the Board why the appointee of the Board should not be accepted.

2292. But is it not a fact, sometimes, that the appointee of the Board is a stranger to the Committee?—Yes; but the Committee should be compelled to find something against the appointee before opposing the appointment, or else should be in the position of accepting the Board’s confirmation.

2293. With regard to teachers of the Home-country, you did not hear the evidence given yesterday by Mr. Joplin, who stated that a teacher from New Zealand had considerable difficulty—in fact, it was almost impossible for him—in obtaining a position in the Mother-country. In your evidence you said something about it being, perhaps, better for teachers to “pull up their stakes” and go Home?—Well, of course, all New Zealand teachers are not able to get appointments here; I could run over a list of twelve who could not get appointments. You have to judge of other things than simply academic status.

2294. You have been twenty-five years in the service of the Wellington Education Board—going on for twenty-six years—and you are in a school with a falling attendance, as I see from the report?—No, my school is not falling in attendance; it is one of the steadiest schools in New Zealand; it has never risen in attendance very much, and never fallen.

2295. You advocate the payment of a bonus on certificates?—Yes.

2296. Are you aware how many Boards pay these bonuses?—No.

2297. Are you in favour of the fine that is suggested in the proposed scale? Decidedly not.

2298. Is a fine in such a case not a bonus?—I simply ask that some slight inducement should be held out to all our teachers to improve their educational standard, apart from all the chances of getting bigger schools; I simply mean to pursue their studies.

2299. Would you advocate reduction on teachers when they become less efficient through getting up in years, or through laziness?—No; it seems to me we are confusing two matters—I am talking of literary proficiency, and not ability to keep a school.

2300. Do you consider literary attainments qualify a teacher for the performance of his duties rather than efficiency as judged by Inspector’s marks?—I did not say so. I say, take two men and put them in charge of schools, and the man of higher literary attainments must have a better influence over the school than the man with lower attainments.

2301. What encouragement would you give to a teacher to conduct his school as efficiently as possible in order to get to the highest grade?—He gets encouragement in being promoted to the large schools.

2302. Would not the same thing apply in regard to literary attainments?—No.

2303. Why not?—For the reason that a man may have high literary attainments, and yet be a poor manager of a school. What you want in the large school is more of what I might call a school “jockey,” not exactly a man possessed of only high literary attainments.

2304. *Mr. Hill.*] Do I understand you to say that if you take away some of the duties of Education Boards, it follows that such Boards will deteriorate in quality?—I do not think I said their duties—their responsibilities, I said.

2305. Well, their responsibilities, then?—I think that would be the effect.

2306. I understand it is one of the reasons why you oppose the principle of a colonial scale; you do not want to see the functions of Boards limited?—No; I wish to see their *personnel* as high as it is at the present time.

2307. You think that each Education Board might well be left to formulate its own policy?—Decidedly.

2308. You recognise, of course, that there is a great diversity existing in New Zealand in the matter of the payment of teachers’ salaries?—Yes.

2309. You recognise also that the diversity is in consequence of there being different sized schools in the several districts?—Yes; I attribute it to the paucity of children in those districts—the preponderance of small schools over large schools.

2310. Do you think it would be a better plan to take, say, the best paid districts in New Zealand at the present time, and pay a capitation grant in each of the other districts, so as to raise the salaries of the teachers in those districts to the salaries received in the better paid districts?—I think it might be done.

2311. You think that the best paid districts ought not to come down to the average for New Zealand?—No, I do not think so.

2312. You recognise that the teachers in the smaller districts are at the present time receiving salaries which are not really commensurate to the work they are called upon to do?—I say nothing about the work they are called upon to do.

2313. If a man receive £70 in the Grey District, for doing the same work as a man in the Wellington District who receives a salary of £120, are those salaries commensurate for the work performed?—No; I think the teacher in the Grey District should be levelled up to the teacher in the Wellington District.

2314. Would you suggest that the two salaries should be added together in order to make the mean, or would you, as you say, raise the salary of the teacher in the Grey District?—I would raise the salary of the teacher in the Grey up to the level of the Wellington District.

2315. Would you suggest that the salaries received in the best paid districts at the present time should be taken as an index for the payment of teachers' salaries generally?—Yes, I think so.

2316. You would not lower any salaries, except, perhaps, those in the best paid districts?—I cannot say that any of the salaries are too high.

2317. Will you be good enough to look at the staffing of the Mount Cook Kindergarten School and compare the staffing in that school with the staffing under the proposed scale?—I would like to say that I purposely have not touched upon the question of staffing at all; it does not occur in my evidence.

2318. In a school of 391, do you see that the staffing gives a principal five assistants and five pupil-teachers?—Yes.

2319. And you see the salaries proposed also?—Yes.

2320. The lady principal is the only one who will suffer through the five other assistants coming in. One lady teacher who receives £125 would receive £165?—Yes.

2321. Four other lady teachers would receive salaries of £125, £110, £95, and £80, respectively?—Yes.

2322. From your knowledge as a teacher, then, do you think that the proposed staffing is better than the staff at present in the school?—You have taken a particular school, which you should not have taken. I think it is a school the Wellington Board uses largely for the training of its teachers.

2323. I will take any school you like—a girl's school, for instance. I want to know would not the school be better staffed with five assistant teachers to help in the training of the other teachers?—It would not leave them much room.

2324. Do you mean to tell me that the proposed staffing—five assistant teachers—is not better than the staffing which obtains at present in the school?—I would prefer you to ask Mrs. Francis. I would not like to give an opinion on that particular school, for I did not come here prepared to discuss the question of staffing.

2325. Would the proposed staffing strengthen the school?—I never heard the school was weak in that respect.

2326. Do you think that the salaries proposed to the assistants of that school, or any school of that class, are too large?—I have not looked at the matter from the assistants' point of view.

2327. Would you pay men and women equal salaries, assuming all conditions to be the same—capacity, the number of children under instruction, responsibility, and efficiency?—Certainly not.

2328. Will you state your reasons?—To my mind two circumstances have always governed the question of wages—one is the law of supply and demand, the other is the cost of living; and no one can deny that the cost of living in the case of a man is very much more than the cost of living in the case of a woman, especially so in the case of a married man with a family.

2329. Supposing you went to a lady typist to get some matter typewritten, would you expect her to charge you less than the folio rate?—No.

2330. Why not?—Because, in that case, the ordinary rule of supply and demand comes in, and it is the market price.

2331. Then, is not a woman teacher entitled to the market price for the work done?—I gave my reasons before.

2332. You prefer the principle of a fixed salary?—Yes.

2333. Are you receiving a fixed salary now?—I suppose it is not altogether fixed.

2334. It is according to the Board's scale?—Yes.

2335. According to the present scale?—Yes.

2336. What is your salary?—£215.

2337. Is that according to the Board's scale for a school of 59 in attendance?—Yes.

2338. You would be a great loser under the proposed scale?—Yes.

2339. What would your salary be under the proposed scale?—£180 or £185.

2340. You do not object to losing part of your salary if there is to be an equal sacrifice on the part of others?—I think every man hates to lose a part of his salary, but it would certainly console me to know that it went into the pockets of the poorer paid teachers, and did not enrich those who are better paid.

2341. Under the proposed scale, are not the majority of the salaries to be raised?—Yes.

2342. The general average will be improved?—Yes.

2343. Do you object to that?—Yes, decidedly, if those richer than myself are participating in the gain, instead of in the sacrifice.

2344. If the salaries of assistant teachers were improved, would you object then?—That is not my point; I object to give up a considerable part of my salary while those who are better paid than myself are not giving up anything.

2345. If the average number of certificated teachers in New Zealand are benefited under the proposed scale, would you disapprove of it?—I would disapprove of it if those who are more highly paid than myself took no part in the sacrifice.

2346. You say you do not think the majority of the teachers in New Zealand have been consulted on the question of a colonial scale?—If the majority of the schools had been consulted, this particular scheme would not have been the emanation of their conference.

2347. You are aware that this Commission has been all over the colony taking evidence?—Yes.

2348. Are you aware that the teachers have been invited to give evidence?—Yes.

2349. Were you debarred from giving evidence here?—No.

2350. Are you a representative of the Institute?—No.

2351. If the other teachers have not been represented and they will not come, who is to blame?—I suppose they are to blame.

2352. If the results are not satisfactory, whose fault is it—if the teachers do not come forward—the Commission's fault or the fault of the teachers?—I do not blame the Commission, it is the fault of the teachers, no doubt. In England it is the same thing, they lack the cohesion necessary for action; they are too broken-hearted.

2353. I understand that you are against the Committees making recommendation on behalf of teachers?—Yes.

2354. Supposing you wanted a pair of boots, would you go by the recommendation of the bootmaker, or would you abide by your own choice?—I should be guided by own opinion of the man's honesty and my opinion of the appearance of the boots.

2355. Do you think School Committees are interested in obtaining good and honest men as teachers?—Yes, they are decidedly interested.

2356. Do you think they would be likely, in such a case, to select an indifferent man in preference to a very good man if they were wanting a teacher?—I not only know it to be likely, but I know it to be absolutely true that they do so.

2357. You have found that these men, given responsibility, will abuse it even when it is against the interests of their own children?—Yes, that is so.

2358. Could you give examples?—I think that is calling on me to do too much.

2359. *Mr. Weston.*] Will you give me your opinion upon pupil-teacher teaching?—It all depends on the year of the pupil-teacher's life you take: given a good training, and particularly a good kindergarten training, for two or three years, I think in the latter part of a pupil-teacher's career he or she would be an efficient teacher.

2360. But under other circumstances, what then?—Then a pupil-teacher cannot be as efficient in the early part of his or her career as a teacher who has had such a training as I have emphasized the need of.

2361. It has been said, by one witness at any rate, that a pupil-teacher has not the control of the higher standards, and that he is not always qualified to fill the position of infant-teacher: do you confirm that statement?—The personal element so much comes in; there is the question, also, of the girl's training: given a well-trained girl, I think she would be competent in the latter part of her career to manage the lower classes in the school up to the Third Standard, and, possibly, a small Fourth Standard also.

2362. Do you think that pupil-teachers under the present system have the best opportunities for learning theory and practice?—No, I do not.

2363. What improvement do you think could be affected in that matter?—Probably by the establishment of training-schools.

2364. Do you think that pupil-teachers, in justice to themselves and the children alike, should be allowed to teach all day?—No, I do not.

2365. How would you apportion the school day?—About half and half.

2366. If there be an evil a remedy must be found: I want you to tell whether, in your opinion, employing teachers all day and expecting them to study at night is an evil?—Yes, I should say it is an evil.

2367. Then, if a pupil-teacher is employed in school all day, and has to study after hours, does it not follow that the children she is employed to instruct may suffer?—I think they may suffer; I have not noticed many cases where I think they would do so.

2368. Do you not think that a boy or girl, especially a girl whose nerves are more highly strung, having to study after hours, must come to the school somewhat jaded?—Yes; I think that naturally follows.

2369. Then, I suppose, if it were not a question of money, it would be, in your opinion, better to have adult teachers in all our schools?—I would increase the proportion of adult teachers.

2370. To what extent?—I did not think I would be questioned on that point, and so I did not come prepared to answer the question.

2371. What class of school do you think a sole female teacher is competent to take charge of?—Schools of an average attendance up to 30 or 40.

2372. You think a female teacher could manage all the standards in such a school?—Yes.

2373. You think she should and would be able not only to teach the standards, but to control the country boys who would be placed under her?—Yes, I think so, and I know it is largely done.

2374. That being the case, if a lady can teach a school up to 30 of an attendance, should she not receive, in the particular school, the salary that a man would receive if he was in charge of a similar school?—No, I do not think so.

2375. Do you think that there should be a minimum salary payable alike to male and female teachers?—No; I should always hold that it would be right to differentiate, on account of the extra expense a man is always put to.

2376. With regard to the functions of Education Boards, I think I understood you to say that you were in favour of the present system of payment of salaries?—Yes, all things considered, I think I prefer it.

2377. I presume in the evidence you have given you base it upon the accepted principle, which lawyers, at any rate, understand, that the presumption is that what is right will be done, and therefore it is to be presumed the Boards throughout the colony will divide their capitation grant fairly and equitably amongst the teachers in their own particular district?—Yes, I think they would certainly do that.

2378. That is your principle?—Yes.

2379. With regard to future uncertainty—you touched upon that point: do you consider that there would be more uncertainty under the present system than under a colonial scale?—I think there would be less uncertainty—that is to say, there would be more certainty of generous treatment from Boards than under a colonial scale.

2380. I mean, whether in the course of time the Legislature might not reduce the capitation grant, and so bring about the uncertainty that, even under the present system, exists?—The Legislature might at any time reduce the grant, as they did once before.

2381. You object to the original and alternative scales of salaries which are proposed, do you not?—Yes.

2382. And you instance your own case as an illustration?—Yes.

2383. If you were asked to frame a scale of salaries, how would you commence?—I am not attempting to do that now.

2384. You are not in the position to enunciate principles that would control you in the preparation of a scale?—No; I have not studied the question of the construction of a scale. I come here as a critic, not as a constructor.

2385. Can you enunciate any principles that you think should actuate the framers of a scale applicable to the whole of the colony?—You must, of course, have a minimum salary.

2386. What should the amount of that minimum salary be per annum?—£100.

2387. As you say that females should not receive the same salaries as males, what proportion of the £100 would you allocate to a lady teacher?—80 per cent. or 90 per cent.

2388. Then, in dealing with lady teachers, in cases where something beyond the minimum salary was payable, what percentage would you debit a lady teacher with from a man's salary?—I would make a reduction of 10 per cent. or 15 per cent.

2389. Is there any other point upon which you would lay stress in the preparation of a colonial scale?—The question of the maximum salary.

2390. What amount should that be?—That would depend on the finances I had at my disposal.

2391. But disregarding finances?—I think it is impossible to do so in framing a scale of salaries.

2392. I want you to tell me what would be righteous and fair?—I cannot dissociate salaries from ability to pay.

2393. Taking the £4 capitation grant, what would you say should be the maximum salary, since you put it in that way, or, rather, £3 9s. 8d., leaving 11s. 3d. for incidentals?—I should say £300 a year would be a fair maximum salary.

2394. That is for a male teacher?—Yes.

2395. And what for a female teacher?—The same percentage as before.

2396. Do you find any difficulty in obtaining pupil-teachers?—This Board apparently finds no difficulty.

2397. Would you advocate any departure from the present rate of pay to pupil-teachers, and if so, what salary do you think they should receive?—I do not think the present rate of pay has much to condemn it. I think it matters not so much what you pay a candidate at the start, provided you hold out to him reasonable hope of obtaining a fair salary afterwards.

2398. Do you think, more especially in the case of male pupil-teachers, that the curriculum—the hard work—enters into a boy's calculations when he is at an age to come forward as a pupil-teacher?—I do not know about the hard work. I think there is a feeling among boys that they do not want to grow up as "old schoolmasters."

2399. So far as that is concerned, do you think there is a future for pupil-teachers in this colony?—I do not think there is a very bright one for them.

2400. Do you think there are too many pupil-teachers employed in the colony?—Not too many male pupil-teachers.

2401. I read even so lately as last night the opinion of specialists that hereafter the majority of teachers will be female teachers: is that your opinion?—I am inclined towards that opinion.

2402. Do you not think, therefore, that the risk Boards of Education take in receiving young girls as pupil-teachers is altogether a mistake, and is one of the causes producing the present effect?—It is one of the causes producing the effect that we are likely, in the future, to have our schools officered by women; 95 per cent. of the schools in Massachusetts are in the hands of women.

2403. Do you think that ladies are competent to teach Standards IV., V., VI., in our town schools?—I do not think so.

2404. Why?—I do not think they have sufficient controlling-power.

THURSDAY, 27TH JUNE, 1901.

Examination of J. J. PILKINGTON continued.

2405. *Mr. Hogben.*] I think you agreed with the remarks of Sir Henry Craik regarding the harm done by excessive competition?—Yes.

2406. Do you think that instead of competitive scholarships, which entitle pupils to free education and something more in secondary schools, it would be better to have what I might call qualify-

ing scholarships, so that if pupils reached a certain standard they should be entitled to free education?—Yes, I think that would be a decided improvement.

2407. You know that Sir Henry Craik is secretary of the Scotch Education Board?—I did not exactly know his official standing.

2408. Have you also read his remarks upon manual and technical education?—No, I have not.

2409. You are not aware he is very strongly in favour of manual and technical instruction in primary schools, and that he gave his opinions as evidence in 1893?—No, I am not aware.

2410. You are not aware that he is of the opinion that in the rural districts of Scotland just as good provision should be made for manual and technical instruction as in the manufacturing districts; this opinion of his you will find in the report of the Royal Commission in 1893?—I was not aware of it.

2411. Are you aware that Somersetshire and Wiltshire are said to be two of the counties in which both manual and technical instruction is carried out most thoroughly, and that in the schools of those counties such instruction takes the form of practical instruction in rural subjects?—Yes; that would to some extent meet my views.

2412. Is it proposed to introduce technical education into the schools in New Zealand?—It seems to me to be proposed all round.

2413. Where is it proposed?—Page 3, section 3.

2414. Do you not recognise that wood-work may be a subject of hand-and-eye training, quite apart from the training necessary for carpenter's trade?—I should say it would be a very retrograde step to take from a boy his drawing-pencil, which is *facile princeps* of all tools, and put him to handle a cross-cut saw, a hammer, or a jack-plane.

2415. You think that the graphite pencil fell down ready-made out of heaven. How long have you studied this question?—Every since I have had the power to study.

2416. Have you tried it in practical education yourself in school?—No.

2417. Are you aware that the use of the hand in the treatment of solid forms reacts on the co-ordinating functions of the brain?—I presume it does.

2418. I am speaking of wood-work as a subject of manual instruction for the simple purpose of training the hand: what is your opinion?—I would still maintain that you cannot train the hand so well as you could do by the use of the drawing-pencil.

2419. Does the drawing-pencil train the sense of touch in the conception of the idea of solidity?—If children take model-drawing I think it does; it certainly trains the sense of touch most minutely.

2420. In connection with the idea of solidity, will you be surprised to hear that there is not a psychologist in the world who holds that opinion?—Yes, I am surprised to hear it.

2421. You said inquiry should be made into the question of technical education in primary schools: I suppose you mean manual instruction in primary schools?—I am speaking of technical education.

2422. There is none proposed. You said that an inquiry should be made before it is introduced in New Zealand: are you aware that a good deal of inquiry has been made?—No.

2423. Are you aware of Mr. Riley's report published two or three years ago?—I have read it.

2424. Does that not amount to inquiry?—It is a report, not an inquiry by a large body of experts to sift evidence, a body like this Commission.

2425. Have you read the report of the inquiry conducted by the Irish Royal Commission on practical and manual instruction in elementary schools in Ireland, in 1898, the most valuable mass of evidence ever obtained?—No, I have not.

2426. Are you aware that manual instruction, including instruction in wood-work, was proposed to be introduced into the rural schools in Ireland, where the conditions were fairly promising, such as those we have in a country like New Zealand?—No.

2427. Are you not aware that that report was carefully gone through, and that that Commission took evidence in regard to rural districts in other parts of the world besides Ireland?—I am not aware of it. I know there was a Commission set up to take evidence, and they presented a report about rural schools, and I was astonished at the barrenness of the report, and the paltry proposals made.

2428. You are not referring to the Commission I mean?—Possibly not.

2429. Are you aware that an abstract of the report was published by the Education Department in New Zealand?—No, I am not.

2430. It was a special report, No. 1, 1899?—No, I cannot say I have read it. If it was sent to me, probably I did; but I do not remember.

2431. Your next point was in regard to salaries and the principle of promotion of teachers by grade and not by units. Take a case like this: supposing a man had 50 pupils in average attendance, what would be the maximum salary payable to him under this Board?—£215.

2432. Supposing his attendance fell to 49, what would his salary be?—£175.

2433. How much would he lose for one unit?—£40.

2434. Then, do you not think it would be less hardship, when the loss had to be incurred, that it should proceed by units instead of grades?—No.

2435. Would it not be a great hardship that for the loss of one child from his school the head-teacher would lose £40 from his salary?—No; of course, there are hardships under any scale, but I prefer the classification by 20's and 25's rather than by units; it avoids the scrambling after units.

2436. Do you not think there would be a scramble after the £40 when the attendance had reached 49 and only another one was wanted?—There might be a scramble after that one, but not after every one.

2437. Do you not think that a good deal of hardship, by the introduction of a new scale, would be done away with by conserving vested rights—that present holders of positions should have their salaries maintained at the present figure?—Yes, I do.

2438. It would allow time to transfer them to places where the salaries corresponded with their present salaries, would it not?—Certainly, if you had some assurance of systematic promotion.

2439. You would not take the power of promotion from the Boards?—No.

2440. If such were the case, how would the Boards have less authority?—I think we endeavoured to elucidate that question yesterday.

2441. Then, I understand that you give the same answer now as you gave yesterday?—Yes.

2442. May I take it that you practically represent schools from 40 to 100 in attendance, or, rather, that you speak for them, as, I understand, you appear to a certain extent on your own responsibility?—Something like that.

2443. Have you estimated the average salaries paid to the head-teachers of those schools in the Wellington District?—I do not recognise average salaries in the Wellington District.

2444. There are twenty-eight teachers, or something like that, and I want to get at the average salary?—We want the average scale salary, not the average individual salary.

2445. You are not aware that the average salary paid in the Wellington District for schools of that class, between 40 and 100, is £196?—I am not aware of it.

2446. Are you aware what the scale salary would be in this district for those schools?—£175.

2447. £160 to £195. Well, take schools in the Wellington District with from 40 to 100 in attendance, what is the average salary the scale would give?—I have not found that out.

2448. Then, how can you criticize a scale of salaries unless you know what it is you are comparing? You cannot construct a scheme without averages?—No, I suppose not.

2449. Are you aware of what the average salary under the proposed colonial scale is?—I have it in your own figures, about £160.

2450. Supposing we come to a few individual cases: are you aware that there is a school of 41 with a salary to the headmaster of £195 in the Wellington District?—Yes.

2451. What would be the maximum salary payable under the scale?—£175.

2452. £20 less?—Yes.

2453. There is another school, salary £205: what is the salary payable to that school of 44 in attendance, head-teacher D1 certificate, according to the Wellington scale, page 9 of the regulations, schools between 35 and 50?—£175.

2454. Then, he is being paid £30 in excess of the Wellington scale?—Yes.

2455. Have you gone through it to see how many of the schools you represent are being paid above the Wellington scale?—It is not my business to do so.

2456. You have not examined it; you represent a certain class of schools, and yet you have not recognised or compared the existing state of affairs with the scale of the Board?—I repeat it is not my business to do so.

2457. Have you examined one scale against another?—Yes.

2458. What is the average salary payable to Wellington schools under the Wellington scale?—It is plainly set out in the scale.

2459. You would like to see the salaries of all classes of teachers in the different districts raised to the highest existing scale under which salaries are paid?—Yes; that would be a natural desire on the part of all teachers.

2460. Would you favour a proposal to give the Boards the means of doing that, taking every class of teacher by itself?—Yes, I should certainly support that.

2461. I presume you know that the conditions in the different districts vary a good deal?—Yes.

2462. Supposing you were considering the payment of teachers in schools from 1 to 9, below 10 in attendance, do you know that the number of such schools varies very considerably in the different districts? Marlborough has thirty-nine such schools?—Yes.

2463. You would have to make provision for Marlborough to pay for thirty-nine schools, whereas for South Canterbury you would not have to make any provision at all?—Yes, I understand.

2464. There would be variations throughout?—Yes.

2465. And the same thing would apply in schools of 14 in attendance: Auckland would have to pay for twenty-nine, and so on, right down to Marlborough which has six, and Taranaki four?—Yes.

2466. You would also have to make provision wherever there was any considerable amount of variation?—Yes.

2467. For schools of 15 to 19, and 20 to 35, you would have to give the Boards enough to pay such salaries?—Yes.

2468. Then, would that not be the same thing as paying them on a colonial scale?—Yes, I presume so.

2469. The principle is the same, is it not? We should have to distribute enough for the Boards to pay?—This is so.

2470. Then it would be a colonial scale to Boards to allow them to make payments?—Yes.

2471. The only difference is that the Boards would not then be compelled to pay salaries in that particular way; they would have the money to do so, but would not be compelled to pay salaries in any particular way?—Not legally, but morally, I suppose, they would be.

2472. Are you aware that certain of the Boards could have paid a scale closely approximating to that scale, at all events, in a large number of their schools before, and they did not do so?—I know that some small appropriations were made—I did not know that they were very large.

2473. You think that Boards would pay on a colonial scale if they were given the money to do so?—Yes, I think they would be compelled to do so.

2474. Do you think they have shown any tendency to do so in the past?—Yes, I think so.

2475. Do you think the appointment of teachers should be left in the hands of Boards?—Yes.
2476. *The Chairman.*] Have you looked carefully over the proposed colonial scale?—Yes; more particularly as it affects schools of my own class.
2477. To ascertain the way in which it will affect teachers in medium-sized schools like your own?—Yes.
2478. Generally, how will it affect those teachers?—They will suffer a very decided reduction.
2479. Take one school for instance, the Mangatainoka School, average attendance 160; the salary of the head-teacher, Mr. Chatwin, is £265: how much will he receive under the proposed scale—his school is in the Forty-mile Bush?—He will get £240.
2480. He suffers a reduction of £25?—Yes.
2481. Do you know Mr. Chatwin personally?—Yes.
2482. Is he an old, inefficient teacher, or is he a young and efficient teacher?—He is a young, smart man.
2483. I presume, one of the best teachers in the district?—I should not be surprised to hear that he was.
2484. Take the Pahiatua School, average attendance 228; the headmaster receives a salary of £285: what will be his salary under the proposed colonial scale?—£257 12s.
2485. He will suffer a reduction of about £27?—Yes.
2486. Do you know him personally?—Yes.
2487. Is he an old or an efficient teacher?—Certainly, so far as I have heard, he is supposed to be a very competent teacher; he is not an old man, but a man in the full vigour of life and manhood.
2488. Is he a good, active, experienced teacher?—Yes.
2489. Take the case of the Kaitawa School, average attendance 41; salary paid to the head-teacher, £235: what reduction will he suffer under the proposed scale?—He will suffer a reduction of £74.
2490. In the case of the Makakahi School, average attendance 65; the headmaster receives a salary of £225, or £205 without house allowance: what salary will he receive under the proposed colonial scale—that is, without house allowance?—£185.
2491. He will suffer a reduction of £20?—Yes.
2492. Again, take the case of the headmaster of the Pongaroa School, one of the schools in the back blocks, average attendance 14—it is set down at 14 in the report—but it is nearly 100 at the present time—
Mr. Hogben: For the March quarter the attendance was 37.
2493. *The Chairman.*] That master receives a salary of £175: what salary will he receive under the proposed scale?—He would lose £100.
2494. Do you know him?—Yes.
2495. Is he a young and inefficient teacher, or an inexperienced teacher?—He is quite young, and, so far as I know, he has had a long Wellington experience at one of the town schools, and he has a high reputation for skill at the School of Design.
2496. Take the case of the Taueru School, which has already been referred to, the number on the roll is 46, and the salary of the headmaster is £205: what salary would he receive under the suggested scale?—He would receive £166, a reduction of £39.
2497. Do you know him?—No, I do not.
2498. Then, again, the Hamua School, the attendance is 41, and the salary paid to the headmaster is £215: what reduction will he undergo under the proposed scale?—His salary would then be £161, a reduction of £54.
2499. Do you know that teacher?—Yes.
2500. Is he a good teacher or an inefficient teacher?—I simply know he is a young man who has been some time in the service of the Board.
2501. So far as you are aware he has a good record?—Yes, so far as I know.
2502. I will take the case of a lady-teacher in charge of the Rongomai School, average attendance, 29; salary, £143 15s.: what salary would she receive under the suggested scale?—£128.
2503. She also would suffer a reduction in salary?—Yes, that is so.
2504. Take the case of a school that has only been established a few years, a school near Masterton—Te Ore Ore; the average attendance is 55, and the headmaster receives a salary of £215: what would his salary be under the suggested scale?—£175; he would suffer a reduction of £40.
2505. Do you know him?—No, I do not.
2506. Every one, without exception, of the medium-sized schools will suffer reduction under the proposed scale?—Yes, that is right.
2507. And a very severe reduction at that?—Yes.
2508. What would the percentage be?—From one-fifth to one-sixth of their salaries—about 20 per cent.
2509. Have you noticed whether the teachers in city schools are likely to suffer any serious reduction under the suggested scale?—I have not noticed; I think they would receive a slight increase.
2510. If reductions are necessary in order to build up the salaries of underpaid assistants, what salaries, in your opinion, can best afford that reduction?—If we have to suffer reduction the holders of the highest salaries should bear a proportionate share in such reductions as are made; they should participate equally.
2511. Is that the case under the proposed scheme; are they participating in the reductions?—No, it is not so.
2512. You were asked a question in regard to one of your teachers, whom you say is an ex-pupil-teacher: is that lady teacher certificated?—Yes; she holds a D certificate.

2513. Has she applied for any of our country schools?—I am not quite sure; I think she applied for the Roseneath School.

2514. Has she parents residing in the locality?—No; her parents reside in Christchurch.

2515. Her salary is £42 a year, is it not?—Yes.

2516. You say you are only aware of her having applied in one instance for another school?—Yes. She may have applied in two instances; I am not sure, I think I should say two.

2517. Is there a prospect of that girl getting a better position if she applied for a country school, and got a house, too?—Yes; but I very much doubt if she would apply.

2518. Are you aware of any gross anomalies in connection with the city schools, where the salaries do not correspond with the amount of work teachers have to perform? Do you think there are any underpaid assistants there?—As I said yesterday, I have not really studied the question from the assistants' point of view; I saw that teachers of all classes were being represented by chosen individuals, and I did not think it necessary for me to go outside my own limits and study other aspects of the case.

2519. Taking the case of a large city school with an attendance of 700 or 800, the headmaster receiving a salary of over £400 a year: do you think £100 in that case would be sufficient remuneration to the assistant teacher in charge of the Seventh Standard, undoubtedly the most competent teacher in the school, and doing the heaviest work of the school?—It certainly seems a very low salary.

2520. Would you consider it an anomaly for that teacher, in charge of Standard VII., and doing the highest work in the school, to be receiving a salary of £100 a year, while the teachers in charge of Standards VI. and V. received salaries of £200 each?—Yes, it seems a very wrong principle.

2521. In such a case, what would you advise if £40 is to be taken off your salary in order to be added on to the salary of your assistant, in the case of a headmaster receiving a salary of over £400?—I cannot help concluding there is something wrong and anomalous about that case; it will not continue to exist long, it is only a temporary sort of an arrangement, I think.

2522. Do you think it would be advisable to make serious reductions in the salaries of the headmasters in order to adequately pay the assistant teachers who are not receiving fair remuneration for their work?—There is no doubt as to who is able to bear the reduction best; I have not held that the headmasters are too highly paid, but I think they should share in the sacrifices if they are to be made.

2522. You think if a sacrifice is to be made it should be made in proportion to the salaries paid?—Yes.

2524. You say that the members of the Teachers' Institute, you understood, took an active part in insisting upon a colonial scale, and said that they were prepared to undergo sacrifices in order to build up the salaries of those who were inadequately paid?—I am not prepared to state that they personally would be prepared to undergo sacrifices, but they advised us all to be prepared to undergo sacrifices.

2525. Do you not think that those who advocated that first, and who have not undergone sacrifices, should have the "exquisite" pleasure of doing so?—Yes, I think they should be the first.

2526. Do you think that the country teachers you represent, and some of whom I referred to this morning, if they were fairly represented on the Institute, would have arrived at the conclusions which have been arrived at and given the evidence which has been given by members of the Institute, in favour of a colonial scale?—Yesterday morning I held a different opinion, but I have accepted an assurance from Mr. Hogben since that this scale has nothing to do with the Institute, and I am bound to accept that assurance.

Mr. Hogben: That is so, neither directly nor indirectly.

2527. *The Chairman.*] Do you know whether the Educational Institute had anything whatever to do with the Bill amending the education system of New Zealand, that was introduced into Parliament in the dying hours of last session; do you know if the provisions of the Bill were discussed?—I do not recollect it.

2528. You cannot say whether the members of the Institute knew anything about this resolution, the provisions of the Bill, or wished to see such a measure passed into law?—I do not know the object of the measure—I am quite in the dark.

2529. You cannot say whether the members of the Institute advocated the passing of that Bill, or brought pressure to pass it into law?—As far as I can speak for our local Institute, I have never heard that question mooted at all.

2530. Were you a member of the executive of the Institute?—No.

2531. It is admitted that the regulations of the Board have not been adhered to, and that salaries are being paid in this district in excess of the scale: do you know the reason why?—I took it to be on account of the consideration of the Board for the hardship that certain reductions of salaries would inflict, when reductions were brought about by no fault of the teachers.

2532. Has the Board been in the habit, instead of constantly cutting down salaries through fluctuations which have occurred, of retaining teachers without reducing their salaries, until they were able to find them more suitable openings?—Yes.

2533. Do you think such would be the case under a colonial scale if teachers were under the central department?—The department seems to be a cold-blooded sort of an institution compared to the Boards.

2534. Do you think that the members of the Educational Institute would be satisfied if they had a colonial scale of salaries, and that no further tinkering of the Education Act took place?—It is a difficult question to answer.

2535. Do you know what their aspirations are?—From time to time I know.

2536. Can you say as to whether they wish to get beyond the control of Committees and

Boards, and placed themselves in the position of Civil servants under the control of the central department?—I cannot say. I should say that is their wish.

2537. You say that it is not a truly representative institution?—It does not fairly represent the smaller schools of the colony, which form the majority of the schools; and as I assured you yesterday, at that particular Council meeting there were only three teachers to represent 82½ per cent. or 85 per cent.

2538. You have been present at meetings of the branch?—Yes.

2539. Can you say whether the country teachers are well represented at those meetings?—They are not.

2540. Are they in the majority or in the minority, as compared with the city teachers?—In the minority.

2541. You are sure they are in the minority?—Yes, a decided minority.

2542. Invariably?—Yes.

2543. Is not the Educational Institute regarded as essentially a city institution by the mass of the country teachers?—I do not know what the opinion of the back-country teachers is.

2544. Have the back-country teachers reasonable facilities for attending meetings?—No.

2545. If they attended the meetings of the local branch of the Institute would it not compel them to undergo very severe sacrifices in the matter of expense?—Yes.

2546. And out of their slender incomes are they able to undergo that expense?—No.

2547. Then, that accounts for their non-attendance at meetings?—Yes, to some extent; not altogether—not for the whole of the teachers.

2548. Do you think there is any lack of interest in the proceedings of the Institute displayed by the teachers?—There must be by a great many, who know it is absolutely impossible for them to attend.

2549. Is that because they feel they have virtually no power?—That might have something to do with it.

2550. So far as the Wellington District is concerned, you do not think that the views expressed by the local branch of the Educational Institute can be considered to truly and thoroughly represent the views of the large mass of the teachers?—I think, Sir, they would have to be modified if the large mass of teachers could attend the meetings.

2551. *Mr. Hill.*] I would like to ask you one question in reference to the staffing of the school I mentioned yesterday, and regarding which I endeavoured to obtain an answer from you: do you think that the staffing of that school would be strengthened by placing five assistant teachers in the school instead of the five pupil-teachers?—Yes; most emphatically.

A. DORSET, Secretary to the Wellington Education Board, examined.

Mr. Dorset: I do not wish to make a statement, but I have some returns here which I have been asked to place before the Commission. The first is in connection with the cookery class, which has been carried on since June, 1898. The return [Exhibit 103] shows the expenditure. I have been unable to ascertain the amount of the receipts (which have been very small) on account of Mr. Riley's absence. The statement shows that the total expenditure for 1898 amounted to £311 2s. 1d.; 1899, £731 1s. 7d.; and 1900, £725 11s. 4d. The next return [Exhibit 102] shows the annual cost of the Technical School, Wellington, for the years 1891 to 1900. I may say that the expenditure on buildings for 1900 includes the cost of the large addition at the back, which was put up at a cost of a little over £3,000. The surplus from the Exhibition was handed over to the Board as a free donation, and was subsidised by the Government. I have also prepared the following memorandum: "The cost of office and general expenses, based on this Board's present scale of grants to Committees for incidental expenses, will, I think, be covered by the £250 and the capitation grant of 11s. 3d., providing the charge for rental of school-sites and temporary schoolrooms is borne by the Building Fund." With reference to the last clause, I may say the Wellington Board has not been in a position to purchase school-sites in the city; we have taken them on lease with purchasing clauses, and are practically paying a heavy rental for three of them.

2552. *Mr. Weston.*] Did I understand you to say that £250 and 11s. 3d. capitation would be enough for incidentals?—Yes, I think so; but not if it is to carry the rent.

2553. Will it be enough for all the purposes mentioned in the Inspector-General's suggested scheme?—Yes.

2554. *Mr. Davidson.*] I find, Mr. Dorset, that the salary for the teachers at schools of between 15 and 20 is £70 under the Board's scale?—Yes, with an allowance of £10.

2555. What is that allowance made for?—It is house allowance, but is made as practically a slight increase to the salaries of the teachers.

2556. So that this scale does not represent the salaries paid to the teachers at schools of that class?—You will find a clause further over, I think, which states that £10 is added to the salaries of the teachers at the smaller schools, £20 to those of the teachers at the larger schools, and £50 to the salaries of the headmasters at the city schools, where no house is provided.

2557. If there is a residence attached to the school the salary is as stated in the scale?—Yes.

2558. Do you think that is a sufficient salary (£80) for the teachers of that class of school?—I think the minimum salary for any teacher should be £100.

2559. The salary suggested in the alternative scale for teachers of schools of from 15 to 20 is from £80 to £100—that would be an improvement on the salary paid under your scale?—I think that the minimum salary is too low altogether, and always has been.

2560. Perhaps you could tell me how many schools there are with average attendances of from 15 to 20 in your district?—Not from memory.

2561. I think there are twenty-six; so that class of school, which is a considerable proportion of the whole number in your district, would be materially benefited under the alternative scale?—Yes, decidedly.

2562. Take the next class, from 19 to 40, according to the alternative scale. I find that under your scale the salary of the teachers at schools of from 20 to 25 is £80?—Yes.

2563. That is for either male or female?—Yes.

2564. Under the alternative scale the salary for a male teacher at schools of this class would be from £120 to £130?—Yes; that would be an improvement.

2565. An increase of from £40 to £50 a year?—Yes.

2566. Do you think it would be in the interests of education to pay such salaries, and induce a better class of teacher to go into the country districts?—I always thought the salaries under the Wellington Board's scale were too low.

2567. The salary is fixed at £100, under the Wellington Board's scale, for teachers at schools of from 25 to 30?—Yes.

2568. Have you noticed the salaries suggested in the alternative scheme?—Yes; the salaries suggested in that scheme would be improvements on those paid under the Wellington Board's scale to all teachers at small schools until they get up to between £130 and £150.

2569. So that, at any rate, more than half the schools in this district would, under the alternative scale, have the salaries attached to them materially increased?—Yes, all the smaller schools, up to, I think, about 30.

2570. About 40, I think you will find?—Yes, perhaps 40.

2571. *Mr. Stewart.*] We have had it stated in evidence that the teachers at a number of schools in this district are paid salaries in excess of those laid down under the Board's regulations: would it be much trouble to you to furnish a return showing the salaries thus paid in excess of the Board's scale?—None are now paid in excess of the scale; they have all been reduced.

2572. From when?—From the first of this month. The Board instructed me to administer the regulations, except where the Board's scale is below the first proposed scale, and I have brought the salaries down to that scale. No teacher's salary has been brought below the proposed scale.

2573. Do you think that the adoption of a colonial scale—I do not specify any particular one—would be to the benefit of education?—Decidedly so; I have always thought it manifestly unfair that one teacher should get less than another who was doing equal work because he was on the other side of a river or a mountain-range. When the boundary of the Wellington District was extended to the Manawatu River the Otaki School was brought into this district, and the salary of the teacher at that school was in consequence increased by £35 a year.

2574. Do you think the adoption of a colonial scale would assist you in keeping the finances of the Board on a sound basis?—I think so; the finances will be kept on a sound basis now that the regulations are being adhered to.

2575. What is the overdraft now?—I could not say at the moment.

2576. But there is a large overdraft?—Yes.

2577. With regard to the return which you furnished showing the cost of the Technical School: has any rent or interest been charged to the Technical School for that part of this building which it uses for technical purposes?—None whatever.

2578. Then, the rent of the rooms which have been used by the Technical School classes should be added to the cost?—Yes.

2579. Then, with regard to the other building that has been erected: has any rent or interest been charged for the amount in excess of what your Board received from the Government and the surplus from the Exhibition?—No charge whatever has been made to the Technical School on account of rent, up-keep, maintenance, or anything of that sort.

2580. Then, am I justified in drawing this conclusion: that no rent, or interest, or any charge whatever having been made to the Technical School, those items have practically been a charge on the general Maintenance Fund of the Board?—Yes. This building was erected with funds taken partly out of the building vote, and partly out of the general account, at a time when there was plenty of money.

2581. Then, a very large proportion of the Maintenance Fund of your Board has been applied to the purposes of the Technical School?—Yes.

2582. Which do you think are the worst paid class of teachers—*i.e.*, those whose salaries should be considerably increased under a colonial scale?—Those with salaries below £100 are the worst paid.

2583. You have already stated that the proposed scale would benefit them?—Yes.

2584. With regard to lady teachers, on looking over the report of the Minister the impression was conveyed to my mind that the lady teachers are woefully underpaid: do you think they are adequately paid?—I do not think any of the junior teachers are adequately paid; the junior assistants are all underpaid.

2585. Take the case of the Porirua School, where the lady who is practically the assistant teacher is receiving £42 a year, after teaching for seven years: is that salary adequate?—It is altogether too low; but the circumstances that governed the position were these: £42 is the highest salary paid to a pupil-teacher; when he or she has finished his or her pupil-teachership the Board has said, "You may stay on at the same salary if you like, and apply for vacancies as assistant when they occur." But many ex-pupil-teachers prefer remaining at the same salary to going into the country. The Board's finances are seriously embarrassed by that system of keeping on the ex-pupil-teachers.

2586. Under the proposed scale the mistress at the Porirua School would be an assistant, and would receive £90 a year?—Yes.

2587. Supposing that all these proposals for a colonial scale fell through, and no colonial scale were introduced, do you think that the finances of your Board would enable it to go on paying its present scale of salaries?—Yes, according to regulations; but it will not be able to as

long as it is hampered by outside items—as long as it has to bear the strain of about £800 or £900 a year for rents, and has to carry on the Technical School.

2588. Do you think that the finances of primary education and technical education ought to be altogether distinct?—Yes; technical education ought not to be a charge on the Board's general funds.

2589. With regard to the middle-sized schools—the salaries attached to which would be reduced very considerably under the proposed scheme—they will be reduced, will they not, by the Board bringing its actual payments into accord with its scale?—Not all of them.

2590. How many of them?—Very few.

2591. What about the Tenui School?—The salary of the master has been reduced to the scale.

2592. Would that master gain or lose by the proposed colonial scale?—I would have to look at some papers on my table before I could answer that.

2593. What is the average attendance at that school?—The average attendance for the March quarter was 25.

2594. And the salary paid for that 25 according to the scale?—£100 a year.

2595. You will observe that, under the colonial scale, if the average were 19 the teacher would get £118?—Yes; there is no comparison between the proposed scale and the Board's scale with regard to small schools.

2596. The teacher at that school would gain £30 a year?—Yes.

2597. Now, considering the settlement of the Wellington District, do you or do you not think that one of the first aims of this Commission ought to be to help the smaller schools, so that the settlers can get adequate education for their children?—It should be the very first aim.

2598. Then, in that respect you approve of the suggested scale?—Yes, for the lower schools.

2599. Do you think that the maximum salary paid in your district to the headmasters of large schools is what it ought to be in order to attract the best class of teachers for the work?—No, I do not think it is. I think the man who enters the teaching profession is very poorly paid for the result of his training.

2600. What is the maximum salary which the headmaster of a city school can get in Wellington, irrespective of house allowance?—£305, exclusive of house allowance.

2601. Do you think that in drawing up a colonial scale the Commission should be content with offering the sum of £305 a year to the headmaster of the largest school in the Wellington District?—No.

2602. Do you think £350 would be enough, irrespective of house allowance?—I would not care to say what the salary should be, but £350 would not be overpayment for the services of a headmaster at one of the large city schools. When the regulations were drawn up the Board had no school of over 300.

2603. What is the maximum salary an assistant lady teacher can obtain in the Wellington District?—£100 a year.

2604. Do you think that £100 a year is sufficient remuneration for a lady assistant at any school in the Wellington District?—Not for one holding an important position.

2605. Do you think £150 would be too much?—No; but it would be a very good salary.

2606. I believe the headmistress of the Mount Cook Girls' School is the highest paid lady teacher in the Board's service?—Yes.

2607. What salary does she receive?—£264.

2608. What is the average attendance at her school?—465, according to the latest return.

2609. £264 is the salary paid to the head of a school of 465?—Yes.

2610. Do you return Mount Cook Boys', Mount Cook Girls', and Mount Cook Infants' Schools as one school, or are they separate schools?—They are entirely separate schools.

2611. Do you think that, in the event of the adoption of a colonial scale of salaries, the influence and power of the Board over its teachers would be minimised or lessened?—I do not see how the influence of the Board over its teachers could be affected at all by the adoption of a colonial scale. The question of salary does not affect the question of control over a teacher.

2612. I notice that, according to your regulations, considerable bonuses are paid for certificates?—No; no bonuses are paid for certificates. So-much of a teacher's salary is paid for his qualifications, and so-much for average attendance.

2613. But a C1 man would get more than a D1 man: is not that a bonus on his certificate?—In some districts a distinct bonus is paid; in this case it is a higher value put upon the services of the man who is better qualified for the position.

2614. Does it not come to the same thing? If a C1 man receives so much more than a D1 man holding a similar position, is not that in effect a bonus on his certificate?—I do not look at it in that light; the C1 man has better qualifications, and is better able to perform the work which he is required to do.

2615. Do you think it right in principle that a C1 man should receive more salary than a D1 man for doing the same work in the same school?—A man should be paid according to his ability to do the work.

2616. Did your Board, in framing its regulations, make any allowance whatever for the difference in the cost of living in different parts of the province?—None whatever.

2617. Do you think it is practicable to do such a thing?—I do not think the locality affects the cost of living, though house-rent is probably less in some places than others.

2618. You think there are compensating advantages where rent is high, which really put the cost-of-living question out of Court?—I think so.

2619. Has your Board any scheme of promotion?—No, we have no scheme of promotion laid down. The practice has been that, all else being equal, teachers in the service of the Board should

be promoted to vacancies, but in making an appointment the teacher who has been in the Board's service must be equal to the outside teacher in order to get preference. This Board has not restricted promotions to its own service.

2620. Supposing you had an appointment open, would you take into consideration the experience of the teacher, his or her certificate, and the reports of the Inspectors, before you submitted the name to the Committee?—All those are taken into consideration when the Board makes its selections. The Board submits to the Committee the names of all the applicants, qualified or unqualified.

2621. Does the Board in making its selection take counsel of its Inspectors as to the fitness of the different applicants for the positions?—Not on every occasion, because the Inspectors are not always in town.

2622. But does the Board consult the Inspectors when it gets an opportunity?—Not on every occasion; but it is the custom to consult the Inspectors when present at the meeting of the Board.

2623. How often is one of the Inspectors in attendance in the course of the year?—They are absent more often than they are present.

2624. Then, the bulk of the Wellington appointments may be said to be made without consultation with the Inspectors?—That is so.

2625. Do you not think that it is a great advantage for any Board to consult its Inspectors as to the fitness of candidates for positions?—That is a matter of opinion; it is a matter for every Board to decide.

2626. You have a very large number of pupil-teachers and ex-pupil-teachers in your district?—Yes.

2627. It is a very important matter that the appointment of pupil-teachers should be most carefully considered?—Yes.

2628. Have you any entrance examination for pupil-teachers as to literary fitness?—The applications from candidates for pupil-teacherships are now submitted to the Inspectors, and they recommend those who have passed an examination equal to what they (the Inspectors) would set as an entrance examination.

2629. May I take your answer to mean this: that, as far as literary qualifications are concerned, the Inspectors judge by credentials presented by the candidates at the time of making application?—Not that entirely, because the Inspectors see the candidates.

2630. Do they have an opportunity of seeing the candidates at work?—Not until they are selected.

2631. Before being selected, a candidate is personally seen by one of the Inspectors, and if the Inspector thinks that the examination passed by that candidate is sufficiently difficult, he recommends the appointment of that candidate?—That is so.

2632. Let us take such a case as that: what is done with the pupil-teacher then?—The Inspectors make a selection from the candidates, and send in their recommendations; they may recommend twenty or thirty candidates as fit for appointment—*i.e.*, any appointment the Board may have.

2633. Is there any probationary time during which their fitness for teaching is tried in the schools?—If at the end of six months the headmaster of the school reports that a candidate is not fitted for the position of pupil-teacher he or she is retired.

2634. Do the Inspectors make any special visits to schools with a view to going into the fitness of the pupil-teachers employed on probation? If you asked one of the Inspectors he would be able to tell you better than I.

2635. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Please turn to page 27 of the Minister's Report (E.-1): there are a few points in connection with the salaries paid to which attention has been called by members of the Commission and previous witnesses. Take the Nikau School: the teacher gets £80 a year for teaching 16 pupils, being at the rate of £5 a head?—Yes.

2636. The next one is Waione—the teacher there gets £90 for teaching 17, practically £5 a head; the same applies to the next, Manuhara; whereas when we take the next one, Pongaroa, we find that the teacher there gets £175 for an average attendance of 14, or £12 10s. a head. Is that teacher paid according to scale?—No; the Board decided not to reduce the salaries of teachers when the attendance fell on account of an epidemic; there was an epidemic in this district; the attendance fell suddenly, and increased again almost as suddenly.

2637. Well, then, the teachers at schools where the attendance is increasing must suffer; the Board is not getting extra capitation from the department?—The Board's funds so far have come out of the bank, that accounts for the overdraft.

2638. I suppose the bank authorities will draw the line somewhere?—Probably so.

2639. With regard to the Tauéru and Hamua Schools, the teacher at the former school gets £205 for teaching 46; whereas the master at the Hamua School receives £215, or £10 extra, and teaches 5 pupils less, the average attendance being 41?—The same explanation will probably apply.

2640. I notice a similar anomaly with regard to the Fernridge School: the teacher gets £205, the attendance being 81; whereas at the Te Ore Ore School the attendance is shown as 55, and the master gets £215?—That is on account of the regulations not being adhered to; but now that the regulations are to be adhered to those anomalies will disappear.

2641. Do you find that the head-teachers under any other Board in the colony, at schools of from 50 to, say, 150, get the same salary as that allowed by the Wellington scale?—I do not think so; the Wellington scale has been exceptionally high in regard to that class of school.

2642. With reference to assistants, is it not a fact that a number of Education Boards pay their assistants—first and second assistants—more than the Wellington Board does?—That is so. There is no possibility of getting a uniform scale until a colonial scale is introduced.

2643. You advocate equal pay for equal work, no matter what part of the colony that work is performed in?—I think so.

2644. As to a colonial scale, you know that in drawing up a colonial scale this Commission are allowed to go up to £4 capitation, instead of £3 15s. : do you think it would be more feasible to draw up a colonial scale on the £4 basis than it would be to remove the anomalies by giving each of the Education Boards the extra 5s. capitation?—The extra 5s. being given to Boards would not remove the anomalies in the districts where they have no large schools: the £4 grant would not remove the anomalies throughout the colony.

2645. With regard to payment by grades or units, do you advocate the system adopted by the Wellington Board—*i.e.*, that of paying teachers by grades rather than each individual unit of average attendance?—We have always insisted that teachers shall maintain their average attendance for a certain time. If a teacher's salary is paid on the unit system, he never knows what his salary is to be—any little change may affect it.

2646. Take the case of a teacher who teaches a school of 49: his salary for teaching that school—the average attendance being between 35 and 50—is £175; if an extra pupil comes along, bringing the attendance up to 50, his salary will be increased under the Wellington scale by £40?—In all grades one must be a turning-point. There is no alteration in salary for the next 25 or 50 under our scale.

2647. The teacher would not feel it so much if an additional pupil came to his school as if one left?—A good many teachers' salaries are altered by the addition or loss of one.

2648. In cases of that kind increases by units would be more satisfactory?—Quite so.

2649. In respect to the working-average, do you find that the percentage (50) is sufficiently high to be of any benefit to country schools in this district?—There are very few schools that have less than half the roll-number present on any one occasion.

2650. Suposing it were raised to, say, two-thirds or three-fourths of the roll-number, would not that afford considerable relief?—Yes, decidedly so.

2651. Do you think a difference should be made between the work expected from a small country school, where the teacher is unaided, and that expected from a large town school?—That is a question that an Inspector would be more qualified to answer. I have nothing to do with the inside of a school; my work is financial and administrative.

2652. With regard to the question of truancy, have you had much difficulty in dealing with truants in the Wellington District?—Not such a great difficulty. The truant officer's efforts are very much hampered by the fact that parents may keep their children away for nearly half the week.

2653. Would you favour an increase from six half-day attendances in the week to eight?—I should think it would be an improvement, because it seems to me to be unfair that a parent should be able to keep his child away for half a week, and expect the teacher to keep him up to the others.

2654. You will have noticed from the suggested scale that under it the teachers at the smaller schools would get higher salaries than are being paid by the Education Boards; that would encourage teachers at country schools?—There is no doubt about that. The teachers at small schools in the country have been the worst paid.

2655. Do you find, judging from the number of applicants for positions in the towns, that there is a tendency on the part of country teachers to gravitate towards the towns?—Not to a large extent. As a rule, when a teacher is placed in charge of a country school, he sets to work to make his home there. The younger teachers strive to take advantage of the university course to better their status.

2656. What do you consider would be a fair differentiation—if there should be one—between the salaries paid to male and female teachers?—I think this Board's regulation is that a female teacher gets 75 per cent. of the salary of a male teacher; but I cannot see why there should be any difference at all in the case of the teachers at the small country schools.

2657. *Mr. Hill.*] I understand that it has been the effort of your Board to adapt the salaries to the conditions of districts?—Yes, so far as the back-country districts are concerned.

2658. That is, they give salaries to teachers in small schools on account of the special conditions existing there. Is that why the salaries vary so much?—The variation in the salaries has been caused by the Board's scale not being adhered to. The Board decided not to reduce salaries on account of the attendance having fallen.

2659. In reality your district has had for some time past a number of scales in operation at the same time?—Yes; practically so.

2660. And teachers at small schools have received larger salaries than teachers at schools with a higher average attendance?—Yes, that is so, because their salaries have not been reduced.

2661. Do you think that if a generalised scheme were adopted, and it was provided that the teachers should hold all the rights which they at present possess in the matter of salaries for a number of years, the very same conditions would exist under such a scheme as exist in your district?—Not under a new scheme.

2662. If the scheme provided that all the conditions which exist at present in your district and other districts were to be continued for a period, would not the same results ensue that now prevail here?—To a certain extent only, because the Boards would be enabled in many cases to make the necessary transfers in order to bring teachers up to scale.

2663. Do you not think that would tend to great dissatisfaction among the teachers?—It is just a question of postponing the evil day.

2664. Do you not think it would tend to cause more dissatisfaction than at present?—I am not prepared to say that.

2665. If it brought up the lower salaries to the level of the higher ones, and the high ones

were not brought down at all, do you think that would lead to great dissatisfaction?—No; I think those whose salaries were increased would be quite prepared to accept the increase so long as their brothers' salaries were not reduced.

2666. You recognise that the scale which has been proposed by the Inspector-General would benefit your schools in a great measure?—Yes, in a great measure.

2667. Would it benefit the majority of the teachers in your district?—I think so.

2668. Supposing that an allowance of £4 a head were paid to your Board, on the distinct understanding that the scale should be so arranged that the increase of 5s. would be spent in increasing the teachers' salaries, could you, from your experience, supply a scale equal to the proposed one?—It is purely a matter of opinion. I think that the information at the disposal of the Inspector-General would be much beyond the information that I would have in the preparation of a colonial scale.

2669. I mean for your own district. Could you draw up a scale yourself, and pay the salaries suggested in the proposed scale?—A proposal was made by the Board to the department, but it did not meet the higher salaries as the proposed scale does.

2670. Did it meet the lower salaries?—The Board thought it met them in an equitable manner.

2671. Was the staffing as generous?—No; not in regard to the assistants.

2672. Did you recognise that your Board could not draw up a scale as generous as the scale suggested by the Inspector-General?—Not with the limited sum at its disposal.

2673. Then, this proposed scale would benefit your district materially?—Yes.

2674. You have heard of the proposal to remove the Inspectors from the control of the Education Boards, and place them under the control of the central department: has your Board ever considered that question?—The very first Wellington Board made that recommendation to the Education Department.

2675. Then the Board wishes to get rid of the control of the inspectorate?—I do not think that is the point: the idea of the Board was that there should be an interchange of districts among the Inspectors.

2676. Have you ever heard any proposal made that School Committees instead of Education Boards should have the appointment of teachers at their own schools, seeing that they know the needs of the schools better?—I never heard of any authoritative proposal of the kind.

2677. Of course, you are aware that this proposal to formulate a colonial scale, if carried out, will limit in some measure the functions of the Boards, inasmuch as it will take away the power of distributing £3 8s. 9d. of the £4 capitation?—Quite so.

2678. Do you understand why the proposal is made to limit the functions of Education Boards in that way?—My impression is that it is to insure a certain amount of money being distributed among the teachers.

2679. It is proposed to leave 11s. 3d. a head to the Education Boards to distribute, is it not?—

Yes.

2680. If we allow this 11s. 3d. to be distributed by the various Education Boards, will not the very same anomalies exist with regard to the school fund as exist with regard to teachers' salaries?—Yes, anomalies exist in the different districts.

2681. School Committees with the same average attendance at their schools do not get the same amounts in the various districts?—No.

2682. Why should not the same treatment be meted out to School Committees as is proposed to be meted out to the teachers in the matter of the allocation of the remaining 11s. 3d.? Why not take away the power from the Education Boards, and ask the central department to formulate a scale so that all the Committees, as well as all the teachers, shall be treated in the same manner? Do you think that would be an unfair demand?—Yes. If that demand were granted the power of the Boards would be unduly curtailed. If you have Education Boards you must give them something to do.

2683. Do you recognise that it would be a good thing for the central department to draw up a scale on the £3 8s. 9d. basis for the teachers?—That would be a matter of equalisation of teachers' salaries all over the colony.

2684. Why not give School Committees, where the average attendance is the same, the same amount for maintenance?—Because the circumstances of districts may affect Committees to a considerable extent and not affect the teachers.

2685. Take two schools in the country, with an average attendance of 25 at each: why should one get £10 and the other £20?—One may have firewood practically stacked against the door and the other may have to cart it from a distance. Then again, the sanitary arrangements are more costly in some districts than others. This Board has invariably helped School Committees when they have got into difficulties. Where we have found the funds provided by the scale were not sufficient to enable Committees to administer their functions properly we have had to do certain works for them.

2686. If the power of the Boards over the inspectorate is taken away, and the power of making scales for the payment of teachers' salaries is taken from them, and if this other suggestion as to the appointment of teachers by School Committees is carried out, what remains for the Boards to do?—Very little. Nearly all their powers would be taken away from them.

2687. What would be the good of them then?—That is a question that I am not prepared to answer; it is a matter for members of the Board to discuss.

2688. I understand that your Board has paid £9,586 for the maintenance of the Technical School during the past ten years, and that during the same period fees have been paid by the students to the amount of £8,676, and the Government subsidies received during the same period amounted to £2,395?—If those figures are in accordance with the statement I read, they are correct.

2689. Have you estimated the amount that has been paid for the maintenance of the Technical School out of the school funds?—No.

2690. Forty-seven per cent. of the cost of the Technical School has been paid out of the school funds, 42 per cent. of the cost has been met by students' fees, and the subsidies from the Government have amounted to 11½ per cent.: do you think that 47 per cent. of the cost of the school should be defrayed by funds which are supposed to provide teachers' salaries?—I do not think that 1 per cent. of the cost of the Technical School should be paid out of the teachers' salaries fund.

2691. Do you know that during the past ten years, according to my calculation, 2¼ per cent. of the total income of your Board has been expended in the maintenance of this school; therefore it is a tax upon the teachers to that amount?—Yes.

2692. The salaries of the teachers in your district could have been raised to that extent had that school been maintained—as I say it should have been—by the Government?—The money would have been available for other purposes. The Board had the power to devote the whole of it to teachers' salaries if it had been available.

2693. Has that school been working specially for Wellington, or for the whole of New Zealand?—I could not tell you.

2694. Has it been working for the Education District of Wellington?—As far as practicable.

2695. It has been doing work not only for the City of Wellington, but for the whole of the education district?—Yes.

2696. Has it fostered art and science in this colony?—I assume that it has; others would be better able to answer that question.

2697. You think that a school of that sort should not be maintained out of the funds which are given for primary education?—The assumption is that the cost of the fostering of art and science is met by the fees paid for instruction in drawing and painting.

2698. But the students' fees amount to only 42 per cent. of the amount received: has the school done no other service besides train those who attend the classes: has it not fostered art education in this district?—Decidedly.

2699. Has it been receiving no more than £240 a year from the Government, on an average, for the ten years?—For the first two or three years the Government subsidies were £100 a year only. It is only in the last year or two that technical education has been considered at all in the matter of subsidies.

2700. Have you considered whether the Manual and Technical Instruction Act will benefit the school at all?—Mr. Riley says it will to the extent of about £1,000 a year.

2701. Do you think the present plan of certification of teachers is a good one?—I think five divisions too many; but that is a matter of opinion, and I am not competent to give an opinion.

2702. Are you of opinion that a man should be paid because he possesses a diploma, or because he shows skill in the profession which he follows?—I think that skill should be the first element, and the diploma the second; but the two should be taken into consideration.

2703. When you go to consult a lawyer do you think of the diploma he holds, or the skill he possesses?—It is a question of the man's ability—his skill.

2704. When you go to a man of that kind do you think of what kind of examination he has passed, or do you go to him in order that you might get the best possible result from him?—In order that the best possible results may be obtained.

2705. Now, do you think that in the case of a teacher you should pay him for what he does in the school, or for something he obtained in order to qualify himself to teach?—The expert man could not be a practical man unless he had studied for these examinations. You should pay him for the examinations he has undergone. I do not think that a man with an E certificate is equal to a man with an A, B, C, or D certificate.

2706. Would you give the same pay to two men occupying similar positions, and doing equal work, if one held a higher diploma than the other?—I do not see why they should not get the same salary if they do equal work and occupy similar positions.

2707. Then take the case of a woman. Supposing she does the same work as a man, what difference, if any, should there be between the salaries?—You have to study outside influences.

2708. You would differentiate the salaries?—Yes. With regard to the Technical School, I may explain that it was established by the Board upon the written assurance of the then Premier of the colony that the money expended on it would be refunded by Parliament. The question of Mr. Riley's appointment was submitted to the Government, it being pointed out to them that if he were engaged he would want to start technical education, and the then Premier gave his assurance that the money spent by the Board on technical education would be refunded.

J. R. BLAIR, Chairman of the Wellington Education Board, examined.

Mr. Blair: I have not prepared a statement, but I should like to make one or two remarks. I have noticed many of the statements that have been made in evidence before this Commission with regard to a colonial scale of salaries. My opinion is that a colonial scale would create a larger number of anomalies than the present scales. If you introduce a colonial scale, how are you going to take cognisance of the difference in the cost of living at different places? There is a difference, I imagine, of at least 25 per cent. between the cost of living at Wellington and, say, Woodville; so that by a colonial scale you would create a series of anomalies extending over the whole of New Zealand.

2709. *The Chairman.*] Have you any suggestion to make as to how salaries could be equalised or made more uniform than they are without the introduction of a colonial scale?—I think that a certain sum should be given to the Boards, and they should be allowed to adjust the salaries to the best advantage; the Boards know the inequalities of their districts. I think that that would be

quite satisfactory, without the introduction of a colonial scale. I have said that a colonial scale, instead of introducing uniformity of pay, would do the very opposite. I have no objection at all, from a theoretical point of view, to the department paying the teachers. I do not know whether it comes within the scope of the Commission to deal with the question of Boards. I have felt all along that Boards are in an anomalous position: they are irresponsible bodies dealing with moneys that are given to them, without any responsibility, practically, as to the disbursement of those sums. If the department or the Minister of Education, or those who are responsible for the present state of affairs, desire to put Boards upon a proper footing they should remodel them altogether. Let the public elect them, and then the Boards would have public opinion behind them, and be able to deal with such questions as salaries and staffing with the public to account to. At the present time they are practically irresponsible, being elected by bodies that seem to think they, rather than the general public, ought to control the Boards. It will be recollected that it was only owing to the fact of the London School Board being elected by the people of London that the imposition of a religious test on the teachers of London was prevented.

2710. You think it would be an improvement if the Boards were elected by the people, instead of by the Committees, as at present?—I certainly think so. I have always felt that we have not had public opinion behind us in any step that we have taken with reference to educational matters—that we were responsible to the Committees, and not to the public. It seems anomalous that in these times a fancy franchise should exist with regard to the election of Education Boards. A good deal has been said about the difficulty of obtaining male pupil-teachers. We have found that we have always had a certain number of applications from males for pupil-teacherships, but the applicants have not been of the same quality as the girls who have applied; although we have, I think, stretched a point in order to employ as many males as possible. The female pupil-teachers have undoubtedly come—and especially of late—better equipped than the boys. We can now in this district obtain the services of female pupil-teachers with the equipment of a D certificate. Those that pass well in the matriculation examination are so equipped—that is, so far as the literary portion of their certificate is concerned; and when they have gone through the process inaugurated by Mr. Lee, our senior Inspector—*i.e.*, sending them into the infants' schools, where they go through the kindergarten system—I am of opinion that they are then excellent material for carrying on the work of junior classes at our standard schools.

2711. *Mr. Davidson.*] You are aware that each of the thirteen Education Boards in the colony has a scale of salary and staffing drawn up by either the officials of the Boards or the members?—Yes.

2712. And that these scales, with regard to both staffing and salaries, differ very much?—Yes.

2713. I suppose you are also aware that very great inequalities exist in the salaries paid to men doing the same work and holding the same certificate?—Yes, I am aware that there are disparities.

2714. Do you think it is in the interests of education that such very great inequalities should exist?—No, I do not think it is.

2715. If the Education Boards had a uniform scale of staff for the different grades of school in the colony, and paid their teachers on a uniform scale of salary, do you not think a good deal of the discontent and dissatisfaction that exist at the present time would be removed?—I do not know. It seems to me that the teachers want to be put in glass cases: that is an impression which has been created in my mind. Take Wellington: so far as the city teachers are concerned, they are in a very good position. They have a special Act, by which all their concerns are governed, they work five hours a day and five days a week, have numerous holidays, and I do not know what more they want.

2716. Do you not think that there is a good deal of cause for dissatisfaction on the part of a man who may be teaching within a few miles of the border of a certain district, and be receiving from £30 to £50 a year less than a man over the border who does the same work and holds the same certificate?—Yes, under the circumstances. I do not mean to say that these inequalities should not be redressed; but I hold they can only be redressed by an administrative body in the district.

2717. What, in your opinion, is the cause of the great inequalities that exist in the salaries paid in the different districts?—Want of money on the part of the Boards. If you take the case of Otago you will find that they have a larger number of large schools than any other district, and the profits arising from these large schools enable them to have a more liberal scale of salaries than a small Board with a large number of small schools.

2718. How would you remedy the evil?—You would have to give the district with the large number of small schools a larger grant.

2719. Then, you would not give an equal capitation grant to the different Boards?—If you did, Otago would be placed in a still better position.

2720. So long as an equal capitation grant to the Education Boards exists you cannot possibly have a uniform scale of salaries?—No.

2721. Do you think it would be a disadvantage to the Boards if they were asked to pay to their teachers the money received from the department on a scale drawn up by this Commission, instead of on the many different scales that now exist?—I think it would be more likely to be satisfactory if the Commission drew up a scale affecting each individual Board and its district rather than a general scale.

2722. If the Commission drew up a uniform scale, and the money received by the Boards from the department were paid just as it is now, but instead of being paid out on a scale drawn up by each Board it were paid out on a scale drawn up by this Commission, would that be more satisfactory?—Yes. It seems to me that, with your extended knowledge, you would be more likely to meet the case than the department.

2723. You have in the Wellington District a scale of salaries to which you have not been able to adhere strictly in the past?—That departure has occurred quite recently—within the last two years.

2724. We have been told that the teachers' salaries have been costing the Wellington Board £1,200 a year beyond the scale amount?—That may be so; perhaps it may be a little more.

2725. I understand that your Board has decided to adhere to its own scale, but in no instance to reduce a teacher's salary to a lower amount than that which he would receive under the suggested scale?—Yes; that is, contingent upon the grant from the Government being continued.

The Chairman: Certain salaries have been increased since this Government grant was placed at the disposal of the Board, and it has been able to do more justice to the teachers.

2726. *Mr. Davidson.*] In future you mean to pay according to a modified scale—you intend to adhere strictly to your scale of salaries?—Yes; the Board has resolved to do that, contingent on the grant from the Government being continued.

2727. By departing from its scale any Board in the colony might become financially embarrassed?—In Wellington up till two years ago we had an annual increase in the attendance, which enabled us to carry on under our scale; for some reason or other, all of a sudden the increase dropped and disappeared, but is now reappearing in a limited degree. In one instance the attendance dropped to such an extent that a man, with a family, who was receiving £150 would, if we had adhered to the scale, have been reduced to £90. I think that in that instance the fall in attendance was due to the removal of some railway-men—a circumstance over which the teacher had no control whatever—and the Board, in considering the position, could not see that it was justified in reducing that man to £90.

2728. But the Wellington Board has determined to adhere it to its scale in the future?—Yes.

2729. So that some of the teachers who were receiving less than the scale will be brought up to it, and those who were receiving more will be brought down to it?—That is so.

2730. It has really been out of sympathy for these special cases that the Board has treated them in a special manner?—Yes.

2731. The Wellington Board pays the teachers at schools of from 15 to 20 in average attendance a fixed salary of £70?—Yes.

2732. Do you think that is sufficient?—No, I do not think it is at all adequate. I have much sympathy with these teachers.

2733. Under the proposed scale these teachers would receive from £80 to £100, instead of the fixed salary of £70: that would be a distinct improvement?—Yes.

2734. There is another class of teacher to whom the sympathy of the Board would have been extended had they the funds, I have not the slightest doubt: I refer to those at schools of from 20 to 25—the next grade?—Yes.

2735. I understand from your answer to my previous question that you would consider £80 an altogether inadequate salary for those teachers?—Yes, that is so.

2736. That class of teacher, under the suggested scale, would receive from £120 to £140 a year?—Yes.

2737. That is the class of teacher whose position, in your opinion, should be improved?—Yes.

2738. The next grade of teacher—those at schools of from 25 to 30—would also be greatly benefited by the suggested scale; so that the majority of the schools in the Wellington District would carry a very much better salary under the proposed scale than they do at present?—Yes. My Board does not take any exception to the increases proposed by the department to teachers at country schools.

2739. If this Commission formulated a scale which would be uniform throughout the colony, and which would vastly improve the condition of the teachers at a great majority of the schools in the colony—*i.e.*, the country schools—would you approve of that?—Yes, certainly.

2740. Do you think that the secretaries of the Education Boards were correct in their statements to this Commission that, in their opinion, the effect of the Boards paying out the salaries to their teachers on a uniform scale, instead of on a scale drawn up by their officials, would in no way weaken the control of the Boards over their teachers?—I do not see any reason for thinking that it would affect the control in any way. We now get a sum of money in one amount, instead of a sum fixed by a scale. It would come to the same thing.

2741. The only difference would be that a Board would be paying the money to its teachers on a scale drawn up by this Commission instead of on its own scale?—Exactly.

2742. In your opinion, should the appointment of teachers be in the hands of the School Committees, or in the hands of the Education Boards?—I am distinctly of the opinion that the Education Boards should make the appointments. I know of a case here in which complaint was made that the Board had made a bad selection, and I was able to prove that the applications sent to the Committee had absolutely never been looked at. I may explain that this Board's practice is somewhat different from that of other Boards; we forward all the applications to the local Committee, intimating that the Board has selected a certain candidate as, in their opinion, being the best fitted for the position. On the occasion to which I refer a deputation from the Committee waited on the Board, and complained that the secretary of the Board had not forwarded them a letter. The secretary had informed me that he had sent them a letter, and that it had been placed in the bundle containing the applications. I asked for the bundle to be produced, opened it, and the letter was on the top of the applications. I do not mean to infer that all Committees do that; I know that some of them take a very keen interest in the quality of their teachers. But the case I have mentioned is an instance—and not a solitary one—of the small interest that some Committees take, being satisfied with the personal application of a particular candidate.

2743. Then, in your opinion, an Education Board is the authority most capable of forming a judgment, after consulting with its Inspectors, as to the qualifications of candidates for the teaching profession?—I have no doubt at all that, if the Education Boards avail themselves of the knowledge and guidance of their responsible officers, they are the proper authorities to make appointments, and the only authorities that can make proper appointments.

2744. I find, according to the last report of the Minister of Education, that the number of pupil-teachers in your district is 175, as compared with 245 adult teachers?—Yes.

2745. Do you think the number of pupil-teachers in this district is too great?—Of course, it is all a question of finance. There is no question at all that the schools would be very much benefited if staffed entirely with certificated teachers, instead of pupil-teachers, provided the country could afford it. There is no difficulty in formulating ideal theories.

2746. Are you aware that in Glasgow, London, Manchester, Birmingham, and other places the number of pupil-teachers has been reduced very greatly indeed?—Yes.

2747. And the salaries paid to the teachers at these places are considerably larger than they were a few years ago?—Yes.

2748. I notice that at a school of from 41 to 75 in your district the staff is composed of a head-teacher and a pupil-teacher: do you not think it would be a decided advantage, educationally, if at such schools the staff consisted of a head-teacher and an assistant?—At the instigation of Mr. Lee, the head Inspector, the Board recently passed a resolution providing that schools of that size should be so staffed in future.

2749. We heard—I think it was yesterday—that in such a case, where an ex-pupil-teacher was employed, under the change of scale that ex-pupil-teacher would become an assistant, and be called such?—Yes.

2750. What salary would be attached to the position?—As far as I recollect, £80 a year.

2751. That change will come into operation?—It is coming into operation now as vacancies occur.

2752. You are really falling in, I understand, with the suggestions submitted to this Commission?—Yes.

2753. *Mr. Stewart.*] You said in your evidence just now that you objected to a colonial scale because you thought it would create more anomalies than exist at present?—Yes.

2754. In the course of your examination by Mr. Davidson you admitted that there were a great number of anomalies existing at present?—Yes.

2755. You indicated one anomaly that might come out by the introduction of a colonial scale—namely, the difference in the cost of living at different places?—Yes.

2756. Would you kindly name any other anomaly that a colonial scale would be likely to create?—Under a colonial scale you would give to a rich district—rich from the point of view of the Board's finances—like Otago, the same capitation grant that you would give to a poor district, such as the West Coast. In Otago there are a large number of schools that make big profits, whereas in the West Coast District there are a large number of schools that make no profit.

2757. Supposing there was a school of, say, 200 in Otago, and a school of 200 on the West Coast, would there be any difference in the salaries paid at those schools?—There ought not to be.

2758. Then, how could Otago make a profit that Westland would not?—I understand what you mean now. Hitherto we have received a grant of £3 15s. a head, out of which we have had to pay everything. If you are going to separate the money for the teachers' salaries from the other moneys, then it will not act in the same way.

2759. The proposal is that the finance with regard to the teachers' salaries should be separated from the finance regarding the other items of expenditure?—Then a colonial scale would not act in the way I have indicated.

2760. Do you not think that from an actuarial and theoretical point of view it is a perfectly sound principle to separate the finance of any business concern, so that the different departments are kept clear and distinct?—There is no objection to that that I can see.

2761. Do you think it would be a sound principle to work upon as far as Education Board finance is concerned?—I certainly think teachers' salaries should be assured.

2762. Supposing that such proposals as I have indicated were carried into effect—namely, that the salary question should be altogether separate from other questions of finance, and a school of 200 in Westland should bring to the Westland Board the same amount of capitation as a school of 200 in Wellington—would you approve of that?—I have no objection to that; but there still would be the anomaly that the teachers at the Westland school would have to pay very much more for house-rent and other supplies than the teachers at the Wellington school.

2763. Would there be any other anomaly? We have got rid of one, which proved to be a misconception: what other anomalies would there be?—A teacher at £80 a year at one of our back-block schools, where there are no roads, where supplies are extremely difficult to obtain, and where accommodation of any kind is difficult to get, will not be paid on the same basis as a teacher in another district who is getting the same salary. That is an anomaly.

2764. I think you instanced Woodville, and compared the cost of living there with the cost of living at Wellington?—Yes.

2765. Would there be a great difference?—Yes.

2766. Which would be the cheaper?—Woodville, of course.

2767. Would not there be the extra cost of commodities being taken from the Port of Napier to Woodville?—No; the Woodville people get their supplies by rail from Wellington.

2768. You think Woodville would be the cheaper place to live at?—I mentioned Woodville because I happened to stay there for a fortnight recently, and I was struck by the low rents and the cheapness of commodities. Of course, the same state of things would not prevail in some of our back blocks.

2769. Then, there are great differences in the cost of living at places within the Wellington District?—Yes.

2770. May I ask what arrangements your Board make to meet those differences in the cost of living in different parts of the Wellington District?—Quite recently the minimum salaries of the teachers at the small schools were raised. My Board did not consider them adequate then, but they did the best they could with the funds at their disposal.

2771. Was that change made simply to make the remuneration adequate, or was it made on account of the differences in the prices of commodities at different places?—It was made on the representation of Mr. Hogg as to the cost of living, and the amount of sacrifice a teacher has to make when he goes to one of the back-block schools.

2772. I think you said that you thought the Board was in a very anomalous position, being irresponsible as a public body?—Yes.

2773. Do you not think that under those circumstances it would be better for the Parliament of the colony to adopt any fair scale that it thought fit, because Parliament would be directly responsible to the people for what they did? If a colonial scale were drawn up by this Commission, submitted to Parliament, and passed, would not your objection be removed: would not that be actual direct responsibility to the people of the colony?—Not on the part of the Board.

2774. But on the part of the House?—Yes; but the House does not administer the education of the district. I might say that, so far as I understand the question, if this Commission draws up a scale, after having fully considered the matter, which would improve the condition of our country teachers, I should support it to the uttermost.

2775. You are probably aware that the proposed scale would decidedly improve the condition of the country teachers?—I do not know what the proposals are.

2776. It has been admitted by the secretary to your Board that the proposed scale would greatly improve the teachers at a large number of your schools?—Then I am quite in favour of it, especially if it would improve the condition of the country teachers.

2777. With regard to the difficulty of obtaining male pupil-teachers, I gathered from what you said that your Board does not get the best class of male candidates—that you only get, so to speak, the second quality: you said they were not equal to the females?—Yes.

2778. Have you any idea as to how that arises?—I cannot say how it comes about. I think it arises principally from the unwillingness of boys to go into the drudgery of the after-study. Boys nowadays do not care about being confined at night studying for examinations. I have had a good deal of intercourse with boys, who have come to me to inquire about what would be expected of them, and I have always found that they disliked that portion of the work.

2779. You think it necessary, in the interests of the country, that we should keep up the supply of male teachers, I presume?—I do not think that, even if you increased the remuneration, it would have any great influence on the supply of male pupil-teachers.

2780. You misunderstood my question: You would not like to see the schools of the colony conducted solely by lady teachers?—No. I do not like to say so, because I have been brought into close contact with a large number of our teachers—a class whom I very highly respect—but I think that another influence has been, and is, retarding the coming-forward of boys: they have begun to look upon the teaching profession as rather an effeminate one, and it has not many attractions from that point of view. I think that a system of education where female teaching predominates is not likely to produce the best results.

2781. You think that there are two spheres of influence in the schools, and they should be filled by the respective sexes?—Yes; and that the female sphere should not predominate.

2782. *Mr. Luke.*] Do you not think that the discrepancies in the salaries paid to teachers in the different education districts is a deterrent to the interests of education generally; and would it not be better if a colonial scale were introduced, by which a teacher with a certain certificate and experience would receive as much salary in one district as in another? Do you not think that would help the cause of education, and tend to make ours a more national system?—I do not know exactly whether that would be so. I think that teachers should be adequately paid wherever they are; but, taking a broader basis, is there any reason for thinking that if teachers were paid the same all the world over the efficiency of education would be increased? You have to pay according to your means, no matter where you are. It is entirely a question of finance. There is no member on my Board who desires to see teachers' salaries reduced. So far as I know, the members would be very glad to increase salaries all round very materially. I have seen the time in New Zealand when it was very difficult to get salaries, and I think the probability is that we will sooner or later have another similar time to face.

2783. In some districts teachers cannot be obtained?—I am glad to be able to say for the Wellington District that we have no such difficulty. Recently for a first-assistantship we had forty-three applications.

2784. Have you many small schools in this district?—Yes, a large number of small schools, proportionately.

2785. Do you think any of these could be amalgamated?—The difficulty that we have had to encounter with reference to those schools is that we have had to place a school, say, in a clearing. We have bush country between that clearing or settlement and the next settlement, but when the bush has been cleared we will be able to amalgamate a number of those schools. That is the reason why we have in this district relatively such a large number of small schools. In one district we have three or four schools where I think two would suffice if roads were made between the places.

2786. Have you ever tried the half-time system?—No, not in this district.

2787. With regard to sending names of applicants to Committees, do you not think it would be better if you sent only a few names to the Committee? Would it not be better to get the

Inspectors to recommend, say, five applicants, and let the Committee choose from among those five?—I do not think so. We have had no experience of such a system here; and, looking at the experience of Otago—we have only got the reports to go by—it seems that that system frequently leads to the choice of the least fitting of the five; and I think I am right in saying that it has given rise to a great deal of squabbling between the Board and the Committees.

2788. That is the system that obtains in Auckland, and it has been fairly successful. The Inspectors generally choose five or six of the best applicants, and their names are sent to the Committee, who are precluded from choosing any one outside of the five or six?—I have had a great deal of experience in going over applications under our system here—probably twenty years' experience—and I do not think that on any occasion when I have had a list of applicants for a vacancy in this district I could not point out the best man of the number. Almost invariably there is one head and shoulders above the other applicants; occasionally, however, there are two or three who might be classed as No. 1.

2789. Under your system does the Committee generally choose the best man?—They do not choose at all; the Act does not permit them to choose. Our system is that the Board selects the teacher whom it thinks the best qualified for the vacancy. It sends that name forward to the Committee, with an intimation that the Board has selected that teacher as the best among the applicants; but it also sends the other applications, so that the Committee may judge for itself as to the accuracy or otherwise of the Board's selection. We have been advised that the Board's making the selection is in accordance with the provisions of the Act, so that the other Boards are practically not administering the Act when they send forward five names. The Committee then makes the appointment.

2790. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] In sending the applications on to the Committee, what instructions do the Board issue? Do they ask the Committee to find fault with the selected candidate and recommend another, giving reasons for so doing; or do they ask the Committee to send in their own recommendation irrespective of the choice of the Board?—The Board sends forward the applications to the Committee, with the name of the applicant selected by the Board; and if the Committee have any objection to make to the Board's selection they have an opportunity. If they make relevant objections the Board attends to them.

2791. Does it not often happen that the candidate selected is a stranger to the Committee, so that they cannot take exception to him?—Probably all the applicants are strangers to the Committee.

2792. Have the Board always adopted the plan of going through the applications themselves and selecting one?—Yes, so far as my experience goes. I think I am right in saying that we have had less trouble with Committees in this district than has been the case in any other district in New Zealand.

2793. Supposing that the Committee does forward reasons against the appointment of the nominee of the Board, does the Board consider the recommendation of the Committee, or does it generally and invariably appoint the applicant that has been first selected?—The Board has always been very anxious to work in accord with the Committees, and when they have had anything like a case at all the Board has given way. The Board has never taken up the attitude that it was absolutely immaculate. Whenever a reasonable representation has been made the Board has given way.

2794. With regard to the adoption of a colonial scale, you consider that the cost of living is a difficulty that will have to be surmounted: is any difficulty experienced in this respect in connection with the servants of the Postal Department or the Railway Department, under whose classification schemes the salaries are the same in any part of the colony?—I think that the railway service is altogether different from the educational service. For one thing, the railways, I take it, carry the supplies for the men employed in their service. Teachers at schools away in the back blocks, which you would have extreme difficulty in reaching, are altogether in a different position from the men in the railway service.

2795. Am I to understand from what you say that the Wellington Board has a separate scale for schools in the back blocks, or does each teacher petition the Board for an increase of salary and get what he can?—It is a special scale in this respect: that at one time not very long ago the salaries paid to teachers at those small schools were very much lower; they have been raised since, and would have been raised higher if the Board had the means.

2796. Have you compared the suggested scale with the Wellington Board's scale?—Yes.

2797. Have you seen the suggested scale No. 2?—With reference to the alternative scale, I may say that the secretary and I went over it with a view to as far as possible reconcile some of the anomalies that exist. We found that, on the whole, the proposals were acceptable. It was in regard to comparatively only a few cases that we disagreed with it.

2798. Have you compared the Wellington Board's scale with the other Boards' scales?—No; the secretary and I went into the Otago scale and the Canterbury scale, and found that, on the whole, especially in connection with the middle class of school, the Wellington scale was rather better than either.

2799. But take the larger class of school: we find that the salaries paid in Otago, North Canterbury, and Hawke's Bay are considerably higher than those paid in Wellington; and the same applies to teachers with lower salaries?—We are more just; we do not give high salaries to those who have plenty.

2800. If you had increased the salaries of the teachers at the smallest schools it would have been better than increasing the salaries of those at the middle class of schools. With regard to the establishment of small schools, do you think that the Legislature should lay down a rule that a school should not be established unless a minimum number of children—whatever it might be—were forthcoming, in order to save the Boards from pressure being brought to bear

on them to establish small schools?—I think that would be very unwise. There are places in the country where the children would never get schools at all at that rate. I think it is a most important matter that the country settlers should have every educational facility that we can afford them.

2801. Do you realise that if the Otago and Southland Boards were as liberal in the establishment of small schools as other Boards in the colony they would not be able to pay the salaries they are paying now?—This is a bush district, whereas Otago is a district that has practically no bush. We have not clear country, and have had to establish schools as settlements were made in the bush. As far as I am concerned, I entirely disapprove of the multiplication of small schools; it is a great educational disadvantage, but we have circumstances which we cannot get over. If small schools are not established numbers of children will get no education at all.

2802. My point is this: There are a small number of schools about Milford Sound, but if the Southland Board had been as liberal in the establishment of small schools there as, say, the Marlborough Board they would not be able to pay the salaries which they are paying?—Even there the circumstances are entirely different. The country about Milford Sound is capable of producing little or nothing, whereas here we have a country that is capable of producing the best, and it is only a question of time when there will be plenty of population here.

2803. With regard to bonuses, do you advocate the system of bonuses being granted to teachers on the certificates they hold?—I am entirely and absolutely opposed to bonuses in any shape or form. I have seen a large commercial concern wrecked by bonuses. You see how the system operates: In a year of the hardest strain no bonuses are given; when everything is prosperous you give bonuses, because you have made profits; then bad times come again, and a man has to worry and do double the amount of work, and gets no bonus.

2804. You said that your Board have endeavoured—very laudably, I may say—to keep up the salaries where the attendance has gone down in country districts?—Yes.

2805. Is it not a fact that by so doing your Board must have been keeping so much back from the salaries of other teachers where the attendance was increasing? For example, suppose there was a sum of £1,200 a year paid beyond the amount allowed by the scale: if that £1,200 were distributed among the teachers at the schools where the average was increasing the salaries would be raised considerably? It was really robbing Peter to pay Paul?—There is no doubt we did wrong under the circumstances. We did not adhere to our scale in the first instance, and reduce salaries when the average attendance fell; and we failed to raise salaries to our scale where the attendance had increased; but the Board had to take cognisance of this fact: that by reducing the salaries where the attendance had fallen we would still further accentuate the difficulty of the position—*i.e.*, by further reducing the salaries of those whose salaries were already inadequate. It was merely a matter of expediency—of doing the best under the circumstances.

2806. Do you notice that under the alternative scale the teachers at the small country schools would receive more than is paid them by, I think, any Board in the colony?—I am entirely and absolutely in accord with that. I support that without any hesitation whatever.

2807. Respecting the anomalies that exist at present in the way of salaries, supposing the extra 5s. capitation were granted indiscriminately to all the Boards, would it tend in any way to lessen the anomalies? Supposing that the Otago and Marlborough Boards—taking the strongest and the weakest—received the extra 5s. a head capitation, would that tend in any way to minimise the disparities that exist?—I do not know about the Otago or the Marlborough Boards. I can only say that the scale that was prepared and submitted to my Board was, on the whole, so far as I know the views of teachers in this district, satisfactory to them.

2808. *Mr. Weston.*] Which scale are you referring to?—The scale that was prepared by the secretary to the Board and myself. It made a few alterations upon the department's scale—not a great many—and, as far as I know the views of teachers, that scale seemed to give more satisfaction than the present scale.

2809. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] The point is this: The only possibility of removing the anomalies that exist is by the adoption of a colonial scale, because if we pay to the stronger Boards the extra 5s. capitation it means that the salaries that are already high will be increased, whereas the extra 5s. given to a weak Board would be a mere bagatelle?—If the capitation grant were to be on the basis of £4 or £5 a head, with so-much for salaries, then the Otago Board would still be in a better position than any other Board. The salaries may be the same, but the Board would have a much larger sum out of the remaining portion for anything else that it chose to do. It would be in the position of being able to still further increase salaries if it so pleased.

2810. I do not see that, unless the Inspectors were placed under the central department, because if the grant were paid by Parliament on the scale of salaries passed by the Legislature the £4 capitation would entirely disappear. The salaries would be placed on the estimates and passed in a lump sum—the same as the salaries of the Railway and Post Office officials are passed—irrespective of whether the amount came to a little more than £4 a head or less?—The remaining portion of the grant would be greater in the case of Otago than that paid to a Board with a large number of small schools.

2811. You mean the 11s. 3d.?—Yes.

2812. With respect to staffing, do you not consider that the same staff that can efficiently teach a school—no matter what the size of the school may be—in Auckland should be expected to teach a school of the same size in Wellington, Canterbury, or Otago—*i.e.*, that we should have a colonial scale of staffs?—I do not know that that is so. There are a good many considerations, as you know, in connection with the strength of a staff. In the first place, the strength of a staff would depend on the quality of the teachers; then it would depend largely on the wisdom of those who selected the staff as to its efficiency. And then, again, the results of the teaching at a school would depend upon the intelligence of the children. The same results should not be looked for from a school in the country where the attendance is bad and the children undeveloped as from a town school.

2813. Regarding the quality of the teachers, is it not a fact that the more liberal the staffing the less liberal will the salaries be—*i.e.*, the more teachers there are to be paid the less there is for each of them?—Yes, that follows. The Otago Board have been able to pay higher salaries than other Boards from the circumstance that they have a large number of large schools, and because their staffing has not been so liberal.

2814. If they staffed their schools on the basis of the most liberally staffed school district in the colony they could not pay the salaries that they are paying now?—No.

2815. When the staffing is not so liberal the Boards can afford to pay more liberal salaries, and the higher salaries attract the most efficient teachers; consequently the Boards that are offering the highest salaries now have the most efficient teachers?—That is one of the influences that are at work, but there are other influences which operate, and operate quite as powerfully as salary. For instance, there is a large number of teachers who desire to stay in the towns, and double the salary would not tempt them to go into the country.

2816. Now, with respect to the salaries paid to females, do you consider that the disparity between the salaries paid to males and females should be minimised as far as possible—*i.e.*, there should not be too large a gap between the salaries when they do equal work?—I think there is too large a gap at the present time, but I do not think it would be in the interests of the female teachers themselves to pay them the same salaries as are paid to men for doing the same class of work. We have had the greatest possible difficulty in securing the admission of a female teacher competent to do the work at a particular country school. A great many School Committees desire to have male teachers, and the only excuse this Board has had for endeavouring to place female teachers in those schools has been that the salary has been lower than would have been paid to a male teacher. If the salaries were equalised the effect, in my opinion, would be that the number of female teachers in charge of schools would be greatly diminished.

2817. The range of the disparity varies considerably. For example, in Southland we make a difference of 10 per cent. between the salaries paid to males and females; in Wanganui I think it is 25 per cent.: what do you consider would be a fair difference? Would 10 per cent. be sufficient in the small salaries and 25 per cent. in the larger salaries?—Speaking from experience, I should say that, with the exception of individual cases, our present (Wellington) scale is as much in the interests of female teachers as anything you can do. If you increase the scale the result will be that there will be practically no openings for female teachers except assistantships.

2818. Has your Board felt the want of a training institution for teachers in Wellington?—We have felt that our teachers are placed at a great disadvantage in that respect. We had a normal school here in earlier years, but did not find it satisfactory: we found that it was turning out a considerable number of teachers in a very narrow groove, and so it was abolished; and what amounted practically to a pledge was given that when a university college was established here we should have a chair of education established. We have not got it yet, but perhaps we will later on.

2819. *Mr. Hill.*] I understood you to say that you object to a colonial scale because it would bring about more anomalies than now exist; and then, at the close of Mr. Davidson's examination, you said that you agree with the principle of a colonial scale: did I understand you aright?—I do not think I went so far as you indicate. I think I said that a colonial scale would not remove anomalies; that is a different thing. Anomalies would not be removed by a colonial scale. You would still have the anomalies which I referred to—*i.e.*, difference in the cost of living, inaccessibility, &c.

2820. You mean to say that environment modifies in a great measure the conditions of existence?—Yes.

2821. You prefer the present plan to the proposed general scheme of paying salaries—you prefer the Education Boards to have the payment of the salaries in their own hands?—What I mean is this: If you have a colonial scale it must be a cast-iron scale; you will have cases of hardship occurring which you cannot remedy; you will set up a number of grievances far beyond what any one of you gentlemen seems to imagine, from the tenor of the remarks which I have seen reported in the papers—I mean the evidence that has been given. An individual Board, coming into daily contact with its teachers, and knowing its district, is in a better position to do justice to its teachers than would be possible under a scale fixed by Act, which could not be varied.

2822. In other words, an Education Board can adapt its salary scale to the special conditions and needs of the several school districts?—Yes.

2823. And from your long experience you can say that these various conditions do actually exist?—Yes, they do.

2824. You have found it necessary to give special salaries to the teachers in some districts because of certain conditions existing?—Yes.

2825. Of course, you are aware that, whatever scheme may be adopted, the great end in view is to improve education in the colony?—Yes.

2826. Have you in your office at present any applications from districts requiring schools?—At every meeting of our Board we have applications from districts requiring schools.

2827. Many of those districts, I suppose, are debarred from having schools because of the fact that they would be very costly?—The districts do not mind about the cost; the Education Board has to consider that.

2828. The Board is afraid to establish schools in certain districts because of the possible cost of maintaining small schools?—Yes.

2829. Let us assume that a colonial scale were in operation, and the Education Boards were not responsible for the maintenance of the teachers; whatever school might be opened, the teacher at that school would be paid according to the scale, not by the Education Board, but in reality by

the central department: do you think that the diminished responsibility of the Board in connection with the establishment of schools would tend to benefit education? I will put the question in a concrete form: Would your Board open schools in these districts where you say schools are difficult to open now if they were assured that those schools would be maintained without any alteration in the salaries payable in the Wellington District?—I do not think it would influence their decision at all. My Board has always considered whether the people of a district were entitled to have a school, and if the Board have been satisfied that the people were entitled to it they have invariably granted the application. There is an objection on the part of my Board to multiplying small schools, if it could see its way to avoid doing so, from the fact that the education imparted at a small school is necessarily inferior to that imparted at a large school. I do not think that the introduction of a colonial scale would have any influence at all in this district in the direction indicated—I mean that under a colonial scale the Board would not open more small schools than it would under the present system, provided that the money which a colonial scale would cost in this district over and above the present cost were placed at the disposal of the Board. I think that, with the extra money placed at its disposal, all the demands in connection with those small schools, so far as they were just, would be complied with.

2830. I understood you to say that your Board fears to open schools because of the inferior education which the pupils at those small schools would get in consequence of the inferiority of the teachers?—Not from that point of view. People in the country sometimes give voice to a feeling that everybody should have a school at his own particular door; and that is where the Board steps in. We say, "We will not place a school there; your children can attend this school or that without any great hardship."

2831. Then, you do not think that under a colonial scale more schools would be likely to be opened in places where there are no schools at present than under the present system?—I will answer in this way: If you give the Education Board of Wellington the added money which the proposed colonial scheme would cost in this district, there would be no obstacle in the way of opening any school which ought to be opened.

2832. Do you think that, instead of having a colonial scale, if the Government paid the Wellington Board, say, the original capitation grant of £4 5s., you could give teachers salaries as high as are proposed in Mr. Hogben's scale?—Yes, I have no doubt we could: I have not the least doubt.

2833. And supply all the educational needs of the district, adapting your scale to the needs of the several places?—Yes.

2834. You have paid salaries to teachers at schools where the attendance has diminished—on the original average?—Yes.

2835. Suppose the attendance had doubled at those schools instead of diminishing, would you have paid the teachers the original salaries?—No; they would have increased under the scale.

2836. Did the Education Department pay you capitation on the original average attendance or the diminished attendance?—The diminished in the one case, and the increased in the other.

2837. Suppose the attendance had kept on diminishing in the majority of instances, what must have been the result?—That salaries would have been reduced.

2838. You could not have paid your way at all?—I understand that there is no scheme formulated that does not take cognisance of this point.

2839. You think that teachers at the small schools ought to be paid the original salaries whether their average attendance falls or not?—No, I do not. That is where, as I say, the Boards can deal with a case on its merits.

2840. Do you think that when, under special conditions—say, through sickness—a district has lost its population it is advisable to pay the original salaries in such instances?—It is not necessary to do so. What we have been asking for is the power of transfer.

2841. That is exactly what I want you to express your opinion upon?—It is a power that we have exercised to some extent—I do not know whether legally or not—but we have been transferring teachers from schools where the attendance has fallen to schools which have been more appropriate to their salaries.

2842. You mean to say that if the Education Board had had the power of transfer the anomalies which have been referred to would never have existed?—That is so.

2843. You would have been able to transfer teachers to schools suitable to their capacities?—Yes.

2844. With regard to Truant Officers, I understand that you have had some experience in the employment of Truant Officers?—Yes.

2845. Have you noticed any increase in the regularity of attendance at the schools since you employed a Truant Officer?—I do not think that the question can be measured in that way. I hold that if you can show that you have forced a reasonable number of children into our schools to be educated who otherwise would not be educated you have done good work.

2846. What I wanted to bring out was a point touched upon by Mr. Robertson in his evidence. He stated that the average regularity of attendance of the children attending school had diminished when the Truant Officer was appointed?—I do not think so at all.

2847. He was correct so far as Hawke's Bay is concerned: as soon as the Truant Officer was dispensed with the average attendance went back to its original standard?—I have not regarded that as the principal benefit derived by this district from the employment of a Truant Officer, but that we have been able to get children into the schools who otherwise would have had no education at all. Our records seem to me to prove that if we had not had a Truant Officer a considerable number of children would have gone without education.

2848. You are opposed to a colonial scale?—No; but, in my opinion, an Education Board is in a better position to administer a scale of salaries than the department, which must lay down a hard-and-fast rule.

2849. Then, you would prefer the present plan?—Yes. I have no objection to a colonial scale in itself.

2850. You think that the system in vogue at the present time would be greatly improved by giving the Education Boards the right to remove teachers from one district to another?—I think that would enable them to reduce the anomalies which are always occurring. I said that our country districts are all bush districts practically. Take a place where there is a sawmill, or two sawmills: if they shut down, nearly the whole population is gone, and you are left with a school and a teacher, and probably only a few children. Unless you have the power of transferring that teacher you must pay to him or her a salary far in excess of the value of the services rendered.

2851. Then, you would take away some of the power at present exercised under the Act by School Committees?—Yes.

2852. And you think that would improve education in your district?—I am of opinion that if we had had untrammelled power of transfer we could have adjusted our difficulties.

2853. *Mr. Lethbridge.*] What building grant do you get?—Roughly speaking, £5,200 a year.

2854. Have you found that sufficient to build new schools and keep old ones in repair?—No, certainly not. The building grant, to be adequate, should be not less than £10,000 a year.

2855. Do you notice that in the first scale it is proposed to pay house allowance for teachers out of the building grant?—Then, there would be nothing left for building purposes. At the present time we have a school at the Lower Hutt which is absolutely unfit to be occupied; it is the oldest school in the district. We have the same difficulty, partially, at Carterton; we want a central school at Levin; the Newtown people want a new school there; and we have got to paint and keep in repair something like 104 schoolhouses out of a grant of £5,200 or thereabouts.

2856. How many head-teachers are there in this district for whom dwellinghouses are provided?—Comparatively few in this district.

2857. How much do you pay for house allowance?—There are four rates of payment, as far as I recollect—£10, £20, £30, and £50 per annum; the latter is the amount paid to headmasters in the town.

2858. Do you pay house allowance to the teachers at the small country schools where no houses are provided?—Yes. If that amount is taken out of the building grant there will be very little of it left.

2859. With regard to allowances to Committees, do they find the amount allowed them sufficient?—No; that is one of the unsatisfactory positions that we are in. We are continually aiding School Committees' grants; there is never a meeting at which we do not have to aid those grants by special grants.

2860. With regard to small country schools, it has been stated that they are a great cost to the Board: I understand that you call them "aided schools" up to 15 in average attendance?—Yes.

2861. Do the settlers assist in connection with those schools?—As a rule, we do not get any assistance from the settlers. In the new districts they are generally a struggling class, and have no margin for helping in that direction. There have been cases in which the teachers have received help, but such cases have been very much in a minority.

2862. Do you know that in the Wanganui District we give a capitation allowance of only £3 15s. to any school of less than 20?—Yes.

2863. I think you said that you do not think too many small schools have been built?—I think there have been too many built, but under the circumstances the difficulty is to avoid building them.

2864. *Mr. Weston.*] If there were a colonial scale of salaries, would it not follow that there should be a colonial scale for distribution of incidental allowances to the schools?—One is just as relevant as the other.

2865. For the reason that you very pertinently gave just now—that the larger districts would get more money by way of capitation than the smaller ones: the large districts would be in a state of luxury while the smaller ones would be starved?—Yes. It would operate very much in the same way as the building grant has operated. In Otago they had provision made for education before the Act came into operation; here in Wellington there was none at all.

2866. Would it not follow that with a colonial scale of salaries, and what must be the inevitable, as it seems to me, result—*i.e.*, a colonial scale for distributing the incidental allowances—the Boards would have little or nothing to do beyond seeing that the money was paid?—If you are going to deal with the question logically the paymaster is the master. If the department is going to fix the salaries and make the grants it should be in a position to redress all anomalies. If it is in that position it can make any movement of the teachers that it pleases.

2867. Would you approve of the Government appointing and otherwise dealing with teachers?—That is the usual course of democratic institutions—to gather all power into the hands of the executive until the whole thing breaks down; that has always been so.

2868. Then, in view of that fear which you have just expressed, would it not follow that, in all human probability, the present system of administering education would be better than a colonial scale of staff, salaries, and incidentals?—I am of opinion that if the department is going to undertake the fixing of the salaries it ought to have the other functions added to it; it cannot perform the one adequately and properly without the other.

2869. You think, therefore, that it will only be a question of time ere the whole scheme is carried out by the Government of the day?—I would not like to say that; I only go the length of saying that the one is the correlative of the other.

2870. Even with a colonial scale of staff and salaries, would it be likely that a Board such as your own would go further afield for a master or a mistress, when one or more of their own teachers, brought up by themselves, were adequate for the position that was vacant?—If my

Board, when considering applications for a position, had an application from a local teacher who was adequate, in their opinion, to fill the vacancy, the Board would appoint that teacher; if it had not such an applicant from among its own teachers it would go outside. I am glad to say it has taken a sufficiently liberal view to make that the practice in the past. Allegations have been made in the newspapers with regard to this question; but we can point to the fact that the headmaster of the Newtown School was brought by this Board from Hokitika; and the teacher who last occupied the position of first assistant at the Mount Cook School came from Timaru. All round there has been no disinclination whatever on the part of the Board to serve the best ends of education by bringing strangers into this district when there was not a suitable applicant from among its own teachers.

2871. When there are local teachers, trained in the district, available they have the preference?—We hold that they have the right to preference.

2872. I take it that you are not altogether at one with others who think that there should be a rigid scale of staff: would not a rigid scale interfere with a Board which, in its discretion, might think that, although a school had risen to a certain number entitling it to extra assistance, the extra assistant should not, for purposes of economy, be placed there? Would not a rigid scale interfere with a Board's discretion?—Yes, that is so. We have a case under consideration just now, in which the head Inspector says that in the interests of the school, instead of an assistant, there ought to be two pupil-teachers. Of course, that means there has been a failure of some kind in the efficiency of the staff, but it has not so far amounted—especially in the face of the special Act—to the position in which the Board can say "Resign." So that a rigid scale would interfere in that respect with the Board's power of dealing with a special case of that kind, for I presume the department would insist upon certain salaries being paid.

2873. Supposing there were, we will say, a couple of families with one or two children in each at a place in your district—a somewhat exceptional one in regard to the nature of the country—what would your Board do to insure that those children would receive education?—We have had actual cases, so I can give you facts. When an application has been made under such conditions we have said, "We will contribute £3 15s. per head of the average attendance, on the conditions that you supply adequate accommodation, that you submit the name of the teacher to the Board for approval, and that you fulfil the requirements of the Inspector." If the conditions have been complied with we have granted the £3 15s. a head capitation grant.

2874. Do you think that, with a view to securing education for the children of pioneers, even a larger provision should be made when it was found by the Board to be necessary?—Our experience would show you that there are two sides to the question. In some cases you would simply be aiding a settler who was sufficiently well off to help himself. There is this danger in helping isolated families: that you may be contributing, practically, towards the cost of a private tutor to a family quite capable of paying for education.

2875. According to your own showing there are occasions upon which children might be regarded as absolutely isolated, far away from a school, or, being near to a school, unable to get there on account of there being no roads: in such cases do you think the Board should go beyond the £3 15s. a head?—I think the Board should, as far as possible, bring education within the reach of every child in the country. I think the Boards should do whatever they can in order that every child should be educated.

2876. In the smaller schools, and in cases where you would help three or four children, would you supply the necessary apparatus and appliances?—Yes; we help them in that way fairly liberally, I think. We have always got spare furniture, maps, &c.

2877. Do you think that sufficient scholarships are awarded, for instance, by your own Board?—That opens up a very wide question. I am not quite sure about these scholarships. You start on the basis that you are going to improve the condition of the people by scholarships. Well, the question is, how do you improve the condition of the people by scholarships? Or, to put the question in another way, how do you improve the milk by taking the cream off it? Because by scholarships you take the best boys out of the people altogether, and put them into a different stratum of society. It seems to me that the whole question of education should be gone into and remodelled. For instance, take our position here with regard to the Victoria College: we have certain scholarships, and the result is going to be that the whole of the scholarships are going to go to one or two Boards, though the district is a wide one, taking in Taranaki, Nelson, the West Coast, &c. I mean to say that if you are going to have a proper system reorganization is necessary, so that every boy and girl should have an opportunity of going right from the primary school to the university.

2878. If scholarships were abolished it would mean that a number of boys and girls who under ordinary circumstances would come to the front would remain amongst the ruck: would not that be rather a backward step for the college to take?—I do not believe that any boy or girl who has got the grit will be debarred from coming to the front in this colony.

2879. What is your opinion with regard to compassionate allowances and sick-pay to teachers, not only in your own district, but in schools generally?—I need not say that, with your experience in connection with important institutions, you are better able than most men to form an accurate opinion?—My opinion is that if the teachers' institutes had been doing their duty they would have formulated a scheme long ago. They have left what is to my mind the most important question severely alone. Take the banks, for instance: with comparatively narrow constituencies they have no difficulty at all in drawing up and carrying on pension schemes.

2880. You think it would be quite possible for a scheme of pensions for teachers to be devised?—It is quite possible in the case of banks to do so, and why should not it be possible with teachers, who are very much more numerous than bank employés? The consideration involved is that the Government should, in the first instance, subscribe a certain sum of money to give the scheme a start, and then the teachers would subscribe a percentage of their salaries,

2881. It has been suggested that if a colonial scale were framed the teachers would manufacture some such scheme: do you, as a man of business, with your experience as a director of a bank, and so on, think that a colonial scale would make any real and specific difference in their ability to formulate a scheme?—No; there would be no difficulty at all in formulating a scheme in this district if the teachers got a sum from the Government equal to their share of what the Government would have to pay as a foundation for a colonial pension scheme. I may say that some of the banks contributed £25,000 as a foundation for a pension scheme, and they have had no difficulty at all in providing adequate retiring-allowances for the officers of these institutions.

2882. Under the present condition of things, what do you think would be fair consideration for a Board to show to a teacher when sick, or to the representatives of a teacher upon his death?—Previously this Board granted sick-pay up to three months' absence, but owing to the state of our finances we were compelled to reduce the time to one month; in special cases, however, we have broken through our own rule. That is the benefit of the Boards dealing with such questions rather than the Government, because the Government could not break through its rules. As I say, we have broken through our rule in deserving cases, and after the one month has expired we have granted further sick-pay.

2883. What I want to get from you is your opinion as to what would be just and right, so as to guide us in dealing with the matter should we think fit to refer to it in our report?—I am rather diffident about expressing my opinion; it would probably involve a misunderstanding. But I have had experience in connection with the matter, and my experience has been—I do not know whether it would apply to teachers—that a liberal scale of sick-allowance induces a great deal of sickness. I do not say that a liberal sick-pay allowance would operate that way with teachers, but I am speaking of my own experience.

2884. What is your opinion in regard to compassionate allowance?—That would depend largely upon the position and length of service of the teacher. I think my Board has given from six to twelve months' pay as a compassionate allowance. I do not think that twelve months' pay is an extravagant allowance to a teacher who has been for many years in the service of the Board.

2885. Does your legal adviser advise your Board that they have the power to grant compassionate allowance?—I do not know about the legal adviser, but the Audit Department, I think, says No.

2886. In view of the statesmanlike evidence which you have given, am I right in concluding that you think that the teachers, if they studied their own interests, would be satisfied with the present system of administration?—I think, myself, that if a colonial scale is introduced the teachers will awake to the fact by-and-by that they have made a great mistake—a much greater one than they have any conception of now.

Mr. Davidson: I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, that the Teachers' Institute have considered the question of superannuation, and several schemes have been brought forward and submitted to actuaries: but, as the witness stated, until the Government are prepared to make a substantial endowment to give a scheme a start it is impracticable to introduce such a scheme. I may also say that one of the great difficulties in the way is the fact that so many different scales of salary exist in the colony at the present time.

Mr. Blair: Then, I have to beg the pardon of the teachers. I did not know that any efforts had been made in the direction of introducing a superannuation scheme. I am sorry that I have done the teachers an injustice.

2887. *Mr. Hogben*.] You said in answer to a question that one of your objections to a colonial scale was that it would imply administration by the department: in what way would the introduction of a colonial scale imply administration by the department?—I did not say that. I said that, in my opinion, the introduction of a colonial scale, governed by the hard-and-fast rules of the department, would logically involve the control of the staff by the department.

2888. The formation of a scale by the Board is not administration; it is legislation by the Board?—But it is the basis of action.

2889. It is legislation on the part of the Board?—Legislation is of no value unless it is translated into action; and when you put it into action you would have a hard-and-fast scale, in order to adjust which you would have to have the power of transferring the teachers.

2890. I would point out that there is a difference between legislation and administration. Would this introduction of a colonial scale necessarily involve the transfer of any administration to the department?—You will remember that what I said was in connection with the anomalies that would arise. If you have a hard-and-fast colonial scale, how is a Board to deal with the questions that will naturally arise under that scale?

2891. You are referring to another part of the question. I am concerned with the question that you were led to answer by Mr. Weston in reference to the administration by the department. One of the questions that he asked elicited from you some kind of answer like this: "The necessary corollary of a colonial scale was administration by the department," or words to that effect: was that not so?—I do not know what you mean.

Mr. Weston: I think what Mr. Blair said was this: that the working-out of a colonial scale of staff and salaries would if the logical outcome were acted upon, lead to the administration of the scale by the Government; but Mr. Blair was careful to say distinctly, not that that would follow, but that it was liable to follow.

Mr. Hogben: If the introduction of a colonial scale meant that any part of the administration, properly so called, would be taken away from the Boards, I could understand Mr. Blair.

Mr. Blair: I want you to understand this: I have no feeling in the matter at all.

2892. *Mr. Hogben*.] I quite understand that; but it was that question of Mr. Weston's that seemed to me to lead you to say something that you hardly meant. I am glad that I misunderstood you. With regard to the elasticity of the staff, Mr. Weston put one or two questions to you as

to whether you objected to a cast-iron rule as regards staff: do you understand that my evidence implies, as part of the proposal, that Boards should be allowed to substitute one assistant for two pupil-teachers in certain cases, or *vice versa*, according to their discretion; also that Boards could substitute a more experienced assistant for a junior assistant and a pupil-teacher, or *vice versa*?—I do not know what you proposed.

2893. Would not regulations such as those allow a Board as much elasticity in the modification of its staff as it is possible to devise? I can hardly think of any modification of staff which does not come under one of those heads?—Undoubtedly that would modify the position; it would meet the case that I mentioned.

2894. Would such proposals as those meet your idea of the elasticity which is necessary?—They would meet cases of that kind, but they would not meet cases of the adjustment of the staff, unless the Boards were given the power to transfer without consultation.

2895. A colonial scale need not stand or fall because of that, for that same difficulty would exist under a Board's scale, would it not? You find it existing now in the Wellington District?—Not to the same extent, because the Board advertises the vacancy, with the distinct intention of, if possible, making a transfer. That is the only way in which the difficulty can be overcome.

2896. Under the other system you would have the same power?—Yes, that is so, but it would be very inadequate.

2897. You think that that power should be extended under a colonial scale?—Yes; that would remove one of the difficulties.

2898. I think you said that Education Boards can adjust salaries to suit particular cases, whereas under a colonial scale the salaries could not be adjusted to suit particular cases: are you aware that it is the boast of Southland and Otago—and I think that North Canterbury and other districts can make practically the same boast—that they do not depart from their scales at all?—I do not know whether they can make that boast or not.

2899. Do you mean to say that they do not find the necessity of studying particular cases?—It indicates that their income has been larger than that of the Wellington Board.

2900. Southland and Otago make that boast, and North Canterbury can make nearly the same boast?—I am not dealing with Otago or Southland: I am speaking for this district.

2901. Do you think there are no special cases in other districts than Wellington?—I have nothing to do with the other districts.

2902. You are going to bring all the salaries in your district to scale, are you not?—Yes.

2903. Irrespective of particular cases?—The particular cases are those in which the attendance has suddenly fallen.

2904. But you are going to bring all the salaries to your scale, irrespective of those special cases?—Yes, so far as we can.

2905. So you are going to disregard those particular cases?—No; it is contingent upon our being able to deal with particular cases that we are going to keep to our scale. Our scale is contingent upon our ability to deal with special cases; if we cannot deal with special cases we cannot keep to a particular scale.

2906. Then, you are not going to bring them all to scale?—We have got £1,200 or £1,400 towards it from the Government; that is why we can do it. If that money is withdrawn we cannot do it.

2907. Are you going to bring those above your scale, or the proposed scale, down?—We are going to transfer the teachers, as far as we can.

2908. Do you not think that cases like that might be got over in a general colonial scale by preserving the interests of the present occupants of the offices for a certain time, every effort being meanwhile made to transfer them to places where they would be justified in receiving the salaries which they are receiving?—That is practically our policy.

2909. That should be included in a colonial scale?—If you made such a provision as that in a colonial scale it would undoubtedly modify the position considerably. We have been very much hampered, because we have not the power of transfer.

2910. You are aware that the Wellington Board has gone back in its finances during the past year?—Yes.

2911. By £4,859?—I am not sure of the amount, but it has gone back considerably.

2912. That is partly due to having paid salaries higher than its own scale?—Yes; upon an average attendance which has been declining.

2913. What was the falling-off in the average attendance in 1899?—If you go back a little further you will find that we had yearly increases of between 500 and 600, but all at once the attendance fell off in 1898 to a decrease of 39.

2914. The Wellington Board went back in its finances during 1899 by more than £4,000?—Yes, considerably.

2915. Though the average attendance increased by 351?—Yes; but it did not increase in the ratio of previous years.

2916. *The Chairman.*] You have had long experience of the schools in this district—I believe you have visited a great many: is there uniformity among the schools? Are any two schools alike, with regard to the quality of the children and the whole character of the school? Is there such a thing as entire similarity?—I think not.

2917. Schools are like everything else—there are not two alike?—The city schools are more or less alike. The tone of the school is largely given by the head-teacher and the permanency of the staff, and the country schools are diversified from the same cause. Then, in the country the schools are further diversified by the situation, by the occupation of the people, by bad attendance, by the character of the children, by the ages of the children, &c. These considerations all tend to diversify schools more or less; but, curiously enough, sometimes we come across a country school that is surprisingly well-conducted compared with other country schools; that, however, is

on account of the excellence of the teacher in charge. The buildings are fairly diversified—some are tumbling down for the want of repairs.

2918. I presume that, while a young lady can easily control one particular school in the country where the children are well behaved, it is a fairly hard job for a good master to control another school of, perhaps, no greater size in regard to the number of children, but where the children are of a different character?—You find both cases, and you find the reverse. You find lady teachers in charge of schools who are unable to control the children on account of the number of big boys; and you find the same thing in reference to masters. On the other hand, you find ladies who can control these schools just as well as any master.

2919. I suppose that almost precisely the same differences exist with regard to the calibre and the power of teachers?—Of course—the diversity of human nature.

2920. Under those circumstances, do you think it is possible to satisfactorily arrange a colonial scale of staffs?—You could put in the same number of units, but you would have to take your chance of being able to get the qualifications. You cannot possibly get every school-teacher to have the same qualifications.

2921. Do not the Inspectors, in the course of their work, sometimes report that one particular school is weaker than another—one teacher strong, and another weak?—You will find that in our Chief Inspector's last report eighty-one schools are described as satisfactory, fifty-one as fair, and thirteen as inferior.

2922. In the case of large schools, is it not found necessary occasionally to strengthen a school by adding an additional teacher?—Yes, that is so; at times we find it necessary to supplement the weakness of a head-teacher by putting in a specially strong first assistant.

2923. Then, if what has been called a rigid scale of staff were adopted for the whole of the schools in the colony, do you think it would be found to be workable—would it give satisfaction?—There would have to be the power of variation, I think; the Boards should have the power of dealing with the staff.

2924. I suppose that precisely the same objection would apply to a colonial scale of salaries, would it not?—We have not had the same difficulty with the scale of salaries. I think that where the Board has felt the disability of our present position is that they have not been able to raise the salaries of the smaller country schools.

2925. Take the case of the back-block teacher, who has been referred to already: I suppose you admit that, apart from the cost of living, there are such things as bad roads, bad weather, irregular attendance owing to the difficulties that children have in bad weather in reaching school, huge social disadvantages, the inability of the teacher to pursue his studies and prepare himself for the employment that he intends to follow: under those circumstances, do you think that even if he receives such a salary as £100 to £120 a year he is fairly paid?—I am quite satisfied that there is a great disparity between £120 in some of those places in the country and £120 in a civilised centre. Owing to the discomforts that lady teachers have to put up with in the country, in some cases they are unable to take advantage of the openings which the Board can offer them; as a matter of fact, just now we have two schools where the staff is deficient because we cannot find accommodation for lady teachers. In some cases there are no adequate lodgings available, and no residence is attached to the school. Teachers in the country are at a great disadvantage, and their salaries are not at all equal to similar salaries in the town.

2926. When vacancies occur in the town schools carrying salaries of £100 and upwards, do you receive many applications?—There are always plenty.

2927. Where do they chiefly come from?—The largest number from outside districts come from Canterbury. Recently, out of twenty applications for a position, five were from Wellington teachers, and the balance from outside.

2928. Do the applications include a good number from country teachers?—We have always a great number from the country.

2929. Headmasters?—Yes.

2930. Is there any great anxiety on the part of country teachers to get into town?—Undoubtedly; there is no question about that at all.

2931. Is there any anxiety on the part of town teachers to get into the country?—There is on the part of some young teachers, who desire to get from an assistantship to a headmastership. In the case of a great many really good openings for our lady teachers—particularly ex-pupil-teachers—we have absolutely had to get outsiders to take them. In some cases where there have been good openings for ex-pupil-teachers no applications from them have been received.

2932. With regard to the Educational Institute, has the Institute made representations to your Board at any time with reference to either salaries or other complaints?—The only representation made by them that I can recollect at the moment was in connection with the Technical School—pointing out that it was absorbing a certain amount of salary-money. I am not sure whether it was in the form of a communication to the Board or a report in the newspapers.

2933. A very large amount of money that otherwise would have been distributed amongst the teachers has been withdrawn from primary education and handed over to the Technical School?—It has been said that the amount has been about £1,100 a year. Of course, the defence of the Board is that the Technical School work is essentially primary education. This question of technical education is one that has been creating a great deal of agitation and discussion.

2934. It has been stated that a good many of the teachers themselves have benefited by the Technical School: do you know whether that is the case?—I think so. We have endeavoured, as far as possible, to place the various classes at the disposal of the teachers. It has been largely with a view to benefit primary education that the school has been carried on.

2935. *Mr. Hill.* Have the teachers been granted special facilities to attend the Technical School?—We have had special classes for the teachers, and have paid their fares from the country to enable them to attend those classes.

2936. *The Chairman.*] Is it due to the school that drawing-lessons have been conducted in a very satisfactory way all over the district?—Yes; I think that is undisputed.

2937. Have the teachers also received instruction in singing through the medium of the Technical School?—Yes.

2938. They have had this instruction free?—Yes.

2939. I think you have already expressed the opinion that it would be a good thing if Education Boards were elected by the people?—I have a strong opinion that the present system of electing Education Boards is an anomalous one: it is entirely wrong. The people themselves should elect the Education Boards, and the people then would have an opportunity of expressing their opinion as a people, and of placing proper representation on the Boards.

2940. I presume you think that a method of popular election would increase the interest that the people now take in education?—I think so. It has done so in London.

2941. Do you think it would be desirable to have a regulation passed providing that schools should not be placed within a certain distance of each other—say, two or three miles?—There is a regulation to that effect now.

2942. The Board's regulation?—I think it is under the Act.

2943. Has not the Board power to erect a school within a lesser distance of another school than that if it thinks the case demands it?—Yes; if the case demands it—for instance, take the city schools.

2944. The Board has a discretionary power now?—Yes; it is provided, either by the Board's regulations or the Act, that no school shall be placed within three or five miles of another, except in the case of town schools.

2945. Would it be well to remove that discretionary power, do you think, seeing that in many cases there are huge mountain-ranges or rivers intervening?—I do not think it would operate at all in this district: it would not be applicable at all. At Kahautaiā there are two schools quite close at hand, where, if there was a bridge across the river, the Ruamahanga School would suffice.

2946. But in the absence of a bridge the two schools must be maintained?—The children used to go over the river in a sort of flat-bottomed boat; but we had to discourage that, lest we might be responsible for the drowning of some of the children.

2947. To sum up the whole matter, do you think that, on the whole, a colonial scale of salaries, controlled by a central department, would be found to be equitable or just to the teachers, or give satisfaction to the people themselves?—I cannot answer that. I am distinctly of opinion that if the Board is properly constituted, and has the means at its disposal, it is in a better position—I am speaking particularly with regard to Wellington—to give satisfaction to its teachers, and could better control education in the district, than would be the case if there were a hard-and-fast scale of salaries, because that involves also, I understand, the placing of the Inspectors under the control of the department.

2948. No, that is not so. Are you aware that the Inspectors themselves, at one of their conferences, passed a resolution in favour of being placed under a central department?—I suppose they want to get out of control, like all the other authorities.

2949. Do you know anything of the Educational Institute—whether it represents the teachers of the country as well as of the city, or whether it is exclusive or open?—I do not know. I know that they are a very active body here in Wellington, but I do not know whether they represent the country teachers or the town ones.

2950. You do not know whether many country teachers attend the meetings or take any active part in connection with it?—No.

2951. *Mr. Hill.*] Has the Wellington Board any regulation limiting the size of the schools: what is the greatest average attendance at any Wellington school?—About 900.

2952. You do not limit the size to, say, 600 or 700?—We have not been called upon to decide such a question.

FRIDAY, 28TH JUNE, 1901.

A. DORSET further examined.

2953. *Mr. Davidson.*] I find that in the Wellington District there are twenty-five schools in which the average attendance is under 15?—Yes.

2954. What is the Board's regulation as far as salary is concerned in regard to such schools? They are usually treated as aided schools.

2955. Your regulations allow £3 15s. for each unit in the school?—Yes; we help the smaller schools as much as possible.

2956. Then, each of the schools would be improved to the extent of £1 5s. per unit under the new scale?—Yes.

2957. Then, these twenty-five schools would be materially benefited?—Yes.

2958. In the next class there are eighteen small country schools which would benefit from £10 to £30 per year?—Either of the proposed scales would improve the small schools.

2959. There are twelve other schools for which your scale allows £80 per year, but the suggested scale gives from £120 to £130, so they would benefit?—Yes.

2960. There are fourteen schools with averages from 25 to 30: under your scale you allow £100 for those schools, and the suggested scale provides for £130 to £140?—Yes; they would benefit.

2961. That is to say, that sixty-nine schools, or nearly half of the schools in the Wellington District, have an average below 30, and would be benefited very materially under the suggested scale?—No doubt.

2962. Are these the schools that should be benefited under any scheme?—Yes.
2963. You will notice that for an increase of one scholar an increase of £55 is given?—Yes.
2964. Under the suggested scale the increase is by units: do you think it is preferable to pay by units?—I do not know. I think that the steps might be closer in the scale.
2965. It is not peculiar to the Wellington District that these smaller schools are underpaid: the same thing exists right throughout the colony?—Yes.
2966. You would approve of a scheme drawn up by this Commission which would increase the salaries for such schools as those throughout the colony?—Yes.
2967. *Mr. Hogben.*] I ask for a return of expenses of your Board irrespective of teachers' salaries and allowances, &c.?—I produce the return [Exhibit 109].
2968. *The Chairman.*] You have been asked about the small schools: have there been a good many applications from time to time for the establishment of small schools in outlying places under the Wellington Board's jurisdiction?—Quite a number.
2969. Is much pressure brought to bear on members of Boards in order to get those schools?—I think there is.
2970. Has the Board frequently, after due inquiry, refused applications for such schools?—Yes.
2971. At the meeting before last of the Wellington Board do you remember any applications being refused?—Yes; two.
2972. Do you recollect the grounds of refusal?—That the attendance in one case was not sufficiently large, and in the other case the bridging of a river and roading would give access to the existing school.
2973. What attendance was expected for those schools?—I could not answer that just now.
2974. The members of the Board were guided by the report of their Inspector, I suppose?—I certainly think so.
2975. Was it considered by the Board that if the parents used a little exertion they would be able to avail themselves of the educational advantages in the district?—Yes; and the Board offered to contribute to the expenses of children attending such schools.
2976. I suppose the measures that are adopted by the Board are modified from time to time to meet the circumstances?—Yes, certainly.
2977. Has not the Board sometimes advanced a small amount of capitation-money to the parents to enable them to furnish horses to carry children to school?—Yes, that has been done. Every effort is made to get children to the nearest school. Every case is dealt with on its merits.
2978. If the Board were to respond to every demand of this kind, what would the result be financially?—You would have no money for building larger schools, and there would be considerable strain to pay salaries.
2979. It would lead to a large increase of expenditure?—Decidedly so.
2980. Are applications occasionally made to assist so-called teachers who are virtually tutors and governesses in private families?—Yes.
2981. If the Board understands the circumstances, are the applications granted or refused?—They are sometimes granted, the Board recognising that the settlers have a fair claim. The condition is that the school assisted must be a public school open to any child.
2982. Are there other applications where no benefit would be given except to a private person?—I do not think so.
2983. Has the Board endeavoured to encourage or discourage the establishment of small schools?—To encourage, where it is the only means of providing education for children.
2984. But supposing other means are available?—Then they discourage it.
2985. If schools were multiplied in the outlying settlements in the way demanded sometimes by the settlers, what, in your opinion, would be the effect on the schools already in existence?—They would practically be denuded in many instances.
2986. Instead of moderate-sized schools you would have a whole crowd of weak and inferior ones?—Yes; and too close together, as many are now.
2987. Do you know how many School Committees there are in the Wellington District?—About 145.
2988. How many Committees have you in the city?—Seven.
2989. Do those Committees represent many parents?—Oh, yes.
2990. But take the country districts: do the Committees there represent parents of many children?—In some schools the attendance is very small.
2991. Are you of the same opinion as the Chairman of the Wellington Board, that it would be a great improvement if Boards were made elective on a broad and wide franchise?—I certainly think so.
2992. Do you think it is reasonable that a Committee representing half a dozen or a dozen parents should have the same elective power and control of the Board as a Committee representing large schools in the city?—No.
2993. *Mr. Hill.*] How much subsidy is paid by the various districts in Wellington—that is, for small country schools under 15?—In most instances the subsidy is arranged to include free board and lodging.
2994. But you do not require those Committees to pay these amounts into the Board's funds?—No; I believe the average payment to these Committees is £40 a year.
- T. R. FLEMING, M.A., LL.B., Inspector of Schools, examined.
2995. *Mr. Davidson.*] Do you find that boys are entering the teaching profession in the Wellington District?—Not to the extent that we would like to see. Generally speaking, the boys offering do not equal the girls.
2996. Would you mind looking at page 8 of the Minister's report for 1899: you will see a table there of teachers' salaries for 1899?—Yes.

2997. You see in that report that there are, apart from pupil-teachers, 1,023 certificated teachers in the colony receiving under £100: do you not think that the knowledge of that fact deters the right kind of boys from entering the teaching profession?—Yes.

2998. How many teachers out of the 3,812 mentioned in this report are receiving between £300 and £400?—I think the number is fifty-eight according to this return.

2999. How many receive £400?—Four.

3000. Do you think that the inducement for boys to become teachers, and for the best class of men who are teachers to remain in the service, is sufficient?—Certainly not.

3001. Is it your opinion that a large section of the public imagine that there are a number of teachers in the colony receiving salaries of £500 and upwards?—I could not answer that.

3002. What is your opinion as to the salaries for schools with an average attendance under 30?—They are not nearly sufficient.

3003. Have you seen the alternative scale suggested?—Yes.

3004. You will notice there that the staffing allowed for schools up to 40 is a sole teacher: do you consider that sufficient or not?—I recognise it is a question of finance. As an ideal it is certainly not sufficient, but we have to consider a great many questions.

3005. Do you think that a thoroughly competent teacher can efficiently manage a small country school having an average up to 40?—A teacher in a school of 40 or up to 58 (with average below 40, and having eight or nine classes) is, I consider, the hardest worked in the service.

3006. The staff suggested here is that obtaining in the Wellington District, is it not?—I find that the staffing in the suggested scale tallies very nearly, except in one place in which it is less than our scale.

3007. I was speaking of schools up to 40, in which it corresponds exactly with the Wellington scale for head-teachers?—Yes.

3008. Take the next group (40 to 90); the Wellington scale (41 to 71) provides for a head-teacher and a pupil-teacher: do you think that a pupil-teacher is the right class of assistant to come in at that stage?—No.

3009. Would you prefer an assistant?—Yes.

3010. Then, you would prefer the suggested scale in this respect: is that so?—Yes.

3011. In a mixed school having an average of over 500 the Fourth Standard would probably have an average of from 60 up to 70?—Yes.

3012. Is the average woman physically capable of managing classes in a mixed school from Standard IV. upwards?—No.

3013. But you think there are exceptional women who may sometimes be able to manage the higher standards?—Yes.

3014. In a staff drawn up by such a Commission as this, would you make the staff so elastic as to allow a woman to take such standards?—Yes.

3015. Would you make a hard-and-fast rule that women must not take such work?—No.

3016. The average woman is physically incapable of doing such work?—Yes.

3017. In separate schools, where the sexes are separate, do you think women can manage girls up to any standard?—Yes, with slight modifications. I would not feel so certain of them, even with girls, as good male teachers.

3018. Do you think male and female teachers should receive equal pay?—No.

3019. How many female teachers have to be trained for each one that remains permanently in the service?—I should say that one in four (which some one has stated to be the proportion) was under the mark.

3020. Is the cost of training women teachers equal to the cost of training men?—It is more.

3021. The State is the loser by women going out of the profession so often?—Yes; and often schools are deranged in consequence.

3022. Do women require sick-leave more frequently and for longer periods than men?—Much more.

3023. These are two reasons why you would not give equal pay to women?—Certainly.

3024. Is the disparity between the salaries of men and women too great?—Yes.

3025. Would you suggest that this disparity be very considerably reduced?—Yes; but I have not gone into the percentage in this scale.

3026. I understand you to say you would not equalise the salaries of the sexes, but would make them approach more closely than they do at the present time?—Yes.

3027. Are you in favour of a uniform scale of salaries and staffing for the whole colony?—Speaking as an abstract principle, I say Yes.

3028. Do you know of any other colony having different scales of salaries and staffing?—No.

3029. Are there uniform scales in Australia?—Yes.

3030. And in the States of America?—Yes.

3031. *Mr. Stewart.*] Is the Commission to understand from your answer just now that you believe in the principle of a colonial scale as just and equitable?—I said I was in favour of it as an abstract principle.

3032. Supposing that a colonial scale was drawn up by this Commission and approved by Parliament, do you think that would weaken the Boards' control over the teachers, even though the Boards pay them and retain their right of making appointments, and that the Boards have the power of removing teachers?—I cannot say that I have gone into this question of a colonial scale from that point of view, consequently my opinion would not be worth anything.

3033. From your knowledge of affairs generally, do you think that the teachers of New Zealand are anything like satisfied with the present rates of pay?—I do not think they are.

3034. You said there is a great disparity between the salaries of men and women, and that it should be lessened?—Yes.

3035. Do you think that the women teachers of the Wellington District are anything like adequately paid?—No.

3036. Then, the suggested scale would receive your approval in lessening that disparity?—Yes.

3037. How many years have you been inspecting in this district?—Eleven years.

3038. You have seen progress of settlement going on?—Yes.

3039. Do you think the cost of living at Pahiatua and other parts is as high to-day as it was eleven years ago?—I really have not gone into the question, but I do not think it is.

3040. Are the roads and general means of communication in the Wellington Province being steadily improved?—Yes.

3041. Is it probable that with the improved means of communication the cost of living is lessened?—Yes.

3042. In drawing up a scale of salaries for the future it will not be wise to take into consideration small differences in the cost of living?—Perhaps not, as regards the cost of living only.

3043. Do you think that during the eleven years you have been inspecting it is very probable that the cost of living in the different districts has been reduced?—Yes.

3044. Looking at the question of the cost of living from the standpoint of town and country, do you think that there are factors in each place which tend to equalise matters—that is to say, high rent in town, and so on?—I will not answer that question “yes” or “no,” because some of the country teachers with house allowance or rent are certainly far better off than those in town.

3045. Take, for instance, the teacher at Masterton: he is really in a much better position than many head-teachers in Wellington?—I should say so.

3046. Has your Board any definite scheme of effecting promotions?—I think the Chairman of the Board told you yesterday that the Board advertises vacancies, and that the teachers taken were those who could show length of service and good certificates. The best of such teachers would get the position.

3047. Do you think that in appointing pupil-teachers the opinion of the Inspectors ought to be taken?—Certainly. I may say that this year our Board has for the first time submitted to us the names of applicants for pupil-teacherships in the city, but not so with regard to country appointments.

3048. In the past the selection of pupil-teachers in Wellington has not been satisfactory, but it has improved in regard to the town, and not in the country?—That is practically so.

3049. Considering the necessity for education in these country districts, do you not think that there ought to be a reform in this matter?—Undoubtedly. I think we should have a training-college at the different centres, so that teachers could be trained there for the country service.

3050. In any case you would not advocate employment of pupil-teachers until your Inspectors had had an opportunity of judging as to their abilities?—No, I would not.

3051. You have those facilities now?—Yes. Our Board has got over the difficulty as well as it can; but we have work to do in different parts of the district, and that prevents us supervising to any extent the training of pupil-teachers.

3052. As to the male pupil-teachers, boys are not so good as girls?—Not as a rule—I mean, judging from the work done in the schools.

3053. Do you think you get the best class of boys, or do you think that, in consequence of many varying factors, you do not get the best class?—I do not think we get the best class.

3054. It is really necessary to encourage the employment of the best class of boys?—Undoubtedly.

3055. Do you think that the provision made for a working-average helps materially in cases of epidemic, &c.?—Yes, in some cases. It does justice in some cases in connection with country schools.

3056. Would you favour raising the working-average to three-fifths of the roll instead of half?—Yes, in the circumstances.

3057. Do you think that payment on average attendance is just to the teachers?—No; I think a better and more just basis would be the roll-numbers.

3058. Are you in favour of the Inspectors being placed under the central department?—No. The Inspectors at their last conference resolved in favour of that, but at the conference in 1894 they decided against it. In both cases I voted in favour of Inspectors remaining as they are at present.

3059. We have no evidence from any Inspector as to why he voted against the proposal?—Well, I consider that amongst the best part of an Inspector's work is going round advising teachers. It seems to me that under present arrangements Inspectors are better able to do that. It is possible some satisfactory system might be arranged by the department, but at present I am against the proposed change.

3060. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Is it not likely that in districts where the same Inspectors remain for a number of years, teachers get into the ways and methods of Inspectors?—Yes, but that can be very easily remedied. I think it is a mistake for a Board to have only one Inspector.

3061. How would you get over the difficulty in the case of small Boards, where perhaps there is hardly work enough for one Inspector?—I do not see there is any necessity for a change in the direction indicated. An Inspector on a Board such as the Westland or Taranaki would do quite as good work under the Board as under the department. Besides, in cases of removal by a department, it must not be forgotten that it takes an Inspector some time to understand his district.

3062. Would such changes lead to uniformity in the work of the inspections, and of the educational work generally?—I do not quite see what you mean by “uniformity.”

3063. Well, judging by Inspectors' reports, the systems in vogue throughout the colony are as different as chalk and cheese?—Discussing this matter in conference, the Inspectors found that there was nothing like the difference which some people seemed to think existed. As to uniformity, in one sense I am dead against it.

3064. Are you opposed to uniformity in the assignment of marks?—I do not see how putting the Inspectors under the department would remedy that. Each Inspector, as it is, gives his opinion, and how would that be altered under the department? The question was discussed by the Inspectors in conference, and it was agreed to observe certain rules.

3065. I understand from the Otago Inspectors that they still intend to adhere to the system in use by them in the past?—I cannot answer for the Inspectors of Otago.

3066. Do you consider that the adoption of a colonial scale of salaries will tend to have the effect that teachers will regard their salaries as having a permanency which does not exist at the present time?—I think you might ask the teachers that.

3067. Would you oppose the interests of the teachers if they passed a resolution affirming that a colonial scale was in their interests?—If the teachers thought it was in their interests, and I thought it was against their interests, I would oppose it.

3068. Do you not think it would lead to contentment on the part of teachers if such a scale were adopted?—I have said I am in favour of the principle.

3069. Do you consider that the allocation of the extra 5s. to the various Boards will tend to remove anomalies now existing in the salaries of teachers?—Speaking for our Board, I think the best will be done to remove anomalies; but that does not mean that I am in favour of the 5s. instead of a colonial scale.

3070. If the £4 is given to a strong Board it would be able to increase its salaries?—Undoubtedly; there is no question about that. I cannot see how the grant will satisfy Greymouth, Westland, or Taranaki.

3071. Do you think that the minimum certificates under the scale are too high?—I would like to look at the scale further before expressing an opinion as to that.

3072. Do you consider that the Inspectors should have power or authority to reduce teachers' certificates?—No.

3073. Inspectors are not unanimous on that point?—Well, my reason is that if you are making a selection of a teacher from another Board the best thing to go by is the last report of the Inspector. I do not think you should degrade a man publicly by reducing his certificate.

3074. Would you support a system of bonus on certificates?—Our scale practically means that up to a certain extent. Perhaps, on the whole, I should like to see some encouragement given to teachers to improve their certificates, as my experience is that many teachers get a certain certificate required, and unless there is some incentive they do not proceed further.

3075. Do you suggest that some incentive should be given?—I think Mr. Hogben's plan is a very good one.

3076. Do you consider that the granting of a bonus on certificates, as adopted by the Wanganui Board, is likely to cripple to finances of the Board?—That is another question. Perhaps the incentive given to the teacher might be quite sufficient without a bonus. I have not made up my mind with regard to the advisability of giving bonuses.

3077. You favour the establishment of training-colleges at the large centres?—Undoubtedly I do.

3078. Would that be preferable to the establishment of a chair of pedagogy in the university?—I think both are desirable. Training-colleges ought to be worked in conjunction with the university. Mr. Hogben, in his address to the Inspectors, said: "Under the heading of 'Training-schools' we read, 'It will become a question for consideration in the near future whether definite training for all teachers should not be provided by the State. In the case of the four large centres it will be possible to co-ordinate this with the work of the university colleges; at the smaller centres those who cannot by scholarships or otherwise find admission to the four chief normal schools should likewise have the opportunity of undergoing a regular course of training.'" And, further, "The director of the training-college should be lecturer also in psychology and in the history of education, both of which subjects should be broadly but not exhaustively treated, with a view to their influence in the making of intelligent and thoughtful teachers." We have considered the question, and I fully agree with what Mr. Hogben says there.

3079. In the case of the smaller towns, such as Wanganui, New Plymouth, and Napier, what do you suggest in place of a training-college?—I think the colleges at the four centres ought to be sufficient to provide for the wants of the smaller places, if teachers were sent to the country from these centres.

3080. Do you think the Board should have full power to transfer teachers in its district?—Yes; I find there is great difficulty in working schools without this power.

3081. Respecting the requirements of the syllabus, do you favour a differentiation between the work expected from the scholars of town and country schools?—Yes, undoubtedly.

3082. Under the suggested scale (No. 1), when the attendance reaches 20 the headmaster is to lose £10 from his salary to pay a sewing-mistress: is that equitable?—No.

3083. Would you favour uniformity in the pupil-teachers' examinations?—We have already expressed our opinion in conference on this point. I think it would be better if the department took charge of this work, and so have the same system all over the colony.

3084. *Mr. Luke.*] Do you think that the university colleges could be utilised as training-colleges through the establishment of a chair of pedagogy?—I think it is practicable.

3085. *Mr. Hill.*] Did I understand you to say that in schools of the same average attendance the salaries should be the same throughout the colony?—Well, broadly speaking, yes. But there are exceptional cases where the schoolmaster is deserving of a higher salary. One such case has been before the Commission in which the average attendance is given as only 14. In 1889 that

school presented for examination 38 children; in 1900, 52; and last year, 59. It is not fair to judge of a teacher's work by the average which has been set down for this school. The teacher is doing far more work than the stated average would indicate.

3086. But, as a general principle, you think that schools having the same average attendance should carry the same salaries?—Yes.

3087. You said there are some cases where some differentiation should be made in the matter of allowances?—Yes, some such power should be given.

3088. You notice there are thirteen Boards in the colony?—I think there are too many.

3089. Do you think there should be a merging in certain cases?—Yes.

3090. Do you really find that men control schools better than women?—Yes, certainly, I should prefer a man to a woman in charge of a school. In the smallest schools of all I should often prefer a woman.

3091. Up to what average attendance do you think it is desirable to have a woman in the school as sole teacher?—Up to an average of 40—taking the scale.

3092. Above 40 what would you suggest?—I do not know that a man might not do a little above that.

3093. In the case of the larger schools, where do you think the woman is best?—In charge of the infant department. That is one feature of Mr. Hogben's scale which I rather like.

3094. Would you not like a woman to teach above Standard II.: is that so?—I think she might take Standard III.

3095. As regards assistants, have you any women taking, say, Standard VI.?—Yes.

3096. And Standard V. also?—Yes.

3097. Would you suggest that under the new scale women should be debarred from taking the higher standards?—No.

3098. Would you limit the teaching by lady teachers up to Standard IV.?—I do not think it is necessary to do so.

3099. Is it your experience that women can do the work required of them as well as men?—No. I have said that in large schools the average woman can do the work up to Standard IV., but above that you want exceptional women for the work.

3100. If the man in mixed schools has to teach Standards VI. and V., do you find that he is as capable of managing the girls in those classes as well as a woman and as efficiently?—Not altogether. There are differences in temperament.

3101. Do you think that women's influence in the school will operate beyond their ordinary instruction?—Yes.

3102. With reference to certificates, are you of the opinion that, in order to foster literary attainment, something should be given—say, a bonus?—If you mean as some incentive to prosecute study, I say Yes.

3103. Would you give them a money bonus?—No.

3104. Some special certificate as an incentive?—Perhaps.

3105. You think men should pursue their studies from the love of it—which brings its own reward?—Yes; but some incentive is generally necessary.

3106. Is it literary knowledge or skill that characterizes the successful teacher?—Both.

3107. Do you find that literary knowledge always goes with technical skill?—No; they are separate.

3108. In order to be a successful teacher, must there not be a specialisation of the man's knowledge?—A man entering the teaching profession should go in for the science of education.

3109. In order to become a teacher, is it absolutely necessary for him to possess a certain amount of knowledge?—Yes.

3110. A teacher is wanted for a certain school, and you have two men holding the same certificates, but one has graduated: do you think the advantage would be to the man who has the highest certificate?—The advantage would undoubtedly be to the man with the literary knowledge, other things being equal.

3111. Is it the literary knowledge or the certificate showing his literary knowledge which is of benefit to him, even though he is not classified?—I do not think it gives the graduate the more chance unless it is incorporated with the certificate, because when it is put before the Committees they do not really understand what the whole thing means.

3112. Do you think they understand the present extraordinary system of classification?—They do not need to understand how the grading of the certificate is determined, but only the rank of the certificate.

3113. Would you suggest the continuation of the present system of classification?—I think I would simplify it a little. I think the E certificate might very well be raised.

3114. Would you suggest the establishment (in the country as well as in the town) of a preparatory school, whereby those who desire to become teachers could anticipate the teaching profession by preparation before entering as pupil-teachers?—I have not considered that question carefully. There are a great many things to be said in that connection. The Education Department is now advocating the establishment of high schools throughout the district, and we hope to get better material for the teaching profession as a result. We must get the best material, no matter where it comes from, and if the country material is not good enough we must get it from somewhere else. Training-colleges, when provided, ought to meet the requirements.

3115. *Mr. Smith.*] You favour the proposal made at the last conference to have pupil-teachers trained?—Yes.

3116. I suppose you know that the proposal was negatived by that conference by only one vote: what advantage would accrue from having pupil-teachers trained by the Boards?—It would hurry the department to establish training-colleges.

3117. *Mr. Weston.*] Do you think there is too much uniformity in our present system of education in the primary schools?—I think I should like to see a little more uniformity in the examination of pupil-teachers; but I would like the standard syllabus to be a little more varied, and the headmaster given more choice.

3118. If you think the syllabus should be more varied, would it not mean that pupil-teachers should not be brought under a dead uniformity system of examination?—The examination itself might be just as varied as the syllabus.

3119. If the teachers are to be examined by the central department, I presume there would be one syllabus for all the pupil-teachers: would not the examiners be appointed for the whole colony, and would not the same questions be distributed throughout the colony?—Yes.

3120. Would that not engender dead uniformity?—No. At present the teachers' certificates are all done by one examination all over the colony. Such a syllabus should be drawn up so as to give variety.

3121. I apprehend you to mean that the object of a certificate is to enable the holder to assert a just claim to positions as they may offer?—Yes.

3122. Therefore a certificate, *plus* Inspectors' reports, would be the man's passport?—Yes.

3123. If a certificate is to be a man's passport, would it not necessarily follow that as a teacher deteriorated, either from direct causes or from age, such certificate should be lessened in value?—I consider such a reduction would be an act of degradation. I strongly reprobate any such course.

3124. Then, would it not be more just for a man or woman starting in the profession to receive a certificate, such as a lawyer gets, and with it leave him to fight the battle of life as best he can?—Then you would have enormous difficulties.

3125. You have said you would rely on the Inspector's judgment whether a man should be appointed?—We must have evidence that a teacher would be up to the work required of him. A certificate does not show the faculty of organization at all, and that is one of the most important considerations in making the appointment.

3126. Do you believe in pupil-teachers being engaged in teaching?—No, not at first.

3127. What do you think should be the course that a boy or girl aiming to become a teacher should pursue?—I would advocate that they come prepared with as good a literary knowledge as possible. At present our regulations are not severe enough to test whether they are sufficiently equipped. They should do a little teaching, and then go through a training-college.

3128. Do you think that more scholarships should be offered than is the case at present?—Well, that, again, is a question of finance. I should like to see a larger number of scholarships, but there is also a question of age. Certain scholarships should be offered for children under thirteen, and again for those under fifteen. No scholarship should lead straight from the primary school to the university. Children should go from the primary to the secondary school, and thence to the university by another examination.

3129. And those scholarships should be multiplied?—Yes.

3130. Do you think that one cause of boys' disinclination to act as pupil-teachers is a dread of the "grind" they must undergo to qualify themselves?—I do not quite see that.

3131. If that is not an element, can you tell us what is the cause of boys holding back so?—Well, they know that it may be many years before they receive even £100 a year.

3132. It is rather a want of confidence in their future career?—Not altogether; partly that.

3133. Then, what is the reason?—I cannot say anything definite.

3134. As to incidental allowances to Committees: if we have a colonial scale of salaries, would it not be just that there should be a colonial scale of incidentals, seeing that the larger schools get more money?—That is rather a difficult question to answer.

3135. But you will admit that the whole of the schools in the colony ought to receive equal justice?—Yes.

3136. Assuming that the colonial scale is passed, and it is based on my friend's lines, will it follow as a matter of course that small schools of, say, 5 children as the minimum average will receive enough to equip them and give the children a proper education?—I do not see how it can, as £5 will not be enough.

3137. Then, you come back to your statement that small schools must have special consideration?—Yes, that is so.

3138. Are there cases in your own district where it would be essential to give special help to, say, a couple of families who, by reason of bad roads and other circumstances, cannot send their children to school?—There are several such cases in our district where we do give help.

3139. You support Mr. Blair's statement that those cases ought to be considered just as much as those having a larger attendance?—They should be considered, certainly.

3140. In all schools is it not essential, in considering the size of the staff, to regard special circumstances?—Yes.

3141. Do you think that the same elasticity that the Boards would probably give might be expected from the Government administering a hard-and-fast colonial scale?—No.

3142. Do you think that in our schools generally, with a colonial scale of staffing and salaries, there would be the same earnest work bestowed by teachers as at present?—I do not think it will make difference in that respect. It would give teachers a better tenure of office, which they ought to have.

3143. You do not think it would weaken their efforts in school-work?—Not a bit in that way.

3144. Supposing a lady were at the head of a school, and an assistant was needed, would you place the man in a subordinate position to the lady, or would you remove the lady, and appoint a man in charge?—I think I would put in a female teacher.

3145. A school grows to be beyond the reach, according to scale, of a lady teacher: what would you do when an extra teacher was required?—I think I would put in a female to assist.

3146. Might it not be the case that there would be a class of child in the school which, in the opinion of the Committee, required the services of a man rather than of a woman?—Yes; there are many disadvantages both ways.

3147. Then, in such case, what would you do with the lady? I presume you would not expect the man to work under the lady?—I said I would put in a female teacher, or make the best arrangement possible.

3148. Supposing it were necessary to put in a male teacher, what would you do with the lady?—I would try to put her in another school.

3149. Then, you would put a man under her?—No, not necessarily. Everything in such a case would depend upon the special circumstances of the case.

3150. *Mr. Hogben.*] You expressed the opinion that, with regard to staffing, there would not be so much elasticity under a colonial scale as under Boards?—Yes, that is my opinion; I was taking your first scale, which I thought was too rigid.

3151. Supposing that the Board was allowed to substitute for two pupil-teachers one certificated teacher?—That would certainly lessen the rigidity.

3152. Again, supposing Boards were allowed to substitute for a pupil-teacher and a junior teacher one strong teacher (instead of the two), would that strengthen the staff?—Undoubtedly, yes.

3153. Or, again, supposing the Board was allowed to substitute for a teacher a pupil-teacher, and to add £45 to the salary of another teacher so as to give more experience, would that be an advantage?—Quite so.

3154. Can you tell me any changes in a staff which would not come under that head?—I cannot remember any change that we have made which would not come under one of these three heads.

3155. Supposing those conditions were inserted in a colonial scale with a limitation, would it not meet possible or likely cases?—Our scale allows one assistant instead of two pupil-teachers, or *vice versa*. There is no limitation: it is at the discretion of the Inspector.

3156. You do not think it advisable to increase the number of pupil-teachers?—No.

3157. How would you limit it, then?—I suppose you could not do it any other way than by drawing up a scale as you suggest.

3158. Do other districts besides Wellington generally make special arrangements in cases like that of Pongaroa?—I cannot answer for other districts.

3159. Do they depart from the scale?—I do not know.

3160. I understood you to say there ought to be a uniform scale of allowances to the Committees?—Yes.

3161. Are fires needed as much in the north as in the south of New Zealand?—No.

3162. Does a school in a dry district like South Canterbury require cleaning so much as schools in other districts?—That all depends on the state of the roads, and other things.

3163. Does not firewood cost very much more in some places than in others?—Yes.

3164. Would not that make a good deal of difference in the needs of Committees?—Those are some of the factors to be taken into consideration.

3165. It would make such a difference as to necessitate a difference in any scale drawn up allowing grants to the various Committees?—I dare say it would.

3166. Then, how could such a scale stand on all-fours with a scale of salaries?—All I can say is that I certainly think that Boards are better able to deal with incidental expenses.

3167. With certain modifications, and such changes as I have indicated, you do not see any difficulty in working the colonial scale?—No, certainly not—that is, working it as a scale. I would like to give a headmaster full discretion in the management of his school.

3168. Is it desirable to have separate schools for boys and girls and infants?—I think the headmaster should have control of the infant-schools, instead of, as at present, in a few cases where the infant mistress is practically the head. In such cases the transfer of children to the higher classes does not work so smoothly as where the headmaster has full control.

3169. *Mr. Hill.*] You have a Girls' School at Mount Cook: do you think it is desirable to adopt mixed schools?—Yes; that Girls' School was established because it was thought desirable by many parents to have a separate school in so large a district, and doubtless it gives satisfaction to some people who desire it.

3170. You would not close that school?—No; there might be some parents so much prejudiced against a mixed school that they still prefer to send their children to the Girls' School.

3171. Would you suggest that some such schools should be merged?—I prefer a mixed school.

3172. In any case, you think the various departments ought to be under the direct control of the headmaster?—Yes; but in the special case of our Girls' School in Wellington I would not disturb existing arrangements as to control.

3173. In the case of infant departments you would have them under the control of the headmaster?—Yes, certainly. It would do away with the chances of friction.

3174. *The Chairman.*] You mean that where there are separate boys' and girls' schools existing you would not interfere unless an amalgamation or alteration was brought about by the action of the parents and Committees?—If the parents and Committees wished an amalgamation I should advocate it, but not otherwise.

3175. In the scale of staffing salaries as proposed you will notice that there are twenty-six grades or classes: might not that number be advantageously reduced?—I do not see that it matters.

3176. You will notice, too, that for smaller schools there is a unit system by which the salaries of teachers in such schools are liable to be reduced or increased from £1 to £5 for each

child: is that an improvement on the system at present in use in this district? Do you think teachers' salaries should be allowed to fluctuate in that manner?—I certainly think that in certain schools it would be better to have a fixed scale. You might have it fluctuating above a certain grade.

3177. The principle adhered to in this scale is "the more pupils the more pay": do you think that principle should be paramount, or should we go on the principle of equal pay for equal work; or, to put it another way, in small schools you might have very hard work for the teacher, in a large school the work is not so heavy, and yet because there are more pupils in that school the teacher's salary is greater?—The teacher's salary ought not to be affected in that way in the small schools, but responsibility must be taken into account.

3178. According to the scheme now proposed, any fully certificated teacher can be appointed to the charge of any school irrespective of its size?—I have not noticed that.

3179. Take both scales and look at the salaries: you will see, on comparing teachers of the smaller-sized schools with those of the larger schools, that one teacher may receive four times as much salary as another?—Yes.

3180. Now, do you think it is possible for one teacher to do four times the work of another?—Then you come to the question of equal pay for equal work; we must estimate the value of that work according to the district. In some cases one might do ten times more work than another. You cannot estimate the value of a man's work in the way you put it to me.

3181. Then, a teacher in a school of about 20 or 30 pupils is doing only one-fourth of the work done by a headmaster in a city school: is that so?—You cannot estimate the worth of a man's work in a large city school; but it can be safely said that a headmaster in a large city school does more than four times the work of a sole teacher in the smaller country schools.

3182. Is that headmaster's work more laborious than the work of the sole teacher in the country school, who has to take charge of his older scholars, and also the infants?—Yes, taking into account the worry, responsibility, &c.

3183. You are aware that the headmaster of a large school has assistants to help him?—Yes, but he is responsible for the whole.

3184. Do you think that the master in town, who has the assistance of a well-educated staff, and who has simply to supervise and control, is doing four times the work of the sole teacher in the country?—Undoubtedly I do; but I think we ought to have a fixed salary for the smaller country schools. The man in charge of big schools has a greater responsibility on his shoulders.

3185. What do you think should be a fair minimum salary for a teacher in the smaller country schools?—I should not give less than £100.

3186. Do you think there should be a maximum for a headmaster of the town schools?—I see no objection.

3187. What should be the maximum?—Well, we have already the fact brought out that four teachers are getting £400. I do not think that is any too much. The responsibility they bear is a very great consideration.

3188. What I want to know is whether you think it is fair that a teacher in an isolated position—a man fully qualified—should receive only one-fourth of the salary paid to the master in the city?—Well, the only thing to do is to put that man into the position where a better salary is paid. I would not lower the city teacher's salary because another man was getting less.

3189. But if you wish to promote the comfort of the teaching profession generally, do you think it advisable that there should be so great a difference between the salaries?—Unless there is a salary of, say, £400 to aim for, you will not get the better class of teachers to do the work. Good men would not enter the service unless there were some decent salaries offering.

3190. Do you think that a high salary attracts more men than the low salaries repel?—We want the salary that attracts; never mind the question of repelling.

3191. If comfort and prosperity and contentment are the results of the amount of money paid in salaries there should be a wider difference between the salaries paid than exists now?—I have not stated that. You must remember that there are grades by which a man steps upward in the profession, and no man obtains a salary of £400 but by passing through those grades.

3192. I do not suggest any disturbance of the grades, but I point this out: that it is quite possible for a man holding the highest certificate to be placed in a worse position in a country school than the teacher with an inferior qualification in a large school?—There is no such case in our district.

3193. But there is the possibility?—If such a qualified man came to us we would snap him up at once.

3194. I want to know whether you think that an improvement might not be effected by fixing a maximum of such a character as would enable the teachers in the smaller schools in the country to get a much better salary than they do at present?—I must say No. I do not see how it can be done by fixing a maximum salary of such a character.

3195. But could not the present system be improved by lessening the great disparity between these salaries?—No, I do not see that it could be done. The smaller salaries would not gain much by reducing the larger ones.

H. B. KIRK, M.A., Assistant Inspector of Native Schools and Chief Clerk in the Inspector-General's Branch of the Department, examined.

Mr. Kirk: I have no written statement, although I should like to have prepared one, but excessive pressure of urgent work has prevented my doing so. I have the permission of the Inspector-General to state the result, so far as I am concerned, of my observations regarding the system of issuing certificates at present in force. I should like to speak as to what I believe to be the strongest point of the present system, not making any secret of the fact that none of us

consider it a perfect system. Its strongest point is, perhaps, that it has induced a large number of teachers to take a university course, and has placed at the disposal of the Boards a much more considerable number of teachers of culture and of high attainments than they could otherwise have had. I do not say that the existence of the scheme alone, without the co-operation of the Boards, would have resulted as it has done with that co-operation. I have figures here which will show that the Boards have co-operated, and have appreciated one strong point of this scheme. Another piece of evidence which cannot be set forth in figures is the manifest anxiety of teachers, as appearing in correspondence with the department, to obtain promotion. Teachers passing some examination not recognised by the department always show the utmost anxiety to prove their case and to secure a higher certificate. Up to the present time the New Zealand University has granted 681 degrees in the faculties of arts and science—the two faculties of most importance to the teacher. Of the 681 graduates, 303, or 44·4 per cent., have been classified by the department. This is without taking any account of a very large number of graduates who have applied for classification, but who have not been classified, not having had the requisite experience, or who, being women, married and did not push their applications to the point of completion. The classification incidentally makes provision for high schools, but that, I take it, is a matter on which I need not say anything. There is one other point I should like to refer to. It has, I believe, been stated in evidence that the method providing for the expression of an Inspector's judgment as to a teacher's efficiency by assigning marks is as clumsy and unsuitable an one as could be devised. There is nothing in the observation of the working of the scheme that gives any support to such a statement. No Inspector has said that he desired a change in this respect, nor have any representations been made to the effect that there exists an Inspector in whose mind the quantity 2 does not bear a more constant relation to the quantity 10 than, say, the word "tolerable" bears to the word "excellent." If I may go back to the subject of appreciation by the Boards of the present scheme, I should like to submit not whole columns of figures, but the results of them to you. They show that in 1886 there were 1,302 classified teachers in the colony, and of that number 769 teachers (or 59·06 per cent. of the classified teachers) were in Class E. At the present time there are 2,622 classified teachers, of which number 981 (or 37·41 per cent.) are in Class E. Class D shows a very satisfactory increase from 29·41 per cent. to 51·25 per cent. The higher classes, except Class C, which constitutes often a resting stage for Class B, also show a constant increase up to the present time. It may be of interest if I place before you a table showing the average number of children intrusted to teachers of each class in Division 1. It shows generally that, efficiency and other things being equal, preference is given to teachers having good literary attainment, although many large schools are still properly held by the experienced and efficient men of lower-class certificates that have held them for years. I have also some figures showing the average length of service in each district that gains promotion: they show the average in each district for each division, and a mean for the colony. [Exhibit 106.] I should like to make it clear that I, no more than any one else, consider this a perfect system, but I think it would be a great pity if a system that has undoubtedly done good work should now be needlessly interfered with.

3196. *Mr. Stewart.*] I would like you to be good enough to tell us what course is followed in allowing the matriculation examination to count for a partial D?—The University places in the hands of the Inspector-General, for confidential use, the marks gained at the matriculation examination. These are compared with the Class D marks, and an estimate is arrived at as to what marks at the matriculation examination should be accepted for Class D. If a candidate has in six stated subjects gained such marks as come up to that estimate he receives exemption in those six subjects.

3197. Have there been many promotions under the head "Further consideration"?—Not for three and, I think, not for five years. It is several years since more than one promotion has been made under that head.

3198. Do you not think that the time has come for the abolition of such a provision?—I do not. Teachers occasionally arrive in the colony not fully equipped with the documents that show their standing at Home.

3199. *Mr. Luke.*] Do I understand you to say that the present system of classification answers very well?—It has answered well in the past.

3200. Do you think that a better scheme could be devised?—It is certainly possible that this might be done.

3201. Could it not be simplified a great deal?—I think the scheme is capable of simplification without sacrificing any point in which it has been advantageous.

3202. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Would you favour the reduction of a teacher's certificate when he became less efficient?—No, I should not. I may say that the Inspectors from year to year record in the books of the department their opinions of the teachers' decreasing efficiency, but those marks are not divulged.

3203. Do you favour a bonus being granted on a certificate?—Yes; or any other step that will foster a teacher's increasing efficiency.

3204. Would you favour as large a bonus as is given by the Wanganui Board?—I have not considered the question sufficiently to be able to give an opinion.

3205. With reference to Class A certificate, do you think that should be restricted to those students who pass the honours examination at the time specified by the University?—That certificate is now issued to teachers who at the honours examination, without limitation as to time, gain marks that would give second or third honours at the time fixed by the University.

3206. You consider that there are too many classes from E to A?—I am inclined to think so. I think we are reaching a point now at which we might consider the question of discontinuing the issue of Class E certificates.

3207. *Mr. Hill.*] Did I understand you to say that you consider the present a most perfect system of classification?—No.

3208. You think it can be improved?—Undoubtedly.
3209. Is not the tendency in all large governments, where there is centralisation, to think that everything they adopt is most perfect?—I have not sufficient knowledge of large central governments to answer that.
3210. Do you think a certificate should be allowed to a candidate because he simply is a graduate?—I do not.
3211. Have graduates who have never been trained as teachers and have never been examined in the requirements of the department been certificated by the department?—Graduates who have not been trained, but who have had the requisite teaching experience, have been classified, as other teachers have been.
3212. Do you think that two years is sufficient to guarantee that a man is capable of managing a large school?—The certificate does not set forth that he is capable of doing so.
3213. You are aware of the plan of granting certificates in the Old Country?—Yes.
3214. Do you think that a man with a degree should be allowed to be classified by the department unless he passes in the subjects required to classify?—I do not.
3215. You think that the present system ought to be improved in this respect?—Yes; I should be in favour of insisting that graduates should not, as at present, be exempt from music, drawing, school-management, and, in the case of women, needlework.
3216. Why should he be exempt from writing?—I would add writing and reading. I should not be willing to give a certificate to a graduate simply because he is a graduate.
3217. Would you insist on his taking geography and history?—I would not insist on his taking geography and history. I think every graduate who has properly taken his degree has such mental capacity that he can approach such subjects and grapple readily with them.
3218. But other teachers can do that equally well?—I do not admit that, except in the case of individuals.
3219. We have it stated by a witness that he has known a graduate who did not understand the elements of arithmetic?—There may be such men, but I have not met one.
3220. Then, if there may be such men, should not graduates be required to take these subjects?—When I say there may be such men, I merely wish to avoid rudely discrediting the statement of a former witness, and to avoid any implication of a right to limit the belief of other men. For my own part, however, I do not find myself possessed of such a stock of credulity as to enable me to accept the statement.
3221. Do you think that a candidate, even under the conditions you have named, should be allowed to be classed without taking all the subjects which the department sets down for the D examination?—I am not at all in favour of sending a man back again to do work he has already done.
3222. You know that candidates have made application to the department to be exempt from certain subjects in the examination on account of matriculation work?—Yes, that is so.
3223. And have been permitted to be so exempt?—Yes.
3224. Do you think it is a wise course to adopt?—Yes, undoubtedly I do. I do not mean to imply that I think they deserve all the recognition that is given. The recognition is, in my opinion, excessive, even given in the guarded way in which it is now given.
3225. Do you not think that some change is necessary in the matter?—For some years it has been thought that a change is desirable.
3226. *Mr. Weston.*] You told us that in your books were noted the shortcomings of teachers?—There is a record of the decreasing efficiency of teachers.
3227. You said that it is a private book?—It is a confidential record of the Education Department.
3228. You would object to any one but just the immediate officers seeing it?—I did not say that, but every officer would strongly object to any person outside the office seeing it.
3229. What is the object of keeping the book?—It purports to be a record of the history and service of each classified teacher. It records promotion.
3230. Who is to benefit by the record, favourable or not, to the teacher?—Nobody is to be benefited by it, except that it forms the basis upon which the teachers' promotion is given from one grade to another.
3231. If it be necessary to keep that record, should not the Education Boards, who have the appointment of teachers, have an opportunity of seeing those records?—It seems to me they should not.
3232. Then, what is the use of the book?—It enables the status of teachers to be determined, and shows how the classification is arrived at.
3233. But if a man's certificate is to guide the Board of Education in dealing with applications for employment, should not a Board have what you possess to guide its decision?—There is no need to do that so long as the Inspector is an officer of the Board.
3234. If the Inspectors have this information and can supply it to the Boards, why is it necessary that you should so jealously guard these records?—The record must be continued for the purposes of classification. The Inspectors have confidence in stating their judgement to us, knowing that we receive it in confidence. We also owe a duty of confidence to the teachers.
3235. *Mr. Hogben.*] The position might be made a little clearer. That book contains not only the records of cases where the Inspectors' marks are lower, but it also contains the records of marks raised?—Yes.
3236. And where there are marks for length of service, &c., entitling the teacher to promotion he gets promotion?—That is so.
3237. That is to say, the figure of the certificate is raised?—Yes.
3238. It is necessary to keep that book from year to year in order to see that the teacher is entitled to a raising of the certificate?—Yes.

3239. And when the figure of a certificate is raised that fact is published in the *Gazette*?—Yes.

3240. Available for the use of the public?—Yes.

3241. So that this book contains records of teachers' careers, which records are practically tabulated from time to time for the information of the public?—Yes.

3242. That is, with the exception of a few cases where an Inspector has expressed his opinion that the teacher's efficiency has decreased?—Yes.

3243. When an Inspector's marks are sent to the department in reference to the teachers it would seem to be rather extraordinary to leave out of the record-book those cases in which he thought the teacher was not worthy of the high marks given previously?—Yes.

3244. In such cases it is possible circumstances might arise in which that information would be most useful to the department?—Yes.

3245. It is available to the Inspector-General almost in the same manner in which that information is available through the Inspector to the Board?—Just so.

3246. There might be some cases in which in a teacher's own interest it would be advisable to have such a record kept somewhere in the colony?—Yes.

3247. *Mr. Davidson.*] You are in favour of holding out inducement to teachers to raise their literary status as high as possible?—Yes.

3248. Are you in favour of any special consideration of allowance being made for teachers in remote districts?—I am not in favour of teachers in isolated parts being treated in this respect more favourably than any others, hard as their lot is. The certificate should mean the same thing for every one that holds it.

3249. You admit that while a teacher is doing his daily work his spare time is limited?—Yes; but I think the value of passing an examination, one subject in each year, is not very great.

3250. Do you not think that a man would be as complete a master of a subject by taking one subject at a time and doing that thoroughly?—I do not think any one is master of a subject studying it for one or for many years.

3251. But he can take an examination year by year?—On that point I state only my personal opinion, seeing that I differ from the Inspector-General. I do not think it would be advantageous to split up an examination to let a candidate take one subject each year.

3252. *Mr. Stewart.*] Is it recognised by the department that an Inspector may give lower marks to a teacher at the end of six or eight years than at the end of four years?—Yes. The lower mark does not take effect upon the teacher's classification, although it is recorded.

3253. *Mr. Hill.*] So far as classification is concerned you do not take into consideration the lower mark?—No.

3254. *The Chairman.*] Is any particular name given to this book?—The Register of Teachers' Classification.

3255. In whose custody is it kept?—It is in the custody of the Inspector-General. He intrusts it to the care of such an official as he has confidence in.

3256. Besides that official, who has access to it?—No one but the officials concerned in that part of the work of the Inspector-General's branch of the department.

3257. Have the Inspectors access to the book?—No. The question is never raised, but I do not think we should keep the information from an Inspector should he desire it.

3258. Teachers who are affected by the marks in that book, have they any opportunity of examining it?—No.

3259. Do you think such absolute secrecy is really necessary or desirable?—I think that, so long as marks for increasing efficiency only take effect in the classification, such secrecy is absolutely incumbent on the department. I do not think the department would be right in making public any lower mark that takes no effect on a teacher's certificate.

3260. Is it not possible that a teacher would not be making such progress as he expects, and not know the cause?—No, I hardly think so. If he studies the regulations on the point, and knows his length of service, he can ascertain what marks the Inspector has given him.

3261. We have heard the opinion expressed that there should be some power to punish teachers if necessary by reducing their certificates: is it advisable that such power should be exercised?—I should be very sorry to see it done. It would be wrong to punish a man for what is not his own fault—advancing age, for instance.

3262. His certificate should be unassailable?—It should express the high-water mark of his efficiency. It would be a very invidious task, in a district where there is only one Inspector, to record on a teacher's certificate a fact that would interfere with his prospects for the rest of his life.

ROBERT LEE, Chief Inspector of Schools, examined.

Mr. Lee: I may say that I am quite in sympathy with the proposal on the part of the Government to launch a colonial scale of salaries. I take it as an honest and well-thought-out effort to do justice to underpaid teachers, and it will ease the Boards when they come to use it. I think possibly it will lead up to what I should like to see—that is, a better recognition all round of the position of the teachers in the community. I think, myself, that the teaching profession is underpaid. It should be recognised by the community that the work of education is one of the most useful and one of the most honourable avocations that a man can put his hands to, and the service should be adequately paid. As an officer of a large district, which for the most part has been paying its teachers on a more liberal scale than most other districts of the colony, I must say that I feel that in this scale there is a little levelling-down; and, as teachers generally are underpaid, there ought to be a little levelling-up. So far as the scale affects us in this district, the teachers of the medium schools will receive less salary than they do at present, whilst in other cases there are increases. I do not know that there is a single teacher in my district who is over-

paid; therefore I would not like any scale introduced that would lower the salaries of teachers with schools of 50 to 100 in average attendance. As to the working-out of the scale, I think the payment by strict average is very trying, especially in regard to the teachers' sense of honesty. There are days in the year when the weather is so extremely inclement as to make it almost impossible to travel, and children cannot possibly attend school. It does seem hard that in such cases the average for the week should be entirely spoiled by one inclement day. I would therefore suggest, as a means of raising salaries, that, instead of the strict average (for purposes of calculating salaries), four-fifths of the best attendances should be taken, allowing one day in the week for exceptionally bad weather. Some allowance should certainly be made for small attendances on bad days. The question of house-rent, which is a big factor with us in the city, does not appear in the calculations of the plan submitted for our consideration. The staffing-allowance is a very fair and reasonable one.

3263. *Mr. Davidson.*] Have you noticed that in calculating the salaries in the new scheme the increase is to take place by units?—Yes.

3264. What is your opinion of that?—I think it very doubtful whether it is desirable.

3265. In the Wellington District there are nine schools with an average attendance between 30 and 35?—I should like to say, with regard to our own scale, that we have departed from it a good deal. If I had my own way as an official we should have no such departures. The scale has been modified, and is lower now than it used to be.

3266. You notice that in those nine schools the salary is £155?—Yes.

3267. Suppose that a school average of 30 should drop one unit, the head-teacher would lose £55 a year?—Yes.

3268. Would it not be a temptation to falsify his rolls under such a method?—I am quite aware that in any scheme there will be small discrepancies. I am sorry the difference is so much as it is here. The temptation is there, certainly.

3269. Do you not think that members of the Board would hesitate before inflicting such a hardship on a man because of the drop of one unit?—I do not think they should, for if we have a rule we must carry it into effect.

3270. In Otago a good deal of hardship has resulted from the same cause—schools of 21 and 35 carried a salary of £140 a year, and when the attendance dropped to 31 the master would lose £40 a year?—That is so.

3271. That has been a source of worry to the Otago Education Board?—Yes.

3272. Do you think it would be wise, if this Commission were drawing up a scale, to take the increase by units?—I do not like such a large discrepancy.

3273. Do you not think it better that a man should know that by such a small drop in the average he would lose a much less sum off his salary?—A small increment might be better.

3274. In your opinion, the teachers in the country districts of Wellington are very much underpaid?—I think that teachers as a whole are underpaid. I know that men who started in life with me—and I am supposed to have done well—have gone into other work and have done better. The schoolmaster's life may be an easy one in some respects; he does not have the worry of a man in business for himself; but many business-men make as much in five years as a schoolmaster can save in the whole of his life.

3275. In England, Scotland, and other countries the tendency is to raise the maximum salaries paid to teachers: is that not so?—Yes.

3276. Have you noticed that in London a fair percentage of the schools carry a maximum salary of over £500?—Yes.

3277. Do you think it is in the interests of education that prizes should be offered for those in the teaching profession to advance themselves?—Certainly.

3278. In some of the largest mining claims in Australia the mining manager is paid as much as £1,400 a year?—I am not surprised to hear it.

3279. The man who is doing the laborious work in the drive gets £3 a week?—Yes.

3280. Are you of opinion that it is best to pay well for brains?—You must.

3281. On the whole, you approve of the staffing conditions of the scale?—I think they are very fair.

3282. In our schools of over 500 (mixed schools), where the attendance in the Fourth Standard is from 60, do you consider that the average woman is physically capable of taking such a class?—No.

3283. There are exceptional women who might do it?—Yes.

3284. Do you suggest any provision whereby such exceptional women might take such work?—I should be afraid of any such provision being pushed too far. There could be no objection to making provision to meet exceptional cases, but on the whole it is not desirable.

3285. *Mr. Stewart.*] You are in sympathy with the adoption of a colonial scale?—Yes. I am pleased that an effort is being made to put things in systematic order generally. I have felt keenly the want of somebody who would take up good recommendations and utilise them for the advancement of education. A proposal to establish cadets on certain lines in connection with New Zealand schools has been set aside as not worth taking up. This want of systematic order is a matter I should like to see threshed out by experts and educationists, and when something like this is done we shall advance. Under the present conditions there is no arterial system of education in the colony, and I hail this scheme of the Inspector-General's as a beginning.

3286. I infer from your answer that education and the carrying-on of it is a matter for experts?—Certainly.

3287. It has been objected that a colonial scale will minimise the influence of the Boards' control: is there anything much in such an objection?—The adoption of such a scale will relieve the Boards of a great deal of anxiety.

3288. Am I to understand that you are of opinion that a colonial scale of salary would be productive of a system of sound finance in the colony?—Yes. There was a time in the history of our Board when we were always solvent.

3289. It is suggested that, instead of a colonial scale, we should have a differential capitation: would that be a cure for existing anomalies?—I cannot give any opinion on that question.

3290. What do you consider should be the minimum salary for, say, a junior certificated assistant in large or middle-sized schools?—I do not take that as a matter of any great moment, because sometimes the junior certificated teacher is an ex-pupil-teacher, and gets a fair salary. We have been giving about £80 or £90. I think £100 would not be too much.

3291. In those grades would you pay equal salaries to both sexes?—Yes, up to a certain point.

3292. What do you think should be the prize for those entering the profession to look forward to?—Well, do you think it is necessary to have any limit?

3293. We are bound to have some limit?—I do not think it serves any purpose to fix a limit.

3294. Do you think that a salary of £400 a year would be too much as a maximum?—Certainly not.

3295. Would you go a little higher?—Yes.

3296. It has been insinuated that the headmasters of some of your city schools are getting quite enough, if not too much: do you consider that such is the case?—No.

3297. Do you think they are underpaid?—Yes.

3298. It would be better for the profession if higher salaries were paid?—Yes. There is not sufficient inducement: there are no prizes. In the year 1850 I was one of four pupils, three of whom lived to receive a salary of over £1,000 a year. I do not get anything like that.

3299. Yet you have reached the top of the profession in Wellington?—Yes.

3300. With regard to the payment of women teachers in this district, do you think they are adequately paid?—Well, they are more adequately paid than men, but they are not adequately paid. I think all salaries for schools of 60 or 70 children and over are underpaid. You must pay men well if there is to be anything worth the name of education.

3301. Do you recognise that for the position of headmaster of a large school you want administrative capacity as well as teaching ability?—Certainly.

3302. Is that administrative capacity very common? Ought we really to pay for this administrative capacity when we get it?—It is a great deal of what we pay for.

3303. The secretary of your Board, in giving evidence yesterday, said that appointments were more often made without the Inspectors being consulted than with: do you think that in making appointments Inspectors should be consulted?—Yes; I am very pronounced on that point. Of late years there has been a disposition on the part of my Board to take things more into their own hands. Now, for the most part, the Chairman looks over the credentials of the applicants, and the Board follows his direction. Occasionally, when it suits, one's advice is asked for.

3304. Then, sufficient consideration is not given in this district to the opinions of the Inspector in regard to making appointments?—That is so. We are suffering now from the effects of a haphazard system of selection of pupil-teachers.

3305. And you will go on suffering from that for some time?—Yes; it is one thing to put a man into a post, but quite another to remove him from it. The mistake is in making a bad appointment. This is a source of great trouble to the Inspectors: we have to find fault simply because the material is bad in so many cases.

3306. We may take it from your evidence that the interests of children in the Wellington Education District have suffered because expert advice has not been taken?—Yes.

3307. To some extent that has been set right in the City of Wellington?—Yes.

3308. Do you think that the present arrangement has sufficiently safeguarded the interests of education in the selection of pupil-teachers?—I hope so.

3309. Do you think there should be an entrance examination before pupil-teachers should be employed?—Yes.

3310. In your report you state that the number of small schools is on the increase: supposing there is an application for the establishment of a school, are the Inspectors consulted as to whether that school is necessary or not?—Yes.

3311. It has been suggested that the present method of taking a working-average is practically inoperative?—I made a suggestion in my opening remarks for altering the present method. We assume that teachers are honest, and would not make out a return for more days than they are entitled to.

3312. Has your Board taken into consideration the differences in the cost of living in various parts of the district in its salary scale?—No.

3313. Do you think it practicable or advisable that this Commission should take such into consideration in drawing up its scale?—There might be something in it, but it would be a difficult matter to determine. Teachers who are relegated to the remote parts of the country will get their living cheaper than those who have a better life in town.

3314. *Mr. Luke.*] Up to a certain point you believe in equal payment for men and women?—Yes.

3315. It would not be in the interests of education that they should get equal payment?—No.

3316. Has the working of the Technical School here been successful?—Yes; I think our Education Board has honestly intended to benefit the cause of education in establishing the school. It has been of great service to the colony; but at the same time the Technical School cannot run on its own wheels, and that is a great pity, but probably it will yet be made a self-supporting institution.

3317. Do schools in the outlying districts (aided schools) get the capitation grant?—They receive the full capitation grant, and are otherwise assisted. They are also visited by the Inspectors.

3318. What is your opinion as to the necessity of a training-college in a district like Wellington: do you think the Victoria University College could be utilised?—I should hardly think the Victoria College would train teachers. I think the time has come when the pupil-teacher system should be modified. Pupil-teachers should be relieved from their actual teaching during the day; perhaps a double set of pupil-teachers could be arranged for, so that they could teach half-time and have the other half for study. One or, at most, two training-colleges ought to do for the whole colony. The training system has never yet been put on a satisfactory footing.

3319. *Mr. Gilfedder.*] Supposing there were a chair of pedagogy in connection with the Victoria College, nevertheless the want of a training-college would still be felt?—Yes; it would make no difference.

3320. If the Wellington Board gives way and modifies its scale of salaries in particular instances, pressure, I suppose, is brought to bear on them in numerous instances?—I have already said we are not keeping to scale.

3321. If you do not keep to the scale you will land in "Queer Street"?—Perhaps.

3322. Do you favour a system of bonus on certificate?—No.

3323. Should an alternative be given to teachers in the country schools regarding which class-subjects they should prepare children in?—We have found no difficulty in keeping to our programme. We have an alternative system for science.

3324. You would not advocate the penalising of teachers who do not hold the requisite minimum certificate?—I think any one must hold a qualification to take charge of a school. If he is a capable teacher for a school he ought to be paid salary accordingly, whether he holds an E, D, or C certificate.

3325. Do you not find that when a good position is advertised a very large number of teachers holding low certificates apply on the chance of getting in?—They may apply, but they do not often get the appointment. With our Board the high certificate generally gets the appointment, and rightly so.

3326. Is preference given by your Board to females as teachers and pupil-teachers in making appointments?—I do not think so.

3327. Not for economic reasons?—No.

3328. In the suggested scale are the salaries for pupil-teachers ample?—They are fair; but I always recognise that pupil-teachers are getting an education. Let them have moderate pay, plenty of time for study, a good education, and a fair opportunity of obtaining an appointment when their apprenticeship is over. The pupil-teachers' examinations might be done away with. The Standard VII. examination might do for entrance, matriculation the half-way house, and the E examination for the end. As things are at present, there is a good deal of overlapping in regard to examinations.

3329. Do you think that the headmasters of schools in which pupil-teachers are engaged should receive remuneration for the instruction given to pupil-teachers?—We have always paid teachers so-much a year for such instruction in the country schools. In the town we have brought the pupil-teachers into classes taught by the first assistants in the city schools, who get something extra for it. This works fairly well.

3330. As to truancy, do you think the compulsory number of attendances should be increased from six, say, to eight per week?—Yes.

3331. Are you in favour of increasing the mileage?—I do not see the necessity. In the country the children often use short-cuts in going to and from school.

3332. Have you considered the question of retiring-allowance for teachers grown old in the service?—Some such allowance is most desirable. The absence of it is one of the drawbacks to the service. We want the Government to come down with a sum so as to give a start in this matter.

3333. Would the adoption of a colonial scale tend to lead the Government to give a grant towards this?—Yes.

3334. *Mr. Hill.*] You are the senior Inspector in Wellington, are you not?—Yes.

3335. You have seen all the changes as the outcome of the Education Act of 1877?—Yes.

3336. And now you believe that a colonial scale of salaries will be beneficial in the interests of teachers?—Yes; provided, as I say, that you level up the present rate of pay in the Wellington District.

3337. You said that at least £400 is not too much for a man in a large school?—No, it is not too much.

3338. What size school would you suggest for a salary of £400?—I am not disposed to fix any limit. I do not see any object to be gained by it.

3339. If to pay such large salaries you would have to lower the salaries of teachers of the smaller class of schools, would you agree to that?—No.

3340. It is necessary to give ample salaries in the smaller schools?—Yes, a fair salary.

3341. Are the salaries in the proposed scale sufficient?—Yes, fairly sufficient, for the smaller class of schools.

3342. Is the staffing in this scale as generous as it is in your district?—I think so. I think, the stronger the members of the staff the less staff we can do with.

3343. In the staffing as proposed, would you give any option to the Board to modify the staff so long as the amount of money was expended on that staff?—It would be necessary to give some discretion to a Board for certain reasons.

3344. On the recommendation of an Inspector would you modify a staff?—Yes; where the exigencies of the case required it.

3345. Would you still give Committees the right or some voice in the selection of teachers?—I have no pronounced opinion about that. There is not much to complain of as things operate with us.

3346. Do you find that Committees take much interest in the selection and appointing of teachers?—It varies very much. Sometimes no interest is taken, and at others the interest is very keen.

3347. Would it be advisable that Boards should have the sole power of making the appointments?—I have not given that subject much thought.

3348. Assuming that the Boards retain the right of making the appointments, would you suggest that they should also have the right to remove a teacher from one district to another if recommended by the Inspector?—Yes, I think so. It is necessary in order to adjust matters sometimes.

3349. Do you think that the sexes should be separated, or that the boys and girls should be taught in the same class?—In all small schools they must be in the same class. In schools where there are 80 or 100 children in a standard they are just as well separated.

3350. Would you suggest that a school should not be allowed to grow beyond, say, 700 children; would you limit the number?—No.

3351. *Mr. Smith.*] What is the smallest number of pupils for which your Board would grant an aided school?—There is no limit.

3352. *Mr. Weston.*] If you separate the sexes would you not require a greater number of teachers?—If I made a recommendation to separate them it would not be a hard-and-fast rule. I would leave it in the hands of the head-teacher.

3353. You referred to a cadet system to show that more elasticity should be given to the authorities in administering the education system?—You put the thing in a different form, but I think we mean about the same. If we had a Council of Education it would, I think, be a good thing in the interests of education generally. The Council could be advised by the department and by the Inspector-General, and could take up suggestions and make direct representations to Parliament. Then we might, for instance, get a good cadet system. As things are now, much depends on the caprices of the Boards as to whether they took useful suggestions up or dropped them.

3354. Does not all that go to advocate central administration of the present scheme?—Yes.

3355. You are favourable to that?—Yes. We need something to push education on, and thus make real progress.

3356. Do you think the colony would approve of a central system of administration?—I cannot say. That is not in my province.

3357. In regard to the present system of primary education, do you consider it is likely to create a dead uniformity in the teaching of the children throughout the colony?—No. So long as men are men, we shall all differ.

3358. You do not think that the fact of having the same reading-books and the same methods, and so on, will produce that uniformity?—No. In any system of education there must be method; hence the standards. As long as the same ground is travelled over, and the same system pervades, there will be a similarity of work; but so long as men are different in their minds and methods there will be differences.

3359. Should the Boards dismiss sentiment and dispense with teachers when they think them beyond their duties?—There comes a time when every man must retire.

3360. Do you think this Commission should initiate a superannuation fund, and compel teachers to subscribe to it?—I think that would be a good thing.

3361. *The Chairman.*] What do you think should be the minimum salary for a country teacher, irrespective of the size of the school?—Not less than £100 a year. I do not advocate limiting salaries, either up or down. It is a difficult question to answer fairly.

3362. Do you think there should be a fixed salary according to the size of the school?—Yes.

3363. If you have no particular limit, how are you going to fix a scale?—Well, we have never given less than £120 to certificated teachers in the smaller schools.

3364. Would that be a reasonable minimum now?—Yes.

3365. What would be a fair maximum?—There is an immense difference in the two things. I could not say.

3366. Do you think the salary should increase with age?—The master must show his ability to rise to the position.

3367. Then, when he becomes old and somewhat deficient in efficiency, you think his salary should decline?—No. As long as he can fulfil his post he should be paid accordingly.

3368. Seeing that the great majority of our teachers in this district, and in New Zealand generally, are only in charge of schools with a limited average (100 and under), do you think it desirable to reduce large salaries to make up the underpaid ones?—I do not agree with that principle. It would be taking away from old servants to give to young teachers.

3369. But do you not believe in the principle of the greatest good for the greatest number?—No.

3370. You are opposed to sacrifices of that nature?—Yes; I like to see the good fall where it is deserved.

3371. There are considerable differences in the amounts paid to the sexes?—Yes.

3372. Is the disparity too great?—It admits of being adjusted. In some cases it is too great. I think, on the whole, that the better work is done by the men, and they should be better paid. In the event of any adjustment it would be a great pity if any teacher now receiving a certain salary should have that salary reduced at all.

3373. On the whole, are the differences between the salaries of men and women fair and reasonable?—Yes, on the whole.

3374. And, on the whole, the difference between the salaries for the smaller schools in the country and those for the larger schools in the city are fair and reasonable?—Yes.

3375. Is there necessity for reducing those differences?—No.

3376. But to raise the lower salaries would it be advisable to reduce the higher?—Any such reduction would have a very deadening effect on the educational system.

3377. But I would like to equalise things a little more?—I do not believe in such equalisation as that.

3378. Are the schools in this district at the present time sufficiently staffed?—Yes, fairly so.

3379. Are the teachers generally competent men?—I think we have in the service a number of headmasters who are as good as can be found. At the same time, as I have already said, the system of making appointments does not reach the best available material.

3380. Do you think the appointments made by the Board during the last year or two will compare with those previously made?—It is rather invidious for me to say. I am in the invidious position of saying things a little disparaging to my own Board.

3381. If the statement is made by an officer of this Board that the appointments made are the best possible, is that correct?—In my opinion, it is not correct.

3382. Then, you say that the members of this Board fail to select the best teachers from their list of applicants?—I have said face to face to the Board that the Board is not making the best appointments.

3383. Seeing that we receive a very large number of applications from outside districts, what can the Wellington Inspector possibly know, who confines his inspection to the town, and does not go into the country?—I should be out of place in discussing that matter.

3384. When a serious imputation against the Board is lodged its character should be vindicated?—I have said to you what I have said to the Board face to face, and I must decline to go further into this discussion.

[Omitted from Mr. Hogben's Dunedin Evidence.]

THURSDAY, 16TH MAY, 1901.

STATEMENT by Mr. HOGBEN on submitting his Suggested Alternative Scheme for Schools with 15 to 330 in average attendance, dated 15th May, 1901.

Mr. Hogben: The amount on which the scale is to be based being limited to £4 capitation on the average attendance for the colony—that amount to provide for teachers' salaries and other necessary purposes—the question arises as to how much shall be devoted to the improving of the staffing of the schools of the colony, and how much shall be devoted to the raising of salaries where they are below what we may justly regard as fair remuneration for services rendered. In my former evidence, I said I should like to see as good staffing as I then suggested. At the same time, that staffing means the cutting down of a larger number of salaries than I should like to see cut down, and the proposed scale that I put before you this morning gives a somewhat less generous staff to the schools than what I originally proposed; but the staffing, I think, is as good as any in New Zealand or the Australian Colonies—better than most of them—yet it does not practically bring down any salaries at all. In introducing the first proposed scale I hope that I conveyed the idea to the Commission that it was a suggestion. I take the full responsibility for making that suggestion, and I wish there were money to carry it out on the higher salaries in certain grades. But I regard it myself as a suggestion. It has not the sanction of the Minister or the Government, but I put it out as a well considered suggestion. At the same time, if we do not give quite so generous a staffing, the salaries will be higher, and it seems to me I shall save time in districts like this, where the pinch would be greatest, if I can show another possible alternative. I have taken the trouble during the last two evenings to work this new scale out to see if it could be done with the £4 capitation. On the printed paper I now put in [Exhibit 50] the only salaries that are dealt with are those of the head or sole teacher, and of the infant mistress. I find that by postponing the appointment of the first assistant until the school reaches an average of 40, and postponing the appointment of the second assistant teacher until the school reaches an average of 150, there is saved altogether £12,740. The increase in salaries is £8,335; so that there is a net saving of £4,405. That is to say, this scheme costs £4,405 less than the other, with a substantial increase in salaries. These salaries, taking the Otago District, are as high, with the exception of one place which is £1 lower, as any salaries that the corresponding officers now receive, and I do not think it is paying them too much to pay them such salaries. This £4,405 will be available, therefore, for raising the salaries of assistants other than the infant mistress. I may be prepared to-morrow to say how much it will be possible to raise these.

FRIDAY, 17th MAY, 1901.

G. HOGBEN, Inspector-General of Schools, examined.

Mr. Hogben: Last night I tried to find how far the £4,405 would go in bringing up the salaries of assistants to the Otago scale, which is the highest scale in the colony, with the exception of about three instances in other districts (I think they are the only instances in which the salaries are higher than in Otago). To bring all the salaries up to the Otago scale you would require throughout the colony £5,335 in addition to what is required by the original scale. We had £4,405 to spare in consequence of the alternative scheme presented yesterday, so that £930 would be required to bring up all the salaries to the Otago scale. It comes to about 2d. over £4 a head. If we left out the first male assistants in schools of 200 to 250, of which there are twenty-seven in

the colony, or omitting also the district high schools—only twenty-one or twenty-two—it only requires £3,715, so that if we bring them half way between my present proposed scale and the Otago scale it could all be done for a little less than £4 per head. But when we get so near as £900 to the total money available, I think we need not bring them down at all. Every head-teacher, every mistress, and every other teacher, with the exception of three or four assistants, in the whole colony can be brought up to the Otago scale, and as for the salaries of those three or four I think they would be recognised as anomalous. That would practically bring all the teachers (except some head-teachers in the Wellington district) up to the Otago scale, or up to the Canterbury scale where it is higher than the Otago scale. It practically means levelling-up almost everywhere, and levelling down hardly anywhere, with an improvement of the staff.

The Chairman.] The Otago scale is the highest in New Zealand?—Yes, with the exception of some head-teachers in Wellington, and one or two instances in North Canterbury.

And nearly all teachers' salaries throughout New Zealand can be brought up to the Otago scale, provided that this £4 capitation is maintained?—Yes, and an increased allowance to Boards besides for incidental expenses. I should be glad to see wiped out also all reductions for certificates.

Mr. Weston.] Will this alteration enable the Government to supply the Boards with funds to pay their overdrafts? Wellington has one and Canterbury has one?—That is a matter that must be taken account of, but it ought not to disturb the permanent arrangement—viz., the establishment of a colonial scale of staffs and salaries.

SATURDAY 29TH JUNE, 1901.

G. HOGBEN, Secretary for Education, recalled.

Mr. Hogben: I have here printed copies of the second alternative scale, C, the original of which I handed in on Thursday last, and I think it will facilitate the work of the Commission if I point out the differences between this and the other scales. In the first place, I may say that the cost of the salaries under this scale would, I estimate, come to £383,416. Compared with the first alternative scale, B, there is an increase in the salaries of head-teachers at schools of from 70 in average attendance, but there is a decrease in the higher salaries, no capitation being given beyond £375. The salary of the infant mistress at a school of from 40 to 50 was set down in the first alternative scale at £90, but in this scale it is £80, which is as high as the salary paid in any district to the infant mistress at a school of that class. Then at a school of from 50 to 70 the salary of the mistress is put down at £85—as high as that paid in Otago, and £5 higher than any other district—and from 70 to 90 it is placed at £100. Otago, which is the highest at that stage, pays £100 in a school of 76 to 100. In all cases the salaries of assistants, where they are increased, begin at a number lower, rather than at a number higher, than under the several Boards, so that the increases begin sooner. The salaries of the masters at the large schools in Christchurch, which, with one exception at Napier, are the highest salaries in the colony when you take into account the payment for instruction of pupil-teachers—I have taken this item into account in all cases in this scale—would be £375 and house allowance, as against £361 and house allowance—£14 more. The salaries of first assistants are the highest nominally in Dunedin, but it came out in evidence that in Christchurch they are really somewhat higher, because the first assistants get part of the remuneration given for instruction of pupil-teachers: they run from £240 to £250. The salary of the first assistants is here set down at £250. The maximum salary of the second assistant I have placed at £175, the same as the top limit in Christchurch and Otago, but it is reached earlier in Otago than Christchurch. The salaries lower down seem to be lower than the Otago scale, and I should like to point out how the case is met. Take a school of 480: according to this scale the salary for the second male assistant is £130, or £115 for a female second assistant. The salary of the second assistant under the Otago scale is £175 at a school of over 500. Note *d* at the foot of the scale bears on this point: "Instead of an assistant a pupil-teacher may be employed, £45 being added to the salary of another assistant." So that if a pupil-teacher is taken instead of the last assistant at £80, £45 is added to the salary of the second assistant, making it £175. The staff would then consist of the headmaster, five assistants, and six pupil-teachers, which is the staffing allowed at that limit, I think, by the Otago scale; and I may say that at that stage the Otago staffing is fairly liberal. It is at the grade below that the Otago staffing is not quite so strong, but that is where the second assistant comes in with the high salary. As far as I can see I have met the Otago, Southland, and Canterbury cases. The staffing proposed in this scale is below the Christchurch staffing in one case, that of the West Christchurch School, which the Board admits is overstaffed now. You will notice one thing in regard to the salaries of assistants that may seem peculiar. I have not numbered the assistants' salaries. I have left the numbers out, so that the Boards can rank the assistants as they like—alternately male and female, or first, second, third, &c., male, and first, second, third, &c., female. Beginning with the third assistant, the salaries for male and female assistants are equal—from £80 to £160. If a female is appointed there, she is the headmistress or the infant mistress, and that allows the Christchurch schools, and schools like them, to have a headmistress at a salary not less than the present salary. If a master is appointed he is the only third master, so it practically makes the salary of the first mistress equal to the salary of the third master, but a Board can appoint which it likes. Without making any difference in the total amount of salary, I have thus allowed the Boards to put either a first mistress after the first two assistants, or a third master, whichever they like.

3385. *Mr. Davidson.*] As a matter of fact a Board might, if it thought fit, have the second assistant a female?—Yes; if it liked. Take a school with an average attendance of, say 840.

Under this scale the headmaster would get £372; under the Canterbury scale he would get £325, and as much as £45 more for the instruction of pupil-teachers—£370. Then the first assistant would get £250 under this scale, as against £225, *plus* pupil-teacher allowances, which may be as much as £18, bringing him up to about £243. The next one is the mistress, who gets £185 under the Canterbury scale, with a possible share of the pupil-teacher instruction money, which may bring her salary up to £200 or over. Under this scale she may take the salary of the mistress, £210. Then the next assistant under the Christchurch scale gets £167: this scale would give £170. Then comes the infant mistress at £155: under this scale she could take the third assistant's salary of £160. And so, all the way through, this scale is a little better than the Christchurch scale in regard to those schools.

3386. *Mr. Weston.*] Have the complaints of the lady teachers and the assistant masters of Christchurch been given effect to?—Yes; the lady teachers would get increases—for instance, the highest salary payable to a second assistant female in Christchurch is between £120 and £130: under this scale the salary would be £135 if the Board chose to give her the position.

3387. *The Chairman.*] Will you please take the Masterton School, and compare the salaries paid there with those that would be paid under this scale?—The headmaster's salary is £295 and £50 house allowance: the proposed scale would increase his salary to £320. The first assistant is at present getting £220: he would get £240 under this scale; the second assistant gets £150, but I will leave him for the present; the third assistant gets £100: his salary under this scale would be £115; the first female assistant receives £90: the salary available for her here would be £150—if it was thought that she was not worth that the Board could transfer some one else, but that would be the salary for the mistress; the second female assistant gets £90 also: there would be a salary of £110 available for her under this scale; the third female assistant receives £80: under this she would get £80 also. The scale would allow five pupil-teachers instead of four—the number at the school. Of course the salaries of pupil-teachers would depend on the year; but an ex-pupil-teacher, who is receiving an allowance for being away from home, making her salary £60, would receive £55 under the scale—a fall of £5; there is another ex-pupil-teacher receiving £40: she would get £50; the next one is another ex-pupil-teacher at £42: she would receive £50 also; the last one is a second year pupil-teacher at £25: she would get £30 under this scale. Then the scale would allow one more pupil-teacher, but a note at the bottom says: "Instead of adding a pupil-teacher a Board may add £35 to the salary of an assistant." Now, if that £35 were added to the salary of the second assistant he would get £165, an increase of £15 on his present salary. If that were done, the total staff would be the same as the present; but that staff is, I think, one more than the school is entitled to under the Wellington scale. The only salary that would be reduced under this scale of mine would be that of one of the ex-pupil-teachers.

3388. *Mr. Stewart.*] Would not the salary of that ex-pupil-teacher fall under the regulations of the Wellington Board?—Yes, that is so. The other scale that I prepared—the one that goes outside the £4 capitation limit, scale D—is being printed, and will be ready on Monday. In drawing up this scale C I have not been able, as I should have liked, to take away the provision for the deductions on account of certificates, because I did not see my way to save the £10,000 thus gained in any other way. I have altered the certificates in one place, where no appreciable difference would be made: I have replaced E5 for schools of from 14 to 19 by E4, and E2 by E3 for schools of from 19 to 40. One balances the other. In the other scale, D—the one going outside the £4 limit—I have taken away the deductions on account of certificates altogether. If the Commission would like it, I will hand in a statement showing the total cost of the salaries under that scale. There are one or two other points that I should like to refer to. One is with reference to a suggestion that was made in evidence—*i.e.*, to make £300 the maximum salary. If this were done and the amount thus saved were distributed amongst the other head-teachers, teachers in schools above 19, they would benefit to the extent of about £1 1s. each. The next point is with regard to the general expenses of Boards. I want to ask whether the Commission desire me to put in an alternative method of distribution to that proposed—*viz.*, on the basis of £250 to each Board, and 11s. 3d. per head. There was a general desire expressed that I should do so, when I suggested to a witness that so much might be paid on the first 100, so much on the second, and so on—a kind of sliding-scale—but the Commission did not ask me to do so. If the Commission desire me to put in an alternative method of distribution, I will do so. I wish now to refer to the question of house allowance. I want to emphasize once more the necessity there is for the Commission's making provision for house allowance. I have said so before, but I think I shall not be considered to be repeating myself unnecessarily if I refer to the point again, because I feel that, unless house allowance is considered, the salaries must necessarily be unequal. Then, with regard to relieving-teachers: I think some provision should be made for that. There are two principal reasons—they are not the only reasons—why relieving-teachers are needed. One is, to fill a temporary vacancy in a school. There no difficulty arises, because the salary, being allotted to the position, is available for the payment of the temporary teacher just as it is available for the payment of a permanent teacher. Then, in the case of sickness, a relieving-teacher is required. There provision is not made for the payment of a relieving-teacher, because when a teacher is sick he is paid his salary for a certain time. I think the time for which such salary is paid ought to vary according to the length of time which he has been in the teaching service, not necessarily under one particular Board, but in the teaching service of the colony. I do not think the system of sick-pay should be made too liberal, because, as Mr. Robertson, I think, has said, a liberal scale of sick-pay might induce more sickness. I think that in some cases sick-pay might be granted up to six months' absence, on certain conditions. There would not be many cases in which it would be found necessary to grant as much as six months' leave; after that there should be provision for retirement, or temporary retirement. Of course, relieving-teachers of several kinds would be required—one to take the place of headmasters at fair-sized

schools. I do not think a relieving-teacher would be wanted to take the place of a master at a large school, because the first assistant could act temporarily; but you would have to have a relieving-teacher to take the place left vacant in the school when the staff was reorganized temporarily. In other schools a relieving-teacher would be wanted simply to take the place of the absent teacher without a rearrangement of the staff at all. Those are the points, sir, that I wish to emphasize. If the Commission are going to make any recommendation in regard to the question of teachers' certificates I should like to be called; but, as I take it that it is only indirectly concerned with the order of reference, it would be out of place for me to assume that the Commission was going to deal with the question in a direct manner, but if it is I should like to be called, and the same applies to the question of training-colleges. It is only indirectly that I have expressed any opinion with regard to training-colleges, and, if that question is to be considered, I should like to have an opportunity of expressing my views.

3389. *Mr. Hill.*] There seems to me to be a class of school to which this scale would not apply. In Hawke's Bay we have four or five schools that we call "side-schools," and we allow children to attend those schools only up to Standard II. When they have passed Standard II. they are transferred to the main school. What I should like to know in connection with the side-school is this: Would you suggest that a side-school be considered as forming a part of a main school, and allow the headmaster of the main school to rearrange and modify the staff at the side-school as he deems best?—I am glad you have reminded me of that. I had intended speaking on that point. I am firmly of the opinion that as long as a school is a side-school—a school from which pupils have to be transferred to another—it should be under the direction of the headmaster of the main school. The two schools should count as one in the matter of staffing. For the purposes of salaries, I have treated the side-schools as forming part of the main schools. With regard to separate schools for boys and girls, I should like to amend the supplementary scale that I put in, so as to make it agree with this (C). The former supplementary scale agreed with the first scheme (A); the salaries are modified, and on the same principle I should like to make the supplementary scale agree with this. I think that no Board should be encouraged to make separate schools. The sheet that I handed in before only applied to the first scale; if you read it you will find that it does not agree with this one. I took all the schools that were separate in the colony, set down the salaries for them, added them together with the schools to which they were presumed to belong, and divided the salaries between them.

3390. *The Chairman.*] And arranged the salaries so that there would be no increased cost?—Yes.

3391. *Mr. Weston.*] In regard to your amended scale: what do you propose to do with schools under 14?—I have expressed myself with regard to those schools. I am not quite certain whether my opinion has not been modified by the evidence which I have heard.

3392. What are your views now?—That perhaps a little more check would be wanted. I do not think the check should be such as to interfere with the establishment of schools—fairly small schools—if they are wanted. There might be cases where it would be rather hard to leave, say, six children without any means of securing education.

3393. What would you propose to do with them?—I do not like to say that salaries should be lower than £60, but salaries lower than £60 are being paid now; in one such case £10 a year and board is the teacher's remuneration. I think that Boards could deal with cases such as those in some way like this: this Commission should name a minimum salary, and the Boards might be allowed to require contributions from the parents if they thought fit. Board and lodging might be counted up to, say, £30; the Boards could count board and lodging as less, if they liked. Supposing there were six children, the capitation would amount to £30, and if board and lodging were provided it would bring the amount to £60. I think any limitation should be as liberal as possible, because the circumstances differ a great deal in the different districts. I would suggest that the Commission should say that the Boards might have the power to require contributions in cases where they thought fit, and they might count board and lodging for such a purpose as equivalent to any sum not greater than £30 a year. I do not like the idea of a teacher receiving only £60 a year—less than a domestic servant—but it would be rather a serious thing to interfere suddenly with those forty schools in Marlborough where the teachers get less than £60.

3394. I hold in my hand a memorandum from the Inspectors of the North Canterbury Board: they say, "We very strongly object to postponing the introduction of the first pupil-teacher till an average of 91 is reached; the lower average of 81 is unquestionably much to be preferred." You have it at 91, have you not?—Yes, 90.

3395. What do you think of the complaint preferred by the Inspectors?—At present a pupil-teacher is introduced in North Canterbury at 91, so that this scale is as liberal as the present North Canterbury scale in that respect. The North Canterbury Inspectors, I take it, want the scale to be more liberal. If it could be afforded I should like to strengthen the staffing at 81. I have not even proposed it in my extended scheme, because I do not think that the need there is so great as it is at one or two other places lower down or higher up.

3396. If it were not for the question of finance you would approve of the suggestion?—Yes, but, as I say, there are one or two other places where the need is greater.

3397. The North Canterbury Inspectors also consider that a second pupil-teacher should be introduced at 110: What is your opinion?—That is a corollary of the other. I prefer that the next addition should not be a pupil-teacher at all, but a certificated teacher. In my suggested alternative scales, B and C, I put a second pupil-teacher in at 120 only to save expense.

3398. After hearing the evidence which has been given, Mr. Hogben, do you still feel it incumbent upon you to stand hard-and-fast to this scale, or do you think that, apart from the question of money, still further improvements might be effected?—This scale is drawn up under

the £4 capitation limit, and I think the Commission know by this time what great restrictions that imposes on you.

3399. What else would you do if it were not for the £4 capitation limit?—I would sweep away the whole of the deductions on account of certificates if I had the money. In this scale I have swept away the deductions for sewing-mistresses. I would rather leave the girls at the 220 schools (I think that is the number) that are under masters and not mistresses to learn sewing at home than that the masters should lose £10 a year each.

3400. Do you think, as a matter of fact, that the girls would learn sewing at home?—In some cases they would, and in others they would not. In very few cases in which the sewing is taught by outsiders is it worth anything at all, in my opinion.

3401. You think the least evil would be to run the risk of the children being taught sewing in their own homes?—Yes; necessity will compel them to learn a certain amount of sewing.

3402. *Mr. Luke.*] Does not the Education Act provide that sewing should be taught?—Yes, but that would have to be altered.

3403. *Mr. Weston.*] Mr. Davidson has just called my attention to this regulation in regard to the New South Wales schools: "In a school containing female children, but no female teacher, it will be the duty of the teacher's wife to teach needlework to the girls at least four hours in each week. In forming an estimate of the efficiency of the school the competency and usefulness of the teacher's wife and the time she devotes to the duties will be taken into account." What do you think of such a regulation as that—*i.e.*, changing the four hours to two? Again, what do you think of the principle of the regulation?—There is a good deal to be said on both sides. I think it is rather important that girls should learn sewing, and learn it well. If they were always taught well, I should not have any hesitation in keeping the deduction of £10 in. A point was made at one place—Nelson, I think—of compelling the teacher's wife to teach sewing, in order that the man might have his £10. I do not think there is any great hardship in requiring a woman to teach twelve or fifteen girls for two hours a week. I do not see any great objection to that regulation.

3404. You have pointed out two directions in which you think this scale might be improved if money did not enter into the calculation: is there any other? It would be valuable to us, because we shall have to consider a scale over and above the £4 capitation limit?—I should like to raise the salary of the second assistants in certain cases without using one of the devices shown in the notes at the foot of the scale. In some cases it is necessary that you should revert to one of those devices, in order to keep the salaries of the second assistants up to what they are at present. If those devices are acted upon the salary of no second assistant in the colony, I think, will suffer.

3405. But without those devices?—With those devices the scale of staffing is as strong as it is under any Board in the colony, but I should like to see it made stronger. I should like to see the salaries of the second assistants brought up to the highest scale without having recourse to these devices.

3406. Is there anything else?—Yes; I should like to see pupil-teachers swept away altogether. It is a very big question; the cost would not be the only thing to be considered, though it might mean something like £15,000, perhaps a little less.

3407. You would sweep away pupil-teachers and substitute certificated teachers at £80 a year?—Yes; but I do not see how it is possible to replace 680 pupil-teachers with teachers at £80 a year. The 340 teachers substituted would have to be promoted year by year as well as the others.

3408. You think the excess of expenditure under such a system would be very large?—I estimated the cost once, but on the basis of a different number of pupil-teachers. The difference would be something not exceeding £15,000; perhaps not more than £10,000. Of course, the change could not be made without the complete equipment of training-colleges.

3409. Supposing you were left with discretion to employ pupil-teachers, or to expend the extra sum and employ certificated teachers, how would you exercise your discretion?—I should gradually do away with pupil-teachers. I do not think it would do to abolish them suddenly, because that would imply changes in the buildings as well.

3410. You would gradually work out the pupil-teachers?—Yes; I should introduce a sliding-scale, under which pupil-teachers would gradually disappear after a number of years.

3411. I should like to ask whether these suggested amendments to your scheme, made by the Inspectors of North Canterbury, would meet with your approval, or be worthy of consideration?—I should like to look at them before I passed judgment. I should be very happy to express an opinion if I had an opportunity of studying the suggestions.

3412. *Mr. Weston.*] I will hand them in. Do you think there is anything else that would be worthy of amendment in the principle of your scale?—I should like to think that over. I might say, however, that I do not think the highest salaries here are quite so high as they ought to be. I should like to see a general rise, beginning with the minimum salary.

3413. What do you think the minimum salary for a certificated teacher should be raised to?—I think it ought not to be less than £100.

3414. Have you considered the question as to the maximum salary of a teacher?—A preliminary question to that is, what is the maximum size of a school? Because I hold very strongly—having been connected with large and small schools a good deal, up to a school of 1,400, in one sort of way—that when a school gets very large it is almost killing work for the master to do it conscientiously.

3415. Would you limit the size of a school?—The difficulty is, in what sort of way would you want it limited?

3416. In establishing new schools, would you limit the number of pupils?—Yes. There should not be more than 500 at one school.

3417. You would hesitate before suggesting any such limitation with regard to those now existing?—Yes.

3418. You have told us what you think should be the minimum salary paid to a teacher: will you now kindly tell us what additions you think should be made to the salaries of teachers generally? You said that you would like to see salaries raised?—I should raise the minimum, and make just as good increases, and rather better, up to £300 a year. I do not think that a man who has a school of nearly 1,000 children is getting too much salary at £500 a year—in fact, I do not think he is getting enough.

3419. Have you considered what amount of capitation grant would be required to frame a scale such as you, with your large experience, would approve?—I have not; I am afraid it is not within the region of practical politics.

3420. Leaving the pupil-teachers as they are, and yet increasing the salaries of the certificated teachers, can you tell us what capitation grant would suffice?—I have not worked it out.

3421. Would £4 10s. capitation grant supply a scale more upon your favoured lines?—Yes; it would not bring up the highest salaries, but nearly all the others—probably most of them. It would not bring the lowest assistants up to £100, but there is no great hardship in a youth or a young woman of twenty or twenty-one beginning at £80, though I think they are worth more. There is a hardship in a married man taking a school at £130 and a house.

3422. You were good enough to make a lengthy statement at the opening sittings of this Commission: do you, after hearing so much testimony on the various points that you then touched upon, stand by all that you said, or are your views modified on any of them?—In the main my views are just the same; but I do not suppose that any reasonable man could have listened to the amount of evidence which has been given without qualifying his views to some extent.

3423. I merely ask that question in your own interests, so that your views may be quite understood by the teaching staff throughout the colony?—I have modified some of my views.

3424. *Mr. Luke.*] I take it from what you have said that you differ from the views expressed by Mr. Lee in regard to large schools. He said he thought a school of 1,500 children would be a good thing in a largely-populated centre, and I understood him to say that he thought a school of that size could be more cheaply managed, and the teaching would be better?—I spoke of a school of 1,400: the one I refer to is in London; it is divided into three parts—almost three separate schools—and the work even then is killing work. I see some advantages in a large school, but there are several objections. There is an advantage in being able to classify pupils as fully as possible, but I hold that in a primary school of 500 children you can get all the classification that is wanted. It is a disadvantage when the number of pupils is so great that the headmaster can practically have no real knowledge of the character of a child—I do not say merely the intellectual power—or a very superficial one. A schoolmaster should not be solely dependent upon his assistants for an opinion of a child, but when the number of pupils at a school is much more than 500 he must be almost solely dependant on the assistants. I think that 500 is a quite large enough number of children to have at one school. If you wish to ask me whether I would prefer separate boys', girls', and infants' schools, I say no. I am against the breaking of primary schools into three parts in this colony. In cities like London or Glasgow the conditions are quite different.

3425. *Mr. Hill.*] You think, Mr. Hogben, that a unified scale of salaries is desirable?—What do you mean by "unified"?

3426. A scale which is common to all the schools in the colony—a uniform scale?—Yes, I do.

3427. In your opinion the principle of equal pay for equal work should be recognised among teachers?—I do not recognise the principle of equal pay for equal work as a just one at all.

3428. Then, on what basis would you apportion salaries?—On the basis of equal pay for equal burdens.

3429. That is the view you advocate in suggesting the construction of a colonial scale?—Not altogether: that is the view I take.

3430. You think that equal burdens should carry equal salaries?—Yes, I recognise that in the abstract; but in drawing up a scale of salaries you cannot always adhere to abstract principles; the question of expediency, of adjustment to existing circumstances, largely enters in.

3431. You propose to give the same salary to the same sized schools?—Yes; but you are pressing me on the abstract principle, not on the formation of a scale.

3432. Well, then, the principle of equal pay for equal work should be recognised?—I am not free, nor is the Commission, to ignore existing conditions, and frame a scale on an abstract principle.

3433. You said, "Equal pay for equal burdens": are the burdens equal in the case of a bachelor and a man with a family?—I did not say I had framed my scales on that principle. I said I was not free to frame a scale on any abstract principle whatever.

3434. You assume that in schools of the same size there will be equal efficiency?—I do not understand what you mean.

3435. You give equal pay to teachers at similar-sized schools; is it because you assume that the results at those schools will be equal?—No, that would be equal pay for equal work. I have not drawn up this scale on any abstract principle whatever; it is a scale drawn up on expediency, with as much attention to justice as the limits allow me to make.

3436. Then you do not recognise that there is justice in the scale?—There is as near an approach to abstract justice as the conditions will allow.

3437. You consider that environment is nothing, and should not enter as a factor in the making-up of a scale?—No, I do not.

3438. Where is it shown in this scale? The salaries are the same for schools of the same size?—I do not quite understand what you mean by "environment."

3439. You give the same salary to the same class of school, no matter where the school is situated, or what the conditions are?—What portion of the environment do you refer to.

3440. All those factors that distinguish one district from another—the difference in the cost of living, the difficulties of getting supplies, and all the surrounding circumstances?—The word “environment,” as ordinarily used, includes more than that.

3441. Well, everything that modifies the individual?—It is too great a question to discuss.

3442. I simply want your opinions?—You are giving me abstract principles to discuss.

3443. Will not the argument for a colonial scale hold equally for a maintenance scale to School Committees?—No, not at all.

3444. Should environment, which you mentioned yesterday, be considered in the amounts payable to School Committees?—I do not think I mentioned it at all. Possibly it should be considered by the Boards.

3445. Why?—The Boards simply have to supply to the Committees enough to meet their reasonable expenses.

3446. If you classify the schools exactly as you have classified the staffing and the payments on that staffing, might it not be possible also to prepare in the same way a scale for payment of sums to the Committees for maintenance?—I do not think so, because the Committees' expenses vary so much throughout the colony.

3447. Why do they vary?—Owing to the difference in the cost of firewood, the conditions under which the cleaning has to be done, &c. The cost of sanitary arrangements, and so on, varies so much that in one part of the colony it amounts to twice as much as in another.

3448. Do not the differences in the prices of commodities apply equally in the case of teachers?—No, certainly not. I think that even the evidence does not show much difference in the cost of living. My opinion is that the difference in the cost of living in different parts of the colony is very much less than the difference in the cost of living in different parts of England.

3449. Do you think that the same compensating advantages that apply to teachers apply also to School Committees?—No, I do not; the range of School Committees' expenses is so small; it depends on the cost of two or three things only.

3450. Then the teachers are the greater sufferers in the matter of environment?—Not at all. There are compensating elements in the more expensive districts, as far as money is concerned.

3451. My point is that whatever compensating advantages there are for the teachers apply equally to the School Committees—the same compensating advantages exist in the one case as in the other?—It is the expenses that the School Committees have to meet that vary so much; in the case of teachers, there are compensating elements to take into account.

3452. Do you not consider that it is just as well for the department to formulate a scale as to allow the Education Boards to differentiate between the Committees' allowances as they do?—No. There are a great many other expenses besides these of School Committees, and I think it would be an extremely difficult thing to frame a scale so that you should differentiate between those expenses in one district and another. I do not think it is advisable to try. The Boards know the expenses of School Committees for firewood and other things, and should draw up their scales accordingly.

3453. You think that, while there should be a differentiation in the matter of School Committees' allowances, there should be none in the case of teachers' salaries—that is, there should be a colonial scale, and not a differentiating one for the different education districts?—I do not think the two things are on all-fours at all.

3454. What public benefits do you think are likely to arise from the establishment of a colonial scale of salaries for teachers?—The greatest argument for a colonial scale is the argument of justice. It seems to me manifestly unjust that a teacher in one part should receive 100 per cent. more salary than a teacher in another part doing precisely the same work; and there is that disparity in a few extreme cases.

3455. Do you consider that teachers should be deemed public servants?—In what sense do you mean “public servants”?

3456. In the sense of being employed directly by the Government for specific work—say, Civil servants?—That is to say, do away with the Boards?

3457. I did not say that?—That is the corollary to it.

3458. I was going to ask you that. Would it necessitate the taking of teachers from the control of the Boards?—You could still have Boards, but they would have very different functions; functions which they now possess would be taken away from them.

3459. You recognise that Education Boards in any case should possess some special functions?—Certainly, very important functions.

3460. You would propose to take away some of the functions defined in the Education Act, section 35?—Yes; but they would still retain the following powers: to establish and maintain public schools, to establish school districts, to divide or combine school districts, to appoint and remove officers and teachers, to establish scholarships, school libraries, and district high schools, to administer the funds granted by the Education Department, and all other funds which may become the property of the Board, &c.

3461. The Boards would administer the funds granted to them?—Yes.

3462. But they would administer a capitation grant of only 11s. 3d., whereas they now administer £3 15s. capitation?—They do not administer as much as 11s. 3d. now: they administer something like 10s. 6d.

3463. You mean to say that the Boards legislate?—Yes, they make local legislation.

3464. Then, they are acting illegally?—No; they are given powers of legislation; nearly every local body has the power of legislation.

3465. Do you know of any department in England, in Europe, or in America, or elsewhere that constructs a scale of salaries for its teachers and gives it to what is legally known as an administrative body merely to distribute?—The Board in North Canterbury gives the money to the Committees to distribute to the teachers.

3466. I said a department of education?—There are many instances of the same thing in other departments; but I do not recall any Education Department that acts just in that way.

3467. You recognise that the Education Act must be modified in order to carry out this proposed scale?—Yes.

3468. Would this limitation of function lessen or not the authority of Education Boards?—No, I do not think it would.

3469. Then, you consider the colony would benefit by a colonial scale of salaries?—Yes, I do.

3470. Educationally?—Yes.

3471. Morally?—Indirectly; if it benefited the people educationally it would benefit them morally.

3472. Of course, it would benefit them physically and socially?—The connection becomes a little remote there.

3473. Do you think that, with the wide experience of thirteen Education Boards during the past twenty-three years, they should not be able to determine the special needs of districts, and adapt teachers and salaries to the needs of districts, better than a central department could possibly do it?—I do not think that there is any likelihood that they would or could.

3474. Has there not been a tendency in these various districts to adapt the education to the conditions and circumstances of the various districts?—There has been that tendency that there would be in any body of reasonable men, but they have not always been moved by the same ideas. In any body of reasonable men, with a desire to do their work, there would be some kind of attempt to approximate to the conditions, and there have been numerous attempts made by the Boards to do so. In some cases the Boards could not do justice to those employed in their own districts—they had not the necessary funds; in other cases they have worked according to different ideas. One Board has had one idea, and another Board another, with the best intentions in each case, no doubt; and, of course, the effects produced have been different.

3475. Do you think that teachers would be able to make their claims known as effectively under a central system as under Education Boards?—It is not part of my proposal that they should be under a central system.

3476. But in the matter of salaries?—They would not be under a central system. The Boards would have the choice as to which individual should go to a school and receive such-and-such a salary.

3477. What I want to bring out is this: the payments would be according to a scale formulated by the central department?—The scale would not be formulated by the central department; my conception is that it would be a scale recommended, say, by this Commission, and made part of an Act of Parliament.

3478. Do you suggest or assume that it would be found necessary to modify that scale?—I think so. I do not see that it should be modified oftener than it would be reasonable to introduce a slight modifying Act. I can conceive that it might be possible—it is not part of my recommendation—for an Act to be drawn up empowering the Education Department, or, rather, the Governor in Council, to draw up a scale; but in a case of that kind I think the conditions ought to be very stringent as to the limits of the scale.

3479. *Mr. Weston.*] Public opinion might change?—Public opinion is very fickle sometimes. I think that in a case like that certain restrictions should be placed on the powers of the Governor in Council. I am rather inclined to say, Draw up a scale, make the best you can, and have it passed into an Act of Parliament, any modification of it being thus required to be by Act of Parliament.

3480. *Mr. Hill.*] My point is this: that at the present time the teachers are so much in touch with the several Education Boards that they can influence the Boards much more quickly than they could the General Government?—I hardly see how that consideration affects the question of the introduction of a colonial scale. Boards do not now consult teachers when they draw up their scales of salaries, certainly not when they reduce salaries. At any rate, nearly all the teachers in the colony seem to be in favour of a colonial scale of staffs and salaries.

3481. You are aware that the Australian States have each a centralised system of education?—Yes.

3482. They have no Education Boards and no School Committees?—They have Boards of Advice, having different powers—more in some States than in others.

3483. But there are no School Committees and Boards of Education, as we understand them here?—There is not much difference, in some cases, between the Boards of Advice and School Committees.

3484. The Boards of Advice have no power to appoint teachers?—Their recommendations in regard to teachers have sometimes considerable weight in the actual appointments.

3485. Are you fairly conversant with the systems in operation in Australia?—I am.

3486. Have you seen several schools in the different States?—Yes.

3487. Do you think the following remarks, contrasting a centralised system and a local system of control in education, are true? The article from which the quotation is taken was written by a gentleman who visited the Australian schools, and compared them with those of New Zealand: "Education is *per se* for the people, but the people have no controlling voice in those colonies beyond what their representatives may say in the Parliament of the country. The will of the Minister of Education is the will of his executive officers, whose authority extends into every schoolroom and influences the training of every child in the public schools. Local interest is dead, for the people have already become the true Lotus-eaters of education, the only prevailing thought among them being the right to have their children taught in Government schools. A system such as this may free the teachers from local oversight and harass such as many teachers

have felt in New Zealand, but I doubt whether a teacher's independence is as great in Australia as in New Zealand, and certainly there is much less room for the growth of individuality in Australian schools, because everything in school management and control has to be carried out according to orders issued by the central department. If local government such as we have in this country had free scope in dealing with a scheme of public instruction like that of New South Wales, I do not doubt that the results would be better than they now are. Public interest in the progress of education is of paramount importance, for once the public recognise the need they devise means to sustain that need, though the central authority should be weak and impotent. Local districts in this country vie with each other in making their schools attractive and efficient, and though School Committees sometimes overstep the bounds of prudence in matters relating to school government, even this is to be preferred to the deadness and the indifference which are the products of centralism, under which the self-reliance of a people is slowly but surely destroyed, whilst dependence is fostered and recognised as a necessary constituent of democracy"—There are too many statements in that for me to say in one sentence whether they are all true or not. If you mean, Do I believe in centralism or not? I say I am opposed to centralism. Centralism in the extreme sense means the concentration of all real control in a central department, leaving only a small local Board of Advice. You should, I think, have effective local government in some form, not merely local Boards of Advice.

3488. Do you consider, with your knowledge of the scales in the different education districts, that an increase of 10s. capitation would enable those districts to pay salaries as large for the several schools as is proposed in your scale—the last one (scale C)?—An increase of 5s. all over the colony would; 10s. would not do it for Westland; that is the only district I have tried.

3489. You say 5s. would do it if spread over the whole colony?—Yes.

3490. Supposing the 5s. or the 10s. was ear-marked for salaries, but the differentiations left as they are now in the different districts, would such a course as that, in your opinion, be advisable?—No.

3491. The order of reference of the Commission requires the construction of a scale on the basis of a £4 capitation grant: is that not so?—Yes.

3492. Your first scale was based on that grant?—Yes; payable not to the Boards, but on the total number of children throughout the colony—payable out of the Treasury.

3493. Assuming that an education district has 1,000 children in average attendance, have you allocated that district a capitation grant of £4, for example?—It has not been awarded yet; it is simply a proposal.

3494. You have been given an extra grant of 5s. for distribution?—There has been a sum of £8,250 available for distribution.

3495. You have not given that at the rate of 5s. to each education district?—It is given on an approximately uniform basis for the whole colony, to bring salaries up to the first scale; the distribution is not quite uniform, because the circumstances differ.

3496. Your first proposal, or suggested scheme, was made on that basis?—Yes.

3497. And you recommended the adoption of that scale to the Commission, did you not?—Yes; with certain qualifications.

3498. What were the qualifications?—I named them in my evidence-in-chief.

3499. You were bound by certain conditions?—Yes.

3500. You have come now, after hearing evidence throughout the colony, to think that your scale has certain defects?—I thought it had certain defects at the time; it was a question whether those defects should disappear or whether other defects should take their place.

3501. The defects which have appeared from your acquaintance with the various facts throughout the colony are very different from the defects which you assume?—There are defects in the alternative scale; it is a substitution of one set of defects for the other set of defects.

3502. Assuming the scale had been adopted without inquiry by the Commission, would it have been accepted by the teachers?—The teachers' point of view is not the only point of view; there are other aspects of the case.

3503. You recognise there are defects?—Yes, in both schemes.

3504. Circumstances have arisen which have caused you to modify your views?—My views are not modified in that sense: they are modified in some senses. The principal issue is the question as to what proportion of money you should devote to strengthen the staffing to increase the salaries respectively. In the first scale there is more devoted to strengthening the staffing than in the second scale; in the second scale more is devoted to increasing salaries than in the first scale.

3505. It is simply an adjustment between the staff and salaries?—That is the principal thing; there are one or two other details.

3506. But the money has been otherwise distributed?—That is the principal thing in the drawing-up of a colonial scale; the distribution of a temporary vote was a different matter; it was not desirable, even if possible, to disturb the staffing of the several Boards.

3507. I understand there is another scheme coming before the Commission?—It has been laid on the table. I have a rough copy of it here; the other copy is in the hands of the printer.

3508. What is the amount of the capitation grant upon which the new scale is based?—It is drawn up without reference to capitation.

3509. Can you give me an approximate estimate of how much it will amount to?—I can tell you very nearly. The salaries of teachers—I am not certain of the exact figures, as I have not had time to check them—amount to about £14,000 more; £10,096 of which comes from doing away with deductions on certificates—that is to say, the deductions on certificates under scale A, B, or C amount to £10,096. I should say the whole cost of scale D is from £14,000 to £15,000 more than that of scale C.

3510. The increase in the capitation grant of 5s. which is proposed will amount to about £28,000?—Yes.

3511. Another increase of 2s. 6d. in the capitation grant will comply with the requirements of the scale you are suggesting?—Yes; of course, if the Boards want their allowances increased, that will mean a further addition to the grant.

3512. It would not be more than 5s.?—I understand they want an increase of 2s. 6d., which is a very large amount for Boards' expenses.

3513. I mean the grant would come to about £4 5s.?—Yes.

3514. Has it not been paid in previous times?—Yes; £3 15s. has been paid ever since 1877, and an additional 10s. was paid for some years.

3515. From your wide experience and knowledge of the colony, you recognise that the conditions in the various districts now are more varied in the matter of demand than they were a few years ago?—I do not think the cost of living has increased.

3516. I am speaking in regard to the difference in demands made on the Education Boards at the present time, and ten or fifteen years ago?—I do not think that the demands upon Education Boards have increased. The building grant, with the exception of two or three years, is rather larger than it was at one time. The Boards are paying more out of the building grants than they were previously. During the last few years the amount transferred from building to maintenance has been very little.

3517. It is not because Boards are more prodigal with their allowances; it is on account of circumstances arising over which they have no control, is it not?—Yes; I think you can reasonably expect the expenses of the Boards, apart from such considerations as buildings, to be greater than they were before.

3518. Causes have been operating like that?—Yes; I think you should expect salaries to rise also.

3519. Do you think if the capitation grant was raised to the old level—£4 5s.—and that amount was available at the present time, it would meet all the demands which your department has made upon it by Education Boards, and would meet the proposed scales?—Yes; of course, there are other things besides that.

3520. I mean external to matters of science and technical subjects: I am talking about primary education pure and simple, not manual instruction?—I regard manual instruction as part of primary education, and I do not think you can separate them.

3521. If £4 5s. was available at the present time, could primary education in the colony be carried out effectively and efficiently, speaking from your experience and knowledge of the colony?—If the £4 5s. grant were spread over the whole colony—not if it were paid to separate Boards.

3522. If such was the case it would enable a scale of salaries to be paid as high as you propose should be paid in any of your scales?—Yes.

3523. You could pay teachers' salaries?—Yes; and give 2s. 6d. extra to Boards.

3524. You mean on a capitation allowance of £4 5s. instead of £3 15s.?—Yes; it is always subject to the idea that as soon as the scale is adopted there is no capitation at all.

3525. I take it that you suggest that the Commission should consider this scale which is now being printed—scale D—on a capitation of £4 2s. 6d.: do you consider that advisable?—I hardly say I recommend it; it is a question of policy that I am not justified in taking up.

3526. Then, you do not recommend it?—I neither recommend it nor do I take the opposite course.

3527. You supply it as information?—Yes.

3528. Information which might become of value to the Commission during the consideration of the salaries-scale question?—I should like to make it quite clear. This scheme C is within the limits laid down in the order of reference of the Commission, and if I am asked to give evidence I presume it is within my rights as a witness to have recommended this scheme as within the order of reference. I would not undertake to recommend the scheme D, outside the limits, without conferring with the Minister.

3529. You are aware that we are limited to a four-pound capitation grant?—Yes.

3530. Do you think that the Commission should ask for an amendment of the order of reference?—I do not know; that question rests with the Commission, I think.

3531. Do you consider the Commission may recommend a scale outside the order of reference?—That is a question of the interpretation of the meaning of the order of reference. I think it should rest in the hands of the Chairman of the Commission, who should be guided by the opinions of members of the Commission.

3532. If you suggest that possibility, it seems to me that this Commission, according to your view of it, may ask the Minister for an amendment of the order of reference: is that not so?—It is undoubtedly within the power of the Commission.

3533. You think that it is within the power of the Commission to ask for an amendment?—Yes, I presume so.

3534. Do you think it would be improper for this Commission to recommend a scale outside the order of reference, and in addition to the scales submitted?—I do not think it is for me to settle what it is proper for the Commission to do; I think that is a question for the Commission.

3535. I see you have put down in scale C the required certificate: I understand it has been put down as a means to provide funds to work the salaries scale?—Well, it was in the original scale. There are a good many arguments in favour of keeping it in, so as to encourage young teachers to improve their status. Since putting it in, I feel that the arguments on the other side are rather stronger than appeared to me at first. Even when I first brought the proposal forward to introduce the certificate, I expressed some doubts as to whether there was not as much to be said against it as in favour of it. To alter it now would mean too radical an alteration of the scale altogether.

3536. I think I understood you to say you did not like the plan of penalising teachers?—I think a somewhat wrong impression has been given by the term penalising, or fining; as I have set it down, you give what is called a bonus for the certificate. There is another way of doing it, and that is to start with a certain certificate and a certain salary, the salary rising with the certificate; or you can give different salaries for different certificates, as the Wellington Board does, only with a smaller range of differences than the Wellington scale. I introduced this plan of mine because it is financially sounder—you know what the maximum is. If you give bonuses for certificates above the lowest you do not know what the maximum will be; it is very uncertain. A bonus system is uncertain because it may add on so much to the minimum amount that is to be paid, that at last it becomes cumbersome.

3537. Is it necessary in a colonial scale of staff and salaries to insist upon a certificate at all—I mean, to insist upon a certain certificate, not that teachers should be uncertificated?—I do not think it is necessary in the sense that it is essential. If it were necessary I should not drop it out of my scale at all, even in scale D.

3538. Then, it is not essential?—No; of course, there are arguments on both sides, and very strong ones.

3539. You are, of course, aware that the English Education Department, in regulation No. 64, says “there is only one class of certificate, but distinction is made as regards the right to superintend pupil-teachers.” Formerly certificated teachers were graded, but these grades are now non-existent, and officially all certificated teachers are of the same professional standing. In 1861 there were no less than twelve grades of teachers; in 1870 the number was reduced to eight; in 1881 the number was further reduced to five; and in 1900 all these grades were abolished?—Since 1890 there were three classes; I have not seen the 1900 Code. The question is not settled in England yet; an amendment is to be proposed by certain members in Sir John Gorst’s Registration Bill, which is said to have a majority of the House of Commons, to introduce two classes in the registration.

3540. The Education Department I look upon as a “fountain of honour,” and is it necessary to require more from a teacher than evidence that he holds from the department a qualifying certificate or diploma?—I do not think the term “necessary” is right; the question is which of the two courses is desirable; you have to weigh all the arguments for and against. I think it is desirable, but not absolutely essential.

3541. In scale C, regulation (b) says “at least three out of the first six assistants in any school above 510 (exclusive of mistress) must be female assistants”; counting the mistress, that will be seven assistants: does this scale allow Education Boards, or School Committees with the permission of Education Boards, to vary the staffing?—Yes; but it prevents them from putting the mistresses down to the lowest salaries; the Auckland Board puts all its mistresses at the bottom of the salary scale.

3542. This will prevent that?—Yes.

3543. In this scale the first mistress will get £180?—Yes.

3544. And the first assistant master £245?—Yes.

3545. Would an Education Board have the right to say that the next teacher on that staff, a master, must get a salary of £150?—Yes; the second assistant.

3546. Would it be competent for that same Board, instead of saying they would have a second assistant as master, to say they would give a mistress £125?—Yes.

3547. Then, the fourth assistant in that school would receive £135?—Yes, whether it was a male or a female.

3548. There would be equality there?—Yes; you must allow it somewhere, so as to allow Boards a certain degree of liberty in staffing schools.

3549. Is £150 the highest possible salary you can give an assistant master in that position, with an average of 690 in attendance?—You could give him a salary of £195.

3550. If you eliminate a pupil-teacher?—No, if you substitute a pupil-teacher for a junior assistant.

3551. *Mr. Davidson.*] If you drop one pupil-teacher out of the staff of that school, I understand the salary of the second master would be £185?—Yes, that is so; that is the effect of note (e).

3552. *Mr. Hill.*] Would you allow, for example, £20 out of the £35 available for the pupil-teacher to be added to the assistant’s salary, and £15 to either of the other teachers on the staff?—No, I should not; I have thought that out.

3553. *Mr. Davidson.*] Do I understand that, in order to get a much more skilled, experienced, and efficient second male assistant in the school, you propose, where it is thought necessary, to drop a pupil-teacher and give such a salary as will secure a teacher possessed of the qualifications I mention?—Yes; instead of having to teach 50 he would very likely have to teach 80, and would need to be a much stronger man.

3554. *Mr. Weston.*] Do I understand that the Board would have power to take either a male or a female teacher?—I think that would be left open.

3555. They are not bound to take either a male or a female?—No; the total cost has been calculated on the most expensive hypothesis, subject to the fact that there are not enough male teachers in the colony to go round.

3556. *Mr. Hill.*] With regard to the salaries of pupil-teachers, I see you suggest an extra allowance to pupil-teachers if obliged to live away from home?—Yes.

3557. A fourth-year pupil-teacher will probably be a young man twenty years of age?—It depends on the district.

3558. You propose to give him £50 a year, and if he is compelled by order of the Board to live away from home you only make him an extra allowance of £5?—That is above the average paid in the colony now.

3559. I am speaking of pupil-teachers. I would suggest that greater allowances should be made to them. I have a boy between fifteen and sixteen years of age—he is at school at the present time—and he has been offered a situation a dozen times in a place in Napier at £1 a week, and he has no experience whatever. It seems to me that full consideration should be given to pupil-teachers if we are to get the best material: do you not think so?—You have to consider the salaries paid at the present time not only to pupil-teachers, but to teachers generally; if you add the money to the salaries of the pupil-teachers you take it away from the teachers.

3560. Could not an alteration be made in the allowances to pupil-teachers who may be required by the Boards to go to another district and live away from home?—If I had the money I would do so; but the assistants should have still higher salaries than in this scale if I had the money to enable it to be done. It is only right that the low salary should come to the pupil-teachers; they are learning their profession, and they have enough to live on.

3561. Do you consider £55 a living-wage?—A boy can live on it, though it is about all he can do. The £1 a week you quote is a very unusual amount to offer a boy of fifteen or sixteen years of age when beginning work. I have had experience in three towns in the colony, and I consider 5s. to 10s. a week is the average wage offered under such conditions.

3562. *Mr. Davidson.*] With regard to the staffing in schools up to an average attendance of 90, I have the staffing of the Southland, Otago, South Canterbury, North Canterbury, and various other educational districts in New Zealand; I have the staffing of such schools in New South Wales, Queensland, Victoria, and South Australia: can you say whether or not the staffing proposed by you is more liberal or less liberal than the staffing in the districts I have just named?—It is not more liberal than Canterbury; it is the same.

3563. It is as liberal as Canterbury?—Yes.

3564. And more liberal than in any of the other districts in New Zealand, or in any of the Australian States I have mentioned?—Yes; I think the staffing in the Australian Colonies is the weak point in the system.

3565. It is more liberal than Southland or Otago?—Yes; up to 110 Southland has no pupil-teacher, only a master and a mistress.

3566. Southland does not admit the third teacher so soon?—Not till an attendance of 110 is reached.

3567. You propose to admit such a teacher at 90 in attendance?—Yes.

3568. Then, the staffing is very much more liberal than Southland?—Yes.

3569. All round, the staffing in your suggested scale is a very great improvement?—Yes.

EXHIBITS.

EXHIBIT No. 2.

NEW ZEALAND EDUCATION DEPARTMENT.

COLONIAL SCALE OF STAFF AND SALARIES, A.

THE accompanying scale of staff and salaries deals with the distribution of the main portion of the vote for primary education—namely, the capitation on average attendance. For the purposes of this calculation a capitation grant of £4 has been assumed. The present statutory grant is £3 15s. per head; without the increase of 5s. per head the suggested scale would be impossible.

The total amount of the capitation grant at £4 would be, on the average attendance for the year ended 31st December, 1899, £441,263.

Out of the capitation grant are payable all teachers' salaries and allowances, and the general expenses of Education Boards and of School Committees.

At present the capitation grant is payable to each Board on the average attendance at the schools in its district. The introduction of a colonial scale of staff and salaries necessarily, therefore, involves the question of the finance of the Boards. A very brief examination of the question shows that the capitation basis of payments to Boards is unworkable in conjunction with a colonial scale: for instance, in the smallest district, Westland, the total of salaries and allowances under the scale exceeds the total amount of the capitation grant, even at the increased rate of £4 per head; and in other small districts, and in large districts where the population is sparse and small schools are numerous, after paying teachers' salaries and allowances according to the scale, the balance available for the general expenses of the Boards and Committees would be too small to meet the legitimate claims made upon it, if the capitation basis of payments to Boards were retained.

In drawing up the scheme an endeavour has been made, among other things,—

1. To improve the efficiency of the schools by increasing and strengthening the staff.
2. To give such salaries as will attract good teachers, or, at all events, prevent the best teachers from going into other professions.
3. To remove inequalities and anomalies in salaries paid in various positions—*e.g.*, to increase generally the salaries paid to women, especially to women holding responsible positions.
4. Consistently with the above, to leave as much discretion as possible to Boards in the management of the schools and of their finances, and to increase the balance at their disposal after satisfying the demands already referred to.

STAFF.

It is obvious that it is practically impossible to have a uniform scale of salaries without a uniform scale of staff.

In the thirteen districts there are thirteen systems of staffing schools, although some of these systems have more or less resemblance to one another. Objection may be taken to them on the following grounds:—

- (a.) In eight districts the first increase of staff takes the form of the addition of a pupil-teacher. This has only cheapness to recommend it: in a school with seven or eight classes there is very little opportunity for the head-teacher to supervise and direct a young pupil-teacher.

The proposed scale gives an assistant teacher when the average attendance at a school reaches 36.

- (b.) The number of pupil-teachers in proportion to adult teachers is too large for real efficiency. The proportion is 2,593 adults to 1,022 pupil-teachers, or one pupil-teacher for 2.54 adult teachers; the proposed scale of staff gives 2,999 adult teachers to 778 pupil-teachers, or one pupil-teacher for 3.85 adults. The difference may be stated roughly as follows: The existing scales give 51 adults for each 20 pupil-teachers; the proposed scale gives 77 adults for each 20 pupil-teachers.

Or, if we exclude schools under 20, there are at present 2,175 adults to 1,022 pupil-teachers, or one pupil-teacher for every 2.12 adult teachers; the proposal would give in the schools of 20 and upwards 2,581 adults to 778 pupil-teachers, or one pupil-teacher for every 3.32 adult teachers. Roughly, under existing circumstances, there are for every 24 pupil-teachers 51 adults; according to the proposed scale there would be 80 adults.

- (c.) The number of pupils intrusted to each teacher is too large for much individual attention.

Taking all schools, the average number per teacher is 30·5; and in schools of 20 and upwards, 32·7. The proposed scale shows a substantial improvement, and the staff suggested, although it may still be regarded as inadequate, is as strong as in the best staffed districts of the colony, and better than in any of the Australian Colonies—slightly better even than in South Australia, which is far ahead of all the others in this respect. Unfortunately, the money available will not suffice to provide an ideal staff. The average number of pupils per teacher, as proposed, will be, for all schools, 29·2; and in schools of 20 and upwards, 31·1.

- (d.) The proportion of pupil-teachers in large schools in some districts is too high. According to the proposed scale, the number of adult teachers is always in excess of the number of pupil-teachers.

The total staff for all schools under proposed and existing scales is as follows:—

	Head or Sole Teachers.	Assistants.	Total Adult Teachers (exclusive of Sewing-mistresses).	Pupil-teachers.
Existing staff (December, 1899)	1,645	896	2,541	1,022
Proposed staff	1,645	1,354	2,999	778

SALARIES.

There is greater difference between the various districts in this respect even than in respect of the staffing. The following table shows some of the anomalies, corresponding salaries in certain other colonies, and the proposed salaries for the posts named:—

Head or Sole Teacher.

	Average Attendance, Schools over 20.				Average Salary.
	20	100	250	600	
Present scales—	£	£	£	£	
New Zealand ... (from	70	160	203	258	£149 11s. 9d.
... (to	115	225	275	375	
Victoria	75	130	157	201	
New South Wales	88	130	185	350	
Queensland	100	210	270	342	
South Australia	110	240	315	420	
New Zealand, proposed ...	120	189	254	324	£160 11s. 0d.

Infant-mistress, or First Assistant Mistress.

Present scales—	Small Schools. Commencing Salaries.			Large Schools. Highest Salaries paid to Infant-mistress or First Assistant Mistress.		
		£		£	s.	d.
New Zealand ...	{ from	42	...	100	0	0
	{ to	85	...	166	13	4
New South Wales	...	72	{ Infant-mistress ...	194	0	0
			{ Girls' Dept. ...	250	0	0
South Australia	84	...	148	0	0
New Zealand, proposed	...	80	...	200	0	0

First Male Assistant.

Present scales—	Small Schools. Commencing Salaries.			Large Schools.		
		£		£	s.	d.
New Zealand ...	{ from	90	...	175	0	0
	{ to	160	...	265	15	0
New South Wales	72	...	225	0	0
South Australia	100	...	200	0	0
New Zealand, proposed	...	150	...	250	0	0

Pupil-teachers : Salaries and Allowances.

	£	s.	d.
Present, average	31	6	10
Proposed, average	35	0	0

All Teachers except Sewing-mistresses.

Average salary and allowances—	£	s.	d.
Present scale (except house-allowance)	96	14	3
Proposed scale (except house-allowance)	100	12	0

HOUSE-ALLOWANCE.

Another difficulty is the question of house-allowances to head-teachers. Three hundred and fifty-one schools with average attendance over 20 have no residences attached : 113 of these are in the Auckland District, 65 in Wellington, 38 in Wanganui, 29 in Hawke's Bay, &c. The salaries, although nominally equal, would still be unequal if no account were taken of this fact. To deal with this question on a sound basis would involve interference with the discretion of Boards in building residences. In fact, although the matter of house-allowances cannot be overlooked in dealing with the question of teachers' salaries, yet it is so closely connected with the treatment of the building-votes that it would appear better to deal with it as a separate matter, say, next year, when the distribution of the building-votes is to be reconsidered. The increase of the balance at the disposal of Boards after payment of salaries will enable them to deal, at all events, with cases in which hardship might otherwise be occasioned by the absence of house-allowance.

FEES FOR INSTRUCTION OF PUPIL-TEACHERS.

The proposed scale does not contemplate the payment of fees for the instruction of pupil-teachers. It would, of course, be open to any Board to make such payments in addition to salaries if it were thought expedient to do so.

GENERAL EXPENSES OF BOARDS.

These include allowances to School Committees, office salaries and other office expenses, Inspectors' salaries and allowances, members' expenses, cost of training teachers, examinations, manual and technical instruction, and sundries.

The cost of manual and technical instruction, as far as the Boards are concerned, will be entirely met (or nearly so) out of the funds provided for carrying out the new Manual and Technical Instruction Act. The grant for the training of teachers has also been increased from £600 to £1,000. To provide for the other expenses of the Boards, it is proposed to distribute the balance left after the payment of teachers' salaries and allowances, by giving £250 to each Board, and 11s. 3d. per head on the average attendance. For this purpose the £4,000 subsidy for inspection is merged in the general fund. This will give the Boards £65,303, or considerably more than they are able to apply to the same purposes now.

DISTRICT HIGH SCHOOLS.

A separate vote has been taken for district high schools, which will be distributed according to a separate scheme, and will be available for increasing salaries and for meeting other expenses of such schools.

TRANSITION FROM THE OLD SYSTEM TO THE NEW.

A short Bill amending "The Education Act, 1877," would be necessary to authorise the proposed method of distributing the total statutory grant, and to increase the rate to £4. There would be a period of transition as regards the staffing of schools and payment of teachers, as the scale increases the number of adult teachers and decreases the number of pupil-teachers, raises some salaries and lowers a few others. The difficulties, though great, appear by no means insuperable, the manner in which the change should be made would form a very suitable subject for discussion at the conference that it is proposed to hold early next year.

METHOD OF PAYMENT.

All the payments would be made, it is suggested, to the Boards as now, distribution according to the scale being left in the hands of the Boards.

CONCLUSION.

In conclusion, although the addition of 5s. to the capitation allowance would not enable the smaller Boards to raise their salaries to what may be regarded as reasonable rates, or to cope with other financial difficulties, it may be justly claimed that the proposed scheme enables the Government, with that addition, to improve the staffing of the schools, to increase, generally speaking, the salaries of teachers, and to give to the Boards a balance available for their general expenses much larger than, after paying salaries and Committees' allowances, has been at their disposal before.

Appended is a financial summary, based on the "working average" for December quarter, 1899, and showing the distribution of the £4 capitation; and a similar summary based on the existing scales payable in the several districts for the same quarter.

ACCORDING TO PROPOSED SCALE.

1. Salaries—	Average Attendance.					£
Schools under	15	Capitation at £5	11,770
"	15-19	Sole teachers	13,812
"	20-35	"	59,277
" over	35	Head-teachers	137,718
"	35	Assistants	129,375
"	75	Pupil-teachers	28,008
						<u>£379,960</u>
Net total salaries						
2. Balance to Boards, for office and general expenses, excluding scholarships, buildings, &c. (some Boards also receive subsidies for training of teachers, £1,000 in all, in addition to district-high-school fees and other miscellaneous receipts = £1,500 at least), £250 to each Board, and capitation at 11s. 3d.						65,303
						<u>£445,263</u>
<i>Contra:—</i>						
Capitation, 110,315·75, at £4						£441,263
Inspection subsidy						4,000
						<u>£445,263</u>

ACCORDING TO PRESENT SCALES.—ESTIMATED FROM BOARDS' RETURNS.

Teachers' salaries and allowances	£ 357,711
Balance available for Boards' general expenses	59,973
						<u>£417,684</u>
<i>Contra:—</i>						
Capitation at £3 15s.	£413,684
Inspection subsidy	4,000
						<u>£417,684</u>

December, 1900.

G. HOGGEN,
Inspector-General of Schools

Teachers' Certificates.—The salaries of the scale are for teachers holding certificates not lower than those named below. Deductions will be made from the salaries shown in Table I. of 1 per cent. for each class below that assigned, and of 4 per cent. for each division below that assigned. A deduction of 20 per cent. will be made in cases of teachers holding no certificate. Licenses will count as E5. Those who have satisfied the literary requirements for a certificate, but have not yet obtained certificates, will be paid, for the first two years only, as if holding a certificate of the 5th division in the class for which they have qualified; after such two years they will be considered merely as uncertificated teachers.

Examples.—A head-teacher in a school of 120 with an E2 certificate—*i.e.*, one class and one division below the class and division assigned—will have 5 per cent. deducted from his salary; his actual net salary will therefore be £201—£10 1s.—£190 19s. An infant-mistress in a school of 675, holding an E3 certificate, will lose 9 per cent.—*i.e.*, her net salary will be £161 4s.; and so on.

These deductions do not apply to schools with an average attendance under 15.

December, 1900.

G. HOBGEN.

EXHIBIT No. 3.

ASSISTANTS: SCHOOLS, 250 TO 600.

(Salaries of head-teachers as for separate schools.)

Boys' Schools.

Girls' or Infants' Schools.

—	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	No. of P.T.'s.	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	No. of P.T.'s.
	A.M.	A.M.	A.M.	A.M.	A.M.	A.M.	A.M.		A.F.	A.F.	A.F.	A.F.	A.F.	A.F.	A.F.	
251-300	£ 200	£ 155	£ 125	£ 100	£ ..	£ ..	£ ..	3	£ 150	£ 115	£ 100	£ 80	£ ..	£ ..	£
300-330	205	160	125	100	4	155	120	105	85	4
330-390	210	160	130	105	80	4	160	120	110	90	80	4
390-420	215	165	130	105	80	5	165	125	110	95	80	5
420-480	220	165	135	110	90	80	..	5	170	125	115	95	85	80	..	5
480-510	225	170	135	110	90	80	..	6	175	130	115	100	85	80	..	6
510-570	230	170	140	115	100	90	80	6	180	130	120	100	90	85	80	6
570-600	235	175	140	115	100	90	80	7	185	135	120	105	90	85	80	7

EXHIBIT No. 8.

SCHOOLS WITH AVERAGE ATTENDANCE OVER 20, WITHOUT RESIDENCES. (1899—LATEST RETURN.)

Auckland	113	Westland	5
Taranaki	17	North Canterbury	18
Wanganui	38	South Canterbury	11
Wellington	65	Otago	3
Hawke's Bay	29	Southland	19
Marlborough	2				
Nelson	22				351
Grey	9				

EXHIBIT No. 10.

EXPENSES OF EDUCATION BOARDS.

Districts.	1898.	1899.	1900.	Average of Three Years.
	£	£	£	£
Auckland ...	13,339	12,346	12,720	12,802
Taranaki ...	2,181	2,239	2,449	2,290
Wanganui ...	3,877	3,945	3,904	3,909
Wellington ...	6,853	7,080	6,479	6,804
Hawke's Bay ...	4,093	4,084	3,906	4,028
Marlborough ...	1,108	1,097	1,181	1,129
Nelson ...	3,586	3,547	3,477	3,536
Grey ...	769	743	803	772
Westland ...	712	692	723	709
North Canterbury ...	10,133	10,120	9,738	9,997
South Canterbury ...	2,617	2,560	2,814	2,663
Otago ...	9,703	9,590	8,709	9,334
Southland ...	3,966	4,330	4,246	4,180
Totals ...	62,937	62,373	61,149	62,153

EXHIBIT No. 50.

PROPOSED COLONIAL SCALE (B) OF STAFF AND SALARIES.

Suggested Alternative Scheme for Schools with 15 to 330 in average attendance.

Average Attendance.	Head or Sole Teacher: Salary.				Infant Mistress.	Remarks.	
	Male.		Female.				
	Fixed.	Capitation.	Fixed.	Capitation.			
Over 14 and not over 19	£ 75	s. 100	£ 75	s. 100	£ ...		
" 19	40	118	40	102	40		
" 40	65	160	20	144	10	90	
" 65	90	185	20	156½	10	100	
" 90	120	210	10	169	5	105	Also one pupil-teacher.
" 120	150	225	8	176½	4	110	Also two pupil-teachers.
" 150	200	237	6	182½	3	115	Also one assistant and two pupil-teachers.
" 200	250	252	4	190	2	120	Also two assistants and two pupil-teachers.
" 250	275	262	4	195	2	125	Also two assistants and three pupil-teachers.
" 275	330	267	4	197½	2	130	Also three assistants and three pupil-teachers.

15th May, 1901.

G. HOGGEN.

EXHIBIT No. 60.

COMPARATIVE TABLE OF STAFFS.

(Presented by Mr. P. Goyen.)

(N.B.—Column 2 shows the numbers being taught by the teachers during the Inspector's visit of inspection.)

Otago Staffing.				Proposed Staffing.			
Class.	No. of Pupils.	Teacher.	Salary.	Teacher.	Salary.		
<i>School with Average Attendance of 590.</i>							
VII.	6	Head-teacher† ...	£ 326	Head-teacher† ...	£ 335		
VI.	72	Male assistant† ...	240	Male assistant† ...	220		
V.	92	" † ...	180	" † ...	120		
IV.	76	" † ...	115	" † ...	90		
III.	79	Female assistant† ...	110	Female assistant† ...	125		
II.	67	" † ...	85	" † ...	85		
I.	67	" † ...	85	" † ...	80		
P.	160	Mistress and 2 pupil-teachers	155	Mistress and 4 pupil-teachers	170		
<i>School with Average Attendance of 526.</i>							
VII.	24	Head-teacher† ...	£ 324	Head-teacher† ...	£ 322		
VI.	43	Male assistant† ...	240	Male assistant† ...	210		
V.	58	" † ...	175	" † ...	110		
IV.	70	" † ...	112	" † ...	80		
III.	63	Female assistant† ...	110	Female assistant† ...	120		
II.	80	" † ...	85	" † ...	80		
I.	63	2 pupil-teachers	" † ...	80		
P.	150	Mistress and 2 pupil-teachers	150	Mistress and 4 pupil-teachers	160		
<i>School with Average Attendance of 430.</i>							
VII.	6	Head-teacher ...	299	Male assistant* ...	303		
VI.	28	Male assist. & 1 pupil-teacher	210	" * ...	190		
V.	51			" * ...	100		
IV.	61	Male assistant ...	150	" * ...	80		
III.	58	Female assistant ...	95	Female assistant* ...	110		
II.	51	" ...	85	" * ...	80		
I.	48	Head-teacher	Head-teacher & pupil-teacher	...		
P.	147	Mistress and 2 pupil-teachers	135	Mistress and 3 pupil-teachers	140		

* One pupil-teacher to assist in these classes.

† Two pupil-teachers assisting in these classes.

‡ Three pupil-teachers to assist in these classes.

EXHIBIT No. 60—continued.

Otago Staffing.				Proposed Staffing.	
Class.	No. of Pupils.	Teacher.	Salary.	Teacher.	Salary.
<i>School with Average Attendance of 353.</i>					
VII.	12	Head-teacher	285	Head-teacher	288
VI.	35	Male assistant	200	Male assist. & 1 pupil-teacher	170
V.	45				
IV.	45	Female "	110	Male assistant	90
III.	49	Female assistant	105	Female "	100
II.	56	"	105	" "	80
I.	46	Head-teacher & pupil-teacher	...	Head-teacher & 1 pupil-tchr.	...
P.	87	Mistress and 1 " "	130	Mistress and 2 pupil-teachers	120
<i>School with Average Attendance of 272.</i>					
VII.	4	Head-teacher	265	Head-teacher	263
VI.	18	Male assistant	175	Male assistant	150
V.	21				
IV.	35	Head-teacher	"	80
III.	25	Female assistant	85	Female assis. & pupil-teacher	80
II.	20	"	85		
I.	28	Mistress and pupil-teacher...	120	Head-teacher "
P.	66			Mistress " ...	105
<i>School with Average Attendance of 203.</i>					
VII.	8	Head-teacher	249	Head-teacher*	240
VI.	14				
V.	28	Female assistant	85	Male assistant*	90
IV.	30				
III.	28	Head-teacher & pupil-teacher	...	Female " *	80
II.	26	Mistress " ...	115	Mistress and 1 pupil-teacher	100
I.	18				
P.	59				
<i>School with Average Attendance of 169.</i>					
VII.	1	Head-teacher	235	Head-teacher*	227
VI.	11				
V.	14	Female assistant	35	Male assistant*	90
IV.	22				
III.	24	Mistress	108	Mistress and pupil-teacher...	95
II.	31				
I.	36				
P.	27				

* One pupil-teacher to assist in these classes.

EXHIBIT No. 92.

STATEMENT ABSTRACTED FROM THE LONDON SCHOOL BOARD REPORT FOR 1898.
(Mr. C. Watson, B.A.)

AVERAGE attendance in boys' departments, 133,257; average attendance in girls' departments, 125,534; average attendance in mixed departments, 23,632; average attendance in infant departments, 147,430: total, 429,853.

Number of boys' departments, 417; number of girls' departments, 412; number of mixed departments, 77; number of infant departments, 445: total, 1,346.

Average number of boys in a department, 320; average number of girls in a department, 305; average number in mixed department, 328; average number in infant department, 331.

Thus, in London, every assistant man or woman has a reasonable chance of rising to a fair position. For, approximately, out of every ten men teachers one is getting a salary of £320 or over; out of every ten women one receives a salary of £200 or over.

Expenditure per child in average attendance in 1898 (exclusive of buildings and sites), £3 19s. 11d.; expenditure on sites and buildings per child in average attendance in 1898, £1 3s. 11d. (in 1897 the expenditure under this head was greater): total expenditure per child (1898) in average attendance, £5 3s. 10d.

London schools are buildings to accommodate on the average about 1,100 children. But these are almost universally divided into a boys' department, a girls' department, an infant department—each under independent management.

Salaries and Staffs.

Beethoven Street School (mixed school).—Average, 659. Staff: One head-teacher and thirteen assistants. Salaries: Head-teacher, £400; one assistant at £165, two assistants at £155, one assistant at £151, one assistant at £145, two assistants at £130, one assistant at £125, one assistant at £115, two assistants at £112, two assistants at £106.

Kilburn Lane School.—Average boys' department, 511. Staff: One head-teacher, nine assistants, and two pupil-teachers. Salaries: Head-teacher, £400; one assistant at £165, one assistant at £155, one assistant at £150, one assistant at £145, one assistant at £125, two assistants at £121, one assistant at £105, one assistant at £95.

Halford Road School.—Boys' department, average, 438. Staff: One head-teacher, eight assistants, and two pupil-teachers. Salaries: Head-teacher, £330; three assistants at £155, one assistant at £140, one assistant at £125, three assistants at £120.

Harwood Road School.—Boys' department, average, 328. Staff: One head-teacher and six assistants. Salaries: Head-teacher, £358; five assistants at £155, one assistant at £115. **NOTE.**—This head-teacher's salary is higher than the general salary. It is one of a number of "commuted" salaries. But I thought it advisable to take these salaries as they come on the return. As a matter of fact, I find that nearly every boys' department of 300 (or about) in average attendance has a head-teacher with one of these commuted salaries.

Hugon Road School.—Boys' department, average, 240. Staff: One head-teacher, six assistants, and two pupil-teachers. Salaries: Head-teacher, £280 16s. 8d.; one assistant at £131, two assistants at £120, one assistant at £115, two assistants at £105.

EXHIBIT No. 97.

RANGE OF SALARIES IN THE SEVERAL DISTRICTS.

District.	20-30.	30-50.	50-70.	70-100.	100-200.	200-300.	300-400.	400-500.	500-600.	Over 600.
Auckland ..	£ 100-135	£ 135-160	£ 160-175	£ 175-200	£ 200-230	£ 240-260	£ 291-311	£ 330-342	£ 354-357	£ 378-408
Females ..	100-108	108
Taranaki ..	88-111	113-134	136-157	158-165	..	202	231	263
Females ..	75-103	91-110
Wanganui ..	97-150	130-174	152-196	168-209	204-261	249	251-300
Females ..	74-119	93-142
Wellington ..	110-165	120-235	195-225	205-260	235-290	275-295	..	345-370	345-370	355-360
Females ..	100-145	100-152	264
Hawke's Bay ..	110-156	135-178	153-167	181-207	184-222	284-288	300	347	365	481
Females ..	102-133	138-168
Marlborough ..	123	170	144-147	..	180-210	264
Females ..	90-110	..	130
Nelson ..	100	110-150	145-200	160-175	150-300	300	..	300
Females ..	80-96	96-112	..	100	100-180	175
Grey	127	142-165	220	..	250
Females ..	88	88-112
Westland	130	134	159-162	..	293
Females ..	90-106	85-117
North Canterbury ..	101-139	127-164	155-170	169-200	193-283	251-262	289-363	320-390	..	365-431
Females ..	100-139	141-150
South Canterbury ..	112-142	130-156	141-148	153-163	175-201	213	258-306	330*	259	..
Females ..	101-129	117-120
Otago ..	85-150	140-170	170-191	191-215	215-247	259-357*	271-313	295-364	310-370	340-416
Females ..	85-100	105
Southland ..	115-143	136-152	154-163	165-175	184-216	223-246	291	309
Females ..	92-124	121-132
Range ..	88-165	110-235	134-225	153-260	175-290	202-300	231-363	250-380	259-370	..
Females ..	74-145	85-168	130	100	100-180	175

* District high school.

EXHIBIT No. 100.

SUGGESTED SCHEME SHOWING CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOLS AND GRADES OF TEACHERS, WITH EMOLUMENTS FOR EACH CLASS OF SCHOOL AND GRADE OF TEACHERS.

- Teachers are classed as:—(a) Probationers or pupil-teachers; (b) junior assistants; (c) assistants; (d) principal or head-teachers.
- (a.) A probationer is a teacher in training under a certificated assistant and a principal teacher.
- (b.) A junior assistant is a teacher who has held a certificate of competency by examination from the Department for a period less than two years, but is not qualified to take charge of a public school.
- (c.) An assistant is a teacher holding a full certificate of competency for a longer period than two years, and is qualified to take sole charge of a public school.
- (d.) A principal teacher is one who has charge of a public school and holds a certificate of competency from the Education Department.

3. Schools are arranged in ten classes, according to average attendance, as follows:—
- (a.) 10th or lowest class, schools with an average attendance not exceeding 20.
 (b.) 9th class, schools with average over 20 and not exceeding 30.
 (c.) 8th class, " 30 45.
 (d.) 7th class, " 45 75.
 (e.) 6th class, " 75 110.
 (f.) 5th class, " 110 175.
 (g.) 4th class, " 175 300.
 (h.) 3rd class, " 300 520.
 (i.) 2nd class, " 520 620.
 (j.) 1st class, " 620
4. (a.) Table I. shows the proposed staffing of schools.
 (b.) Table II. shows the emoluments of head or principal teachers for each class of school, with proposed capitation increase from a minimum to a maximum in each class.
 (c.) Table III. contains the proposed emoluments of assistants, both male and female, with proposed capitation increase from a minimum to a maximum. The proposed rate of capitation increase between minimum and maximum is subject to arrangement.
 (d.) Table IV. contains the proposed emoluments of junior assistants and probationers.

Table I.—Showing the Proposed Staffing of Schools in New Zealand.

Average Attendance.	Principal Teacher.	Assistants.										Junior Assistants.	Total certificated.	Probationers*.	Total Staffing in Terms, Probationers or Pupil-teachers.	Remarks.
		Males.				Females.										
		1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5						
Below 30 ..	1	1	..	2	Mistress preferred.	
Over 30 to 45..	1	1	..	2	Master preferred unless	
" 45 " 75..	1	1	2	4	school has grown under	
" 75 " 110..	1	1	2	5	mistress.	
" 110 " 140..	1	1	2	2	6		
" 140 " 175..	1	1	1	3	8	A junior assistant male	
" 175 " 235..	1	1	1	1	4	10	or female may be appointed	
" 235 " 270..	1	1	1	1	4	4	11	in place of two	
" 270 " 300..	1	1	1	1	4	4	12	pupil-teachers if desired	
" 300 " 350..	1	1	1	1	1	5	4	14	by a Committee.	
" 350 " 400..	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	16		
" 400 " 430..	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	17		
" 430 " 480..	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7	19		
" 480 " 520..	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	21		
" 520 " 580..	1	1	1	1	..	1	1	1	1	1	9	23		
" 580 " 620..	1	1	1	1	..	1	1	1	1	1	9	24		
" 620 " 670..	1	1	1	1	..	1	1	1	1	1†	..	1	10	26		
" 670 " 700..	1	1	1	1	..	1	1	1	1	1†	..	1	10	27		

* Two probationers are deemed equal to one assistant.

† May be fourth assistant male, or fifth assistant female.

Over 700 the staffing increases by one junior assistant for every 40 in average attendance, or one pupil-teacher for every 30, and so on alternately as may become necessary.

Table II.—Classification of Schools and Emoluments of Teachers in each Class.

- 10th Class.—All schools in which the average does not exceed 20. Emolument: from £5 to £100, or £5 capitation for each pupil.
- 9th Class.—Schools over 20 and not more than 30 in average attendance. Salary: from £100 to £130, or £100 + £3 capitation for every increase over 20.
- 8th Class.—Schools over 30 and not more than 45 in average attendance. Salary: from £130 to £160, or £130 + £2 capitation for every increase over 30.
- 7th Class.—Schools over 45 and not more than 75 in average attendance. Salary: from £160 to £175, or £160 + 10s. capitation for every increase over 45.
- 6th Class.—Schools over 75 and not more than 110 in average attendance. Salary: from £175 to £188 2s. 6d., or £175 + 7s. 6d. capitation for every increase over 75.
- 5th Class.—Schools over 110 and not more than 175 in average attendance. Salary: from £188 2s. 6d. to £212 10s., or £188 2s. 6d. + 7s. 6d. capitation for every increase over 110.
- 4th Class.—Schools over 175 and not exceeding 300 in average attendance. Salary: from £212 10s. to £259 7s. 6d., or £212 10s. + 7s. 6d. capitation for every increase over 175.
- 3rd Class.—Schools over 300 and not exceeding 520 in average attendance. Salary: from £259 7s. 6d. to £325 7s. 6d., or £259 7s. 6d. + 6s. capitation for every increase over 300.
- 2nd Class.—Schools over 520 and not exceeding 620 in average attendance. Salary: from £325 7s. 6d. to £345 7s. 6d., or £325 7s. 6d. + 4s. capitation for every increase over 520.
- 1st Class.—Schools over 620 and not exceeding 700 in average attendance. Salary: from £345 7s. 6d. to £353 7s. 6d., or £345 7s. 6d. + 2s. capitation for every increase over 620.

No salary allowance in the way of capitation is made to any teacher in a school beyond 700 in average attendance.

These salaries are exclusive of house-allowance. When no house is provided for a principal teacher the following allowances will be made in lieu of house: Principal teachers in schools below the 3rd class, 20 per cent. of the amount of salary payable; principal teachers in schools of the 3rd, 2nd, and 1st classes, 15 per cent. of the amount of salary payable.

Table III.—Assistants.

(NOTE.—The salary of assistants is the same as the salary of principal teachers in schools of a lower class.)

(a.) FEMALES.

- 1st Assistant.—From 110 to 700 in average attendance. The salary varies from the highest salary paid to a teacher of the 9th class of school and with an average attendance of 25, to the highest salary paid to a principal teacher in a school of the 6th class—viz., from £115 over 110 average to £188 2s. 6d. at 700 in average attendance.
- 2nd Assistant.—School where the average is 235. The salary varies from the highest salary paid to a teacher in a school of the 10th class to the highest salary paid to a principal teacher in a school of the 7th class—viz., from £100 over 235 in average to £175 at 700 in average attendance.
- 3rd Assistant.—School where the average reaches 430. The salary varies from the highest amount payable to a teacher in a school of the 10th class and with an average attendance of 18, to the highest salary paid to a head-teacher in a school of the 9th class—viz., from £90 at 430 average to £130 at 700 average.
- 4th Assistant.—School where the average reaches 480. The salary varies from the highest amount paid to a teacher in a school of the 10th class and with an average attendance of 18, to the highest salary paid to a head-teacher in a school of the 9th class—viz., from £90 at 480 average to £130 at 700 average.
- 5th Assistant.—School where the average reaches 620. The salary varies from the highest amount paid to a teacher in a school of the 10th class and with an average attendance of 18, to the highest salary paid to a teacher in a school of the 9th class and with an average attendance of 24—viz., from £90 at 620 average to £112 at 700 average.

(b.) MALES.

- 1st Assistant.—The salary varies from the highest salary paid to a principal teacher in a school of the 9th class to the highest salary paid to a principal teacher in a school of the 4th class—viz., from £130 above 175 average to £259 7s. 6d. at 700 average.
- 2nd Assistant.—The salary varies from the highest salary paid to a principal teacher in a school of the 9th class to the highest salary paid to a principal teacher in a school of the 5th class—viz., from £130 above 300 average to £212 10s. at 700 average.
- 3rd Assistant.—The salary varies from the highest salary of a principal teacher in a school of the 10th class to the highest salary paid to a teacher in a school of the 7th class—viz., from £100 above 520 average to £175 at 700 average.
- 4th Assistant.—See 5th assistant female, and note under tabulation showing staffing.

Table IV.—Emoluments of Junior Assistants and Probationers.

1. Probationers or pupil teachers (male and female):—

- (a.) First year: The salary will be £20 per annum, with £15 additional if required to live in a district away from home.
- (b.) Second year: £30 per annum, with £15 additional as above.
- (c.) Third year: £40 per annum, with £15 additional as above.
- (d.) Fourth year: £50 per year, with £15 additional as above.

Special facilities will be given to enable probationers to pursue their studies with a view to their qualifying themselves as certificated teachers.

A special bonus of £10 will also be given to every pupil-teacher on the completion of his or her full term of service, and who obtains a certificate of competency from the Education Department at the first examination following the termination of his or her engagement.

2. Junior Assistants:—

Junior assistants are employed in schools of the 7th and 8th classes, and in such other schools as their services may be required under the staffing regulations.

The salary of a junior assistant shall be £90 or £100 per annum according to the year of service as junior assistant.

25th June, 1901.

H. HILL.

EXHIBIT No. 106.

EXPERIENCE OF TEACHERS PROMOTED IN JUNE, 1901.

Education Districts.	Division 1.		Division 2.		Division 3.		Division 4.	
	Average Years.	Number of Teachers.	Average Years.	Number of Teachers.	Average Years.	Number of Teachers.	Average Years.	Number of Teachers.
Auckland.. .. .	14.32	14	9.59	37	5.51	41	5	3
Taranaki... .. .	15.33	3	12	3	7.16	6	5.2	5
Wanganui... .. .	19.5	2	12.33	6	18.5	2	6.5	8
Wellington... .. .	13.9	10	9.63	11	7.06	14	3.66	3
Hawke's Bay... .. .	15	1	9	2	9.14	7	6.5	6
Marlborough... .. .	22	1	8	2	4.5	2
Nelson... .. .	11	3	9.14	7	5.66	3	4	2
Grey... .. .	14.5	2	10.66	3	6.5	2
Westland...	6	1
North Canterbury... .. .	20.33	3	11.76	13	9.5	22	6.66	9
South Canterbury... .. .	20	2	11.66	6	6.87	8	5.5	2
Otago... .. .	19.55	15	12.76	13	8.07	14	3	1
Southland... .. .	17.75	4	10.85	7	8.16	12	4.2	5
Means for colony... .. .	16.93	..	10.61	..	7.89	..	5.02	..

CLASSES OF CERTIFICATES IN EACH DISTRICT, JUNE, 1901 (NOT INCLUDING INSPECTORS).

Education District.	1901.						1886.					
	A.	B.	C.	D.	E.	Total.		B.	C.	D.	E.	Total.
Auckland	3	11	13	277	304	608	2	8	11	73	189	283
Taranaki	3	1	5	32	33	74	..	1	2	4	15	22
Wanganui	4	3	13	74	101	195	..	1	7	12	48	68
Wellington	1	12	18	131	94	256	1	5	3	33	47	89
Hawke's Bay	10	5	48	62	125	..	2	2	16	26	46
Marlborough	1	2	20	18	41	4	14	18
Nelson	2	6	5	53	56	127	1	12	36	49
Grey	1	1	15	25	42	..	1	..	1	8	10
Westland	2	2	15	10	29	2	1	16	19
North Canterbury	5	22	41	237	77	382	3	12	28	89	136	268
South Canterbury	1	8	2	67	37	115	2	2	4	11	28	47
Otago	5	27	37	277	74	430	1	11	32	104	167	315
Southland	1	13	11	93	90	208	..	3	3	23	39	68
Totals	25	117	155	1,344	981	2,622	9	46	95	383	769	1,302
Percentage for colony..	0.95	4.46	5.91	51.25	37.41		0.69	3.52	7.29	29.41	59.06	..

ASSISTANTS IN DIVISION I., 1899.

Education District.	A1.	B1.	C1.	D1.	E1.
Auckland	1	..	7	1
Taranaki	1
Wanganui	3
Wellington	1	1	6	1
Hawke's Bay	2	1	1
Marlborough
Nelson	2	..
Grey	1	3
Westland	2	1
North Canterbury	1	3	1
South Canterbury
Otago	1	1	2	4	2
Southland	1	..	1	..

AVERAGE NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN CHARGE OF CLASSIFIED HEAD-TEACHERS, DECEMBER, 1899.

Education District.	A1.		B1.		C1.		D1.		E1.	
	Children.	Teachers.	Children.	Teachers.	Children.	Teachers.	Children.	Teachers.	Children.	Teachers.
Auckland	417	4	208	5	191	62	82	17
Taranaki	173	1	202	3	92	6	41	3
Wanganui	245	2	202	4	191	12	91	7
Wellington	228	6	140	8	181	23	76	14
Hawke's Bay	248	3	150	1	264	11	137	6
Marlborough	110	2	88	8	31	1
Nelson	258	1	73	3	79	10	74	11
Grey	146	6	31	4
Westland	258	1	83	1	109	4	46	1
North Canterbury	857	1	515	6	254	11	181	23	83	6
South Canterbury	340	4	30	1	119	4	48	2
Otago	358	2	300	7	255	13	218	26	59	5
Southland	165	4	328	2	134	17	64	8

EXHIBIT No. 110.
PROPOSED COLONIAL SCALE OF STAFFS AND SALARIES.—SCHEME D.

Average Attendance.	Head or Sole Teacher.		Missess.	Assistants.											No. of Pupil-teachers.			
	Male.			Female.	Capita- tion.*	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M		F	M	F
	Fixed.	Capita- tion.*																
Over 14 and not over 19	£ 75	S. 100	£ ..														1	
" 19	118	75	100	..													1	
" 40	160	102	40	90													2	
" 50	170	144	10	95													2	
" 70	200	159	10	100													3	
" 90	230	169	5	105													3	
" 120	235	176½	5	110													3	
" 170	250	189	4	115													4	
" 200	259	195	4	120													4	
" 250	274	205	4	125													5	
" 330	279	210	4	130													5	
" 390	302	221	4	135													6	
" 420	308	233	4	140													6	
" 480	320	239	4	145													7	
" 510	326	&c.	4	150													7	
" 570	338	&c.	4	155													8	
" 600	344	&c.	4	160													8	
" 680	356	2	4	170													9	
" 750	359	2	4	180													9	
" 780	365	2	4	190													10	
" 840	368	2	4	200													10	
" 870	375	..	4	210													11	
" 930	375	..	4	210													11	
" 960	375	..	4	210													11	
" 960	375	..	4	210													11	
" 1020	375	..	4	210													11	
" 1050	375	..	4	210													11	

* Capitation is payable on the number in excess of the lower of the two numbers in the column "Average Attendance": for instance, the salary in a school of 15 is £80; in a school of 25, £130 or £114, &c.

Allied schools, 1-14: capitation at £5.
SALARIES OF PUPIL-TEACHERS.
First year, £25, with allowance of £15 if obliged to live away from home.
Second " £30, " £15

A fifth-year pupil-teacher continuing in the same school shall receive the remuneration of a third-year pupil-teacher; but otherwise, or if he has passed the examination for a teacher's certificate, he shall receive the salary of a fourth-year pupil-teacher.

(a.) The number of male assistants must not exceed the number of female assistants (including the mistress).

(b.) At least three out of the first six assistants in any school above 510 (exclusive of the mistress) must be female assistants.

(c.) An assistant at £30 may be substituted for two pupil-teachers, or vice versa.

(d.) Instead of an assistant a pupil-teacher may be employed, £45 being added to the salary of another assistant.

(e.) Instead of adding a pupil-teacher, a Board may add £45 to the salary of an assistant.

(f.) Only one of these changes (c), (d), and (e) will be allowed in schools not over 420, and only two in schools over 420.

(g.) The total number of pupil-teachers in any Education District must not be increased by such changes as (c), (d), and (e) above the number allowed for such district by the scale.

N.B.—It is not proposed under this scheme to make any deductions on account of low certificates.

27th June, 1901.

GEORGE HOBGEN.

EXHIBIT No. 116.
CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOLS FOR SCHEMES C AND D.
 [Taken from school returns for December Quarter, 1900.]
NUMBER OF SCHOOLS IN EACH DISTRICT ACCORDING TO WORKING AVERAGES.

Working Averages, Dec., 1900.	Auckland.	Taranaki.	Wanganui.	Wellington.	Hawke's Bay.	Marlborough.	Nelson.	Grey.	Westland.	North Canterbury.	South Canterbury.	Otago.	Southland.	Totals.
1 to 9	5	4	5	14	1	39	24	8	14	7	..	7	1	129
10 " 14	29	4	9	9	7	4	15	5	5	15	4	25	6	137
15 " 19	53	7	11	17	7	3	19	1	7	22	6	24	14	191
20 " 40	144	26	57	48	20	8	34	7	2	68	30	71	67	582
41 " 50	21	10	13	7	11	3	9	2	2	23	7	16	15	140
51 " 70	36	3	17	15	4	2	8	2	1	10	9	26	12	145
71 " 90	8	5	6	6	7	..	6	3	2	17	4	14	9	87
91 " 120	16	2	7	6	6	2	3	11	1	8	7	69
121 " 150	7	..	6	6	3	2	1	4	..	4	2	35
151 " 170	5	1	..	2	2	1	1	2	1	2	..	17
171 " 200	5	1	1	2	2	3	1	1	4	20
201 " 250	7	..	4	3	1	..	1	1	2	4	1	5	2	31
251 " 275	1	..	2	1	2	..	1	1	..	1	..	9
276 " 330	1	..	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	10
331 " 390	3	1	3	2	2	1	3	..	15
391 " 420	1	1	2	1	1	..	6
421 " 480	3	1	..	2	1	..	4	..	2	..	13
481 " 510	3	1	..	2	..	6
511 " 570	6	1	1	4	..	12
571 " 600	1	1	2
601 " 660	5	1	1	1	1	1	10
661 " 690	1	1	..	2
691 " 750
751 " 780	1	1	2
781 " 840	1	1	2
841 " 870
871 " 930
931 " 960	1	1
961 " 1020	1	1
1021 " 1050
Totals ..	354*	65	143†	147	77	65	124	30	36	201‡	68	222	142‡	1,674

* This includes 54 half-time schools, which are reckoned as 27. † This includes 2 half-time schools, which are reckoned as 1. ‡ This includes 8 half-time schools, which are reckoned as 4.

AGGREGATE OF WORKING AVERAGES FOR DECEMBER QUARTER, 1900, FOR SCHEMES C AND D.

Working Averages.	Auckland.	Taranaki.	Wanganui.	Wellington.	Hawke's Bay.	Marlborough.	Nelson.	Grey.	Westland.	North Canterbury.	South Canterbury.	Otago.	Southland.	Totals.
1 to 9	32	28	34	83	8	224	120	56	81	55	..	52	9	782
10 " 14	355	49	107	116	91	48	173	61	62	189	47	311	72	1,681
15 " 19	897	117	196	285	114	50	325	16	122	376	100	402	236	3,236
20 " 40	4,100	753	1,659	1,405	588	238	974	199	61	1,883	875	2,110	1,874	16,719
41 " 50	935	449	595	308	505	139	398	92	137	1,046	303	711	670	6,288
51 " 70	2,117	178	986	887	230	122	455	114	54	599	510	1,539	728	8,519
71 " 90	644	402	454	498	545	..	461	243	161	1,353	326	1,086	745	6,918
91 " 120	1,691	215	714	619	660	218	318	1,139	110	844	765	7,293
121 " 150	939	..	786	788	425	283	143	560	..	543	270	4,737
151 " 170	774	154	..	327	319	151	156	312	158	317	..	2,668
171 " 200	897	174	192	382	348	546	186	195	751	3,671
201 " 250	1,530	..	819	652	221	..	220	202	461	872	204	1,154	416	6,751
251 " 275	263	..	516	255	537	..	251	256	..	270	..	2,343
276 " 330	317	..	319	311	285	284	315	909	285	3,025
331 " 390	1,116	339	1,093	725	693	333	1,103	..	5,402
391 " 420	406	408	832	420	410	..	2,471
421 " 480	1,336	466	..	921	472	..	1,772	..	850	..	5,817
481 " 510	1,473	495	..	1,009	..	2,977
511 " 570	3,195	532	551	2,084	..	6,362
571 " 600	588	580	1,168
601 " 660	3,147	630	626	624	628	627	6,282
661 " 690	674	680	..	1,354
691 " 750
751 " 780	755	759	1,514
781 " 840	786	807	1,593
841 " 870
871 " 930
931 " 960	941	941
961 " 1020	981	981
1021 " 1050
Totals ..	23,968	3,324	8,874	12,346	6,842	1,784	4,682	1,455	1,139	16,750	4,511	17,795	8,028	111,498

EXHIBIT No. 117.

CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOLS FOR MR. HILL'S SCHEME (EXHIBIT 100).

[Taken from school returns for December Quarter, 1900.]

NUMBER OF SCHOOLS IN EACH DISTRICT ACCORDING TO WORKING AVERAGES.

1. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS in each Grade.

Working Averages, Dec. 1900.	Auckland.	Taranaki.	Wanganui.	Wellington.	Hawke's Bay.	Marlborough.	Nelson.	Grey.	Westland.	North Canterbury.	South Canterbury.	Otago.	Southland.	Totals.
1 to 20	97	17	27	42	18	46	61	14	26	46	10	60	23	487
21 " 30	80	15	30	28	7	4	18	4	1	45	18	31	40	321
31 " 45	66	14	30	24	15	5	19	4	2	32	18	46	35	310
46 " 75	47	9	29	16	13	4	14	4	3	28	11	35	18	231
76 " 110	18	6	7	10	7	1	4	2	2	19	4	17	11	108
111 " 140	8	..	8	7	4	2	2	5	..	4	5	45
141 " 175	9	2	..	3	6	2	2	5	1	4	1	35
176 " 235	10	..	5	5	1	..	1	1	2	6	2	3	6	42
236 " 270	2	..	2	1	1	..	1	1	..	4	..	12
271 " 300	1	..	1	..	1	1	..	2	1	7
301 " 350	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	..	10
351 " 400	2	..	2	1	1	..	3	..	9
401 " 490	1	1	3	1	3	..	9
431 " 480	3	1	..	2	1	..	3	10
481 " 520	2	3	1	..	4	..	10
521 " 580	4	1	1	2	1	9
581 " 620	3	1	..	4
621 " 670	2	1	1	1	1	1	7
671 " 700	1	1	..	2
Over 700	1	1	4	6
Totals ..	354*	65	143†	147	77	65	124	30	36	201‡	68	222	142‡	1,674

* This includes 51 half-time schools, reckoned as 27. includes 8 half-time schools, reckoned as 4.

† This includes 2 half-time schools, reckoned as 1.

‡ This

2. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS in each Class.

Working Average, Dec. 1900.	Auckland.	Taranaki.	Wanganui.	Wellington.	Hawke's Bay.	Marlborough.	Nelson.	Grey.	Westland.	North Canterbury.	South Canterbury.	Otago.	Southland.	Totals.
1 to 20	97	17	27	42	18	46	61	14	26	46	10	60	23	487
21 " 30	80	15	30	28	7	4	18	4	1	45	18	31	40	321
31 " 45	66	14	30	24	15	5	19	4	2	32	18	46	35	310
46 " 75	47	9	29	16	13	4	14	4	3	28	11	35	18	231
76 " 110	18	6	7	10	7	1	4	2	2	19	4	17	11	108
111 " 175	17	2	8	10	10	4	4	10	1	8	6	80
176 " 300	12	..	8	6	3	..	3	1	2	8	2	9	7	61
301 " 520	8	2	4	7	1	1	1	1	..	9	3	11	..	48
521 " 620	7	1	1	3	1	13
621 & over	2	3	2	4	1	2	1	15
Totals ..	354*	65	143	147	77	65	124	30	36	201‡	68	222	142‡	1,674

* This includes 54 half-time schools, reckoned as 27. includes 8 half-time schools, reckoned as 4.

† This includes 2 half-time schools, reckoned as 1.

‡ This

EXHIBIT No. 118.

SUPPLEMENTARY SCALE (UNDER SCALE C) FOR SEPARATE BOYS', GIRLS', AND INFANT SCHOOLS (SCHOOLS 201-600).

	* Boys' Schools.				* Girls' Schools.				* Infant Schools.											
	Assistants.		P.Ts.		Assistants.		P.Ts.		Head-teacher.	Assistants.		P.Ts.								
201-250	190	150	120	2	140	110		90	2	165	125	90	85
251-280	200	155	125	3	150	115	100	3	175	130	90	85	3
281-330	205	160	125	100	..	3	155	120	105	85	..	3	180	140	100	90	85	3
331-390	210	160	130	105	85	3	160	120	110	90	85	3	185	145	110	100	90	85	..	3
391-420	215	165	130	105	85	4	165	125	110	95	85	4	190	150	115	105	95	85	..	4
421-480	220	165	135	110	90	4	170	125	115	95	85	4	195	150	115	105	95	90	85	4
481-510	225	170	135	110	90	5	175	130	115	100	85	5	200	155	120	110	100	95	85	5
511-570	230	170	140	115	100	5	180	130	120	100	90	5	205	155	120	110	100	95	90	5
571-600	235	175	140	115	100	6	185	135	120	105	90	6	210	160	125	115	105	100	95	6

* Salary for Head-teachers as under Scale C.

19th July, 1901.

G. HOGGEN.

WITNESSES EXAMINED.

WELLINGTON.		Page	Saturday, 11th May.		Page
<i>Monday, 22nd April, to Thursday, 25th April, 1901.</i>					
G. Hogben, M.A., Secretary for Education and Inspector-General of Schools	1		R. J. Paull, Chairman, Richmond School Committee ..	121	
BLLENHEIM.					
<i>Saturday, 27th April.</i>					
Capt. Baillie, M.L.C., Acting-Chairman, Marlborough Education Board	17		W. J. Boyce, teacher, Grey Downs	123	
R. McCallum, member, Marlborough Education Board ..	21		C. D. Hardie, president, Ashburton section, North Canterbury Educational Institute	127	
F. Birch, Chairman, Blenheim School Committee	26		R. B. Ryder, president, Oxford section, North Canterbury Educational Institute	129	
Miss M. C. Williams, teacher, Marshlands	27		L. Watson, teacher, Kirwée School	134	
C. C. Howard, head-teacher, Picton school, and president of the Marlborough Educational Institute	28		His Honour Mr. Justice Cooper, recently member of the Auckland Education Board	136	
D. A. Sturrock, headmaster, Blenheim Boys' School ..	34		<i>Monday, 13th May.</i>		
G. Wilmot, teacher, Waitohi School	36		E. Watkins, B.A., principal, Christchurch Normal School	140	
N. T. Pritchard, Chairman, Grovetown School	37		J. R. Brunt, Chairman, East Christchurch School Committee	144	
NELSON.					
<i>Tuesday, 30th April.</i>					
F. G. Gibbs, M.A., headmaster, Nelson Boys' School, and president of the Nelson Educational Institute ..	37		G. F. Henry, secretary, East Christchurch School Committee	144	
G. Talbot, Chairman, Nelson Education Board	41		T. Hughes, M.A., honorary secretary, North Canterbury Educational Institute	144	
T. Bailie, member, Nelson Education Board	45		T. S. Foster, M.A., headmaster, West Christchurch School	147	
H. Philips, member, Nelson Education Board	46		Miss Glanville, assistant, Woolston School	150	
Stead Ellis, secretary, Nelson Education Board	47		Miss Kitchingman, headmistress, Normal School, Christchurch	152	
G. A. Harkness, M.A., Chief Inspector, Nelson Education District	48		Mrs. Wilkinson, infant mistress, Riccarton School ..	153	
L. D. Easton, teacher, Lower Moutere	53		Miss Menzies, assistant, West Christchurch School ..	155	
Rev. J. P. Kempthorne, Chairman, Nelson School Committee	55		Mrs. Lissaman, Christchurch	156	
Rev. J. H. McKenzie, member, Nelson School Committee ..	59		Miss Glanville, evidence continued	159	
W. F. Worley, assistant master, Nelson Boys' School ..	62		C. D. Morris, Chairman, West Christchurch School Committee	159	
F. V. Knapp, assistant master, Nelson Boys' School ..	65		F. Rowley, first assistant, West Christchurch School ..	160	
Stead Ellis, evidence continued	66		H. C. Lane, evidence continued	161	
GREYMOUTH.					
<i>Saturday, 4th May.</i>					
S. R. Harris, Chairman, Grey Education Board	66		DUNEDIN.		
W. R. Kettle, member, Grey Education Board	69		<i>Thursday, 16th May.</i>		
J. Petrie, member, Grey Education Board	74		G. Hogben, M.A., evidence continued	605	
W. A. Rundle, president, Grey Educational Institute ..	77		Rev. P. B. Fraser, M.A., member, Otago Education Board	161	
H. Smith, B.A., honorary secretary, Grey Educational Institute	78		J. Mitchell, member, Otago Education Board	169	
F. W. Riemenschneider, secretary, Grey Education Board	82		P. G. Pryde, secretary, Otago Education Board	173	
A. A. Adams, headmaster, Greymouth District High School	82		<i>Friday, 17th May.</i>		
HOKITIKA.					
<i>Monday, 6th May.</i>					
A. A. Adams, evidence continued	83		P. G. Pryde, evidence continued	178	
J. McWhirter, Chairman, Westland Education Board ..	85		P. Goyen, Inspector of Schools, Otago District	179	
J. Grimmond, member, Westland Education Board ..	91		<i>Saturday, 18th May.</i>		
H. L. Michel, member, Westland Education Board ..	92		D. R. White, M.A., principal, Normal School, Dunedin ..	190	
A. J. Morton, B.A., Inspector of Schools and Secretary, Westland Education Board	94		W. E. Bastings, representing Oamaru Branch, Otago Educational Institute	196	
H. G. Wake, B.A., headmaster, Hokitika District High School, and president, Westland Educational Institute	97		W. G. Macdonald, president, Otago Educational Institute	200	
J. J. Henderson, headmaster, Arahura Road School, and honorary secretary, Westland Educational Institute	101		Miss Hooper, representing Otago Educational Institute	207	
Miss W. J. Aitken, assistant, Hokitika District High School	104		<i>Monday, 20th May.</i>		
W. D. Mackay, headmaster, Woodstock School	105		Miss E. Wilkinson, representing Otago Educational Institute	209	
CHRISTCHURCH.					
<i>Friday, 10th May.</i>					
H. C. Lane, secretary, North Canterbury Education Board	106		C. Young, representing Otago Educational Institute ..	212	
L. B. Wood, M.A., Inspector of Schools, North Canterbury District	112		A. Marshall, representing Otago Educational Institute ..	214	
			C. G. Smeaton, representing assistant masters	218	
			J. Reid, B.A., representing assistant masters	221	
			H. Harroway, Chairman, Otago Education Board	224	
			A. Davidson, representing Otago Educational Institute ..	227	
			W. S. Fitzgerald, Inspector of Schools, Otago District ..	228	
			P. Goyen, evidence continued	233	
			D. R. White, evidence continued	233	
			INVERCARGILL.		
			<i>Wednesday, 22nd May.</i>		
			J. Cowie, Chairman, Southland Education Board	234	
			J. Neill, secretary, Southland Education Board	235	
			W. H. Clark, B.A., honorary secretary, Southland Educational Institute	242	
			G. R. George, member, Southland Education Board	250	

<i>Thursday, 23rd May.</i>		<i>Page</i>	<i>Tuesday, 11th June.</i>		<i>Page</i>
J. Hendry, B.A., Inspector of Schools, Southland District	253	Dr. J. Smyth, evidence continued	396	G. Grant, representing teachers of the Palmerston North District	398
W. McAllister, member, Southland Education Board	258	J. Aitken, B.A., representing the Wanganui Educational Institute	413	J. K. Law, representing the Wanganui Educational Institute	415
Miss J. B. Hamilton, assistant, Nightcaps School	263	G. H. Espiner, representing country schools of the Palmerston North District	417	A. A. Browne, secretary, Wanganui Education Board	419
W. G. Mehaffey, headmaster, Middle School, Invercargill	264	<i>NAPIER.</i>			
A. Clark, assistant, Winton School	268	<i>Thursday, 13th June.</i>			
C. W. G. Selby, representing assistant teachers	269	Rev. Dr. D. Sidey, Chairman, Hawke's Bay Education Board	420	T. Tanner, member of the Hawke's Bay Education Board	425
J. Porteous, M.A., assistant, South School, Invercargill	272	G. T. Fannin, secretary, Hawke's Bay Education Board	433	Miss J. C. Brown, mistress, Napier Main School	434
<i>TIMARU.</i>		<i>Friday, 14th June.</i>			
<i>Monday, 27th May.</i>		J. D. Watson, M.A., president of the Hawke's Bay Educational Institute	437	J. A. Smith, B.A., representing the Hawke's Bay Educational Institute	449
A. Bell, M.A., assistant secretary and assistant inspector, South Canterbury District	272	J. C. Westall, member of the Hawke's Bay Education Board	455	J. Hislop, representing assistant teachers	457
W. B. Howell, Chairman, South Canterbury Education Board	278	Miss Burden, head-teacher, Kumeroa School	459	R. B. Holmes, headmaster, Havelock North School	460
Rev. G. Barclay, member, South Canterbury Education Board	280	J. Caughley, headmaster, Kaikora North School	464	<i>WELLINGTON.</i>	
J. G. Gow, M.A., Inspector of Schools, South Canterbury District	285	<i>Monday, 17th June.</i>			
J. A. Johnson, M.A., president, South Canterbury Educational Institute	289	C. Watson, B.A., representing the Wellington Educational Institute	467	A. Erskine, representing assistant masters	479
<i>Tuesday, 28th May.</i>		J. A. Erskine, representing assistant masters	479	J. C. Webb, B.A., representing assistant masters	484
J. A. Valentine, B.A., secretary, South Canterbury Educational Institute	293	Miss Lorimer, M.A., representing the Wellington Educational Institute	486	<i>Saturday, 22nd June.</i>	
J. P. Kalaugher, teacher, Seadown School	296	Mrs. C. A. Francis, headmistress of the Mount Cook Infant School	491	F. Bennett, representing the Wellington Educational Institute	495
M. McLeod, B.A., head-teacher, Temuka School	298	Miss Myers, assistant, Roseneath	507	<i>Monday, 24th June.</i>	
Rev. G. Barclay, evidence continued	Miss Craig, representing the Wellington Educational Institute	510	W. T. Grundy, headmaster, Clyde Quay School, Wellington	517
<i>AUCKLAND.</i>		T. H. Gill, M.A., LL.B., secretary, New Zealand Educational Institute, and headmaster, Newtown School	527	<i>Tuesday, 25th June.</i>	
<i>Saturday, 1st June.</i>		C. R. Joplin, headmaster, Wadestown School	538	J. Robertson, member of the Wellington Education Board	542
T. U. Wells, president of the Auckland Educational Institute	300	<i>Wednesday, 26th June.</i>			
F. Brown, representing first assistant masters	306	J. J. Pilkington, headmaster, Porirua School	553	<i>Thursday, 27th June.</i>	
J. D. McNaughton, representing teachers of the Pukekohe district	307	J. J. Pilkington, evidence continued	564	A. Dorset, secretary, Wellington Education Board	569
J. Armstrong, representing headmasters, Auckland	309	J. R. Blair, Chairman, Wellington Education Board	575	<i>Friday, 28th June.</i>	
A. Taylor, representing medium-sized schools	316	A. Dorset, examination continued	589	T. R. Fleming, M.A., LL.B., Inspector of Schools, Wellington District	590
Miss Shrewsbury, M.A., representing assistant mistresses	319	H. B. Kirk, M.A., Assistant Inspector of Native Schools	597	R. Lee, Chief Inspector of Schools, Wellington District	600
<i>Monday, 3rd June.</i>		<i>Saturday, 29th June.</i>			
W. R. C. Walker, representing first assistant masters	321	G. Hogben, M.A., evidence continued	606		
H. Campbell, barrister, Auckland	328				
W. N. McIntosh, headmaster, Onehunga School	330				
G. Squirrell, Chairman, Auckland School Committee	333				
Miss Newman, representing infant mistresses	336				
G. Large, teacher, Waiuku	338				
Vincent E. Rice, secretary, Auckland Education Board	340				
<i>Tuesday, 4th June.</i>					
L. J. Bagnall, Chairman, Auckland Education Board	350				
D. Petrie, M.A., Chief Inspector of Schools, Auckland District	362				
R. Hobbs, ex-Chairman, Auckland Education Board	362				
O. Mays, Chairman, Devonport School Committee	363				
<i>NEW PLYMOUTH.</i>					
<i>Thursday, 6th June.</i>					
D. McAllum, Chairman, Taranaki Education Board	363				
G. W. Potts, representing the Taranaki Educational Institute	367				
W. E. Spencer, M.A., B.Sc., Inspector of Schools, Taranaki District	370				
<i>Friday, 7th June.</i>					
P. S. Whitcombe, secretary, Taranaki Education Board	378				
H. Allsworth, member of the Taranaki Education Board	380				
H. Dempsey, representing the Taranaki Educational Institute	384				
<i>WANGANUI.</i>					
<i>Monday, 10th June.</i>					
G. S. Bridge, Chairman, Wanganui Education Board	386				
Dr. J. Smyth, Chief Inspector of Schools, Wanganui District	391				

A LIST OF STATEMENTS RECEIVED.

1. Mr. F. Alley, Amberley.
2. Mr. James Smith, Milburn.
3. Mr. S. C. Owen, East Christchurch.
4. Mr. W. Winchester, Ross.
5. Mr. A. C. Maxwell, Dromore.
6. Mr. T. H. Newlyn, Christchurch.
7. Mr. W. Macandrew, Mataura.
8. Mr. A. M. Rust, Auckland District.
9. Mr. A. Bramley, Greenpark, Auckland.
10. Mr. A. W. Tindall, Blue Spur, Otago.
11. Mr. H. von Blaramberg, Palmerston North.
12. Mr. J. H. Burnard, Taieri Beach.
13. Mr. James Moir, Pukewai, Otago.
14. Mr. F. Jameson, Clevedon, Wairoa South.
15. Mr. G. W. Murray, Kaukapakapa.
16. Miss Kate Baldwin and eleven other assistant mistresses, North Canterbury.
17. Mr. H. B. Lusk, B.A., representing graduates and undergraduates, Auckland.
18. Mr. E. J. Darby, representing second and third assistants, Auckland.
19. Mr. A. Matthews, Shag Point.
20. Mr. W. Bannerman, Kyeburn.
21. Mr. J. L. Scott, Parnell.
22. Mr. D. O'Donoghue, Mount Roskill, Auckland.
23. Mr. B. Cronin, Auckland.
24. Mr. T. W. Leys, Editor *Star*, Auckland.
25. Mr. F. P. Burton, B.A., Dargaville.
26. Mr. K. Williamson, Chairman, Kokonga School Committee.
27. Mr. C. Brown, secretary, College Street School Committee Palmerston North.
28. Mr. D. L. Smart, Tuakau.
29. Mr. H. J. Howard, honorary secretary, Marlborough Educational Institute.
30. Mr. C. M. McKenzie, Hastwell.
31. Mr. A. A. Adams, Greymouth.
32. Mr. W. Rapson, Whangarata.
33. Mr. J. Taylor, Chairman, Woodville School Committee.
34. Mr. E. K. Mulgan, M.A., Inspector of Schools, Auckland.
35. Mr. F. T. Evans, assistant, Normal School, Christchurch.
36. Mr. T. Holden, Braemore, Hunterville.
37. The Secretary, Marlborough Educational Institute (through Education Board).
38. Mr. F. Neve, M.A. (for teachers of the Buller district), Westport.
39. Mr. A. W. Shrimpton, M.A., Christchurch.
40. Mr. R. B. Holmes, Havelock North.
41. Miss C. Henderson and other officers and members of the North Canterbury Women Teachers' Association.
42. Mr. W. F. Ford, Wellington.
43. Mr. N. S. Law, representing third assistants, Auckland.
44. Mr. H. H. Daniel Wily, Buckland, Auckland.
45. Mr. J. C. Mill, Long Bay and Greenhithe, half time, Auckland.
46. Mr. D. McNeil, Waihopai, Invercargill.
47. Mr. E. Cowles, Richmond Nelson.
48. Mr. J. N. Marsden, Waikiekie.
49. J. N. Dodds, B.A., Napier.

LIST OF EXHIBITS.

	Pag		Page
1. The Commission. (See p. i.)		25. Statement presented by the Westland Educational Institute. (Not printed.)	
2. Scale (A) of staffs and salaries (Mr. Hogben)	617	26. Regulations (staffs and salaries), North Canterbury Education Board. (Not printed.)	
3. Scale relating to boys', girls', and infant schools, attached to A (Exhibit 2)	622	27. Regulations (incidental expenses), North Canterbury Education Board. (Not printed.)	
4. Tables showing (a) the number of schools in each district according to working average; (b) the aggregate of working averages for December quarter, 1900 (Mr. Hogben). (Not printed.)		28. Regulations (pupil teachers), North Canterbury Education Board. (Not printed.)	
5. Financial summary, December quarter, 1900 (Mr. Hogben). (Not printed.)		29. Comparative statement of expenditure (1900), North Canterbury District (Mr. H. C. Lane). (Not printed.)	
6. A table of comparative staffing (Mr. Hogben). (Not printed.)		30. Annual reports (1900), North Canterbury Education Board. (Not printed.)	
7. A table of maximum salaries of headmasters (Mr. Hogben). (Not printed.)		31. Regulations, Otago Education Board. (Not printed.)	
8. Schools over 20 in average attendance without residences (Mr. Hogben)	622	32. Annual reports (1900), Otago Education Board. (Not printed.)	
9. Summary, showing the distribution of a £4 capitation according to Mr. Hogben's Scale A. (Not printed.)		33. Regulations, Southland Education Board. (Not printed.)	
10. Summary of Boards' expenses for the years 1898, 1899, 1900	622	34. Regulations (pupil teachers), Southland Education Board. (Not printed.)	
11. Regulations of the Marlborough Education Board. (Not printed.)		35. Annual reports (1900), Southland Education Board. (Not printed.)	
12. Inspector's report (1900), Marlborough District. (Not printed.)		36. Regulations, South Canterbury Education Board. (Not printed.)	
13. Report of the Marlborough Education Board to the Hon. Minister of Education. (Not printed.)		37. Regulations, Wellington Education Board. (Not printed.)	
14. Statement presented by J. Harre, Elton. (Not printed.)		38. Annual reports (1900), Wellington Education Board. (Not printed.)	
15. Regulations, Nelson Education Board. (Not printed.)		39. Regulations, Wanganui Education Board. (Not printed.)	
16. Statement presented by the Nelson Educational Institute (Mr. F. Gibb). (Not printed.)		40. Regulations (pupil teachers), Wanganui Education Board. (Not printed.)	
17. Regulations, Grey Education Board. (Not printed.)		41. Regulations, Taranaki Education Board. (Not printed.)	
18. Inspector's report (1900), Grey District. (Not printed.)		42. Regulations, Hawke's Bay Education Board. (Not printed.)	
19. Statement of teachers, salaries, &c., for the year 1900, Grey District. (Not printed.)		43. Return of expenses, 1898, 1899, 1900, Nelson Education Board. (Not printed.)	
20. Regulations, Westland Education Board. (Not printed.)		44. Amounts payable to School Committees for incidental expenses, 1899 (Mr. Hogben). (Not printed.)	
21. Annual reports (1900), Westland Education Board. (Not printed.)		45. Regulations, Auckland Education Board. (Not printed.)	
22. Return of teachers, salaries, &c., March quarter, 1901, Otago District. (Not printed.)		46. Statement of incidental expenses, East Christchurch School Committee (Mr. Brunt). (Not printed.)	
23. Return of expenses, 1898, 1899, and 1900, Westland Education Board. (Not printed.)		47. Statement presented by North Canterbury Educational Institute (Mr. Hughes). (Not printed.)	
24. Circular, relating to district high schools, issued by the Education Department. (Not printed.)			

Page	Page
48. Return of expenses, 1898, 1899, 1900, North Canterbury Education Board. (Not printed.)	84. Return of expenses, 1898, 1899, 1900, Marlborough Education Board. (Not printed.)
49. Suggested amendments to the proposed scale (Mr. L. B. Wood). (Not printed.)	85. Return of teachers in schools over 500 on average attendance, South Canterbury District. (Not printed.)
50. An alternative scale (B) (Mr. Hogben) 623	86. Return of teachers, salaries, &c., for the March quarter, 1901, Westland District. (Not printed.)
51. A scale of staffs and salaries (Mr. P. B. Fraser). (Not printed.)	87. Return of expenses, 1898, 1899, 1900, Wanganui Education Board. (Not printed.)
52. A statement of allowances to Committees, Otago District (Mr. P. G. Pryde). (Not printed.)	88. Return of appointments of teachers and cost of relieving-teachers for the years 1899 and 1900, South Canterbury District. (Not printed.)
53. Amounts raised locally by Committees, Otago District (Mr. P. G. Pryde). (Not printed.)	89. Return of appointments of teachers and cost of relieving-teachers for the years 1899 and 1900, North Canterbury District. (Not printed.)
54. An estimate of receipts and expenditure for the Otago District under the suggested scale. (Not printed.)	90. Return of teachers, salaries, &c., for the March quarter, 1901, North Canterbury. (Not printed.)
55. The report of the Committee of the Otago Educational Institute. (Not printed.)	91. Maps of the various education districts, with position of schools. (Not printed.)
56. Comparative statement of the salaries of first assistants (Mr. Smeaton). (Not printed.)	92. Statement abstracted from the London School Board Report for 1898 (Mr. C. Watson) 624
57. Comparison of the salaries of teachers with those of Civil servants (Mr. Reid). (Not printed.)	93. Return of schools supplied with caretakers' cottages, North Canterbury District. (Not printed.)
58. Table showing the salaries of the Otago teachers, (a) at present, (b) as recommended by the Otago Board in connection with the supplementary grant (Mr. Harroway, Chairman). (Not printed.)	94. Return of teachers in schools over 500 average attendance, North Canterbury District. (Not printed.)
59. Return of expenses, 1898, 1899, 1900, of Otago Education Board. (Not printed.)	95. Return of teachers in schools over 500 average attendance, Hawke's Bay District. (Not printed.)
60. Comparative table of staffs (Mr. Goyen) 623	96. Return of teachers in schools over 500 average attendance, Southland District. (Not printed.)
61. Statement of certificates held by teachers of the colony. (Not printed.)	97. Statement of the range of salaries for similar positions in the several education districts (Mr. Grundy) 625
62. The Supplementary Commission granting an extension of time for thirty days. (Not printed.)	98. Return of teachers, salaries, &c., for the March quarter, 1901, Southland District. (Not printed.)
63. Return of teachers, salaries, &c., for the March quarter, 1901, South Canterbury District. (Not printed.)	99. Return of the amount transferred from the General Account to the Building Fund during the six years ending 1900, Marlborough District. (Not printed.)
64. Return of teachers, salaries, &c., for the March quarter, 1901, Marlborough District. (Not printed.)	100. Scheme of staffs and salaries, presented by Mr. H. Hill, B.A. 625
65. Return of teachers, salaries, &c., for the March quarter, 1901, Hawke's Bay District. (Not printed.)	101. Return of teachers in schools over 500 in average attendance, Otago District. (Not printed.)
66. Statement presented by the Chairman of the Auckland City School Committee. (Not printed.)	102. Statement of the annual cost of the Technical School, Wellington, from 1891 to 1900 (Mr. Dorset). (Not printed.)
67. Return of expenses, 1898, 1899, 1900, Auckland Education Board. (Not printed.)	103. Statement of the annual cost of cookery classes, Wellington (Mr. Dorset). (Not printed.)
68. Return of teachers, salaries, &c., for the March quarter, 1901, Wanganui District. (Not printed.)	104. Return of teachers in schools over 500 in average attendance, Wellington District. (Not printed.)
69. Return of teachers, salaries, &c., for the March quarter, 1901, Nelson District. (Not printed.)	105. Return of appointments of teachers and cost of relieving-teachers, Wellington District. (Not printed.)
70. Return of expenses, 1898, 1899, 1900, Taranaki Education Board. (Not printed.)	106. Three tables relating to the issue of teachers' certificates (Mr. H. B. Kirk) 627
71. Return of teachers, salaries, &c., for the March quarter, 1901, Wellington District. (Not printed.)	107. Complete scheme (C) of staffs and salaries on the basis of a £4 capitation (Mr. Hogben) 629
72. Return of appointments of teachers and cost of relieving-teachers, 1899 and 1900, Nelson District. (Not printed.)	108. Scale and statements by the Inspectors and secretary, North Canterbury District. (Not printed.)
73. Return of expenses, 1898, 1899, 1900, Southland Education Board. (Not printed.)	109. Return of expenses, 1898, 1899, 1900, Wellington Education Board. (Not printed.)
74. Return of appointments of teachers and cost of relieving-teachers, 1899 and 1900, Marlborough District. (Not printed.)	110. Scheme (D) of staffs and salaries on the basis of a capitation of £4 5s. (Mr. Hogben) 630
75. Return of teachers, salaries, &c., for the March quarter, 1901, Taranaki District. (Not printed.)	111. Return of teachers of schools over 500 in average attendance, Auckland District. (Not printed.)
76. Return of appointments of teachers and cost of relieving teachers, 1899 and 1900, Westland District. (Not printed.)	112. Return of the appointments of teachers and the cost of relieving-teachers for the years 1899 and 1900, Auckland District. (Not printed.)
77. Return of appointment of teachers and cost of relieving-teachers, 1899 and 1900, Hawke's Bay District. (Not printed.)	113. Return of teachers, salaries, &c., for the March quarter, 1901, Auckland District. (Not printed.)
78. Return of appointments of teachers and cost of relieving-teachers, 1899 and 1900, Otago District. (Not printed.)	114. Return of appointments of teachers and cost of relieving-teachers for the years 1899 and 1900, Grey District. (Not printed.)
79. Return of expenses, 1898, 1899, 1900, Hawke's Bay Education Board. (Not printed.)	115. Return of expenses, 1898, 1899, 1900, Grey Education Board. (Not printed.)
80. Return of amounts transferred from the General Account to the Building Fund during the years 1885-1901 by the Hawke's Bay Education Board. (Not printed.)	116. Table showing the number of schools and number of pupils in each grade classified according to Mr. Hogben's scales C and D (Exhibits 107 and 110) 631
81. Return of appointments of teachers and cost of relieving-teachers for the years 1899 and 1900, Taranaki District. (Not printed.)	117. Table showing the number of schools in each grade classified according to Mr. Hill's scheme (Exhibit 100) 632
82. Return of expenses, 1898, 1899, 1900, South Canterbury Education Board. (Not printed.)	118. Scale relating to boys', girls', and infant schools attached to Mr. Hogben's Scale C (Exhibit 107) 632
83. Return of appointments of teachers and cost of relieving-teachers for the years 1899 and 1900, Southland District. (Not printed.)	

Approximate Cost of Paper—Preparation, not given; printing (4,375 copies), £762 10s

By Authority: JOHN MACKAY, Government Printer, Wellington.