

107. *The Chairman.*] Have you considered whether it would be wise to reduce the amount paid to Boards—whether there is a possibility of working the Act more economically, having regard to efficiency?—I do not think you can combine the same extent of efficiency with a lessened expenditure. With a lessened expenditure you may have a certain amount of efficiency, but the result would not be as good as at present. I do not think our Board wastes anything of its expenditure. There are some large items of expenditure besides the amount paid to teachers. The amount paid to School Committees is £6,000, and a number of repairs of various kinds have to be paid for, but these amounts are for necessary work.

108. *Dr. Fitchett.*] Do you think the number of Boards might be reduced?—That is a matter of which I am not competent to judge.

109. Do you think that the salaries of teachers are excessive?—No.

110. Or the Inspectors?—I think the Inspectors give themselves a great deal of work more than they need to do.

111. You do not think they are overpaid?—Certainly not overpaid; but, from mistaken notions as to their duties, they give themselves a great amount of unnecessary trouble.

112. Can you say whether the number of Inspectors might be reduced?—I cannot say.

113. *The Chairman.*] Do you think that, if the teacher had a smaller salary, considering the cost of living, it is not possible—even with this smaller salary—to place him in as good a position as he occupied some nine or ten years ago?—Yes.

114. *Mr. M. J. S. Mackenzie.*] Admitting that there is no waste in the expenditure of the Otago Education Board, you do not go the length of saying that there is no room for economy?—No; I do not.

115. Do you think the teachers would resist the lowering of their salaries?—I think they rather expect some alteration.

116. Would it be going too far to say that they would entertain a feeling of acquiescence?—I do not think that, but I do not think there would be any rebellion. The fact is that I can form no reliable opinion on that subject; the only means I have of forming such an opinion is by reading the reports of their meetings.

117. *Dr. Fitchett.*] Are you aware that the bulk of the teachers receive less than £200 a year, and none more than £500?—I am aware of the fact that out of five hundred teachers in the Otago Education District only thirty receive over £200 a year.

118. Does that include bonuses?—No.

119. Do you know whether teachers in New Zealand are paid higher salaries, relatively, than the other colonies?—No.

120. *Hon. Mr. Fisher.*] Do I understand you that you have no means of making a comparison?—I have not.

121. Nor any means of comparison with the salaries of teachers in England and Scotland?—No; I have not.

122. *Mr. M. J. S. Mackenzie.*] Have you found any difficulty in getting certificated teachers?—Not as a rule; there has been difficulty occasionally in outlying places.

123. But taking the schools all round you have had no difficulty in getting certificated teachers?—No.

124. As a matter of fact the supply is plentiful?—Yes. Perhaps the Committee would allow me to make a remark as to the way in which the teachers are paid. There are two ways in which they are paid: one is according to the average attendance at the school, the other is by means of bonus. The word "bonus" is a most unhappy one to use, for it suggests that this is something like a gift or present to the teacher, and forms no part of his regular salary. That is a mistaken idea. The "bonus" is simply a moiety of his salary, the amount being divided—one part is given according to average attendance, and the other according to merit and seniority. I think it would be disastrous if the "bonus" were taken away. The word is an unfortunate one, and ought never to have been used in the way it has been used with reference to payment of teachers. It is really the means provided for securing the culture and intelligence of the teacher-class. If you reduce the teacher to a mere craftsman, who will teach children A B C and other lessons as if by rote, you can do so, but you will then have a very inferior educational system. But if the teachers are to be of any real value in educating the children of the community, it appears to me that such consideration justifies the method of payment adopted by the Otago and some other Boards. But I would do away with the word "bonus" altogether.

125. *Hon. Mr. Fisher.*] Are most of your headmasters provided with residences?—I think all our headmasters are provided with residences.

126. *Mr. Allen.*] When you mentioned the amount of salary paid to teachers, did you include bonus?—No; I did not.

127. *Hon. Mr. Fisher.*] And you did not include the consideration of the teacher having a free house?—No.

*Witness:* With regard to question 4, I would simply say that the number of pass examinations should be reduced. My reason for this is that I think it would be a wise thing to do away with written examinations; let them be confined to writing itself and arithmetic, which require you to have written questions; if you like, the pass examination might include drawing. Knowledge of other subjects can be very well tested by class examination. That is the way in which most men of ripe years have been educated. How many are there who have any experience of the benefit to be derived from written examination? But some of these class subjects ought to receive very much more attention than they do. Some months ago the Otago Board adopted the plan of sending a circular to the teachers, in which they were directed to give special attention, not to pass subjects only, but to the efficiency of the school in class subjects and the additional subjects, such as singing and some others,