

but the difficulty is in doing it all at once. The only way to do it is by bond, and that means security, of course. I think that might be kept in view; but what we want now is to get hold of the teachers; we do not want to make the conditions too stiff at first.

40. *Mr. Fowlds.*]—There is one stipulation that has been suggested which we think might be added, and that is that in addition to the declaration of intention to become a teacher in a public or secondary school in the colony, candidates should also bind themselves down to continue in the district from which they come?—I am against that.

41. How are you going to get over the difficulty of Southland and other districts similarly circumstanced having to send all their pupil-teachers away to another place to be trained, where they may be picked up by the Education Board there and never go back to the district that has supplied them?—That might be a slight difficulty in the case of local control; but I do not think the difficulty likely to arise. Two years is not such a very long time for a teacher to be away. If they are not appointed in one district they will be in another. The salaries are the same everywhere.

42. *Mr. Hardy.*] With regard to Mr. Fowlds's question as to a boy going from Southland to Otago and the Otago people getting him, I think it would be a good thing even if the Otago people did get hold of him, because this might enable the Southland people to get an Otago teacher and there might be an interchange?—There would necessarily be an interchange if you trained only the number required.

43. Subsection (c) provides that a candidate "shall give satisfactory evidence as to health, character, and ability to teach." Would you approve of a doctor being appointed at each of these centres to examine the pupil-teachers before they are appointed?—I think it would be a very good thing, but I do not think you need appoint a doctor. The Local Health Officer would do the examining. He does it for the Government Departments at a fee of 10s. 6d., and if you appointed a special doctor you would have to pay him a retaining-fee as well.

44. It has perhaps not come within your knowledge that we in North Canterbury have asked for the certificate of a doctor, and we have found that very often the family doctor will give a certificate that is perhaps not everything that the Board desires. In order to get over that difficulty would it not be wise to employ a doctor whose fee would be 7s. 6d. and who would not require a retaining-fee, because he would have a good number of young people going to him?—I suggest that the Local Health Officer be employed. He is generally a man of some standing, and he is pretty rigid. We find from experience that it is fairly satisfactory to get him.

45. Would you approve of the course which has been adopted by the North Canterbury Board of Education, that is, to employ a doctor who has been examining for the Government Life Insurance Department and who has himself been a schoolmaster and knows exactly what is wanted? To this man the North Canterbury Board expects that every pupil-teacher shall go to be examined. Would you approve of such a course as that?—I think he would be a suitable man, but the Civil Service candidates are at present examined by the Local Officer of Health, and I do not see any reason to choose between one and the other. I think the Government Life Insurance man would be just as good. I approve of an independent officer examining the candidates.

46. Not the family doctor?—I should not call it satisfactory evidence unless you got somebody that the Government or the Board nominated itself—a person not nominated by the candidate.

47. You know that it is the custom at the present time for Boards to accept certificates from any medical officer?—Some Boards do, but some require an independent officer's certificate.

48. *Mr. Baume.*] With regard to the recommendation as to local control or central control: The communications that you have received from the Boards have been subsequent to your interviews with, say, the Chairman, in Auckland?—Yes.

49. That is to say, although you told us the Chairman himself favoured central control, the Board as a whole favours local control?—Yes, that is so.

50. Subsequent to your interview?—That is what I gather.

51. Auckland, Wellington, North Canterbury, Otago, and Taranaki favour local control where the four colleges are established?—I do not know that Taranaki favours local control.

52. It is stated here that "Taranaki suggests control by Education Boards if four colleges established, but by Department if only one established"?—Yes.

53. There is not one single Board that favours absolute central control?—What about Southland? Westland, South Canterbury, and Southland, as I understand, favour control by the Department with representation by the Boards.

54. There is not one of them that favours the matter being left entirely to the Department. It says here that those three Boards "favour dual control"?—Yes; that is the way in which it is expressed—the colleges to be under the Department with representation by the Boards.

55. What do you mean by central control with representation by the Board? Do you mean simply a Board of Advice?—That is what I understand.

56. What does this mean in this document?—It means that the training college should, in the opinion of the Westland, South Canterbury, and Southland Boards, be under the Department.

57. What is "dual control"? Does "dual control" mean dual control or does it not?—Before expressing a very definite opinion on that I should like to see the communications. I know perfectly well the opinions of the Boards as they were expressed to me in two of those places, but I do not know the opinion of the Westland one.

58. You are not prepared to say what this means?—No; I should like to see the details, but that was the way I took it. Perhaps I am reading into their letter what I know of in other ways, but I am sure that that is what they mean. It is quite natural that the Boards in the four centres should want local control.