

1883.

VICTORIA.

EDUCATION COMMISSION.

SECOND REPORT

OF

THE ROYAL COMMISSION APPOINTED TO INQUIRE INTO AND
REPORT UPON THE ADMINISTRATION, ORGANIZATION, AND
GENERAL CONDITION OF THE EXISTING SYSTEM OF PUBLIC
INSTRUCTION.

PRESENTED TO BOTH HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT BY HIS EXCELLENCY'S COMMAND.

By Authority :

JOHN FERRES, GOVERNMENT PRINTER, MELBOURNE.

APPROXIMATE COST OF REPORT.

Preparation—Not given.
Printing (1,075 copies) ..

£ s. d.

14 10 0



SECOND REPORT.

To His Excellency the Governor.

We, Your Excellency's Commissioners, whose hands and seals are hereunto set, having been appointed by Your Excellency to inquire into the whole administration, organization, and general condition of the existing system of Public Instruction in this colony, with the object of ascertaining its deficiencies, improving its working, and, while retaining its efficiency, providing the most economic mode of further extending its operation, do most humbly submit to Your Excellency the following, our Second Report :—

On the 1st of May 1882 we reported to Your Excellency as follows :—

“ Before we had proceeded far with the inquiry we were commanded by Your Excellency to make, our attention was directed to the fact that the Education Department possesses an Architect's Branch, whose duty it is to construct and repair school buildings under the superintendence and control of the Department. This privilege, which no other department of the State possesses, naturally led us to investigate the advantages or otherwise of such a system. Accordingly we somewhat interrupted the course of our inquiry in order to give Your Excellency our opinion on this important subject. Having made the fullest investigation, we have come to the conclusion to recommend Your Excellency to transfer the duties now performed by the Architect's Branch of the Education Department to the Public Works Department, to which we think such duties more naturally appertain. The chief argument advanced in favour of the retention of the present system was that the Education Department by this means is enabled to have repairs and other necessary works effected more expeditiously than could otherwise be done. We, your Commissioners, do not think that this contention is borne out by the evidence adduced from the officers of the Department whom we have examined, whatever may have been the case when the present Act came into operation. On the other hand, we are of opinion that, if our recommendation is carried out, greater economy, without any loss of efficiency, will thereby be promoted, besides the advantages which a concentration of the work of inspection and supervision of all State buildings will undoubtedly confer.

“ If the transfer now recommended is effected, we think that the expenditure upon the construction, repairs, and supervision of school buildings should be shown separately and distinctly in the accounts of the Public Works Department. An approximate amount will effect the object in view, namely, ascertaining from year to year the total cost to the State of the Educational system of the colony.”

Since that Report we have directed our attention more particularly to the teaching branch of the Education Department, and after a lengthy investigation have decided to again address Your Excellency on three subjects, all of which, we think, of urgent importance, namely—first, the appointment and promotion of teachers; secondly, night schools; and thirdly, corporal punishment of scholars.

I.—APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION OF TEACHERS.

The proper instruction of the young is a subject requiring such peculiar qualities in the teacher that we think it unwise that a system should be allowed to exist which is without those safeguards which are necessary to prevent incompetent or even immoral teachers from being either appointed or promoted, to the prejudice of those possessing the intellectual and moral qualifications so essential to the office of a teacher.

The evidence given before us on this subject, though almost entirely confined to the officers of the Department, shows that a state of things exists which would seriously affect the teachers and the pupils, morally, physically, and intellectually, if it were to be continued. The system referred to is the existing system of political patronage, which permits the Minister of Public Instruction to make appointments of teachers without, and even contrary to, the recommendations of those better qualified to judge of the teacher's attainments, namely, the permanent heads of the Department.

From returns furnished to us by the Department (*see* Appendix A), and which extend from the year 1873 (when the present Education Act came into operation) to 1882 inclusive, it appears that, during the years 1877, 1878, 1879, 1880, and 1881, appointments made by the Minister were as follow:—Contrary to the recommendation of the permanent officers of the Department : 1877, 6 ; 1878, 4 ; 1879, 8 ; 1880, 13 ; and 1881, 24. Without the recommendation of the permanent officers of the Department : 1877, 57 ; 1878, 150 ; 1879, 211 ; 1880, 100 ; 1881, 160.

Though the returns show that, prior to 1877, the evil existed in a very much less degree, and although since 1881 it may be said to have been gradually abandoned, yet, until the power of making such appointments is removed from the Minister, and some fixed system of making appointments and promotions is established, the evil may be revived on an equal scale with that of the years to which we have drawn special attention.

We therefore think it our duty to recommend Your Excellency to take such steps that a recurrence to a similar course would be impossible. The existence of such a system, under which one man may appoint any one to such an important and responsible office as that of a teacher of the young, and make the appointment arbitrarily, without assigning any reasons, and without putting down on the face of his order of appointment the special qualifications of the person appointed, tends, as it seems to us, to degrade the whole body of teachers, to impair their sense of honor and manliness, and to lessen their love for and interest in their duties. When a teacher who has been in the employ of the State for a period of time striving to do his duty to his pupils and the State, leading a moral, blameless life, and looking forward to promotion in due course, finds that he is time after time passed over in favour of some other of inferior qualifications, who has enlisted the favourable services of a member of Parliament to secure his promotion—such a teacher, we cannot but think, is likely to lose all interest in his work, and gradually sink into a mere mechanical drudge, utterly unfitted to perform really useful service. That this evil exists, the evidence given before us amply shows. We might have multiplied cases on this subject by seeking information from individual teachers, but, as we found sufficient material in the evidence given by the officials, and from official records and documents, to warrant us in arriving at the conclusion we have done, we did not deem it necessary or expedient to obtain evidence of persons who might be suspected of being in some degree biased. Our examination of the departmental witnesses has been assisted by the returns furnished to us by the Department on our application. Since the Act came into operation appointments have been set out on a paper called a "schedule of appointments." In the year 1877 the then Minister of Public Instruction appears from the evidence to have given directions that this schedule should contain a column in which the names of the members of Parliament who had made recommendations in favour of the appointments should be stated. This was a direct encouragement of the pernicious system of political interference with departmental appointments.

It must, however, be noticed, in justice to other Ministers of Public Instruction, that it was during the term of office of the Minister of Public Instruction who introduced this practice that by far the largest number of the appointments complained of were made.

In a country such as Victoria, the population in some places, notably in gold mining villages, is often subject to a sudden decrease, owing to its migratory character. These sudden fallings-off in the population have of course a corresponding effect on the attendance at State schools situate in such neighborhoods, and good teachers have suffered considerably in consequence. We have found that, where teachers have thus suffered, through no fault of their own, instead of being removed to a better school, they have been passed over in favour of younger men, who have had the advantage of political influence, the older and more experienced teachers being left at the decaying schools.

The injustice thus inflicted on teachers without political influence seems all the more glaring when contrasted with the favourable treatment of teachers who possessed political influence. One case which came under our notice may serve as an illustration. A head teacher was in charge of a school, and decided to enter political life as a member of the same political party to which the then Minister belonged; the Minister granted the teacher leave of absence for the purpose of contesting the election. The teacher was unsuccessful, and the Minister directed his appointment to another school of the same size. Subsequently directed the same teacher's appointment to a much larger school. This appointment was at first temporary, but was soon made a permanent one—the teacher being promoted at one step from a school with an allotment of 100 to 125 to one with an allotment of 275 to 300. This rapid promotion was effected by the Minister without the advice of any officer of the Department, and the evidence clearly shows that numbers of deserving teachers were passed over in favour of this more favoured teacher. 2015-25.

The evil of political patronage is not, however, limited to cases of promotions in the service, as will be seen in the appointment of pupil-teachers. When there is a vacancy in any particular school for a pupil-teacher, it is the usual course for the Department to ask the head teacher of the school in which the vacancy occurs to recommend the most suitable of his pupils for the appointment. He recommends upon the result of examination, and also upon the promise they show as teachers (candidates for pupil-teacherships being employed as monitors in the schools). Political influence has tampered with this reasonable custom, which, in one prominent instance, resulted in a female, altogether unfitted for such a position, being appointed as a pupil-teacher. The Minister of Public Instruction appointed this female on the recommendation of a member of Parliament without reference to the head teacher or any officer of the Department; and although, from the documents furnished by the Department, it would appear he knew at the time she was not a fit person, and that the head teacher would object to the appointment. After the appointment was made, the head teacher objected strongly, recommending that the appointment be cancelled, as the teacher was utterly unfit for the position; he suspended her, and requested the Department to hold an inquiry. An investigation was thereupon held by the District Inspector, and he reported that he considered her unfit. The appointment was accordingly cancelled. 804.
2036.
2061.

The proceedings in an inquiry lately held by the Inspector-General to investigate a charge of immorality against a teacher have brought to light another striking illustration of the evil consequences of appointments made upon the interference of members of Parliament. The statements made at the inquiry showed that a notoriously unfit female had been appointed a teacher on the recommendation of a member of Parliament, who, from the facts stated, we must conclude, had knowledge of her unfitness, but had been induced to recommend her appointment by the importunity of the head teacher referred to. The character of the person so appointed was well known in the neighborhood, and the appointment caused a great scandal, of which the Department appears to have been unaware until disclosures took place in connection with charges made against the head teacher of a neighboring school, when an inspector was instructed to inquire into the case. The result of the inquiry was that the teacher was called upon by the Department to show cause why she should not be dismissed, and she was informed that if she denied the truth of the charges a Board would be appointed; she thereupon applied to be allowed to resign, and was permitted to do so.

Many teachers have been promoted, by order of the Minister without any consultation with the officers of the Department, over the heads of other teachers of equal qualifications and longer service, whose reports were excellent, and many instances have occurred in which teachers have been promoted several grades at once. In one instance, in which the appointee was the daughter of a member of Parliament, upwards of one hundred other teachers were passed over in her favour. 6-12, 17-19, 101,
2015-25, 2482-
93, 2523, 2535,
2599, 2826, 2896,
2863, 3544, 3552,
5746.

With reference to the returns of appointments made by the Minister since the Act came into operation, contrary to, and without the recommendation of the permanent heads, the Secretary of the Department stated in his evidence that, in the majority of these instances, he knew of no reason for these appointments, as they were made by the Minister, either without any reference to the Department or contrary to its recommendation, but that in some cases the appointments made by the Minister were as suitable as those recommended by the Department.

In the year 1879 a large number of appointments was made by the Minister in excess of the requirements of the schools to which the teachers were appointed. The evidence of the permanent head of the Department showed that these appointments were made by the Minister when he knew that they were unnecessary, and in excess of the number authorized by the regulations issued under the Education Act. Apart altogether from the large extra and unnecessary expenditure thus incurred, these persons were appointed irrespective of the higher claims of others.

8490. That political appointments have done a great deal of injury may be gathered from the following evidence, given by one of the witnesses:—"I can mention two cases of political appointments in my own school, where two young people, without any classification whatever, were sent to me. One was an assistant teacher sent from Ballarat. She had no qualification, and had not even a license to teach, and had little or no experience in teaching. I found her thoroughly inefficient." This witness, after describing how utterly inefficient this teacher was, continued—"I called her aside and spoke to her, and said it was either inattention to or ignorance of her duties; that if it was through inattention, that I had a right to report her, and if she was so ignorant she ought to be removed from her position, and I said, if it went on again, I would report her. She said, 'You may write, but if you write to the Department, I will write to the Major.'" He complained to the Department, but with no result; a sister of this young lady, also without any qualification, was then sent up from Ballarat, although he had not applied for and did not want any extra assistance.

11066. Amongst other witnesses examined in reference to the question of appointments and promotions, was the Honorable Charles Henry Pearson, M.P., who was appointed under a Royal Commission in 1877 to report upon the Education Department. Mr. Pearson, in reference to the question of political patronage, gave the following evidence:—"I never heard any complaint, I may say, about appointments of that kind (viz., political appointments) among the teachers, though I have often heard that you required interest to be properly pushed. The system is a thoroughly bad one. At the same time you see the distinction. What I mean is this, the men feared that their particular claims would not be recognized unless they, in some way, brought themselves before the Minister's notice."

11066. From the evidence given before us, we have no hesitation in reporting to Your Excellency our opinion that it is of the highest importance to the future beneficial working of the Education Act that a system of appointment and promotion of departmental officers and teachers should be as early as possible established by law, which should be free from all political or other favouritism or interference, and which should be based upon certain well ascertained and fixed principles. The law to be so established must have for its aim the appointment in the first instance of none but properly qualified persons, and the promotion amongst those appointed of the most worthy, the length of past good service being taken into account with other merits; and that no unnecessary appointments should be made.

We believe the best mode of attaining the end proposed would be to adopt by Statute the principle of competitive examination which has been by degrees established under Orders of Her Majesty the Queen in Council for the regulation of the Imperial Civil Service. These Orders in Council would afford material to frame a Colonial Statute, which should contain such safeguards as would avoid the means of evasion, by which the Colonial Civil Service Act (as to any good effects to be produced by it) has been rendered a dead letter.

Any regular system of appointments and promotions must be based upon a classification of officers, and, preparatory to the introduction of the system, a preliminary classification of the present officers of the Department, especially of the teachers, both male and female, must be made. All subsequent promotions should be regulated in reference to the classification laid down in the general system.

There is no doubt, at the present time, dissatisfaction exists in the teaching staff in reference to appointments and promotions made in the past, and one of the points which has received our attention is how far that feeling would be allayed by a classification of those now in the service upon some fixed system which should regulate their claims to promotion in the future. From the evidence we have taken on this point, we believe the establishment of a regulated system of promotion which would secure some certainty for the future would be generally looked upon as some compensation for possible inequalities which might arise in the establishment

of the preliminary classification. At the same time it is most desirable that every exertion should be used to minimize these inequalities to the utmost.

The subject has been under the consideration of the Department, but up to the present time no general scheme for the classification, appointment, and promotion of teachers has been adopted. In accordance with instruction given by the Minister in a "memorandum" of the 10th August 1880, certain officers of the Department were engaged in the preparation of such a scheme. A report containing the recommendations of these officers, based upon lists of teachers prepared by the Department, was presented to the Minister in January 1881, but it appears from the evidence of Mr. Main, Assistant Inspector-General, who was one of the officers engaged in its preparation, that this report—the product of five months' continuous labour—was "laid on the table, and left lying there."

This report and scheme, so prepared by officers of experience, well deserves consideration and attention, although many modifications may be necessary when any permanent classification is adopted. The lists to which we have referred as used in the preparation of the officers' scheme in themselves as arranged do not appear to us to afford the information which would be necessary as the foundation of a classification of the existing teachers; and upon examining the Secretary of the Department in reference to these lists he stated that they would not, of themselves, be sufficient to establish a classification from which promotions might in future be made; but that it would be necessary to prepare a list giving the information we had requested from the Department, which could be prepared only at some expenditure of money and time.

In any system of classification to be adopted we would suggest that the classification should be twofold: 1st, a classification of offices, and, 2nd, a classification of officers. The first would graduate the offices in the disposal of the Department. The second would regulate the order in which the officers of the Department were entitled to promotion from a lower to a higher office. In the classification of offices it would be necessary to classify the offices in the Department filled by the office staff separately from those filled by the teaching staff. The classification and regulation of the offices filled by the office staff would probably be best regulated by reference to some system of classification of the Department in the Civil Service generally. We would treat the inspectorships as amongst the offices connected with the teaching staff, to which they properly belong. If the principles of this system which we propose should be adopted, the details of classification would necessarily require careful consideration by an independent Board in consultation with the heads of the Department.

II.—NIGHT SCHOOLS.

Upon the subject of free night schools we have to report that, however necessary such schools may have been when the compulsory provisions of the Education Act first came into operation, the evidence taken by us shows that their longer continuance is unnecessary, and would operate detrimentally upon the proper enforcement of attendance at day schools, and would continue to be a source of considerable expense to the State without any corresponding advantages.

It being now ten years since the Education Act came into operation, all those of school age whom at the time of its passing it might have been difficult to bring into day schools must now have passed the school age, and those who have attained the school age since the coming into operation of the Act should, had the compulsory clauses of the Act been properly observed, have been in attendance at day schools. The evidence before us is not altogether uniform as to the moral character of free night schools, but the weight of the evidence is certainly that they tend to disorderly conduct in the scholars of both sexes. But whilst the State night schools, which are free, appear to have militated against the efficient working of the Act, we have received evidence that there is a class of scholars, who, from being either over age or from other causes, find it difficult to attend day schools, who would, from a desire to educate themselves, be glad to attend night schools under competent masters, if such night schools could be opened under the surveillance of the Department, but for attendance at which a small weekly fee should be paid by the scholars to the teachers. We received evidence that, whilst free

night schools are scenes of disturbance, in private night schools, for attendance at which scholars paid a small fee, order and studious habits were observed.

We therefore recommend that the present system of free night schools should be abolished, and that State school teachers should receive permission from the Education Department to open a night school in the State school-room, for attendance at which the teacher should be permitted to charge the scholars a small weekly fee. Attendance at such night school should not, however, be allowed to excuse attendance at a day school; nor should both male and female pupils be allowed to attend at the same school.

III.—CORPORAL PUNISHMENT.

In reference to the third subject of this Report—viz., corporal punishment of scholars—we have to report to Your Excellency that, in the year 1873, an order was issued by the Department that the Minister considered the practice of inflicting corporal punishment on girls highly improper, and that he would not permit it in future; and further, that, in the case of boys, corporal punishment should “be inflicted by the head teacher only, and not until the termination of the school meeting.”

Circular 73/22,
30th June 1873.

In the following year, teachers were informed that the latter part of circular 73/22, having reference to boys, would not be insisted on in future. In 1877 the Minister directed that, for the future, corporal punishment should only be inflicted by head teachers, except in cases where his (the Minister's) personal permission for a different arrangement had been obtained. Subordinate teachers were to report misconduct of any pupil to the head teacher, who alone was to be held responsible for the pupil's correction. It was further directed that a book was to be kept in each school in which the teacher was to enter the name of each pupil offending, and the offence for which he was punished.

Circular 74/4,
30th January
1874.

Circular 77/12,
20th July 1877.

In 1880 the Minister directed that all previous circulars (viz., 73/22, 74/4, and 77/12) should be rescinded, and the following instructions were substituted:—

Circular 80/10,
M.O. 8314,
1st July 1880.

- (a.) Corporal punishment may be administered by the head teacher, and by such assistant teachers as he may authorize.
- (b.) When more than one stroke is given, an entry shall be made in the “Register of Corporal Punishment,” giving the date—the name, class, and age of the pupil—the nature of the offence, and the extent of the punishment.
- (c.) The names of the assistant teachers authorized by the head teacher to inflict corporal punishment shall be entered, from time to time, by the head teacher on the first page of the “Register of Corporal Punishment.”

3. The head teacher will be held responsible for the nature and extent of the punishment inflicted in the State school under his charge.

4. On no account is corporal punishment of any kind to be administered to girls.

5. The Minister deems it unnecessary to specify any particular instrument for the infliction of corporal punishment, but is of opinion that the use of a strap is preferable to that of a cane or rod.

The teachers of the Department appear to have generally regarded these orders as calculated to imperil the discipline of their schools, and from the evidence given before us the orders would appear to have been widely disregarded. We have no doubt that, had the orders been rigidly observed, the maintenance of proper discipline would, as stated by the teachers examined, have been impossible—in fact, in our opinion, the reason why the orders have not had a worse effect on the discipline of the schools is that they have been in a great degree disregarded—and we think that it is much to be regretted that such orders were ever issued. They are evidently framed in distrust of the teacher, and the punishment permitted is so surrounded with troublesome requirements that, were they observed, they would neutralize the physical punishment, whilst they would leave hurtful records against the children which might be raked up in after years.

5394, 5828-29,
5841, 8227,
10284, 10312-14,
and 10353.

In regard to that portion of the circular ordering that “on no account is corporal punishment of any kind to be administered to girls,” we would remark that it especially appears to have been fraught with evil. One of the first teachers examined stated, in answer to a question—“We have girls in our schools that require a sound thrashing far more than boys, occasionally.” Another witness, a gentleman who has retired from the service, said that “from the time of the introduction of the order about flogging all discipline amongst the girls seemed to cease; they became far worse conducted, and far more difficult to manage.” And the evidence of these two witnesses is fully borne

5335.

8507.



out by that of a large proportion of the witnesses whom we examined on the subject.

But the strongest evidence, in our opinion, against the regulation with reference to the corporal punishment of girls was given by the five lady teachers examined by us. These ladies have had long experience as teachers; their records in the Department show that they possess the entire confidence of its officers (in fact of one it was stated by the Assistant Inspector-General that she was "one of the best—if not the best—first assistants in our schools"); and their sympathies would naturally be with the girls. These ladies testified that girls—more especially when young—required to be corporally punished. The first stated "the great reason why girls were bold was that the teachers were not allowed to slap them." The second stated that "the circular was most injurious in every way to the discipline of schools, because girls in many cases required more caning than boys." She likewise said that "there was more need for caning since the prohibition on it, as the girls had learned to defy their teachers." The third stated that she had noticed among girls evil effects from the issue of the circular, but added naively that "there were a good many teachers who did not take any notice of the circular," and necessarily so, "because if you see anything wrong and punish for it at once, it is far better than to let it go; if the girl were rude, it would be far better for the child and teacher to do so." The fourth stated that "the circular affected the discipline of the younger classes, but not so much with the girls who had reached the fifth and sixth classes, because there were many ways of punishing them and making them ashamed;" and "that the teacher should be in the place of the parents for the time." And the fifth said she thought that "the circular awoke an evil spirit in some girls who had never thought of the matter before; it made them defiant."

We are quite aware there is a sentimental feeling abroad against corporal punishment being inflicted on girls—and for that matter on boys too—but it is the experience of teachers and others that this feeling is indulged in a great measure by persons who are not parents. In fact, we have it in evidence that in several instances teachers have been requested by parents and guardians to inflict corporal punishment on their female charges. One mother put the case very forcibly when she said to the teacher (as given by him in evidence), on his telling her that he was not allowed to beat girls, "Well, is it better that that girl should suffer a little, or that this bad habit she has got should become inveterate in her?" Equally forcible was the remark of a person who took another child (on behalf of the mother) to the teacher, on his refusal to flog the girl, "Well, do you think it is better for you, even though you are breaking the law, to let this girl grow up to be a nuisance to society, or to put a stop to it by the means in your power?"

A sense of respect and of dutiful obedience to the teacher of a school from the pupils is absolutely necessary to secure that moral discipline of the school without which school life loses one of its greatest advantages. If the scholars are not trained up in habits of order and obedience, with a respect for those in authority, they are not likely out of school, and when their school life is terminated, to be well ordered and conducted. There can be no doubt that much of the disorderly conduct observable in the youth of the colony, and which has acquired the name of "larrikinism," is to be traced to a want of discipline both in the home and in the school. Correction in the home must be left to the parents, but in the school it should be entrusted to the head teacher, who, in our opinion, should, during school hours, stand *in loco parentis*, and should be left unfettered by the Department to exercise his authority, and apply his correction with no other restraint than that which the law imposes upon the parent; with the proviso, however, that the girls should in *all* cases be corporally punished, when necessary, by female teachers (head teachers or assistants). If the teacher should overstep those bounds of reasonable chastisement which the law recognizes, he is at once amenable to the ordinary tribunals for the abuse of his authority. Upon a conviction being certified to the Department, it might be well that the master should be, in a case with extenuating circumstances, lowered a step in the service; or in a flagrant case, or in the case of a second conviction, dismissed the service, or permitted to retire; and in the order withdrawing the existing circular it would probably be well that an intimation to this effect should be given. This course would secure to the efficient teacher the fullest recognition of his authority by his pupils, and would be quite sufficient to restrain teachers of hasty tempers or of too severe dispositions. We think that the removal of all restrictions regarding corporal punishment will not necessarily lead to additional punishment being inflicted upon the pupils, but, on the contrary, will rather have the

5335, 5726-27,
5841, 6193, 6509,
6767, 7103, 8180
8507, 9881, 9950,
10284, 10309,
10354, 10393-95
10444-46.

10284.

10309.

10309.

10353.

10354.

10393.

10395.

10444.

5395.

5728.

desirable effect of lessening the frequency of its application, as, the teachers being placed in their proper position, the power of inflicting the punishment will act *in terrorem* over the pupils, and thus render severity unnecessary.

We shall proceed with due diligence to consider the other matters embraced in Your Excellency's Commission, upon which matters we have already taken a considerable amount of evidence; and we humbly submit to Your Excellency's consideration this our Second Report.

J. WARRINGTON ROGERS, (L.S.)
Chairman.

JOHN MACGREGOR. (L.S.)

C. J. HAM. (L.S.)

FREDERICK McCOY. (L.S.)

W. H. ARCHER. (L.S.)

FRANCIS ORMOND. (L.S.)

HERBERT J. HENTY. (L.S.)

EDMD. KEOGH. (L.S.)

H. N. LOUGHNAN. (L.S.)

GEO. MEARES. (L.S.)

J. M. TEMPLETON. (L.S.)

DUNCAN LOVE. (L.S.)

W. H. CUTTS. (L.S.)

A. GRANT McINTYRE,
Secretary,
18th April 1883.

APPENDIX A.

Year.	Appointments made by the Minister.	
	Contrary to the recommendation of the Permanent Officers of the Department.	Without the recommendation of the Permanent Officers of the Department.
	Number.	Number.
1873	Nil	Nil
1874	Nil	1
1875	2	2
1876	Nil	1
1877	6	57
1878	4	150
1879	8	211
1880	13	100
1881	24	160
1882	Nil	Nil
Total	57	682