

suggested to them many times that they should ask that the Boards be given greater powers in the matter of transfers and dismissal of teachers. If that is not done, some day or other the people of New Zealand will rise up and say they will not have the present condition of affairs at all, and ask that the Court of Appeal be swept away altogether. I think it is in the interests of the teachers that the Court of Appeal Bill should be very carefully revised. We have refrained from taking action in the interests of the district, because we realize that if a teacher took a case before the Court of Appeal we should be beaten. I think it is a very serious matter indeed. I do not think there is any other body of incompetent people protected as the incompetent teachers of New Zealand are by that Court.

34. What have you to say to my suggestion of substituting a Judge or Magistrate?—I do not think it would affect the proposition in the slightest. I still think the power is there in the Act. In one celebrated case we had in Auckland I do not see how the Judge or assessors could have given a decision different from that which they gave, and yet at the same time I am satisfied that the decision was wholly against the interests of the people of the district in which that man was teaching. I think this Court of Appeal Bill wants careful consideration. Personally, I think the most important matter I have brought before your notice this morning is that of the establishment of separate infant schools. I believe that is very largely going to affect the policy of New Zealand and all other educational districts right throughout the world. When I brought the underlying principle before the Inspectors' Conference some years ago I was asked by the Inspectors to waive the question because it was so big, and it was voted against in order that it might be given more mature consideration. When I brought the matter up three years subsequently it was carried at the Inspectors' Conference by an overwhelming majority, and I think the Committee should seriously consider the establishing of that practice in New Zealand.

35. *Hon. Mr. Allen.*] With regard to the decision of the Conference, may I ask whether that decision was upheld at subsequent Conference?—I could not say. I did not subsequently attend the Conference, and I am not sure whether it was or not.

36. I have some idea that a Conference reversed its decision subsequently?—Not on any occasion. I am sure of that.

37. I am informed that the Conference did reverse its decision subsequently. If we do allow these separate schools for a smaller number than 161 down to fifty-one, does it not mean separate headmistresses at infant schools with consequent increase in salaries?—Just as there is a differentiation between the payment of primary-school teachers and secondary-school teachers, so there would be a differentiation in salaries paid to true primary-school teachers and the grade between approved and secondary.

38. Is there not a difference in the salaries between headmasters and assistants?—Yes.

39. In a separate infant school would not the headmistress have a separate salary?—Yes. I think in respect of schools it is only applicable to large ones. You might have a separate scale and staffs and salaries.

40. Would not the provision we have in the Bill satisfy you about the side schools?—No. We do not want to establish side schools, because by doing so we withdraw the services of the headmaster from the main work of the school, and, in point of fact, every headmaster knows and will say clearly and distinctly that so far as the primary department is concerned the infant-mistress is really the one who supervises, controls, and does the whole of the work of that primary department, and we think she should be paid for it.

41. If she is appointed as headmistress will it not increase the cost?—I think not, sir. I think you find that in that way you will aggregate your upper children, and by decreasing the cost of the teaching of the upper classes by a system of aggregating you will decrease the cost of the whole system. I worked it out in detail some years ago, and I should be very glad to send to the Committee a memorandum of the cost which I drew out on that occasion.

---

THURSDAY, 30TH JULY, 1914.

NELLIE COAD examined. (No. 3.)

1. *The Chairman.*] Whom do you represent?—The Women Teachers' Association, Wellington Branch.

2. Do you wish to make a statement to the Committee in reference to the Bill now before us?—Yes. While recognizing that many reforms have been embodied in the new Education Bill, and while admitting that increases in salary have been granted to most head teachers and upper assistants, still we wish to point out that it provides no increase for a large number of experienced and deserving teachers in Grades I and II. Take, for instance, three types of schools—one in Grade VIIc, one in Grade IVc, and one in Grade 3B—and apply the proposed scale of salaries to the staffs of each. First of all, Grade VIIc, taking for our type a certain school in Wellington City (South Wellington), in which there is a staff of sixteen assistant teachers. This is what we find: (a.) Among upper assistants—Head teachers get an increase of £40; first assistant an increase of £10; second assistant an increase of £10; third assistant an increase of £40; fourth assistant an increase of £40; fifth assistant an increase of £15; sixth assistant an increase of £15. (b.) Among lower assistants—Seventh assistant gets no increase; eighth assistant gets no increase; ninth assistant gets an increase of £15 up to £140 (maximum); tenth, eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth assistants get no increase. Omitting the last two (twelfth and thirteenth) assistants, who are recently appointed and therefore are not so experienced as the tenth and eleventh assistants, four deserving teachers on such a staff do not benefit. Two of these have been teaching from