

6. Is not that the same thing in effect as pooling the reserves?—Yes, I suppose it comes to the same thing.

7. What exactly do you mean when you say that a primary-school teacher who begins at £100 a year in salary rises to £310 in a definite number of years?—I mean that when a primary teacher starts his teaching career he has a definite promotion ladder to go up.

8. Do you mean to say that every teacher in a definite number of years rises from £100 to £310?—No. That is how the printed statement read, but I qualified that when I read it. I said it would be quite possible for a man to rise from £100 to £310.

9. May not a secondary-school teacher rise to various positions by promotion in the same way as this primary teacher does?—Yes, he may quite possibly rise. What we object to is that there is no definite path for him to advance. If we felt quite sure, for example, that if we did our duty faithfully and conscientiously one year we would get a definite rise, and the year after that a definite rise, we would have something to work for.

10. Your objection is that there are not a definite number of higher positions to which assistants could rise in the profession within New Zealand?—That is so. And the other great objection that we have is that we spend four years, most of us, in a university career; we spend exactly the same number of years and have just as hard work to do as a lawyer or a medical man; yet when we come to enter what we term a profession we are not paid according to professional rates. The lawyer and the medical man in a few years' time earn nearly double the salary that we earn.

11. Take school B in the instances that you give in your statement: do you know how many of the 327 pupils are lower-department pupils?—No.

12. That vitiates the figures to start with, does it not?—Those facts and figures were got by a member of the executive from the secretary of that school. Both the executive member and I assumed that 327 was the total exclusive of any in the lower department. We were quite under that impression.

13. Does the £3,170 include the salary of the teacher who teaches the lower department in that school?—All I can say is that we were given to understand that £3,170 would cover the salaries of all teachers in the school, and that none of the teachers were occupied exclusively in teaching children in the lower department.

14. Where is account taken of the fees paid by the paying pupils there: are they not left out of account altogether? According to your figures there are fifty-seven paying pupils?—Yes.

15. What about their fees? You have not gone into this matter yourself?—No.

16. Fifty-seven paying pupils, I suppose, would pay a fair amount of money, would they not?—£12 or £13 a year each.

17. Not at this school, but they would at yours?—Yes.

18. *The Chairman.*] That would cover your difference, then?—No, nowhere near it. It would still leave £300.

19. *Mr. Hogben.*] About the Appeal Board: supposing that a reduction of salary was made definitely the ground of appeal for secondary teachers, as it certainly is in the case of primary teachers, would not that meet one point?—Yes, I certainly think it would; but we have nothing of that sort at present.

20. You think there is some doubt about it?—Considerable doubt.

21. May I ask if your association has taken a legal opinion about that?—No, but certain members of the executive have gone very closely into the matter, and they have come to the conclusion that the only thing we can appeal on is the question of dismissal.

22. If that were placed beyond question it would clear up that point?—Yes, very considerably.

23. With regard to motion 5, you are aware that most of the boys' and girls' schools are managed by the same governing body, are you not?—Yes.

24. And that the funds of the two schools under the law are one?—Yes.

25. Does not that give the Board the opportunity of differentiating, if it thinks it wise, between the salaries of the boys' school and the salaries of the girls' school?—Yes, it certainly does; but we as a body would like to have it made clear to us by the Government whether or not the Board could, if they wished, pay equal salaries to men and women. We as a body hold that there should not be the same salary paid to men and women.

26. Do you know of any Government that ever dared to face the question of equal pay for equal work for women quite irrespective of party?—No, I have never known any Government that has, and I do not ask the Government to dare to face it. What I would like the Government to do is to put forward some definite example. Supposing £12 10s. were put down as the definite basis, where a Board managed two schools we should like to see it allocated something like this: £13 10s. for boys and £11 10s. for girls.

27. You see it involves that question?—Yes, certainly; but unless there is some definite statement made in the Bill there is nothing to prevent mistresses in girls' schools getting the same as a male assistant.

28. What about the average salary?—That does not altogether cover it. The average salary may work out to that, but it is quite possible for some senior mistresses to get the same salary as some senior male assistants.