

school with a Grade 4 (£190-£220) salary now becomes second assistant with a Grade 3 (£150-£180) salary in the Grade Vb school. According to the Education Bill of 1914 there is no provision against such teacher dropping at once from perhaps the maximum of the Grade 4 (£220) to the maximum of Grade 3 (£180). Such a case, if not cases, occurred under the provisions of the Education Act of 1908, and such cases will occur again under the Education Bill of 1914 unless the anomaly is removed, for on this point the Bill of 1914 reads exactly as did the Act of 1908, as may be seen by comparing them. Section 56 (5) of the Act reads, "Notwithstanding the provisions of the last preceding subsection, if a teacher in a public school is transferred from one position to another position (whether those two positions are in the same school or in different schools, or under the same Board or under different Boards), his salary in his new position shall be determined in the manner following: (a.) If the amount of the final salary which he received in his former position is less than the minimum salary of the grade or subgrade of salary attached to his new position, he shall receive as his initial salary in his new position the amount of such minimum salary, and thereafter shall receive an annual increment in the manner provided in the last preceding subsection. (b.) If the amount of the final salary which he received in his former position is greater than the maximum salary of the grade or subgrade of salary attached to his new position, he shall receive as his salary in his new position the amount of such maximum salary. (c.) In any other case he shall receive as his initial salary in his new position the amount of the final salary which he received in his former position, and shall receive his first increment of salary on the same date as if he had continued in the position from which he was so transferred." I think that section 75, subsection (4) (b), of the Bill reads exactly the same as the Act of 1908.

3. *Hon. Mr. Allen.*] Do you suggest it is possible for a teacher's salary to be reduced under section 75 even if transferred?—A case occurred in our district. The teacher is now suffering a loss of £30 in salary.

4. But could any teacher's salary be reduced by transfer under section 75 of this Bill?—Yes.

5. Any existing teacher?—Yes. I have an example here. For example, in Grade VA, according to the provisions of the Bill, in a school with an average attendance of 241 to 280, the first assistant's salary is £190 to £220. The school rises, say, to Grade Vb, then the first assistant's salary is £230 to £250. If the transfer is effected of the first assistant to the position of second assistant, the second assistant in that case gets £150 to £180. According to the regulation—section 75 (4) (b)—the assistant must receive the maximum £180, but that maximum of the second assistant may be £10, £20, £30, or £40 below what the teacher was receiving as first assistant.

6. But do you suggest that a first assistant in Grade VA school, if that school rose to Grade Vb, might under any circumstances, except the one I will allude to presently, be put into that school as second assistant?—It happened in our district this year, and can happen again under that same provision.

7. Are there not some certain circumstances under which it would be just for it to happen? Supposing a teacher proved inefficient, ought there not to be some power in this Bill in the case of a transfer to put that teacher in a lower grade?—If the teacher were proved inefficient.

8. Has that teacher not the right to go to the Court of Appeal?—I think the teacher should have that right.

9. Has she not got the right?—I suppose she has.

10. Well, if there was any injustice in reducing her, and she was not reduced because of inefficiency, she has the right of appeal?—Yes, and the right of appeal should be exercised.

11. So that she would have justice?—If she knew the Bill, as she should.

12. The object of the clause is to give the Board power to put a teacher into a lower position on transfer because of inefficiency?—Yes.

13. We must keep that right, otherwise where should we be?—I see, yes.

14. The teacher is protected by the Court of Appeal?—Yes.

15. *Mr. Hogben.*] The transfers are left to the discretion of the Board. It is quite conceivable that a Board might transfer a teacher from Grade IV to Grade III, but if the Board did so without sound reason there would be the right of appeal.

16. *Mr. Poland.*] I understand the case you referred to occurred last year simply because that particular school rose from Grade VA to Grade Vb?—Yes. The woman was first assistant in the school, and it was deemed necessary that a man should be appointed as first assistant. There was no question of inefficiency. The woman put her case in the hands of the New Zealand Educational Institute.

17. *Hon. Mr. Allen.*] And what did the New Zealand Educational Institute do?—That is what she wants to know.

18. *Mr. Poland.*] If that school had not risen from Grade VA to Grade Vb that teacher would not have had her salary reduced?—No, not if the school had not risen from the one grade to the other. If it had not been for the raising of the grade of the school the teacher would this year have been receiving a salary of £30 more than she is at present receiving.

19. That teacher would be first assistant till another forty pupils came into the school, but the Board considered that a male teacher was required, and they reduced her salary and her status?—That is so.

*Mr. Hogben:* Miss Finlayson is quite right in regard to what did happen. The case did occur, and I do not know what was in the minds of the members of the Board. I cannot say that the Board did wrongly, but taking such cases generally, if there is no question as to the efficiency of the teacher but merely the efficient conduct of the school, I think a wise Board would, and they do, wait for an appropriate opportunity for transfer. The Board probably overlooked the effect of its action.