

shabbily treated in the amending Bill." A Southland headmaster writes, "The local Institute has passed a resolution embodying your proposal." It will be observed that these letters cover a wide range; they are typical of scores received. Another headmaster writes, "There are grave defects in the schedule of salaries. I have had thirty-one years' service, and am in present Grade V (81-120)—£210-£240; new grade, £200-£250. Here is a drop of £10 at the start, and five years to reach the maximum, whereas some assistants start at £230 and reach the maximum in two years. I have to teach four standards—III, IV, V, VI—maybe, say, thirty-five to fifty children; have a large measure of responsibility for the other classes in teaching, clerical work, schemes of work, and examinations; oversight of all the interests of the school, besides all efforts for school funds; yet my grade is worse off than that of all first assistants of Grade Vb and of some second assistants. They start at £230, as against our £200. Most of them are simply class teachers, and with the new staffing will have a great advantage as compared with headmasters of Grade IIIb. In four grades or subgrades three extra assistants are provided, so these get a rise in salary and less work, while assistants in Grade IIIb do not get a rise of a penny on this year's salary; the headmaster gets £10 above present maximum after five years' service, but with no relief from the drudgery of attempting to do justice to four standards. The scale proposed by the New Zealand Educational Institute is nearer to the point of justice; or, better still, join Grades IIIb and IVa. Under the proposed grading no first assistants will ever seek appointments in country schools."

1. *Mr. Hogben.*] With regard to the increasing number of female teachers in New Zealand, do you think there is anything alarming about that—about the number that we have in New Zealand?—I think it is a great mistake to have women teaching boys over the age of ten or eleven.

2. Would you have no mixed schools at all, then?—I do not say that.

3. In that case how would you organize matters so that the men taught boys and the women taught girls? How could you organize matters?—I am not prepared to answer that question off-hand.

4. What proportion of the children are under ten years of age?—That also I could not say off-hand.

5. Would you be surprised to hear that half are under ten years of age?—No, I should not be surprised.

6. For those children would not women be generally the most suitable?—I would not say the "most" suitable.

7. But generally?—I believe in men teaching boys as far as possible.

8. Right down to tender age?—Yes.

9. Do you think most people are of the same opinion?—I could not say. That is my opinion.

10. You think it would be dangerous for women as a general rule to teach boys under ten?—I do not say it would be dangerous, but inadvisable.

11. For women to teach boys under ten?—Under ten or eleven, yes.

12. With regard to those over ten, should not women teach the girls if men teach the boys over ten?—Yes.

13. What proportion would that be, then?—I could not say offhand.

14. How many will there be over ten if there are half under ten: half, will there not?—Yes.

15. Supposing you allowed the children under ten to be taught by women, and you provided that girls above ten should be taught by women, what proportion would that give you of women to men in the profession?—I am afraid I cannot answer.

16. Would not half the number of teachers be women for those under ten, and half the remainder be women for girls over ten?—Yes.

17. That would be three to one, then, would it not?—Yes.

18. Is not that about the proportion in Great Britain? Do you know what that is?—No, I do not know.

19. That is the proportion in Great Britain—303 to 100; I mean, adult primary teachers. Do you know what the proportion of adult primary women teachers in New Zealand is to adult men?—No, I have not those figures.

20. Will you look at this table, please [document shown to witness]: it shows 151 to 100. You will not question it, I suppose? It shows three to two. Is it not the case, according to that table, that we have half the proportion of women that they have in Great Britain?—(No answer.)

21. What I want to ask you is this: do you think there is anything really alarming when we have twice as many men in proportion to women that they have in Great Britain?—I do not say that it is alarming, but I do not think it is in the best interests of education that it should be so.

22. That we have one and a half times as many women as men in the profession is not in the interests of education?—I think you are getting away from what I said. I think it is advisable as far as possible to have boys taught by men and girls taught by women.

23. Even young boys?—I should not go so far as to say very young boys, but, where possible, boys of from ten or eleven upwards. We have at present a large number of boys over ten and eleven being taught by women.

24. Then I come back to the first question: would you do away with mixed schools?—I would if I could.

25. How would you run it in the country?—I am not going into that question.

26. You spoke about the increasing number of women teachers. Do you know how many men and women it requires to enter as pupil-teachers or probationers in order to get an equal number of women to men: have you worked that out?—No.

27. Do you know how many women it requires to enter at the stage of certificated teachers to get the number of women equal to the number of men?—No, I have not gone into that.

28. Is not that an essential factor in determining how many men and how many women remain in the profession?—Certainly.