

The making of these increases was also not dealt with by the outgoing Board, but by the Board of the year for which the teacher was re-engaged.

On the 1st February, 1900, the Board adopted, with some amendments, the report of its Finance Committee of the 29th of the previous January recommending a scale of salaries for its teachers, including principals of schools, and for its officers and servants. According to this scale provision was made as to certain classes of teachers for a minimum and maximum salary, and for an annual increase of salary from the minimum until the maximum was reached; in some classes the annual increase was to be \$50, in others \$24, \$20, and \$12, respectively.

Although, as I have said, an agreement similar in form to that for 1901 was made with the teachers for 1900, the salaries paid in 1900 were not, save perhaps in a few exceptional cases, those set opposite the names of the teachers in the schedule to the agreement, but the salaries fixed by the Board of 1900, which included the increase according to the scale adopted by the resolution of the 1st February, 1900, and for the payment of these salaries provision was made in the estimate submitted by the Board to the Municipal Council for 1900, without any question being raised as to the propriety of the course which was adopted.

The increases which the teachers who were re-engaged had, therefore, when they signed the agreement for 1901, some reason to expect would be made in 1901 to the salaries they had received in 1900, they will not receive, if my brother Street's order stands.

In 1901 the question of salaries was again considered by the Board, and a new scale was adopted by resolution on the 6th March, 1901.

Acting upon the view that, as had been the practice, have said, it was for the Board of 1901 to fix the salaries of the teachers for that year, the salary of each teacher was fixed by the Finance Committee in preparing the estimate.