

69. Yes?—Supposing the time should come when the Railway service will cease; though of course it will not cease. That is one of the points I have not tried to make use of, because I know that from an actuarial point of view it is not taken any notice of. Where there is a natural inflow into the service, and that inflow is compulsory, naturally the incomers will help to pay those that are going out. But I am not allowed to use that argument, I think, from an actuarial point of view.

70. The only point you seem to have is that the Railway-service scheme is much superior to that of the teachers. There may be reasons for this, owing to the difference between the two services. If it is the old teachers that are bursting up the scheme now, that will not obtain in the Railway service, with the larger proportion of younger people going into the service?—Put it in another way: If there are a large number of old teachers going from the service now, will not the actuarial deficiency gradually decrease when these aged persons die off, and their places be taken by young ones?

71. Yes?—Then the amount the Government will have to contribute from year to year will be a decreasing amount. You will find the greatest trouble in the first few years.

72. *Mr. J. Allen.*] I understand you have no objection to the scheme as regards those who are under thirty?—No. They pay on a 5-per-cent. basis. I was not going to bring up details, but there are one or two points I might mention. For instance, with regard to rent allowance. A man may be an assistant at £200 a year, and he may take a country school at £180. By doing so, he has a house. But if his annuity were to be counted on the lower salary, it would act as a deterrent to the teacher taking a country school. I should like you to consider that point. Supposing I were a young man at £180, and a country school were offered to me at £160, I should be inclined to take it if I were not going to have my annuity reduced in consequence; but I would not take the country school if the fact of my having a residence were going to tell against my annuity. There is another point—with regard to widows and children. We should like to see an arrangement made something like this: According to the Bill, if a man dies, a certain amount is to be paid to his widow. That is to be payable in two or more instalments. Supposing the widow were to die after one instalment had been paid, we should like to see provision made for the remaining portion to be paid over to her children if she had any under fourteen years of age. This is a small point; but I look upon these two as being necessary to a perfect scheme. The main point is the one I drew attention to before. I think the allowance to the widows might be left very largely in the hands of the Board.

73. Coming to the ages of from forty to sixty, I understand that your chief objection there, is that the back service does not count. Is that so?—As I read the Bill, supposing a man is at forty-three now, and his average salary is £180: he gets £3 for each year of service, and is in for seventeen years; he then retires on £52 a year. A man could retire now on £52, but in seventeen years' time the average-salaried teacher would not retire on more. And it is the average-salaried teacher that you want to look to, rather than the high-salaried teacher. Mr. Hogben might be able to give you an idea of how many teachers there are earning £180 and under.

74. You made some suggestion to get over that, from your point of view. I was not quite clear what it was. Was it that you wanted some specific kind of back allowance?—That is so. The Institute recommended that the service should count from 1877 to the time of the passing of the Act, but that the amount to come to a man should not exceed £120, and that to a woman should not be more than £78.

75. That is the maximum?—Yes, the maximum for back pay, to which was to be added whatever they might earn by contribution; the same as in the Railway service. But perhaps you will find the actuarial deficiency so much that you cannot possibly do that.

76. Have you any idea, from your own calculations, what that would come to?—That is a matter for the experts, sir. If you cannot make it £120, perhaps you might fix it at about £100 or £78, for back service purely.

77. Would it be, as far as you know, a large amount?—I could not say. Perhaps Mr. Hogben could give you an idea.

78. You favour back allowance to a limited extent. You would limit it to £72 for women and £120 for men?—Yes: £120 is two-thirds of £180, the average salary of the man, and £72 two-thirds of a woman's average salary.

79. Would you now give me a comparison of the Bill and the conference proposals?—Supposing that the Bill were in force, what would a teacher get at the retiring-age—sixty—his salary being £300?—Fifty-two pounds a year.

80. Under the conference proposals what would he get?—One hundred and twenty pounds, that is, if his average salary were £300.

81. Take a lower-paid teacher, one whose average salary was £180?—If he were forty-three now, on retiring at sixty, he would get £52 under the Bill.

82. What would he get under your proposal?—Eighty-four pounds for back service plus £51 for the seventeen years he would be a contributor.

83. Now, take a teacher with an average salary of £90. What would he get on retiring at sixty?—Fifty-two pounds according to the Bill, but £42 according to conference proposals, that is for service since 1877, but you will find, I think, that probably there are no certificated teachers that will have an average of only £90 for the whole term of service.

84. Will you give us what you think would be the lowest average for any of the teachers?—I could hardly give that off-hand.