

131. *Mr. Buddo.*] You stated that you yourself would take a position in the country at a lower salary than you would receive as an assistant in a large town school?—Yes.

132. Can you give any instance of an assistant at a large school in a town taking a lower salary in the country?—Yes, myself.

133. If I told you that the North Canterbury Board had had no case of the kind for the last fifteen years, would you say it was correct?—That is a matter of your own experience; but I left the Mornington School, where I was first assistant, at £220, and went to my present position at £190. I was paying £40 a year rent, and I was £10 better off. For the annuity, however, I should be worse off. You will find others in Otago who have taken a lower salary in the country.

134. What is your opinion of the benefit of this proposal to a teacher who at the present time is fifty years of age?—It depends upon his salary.

135. Would it be advantageous to him to fall in with this scheme?—It depends upon his salary, I think.

136. Assuming that his salary is £200?—Comparing it with the purchase of an annuity in an ordinary company, he would be much better off.

137. What advantage would it be to a teacher who is at the present time forty-five years of age, with a salary of £200, assuming he does not retire till he is sixty-five, and thus contributes £18 a year for twenty years?—I do not know how that would work out from the annuity point of view.

138. You would not like to express an opinion?—No; but I should imagine the comparison would be in favour of this scheme.

139. Would you think that the weakest part of the scheme from the teachers' point of view?—The teacher would naturally wish to have more allowance made for his service.

140. You consider that under forty the scheme is fairly advantageous?—Yes.

141. But you would have strong doubts as to it after those years? You admit that from fifty years upwards it would be advantageous to the teachers to contribute to the fund?—Yes, to the average teacher.

142. But you would like further time to consider whether it would be advantageous from forty-five years?—Well, the same money invested outside might return more to a teacher than it would if put into the teachers' fund.

143. *Mr. A. L. D. Fraser.*] In the interests of education, do you think it would be preferable that women teachers should have the option of retiring at fifty or fifty-five?—From an educational point of view I should say they should have the option of retiring at fifty.

144. That is, in the interests of education?—Yes, not considering finance.

145. *The Chairman.*] Is it a fact that there are very few women over fifty in the employ of the Education Boards?—I think there are a fair number in Otago. I think you will probably find there is a larger proportion over fifty in the South than there is in the North.

146. I am told that Education Boards do not favour the retention in their service of women over fifty?—The Otago Education Board has, I think, been very fair to women.

147. You can only speak for the Otago Board?—Yes, but I do not think any woman over fifty has had cause to complain.

148. Have you placed before us all the objections that you think ought reasonably to be put before the Committee with regard to this scheme?—I should like to mention them again to make sure that I have not missed any. Back service, I think, is the first.

149. The superannuation to be computed upon back service instead of contribution?—In addition to contribution—to be computed upon a portion of the back service.

150. Now, No. 2?—That any amount not claimed by the widow should be handed over to the children under fourteen, if any?

151. Yes, now No. 3?—If possible the house allowance should be taken into consideration when calculating the annuity. Those are the three points.

152. Then you do not regard the reduction of the retiring-age for women as an important question at all?—From an educational point of view I do.

153. But not from the point of view of the scheme?—Yes, I would put it in because I am considering the matter from an education point of view right through.

154. Are those all the points?—Those are all, the fourth point being the retiring age of the women.

155. Those are the objections to the scheme?—Yes.

156. *Mr. Fisher.*] It is quite possible, is it not, that some other witness may come before us and give a reasonable objection, in addition to the ones you have mentioned?—Yes.

157. It is possible you have overlooked something?—Yes.

*The Chairman* (to Mr. Gill): Will you continue now, Mr. Gill?

*Mr. Gill*: I would rather take a little longer time, Sir, to look into the differences between the conference resolutions and the scheme embodied in the Bill.

*The Chairman*: Very well.

MORRIS FOX, Actuary, Government Life Insurance Department, examined. (No. 3.)

158. *Right Hon. R. J. Seddon.*] You have perused the Bill before the Committee, Mr. Fox?—Yes.

159. Can you tell the Committee, taking the payments provided there—the one-sixtieth pensions—what would be the capital value required to make the minimum pension £52?—Are you referring to the total subsidy?