

now receiving £16,000 per year. Averaging them at £600, because the promotions will not be very frequent in future, that will make a bill of £26,000, and it will not reach that for probably five or seven years. Now, with regard to the question of dental and medical treatment. The Institute considers that section 131 is too drastic: that is, the provision that if a man fails to act upon the advice of a Medical Inspector he shall render himself liable to prosecution for cruelty. The Institute proposes, instead of that, that provision should be made by the Public Health Department for free dental and medical treatment for the children of parents in poor circumstances. The line of argument which prompted the Institute to make this suggestion is simply that it is the State's business to care for the development of its citizens. The Education Department deals mainly with the intellectual and moral development. It has lately taken a considerable hand in the physical development, but the State's duty is equally as much concerned with the health of the community, and the Institute believes that it is the Health Department's proper function to do what it can to safeguard the health of the young citizens so that in time to come they shall be sound and healthy adult citizens. I think that is putting it briefly without saying any more in the way of amplification or explanation. I come now to a point on which it is my pleasure, as well as duty, to express the unqualified gratification of the Institute and all its members at what is believed to be a very valuable provision, and one that will lead to exceedingly valuable developments in the future—that is to say, the subsidies on local contributions. The Institute feels that this is an acknowledgment of the right of the people to be interested in their own schools, and their right to be encouraged to assist in the development of their own schools. It will have, we believe, a great effect in bringing education home to the minds of the members of the community in such a way as has been very largely neglected in the past, and is only now coming to be partially acknowledged. For that reason the Institute heartily welcomes this proposal. It would like to go a little further and suggest that local bodies should be allowed to make contributions to primary schools. It is being done in this city in an indirect way now—in a small way: that is to say, the city is supplying the schools with libraries. There is no good reason that the Institute can see why a Borough Council should not be allowed, not to levy an education rate, but to make a contribution out of its funds to assist any local movement in connection with a school—such, for instance, as building a swimming-bath or a public gymnasium—which would be of benefit to the school and would bring school life into touch with social life. The Institute thinks that that might very well be done, and thinks that it would be a very wise, and proper, and good thing to do. Further, it recommends that the limit in the Bill of £250 for subsidies should be raised to at least £350. I have to mention now a matter which is not specifically mentioned in the Education Bill, but we take the opportunity of mentioning it here. I refer to superannuation. "The Institute requests that the Superannuation Act be amended so that retiring-allowances be calculated on the best three years of service, and that house allowances be taken into consideration in the computation." In this, as in other matters, teachers are only asking that they be treated as other public servants are treated. All the other branches of the Public Service have their superannuation allowance calculated on the best three years. If for the benefit of the Service a man, towards his retirement, is obliged to take a lower position and a lower salary, his pension is not thereby prejudiced; he takes his superannuation on the three highest consecutive years. Teachers are not treated in that way. If for any reason they are required to take a declining salary at the end of the period of service, their superannuation is affected for the rest of their lives. We have very good warrant for asking for this. I will mention only two points: One is that other public servants are so treated; the other is that the Actuary has recommended that this alteration be made. He considers—and experience is rather tending to prove it to us—that if it were done it would save the fund rather than injure it, by the fact that some people would not go out on superannuation so soon if they had not any reason to fear that their pensions would suffer. With regard to house allowances, so far as I know, there is only one other service that has a considerable number of houses for its servants—the Mental Hospital service—and it was announced the other day that they are to have their house allowance computed as salary for the purposes of superannuation. I am instructed to ask that teachers be treated in the same way. It is quite true to say that the house allowance is a part of the conditions of the teachers' service. It is part of the inducement that is offered for a teacher to take up the work, and therefore it is to all intents and purposes a part of his salary. Now I come to deal with probationers: There is no need to tell this Committee that there is a shortage of teachers, and it is an increasing shortage. The ideal way of supplying it is by training more young people. The only young people that you can get to train are probationers—assuming that pupil-teachers will, in the moderately near future, be discarded. The Institute then recommends that in order to increase the supply of teachers the number of probationers be considerably increased, and that with a view of making the teaching profession more attractive to young people the salaries of probationers and allowances to training-college students be materially increased. I wish to point out that these probationers are to a large extent young people of pretty good quality, who have not been successful in getting a place in the Public Service. Most people prefer the Public Service to the teaching service—quite naturally—and the probationers are to a large extent those who have not been able to get into the Public Service. I believe the nation does not want the refuse for teachers: it wants the best, and in order to get them it is necessary to improve the inducements. Therefore we ask that they be paid larger salaries. One must consider the arduous nature of a probationer's life. They are usually young people of fifteen or sixteen. They go to school for a few hours' duty each day. They are not called upon to teach very long. Some of them are called upon to do a full day's work very often, and they do a very great deal of work. Then they have as many hours as you like of study, beginning their duties at 9 o'clock in the morning, we will suppose, and finishing at anything you like after midnight. It is perhaps not so long as that in all cases, but we know from practical experience that they are engaged in very arduous