

so that those who can attend them will be encouraged to do so. This is essential in the interests of those students who can give their undivided attention to the university; it is essential if the standard of instruction for our degrees is not to be far below that in other universities; it is essential if there is to be any corporate college life in the North Island, and too great stress cannot be laid on the value of the influences of university life. The next question I propose to take is the question of finance of the different colleges. In considering the financial arrangements of the University and its colleges it is necessary to notice a very important distinction between our University Colleges and the universities, say, in Australia. Each of the colleges in New Zealand is to most of the students attending them a university. For example, Canterbury College is to a student attending it the only university in New Zealand. The only help which he can obtain from any other college in New Zealand is from the Otago Medical School. Except in the case of medical teaching the other colleges are of no help to him.

2. How about mining?—Yes, I overlooked mining. But so far as the subjects in the arts curriculum and in the science curriculum and the subjects of law and engineering are concerned, it is his own college which teaches him, so that it is not appropriate to compare the combined resources of the four colleges with one university in Canada, Australia, or in any of the States in America, for those combined resources are never availed of by New Zealand students; but we have to compare each of the colleges with each of those universities, remembering all the time that the colleges do not quite cover the whole ground of a university. But they cover the greater part of it, and probably three-fourths of the ground; and to cover three-fourths of the ground implies that our colleges must have an income somewhat comparable with the income of other universities in the world of about the same age. I would like to call your attention to the income of the New Zealand colleges. The Auckland University College has an income of £10,000; Victoria College, £10,500; Canterbury College, £16,400; Otago, £15,600. Now take the universities in other parts of the world. Adelaide University serves a population of 400,000, and has an income of £22,000; Sydney, which serves a population of 1,600,000, has an income of £64,000; Toronto University, which serves a population of 2,250,000, has an income of £140,000; Stanford (California), serving a population of 2,000,000, has an income of £400,000. California has two universities to choose from, either of which has an income of £200,000. The New-Zealander has a choice of Auckland University College, Victoria College, Canterbury College, and the Otago University, and the best-off of them has an income of £16,000. And money does not purchase in New Zealand more than it does in California, and so you can see pretty clearly the relative value of the university education our colleges offer compared with that of the countries mentioned. Taken as a whole, Stanford and Berkeley Universities, which serve a population only twice that of New Zealand, have an income of £400,000, which is to be compared with the £52,500 that our colleges receive. The point I want to bring you to is that the policy of our Legislature is that we should have four colleges, one in each of the centres, and such a policy logically and definitely entails a certain expenditure, and the expenditure that has been required by that policy has never been met or recognized in any way, as you can see from the figures I have quoted. For example, take the case of the University of Adelaide. I think it has been established for a shorter time than our University. It was established in 1876, while ours was established in 1870. It serves a population of 400,000 people, but its university has an income of £22,000 a year. It, of course, teaches somewhat more subjects than do any one of our colleges. It teaches, I understand, medicine, dentistry, electrical engineering, and the arts and science subjects; but that is not very much more than any of our colleges teach; and yet in that State, with a more recently established university and with a community only two-fifths of our community, they are able to maintain a university which has a larger income than any of our colleges. I cannot find any university which is so poorly financed as our four colleges. It is not only in the matter of income that our colleges are at a disadvantage. They are at a much worse disadvantage in the capital which has been spent on them. You will notice that the total expenditure on the buildings of the different colleges is—Auckland, £7,000; Wellington, £36,000; Christchurch, £50,000; and Dunedin, £40,000. I would draw your attention to the type of buildings in Sydney and in New Zealand universities, as shown by the photographs before you. The figures quoted are subject to correction, but from the returns from the Inspector-General of Schools I find that the capital expenditure on buildings in New Zealand is £133,000, while the total capital expenditure on buildings in the University of Sydney is £320,000. *Per capita* the expenditure in New Zealand is 3s. per head; *per capita* in New South Wales for the Sydney University it is 4s. per head. So we are behind even in *per capita* expenditure; but when it comes to the buildings actually provided we cannot be compared for a moment to Sydney University. If you take the trouble to compare the buildings in Sydney with the buildings in any one centre in New Zealand you will see that they are of a different type altogether. Even if you compare the best in New Zealand—which I believe is in Canterbury College—with the Sydney University the comparison is very much against us; but if you compare the buildings at Auckland with the buildings in Sydney you will see that they are a different order of things. Some of our buildings are like up-country schools instead of university buildings. If New Zealand attempted to provide facilities distributed over four colleges equal to those which exist in New South Wales I think there is no doubt it would need to spend, say, twice as much as has been spent in New South Wales, and that would be 8s. per head of a population. It has actually spent 3s. In making this statement I cannot claim it has accuracy, but 8s. per head is about the amount that would be necessary for New Zealand to spend in order to get reasonably good museums, libraries, laboratories, and so on. You can see the result of the parsimony in capital expenditure particularly clearly in its effect on our college libraries. I think one can say, having regard to what is a proper university library, that we have not got in New Zealand a university library, and that is one of the outcomes of starving the University Colleges in capital expenditure. The only other question I wish to draw attention to