

in the classics; but, still, that does not debar professors doing work of some kind in an original manner. I think each Chair should be occupied by a man who shows some originality of mind.

8. On page 107 you say, "A New Zealand Science Professor will ordinarily be more capable of directing research in pure than in applied science—a subject he does not teach." Does that apply to the teachers of biology, medicine, and mining?—No; I have in my mind there the professor of pure science, who is expected to direct applied science research. We have only a few professors of applied science, and I think we have twice the number in pure science. That statement was made in connection with the Government system of scholarships, which are given ordinarily for applied science alone.

9. Take a special case—Professor Easterfield's case—that of a teacher of research in the vegetable poisons of the country: would you call that applied science?—No; we would call it pure science.

*Professor Easterfield:* Take such a case as Burroughs and Wellcome's medicinal manufactures. Most of their products are the result of researches in pure science; but when these researches are done there are men who obtain substances, and these substances are what you might call the result of applied science rather than pure science. In my own case I can say I can procure poisons from plants, but if I had to put the products on the market it would be a different thing.

10. *Mr. G. M. Thomson.* On page 107 you say, "such good fame as the New Zealand University has abroad is not in the least due to the English examination, but is attributable to the valuable investigations that have been made in biology and geology in most of the colleges, in chemistry and mathematical physics in Victoria College, in physics and chemistry at Canterbury College, and in chemistry at Auckland University College." It seems to me you have rather a misleading sort of statement there. I do not know that you are aware of it, but most of the researches done in New Zealand have not been done by New Zealand University men at all. Can you throw any light upon that statement?—We do not compare there the value of the investigations made by the University men with the researches of men who are not attached to the University. The meaning of the whole statement is that the University's reputation abroad depends upon research. Any reputation it gets abroad will depend upon the research-work of its teachers.

11. On page 108 you say, "All the independent investigators who are working outside the University should receive from it help and recognition." How would you suggest that could be carried out?—I would suggest that the independent investigators should have full use of the college libraries and laboratories, and should be invited to indicate the results of their work in the form of a few lectures to the more advanced students in the University, so that they should be brought into contact as much as possible with the college and its teachers, and the teachers with them.

12. With regard to the statement that you made to-day, that you considered the Otago School of Medicine has failed as a School of Medicine. Is the cause due to the students, say from Auckland, not going to Dunedin in such numbers as they did at one time?—You have exactly analogous conditions in Australia. In the three large cities of South Australia, Victoria and New South Wales you have three Medical Schools. Naturally, the majority of the people living in those States do not live in the cities in which the Medical Schools are situated, so that many of the students have to come from a distance to attend the schools. The position may be compared with that of Auckland and Dunedin. A man in Auckland, when he can afford it, very frequently goes Home to Edinburgh or to a foreign Medical School, and not to Dunedin. In Australia the resident in the country goes to the Medical School of his State. I leave you to draw your own conclusion from that fact. My conclusion is that our Medical School is not satisfactory.

13. Is that not partly due to this fact: that there are in this country, unfortunately, provincial jealousies?—I should not think so. I do not think any one would spend £50 or £100 a year, or whatever the extra cost is, on account of provincial jealousy.

14. Have you any opinion as to how far the Otago graduates of the University are filling positions in New Zealand?—I cannot speak with authority on medical matters, but have merely stated facts that can be verified, and you can draw from them your own interpretation.

15. In speaking of this Medical School, you say that finance is the criterion: have you information about the Scottish universities, many of which are notoriously very poor in their endowments, or were very poor?—What I say is that it is impossible to maintain a modern Medical School with trained teachers at a cost of £3,600 a year.

16. You are not quite sure that that is a correct statement of the cost?—It is very close to it.

17. The existence of the four Colleges was the policy of the legislature: do you not realize that to some extent it is a geographical necessity, and also the outcome of the urgent needs of the different districts?—When we say it is a policy of the Legislature, I mean that Parliament passed an Act in every case setting up the institution, and therefore affirmed the action of the people who initiated the college. Parliament is most certainly directly responsible for the institution of four colleges. If they had said that there should be two or three, no doubt they would have passed Acts only creating two or three.

18. Do you think there should be only one University in New Zealand in one location?—No. I speak for myself alone, so that my views are not to be taken as representing those of the Reform Association. My own view is that it would be very desirable to have all the professional schools in one centre. A man has to go at present to different parts of New Zealand to get a special training. I can understand the provincial jealousy which would arise from such a proposal as that, but I do not think provincial jealousy is a matter that should be considered where the highest interests of the people are concerned, such as they are in education. I think that is essentially a matter that a Royal Commission should go into—whether the University should be in one centre or not. I certainly think the arts and sciences should be continued to be taught at all the centres.