

cannot. That could only be done if this Committee does not accept the findings of the previous Committee, and those findings were adopted by the House of Representatives.

5. That is, unless this Committee adopts everything?—I think it would be a waste of the time of the witnesses who have appeared before this Committee if it does not adopt the whole of the findings of the previous Committee.

6. But this Committee has not been sitting in the same way as the other?—Well, you have accepted its findings in other directions, and so I submit you should accept its findings in this respect.

7. This Committee is considering Mr. Hogben's report now?—I would respectfully submit that the proceedings of this Committee are likely to involve a waste of time and repetition if what I mention is not done.

*Mr. Sidey:* The understanding was that we would take the whole of the evidence given formerly by the Reform Association and place it before this Committee for consideration.

*The Chairman:* Yes.

*Witness:* I think that it was only due to the witnesses that you should adopt the report presented to the House of Representatives by the previous Committee, because I do not think they would have wasted their time in giving evidence if they had known you intended to do otherwise.

8. *Mr. Sidey.* At any rate, you will admit this: that this Committee may come to the conclusion that reform is desirable, but may not come to the conclusion that a Royal Commission should be set up, and they would be quite logical in that?—I would submit that they would be reporting entirely against the whole weight of the evidence that has been given if that is done.

9. But I submit that the Committee might come to the conclusion that while reform is necessary a Royal Commission may not be necessary?—If so they would not be finding in accordance with the evidence.

10. You support entirely the suggestions made by the Hon. Mr. Herdman on the previous occasion as to the constitution of the Royal Commission?—Yes.

11. Do you not think that with only one educational expert on the Commission his views would dominate the findings of the Commission?—I can see no point in putting him there if his views were not to have considerable weight.

12. But do you not think that a local expert should be put with him?—If you can find a local expert who is familiar with the different educational institutions in New Zealand, and with those outside the Dominion as well, then I think he would be suitable; but if he were not intimately acquainted with the organization of at least one University outside New Zealand then he would be quite unsuited to be a member of the Commission.

13. You would not object to a Commission of five?—I do not think the number is essential, but the qualifications of the men are most essential.

---

GEORGE HOGBEN, Inspector-General of Schools, examined. (No. 24.)

1. *The Chairman.* I understand, Mr. Hogben, you have a statement to make regarding the criticisms which have been passed upon your report by the Professorial Board of the Victoria College?—Yes. I am sorry that it is not a short one. I have not dealt with any criticism of my report from any of the other colleges, because I have not seen any. My statement is as follows:—

Before dealing in detail with some of the objections to certain statements and recommendations in my report upon the University colleges made by the professors of Victoria College I should like to point out some of what I may describe as misconceptions as to the purpose and scope of that report, and some assumptions made by the professors which seem to me to be hardly warranted by the facts.

(1.) Professor Picken, giving evidence on the 29th July, said that the Professorial Board of Victoria College "differs very largely from the Inspector-General's report in its views of what should be the future policy of New Zealand in the matter of University education." I would point out that the report was limited to a narrow range. I was not directed to report upon the reforms that might be made in the policy or the organization of the University; in fact, it is, I think, unmistakably implied in the report of the Education Committee of 1911 that I was not to deal with such matters. I was to report upon its needs—practically upon its immediate needs. I was not free to assume any other university policy or organization than that existing at present. My report, therefore, was not intended to, and could not, take the place of an inquiry by a Royal Commission, or by any other body or person, into the constitution, policy, and organization of the University. Personally I believe that these need a considerable amount of reform, and my attitude thereon and the battle I have, along with others, fought for reform on the Senate for many years ought, I think, to have prevented the Victoria College professors from imagining that I held such views as they have attributed to me, or from reading such views into the report. With regard, for instance, to the question of day and night classes, I was not free to assume any other arrangement than the present one; my personal attitude in regard to the question is surely sufficiently indicated by the following sentences on page 9 of the report: "It is only fair to admit that the standard of work should be set by the day students, and, if this be so, those who are occupied during the day and are thereby prevented from attending any other than evening classes should be allowed to take a smaller group of subjects at one time, and so consequently to spread their degree work over a greater number of years. This would not, however, do away with the whole or partial duplication of the staff that would be entailed by the carrying-on of both day and evening classes in the one college." I had to deal with present financial needs on the present basis of policy, and I went outside this only when additional light