

same quotation will suffice, I trust, to remove two other misconceptions of the same witness, namely—(a) “The funds were to be earmarked by Parliament”; (b) “Too definite a relation between the strength of the staff and the number of students should be left to the college itself.”

(6.) There is some confusion in the use of the word “specialization”: it means sometimes “professional courses,” sometimes “higher or post-graduate work, especially research.” I think the report is clear enough in respect of professional schools. Because Auckland is supposed to specialize in commerce and Victoria College in law it is argued that the university work done by the ordinary lawyer or the ordinary accountant should not be provided for at more than one college. Unlike other evening students, these students are for the most part following during the day an occupation cognate with their studies; they are earning in whole or in part a livelihood; they are living for the most part at home; in short, the smallest consideration will show that it would not, as was supposed, be more economical to found law and commerce scholarships than to provide tuition in four places. It was contended by Professor Laby that “the effect of introducing the teaching of commerce and law into all four centres” (it has already been introduced, I may say), if it is to be put on the same basis as the teaching of arts and science, will mean the introduction of propositions which will in the long-run mean that the demands on the finances of those four colleges will be such that an improvement in the standard of teaching in the other colleges will be impossible (probably what is meant is that “an improvement in the standard of the other teaching in the colleges will be impossible”). This is met by the passages in the report on page 7, “Professional Schools or Faculties.” I have not overlooked the specialization—that is, the provision for higher work—that should be made for commerce at Auckland University College and for law at Victoria College, but I understand that a student who desires to do higher work in law at Victoria College is still a *rara avis in terris*, and at the Auckland University College there is apparently as yet no demand for higher work in commerce or economics at all. Therefore further provision for these could hardly be considered as immediate needs. It is true that the number of commerce students last year (273) was very much larger than it is likely to be again for some time to come, but putting the number down as normally a hundred and twenty or a hundred and thirty at each college, and the amount necessary for scholarships to put them in even approximately as good a position as they are now at £50 each in addition to fees, we should require, say, eighty scholarships at £50, or £4,000 for those commerce students at the three centres where the course in commerce was not taught. This is much greater than the amount needed with the fees and other income to run separate schools. Moreover, the insurance and other mercantile houses in the three centres would still need clerks. Where, then, could the commerce students find posts when they had finished their course? The same arguments apply even more strongly to the college courses provided for the ordinary professional training of lawyers. It would be a bad thing for the country if the majority of its lawyers and accountants were altogether cut out from the advantages of some degree of university education. The suggestion that the instruction in these subjects would be of the nature of cramming seems to me to be an unworthy one. Why should it not be of as truly educational value as the training of doctors or engineers? I am speaking, it will be understood, of the ordinary professional training, not of higher courses in law or commerce. The school of home science is already in existence. It is the only school which provides directly for what I may call the professional training of women. It cannot much longer be maintained, as it is to a large extent now, by voluntary contributions; the number of students taking the full course is rapidly increasing, and the proposal to put the existing school on a sound basis appears to me reasonable.

(7.) I come now to the vexed question of fees, which is dealt with on page 15 and elsewhere in the report. First, let me try to remove one or two misconceptions that seem to exist in the minds of the professors, or, at all events, in the mind of Professor Laby: (a.) He says that it is unfair to compare the fees at Otago or Canterbury and at Wellington because at the former there are expensive courses like medicine, engineering, dentistry, and mining. Reference to page 15 will show that the fees for these subjects have not been included, but only those for arts, science, commerce, and law. (b.) He says that only the fees paid by an inconsiderable select body of students, national scholars and bursars, have been taken; these take more subjects, and the average fees are lower.

The following (Table M) shows that the number of holders of scholarships and bursaries of all kinds is by no means inconsiderable:—

Scholarships, Bursaries, Exhibitions, and Studentships held at Affiliated Institutions: Estimate for 1913.

Scholarships.	Auckland.	Victoria.	Canterbury.	Otago.	Totals.
Junior University Scholarships	9	3	3	13	28
Senior National Scholarships	6	12	14	24	56
Taranaki Scholarships	..	2	..	2	4
Senior University Scholarships	3	4	1	8	16
Bursaries under University Bursary Regulations	31	42	27	82	160
Home Science Bursaries	..	..	..	13	13
Sir George Grey Scholarships	1	1	1	1	4
Other exhibitions, &c.	2	2	12	8	24
Training college studentships	108	108	111	119	446
	160	174	169	270	773