

5. Then you give advice at present as to the course of work which should be taken up by research scholars?—Yes, we make suggestions. The Research Scholarship Board of the College sends in recommendations, and the Government appoints some expert outside the colleges, and he is consulted.

6. That is, in setting the course of study?—Yes.

7. Of course, the Government will keep in mind the benefit to be derived from research in particular subjects?—Yes. There is a list of suggested subjects in the regulations, and they also say, "and such other subjects as the Minister may approve." The subjects are connected with different Departments, and we have consulted the officers of the Agricultural Department and the Mines Department.

8. *Mr. McCallum.*] I am only going to ask you a few questions regarding Victoria College. If you will turn to page 15 of your report, and add the suggested deficiencies to the present annual income, you will find that Auckland and Victoria College work out at £13,800, Canterbury College £17,450, and Otago University £22,950. If you compare Victoria College and Otago University there is a difference of £9,000. The people of Auckland and Wellington think you are favouring Otago. We recognize that the medical section is the most costly, and we allow from £4,000 to £5,000 extra for that, but there is a difference of £9,000. Otago will be allowed £9,000 more than Auckland or Victoria College?—Well, if you will turn to page 11, Table I, you will see how that amount is arrived at.

9. Then, the fact that you did not put in the word "law" as a special subject has been commented upon?—I did not cut it out; the word "specialization" is not mentioned in that table.

10. But you put in "engineering" as a special subject?—Because everybody thinks of it as a special subject.

11. You allow "dentistry" and three other items, but you cut us out in law?—I took the existing schools. I have not cut you out of law. If you take the minimum staffs suggested for each college on page 10, there are eight at £700 (£5,600), eleven at £300 (£3,300), five—without the law man—at £150 (£750). Then you must add the estimated cost of two law lecturers, £600. That should give a total of £10,250 for the ordinary courses in arts, science, commerce, and law. If we strengthen the Law School by substituting two professors at £700 for the two lecturers at £300, and by adding an assistant lecturer at £150, we are adding £950 to secure a certain degree of specialization in law. The total now becomes £11,200, including the amount allowed as immediately required for specialization in law. This agrees with the figures in the revised table of proposed expenditure set out in the statement I have just read.

12. I just wanted to point out that the framing of Table I is defective, and has caused some trouble?—The difficulty is that "law" would have had to appear in two lines, because it was a special subject in one college and an ordinary subject at others.

13. You do not go into the larger question as to the efficiency of the staffs?—Oh, no; I had to avoid that point carefully.

14. *Mr. Sidey.*] Speaking generally, Mr. Hogben, you practically adhere (with the exception, possibly, of the provision for three years until the additional fees will be received) to the report which you have made?—Yes, as regards the revenue, except that I have brought the fees down £450. I have taken £450 off my estimate of the students' fees for Victoria College, and I have added the sources of revenue not included before, so that the statement of revenue is more complete.

15. And with that modification you do not propose to make any alteration in your report as the result of the criticism to which it has been subjected?—I have made three other alterations. I have put the annual amount for laboratories up to £750, and that for the libraries up to £300—that is, out of the College fund. I want it to be distinctly understood that the money proposed to be placed in trust with the University Senate is available in part for library grants to the colleges. At the same time I have cut down the administration to £1,750; I think that is sufficient.

16. You make no difference in the ultimate total which should be paid to each of the colleges?—No.

17. It remains as it was?—Yes; but I have put into the estimate for Victoria College the £500 to be paid from the Taranaki higher education reserves. If you will refer to page 16 of the report you will see that I say, "It would be, in my opinion, a very just thing for Victoria College to receive £500 a year from these reserves until such time as a University college was established in Taranaki."

18. I think you expressed agreement, to some extent, with the Reform Association in some of the requests that they are making with regard to the constitution?—Well, I have not touched upon that because I did not consider it was referred to me.

19. But you did express some agreement with their views?—Yes. If the general question of reform comes up I am fully prepared to answer any questions.

20. The reason I ask that question is that those who gave evidence from Victoria College were very emphatic that no effect should be given to your report until the question of the constitution or the alteration in the constitution is settled?—I do not know how long it is going to be before there is an alteration.

21. Supposing this Committee were to recommend the Government to set up a Royal Commission, would you consider that no effect should be given to your report until the recommendations of that Commission were brought down?—No, I think at least some portion of the report should be given effect to at once. I think you are wasting money while the colleges are inefficient.

22. Your scheme is based upon what you call the minimum requirements for the present policy?—Yes, I cannot conceive a Royal Commission taking the money away from the colleges, or recommending that that should be done.