

23. So that if the whole of the money recommended by you in this report were given to the various colleges you cannot conceive that any Royal Commission that might be appointed would interfere with these grants?—No. I think that if a Commission were set up the result would be that their recommendations, as far as finance is concerned, would involve a large sum of money. It would not mean taking away money from any of the colleges.

24. But rather to give them more money?—Yes. Then again, even if you had a Royal Commission you would have to consider their report, and then after this Committee or the House had considered their report there would have to be legislation brought down, and it seems to me that it would be three or four years at least before you got matters settled.

25. Then your opinion is that even if a Royal Commission were recommended this year the whole of the recommendations in your report should be given effect to?—Yes, leaving questions of policy open to the colleges.

26. Coming for a moment to the question of law, you will remember that Professor Adamson and some other professors considered that you should have made greater provision for the teaching of law at Victoria College?—I have not made the adequate provision that there should be if there were an adequate number of students. But, of course, I know that the professors said that.

27. Very well, your reply to that is that they wanted the extra teaching at Victoria College to do advanced work?—Yes.

28. Well, now, is it not a fact that Professor Adamson suggested additional teaching, and not advanced work in other subjects, such as conveyancing?—Yes.

29. If it can be shown that there is other work, which does not come under the designation of advanced study for legal work, which it can be shown should be done at Victoria College, you would not be inclined to alter your report and make a further recommendation as regards subjects not including advanced work?—Yes, if that were shown. But this represents £600. Some universities spread that over four lecturers. I have taken the LL.B. course myself. I attended an extremely good course at Canterbury College, and my experience of that was that a good many barristers are willing for a comparatively small fee to give, say, three hours a week to help really to put on a broad basis the teaching of their own clerks.

30. In this suggested scheme you did not include any provision for the teaching of conveyancing at Victoria College?—No; the opinions of two colleges were against procedure or conveyancing outside of Victoria College.

31. Seeing that it is intended to specialize in law at Victoria College they should have a claim for consideration in the establishment of that subject?—I am afraid my idea of the teaching of law would be to entirely reorganize it, as it is in New Zealand. I should like to see the method introduced which they have at Leland Stanford University. I came over from America with the Dean of the Faculty of Law of that University, and from what I learned from him it would not be difficult to establish it here on similar lines to theirs. It is not one of those Americanisms we hear so much about—it is really a Germanism. It would require the entire reconstitution of the whole system. Of course, it would mean a larger staff.

32. You will admit this: that since articling was abolished in New Zealand there has been no test of the practical work required of students?—Yes.

33. And do you think it would be desirable that a school of law should be established which would be training students in practical work?—Well, the course of work in the Leland Stanford University gives the practical work first; they teach the theory afterwards.

34. Do you not think that provision should be made now in the outline of the work you give here for the institution of practical work in law at Victoria College?—I do not know. You mean in conveyancing, and practice and procedure, and part of evidence? Well, my opinion is that it would have to be very carefully done to avoid cramming.

35. Professor Laby referred to that?—He said it would be pure cramming. I am quite satisfied that if you are going further than they have been going, say, at Canterbury College you will require greater provision.

36. You refer to what Canterbury College was doing in the matter of law?—Yes; they are doing about the same now with two men instead of one.

37. Of course, you recognize that it is intended to specialize in law at Victoria College?—Yes, I have made provision for that, but I say that provision will have to be increased if there is a substantial number of students.

38. Do you recommend that it should be increased if the teaching of law is to be extended?—That is one of the things a Royal Commission might do.

39. Are you prepared to recommend this Committee to make larger provision for law at Victoria College?—Well, the total gives them a sufficient margin to enable them to go in more for law if they like to have less in some other subjects. I quite agree that the law course should be completed, but that is one of the things which depends upon the methods by which you are teaching it.

40. Now, in your estimate with regard to the Otago lecturers, you put down one lecturer and one assistant?—No, two lecturers in law.

41. That is your suggested course, but at the time you drew up your report you said they had one lecturer and one assistant lecturer?—Those figures were given me by the staffs themselves, and were corroborated by the Registrar's officers.

42. Were you aware that the Otago Law Society was providing a grant of £100 a year?—Yes.

43. And that the Accountants also were giving £100?—Yes, and £150 in Wellington, £100 in Canterbury, and £150 in Auckland.

44. Then you make a larger allowance for the grant for Otago University: you do so, I take it, because of the actual expenses of the classes there?—Yes. You could not neglect the home-science classes with something like seventy full-time students.