

for the teaching and study of these two important subjects. Mr. Hogben does not ignore their importance: see his general remarks under the head of "Economics" on page 5. In the suggested type on page 10 he proposes a professor and lecturer for the two combined, but the minimum suggested for each college only proposes two lecturers, except in Canterbury College, where a lecturer is added to the already existing professor. His suggested minimum thus falls far short in these subjects of the suggested type. In the case of mental science he proposes the suggested type as the minimum. This involves the conversion of lectureships—poorly paid in two colleges, Auckland and Canterbury—into professorships, and the addition of four assistants. The proposal for history and economics (two subjects) involves the addition of only four lecturers to the present staff. In the case of the sciences—physics, chemistry, biology, geology—it is also proposed to establish the suggested type in all four colleges as the minimum, with the altogether minor exception that instead of two assistants in biology, as suggested in the type, one assistant is proposed. A consideration of the present staffs of the colleges will show that to bring them up in science to the minimum the report proposes to add one professor, nine lecturers, and six assistants to the present staffs. I do not mean to imply that the additions proposed in mental science and science are unnecessary: I have made the comparison merely to show that justice has not been done to history and economics. Without denying the importance of the study of mental science and the sciences proper, I think that a good case might be made out for the equal importance of the study of history and economics, which the report comparatively leaves out in the cold. The position of history and economics in many universities is not satisfactory. The main reason for this is an historical one—namely, that these subjects were not included in the trivium and the quadrivium, on which mediæval university education was based, and which to some extent still dominate university arrangements in the Old Country. But of the great importance of the study of history and economics in New Zealand there can be no doubt. One of the great defects of New Zealand education at present is the small attention paid to history in the schools; and in an isolated country like this, removed from the main stream of European history, and with no history "in the air" as it were, without old castles or historic towns—with a scenery absolutely devoid of legend and human interest so far as the white inhabitants of the country are concerned—the necessity of cultivating the historic sense and imagination is even more clamant than in Europe, where any child of average intelligence is surrounded, in a sense, by history. We cannot understand ourselves unless we understand how we have come to be what we are, and we can only do that by the study of history. For the study of economics in New Zealand the case is quite as strong—from a university point of view almost stronger. The semi-socialistic legislation of the last twenty years in New Zealand has made this country the *corpus vile* on which a considerable number of social experiments have been tried, and is bringing about a state of things which is highly interesting to the economist, and will abundantly repay investigation. That this is so is shown by the fact that economists visit New Zealand from other countries merely to study the economic conditions here, and there is a wide field of virgin soil for investigation by trained economists on the spot. Such investigations would prove interesting and valuable not only to those who are most concerned in them—that is, the inhabitants of New Zealand—but to the world at large, either by way of encouragement to embark on similar experiments or as a warning against them. In this respect the study of economics in New Zealand is in much the same position as the study of biology. In both subjects there are certain aspects which can only be studied here—certain forms of animal and plant life in the case of zoology and botany, and in economics certain trends and tendencies in the relation of capital and labour, and the effect of legislative interference on the free contract between employer and employed. In this respect economics and biology and geology seem almost to stand on a different footing from the other sciences. It is not necessary to labour this point. One of the things Mr. Bryce recommended in an address he delivered in Wellington about a year ago was the establishment of something like a school of economics. Such an arrangement as appears in the suggested type would probably be sufficient in the meantime—that is to say, that each college should have a professor either of economics or of history, as the case might be, and that there should be associated with the professor a competent lecturer to deal with the subject in which the professor is not a specialist. Arrangements could be made in this way so as to secure two Professors of History and two of Economics in New Zealand. Mental science: On page 5 the report rightly lays stress on the importance of this subject, and refers to the new development in the direction of experimental psychology. Mr. Hogben does not, I think, suggest that experimental psychology ought necessarily to be taught in all the colleges, and if this is his point of view I think that it is a wise one. Experimental psychology is to some extent a specialty, and there are many admirable teachers and students of mental science—or, to employ a better title, of mental and moral philosophy—who feel no profound interest in it, but devote themselves to other aspects of this very wide subject. But if experimental psychology is to be taught, the provision suggested, that of an assistant in addition to the professor, is quite inadequate. The association of experimental psychology with mental science at once puts mental science in the same category as the experimental sciences proper, and a similar staff would be required. This is the view of Professor Hunter, who has devoted considerable time to this special branch of his subject, and I think it will recommend itself to the Committee as a reasonable one. The Professor of Mental Science is almost certain to be overburdened with work. His classes will probably be larger than those of the average Professor of Science, and if teachers are encouraged to take this branch of study it will be mainly for its psychological and experimental side, so that the amount of laboratory work will be very considerable. Higher teaching in arts: The report has been already criticized from the point of view that, whilst it provides a greater amount of teaching of an ordinary type suitable for the average pass and honours student, it makes little or no provision for higher or more concentrated study, which