

or lectureships that might be established in any of the colleges with the approval of the Senate; (b) to meet the cost of buildings required in consequence of the establishment of such new faculties or Chairs, or in consequence of the increase of students, either by grants or by loans repayable over a term of years; and (c) for grants in aid of college libraries." Yes, that is to be given to the University of New Zealand.

21. For what purposes?—In trust as might be required from time to time to meet the cost of staffing of any new faculties or Chairs of lectureships, cost of buildings, and in aid of college libraries.

22. Do you not think that could be interpreted to make provision for further specialization or for assistance to existing specialization?—I should be sorry to think so with the present constitution of the Senate and under the University of New Zealand Act. With the University established by Act of Parliament as being an institution which is to encourage higher learning by passing examinations and setting up of examinations and granting of degrees, it would be outside the function of the present Act to administer this sum in the present way. I am by no means satisfied that the Senate as at present constituted would be the right body to have it.

23. Well, I would like you to banish out of your mind for the time being the constitution of the Senate and deal with the finances apart altogether from the Senate. I want to know whether provision is made here for finances in this suggestion for further specialization or for assisting existing specializations?—I take it that the object might be to assist any specialization.

24. Is there not provision made for the finances to be placed in the hands of the Senate which may be used for further specialization at the College or to assist existing specializations?—It may apparently be used by them, I admit, for one or all of these purposes.

25. Would that be an increasing amount as the national-endowment revenues increase?—It could, but I think this is outside the portion of my evidence.

26. You connected the finance with the staffing, that the staffing is only the suggested minimum, and you have already said that it is supplemented by the heading "Staffing" in the report?—That is what provision is made for in the total finance, and Professors Picken and Laby can give very complete evidence on that question.

27. Now, in regard to libraries, how much per annum do you think ought to be given to each of the colleges for libraries?—A University college should, I consider, from our experience of the needs, be spending £500 a year.

28. Was any evidence taken by the Inspector-General of Schools in regard to this need for library money at Victoria College?—Yes, he got some.

29. What was he told would be necessary?—We certainly understood we were only dealing with the absolute immediate requirements, which would be only for a year or two.

30. I want to know whether in the report there is not provision made for the immediate expenditure of £500 and £250 per annum?—Yes, but £250 per annum is much below our present expenditure.

31. Is there any further provision suggested for libraries out of moneys that may be in the hands of the Senate?—Yes, a possible provision only.

32. Are not these words at the bottom of page 15: "For grants in aid of college libraries"?—Yes; that is, if they like to do it.

33. *Mr. Sidey.*] With regard to the subject of law, you suggest that there should have been two additional professors and one lecturer?—I said one professor and two lecturers, but I decline to make any specific proposals with regard to the law faculty.

34. If that provision were made in Mr. Hogben's suggested scheme of staffing for each college, would you be satisfied with Mr. Hogben's report as regards the law?—I should certainly require a special report brought down by the law faculty for consideration.

35. If that provision is made for Wellington you are not objecting to the provision of a lecturer at the other colleges?—If the lecturer is doing really sound law work I cannot see that that affects the matter. It only seems to be a fleabite on the total finances; but if it is going to mean that each of the centres will try to get a law school—and that is what one is always afraid of—then I should be against it. But I say that the law school in Wellington is a totally different thing from this provision of a lecturer in order to help law students in the other centres to get through the elementary law examinations. Such provision may not mean University work at all.

36. *Mr. McCallum.*] Our University Act was established not for the purpose of teaching, but for the purpose of encouraging in the manner hereinafter provided in pursuit of a liberal education, &c., and your best answer to the Hon. Mr. Allen would have been that we are bound by section 27, which sets out the degrees, and it means that an amendment of the University Act would be necessary?—Yes.

37. *Hon. Mr. Allen.*] Have you read the report of the Inspector-General of Schools?—Yes.

38. On page 15 it states "that the remainder should be paid to the University of New Zealand in trust for the following purposes." Do you mean to tell me that it needs an amendment of the Act to permit Parliament to pay over to the Senate a sum of money in trust for certain purposes?—Of course, I am not a lawyer. Whether if paid out in trust to them they would legally be entitled to get rid of it in the way suggested here without an amendment of the Act I do not know. I think it is possible that they could not. I trust that the other witnesses will be cross-examined on the points of law and finance in order that the whole position may be made clear; but the point I was making in that connection is this: that if I am right in believing that the development of the law department is going to be hampered, then the whole College will suffer with it, and I should like that to be placed on record.

39. If you are right?—It may be my views are right, and if the law department is to suffer then the whole College will suffer with it, and the standard of University education will be brought to a lower level than at present.

40. How many professors in law are there now?—Two professors and one lecturer. The efficiency as a school must certainly be hampered unless a special grant for the law school is forthcoming.