

31. But if you desire to specialize to the extent that you are proposing now, does it make any difference at all whether your College serves a big district or a little district?—What I complained of was that our provision in arts, law, science, and commerce in Mr. Hogben's report was the same for all University districts although their populations differ, and the inequality was not made up by giving the colleges which served the big University districts special schools. The two colleges which served the biggest University districts were given no special schools. Sixty per cent. of the population of New Zealand live in a district served by the Auckland University and the Victoria College, while those two colleges it was proposed should have no special school.

32. Supposing there is a young man in Palmerston North, it does not matter to him whether he boards in Auckland, Wellington, or Otago—it is the same to him as far as the cost of living is concerned?—Yes.

33. It does not matter, then, where your University college is in that sense?—Yes, and the logical result of that argument is a thing which I personally believe but which I can get no support for in New Zealand—that is, you ought to have a single university. If there is any flaw in the argument for a single university then the flaw also exists in the position that these special schools should not be put where the population is.

34. Then you do not consider the University should be in touch with the up-to-date communities, which it would not be if you had it centralized?—I do not see how it is out of touch.

35. Well, it is not proposed in all our University centres that we shall if possible retain the system of night classes as well as day classes, or would you abolish the night class system absolutely?—I might say on that point that I was an evening student myself in the Sydney University, so I fully appreciate what the advantages of evening study are, and I think evening lectures should exist wherever possible; but I think first you must have university education which reaches a university standard, and the next thing you would introduce would be evening work. Both are very desirable, but if you have to make a choice then you have to ensure that you have work of a university character somewhere, otherwise the whole university system will fail to fulfil its purpose. In trying to give a great many people something you will give none of them anything of any value.

36. Did the night classes you attended not reach the university standard?—They did reach the university standard because the University had been built up as a day institution and night classes had been added; but my experience then was to show what I contend now, that it is only under the greatest difficulty that any one can do the best work in the evening. I remember attending lectures on geometrical conic sections from 9 to 10 p.m., and working at a distasteful mathematical subject it is only those students who are keen that would do any good work at all; and I see the same thing happening here, that the work is not of a high character which is done at night, especially late at night.

---

Professor PICKEN examined. (No. 19.)

1. *The Chairman.*] I want to know whether the Professorial Board of Victoria College approached the Macarthy Trustees with regard to receiving a grant?—Yes.

2. For what purposes?—The main thing that the Council asked for was provision to help it in introducing day teaching in science. They asked as an alternative for means to set up a Chair in economics or history.

3. It was not an application to them for funds for research work?—No. That was not specially put forward, but a printed memorandum was sent to the Trustees, and that included a variety of proposals.

4. I wanted to find out whether, in considering the proposal to apply to the Macarthy Trust for assistance, your Professorial Board had not had some confusion of opinion in regard to what you were going to seek?—There are in the memorandum suggestions of considerable variety, and some were naturally supported more strongly by some members of the Board and other proposals by others. The printed document was drawn up at the request of the Council by a committee of the Professorial Board, but it was endorsed by the Professorial Board. It is regarded by the College Council as a fair statement of the way in which the College ought to expect to develop in the near future.

---

TUESDAY, 2ND SEPTEMBER, 1913.

Professor ADAMSON further examined. (No. 20.)

1. *Hon. Mr. Allen.*] I would like you to explain to the Committee what you consider the minimum necessary for specialization in a law school?—In the first place, if you look at Table H on page 10 you will see that only one assistant is allowed to two professors, whereas in every other case an assistant is allowed to each professor, and that without any specialization at all in the special sense of the word. For instance, you have Latin, English, and Greek.

2. But then there is only one professor?—No, there are two, and we are specializing. If there are two professors in law, why should not each have an assistant?

3. You apparently do not agree with the minimum suggested by the Inspector-General. What do you suggest?—I answer that by, first of all, a reference to the memorandum which was presented by a committee of Victoria College to the Macarthy Trustees. You will see it is there suggested that there should be an assistant to the professor—that is, in addition to the present assistant.