

4. How many professors in law have you now?—Two professors and one assistant.

5. You suggest, then, one more assistant?—One more assistant; and I suggest a lecturer in procedure and evidence.

6. You suggest what is in the report?—No. I say those are the minimum needs of the law school. I suggest, in order that you should put it on a proper footing, that you should have a lecturer in conveyancing.

7. And a lecturer on procedure and evidence?—Certainly.

8. Two more lecturers?—Certainly. I suggest that as the minimum.

9. You suggest those two professors in the minimum suggested by the Inspector-General and a lecturer on conveyancing?—Yes.

10. And a lecturer on procedure and evidence?—Yes.

11. And what else?—And an assistant to the professor.

12. That would be two professors, two lecturers, and two assistants?—That is so. Would you allow me to qualify that by saying that I do not regard that as an ideal school, and for that purpose I refer to my evidence in chief.

13. Now, you know, of course, that there is a good deal of law taught at the other University colleges besides Victoria College?—I do.

14. In one University college there is specializing in law, but I want to know how far that work can be carried on at the other University colleges?—I answered that question in my examination in chief. I repeat that I consider the proper course would be to have one law school, and that the money which is devoted to teaching the law in other colleges should take the form of bursaries to enable the law students to attend the principal school until we have a thoroughly efficient law school in New Zealand.

15. Then do I understand you to say that you do not think part of the work can be done at other colleges than the one where the specialization is?—My opinion is that the public money should not be devoted for this purpose. I may add that I can see no objection to special lectureships financed by local bodies. I would illustrate it in this way: Engineering is specially provided for in Canterbury—a special grant is given for it; but it is possible that the local Engineers' Institute in Wellington might institute a lectureship at Victoria College, and in the same way lectureships might be instituted by local bodies at other colleges.

16. Is not that what is done now to some extent?—I have no objection to that if that is so, but what I object to is that provision is made for them out of public money.

17. On what ground do you object to public money being so spent?—I repeat again that the scheme of this report as gathered from page 10 is to have in each of the four affiliated institutions departments of arts, science, commerce, and law, and by that policy you will have four inefficient law schools in each of the four different centres instead of having a properly equipped law school in one centre.

18. And then I understand you to say that you do not approve of these two lecturers in Canterbury, Otago, and Auckland?—I do not approve of the public money being devoted for that purpose, if you will take my qualification, until a proper law school has been thoroughly equipped at one centre.

19. How are you to get over this difficulty as it presents itself to us in New Zealand—that you have a number of young men who are attending offices and gain their practical experience who could not, I imagine, leave to go to a central school, but who could supplement their practical knowledge with a certain amount of theoretical work if opportunity was given to them: how would you get over that difficulty?—I say the same difficulty applies in every country. It applies in Scotland.

20. Well, I want to know how they get over it?—They go to Edinburgh. Three-fourths of the law students have to leave their native towns and go to Edinburgh to study. There is a law school in Glasgow. From the west of Scotland a great many go to Glasgow.

21. But the position is rather different there, is it not, from New Zealand, where young men are living in three other centres where the Law Societies themselves help to provide a certain amount of teaching for them?—Yes, I quite agree. I have no objection to that, and I think I have already said so.

22. You do not object to the principle, but object to public money being applied to the principle?—No, I do not. I wish, first of all, to see a well-equipped law school in New Zealand before public money is devoted as is proposed in the report.

23. Now we come to this: assuming that there was a well-equipped law school at Victoria College you would not object to a certain amount of public money being spent for the purposes we have been talking about in other centres?—Certainly not.

24. Then you do not object to the principle of the thing?—No.

25. You have the principle before you—that is, the better equipment of one great law school?—My principle is this: that I should, first of all, like to see a well-equipped law school in which specialization is carried on, and once that is established I have no objection to a certain amount of law teaching in all the centres. I would not have specialization in all the centres.

26. I do not suggest that?—I quite agree.

27. How many law students are there now at Victoria College?—I could not say. You will find them in the Inspector-General's report—there are 164.

28. Does that include the post-graduate students?—I presume so.

29. How many post-graduate students are there?—I could not tell you just now. I have three going in for honours in law, and I have others taking what are really law subjects but which are also part of the arts curriculum. There are four taking jurisprudence and constitutional history, and there are two others for constitutional history only.

30. Those are all post-graduates?—Yes.