

is in the wrong hands: the Governors of the Canterbury College are no doubt very estimable men in many respects, but I do not think they have shown the tact or experience necessary in the management of an agricultural college, and as a consequence money has been frittered away on many unnecessary objects; the result is, there is apparently no money for experimental purposes, or for establishing scholarships, or other objects which might fairly be expected. The second cause of failure, I consider, is the high rate of fees, the best proof of this being that since the fees were raised to the present rate the number of students has been reduced. I consider, further, that the system of farming is too extravagant, and not such as young farmers should be taught to pursue. We find that the labour-bill for three years, commencing 1884, averaged over £1,000 a year (including payments to students) for 660 acres. The income of the farm for the same period averaged £2,075 per annum. Adding the cost of manures, seed, and maintenance of the establishment to the labour, the accounts show a loss of £574 per annum. Excluding the cost of maintenance, and taking only labour, seeds, manures, and implements on the Dr. side, and sales of produce on the Cr. side, the accounts would show an average profit of only £403 per annum—that is without rent, or interest, or taxes, and with students' unpaid labour given in. I bring this forward to show that it is an extravagant system of farming, which no farmer would wish to teach his sons. I consider another cause of failure to carry out the original intention is that the Board of Governors has never tried to keep in touch with the public, nor aimed to make the institution popular: they even refused to publish detailed accounts until called for by the House of Representatives. I consider that the Board should publish full particulars annually. About a year ago Mr. Enys, a member of the Board, endeavoured to get a statement published, and it is on record that the Chairman stated it was not advisable to do so—that there were many things which it was not desirable to make public. The Board supported the Chairman, and the statement was refused. Hence my action in asking for an inquiry to be made, as I look upon it as very important that the agricultural public should thoroughly understand the position of affairs, and have faith in the management of such an institution. I do not wish to go further into the management than to show need for reform. I consider the labour-bill out of all proportion to the amount of work done. I notice that the students' fees for the three years above referred to have been nearly swallowed up by the cost of board. In 1884 the fees amounted to £1,322; board for students and staff amounted to £1,462: in 1885 the fees amounted to £1,740; board cost £1,590: and in 1886 the fees amounted to £1,226, while the cost of board amounted to £1,190. Another point I wish to draw attention to is, that the Board of Governors seem never to have kept the interest accounts distinct, or, at least, they have never shown how the account is made up. The abstracts of accounts for the years 1884, 1885, and 1886 show an excess of expenditure over income of £3,616, which must have been met out of interest or capital.

1. *The Chairman.*] You complain that the experiments have been very few, and that the public has not had the benefit of them owing to the results not having been published: do you consider that the colony should benefit by the publication of the results from time to time?—Yes, certainly.

2. You say the Board of Governors is not in touch with the public: do you know what weight or influence the reports of the farm-examiners have had with the Board, and whether their recommendations have been given effect to?—I have seen some of their recommendations; but have not heard that they have been attended to. They have usually been of a very general nature.

3. Do you consider the reports of the farm-examiners have done any good or harm?—I consider they have done harm in this way: They have generally reported things going on well, and have been quoted by the Board for the purpose of proving the general management satisfactory, and so have prevented faults being seen.

4. Do you think that if the examiners had larger powers—*i.e.*, if they had to examine the farm accounts, and to report whether the farm was being worked on economic principles—they would have been more useful?—Most decidedly so.

5. *Mr. Murphy.*] If the original intention of placing the institution under an Agricultural Board had been carried out, the results would have been better?—Yes.

6. Have you understood that the reserves and accounts of the School of Agriculture were to be kept distinct from other branches of the Canterbury College?—Yes.

7. You know of no authority under which the Board of Governors could devote the proceeds of the reserves to any other purpose than the School of Agriculture?—I know of none.

8. Would you go so far as to say that any money applied to the building of Canterbury College or any other purpose should be refunded?—Most decidedly so, and I would consider it a breach of trust to apply the funds to any other institution.

9. *The Chairman.*] What remedial measures would you suggest?—I have a very strong feeling that the first step would be to have the management taken out of the hands of the Canterbury College. I should be glad to see the Government advised to bring in a Bill to place the management in the hands of the Canterbury Agricultural and Pastoral Association, and I have no doubt that the association would very soon make a success of the institution, as it has of everything it has undertaken. The sole control of the reserves and the management of the school and farm should be in the hands of the association. Three or five members could be appointed as a Board, and should be paid, say, £50 per annum for their services. The original intention was to place the institution in the hands of just such men as compose the association, as will be seen by looking at the names of the original Committee appointed by the Provincial Council. The present system of electing members of the Board of Governors of Canterbury College is likely to preclude the election of men competent to manage an agricultural college. I should like to see the Act provide that the fees should simply cover the cost of board—about £25 per annum. The fees for sons of New Zealand settlers should be lower than for students from outside the colony. Travelling expenses should be allowed, as is now done, to students from other parts of New Zealand, so as to place all parts of the colony on a similar footing; but no expenses should be allowed to students from places beyond the