

is the external system. This external system was adopted by the London University to meet quite unusual conditions; but, as the result of two Commissions, London has become a teaching University as well as an examining one, and it is being urged before the third Commission, now sitting, that the internal and external sides should be separately organized and administered. The purely external method is practically unknown in America and Germany. No British university of repute, except London, now adopts it, and, as I have said, London has been compelled to modify its methods. The external system has been condemned by Commissions on the New Zealand University (1879), on the Scottish Universities (1899), on the Melbourne University (1904), and by the New Zealand Education Department (Special Report, No. 7, p. 94). In 1886 it was severely criticized by the present Chancellor of the University (Sir Robert Stout), then Minister of Education, and in 1899 the Senate itself formally recognized that the method involves inevitable hardships on students (minutes, p. 46). The sixty-five authorities whose opinions are quoted in the appendix of the volume "University Reform in New Zealand" almost unanimously condemn it. These include men who, as students or professors, have worked under the system in New Zealand—*e.g.*, Professors Beattie (Sheffield), Connall (Leeds), Inglis (Reading, now Otago), Tucker (Melbourne), Dendy (King's College, London), and President R. C. Maclaurin (Boston). Fifteen men who have served the University as examiners in Great Britain agree that the system ought to be altered. Among these are men of world-wide repute—*e.g.*, Sir William Ramsay, Professors Poynting, Tout, Nicholson, S. P. Thompson. Some of the local opinions imply that the association's letter to the overseas authorities does not fairly present the case on this point. As the letter is printed in the appendix of the pamphlet, the Committee will be able to judge for itself. The letter does not seem to have raised this suspicion in the minds of those authorities who have had experience of our system. Professor Dendy, in his reply, writes, "A man who is not fit to examine his students is not fit to be a professor. I felt this very strongly when I was myself a professor at Christchurch, and my opinion remains the same now that I am an examiner in England for the New Zealand University." Some years ago the Department of Education considered the system detrimental to the best interests of primary education in New Zealand, and modified the methods in vogue accordingly. This almost unanimous condemnation surely points to the fact that the method of purely external examination is injurious to education. The reasons are obvious: The method is unfair to teachers and students alike; it degrades the former and leads to "cram" on the part of the latter, and, by undermining the initiative and individuality of both, it robs the community of some of the real benefits of a university. It may be urged that many reputable universities have external examiners. This is true, but they act in conjunction with the teacher, as in medicine in New Zealand, and not as purely external examiners. It is urged in some New Zealand opinions that we have laid before you that the "terms" examinations give the teachers power to deal with their students as they desire—*e.g.*, that New Zealand professors may fix their own standard, select their own methods of teaching, &c. In practice this is far from being the case. (1.) No "terms" are required for examinations in medicine, dentistry, veterinary science, agriculture, and engineering. In these a certificate of the professor is sufficient. In the subjects for the professional law examinations neither "terms" nor certificates are required. Such differences in the treatment of different subjects obviously show that it was never intended that "terms" should be a means by which the freedom of a New Zealand professor in his methods of teaching was to be guarded. (2.) There is no university machinery to insure that a student must pass "terms" in these subjects that he takes for his degree examination. The colleges may, and some do, make regulations to this effect; but, so far as we can ascertain, there is no means by which the college teachers could, in the last resort, make their regulations effective. (3.) In any case, however, it would obviously be unfair for any professor in any college to exact a higher standard than that demanded by the English examiner. It would certainly defeat one of the ends to obtain which these same authorities consider the external system is necessary—*viz.*, uniformity in the degree standard throughout New Zealand. There are really three points involved in the question of an examination system: (i) The definition of the scope of the examination—the drawing-up of the curriculum and syllabuses; (ii) conduct of the examinations—the selecting of examiners, &c.; (iii) the actual examining—the setting and marking of the papers. If the teachers were excluded from taking part in any one of these tasks such serious consequences would not follow as in New Zealand, where the teachers, *ex officio*, take no definite part in any of them. One or other of two reasons alone would suffice for the total exclusion of the teacher that exists in New Zealand—(1) the teachers, or some of them, are incompetent; (2) the teachers, or some of them, are unfair. If it is suggested that there is even a suspicion that either of these charges is true, a thorough inquiry into the staffing of the colleges seems necessary. Research: The importance of the research side of a university is now universally recognized by competent authorities. Both in its influence on university teachers and students alike and on university teaching methods, and by its importance for the economic progress of a community, research is now regarded as essential in an institution that is deemed worthy of university rank. It is true that good research-work is being done in some departments of university work in New Zealand, but the organization of the University does not lend itself to this important aspect of university work. Libraries: A well-equipped and an efficiently administered library is as necessary as teachers, students, and laboratories if the functions of a university are to be properly fulfilled. The state of university libraries in New Zealand, as disclosed in the table on page 92 of the pamphlet on university reform, is certainly a grave reflection on university administration in New Zealand. After forty-two years of university work, Otago University has 3,150 books and 52 sets of periodicals in its library. Even these, however, are not readily accessible to the students, who must apply to the Registrar for the key. Canterbury College, after thirty-eight years, has 4,000 volumes stored temporarily in one small room and in a few cases in the college hall. It is true that Auckland University and Victoria College have made somewhat better provision in this respect, but in comparison with Adelaide they show how neglected this side of university work has been in New Zealand. Adelaide