

(founded in 1874), serving a population approximately the same as that of the district of Victoria College, has 24,000 volumes—*i.e.*, more than all the New Zealand college libraries together; over seven times as many as Otago University, founded five years before Adelaide; and three times as many as Victoria College. In periodical literature the New Zealand colleges make a worse showing, if that be possible. Canterbury exists on eight per year. The Medical College of Otago seems best provided for in this respect. Fourteen free periodicals are obtained in all the New Zealand colleges; 250 in Adelaide. When one remembers that the Australian university libraries are relatively small, one is forced to conclude that university methods in New Zealand have discounted the importance and use of libraries.

Professor VON ZEDLITZ recalled. (No. 6.)

1. *Mr. G. M. Thomson.*] How far are your views shared by the professors in the other three University Colleges?—We communicated with them in the first instance at the foundation of the University Reform Association. We received altogether about fifteen replies which were favourable to the general purposes we set forth. We then communicated with them in regard to the letter which was sent to the English people, which letter is printed in the pamphlet, and we asked them if they cared to reply, and we got about fifteen replies, in which you may say a few are favourable and a few unfavourable, properly classified. From my own personal knowledge of the other colleges I should say that on the whole the Canterbury College people would agree with us, the majority of the Auckland people would agree with us, and the majority of the Otago people would be against us. I should perhaps correct this to this extent: There are very few dissentients with regard to reform in organization, but there is some dissent on the question of examination.

1A. (To Professor Hunter.)] Your figures here dealing with the Otago University library do not seem to recognize the fact that there is a large library in connection with the Museum which is available for biological students?—I can only say that the figures forming the basis of that table were obtained from the Registrars of the various colleges. When the Registrar of the Otago University sent them I wrote to ask if they were correct, and he informed me that they were.

1B. Does the undergraduate use the library to any great extent?—I can say from my own experience as a student of the Otago University that it was a standing grievance with the students that the library was not open to them. You will find articles in recent issues of the *Otago University Review* showing that they want to use the library. Our experience in the Victoria College is that the library is very largely used by the students.

2. *Mr. Allen* (to Professor von Zedlitz.)] You gave four reasons in reference to the normal work of university teachers and so on: what were those reasons?—I suggested that my argument about organization was not logically complete without four assumptions, and they were these: (1) That the work above-mentioned—namely, the work of preparing the syllabus of university studies—is the normal work of university teachers; (2) that to exclude the university teachers from that work reacts disadvantageously upon themselves and upon the university; (3) that the presence of a few professors on the Senate, and any willingness on the part of the Senate to listen to professorial advice, does not in the least meet the requirements of the case. Perhaps that is badly worded. I meant this: that when we have said that the organization excludes the professors more or less from this normal discharge of their functions, we have been met with the reply that there are a number of professors on the Senate. In the second place we are told that the University Senate is always willing to listen to the advice of the Professorial Boards, and pays great deference and attention to suggestions coming from that source. We say that is true, but the evidence in the pamphlet shows that, even fully admitting these contentions, they do not meet the requirements of the case. It would necessitate a long speech to show how they do not meet the case, but the essential point is that you want to be dealing with the requirements of each subject and the details of the syllabus of each subject; and these should be dealt with by men having a certain degree of knowledge in order to exercise a certain degree of system. I am represented on the Senate by my friend and colleague Professor Brown, but he at the same time would be the first to admit he is not qualified to represent my view. The first point is brought out very strongly indeed in Professor Eliot's book—that the teacher should be an expert authority. What you want to do is to try and stimulate in every way his responsibility. If you exclude him and say that all that can be managed better by somebody else, you inflict a blow upon his intellectual enthusiasm which, with ordinary human beings, tends to destroy it. Eliot puts it that in forty years' experience the whole scope and method of university work in every single department has undergone great change, and it is absolutely necessary in this modern world that a man should be kept alive and interested in understanding these changes. A system which shunts these responsibilities on to a lay body, supposing that they listen to representations every time and that they do consult us, results in responsibility being taken away from us. The responsibility rests upon them, and it is not fair to ask them to take it.

3. Following that up, you have emphasized one point I wanted to ask you about. You assume that the normal work of every teacher should include certain things. Do you suggest that every teacher should be given an opportunity to prepare the syllabus, or should the representation be by departments. The department's interests would be represented by some head of the school?—Your question immediately goes to the core of the matter, that there should be a certain amount of give-and-take. We cannot get a solution from abstract theory; but I would suggest that the Welsh way does actually accomplish that. Every teacher is concerned in the Professorial Board. This Professorial Board is represented on the joint body by teachers responsible for departments. When in one department you have a couple of professors and three or four assistants, one or two, as the case may be, will act as representatives on the particular body.

4. You suggest that every teacher should be concerned in the suggestion of a syllabus, and that that should be submitted to a representative body?—Yes. The representation would become very difficult if done in any mechanical way. It behoves us to suggest it in the form of department representation rather than the mechanical representation of every individual.