1911.

NEW ZEALAND.

EDUCATION COMMITTEE:

PETITION OF THOMAS H. LABY AND TWELVE OTHERS (UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS),

(REPORT ON THE).

(MR. SIDEY, CHAIRMAN.)

Report brought up on Wednesday, 25th October, 1911, together with Minutes of Evidence and Appendix, and ordered to be printed.

ORDERS OF REFERENCE.

Extracts from the Journals of the House of Representatives.

FRIDAY, THE 4TH DAY OF AUGUST, 1911.

Ordered, "That a Committee be appointed, consisting of ten members, to consider all matters relating to school-teachers, education, and public instruction generally, public-school training of teachers, higher education, technical education, and manual instruction, and such other matters affecting education as may be referred to it; to have power to call for persons and papers; three to be a quorum: the Committee to consist of Mr. Allen, Mr. Hanan, Mr. Hardy, Mr. Luke, Mr. Poole, Mr. Sidey, Mr. Stallworthy, Mr. G. M. Thomson, Mr. J. C. Thomson, and the mover." —(Hon. Mr. FOWLDS.)

WEDNESDAY, THE 20TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 1911.

Ordered, "That the name of the Hon. T. Mackenzie be added to the Education Committee." - (Right Hon. Sir J. G. WARD, Bart.)

REPORT.

PETITIONERS pray for the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into the question of reform in University administration and education in New Zealand.

I am directed to report that the Education Committee, having considered this petition, and the evidence of the petitioners and others in relation thereto, is of opinion—

(1.) That a case has been made out for reform in the constitution of the New Zealand University, more particularly in the direction of the utilization in a larger measure than at present of the Professorial Staffs of the colleges in the framing of curricula and syllabuses, and in the conduct of examinations.

(2.) That the appointment of a Royal Commission is not necessary at present, as the Committee believes there is evidence that the University is itself moving in a direction which will gradually evolve a scheme of reform on the lines indicated, and this is borne out to some extent by the fact that in November, 1910, in accordance with a resolution of the Senate, a conference of representatives of the Professorial Boards was held in Wellington to consider certain academic questions referred to it by the Senate.

(3.) That, with regard to finance,—

(*a*.) The fees charged in the various colleges should be uniform;

(*b*.) All the colleges should be adequately endowed, and where grants of a permanent character are made by Parliament, these should be statutory; and

(*c*.) The financial position and requirements of each college should be inquired into, each college being considered on its merits, and provision made accordingly. (The Committee think that this inquiry might be conducted by the Inspector-General of Schools.)

(4.) That—

(*a*.) The library equipment of the colleges should be strengthened, especially in the interests of research.

(*b*.) The Inspector-General should be asked to report on this matter. (In preparing his report the Inspector-General should consider whether a system of interexchange of books between the libraries could be given effect to.)

(*c*.) The reports of the Inspector-General under this and the preceding paragraph should be referred to the Education Committee of the House next session for consideration.

(5.) That, considering the age of the institution, and the geographical and other difficulties with which it has had to contend, the University has done very good work, and is justifying the expectations and accomplishing the objects of its founders. University education is free to all holders of scholarships, studentships, and bursaries, the number of these current last year being 557. If a student does not obtain a scholarship, but gains credit in the University Junior Scholarship Examination, he is entitled to a bursary, which carries with it the payment of college and University fees for three or four years. The University has thus opened the doors of the professions to all classes of the community, and its graduates are taking leading positions in all walks of life. The Committee believes, however, that with reform on the lines above indicated the University will extend its usefulness as an educational agent, and become increasingly identified with the practical life and work of the community.

(6.) That—

(*a*.) This report be laid on the table of the House, and be referred to the Government for consideration.

(*b*.) That the minutes of evidence, together with the pamphlet of the petitioners entitled "University Reform in New Zealand," and the "Opinions of some New Zealand Educational Authorities," be laid on the table of the House, and that the minutes of evidence be printed.

25th October, 1911. T. K. SIDEY, Chairman.

(NOTE.—The petition of Thomas H. Laby and twelve others (University professors), together with the departmental reports thereon, are included in I.–13A, 1910.)

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

FRIDAY, 1ST SEPTEMBER, 1911.

A. L. HERDMAN, M.P., attended and made a statement. (No. 1.)

The Chairman: We are now prepared to hear what you have to say, Mr. Herdman, in your opening on behalf of the petitioners, and also what witnesses you wish to call in connection with the petition. I do not think we need to have the petition read, because it has been on our list for some time, and the Committee is familiar with its contents.

Mr. Herdman: Mr. Chairman, what I have to say in connection with the petition will be brief, because in bringing the question of university reform before the Committee we have determined—although the subject is of very great importance, almost of national importance—that it would be wiser for us and more convenient for the Committee that the case should be put in as compact a form as possible. You are no doubt aware that a pamphlet dealing with university reform has been published by the New Zealand University Reform Association. That pamphlet constitutes the substantial part of our case. I propose to put the pamphlet in. In addition to putting in the pamphlet, I propose, with the permission of the Committee, to put in the opinions of some of the highest educational authorities in New Zealand upon the various questions raised in the pamphlet. You will notice at the end of our pamphlet a number of opinions obtained from England and America in answer to letters addressed to high authorities. The communications which I hold in my hand now are local opinions—some are favourable to our case, some adverse: these I would like to put in. The great bulk of the opinions are strongly in favour of the reforms we advocate. My contention is shortly this: Our system of university government in New Zealand is obsolete—it is old-fashioned, archaic. University government in England, Scotland, Europe, and America has advanced with great strides during the last quarter of a century, but no radical alteration has taken place in our system of university management since it was first given birth to. We believe that the great bulk of the evidence collected goes in the direction of showing that some searching investigation should be made into the whole question. We believe we can satisfy you that New Zealand has been lagging behind; and of such great national importance is a university established upon efficient modern principles that Parliament would be well justified in asking the Government to set up a Royal Commission to inquire into the present condition of our local institutions. The question is not political; it is not a party question: it is a problem of intense interest to any one who is deeply concerned about the future welfare of this country. I propose to-day to call four witnesses—Mr. A. R. Atkinson, Professor T. A. Hunter, Professor Von Zedlitz, and Mr. A. P. Webster, Inspector of the Bank of Australasia. I will first call Mr. Atkinson.

A. R. ATKINSON attended and made a statement. (No. 2.)

Mr. Atkinson: Mr. Chairman, I wish to open, if I may be allowed, with a personal disclaimer. I wish to disclaim the possession of the technical knowledge necessary to put this matter fully before the Committee in all its details, or perhaps even in all its cardinal principles. I also wish to make it plain that, although I am not an expert witness and I happen to be a lawyer, nevertheless I am not here in a professional capacity. I am not a petitioner, but a member of the University Reform Association in Wellington which has promoted this petition, and I have really been put in the position of first witness, although far from the most important, in order that I might put before you perhaps what may be called the view of a man of the world rather than that of an expert in regard to the general aspects of the matter as they present themselves to me. I may say that I had followed the discussion in the Wellington papers for some while without coming to any definite conclusion. Last year I went to a public meeting convened on the subject and addressed by the professors of Victoria College and others, and I was firmly convinced that a case for inquiry, and probably even for reform, had been made out. Accordingly I subsequently joined that association, and I desire to give this petition the strongest support I can. Mr. Herdman referred in his opening remarks to the movement that is distinguishing all the leading nations of the world—the progressive movement in the matter of university education. All the nations are turning their attention to this engrossing subject of education from the primary schools right up to the university. It is a commonplace that the German student is a greater power than the German soldier, and the German professor than the German general. The result of this great educational movement, this appreciation of the part that education plays—and must play—in the life of a nation, and especially a democracy, is to add immensely to the significance of the university and to the determination to bring it into the closest possible touch with every phase of national life; and thus we see the determination of the leading nations of the world to increase the efficiency, the scope, and the influence of uni-

versity education. The result of that is the tendency to revise established methods and to adapt them to current needs. It is a remarkable thing that even conservative England is being stirred on the matter about as deeply as progressive America. In other parts of the Empire similar movements are going on, and I have read in connection with university education in South Africa arguments to show that the matter is being fought substantially on the same principle that the petitioners desire to place before the Committee now. So it is that the traditions that have endured for centuries in an old country like England are not exempting the oldest universities from the effect of this change in spirit and outlook any more than the comparatively mushroom growths which are the creations of the last fifty years. Oxford and Cambridge have not been exempt from the spirit, and they are also being revised and brought up to date. If this be so, would it not be remarkable if New Zealand were not also affected? It would have been especially wonderful if New Zealand, which is constantly experimenting in the field of primary and secondary education—not to mention the political and social fields—should have left this question of academical education untouched. It is not our desire to disparage anything that has been done by those who are as deeply interested as we are in university work, but who possibly do not see eye to eye with us. We can all be thankful to the Otago pioneers who founded the first university in New Zealand, to those who afterwards founded the New Zealand University, and to those who have carried on the work of teaching and administration. But it would be foolish, we submit, to allow gratitude to blind us to the fact that even a good thing can be capable of improvement; and it would be little short of a miracle if the old system that has obviously grown up in a piecemeal, irregular, and spasmodical fashion during the last forty years could claim exemption from the ordinary rule of human institutions or from that special necessity which all the universities of the world have recently felt for revising their methods. A bare glance at the chronology on the subject will be sufficient to establish this part of our case: In 1869 the founding of the Otago University; 1870, the passing of the New Zealand University Act; 1873, the founding of Canterbury College; 1874, a new Act substituted for that of 1870; in 1879 the appointment of the Royal Commission which overhauled the whole matter and submitted a very full report; 1882, Auckland University College founded; 1897, Victoria College founded, representing Wellington and the middle district. In 1892 there was a university amendment, and there have been several amended Acts; but none of these deal with the crucial points that we desire to submit to this Committee. The change which was made by the Act of 1874, which repealed the Act of 1870, constitutes one, and I suppose the most important, of the crucial points in our case. The preamble of the Act of 1874 enacts "Whereas it is expedient to promote sound learning in the Colony of New Zealand"; and that Act empowered the New Zealand University to treat with the Otago University Council with a view to absorbing that institution, and certain provisions were made against that contingency. It was expressly stated in the Act of 1874 that the University as reconstituted was not for the purpose of teaching, but to conduct examinations. The cardinal point of our contention is that that distinction of the Act of 1874 was an admitted and undeniable violation of the original University Act. That is the vital change to which we desire to direct attention, and in respect of which we desire to have a full investigation. The Act of 1874 limited the functions of the University to examinations. Mr. Herdman referred to the opinions of experts that will be found in the book and in the papers that have since been put in. I have not seen all the local opinions, but with regard to the opinions from outside sources we see that there is practical unanimity in connection with the undesirable character of complete separation between the teaching and examining functions. It is referred to by one of the leading university men of London as a curse or blight. He says that this divorce was the curse of the London University. I referred to the fact that a Royal Commission reported on the matter in 1879. They recommended the abolition of the anomaly which I have indicated, and which was practically forced on the country by Otago being the first in the field and not desiring to merge her identity with the new University. The 1879 Commission recommended the abolition of that anomaly. It recommended, in the first place, that there should be colleges established in the several centres, and that they should be brought into organic affiliation with the New Zealand University, and should be colleges of that University instead of entirely separate institutions as at present. That was in 1879, but no action was taken. Thirty-two years have passed, and all that has happened in connection with that recommendation is the foundation of University Colleges in Auckland and in Wellington. All that was done by the institution of these colleges was to provide the framework and the means of carrying out and strengthening the reforms which the University Commission desired. It was impossible in 1879, without colleges being established in other centres, to carry out fully the recommendations of the Royal Commission. The foundation was not there until 1897, because not till then was the necessary number of University Colleges established to represent practically the whole of the country, so that the foundation accordingly was not there to enable the ideal reforms which the Commission of 1879 had in view to carry out what was intended. I am only attempting to put the matter in a sketchy form, which will be filled in by men after me who have a better acquaintance with the subject. This petition is not asking for any new thing at all. It is asking for practically what was desired by the Royal Commission of 1879, and its request is in accordance with the general movement that is distinguishing all the leading universities in the world. I wish, in a final word, to make this quite clear, that although the matter is substantially as stated, the petitioners do not desire to submit any scheme to the Committee, and, indeed, they have not got any cut-and-dried scheme which they desire to thrust down any one's throat. But they do desire a full inquiry into the system in the light of the most modern developments of university teaching and administration, and they feel perfectly satisfied that this Committee—and the House, if the Committee reports favourably—will recognize, inde-

pendently of the merits of this particular reform or that, that a case has been made out for a thorough overhauling of our university methods in the light, as I say, of the most modern and up-to-date knowledge.

Professor G. W. Von Zedlitz examined. (No. 3.)

1. *The Chairman.*] What is your subject at the University?—Modern languages. On the question of organization of the University Mr. Atkinson has made it plain how, in the most natural and intelligible way possible, there never has been any revision in Parliament. It has never been before Parliament in any shape. The question of organization is the most important part of the reform movement. We have traced to a defective organization most of the defects now visible in the working of our system, and these defects are of such a nature that they can only be removed by a reorganization, and gradually. For convenience I shall separate the subject into two parts—I, the University itself, and its relation to the colleges; II, the internal arrangements of the colleges. I. In the early days of our University, in the seventies, in addition to Otago University and Canterbury College, there were a number of secondary schools in various parts of New Zealand "affiliated" to the University, and engaged in preparing students for University examinations. These institutions naturally differed greatly in character and standing, and Parliament, in providing a central authority to frame a University syllabus and control University examinations for all of them, could hardly have proceeded otherwise than by creating a governing body which should stand outside of and above the various schools and colleges. In 1879 a Royal Commission took evidence on the state of affairs thus created, and recommended that the secondary schools should be disaffiliated—that institutions of a University character should be created in Wellington and Auckland, and that these new colleges, with the Otago and Canterbury Colleges, should constitute the University—*i.e.*, that, instead of being subordinate to and outside of the University, as they actually are, they should conjointly be the University, which would thus lose its objectionable character of a mere examining body and become a federated teaching body under the supreme control of a Senate containing representatives of the four colleges and also nominees of the State. The Commission also laid down the safeguards required in its opinion to protect the academic independence of the colleges, so that in the distant future they might develop into independent universities—say, when the population of New Zealand should reach three or four millions. The first material step towards carrying out the recommendations of the Commission was the foundation of colleges in Auckland and Wellington, and this step was taken as regards Auckland in 1882, and Wellington in 1897. But the Acts required to found these institutions gave no opening for a reconstitution of the University on the lines advocated by the Commission; and it is scarcely surprising that in 1897 the report of the Commission of 1879 should have been more or less forgotten. At any rate, Parliament never at any time has had before it for discussion the constructive recommendations of the Commission of 1879, with the result that a system suited to entirely different conditions—conditions which have long vanished—still subsists; and, although that system was condemned as long ago as 1879, no one can exactly be blamed for the shelving of this report of the Commission. Parliament has never had the opportunity of attending to it, and the great lapse of time between the presentation of the report and the maturing of the conditions for a federal University—eighteen years—makes it very natural and intelligible that the recommendations have never been considered by Parliament. The result is, we have now four University Colleges, with staffs of professors and lecturers, and yet the technical detail work of determining curricula of studies and managing examinations, which in all universities are part of the duties for which professors get paid their salaries, falls upon our Senate or supreme body. The body which ought to do this work, and is receiving emoluments on a scale which presupposes ordinary professorial duties, is shut out from it, and the work is thrown upon a body not well fitted to perform it. This is not a reproach against the Senate. The evidence in our pamphlet shows that every subject of instruction in a university needs representation on the body which initiates legislation; and in general I refer you for proof of these views to the pamphlet, in which so large a number of experts unanimously agree in condemning this extraordinary feature of our system. While expressing my sincere respect for almost all the members of the Senate, as individuals, I venture to suggest that that body, though it may be perfectly fit to discharge the normal duties of the supreme governing body of a university, is ill composed for the purpose of doing the normal technical work of a body of professors, and ought not, in common fairness, to be asked to do it. My argument involves certain assumptions of fact, namely—(1) That the work above mentioned is the normal work of university teachers; (2) that their exclusion from it reacts disadvantageously upon themselves and on 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; (4) that none of the departments of study in a University College ought to be thrust into the disadvantageous position of not being represented in the body which prepares the detailed legislation. As regards these four assumptions which underlie my argument, we also have the unanimous support of the authorities consulted by us, and, so far as we are aware, of every authority on university education. I have tried to show how naturally our anomalous system arose. It has subsisted all these years mainly owing to the separation of the four colleges. In New Zealand there has been no professorial body to discharge the normal duties. The professors of the four colleges have had no common meeting-ground—not even conferences—and have therefore been physically unable to perform conjoint duties. Besides, this has led to mischievous intellectual isolation and dispersion of effort. But I will not here enter upon a recital of the resulting evils, which are set forth at sufficient length in the pamphlet. I should prefer to point out briefly how analogous difficulties to ours are met in the case of the federal University of Wales, consisting

of three colleges separated by considerable distances, and which is now the chief federal university left. In many ways we are like Wales—modest of resources, character and size of staff, numbers, and general type of students. In Wales, the Professorial Board for each college in the first instance draws up its own syllabus. This is then subject to confirmation by the professors of all three colleges sitting conjointly, and ultimately the confirmation of a supreme body of the type of our Senate. There you have the following advantages: The proper body is responsible for being up to date and for initiating changes of detail; the control exercised by his colleagues over each professor's proposals is very thorough; the body that has to revise the syllabus meets frequently, and its members are in constant touch with one another; the bodies that have to be brought together from a distance, and can only meet at longish intervals, are relieved of the heavy mass of detail work; the supreme body in particular deals only with broad questions of policy, and is so better calculated to attract representative public men; in the matter of new appointments the ruling body has at its disposal organization and advice such as are at present missing altogether in New Zealand. II. The Colleges: The constitution of the individual colleges seems to have been influenced by the form given to the University. Otago, which is anterior to the University Act, has a normal constitution. The other three colleges contain a curious anomaly which, so far as we know, does not exist in any other similar institution: the members of the Professorial Board are directly excluded from holding seats on the governing body of their college. The reason for this departure from precedent seems to have been that since the College Councils have mainly financial duties, and in particular do not deal in any form with the syllabus or the examination, there was not the same need as in other university colleges to have a leaven of academic representation on the governing body. Probably there were also people who thought that salaried persons should not sit on a body whose duty it is to fix their salaries. The only reply to this suggestion is that there are many universities in the world, and that this objection is not felt—indeed, can hardly be said to be understood—outside New Zealand. The Bill dealing with Auckland College now before the House provides for direct representation of the Professorial Board on the Council, and the same arrangement should be extended to the Canterbury and Victoria Colleges. In Otago it has always existed. Parliament does not realize, probably, that the net outcome of the whole of our arrangements is that the body of professors, having little say in the academic government of the University, and little say in shaping the policy of the colleges, and little say in the appointments made to their own body, are to all intents and purposes precluded from rendering to the State and the community a large part of the services in return for which professors in other countries draw their salaries; that this makes New Zealand a very comfortable place for a lazy or dishonest professor, but is not conducive to the best interests of the University or to an economical use of the money provided by Parliament for higher education. We are not without a scheme of constructive policy, and we place it before the Committee in the pamphlet which has been put in; but we want to make it as clear as possible in what spirit we place it before you. We do not want to thrust it upon you and say "That is the only scheme." There are other schemes which may be formulated, one of which may be particularly suited to meet the requirements.

A. P. WEBSTER examined. (No. 4.)

1. *The Chairman.*] What is your occupation?—An Inspector of the Bank of Australasia. Might I just in a word state that my position in connection with this matter is substantially that of Mr. Atkinson—namely, one of interest in the subject as a more or less intelligent layman. I have taken an interest for many years, as a matter of fact, in educational movements, and in this matter I have been for the last ten years or so more or less in touch with university professors, and in that way I have come to look on this subject with an amount of detail which an outsider without that privilege might not have done. However, I am not here to-day to talk in any sense at all as an expert. My duty is to put, in a brief and compact fashion, the present financial position of the University Colleges, and to indicate one or two directions in which, it appears to the association, those aspects of the matter certainly call for the serious consideration of the Dominion authorities. When considering the cost of university education in New Zealand it has to be borne in mind that, although the aggregate annual expenditure—viz., 16d. *per capita*—compares not unfavourably with such centralized universities as those of Ontario (15d. *per capita*), New South Wales (8d. *per capita*), and South Australia (13d. *per capita*), yet New Zealand obtains a greatly impaired result because there are four decentralized University Colleges to maintain. On pages 57 to 59 of the pamphlet the wastefulness of our system is shown, but, as the policy of the Dominion seems to be to render university education as accessible as possible, it only remains to emphasize the fact that the present system inevitably involves a much greater relative expenditure if thoroughly efficient results are to be obtained, and this extra expenditure must be faced by the Dominion if true university ideals are to be attained. In this connection the following proportions as to sources of income are significant. Out of every £100 of revenue, State grants and provincial endowments equal 67 per cent., private benefactions 4 per cent., and fees 29 per cent.; and if from fees is deducted the amount which represents scholarships, then only some 19 per cent. of university income in New Zealand is found by students. On page 57 of the pamphlet I think there is necessity for a slight revision in the figures. The alteration is only as to the amount found by the student after deducting fees. I think the figures should be 19. I might say that Professor Laby and myself are responsible for some of the tables in that particular portion of the pamphlet. We did not check the percentages, and that is probably responsible for the difference. The Dominion therefore is already carrying nearly the whole burden, and there is no indication that the position is likely to change; on the contrary, there is urgent need for increased expenditure both on buildings and equipment, especially in the North Island. The following analysis of income and expenditure of the University and the four colleges for 1910 carries some obvious conclusions on its face:—

Income and Expenditure of University and Colleges.

	University.	Auckland University College.	Victoria College.	Canterbury College.	Otago University.	Totals.
Income.						
From—	£	£	£	£	£	£
Government	6,100	7,250	8,300	3,260	2,550	27,400
Private foundations	1,100*	390	290†	8	740	2,400
Provincial endowments	Nil	460	70	9,300	7,100‡	17,000
Fees	6,300	1,840	1,860	3,790	5,200	19,000
Total	13,500	10,000	10,500	16,400	15,600	66,000
Expenditure.						
Salaries	3,070§	7,300	8,000	11,400	13,800	43,500
Administration and maintenance ..	5,150	1,150	3,300	5,660‖	2,320	17,600
Scholarships	4,980	140	980	400	100	6,600
Library	Nil	130	270	110	¶	520
Total	13,200	8,700	12,600	17,600	16,200	68,000

North Island, total, £20,500; South Island, total, £32,000.

* Includes £1,009 of interest on accumulated surplus. † Of this, £150 is interest on accumulation, which will be used in a year or so.
‡ Includes £1,800 Presbyterian Church grant. § Fees to examiners. ‖ Includes an exceptional outlay of £2,656 on apparatus.
¶ No library expenditure recorded in accounts.

(1.) The meagre endowment in the past of higher education in the North Island when compared with the South Island: This is evidenced by the fact that income from endowments in the South Island is £16,400, while in the North Island it is only £530. The significance of this disparity becomes even more patent when the relative growth of population in the South and North Island is compared. In 1879, the year of the Royal Commission's report, the total population of the Dominion was 414,412: in the North Island, 158,407, equal to 38 per cent.; in the South Island, 256,644, equal to 62 per cent. In 1911 the population was 1,098,407: in the North Island, 568,729, equal to 56 per cent.; in the South Island, 444,678, equal to 44 per cent. Deducting from the South Island the population of Marlborough, the West Coast, and Nelson, which are part of Middle University District, the percentages are 63 per cent. and 37 per cent.; and while the population served by the Middle University District is 379,371, equal to 37 per cent. of the whole Dominion, the Victoria College revenue was only 20 per cent. of the total revenue of the four University Colleges, exclusive of the University revenue, the latter being 20 per cent. of the whole. (2.) A quite inadequate amount is being spent on libraries by all the colleges, and equipments by all the colleges, except possibly by Christchurch on its Engineering School. (3.) There is no margin between revenue and expenditure to meet normal expansion. The financial aspect of specialization calls for attention. It has been generally recognized that the four colleges should not all attempt to teach every subject, and special Government grants have in the past been made on this supposition; but there is unfortunately a tendency to depart from this sound understanding, and, as adequate funds are not available to maintain a university standard of teaching at the four colleges in every subject, the result is the lowering of the standards. It is essential, if co-ordination is to be secured, that the governing bodies of the University and its colleges should be in close touch with one another. How this may be attained falls to be dealt with under organization. From the point of view of economical finance the need is urgent. Salaries and Pensions: The information obtainable as to the former in New Zealand is meagre, but as far as it goes it appears the average is £225 per annum less than the average of the four Australian universities, including the proposed university for West Australia. Not only is the average salary substantially less, but also there is no pension scheme in New Zealand for University teachers. Both of these defects operate in directions detrimental to the best results. To the extent to which salaries suffer by comparison the Chairs are less attractive, and without proper provision for retirement and pensions the occupants of the Chairs may continue to teach after they have ceased to be efficient. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching in America aims directly at establishing in higher institutions of learning an efficient system of retiring-allowances for professors, and the administrators of the fund have affirmed that it is as important to provide pensions as to increase laboratories and lecture-rooms. There is great need that the State—which contributes directly and by endowment, as has been stated, some 80 per cent. of University income in New Zealand—should require the adoption of uniform returns from all the colleges, covering the whole subject of their administration. The numerous items of expenditure should be so grouped as to give some fair estimate of the colleges' methods of spending their money. There is no gain to be had by presenting a series of statistics unless they enable sound conclusions to be come to concerning the operations which the expenditure represents: *e.g.*, the returns should show—Amount paid for salaries, distinguishing salaries paid for various grades of teachers; expense of each department, viz., salaries, laboratories, library; how much is spent on teaching; how much is spent on research. It is a fact that all the British universities which accept Government aid (except Oxford and Cambridge) now have to furnish annual returns of revenue and expenditure in conformity with Government requirements. The work of the university is unending, and its wants indefinitely large. An institution professing to conduct the work of a university with manifestly inadequate resources both harms the cause of education and misleads the students, for the latter fail to get the needed stimulus. The aim must be to secure an adequate income and efficient administration.

2. *Mr. Allen.*] In the compilation of the statement of University revenue, have you taken out the different accounts for the schools and bodies governed by Canterbury College?—We have not taken any account of the Public Library and various other matters. We have been careful to include what strictly belongs to Canterbury College as distinguished from other branches.

3. You did not include the School of Art?—No.

4. Nor the Engineering School?—The Engineering School is in.

5. Specialized schools are in?—Yes. That is one of the difficulties I emphasize in what I have stated. We admit that we may have made mistakes. We found ourselves often up against a brick wall when endeavouring to determine whether a particular item should or should not go in; but so far as Professor Laby—who has the technical knowledge—and I, looking at the matter as a practical layman outside, are concerned, we endeavoured to make a fair statement of what might properly be regarded as university expenditure.

6. Canterbury College has an income of £9,300: can you say whether that is income purely from provincial endowments for Canterbury College, or does it include other endowments?—That I cannot answer. These figures were taken from the Government return last session, which embodies returns from the colleges.

7. Does it include anything in regard to the Public Library or the School of Art?—No. Of course, we accepted the figures as they appeared in the account.

8. Can you say whether they separate those endowments and show how much is for Canterbury College, the Public Library, School of Art, and so on?—I cannot say.

9. If that cannot be worked out, is it not unfair to say that the expenditure was for 67 per cent. of the population in the North and 33 per cent. in the South? You have in the South, owing to the colleges having been established earlier, the two costly schools of Engineering and Medicine. Victoria College, you said, served a very large number of people in New Zealand, and so it does; but is it correct to say that the Medical School in Otago and the Engineering School in Canterbury serve only South Island students?—I cannot answer that categorically. I do not know how many medical students go there from the North.

10. The schools are for the whole of the Dominion and not for those particular colleges?—We have not got the figures to show what percentage of students go from the North, but I have no doubt there are some.

11. With regard to the Otago University, you have included £7,100 as provincial endowments and note that they include "£1,800 Presbyterian Church grant." Do you include those in endowments?—A fixed amount had to be contributed in connection with some of the trusts.

12. No; they had certain trusts and utilized the money for a certain purpose—they were not tied down to the Otago University?—I understand there was some arrangement of that kind.

13. You want some returns. I do not know that the Department publishes the returns of the different colleges, but I am sure that Otago sends up details of each department. The schools are charged with salaries and credited with expenses?—So far as Canterbury College was concerned, our difficulty was that there were so many statements, and apparently there were many cross-entries for rent, &c., so that it became a very difficult matter to say what was the position.

14. The average salary here, you said, was £225 lower than in Australia. Have you included in the salaries here the fees the professors receive, in some places at least, in addition to their ordinary salaries?—Yes.

15. How could you do that with regard to Otago? Where did you get it from?—They used not to show it, but—after this agitation began, I understand—in the last return they did show it. We noticed there was a difference in the way the returns were sent in.

16. *Mr. J. C. Thomson.*] Are pensions paid in the universities of Australia?—They have a scheme of pensions.

17. And they are payable now?—Yes, they are provided for in their constitution.

18. Are pensions paid in the Old Country too?—That I cannot say.

19. You made a statement with regard to the deficiency in salaries and the absence of pensions here. Do you think that a high salary, with the knowledge that there will be a substantial pension after a given number of years' service, makes for the highest efficiency?—I should say that is so, distinctly—that is to say, where the activity is one where the position is essentially an intellectual one. The peace of mind and the feeling that one's family and wife are not at the mercy of misfortune and accident would distinctly make for efficiency in the work of an honest and zealous individual engaged in university or teaching work generally. That is a view which is affirmed with reiterated emphasis as the result of inquiry by the Carnegie Trust. I would recommend the bulletin on salaries and pensions issued by the Carnegie Trust to the attention of this Committee.

20. *The Chairman.*] You spoke of the fewer endowments in the North Island as compared with those in the South. You admit, of course, that it was through the foresight of the founders of the University institutions in the South that these endowments were provided in the early days?—Undoubtedly. My argument is not that there should be fewer in the South, but more in the North.

21. Do you suggest that, though the founders of the educational institutions in the South had the foresight to provide these endowments, no consideration should be given to them in the allocations to the four colleges?—I am only drawing attention to the fact that the finance in the North is a much more difficult matter for the University Colleges, because they have only £400 or £500 coming in from endowments. For everything else they have to depend upon the fees or go cap in hand to the Government.

22. In making allocations from the public funds for carrying on the various colleges, do you consider that no consideration should be paid to the South owing to the fact that provision was made out of the local funds for the upkeep of colleges?—The so-called endowments were granted in years gone by under the Provincial Government. Those endowments are in effect State endowments.

23. *Mr. Hardy.*] Not a bit of it?—They were public lands. I admit that the wisdom of the men who set apart those lands is worthy of all commendation—I am not calling that into question in the slightest degree; but it is unfortunate that in the North, for reasons that it is not necessary to discuss here, similar provision was lost sight of.

24. *The Chairman.*] You stated that the Middle District (Victoria College) only received some 20 per cent. of the total revenue, whereas it serves a population of something like 40 per cent. of the whole of New Zealand?—Yes.

25. Have you not got to give consideration to this fact, that in Dunedin there is a Medical School which serves the whole of New Zealand, and in Christchurch there is an Engineering School which serves the greater part of New Zealand?—I am not prepared to say that is not so. Of course, we have no particulars.

26. Should not that consideration have an important bearing upon the figures you submitted to us in connection with the district served by Victoria College?—If you could say what percentage of students are in the habit of attending those schools from the North Island I think it would be proper to put it on record.

27. *Mr. Hardy.*] You were speaking about the difficulty in getting money to manage the colleges up here, and I think you spoke about funds which are evidently plentiful down South. Would you propose to pool those funds in any way?—No. Perhaps I should have made that clear before. There might be a feeling created that the North has been casting covetous eyes on the South. That is not so. We think that the South is entitled to all it has, but there should be an endeavour in the North to get equal assistance in the future. My suggestion is that the North is handicapped, but there is no suggestion that there should be a pooling or an equal division of the funds all round.

28. Is it within your knowledge that the Canterbury Association charged £3 per acre for its lands, £1 to go to the making of roads, £1 for education, and £1 for carrying on the management of the district?—No, I cannot say it is. In my time in Canterbury, which runs back about thirty years—I mean in the post-provincial days—I think they were willing to sell their land for £2 an acre.

29. That is not so?—I was not there when the Association was founded.

30. It is within your knowledge that land was sold at a much lower rate in the North Island?—I know that in the South the lands of Canterbury are much more valuable. I know myself of men who paid £2 an acre and got the whole of their purchase-money returned in one season. Of course, you must consider the relative value of lands.

31. Would there not be a return from shingle, which is of value up North and which is of no value on the Canterbury Plains?—I know that the land in Canterbury is very patchy.

32. *The Chairman.*] There is a point which requires a little consideration. The suggestion is that sufficient money should be allocated to the colleges in the North Island to make up for the difference between the endowments in the South Island and the North?—I do not think so.

33. The question is whether some consideration should not be given to the individuality which has been developed by the various colleges on their own lines owing to their having been provided with endowments originally. Should not that be rather fostered than otherwise?—Do you mean that in the North the bulk of the students are night students?

34. No; it only arises out of a suggestion which, I understand, is implied in your statement with regard to the want of endowments in the North Island. Is it not that you wish the North Island to be placed on an equal footing with the South?—It is the position as it is we have to deal with. I refer to those figures simply because they are in the accounts; but as to the future, assistance must come from the State, I think.

35. *Mr. Allen.*] Could you suggest to us any means of putting the finances on a satisfactory footing? Do you suggest that further endowments should be given, or how do you suggest some elastic means of revenue?—I do not think I can—no constructive means. We are only concerned in putting the case as it occurs to us at the moment.

36. *The Chairman.*] There is practically no limit to which a university may use funds?—That is so. I have said so in my statements; and the broad principle which I think should always be kept in view is that it should be elastic in its funds. You cannot reach a point where a university has attained its ultimate limit, and finally that comes back to the question of finance.

37. Can you suggest any scheme indicating the lines upon which the improvement of the finances of the colleges should proceed?—I admit it is a very important matter. I would not promise to suggest a scheme. Speaking broadly, the Reform Association have not discussed the question of ways and means at all. We have been concerned, admittedly, primarily with the question of organization. We considered that should be one of the first steps.

Professor T. A. Hunter examined. (No. 5.)

1. *The Chairman.*] What is your subject?—Professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy, Victoria College. In order to be as brief as possible, I may state that the Reform Association desires to lay some stress on three additional subjects—(1) examinations, (2) libraries, (3) research. The association is aware that Parliament itself will not deal with such matters of detail in university organization, important though they be. Nor does the association desire that it should. The method of examination to be adopted, the formation of adequate university libraries, and the organization of the University so that research may become one of its normal functions, are questions that may safely be left in the hands of the University when reformed. But weaknesses in these aspects of university work, flowing as they do from faulty organization, are indications that an authoritative inquiry should be held. Examinations: In medicine and dentistry New Zealand students are examined by their teachers acting with assessors or external examiners; in arts, science, law, and engineering, by purely external examiners resident in Great Britain or in New Zealand. The teachers are excluded from taking any part in such examinations. This

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

(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.

5. Where would the initiation take place—take the question of the syllabus?—In my opinion the power of initiation would rest both with the professorial body, with the conjoint body, and lay body; but in practice it would be exercised by the local bodies.

6. Do I understand that you suggest that the local body should initiate the syllabus?—Yes, that is my personal idea of what should be done.

7. You think we should follow Wales?—You are asking me a very difficult question, because I confess that if I were an autocrat, and were asked what I considered to be the most statesmanlike way of getting over the difficulty we are in, I should advocate making one centre the chief seat of a teaching university. I think that would be a proposal having no chance of success.

8. Perhaps you would like to think it over and tell us about it later on?—If I were sole master and free from other considerations and other people's opinions, I should say the most statesmanlike course now would be to create a university in the full sense of the word in one of the two South Island centres—either Canterbury College or the University at Dunedin—and leave the other colleges on the footing of professional schools or technical schools of the type represented in Germany by the technical high schools, and in particular the Commercial High School of Berlin, an institution of university standing.

9. The teaching staffs now have no common meeting-ground?—Are you aware that the Senates have invited the teaching staffs to meet on a common ground?—That was on one occasion. We make reference to that in the pamphlet.

10. That shows a little advance on the part of the Senate?—It is one for which we are very deeply grateful.

11. Supposing they did meet on a common meeting-ground, can we assume that they would come to a conclusion satisfactory to all on the question of the syllabus?—I know our real troubles are going to begin if we succeed in carrying out what we have put before them. The great difficulty is that it must take a very considerable time. We have men who came out a considerable number of years ago and who have got thoroughly wedded to the present system. They have got into more or less narrow grooves, and the prospect of getting some of my colleagues out of these narrow grooves is most appalling. We shall have to look to changes of an exceedingly gradual description, but we look to improvement in the general methods of appointments to the staff, like that of Doctor Inglis in Otago, and to a gradual leavening. Every well-appointed new professor is an ally in our camp, and incidentally the public will not be horrified by sudden and violent changes. Then, again, there is this consideration: that some of our colleagues are able to take up an attitude of, say, hostility to modern ideas. Put them upon a Board and it is exceedingly difficult to take up a line which they can otherwise take up with a certain amount of effectiveness. There you have them on the University Senate, and members of the Senate like Mr. Allen are exceedingly courteous towards these professional gentlemen, and naturally assume that they represent the view of the general body, and you know it is exceedingly difficult to put a man out who has been twenty years there, on the ground that he does not represent the views of others. We know that any changes are going to be very gradual, and I know that I shall not see some of them in my lifetime. Still, we thought it worth while to put these matters before you.

12. You know the modern policy of the Senate has been to ask advice from the Professorial Board on some questions. Has it not been a difficulty with the Senate that they could never get anything like a unanimous voice from them?—Call them together and you might get a majority voice. Look at the way the English people are working: if they get a report from the academic gentlemen and find that there is a considerable minority, they go into details and try to use their own judgment.

13. Is not the Senate doing that now?—I do not know.

14. Did they not do that in connection with the B.Sc. degree?—We got a majority report. There was only one point on which there was a sharp division of opinion; and what is exceedingly promising for the future is that we did manage to come to an agreement on all points except one, and even that we could probably have got if we had been absolutely independent. We were exceedingly limited in the scope of what we had to discuss. If the Senate is desirous of getting the opinions of the professors, the best way is to call them together.

15. Did they not call them together?—Once only.

16. *Mr. Luke.*] Is it your proposal to extend the scope of inquiry into the insular disability that we suffer from in this Dominion—and, I am going to add, on the technical side, the engineering side—by having a particular college dealing with particular work in the South, which prevents the students in the North Island obtaining the same privileges as those of the South Island; or, in other words, will you extend the scope of the inquiry with a view to considering whether the four colleges should specialize or be more extensive in their operations?—I should say I am anxious that the scope of the Commission should include that question. My opinion is that we ought to specialize rigidly in connection with technical schools. We have a good Engineering School now, and if an attempt were made to have four they would give relatively poor results. It is better to have one which is sound than four not sound.

17. I am in agreement with you, but I want you to consider whether it is not advisable, if these colleges were located on one Island, that the State should advance sufficient money to enable the poorer students from a distance to obtain the privileges which the State extends now, but which the individual cannot obtain on account of financial strain?—That is a question we have not touched upon. We look upon it rather as impertinence upon our part to refer to questions dealing with large sums of money. The way we are looking at it is that our end of the stick is to make this education available for practically the whole of every class of the community by its being placed in the four colleges, and to make that, with regard to the bulk of it, as good as it can be, so that the student shall not suffer. Our desire is to see that the people do not suffer through getting a relatively inferior education. When it comes to technical-school work like engineering, we realize that we cannot have it in the four centres, and that far the better plan is to have it concentrated in one centre, while facilities should be given to students from other parts of the Dominion to go there.

FRIDAY, 8TH SEPTEMBER, 1911.

Professor G. W. VON ZEDLITZ recalled. (No. 7.)

1. *The Chairman.*] I think you agreed, professor, that there should be some co-ordination in the work of the New Zealand University and its colleges?—Yes.

2. I want to give you a concrete instance, and I should like you to illustrate what the proceedings would be if the University Colleges were co-ordinated as you suggest: Some time ago the Otago University instituted a Chair of Domestic Science. I want you to tell us what procedure would have to be gone through in order that that Chair might be instituted in Otago, and also in the framing of the necessary curricula for it, supposing the colleges were co-ordinated as you suggest?—I think they are two distinct questions, are they not?

3. I think they are?—They seem to me to be two distinct questions. It comes down, first, to the right of the Otago University to establish a new Chair; and the other question is as to the framing of the curriculum in that subject. I should like to reply separately to the two questions. The exact relations of the University Colleges to the general governing body seems to me just one of those questions of such difficulty, involving so many distinct interests, that an inquiry of the nature of the Royal Commission suggested would be necessary before determining the exact arrangement. That is one of those important questions of detail that the Reform Association did not think it was competent to solve for the whole of the community; but I should point out that our line in that direction is obviously the same as the line which was taken by the Commissioners of 1879, who said that the governing body practically should have the right of veto. The report did not put it in those words, and I do not know that we actually quoted those words in the pamphlet. It is worded to this effect: that the institution of a new Chair is in some sense under the control of the governing body, or the governing body should have some right of advice. It is stated in that guarded way in the report of the Commissioners of 1879, and I do not think we would go further than that.

4. You say that the Otago University should not have the right to institute a Chair of that kind without the consent of the Senate?—I think so. Our attitude is entirely modest with regard to a question of that kind. We would not like to say it was a necessary measure.

5. Taking that particular instance, and in view of the fact that there was a division of opinion on the Otago University itself, and when you consider the amount of interprovincial jealousy there is, the Chair would probably not have been established at all if the Otago University had not had the opporunity of taking the initiative on its own account?—Of course, the power of the supreme body to interfere, to check the appointment of a new Chair which was desired by a Council, was intended to be exercised with a view to preventing the multiplication of Chairs in different colleges. It was with the view of preventing the establishment of a medical school in one of the other centres. I should imagine that the supreme body would act in that spirit. If the Otago University could show that it was a reasonable proposition that the Chair should be established in Otago rather than elsewhere, the supreme body would naturally not offer opposition. In a matter of this kind it depends upon the spirit in which the supreme body uses its powers.

6. It is putting a restriction on the privileges of the colleges which they have hitherto enjoyed?—You have to look at the matter in the broadest sense. You have either to disintegrate the colleges or to make them *de facto* depend on one another. You have to make the bond either loose or tight, and the advantages of both are considerable. We have reached the view that the wisest course to take is to make it a close corporation. We recognize that we have Dr. Maclaurin against us—a good authority—who desired to make us *de facto* separate institutions. We decided to the best of our judgment that his policy was not the best policy for us, for two reasons: one was because the opposite policy had been advocated by the Commissioners in 1879, who held that the independence of the colleges was desirable as things stand, and was of a kind which safeguarded the teaching, but not with regard to such things as a new Chair. That maintained the active enthusiasm of the teaching staffs throughout New Zealand, and at the same time guaranteed the independence of the University Colleges. The second reason that led us to take that line is that we thought we saw that much of the unsatisfactory condition of the University was attributable to the dispersion of the intellectual interests—that each of the four colleges worked along lines that were not conducive to a common bond of interest or service; and it was considered desirable to concentrate our interests and work together so that we might unite the intellectual interests throughout New Zealand.

7. Of course, you recognize that after introducing the scheme with restricted numbers others joined afterwards?—Exactly. We see the difficulties of the constitution. With regard to the other question, the framing of the curriculum, again I do not tie myself to any definite consideration of a final kind. I suggest that we might gain some advantage from the system adopted in the federated University of Wales. In that case, supposing a Chair of Domestic Science had been established, the duty of drawing up the curriculum would have fallen on the Professorial Board of the Otago University. It would have had to pass the conjoint Professorial Boards of the four colleges. It would have had to go from there to the supreme governing body; and as it works in practice in Wales, what happens is this: before a proposal goes forward to the conjoint professorial body an agreement has been actually reached. The approval of the colleges is ascertained beforehand. It never goes forward in a state that can be rejected by the joint Board, and thus it reaches the supreme body with the imprimatur of the teaching colleges all together.

8. Coming to the constitution of the individual colleges, you are aware that there is a Bill before the House just now to amend the Otago University: have you seen it?—No. I have only heard of the one to amend the Auckland University College.

9. It is somewhat on the same lines as the Auckland Bill, we are told. I understand you agree with the recommendation made in the pamphlet, that a particular interest should not be

considered in the election of members of these Councils. I might mention that the proposal in the Bill is that there should be a group of four members appointed by the Governor in Council, two from the Professorial Board — well, without mentioning the numbers; the governing Council will also consist of representatives from the graduates, Education Board, the City Council, teachers of public schools, teachers of secondary schools, and we also suggest representatives from the Hospital and Charitable Aid Boards and High School Boards. I want to ask your opinion with regard to these proposals, and if you think they are on wrong lines what constitution do you suggest?—I am not sure that I am a suitable person to reply to that particular question, or so suitable as some of my colleagues might be. The reason which leads me not to like proposals of that kind is because, as far as I can judge, in the past they have been interpreted as meaning that certain classes of individuals more or less interested should be protected by representation. The representation of interests of that kind I look upon as attacking the problem from the wrong end, because it induces a feeling that their business would be to protect or guard the interests of the class they represent and not to promote the interests of the University regarded as a whole. That kind of objection does not apply in the slightest degree to the appointment of members of the Dunedin City Council. For instance, we have not had any representation of the City Council, and we very much regret it. That makes all the difference. I think the arrangements hitherto adopted for the Professorial Boards or School Boards to be represented have been calculated to produce unsatisfactory results.

10. You recognize that to put individual City Councillors into a constituency along with all the others would be practically valueless?—Practically valueless. We are putting forward a principle and leaving it to you to apply it as you think fit.

11. *Mr. Allen.*] Why do you think it would be valueless?—I simply echoed what Mr. Sidey said on the subject without much thought.

12. Some references are made in this pamphlet to what have been termed a number of bad appointments made in the professors?—Yes.

13. Do you consider that applies to all the colleges?—I know it applies to ours, and that, of course, is the only one of which I have absolutely direct evidence; but I am strongly of opinion that it also applies to one, if not more, of the others. It is a question there of not speaking without absolute personal knowledge, and I am only personally satisfied that there have been bad appointments in one, but I think there have been more.

14. What proportion, do you think, of the total number?—It is not large; but from our point of view even one bad appointment on a relatively small staff is a thing which, of its kind, is calculated to throw back the value of the institution and of higher education for a great many years. It is a matter, perhaps, of forty years in some circumstances.

15. One other point occurred to me, and that is a matter I noticed when reading through the pamphlet: it is the number of medical students attending the schools in Edinburgh. "In 1909 forty-eight New-Zealanders passed medical examinations at Edinburgh." How many of those took part of their course in Dunedin, because it has been customary for students to take some portion of their course there? Perhaps they graduate and then go home for a course in the Edinburgh University. There is a particular statement made here, and I want to know if you can tell us how many of that number attended the Dunedin Medical School?—Our attention was drawn to the fact by a letter from one of our correspondents in England, in which he pointed out that he had been struck by the fact that the number of New-Zealanders studying at English or Scottish Universities was much in excess of those from Australia.

16. You are not in a position to state the number—you have not the information as to whether any of those mentioned here took part of their course in Dunedin?—I am afraid not. I think a good many of them have done so.

Professor HUNTER recalled. (No. 8.)

1. *The Chairman.*] You are opposed to the system of external examination?—Yes.

2. Do you approve of the suggestion that the examinations should be conducted as they are in the medical schools, where the professor examines for the degrees along with one assessor?—Personally I should have no objection to that.

3. Do you think that system would be suitable, say, in the examination for the degrees in the arts and sciences of New Zealand at the present time?—No, I believe not.

4. What would be the objections?—The objection I foresee is this: first, an objection in regard to getting a suitable man to act as an assessor in certain departments. I know it is possible in some subjects, but in other subjects it is difficult to get even one assessor for the whole of the Dominion. The reasonable way out of the difficulty is to modify the principle by setting up Boards of Examiners from the teachers in the four colleges.

5. That is to say, the examination in classics might be conducted by the four professors in the four colleges?—Yes.

6. Is it not a fact, speaking generally, that an examiner does not in his examination go beyond work that has been done in the class—really, not far outside of his own notes?—That is not my experience. I can quote my own case. The New Zealand University does not recognize any work in experimental psychology, and for the most part I treat psychology from that point of view.

7. Is that not likely to be the case more in some cases than in others?—I think it depends upon the professor.

8. Do you think the effect of the external examination is to induce the students to read a little outside the professor's notes?—No. I think it may induce a student who is under a professor who is trying to give him a good view of his subject not to pay any attention at all, but to read up the book the examiner has written. I think you will find the books on the subject written by the examiners are as far as possible the books that the students use.

9. As a general rule I suppose the professors do not go far outside of their own notes?—I cannot give the general rule.

10. Supposing you have the four professors in the four colleges examining on one subject, would there not be an exchange between the students and a comparison of the notes?—If your four professors are of that type, then all I can say is that you want four different professors.

11. You do not see any difficulty there?—I do see difficulties in the system of a conjoint Board, but as far as my judgment and actual experience go as a student and teacher in the institution my judgment is that that is the best solution at the present time.

12. Do you not think it is probably owing to the difficulty of getting experts in New Zealand outside the professors that the English examination was instituted—that was one of the reasons?—Judging from the report of the 1879 Commission, I should not say that was the case. I should say the external examination was instituted for the purpose of preventing the New Zealand University from teaching. In order to prevent it coming into competition with the Otago University it was made an examining body.

13. In one part of the pamphlet it says that the external examination was due to want of confidence in the professors?—It is an interpretation of what we mean by "want of confidence." What we mean is want of confidence either in their competence or fairness. A previous question of yours suggests that want of confidence.

14. Have you not a distinct professor's examination?—Yes, as far as "terms" examinations are concerned.

15. That could not indicate want of confidence in them?—Perhaps not; but professors cannot pass students for degrees.

16. Professor Sale did not object to the external examination?—I think the reason for that is the difference in the subjects taught. There are some subjects in which the external examination does not limit the freedom of the teacher as it does in other subjects. I suppose classics would be a subject of the former kind.

17. When you refer to the keeping of "terms," it is possible, is it not, for a student not to keep terms in a subject which he wants for a degree examination?—Yes.

18. So that a professor could not keep a student back by "plucking" him?—That is so. Two colleges have tried to do this, but so far as we know there is no authority to enable them to carry out their regulation.

19. *Mr. G. M. Thomson* (to Professor Von Zedlitz).] There is a statement on page 26—I do not want to press it too much—but you say there that "the legislation of 1902, which reduced the number of professorial representatives on the Senate, is mainly attributable to the fact that in one or two cases professorial Senators had incurred the suspicion of having used their academic position to further private ends." Is there any evidence before you in making that statement, because we have our ideas on the subject?—Yes. You could call evidence on that if you liked. It is a difficult thing, rather, to ask me to answer it.

20. I am asking you, because Professor Laby shunted this on to you?—Yes. I will say this: you have access to Dr. Fitchett, who was, I believe, mainly responsible for the form of the legislation of 1902. He might say there was not a word of truth in it, but you might get an answer from him. If you desire to press the point I could produce other evidence. I understand Professor Haslam, one of our colleagues in Christchurch, and who proposes to attend here if you wish to examine him, could give you details. I am not going to give the personal details, because they are not within my personal knowledge. In former times the unfortunate system prevailed of partial payment to the professors by fees. Men who advocated legislation calculated to increase their own classes would therefore lay themselves open to that suspicion.

21. *Mr. Allen* (to Professor Hunter).] You referred to the difficulties of a conjoint Board of Examiners. I would like to hear what they are?—The difficulty is in bringing together the men from the colleges. If you have a conjoint Board these men should come together and confer on the papers. It would not do to arrange the matter by writing—they must meet.

22. Practical examination, and oral?—I take it the Board would decide its own particular methods. At the present time the University spends a considerable amount of money in fees to the Home examiners, and that expenditure would be saved. We conceive that University examining is part of the professor's work, and all that the University would pay would be the actual expenses.

23. Do you think there would be any possibility of a professor favouring his own pupil?—I suppose there is that possibility.

24. Or probability?—I do not think there would be any probability when you have four professors on the Board, and three men check what the other one does. If it happened that in one particular subject you had four unscrupulous men, what you suggest is probable.

25. (To Professor Von Zedlitz): Do you approve of fees as part payment of professors?—No. I think they are generally abandoned, on the whole. They are not abandoned in Germany. The system partly exists in Germany, and it is known that in a few cases professors have made very large fortunes in that way; but there, I understand, the system is a tradition of great antiquity. It is felt to be a disadvantage.

25A. What disadvantage do you say it is yourself?—With regard to compulsory subjects, it is a difficult thing to ask a man who is receiving a certain number of fees to come forward and say, "I do not believe in compulsory subjects." Then, with regard to making the subject easy: The New Zealand student to a considerable extent likes to take a subject which is currently reported to be easy, and the professor examining him would be prone to make the subject easy and attract members to his class. In America there have been cases on record, even when the system of payment by fees has not been in existence, where the professors have been brought up sharply by their colleagues. It is a temptation to the professors to let their students through too easily, especially if they profit by the subject they teach. If the Professorial Board have any control of the examina-

tion they can check the practice, but under the existing system there is no check. Under the existing system, where the professor is partly paid by fees, his income depends to some extent upon attracting students to his class. The source of attraction is not the excellence of the teaching he gives, but the facility with which he helps the students through their examination. Therefore the temptation is put upon him to be a mere crammer. In such a subject as mine, or of law, the temptation to a professor to be dishonest is tremendous. In law the "cram" idea seems to be to train students to answer likely questions of the examination, and the best method of training the student for the examination is one that leaves out fundamental principles altogether. Now, that sort of thing is actually done by coaches. The student goes to a coach and pays him £10 10s. or £15 15s., and the coach shows him what to learn. For a professor to take that position simply means that the money the nation provides is thrown into the sea. Then, take my own subject. The Commission set up on the University of Melbourne in 1904 went into the matter of the best method of teaching foreign languages, and they found that it was universally admitted that all except elementary teaching should be delivered in the language in question. Under our system, where the work of the students is tested entirely by an examination conducted outside, you can see that I could prepare them for their examination in one-quarter of the time by giving them in English answers to likely questions. If I were getting fees the temptation would be given to me to teach in a form which, though not right, paid me best.

26. The main alteration you want is the establishment of a conjoint Professorial Board?—Yes.

27. Do you approve of the system of examination for matriculation?—I believe they have solved the problem very advantageously in England and Scotland through the action of the Oxford and Cambridge Boards, and my opinion for some years has been that the proper solution of the difficulty in this place is this: You cannot do without an examination for matriculation in some form or other, because you have some students who have not gone through the secondary schools, but I believe the best way is to accept the certificate of the headmasters of the school, provided that the schools themselves have conducted an examination of their own pupils and have conducted it in accordance with the ideas of the University Senate.

28. Is that done in America?—I cannot tell you. It is done, but I cannot say whether it is done precisely in that form. The benefit of that system is that the University Senate would recognize certain schools as able to grant certificates. The recognition is based on the syllabus of the school being confirmed by the Senate. The Senate would then be able to say, "No, your syllabus and standard of examination do not meet our requirements." Practically it would mean that the Senate would determine roughly the requirements of the school course, but the examination would be entirely conducted by the school.

29. Do you find the standard of matriculation high enough for university purposes?—No, certainly not. That is to say, I have to do—and a majority of my colleagues have to do—a considerable amount of what might be called secondary-school work. At the same time I would point out that there is probably a great difference as regards the various subjects. That is to say, whereas in some subjects it might be felt that the students were inadequately prepared to begin the higher work, it would not be felt in others. The teachers of chemistry, for instance, sometimes take the line that it is preferable that the student should not have been taught in another school. That attitude is sometimes taken.

30. In the University?—Yes. I know in my subject that the student sometimes comes up—a junior scholar—so well prepared that he is at the point that I hope to reach with the matriculation student at the end of his course—three years—I mean with the student who has got through his matriculation without much of a margin.

31. *Mr. G. M. Thomson.*] You say practically that the junior scholar is up to the B.A. standard?—Yes. He has not gone through the specific work of the B.A. student, but his standard is that of the B.A. degree. The Junior Scholarship is competitive. It has a very high standard, and is a strain on the boy.

32. *Mr. Allen.*] Is it too high?—I would not say that.

33. Do you think the matriculation is too low and the Junior Scholarship too high?—I think that is so. You are asking me very difficult questions. I would like to approach the whole question of State aid to suitable students from a different point of view. I think the scholarship should be eleemosynary.

34. *Mr. G. M. Thomson.*] Do your remarks imply that the standard has been raised this year?—I am aware of that.

35. Do you know that it will take a boy four years' hard work to get a scholarship? You say the matriculation is too low?—It has been too low.

36. *Mr. Allen.*] I understood you to say, in answer to one of Mr. Sidey's questions, that you do not believe in the University Colleges having charters to give their own degrees?—I think one University is absolutely all that the population and the resources of the Dominion can possibly run to. To maintain a University effectively a population of a million is rather small.

37. What difference would it be if you took away the University Senate and gave the colleges charters to give their own degrees?—I think it would make them ridiculous.

38. Why?—Our pride has been that we have kept ourselves absolutely clean of what in England are known as American and colonial university practices. The English people do not know much about the colonies, and have a rough-and-ready method of lumping together colonial and American colleges as frauds, simply because in some of the places miscalling themselves universities degrees have been granted for cash.

39. Do you think we might suffer from that?—Yes. I think it would react upon ourselves and injure the University if an attempt were made to establish four distinct universities. At the same time we ought to so organize our institution that when the population of the Dominion admits of it the four colleges would be in a position to confer degrees.

40. Is it a matter of population or a matter of standard?—The two are inextricably mixed up together. Only a certain proportion of the inhabitants of the country are fit for the higher studies. You can only have a certain number of lawyers and doctors, because only a certain proportion of the population have the means of paying for their education.

41. I asked whether it was a matter of population or a matter of standard of work that was necessary for the degree?—It seems to me that in order to get numbers into the college you have to get population.

42. That would apply in both cases, whether you keep them separate or conjoined in New Zealand?—It would not probably make any difference, but it would mean that the number of students and the resources of New Zealand would have to be divided by four. There is one university that has something like 1,800 students.

43. *Mr. Herdman.*] Supposing you had four distinct universities here, would that mean that you would have a Medical School and classes for law, the arts, and science?—Yes.

44. Would that be financially possible in a country like this?—No.

45. *Mr. Allen.*] Why could you not specialize?—If that were done we might have in three of the centres a specialized school and in one of them an institution which we could call the University.

46. *Mr. Sidey.*] It is purely a question of money. There is no compulsion on the four colleges as to what courses they should take. As a matter of fact, we have no School of Law in Otago now?—I understand there was a Lecturer of Law there last year. My statement was based on that fact.

47. *Mr. Luke.*] At the present time examinations in reference to the School of Engineering in Christchurch, both on the technical and theoretical side, is confined absolutely to Christchurch, is it not?—I think you are wrong. I believe they are all examined in England.

48. In theory?—Yes.

49. Does the same apply to medicine?—No.

Professor Hunter: Generally speaking, the examination in engineering is done at Home. The candidate must get a certificate from the professor before he can sit. In medicine the examination is conducted by the teacher with an assessor. The M.D. degree is examined at Home.

50. Has there been any weakness demonstrated on the technical side through the examination being held in England?—That is a question I am not competent to answer. My opinion, so far as it is of any value through talking to the students and so on, is that the engineering degree is looked upon as a very good degree. But in the case of the engineering degree you had a professor with a perfectly free hand; and if we may judge by outside results—say, by the positions held subsequently by the men who have left New Zealand—the Engineering School has been one of the most successful in the Dominion. But the whole matter does not depend merely upon examination. If you go to the Otago Medical School you find there a small population and an absence of clinical material. You can make engines, but you cannot make the diseases to combat which a knowledge of medicine is required. In one of the issues of *The Times* lately an engineer of repute, associated either with the Board of Trade or some Department of the English Government, condemned the system of holding engineering examinations by purely written papers.

51. *The Chairman.*] What paper do you refer to?—It was the Engineering Supplement in the London *Times*. In the April number, I think.

52. *Mr. Luke.*] We heard that the English people estimate the colonial diploma on the same basis as the American one: do you think that opinion is prevalent?—I should think not. In America you have institutions that are universities and some that are not. The value of the degree varies with the university by which it is granted. The same thing holds with us. I do not think the holding of examinations at Home has had any value so far as the degree is concerned.

53. Seeing that a proportion of the examinations have to be held in New Zealand, you maintain that it would be safe to take the whole of the work in New Zealand?—I maintain that it is the best method in the interests of education.

54. (To Professor Von Zedlitz): Would it not be better for the professors to get a fixed annual income, with a provision made for some system of pensions, than that the professors should build up their income by a system of fees?—Certainly.

W. C. W. McDowell, B.A. (N.Z.), M.D., Member of the New Zealand University Senate, Auckland, made a statement and was examined. (No. 9.)

Witness: Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen,—I am much indebted to you for your courtesy in inviting me to appear at this stage on account of my having to leave Wellington to-morrow. I feel much obliged to you and to Mr. Herdman, because I understand that the witnesses for the Reform Association have not fully completed their evidence. I come here primarily as an advocate of the Auckland University College Graduates' Association, in answer to this letter: "University College, Auckland, 3rd September, 1911.—W. C. W. McDowell, Esq., M.D., President, Auckland University College Graduates' Association.—Sir,—I am instructed by the Auckland University College Graduates' Association to ask you if you would kindly attend on behalf of the association the meeting of the Committee lately appointed by Parliament to consider the question of university reform and bring to the notice of such Committee the following resolution which was unanimously carried at the last general meeting of the association: 'The Auckland University College Graduates' Association is of opinion that it would be seriously detrimental to the interests of the New Zealand University to abolish the present system of degree examinations.'—I have, &c., Douglas Chalmers, Hon. Secretary, Auckland University College Graduates' Association." I am sorry to say, sir, that we were unable to get more than one copy of the platform of the University Reform Association prior to our meeting, and we were not therefore able, at the meeting called to discuss the question, to deal with all the proposals set forth in that pamphlet. But the question that more immediately concerned the graduates was the proposal to interfere with the present mode of conducting the University examinations for the degree. I may say that this matter

was carefully considered, and the association was unanimously of opinion that it would be undesirable that any interference should be made with the examination for the degree, and the corollary to that was that they considered the present system generally satisfactory, and that the University was pursuing its chartered object of providing sound learning in New Zealand, and that it was not necessary to make any revolutionary changes in the system that had been adopted. As president of that association, I may say that my association was quite in agreement with what was described as evolutionary reform in the system, but they thought the proposal of the Reform Association could hardly be classed as evolutionary. I have heard something said here this morning in regard to the question of the value that has been placed upon the New Zealand University degree through the system of external examination, and, sir, I contend from my own experience as an old graduate—I graduated in 1885—and from what I have ascertained from other graduates, not only in Auckland, but throughout New Zealand, and also from the experience I have had in many tours when travelling round the world, and in conversing with educated people—that the fact of the New Zealand University degree having been awarded mainly by men of great learning and European reputation has added enormously to the value of our University degree. And the graduates, not only of Auckland, but practically of the whole of New Zealand—the vast majority—are most unwilling to see the present system which has been in vogue so long in any way modified. I should also like to say I am speaking here to-day in response to an invitation from the Chancellor of the University asking the Fellows of the University Senate to express their opinion before this Committee, and I want to speak as a Fellow of the University of eight years' standing. I should like to say that this question of doing away with the external examination for the degree has been discussed almost every year since I have been a member of the Senate, and it has always been rejected by a very large majority indeed.

Mr. Allen: Not last time.

Witness: Well, up to last year the motion to alter the system has been defeated, and I may say without fear of contradiction that on each occasion the eight representatives of the graduates upon the University Senate have been unanimous in rejecting any proposal to do away with the external examiners, and I think they represent a large majority of the constituency of the graduates of New Zealand, so that one can safely claim that they were voicing the opinions of the graduates; and I think due regard should be paid by this Committee to the voice of the graduates of New Zealand in regard to this question, which is one of the most important planks in the platform of the Reform Association. The University graduate of New Zealand, sir, regards the external examination as being a hall-mark upon his degree, and he is fearful that anything should be done which might obliterate the hall-mark. It has, I am sure, had a beneficial influence upon the course of studies of the student. The fact that they know that they will have to present themselves for examination before an examiner who is a man of the highest standing often in the world in the special subject in which he examines, I think, from my own experience, has its influence upon the general work, character, and enthusiasm of the man, because he knows that he will have to submit his work to the judgment of an external examiner of such repute. And it has been claimed in addition that it has a beneficial influence upon the professors themselves. It has stimulated them to keep themselves abreast of the highest work that can be done in their respective departments of learning. I know that has been traversed in this pamphlet, but nevertheless I feel, sir, that it has had in many ways a beneficial influence upon the work of the professors. I should like to say, sir, that those who advocate the maintenance of this external system of examination are not unconscious of the difficulties that it involves. They recognize it, sir. But I would also say that the reason why most of the members of the Senate are desirous of maintaining the system of external examination is because they recognize that the system advocated of having internal examiners represents so many difficulties that they prefer to maintain the system that has done such excellent service in regard to the University of New Zealand. I should like also to refer to the fact that in this pamphlet we have evidence of the opinions of a great many people in other parts of the world in regard to the question of external or internal examination. I think, personally, and it is the opinion of the Graduates' Association and others interested in education in Auckland, that a large part of this evidence may be discounted on the ground that those who give their evidence are not perfectly familiar with the conditions as they exist in New Zealand. A large number, apparently, do not recognize the difficulties that exist in connection with the four separate University Colleges, and those difficulties, sir, are very great indeed in regard to the question of conducting internal examinations. There is no doubt, and one cannot blink the fact, that between the four centres of the University there is a spirit of great jealousy existing. The same jealousy which exists in provincial matters exists in the educational world, and I may say that the opposition in the University Senate, as far as I can remember, has been largely made by the professors of the University Colleges who are on the University Senate. I have heard them again and again pointing out the difficulties that would arise through the students of one college having to submit to examination by the professor of another college. This difficulty is recognized as a very serious one indeed, and it has been urged again and again that it is one of the chief obstacles that lie in the way of adopting any other system of examination. Now, sir, I think, if the writers of many of these answers had been acquainted with the conditions that surround the university life and functions of our individual colleges, they would have realized the difficulties there were in carrying out a system of internal examination for the degree. But, sir, I should like to point out that the test for the degrees in the New Zealand University is not purely an external test. For three years during the student course a student has to pass the annual term examination, which is solely in the hands of his teacher. Each year he has to pass this examination, and in the Auckland and Canterbury Colleges it is laid down that the student must pass his third-term examination in the subjects he intends taking for the degree before he can appear for the degree examination, and if that system were applied to all our colleges it would be a safeguard. One realizes that it is not fully equivalent to

direct examination by an examiner for the degree, but some weight should be given to the point that when a student has passed his third annual term examination and satisfied his teacher he is, in his teacher's opinion, competent for his degree immediately before he passes his last examination set by the external examiner in England, and so the candidate comes forward with a certificate from his professor that in passing his annual examinations he is qualified to obtain his degree. That is a certificate which is corroborated or otherwise by the external examiner. So, sir, we claim that our system of test is partly conducted by the internal professor and partly by the external examiner. Now, the Graduates' Association of Auckland also objects very much to the idea propounded by the Reform Association that the examinations should be conducted solely by the teachers of the subjects. They think that would be most undesirable. They think, as has been pointed out, that it might lead much more to the danger of a system of cramming than the system at present in vogue. I would ask, would it not be possible, if the examination were limited to the four teachers of the subject, for the students, through interchange of notes, to get to know the idiosyncracies of the professors if they wanted to pass through their examinations easily in that way? I do not think the majority of graduates would be willing to have this system of internal examination solely. The only country in which this is carried out is America. It is carried out to some extent in Germany, but in Germany—and I know something of German education because I was a student in the University of Berlin—the student has to pass a very drastic system of secondary education—a very broad culture is demanded of the German student—before he enters the university; and in that way the ill effects that might result from the system are to a large extent avoided. The system of examining by teachers alone is characteristic of very many American universities, and I do not think that those interested in education, in this country at any rate, are so enamoured of the general reputation of American universities and schools as to say they should like to see this system carried into effect in New Zealand; and the only thing that could be substituted for the present external examiners would be to have assessors appointed in New Zealand to be associated with the professors here, and I do not think the time by any means has come for that. I base my opinion on my experience for eight years as a member of the Medical Committee on the Senate, which has had to do with outside assessors in connection with the medical examinations, and it has been a matter of very great difficulty to find men outside to act as examiners. We found the difficulty very great in the intermediate subjects of physiology, pathology, and materia medica, because it is impossible for men engaged in a busy practice to keep up to date in these particular studies, and the same thing to some extent applies to medicine, surgery, and midwifery. In New Zealand we have had men well qualified in these departments, but they find it is difficult to keep up with the advancement in these subjects, and it would be very difficult with men otherwise qualified if they had not had experience in examinations, which is essential to any one being associated in examination of university students. I should like to say this, sir, that I do not think it is possible now, or for many years, judging from my experience in medicine, to find an assessor that could be associated with the professor in the several subjects of the arts and sciences. What will happen in years to come I do not know, but I certainly feel convinced that the time has not yet arrived when such a system might be instituted, and in the meantime I feel that nothing should be done to tamper with the present method. We have the partly internal and partly external examination, which has done so much to maintain the high standard of the degree in the estimation of people abroad. I repeat that it is a high standard. The value of a degree depends upon the standard of examination, and upon the individual performance of the holder of the degree, and the teacher of the school under whom he has worked, and I think these requisites have all been filled in the case of the New Zealand student. The degree of the New Zealand University in the estimation of people abroad, I know, is a high one indeed. The qualification of the student of our schools is a high one, I also know from my experience. In the course of my study at Edinburgh for medicine, among the students there were many from the Medical School of the University at Dunedin—there were many of us who had taken the intermediate medical examination or full arts course of the New Zealand University; and I may say that the records of the New Zealand men during that time—and I have carefully watched the records of medical students who had partly studied in New Zealand and partly in Edinburgh—showed that they maintained a very high reputation indeed, and by the standard they have acquired they have made the university work done by the New Zealand students very much appreciated indeed. Then, sir, I think we have the fact that our students are able to quote the circumstance that they have been under men whose names are respected in the laboratories of the highest teachers in the Old World. I am sure that any student going from Auckland with a certificate from Professor F. Brown, or Professor Thomas; or Professor Chilton, of Canterbury College; or Professors Laby and Easterfield, of Wellington, would satisfy teachers in the Old World that they had been trained under men of high reputation. In my opinion the University of New Zealand has succeeded in placing on the men a hall-mark of quality that is not to be despised under any test of the value of a university degree. I should like to refer members of the Committee to the letter of Professor Oman in the Reform Association's pamphlet, page 158, in which he points out the feeling of Oxford University in regard to teachers taking the examination. He says, "I am entirely unacquainted with the special conditions of New Zealand University teaching, but if I am asked to give Oxford experience I may say that feeling there is absolutely against allowing anything like a certificate from the teachers to supersede the examination class as a test of merit. I note in one of the papers sent in the extraordinary statement that 'the tendency of modern education is to ask not what degree a man has, nor where he obtained it, but who was his teacher in his principal subjects?'" And then he says, "In the two great schools of classics (Literæ Humaniores) and modern history, in which I have been teaching in Oxford for the last twenty-five years, this is not my experience. Professors are human, and there can be no doubt there is a tendency in every man to 'mark up' the student who reproduces the theories and facts which we have taught him in a clear and intelligent shape. I am not sure there is not a corresponding

tendency to 'mark down' the student who produces what we believe to be wrong, heretical, or doubtful facts and theories drawn from other teachers. It is also very difficult to exclude personal interests when we are dealing with known individuals who have been working under us for months or years. For this reason it is the rule in the 'great final examination' that no examiner looks through or marks the work of his own pupil. This makes necessary much rearrangement of papers between the examiners, but I regard this as unavoidable. I would much rather have the judgment of some one else if I am to differentiate between the work of one of my favourite pupils and the work of some student whom I do not know by name or sight." That letter shows the opinion of a distinguished man who gives his experience of what has been found in Oxford with regard to the examination conducted solely by the teachers, and I have been looking through the letters contained in the pamphlet and find above thirty who object to an examination conducted by the teachers alone, but who advocate an examination by the teachers and external examiners; and I claim to-day—to a certain extent, at any rate, by our internal examination and external examination, and as far as we have been able—that with our present conditions of separate colleges we have tried to carry out this arrangement of joint examination between the teachers and the external examiners. I do not see myself how we can do anything else, or how it would be possible to carry out the wishes of the Reform Association to have teachers along with outside examiners, unless we have the four separate University Colleges constituted into four separate universities, and it would be practically impossible to have four separate universities on account of the enormous expense involved, also it would raise the possibility of there being four different standards of degrees in New Zealand. Then, sir, the only other system which would enable it being carried out would be to have one teaching university for the whole country, and I do not think it is possible to carry that out, because one of the great results would be to prevent university education being accessible to the students of this country. Now, sir, the question of accessibility of university education to the people is the next point I would refer to. The pamphlet, I am sorry to say, rather casts disparagement on what are known as night students of the University. I have again and again proclaimed in Auckland that I believe the provision to enable men to attend university studies at night is the glory of our university system in New Zealand. Sir, the tendency of this country has been to allow the University to get the control of practically all access to the highest education of the people—I was going to say, even for almost all avocations above that of the manual labourer and the tradesman. If you look through the list of degrees you will find how university qualification is required for registration. You will find that practically in medicine, in veterinary science, and dentistry registration is required. The University degree is also required for the enrolment of the barristers of the country, and practically all our teachers require it, for the arts degree and science degree is really their professional degree. And, more than that, last year the University undertook the examination of the accountants of New Zealand. Every accountant the year after next must be a matriculated student. The Registrar of the New Zealand University told me yesterday that there are seven hundred entries this year for the examination of accountancy. Mr. Shaw, who is president of the Auckland Accountants' Society, informed me, sir, that in the next few years in Auckland alone we shall have one hundred and fifty to two hundred candidates attending our annual commerce course in the University; and I am sure from what I know of the commercial community of Auckland—I have had the honour of addressing the Chamber of Commerce of Auckland on commercial education—they are eager to encourage men engaged in commercial pursuits to go to the University. It has been the programme of the University authorities in this country that university education should be made accessible to students, and to bring as many people within the range of university education as possible; and in order to do this it is necessary that these night classes should be maintained, because the students can only get away to their university work after 4 or 5 o'clock in the afternoon. I was making an analysis of the lectures given in Auckland by the University College the other day, and I found that about 75 per cent. of the lectures are given between 4 o'clock in the afternoon and 9 o'clock at night. I hope, sir, that nothing will be done to reverse this policy which has been adopted by our University. I say there is great danger on the part of the Reform Association in looking with contempt upon night students, which I am very sorry for indeed. It might possibly mean a lower standard generally of educational requirements for a University degree in this country. I am quite willing to admit that, but I maintain that there should be this lower standard if a wider circle may be brought within the range of university influences. And I think another plea might be made for the encouragement of research work—research in regard to applied science, upon which the Reform Association places such stress. The more you can interest the members of the mercantile and industrial communities of our cities in New Zealand in university education—the more you can lead their sons and employees into the range of university education—the more those engaged in the industries of New Zealand will appreciate its value. What are you going to do with the large number of research students you are seeking to turn out? Where are you going to get employment for the students trained in research unless you can interest the whole of the industrial community and encourage them to spend money to give encouragement to research? There will always be an opportunity to encourage the best students to make research. There is nothing to prevent a teacher picking out his best students and encouraging them to go on in order to make original research. I think the training in scientific method should be encouraged from the kindergarten right up to the university, and, before all, the making of experiment and exercising the logical power should begin early in life. That does not mean that those trained in scientific method should necessarily devote themselves to research, because a researcher needs to be born, not made. There are certain peculiarities of mind and character necessary to enable a student to make original research, and it is only the special student who is qualified to carry out such work as that. I am at one with the association in encouraging research students in our University, and I think those students who can give the necessary time to the work

should go on with it. But I do not think that prevents the association trying to give as high an education as possible to those who have disdainfully been called night students. I should like to call attention to what the University of London has done with regard to night students. I find that there are two statutes of the University of London with regard to internal students respecting this. One statute reads: "No disability shall be imposed upon any internal student by reason of the approved course of study pursued by him being or having been pursued in the evening alone." The other statute reads: "The Senate shall not impose any limit of time or require any number of hours' study within a limited period or make any similar provision which will prevent such internal students as study in the evening from obtaining a degree as internal students." That quotation shows the view of the University of London with regard to the night student, and I hope nothing will be done as the result of the present appeal to Parliament that will place any disability upon the night students of our New Zealand University. I should like, briefly, to refer to the question of medical students, which has been raised this morning, and to express my regret that there has been some sort of disparagement also made with regard to the quality of the teaching in our University School of Medicine at Dunedin. I claim that the School of Medicine has been a most successful school indeed. It is well equipped for its work as far as the tuition goes, and it has turned out men in every way thoroughly qualified for the work of the profession of medicine; and there is no reason whatever to cast any disparagement on the good work that has been done by the Medical School at Dunedin. It is true, sir, that it has a comparatively limited amount of clinical material to work upon, but it has been customary for the students in Dunedin, after qualifying, to go abroad, and I know they are distinctly encouraged by their professors to go abroad in order to make up what has been found to be deficient through post-graduate work, facilities for which are freely offered in the Old Country. I know a great many students who have been able to do that. A Dunedin student, when he goes abroad, has great advantages in regard to his studies. Dunedin being a small school, the professors of the different subjects are able to devote a great amount of their time to individual students. A man is able to get thoroughly qualified in his work, and having passed through his degree here he understands the points on which he needs further experience, and that is why so many students go away from New Zealand to other places and especially to Edinburgh to complete their medical education. To a man living in Auckland the expense of sending his son and maintaining him in Dunedin is not very much less than it would be to send him to England. There is only the expense of the voyage one way to England to be considered, because on the return journey the students nearly always come out as surgeons of a ship. Now, on account of the small amount of clinical training his son would get in Dunedin, would it not be better reasons for a parent to send him to the University of Edinburgh, where there is plenty of material, rather than to send him to Dunedin? The Dunedin School serves its purpose admirably indeed, and specially suits students living in Dunedin, Christchurch, and other towns near at hand. I know from personal experience as a medical student that those are the arguments which are used. One of the chief attractions in the Old Country is that there are so many opportunities for a student. The medical journals are full of advertisements for house surgeons and specialists in the different hospitals, and it is as house surgeon the student finds his footing. The house surgeons required here are very few—perhaps three or four every year; but in the Old Country there are so many opportunities, and that is why so many men go to England for medical study—it is not because they look with disdain or want of trust on the teaching provided in our Medical School in Dunedin. There is just one word more I should like to say with regard to research. In training the student for definite research there is a danger of beginning too early. One should like to have a broader basis of general knowledge and acquaintance with instruction in what has been accomplished up to the present time before they begin to make researches on their own account. In practically all the faculties there are three grades—there is the bachelor, the master, and the doctor; and my opinion is that this research work should be practically confined to those studying for honours. They should do a certain amount of research work in order to obtain the master degree for either arts or science, and then original research should be pursued for the doctor degree—for the doctor of literature, science, and law, and other faculties. It is at that stage of the degree that the University is making the highest provision for research in the different faculties. I should like to note, with reference to the second question, that the association referred to the people in other parts of the world, and that was the question of the constitution of the University Senate, and the proposal they made in regard to that. I should like to say that the present constitution of the University Senate is in every way a remarkably good one, and that the Senate since it was constituted has done exceedingly good work. It has been described as a pre-eminently lay body, and I do not think it deserves that description. It certainly is not a pre-eminently lay body. There are twenty-four members of the Senate, and, as the association points out, there are on it six active professors out of twenty-four members, and one retired professor. They have a full knowledge, surely, of what is required in the construction of curricula for the different degrees. And then we have another member of our Senate, Mr. Hogben, who I do not think can be regarded as a layman, especially in the preparation of a syllabus—I think he is past-master of that—so that I think all important questions receive due attention, seeing that there are seven or eight men who have practical, everyday knowledge of the matters which surround the professors in regard to their work. And then on the Senate we have men who have been intimately acquainted with educational work in this country—Sir Robert Stout, the Chancellor, Sir Charles Bowen, the Vice-Chancellor, and Sir Maurice O'Rorke. Those men have done yeoman service in regard to carrying out the education system of this country. And there is also Mr. James Allen, for I place him among the pioneers of education in New Zealand. There are eight graduates' representatives, and three men who are medical men, among whom I am included, and we are qualified to advise on courses of medical studies. Mr. Hay and Dr. Fitchett, who have been connected with the University Senate since its first establishment, and who

know all the details about its work, and who, with Mr. Tole and Mr. Von Haast, being all lawyers, are able to advise the Senate with regard to the legal curriculum of the University. In addition there is Professor Scott and Mr. Gordon, who are acquainted with engineering. Out of the whole membership of the Senate there are only three who are not men with University degrees. Therefore I think the Reform Association were a little hard when they dubbed us a lay body. My attention has been drawn to the fact that I used the wrong expression—that it is "preponderating" instead of "pre-eminently lay body" that the association uses. I would like also to say it is not this "lay element," as it is called, upon the Senate, that the chief objection in regard to their platform comes. It is largely from the professorial members of the Senate as well as from the graduates' representatives. We do not take up that attitude for a moment, gentlemen, because we do not think the professors are competent to carry out the system, but it is solely or mainly on account of the jealousy which exists between the four colleges and the difficulties there are of evading that in a satisfactory way in connection with the University examinations. I must thank you for the patient way in which you have listened to me.

1. *Mr. Herdman.*] You are a member of the Auckland University Council?—Yes, and have been for twelve years.

2. Of course, you know the object of this petition: we are not desiring legislation, but require an inquiry into the whole university system of the Dominion?—I do not quite understand that part of your proposals.

3. Am I to understand that you consider the present system in New Zealand in every way satisfactory and not calling for any inquiry?—We find that it is generally satisfactory. Improvements can be made in a number of particulars, but I do not think it is necessary to set up a Commission to inquire into them. For a long time in Auckland we have thought it would be desirable to have professorial representation on the Council, and I moved in that direction about six weeks ago. In consequence of that we applied to Parliament to bring in an amending Bill. We also wished to add to our graduates' representation, on account of the number that belong to our college now. This Bill has been introduced, and I understand from Mr. Hogben that the Government proposes that it shall be on the lines of the Otago University Amendment Bill. I think there should be uniformity in regard to the constitution of our College Councils. I shall be quite willing to support that idea.

4. If you are of opinion that it is desirable that these College Councils should be brought into line, would it not be in the interests of the country to have an investigation made by some Commission?—I do not think it is necessary, but I think it might be desirable for the other colleges to make representations to the Government to secure uniformity. So far as I know the Auckland Council, it does its work very satisfactorily.

5. You are of opinion that all should be brought into line?—I am.

6. In order that it should be done satisfactorily, do you not think there should be an examination by some independent body—some Commission?—I do not think so.

7. Do you think the matter of finance is satisfactory?—I cannot say that it is satisfactory.

8. The success of the University Colleges and the New Zealand University very largely depends upon having a satisfactory finance—that is quite obvious?—Yes.

9. You will admit that to get a satisfactory financial policy is a matter of very great difficulty?—Yes, owing to the demands of the four colleges.

10. You know that one of the objects of the petitioners is to have an inquiry into the working of the system so that a satisfactory method can be devised for the four colleges: do you not think that would justify the appointment of such a Commission?—I might say that with regard to these questions I have not had a sufficient opportunity of studying them. I should like to say that I am in entire sympathy with the Reform Association in their plea for the establishment of libraries.

11. So that, so far as libraries and finance are concerned, on those two questions, at any rate, you agree that there might be a very great improvement, which perhaps would justify the Government appointing a Commission to investigate them?—Yes. The only fear I have in regard to the Commission is that the present constitution of the New Zealand University would be endangered and thrown into the melting-pot.

12. You said in the course of your evidence that the matter of external examination had been discussed in the University Senate, and the proposal to have external examinations had been rejected by a large majority?—I said it had for years. Last year some recanted and there was a very narrow division. Before that there was a preponderating majority.

13. Last year it was rejected by one vote?—Yes, but I know that the battles for years had been very great.

14. *The Chairman.*] I think you said the graduates' representatives were always opposing the change?—Yes, consistently so.

15. Is that shown in your division-list?—Yes, and I think the majority of the professors on the Senate opposed it. [Division-list referred to.] I find I am wrong: Mr. Tibbs, who represented the graduates, voted with the Ayes.

16. Whom did he represent?—The Auckland graduates.

17. *Mr. Herdman.*] Are you aware that the Wellington graduates declared in favour of the examination by the professors?—I was not aware of it.

18. I understand that the Medical School examinations in Dunedin are conducted locally?—Yes.

19. Do you think that in the case of the Medical School there should be an external examination, or are you content with the examinations by the local professors?—I am in favour of that. In clinical and laboratory work there is so much to be done by the student.

20. Is not that necessary also in engineering?—Not to the same extent. I do not think the engineering training is quite on a par with medicine, on which life and death hang.

21. Take chemistry and biology, in which practical work has to be done: why be against external examination in some subjects if you are in favour of external examination in the others? The same argument applies in the case of biology and in the case of physics?—I do not think it has the same important bearing. I think the need of medical men being thoroughly trained in practical work is of very much more importance. In regard to medicine years ago the Scottish system was adopted in its entirety.

22. You declare that the system is satisfactory: why should you be in favour of one and not the other? In physics, biology, and chemistry, practical work has to be done in every case?—That may be so. The system has been adopted for years, and it would be impossible to get examiners in such subjects.

23. Is not that a reflection on the professors?—I should not object if one could get qualified outside examiners on all those subjects. I received to-day a letter from Professor Chilton, in which he says that in regard to his own subject—biology—it would be impossible to get an assessor to examine with him in regard to that subject.

24. You said that many abroad approved of our system of external examination?—Yes.

25. Will you give me the names of any well-known educational authorities who have approved of the system?—I cannot recollect them, but in the course of travelling in different parts of the world three or four times I have met with many educated people who have questioned me with regard to our University examination, and who expressed their appreciation of the New Zealand degree, and stated that that had been enhanced on account of the examinations being conducted by eminent men known all the world over.

26. You cannot give me any authorities for that?—I did not say "authorities." I was careful to say "many educated people."

27. In the course of your evidence you said that the men whose opinions were given in the appendix to the book on University reform were not familiar with local conditions?—I said the bulk of them.

28. You know Professor Dendy—he has had local experience; he was formerly on the staff of the Canterbury College: he is a man who can speak from local experience?—Yes.

29. He says, "A man who is not fit to examine his students is not fit to be a professor"?—Yes.

30. He says, "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." That is a man of local experience, and who carries much weight?—Yes.

31. You know Professor Eliot, President of Harvard University? Of course, he has not had local experience?—He is an eminent man.

32. He is a man whose opinion ought to be respected?—Yes.

33. Did you read his statement? He says, "American education authorities would generally deny the name of 'university' to a body which was merely an examining body"?—I do not agree with that.

34. Professor Foxwell says external examination "has been the curse of the University of London, and the principal reason for the deplorable condition in which that university now finds itself. 'Its constitution is the laughing-stock of foreign professors"?—I should like to have the evidence of many others.

35. You know that there is a Commission inquiring into the condition of the University of London, and that it is the third?—Yes, I believe so.

36. Do you know that our University at Dunedin was moulded on the University of London?—Yes.

37. Do you know that those professors have reported on external examinations and have condemned the system?—I think they have in London.

38. Then why in London and not New Zealand?—Because the universities are so different.

39. In what respect?—We have four University Colleges.

40. Are you not of opinion that the professors who teach in the various colleges should meet together and settle on a plan of action; and if they did that do you not think that a good deal of this interprovincial jealousy would disappear?—Yes.

41. Do you not think it is desirable that those teachers should have a greater voice in fixing the curricula of the University and conducting the examinations?—As regards the curricula, practically it is all done by the professors. That has been my experience.

42. Does that apply with regard to accountancy work?—No. I was referring more particularly to the science and arts department. I am not sure regarding the first syllabus, but the teachers of the subjects were consulted regarding the modified syllabus for the Bachelor of Commerce degree.

43. I want to take you to the professors again. Do you know Professor McCallum and Professor Beattie?—I know Professor Beattie personally. He was in Edinburgh when I was there.

44. He is an old Otago University man?—Yes.

45. He says, "I am strongly of opinion that an examination by a purely external examiner is entirely unsatisfactory"?—I say it is not an entirely external examination—it is only partially so.

46. When it comes to the critical point of the man getting his official degree, the internal examination has nothing to do with it?—No, not completely.

47. You said that the men who have given their opinions are not familiar with local conditions. Do you know Professor Connall, of Oxford?—I know him by name. I know there are a certain number of good professors who have had experience, and I admit that some of them are acquainted with the local conditions.

48. Do you know Professor Inglis, who has been appointed to the University of Otago? He was Professor of Chemistry at Reading. He says, "I consider an external examination unfair

for the students and unsatisfactory for the teachers." You have read Professor Maclaurin's opinion?—Yes. It is tinged with the American style now.

49. He is a man of ability?—Exceptional ability.

50. He was in New Zealand?—Yes, and was a great friend of mine, and I am sorry to see that he has changed.

51. He says, "The conditions have, however, been wholly changed, and your system is now antiquated and entirely opposed to the trend of the best educational practice"?—Yes, but I do not admit it.

52. Since Professor Maclaurin has gone to America he has come to recognize, after acquaintance with the American universities, that our system is a little bit antique—archaic?—I think he has probably been affected by the American institutions.

53. Professor Tucker is a man of local experience?—Yes, he is now in Melbourne.

54. He says, "Of course, I should regard the present state of things in New Zealand as intolerable. It is cumbrous; it is humiliating; and it is educationally a drag"?—Yes.

55. I put it to you that these opinions have been quoted from eminent educational authorities, and that they all declare that the system of examination adopted here is unsatisfactory?—I do not say it is entirely satisfactory myself. I have acknowledged that.

56. Then do you not think it is advisable for Parliament to set up a Commission to investigate the whole matter?—No.

57. The libraries and finance?—Yes, the libraries.

58. Have you read the opinions of the men who have the examining themselves, in the appendix?—No, I have not had time yet.

59. Let me direct your attention to what Sir William Ramsay says?—I have read that.

60. Sir William Ramsay says, "I have examined in chemistry for the University of New Zealand for four years; having examined for the London University, before its reform, for five, I have much experience of the system of external examinations, and do not hesitate to condemn it utterly. Its worse consequences are still to be seen in the Indian universities, which are thoroughly rotten—where all the work is examinational, and where the results are beneath contempt. The results of my experience in examining for New Zealand have confirmed my conclusions." These are words of very great weight, are they not?—I do not know that they are.

61. Would not such opinions, coming from the lips of a man like Sir William Ramsay, lead you to believe that you are wrong?—No. I think if he were as familiar with it as I have been all these years he would not say that.

62. I put it to you that these opinions of gentlemen acquainted with our system for a long time in New Zealand offer a strong body of evidence which raises the presumption that the system of external examination is unsatisfactory?—No, I think we ought to work out our own system, and not Anglicize, Germanize, or Americanize it. We ought to grow under the system established here, and should not be influenced by American or German institutions as to how we should conduct our examinations.

63. Have you read about the system at the Melbourne University?—I do not think the Melbourne University is on a par with ours; there is one university there, and where that is so it is all right having local examinations; but the peculiarities of our system are such that it would be more objectionable to have an internal system than the present system.

64. But why not have an inquiry?—I did not come down to object to an inquiry. I came down to speak in reference to the colleges, the hall-mark of the degree of the University of New Zealand, and to show how admirably adapted it is to its purposes. The Council of the Otago University has been enlarged. We shall probably have fifteen or sixteen members on our Auckland College Councils, and that would mean sixty-four or seventy members on our Senate if the proposal formulated by the Reform Association was put in force. It is somewhat difficult with us in Auckland, with the number of our present Council, to get a quorum on account of some of the members not being able to attend. There are several lawyers on it, and owing to their Court practice they cannot be present at times. It will be a great help to us to get several additional men.

65. You have read Chapter VIII on "Reorganization"?—Yes, I have glanced at it.

66. It is suggested here that any scheme of reorganization "must promote the co-ordination of the work of the University and the four colleges." Do you not think there is room for co-ordination in the work, and for some sort of a system that will bring the representatives of the four colleges together for co-ordination work?—I do believe in that, and I think I told Professor Laby in Auckland that I should be pleased to see regular meetings of the whole Professorial Boards.

67. Taking a step further, do you not think it would be desirable that those professors who meet should have a greater voice in arranging the curricula?—Yes, I think that would be desirable.

68. Do you not think likewise that the scheme of reorganization would promote the individuality of the four colleges?—I think that they should maintain their individuality.

69. And that any scheme should prevent as far as possible any overlapping?—Yes, but there will always be a certain amount of overlapping.

70. On page 112 it says, "The professoriate should form a conjoint Board whose business it would be to draw the curricula for degrees, subject to veto by the Senate, and to conduct examinations according to such policy as the university may adopt." You will not believe in that because you believe in the external examination?—Yes, I do.

71. *The Chairman.*] I understand that your chief objection to the setting-up of the Royal Commission is lest it would endanger the present system of examination?—Yes, and put disabilities on the night students.

72. *Mr. Herdman.*] Can you point to any passage in the pamphlet which indicates any intention to interfere with the night classes?—I think so. At page 10 it practically says that owing to the night classes it is not worthy to be called a New Zealand University education.

73. *The Chairman.*] In comparing the position of the examinations of the Medical School with the examinations in other subjects like the arts and sciences, is not the position made much simpler from the fact that there is only one Medical School in the Dominion?—Yes.

74. And in order to make this the same you would have to have a Medical School in all the other centres?—Yes.

75. *Mr. G. M. Thomson.*] It is sometimes stated that much of the marking of the papers by the external examiners is really done by "hacks." Have you any knowledge of that?—If it has occurred at all I know nothing of it. I have had nothing to do with the marking committee of the Senate.

76. It has frequently been said?—Yes, I understand so.

77. Did I understand you to say that you would approve of joint examination by the four teaching professors and outside examiners?—I would disapprove of the four teachers examining alone, and the only thing I would approve of would be external examiners associated with those here. But I do not think the time has come for that.

78. Are you aware that the associates of the Otago School of Mines, which has a very high standard outside of New Zealand, pass an internal examination?—Yes.

79. *Mr. Hardy.*] I do not know whether you say that a Royal Commission should be set up or not?—I do not approve of it altogether.

80. Is it not your opinion that an outside Commission would be able to take evidence and make suggestions if they thought fit?—Yes.

81. Is there anything in the present management on which you are afraid light might be let in by such a Commission?—Not at all. The only thing I should like is that the Commission should be thoroughly seized of all the facts. If I could be sure that the Commission would be thoroughly conversant with all matters connected with the University I do not think there would be any objection. But there is no clamant need for a Commission, and I think, with regard to libraries and finance, what is necessary could be done through the Government.

82. You are thoroughly in earnest and believe in the present system?—I do.

83. You think it is nearly perfect?—As nearly perfect as it is possible here.

84. Do you not think your opinion might be strengthened by having these matters investigated by a Commission?—Yes.

85. Then why object to it?—I do not object to it, but do not think it really necessary.

86. These people ask that this Commission should be set up?—Yes, I see that.

87. You would not object to the Commission and believe it would strengthen what you say with regard to its being perfect?—Yes. I think if we had one University the difficulties regarding examinations would be got over, but, as I said before, I do not approve of there being only one University for New Zealand.

88. *Mr. Allen.*] With regard to the constitution of the Senate: Do you think the Senate, as constituted, is capable of dealing with the work now coming before it by itself—take the question of the syllabus?—Not without consultation in some of the matters with the Professorial Boards.

89. Is it not a fact that the Senate has consulted the Professorial Boards without very good results—separately?—Yes, it has been difficult to get on with a syllabus at times.

90. Did not the Senate get representatives of these Professorial Boards together for consultation?—Yes, I thought it was a good arrangement. I agree with that. It is not, however, a bad thing when there is delay sometimes through referring matters back to the professors. Several revolutionary proposals were made that have quietened down.

91. With regard to the question of the syllabus, is not that practically what the Reform Association is asking for—that the Professorial Boards should meet together and arrange the syllabus?—Yes, I agree with that.

92. With regard to external examiners: What influence do you think the external examination has had upon the professor or lecturer? Has it been for good or evil, or has it had anything to do with the examination?—I claim it has had a great deal to do with what leads up to the examination in the way of study. From what I have heard I think it has had a good influence upon the professors. It has kept some of them up to date. We have heard of some bad professors here.

93. You are referring to the college examiners?—Yes.

94. Have these college examiners insisted on the keeping of terms in subjects afterwards taken for the degree in all the University Colleges?—I believe in Victoria College and Otago University they do not insist upon students passing in the subjects which they are taking for their degree examination, but in Auckland and Canterbury Colleges they do. They have to pass in "terms" in Victoria College and in Otago University, but not necessarily in subjects required for their degree work.

95. That is not entirely satisfactory?—No.

96. You made a remark in your address which was very significant to me: you said that the certificate of Professor Laby, Professor Chilton, Professor Brown, or Professor Thomas would be recognized outside New Zealand?—I said, in the laboratory of Sir William Ramsay or any other distinguished scientist.

97. If the certificate of Dr. Chilton for biology would be recognized, would the man having the degree be recognized?—It would be by this professor, because of his knowledge of the teacher of the particular subject in which he was interested, but it would not stand higher in reputation with men of education, because they would judge of the value of the standard of the degree as a whole. The men who go from New Zealand to Edinburgh stand high on this account.

98. You draw a distinction between the opinions of eminent professors in England and the educated people of England?—I think that is natural. I know in my own profession how strong the feeling of comradeship is to one another. I think if some of these professors knew that the Reform Association had been initiated by thirteen or fourteen professors and teachers they might be inclined to give replies in favour of what the Reform Association advocate.

99. Do you think the certificate of any of these men you name would be accepted, not by the professors in England, but by the public?—I could not say that.

100. Is there any reason why they should not be?—No.

101. If you admit that, is there any reason why the examination for the degree should not be taken here?—A degree covers the whole ground of a man's training.

102. Would you argue from your own personal experience that a man who wanted to be trained for medicine could be trained at evening lectures?—No, he would have to go during the whole time for that.

103. Do you argue that a dentist could do so in Otago?—No.

104. Or that a teacher does so or could do so?—Not fully, although many of our teachers have risen in their grades through attending night-work.

105. I mean a teacher as a professional?—I think the professional men would have to go through the whole of the work.

106. Then you do draw a distinction between those who go there for the whole of the time and those who go for the night-work?—Yes.

107. Do you not think it would be an advantage to have the work taken at separate institutions?—No. It might be necessary to help the professors with tutorial assistance to carry through the system satisfactorily. I should be very sorry indeed if anything were done to lower the status of the night-school work.

108. Would there be any disability if their education were handed over to a separate institution?—I say it is well for the men who have to go to business avocations during the day that they should be associated with those who are going into other professions—with the lawyer, the teacher, and the divinity students and so on—that they should be associated in the common room, debating, and sport clubs of the University. It would have a tendency to make them better men and better citizens, and it would be altogether a pity and a wrong if they were to be handed over to a separate institution and withdrawn from the University atmosphere.

109. Do you think a student going day after day and taking the three-years course for the arts degree can be compared with the student who is attending the night-school? What is the product of the two?—The longer the time a man can give to his study the better.

110. If that is so would you favour, with regard to the night student, the time being extended for his degree—say, to four years for the arts course?—That would be putting a disability on him.

111. Do you argue for two standards in the degree?—No. I do not see why the pass student's qualification should be above what it is now. Our Auckland professors devote all the morning to the honours work, and go through the other work at night-time.

112. I understand that you argue that the ordinary B.A. degree is a degree that a man could cover by a night course?—Yes, I think it should not be made so severe that men could not undertake it.

113. Would that degree be equivalent to the Oxford or Cambridge degree—would it not be lowering it?—It has been accepted as a good degree. I was a night student myself, and should not like to have missed that intellectual privilege. I feel for those who are not in a position to attend throughout the day, and I want to maintain that privilege.

114. I want to get at the standard of the work?—It is a good standard.

115. Is the ordinary B.A. degree lower or higher than that of Oxford or Cambridge?—I have always believed that the B.A. degree was somewhat higher than that of Oxford or Cambridge pass degree.

116. Can you give us any authority for that?—I think Professor Thomas and Professor Brown will indorse that.

117. With regard to libraries and finance, do you think there is any necessity for setting up a Commission to find if we want more money for libraries?—I do not.

118. Or with regard to finance?—No.

119. Are they not both admitted?—I think they are. I do not want to stand in the way.

120. *Mr. Poole.*] You say that the New Zealand University stands high in the Old Country?—Yes.

121. Is it a fact that you are fighting for the continuance of the external examinations because you believe it will maintain the high standard of your local educational work—is that your reason?—That is the reason, sir.

122. You think the abolition of the Old Country examinations would be calculated to lower the standard of university work here in the minds of people abroad?—Yes. I think the time has not come for any other system, and that is why I am opposing such.

THURSDAY, 14TH SEPTEMBER, 1911.

Professor T. A. HUNTER recalled. (No. 10.)

1. *The Chairman.*] I understood you to say, Professor, that you were not in favour of the professors examining by themselves—that is, without an assessor?—No, I am not in favour of any individual professor passing his students. I am in favour of a Board of Professors.

2. Will you give your reasons why you are not in favour of the individual professor?—I can see that if each professor examines his own students we shall have four different standards throughout New Zealand, for each professor would fix his own standard.

3. You have no other objection than that?—I have also the other objection that if you have the individual professors examining their own students it will keep the professors apart, and I contend that the system should tend to drive them into conference rather than to isolate them. My objection is, first of all, that you get four different standards throughout the colony in any one subject; and, secondly, that it would further isolate the professors.

4. Professor Sale, in dissenting from that part of the report of the Commission of 1879 in which it is recommended that the examiners of the New Zealand University should be taken from among the professors of the University Colleges, said: "I think it wrong that any professor or lecturer should be placed in the exceedingly difficult position of having to pronounce upon the relative merits of his own students and others educated at rival colleges. I think it not unlikely that this difficulty will lead to the breakdown of the scheme, and will precipitate the establishment of four or more distinct universities." Do you dissent from that view?—No. The view there put forward is not the view we are now putting forward. Professor Sale is objecting to the system by which one professor of a subject would examine all the students of that subject in New Zealand. The Professor of Classics, say, in Auckland, would examine his own students as well as all the other students in classics. I would object to that, as I do to the external system.

5. Supposing you have four professors examining a number of the students from an individual college, and we will say that the examination is not for the degree, but for a scholarship: do you not think the professors might be put in a difficult position in having to choose between their own students and the students of rival colleges?—The method of adjudicating upon scholarships in New Zealand is generally looked upon, I think, as educationally unsound.

6. The reply is that you would alter the method of awarding scholarships?—Yes. I think an alteration in that method is desirable. The retention of the present method of awarding scholarships is not to be put on a par with the necessity for altering the present system of external examination.

Professor T. H. LABY examined. (No. 11.)

1. *The Chairman.*] You wish to make a statement Professor?—Yes. The petition we make, gentlemen, is that the House of Representatives "will inquire into the state of university administration and education in New Zealand." My evidence will be directed to show that there is an urgent need for a Royal Commission to inquire into university education, empowered to take evidence in New Zealand and abroad, and to report on the constructive reforms that are necessary to give the Dominion an efficient university system suited to its needs and resources. You, gentlemen, have it in your power to initiate the practical steps which may give to New Zealand a real university—the intellectual centre of a nation—whose influence would extend through the schools and professions to every part of the community; an institution that would show, as the German universities have especially shown, that trained minds are of inestimable value to a nation in all its activities—in fact, are essential to any modern community if it is to compete with success with the most progressive of other communities. My evidence will be directed mainly to establishing the statements which we make in the petition before you, and to answering certain general questions which members of the Educational Committee have asked. If our university system has failed, as we contend it has, then there should be very definite evidence to that effect. I propose to mention specific facts, which, to my mind, prove that our University has failed signally in what should have been its functions. But before doing that, may I disclaim any desire to depreciate the Senate of the University or the students. As a teacher in Sydney University and a student in Cambridge, I came in contact with a number of students, and after that experience the enthusiasm and natural intelligence of the New Zealand students seemed to me surprisingly good. If the training of the University Colleges is poor it will drive away such students as can afford it to study abroad. I contend that New-Zealanders who can send their sons to universities abroad are very often doing so. I consider that, if they believe the university training abroad is worth the heavy extra cost, they act rightly. The main consideration is good training, wherever it can be obtained. But the matter which is of importance to you is that there are a large number of New-Zealanders studying at universities abroad. No one would send his son abroad unless he had no doubt whatever that the training to be obtained in New Zealand colleges was distinctly inferior to that of the English universities. The extra cost of a university training abroad alone amounts to, say, £100 a year. Further, the student is separated from his people, and thrown with few restraints on the large centres at Home. At first, Canadians and Australians, who could afford it, went to English universities; but the growth of efficient universities in Canada and Australia practically stopped the exodus. South Africans, who until recently had access only to a university which was possibly a greater failure than the New Zealand University, when they could afford it, went to universities in all parts of Europe. There is definite evidence of the exodus of New Zealand students; it is not merely a personal impression. In 1909, forty-eight New Zealanders passed medical examinations in Edinburgh alone, and no doubt some failed, and others studied at the London medical schools. We may safely conclude that there were then at least sixty New-Zealanders at Home studying medicine. How many there were studying other subjects I have no information. The following letter from the Professor of Anatomy in the Melbourne University Medical School, Dr. Bevy, is evidence that while the Australians studying medicine at Edinburgh have decreased the New-Zealanders have increased. I attribute the change to the failure of our Medical School, and the success of the Australian medical schools. Professor Bevy, in his letter, says, "Unfortunately, I know but little of your University, but when in Edinburgh last year I was much struck by the fact that a large majority of Australasian students in Edinburgh emanate from New Zealand, which did not use to be the case in my student days in that University." What is the failure of our Medical School, which has the miserable income of £2,600, costing New Zealanders? It is not possible to say exactly,

but if the sixty students mentioned above spend £150 a year each — and that is a moderate estimate—then New-Zealanders send £9,000 a year Home to maintain these students. The Legislature's duty in this matter is clear. It ascertains by a Royal Commission whether medicine can be taught efficiently in New Zealand. If it can, then it should give the necessary financial help to make the medical teaching efficient. If medicine cannot be taught efficiently, then it is high time, on the grounds of public economy and in the interest of the sick, that the school should be closed. Personally, I believe we can do in New Zealand what is done in New South Wales and Victoria. In both those countries the locally-trained medical man has displaced the foreign-trained, and that is so, even though in Dr. Bevy's student days, I take it, that in Edinburgh University there were more Australians than New-Zealanders. It is high time that our Senate was reorganized and gave up wasting its time on petty details of curricula, and gave its attention to the Medical School and other equally important matters, such as an efficient Agricultural School and the encouragement of research. The present position of our University is that those who can afford to go abroad frequently do so; but the University is good enough for the poor man's son, who has no choice but to attend one of our colleges or have no university training. The next question is that of evening work: Universities sometimes provide evening lectures for those who are earning their livelihood during the day, and who are consequently unable to attend day lectures. In my experience evening students are usually an earnest, hard-working body of men, who value highly the education they make sacrifices to obtain. In other universities the evening course for a degree is often extended to last a year or two longer than the day course, otherwise it would be impossible for the evening student to cover the same ground as the day student. Some universities provide no evening lectures, holding that a degree does not merely imply that a student has listened to a course of lectures and passed certain examinations, but that for a period of years the student has been taken apart from his ordinary life, so that he has been free to experience fully the personal influence of his teachers, and of his fellow-students in the daily life of a university—free to make full use of the libraries, museums, and workshops. A university fails to educate its students if it merely affords instruction in the lecture-room or workshop. If the only education provided for a degree—it cannot be called a university education—is evening lectures extending over three years, then not only do the many influences referred to above disappear, but the standard of instruction is lowered, and positive harm done to those students, usually in the majority, who could give their whole time to a university education. Now, in the North Island colleges most of the lectures are delivered after 5 p.m., and so these colleges are practically night schools. What should be merely an additional means of university education becomes the only education available to many New Zealand students. To meet the hardship of the exceptional student, a hardship is inflicted on all the students. Let us consider the position of the most intelligent youths of from eighteen to twenty-one years of age, who are intellectually fit for a university education, and consequently upon whom more than any one else depends the future of New Zealand. I have here an extract from the "Provisional Regulations for the Military Forces of the Dominion for 1911." The minimum amount of training to be carried out annually by all ranks of the Territorial Force, Reserves, and Senior Cadets will be as follows: Territorial Force: (*a*) thirty drills (twenty of which will be outdoor parades); (*b*) twelve half-day or six whole-day parades (all of which will be exercises in the field, except in the case of Garrison Artillery units, which will be exercised at the works of defence to which they are allotted on mobilization); (*c*) seven days' annual training in camp (exclusive of the days of arrival and departure); (*d*) prescribed course of musketry. "Drill" equals one hour and a half actual instruction; "one-half day" equals not less than three hours' instruction in daylight; "whole day" equals not less than six hours' instruction by day or night. What do the State and the University in their wisdom do for these people? The State compels them to prepare for the defence of this Dominion; it requires them to attend thirty drills of an hour and a half, twelve half-day drills, and a week's training in camp. The university system in the North Island invites these boys to earn their living concurrently with their university education. Now, all competent authorities are agreed that to obtain a degree in three years is sufficient to occupy the whole and undivided attention of any student. The student in this island is expected not only to do that, but to earn his living and take his share in the defence of his country. And this is done, gentlemen, in a community which holds itself up to the world as a model in the humanity and wisdom of its social arrangements. You may ask, What is the remedy? I do not suggest that the student should at present be relieved of his military training. Later, when that training is working smoothly, university students might well be exempt as a recognition that to undergo a university education implies sacrifices and a training more valuable even than those involved in our military service, and to expect both forms of training is to expect more than is possible of students from eighteen to twenty-one years of age. But I certainly think it is high time that the Legislature made it possible for the North Island colleges to cease being mere night schools. In England night schools have always been refused recognition as universities. The normal training in Victoria College and Auckland University College should be a day training, evening classes being held for those who cannot attend during the day. I would like to lay stress upon that. The University Colleges should encourage students to attend during the day, and not encourage them to be night students. There seems to me no possible reason why the North Island should be so far behind the South Island in this matter. Dr. McDowell, in his evidence, appeared to think we wish to discriminate between evening students and day students in academic arrangements. On the contrary, as one who attended certain evening lectures in Sydney University, I think it is most undesirable to make any discrimination between the two classes of students. I do not think any member of the University Reform Association wishes to put the evening students at any disadvantage. I think, however, it certainly is the duty of the Legislature to provide day classes in the North Island.

so that those who can attend them will be encouraged to do so. This is essential in the interests of those students who can give their undivided attention to the university; it is essential if the standard of instruction for our degrees is not to be far below that in other universities; it is essential if there is to be any corporate college life in the North Island, and too great stress cannot be laid on the value of the influences of university life. The next question I propose to take is the question of finance of the different colleges. In considering the financial arrangements of the University and its colleges it is necessary to notice a very important distinction between our University Colleges and the universities, say, in Australia. Each of the colleges in New Zealand is to most of the students attending them a university. For example, Canterbury College is to a student attending it the only university in New Zealand. The only help which he can obtain from any other college in New Zealand is from the Otago Medical School. Except in the case of medical teaching the other colleges are of no help to him.

2. How about mining?—Yes, I overlooked mining. But so far as the subjects in the arts curriculum and in the science curriculum and the subjects of law and engineering are concerned, it is his own college which teaches him, so that it is not appropriate to compare the combined resources of the four colleges with one university in Canada, Australia, or in any of the States in America, for those combined resources are never availed of by New Zealand students; but we have to compare each of the colleges with each of those universities, remembering all the time that the colleges do not quite cover the whole ground of a university. But they cover the greater part of it, and probably three-fourths of the ground; and to cover three-fourths of the ground implies that our colleges must have an income somewhat comparable with the income of other universities in the world of about the same age. I would like to call your attention to the income of the New Zealand colleges. The Auckland University College has an income of £10,000; Victoria College, £10,500; Canterbury College, £16,400; Otago, £15,600. Now take the universities in other parts of the world. Adelaide University serves a population of 400,000, and has an income of £22,000; Sydney, which serves a population of 1,600,000, has an income of £64,000; Toronto University, which serves a population of 2,250,000, has an income of £140,000; Stanford (California), serving a population of 2,000,000, has an income of £400,000. California has two universities to choose from, either of which has an income of £200,000. The New-Zealander has a choice of Auckland University College, Victoria College, Canterbury College, and the Otago University, and the best-off of them has an income of £16,000. And money does not purchase in New Zealand more than it does in California, and so you can see pretty clearly the relative value of the university education our colleges offer compared with that of the countries mentioned. Taken as a whole, Stanford and Berkeley Universities, which serve a population only twice that of New Zealand, have an income of £400,000, which is to be compared with the £52,500 that our colleges receive. The point I want to bring you to is that the policy of our Legislature is that we should have four colleges, one in each of the centres, and such a policy logically and definitely entails a certain expenditure, and the expenditure that has been required by that policy has never been met or recognized in any way, as you can see from the figures I have quoted. For example, take the case of the University of Adelaide. I think it has been established for a shorter time than our University. It was established in 1876, while ours was established in 1870. It serves a population of 400,000 people, but its university has an income of £22,000 a year. It, of course, teaches somewhat more subjects than do any one of our colleges. It teaches, I understand, medicine, dentistry, electrical engineering, and the arts and science subjects; but that is not very much more than any of our colleges teach; and yet in that State, with a more recently established university and with a community only two-fifths of our community, they are able to maintain a university which has a larger income than any of our colleges. I cannot find any university which is so poorly financed as our four colleges. It is not only in the matter of income that our colleges are at a disadvantage. They are at a much worse disadvantage in the capital which has been spent on them. You will notice that the total expenditure on the buildings of the different colleges is—Auckland, £7,000; Wellington, £36,000; Christchurch, £50,000; and Dunedin, £40,000. I would draw your attention to the type of buildings in Sydney and in New Zealand universities, as shown by the photographs before you. The figures quoted are subject to correction, but from the returns from the Inspector-General of Schools I find that the capital expenditure on buildings in New Zealand is £133,000, while the total capital expenditure on buildings in the University of Sydney is £320,000. *Per capita* the expenditure in New Zealand is 3s. per head; *per capita* in New South Wales for the Sydney University it is 4s. per head. So we are behind even in *per capita* expenditure; but when it comes to the buildings actually provided we cannot be compared for a moment to Sydney University. If you take the trouble to compare the buildings in Sydney with the buildings in any one centre in New Zealand you will see that they are of a different type altogether. Even if you compare the best in New Zealand—which I believe is in Canterbury College—with the Sydney University the comparison is very much against us; but if you compare the buildings at Auckland with the buildings in Sydney you will see that they are a different order of things. Some of our buildings are like up-country schools instead of university buildings. If New Zealand attempted to provide facilities distributed over four colleges equal to those which exist in New South Wales I think there is no doubt it would need to spend, say, twice as much as has been spent in New South Wales, and that would be 8s. per head of a population. It has actually spent 3s. In making this statement I cannot claim it has accuracy, but 8s. per head is about the amount that would be necessary for New Zealand to spend in order to get reasonably good museums, libraries, laboratories, and so on. You can see the result of the parsimony in capital expenditure particularly clearly in its effect on our college libraries. I think one can say, having regard to what is a proper university library, that we have not got in New Zealand a university library, and that is one of the outcomes of starving the University Colleges in capital expenditure. The only other question I wish to draw attention to

is with regard to the anomalies that exist in our University finance. You will see, for example, that to maintain a University which is purely an examining University—and does no work of a constructive kind—it does not help to teach any subject or promote research, but it costs £8,000 a year. £5,000 a year is spent in scholarships, which are, of course, a direct help to students; but the total expenditure of the University is £13,000, so (subtracting the scholarships) we find that the University spends £8,000 on merely testing the knowledge of the candidates. You will find that Auckland University College spends £8,700 a year, but, instead of holding the examinations, Auckland has to maintain a staff of teachers, and attempts to teach all the subjects of the arts, science, mining, music, commerce, and law degree courses. I think you can see at once the extraordinary anomaly which exists here, that the University should spend merely on the annual examinations for New Zealand as much as the Auckland University College spends in teaching all those subjects to a large number of students. Another anomaly is the relative expenditure on engineering and medicine. You see that the expenditure on engineering is £6,600 a year. There are twenty-five students for the degree, and 151 other students. Of course, the other students are not comparable with the students studying for the degree. The Medical School has about £3,600 a year, but it is very difficult to discover what the Medical School spends owing to the nature of the accounts available. The number of students is eighty-four for medical and ten for the dental degree. They devote all their time to the work, and are taking a full course in dentistry and medicine. The teaching in engineering is well done. The Engineering School is an efficient institution, well equipped, and the teaching is reasonably high when it is remembered that we are a community of only a million and the University has existed for forty years. How is it possible for the Medical School to attempt to cover all the subjects, medical curriculum, and teach all those students on an income of £3,600 a year? It is impossible. I pointed out to you that New-Zealanders are probably sending at least £9,000 a year Home to maintain medical students who are being educated there. It seems to me, in face of these facts, that it is for you to say whether that should be continued, or whether the Medical School here should not be made as efficient as is the Medical School in Melbourne or in Sydney. There are other anomalies in finance, but I do not wish to take up too much of your time, so I will pass to some other questions. I might say that I should be very glad to answer any questions you may have to put to me on the subject of finance in connection with the University, and I will attempt to defend the statements that are made in the pamphlet. I think Mr. Allen asked me for some constructive evidence to remedy the position of the University. I would like to mention certain principles that seem to me ought to be applied in any attempt to put the finances of the University and its colleges into order. The first principle is that a higher income which anticipates an increase of students and the needs of the community for a more highly specialized training should be provided for the University and the colleges. The income should be assured. When you look at the finance of the Victoria College you find that it exceeds its income by from £1,000 to £2,000 a year. The figures I have show that it is going to the bad by £2,000 a year. I have found out from the Treasurer of the Victoria College that it is certainly going to the bad by over £800 a year. I think that is a very unsatisfactory position for a college. The reason is that we have not an assured income. The college is overspending its income, and knows it has to stop when it has exhausted its reserve funds. After that it gets an overdraft, and if that is called up the councillors will have to stop work. Finance of that kind is one of the things that arise from an uncertain position. The councillors of the college believe if they go on like this they will go to the Government, and the Government will give them something to put matters right. I think that is very unsatisfactory. I do not think a University College should be put into the humiliating position of having to wait on the doorstep of the Minister of Education; and, on the other hand, the Government should not be engineered into the position of being forced to give an extra grant. The second point is that the expenditure on a university should be in accordance with the needs of the students and the community. It must be obvious that if no extension of expenditure is possible, all concerned in the university lose heart in their work. The second principle is of a negative character: it is that there should be no payments by results. You must not count the number of students and give a grant accordingly, because that entirely leaves out of account quality of work; and I think it is sufficient to say that the effects of payment by results has been ruinous wherever it has been tried. The Royal Commission we ask for should fix the income given to each college, as is done in England. The Commission, I think, should be asked to state what are the reasonable needs of the various colleges when it reports; and in doing so it would take into account, as the standing English Commission does, the various needs of the number of students and the quality and nature of the work in each college. It would then be for the Government to make some definite provision for that income. There are two possible ways of providing it. One is to do as they do in America—to give a certain defined fraction of the revenue of the State. The income of New Zealand is of the order of £10,000,000. Supposing it was decided by the Commission that the Government were to give £35,000 or £40,000 per annum—that is somewhat more than they are giving at present—it would amount to 0·35 per cent. of the income of the Dominion. In America the system is to give such a percentage on the average income of the State for the last three years. Then, as a State grows, and its population and prosperity increases, its revenue increases, and so does the revenue of the university. On the other hand, if the State goes back the university revenue is cut down. I do not think there is any great objection to stopping the expansion of the university under such circumstances. Another way by which a permanent and assured income could be given to the colleges would be to set apart land in the North Island to endow the colleges of both Islands. It has to be said for the South Island that the Provincial Legislatures of Otago and Canterbury have done that for their colleges, but the land endowments in the south would have to be increased. Such a policy would also meet the requirements of an increased expenditure, because no doubt the value of the land would increase with time, and so provide an expanding income for the colleges and university.

3. *Mr. Allen.*] Do I understand that that would be an alternative way of providing revenue? —Yes. A further suggestion is that the Government should put on a definite basis the question of a subsidy on amounts given by private individuals. If the colleges receive sums from private individuals, the Government should give a pound-for-pound subsidy, as they do at present irregularly, to encourage local support. I do not think the Treasury would be called upon to pay very much, judging from what already has been given by private individuals for University purposes; but there is this to be said in favour of the policy, that it is an encouragement to local people to help their own college, because they would know that a Government contribution would be added to the amount. It is also sound from the Government point of view, because it rather prevents faddish schemes being brought forward. It ought to be definitely said that no constructive scheme of University finance should be entered upon before a well-considered and general scheme of reorganization has been considered. If you fix on any scheme of finance you tie the hands of the Commission. Supposing one college had started before the Royal Commission began an Agricultural School, or had got the mere beginning of one under its management, and it was receiving from the Government £4,000 or £5,000 a year for the purpose. If the Commission then decided to put the Agricultural School in another centre you would get no support for the proposal. So if the Government or the Legislature fix the financial position of the colleges, they thereby at the same time fix the whole policy of the University in many other directions. I think the whole question of reorganization and reconstruction of the University Colleges, both financially and in other directions, should be delayed until one body could go into the question as a whole, in order that that body can have a free hand. The next question is that of libraries. Professor Hunter described to you very clearly the condition of our libraries, and I do not think that there is any one who disputes the fact that they are in a very bad condition. In fact, if you were to recall any university library in any other part of the world, it cannot be said in any sense of the word that we have a university library. I might give you a few particular examples of the poorness of the libraries in New Zealand. Speaking as a Professor of Science, I say there is not to be found in New Zealand libraries the science journals which record the progress of science, and it is impossible for a professor to treat his subject in an original manner because of the absence of books and periodicals. The researches and discoveries of Professor Rutherford, which constitute a new science and form the greatest intellectual achievement of any New-Zealander—researches which have gained the applause of the intellectual world—are not to be found as he wrote them in any Wellington library. Such is the respect which we pay to the finest contributions to knowledge made by any New-Zealander—contributions which any nation would have been proud of! I think that is a very grave position, and says very little for our patriotism. If you just recall how New Zealand depends upon the freezing industry for its existence you will see the enormous importance of this subject, and yet you will find that Ewing's "Mechanical Production of Cold" is not to be found in any Wellington library. I do not know what might be said of the civilization of the community which makes so much out of the freezing industry and yet does not provide a book of that kind. I know that in the details of chemistry, physics, and mathematics it would be impossible for any New Zealand professor, relying on the public libraries, to write a book which would be original in its treatment upon the subject of his study. Any one who is a candidate for a Chair in this Dominion will ascertain that before he comes out here, and he makes up his mind either to give up research work of an original kind requiring books for its performance or provides them for himself. I could mention two specific cases where applicants for New Zealand Chairs abandoned their intention of coming here because they did not wish to be isolated and have all their future work killed. I would appeal to you as a Committee to urge upon the Legislature and the Government that the question of our University libraries should be faced and solved as early as possible. Every one is agreed as to the urgent need of this. Those opposed to us in university reform are not against us in this matter. The University has been stinted in capital, and this mistake could be partly retrieved by placing a capital sum apart for libraries. The next question that I have to deal with is our examination system. The type of university examination which we have in New Zealand was devised by Napoleon I. Under Napoleon's system strict study, regulations, and prescribed curricula and examinations control the entire system, and the professors were nothing more than instructors who prepared students for the examinations of the Université Imperiale. Napoleon's system was copied in London, in Ireland, in India, in South Africa, and in democratic New Zealand. Everywhere it has been a failure. To my mind, it has been the most disastrous invention ever made in education. Its failure in France has weakened the French nation; its failure in London has led to three Royal Commissions on that University, and every witness before a University Royal Commission for Ireland admitted its defects. In India the system lent itself to such abuse by the Indians, who have remarkable memories, as to make the Indian universities a laughing-stock. In South Africa the harm done is only now being remedied. We are before you in order to ultimately rid New Zealand of the Napoleonic examination system that has been such an expensive failure wherever it has been tried. I will read to you the final report of the Commissioners on the Royal Commission on University Education in Ireland. The Commissioners were James Patrick Bannerman, Baron Robertson, one of the Lords of Appeal in Ordinary, chairman; Matthew White, Viscount Ridley; the most Reverend John Healy, D.D., and Senator of the Royal University of Ireland; Dodgson Hamilton Madden, Judge; Sir Richard Claverhouse Jebb, D.Lit., Hon. D.C.L., Regius Professor of Greek in the University of Cambridge; Samuel Henry Butcher, Fellow of the University College, Oxford, and Professor of Greek in the Edinburgh University; James Alfred Ewing, F.R.S., Professor of Mechanism and Applied Mechanics in the University of Cambridge; John Rhys, M.A., Professor of Celtic in the University of Oxford, and Principal of Jesus College, Oxford; Arthur William Rucker, F.R.S., Professor of Physics at the Royal College of Science, London; James Lorrain Smith, Lecturer on Pathology and Bacteriology in Queen's College, Belfast; William

Joseph Myles Starkie, Senator of the Royal University of Ireland, Resident Commissioner of National Education in Ireland; and Wilfrid Ward, late Examiner in Mental and Moral Science at the Royal University of Ireland. That was the Commission, composed of men who may be regarded as eminent in science, literature, and education. I will read what they say in regard to the system in Ireland: "Accordingly, as regards its main function the university is an examining body empowered to confer degrees on all who successfully pass its prescribed examinations, irrespective of their place of education." The point I wish to make by that quotation is that the University of Ireland was analogous to ours in that it is an examining body empowered to confer degrees on all who successfully pass its examinations. In another part of the report it states that witnesses admitted that the system had failed: "But while those who have administered the system have done their utmost to make it work well and smoothly, the system itself suffers from incurable defects. Every witness who has touched on the question is conscious of their gravity. Of these defects some are inherent in a university whose sole function it is to conduct examinations. Degrees are conferred without any evidence of academic training, except in the Faculty of Medicine, which is subject to the regulations of the General Medical Council." Our University differs in some respects from the University of Ireland, because it gets from non-exempt students a statement that the candidate has undergone an academic examination. "The sole test of merit lies in the examination results. A false conception of learning is thus held up before the eyes of the student. The teacher on his part is expected to keep a close watch on the ways of the outside examiner; if he fails to do so he may seem to imperil the success of his pupils or of his institution. Day by day his teaching is subjected to the tacit criterion—Is it of direct examination value? No more paralysing and disheartening influence on an able and enthusiastic teacher can be imagined than to see that the more thorough his method, the more connected a view he seeks to present to his subject, the more likely is his lecture-room to be deserted, and his teaching branded as excellent but useless. Yet in teaching pass men for the degree of a purely examining university he must be prepared for such a fate. Now, the pass man is precisely the student who most needs to be lifted out of the examination groove; and university teaching for a pass degree ought to be raised well above the pass level. One who is a master of his subject knows how to treat even the rudiments in the spirit of a broad culture. Facts seemingly disconnected are brought into relation with principles; light is thrown back from the more advanced results of study upon the earlier stages. A skilful teacher, by his very digressions, will suggest new ideas and stir a quickened interest. He will open up fresh horizons of thought without losing sight of his central subject. He summons to his aid other branches of learning by way of illustration or contrast. His object is not to impart the modicum of knowledge that is needed for the next examination, but to train the student in the true method of study and to guide the reading. Students under the stress of an impending examination may not unnaturally think that they are encumbered with learning which will not pay; but in later years, when experience has altered their perspective of things, they feel grateful to those who have enlarged their vision. Moreover, there are many subjects—and literature is such in a pre-eminent degree—which are best fitted to discipline and emancipate the mind, and yet least fitted to be brought to the test of mere examination, where an acquaintance with manuals, a repetition of ready-made critical judgments, and in general the exercise of memory, have a value out of all proportion to their real worth. But it is in the higher branches of study that the freedom of the teacher becomes of cardinal importance; and here the vicious effects are most apparent of a system which, divorcing teaching from examination, makes the examination of an outside body the final test of excellence. Freedom is in truth the life of the higher learning. Any collegiate or university organization which, instead of eliciting the aptitudes and original powers of the teacher, prescribes rigid programmes, or in other ways tends to impair his spontaneous initiative, to cramp and formalize his teaching, stands fatally condemned. In science, more clearly perhaps than in any other department of study, the inadequacy of the examination test has been established. The modern conception of scientific teaching requires that much of the time hitherto spent over books shall be spent in the laboratory. Science is in a special sense a living and growing body of truth, and almost every teacher of distinction is an investigator within his own domain. The best of his students are trained to follow his researches. In the laboratory not only are old experiments repeated, but new problems are solved as they arise. Learning becomes vitalized by contact with such problems. The record of the advanced student's work in the laboratory is probably the true record of his progress in science, and of his capacity as an independent observer. Compared with the results of this sustained discipline, carried on over weeks or months, any single examination is a poor and inadequate test. Its natural effect is to exalt the text-book over practical work, and teaching in science directed towards success in examination is apt to become an epitome of facts rather than a training in the processes by which truth is discovered. The importance of laboratory instruction has given the first impulse to a reform which is likely to prove a valuable corrective of the examination system. Interesting evidence has been laid before us showing that, even in universities where teaching is not divorced from examination, there is a growing sense that the work done in the term ought to count for the degree examination. The practice already exists in America, and has recently been adopted in the University of Birmingham. There, as in America, the principle is applied not to science only, but with varying details to all departments of study" (Royal Commission on University Education in Ireland, 1903, pages 22 and 23). In view of these opinions of the Royal Commission in Ireland, I think it is not possible for any one to come down here and say the view we take is a purely local view. I think we state an educational principle which is recognized in the Old World. I think that any one that states that our examination system is sound is called upon to prove that the examination system has not been a failure in London, France, Ireland, South Africa, India, and New Zealand. The worst injury it has done for education in New Zealand is that it implies that New Zealand professors are incom-

petent and untrustworthy, for if they are competent and trustworthy there is no reason why they should not be examiners, as are the professors in Canada and Australia. Now, if a system stigmatizes a man as untrustworthy and incompetent, he tends to become so. The worst effect of the examination system has been that it countenances the appointment of incompetent professors. I might say the true principles of examination seem to me to be put forward with unequalled insight and lucidity by Professor J. T. Wilson, F.R.S., on page 185 of "University Reform in New Zealand." The failure of our university system is most clearly shown in three other directions—the neglect of research, the absence of any university teaching in agriculture and veterinary science—sciences underlying the industries upon which the whole prosperity of New Zealand is dependent—and the serious neglect of university libraries. The pastoral industries are the backbone of New Zealand. The other industries—or many of them—are insignificant compared with them; yet none of the University Colleges teach agricultural science or veterinary science. The University merely grants degrees which, alone, are an absurdity. The Canterbury Agricultural College at Lincoln has a staff of six, but of this staff of six three teach the subjects chemistry, biology, and mathematics; so there are only three left to teach agriculture and veterinary science, one of whom has to be the head of the college, and has, of course, a lot of administrative work. I do not think it is necessary for me to go to any length to prove that you cannot, with any good result, go on manufacturing degrees such as that in agriculture when you have just to appoint a few English examiners. With this college in mind, I do not think it can be said that the degree in agriculture does any real good to New Zealand in agriculture or veterinary science. My last subject is the question of research in New Zealand. The first point is, how has research been treated in the past in New Zealand? The relation of the University to research is that it grants certain degrees after a thesis has been printed. But it is only in the case of doctors' degrees that the thesis is the only requirement to obtain a degree. In fact, as far as the University is concerned, its recognition begins and ends in taking original work into account for degrees. It has never given scholarships for research or helped it in any way by money. The colleges are too overburdened with ordinary teaching work to enable them to promote research in any way. There has been a good deal of research-work done, but it has been done through the energy and initiative of the professor, not because of the assistance given to it by the Senate or the College Councils. It must be said that in some cases the College Councils have known that research has been going on, and they have been somewhat more liberal in their grants to the department concerned. The value of research is fully stated in the pamphlet, and I think you are pretty well all aware of its subjective value to the student and the community. The student who applies himself to research in the university attack a difficult problem, and is thereby better equipped to attack and solve future problems in his life and profession. Take the case of an agricultural student: if he has solved some problem in agriculture, involving such problems as may arise in his future work, he is thereby as perfectly equipped as possible, and as far as the present teaching methods can make him. Then there is the actual value of the products of research to the community. It might be definitely stated that the present position of Germany—the commanding position she occupies—is mainly attributable to her universities. One could give innumerable examples of the value university research has been to the German nation. But we do not need to go so far as Germany. We only need to go to Australia to see the value of original investigation there. It is mentioned in the pamphlet before you that William Farrer, by growing new types of wheat, has produced varieties which have been invaluable to Australia, and the newspapers over there have been filled with articles having reference to the value of these wheats. So that even from the low point of view of monetary profit the State would be well advised to encourage research in order to get an immediate return from its expenditure. The finest results in Germany have been obtained from a different point of view. The view is that if you encourage science as such, in the long-run that is a greater advantage to industry than any other possible policy. The accuracy of the pamphlet has been called into question in two places. One is in regard to the percentage which occurs on page 57, where it says, "the residue of fees (£10,000) is only 14 per cent. of the University revenue." That should be "only 16·6 per cent." The £6,600 should be deducted from both amounts. It should be deducted from £17,000 and £66,000, and therefore the fees, less scholarships, form 16·6 per cent. of the revenue of the university. The other question on which the accuracy of the pamphlet is attacked is where it states that law is taught in Otago University. This is the Calendar of the University of Otago for 1910; on page 129 you will see there were three lecturers on law; one has since resigned. I think we are justified, therefore, in saying that law is taught in Otago University.

4. *Mr. G. M. Thomson.*] Allow me to call your attention to another remarkable error in the pamphlet, on page 102, where it says the aggregate population of the Punjaub is about 827,000. I think it is some 5,000,000?—The passage in question is quoted from a speech by Lord Cromer. The speech must be inaccurately quoted.

5. On page 12 you say, "one of the urgent needs of the University at the present time is that much greater care should be exercised henceforth in the selection of professors"?—Yes.

6. How do you propose to do that—is it not a question of supply and demand?—I mean the actual method. I can mention a specific case. A professor was appointed here in one of the colleges at a single meeting, without notice, I am informed. A motion was introduced that a certain gentleman be appointed. The professor was appointed at a salary of either £200 or £300 a year, and he was allowed the right of coaching. Well, I think it is possible to take more care than that in making appointments.

7. At page 43 you say that "a teacher not actively engaged in original research is unsuited, however good an instructor or coach he may be, to hold a university Chair." Do you consider that applies to teachers in the arts courses?—Yes, that is the view existing now in England, and which has existed for some time in Germany. No professor is appointed unless he has shown some originality in his subject. No doubt, in New Zealand it would be difficult to do research work

in the classics; but, still, that does not debar professors doing work of some kind in an original manner. I think each Chair should be occupied by a man who shows some originality of mind.

8. On page 107 you say, "A New Zealand Science Professor will ordinarily be more capable of directing research in pure than in applied science—a subject he does not teach." Does that apply to the teachers of biology, medicine, and mining?—No; I have in my mind there the professor of pure science, who is expected to direct applied science research. We have only a few professors of applied science, and I think we have twice the number in pure science. That statement was made in connection with the Government system of scholarships, which are given ordinarily for applied science alone.

9. Take a special case—Professor Easterfield's case—that of a teacher of research in the vegetable poisons of the country: would you call that applied science?—No; we would call it pure science.

Professor Easterfield: Take such a case as Burroughs and Wellcome's medicinal manufactures. Most of their products are the result of researches in pure science; but when these researches are done there are men who obtain substances, and these substances are what you might call the result of applied science rather than pure science. In my own case I can say I can procure poisons from plants, but if I had to put the products on the market it would be a different thing.

10. *Mr. G. M. Thomson.*] On page 107 you say, "such good fame as the New Zealand University has abroad is not in the least due to the English examination, but is attributable to the valuable investigations that have been made in biology and geology in most of the colleges, in chemistry and mathematical physics in Victoria College, in physics and chemistry at Canterbury College, and in chemistry at Auckland University College." It seems to me you have rather a misleading sort of statement there. I do not know that you are aware of it, but most of the researches done in New Zealand have not been done by New Zealand University men at all. Can you throw any light upon that statement?—We do not compare there the value of the investigations made by the University men with the researches of men who are not attached to the University. The meaning of the whole statement is that the University's reputation abroad depends upon research. Any reputation it gets abroad will depend upon the research-work of its teachers.

11. On page 108 you say, "All the independent investigators who are working outside the University should receive from it help and recognition." How would you suggest that could be carried out?—I would suggest that the independent investigators should have full use of the college libraries and laboratories, and should be invited to indicate the results of their work in the form of a few lectures to the more advanced students in the University, so that they should be brought into contact as much as possible with the college and its teachers, and the teachers with them.

12. With regard to the statement that you made to-day, that you considered the Otago School of Medicine has failed as a School of Medicine. Is the cause due to the students, say from Auckland, not going to Dunedin in such numbers as they did at one time?—You have exactly analogous conditions in Australia. In the three large cities of South Australia, Victoria and New South Wales you have three Medical Schools. Naturally, the majority of the people living in those States do not live in the cities in which the Medical Schools are situated, so that many of the students have to come from a distance to attend the schools. The position may be compared with that of Auckland and Dunedin. A man in Auckland, when he can afford it, very frequently goes Home to Edinburgh or to a foreign Medical School, and not to Dunedin. In Australia the resident in the country goes to the Medical School of his State. I leave you to draw your own conclusion from that fact. My conclusion is that our Medical School is not satisfactory.

13. Is that not partly due to this fact: that there are in this country, unfortunately, provincial jealousies?—I should not think so. I do not think any one would spend £50 or £100 a year, or whatever the extra cost is, on account of provincial jealousy.

14. Have you any opinion as to how far the Otago graduates of the University are filling positions in New Zealand?—I cannot speak with authority on medical matters, but have merely stated facts that can be verified, and you can draw from them your own interpretation.

15. In speaking of this Medical School, you say that finance is the criterion: have you information about the Scottish universities, many of which are notoriously very poor in their endowments, or were very poor?—What I say is that it is impossible to maintain a modern Medical School with trained teachers at a cost of £3,600 a year.

16. You are not quite sure that that is a correct statement of the cost?—It is very close to it.

17. The existence of the four Colleges was the policy of the legislature: do you not realize that to some extent it is a geographical necessity, and also the outcome of the urgent needs of the different districts?—When we say it is a policy of the Legislature, I mean that Parliament passed an Act in every case setting up the institution, and therefore affirmed the action of the people who initiated the college. Parliament is most certainly directly responsible for the institution of four colleges. If they had said that there should be two or three, no doubt they would have passed Acts only creating two or three.

18. Do you think there should be only one University in New Zealand in one location?—No. I speak for myself alone, so that my views are not to be taken as representing those of the Reform Association. My own view is that it would be very desirable to have all the professional schools in one centre. A man has to go at present to different parts of New Zealand to get a special training. I can understand the provincial jealousy which would arise from such a proposal as that, but I do not think provincial jealousy is a matter that should be considered where the highest interests of the people are concerned, such as they are in education. I think that is essentially a matter that a Royal Commission should go into—whether the University should be in one centre or not. I certainly think the arts and sciences should be continued to be taught at all the centres.

19. *Mr. Allen.*] With regard to your evidence in connection with the Otago Medical School, does your £3,600 include the Dental School?—No.

20. Where did you get your figures from?—Page 56 of the Report of the Minister of Education for 1910: it there states that the cost of the Medical School is £4,829 a year. Of that amount you will find, on referring to the Report of the Minister for 1909, that £600 is partly the cost of teaching the pure sciences, so I deducted that. The figures of the Medical School are referred to in a footnote on page 67 of "University Reform in New Zealand." The footnote (*b*) says, "The Otago University accounts, 1908, give the Medical School expenditure as £3,640; the smallness of this amount having been criticized, in 1909 it suddenly jumped to £4,830 by the inclusion of 'Fees paid over,' £1,570. The report of the Director mentions no corresponding increase in staff. £600 is deducted from the above amounts, as it is not a real expenditure." You will find that in the accounts for the University a great deal of obscurity is due to the way the accounts are kept, and to get at the real conditions you have to deduct some of the items, otherwise the expenditure would be very much swollen. I think there is no doubt that the real expenditure on the Medical School is not more than £4,000 a year.

21. I do not want to argue for a moment that the Medical School in Otago has got anything like sufficient money to run it efficiently, but I do not think it wise to present to Parliament evidence with our indorsement which I do not think would stand examination. I will allow it to go on the understanding that the evidence which will be of real value to the Committee will be contained in some returns we are to get as to the cost of this Medical School?—That does not raise the question of the accuracy of the pamphlet. On page 55 we say, "The Board of Education in England required the State-aided universities to send in uniform returns on the whole subject of their administration, and until that is done here accurate and strictly comparable figures for our University will be impossible." The point is that we have specifically drawn attention to the fact in this pamphlet that there is a great deal of difficulty in ascertaining the facts, and we have done the best we could in elucidating the position of the colleges by calling attention to the difference in the figures of the Medical School for 1908 and 1909. The only remedy is for the Otago University to give its returns in considerable detail. In investigating the position of the Medical School it is essential to eliminate the cost of preliminary study. In the 1908 account there was a statement that there was a certain expenditure on preliminary science subjects, and that amount was deducted by us from the expenditure of the Medical School. If you deduct £600 from the 1909 returns you get £4,200 as the cost of the Medical School. The statement in the pamphlet is £3,600.

22. What is the £600 deducted for?—As the cost of preliminary study, biology, &c. The cost of teaching of anatomy, physiology, and all the professional subjects are the proper charges on the Medical School, and the criticism is that the amount (£3,600) is inadequate to enable the Medical School to maintain its efficiency.

23. As regards the figures of the Medical School, what we have done in recent years is to allocate only a portion of the salary of the professor to the ratio of the number of students. With regard to students abroad, you gave it in evidence that one of the failures of the University was due to so many students going abroad: do you refer to the Medical School?—I refer to all students. It is not possible to make one's statement specific except in the case of medicine. But in the case of medicine we have these figures for one year. I have also the figures which appeared yesterday.

24. Do you know there are many Australian medical students even that go abroad?—My impression is that there is a larger number of New-Zealanders abroad than Australians, which implies, to my mind, the comparative success of Australian universities as compared with that of New Zealand.

25. May it not be ascribed to the greater intelligence or desire on the part of the New-Zealander to obtain a wider knowledge?—It seems to me it is largely a matter of ability to pay the heavy expense involved in studying abroad. A New Zealand student has very good reason for supposing that the education to be obtained abroad is altogether different to what can be obtained locally, and he is therefore prepared to spend the other £50 or £100 a year required.

26. What influences a father in New Zealand to send his son to a university? Is it not largely that he shall get another aspect of university life, and that his social life shall be of a wider quality?—Yes; I contend that New-Zealanders send their sons abroad and pay the extra cost in order to give them a good university training. I think they are quite justified in doing it, and act wisely.

27. I refer to the social aspect of the question—the living in the university itself: is not that an attraction and an inducement to many New-Zealanders now to send their sons to Cambridge or Oxford?—Yes, I think it is one of the attractions.

28. You say things have changed in Australia: is it not a fact that in Australia they have built up institutions which board the students in the university itself?—Yes.

29. So that they have a social life?—Yes.

30. Have we in New Zealand?—No.

31. Do you think it is advisable that that should be cultivated?—Yes, it is a most valuable part of university life.

32. With regard to students going abroad, do not a good many English students also go abroad?—Yes, in the case of post-graduate students; but the fact of students going abroad is then not evidence of the non-success of their university. The reason is that the student goes to a particular teacher, and if a world-known specialist happens to be in a particular university, then many post-graduate students desire to go there. It is not a reflection on other universities. Only one university can have the most eminent teacher and investigator of a particular subject.

33. May not the same thing, only in a modified degree, be said of the Medical School here? —I do no think the same considerations apply to the post-graduate student and the beginner in medicine. The first goes under a great investigator, the second expects and requires merely good teaching.

34. Can candidates from Dunedin get clinical instruction as good as in Melbourne or Sydney? —I cannot tell as to that, but a Director of a New Zealand hospital told me that the larger hospitals here are not made use of.

35. Do you know whether there has been any complaint that a New Zealand medical student, when he has gone to England to complete or partially complete his course, has been badly trained? —No, I do not know that.

36. Is it not a fact that men who have not been able to pass in New Zealand have gone to England to pass?—It is commonly said to be the case. I have no personal knowledge of it.

37. Would it be fair to say that, because of the greater advantages in the way of hospitals and clinical teaching, a good many students go to England rather for that than on account of the value of the teaching, as far as it goes?—I would say it is probably due to the inadequacy of the clinical material here that the student goes abroad. But the clinical material could be obtained in hospitals in the other centres.

38. Are there not some practical difficulties in the way of utilizing the clinical material of hospitals in the other centres?—I suppose there are, but not insurmountable ones.

39. With regard to evening work, I understand your suggestion is to carry on both evening classes and day classes: would that not involve extra lecturers or professors?—Yes.

40. That would mean extra expense?—Yes.

41. You approve of the evening classes being carried on?—Thoroughly.

42. Do you know whether the University Colleges are charging students varying amounts of fees for lectures?—Yes.

43. Can you give us any idea of how they vary?—You will see by a statement on page 56 of the pamphlet that the fees in the South Island amount to £9,000, paid by about 820 students. The fees in the North Island are £3,700, and the number of students is 870. You will see that the fees are more than twice as much in the South. It has to be remembered that the colleges in the South teach such expensive subjects as engineering and medicine.

44. But does the larger amount apply only to such subjects as engineering and medicine?—It applies to other subjects.

45. Do you think it is right that there should be a varying amount of fees charged, say, for the English lectures?—It seems to me that if the governing body of the college sees fit to charge different fees compared with another college I do not think there is anything, educationally, very unsound in it. The only authority that could complain about it seems to me to be the Government.

46. The Government would have a right to complain if—I am only using this as an illustration—you were collecting, say, in Victoria College one guinea and in Otago three guineas, and the Government were asked to make up the balance to Victoria College?—Yes, I think they would have a right to complain; but charging the extra fees is done with the cognizance of the Government. The college has proposed to raise the fees, but the Government desires that they should not be raised.

47. *Mr. Hogben.*] No, that is not so. It was allowed when it was proposed?—Well, the Government-nominated members of Victoria College Council have opposed the raising of the fees.

48. That is quite a different thing?—I believe that to be the case, but I may be incorrect in stating that.

49. *Mr. Allen.*] Do you think it is fair that when one college is charging a heavy fee and another a light one that the one that is charging the light fee should claim from the Government the difference?—I do not think we should have a dull uniformity among the colleges. It it certainly one of the problems of finance. I do not see any objection to the mere difference of fee. It will have its own remedy, because the students will go to the college charging the low fees.

50. *The Chairman.*] Is it fair to the other colleges that there should be competition?—No. I think both are the same in some subjects, but it is most improper in specialized teaching.

51. *Mr. Allen.*] Do you think it is a proper thing that there should be a difference in the same subject, and then that the college charging the small fees should complain for want of finance? —I find it difficult to answer that question, because if the fees were increased no doubt the number of students would fall and the total revenue might stand the same. You cannot assume that if you decrease the fees you increase the revenue.

52. Would not the students be more influenced by locality than the alteration in the fees?—No, I think the fee affects the students. I believe the science fees are more than the arts fees, and that is acting detrimentally on science.

53. That is internal. Does it not seem anomalous that the South Island should be raising £9,000 and the North Island £3,700?—I admit that, on the present basis.

54. How would you correct it?—That seems to be largely a question of policy. There are in many democratic States steps being taken to make education free. If the Government or Legislature were prepared to provide the extra money, I do not see any reason why the standard of fees of the South should not be lowered to that of the North Island; but some revenue must be put in place of the fees.

55. But while we are depending as we are for assistance in university teaching, would it not be fairer for all the colleges to charge the same fee for the same work?—Yes, that could be done.

56. Is it not dragging students from one college to another?—Probably it is, but the difference would not pay students to do that in many cases. They have to consider the differences in the cost of living in another town. If a student is living in Christchurch he would never be attracted to Wellington on account of the lower fee. But the choice of a student not living in either Christchurch or Wellington might be affected by the question of fees.

57. From the figures you gave you are quite sure the cost in the South Island is £11 per student as compared with £4 per head in the North Island?—In both cases. I think the fees are absurdly low in the North Island, and it would be desirable to raise them in the present state of the finances. Recently in New South Wales the Government gave a considerable grant to Sydney University to enable it to reduce the fees. I am not prepared to say on the spot what is a reasonable fee.

58. Do you think it is a fair thing that a fee should be charged—a reasonable fee?—Yes, I believe in a reasonable fee.

59. You gave us some information about the examination system from the report of the Royal Commission who dealt with the Irish system. Could you tell us what that Commission recommended with regard to the examination of students?—The report of the Commission is that, "As regards the university examinations counting towards the degree, it is proposed that they should be held in the colleges and conducted by at least two examiners in each subject—one being the college professor and the other or others being appointed by the Senate of the university as extra examiner or examiners unconnected with any of the constituent colleges of the university, or with any college whose teaching is recognized by the university; and no candidate should be passed without the consent of the university examiner or examiners."

60. Is it not that the examination should be by the examiner or lecturer plus an assessor unconnected with the university and plus the right of veto by the university itself?—I do not approve of that. It has been tried in Wales, and the reputation of the Welsh universities I do not think is such as to justify us in trying it.

61. Will you tell us what you approve of?—I believe what we ought to have is a Board of Examiners constituted for any subject of the four independent teachers of that subject in the four colleges. In that case every student has three examiners who are not personally familiar with him and one who is. I think it is a reasonable compromise between a purely internal examination and a purely external examination.

62. You do not believe in the present external examination?—No.

63. Or the assessor?—The assessor would not be satisfactory, because in a number of subjects it would not be possible to obtain a man who was sufficiently well informed on the modern aspect of the subject on which he was examining. In England the assessor is almost invariably a professor in another university or college, and so is familiar with the subject and problems of teaching. In New Zealand it is naturally impossible to obtain such an examiner unless you draw him from the other colleges.

64. Do you yourself approve of the four professors on the subject forming a Board?—Yes. Bring them together and they could examine as well as any Board we could get in New Zealand.

65. There would be no liability of individual students being favoured by the professors?—I think that implies partiality on the part of the professors.

66. It might be unconscious?—You might say a Judge might be partial because he knows the person before him. Any professor who showed partiality would be untrustworthy and not fit for his position.

67. In engineering you approve of the principle of the professor or lecturer examining his own students?—Yes. There are certain difficulties when four professors do not exist.

68. I understood you to recommend that the University should have connected with it—or one of the colleges—an Agricultural School and a Veterinary School?—Yes, that is one of the most urgent needs in New Zealand at the present time.

69. And you believe that agriculture as a scientific training would be better taught at the University than in any other institution?—Infinitely better taught.

70. Is agriculture taught at Cambridge University?—Professor Watt, the new Professor of Agriculture at Sydney University, stated that the Cambridge School was the best existing in England.

71. You are a Cambridge man?—Yes.

72. Do you know anything about the Cambridge Agricultural School?—Yes.

73. What is your own opinion?—In the results in wheat-breeding obtained it is, I understand, one of the best in England.

74. It is a great success?—I think by establishing the agricultural and other schools Cambridge has made itself a national institution.

75. Has Cambridge a Veterinary School yet?—No.

76. I would like to ask a question about the superannuation of professors: do you approve of that being provided?—You do not provide superannuation for a professor, and you are left in the position that a professor is induced to continue his teaching many years after the time he should retire. You have many much older men occupying Chairs than there should be. You put the professor in the position that when he arrives at over sixty years of age, and he feels possibly that he cannot fulfil his duties adequately and properly, that he has to make a sacrifice if he retires.

77. *The Chairman.*] You heard Professor Hunter's evidence with regard to the examination system?—Yes.

78. I gather that you agree entirely with him?—Yes.

79. Do you approve also of an alteration being made in the method of awarding scholarships?—I understand Professor Hunter to mean that they should be given only to students needing them.

80. And they should not be competitive?—The scholarship should be so awarded that it should be put into the hands of the Professorial Board of any college to encourage their best students to continue their work. The object of a scholarship fund should be to provide means to enable the best students to continue their work.

81. Then you do not approve of giving the reward as a result of competition?—I think it is an improper principle, especially where the student does not require it.

82. In whose hands would you leave the power to decide?—The Professorial Board should know the students and their needs. Subject to the approval of a lay body, the initiation should be in their hands.

83. As between the students of different colleges, how are you going to determine it? Do you suggest that so many should be awarded to each college?—I suggest that each college should be put on its own legs, and that there should be funds adequate to the number of students.

84. Distinct for each college?—Yes.

85. You are opposed to the assessor?—Not opposed, but I believe you cannot obtain suitable assessors in New Zealand.

86. Is that the only reason—because you cannot get the men?—Yes. If you could obtain thoroughly competent men with equal ability to the professors in New Zealand I would be quite willing to have them.

87. Would it be preferable to the other system if the men were obtainable? I am not prepared to say that. One of the advantages of having the four professors would be that they would be brought together. Through the professors not having been brought together the effect has been disastrous.

88. Do you think the system in the Otago University is better, having men acting as assessors? —I understand that is done in the Medical School.

89. You approve of that?—Yes.

90. You referred to the students going away from the country to finish their education?— Yes. There is some information about that which appeared in yesterday's paper. In 1911 there were awarded in Edinburgh seven M.D. degrees and ten M.B. degrees to New Zealand students, making seventeen in all; in New Zealand, twelve M.B.s and one M.D., making thirteen in all.

91. Are those figures reliable, or is it just a newspaper report?—A newspaper report: it is all the information I have.

92. Do you know what proportion of those students have taken part of their course at the Otago University?—I have no information.

93. Is it not likely that the greater number of those M.D.s have gone Home to take their post-graduate course?—Judging from analogy it is desirable that they should go Home. I do not think it is possible always for us to do the higher work required of an M.D.

94. You referred to the increase in the number of students at Home and the decrease in the number of Australian students there?—Yes.

95. Might that not be due to a considerable extent to the fact that there is a much larger population in the cities of Australia than there is in New Zealand, having regard to the fact that we have just one Medical School in a city of 50,000 or 60,000 people in a country with a total population of a million?—In New South Wales there are a million people outside of Sydney. There are 600,000 people in Sydney. You have in New Zealand a million outside of Dunedin.

96. Take Adelaide: what is the population of South Australia?—Four hundred thousand.

97. How many people are there in Adelaide?—About 100,000. [Added later: Population in 1906 was 175,000.]

98. I think there are more. You will see that in proportion to the number of population in the city where the university is situate there is a much greater number in the cities of Australia than in the cities of New Zealand?—There is undoubtedly a larger number in the cities of Australia.

99. Would you not expect that to have an effect upon the proportion of students who go Home?—It would make the clinical school in Sydney possibly better than the clinical school in Dunedin.

100. But would not the matter of expense be concerned?—Compared with a student living in Goulburn, New South Wales, and a student living at a distance from Dunedin it seems to me about the same.

101. It is not a question of the student going to Sydney, but the very much larger number living in Sydney who do not have to go any distance?—If that were the case it would imply that a greater number of Australians would go to Edinburgh than actually do. But the Sydney Medical School practically trains all the doctors required for New South Wales. I make that statement on the basis of a lecture given by the Dean of Faculty of Medicine in Sydney, in which he pointed out that the Medical School there trained nearly all their own doctors, and they obtained few from abroad.

102. When you compared the expense of carrying on the school in Adelaide, did you take into account the fact that in New Zealand a considerable amount of the expense is incurred in connection with the New Zealand University—I mean that the examination-work, which is conducted by the New Zealand University, is included in the amount of money available in Adelaide? Is not that consideration to be taken into account?—Yes. It works in this way: that because the examining is done in Adelaide the fees that are paid go to the professors. The salary paid to a professor covers his examination-work. That enables higher salaries to be paid there than in New Zealand. Under the present system in New Zealand a large portion of £6,000 goes Home to pay certain Englishmen for going through the examination papers.

103. With regard to the fees: might not the table you have supplied be misleading without further analysis? I mean to say, supposing you have a student taking one subject in the North Island and another student taking, say, a full course—it might be at the Medical School: taking the number of subjects, the fees paid by one student might be three or four guineas and by the other thirteen guineas. By lumping the fees together might not the figures be misleading?—I believe the students I mentioned are matriculated students taking their full degree course. The figures would require further analysis.

FRIDAY, 15TH SEPTEMBER, 1911.

The Chairman: The question of the proportion of the people living in the various Australian cities compared with the total population in the several States was raised yesterday, in connection with those cities where the Medical Schools are situate. I note by the Commonwealth Year-book that the population of Adelaide is 184,393. The proportion of those living in the three principal cities where the Medical Schools are situated compared with the total population of the three States is — Sydney, 37·36 per cent.; Melbourne, 43·14 per cent.; Adelaide, 44·32 per cent.; whereas in Dunedin, the city of New Zealand which has the Medical School, there is not more than 6 per cent. of the population of the Dominion.

Professor H. B. KIRK examined. (No. 12.)

1. *The Chairman.*] What is your subject?—Biology. Before speaking on the subject of libraries, I should like to say that some of us think there have been left on the minds of members of this Committee an impression that the professors of Victoria College are opposed to night-work. That is certainly not the case. I take it that what we do realize very clearly is that the student who is engaged during the whole of the day and comes to his class during the evening hours when he is more or less worn out, compared with the student who gives the whole day and his best work to his subject, makes less actual progress.

2. It was thought that, while not opposed to night-work, the professors held that there should be both day and night work in both classes. Thus, classics should be taught both in the day and at night, but an additional professor would be required for the additional class?—I take it that would be the arrangement. I am not justified in giving assent on behalf of my brethren on the professoriate, because it is a point we have not discussed. It seems to me the night staff might be less expensive than the day staff.

3. Professor Laby expressed himself that additional teachers would be wanted, but he did not say that they should be less qualified?—In the science subject I do not see why, if there is a sufficient staff of demonstrators, they should not be responsible for the evening work. The science professors would probably often choose to be there in the evening as well as in the day, as they are now, and would give any needed guidance. Before I speak with regard to libraries, I wish to say that I am in absolute sympathy with the movement for university reform in New Zealand, and am in accord with the broad statements as to the need for reform that are made in the pamphlets submitted to the Committee by the members of the Reform Association. I should like to be allowed to speak especially of the needs of the colleges in the matter of books. It is to be admitted that in this matter, if once the need for improvement were recognized, improvement might be effected without reform of the university. But that need is not recognized except by the actual worker—at all events it is not recognized in any practical way. Such a changed attitude as would result in judicious and efficient reform would of necessity result in improved libraries, for the present state of things is unthinkable in connection with a vigorous university constituted and administered on modern lines. It may fairly be said that provision of books and use of books constitute a measure of intellectual activity. It is of the Victoria College library that I am best qualified to speak, and of the science department of that library; but that library is not poorer than other college libraries in New Zealand, and the needs felt by the Science Professors are, possibly to a less extent, felt by the professors in other faculties. If work is to be worth doing it cannot be confined to the laboratory (including the field) and the lecture-room. Laboratory practice, or the equivalent in other than science subjects of laboratory practice, is absolutely essential, but it must be stimulated and largely guided by reading. In the direction of what are usually called "text-books" the college library is only moderately equipped. Still, there is what may possibly be regarded as the minimum in that direction so far as the pass student is concerned. But if the real aim is not the achievement of a pass, but the doing of work in science, then there is a well-nigh fatal lack of material. A disability that the New Zealand worker can by no means obviate is imposed by his geographical position; his complete physical isolation from the workers in other lands means that he must lose the stimulus and guidance that come of contact with the world's leaders in research. His geographical position involves, moreover, that he must at best be months behind Europe and America in even knowing at second-hand what has been done there. But in reality he is not months but years behind. To the necessary physical isolation is added an intellectual isolation that ought to be unnecessary—an isolation due to actual poverty. This would be to a very large extent remedied if access could be had to current periodicals in which original papers recording results are published. These periodicals should be not only those of the current year, but the back numbers for several years should be available. Then the student of a subject could not only learn what had already been done by other workers, but would have at the same time the benefit of the original account, with its essential and stimulating details. These advantages are not to be gained from text-books. Text-books are at best statements of results: in a progressive subject a text-book is on some points out of date before it is isued, and many books make no very serious attempt to be up-to-date. It is, moreover, very undesirable that reliance should be placed on the statements of a text-book writer, who cannot be a specialist in all branches of his subject, and on his interpretation of a specialist's work. What I have said with regard to text-books does not so fully apply to great serial publications, such as the *Pflanzenreich*, of which there are several, seeing that these are mainly the work of a number of specialists. But these expensive works cannot be obtained here, and if they could they would not keep one up-to-date, and would in other respects not take the place of periodicals. Still, it is an extraordinary thing that these great works, with their enormous usefulness, are not accessible to university students. In using the word "student" I, of course, include professors and lecturers. If these cease to be students in the fullest sense they lose their qualifications to be teachers. It would be little to be wondered at if, in a country where they

had not access to books—and this is such a country—they lost all loftiness of ideal and became satisfied with the state of things in which they found themselves. Wellington students have the advantage that there are in the town the Assembly Library, the New Zealand Institute Library, and the Public Library, to all of which they have access. By a joint arrangement between the managers of these libraries and the college library, needless overlapping of books and periodicals is avoided. Yet even so the science student finds at every turn that he is unable to direct his work well, because he does not know what has already been done by other workers. The following instances, among an almost infinite number that could be given, show the position: In Campbell's University Text-book of Botany, page 93, is a very incomplete bibliography of the Fungi. So far as applied biology is concerned, there is scarcely a branch of the subject of more importance than this. It comprises thirty-one books instead of several hundred. Of these thirty-one, four are available in Wellington. Ray Lankester's "Zoology," No. 1, "Fishes," gives a bibliography of 514 publications. About one in five of these may be available, but that is a liberal calculation. The "International Catalogue of Scientific Literature" for 1908 gives a list of fifty-five papers for the year on the "Clotting of Blood." Of these not one is available here. Bateson, in his book on Mendel's "Principles of Heredity," page 369, gives 323 books on this most important subject. Possibly one in ten of these could be seen in Wellington. There is no reason to suppose that other sciences are in a much better position than biology so far as the provision of books is concerned. If this state of things be compared with what exists in Sydney, the disabilities under which the New Zealand student labours will be very evident. I may perhaps give this instance: A New Zealand student had worked for three years at a most important piece of work, kept back all the time by one particular difficulty: the information he needed on that point was not to be got here. Going to Sydney he took with him a list of nine books that could not be consulted in New Zealand. In the Fisher Library eight of these books were available. He found in one of these information published two years before dealing with his special difficulty. He had wasted two years. In the circumstances there is no reason why he or any other New Zealand student should not waste half a lifetime doing what other people have already done. There are many branches of research with regard to which New Zealand students ought to be advised by their professors that they should go to Sydney or some other place where books are available. I have not dealt with the subject of research because I understand that is the subject on which Professor Easterfield is going to give evidence.

4. *Mr. Luke.*] You said that your personal opinion was that night-work did not call for such experienced professors as day-work?—Yes. I think with regard to the day students the more advanced students need the professor's assistance more. The night student, in the time at his disposal, will be largely a student of what has already been done, and will not often advance to original work himself or need the collaboration of the professor.

5. Has it been the experience of the college in recent years that the night student has shown less aptitude, less capacity, and achieved less results than the day student?—I cannot say. He has not had the same time to devote to his work, and has not made the same advance. I speak of science students and the student in general.

6. In your opinion the result has not been so satisfactory from the night student as compared with the day student?—I do not say it has not been so satisfactory, but the same results have not been achieved.

7. The primary importance is the capacity of the student?—I do not suggest he has less capacity, but his capacity may not have the same scope, because he is more or less weary after his day's work, and he has less time to give.

8. In view of the geographical conditions of these Islands as affecting employment, and the desire of our citizens to give facilities to each and every one to enter into the full privileges that the State provides; do you not think it is absolutely necessary that the highest skill should be put into the work of the night classes?—I think it is desirable, although not absolutely necessary, because, as I said, the night student seldom advances to the point where he needs the help of an expert of standing.

9. In your opinion would it be desirable that the State should meet the difficulty by a system of bursaries to enable the most promising evening students to take advantage of the day tuition which they cannot possibly get on account of their financial surroundings?—I would welcome everything that would enable the students of ability to exercise their ability as students.

10. And you stand for the best work during the day-time?—Yes; when a man is at his best.

11. *Mr. Stallworthy.*] Can you give me any information as to the number of night students as compared with the day students?—I think that is in the paper. I am afraid I cannot give it. On the science side there is a greater proportion of day students than on the arts side. I speak only of Victoria College. With regard to Canterbury College, there is much more day-work done there than here.

12. Can you tell me of any night students having displayed aptitude who have become day students?—I do not know of any cases here. We have students who become students by living upon the results of their earnings; but I do not know that when making those earnings they were night students.

13. *Mr. G. M. Thomson.*] Can you give me an idea of the number of volumes in the Institute Library here, and are they available to university students during the session?—They are available always. Probably there are about 8,000. Many of them are not useful. The great drawback is the uncertainty as to whether you will find many periodicals complete, and many periodicals are not there.

14. Do the students of your college take advantage of the Parliamentary Library during the recess?—Yes, very freely.

Professor T. H. EASTERFIELD examined. (No. 13.)

1. *The Chairman.*] What is your subject?—Professor of Chemistry in Victoria College. Before I go to the main subject which I wish to deal with, I wish to correct a misstatement in the University Reform Association's pamphlet, page 84, and the ninth line from the bottom. Although this statement does not affect the argument, there is a sentence inserted there which is in opposition to fact. It is stated "For honours no certificate is required, but in some cases a thesis, which may be a theoretical one and so may not be evidence of skill in practical work, is necessary." I must say that statement is wrong. It should be this: "For honours in all experimental sciences a certificate of having attended an approved laboratory course is required, and in some cases a thesis embodying the results obtained by the candidate in some investigation or research. In physics no such thesis is required." I pointed out that this does not affect the main argument, that in awarding the marks to a scholarship or degree candidate in science the examiner in England is unable to take into account whether he has experimental skill or not.

2. Is that in the honours examination?—No, for the examinations generally.

3. Is there no difference in these examinations?—Yes, I will come to that later. I will now just illustrate what I mean: Supposing I had a man who is a born chemical manipulator, just as you get the born mechanic who can work three times as fast as and do superior work to that of the ordinary man. Such men are rare, but you find them. That man would be put down by me as being a first-class practical worker in the pass degree class, and he gets his certificate that he has satisfied me. When he sits for the degree examination the examiner, not having conducted a practical examination, will not know that the man was perhaps a real genius or is at any rate better than the rest of the people. It means a real hardship sometimes to the candidate. The best instance I can give is that of an English student who worked with me some years ago. He could never learn to spell, and was, of course, badly handicapped in all written examinations, but he was without exception the best experimentalist I have met and had a deep knowledge of the theory of chemistry. Owing to my taking an interest in him he was taken into the private laboratory of one of the best-known men in Germany, and the professor wrote to me to tell me that I had discovered a genius. Going back to England he was appointed Director of Research Laboratories to the British Government and Chemical Expert to the Explosives Committee and Ordnance Research Board. Well, such a man as that would have been discounted in such science examinations as are conducted by our University, in which written work only counts. I think that it an indictment against the present system of carrying on the examinations in science. In some of the higher examinations things are little better, because the candidate must produce a thesis—that is, he must send in an account of a set of practical experiments that he has himself conducted, and the professor must certify that the man did the work himself. At the same time everybody who has worked in the laboratory will know that even though a high-class manipulator who takes up a particular investigation, and does his work very well, he may (metaphorically) run up against a stone wall. For example, he may attempt to prepare a new compound that will be of peculiar interest, and nature is against him because the substance is incapable of existence. He may have worked for a whole year and at the end of the time he comes to the conculsion that this substance cannot be produced—just as the inventor may attempt to invent a machine for a particular purpose and at the finish not be able to turn out a satisfactory article. The probability is that the examiner would from this thesis recognize that the man knows something of practical chemistry, but the positive results obtained by a weaker candidate who has successfully attacked a less difficult problem would certainly receive much greater approbation from most examiners. For honours in physics things are worse, because the thesis was abolished in 1892, and the examiner is in ignorance about the candidate's experimental skill, exactly as in the case of the pass degree: with this exception, that a paper is set by the examiner upon a schedule of practical work, which practically tests what the candidate remembers outside of the laboratory of the work he was doing inside. Well, I ask any engineer who may be present, would you trust a mechanic to do a simple job in iron moulding or turning or fitting merely because he could describe on paper how the thing ought to be done? I know what would be done. He would be sent into the workshop, and then it would appear very plainly what his knowledge amounted to. I say, further, that in physics such a system as this gives the candidate who will learn up descriptions of how a certain thing should be done rather than that he should do it himself, an unjust advantage. It is a direct incentive to students to neglect the practical side of the science—and yet it is only through the practical work that the majority of students can really understand the theoretical portion. That is everything I have to draw your attention to in connection with the statement on page 84. It is quite possible that the error has crept in through a statement being rewritten that I had supplied to one of the editors, and which was misinterpreted. It is a very obvious error, and it is only right that it should be corrected. The next point I would like to refer to is in connection with the evening students. I am told that there is an impression in the minds of the Committee that we are opposed to evening work at all. I can hardly suppose that that is so, for the statement which is made in connection with evening students, it seems to me, is smypathetic. On page 14 we find, "In our experience evening students are usually an earnest, hard-working body of men who value highly the education they make sacrifices to obtain." It seems to me that indicates sympathy with the evening student, and if you knew the amount of self-denial that my colleagues have displayed in connection with evening students I am perfectly certain that no misinterpretation could be made as to their attitude. I have been informed by a member of the Committee that such an idea had arisen. I may say that it has been no uncommon thing for my colleagues to teach these students up to 11 o'clock at night, and when I have left the college at half past 11 I have left my colleagues still there. How far it is going to affect the health of the students I do not know, but I have known them to be at the laboratory until 3 o'clock in the morning. There is no doubt that it does account for a certain

amount of brain-fag. A member of the Committee asked whether evening students ever became day students. I remember only one case where a Government servant asked for six months' holiday without pay in order that he might be able to qualify himself. He was a Government servant in a scientific Department in which his knowledge acquired in our laboratories would be of very great advantage, and it was a relief to us when consent was given that he might be away for six months and return to his work at the end of the time. Now, I want to say a little on the subject of research work in our University Colleges. It appears to me that the State in providing a university education for the masses is only justified in doing so on socialistic grounds, and these are, I think—first, that our graduates should be a body of men who shall raise the general character of the community and put ideals before their fellow-men; second, that they shall be scholars who will transmit accurate knowledge; and, lastly, that in them we might have a body of experts upon whom the State may rely to improve the general working efficiency of the community. Now, there are many who will at once tell you, and not without justification, that a great deal of our university education does not tend to produce people belonging to either of those three classes, but to produce a class whose highest ideal has been to put certain letters after their names. The socialistic idea of a university which I have formulated would be quite contrary to the notion that the State should provide a cheap education with the object of allowing a clever man to step from the masses into a close corporation—we will say, either as a solicitor or as a doctor—where he might use his cuteness for the exploiting of his fellow-man. That is certainly not the object of the State, and it is necessary that our university training should be directed in such a way as to minimize the possibility of such an abuse. It follows that the main object of a university education shall not be directed towards the passing of an examination. Nevertheless the only thing which the University Act seems to be directed to is improving the intellectual efficiency of the community by holding examinations. If you read the University Act you will find that it is examinations only that the University has to deal with at present, and that is one of the points on which we certainly need reform. Now, the passing of an examination is not a proof of efficiency. It is almost impossible to arrange an examination in such a way that it will be a proof of efficiency. Supposing you merely have the examination of a few hours, you give such a liberal premium to the man who is only a "crammer" that the student that has not had an ideal put before him, and who knows that the passing of an examination would be worth so much in pounds, shillings, and pence, will almost of necessity go to a "crammer," or will arrange his work on lines that will assuredly give him an examination success, however little real education he obtains. That there is that tendency I know too well. When I first came out here I stated that I was going to set out with the idea that every student was to be looked upon as potentially a research student—that is, as a student who might eventually become a person who could do high-class work. Then on that account I should endeavour in my lectures not to prepare for any examination, but to treat all the subjects in such a way that the student should really understand them, and, as far as possible, stimulate the students so that they might desire to ask questions in order to attain further knowledge, and I should lead them to find out answers to such questions themselves. At my next lecture about one-half of the students did not come; that is to say, they recognized that it was not going to be a training which would easily put them through an examination. I have repeatedly since had students who objected to going rigidly through a careful course of practical work. They would say, "We have already passed several examinations in this subject and we know a great deal about it." I have had to reply, "You have learned a text-book—you do not know the subject—and you must do these experiments," and it has generally ended in such students going away and taking a subject in which the text-book will practically suffice. I say that spirit is undoubtedly there, although it may not be largely distributed. If you encourage the student just to go on sitting for examinations you could easily keep him on to the lower plane. It is not the pass degree examination particularly: in one case an honours student came to me and asked what he should read. I said, "There are certain books, and I will give you a list of papers in the college library and others that I have in my own library which you must read." The man took a small book out of his pocket and said this is all the reading I can get through. He said "I will use this," and the examiner afterwards gave him first-class marks. That was the reading he had done. It was the cause of great amusement in the laboratory when the news came out that he had obtained first-class marks, more particularly when it was known that another man had failed who could have run rings round the successful candidate. I think that is sufficient to show there is danger unless we safeguard very carefully what is done in the examination. The present system cannot safeguard that. In fact, any system which does not take account of the work of the student during the whole course of his curriculum cannot, in my opinion, absolutely tell us who are the best people and who are not. I said that many students are satisfied if they are coached in their lectures. You know the boys at school learn so much a day, and if they learn systematically they probably get through matriculation and everything appears satisfactory. When they come to a University College we might treat them on the same lines and say, "I will give you a lecture; I will dictate notes to you, and shall expect you to know these notes"; and if, further, in making those notes I had carefully consulted all the examination papers for the last ten years—since history repeats itself more frequently in examinations than in anything else—I know the candidates who had committed the notes to memory would get through, and many of such candidates would proclaim me as a model teacher who never had a failure in his class. My Council, or many members of the Council—since a Council has little to judge by except examination results—if consulted, would be obliged to say of me, "He has been a most successful teacher"; but what would be the effect upon the students who are passing through my hands? Their knowledge would be confined within a narrow groove; anything that would not be likely to pay in an examination would be strictly discarded; and when these men got out into the world they would have no interest in the subjects which they had studied—or rather crammed. Such a system of preparation for examination by means of carefully dictated notes

would be most successful; it would be the easiest system for the professor to adopt, but it would kill the spirit of science in any class in which it was adopted. I might say that students coming to me from school have frequently said, "It would be so nice if you would always tell us what parts of your lectures are the parts we ought to write down." And when I have asked "Why?" they have said, "We would know then what to get up for the examination." In the case of immature junior students coming from schools at too early an age—more particularly so in the case of Queen's Scholars who used to have only two years' education at a secondary school at the expense of the State and then came to us at the age of sixteen—I find that they cannot at first learn from my lectures and the library reading, because they have always been previously accustomed to get their work strictly parcelled out for them. One such student, who eventually became one of our best graduates in honours, told me that the first year was useless, and that every lecture she attended made her feel more and more despondent and what a very ignorant person she was. She required four years to take her pass degree. Some people probably thought that our system was wrong in that it did not give her a degree in the minimum time. She afterwards told me that the delay was the very best thing that could have happened to her, because at the beginning of her second year she had come to understand what kind of work would be expected in a university class. College Councils are apt to be satisfied if the students get through the examinations, and, if a number did not get through, it would certainly lead to inquiries in connection with the teaching. A university has a noble duty to perform in directing the ideals of its students. It seems to me that we must direct the teaching so that a student may learn to think for himself. When I came to Wellington I chose as my inaugural lecture a subject which I was advised to avoid because it might lead to controversy. I entitled it, "Research as the Prime Factor in a Scientific Education." I pointed out that we could not get real higher learning until the student was surrounded with what we might call the "research atmosphere"; that is, that both his fellow-students and his teachers must be in pursuit of knowledge with a real spirit of inquiry; and I pointed out the objections which are commonly raised. The objection which is commonly raised and which, like most commonly raised objections, is a sound one within limits—but only within limits—is that a person cannot begin to specialize until he has had a fairly broad preliminary training. That is a perfectly true statement, but it does not prevent every subject being put to the student in the spirit of inquiry. Examine our large text-books: you will find scarcely a chapter in which there are not points which are either not made perfectly clear or which are not open to question. That is to say, the statement is too sweeping, or in some cases the statement is absolutely wrong or too shallow, and the university professor, to do his duty, must draw attention to points of that kind. But I have had objections raised. I will give you one instance on the part of one who is now the headmaster of a large primary school. I was lecturing on a certain law and said that this law in the text-books—the elementary text-books—spoke of it as an accurate law; but if they would read larger treatises they would find that it was only approximately accurate for ordinary conditions, and that if tested strenously it was an absolute falsehood. This poor man came to me after the lecture and said, "I do not know what to do; I have always taught that to my boys as being the most accurate statement in nature, and it will perplex them tremendously if I now tell them it is not true." He said he did not think it was quite right for me to draw the attention of the class to the fact.

4. *Mr. G. M. Thomson.*] I do not think that is uncommon: it is a simple fact that people follow authority. A man has put something into a text-book twenty years ago, and everybody follows him. Is that not so?—That is so. I am merely saying that if we are to train a man to be a thinker we must draw attention to the exceptions of the law quite as strongly as to the laws themselves, which, after all, are only generalizations. If that attitude is adopted, the student concerned begins to come round and to pester the professor with questions. It means that the professor has to answer a lot of questions, and he is often put into the position of not being able to answer, because none of us know very much. It does not matter how much a professor has learned, he has only got a little way towards the complete understanding. What is to be done in such circumstances? I find the best thing to do, if it is a simple question, is to say first of all, instead of giving an answer, "Are you really interested?" And if the student says "Yes," I say, "If you will go into the library and consult such-and-such a book or treatise, you will find the matter put in such a way that you will understand it. Read the article, and then come back and discuss the question with me." That gets into the student the spirit of inquiry which no training for an examination can do. And what is the result? That in our science libraries up at the Victoria College, usually from 5 o'clock to 9 o'clock, there is scarcely sitting-room for the students—they are consulting works of reference. Similarly in the lectures themselves I have always considered it my duty to say, "Here is the general statement, but it is not enough for you; such-and-such references must be read in the library in order that you may properly understand how the discovery was made." And there is no difficulty, if such ideas are put earnestly before the student, in getting him to go into the library and turn up the scientific journals and books, and work at those things himself. It means that a man learns to help himself, whereas if he is spoonfed for an examination by means of a complete set of notes derived from his teacher, his most useful faculties remain untrained. That is the difficulty. I have met honours students trained with non-research ideals who, if asked for the authority for a statement, would not know how to try to find out upon what evidence the statements had been made. They did not even know the names of the journals in which the work had been published. Now, it often happens that a student comes along with some question which by means of a few hours' work in the laboratory he can answer for himself. And there is nothing that I know of which stimulates a man so much in his reading and improves his intellectual calibre as attempting to solve a problem for himself. I might give you my early experience if you will not think I am too egotistic in talking of myself. My early experience of chemistry was under Sir Edward Thorpe, now Director of the Chemical Department of the Imperial College of Science and Technology. I had worked for two years and

found chemistry not too interesting a subject. What stimulated my interest was Professor Thorpe's coming to me and saying one day, "I am in a hurry; I have had a question asked me that I cannot answer. It will need some practical work. Will you attempt to find this out?" It was in connection with the chemistry of photography. I pointed out that I was an elementary student, but said that I would do my best. I obtained a result which was satisfactory, and which I checked by other experiments, obtaining the same result in each case, and he said "I am satisfied." That gave me confidence. The same experience I find repeated amongst my own students. Two medical students whom I asked to help me in investigations have since been appointed to professorships of chemistry. In New Zealand I have no difficulty in getting secondary-school masters so far interested that they have successfully attempted to do original work, and have appreciated work given to them in that way. Let me read to you a letter which I received from one such student who came down to Wellington admittedly with the sole object of obtaining a degree, and he only took chemistry because he thought it would help him in getting an appointment. Subsequently he became my demonstrator, and is now headmaster of a school and is doing well. This is what he wrote when he left Wellington: "I want to thank you for the excellent testimonial you wrote for me, which I am sure helped me materially in securing the appointment; but I want to thank you and express my deepest gratitude for more than that, for the kindly interest you have taken in me, for all you have taught me, and for the influence you and your friendship and your laboratory have had on my life and career. I came to Wellington in many ways green, my scientific knowledge scant. You pulled me along, gave me confidence, imbued me with a spirit for science, and by appointing me your demonstrator gave me a new standing and a new faith in myself and my work." It is a very big change from the man who had merely come down here in order to get his degree as quickly as possible. You will find the same thing throughout. Dr. McDowell spoke of research as being something for the exceptional man. My experience is that a very large body of men can do research which is useful, and certainly research that will have such an influence on their mental attitude that their influence as citizens will be enormously enhanced. On the other hand, I will instance the slackness that may come from university training in other directions. The headmaster of one of the largest secondary schools in New Zealand said to me, "My complaint is this: that my under-masters have learned a large number of subjects, but they have no special interest in any one. When I was appointed I called my masters to me and said to each of them, 'What subject do you prefer to teach?' And they all said they did not care—they would as soon teach one subject as another. And then I said, 'Would you not like to go further, so as to obtain a masterly knowledge of some one of these subjects?' And they almost universally said they did not care about learning any more, but they would like to get more degrees." Well, that is a very severe indictment. Another indictment of similar type came from the headmaster of a secondary school again, and one of the best-known schools in New Zealand. He said, "My complaint is that many men with a B.Sc. degree take little interest in science as science: to them science ends with the curriculum which has been prescribed by the University." We must insist upon the research spirit, and yet what does the University do for research? None of its funds are given to post-graduate scholarships. We give scholarships to enable medical men after graduation to go abroad, and to allow engineering graduates after examination to go abroad; but to encourage post-graduate research in New Zealand not a penny is given by the University out of the scholarship funds. The Government, I am glad to say, gives a scholarship to each of the colleges, and very good work has been done by those who have accepted such scholarships; but the attitude of the Universtiy towards research is not one of appreciation. The University, however, offers gold medals and certificates to graduates who have passed the honours examination. They must apply for the honour, pay £5, and present a thesis of sufficient importance.

5. What university is that?—The University of New Zealand. But I think I am right in saying that self-respecting investigators are not likely to send in a thesis and ask for the gold medal. It is the thesis itself which is proof to the scientific world that the man is a good investigator; it is the publication of the work by a society of standing. If one of our men went to Germany, and said he wanted to do research-work in a laboratory, the professor would say, "Where did you work, with whom did you work, and in what journal was the work published?" Perhaps the man might say, "I have obtained first-class honours," and the professor would say, "Where is your work?" and if there was no published work the professor would say, "I must test you for a few weeks in laboratory work." Such cases have come under my notice. In another case one of my students had published papers in the "Journal of the Chemical Society," and the professor said, "This is evidence that you know how to work; I will intrust you with an investigation forthwith." That is the correct attitude. I am glad to say that for the Doctor of Science degree a thesis is required. But those who were present at the last meeting of the Senate may remember an attempt being made there not to reduce the standard, but to reduce the hardships of the preliminary conditions required in order that a man may become a candidate. We were met with a statement that the University of New Zealand had made a great mistake by giving the Doctor of Science degree as the result of original work, and that a very stiff examination ought to have been given instead. I might say that "Hear, hear," on that occasion was heard from several members of the Senate. I have not referred to the technical importance to the community of research, but it is perfectly obvious that the diffusion of the spirit of research will be of benefit to all our industries. It will mean that the interest in the experimental sciences will be quickened and the spirit of the agricultural and manufacturing community will be more progressive. Without waiting to see the results of experiments carried on in other countries, we shall attempt to help ourselves. If, on the other hand, our science professors fail to investigate and to stimulate others to do research-work they must be regarded as derelicts in their profession, however useful they may be in some other capacity. I trust I have made my attitude sufficiently clear.

6. Do I gather from you that from your experience of New Zealand students they come to you for passes in degree subjects and not for knowledge?—My experience is that many come in the first instance for that, but I do not think they leave in that spirit. I may say that a more or less heavy weeding often takes place after about three weeks, and that the people who remain appreciate the fact that they are not being trained with any examination in view. Even the medical students, who as a class have no great ambition for scholarships, become deeply interested in the purely scientific side of their work, and this is essential if they are to become really scientific practitioners.

7. Then you have not had to give up the idea in teaching, that each of your pupils is potentially a research student?—I have not; and nothing has gratified me more than the students who have come, who are not working for any degree at all, and have stayed until they became research students. One student has continued to work with me during the whole of the thirteen years I have been out here—Mr. Aston, Chief Chemist of the Agricultural Department. He spends his evenings very largely on research in native plants up in my laboratory. Of course, his time is very much occupied by departmental work, but I have not the least doubt that the Department has benefited very largely from the spirit of inquiry fostered in my laboratory.

8. Would you have any difficulty in finding qualified assessors in New Zealand outside the University who could act along with you in examining for the degrees in your subject?—There are a few, but our best men have very largely gone Home with 1851 Exhibitions and have received appointments outside. I know certainly two men in New Zealand at present who are not professors who could certainly be intrusted with the examinations in chemistry.

9. *Mr. Luke.*] Is there much dead work in connection with university work? Are there many students attending more on account of a desire to be associated with the University as against a desire to benefit themselves intellectually and educationally?—In connection with my own students I might say there are very few who are not seeking benefit. In fact, I can only think at present of one student in my class who really takes no interest in the work, and that one is more or less driven to it by outside circumstances. If he did not come I fancy his people would make a noise.

10. On the general principle you consider that the internal examinations held in this country, and the general knowledge that is obtained by the people examining here as to the fitness of the candidate, is preferable to any outside examination?—That is certainly my opinion. If I gave a man a testimonial on his going to Europe, that would be accepted at Home amongst chemists before the fact that he had got his first-class honours in the University examinations. A man was ploughed in the honours examination, and I gave him a testimonial. He went to work with the examiner who had ploughed him, and the examiner appointed him in three months as demonstrator in his own university.

11. Mr. Thomson asked you whether you were of opinion that there would be assessors in this Dominion to carry out the functions of examiners provided we change the system. I would like to ask whether a man, after leaving what you might term the principal side of university work and entering into another sphere of activities, would still be a fit and proper person to be called in as an assessor or examiner?—Not unless it was known that he had kept up his scientific work.

12. Who would be in a position to know that? We have men in this country very competent and very capable. They come out here and stretch out into other spheres of usefulness, and I want to know whether in going into those other spheres they still have the faculty to act as assessors—would the people of New Zealand assume such individuals to be efficient to carry out that work?—I do not know that I have had experience of that kind. I know one or two who would be. One man is Dr. MacLaurin, Government Analyst. There are others who still give evidence that they are keeping up to date by publishing their work.

13. Suppose that Professor Easterfield left his present sphere and went into, say, a bank, and say the Dominion accepted the change asked for by the Reform Association, would he, if called in as an assessor, be as strong a factor for the position as Professor Easterfield is to-day?—No, for the simple reason that if I had forsaken my scientific work as my chief work I should not have kept up to date.

14. Shortly, it means that, in answer to my friend Mr. Thomson, you say there would be some difficulty in obtaining assessors outside the University?—Yes. As I say, there are certainly two men in sight.

15. *Mr. Stallworthy.*] Am I justified in concluding from your statements that there are many degree men who are not qualified to be called degree men?—Yes.

16. And that a man who got his degree years ago is not qualified to act as a degree man to-day?—That is hardly fair. I suppose if I had to sit for my honours degree to-day I should have to read up for it. A man is apt to forget a great deal of book knowledge, but if he has acquired the spirit of scholarship that will not leave him.

16A. I have always thought that the majority of degree men were men after dollars and not after studies?—I would not put it in that way. We cannot ignore the fact that our students will eventually have to earn their own living; in the meantime we must do our utmost to raise their ideals and inculcate the spirit of scholarship and inquiry.

17. And avoid narrowness?—And avoid narrowness. I was told in England and when I landed here that it is only bread-and-butter that most New-Zealanders are after—that is, the majority. I have not found it so. But if it were true, the University should cater for students of a higher type, otherwise it would be merely helping men to become more or less charlatans.

18. *Mr. Allen.*] If you found it really a difficult job to get an assessor in New Zealand, would you favour the securing of an assessor from Australia?—I should prefer that all the professors of the various colleges should be the examining Board.

19. Without an assessor?—Yes.

20. You know the report of the Irish Commission?—Yes.

21. Do you agree with that or not?—As I have not read the whole report I cannot make a definite reply.

22. They recommended an assessor?—Practically the Cambridge system is to appoint one internal examiner and one external examiner.

23. Is not that the general rule?—The external examiner is only like a professor in any of the colleges here. He is a man who is also teaching.

24. Do you see any objection to drawing an assessor from Australia?—I think it is a system which might work extremely well, providing he came over to do the work

25. My question assumed that?—I did not know that. He would certainly be preferable to the present system.

26. I read the pamphlet, and it left an impression on my mind that the Reform Association was against evening work. Will you read part of page 41?—"By the low level of matriculation"—I agree with that; "by the low standard of the degree"—I agree with that; "by creating false impressions as to what university work means, the Senate has thrown the bulk of this evening work in the North Island not on mature men and women, but on boys and girls of school age." I agree with that. "What it amounts to is this: Growing boys and girls, whose proper place is in the secondary school, are being encouraged to combine night-work at a college with office or teaching work by day. In many cases this must mean a waste of the greatest asset of the community, the physical and intellectual strength of its future citizens. Under the circumstances it is not surprising that a great deal of the work done in the University Colleges is below University standard, or that an official New Zealand report should characterize the requirements of the New Zealand University B.A. as more or less on a level with those of the leaving certificates of secondary schools in other countries."

27. You indorse that statement?—Yes, on the whole.

28. Is that not an indictment against evening work?—No; it is a recognition of the fact that you cannot get the same value for the nation from half-timers as you can from those who put their main energy into their work. The Dominion needs very highly trained men, and the evening student is undoubtedly at a disadvantage in getting the highest training. I have certainly got the best work out of the people who work by day. I do not know how the employers find it, but I will illustrate what is at present occurring. I have a student who goes to work at 8 o'clock in the morning and works until 5, and then at night works in my laboratory till 11.30. If the man went on like that for three years he would probably break down. Fortunately, he is an athlete.

29. Have you any instance of a breakdown?—I do not think they are very common, but I have had a few.

30. In the case of evening work are students spending enough time over the preparation?—No; the day students naturally give more time to preparation than those who come in as evening students.

31. Is it your experience that the evening students are giving four years?—I think that is the usual thing, but I have not analysed the figures. I imagine that is so.

32. How do you manage with your chemistry classes with both day and night work?—Being one of the original professors here I am in the fortunate position of putting in pass degree work at 5 o'clock, which can be attended by day or night students; but in order to get more time I have to give a lecture on Saturday morning, which I give at 9 o'clock, and I am glad to say that the employers have often allowed the students to come at 9 o'clock. I hold no honours lecture later than 4 o'clock.

33. What happens in the other subjects—the Professor of Biology is not so fortunate as to be able to give a lecture at 5 o'clock which would suit both the day and the night students?—I have never inquired. I know some professors get there at 9 o'clock in the morning and leave somewhere about midnight.

34. Is it possible to carry on both day and night work satisfactorily with the staff you now have?—No. The teaching staffs in all the colleges are undermanned already.

35. If we carry on both you must have more staff?—Yes.

36. Are you satisfied with Mr. Kirk's evidence that night-work can be done by professors whose qualifications are inferior?—What he suggests is to a large extent the custom in those universities which give both day and night work. The professor gives most of the day lectures and a few night lectures. The junior professor takes some teaching by day and the larger number of the evening lectures. I should prefer the professor giving a short course in the evening dealing with special subjects; but opinions differ as to whether the professor should give the elementary or advanced lectures. I am inclined to think that the foundation should be laid by the most highly skilled teacher. Of course, I am not going to shift from my 5 o'clock arrangement so long as I can continue it.

37. *The Chairman.*] Speaking generally, you support the statements in the pamphlet?—Generally, I do.

38. You made some reference to persons rising from the ranks and joining close corporations outside of the universities?—Yes.

39. Did I understand you to say that the present system of examination encouraged teachers and students to cram for the examination?—I think so. If you have a man who has the spirit of a "crammer" you will not easily circumvent him. The present system seems to give an extra chance of that—possibly not in medicine, because there you get the practical and *viva voce* examination, and if it is found that a man is seeking to get through by the least amount of work he gets pulled up. I know men who have had to leave our University Colleges because they are always trying to work on the minimum.

40. *Mr. Hardy.*] What is the estimated value of the New Zealand degree compared with that of Oxford and Cambridge?—It is very hard to make a comparison, because a man who takes a pass degree in Cambridge is generally looked upon as an incompetent. The majority of the people at Cambridge are taking honours. The pass degree men there are either intellectually

incompetent, or they have gone there for the sake of athletics, or for social purposes. They are very useful, because they bring in fees, and cost the University very little. They are milch-cows. In England a man with a pass degree finds it hard to get an appointment as a schoolmaster in a good school—unless he is an athlete.

41. You really think, then, there is some value in the New Zealand degree?—Yes, it means that the student has passed an examination in a number of subjects.

42. You think that if the proposals you have set forth in this pamphlet are agreed to they will in some measure strengthen the New Zealand degree?—Yes.

43. And there will not then be a great difference between our degree and the English degree? —There will be a big difference in the honours degree.

44. If these proposals are given effect to we might hope that the honours degree will improve later on?—Yes, I am certain of it.

45. You would not recommend a New-Zealander to send his boy or girl to Oxford or Cambridge so long as we have a University in New Zealand?—Apart from the social side and general culture of a Home university, a man of genius has a far better opportunity of development there, for he will be surrounded by teachers of every school of thought. I cannot hope in my lifetime to have at the outside more than three people assisting me in teaching chemistry in Wellington. At present I have a demonstrator at £100 a year, but he is a student at the same time. But at Cambridge you have a very large number of lecturers and demonstrators in each scientific subject. In my day there were seventeen officially recognized teachers of chemistry, besides a number of assistant demonstrators, and the staff has now been greatly increased. This alone makes a body of scientific thought which is of the greatest value to the student, and is of far greater importance to him, if he is alert, than passing through the hands of one man such as our professors, who become more or less behindhand through lack of contact with other workers in their own line.

46. Are you a believer in self-help?—Yes, I am.

47. Then you are a great advocate for this research-work?—Yes.

48. Can you not set your students to work themselves, and by that means carry out their own ideals—that is, carry out work on their own account, just as you said you were stimulated whilst still an elementary student?—Supposing I said to my students, "I am not going to give you any teaching at all; you must find something out for yourself," I think they would find their way out of the building.

49. I think you said the New Zealand degrees were equal to those of Oxford and Cambridge? —No, I did not. I said the New Zealand pass degree is of greater value in getting a billet in New Zealand than the pass degree of Oxford or Cambridge in getting a billet in England.

50. I hope you have a higher ideal than that your pupils should be able to get a billet?—That I have already made clear.

51. Can you say the New Zealand University will be as good for the youth of New Zealand as those of Oxford and Cambridge?—The point I have made is that with a University with such facilities as we have we cannot expect for many many years, if ever, to get anything to compare with Oxford or Cambridge, or even with the newer English universities. When we find post-graduates from all parts of the world are gravitating to Cambridge for further study, it would be presumption on my part to say that if any particular proposal is carried we shall have just as good a university here.

52. Would it not be better to do without the university system and merely prepare boys for the purpose of sending them to the seats of learning in England, where they would get so much of value to them in after-life?—No, because of the great influence which a properly conducted university has upon the community in which it is situate.

53. The difference between Oxford and Cambridge Universities and the New Zealand University is merely the gilt-edge which Oxford and Cambridge Universities are able to put on a young fellow's degree?—No. I think you are trying to "pull my leg."

J. ALLAN THOMSON examined. (No. 14.)

1. *Mr. Herdman.*] What are you?—I am a graduate Senior Scholar, Exhibition Scholar, and Rhodes Scholar of the University of New Zealand, and an Associate of the Otago School of Mines. I am a graduate and Burdett-Coutts Scholar of the University of Oxford, and have been a research student in the universities of Paris and Sydney. I have been a lecturer of St. John's College, Oxford, and a demonstrator of Oxford University. I have refused an appointment as lecturer in Victoria College, Wellington. I may thus claim to have had considerable university experience. The evidence which I wish to bring before the Committee bears on four points: (1) The value of the system of external examiners; (2) the system of government of the University; (3) the low salaries offered to professors; (4) the requisitions for keeping terms. (1.) The value of the system of external examiners: (*a.*) Does it raise the standard of study? (*b.*) Does it enhance the estimation in which the degree is held? My answer to both these points is No. (*a.*) It is obvious that the standard of study will not exceed the standard set in the examinations. I hope to show that the standard of examinations is lower than that of Oxford and other British universities. At the same time I am glad to give testimony to my experience that the standard of teaching, except where it is hampered by the degree regulations, was in no wise inferior in Otago to that in Oxford in most subjects I took, especially in geology. My personal experience in studying geology both at Otago and at Oxford shows two things; firstly, that in New Zealand, not knowing the peculiarities of the examiner, it is necessary to attempt to cover all branches of the subject; but, secondly, notwithstanding this, the standard required in New Zealand is considerably less than that in Oxford. I was in the peculiar position of studying two years at Oxford under the very professor by whom I was examined in New Zealand; but even with my previous knowledge of the subject, and with an insight into the special branches of geology in which my examiner was interested, I found it necessary to put in a year's hard work to keep up

the same class in the honours examination. My examiners did me the honour to tell me that I was an easy first in New Zealand, and barely scraped through in the same class at Oxford. Another New Zealand student who went to Oxford dropped a class in honours there. Moreover, in a scientific subject like geology, it is necessary in Oxford to excel in the practical as well as the theoretical branch of the subject to obtain high honours, whereas in New Zealand a pass only in practical work is all that is required. It is true that in New Zealand a research thesis is demanded for honours in some sciences, and this does tend to raise the standard of practical work. But it is undoubtedly the case that the Oxford system of giving a separate and subsequent degree for research-work (B.Sc.) insures a still higher standard of research-work. Again, the system of *viva voce* examination at Oxford prevents a student from obtaining high honours by "picking" or "fluking" questions. These *viva voce* examinations last as long as an hour when the examiners are in doubt as to the true ability of an examinee. These remarks on the different standards required in science at Oxford and New Zealand may be applied with still greater force to literary subjects. Looking into the records of graduates of the University of New Zealand who subsequently went to Oxford, I find that while in science two out of three kept up the same honours standard, only one out of five did so in literature, the others dropping a class. Of five scholars of the University of New Zealand only one obtained a university scholarship at Oxford. The difference in standard between the two universities is clearly shown by the fact that it is a common experience in New Zealand for a student to gain double honours (*i.e.*, honours in two subjects in the same year), whereas at Oxford any one who wishes to gain double honours is required to devote one or two more years to the second subject. The system of double honours prevailing in New Zealand is a striking condemnation of the standard of the degree examinations here. These remarks on the difference of standard in Oxford and New Zealand could be extended to other British universities. But I believe that it is the case that in medicine, where New Zealand has internal examiners, the standard here compares favourably with that of British universities. (*b.*) Does the system of external examiners enhance the value of the degree? I have never found any one abroad, whether in university circles or not, who believed that a degree from New Zealand was in any way superior to one from one of the Australian universities. In fact, even in university circles, there is a very widespread ignorance of the fact that there is any difference in the methods of examination in these countries. Non-university people, say mining specialists, are much more interested in the general prestige of the university through the public position taken by its professors and graduates than in the system of examination. It is safe to say that the value of Sydney degrees have been enhanced in Australia by the explorations of Professor David and Dr. Mawson in the Antarctic. Amongst scientific workers, on the other hand, a man is judged not by his degrees but by the work he has done, and there is a tendency to look down on a man who has high degrees and who does not live up to them by producing strikingly original work. I can find no evidence to suggest that the system of external examiners has raised the value of New Zealand degrees. As regards the system of government of the New Zealand University, it is strikingly different from that of most British universities. In the first place, the latter are free in a sense that the University of New Zealand is not. The British Universities won their freedom by a long struggle both from ecclesiastical and political control, and history has proved that such freedom is conducive to the greatest progress in learning. New Zealand University is not free in that it has Government nominees on its governing bodies, in that it is not financially independent, and in that it cannot grant new degrees, such as that in theological studies, of its own free will. In my opinion, it will never be able to carry out its functions properly until it is completely free in every sense. The Hebdomadal Council of Oxford consists of the Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor, Proctors, heads of colleges, and members elected by the Masters of Arts. So far from having Government members on its Councils, the University has actually the right of having its interests represented in Parliament by electing two members of Parliament. (3.) I am convinced that the low salaries now offered to New Zealand professors are detrimental to the prestige of the University and to the value of the teaching. Second-rate men cannot get out of the position once obtained and stay for life, while first-rate men quickly leave New Zealand. The Australian universities with their higher salaries have kept such eminent men, to the great advancement of learning in their universities. I know of two cases where Australian professors have refused professorships at Oxford. In my opinion the standard of teaching is on the whole much higher in Melbourne and Sydney than in New Zealand. Should a system of internal examiners with assistant external examiners be adopted, the money now sent to England would go in part to increase the emoluments of the professors. If Australian external examiners were appointed, the Australian universities would no doubt reciprocate by appointing New Zealand professors as their external examiners. Should local external examiners be found amongst the headmasters, scientific men, and other learned professions in New Zealand, the money thus spent would tend to raise the dignity of educational positions in New Zealand. (4.) The requisitions for keeping terms in the colleges of the University of New Zealand differ a good deal from those of other universities, and press in some respects very hardly on students who have not had a secondary-school grounding, or who are not able to devote their whole time to university work. To keep terms in the residential universities such as Oxford, no attendance at lectures of university professors is requisite, nor does the university impose any terminal examinations prior to the degree examinations. All that is necessary is to reside in a college for six weeks during each term. The colleges, of course, are at liberty to impose what conditions they please, but the percentage of attendances at lectures is not a condition frequently imposed. A man can reside at college for three years, either continuously or at intervals, and can sit for his pass degree practically at any time. For honours examinations a time is fixed, dating from the beginning of residence; that is to say, an undergraduate who is forced for reasons of health or finance to give up residence after his first year can still sit his honours examinations at the end of the third or fourth year—he cannot take out his degree until he has completed his three years' residence.

As regards practical work for science degrees, the university demands no certificates of attendances, and limits itself to examining the capacity of the student to carry out practical work. In other words, provided an undergraduate keeps terms by residence, the university does not inquire in what manner he has obtained his knowledge. In New Zealand the system is very much more rigid. A fixed attendance at professors' lectures is required, and certificates of passing terminal examinations, both theoretical and practical, are an essential before the degree examinations may be attempted. In cases where the professor is not a good teacher and the students have to rely on outside coaching, the fixed attendance at lectures and the double fees are a great hardship. The requisite attendances at practical work in science subjects, and also at demonstrations in the professor's lectures, practically debar the B.Sc. degree to those students who are earning their own living. The system of terminal examinations, followed by degree examinations in a fortnight, imposes a great strain on the health of the student. I am of the opinion that the requisitions for keeping terms in the affiliated colleges could be greatly relaxed without the discipline of the college suffering and to the great encouragement of the poorer students.

2. You have read the pamphlet?—I have.

3. Generally, are you in agreement with the views expressed in the pamphlet?—Yes.

4. And you are quite satisfied that reform in the university system here is needed?—Yes.

5. From your experience of university life in the Old Country and the university life here?—Yes.

6. Regarding the alterations in the constitution of the Senate and the Councils, have you any practical suggestions to make?—I have not thought out a scheme. The first requisite would be to make New Zealand's University financially independent. Until that is done I suppose there must be Government nominees.

7. You are satisfied, I presume, that the professors attached to the four colleges should have a greater voice in the fixing of the curricula of the colleges and the general government of the University?—Yes. Coming to details in organization, it is remarkable that all the leading universities of Great Britain and America find it necessary to appoint paid principals, devoting their whole time to the supervision of the university affairs, while New Zealand has no such officer, either for the whole University or for the affiliated colleges. In Oxford, besides a paid Vice-Chancellor of the university, there are sixteen paid heads of colleges, in addition to paid proctors, registrars, and college bursars. Strange as it may seem, Oxford is more democratic in its government than New Zealand. All changes in the statutes must not only pass the Hebdomadal Council, which corresponds to our Senate, but also Congregation, which corresponds to our Professorial Boards and Convocations, which consists of all Masters of Arts, who keep the names on the college books. Every graduate of the university has thus an opportunity of discussing and voting on every important change proposed. The professors, apart from the heads of colleges, possess no special privileges in government.

8. No special privileges?—Not more than other graduates. The difference is that Oxford and Cambridge are practically associations of colleges. The heads of colleges dominate the university much more than the professors. The heads of colleges are very rarely professors.

9. What about the Faculties?—They have Boards of Faculties for passing regulations in connection with the curricula.

10. Regarding New Zealand, the view you take is that the professors should have a greater voice in fixing the curricula?—I think any proposed change should be allowed to be promulgated by the Professorial Board or graduates. At present it must be promulgated by the Senate.

11. The whole question of reform is one of very great difficulty?—Yes. Of course the great difficulty is the geographical isolation.

12. Do you not think it would be wise to refer the whole question to a Royal Commission?—Yes, I think it would.

13. *Mr. G. M. Thomson.*] If you had applied for a position in the Old Country, do you consider that your New Zealand degree would have carried much weight?—No, I do not think it would have carried any weight through being a New Zealand degree. The fact that I got for the same work a B.A. degree in Oxford and a B.Sc. in New Zealand, and thus had two degrees, would have carried weight, but not the fact that it was a New Zealand degree.

14. *Mr. Hardy.*] I understand that to all intents and purposes it discounts the New Zealand degree so far as getting an appointment is concerned?—So far as getting an appointment is concerned, the New Zealand degree is on the same level as most other colonial degrees. In New South Wales a Sydney man would have a better chance than a Victoria man, and in Victoria a Melbourne man would have a better chance. The thing that would determine it would not be the fact that New Zealand had external examiners, but had celebrated professors.

15. Do you think your statement as to the relative value of the New Zealand degree is warranted in consequence of the poor training they get here?—The value of the degrees held seem to me to bear very little relation to the training. It is simply the prestige of the university that is taken into account.

16. Do you think the training here is as good as in the Old Country?—I think, considering the difficulties under which New Zealand is working, it is as good as it could possibly be. It is hampered very much by the examinations. It often leads to coaching instead of a man thinking for himself.

17. Have you received any ideals in your training in New Zealand, or were your ideals increased by your training at Oxford more than your training as a New-Zealander in your own home?—Do you mean ideals in geology, or generally?

18. I mean generally. You may be a specialist, but you have some views outside of geology, have you not?—Yes.

19. Did you get any inspiration for research-work in New Zealand?—The only inspiration I got was having to do research, and I liked it so much that I wanted to get on with it at Oxford.

20. In that instance you did get inspiration for research in New Zealand?—Yes.

21. *Mr. Luke.*] Did you get much of your student life in the evenings, or were you one of the day students?—I was giving the whole day to the work, but certain classes were appointed for teachers, and I had to attend those in the evenings.

22. Were you employed in any other occupation?—No; I was giving the whole of my time to it.

23. You spoke about the standard of the examinations being lower in New Zealand and the standard of teaching higher?—I said the standard of teaching was in no way inferior.

24. Then you do admit that the teaching throughout the university work is equal to that of the Old Country?—In most branches. I have only had experience of the teaching in one college.

25. You say some men here take double honours in one year?—Yes.

26. You could not have done so in the Old Country without putting another year in?—My argument is that if it takes a man three or four years to obtain single honours at Oxford, and a man here can in one year obtain double honours, it shows that the standards are different.

27. Is our University system being retarded by not having *viva voce* examinations?—It is much more satisfactory to the examiner to have them.

28. It would demonstrate the general knowledge of the candidate to the examiners?—Yes.

29. You say that our University degree is not appreciated much abroad, but that that is largely controlled by our geographical isolation and environment and limited opportunities as compared with the larger universities?—The point I was trying to make is that it is often stated that the New Zealand degrees are better than the Australian degrees, because we have external examinations and they have not. But I have not found any great advantage so far as the examinations are concerned.

30. The Sydney University being better known throughout the world, it carries a certain amount more weight?—Yes.

31. *Mr. Allen.*] You say the salaries in Australia are higher than in New Zealand for professors: what would you consider an adequate salary?—The cost of living has gone up so much lately that I do not think a professor can keep up his dignity in the community under less than £800 a year.

32. You said that there were no terminal examinations at Oxford: were you referring to any particular college?—The colleges have no terminal examinations in our sense. There is no question of passing or failing in those examinations. The teachers simply judge from the way the men are working, and if they are not working tell them that they had better work.

33. Do you know the position in Cambridge?—It is the same.

34. Are there any college examinations there?—I think they are the same.

35. With regard to Australian assessors: do you think there would be any difficulty in getting Australian assessors over here to assist the local professors?—I do not think there would be any difficulty. In Australia there are four different universities to draw from, and the chances are that one of those four would be available every year.

36. You made a reference to changes—I suppose you meant in the syllabus, and so on—being promulgated by the Senate?—Yes, it is entirely fixed by the Senate, is it not?

37. Have the local Professorial Boards not ample powers to make suggestions to the local Councils, and through them to the Senate?—I was pointing out the difference between Oxford and New Zealand. The difference is that the Oxford Court of Convocation could bring in a Bill which must be voted on. Here the Senate can take what notice it pleases of recommendations from the Professorial Boards.

38. You mean the difference is that in Oxford the Hebdomadal Council have the power of initiation of statutes, which would have to be considered, and here the Professorial Boards' proposals would not be considered?—Yes.

39. Do you know that we have *viva voce* examinations in medicine here?—Yes.

40. Do you believe in the exempt student being allowed to come up for examination as we do it in New Zealand?—Yes.

41. *The Chairman.*] Will you make plain what your idea of the examination is that you suggest for this country?—It is suggested that, instead of the professors, a preferable system would be to have a Board consisting of four professors on each subject?—In passing ordinary examinations that might work very well, but in the scholarship examinations you would have to get an outside examiner.

42. Would you suggest there should be one assessor with the four examiners, or the same assessor right through with the professor of each college?—Is that for a scholarship?

43. It is suggested that scholarship examinations should be altered, and should not be awarded as the result of a competitive examination at all?—I think it is desirable that some scholarships should be given by competitive examination.

44. If not given by competitive examination, would you suggest that the four college professors examine in the degree?—No.

45. You think it would be unwise to do away with the competitive scholarship?—I think it would be very difficult to judge without some system of examination.

46. It is suggested that certain scholarships should be awarded or placed at the disposal of the four colleges, and that the professors should have the right to give this scholarship to those who were in need of it, apart from an examination altogether. What do you think of a system of that kind?—That system is becoming more general in examinations. The Rhodes Scholarships had a great influence on the examinations in that way. There are no competitive examinations in connection with them. The Oxford colleges have a system of exhibitions in addition to the scholarships. The scholarships are given for competitive examinations, and the exhibitions are given to the poorer men.

47. Supposing we asked an Australian professor to come over here, do you think he should examine with one professor — I do not mean with a Board of four professors, but with each professor in his own subject?—I think it would be satisfactory with one professor in each college.

48. You referred to the standing of medical schools as compared with our school here?—Yes.

49. On what evidence do you base your opinion that our standard in medicine compares favourably with the standard at Home?—Well, I have not got complete figures in regard to the success of New Zealand students, but there have been so many students who have failed in New Zealand who have won even prizes in Home universities, in Edinburgh, and gained scholarships, and that goes to show that in science and arts they are not keeping up to the same standards.

50. Have you seen the statements in the pamphlet to the effect that there are quite a number of New Zealand students taking a medical course in Edinburgh?—Yes.

51. In what way would you account for that?—I have no doubt that those who can afford it go to England, and like to go to a college that is better known abroad. The Edinburgh degree has been recognized so much longer and is better known than the New Zealand degree; and you can get so much more experience in the hospitals, and in a great many cases it is certainly the case that the course was easier.

52. The success of our students has encouraged others to go because they thought they could get through more easily there?—It is the general opinion of medical students in Otago that only half will get through the final, and the other half do not wait, but they go Home.

53. On the subject of keeping terms, did I understand you to say that in Oxford the separate colleges did not insist on the students keeping terms?—The terms are kept by residing at the colleges. The colleges direct the course set for the students. They either tell them to go to the professors' lectures or they may send them to their own lecturers or private coaches. They have a general direction of their study, but there is no fixed percentage of lectures, and so on.

54. *Mr. Allen.*] Can they get degrees without keeping their terms?—They cannot get their degrees. The requisites are sleeping forty days in Oxford each term.

55. *The Chairman.*] But no examination?—No.

FRIDAY, 22ND SEPTEMBER, 1911.

(No. 15.)

Mr. G. M. Thomson: I desire to put in the following memorandum *re* library equipment:—

Memorandum re *Library Equipment.*

The number of books in the Otago University library is put down in the Reform Association's pamphlet approximately at 3,150, but it is admitted that the correct figures were not obtainable. Professor Benham informs me that the number of volumes in the University Museum library is about 5,000. "This includes the series of volumes in the various periodicals and Proceedings; the 'Challenger' reports; the Fauna and Flora of the Naples Station; the valuable set of zoological catalogues issued by the British Museum; the various publications of the American institutions; and the books on zoology belonging to the Biological Department. All these are available for any one doing research, and are almost entirely works on biological matters."

Mr. D'Arcy Haggitt, Librarian of the Supreme Court library in Dunedin, states: "The number of books in the library is quite 6,000. This includes the Law Journal Reports, numbering about 300 to 400 volumes; the Law Reports, numbering fully as many; and all the other report books. All students belonging to the Law Debating Society are allowed to use the library at certain hours."

GEO. M. THOMSON.

18th September, 1911.

The Chairman: Does that include the Hocken Library?

Mr. G. M. Thomson: No.

Professor Hunter: I think we have made it clear that we have had to rely for our figures on the information supplied at our request by the Registrar of the Otago University.

Mr. G. M. Thomson: I also wish to put in the following return:—

Comparative Analysis of the Contents of the "Transactions of the New Zealand Institute," showing by what Classes of the Community the various Papers were written.

The figures give the number of pages in each volume contributed by each of the four classes specified.

Volume.	Graduates of New Zealand University.	Professors in New Zealand University Colleges.	Graduates of Foreign Universities (mostly British).	Without any University Degrees.
1	..	..	83	299½
2	..	..	78	207½
3	..	..	22½	327½
4	..	..	72½	254
5	..	..	38½	339
6	..	..	111¾	243
7	..	38	111½	308½
8	..	..	83½	297
9	..	..	113	482

Comparative Analysis of the Contents of the "Transactions of the New Zealand Institute," &c.—continued.

Volume.	Graduates of New Zealand University.	Professors in New Zealand University Colleges.	Graduates of Foreign Universities (mostly British).	Without any University Degrees.
10	..	..	93	404½
11	..	15	40½	443½
12	..	30	62½	321½
13	8	26½	29½	352½
14	9	23½	68½	410
15	48	27	101	332
16	33	27½	166½	290½
17	3	11½	167	250
18	25½	15	52	311½
19	24	5	75	472
20	27½	18	73½	309½
21	23	20	63	365
22	31	2½	94	372½
23	38½	4	147	390½
24	59	1	41	570½
25	20	6	24½	463
26	71½	79½	23½	445
27	87½	37	34	472½
28	175½	5½	80½	450
29	31½	9½	35½	513½
30	40	27½	69	392½
31	79	24	48½	500½
32	45½	9½	20½	333
33	47	76	55	351½
34	75	50½	25	392
35	119	43	72	308
36	23½	53½	40	391½
37	98½	61½	154	270
38	157	17½	30	366½
39	41½	41½	43½	393½
40	137	114	59	326½
41	128	12½	104	194½
42	112	2	35	488½
43	320	26	52½	277
	2,138½	861	2,983½	15,683½

The object of the foregoing tables is to show to what extent the New Zealand University has aided in the scientific research-work which has been accomplished in the Dominion.

The figures in the table work out to the following percentages:—

By New Zealand University graduates	9·8 per cent.
By professors in University Colleges	4·0 ,,
By authors holding foreign degrees	13·7 ,,
By authors without university status	72·3 ,,
	99·8 ,,

The first column includes papers by Professors Chilton, Marshall, and H. Kirk, Messrs. Speight, Laing, and others. Some of these are now professors in University Colleges, but their first research-work was done while they were still students or school-teachers.

In the second are papers by Professors Parker, Bickerton, Dendy, Benham, and others.

The third contains the work of Sir James Hector, Sir J. von Haast, Dr. Farr, Messrs. Hogben, Petrie, Meyrick, &c.

The fourth includes papers by Captain Hutton, Sir W. Buller, Messrs. Aston, Brown, Buchanan, Cheeseman, Cockayne, Colenso, Fereday, Hamilton, Hudson, T. Kirk, Maskell, Park, Potts, Skey, Thomson, Travers, Urquhart, &c.

It may be urged that a good deal of the material included in the fourth column is of comparatively little value, and this is quite true; but a glance at the list of names just given shows that it also includes the greatest part of the work done in all departments of natural history in New Zealand. Even if one-third of the whole—and this would be a large concession—were admitted to be of poor quality, yet the proportion left would still outweigh the other three classes combined.

It is the case, of course, that much of the work of University men in New Zealand—*e.g.*, Professors Parker, Benham, Dendy, Thomas, Chilton, &c.—has been published elsewhere, but this remark applies equally well to such writers as Hutton, Buller, T. Kirk, Cockayne, Park, Thomson, &c. Further, the valuable monographs on birds, Lepidoptera, Coleoptera, and Mollusca, the Floras written by Kirk and Cheeseman, and most of the papers in the Geological Survey and Chemical Laboratory reports are all by men without university status.

15th September, 1911. GEO. M. THOMSON.

PERCY GATES MORGAN examined. (No. 16.)

1. *The Chairman.*] What are you?—I am a Master of Arts in the New Zealand University, Associate of the Otago School of Mines, and am now Director of the Geological Survey. I have lived in New Zealand since early childhood. From 1875 to 1881 I attended primary schools; from 1882 to 1884 a secondary school (Dunedin Boys' High School); from 1885 to 1893 the Otago University and the Otago University School of Mines. I taught privately (coached) during some of my university years. From September, 1897, to May, 1905, I taught in schools of mines. I have therefore had considerable experience of education in New Zealand in nearly all its aspects. Before speaking of university reform I wish to refer to the great necessity of co-ordination between primary, secondary (including technical), and university education. Overlapping ought to be prevented as much as possible. At the present time there is overlapping of function between technical schools and the ordinary secondary schools, and there is also overlap between the technical schools and the University. There is also the serious overlap caused by the establishment of four University Colleges in a comparatively small population. It being now apparently impracticable to have one central University, further attention ought to be given to specialization in each college. Owing to there being four distinct colleges, it ought to be recognized that efficient university education must be more costly in New Zealand than in other countries where it can be centralized. The isolation of New Zealand and the high cost of living are other factors adding to the price that must be paid for the higher education. I may here say that I am in favour of a Royal Commission—not merely on university education, but also on primary, secondary, and technical education. It may be pointed out, however, that it ought to report separately on each of these divisions, and that each report ought to be concise and clear in language so as to be understood by the ordinary taxpayer. Functions and ideals of a university: I consider that the function of the University in New Zealand is to supply an education that will lead to the progress of the nation — material, intellectual, and moral. Research, then, must be the main objective of the University, and knowledge must be regarded as merely the end to this means. Hitherto I think we have all sought too much after knowledge without regard to its practical usefulness. Material progress: The University ought to adapt itself to the needs of the country as far as possible. If, then, it is modelled wholly on foreign institutions, and has little power of altering its organization, it will in some respects be a failure. Intellectual progress: I need not speak much of this, since it is certain to be given sufficient prominence in any discussion on university ideals. Many people seem to think that it is the main ideal of universities to cultivate the minds of people. Hence the stress sometimes laid on culture, which in the New Zealand University has not led to general progress. In my opinion, a man may acquire what can be truly called culture in any pursuit where skill is involved—*e.g.*, agriculture, mining, blacksmithing, house-building, or even politics. To promulgate the idea that culture is almost necessarily confined to university graduates is both absurd and harmful. Moral progress: It is essential that moral progress should keep pace with material and intellectual progress. In some respects —for example, in the inculcation of perseverance, honesty, and truth—the higher education is an excellent teacher of morals. I feel sure, however, that the inculcation of virtue ought to be a prime object in a university. I will not pretend to say how this ideal can best be accomplished, but will merely draw attention to its importance. Scope of university: Since I regard the university as for the nation, not the individual, its doors should be open to all who can benefit by its instruction. Fees, therefore, should be abolished, or almost so. Thus I believe in a free university. Entrance examination: The Matriculation Examination need not be made more difficult than it now is until some finality is attained with regard to higher examinations. I am glad that Maori is now a subject for matriculation. I utterly fail to see why Latin and Greek should each be considered of double the value of such a subject as English. Entrance scholarships: These are much more numerous than twenty-five years ago, and probably almost or quite adequate in number. The emoluments of most or all scholarships should be sufficient to cover cost of board, class fees (if any), and necessary books. I hardly think that many of the scholarships are sufficiently valuable. As regards the subjects of examination, I cannot see any reason for Latin being assigned 50 per cent. more marks than English, nor why history and geography should be given the lowest places. Maori ought certainly to be a subject of examination for scholarships in this country. Subjects of instruction: The only limit that should be placed on subjects of instruction and the standard to which they are taught is that imposed by financial considerations. In this comparatively poor country, still thinly populated and in large measure undeveloped, it would be absurd to teach such subjects as, say, Oriental languages at the public expense. Before the present list of subjects taught in the various colleges is materially extended it is highly necessary that adequate provision for the efficient teaching of the more important subjects be made. I consider, however, that the teaching of Maori to an honours standard ought to be undertaken, and the necessary means provided without delay. Of course, I need not say that Maori in its purity is now passing away, and measures ought to be taken to preserve a knowledge of it. Auckland is obviously the proper college for the location of a professor of the Maori language. The failure of the New Zealand University to provide for instruction in Maori illustrates better than any verbal statement its lack of adaptation to New Zealand needs. Presumably the authorities are waiting for Oxford or Cambridge or some other great university to take the lead. Degrees and courses of study: I consider that there should be homogeneous correlation of subjects in connection with the arts and sciences degrees. This would involve radical alterations in the regulations dealing with these degrees. I do not think that any one foreign university furnishes the best model for New Zealand needs. Even though the necessity for reform be admitted, it does not follow that we shall be able to formulate the best possible constitution right away; some amount of trial will be necessary. Classes and degree examinations: It is now recognized in the educational world that examinations have for many

years been overdone. Some authorities regard them as a necessary evil; others advocate their complete abolition. If degree examinations by external examiners are to be retained, the present class examinations by professors ought to be abolished, or at least no class examination should be held within the two months preceding the degree examinations. My own personal experience is that the strain of two sets of examinations closely following one another is harmful. For women it is likely to be even more injurious than for men. There ought to be some system about such class examinations as are intended to be adjuncts to the teaching. These should be held according to a time-table arranged by the whole body of teachers. I am in favour of abolishing the present system of external examiners for most degrees, and of substituting a system in which the teachers should act with examiners external to their college. Even if the teacher of a subject were made the sole examiner, I do not think that the personal bias of any respectable man is more to be feared than the intellectual bias of an external examiner who does not know the students whom he examines. I do not think the personal element with regard to unfairness is greatly to be feared in the case of men who are university professors. There is a very considerable element of chance in the success attained by a student under the present external-examiner system. He simply has the one shot, and either succeeds or fails on one week's work. A most harmful feature is the delay between examination and the obtaining of results — at least three months. The average student, not knowing whether he has failed or passed, cannot settle to any regular course of study during that time. Especially in the case of scholarship candidates the delay is cruel, because their whole career sometimes depends upon their obtaining the scholarship, and they may not be able to sustain their studies without the assistance of a scholarship. Compulsory subjects: I hardly think that any subject should be compulsory to the degree standard, but consider there should be an intermediate standard of compulsion in certain cases—*e.g.*, English for all; German for science students, &c. There will, of course, be more or less compulsion in correlated courses of study. If any one subject is to be compulsory for the B.A. degree, it should be English. My experience is that many graduates do not write really good English.

2. *Mr. Hanan.*] And many professors?—Yes, I dare say that is quite true. The necessity of being able to speak and write clearly and concisely in his native tongue should be impressed on every student. Scholarships: There should be senior and research scholarships for all who reach a prescribed standard. If this standard is not quite reached one scholarship might still be awarded. I do not believe in emphasizing the competitive feature of scholarships. There may be two or three candidates nearly equal and only one can get the scholarship. There ought to be numerous travelling scholarships, tenable at foreign universities, &c. Evening work: As pointed out in the pamphlet on University Reform (page 15), the present system of evening classes is a hardship to those students who devote their whole time to study, and leads to a lowering of the standard attained. I do not advocate the abandonment of evening university classes, but that the whole-time students should not be sacrificed to the part-time students. Libraries: I indorse the paragraph in the University Reform pamphlet on libraries (page 14). The condition of affairs that has prevailed at Otago University for the past twenty-five years or more is simply disgraceful. Appointments and emoluments of teachers and professors: Appointments to the teaching staff of a University College ought to be made under the advice of educationalists in touch with New Zealand needs. New-Zealanders ought always to be preferred, other things being approximately equal. I am strongly opposed to class fees being paid to professors, as is done in Canterbury and Otago. Considering the length of their holidays, professors are fairly well paid in New Zealand. I think, however, that their emoluments should be indirectly increased by making liberal provision for pensions. It ought to be remembered that a professor has received an expensive education, and before becoming a professor may have held poorly paid positions for many years. All professors should be allowed to retire on full pension at sixty, and on part pension at earlier ages. At sixty-five retirement should be compulsory except in special cases, and in these there should be a young colleague to undertake the main burden of teaching. Professors should be encouraged to visit the Northern Hemisphere every few years, and allowed full pay, and in some cases travelling-expenses, while absent from New Zealand. The cost of such journeys is part of the price we must pay for our isolation from the great centres of civilization. In this Dominion we suffer from isolation, but we may be able to do something to remedy it. So far as I can judge, past and present professors of the New Zealand University Colleges are by no means so mediocre or inferior as would be judged from a perusal of page 26 of the University Reform pamphlet. As a body they are as good as, or better than, could be expected from the present system of university government. I think the University Reform pamphlet rather overstates the deficiencies of the University Colleges on page 26. It gives one a rather bad impression of the professors, and it will give outside people even a worse impression. Government: The educational part of the University—that is, courses of study, examinations, &c.—should be controlled mainly by the professors. It would doubtless be advisable to give graduates and perhaps the Government (as representing the general public) some say. I think it would be quite useless to have manhood suffrage in connection with the election of University governing bodies. The general government of the University and of its constituent colleges should be in the hands of bodies representing professors, graduates, and the general public, not in proportion to numbers, but in proportion to the intelligent interest taken. If the University becomes free, the graduates will be drawn from all classes of the community, and a body elected by them will be truly representative of its best elements. As regards the Senate, I would not greatly interfere with its present constitution for the time being. I think its members ought not to sit for more than four years without re-election. The present system of electing College Councils leave much to be desired. I do not see why at Auckland, Wellington, and Christchurch members of the Legislature should directly elect members of the Council, seeing that the Governor in Council already appoints several members. In Otago the Governor in Council is far too strongly represented. He

appoints six out of twelve members — half the Council. Why should primary-school teachers elect members to Victoria College Council, when the Education Boards are represented? If primary-school teachers are to be represented, why should teachers in secondary and technical schools not be represented? By the same token doctors, lawyers, clergymen, and other professional men ought to be represented. I had almost forgotten to mention the undergraduate student as worthy of representation. The climax of futile representation is, I think, reached in the case of Canterbury College, where three representatives are elected by members of School Committees, as well as three by primary-school teachers. The system of giving primary-school teachers and members of School Committees direct representation in the University is entirely wrong. It is putting the cart before the horse with a vengeance. The University authorities should have some say in both primary and secondary education, but to give primary teachers and school committeemen, as such, votes in controlling the University, although they have practically no say in the matter of primary education, seems ridiculous in the extreme. Recommendations as to government of the University: The ultimate form that the highest governing body of the University—namely, the Senate—should take must be determined largely by the nature of any reforms that may be decided upon. As I have already indicated, I do not, for the present, advocate any great change in the *personnel* or mode of election of the Senate. I cannot say how it should be elected until I know what system of education in the University is to be carried out in the future. For each college there should be two bodies with administrative functions, one concerned mainly with financial questions, the other with academic control. The financial body, which by virtue of its controlling the sinews of war would prevail in any conflict of authority with the academic body, should be elected on as broadly democratic a basis as possible. In the academic body the professors should have the controlling voice. Besides the general public (represented by the Governor in Council), graduates and also under-graduates should have a representative. It is clearly impossible that one man should be able to suggest the cure for all the evils under which the University labours. The lack of funds, however, is the greatest single drawback to University efficiency. In order that the subject of reform may be adequately investigated, I advocate, as stated at the beginning of these remarks, a Royal Commission to consider the subject of education in New Zealand in all its branches.

3. *The Chairman.*] Have you thought anything about the *presonnel* of the proposed Royal Commision?—I have not given any thought to it, but I presume it would be very much on the same lines as the Royal Commission of Victoria.

4. How was that constituted?—I do not know exactly. Of course the Government would be represented, and I suppose the University Council and the graduates.

5. You have not thought carefully over the subject?—No.

6. Do you think the qualifications to sit on such a Commission are the same as those required to consider primary education—do you think the same Commission would be a proper one to consider both questions?—I have not thought that out. It might possibly be desirable to have three separate Commissions if there were difficulties as regards the *personnel*. I think that primary, secondary, and university education ought to be co-ordinated, and from this point of view one Commission rather than three would be desirable.

7. When you speak of the fees being abolished, do you suggest that they should be abolished for all matriculated students?—Not necessarily for those who do not reach a certain standard.

8. What standard do you suggest?—The credit pass of the Junior Scholarship Examination.

9. Is that not done at the present time? Are those who pass with credit not entitled to a bursary?—I believe that is so, but I did not think of that at the time I spoke. I held a Junior Scholarship and paid fees.

10. You were not aware that a bursary in that case was equal to the class fees?—No. I think the matriculation standard ought to be raised, but we ought not to begin raising the matriculation standard until the funds are available for a free University.

11. When you said that an assessor should act with the professors when examining for a degree, in what way did you propose to bring about a uniformity or standard in connection with the four colleges?—The professors might meet together and could arrange that only two should act at any one college. Two might examine, say, at the Otago University, and two at the other colleges.

12. But in what way do you propose the assessor should act? I understand you to suggest now that the examination should be on the lines mentioned in the pamphlet—namely, that the four professors should act as an Examining Board?—Not necessarily. I am not wedded to any form of examination. I think there might be an external examiner acting with a professor.

13. If you had the four professors acting as a Board, would you have external examiners too?—Not if the four were examining.

14. Which do you think the better way, either the Board of four professors or one assessor with a professor?—I look forward to the four colleges being separated with regard to degrees, but until that comes about I would be in favour of the four professors acting together.

15. Without the assessor?—Yes.

16. Generally speaking, you agree with the pamphlet?—Generally, yes. I was not at first in favour of it, but having thought it out more I now am.

17. Do you think the system of competitive scholarships should be abolished?—Yes. I think all who can reach the prescribed standard should have a scholarship.

18. Irrespective of whether their position is such that their parents can afford to pay?—I do not think a man worth £10,000 a year should be permitted to send his son up for a scholarship.

19. You probably agree with the professors that the gift of these scholarships should be in the hands of the professors, and that they should be given to those who cannot afford to pay for their education?—Those who cannot afford to pay for their education should have the first claim.

20. You referred to the governing bodies of the colleges: have you seen the draft Bills which are before Parliament just now?—No, sir.

21. There is one dealing with the University Council of Otago and another with the University Council of Auckland, and I think they are on the same lines; but are you aware that in the pamphlet it is suggested that, instead of having particular interests represented on those Councils, there should be one electorate? On page 112 it says: "Election to the Senate: In determining the constituencies which are to return the members of the College Councils, who *ex officio* constitute the Senate in the scheme under discussion, the guiding principle should be, not that particular interests, whether of professors or others, need representation for the furtherance or protection of those interests." Then it goes on to say, "Nothing should be taken into account but the fitness of members of the Councils to stand for the highest educational interests of the Dominion." The idea is that there should be one electorate of all those you propose to give an interest to in electing representatives to the College Council?—Yes, that I take to be the meaning.

22. I want to know what your idea is on that point?—I did say that the Council, which has the financial control, should be as broadly representative as possible; and I think I said that besides the professors and members of the general public the graduates and undergraduates should be represented. I would also include professional men and members of the Education Boards in the classes to be represented.

23. In the Bill it includes not only the teachers of the primary schools and secondary schools, but Education Boards and Convocation: do you approve of all those classes having representation?—Yes, but not necessarily that they should vote as classes.

24. In this Bill teachers of primary schools are going to have the right to elect a representative. In your remarks you took exception to that: are you in favour of it?—In the case of Canterbury College Council members of School Committees elect three representatives and the primary-school teachers elect three. This is over-representation. I do not disagree altogether with the principle that the classes mentioned should have some representation.

25. Do you think they should be in one constituency or have a separate representation?—I certainly think that School Committees and primary-school teachers should vote together in one class.

26. You do not express a definite opinion on the question as to whether it is better that there should be one constituency as against separate interests?—I should be inclined to give the graduates more representation in proportion to numbers than other bodies in the Dominion.

27. You would not class them with the others?—If they were classed with the others I think they would be swamped; otherwise it would be better if all classes could meet together.

28. *Mr. J. C. Thomson.*] You say that the chief need of a university is one of funds?—Yes.

29. Then you say that research must be the main objective, and knowledge the means to this end?—Yes.

30. Then you agree that numbers have attained a position enabling them to pass an examination in order to enter a close corporation?—They pass examinations in order to enter a profession.

31. Therefore, in their case success in their examination is the main objective of those students?—Yes.

32. Then you stated that university education should be provided for by the nation and not by the individual, and that all fees should be abolished?—I think students who show a certain degree of fitness should have free education.

33. By saying that you say that research is not the main object of the University?—I do not say that.

34. You say that the four colleges should specialize in the matter of research?—What I am most interested in is science research, and the provision for that is certainly very poor in all the four colleges just now. They need much larger libraries and laboratories.

35. You would not extend the scholarships to students who are going to take up a professional line of life?—Well, take medical students: I would give travelling scholarships to these so that they could go through the hospitals at Home. In the case of lawyers, I do not know whether they require travelling scholarships or not.

36. *Mr. Hanan.*] Do I understand you to hold the belief that because lawyers and doctors qualify for a certain profession that that profession is a close corporation?—Oh, no; I do not see why it should be so.

37. Then it is not a close corporation any more than the Sixth Standard is a close corporation for a boy who can pass it?—No.

38. As to a free University, what are the advantages that would be secured compared with what exists at the present time so far as the great body of the pupils are concerned?—My experience of University students is that they are very poor. They have to work in order to obtain the fees, or get them from their parents. Junior University Scholarships are fairly numerous, but something ought to be done with regard to the fees. It is desirable that more students should be assisted to pass through the University. Senior Scholarships for advanced students are few.

39. Would you draw a line between bright students belonging to rich parents and brainy children belonging to poor parents?—I think the child of a poor parent should receive preference.

40. Do you think the system of scholarships to the University provides ample opportunity for those students who are above the average and are fitted to receive the benefits of university education?—I think the emoluments are hardly sufficient

41. Then, why go the length of advocating a free University?—I do not think fees should be abolished irrespective of the standard of education, but should be abolished for all who reach a certain standard.

42. Do you know any country in the world where more facility is given to a boy of humble parentage of going from the State school to the University and taking his B.A. degree with less

expense to his parents than in New Zealand?—I think New Zealand is as good as any country in that respect, but I fancy that in some of the United States the facilities may be somewhat greater, although I do not know for certain.

43. Would you abolish the entrance examination to the University—the Matriculation?—I would not advocate that if the University were free, because I do not think that those who do not reach a certain standard should have free entrance into the University.

44. Now, with regard to curricula of the University: whom do you think are the best fitted to draw up the curricula for our Universities—the professional man or the man who is out in the world earning his living, and who knows what the agencies are that make for success?—There is something to be said for both classes of men. The professors, I think, should have the final voice, but the man who is out earning his living should be allowed to explain weak points in the system.

45. Would you say that scholarship success or college grading is the foundation of after-success in the world?—In New Zealand there are many men without any university training whatever who have been far more successful than men with university education.

46. What is your reason for urging that graduates should be represented on the University Council—why?—Graduates, as a rule, know more about the working of a university than other people. Having passed through it, they naturally know a great deal about it, and are the persons who take most interest in it.

47. Would you agree to primary teachers being represented on the Education Boards or School Committees?—It is the same principle as giving the teachers representation on the University Councils. I do not see why teachers should not have a representative on the Education Boards if they wish to—I think it would be a good thing—but not that they should have a controlling interest.

48. I understand you desire to bring the University into closer touch with the people?—Yes.

49. Is it not a fact that universities now are being brought into closer touch with the people with a view to the practical needs of the people being provided for, so as to equip them for the battle of life?—Yes, I think there is now a tendency to do that all over the world.

50. Do you think when the curricula are left to the university professors there is a tendency to have regard to certain phases of education in which they are deeply interested?—I think if the curricula were left altogether to the professors they would become too academic, and regard would not be had to the actual practical needs of life.

51. Do you know anything about the Royal Commission set up recently in South Australia in connection with secondary education?—No.

52. *Hon. Mr. Fowlds.*] You stated that there was an overlapping between the technical and secondary schools?—Yes.

53. In what direction—where can you give us an illustration of that?—In the teaching of mathematics. The technical schools teach mathematics, as do also the secondary schools.

54. That is only where there are technical day schools?—Yes.

55. Would you divorce altogether the teaching of this subject in the technical schools and confine it entirely to the secondary schools?—I do not see much reason why the technical and secondary schools should not be combined.

56. We do combine them where the conditions are suitable. Take, for example, the high schools in Wellington: you could not very well combine those with the technical day school; both are large enough to keep separate. You cannot point to a place and say in that particular place there is overlapping?—I have not sufficient knowledge of technical education in towns to say, but I think there is a tendency that way.

57. There are only six recognized technical schools giving day courses at all, and the position, as far as I know, is that there are sufficient pupils to keep both staffs fully employed; and in places like Wellington, Auckland, Christchurch, and Dunedin I do not see how you are to separate the two courses?—I look at it from this point of view: the technical schools appear to be more popular than the high schools, and take pupils from them, or tend to do so. There is a point, perhaps, where the students should go on and get a university education or the equivalent of it.

58. *Mr. G. M. Thomson.*] The petitioners believe that the constitution of the University is unsound: do you agree with them?—To a considerable extent. I might put it this way: I consider the present constitution of the University unsuitable; it is not fitted to be a permanent constitution, and is not altogether adapted to the needs of this country.

59. Do you consider that the methods of administration of the University are inefficient?—I would not like to say they are inefficient as a whole, but they are in some respects. I mentioned the failure to provide for the teaching of Maori, and there is a great failure to provide for research-work.

60. Do you consider that the methods of administration of the colleges are inefficient?—It is so many years since I attended the University that I do not know that I can say anything is inefficient in the colleges at the present time; but in my time I think the administration was inefficient to some extent in some ways.

61. Do you consider that sound learning is or is not being promoted in the way most effective for the development of the national life and industries of the Dominion?—I think sound learning is not being promoted in the way most desirable.

62. *Mr. Luke.*] Do you think the overlapping in the technical and secondary schools is confined to the four centres, or is it more acute in one centre than another?—I was only speaking generally. My real meaning is that there is overlapping of functions

63. Does that overlapping obtain as between technical schools and the University, or as against the extended lessons in the secondary schools other than technical schools?—The establishment of the technical schools has diminished the attendance at the secondary schools, or has a tendency to do so.

64. Do you think the very fact of students following up their studies at the technical schools enthuses them and fosters in them an educational desire, and that they then gravitate to the University? Is it not a means to that particular end?—I know of one particular case, but I do not think it is general. It does happen occasionally that a brilliant student goes to the University.

65. In fact, you do not think it enthuses the student to go further?—No, not generally speaking.

66. There are difficulties in the way of a student going from the technical school to the university, because he has to pass his Matriculation?—I cannot speak as to the desire of the technical students for university education.

67. You favour specialization in connection with the four University Colleges?—Yes, if they are to be separate.

68. You think that is consequent on the isolation we suffer from?—Yes; we have not enough money nor the number of people to run four University Colleges.

69. You say that the stress on culture in this country has not led to progress in New Zealand?—It has been said that the object of examining students for their B.A. degree is culture.

70. It does not stand for much in our citizenship?—It is not much use a man learning Latin, Greek, and Oriental languages if he is going into the farming business.

71. You said that you would be prepared as an educationalist to throw over Latin as a compulsory subject and substitute a greater development of English?—Yes.

72. And you are in favour of having a Professor of Maori Literature?—Yes.

73. You say that the personal element has not to be regarded in examinations. Are students likely to suffer now from that personal element, seeing that their papers are examined abroad? Does it reduce the chance of our students having a fair show in their examination?—The student gets a perfectly fair show on the papers, but the foreign examiner may have an intellectual bias.

74. But supposing the candidate comes into a *viva voce* examination with the professor, would that be a factor as against a paper?—I think it is a desirable factor that the examiner should know his student and what he can do—be able to size him up, if I may say so.

75. That would be a factor in arriving at a decision as to the student's fitness for passing?—Yes.

76. You say you are not in favour of class fees being paid to professors?—No.

77. You say there should be some inclusive fee: do you think the professors are fairly paid now?—I think so.

78. But you think we should safeguard their usefulness by giving them a pension later on?—Yes.

79. *Mr. Allen.*] When you gave your answer with regard to the poorer class of people having to pay fees, were you aware that a considerable alteration has been made in the number of scholarships and the payment of fees?—I know that there has been a considerable alteration and that the number of scholarships has been considerably increased.

80. This is E.-7, 1910, and Table M3—"Scholarships, Bursaries, Exhibitions, and Studentships held at the Affiliated Institutions in 1909" [handed to witness]. At the top of the list you will find "Junior University Scholarships, total 16." Are you aware that the holder of the Junior Scholarship gets £20 a year and fees if living at home, and £50 and fees if he is away from home?—I understood they paid their fees out of the £50.

81. The next are the Senior National Scholarships, 48: are you aware that the holder gets £50 a year?—I thought also he paid his fees.

82. Taranaki Scholarships: Are you aware that the holder is getting £60 and fees?—Yes, but I did not know his fees were paid.

83. Are you aware, with regard to the Queen's Scholarships, that they are the same as the Junior Scholarships?—I knew they were about the same.

84. With regard to the Senior University Scholarships, the holder gets £60 a year and no fees unless he is a bursar, and then he gets his fees?—I was not aware of that.

85. With regard to the Bursaries Scholarships, did you know they get their fees?—No.

86. And the Sir George Grey Scholarships: were you aware they get £50 and also a bursary?—No.

87. Then there are "Other scholarships and exhibitions, 31"; and with regard to Training College studentships there are two classes of students: are you aware that some get £30 when at home and £60 when away from home and all the fees, and that another class gets £20 and £40 and all the fees?—Yes, I understood some did.

88. How many scholarships are there in the table?—Four hundred and seventy-four.

89. Four hundred and seventy-four students who are getting scholarships and their fees paid for them: do you think that is a liberal provision to be made by the country?—I see there are 474 scholarships, but of these 319 are Training College Scholarships.

90. Do you think that is a liberal provision to be made by the country?—I think it is a fairly liberal provision, but I do not know that in the case of Training College students the best available material is picked out.

91. I suppose you will admit that an attempt is made to pick out the best?—Yes.

92. With regard to a bursary, although there is no picking out the bursar, he must reach a certain standard before he can get his bursary: is that not satisfactory?—Yes, that is satisfactory.

93. In view of what you now know, will you still say you would like all the fees abolished, seeing that all these fees are paid?—I would like all fees to be abolished in the case of those who reach a certain standard.

94. After seeing that 474 students get practically all their fees paid?—Yes, I would abolish fees to those who reach a certain standard, if there were two thousand of them. The conditions are certainly very much better now than twenty or twenty-five years ago, but I would like even further opportunities to be given.

95. How much further would you go?—I would leave to the education authorities the question as to whom free education should be given.

96. Have they not fixed the standard of free education when giving a bursary?—It would be fixed, I suppose, on the recommendation of the professors.

97. *The Chairman.*] You said you were prepared to admit that there were more free students than you thought at the present time. We admit all those who come up to a pass with credit in the Junior Scholarship examination: do you want a lower standard than that?—No.

98. Even if two thousand come up to that standard they get free education. Are you satisfied that existing conditions go far enough now that you understand what they mean?—I am very nearly satisfied, but fancy my knowledge of existing conditions is still behindhand.

99. *Mr. Allen.*] Do you not think £60 and fees for scholarships is adequate?—Yes. I had £45, and had to pay fees and my board out of that.

100. Some one asked you if you thought one Royal Commission would be sufficient, or whether you required a Commission for primary, secondary, and university education. You gave evidence about co-ordination and overlapping, and said you did not believe in overlapping. Do you look upon education from the primary school to the university as practically one system?—That is how I look at it. I wish all to be co-ordinated.

101. You think they all rely upon each other?—Yes.

102. Then, would not one Commission be able to meet that?—I think I weakened somewhat when being questioned on that point.

103. You as a university man would not argue that we could build up a university without a foundation leading up from the primary school?—Certainly not.

104. So that the whole is one system?—Yes.

105. I think you said education was costly: were you referring to the cost to the State or to the student?—To the State, in university equipment, libraries, &c.

106. You said you did not believe in fees being paid to professors: what influenced you in saying that?—There have been some statements made—I do not know on what authority—about professors in the Senate regulating examinations, and so forth, so as to bring a number of students to their classes for the sake of the fees.

107. Do you think that might happen?—I think it might.

108. Have you any other reason to give?—I think the main reason is that the professors' salaries should not vary. I think they should be put on the same footing—whether the class is popular or not, the professor should not suffer in salary.

109. Does the payment of fees create a distinction in salaries?—Yes. I think the salaries should be regulated by the governing bodies.

110. You were speaking about technical education, and you are a scientifically trained man yourself. Have you much knowledge of the technical education provided in New Zealand and the general organization of it?—No, not as organized under the Education Department. My knowledge was gained chiefly in the School of Mines. I taught in the Thames and Waihi Schools of Mines for nine years.

111. What is your idea of the training there?—In some of the subjects it is good and in other cases inefficient. That is partly caused by the external examinations. The teachers cannot teach the subject as they would like, but teach to a syllabus and to the needs imposed by the examinations.

112. With regard to scientific mining you were advocating specialization: do you think there is room in New Zealand for two University Schools of Mines?—Decidedly not.

113. You think it is a waste of money to have two?—Yes; there are not the students for them. There are not really sufficient students for one under present conditions. I speak of the University Schools of Mines.

114. Do you think we are getting good value out of the Schools of Mines on the goldfields?—Yes; I believe in having them in the mining centres.

115. This is your remark in your statement: "If the external examination is to be retained, then the class examination ought to be abolished"?—Yes, that is what I said.

116. If the class examination is to be abolished, will that not make the position different from the point of view of what is advocated in the pamphlet by the Reform Association?—What I mean is that there should be no class examination immediately before the degree examination.

117. If you abolish the class examination what check will you have on the student from the point of view of the teacher with regard to his degree or scholarship?—There would be practically none. The responsibility would be thrown on the external examiner.

118. Would not that make things worse?—It might.

119. Is it not argued now that the local college examination is one means by which the teacher himself has some influence upon the degree or the scholarship that the student may get?—A professor can prevent a student from sitting for his examination if he likes, but he cannot possibly give him his degree.

120. But he has some influence on the degree?—He has a negative influence.

121. Would you abolish that negative influence?—Yes, if I were a professor I would not like to have that influence only. I would pass every student I possibly could—from kindness of heart perhaps.

122. Do you think that is done?—I think so. I know a case of a student who failed in Latin, but he was given a pass on the condition that he did not sit for Latin in his degree examination. He sat for Latin, however, and passed.

123. Then you do not look with much faith upon this class of examination?—No. It is mainly owing to the strain on the student caused by these two examinations coming close together that I object to it.

124. Need they be close together?—If they were not it would remove the greater part of my objection.

125. Supposing they were not close together, would you still wish to do away with the class examination?—No.

126. Then you think the class examination does give to the teacher some say?—I would not bar the teacher from having an examination of some kind, but if there is to be an external examination I do not see why there should be this other examination for keeping terms. I would let the external examiners take all the responsibility.

127. Then you do not agree with those who argue that this class examination gives the teacher some influence over his student in obtaining his degree?—He can stop a student from going up for his degree as a rule, as in the case I mentioned; but there the student (being allowed a pass) did go up, and there was nothing to prevent him from doing so.

128. *The Chairman.*] That is not so in all the colleges: he must keep terms in the subjects in which he goes up for his degree examination?—I do not know how the college authorities can do that legitimately; there must be a backdoor way of gaining their point. The regulations are fixed.

129. But the college authorities have sufficient power to give such interpretation as they think fit as to what shall be construed as keeping terms?—That may be so.

130. *Mr. Allen.*] With regard to the constitution of the College Council, you do not approve of primary-school teachers being on it?—I do not approve of their having three representatives on it. I do not think that the primary-school teachers should have any direct representation on the University Council, but only as members of the general community.

131. Do you see any reason why, if the primary-school teacher as the holder of a degree should have representation, and also the secondary-school teacher, they should also have representation as members of Convocation?—I think there should be "one man one vote" in a case like that.

132. I do not suggest he has got more than one vote: but do you not think that is over-representation by the community?—Yes.

133. *The Chairman.*] Coming to the last question, I was asking you about the constitution of the local colleges: you expressed the opinion that to put the graduates with all the others into one constituency might mean that the graduates would be swamped?—Yes.

134. Would that not apply in much greater degree to another class that is proposed to be given representation in the Bill before the House—that is, the Council of the City of Dunedin?—Yes.

135. There would be much greater possibility of the City Councillors being swamped then?—Yes, they would be altogether swamped.

136. And with regard to graduates, is it not likely that you would get from them a much greater variety in the interests they represented than you would have in, say, the representatives of the scholastic institutions?—Yes, the graduates would be more representative.

137. Are you in favour of the abolition of the keeping of terms?—I expressed that opinion, but I certainly think students ought to attend classes.

138. Your only objection to it is that the final examination comes too close upon the external examination?—Yes.

139. You were a student of the Mining School of Otago?—Yes.

140. In the Mining School you did not have the external examination for your diploma?—No.

141. Do you reckon your diploma has suffered in value on that account?—Not in the least.

142. Following that up, may we gather from that that the factor which determines that value does not depend upon whether there is an external examination or not?—It does not depend upon the external examination; it depends upon the teaching staff and the graduates themselves—the reputation they make in the outside world.

143. You referred to the different provincial Schools of Mines: I wish to ask whether you think that for a mining degree or diploma such as is granted by the University schools a less term of underground work should be required than for the mine-manager's certificate?—Certainly, those who attend the classes and pass examinations should not be required to be so long underground as those who do not.

144. What length of time do you think would be sufficient underground for the requirements of the University mining student to qualify him as a mine-manager?—If five years is all that is required by the Government for mine-manager's certificates, I think three years would be sufficient for the University student.

145. Do you agree with the professors being represented on the University Councils?—I think there should be two governing bodies—one academic body and one for finance.

146. Will you give them representation on finance?—Yes, one representative.

147. And on the academic side that would correspond somewhat to the Professorial Board?—Yes.

148. Exclusively of professors?—No; there should be a graduates' representative, and I think it would be desirable to have the general public represented.

149. Do you not think the interests of the general public might be conserved by making the academic work subject to the approval of, say, the financial body?—Yes, it could be done in that way.

150. Do you think that the professors receiving fees is not a stimulus to them?—It is a stimulus in a way, but if you have the right man as a professor I think he will work for the sake of knowledge whether he receives fees or not.

151. But suppose a good "coach" is in existence to prepare students for examinations, might not the question of competition enter into the case as between him and the University professor, and would it not in that case be wise to let the professor have the fees?—I do not think that is a very desirable kind of stimulus to apply to the professor.

152. That is really answered by the reply you gave to the previous question?—Yes.

153. *Mr. Allen.*] With regard to the books in the University libraries: could you get books if you wanted them?—I could get them on application to the Registrar, but very often the Registrar was out, and I could not get them because the doors were locked.

154. Do you know why they were locked?—Because the books were taken out and kept.

155. They were stolen?—Yes.

156. They were locked up as a precautionary measure?—Yes. There was no librarian.

THURSDAY, 28TH SEPTEMBER, 1911

Sir ROBERT STOUT, K.C.M.G., Chancellor of the University of New Zealand, attended and made a statement. (No. 17.)

Sir Robert Stout: I accept the invitation of the Committee to make a statement regarding university education in New Zealand. In doing so I speak only for myself. I have no authority to speak on behalf of the Senate of the New Zealand University. I understand that the Committee is considering a petition of certain professors of Victoria College, and I assume that the pamphlet prepared by three of the petitioners has been laid before the Committee. It states, I understand, the views of an association formed in Wellington called the "New Zealand University Reform Association." I am glad, however, to learn from the pamphlet itself that the members of the Reform Association are not responsible for the statements in the pamphlet. The pamphlet contains many misrepresentations, many inaccurate statements, and some statements in very questionable taste. Let me give some examples of what I refer to. On pages 45 and 46 the following appears: "The University of New Zealand has laid all possible stress upon examinations. Its schemes of study have been drawn up in reference to examinations conducted in Great Britain. The question of training young New-Zealanders to deal scientifically with local problems in agriculture, industry, economics, and government has been left aside, and the supremely important problems of securing desirable university teachers has been treated as of less importance than securing good examiners. The methods adopted have been haphazard, and are not in accordance either with the practice of most universities or with the recommendations of any authority who offers his advice on this point. It is quite true that under these conditions a small number of first-rate men have been associated with university teaching in New Zealand, such as Geoffrey Parker, Von Haast, Hutton, Ulrich, Tucker, Maclaurin, Dendy, and J. W. Salmond, and that a number of others, though not of equal distinction with these, have been competent teachers and investigators such as other universities might be willing to employ; but very many have not, and one palpable result of this fact is that the Senate insists on retaining the purely external method of examinations, justifiable only on the ground that the teachers have been untrustworthy." It is entirely untrue that the schemes of study have been drawn up with reference to examinations conducted in Great Britain. To begin with, the medical examinations are conducted in New Zealand. Most of the law examinations are conducted in New Zealand, and several other examinations are conducted in New Zealand. In the second place, the schemes of study were drawn up in order that there might be co-ordination in the teaching in the various colleges, and, further, the schemes were drawn up by professors who had as much knowledge of universities as any of the three pamphleteers. Again, the question of training New-Zealanders to deal scientifically with local problems in industry, economics, and government has not been left aside. The University of New Zealand is not a teaching body. It has only to deal with the awarding of scholarships and the granting of degrees. If, therefore, attention has not been paid to the practical questions mentioned, the blame does not rest with the New Zealand University. It is incorrect, however, to say that attention has not been paid to agriculture, industry, economics, and government. Many students have studied these questions. The New Zealand University was one of the first universities to make agriculture a subject for a degree, and its honours examinations in science provide for theses on scientific subjects, and in its highest literary degree, as well as in its highest law degree, original work has to be done before the degree is conferred. Economics, chemistry, mental science are in its syllabus, and the problems of politics or government can only, in my opinion, be approached in a scientific manner through philosophy and ethics. One student obtained his degree of Doctor of Literature on a very valuable thesis which he had composed dealing with one phase of social life in the Dominion. The University has nothing to do with the appointment of professors, and therefore that question has never come before it for consideration. It is outside its jurisdiction. What is meant by stating that its methods have been haphazard I am at a loss to understand. If the sentence means that it has proceeded in fixing schemes of study without consulting the professors of the various subjects, then that is entirely incorrect. No scheme of studies has ever been drawn up without taking the advice of the professors in the subjects. The sentence dealing with the classification of past professors into first-rate men and those not first-rate men is not only in bad taste, but is impertinent and incorrect. The fact is that some of the most inspiring teachers that have been in the University are not named, and they are classed as not of equal distinction with those who are named. I may mention the names af Aldis, Mainwaring Brown, Macmillan Brown, Macgregor, and Sale; and there are others. I believe that the pamphleteers never heard those whose names I have mentioned lecturing, except perhaps Professor Hunter, who may have heard Professor Sale; and they know nothing of some of the professors whose names they mention, and they are consequently

not competent to express an opinion about their work. Then, as another specimen of bad taste, may I refer to a sentence on page 12 of their pamphlet? It is there stated, "There is evidence that successful coaching has been regarded as demonstration of fitness to occupy a Chair." It is well known to whom this refers. This is how the three pamphleteers dragoon one of their fellow-professors whose academical standing and teaching ability are certainly not secondary to any of the authors of the pamphlet.

I propose to deal with the charges made in the pamphlet against the New Zealand University. They seem to me to amount to nine—(1) That professors have no voice in the management of the university; (2) that the matriculation requirements are too low; (3) that the standard of the Bachelor of Arts degree is too low; (4) that the number of subjects for the B.A. degree is too large; (5) that the system of external examinations is bad; (6) the neglect of research; (7) the inefficiency of libraries; (8) the holding of classes in the evening is improper; (9) the granting of degrees to external students is wrong.

I do not propose to deal with the financial questions raised in the pamphlet, and for this reason: that the properly audited accounts of all the colleges and of the University are yearly laid before Parliament, and any information required by the Committee can be obtained from these accounts or from the college Registrars. The mode in which the figures are presented in the pamphlet does not give a proper view of the finances of the colleges; in fact, the tables, &c., given are misleading. For example, the fees charged at the various colleges are not uniform, and a stranger reading the pamphlet would be misled as to the sources of income of the different colleges. Again, at pages 67 and 68 of the pamphlet, under the heading of "Anomalies in University Finance," is is said, "The cost of University examinations (including Matriculation, &c.), £6,500." The total cost was for last year, £5,588 1s. 7d. This, however, is a small error for the pamphleteers to make. It is only an error of £911 18s. 5d. It may be that the professors have forgotten their arithmetic. They ask, "Is not £6,500 an excessive amount to pay for the testing of theoretical knowledge by written examination papers? Would it not be better to spend less in testing candidates' knowledge and more in educating them?" Would it be believed by the Committee that the sum of £5,588 1s. 7d. is not spent on examining University students. Of this amount £2,132 18s. 9d. is spent in examining pupils of primary and secondary schools who sit for Matriculation, Junior Scholarships, or the Medical Entrance. We are told the Matriculation is too low. Is there to be no Matriculation Examination? And may I ask, how can the University educate primary- and secondary-school pupils? Again, the inference to be drawn from the sentences I have quoted is that the sum of £6,500 is paid to examiners out of New Zealand. The fact is that the total cost of the outside examiners was last year £1,221 0s. 6d., and the expenses in England of examinations, &c., were £186 16s. 2d., the total cost in England being £1,407 16s. 8d. The amount paid to the New Zealand examiners was £2,078 6s. 10d., and the expenses £2,101 18s. 1d., the cost in New Zealand in all being £4,180 4s. 11d. Of the amount paid to examiners in New Zealand £1,201 6s. 4d. went to professors. I presume accountancy was not taught at the universities where the pamphleteers were educated. I may add that the fees received by the University for examinations exceeded the cost of the examinations by £491 10s. 5d. If, therefore, the examinations were given there would be no £6,500 or any other amount to spend, as the pamphleteers suggest. The pamphleteers object to the method that the University has adopted of creating a fund for scholarships purposes. That fund now amounts to about £25,000, and but for the thrift and care of the Senate in the past the New Zealand University would not have been enabled to grant the numerous scholarships that it now grants.

Any one who understands education, and the growth and development of the methods of education, would say that no educational system anywhere is perfect. There are many things in our primary, secondary, and technical systems, as well as in our university system, that may be found fault with. There are also many educational questions on which the ablest and best educationists differ. We have to remember, however, what the old French proverb says—namely, that "the best is the enemy of the good." Abraham Lincoln said that if he got the second-best he would consider himself very fortunate. It is our duty from time to time to try and improve our system and make it more suitable for our requirements. The Reform Association, however, has not proceeded along these lines. The only fitting illustration of their method of procedure is that mentioned by Charles Lamb in one of his essays. The Chinese for the first time tasted roast pig. (I am condensing.) Its delicacies were discovered by them through the burning of some of their houses, and the destruction of one of the pigs in the fire, and to get roast pig in the future the burning of buildings became common. Instead of seriously pointing out to the University Senate the reforms that they think the University should adopt, they have begun and continued a campaign of depreciation and denunciation of the University, thinking that by that means they will secure the vesting of the management of our highest educational institutions in the professors. I do not think that this is the best way to obtain reforms in education.

(1.) The first complaint is that the professors have no voice in the management of the University. The Senate is termed a "lay" body. The word "lay" is borrowed from ecclesiastical language, and is used in connection with an organization in which there is recognized by some people "apostolical" succession, or a special setting-apart of particular people for special functions. If by "lay" is meant persons who have had no experience in education, the phrase is inapt when applied to the members of the present Senate. All of them except one or two have been at universities, and nine of the present members have been either professors or lecturers at universities. Some of them have been or are teachers in secondary schools. To say that professors, lecturers, teachers, and university men are laymen in dealing with educational problems is to impose on the ignorant. The Committee knows the mode of appointing of the University Senate, and it is not necessary that I should explain it; but I may add that when one college has had professors of high standing, great knowledge, and common-sense, the number of professors selected for the

Senate has been large. For example, until Professor Sale's retirement, the Otago University district, out of the five representatives chosen, elected four professors, and now sends three. If other University districts and the government have not followed Otago's example, the electors or the candidates, and not the system, are to blame. When the constitutions of other universities are examined it will be found that in no modern university do the professors dominate its management, nor in many old universities do the teachers rule. In Cambridge the legislative power is vested in the Senate — that is, in the graduates generally, who are Masters of Arts, Laws, or Science, or Bachelors of Divinity; and it is to be remembered that both at Oxford and Cambridge there is a demand for reform in the management of these institutions. The reformers in these ancient universities do not, however, proceed as these pamphleteers proceed, by denouncing their universities, nor by belittling the great work they have done. The New Zealand University has been created to perform only a part of the duties appertaining to university education. It has, as I have already said, to co-ordinate the work of four colleges, and to provide for scholarships and the granting of degrees. This makes it quite different from any of the universities in Scotland. It is more like the modern University of Wales, and in Wales the institutions that control the university are the following—the University Court and the Senate. The former is the legislative body, and is what the pamphleteers would call a "lay" body.

Though the professors have not direct control, they have not been ignored by the Senate of the New Zealand University. The fact is that, notwithstanding that the Senate has always had among its members many experts who were able to advise it in all matters of university education, it has always consulted the professors on schemes of study, and at the present time the question of the pass degrees has been referred to the Professorial Boards of the four colleges. By a resolution passed at the Senate this year the following questions were referred to the Professorial Boards and the Courts of Convocation for their advice: (1) Whether the present degrees of B.A. and B.Sc. should be amalgamated? (2) the repetition of two subjects; (3) the desirability of the Professorial Boards approving of the courses to be taken by students; (4) the several limitations of the selection of subjects in the report; (5) if amalgamation is approved, ought the B.Sc. degree to be retained as a special science degree? (6) what, if any, subjects should be compulsory? It is rather interesting to notice that this resolution was carried by fifteen to six in the Senate, and in the minority three were professors. This resolution, however, only follows the usual course adopted by the Senate from its inauguration, when there were professors or Professorial Boards to consult. What is desired by the pamphleteers is that the whole control of the University should be vested in the professors. The Senate is only to have a mere vetoing-power. It is to have no initiative power. I doubt, if this had been the case in the past, whether our University would have been so advanced as it is. It was the first British University to admit women to equal rights with men in university education, and it was also amongst the first not to insist upon Greek being compulsory. It has been more progressive and democratic than the ancient universities in which the professors have considerable power. Until a few years ago the members of the Senate were members for life, and in the case of vacancies they were filled alternately by an election by the graduates and an election by the Senate itself. This was considered by the Minister of Education, and affirmed by the Parliament of New Zealand, as not giving what may be called the popular element sufficient representation, and it was changed. Is there to be a reversal of the policy the Parliament affirmed in 1902? To suppose that professors are necessarily the only people that are fit to govern the University is to make an assumption without proof. The danger of a professorial element has been well stated by an eminent educationalist, and one who has, I understand, had professorial experience. Andrew Macphail, in his "Essays on Fallacy," says: "In every occupation there is a kind of professorial cant, and in none is it so elaborately framed as in that which is technically known as the professorial. The last man in the world from whom we should apply for a correct opinion upon the value of a thing is he who is engaged upon it. A Highland piper is apt to possess an exaggerated notion of the place of music in the world, and the pleasure which it gives, especially of that music which he performs so well. To the tympanist the sound of the drum alone gives coherence to the various sounds which are produced by other members of the orchestra; and I have heard the lecturer on poultry in an important university declare that the rearing of hens was the best possible training for the memory, as the birds resembled each other so closely, whilst in reality they were different. The lecturer in classics did not agree with him; he thought that learning words out of a dictionary was a better method. It is the professor who is most completely convinced of the importance to the world of that kind of education which he gives. He is the university; but that does not prove the value of the professor of the university or of the business in which both are engaged. That must be determined by other considerations entirely. Whilst the Italians of the fifteenth century were painting pictures there were no professors of art, and no professors of literature when the Elizabethans were writing immortal poetry. Sophocles and Æschylus wrote their tragedies before Aristotle showed them how." What the professors would do if they had the power is, I think, apparent from this pamphlet itself: (1) There would be no classes in the evening; (2) there would be no external students; and (3) there would soon cease to be any co-ordination amongst the colleges, for the aim as disclosed by the pamphlet is to create either one central university or four separate universities. I do not think it would be safe to hand over to the professors the initiative in university management, and that is what their proposal means. The history of the Oxford and Cambridge Universities does not show that the professorial element was prominent in effecting many reforms that the statesmen of England had to insist on in these English institutions. Further, this proposal to leave the management of "schemes of courses" and all initiative to the professors may have a far-reaching effect if the legislation or administration of our Dominion is to be logical and to follow some well-defined principle. Hitherto the method of government in British countries has been for representative persons to be governors; and experts to tender advice to those who are the

governors. We see this system even in military and naval affairs in Britain. A layman is First Lord of the Admiralty and practically ruler of the Admiralty. So the Minister of War who has the command of the army is also a layman, and is very rarely, if ever, an expert. We see it also in our municipal government, and in our colonial administration. The advice of experts is always taken, but the experts have not finally to decide on any course of action: they have only to tender advice. For example, the important duties of a Municipal Council are street-formation and management, waterworks, gasworks, trams, etc. All these enterprises are managed by laymen, but the advice of experts is, of course, continually sought. In our education system the same procedure is adopted. If the Senate of the New Zealand University is what is called a "lay" body, it asks for the advice of experts — the professors and other persons. Were the experts to rule we should have no need for Municipal Councils. Gas would be left to a gas expert, water to an hydraulic engineer, and street-formation to a civil engineer, and famed electricians would look after our electric plant and the workings connected therewith. Again, if this principle that the professors seek to have enforced is adopted, why should it in education be confined to the management of only our highest educational institutions? Ought not the teachers of the primary schools to settle the primary syllabus, to look after the appointment of teachers, to fix the hours, &c.—in fact, to manage the primary education work of the Dominion? Unlike the professors, they have practically no voice or share in the management of any department of education save their actual teaching in the schools. The professors have, through their Professorial Boards, considerable powers which the primary teachers do not possess. If the professors' system were adopted, why should the School Committees not be abolished and the primary teachers left to manage all the schools? Committees have not now to provide finance: that is done by the General Government. Again, we have the Minister of Education: he is the ruler of the Department and of the experts who may be his officers. Is the Minister to be abolished and the experts to be the Ministers? Again, there are the secondary schools. Why should the secondary-school teachers not manage the secondary departments if the professors are to manage the university? Without enlarging on this aspect of the question, it will be seen that what is proposed is practically the adoption of a system foreign to the administration of any British community. It may be said, "But what of the management of the universities in England?" In the first place, I repeat that in the newer universities, as well as in the older, the professors or teachers have not the government of the universities. I have already referred to Cambridge. Both Oxford and Cambridge are the products of the semi-monastic rule of the middle ages, and their systems are ill adapted to our circumstances. I have also mentioned the new University of Wales. Its supreme governing body consists of 102 members—the Chancellor, thirteen members appointed by the Government, twenty-seven appointed by County and Borough Councils, thirty-six by the three affiliated colleges, thirteen by the guild of graduates, three by the headmasters of secondary schools, three by primary-school teachers, and six by the Central Welsh Board of Intermediate Education; and there are very few members of the Court who have been or who are university teachers. The Senate consists of sixty members, the three principals of colleges, and the head professors, but not all the professors in the university. The Council in Cambridge does not consist of the teachers: it consists of the Chancellor, the Vice-Chancellor, four heads of colleges, and eight members of the Senate. In London University the supreme authority is vested in a Council of fifty-six members, and only sixteen of these are elected by the faculties—that is, by the professors and teachers. Professors, as I have said, are eligible for seats on our Senate, and, as I have pointed out, one University district, out of the five members it returned sent four professors, and there is nothing to prevent other University districts from doing the same if the electors consider that University professors are the most suitable persons to appoint as members of the Senate.

(2.) The second charge is that the Matriculation standard is too low. Are the writers of the pamphlet aware that for some hundreds of years one of the most successful universities in the world—a university that has turned out men of great ability and learning—I mean the University of Edinburgh—had no Matriculation Examination at all? Any one was free to enter it, and get what knowledge he could from its professors and lecturers. If the Matriculation Examination in New Zealand was raised higher than it now is, hundreds of New-Zealanders would be denied any chance of university education at all. We have not in New Zealand in our primary schools teachers who have been educated in universities, though these were common in the parish schools of Scotland forty or fifty years ago. It is well known that some of the most distinguished students in Scotland went direct from what we call the primary schools (called in Scotland the "parish schools"), to the university. In the parish school at which I was educated never less than one-twelfth of the pupils were studying the classics, mathematics, and French, and our school was a very small school, containing only, infants and all, about 130 pupils. We have not in our back-blocks school-teachers who can give the requisite training to their scholars to fit them for university education, and it is difficult for the children of poor parents to attend the secondary schools. No doubt, by the system of free places, and increased scholarships, greater opportunities have in recent times been afforded to the children of New Zealand to get higher education, but there are still many who, if they desire a university education, must be prepared in primary schools, and to raise the standard might prevent students so prepared from entering as university students.

(3.) The third charge is that the B.A. degree standard is too low. Without doubt the B.A. degree is more easily obtained at Oxford and Cambridge than in New Zealand. I believe also it is more easily obtained in Dublin, judging by many B.As. from Dublin that I have met. That our standard is higher than that of Oxford and Cambridge has been admitted to me by Fellows of colleges in both those universities, who were cognizant of our requirements, and knew what was happening in their own universities. Our University does insist on some general culture of a higher standard than is required in both Oxford and Cambridge, and if our standard is compared

with the standards of the Australian universities it will be found that our standard is as high if not higher. The statement, therefore, that our standard is lower than that of old and well-established universities is entirely inaccurate and without foundation. I may add that the reports of English examiners show our students as a rule do well in their examinations.

(4.) The fourth complaint is that the choice of subjects for the B.A. degree is too large. It is strange if this is true that the professorial conference which met in Wellington in 1910 did not suggest an alteration of the scheme or a diminution of the subjects. They had the opportunity to do so and they made no recommendation in that direction. On the contrary, some of them were in favour of adding subjects to the present number. The number of subjects given is smaller than that in most universities. Cambridge, for example, has six subjects for the previous examinations, and it has eleven triposes, and each tripos has more than one subject. London has twenty-four subjects, Glasgow twenty-two, and Yale twenty-seven, and Sydney twenty-one, &c. It appears as if the pamphleteers were not cognizant of what is taking place nowadays in the leading universities. This matter is, however, under the consideration of the Senate, and, as I have already mentioned, certain questions regarding the B.A. and B.Sc. degrees have been referred to the Professorial Boards for their advice and opinion. The whole subject will be discussed at the ensuing meeting of the Senate in January. I should like the professors to point out the subjects that a student should be debarred from taking. There are altogether twenty subjects. They are the following: Latin, Greek, English, French, German, Hebrew, mental science, pure mathematics, applied mathematics, economics, history, physics, chemistry, botany, zoology, geology, domestic science, education, military science, physiology. It would be interesting to learn what subjects should be omitted from the list. I venture to assert that the majority of the professors would object to the omission of any one of them.

(5.) The fifth objection is one that has led to considerable discussion both in the University Senate and in the public Press, and that is the system of external examiners. I have already said that the New Zealand University is appointed specially by its statute and charter to grant degrees on examination, and the question is, who is to examine? Now, if I understand the contention of the Reform Association aright it is that the examinations should be conducted by the teachers. The members of the Reform Association have made inconsistent and conflicting statements as to who are to be appointed examiners. Some have suggested that the examiner must be the teacher alone. Others suggest that it should be the teacher coupled with some external examiner or examiners. Others suggest that the Professorial Boards should be the examiners. Let me deal with the first statement—that the teacher should alone be the examiner. In no British university of any standing is that the custom. As was pointed out by Professor Oman, at the examination at Oxford called "Greats," which is really the examination on which degrees are granted, the teacher is not the examiner, nor is the teacher the examiner at Cambridge. I was much struck on receiving the other day a letter from one of the leading men in Cambridge. He is the master of a college, and stands high as a teacher. As an excuse for not writing me earlier he stated that he had been in London regarding the appointment of an examiner for a certain subject, and he stated he had been happy to obtain one who was an official in the India Office. One has only to look at the lists of examiners in the university calendars of Oxford and Cambridge to see that the teacher is not allowed to pass his own pupils. Nor is it the rule in the Scotch universities. The Scotch professors when acting as examiners have associated with them one or more assessors who really do the main part of the examination-work. Many of the assessors are not university teachers. Again, according to the charter of the University of Wales no student can be passed for his degree save by the external examiner, and I notice that Dr. Giles, the well-known classical scholar at Cambridge, has been examiner in classics for the University of Wales for thirteen years. I may point out that the system of external examination is adopted by us in our primary and secondary schools. The Education Boards go to the expense of appointing Inspectors of Schools. For what purpose? Does the appointment of Inspectors show that they distrust the teachers, as the pamphleteers say the University does, because it does not appoint professors as examiners? Certainly not. But in every education system in the world there are inspectors of schools. The people have the right to know whether their system is efficient, and they are not called upon to rely upon each teacher's statement as a proof of his own efficiency. Then, we have examiners in New Zealand for our secondary schools appointed and paid by the Education Department. Further, the secondary-school governors always appoint external examiners to examine the secondary schools once a year. Why is all this expense incurred? Is it not to show that both the primary and secondary educations are efficient? Who is to examine the universities? Is their examination to be left to the teachers? If so, why not leave the examination of primary and secondary schools to the teachers of the primary and secondary schools? In my opinion they are just as able for their work and as conscientious in the discharge of their duties as the teachers in the University. It may be said, however, that external examiners are not objected to if the professors are associated with them in the work. Let me state what is the New Zealand system, because the pamphlet does not clearly declare it. To begin with, no student from the University can sit for any examination unless he has been examined and passed by his professors. What harm, then, can the external examiner do? There are only two things possible: either students are passed who ought not to be passed, or students are denied degrees who ought to get them. Will the professors say that either of these wrongs has been done? If degrees are conferred on students who ought not to get them, then the professors are to blame, for they should not give certificates that enable unqualified candidates to be examined. If degrees are refused to students who ought to get them, then it must be that the standard of the examiners is higher than the professors think it should be. But their complaint is that the standard at all events of the B.A. degree is too low. It cannot be said, therefore, that degrees are denied to students who ought to get them. There must, in my opinion, be external examiners such as are in existence

in Oxford and Cambridge, and in all the leading universities. So far as examiners outside of New Zealand are concerned, that is a mere passing phrase of university evolution. I hope the time may soon be when all our examiners will be resident in New Zealand, and that I know is the hope and aim of almost all the members of the University Senate. We have to go to England because we have not had sufficient competent examiners outside the University professors. Where we have had such in New Zealand their services have been obtained. In medicine, in most of the law examinations, in parts of engineering and accountancy, the examiners are New Zealand examiners, and no doubt as New Zealand increases its numbers of trained university men we shall have examiners in New Zealand, and we shall not require to employ able and leading educationists resident in the United Kingdom. I may point out that our Matriculation is not conducted by primary- or secondary-school teachers. If teachers ought to examine, this examination ought to be conducted by the primary- or secondary-school teachers, and not by the professors of the University who have not taught the candidates for Matriculation. Are the members of the Reform Association prepared to advocate that change? I do not think so. Further, some University professors are, I understand, often engaged in Junior and Senior Civil Service Examinations, and in some scholarship examinations. They are not the teachers. Why should they undertake these examinations? The authors of the pamphlet have been good enough to quote part of a speech I delivered in the House of Representatives in 1886 on examinations. There is nothing in that speech that I withdraw. I believe we ought not to have our eyes continually directed in education towards examinations. The training of the youth and his acquirement of knowledge is of more importance than the passing of an examination. I believe we have too many examinations in New Zealand. The Education Department is an examining body, and it ought not to be so. I believe one examination would be sufficient to determine who should matriculate or enter the Civil Service or obtain a National Scholarship. One examination ought to do for all, and this examination could and should be undertaken by the New Zealand University. I do not see, however, that any suggestion in this direction is made by those who are members of the Reform Association. I should try, if I had the power, to limit examinations as much as possible, but I recognize what the statute and charter of the University of New Zealand recognize, that if degrees are to be granted at all they must be granted on examination. There is no other way of ascertaining whether a student who has attended the University is fitted to receive the hall mark of a degree. No doubt work must count as well as paper examinations. The New Zealand University provides for that, and they allow the teacher to decide whether the student has done and can do what is termed "laboratory work." They do not ask for any external examiner to determine that question. That is left for the teacher alone. As for the assertion that the position of a professor or teacher is belittled by the system of having external examiners, it is pure nonsense. No teacher at Oxford or Cambridge has ever felt belittled because he was not the examiner appointed by the university to examine his own pupils. Again, how are scholarships to be awarded if not by examiners? and would it be wise to leave the selection of scholars to the professors? The remarks of Professor Oman as to what he found in England, are, I think the best reply (see pages 158 and 159 of the pamphlet). To sum up this question, if there are to be no external examiners, then there ought to be no Inspectors of Schools, and the Matriculation and the scholarships and the Junior Civil Service Examinations ought not to be conducted by examiners who are not the teachers of the candidates who sit as such examinations. I may make one further statement, and that is that yearly the various English examiners send to the University confidential reports on what they have found in their examinations. These are, in my opinion, most valuable. Copies of them are sent to the various professors, and by perusing them the University is able to ascertain how our New Zealand student is doing, and the adaptability of our standards or schemes compared with the standards and schemes of study in the home universities In this way our University is kept in touch with the development of the higher learning in the United Kingdom; and though the time will no doubt soon come when we shall be able to dispense with examiners resident in Europe, this dispensation will not be without some loss to our university system.

(6.) The sixth question is the subject of research. It cannot be expected that in the small and poorly endowed colleges of New Zealand we can emulate the great laboratories of European universities. It may take a century before we can have a laboratory like the Cavendish Laboratory in Cambridge. I have heard New Zealand professors educated in Cambridge saying that for a student of science to go to Oxford would be to waste his time. It appears, therefore, that New Zealand is not alone in its want of equipment for scientific teaching. We have in New Zealand been able to provide for considerable research-work, and much of our research-work has been done by men who were not university students or graduates. The late Mr. Skey, the Government Analyst, did very valuable work, and I do not know if any of the professors of chemistry have excelled him in the research-work that he accomplished. Of that, however, I am not competent to speak. One scientific man told me some years ago that Mr. Skey's work was exceedingly valuable. The University has made provision for research-work in its schemes of study. It has also provided for a yearly travelling medical scholarship so as to encourage research in medical work. There are also four scholarships given every year by the Government for research-work, and our laboratories, considering our means and surroundings, are exceedingly well equipped. Indeed, they are all better equipped than was the laboratory which Lord Kelvin had for many years in Glasgow University, and he did his work without finding fault with his tools. There are, however, in research-work, as in other things, many dangers. It may happen that some professors may think more of acquiring "facts," as they are termed, than of teaching their students and setting before them high ideals. Grave dangers have arisen in one university where the mode of teaching has been left to professors. I am not making this statement without foundation. I suppose that the reformers have been paying attention to what is passing in other universities with regard to reform. I presume that they are aware of the discussion that has taken place

during this year in Paris regarding research-work at the Sorbonne. May I quote an article written by a Frenchman which appeared a short time ago in the *Morning Post*, in London? It is headed "Schools and Scholars: The Campaign against the Sorbonne." The article is long, but I think it is well worth perusal when the questions of research, and of the government of our University by professors, are under consideration. The book referred to in the article I hope to have perhaps in a month or so, and if the Committee is then sitting I shall hand it to them. It is entitled, as will be seen from the extract, "L'Esprit de la Nouvelle Sorbonne." The article is as follows: "The last few months have seen the opening of a strong campaign against the new methods of teaching adopted by the Sorbonne. It was started by a few remarkable articles signed 'Agathon' in the French weekly *L'Opinion*, and backed up by a large number of prominent men, such as M. Boutroux, the well-known philosopher, not to mention a score of younger scholars, who felt rather keenly about the matter, and who fell for once into line with the most conservative papers, such as *Le Temps* or *Les Débats*. On the other hand, all the pontifices maximi of the Paris University—MM. Lavisse, Aulard, Croiset, Lanson, and others—thought it necessary to take the field in order to defend what they call Science (with a capital S), and yelled louder than did poor Polyphemus after Ulysses punched his eye. Such a Sorbonic war has never indeed been waged since the days of Rabelais. English people who will read 'L'Esprit de la Nouvelle Sorbonne,' by 'Agathon,' which has just come out, will never regret their two shillings and eightpence. They will find, to their delight, that the Sorbonne is suffering nowadays from an evil which is by no means unknown in Oxford and Cambridge—I mean from over-Germanization. To illustrate that interesting piece of news, it will be perhaps allowed to the present writer, who can boast of being a victim of the new methods, to quote some of his personal recollections. When I entered the École Normale, ten or twelve years ago, as a student of history, the first thing I was given to understand was that I ought to give up thinking. Up to that time there had been great historians, such as Fustel, or Coulanges, or Guirand, who had made the foreign students believe that French teaching was remarkable by its power of generalization, as well as by its accurateness. But German science (I beg your pardon, Science) has come in, and I remember vividly how, on the very first day, our eminent professor spent one hour and a half commenting on one line of the 'Vita Caroli of Eghinardus.' The burning problem he tried to solve was whether Emperor Charles had married his fifth wife in May or September. Eghinardus stood for September, but after carefully looking through the babylike chronicle written by the Monks of Metz we were led to believe he had married the woman as early as May; while another huge quarto, named 'Annales Laurissenses,' seemed to assert that he had not married her at all. Of course, we came to no conclusion. I confess I ran away and never came back. Now, what was only beginning ten years ago is to-day a triumphant epidemic in all the departments of the Sorbonne. Of course, History is the most hopelessly sick of all. M. Seignobos, the most influential of all the professors of history, is largely responsible for it. The change of methods he advocated was in more than one respect a good one. Under the old *régime* rhetorical exercises too often took the place of the study of facts. While the Germans were suffering from overspecialization, we had to contend in France against an elegant shallowness of mind. M. Seignobos was right in trying to react against this, and there is no doubt that foreign students would not stream to the Sorbonne as they have done in recent years if they did not feel that some good work was being done under the new roofs of the old university. But under the influence of MM. Seignobos and Aulard all the students in history are now going to the other extreme. They are taught by a little book called 'Introduction aux Études historiques'; that history is a branch of physics; that the only important part of historical work consists in gathering and picking documents as physicists deal with facts; that they must beware of taking any interest in the political side of history. A student's room in the Sorbonne is no more called a 'study'—a term which sounds unscientific—it is pompously decorated with the name of 'historical laboratory.' The poor devils who enter such a laboratory in the hope of being converted into scientists have to spend their whole time in gathering thousands of files on Charles the Great's wedding, or simply on the bibliography of the subject: they call it *La mise en fiches*. And the only work that requires brains consists in sewing those slips together without much discrimination, as if they were playing cards. The same scientific mania has invaded the teaching of philosophy. Of course, there are still in France philosophers who think. You would have only to cross from the Sorbonne to the College de France to hear the man whom William James deemed the greatest thinker of the time —M. Henri Bergson. In the Sorbonne itself will be found several distinguished professors (M. George Dumas, for instance) who are not afraid of drawing general conclusions from their psychological researches. But the philosophical Sorbonne has an evil genius in the person of M. Durckheim, who claims to have invented a new science called sociology, and wants to 'sociologize' every department of human thought, be it ethics, æsthetics, or religion. M. Durckheim, who is perhaps the most powerful of all the professors in the Sorbonne, holds the view that a sense of life, not to speak of a sense of humour, is utterly damnable in a scientist. The result is that most students are compelled under his direction to study ethics among the wild tribes of Australia or Central Africa (of course, by reading books travelling would mean a plunge into life): they are sometimes allowed to read the history of philosophy, but must carefully refrain from expressing, nay, from having, a single personal idea. Before all they are taught that it is highly unscientific to speculate about the moral problems of the present time, as it will require at least two or three hundred years of sociological work before M. Durckheim's school will be in a position to draw a conclusion concerning modern ethics. The most absurd and at the same time the most enjoyable results of the new methods are to be found in the literary field. Ten years ago the Sorbonne was renowned throughout the world for the refined taste its professors and students were displaying in the study of literary masterpieces, for its keen appreciation of Greek and Latin authors, its reverence for that marvel of logical precision, the French language—in one word,

for the traditions of high culture it had inherited from the humanists of the sixteenth century. Everything has been changed in that respect since M. Lanson and others decided that German philology was to be the model. Fine feeling is to be replaced by knowledge, which means that literary criticism has to give way to comment on grammatical questions and concourses. M. Lanson himself showed the way by publishing a scientific edition of Voltaire's philosophical letters, in which for each word Voltaire wrote there is a full page of comment giving all the certain, probable, and possible courses (books, men, newspapers, &c.) from which the poor great writer is supposed to have drawn the word in question. A well-known professor of literature spent recently a whole hour in discussing a verse of Leconte de Lisle in which the poet said, according to one edition, that the lion's belly is white, and according to another one that it is yellow. Of course, the candidates to the literary degrees have to follow these scientific examples. The former literary essay has been replaced at the licence (which corresponds to M.A.) by a so-called composition on a text. A candidate to the licence degree is asked to write an essay on the verb or the adjective in such-and-such a page of Montaigne; 'on the subjunctive in Heine's following verse,' &c. If he wants to attain the highest degree, the aggregation, he has to prove that he is a worthy scientific workman, and to give himself for a whole year to the exciting study of philological subjects, such as 'Put the right date on ten of Voltaire's letters'; 'Find out in what cases, in Plautus and Terentius, the substantives ending in *-um* elide themselves when followed by a dissyllabic beginning with a vowel, and in what cases they don't.' A well-meaning candidate wrote last year a long essay on 'The Ablative in Apuleius' Metamorphoses.' It is impossible not to be reminded of the famous Sorbonic subject Rabelais was laughing at: 'Utrum Chimaera bombinans in vacuo possit comedere secundas intentiones.' The painful side of all this fun is that French culture is seriously threatened by that intellectual invasion of silly Germanism. The very love of literary beauty which was at the bottom of the best works France has produced would surely be extinguished in the long-run if the elite of French youth were submitted much longer to the so-called scientific training. There are already many signs that both originality of mind and purity of language are declining among the very best students. Many Sorbonne professors complain themselves that the examination essays are badly written, and that the literary standard is distinctly lower in the university than it used to be ten years ago. A characteristic letter was written in December last by a business man, M. Guillain, President of the French Ironworks Committee, in which it was stated the general disfavour exhibited towards humanism not only in the Sorbonne, but in the secondary schools, since 1902 has had a distinctly bad effect on the young engineers themselves. The reason of this fact is obvious. The general literary culture which used to be in honour before the Sorbonne became partly Germanized was not only helpful to the future university professors; it gave to every intelligent Frenchman, whether he was to be a writer, a statesman, or an engineer, a clearness and a precision of mind which the Germans have always been wanting, and which will never result from the mere mechanical training called philology, sociology, or historial 'heuristic.' Fortunately, a healthy reaction is already beginning to set in. There is one thing you cannot do to a Frenchman, if he does not happen to be hopelessly stupid, and that is to abolish his sense of humour. Something, of course, had to be done in order to kill that sort of dilettantism which indulges in a display of shallow words and to which the old French system was often leading. Let us have scientific scholars in France as well as in England, provided that they do not take themselves too seriously. But there is no necessity for giving up that part of French teaching which is still represented by philosophers like Henri Bergson, or even by scholars like Joseph Bedier, who try to preserve the old traditions of keen literary feeling and powerful thinking which made French civilization. Now that the war has begun, it will be continued till the fine old tradition is triumphantly vindicated. This is not the first time that pedantry has tried to invade France. Old Rabelais taught us long ago how to fight it. And then the present struggle is beneficial in one way at least, as it makes the Sorbonne the liveliest place in the intellectual world, while every average university shows an untoward inclination to academic sleep."

I believe that no university is performing its functions if it does not provide for research-work, but, considering the age of our University, and the means at the disposal of the University Colleges for research purposes, it is amazing to me that so much research-work has been done. The desire for research is yearly increasing, and that without the adventitious aids of the pamphleteers. Let it not be forgotten, however, that to turn out a student capable of research-work in any one subject would not necessarily be sending forth an educated man. An educated man ought to know something of what are termed "the humanities."

(7.) The seventh ground of complaint is the inefficiency of the libraries. There is no doubt that the libraries connected with the colleges are not large, but it has to be remembered that in every town where there is a college there are other libraries that are open to the students. In Auckland there is a very fine public library. In Dunedin there are two public libraries—one the Free Public Library and the other the Athenæum and Mechanics' Institute Library. In Christchurch there is a public library, and in Wellington the General Assembly Library can always be made use of by students with the leave of the Library Committee, and the Library Committee has been exceedingly generous in allowing students the use of books. There is also a very valuable scientific library belonging to the New Zealand Institute, and an excellent reference library in the Free Public Library. In my opinion New-Zealanders have better opportunities of obtaining books than had their fathers who attended some of the universities in Europe. The fact is that a student who has to study the subjects of his course has not much time for reading many books. Books of reference are, no doubt, necessary for those engaged in research-work, but I do not think it is necessary to have all the past numbers of scientific publications to enable the scientific student to pursue research. When new discoveries or inventions are made they are soon embodied in books, and the scientific journals become therefore of less importance because the main results of

research appear in the text-books. Students who desire to see law-books can get admission to the Supreme Court libraries in the four centres. On the whole, the students of New Zealand have not much to complain of as regards libraries. The libraries are, in my opinion, fairly sufficient for the ordinary student, and the extraordinary or research student can, no doubt, get all the books that are necessary to carry on research-work here. There is some research-work that, of course, cannot be carried on without the aid of libraries like those of the British Museum, the Bodleian, the National Library in Paris, &c., but we cannot hope to have libraries like these for centuries to come. Our libraries are yearly being added to, and when more funds for higher education are available the libraries will, no doubt, be improved.

(8.) The eighth ground of complaint is the holding of classes in the evening. In my opinion, the system of evening classes must be continued if the number of our students who are to study in the university is not to be reduced by perhaps one-half. I do not understand why it should be more difficult for the professors to teach, or for the students to learn, in the evening than in the daytime. One advantage lecturing in the evening has is that the professor has the daytime to study and prepare his lectures, and this is surely the most laborious part of his duty. If evening classes are not kept up it will be unnecessary to have as many professors as we have now, for if the students are reduced by one-half we surely shall not require the same number of professors. In my opinion a great blow would be struck at university progress and university education if the suggestion in the pamphlet as to the stopping of evening classes is adopted. I do not quite understand the attitude taken up by the "reformers" on this matter. Apparently there are to be evening classes, but there are not to be University evening classes? If the subjects to be taught are subjects at the University standard, why should they not be taught by University professors? If the subjects are not of that class the students will not go to the University. They will get the tuition they desire either at night-schools which teach primary subjects or primary and some secondary subjects, or at technical schools.

(9.) The ninth cause of complaint is the system of external students. This system was borrowed from the London University system, and the ideal of the London University was, under the circumstances, a great one, and did great service to England. The object of the London University was to grant degrees to all those who could by examination prove that they were qualified to obtain them. The London University asked not where the person was taught. It wished to know by examination what he could do, and on the examination they granted degrees. In New Zealand, with a scattered population, and with many people without means to attend universities, we must, if we desire to have higher education disseminated in New Zealand, allow the system of external students to continue for many years to come, if we ever give it up. It is the only way that poor students in what are termed the backblocks, or in places other than the four centres of population, can obtain University distinction. It would be better if these students could attend the University lectures. Who can value the influence of the living voice and the personal magnetism of a teacher? It is a great loss that they cannot attend lectures. But that is no reason why they should be denied University distinction if they can prove by examination that they have acquired knowledge equal to what the students who attend classes have acquired. It has to be remembered that none of these external students can sit for examination under the New Zealand University unless they have been passed by professors at an examination held by professors. There is not, therefore, I think, much risk of uneducated persons getting a degree in the New Zealand University. I desire to recall an incident that occurred to me at the Melbourne Exhibition in 1888. One of the most interesting Courts of the Exhibition was the French Education Court. I saw there specimen class-rooms fitted up, the books used in the schools, the exercise-books of primary- and secondary-school pupils, and the school furniture, &c. Everything, in fact, was displayed that would give one an idea of what the French education system was. The thing, however, that pleased me most, and that was most interesting to me, was a small square box, perhaps 18 in. each way, containing a selection of books. The box was opened and shown to me. I noticed that it had a Latin Dictionary, a Latin Grammar, and two or three Latin books. It also had some books on mathematics and books on other subjects, and on asking the director who was in charge of the court what the box was he told me that if any student who was unable to attend a college or a lyseum wrote to the Education Department, stating his desire for university education, and produced testimonials as to his character and fitness for study, the Department would send him on loan a box of books necessary for university study, like the one exhibited. The Department would communicate with him from time to time and advise him in his studies, and the director said that there were hundreds who were obtaining university education in this way in France. We have not been as liberal as the French Education Department in helping our students in the backblocks. If we abolish the external-student system I am afraid we shall do a great injury to many of the youth in our Dominion and discourage their pursuit of knowledge. It would be well for New Zealand if we could see part of the time our young people spend in sports devoted to mental culture.

I have now dealt with the main charges brought by the reformers against our New Zealand University system. There are many statements in the pamphlet that I could reply to, and combat; but I think it unnecessary to do so. I feel that I have unduly trespassed on your time. Let me say that in viewing our university system there is one test that may be applied: that is what is called the "pragmatic" test. We can best appreciate the value of an educational institution when we understand what it has done, and what has been its effect on its students. How stand our University students to-day? They have been successful in New Zealand. Have they been able to hold their own in the intellectual battlefields of the world? What has been the fate of New Zealand University students who have gone to the universities of Europe and competed with the best-trained men that are to be found in those institutions? The answer must be that our students are not second to any students. If you take the Rhodes Scholars it will be found that on the whole

they have done better than the students from the United States of America. They have done on the whole better, I think, than the students from Australia, and they have been able to do as well as the students that have come from Scotch universities to Oxford, or from German universities to Oxford, or from public schools in England to Oxford. Then, again, consider the number of our students who are holding eminent positions all over the world—in India, Africa, America, England, Australia, and elsewhere. We need not feel ashamed of our University when we consider the position that its *alumni* have taken in the intense social struggle that is waged in older communities; and, notwithstanding our distance from the intellectual centres of the world, and the disadvantages of our intellectual solitariness, we have attracted to our shores many eminent professors, and our most eminent men have not attempted to belittle our educational institutions. One thing I may add: I do not say, and have never said, that there is no room for reform in our educational institutions. The Senate of the University is yearly discussing its statutes and regulations, and is never antagonistic to change. It does not think the last word has been said about university education anywhere. There are many improvements that I could suggest, and many improvements that I have suggested that have not been given effect to. Some things I think we can take credit for. In our university system our colleges have been free. There is a freedom in University teaching. No college has ever ventured to interfere with the teaching of its professors. This cannot be said of university colleges in England, in America, or in Germany. Further, the government of our University institutions is more democratic than those in England, and even more democratic than those in America, for in America the President is the officer who rules, backed, no doubt, by trustees who are not professors, but who are what the pamphleteers would call "lay" persons. I should like to see the professors better paid and their tenure improved, and I think it is a clamant necessity that a pension system in connection with all professors and teachers and officers of our University and colleges should be established. I hope the time may come when the tuition in our universities will be free, but this, I am afraid, is not the place or the time to point out the many things that are requisite for the improvement of our University system. I mention my position because some people may assume that if the suggestions of the Reform Association are not accepted no reform is necessary, and that all reform is opposed. That is not my attitude, nor is it the attitude of the University Senate. I conclude by saying that I regret and reprobate the mode in which many of the members of the Reform Association have attempted to enforce their views, for I feel they have by their action done great harm to university education in our midst. They have diverted the attention of the people from real advancement to schemes that would not be beneficial to our higher education.

FRIDAY, 29TH SEPTEMBER, 1911.

CHARLES WILSON, General Assembly Librarian and Chairman of the Council of Victoria College, examined. (No. 18.)

1. *The Chairman.*] You wish to address the Committee on the subject of this petition?—I desire to make a few remarks upon the petition which your Committee has at present under consideration. I occupy the position of chairman of the Victoria College Council, of which body I have been a member continuously since its incorporation. In earlier life, I may add, I was a teacher in a Wellington State School, and afterwards was an assistant master for three years at the Wanganui Collegiate School. It would take up too much of your time were I to discuss in detail the various statements made by the editors of the pamphlet entitled "University Reform in New Zealand." Some of those statements are, I am sorry to say, in my opinion, in very questionable taste; others are lamentably inaccurate. This is all the more regrettable inasmuch as it is specially from such gentlemen as have been responsible for issuing the pamphlet that those interested in the progress of education in New Zealand have a right to expect useful light and leading. There are, however, certain points set forth in the pamphlet issued by the petitioners to which I feel it my duty to draw your attention. For instance, I cannot agree with the statement made on page 13 that the New Zealand system "entirely excludes the teacher from conducting the degree examination," for no student can present himself for a degree unless he has previously passed a term examination by his professors. The professors have thus an all-important "first say" in the matter. No British university, I believe I am correct in stating, confers degrees on the recommendations alone of the professors who are actually the teachers of candidates, unless in the special case of research degrees. I would like to point out that in the circular of inquiry addressed to outside professors and authorities on university education, and signed by Mr. A. L. Herdman, M.P., president of the University Reform Association, and by Professor Hunter, hon. secretary of that association (se pages 114 and 115 of the pamphlet), it is stated that the Senate—which, by the way, is inaccurately styled a "preponderating lay body"—awards degrees on the results of examinations conducted by examiners appointed in Great Britain, and that, except in the case of medicine, the teachers are not consulted as to the students to whom degrees are to be granted. Herein is surely an instance of *suppressio veri suggestio falsi*, for, as I have said, the examination of students is not entirely external, and is primarily dependent upon professorial opinion. Is it not possible that, had some of the gentlemen whose opinions have been sought been aware of all instead of only some of the facts, the replies might have been different? This, to me, seems a very reasonable hypothesis. College libraries: Several pages of the pamphlet are devoted to the subject of college libraries. It is, I think, a matter of regret that the editors of the pamphlet, when making comparisons, have not paid greater attention to differing conditions. A comparison is made, for instance, between Victoria College and the Adelaide University. The

latter, which (I quote the pamphlet) serves a population of 400,000, has a library of 24,000 volumes. That of Victoria College, which, so it is stated, "serves" the same number of people, has only 7,250 volumes. But Victoria College has only been in existence some fourteen years—its library only twelve years—whereas the Australian institution must be close on three times that age. With an annual grant of £650 per annum, Adelaide adds an annual average of 650 volumes; Victoria College is set down as enjoying an annual grant of £250, and its annual average is 520 volumes. These figures hardly bear out the contention that the New Zealand college libraries are starved. Great stress is laid, and very properly, upon the scanty supply in the college libraries of back numbers of scientific periodicals. The pamphlet states that "little or no attempt has been made" to obtain these publications. In the case of the Victoria College library, however, I would point out that, if there has been any such remissness, the blame must lie with the members of the Professorial Boards. I desire to place it on record—and I am here speaking as one who for some years occupied the position of chairman of the College Library Committee—that not one single order for books or periodicals has been sent away without such order having been selected by the various professors interested. Seeing that the Councils are charged with the neglect of the libraries, I would like to point out that the Victoria College Council cannot possibly, from its extremely limited resources, afford to spend more at present than £150 to £200 a year on the library. To comply with all the library requests of the professors is simply a matter of impossibility. Some time ago, when formulating requests for library extension, one professor alone at the Victoria College estimated the sum necessary to make the library a really efficient aid to the teaching of his subject at £900. At a conference of the Library Committee, the Council, and representatives of the Professorial Board, another professor stated that the back numbers of French and German periodicals required for the purpose of his Chair would cost some £350. The number of this professor's students was a little over twenty, and in answer to a question as to their linguistic abilities the professorial answer was that one student was a good German scholar and another had a fair working knowledge of French! Whilst not in the least underrating the value of college libraries, it seems to me to be only right to point out that the financial resources of the New Zealand colleges do not permit at present of any extensive additions to the stock of books and periodicals. Also, it is a debatable question whether we can hope, in a new country such as this, to do the same research-work which is done in countries where the universities are richly endowed by private generosity and are thus enabled to maintain libraries of a necessarily expensive character. So far as the Victoria College is concerned, the welfare of the library has ever been one of the chief considerations of the Council. That this is so is proved by the relatively high position—considering the age of the institution—of its library. To establish this fact I need only refer members of the Committee to the table on page 92 of the pamphlet. Day *versus* evening tuition: I trust that neither your Committee nor any Royal Commission which may be appointed, nor the supreme authority, the Parliament of this country, will ever countenance—so far at least as Victoria College is concerned—what is apparently the proposal of the petitioners made in page 15 of the pamphlet, that evening lectures should be discontinued or their scope and value in any way diminished. Such a proposition seems to me at least entirely opposed to those broad principles of democracy upon which the State system of education in this country is, or is presumed to be, based. It is owing to our system of evening lectures that we have in Wellington such an exceptionally large number of young men and young women attending, at much personal sacrifice, to university study. To abolish the evening course of tuition, or to serve out—if I may use the expression—"a lower quality of tuition" (by inferior-grade lectures in lieu of more highly qualified professors) to the students who can only attend in the evening, and thus create, as it were, a day-student aristocracy, would be most objectionable. Such a fantastic suggestion will, I trust, receive a very short shrift should it ever reach Parliament. The Boards and the Councils: It is apparently the desire of the petitioners that the selection and the appointment of the professors and lecturers should rest almost entirely with the Professorial Boards. On page 87 I find the following somewhat remarkable passage: "There is a great danger that the value of a member of a college staff, actual or prospective, may be judged in terms of his capacity for getting students through the necessary examinations rather than his capacity or enthusiasm for his subject. Under such conditions laymen may be pardoned if they do not fully appreciate the vital importance of good appointments." It is probable that mistakes have been made by the "lay" Councils in the appointment of professors and lecturers. In one case I believe a professor has made such gross errors in spelling when writing on his blackboard as to arouse the scarcely concealed derision of his students. On the other hand, surely it is unfair and indeed futile to seek to belittle the popular estimation of examination lists and to underrate the value of practical teaching ability in such a way as I have referred to. So long as examinations are the test provided for entrance to the learned professions, it appears to me to be childish to be for ever girding at examinations. On page 12 of the pamphlet I see it is stated that "there is evidence that successful coaching has been regarded as demonstration of fitness to occupy a Chair." That may be so; indeed, in the case of a comparatively recent appointment at one college, it certainly was so. And with what result? A purely academical and entirely non-practical teacher, or professor, retired, being replaced by a gentleman whose qualifications as a coach are well known all over the Dominion. When the change took place the number of pupils in that particular class had fallen to about twenty. Within less than a year the number had nearly quadrupled. After all, the students themselves are no mean judges of professorial ability, even if it be the much-despised coaching character. Final remarks: There are many other points in the pamphlet supporting the petitioner's request to which I would fain refer, but time will not allow. Whilst differing from certain of the arguments set forth in the pamphlet issued by the petitioners, I would express the opinion that in gathering together such a mass of information on the question at issue they have done a good useful service to the State, and this should, I think, be widely and cheerfully recognized

by those who may not see eye to eye with the editors on each and every point dealt with. I desire to state, in conclusion, that I support generally the prayer of the petitioners that a Royal Commission should be appointed, but the order of reference should include an inquiry into the secondary education system of the Dominion, upon the extent and efficiency of which the best results from university education must infallibly be so largely dependent. I support the petition in the full belief that it will be found by any impartial Commission which may be set up that the "lay" element in the governance and control of the various university colleges cannot be dispensed to such an extent as the petitioners seemingly think should be the case, without a very serious injury being done to democratic principles and interests. That in matters of the syllabus, in matters strictly appertaining to the instruction given, the control should be almost wholly in the hands of the Professorial Boards, I cheerfully admit. To agree, however, to the theory apparently laid down in the pamphlet, that the academic element should have equal power with the lay element in matters of finance and general administration, is quite another question. A Royal Commission properly constituted, composed of persons having due experience of the chief matters to be dealt with, cannot, I think, fail to achieve much good results. It will gather much valuable information, its very appointment will stimulate public interest in university education; it may—I hope it will—remove some real or imaginary grievances; and its report, when presented to the Houses of Parliament, may, and I trust will, result in a general amendment and permanent improvement of the University and secondary education systems of the Dominion.

2. *Mr. Herdman.*] You agree generally with the prayer of the petition, that a Royal Commission should be appointed?—Yes.

3. First of all, in reading from the circular sent out signed by Professor Hunter and myself, you complain about the *suppressio veri* and *suggestio falsi*. You quoted part of the sentence; why did you not finish it—"Except in the case of medicine, the teachers are not consulted as to the students to whom degrees are to be granted"?—"Although by regulations for 'keeping terms' the Professorial Boards have the power to exclude students from sitting for the degree examinations." It is not for me to declare what that means.

4. The point I make is this: that you make a very damaging statement—you say we are suppressing the truth and suggesting something that is untrue?—That is my opinion.

5. Why do you quote from the pamphlet a portion of a sentence and not the whole of it?—I do not think it affects my argument at all.

6. Do you think it is fair or honest to quote part of a sentence and suggest that we are suppressing the truth?—I do not think it is an honest way of putting it.

7. Are we to judge the whole of your evidence from that standard?—My object is perfectly clear, that it conveyed an entirely misleading impression.

8. *The Chairman.*] Do you mean that the whole clause creates a misleading impression?—Yes, I do.

9. *Mr. Herdman.*] Is that statement misleading?—Yes, because it conveys the impression that the professors have really no say in the matter of examinations.

10. Do the professors take any part in the examinations upon which the granting of a degree is conferred upon the student?—No, they do not, because it is impossible for them to do so. The student could not go up for examination unless he passed the degree examination.

11. Who conducts the examination upon which the degree depends?—On the arts side the examiner, I know, is in England, but as regards the science side the student could not proceed to the examination unless the professor was satisfied that he had made sufficient progress.

12. Is it not the case that the statement contained in the pamphlet is perfectly accurate?—No.

13. In what way is it inaccurate?—In the way that it conveys a false impression.

14. In what way?—That the teachers are not consulted.

15. Can you give me any case where the professor is consulted?—It seems to me, and I say it with due respect, that you are quibbling over the matter.

16. I want to know from you in what respect that statement contained in the letter is inaccurate?—I say it conveys the impression to the outside mind that the professors have no say in the examination of the students.

17. Would it convey such an impression to Professor Maclaurin?—I cannot penetrate Professor Maclaurin's mind.

18. The professor's examination simply excludes a man going up for his degree?—Surely that affects the man going up for his degree.

19. Is it not stated there?—No. It is the first part that misleads. Any one who reads that will get that impression.

20. You declare that the authors of this pamphlet have asserted that evening teaching should be discontinued: will you point out any part of the pamphlet which says that?—I say that is the only conclusion I can draw from the whole paragraph on evening work and alluded to indirectly in other parts of the pamphlet.

21. Have you read the whole of the pamphlet?—No.

22. On page 41 you see that evening classes are approved of?—On page 15 it says, "If the only education provided for a degree—it cannot be called a university education—is evening lectures extending over three years," &c. There is a deliberate belittlement of evening tuition.

23. On page 41 it says, "The misconception with regard to evening studies is even graver in its evil results. Here again the English idea is a splendid one: to place at the disposal of men and women engaged in professional pursuits or as artisans opportunities of being taught by first-rate teachers, and of winning a place in university distinction, and the advantages degrees can give, equal to those of any more leisured class. The idea is splendid, and has led to splendid results, stimulating very large numbers of self-sacrificing patience in the labour of self-improve-

ment"?—Yes; if you go on to the next paragraph, having granted that evening graduates have producer excellent results, you will see that the tenor of it is in favour of the supposition that evening instruction in New Zealand will not give the same results as at Home.

24. As a practical man you will agree that young men who are employed during the day cannot be expected to attain university proficiency in the same time as others who are not so engaged?—No.

25. Is not that what the professors point out?—I do not know. I think the inference to be drawn is that the professors are opposed to it.

26. Do they not suggest that the men who have not the time should have the opportunity of studying at night and that those who have the time should study during the day?—I do not think that would work in Victoria College. We have not been able to analyse the number of students who could come in the day or night, but I think quite three-fourths of our students would not be able to attend the day classes.

27. You are not satisfied with the finance at Victoria College?—No, I think it is horrible. If we go on as we are now, I think at the end of next year or the year after we shall have to cry a halt altogether, financially. One endowment returns us £75 a year.

28. *The Chairman.*] Have you thought of how the Commission should be constituted?—No, not in the least.

29. Do you consider that the qualifications of the Commission should be such as would enable them to inquire thoroughly not only into university reform, but also into our primary and secondary system of education?—They are interdependent to a large extent.

30. I mean the whole education system from top to bottom?—I have had very little experience in connection with primary education. I merely say secondary education at present. I think everything depends upon the constitution of the Commission.

31. *Mr. Allen.*] Why does not Victoria College add to its financial stability by putting its fees on the same basis as the other colleges?—We are bound by statute and cannot do it.

32. What statute?—The statute under which we exist.

33. Is there anything in that limiting the fees?—I was told by the Registrar last night that that was so. It is governed by the same Act.

34. *Mr. Hogben.*] The statute says that the fees shall be approved by the Governor, but the matter of increase has never been approved?—The question has come up several times, and twice I voted for an increase in the fees. It is the evening classes I am particular about.

35. *Mr. Allen.*] Do you not think it is rather hard on the students who can attend during the day who are at present prevented from getting that advantage?—No, I think it is better for the community to have the night scholars. If we raise the education of the artisan class the better it will be for the community. We cannot have an Oxford or Cambridge here—I wish we could.

Sir ROBERT STOUT, K.C.M.G., Chancellor of the New Zealand University, examined. (No. 19.)

1. *Mr. Herdman.*] May I ask you, Sir Robert, how long you have been Chancellor of the New Zealand University?—About eight years. I have belonged to the University Senate over twenty-five years.

2. How often does the University Senate meet?—Twice a year. It has its special meeting generally in April, and the general meeting at the end of January.

3. The special meeting will be a short meeting?—Generally, it lasts a day and a half. It only deals with the results; it has no power to deal with general matters unless these are left to it by the general meeting.

4. I take it, from the statement you have submitted to the Committee, that you are of opinion that there is no need for a Royal Commission to inquire into matters affecting the University?—I do not think there is. I do not know where you would get better men than those on the present Senate to put on a Royal Commission in New Zealand.

5. You have no reason to think there is a necessity for a reconstitution of the College Council?—Every College Council is a separate organization. I do not say I approve of the present mode of electing its members. There might be an improvement made, but I do not think it needs a Royal Commission to decide that. The Otago University Council is constituted quite differently to the Auckland Council; in fact, there are four different forms of Councils for the four colleges.

6. Do you think there should be uniformity?—I do not think so. The present system has worked very well.

7. Your opinion is that the constitution of the University and the colleges is satisfactory?—Yes. I do not mean to say that I could not suggest alterations, and I did so when the constitution of the College Councils was put before Parliament; but I do not suppose you would be able to get any number of educationalists to agree as to what form the elections should take.

8. Comparing our University and College Councils with modern universities, do you think they are up to date?—I think they are better than many universities in England and Wales, for instance. I think the University of Wales has over a hundred representatives on its Councils.

9. Has the Council of the University of Wales anything to do with the academic side of the university?—Certainly, they are the legislators. They have to carry out just the same matters as the New Zealand University Senate deals with.

10. Are you satisfied that the financial position of the College Councils in New Zealand is satisfactory?—I do not say that. We could do with more money, no doubt, but we are going on very well.

11. That is not the case with Victoria College?—We are pressed, no doubt, but the Council would get on better if it increased the fees to the rates charged in other colleges.

12. Do you think that should be done?—No. I have always advocated that the colleges should be free, but we cannot get all that we would like.

13. Is not that an important question?—Yes, but we cannot afford that in the present state of the finances.

14. Do you not think it is of sufficient importance to submit to a Royal Commission?—I do not think a Commission could tell you more than members of Parliament already know. We are spending very large sums of money on education now—not perhaps more than they are in some places; but some universities are spending a great deal less than we are.

15. Are you quite satisfied, then, with the present financial position?—I should like, if Parliament could afford it, to get a little more assistance. I know very well they have given assistance from time to time, but I should like to have permanent endowments given, so that we should not be dependent on Parliament.

16. Would it not be wise to have a Royal Commission to inquire into that?—It need not take Parliament five minutes to determine that question.

17. Do you think Parliament is more qualified than a Commission to deal with such matters?—I do not think a Royal Commission is needed. The Council has told the Minister what is wanted, but he cannot do all that we would like.

18. We take it, then, that you consider there is no need for a Commission to investigate the finance and constitution of the University and its colleges?—No, I think members of Parliament are quite able to investigate their position. We have had two statutes during the last twenty years dealing with the constitution of Canterbury College and Victoria College. I made proposals in a Bill I introduced.

19. You know that in the case of the London University these matters were referred to a Commission?—You must understand that the London University is in a very different position to us. It was not formerly a teaching body, and it has a large number of colleges attached to it. It is now starting a new career, and it is an enormous institution. It has between eight hundred and nine hundred accredited teachers.

20. Can you suggest any way in which the financial position of the colleges can be placed on a better footing, or suggest any scheme of improvement in the organization not only of the colleges but the University Senate?—With regard to finance, that depends upon the amount of money in the Treasury chest.

21. Can you suggest anything yourself?—Parliament might give us permanent endowments. That matter has been brought before the Government and Parliament several times. I do not want to see our University become a burden upon the State, because I am afraid there will be a reaction and the standard of education reduced. The amount granted now for education is a very large one for a million people.

22. Is that not an excellent reason for the setting-up of a Commission to investigate the whole matter?—I do not think it would do any good. We have people here who could in five minutes ascertain all that is required. As to the question of endowments, that is a matter of policy which Parliament and the Minister can settle at once.

23. Do you not think that the professors should have a greater voice in fixing the curricula for the University?—I think they have all the voice necessary now. No curricula in my time has been changed except with the professors' advice.

24. Do you know the practice with the University of Melbourne?—That is in quite a different position. We have a University with four different colleges.

25. Have they as great a voice as the professors of Wales?—I do not think they have. Wales has a Council which consists of the heads of the colleges and senior professors; but the legislative power is not vested in the professors at all—they can only make suggestions.

26. You notice Statute XVIII of the University of Wales reads, "Provision as to University Studies and Examinations: (1.) No statute concerning schemes of university studies or examinations for degrees, diplomas, certificates, fellowships, scholarships, exhibitions, or prizes (save in the Faculty of Theology), and no statute for the amendment or revocation of any statute concerning the same, shall be enacted by the Court unless the Senate shall recommend the enactment of such statute, or unless and until the proposed statute or amendment of a statute concerning such schemes shall have been submitted to the Senate for consideration and the Senate shall have had a reasonable opportunity of considering and reporting thereupon"?—As I said, they have the initiative in the Council. The Senate can pass no Act without the consent of the Council.

27. Does not the Senate wish that the professors shall have absolutely no voice in fixing the curricula?—I tell you there has not been a single curricula fixed without consulting the professors. There might be a slight change made, but every great change has been referred to the professors for their consideration.

28. I notice in your statement you say that "No scheme of studies has ever been drawn up without taking the advice of the professors in the subject." You adhere to that?—Yes. We have drawn them up when we found that the professors could not agree. For example, in English there were two professors on one side and two on the other.

29. Do you mean to say that the Senate follow the advice of the professors?—No, I do not say that. They would be very foolish to do so in some subjects.

30. Do you remember the scheme for the B.Sc. "research" being drawn up?—Yes.

31. Was that referred to the professors?—No, but immediately after it was referred to the Boards before it went into operation, and the thing was dropped.

32. But you say that no scheme has ever "been drawn up"?—"Ever given effect to" would perhaps have been better.

33. Is it not that the B.Sc. research scheme was introduced by the Senate without consultation with the professors, and was subsequently suspended because it was found to be impracticable?—No, it was suspended because some of the professors were against it. That was never put into force until after the Boards were consulted, and after they were consulted the thing was obliterated,

34. But you say that "No scheme of studies has ever been drawn up without taking the advice of the professors in the subject"?—I did not mean "drawn up," but "given effect to." The B.Sc. was never given effect to.

35. I understand some of the students did take it?—I am not aware of that. It was suspended at the next sitting. I understood it was those who were anxious for research who pressed it on the Senate, and I believe the Senate went too far.

36. You referred the question of Wordsworth's "Michael" to the professors?—No, I was not on the Committee.

37. I will just put this to you: Wordsworth's "Michael" was unanimously selected as a "set book" by English professors. It has been favourably reviewed by all centres of literature, has been a set book in all Scottish universities, and is now a set book of present examiner in English. The Senate struck it out and made other alterations in the syllabus suggested by the English professors who had a conference at their own expense. Do you remember that happening?—No. There have been scores of suggestions made by the professors.

38. Is it a practice of the Senate to consult the professors?—In all details, certainly not. We have a committee of men as able as the professors—men who have had professorial experience.

39. You say, "What is desired by the pamphleteers is that the whole control of the University should be vested in the professors. The Senate is to have mere vetoing power; it is to have no initiative"?—That is to say, so far as the studies are concerned.

40. You have read the pamphlet?—Yes, and I say that is the meaning of the whole argument.

41. This is the suggestion on page 111 of the pamphlet: "It is suggested that the University should be administered by the following bodies: A Senate, the supreme lay body of the University, consisting of the lay members of the College Councils sitting as one body, together with (say) four professors; four College Councils to administer the colleges as at present, but to the lay members would be added (say) two professors elected by the college Professorial Boards. It is suggested that the lay members of the Council should be elected for the particular university district by one broad electorate described below." Then, on page 112 you will see this paragraph: "Academic Control.—Conjoint Professorial Board.—The professoriate should form a conjoint board whose business it would be to draw up a curricula for degrees, subject to veto by the Senate, and to conduct examinations according to such policy as the University may adopt"?—That means that the Senate has only the power of veto, not the power to initiate.

42. What you say in your written statement is, "What is desired by the pamphleteers is that the whole control of the University should be vested in the professors"?—That is the whole control. The University is set up for providing the curricula of studies. The academic control is based on these two things—the curricula of studies and finance. You do not mean to suggest that the professors should control the finance which comes to us from the Government? There is no control needed except the investment of our funds. The Senate leaves the whole question of control of the studies to the professors.

43. Does not the Senate deal with evening lectures?—No, that is left entirely to the Professorial Boards now. They have large powers now in dealing with students. We have nothing to do with fixing the evening classes at all. If you look at our statutes you will see what is in them. Any person can see them in the University Calendar.

44. Should not the evening lectures be in the hands of the lay body?—It is not in the hands of the Senate now. If you read the Victoria College Act you will find it is in the hands of the University professors.

45. You say on page 8 of your paper, "What the professors would do if they had the power is, I think, apparent from the pamphlet itself—(1) there would be no classes in the evening"; and on page 25 you say, "Apparently there are to be evening classes, but there are not to be university evening classes"?—The professors have dealt with the evening classes here and denounced them. This is what they say in the pamphlet. You begin at the bottom of page 14 and read down nearly to the end of page 15. You will note that it says, "If the only education provided for a degree—it cannot be called a university education—is evening lectures extending over three years, then not only do the many influences referred to above disappear, but the standard of instruction is lowered and positive harm done to those students, usually in the majority, who give their whole time to university education." What is the meaning of that? It means only one thing.

46. Is it suggested anywhere in this pamphlet that the evening lectures should be absolutely done away with?—I do not say that one or two may not be given, but the suggestion is that harm is being done.

47. On page 41 the pamphlet says, "The misconception with regard to evening studies is even greater in its evil results. Here again the English idea is a splendid one—to place at the disposal of men and women engaged in professional pursuits or as artisans opportunities of being taught by first-rate teachers, and of winning a place in university distinction, and the advantages degrees can give, equal to those of any more leisured class. The idea is splendid, and has led to splendid results, stimulating very large numbers to self-sacrificing patience in the labour of self-improvement." Did you see that?—There may be a few special evening classes, but those who are studying for degrees in the evening are discouraged. I say that no one can read through this pamphlet without saying that it is hitting at our evening classes by saying that positive harm is being done to the students. No honest fair-minded man can read the pamphlet without coming to the conclusion that the whole system of evening classes is condemned.

48. You say that there will be no evening classes if these professors had the power they want—is that a fair statement to make?—Yes, I think it is a fair statement from what I have read on page 15—that evening lectures extending over three years lower the standard of instruction and do positive harm to the students who give their whole time to a university education.

49. Is it not the case that that paragraph you have read relates to universities in which the only means of education is evening classes?—I told you that only a few evening classes would be available. Any person now can get the B.A. degree at the University with evening classes alone.

50. Where can you point to any single sentence stating that evening classes should be abolished?—What is the meaning of the statement on page 15 of the pamphlet? Do you mean to say that the professors are going to continue a system which cannot be called a university education and is doing the students positive harm? If so, what is the use of having professors to manage?

51. Is it not a fair inference to draw from that, that the night-school system should not be the only university system?—I tell you that you cannot at present carry on classes for the B.A. degree if they are not held at night.

52. That is not the point?—That is the whole point.

53. You are making an attack on the professors?—I am only making an attack on what they say on pages 14 and 15. They say, "To meet the hardship of the exceptional student, a hardship is inflicted on all students." Does that mean a hardship?

54. What you say is that the inference to be drawn is that the evening classes should be abolished?—That is the ordinary meaning of the English used.

55. You say they say that there should be no external students?—That is another inference to be distinctly drawn—they object to external students.

56. Where do you find the statement in which the professors say there shall be no external students?—They condemn the system, and in the questions that they put to outside professors they dealt with that, objecting to the system. Look at page 10, and you will find that they call the North Island colleges evening schools—"Evening courses are a necessary addition to full-time day teaching, but in the North Island colleges all instruction is in the evening, which has adversely affected the standard of work, and has certainly checked a development of collegiate life." You are not probably aware that the majority of the students at Victoria College cannot attend during the daytime at all, and if you say they must attend during the daytime it will prevent them getting a university education.

57. You make a declaration in your written statement that if the scheme the professors advocate were carried out there would be no classes in the evening?—Yes, no classes in the evening for ordinary students.

58. That is not what you say?—Well, I will say that ordinary classes in the evening are to be abolished, and if that happens half the students in New Zealand will not be able to get a university education.

59. Do you think any one reading that document can come to that conclusion?—I think they can come to no other conclusion.

60. There is an emphatic declaration by you that there will be no classes in the evening, while you have the statement made by the professors themselves that "evening courses are a necessary addition to full-time day teaching?—If the evening classes are abolished half the students will have to leave.

61. You cannot point to any other passages stating that?—I have not time now to go through the pamphlet carefully.

62. Can you point to a passage in which they say there shall be no external students?—I cannot put my hand on it at the moment, but at page 40 of the pamphlet it is stated, "The reasons why the University Senate, in shaping its policy, has determined the standard of the degree to match the normal attainments of exempted and evening students are probably twofold. Certainly the Senate never intended to debase our arts degree, but in the first place it did not realize that an external examining system inevitably adjusts itself to the normal standard of candidates; that is, that as long as examination is done entirely from outside, instructions as to standard required will not avail to prevent roughly the same proportion of passes and fails being maintained from year to year. And in the second place, the Senate has entirely misconceived the nature of evening work and exempted work as carried on, for instance, in London. The whole idea of admitting exempted students to degrees by examination rests on the theory that students not able for any reason to reside in a university town should be enabled to gain degrees, and encouraged to study, by recognition of private work done by them at home." So it goes on—the whole thing is to be abolished. I do not say the professors are alone in their opinion.

63. Do you sincerely declare that means that the external student is to be abolished?—I cannot see anything else in it.

64. On page 39 the pamphlet says, "No doubt the encouragement of such students is highly desirable, but it should be done without sacrificing the interests of the other classes of students or the institution as a whole"?—I should like to know how it is to be done if not done in that way.

65. Do you say that that means that the external student is to be abolished?—Yes, and I say that many members of the Senate in the old days were of the same opinion. Mr. Habens was a notable exception.

66. You say, "There would soon cease to be any co-ordination amongst the colleges, for the aim as disclosed by the pamphlet is to create either one central university of four separate universities"?—Yes, that is to be the aim as is stated here, to lead up to separate universities. There is a passage in the pamphlet to that effect: "(*b.*) Promote the individuality of the four colleges and their development ultimately into universities." I say that is the aim.

67. Is there anything wrong with that idea?—I think there is.

68. Why?—The whole tendency at Home is to get all the universities to agree to one examination. Take the colleges of Manchester, Liverpool, Leeds, and Durham, they were all coming in when I was at Home to one Matriculation Examination. I think the tendency is to have one examination to meet university requirements.

69. Do you say that is to be international?—No, that is too large.

70. Is it not a fact that every federal university has broken up, except Wales?—I do not think so.

71. What about Victoria University?—That is not broken up. They have one at Manchester, Liverpool, and Leeds. Victoria College, Manchester, and Liverpool College commenced first as colleges, and it is only lately that Manchester has got full university powers.

72. All these universities are distinct universities in England?—Yes.

73. The only federal university is that of Wales?—Yes.

74. Do you not think, when the population of the country grows, that what is suggested in the pamphlet is this: that the four colleges should be constituted into one university?—I do not know that you can constitute it better than it is now if you want to have federal control.

75. Was not that the idea of the Commission?—Not in the form you put it. At the time there were only two university colleges here, in Canterbury and Otago. What was intended at first was that Otago should be the university, and it would have been, but the Government of the day did not attempt to carry out the intentions of the Act until the time had expired for doing so.

76. It was suggested that in time the four colleges should be one university—that was the report of the Commission?—I did not agree with that. The Commission gave us a valuable report, but I did not agree with all its recommendations.

77. You say, "The University is not a teaching body. If, therefore, attention has not been paid to the practical questions mentioned, the blame does not rest with the New Zealand University." Is it not desirable that the University should be so constituted as to be able to prevent the overlapping of important matters?—No, I think you should leave the local control to the colleges, and they are doing it. I was the first to move that agriculture should be made the subject of a degree.

78. Do you not think the whole thing would be haphazard?—Not at all. I think the agricultural degree would be as good as any other agricultural degree in the world. We have already got two good teachers in the theoretical part.

79. Would there not be overlapping?—Yes, but you cannot help that. If you have students who can afford to go away from home there is nothing to prevent them.

80. On page 6 you say, "The New Zealand University had been created to perform only a part of the duties appertaining to university education?—Yes.

81. Do you not think a Commission might decide that it was desirable that the University should be so constituted as to enable it to perform all its proper functions?—I cannot understand any Act being passed by Parliament that would enable that to be carried out.

82. You declare that the New Zealand University has been created to perform only a part?—That is so.

83. Do you not think a Commission might decide that the University might be so constituted as to perform all its functions?—There is no university in the world which performs all its functions. I believe that specialization in the government is the proper thing to have—not an autocracy; and if you look up the *New Zealand Magazine* in 1875 you will see the whole thing argued out in a paper I wrote on "Specialization in Government."

84. You referred to a speech you made, and said there was nothing in that speech you would withdraw?—Nothing. We should not look to the examinations alone. I think, as I have said, there are too many examinations in New Zealand. I would have one examination to deal with the Civil Service, Matriculation, and Junior University and National Scholarships.

85. You say, "The main fault of our university system is that it regards examinations as the beginning and the end of the function of a university"; and "it has trained our teachers in primary and secondary schools and in colleges to think that examinations are the be-all and end-all of our education system. Nothing could me more mischievous"?—Yes, that is so.

86. It is strange to think that "examinations are the be-all and end-all of our university education. Nothing could be more pernicious"?—Yes. If you could say that the New Zealand University now was looking to examinations and not teaching, that would be the effect. In all the sciences and arts it asks that the student should be properly trained before he can get a science degree. We have modified our curricula greatly since 1886.

87. Is it not the case to-day that the examinations are the be-all and end-all of our educational system?—No.

88. What functions has the University got?—The granting of degrees and scholarships.

89. You say, "Except, however, by its examinations and scholarships, it is out of touch with the teaching colleges"?—That is so.

90. "Over them it has no control. It has not even the power of making suggestions, and the teaching colleges are quite separate and apart from the University"?—Yes, that is so. We have had a change since then. We have got more *en rapport* with them.

91. "They, again, have no power to guide it in its regulations, nor even to make suggestions to it. This is the weak point in our university system. The teaching colleges and the examining body should be in accord, and one should help the other." Is that so now?—No. The Professorial Board is making suggestions to us. The whole attitude is changed in many ways. We are consulting them more now. The constitution of the University has been changed. Formerly the vacancies in the Senate were filled alternately by the graduates and the Senate themselves. That is all changed now.

92. Do you approve of the change made in 1902?—No, I do not. I think we could have got a better system of election.

93. In speaking of the recommendations of the Commission of 1879 you say, "I have no doubt that if this scheme were adopted the relation between the teaching and examining body of the University would be improved; the University would be strengthened; the revenues at its disposal would be better utilized than they have been in the past, and we should have a new start

in university life"?—Yes. If you read the minutes of the University Senate from 1886 downwards you will see that I have moved certain amendments, some of which have been carried out. I think our students were then doing theoretical and not sufficient practical work. They thought the main thing was to get a B.A. for people who knew nothing but the Old World classics and mathematics.

94. You say, "I have no doubt that if this scheme were adopted the relation between the teaching and examining body of the University would be improved." Let us see what the scheme was: Shortly stated, the Commission said that there should be four colleges; co-ordination in the government of the University and the colleges; that the professors should take a considerable share in the government of the colleges; and that the four colleges should constitute the University." Do you agree with that?—No, I do not think it is possible. What may be called the local feeling is too strong to leave the matter to one body, and it might militate against university progress.

95. Do you think the local feeling is as strong now as it used to be?—I think it is more intense. You see one district fighting another when anything in Parliament crops up. I do not think the district feeling has changed much. Do you think, for example, that Otago and Canterbury are going to give up their reserves for university education for the benefit of all New Zealand? It is a very wrong thing to ask, in my opinion.

96. You say, "At the last meeting of the Senate six questions were referred to the Professorial Boards and Courts of Convocation by fifteen votes to six; in this minority were three professors"? —Yes. That simply shows that the lay members—which is an inaccurate phrase—are not opposed to the professors.

97. This minority consisted of Professor F. D. Brown, Professor Chilton, and Professor Easterfield?—Yes.

98. Is it not a fact that these professors opposed on the ground that these questions had been decided by the Professorial Conference?—The position was this: that the question had not gone to the Professorial Boards.

99. Is it fair to say that without referring to these gentlemen?—It was not referred to the Professorial Boards before—these specific questions. Some had been referred to the Professorial Board, and they were not agreed to. I think there were two Professorial Boards who disagreed.

100. You have read the different statements received and published in the pamphlet from different educational authorities?—Yes.

101. You recognize that they are from eminent men in the educational world?—Yes, but there are in the United Kingdom and Ireland at least three thousand or four thousand men who have been or are professors and teachers in universities, and if you take sixty opinions out of three thousand what is the value of them?—If you take the universities of the world you will find there are about thirty thousand professors and teachers. What is the value of these statements of sixty-five?

102. Then, to be absolutely sure of our position you think we should have to get the opinions of thirty thousand people?—Not at all. I say that if Parliament appointed a Royal Commission to make recommendations you would probably get more than sixty-five to condemn them.

103. Are these authorities of no value?—Not as guiding us. You have only sixty-five, when there are at Home over three thousand authorities.

104. Am I to understand that in order to assure ourselves as to what is best to be done we should get the opinions of the three thousand?—No, I do not say that; but we are not to accept the opinion of the first sixty-five we can pick up.

105. Do you think the opinions of Royal Commissions are of value?—I do not say anything about that. I say that if the opinions of sixty-five people are to dominate us when there are three thousand teachers of higher education in England, the position is ridiculous. I asserted that in educational matters there is a great difference of opinion.

106. Can you point to any gentlemen in Great Britain and America who can be regarded as higher authorities?—I can name several. I have had letters from people who disagree entirely with the views expressed in this pamphlet, but I am not in a position to give their names.

107. Can you give us the names of people who are higher than these?—I dare say there are many who are as high—I do not say higher.

108. There is another statement you make: "I think the University has stood the pragmatic test, because it has produced notable graduates." Do you think the opinion of these notable graduates would be of any value?—You have taken two or three of these. You do not understand that in educational matters, as in other matters, men do not always agree. Take tariff reform: how many would you get to be in favour of tariff reform and how many against?

109. Is it not remarkable that, with the exception of two, all the authorities are agreed?—No.

110. You say you cannot get educational authorities to agree?—I say that to take the opinions of sixty-five out of three thousand is ridiculous.

111. Is that fair to us?—I think it is fair; and I think the way you framed the questions was unfair.

112. Is it not a fact that sixty-three out of sixty-five to whom we referred agree, in face of what you say—namely, that educational authorities do not agree?—I do not know to whom you sent the circular. Perhaps the majority of them thought it was not worthy of reply.

113. Would you be surprised to learn that many replied to whom we sent the circular?—No, but I complain about the way in which you put the questions. It is unfair—it does not state the facts.

114. You say that judged by the pragmatic test our University is satisfactory?—Yes, it has done better than any in Australia that I know of.

115. Judged by the pragmatic test do you think it would be fair to take the opinions of these men?—No. What has the University done? That is the meaning of pragmatism as laid down by Professor James—what is the result?

116. Is not Professor Maclaurin a notable graduate, and is his opinion of no value?—I did not say it was not of value.

117. Do you think he is wrong when he says, "As to your first question, I should answer unhesitatingly, 'Yes.' It was probably wise to adopt your present system in the early days when the standards of the University were wholly undetermined. The conditions have, however, been wholly changed, and your system is now antiquated and entirely opposed to the trend of the best educational practice. You are far too much dominated by examinations, and you must escape from this thraldom or be crippled in all that is of most vital importance to real education. Doubtless, examinations are necessary and indeed highly valuable within their proper sphere, but of course they form only one of the many tests that the real teacher knows how to apply. In these days examinations conducted from without are practically unknown in all the leading colleges of this country, and in England they are much more rare than of old"?—I do not agree with him. There are just as able men who take an opposite view. One has written a book five times as big as this pamphlet who was appointed by the Carnegie Institute to examine all the laboratories in connection with physical science, and his views are directly opposed to Professor Maclaurin's.

118. Was it dealing with any question contained in this pamphlet?—No.

119. Then what is the value of it?—He put in a long and able report, and Professor Maclaurin replied disagreeing with all that gentleman's suggestions.

120. Professor Laby suggests to me that he is not known at Home?—I do not think the Carnegie Institute would have appointed him if they had not considered him to be an eminent man.

121. Do you consider the opinion of Professor Robertson, a Rhodes Scholar, of any value?—I think he used the phrase, if I remember rightly, "pragmatical" in connection with a university that had done well. I do not say you will not find thousands of eminent men with opinions the same, as you have men in New Zealand with opinions.

122. Do you not think that if sixty-three out of sixty-five agree it is remarkable?—It is not sixty-three out of sixty-five—it is sixty-three out of three thousand. I could write to different men and receive in reply a different view.

123. Do you know that Professors Beattie, Inglis, Robertson, Connall, and Maclaurin, all former students of the New Zealand University, all condemn our system?—If you ask Professor Laby and others they will condemn the Oxford teaching and tell you the science degree there is not worth having. I have heard professors taught in Cambridge say that Oxford was perfectly useless as a university for science.

124. On page 6 of your statement you say the New Zealand University "is more like the modern University of Wales, and in Wales the institutions that control the university are the following: The University Court and the Senate. The former is the legislative body, and is what the pamphleteers would call a 'lay' body." Is that statement of yours correct?—Yes. Bring forward the Welsh Calendar and I will be able to give it to you. I told you that the Senate consists of the heads of the colleges and the leading professors.

125. You know the constitution of the Senate?—Yes, I said so in my statement.

126. Doctor Hill says that the Senate has the carrying-out of the curricula?—Yes; the Council is a legislative body. In the Welsh universities no person can get a degree without the certificate of the external examiners. I know Doctor Giles, Professor of Classics, has been examining in Wales for thirteen years, and no one can get a pass in Greek without his certificate. That is the position. It is in the charter of the university.

127. On page 77 of the pamphlet it says, "As the Welsh University is a federal one, and as it has been suggested that its method of examination is external, it may be advisable to outline its system. The examining Board in any subject consists normally of the principal teacher of that subject in each of the three constituent colleges, and an external examiner appointed by the University: *i.e.*, on the Board of four there are three teachers, but the external examiner is given the right of veto." That is correct, is it not?—Yes, that is what I said. It is actually put into the charter, so that neither the Senate nor Council can alter it. Unless the external examiner signs the certificate no one can get a pass degree. If the external examiner is "the boss," to use a colonial expression, what does it matter what the others are?

128. What part do they take here?—No students can sit as competitors unless the examiner has passed them.

129. Is that so in honours?—Yes, in Science.

130. Is that in law?—No.

131. You say in "all examinations"?—I did not say "all examinations." I said they cannot get a degree.

132. On page 77 the pamphlet says, "It must be remembered, however, that in the University of Wales the teachers in each college draw up the curriculum for their own students—*i.e.*, define the scope of the examination. The attitude of the Welsh University may be clearly seen by the evidence given by Principal Riechel before the Commission on the Welsh University"?—I did not say that the curricula is approved by the Council. It has to be drawn up and approved by the Council.

133. *Mr Allen.*] What do you mean by "the Council"?—I mean the University Court.

134. *Mr. Herdman.*] I understand you know Statute No. 18 of the University of Wales—"No statute concerning schemes of university studies or examinations for degrees, diplomas, certificates, fellowships, scholarships, exhibitions, or prizes (save in the Faculty of Theology), and no statute for the amendment or revocation of any statute concerning the same, shall be enacted by the Court unless the Senate shall recommend the enactment of such statute, or unless and until the proposed statute or amendment of a statute concerning such schemes shall have been

submitted to the Senate for consideration and the Senate shall have had a reasonable opportunity of considering and reporting thereupon "?—This is in the charter, Article XV, headed "Examinations," section (2). "Every examination conducted by the Court as a qualification for a degree shall be conducted by the external examiners of the university for the subjects concerned jointly with examiners (herein called 'internal examiners') appointed by the constituent colleges in such numbers as may be prescribed by statute, and no examiner's report shall be received by the Court unless the external examiners have concurred in the said report."

135. What part do the professors themselves take in the examination?—I say, no matter what part they take, unless the external examiner passes them the students cannot get their degree.

136. But what part do they take—are they on the Board?—What we have done is this: no one can go up for a degree unless he is examined by his teacher and passed by him, and then the external examiner answers whether he is fit or not.

137. The statements made in your written statement are accurate?—I think so. I dictated it because I had not time to write it myself.

138. It is an important document, is it not?—I hope it is.

139. You say, "Let me state what is the New Zealand system, because the pamphlet does not clearly declare it. To begin with, no student from the University can sit for any examination unless he has been examined and passed by his professors?—I meant "degree examination."

140. But is that the case in law?—Yes. He cannot sit for jurisprudence, Latin, and mental science unless he has passed his professor.

141. Is it fair to say that he cannot sit for any examination?—I say "the examination"; "in all cases where terms have to be kept" might have been added.

142. Is it the case that before a student can sit for any examination in honours he has to be examined by his professors?—So far as science is concerned, yes. In honours "terms" are not required, because if the student is a B.A. you do not want a professorial examination.

143. The point is this: you say that no student can sit for any examination?—I should have said "degree examination."

144. Then you admit that your statement is inaccurate?—It is not inaccurate. These are merely pin-points.

145. I want to ask you about Principal Reichel's evidence before the Commission on the Welsh University. He says, "The object of the university was to insure two things: First, that the teaching and examining should as far as possible go together—that the examination should be fairly on the line of the teaching—so as to avoid the danger of cram which comes with purely external examinations; and, secondly, that there should be an external reference which should bring in light from outside and also should conserve uniformity of standard between the three colleges." The chairman put a question to him, "Do you allow the professor to examine on the subject which he has been teaching to the candidates?" and he replied, "Oh, yes; indeed, we insist on this. That is our very object, to get the teaching and examining to go together. The college appoints the internal examiner in each case; the university appoints the external examiner"?—That is not the rule in either Cambridge or Oxford. That shows the difference of opinion. No teacher at Cambridge or Oxford for the degree examination is the examiner, and you want us to adopt such a system. When I was at Cambridge I asked who were the examiners, any they gave me the list. I said, "Are these the teachers?" and they said "No." One of the teachers was not sitting as an examiner this year, and in writing to me he said he had pupils this year and they required an external examiner.

146. Do you think the external examining does harm?—No, it does no harm in the battle of life.

147. It does not affect the teachers in colleges?—It does not affect the teachers at all.

148. You say the external examining does no harm. Allow me to read what Professor McGregor says at page 83 in the pamphlet: "The late Professor McGregor, before the New Zealand Commission, said, 'The whole tendency of that mode of university education is to foster and encourage cram, and to discourage free learning—that is to say, learning whose object is to master a subject, instead of making a good appearance at an examination.' Did you notice that statement?—Yes, I know that Professor McGregor afterwards voted for the external examiners being retained. That was his opinion in 1879. The best way to get his opinion is when the question came before the Senate, when, as I say, he voted for the external examiners being retained.

149. Professor Hunter informs me that twelve months before he died he was against the system?—You can see his vote on the question in 1899.

150. On page 85 of the pamphlet you will see that, giving evidence before the Commission of 1879, the late Professor McGregor said, "I also think that the system of examining in the New Zealand University must in the nature of things be incapable of really examining in science. In fact, the whole system of examination by papers alone will produce the most mischievous effects on the education of this country. My conviction from a long experience is that education in science is not only useless, but mischievous, when conducted by such examinations as those of the New Zealand University"?—Yes, and so the University thinks; and yet good practical results are obtained now by the professors.

151. In the professor's own subjects?—No; that was in philosophy. We have amended it.

152. In connection with libraries, you say that research students can no doubt get all the books necessary to carry on research-work?—What I meant is this: there are some valuable papers in old journals or magazines, or in the Transactions, but all the main things are embodied in books after a few years; and to think you can afford to deal with research students in the matter of books as is done at the Cavendish Institute and other institutions of the world would be absurd. If students want research-work of a high class they must go Home for it. You cannot have here such libraries as the Bodleian and other well-known libraries.

153. You cannot get books on chemistry, biology, and mineralogy, says Professor Laby?—I do not agree with him. You can get books on research-work. I am not satisfied with the libraries myself, but I say that we are growing, and we cannot get everything we want at once. But we are doing well, and I warn those who are asking for more and more money from the State that if they make the University top-heavy they will make a mistake and we shall have a reaction, and that is what I do not want to see.

154. I gather from what you said that you are satisfied with the existing order of things?—No, I am not satisfied. I agree with progress—not by destruction, but by slow evolution.

155. Do you think there is destruction going on?—Yes; the professors have been denouncing the University. Professor Laby within a few months after his arrival began to find fault with the University.

156. He has a right to express his opinion?—I say he has not a right to express it after only a few months here.

157. Do you mean to say that a man who has had experience of the universities at Home, and who was a professor of the Victoria College, is not entitled to offer honest criticism?—I do not object to honest criticism.

158. Can you point to any dishonest criticism on the part of the professors?—I say that they have expressed opinions before they have had time to form them. I was told that Professor Laby had not been more than a month here before he began to find fault with the University.

159. Then I take it that all the opinions compiled in this pamphlet here are absolutely useless?—I do not say that.

160. And that they should not be taken notice of?—I do not even say that; but the truth could not be obtained by the questions put.

161. You do not think it remarkable that sixty-three out of the sixty-five replies are unanimous in the conclusion that our University system is at fault?—No. When the London University has eight hundred or nine hundred teachers alone, and the British and Irish universities have between three thousand and four thousand teachers and ex-teachers, I say it is not wonderful that you should get sixty-three to agree on any point.

162. *The Chairman.*] You referred to the question of a Royal Commission: have you considered whether there is no necessity for a Royal Commission to inquire into not only questions affecting the University, but the whole system of education from the bottom to the top?—I think on the whole our system is doing very well, and that we have very fair officers. I think the officers controlling our system know just about as much of our educational requirements, and are just as anxious for progress, as any Royal Commission.

163. It has been suggested that something like £1 per head of the population is being spent on education in this country, and that, as overlapping has been suggested as taking place in some of the Departments, some inquiry should be made?—The only overlapping that I have heard of is in connection with laboratory work. You must have laboratories in every town. That is overlapping, but it is the same in all parts of the world. I have been told that there is also some overlapping in connection with the technical schools and colleges. If so, it is a pity—a great pity. I think care should be taken to avoid expensive laboratories in the different towns. I know that this Dominion can only spend a certain amount of money on its University and education generally, and you must exercise a certain amount of thrift or there will be trouble in the future.

164. When you say that education should be free right up to the University, do you mean that those who are admitted to the University should not be required to come up to a certain standard of education?—No; I believe in matriculation. If I had charge of the funds and found that a student had attained a certain amount of education, I would give him his University course free.

165. For all who pass now with credit the Junior Scholarship Examination free education is provided: you suggest that it should be extended to, say, the Matriculation standard?—I am very doubtful about the wisdom of demanding too much money from the State, because I know the State cannot afford it.

166. *Mr. Hanan.*] Regarding expenditure in increasing our grants: would it be better, if we had the money available, to spend it in the direction of extending the scope of the University or in assisting secondary education?—I think we are doing very well in education; but if you have money to spend I think you might assist some of the colleges more in the future than you have done in the past. I am not competent to say what is being done in connection with secondary education, because I have not considered the question.

167. Are you acquainted with the system of education in Switzerland?—Yes, by reading and seeing a little bit of it. I was a month in Switzerland, and wherever I went I found myself interested in its system of education. I was not at Zurich, where there is a fine technical college, but I was at Geneva, and had a talk with the professors there.

168. Are there any features of the educational system in Switzerland that we could introduce into New Zealand to our advantage?—I would not like to express my opinion on that, because my knowledge of Switzerland was only partial, not complete.

169. As to Stanford University, can you say anything as to entrance there?—There is a strict entrance examination there in a great number of subjects, and if the student does not work hard he is sent about his business. The university is free. Before Mr. Stanford died he communicated with me and sent me the constitution of the university. I know one of the trustees—Thomas William Stanford—very well, and often communicate with him, but not on educational matters.

170. Would you approve giving the same facilities in the use of our universities?—If we could afford it; but we have to make our coat according to the cloth we have. I hope as we get older some of our wealthy men out of their abundance will give some aid to our educational institutions.

171. Do you believe in Professor Huxley?—He was a very able man.

172. Do you believe in his contention that there should be no examination for entrance into the University?—I do not think that is possible. That was the old system in Scotland. Matriculation is only about twenty-five years old as far as Edinburgh is concerned.

173. You would not approve of fixing a test after the student had been there a certain time?—No, because if you do not have the test at the entrance the student would be wasting his time.

174. You approve of examinations for matriculation?—I think the standard is high enough.

175. Do you not think it is hard on the students working at night? Does not the matriculation, as far as the standard is set now, mean that many lads will be debarred from entering a profession?—I do not know that. If a lad chooses to work hard he can easily work up to his matriculation pass in time. I can say what happened to one of my own boys. One of my boys had not got on very well at school, and when he passed his solicitor's examination at fourteen he was not abler than many of the other boys, but he worked hard.

176. Take men like yourself who have qualified after leaving school: those are the lads I refer to who have to work during the night-time?—They can easily get sufficient education to pass their Matriculation if they choose to work hard.

177. Take Latin alone; how many years does it take a boy to master that at high schools?—A lad does not need to take Latin if he takes science. I have known a boy who knew nothing of Greek to pass an examination at Cambridge after six months' education, and he had not seen Greek before.

178. I am talking of one who has not had the opportunity of attending a day-school?—I have no doubt he would get up his Latin if he were a hard-working boy in twelve or eighteen months.

179. You think, then, the standard as set is a reasonable one?—I think so. Generally, the Latin papers are set by one of the professors.

180. You know it has been stiffened up?—Yes, it was stiffened up the year I was away from New Zealand.

181. You approve of that?—As far as I know, I do not think any student has been debarred. I think if a student is kept back a year it will not hurt him.

182. *Mr. G. M. Thomson.*] Research: I think you said that the books necessary for research are mostly here?—No, I do not think so. I do not think you can get books necessary for all research-work here, but the libraries are improving. When we started with the Otago University we had no library, and we got our students through in mental science very well.

183. "The object of our pamphlet and our petition is that we should have a Royal Commission appointed": Do you consider that the Department of Education with its present staff is able to report fully on the co-ordination of education throughout New Zealand?—I do not know what you want a Royal Commission about. Do you want to alter your primary, secondary, or University system? I am only dealing with the University system. So far as the Senate is concerned, you might get twenty men as good as they are, but taking them as a whole they are just as competent to deal with these matters as any Royal Commission you can appoint. Take their names and look at them. They are men who have had a large experience in education, and some of them have been teaching in universities all over the world.

184. *Mr. Luke.*] In dealing with the London University do I understand you to say that they are reviewing their policy with a view to assimilating it to modern conditions?—I believe they have. The London University was originated to give degrees to Nonconformists, because both Oxford and Cambridge would not give degrees to Nonconformists. Then the London University went on and affiliated to itself many theological colleges.

185. As a matter of fact, that was only on account of the widened thought of the people?—Yes: not only that, but they saw that they wanted some better system of teaching than they had in those theological colleges.

186. You favour specialization in university work?—Yes. I do not think we can afford to have a fully equipped university in each centre. I think we ought to try to have special schools. We have a Medical School in Otago, an Engineering School in Christchurch, and a Music School at Auckland, and we are supposed to have a Law School in Wellington.

187. Seeing that the maximum for bursaries is £20 per annum, do you not think it is advisable to extend them to very promising students?—That is so; but when the student has to go away from home he is allowed something extra.

188. Considering that we have to admit our isolation and limited population, and yet we have students in the four centres who are fitted for a higher sphere of life and work and cannot obtain the necessary teaching in the particular city in which they are living, would you not extend the bursaries?—I would not mind if he could afford it, but you must remember that in America and in Scotland the students work during certain periods of the year to provide means for educating themselves. Twenty years ago men used to go harvesting in order to obtain the money to enable them to attend a university. In the United States of America many young men go as waiters even to enable them to do so, and I know some eminent educationalisis in Scotland who got their education with very little assistance from their parents.

189. I know that engineering students have put some time in the local shops. In connection with what has been said about overlapping, do you think that is more on the technical side?—I am not competent to speak of that. The reason I mentioned it was that in one of the technical schools a gentleman told me that they were going to too great an expense, which he thought was unwise. It was not in Dunedin; it was in Auckland.

190. You said you would be against the Dominion exploiting Canterbury and Otago in connection with their reserves. Would you be in favour of the State setting aside other endowments to build up the colleges in Wellington or Auckland?—That ought to be done. I think both Auckland and Wellington ought to have more endowments for their colleges.

191. *Mr. Allen.*] With regard to examinations: I understand that the connection between the professor or teacher with the student is that the student who is going up for his degree has to be passed in keeping terms?—Yes.

192. Is that universal for every one who goes up for a degree?—I do not know any one who does not keep terms.

193. Does the honours student?—No; they only require to keep terms in what are called preliminary degrees; but in honours in science they require certificates from their professors as to practical work done.

194. Do you think it is a good thing that the professor or lecturer should have a certain amount of say in the granting of the degree to his own students?—He has that I think, and ought to have a say. There is a great number of eminent educationalists who think not; and if you had been in the Senate in the old days when Mr. Habens was alive you would know that he took up the position that the only test should be "Can you pass the examination," no matter where you got your knowledge.

195. Do you know whether the practice is similar in the four University Colleges with regard to these certificates?—I cannot say that. I do not know how the certificate is given. We trust the professors.

196. Do you think there is any fear that a professor, anxious to allow his student to get a chance for his degree, would pass him easily?—Well, I do not think such a professor is doing his duty, and I should be very sorry to think any professor was not doing his duty. I have not heard of that charge being made. I do not think any professor—although we may differ in many things—would neglect his duty.

197. It might be a difficult thing for a professor to refuse?—I have seen the lists of some of the students who have passed, and I know there have been several students who have not passed.

198. Do you think that connection between the professor and the student is satisfactory?—I do not know what other connection you can have. I hope in the time to come we shall be able to get as many examiners here as we want, so that we shall not have to rely upon the Home examiners.

199. In the science examination, do you think the certificate of the professor that the student has completed a laboratory course is sufficient?—What else can we get?

200. Do you not think the examiner should come in to closer touch with the students in the laboratory?—We have allowed the professor to pass them.

201. But he only passes the student on to the examiner?—No; the examiner does not examine him in practical work.

202. Do you not think he should?—He could not do that unless we had him here. If we arranged for some ex-professors to act as examiners some of the professors here would be up in arms.

203. Do you not think the examiner should come into personal touch with the student in the laboratory?—Then we would be told that we were casting a slur on the professors.

204. You see no objection to an assessor acting with the professor?—No; if we could get the men. We may get them soon.

205. Would this be an improvement—take, for instance, chemistry in Otago—that the professor should there examine the student along with the professor in that subject in Auckland?—That would lead to endless trouble. I do not think it would work at all. If you got an external man I think it would be wise. But they might disagree if you got the professors here, and it might be charged against them that one would say, "You pass my man and I will pass yours."

206. If they disagreed would not the report be referred to the Senate themselves?—What is the Senate to do in that case if they know nothing about chemistry?

207. The Senate would examine the report and come to a conclusion?—I do not think that is wise. If you are to have an external examiner he ought to be an examiner and not a teacher.

208. Do you think with regard to many of our other subjects we could get examiners in New Zealand now: with regard to law, for instance?—We have one or two who could act. We have the Solicitor-General who could act as one.

209. And Mr. McGregor in Dunedin?—Yes; but that is a thing which would come gradually. I do not think there are many men who could examine in Roman law in New Zealand, except perhaps Professor Salmon. Besides, by our statutes we could only appoint examiners for five years in one subject.

210. Still, you agree that if we can find examiners in New Zealand it would be a good thing?—Yes.

211. With regard to the constitution of the University: the Professorial Boards are now represented on our Senate?—Yes; four members are elected by the Professorial Boards.

212. Do you think that the Professorial Boards should be constituted into another body similar to the Senate in Wales, although perhaps not so large, for the purpose of fixing the studies and for examination purposes?—That would be too great an expense.

213. With regard to the existing Senate: you say that the Professorial Boards have been consulted with regard to alterations in the syllabus?—Yes.

214. About two years ago, did not the Senate refer to the Professorial Boards the question of the B.A. and B.Sc. degree?—There was a conference of the Professorial Boards.

215. Was it not decided that the question be referred to the Recess Committee with power to consult the Professorial Boards and with power to call a meeting?—Yes.

216. That costs money?—Yes. I would not object to that being done yearly if it were not for the expense.

217. Would the expense be too much for the Senate?—I try to keep down the expense as much as I can. That has been my object, in order to create a fund for scholarships. That has been the policy of the Senate from the first.

218. There has been a pretty large accumulation of funds for scholarships?—About £24,000.

219. Would it not be wise to devote some of the money to these annual conferences?—I should not object. I have always voted in the direction of getting the opinions of the professors.

220. That is not very far removed from the constitution of the Professorial Boards as permanent Boards?—I do not object to that. We could do it by bringing the Professorial Boards together.

221. But has the consulting of the professors without calling them together not been a failure?—Yes, in some cases. I mentioned the case of two professors in English going one way and two another.

222. Can we get a decision of any value without bringing them together?—I would not say that. You cannot expect people to agree on educational questions any more than on religious questions. Take this Professorial Conference for instance: there was something proposed about physics and they did not agree about that. The Professor of Physics, when it was proposed to get it further specialized, objected to what had been done.

223. With regard to the constitution, have you not very great faith in President David Starr Jordan?—I have, but I do not agree with everything he says. His system is entirely different. It is a presidential system. He generally rules, and the institution is a monarchy.

224. You have said of President David Starr Jordan that he is one of the ablest men in the United States?—Yes.

225. Did he not write "that examination should be the function of the professor and not the university"? You agree with him?—No, I do not.

226. Do you agree with him that "requirements of degrees should be stated in terms of work accomplished, not in terms of examinations required"?—I do not think we can do that. He would not have any pass degrees. He would like only one degree, and would not give any man a degree unless he had done original work. A great deal has to be said for that, but I do not think it is suitable to our requirements, and if it were adopted here I do not think we would get a dozen students a year.

227. Do you agree that "the professorship should carry greater power and greater responsibility than now, and much of the work of the Council should be transferred to the four Professorial Boards"?—No.

228. "In general, the professor as teacher has far too little initiative in Australian universities": is that so?—I do not think so. If you look at the Stanford Calendar itself you will see that the professor is bound by the curricula of studies laid down in that calendar. He does not lay it down.

229. Do you agree that "Degrees should not be granted for extra-mural study, and in general not for attendance on night lectures or extension lectures"?—I disagree with that entirely. We are differently situated, and cannot enforce that at present. The time may come when we can.

230. "To do work really worthy of university recognition the student should enter the university atmosphere. He should make all possible use of teachers, laboratories, and libraries." Do you agree wih that?—No doubt, but you cannot get that here.

231. Is there very much in President Jordan's memo. that you do agree with?—Not very much. I do not think it is suited to our circumstances at present.

232. With regard to fees, you said you would like the University to be free?—Yes, but we cannot afford it.

233. Is not the University free, or nearly free, to the poorer students?—Yes.

234. Do you know how many scholarships, bursaries, and exhibitions there are?—No; I suppose there are a great number.

235. Including training-college studentships, how many are there on this list [list handed to witness]?—I see there are 474. If you deduct the training-college studentships there will be 155.

236. Do you not think 474 is a very liberal provision?—I do not say it is not.

237. With regard to evening classes, you know what happens in the old universities in England: the whole day is given up to study, and in the evening they read?—That is so.

238. Is it possible for us, with evening work alone, and with the student following his ordinary occupation in the daytime, to prepare the student in three years to the standard of Oxford or Cambridge?—Not unless he is a brilliant student.

239. Have you any suggestion to make? Do you suggest that the time should be lengthened to, say, four years?—If he can pass at the end of three years I would allow him. Some have to work four, five, or six years, and if they cannot pass they must come up again.

240. I suppose it is hardly fair to say that the ordinary student working three years is able to get up his degree work?—The ablest boys who go for a university career are often able to do it in three years, just as in Cambridge you will find a student getting through his work in under three years.

241. You said something about Lincoln College: I would like to ask you whether it would be advisable to tie up that school with Canterbury College itself?—It is part of Canterbury College now, but has a separate maintenance. I would like to see agricultural work in the schools, &c., carried out far better than it is at present; and if you refer to the report of the two English inspectors as to what they do in France in agriculture you will be able to compare it with what they do here. I would like to see agriculture carried out more fully; but I have to say this: that the Agricultural Department is doing a very great deal in this direction.

242. Do you think it is economical to have Lincoln College run as a separate institution?—It is affiliated for the purpose of degree work.

243. But does Lincoln College make use of the teaching available at Canterbury College?—My opinion is strongly that they ought to do so. They ought to go there for botany, chemistry, and other things.

244. Do you not think it would add to the usefulness of the University?—Yes.

245. With regard to the Commission, do you think that a Commission to inquire into university education without at the same time inquiring into primary and secondary education, would be any good?—No.

246. Do you think a Commission should be appointed to inquire into primary, secondary, and university education?—It would all depend upon the Commission. I do not think there is any clamant necessity for it. Things are going on very well, and it is a matter of expense.

247. Would the Commission get all the evidence they want satisfactorily in New Zealand, or would they have to go abroad?—It is very doubtful. Mr. Hogben wrote a very valuable report on what he saw in Switzerland and in America. That is very valuable, and I think there is sufficient matter in the various reports and books. Washington Bureau of Education always publishes two volumes a year stating what has been done in primary, secondary, and university work, and they can be obtained here. You can get all that has been done all over the world. The Commission might do good in that way, but I do not think it is necessary.

248. In view of Mr. Hogben's reports and the Australian reports that have come before us in recent years, do you think we should get value for the money spent?—No, I do not think so. I think it would be casting an expense on the Department from which there would be very little advantage.

249. With regard to the sixty-five authorities who gave evidence contained in this pamphlet: you said there were three thousand or more professors and teachers at Home who have not been asked to express their opinions?—No, whose opinions you have not got. They might have been asked.

250. Might it not be fair to say that as two out of the sixty-five expressed different opinions to the sixty-three that might be taken as a fair proportion of the three thousand?—I do not think so. When I went Home I visited all the universities I could get to, including Oxford, Cambridge, Glasgow, Edinburgh, Geneva, and the Sorbonne, and from what I could learn, when I explained our system, many said it was new to them, but they did not condemn it. I was not in Wales.

251. Is it fair for the Committee to assume that so large a proportion as sixty-three out of sixty-five would represent the opinions of the three thousand?—It would not affect my opinion if they had 363.

252. But I am speaking of the proportion?—That might be so—I am only giving my opinion. I have made a special study of education, and have read and am reading as many books on education as any professors, and am getting them continually. I have been in touch with the Bureau of Education in Washington and nearly every university at Home, and I have my own opinions.

TUESDAY, 3RD OCTOBER, 1911.

(No. 20.)

The Chairman: I have received the following communication from the Chancellor of the University of New Zealand:—

"DEAR SIR,— "Judges' Chambers, Wellington, 2nd October, 1911.

"I find, in looking over a copy I have of the statement that I forwarded to your Committee, that a paragraph has been omitted by mistake. I find it is my blame, as the paragraph does not seem to have been dictated to my secretary who took it down in shorthand. It ought to come in immediately at the close of the part dealing with the first charge, and before the second charge—that is, after the word 'Senate' at page 11, and before '(2).' It is not a statement of any facts, nor does it have any reference, it will be seen, to the questions put to me when I was examined before the Committee. If, however, any member of the Committee or the petitioners would like to examine me about this omitted statement which I now forward I shall be glad to submit to any examination that may be necessary. "Yours truly,

"ROBERT STOUT.

"The Chairman, Education Committee, House of Representatives."

"I may add that if what is called the academic control of the University were left to the Professorial Boards, or to a Council consisting of all the professors, the determining of the courses of study would not be performed by experts. So far as the professional curricula of studies are concerned, that will at once appear. Those professional courses are in law, medicine, engineering (in several branches), mining, music, and agriculture. If the syllabus of subjects for law, for example, had to be fixed, what would the majority of professors, whether in four Professorial Boards or in one Council of Professors, know of the subject? Could the Professors, say, of Physics or of Medicine settle the law syllabus? And similar questions could be put in the case of other professional subjects. Even in arts and science the specialization of education is such nowadays that the majority of the professors could not be called experts in many subjects included under the heads of arts and science. Would the Professors of Classics be content to take the opinions of the Professors of Physics and Chemistry on the authors and periods to be set for tuition or examination in Latin? Again, in science, would the Professor of Physics be content to leave the fixing of the syllabus in physics to the Professors in English, or would the Professors in Mental Science be left to determine the subjects of study in chemistry? In fact, if the determining of the curricula in arts and science, or in the professional subjects, were left to the Professorial

Boards, or to a Council of professors, the settling would be left to what the pamphleteers call 'a lay body': it would not be a body of experts. It may be said that the Professorial Boards or a Professorial Council would leave the special subjects to the professors of those special subjects. If the determination of each syllabus is to be left to the professors of the subjects, then what need is there for the Professorial Boards or a Professorial Council dealing with the matter? Cannot the Senate of the New Zealand University get the advice of the professors of the subjects directly, without filtering it through the Professorial Boards or Professorial Council? From no point of view can there be, therefore, in my opinion, the need shown for creating a separate or special body for the purposes of dealing with the courses of study. The Professorial Boards have power to deal with many academic matters, as a reference to the various statutes constituting the colleges would show, and I am not aware that any one has ever proposed to interfere with the powers of those Boards. "ROBERT STOUT."

["The above ought to be read as part of statement, and to follow on where I have pointed out in my letter.—R.S."]

Mr. Herdman: I do not want to re-examine Sir Robert Stout, but I would point out that the statement he makes in this addendum is completely answered by the last paragraph in Dr. Hill's letter on page 144 of the pamphlet. The last paragraph reads as follows: "The fact that all the universities which have been free to devise their own statutes, unfettered by Act of Parliament or by traditions too firmly established to be ignored, have adopted similar schemes which throw the whole responsibility for teaching and examining upon the heads of their teaching staff is, as it appears to me, of more importance than any individual opinion." Secondly, I would say that all the replies we have received in answer to our circular declare that the work referred to by the Chancellor of the University should be performed by the professoriate. That is all I have to say.

The Chairman: With regard to sending out the circulars, can you say to whom they were sent?

Mr. Herdman: On page 114 of the pamphlet it will be seen to whom we sent for information. We sent out circulars to the following persons—about 150 authorities, including "(1) Chancellors, vice-chancellors, presidents, and principals of the chief universities of Great Britain, America, and Australia; (2) past and present examiners of the New Zealand University, New Zealand graduates holding posts abroad, and Australian and other professors." Of course, the replies which have been received from the local people have not been printed in the pamphlet, but have been put in before the Committee. The inquiries we have made of people outside New Zealand have produced sixty-five answers out of the 150 circulars we sent out. The local replies are not included in the 150.

TUESDAY, 3RD OCTOBER, 1911.

JOHN O'SHEA, M.A., LL.B., University of New Zealand, examined. (No. 21.)

1. *The Chairman.*] The Committee are willing to hear what you have to say in connection with this petition as a graduate of the University of New Zealand?—In the first place, I wish to state that I opposed the gentleman responsible for this petition at a public meeting, and in consequence, no doubt, they did not send me notice to attend before this Committee. I might state that I look upon this petition as a move on the part of the professors to obtain more power. The great aim of the professors is to do away with the outside examination, and so far as the arts course is concerned I think that is wrong. The whole scheme has been very cleverly drawn up, and is full of half-truths. My opinion is that the great factor that goes towards the eminence of our University is the outside examination. Personally I believe that our degree stands higher than the Australian degree simply because we have had the outside examination. The professors want to have this extended power because, as they say, they know better what the qualifications of the students are. Well, in my opinion, they do not. The whole education system of New Zealand, in my opinion, is going wrong. We have the headmasters of our schools examining their own pupils, and that is wrong. I am outside any educational body, and am simply a looker-on; but I have been through our educational system. I started at the bottom rung of the ladder in a public school and finished at the top rung of our University, and I have therefore had considerable experience of our whole system of education. I think if you will look at my record in the New Zealand University you will find that no one has the same record. I am against all the extremists. I believe that the education system as it was twenty years ago was a far better system than it is now, and think that if you are going to obtain any satisfaction in connection with this matter it will be better to have a Royal Commission appointed, and you had better put on that Commission men like Mr. H. D. Bell—a man who has been in Parliament, who is a good barrister, a highly educated man, and a student. I will now address myself to this petition, which, as I said, was very cleverly drawn up. The petitioners say that the present constitution of the University is unsound. Well, that is true about everything—there is nothing perfect; and they draw attention to the number of different governing bodies. I do not know that the Court of Convocation is a governing body at all, but it has certain powers of election, and in that Court you have men who are not actually engaged in educational matters, and you get their opinions occasionally. It is a very good body in its place. The petitioners say that the hours of study are wrong because the instruction at Victoria College and the Auckland University is given in the evening. Victoria College is trying to meet the requirements of the public, and therefore the lectures there are given in the evening. I contend that it is not for the professors to say that the students ought to attend

in the daytime. The professors are there to bear their burden and to carry out their duties. In my opinion the medical students who go through the Otago University are better trained than are the men at Home, and the teaching there is more intense. The student may not get a knowledge of tropical medicines or a case of Addison's disease; but the tuition is more thorough, in my opinion, than that given in many other universities. Naturally, the reasons for our students going Home is that they want to be fashionable, and to get the hall-mark of a Home university. As to the final examination in connection with what President David Starr Jordan has stated, all I have to say in reference to him is that I think he is more or less of an advertiser; and I am absolutely certain of this—and I have come here to state my opinion—that we ought to uphold the external examination as against the internal examination. As to the B.A. degree, I notice that there has been a lot of talk about it on the part of the professors; but the real secret about the B.A. degree is that it is only a sort of statement that the man has been to a university. My view is that there ought to be fewer subjects and that they ought to be made harder. The ordinary B.A. student, when he gets through, does not know anything about Latin and mathematics—especially Latin. The ordinary man who passes in Latin does not know anything about the subject, especially a man who has not been trained in a secondary school. I know of no better educational training than that a student should become thoroughly capable in Latin, but it is too difficult for men who have not been previously trained in the secondary schools. As to mathematics, that is not taught properly in the secondary school, and these schools do not reach at all the standard of the English public schools in mathematics.

2. *Mr. Herdman.*] You are a product of the New Zealand University, Mr. O'Shea?—Yes.

3. *The Chairman.*] You referred to the question of a Royal Commission: do I understand that you advocate the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into university requirements?—I think it should inquire into the whole system of education, which seems to me to have broken down.

4. Do you think the qualifications required of the members of the Commission to inquire into university matters should be such as would enable them also to inquire into the lower portions of our education system?—Yes.

5. How would you suggest the Commission should be constituted?—That is not for me to say. The only man I would suggest is Mr. H. D. Bell, because I consider him one of the broadest-minded men in New Zealand.

6. Do you suggest that the Commission should consist of educationalists, or men of another type?—I think you should have educated men and not educationalists on it—men who could be lookers-on and be judicial.

7. *Mr. Luke.*] Do you think we are getting the best out of our University by the system of specialization which we have at the present time in connection with the four colleges?—Yes, I believe in specialization.

8. You believe that the outlay on it has been for the benefit of the New Zealand student?—I do not see how you could afford to do otherwise.

9. You know that specialization in this country must be subject to our financial position—you could not build up a university system in each of the four cities?—You cannot afford to have a perfect university in each city.

10. And therefore we shall have to suffer in some way?—Yes, but you will get the least suffering by a system of specialization.

11. *Mr. Allen.*] Upon what grounds have you come to the conclusion that the outside examiner raises the standard of the degree?—We have not got enough men in New Zealand, outside of the professors, able to undertake the examination.

12. I do not think that is quite an answer to my question: I want to know upon what grounds you have come to the conclusion that the outside examiner raises the standard of the degree?—We are not strong enough to live by ourselves in educational matters. We are not big enough to have independent men able to examine in the arts course.

13. Do you refer only to the arts course?—As far as law is concerned, English examiners cannot examine us.

14. Do they examine in Roman law?—Yes, that is right.

15. Could we not do that here?—Yes, but we could not do it so well. They have specialists in England in Roman law, and we have none.

16. Do you think that Professor Salmond would be quite competent to examine in Roman law?—No; I think there are better men in England.

17. That is hardly sufficient: would he be competent to examine sufficiently satisfactorily for us in Roman law?—No.

18. You stated that your opinion was that the New Zealand degree, on account of the external examination, was of a higher status than that of Australia?—Yes.

19. On what grounds do you state that?—That is my opinion, based upon what I have heard from men speaking on the matter for the past fifteen years.

20. It is based upon what other men have told you?—Partly.

21. You have been to Australia?—Yes.

22. Have you examined their university system at all?—I know something of it.

23. And their examination system?—Yes. I know their paper is not as difficult as ours for honours, but I believe their B.A. degree is better than ours.

24. With regard to evening lectures: do you think that in a course of three years of evening lectures a student undergraduate can get sufficient university knowledge under existing conditions to qualify him for the B.A. degree?—No.

25. What do you suggest, then, by way of reform?—I suggest that you diminish the number of subjects to four.

26. And keep to the three years?—I suggest that you raise the standard and let the students pass when they can. If a man cannot get through in three years, let him stay longer.

27. Do you think many could get through in three years unless they were exceptionally brilliant?—No, I think it is too much to ask of them.

28. Would you favour the establishment of day lectures instead of night lectures?—If possible, I would make it all day lectures.

29. But the conditions do not allow of that now?—I do not think so.

30. You think day lectures would be more satisafctory from the university point of view?—Yes; but if you want to have a perfect university it should be all day-work.

31. You referred to the B.A. degree, and said that a man who gets a B.A. degree does not know anything about Latin or mathematics?—I do not think I said that.

32. You said, "The ordinary B.A. student, when he gets through, does not know anything about Latin and mathematics—especially Latin. The ordinary man who passes in Latin does not know anything about the subject, especially a man who has not been trained in a secondary school. . . . As to mathematics, that is not taught properly in the secondary school. We do not reach at all the standard of the English public schools in mathematics"?—Yes, I do not want to modify that statement.

33. What does our ordinary B.A. degree represent—only the fact that a man has been in a university, from your point of view?—Yes.

34. Do you think that is satisfactory?—No.

35. Are you opposed altogether to the professor having anything to do with the examination of his students?—No, I would like him, as now, to have to pass them in terms.

36. Take, for instance, science and laboratory work: is there anybody more likely to know the capabilities of the student and the value of his work than the professor who has been with him in the laboratory?—Yes.

37. Who would?—Another professor in the same university. The practical examination should be local.

38. Take the case of a professor in chemistry: we have only one, as far as I know?—You can take them from another university. I would change them round.

39. You would not allow a student's own professor to have anything to do with his laboratory work?—I say I would let him pass a terms examination.

40. Prior to the student going up for his degree?—Yes. We are breaking down all our institutions in New Zealand.

41. If you allow the terms examination, what is the difference?—There is all the difference in the world. Professor Sale used to let his students through on terms, and say that if they could pass the English examiner it would be satisfactory; and I think he was the brainiest professor in the University.

42. Do you know that is a common practice to let men go through their terms examinations because subsequently they have to run the gauntlet of another examiner outside?—No, it was not done, except in Latin; but Latin was the most difficult subject for the students.

43. Was it done in any other subject?—I do not think so. Latin was my subject.

44. Do you know all the other subjects?—I knew them all pretty well.

45. Can you speak with confidence of the other subjects except Latin which you knew about?—I can say this with absolute certainty: I believe that Latin was the only subject in the University in which it prevailed to any extent.

46. Is that not a very unsatisfactory state of things, even in respect to Latin?—The trouble is that many students have not been taught in the secondary schools, and Latin was not taught thoroughly in some of the secondary schools.

47. Did they teach science or chemistry properly in the secondary schools in your day?—I had to throw up chemistry and learn German, because I wanted to get a university scholarship.

48. You were at a secondary school?—Yes, the Otago High School.

49. From your knowledge of the Otago High School, was the teaching of any science satisfactory?—No. They starved the science side. There was not enough apparatus, and the teachers did not get a fair show. That is one reason why I did not stick to it.

50. Then, in your time they went on to the Otago University unprepared to take a University course in science from a University point of view?—Yes. They were as well taught as they could be under the circumstances. The Rector in my day was a most unsatisfactory man.

51. Was it the same in Latin?—No; we had a genius for our Latin master—Mr. Watson.

52. As regards the University, I understand you to say the students came up unprepared?—There are a good many men who come up to the University who do not go through the secondary schools.

53. Can we help them in any way?—No, we cannot.

54. Are there any other subjects in which men come up unprepared—we have got Latin and science: what about mathematics?—We did not learn much mathematics in school. The only school that taught mathematics properly in those days was Nelson College, but that was because Mr. Littlejohn was the master.

55. What about English?—We were taught English very well; but the English subject in the University ought to count two. Language ought to be one subject, and literature ought to be another. It is too vast and difficult to pursue as one subject.

TUESDAY, 3RD OCTOBER, 1911.

GEORGE HOGBEN, M.A., Inspector-General of Schools, examined. (No. 22.)

1. *The Chairman.*] We are now prepared to hear you, Mr. Hogben, on the whole question?—I have prepared a number of notes on the general question, and propose first to deal with the constitution. The most important need of the New Zealand University, is, in my opinion, the reform of its constitution. If this reform were carried out, the rest would follow. In every British university, as far as I am aware, all purely academic matters are dealt with by a body that is at all events predominantly academic—in some cases wholly academic. We have no such body in our University. I. Constitution of the University: (1.) I would have a general mixed body with supreme power, partly lay and partly academic; but the academic element of this body should be a minority. The present Senate corresponds very nearly to this. But it should have a regularly constituted executive or council to perform administrative functions, so as to avoid the necessity for frequent or long meetings of the whole Senate. I regard the present meetings of the Senate as abnormally long: all sorts of questions are brought up. I use the word "Senate" as it is now used with us, although the term is generally applied elsewhere to the academic body. The Senate, by itself or through its executive, should have sole control of finance, and of all other matters except those to be mentioned later; but its powers in regard to studies, degrees, scholarships, college terms, and examinations should be limited to the approval or disapproval of recommendations made by the academic body. (2.) The academic body—which might be called the Board of Studies (as the word "Senate" is already appropriated)—might, I suggest, be constituted somewhat as follows: (*a*) Five to be appointed by the Professorial Board of each college, to include at least one representative of each non-professional faculty; (*b*) the head or dean of each recognized professional school—Medicine, Dentistry, Mining, Agriculture, and of such other special schools as may be recognized by the Senate from time to time; (*c*) a representative elected by the principals of secondary schools as defined by the Education Act, together with such other secondary schools as the Senate shall approve for this purpose; (*d*) the Inspector-General of Schools; (*e*) four persons appointed by the Senate. Powers of the Board: the Board should draw up general schemes of studies in non-professional courses, regulations for keeping of terms, and for degrees, scholarships, and examinations; recommend examiners, draw up detailed schemes of study in professional courses, subject to the final decision of the Senate; approve or disallow (subject to appeal to the Senate) detailed schemes of study drawn up by the Professorial Boards of the colleges in courses other than professional courses. The Board may appoint consultative committees and Boards of Faculties, and may delegate to them such powers as it may see fit. Professorial Boards should draw up detailed courses of study in all but professorial courses, subject to approval by the Board of Studies, and to appeal if need be to the Senate; make suggestions on such other academic matters as may be referred to them by the Senate or by the Board of Studies. (3.) Convocation: This to be as it is now, but the General Court of Convocation should be the important body, not the district Courts.

2. *Mr. Allen.*] What do you call this Board you propose to set up?—The Board of Studies—the academic body. The rule that appears to be followed in some of the English universities is that a certain number of persons on the academic body are appointed by the General Council (corresponding to our Senate), but in no case does the proportion of such persons exceed one-fourth. I think they should be in a distinct minority.

II. External examinations—that is, examinations by external examiners alone: The harmful effect of laying emphasis on examinations rather than on education itself is to my mind the most vicious thing in our education system to-day. This emphasis is most pronounced and most inevitable when the examiners are external examiners. I will explain my general grounds for that opinion. It is utterly impossible to test (I hardly know any subject in which it is possible thoroughly to test) the training that a candidate has received, by a merely written examination, which is the form our examinations take generally. I do not know any subject in which you can test the value of the training of the candidate by examinations alone. If you attempt to test it in that way the tendency of the candidate, and the inevitable tendency of the professor (who, besides the love of his subject, has the material needs of the student in mind), will be to give undue prominence to matters which are capable of being introduced into a written examination paper, and to cut out of the teaching of the subject many matters which in the highest degree are of value for intellectual training. The tendency is for the student to pay less and less attention to things that cannot be tested by answers to written questions—some of the most important parts. As to research, confining your tests to written examinations almost kills research. You cannot test the required power to make research, or the required knowledge of the research method, by a written examination. You may do it to a slight extent now and then. You may think that you have framed a question to do it, but the "coach" will beat the examiner all the time. The whole effect of the written examination is to concentrate the attention of the student on things that relate to the more formal part of the work, and not to what is higher and better. That is my general reason for objecting to the predominance of the external (written) examination. That is the result of my observations for a great many years. I am prepared to give examples to illustrate it if necessary, although it would take a very long time to give complete evidence on this point. Contrary to what was stated by one witness, we are trying to reduce external examinations in our secondary system. We have practically abolished external examinations in our primary system. It was stated by one of the witnesses that the teachers of the primary schools did not examine their pupils. Since 1894—five years before I came to the Education Department—the pupils in the lower classes of the primary schools had been examined by their teachers. Since 1900 the whole of the pupils have been examined by their teachers. The classification of the schools for the purpose of teaching is entirely arranged by the teacher himself, except when the Inspector sees grounds to interfere on

account of incompetence on the part of the teacher. Unless the Inspector really sees signs of incompetence—that is, signs of inability to classify—he is not justified in upsetting the teacher's examination. The leaving examination — that is, the examination for the leaving certificate or "certificate of proficiency"—is an examination conducted by the teacher and Inspector jointly. In fact, the Inspector, if he has evidence of sound work, has power, on satisfying himself, to accept the results of the head teacher alone. So it is hardly correct to say that in the primary schools the teachers do not examine their own pupils. In the secondary schools practically the same thing is done. It is not so well known that this is done in the secondary schools, because the method of examination is in the process of transition. It was stated that in the secondary schools the Boards of Governors appointed outside examiners. Never at any time have all the secondary schools had outside examiners appointed, and now very few of them appoint outside examiners. Take the last three years. In 1908 only three secondary schools had outside examinations—Wellington College (two schools) and Christ's College. In 1909, four schools—two of them under one body—had an outside examination, and only one of them had a complete one. The Wanganui Girls' School had a very partial examination. The Christchurch Boys' High School, as the result of a report of a Committee dealing with the school, had an examination of the middle and lower part of the school, and not of the upper part. The Christchurch Girls' High School was treated in the same way. The Christ's College Grammar School had a complete examination, but no other school. In 1910, the Wanganui Girls' School again had a partial examination, and the New Plymouth High School had a special examination, while Christ's College had a complete examination. The principal reason for the Wanganui Girls' School having a partial examination was, I believe, that they might award certain scholarships. The Christchurch Boys' School also had a small examination that year, but that was for scholarships. This is the position as far as I can trace it. I am informed on good authority that the Wanganui Collegiate School had a partial examination. I have had all the accounts searched in order to ascertain the facts. All the reports have been gone through, and these are all the outside examinations in secondary schools that I can trace in the last three years.

A number of these examinations are partial, and you say that, generally speaking, in the secondary schools the scholars are examined by their own teachers?—Yes. Nearly all the schools follow what is called the Harrow system of promotion, and the schools are organized and classified in that way. The prizes are given on that system too, equal weight being given to the work done during the year and in the examination at the end of the year. The point I am concerned about is rather this: what the secondary schools are doing in conjunction with the Education Department. It was stated that we examined secondary schools, and we do to a certain extent, but the examination is that kind of examination which is an essential part of inspection. Its purpose is not to pass individual pupils, but to ascertain and enable us to form some judgment on points about which we may have doubts as to the efficiency of the instruction.

4. *Mr. G. M. Thomson.*] It is really an inspection of teachers?—We do not like to look upon it in that way, but it is to enable us to see the weak points, and it is always done in co-operation with the teachers. We do not upset the time-tables—we put only a few questions, and we show the questions to the teachers beforehand to see if they agree with the fairness of them. This helps to give the teachers confidence, and when they see that the pupils are doing well they are satisfied if we go a little further. I do not think there is a single instance where they do not welcome it, and they often ask, if we do not do it, if we are not going to do it. That is very different from an external examination. The same examination (that is, the examination made for the purpose of inspection) is used in another way. It is a most important departure, and I hope it will more and more obtain currency in the secondary schools. Boys and girls obtain junior free places as the result of the proficiency certificate examination or of a special examination held by us. I wish it was not necessary to have a special examination held by the Education Department. The Junior Free Place examination is set on the same work as the Proficiency Certificate Examination. The Junior Free Place pupils get free education for two years, and after that time they can by gaining Senior Free Places get further free secondary education until they are nineteen. There are two or three ways of getting Senior Free Places. One way is by qualifying for a Senior Scholarship given by an Education Board, or by passing the Civil Service Junior Examination. Another way is by passing the Senior Free Place Examination, or Intermediate Examination, as it is properly called. All these examinations are conducted at the same time, the syllabus is the same, and the standard is the same. We have simplified the system of recent years. At one time there were twenty-seven sets of examinations (Civil Service Junior, Scholarship, and Pupil-teacher Examinations); now there is one set. So we have simplified the system and reduced the burden on the candidates, because they enter for only one examination. These examinations are, of course, purely external. The papers are different, according as the pupils are competitive or non-competitive. Competitive pupils are those who enter for a scholarship and those who enter for a position in the public service. The third way of gaining Senior Free Places brings me back to the examinations of the secondary schools by the Department. On the recommendation of the headmaster, supported by the Inspector-General of Schools—which is based on the report of an Inspector of the Department—a Senior Free Place may be granted without examination. This method is altogether satisfactory. It does not disturb the student's course by requiring him to sit for an external examination in the middle of the course, and it does not in any way lower the standard. Indeed, the difficulty we sometimes have is to prevent the standard adopted from unduly shutting out pupils who are qualified for two or three years more of secondary work. The examination we give in the course of inspection is most detailed in the classes containing the second-year pupils. Our examination of the district high schools, too, is directed, among other things, to keeping that standard for Senior Free Places uniform. So that we attempt to do justice by giving Senior Free Places on the same lines everywhere. But the examination is on

the work actually done. We take the programme of the schools. If the programme is too small, or the quality, in our opinion, is not up to the mark, we say we cannot accept it, and that the boy or girl who is a candidate for a Senior Free Place will have to go up for examination. I believe the great majority of the secondary-school teachers hope that in the course of time this will be practically the only way of getting a free place. The tendency, therefore, in the secondary schools is to do away with examinations by external examiners. But there are one or two headmasters, for whom I have a certain amount of respect, who are holding out. One of those who held out most strongly is now sending in pupils under the clause for awarding Senior Free Places on recommendations only, but he is sending in only his very strongest—those in respect to whom there is no doubt. Their view is that it is a healthy thing for a boy who is going into the struggle of life to go through the conflict of outside examination and to work hard in preparing for the examination. In my opinion, if he goes into the struggle of life at a tender age he is simply sacrificing his mental training to Spartan hardness—you may say if you like that he is exchanging one kind of education for another kind of education. To sum up, we now give in the secondary schools, on the work alone, three kinds of certificates: the intermediate certificate, when a minimum of satisfactory work has been done in the school or district high school, two years in duration. That qualifies for entrance as a probationer in the public-school teaching service. It qualifies a person for being admitted under the regulations as a second-year pupil-teacher, and qualifies for everything that the Civil Service Junior Examination qualifies for. Then there is the lower leaving certificate; that is given on three years' satisfactory work. The standard of work we aim at is the standard set for the D certificate, or that formerly set for University Matriculation. But the certificate is not given necessarily as the result of external examinations. I should say the standard would be at least as high as that reached by most candidates for Matriculation. This lower leaving certificate admits to the full privileges of the Training College. That gives two years' training to the teacher, and all the other privileges that passing the D examination would give. There is, again, the higher leaving certificate, for four years' satisfactory secondary work, which we are giving for the first time this year. That will be given exactly on the same lines, as regards the standard and the amount of work, as the new Matriculation—that is, given on four years' satisfactory work in a secondary school; and I have no hesitation in saying that if the Education Department could encourage pupils to obtain these certificates it would do them a great benefit in securing thus four years' sound work. I would let this certificate take the place of the Matriculation Examination, with proper safeguards. I should propose that the bursary system be extended by granting to those persons bursaries—that is, not only, as now, to those who qualify for University scholarships, but also to all those who get the higher leaving certificate. The Matriculation Examination up to the present has been too low to justify the authorities in giving a bursary to every one who passes it.

5. You would not give a bursary to a student who had passed his Matriculation unless he had had four years in a secondary school?—No, I do not say that. Without an outside examination I would give a bursary to every one who had had a four years' satisfactory course in a secondary school and who had a higher leaving certificate. If he did not have that certificate you should make the examination good enough to enable you to say there is no doubt about the man's value as a university student. If the Matriculation is made hard enough, then we could give it on that. In parts of our university system we do not use external examinations. But it is the ruling feature in regard to the great bulk of our students. This is a feature peculiar to our University: in no other university I know of are the examiners merely outsiders who are altogether dissociated from the life and teaching of the university. Oxford and Cambridge may seem to be exceptions, but in reality are not exceptions to the broad principle I have enunciated. In all the new universities of England, and in the older universities of Scotland, the internal and the external examiners are associated. Perhaps it is fair that I should explain what I mean by saying that Oxford and Cambridge Universities may seem to be exceptions. They are not exceptions because of this: It is quite true that in the honours examination the examiners do not teach generally at the same time that they are acting as examiners. There are two reasons for that. One reason is that it is considered perhaps that they should not examine their own students. In speaking of Cambridge I may say that there is another reason. Take the Mathematical Tripos: it would be utterly impossible for an examiner to keep on his full work as a lecturer and at the same time act as an examiner. In my time there were five examiners meeting frequently to prepare the papers for the Mathematical Tripos, and that would occupy their full time. The point I want to make is this: that those men who are examiners are undoubtedly associated with the whole life and teaching of the university—they live in the midst of it. If not teaching actually at the time—and some of them go on with their teaching—all those examining are familiar with the work. You could not call these men external examiners in the sense that our men are external examiners. They are not like our external examiners, who are dissociated altogether from the life of the New Zealand University. The important thing is that the examiners should be closely associated with the teaching—the teaching should come first and the examination second. This is the rule I would follow in New Zealand. There are many ways of carrying it out; I am content so long as the examining is kept in close association with the teaching. I suggest that in each subject the four professors, with one who is not engaged in university teaching (if the Senate chose such a person), should be the examining Board or Committee for that subject. The actual examiners of the students in any given college should be the professor of that college and an external examiner, who might be the person chosen by the Senate (if any) or a professor from another college, who would be an external examiner as far as the student of the given college is concerned. What is meant by an external examiner in Wales and Liverpool, and all the other modern universities in England, is a professor from another university, and often a graduate of that university in which he examines. The judgment of the internal professor and external examiner would be communi-

cated through the examining Board (really the Board of the Faculty) to the Board of Studies, which would report to the Senate. But I look upon the particular method as a matter of detail which might be settled by the Board of Studies. The varying interchange of professors would keep the standard practically the same. Examinations thus conducted need not and should not be limited to written papers. External examinations do not raise the standard or prestige of our degrees.

III. Scholarships: I would allocate these to the several colleges, and in any case I do not believe in competitive scholarships. Still less, however, do I believe in any "poverty test"; it is, so far as I know it, vicious in practice, and often breaks down completely. I would rather have competitive scholarships than a poverty test, but still I do not see any need for either.

6. *The Chairman.*] Would you abolish the Education Board Scholarships also?—Yes. They are what are called in England baby scholarships. I would give a scholarship or bursary to everybody that qualifies. We are giving free places in secondary schools now to everybody who qualifies, and so long as they live in the place where the school is that is all that is needed.

IV. Evening students should not be excluded, but encouraged. I do not think the professors here intend to deprive the evening pupils of university privileges. Before I went to Cambridge I was an evening student myself at the University College, London, and at the Birkbeck Institute. Evening students should not be excluded, but encouraged, provided the standard of work of the regular day student was not lowered. This could be secured by the way in which the courses in study were drawn up; and the evening student could be allowed and encouraged to take, say, five years over what takes the ordinary student three years. I believe that an evening student of good physical constitution could do good work under these conditions. A full duplication of staff would not be necessary. But evening students should be encouraged to become day students.

V. Exempt students: Any change would have to be made very cautiously, because it would not be fair to take away the privileges they now possess unless you replaced those privileges by something substantial; but I think we should aim at making a change. This question is very difficult, because of the vested right that has been acquired or is supposed to have been acquired. I do not consider that such students are properly university students at all. The weighing and measuring of a certain amount of knowledge of facts in a written examination gives no evidence of the kind of mental discipline and training that university work is presumed to give. Their work should be encouraged and, if possible, assisted by extension courses, and in other ways, but the reward should not be a university degree. They should be encouraged to become regular students, and so gain their degrees.

7. It would prevent these students getting degrees at all?—I say, too, that there would be injustice unless you give them something substantial instead. You do not want to discourage private study, but I do not think the university degree is a proper certificate for private study.

VI. It is inevitable, and always has been, that there should be four colleges; there are a thousand reasons for it, for New Zealand is a thousand miles long, or more. The same problem exists in regard to the training college. One training college for the whole Dominion would cost as much as or more than four separate training colleges, on account of the larger number of boarding-allowances. Unless you paid these additional boarding-allowances the policy would be undemocratic.

VII. I would have all university teaching free to all that are qualified; but boarding scholarships would be necessary besides payment of fees. A slight extension of the present bursary system would give free tuition to all qualified persons.

8. *Mr. Hanan.*] What do you mean by "qualify"?—I have already explained the standard of qualification as four years' study in a secondary school. The Board's Scholarships would be necessary besides the fees.

VIII. The want of libraries is absolutely woeful, but it is the need that is most easily repaired. Books are absolutely necessary to all research in almost every branch, both as a stimulus and as material to work on. I think the University might give assistance to some of the colleges from the funds it has accumulated for scholarships.

IX. Fees: I do not think a professor's salary in any case should be either in whole or in part, dependent on fees or capitation.

X. Constitution of the University College Councils: I do not agree with one of the witnesses that there should be a general constituency.

9. *The Chairman.*] You do not agree with the pamphlet in that respect?—No. If so, it would be absolutely unnecessary to hold any election at all: they could be nominated by members of Parliament at once, who are elected by the general constituencies. I think it is absolutely necessary that those who come into contact with university education should be represented on the non-academic or lay body. This opinion is borne out in the constitution of Birmingham University and elsewhere.

10. What about the primary schools?—I think they should be represented on the Councils by the Education Boards. The teachers are one-fourth of the graduates of the University. Their training college is part of the University, and I think it is very important that there should be one representative of the primary-school teachers, who have a definite standing; but not School Committee—the ordinary member of a country School Committee does not of necessity know anything about the subject of university education. I would propose the following representation: Education Boards in the University district, one; High School Boards or Secondary School Boards within the University district, one; secondary-school teachers within the University district, one; certificated primary-school teachers, one. Those four would represent those particular interests. When there is a definite body dealing with professional education, I would have a representative of that body on the Council. For instance, if there is a Medical Faculty at the college, I would have some representative of the medical interests outside the college—say, the Medical Association, or the Hospital Board might do.

11. *Mr. Allen.*] They are two different things?—I would rather have the Medical Association myself. But that is only in the lay body. The Professorial Board is the academic body.

12. *The Chairman.*] Does that complete your representation of these Councils?—There should be two professors, which I think would be enough, as in Otago. I think it is most important that they should be represented. Then I think the District Court of Convocation should have a substantial representation, say, four; and so long as the Government gives monetary assistance, it should also have some representation, say two. I do not believe in a federal university in the same sense that one of the professors put it.

13. You do not think the four Councils should represent the whole University?—No, I do not; it appears to me to be a somewhat crude method. Special schools should be recognized by the Senate after consultation with the Board of Studies. This question of recognition is partly a financial question and partly professorial. And both bodies could consult and agree. I notice that Dr. McDowell said he would agree to joint meetings of the Professorial Boards (there has been one for that purpose), and they should have great powers with regard to the curricula. I expressed at the Senate the hope that the practice of holding a general conference would grow up, and that it would be legalized later on. I did hope that we could get this by evolution; but my hopes were dashed to the ground when, after such a conference, and after receiving reports passed at that conference, the Senate referred back the report of its Recess Committee to the four separate Professorial Boards. I felt that as the final report was prepared by and presented to a lay body, it would have been perfectly right to refer it back to the Conference; but to refer it back to the four Professorial Boards was a proceeding I could not understand the reasonableness of—to put it very mildly. Dr. McDowell and the Chancellor practically agreed to the same thing, but they would go very slowly. Dr. McDowell referred to research, and asked where we would get the students for research in New Zealand. I think there is a misconception here. The whole idea present in my mind is that the good points of a modern education are to be found probably in this—that the spirit of research is extending over all kinds of study; and what you want to do is to get into the student's mind this spirit of research and the ability to pursue research. So that in asking the question where you can employ the students in research, it seems to me that you are rather missing the point, which is one as to a change of the methods of teaching. You want to get into the minds of the students the habit of research. My view is that the spirit of modern education is the spirit of research. I therefore agree with what Professor Easterfield said, that the student must be surrounded by a research atmosphere. I think the following should be contradicted: It was said by Mr. Morgan that the tendency of technical schools was to overlap with the secondary schools. I am prepared to say that there is no overlapping between the technical schools and the secondary schools to any serious extent. There must be some overlapping, because if there is not some overlapping in some places there will be gaps in others; students are not all made in the same mould. Mr. Morgan said the attendance at the technical classes had diminished the attendance at the secondary schools. If it has diminished the possible attendance, it is still true that the number of pupils at the secondary schools has increased enormously, at the same time that the number at technical schools has increased.

14. *Mr. G. M. Thomson.*] I do not think it is necessary to labour the point; it is only an individual opinion?—That is so, but I can give the numbers if necessary.

15. *Mr. Herdman.*] Regarding the University of Wales, can it be said fairly that their system of examination is in any way similar to ours?—No, I do not consider that can be said.

16. I understand that in their system of examinations they have Boards each consisting of three professors and one external examiner?—Yes.

17. And the external examiner has the power of veto, has he not?—Yes.

18. Do you know whether that power of veto is frequently exercised?—I asked the Registrar, who was formerly Professor at Aberystwyth, whether, and how often it was exercised. He said he had been in the university since its inception, and he was not aware that it had been exercised more than once. It was in 1907 that he made the statement, and the university was founded more than twenty years ago.

19. You said in the course of your evidence that the system of external examination did not raise the prestige of the degrees?—I do not think it does at all.

20. And you said you could give some statements in proof of that?—I could give a general statement, if necessary, or mention some names. Some of them appear in the pamphlet. I had an opportunity of conversing with a great number of people when at Home.

21. *The Chairman.*] When was that?—I was in London in 1907. There was a University Conference there, and Professor F. D. Brown, Professor Cook, and myself were the representatives of New Zealand. There were two or three meetings held; at one meeting Lord Tennyson was in the chair, Dr. Butlet represented Cambridge, and Mr. Balfour and the Vice-Chancellor of the Oxford University were there. I do not remember who was the other representative of Cambridge. All the universities of England were represented, and most of the other universities of the Empire. In connection with that conference we visited Cambridge, Oxford, and Birmingham, and were in constant conversation with those concerned in university education. Several times I was called upon to explain at length the university system in New Zealand. It naturally induced criticism and discussion, and in the course of that I had an opportunity of learning the views of many persons connected with British universities, and not one of them expressed the opinion that our examination system raised the prestige of our degree in the judgment of British authorities; indeed, a great many expressed the opposite opinion.

22. *Mr. Herdman.*] You know that a conference of Australian universities has just been held in Sydney?—Yes.

23. Do you know that they passed two resolutions?—I do not know. I have been so busy lately that I have not had time to notice what was done.

24. You say that you are quite satisfied that reform of the constitution of the University is highly desirable?—Yes, I think it is a most important thing. I think if that was solved most of the other things would follow.

25. I did not quite understand your suggestion about the constitution of the Senate?—I did not make a suggestion as to any alteration in the Senate. I do not think it is quite perfect, or that it is so far wrong that it is necessary to insist on an alteration if you have an academic body. You must always presuppose that you have an academic body.

26. I understand that your Board of Studies would have functions which would be practically carried out by the suggestions in the pamphlet, or in the letter of Professor Maclaurin?—Yes; but I have expressed it in my own way after reading over the constitutions of several of the British universities.

27. This is what we say in the pamphlet: "The professoriate should form a conjoint Board, whose business it would be to draw up the curricula for degrees, subject to veto by the Senate, and to conduct examinations according to such policy as the University may adopt." That is practically what your Board would do?—Yes. I would go a little further into detail, because I distinguish between their powers for dealing with schemes of studies, professional and otherwise.

28. As to the College Councils, you do not agree with the proposition of the pamphlet on page 111?—I do not agree with that.

29. Do you agree with the suggestion as to the constitution of the College Council—"Four College Councils to administer the colleges as at present; but to the lay members would be added, say, two professors elected by the College Professorial Boards. It is suggested that the lay members of the Council should be elected, for the particular University district, by one broad electorate described below"?—What is a broad electorate?—That is on the next page, I suppose.

30. Yes, the concluding paragraph?—I do not know where you are going to stop. I do not understand that electorate. If it does not mean the whole population, I do not know what it means. I believe the whole of society should be organized except paupers.

Professor Easterfield: I think that was the idea of the electorate that has been adopted in Brisbane—that every profession elects.

Witness: Birmingham has a great many organizations represented. I am in favour of the people who come in contact with university education being represented.

31. *Mr. Herdman.*] What do you consider should be the functions of the College Council? They would not take part in the academic control?—No.

32. They would be interested in the administration of the funds of the university?—Yes, but they would take no part in the academic control except in the appointment of the staff—the professors and lecturers—and the allotting of the funds to the several departments.

33. Would you not require business men on the College Council, or that class of man, rather than people who are identified with education?—I think the College Councils, as a rule—or the two or three that I know best—have a good proportion of business men on them. I have met several of them a good many times, and been very much impressed with them—in the two southern colleges, at least.

34. You suggest that the number of members should be about fourteen or fifteen: do you not think the business would be better transacted by a smaller number of business men on the Council?—It might be better, but I do not think that would be necessarily the object, to get a large or small number. Generally, you have to find a certain number of people to act on committees, and it is better to have the committees largely independent, otherwise the work would fall upon a few men all the time, and if you make the number of the Council too small these men would become too powerful.

35. You said that the Council would have to make all the appointments: do you think it advisable that the Council should consult the academic body before making an appointment?—Yes.

36. You mean that, supposing a man has to be appointed to a particular Chair, the professors themselves would be the men most capable of filling it, and therefore would be able to make the selection?—Of giving advice as to the appointment. I think it is possible to make mistakes in appointments simply through ignorance; in fact, there have been mistakes made through ignorance of the requirements, and ignorance of the qualifications of candidates.

37. In connection with the College Councils, apart from the question of making appointments, the members would run the finance and general business of the college?—Yes.

38. Do you not think it is desirable to provide in some way that the business men of the city in which the college is situate should be represented?—Yes, I left that out inadvertently. I think the City Councils should be represented.

39. The view, I take it, is that the best business methods concern the Council, which deals with money and buildings: usually that sort of work should be left to business men, and by having them you would enlist their sympathies?—You are going on the hypothesis that businessmen have more capacity in educational matters.

40. It is a business matter, and they would be assisted by two professors?—I do not find that a man who is engaged in commerce has more business capacity than a professor.

41. Professor Eliot says, "The kind of man needed on the governing Board of a university is the highly educated, public-spirited business or professional man"?—You must remember that nearly every one of those business men in America is a graduate. Some of the business houses would not employ any one who is not a graduate of some university. I should, however, have mentioned the type of man required.

TUESDAY, 10TH OCTOBER, 1911.

Professor LABY re-examined. (No. 23.)

1. *The Chairman.*] In connection with the constitution of the local University Councils, a difference of opinion has been expressed with reference more particularly to the suggestion contained in the pamphlet with regard to the constituency which should elect the Councils of the University. I think the Inspector-General said he was of opinion that particular interests should be represented, whereas the pamphlet suggests that they should all be combined in one electorate. I should like you to give us your opinion from the point of view of the petitioners?—The reasons that weighed with us in drawing up the chapter on "Reorganization," in which we state that the four College Councils should be elected in the manner mentioned on pages 112 and 113 of the pamphlet, were that we attached very great importance to the proposal that the Senate should be constituted by the College Councils sitting together. For we believe no more effective way than this has been proposed for obtaining co-ordination in the work of the colleges and University. Some such proposal was made by the Royal Commission of 1879, and I think it recommends itself to every reasonable person. If you admit also that the Senate must not be unwieldly in size—I should describe a Senate of sixty members as unwieldly, because you would not be able to get the members of it together—I should say that thirty would be a more effective number. If these two assumptions are accepted—that you have a Senate not too large and also that it is to be made up by the College Councils—the size of the College Council thereby becomes limited. We then get a College Council which cannot possibly have a membership of more than ten, and I think President Eliot has put that very well when he says that about seven is an ideal number for a College Council, as it is a body which works quickly. If you admit that about seven is the proper number of Councillors you should have, then you cannot admit the principle of special representatives on the Council, because seven members could not represent all the interests. First of all the graduates must be represented, and then the school-teachers, and the City Council, the learned bodies—such as medical profession, barristers and solicitors, architects, dentists, engineers, and others—I believe, all have an immediate interest in the University, and the University can derive great strength from their support, so they should be represented. If you constitute the Senate of the College Councils, and it is not too unwieldly, it is not possible to have all those representatives on the College Council. I think you must attain it in some other way, and the idea we have borrowed from the Queensland University Act and the West Australian Bill, if it has commended itself to those two democracies as wise, may recommend itself to New Zealand. Their school-teachers, graduates, lawyers, doctors, &c., and I understand their City Council, are fairly represented on the body which elects the Senate. You would not have the absurdity of having one City Council elector among two hundred graduates, but you would give them such representation as to enable them as a group to return a member, or considerably influence his return.

2. You mean to say you would have some system of proportional representation?—Yes, you would get the ratios on the larger body. When you get that all through I think you are much more likely to get good men on the Council than under the present system of representation, where you have elections taking place in such a way that those most interested in the colleges do not know where they are taking place. The present College Council elections attract little attention, and there are few circumstances that bring out the best men to stand for the election. I think by less frequent elections by a large body voting as a whole you would get, as in Australia, eminent men to compete with one another for a position on the governing body of the University. I think we want the most able men as candidates. The method we propose will lead men to believe that it is a high honour to be on the University Senate. The ability of the men to be obtained by a bigger electorate is shown in New South Wales. Sir Samuel Griffiths, Chief Justice of Australia, Sir Edmond Barton, and Sir Norman McLaurin, and Chief Justice Cullen are members of Sydney University Senate.

3. They have the City Councillors represented in Queensland, have they not?—I think they are.

4. Supposing there were between the graduates and the teachers together about four hundred in one constituency, the number of City Councillors would not be more than eighteen: do you not think it would be very difficult to give a representation which would not swamp the vote of the City Councillors in a constituency of that kind?—It would be manageable to adopt a method by which the City Councillors each could have two votes. It is a matter of detail. It is not so much a matter of votes as to interest men to come forward and stand for election. The graduates and teachers would see the wisdom of putting a suitable representative of the Council on the College Council. There would be no conflict of interest.

5. You suggest the College Council should consist of seven or not more than ten: that is chiefly because the four College Councils are to constitute the Senate, and it is not desirable to have the Senate too unwieldly. Supposing that is not done, is there the same necessity for limiting the number of the Council?—No, not the same complete necessity, but I think large Councils are not so efficient as small ones. As one witness before you admitted, in Auckland they frequently found it difficult to get a quorum of five, and when there is just a quorum present members feel that there is a lack of interest shown in the work.

6. In our Otago University there are three members of Parliament on the Council, and if you limit the number to seven there will be great difficulty in getting a sufficient number present during the sitting of Parliament to do the work. I mention that as a practical difficulty if you have a small Council. Do you think a member of Parliament should be on the Council?—I think you should get the best men wherever they can be found.

7. Three members off a body of seven would leave too few to transact the business. However, I am glad you have had an opportunity of explaining a little more fully the idea which was in the minds of the petitioners in that connection?—Thank you.

Mr. HERDMAN made a statement. (No. 24.)

Mr. Herdman: On behalf of the petitioners, I desire to say, first of all, that at the beginning of this inquiry it was mentioned by me that we wanted to make a slight alteration to the prayer of the petition. It reads in this way: "Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your honourable House will inquire into the state of university administration and education in New Zealand." I would like that amended, with the permission of the Committee, so as to read, "Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your honourable House will recommend that a Royal Commission be appointed to inquire into the state of university administration and education in New Zealand." I desire, first of all, on behalf of the petitioners, to thank members of the Committee for the care and attention they have given to the evidence which I have called. It has been quite obvious that the Committee have recognized that this petition, which asks for an inquiry into the system of university education in this country, is one of very great importance. To begin with, I would say this: I think it is admitted that the effect of university teaching upon the life of nations has in modern times come to be recognized as of enormous importance. National life is becoming exceedingly complex. The business of nations is becoming complex, all our modern conditions are becoming complicated, and the necessity of having a national institution that can fit men to go into the world and take their part in the affairs of life is becoming more and more obvious and more necessary. Secondly, I say this: that I do not propose to argue that there is a case for reform. To argue that there is a case for reform is only beating the air, because it is obvious from the evidence given by Mr. Hogben and by various professors that reform of the university system is necessary. I do not propose to occupy the time of the Committee in attempting to prove that reform is necessary. I take it that the Committee recognizes that our university system is in such an unsatisfactory state at the present time that some drastic inquiry should be made, and that immediate steps should be taken to bring our University into line with most up-to-date modern universities. Mr. Hogben, in the course of his evidence, suggests that if there is enough evidence before the Committee to show that reform in the institution is necessary there is no need for a Royal Commission. With great respect for Mr. Hogben's opinion, I beg to differ from him in the position he takes up. I suggest to him that, as the head of the Department, it would be of immense advantage to him and the Government, in taking the necessary step to effect university reform, were they to be backed up by the opinions of a competent tribunal. The matter is of such great importance that there is no use in patching up our university system. It is obvious that if any radical change is to be made it must be a change which is going to last for years. It would be madness, in my opinion, to patch up our system to enable us to tide over some five or six years. If any inquiry is to be made into the constitution of our university system of examination and finance it must be such an inquiry as will place them on a secure foundation, enabling them to last and do good for many years. Since the New Zealand University was established no radical changes in its organization have taken place. It is perfectly true that a Commission was appointed some years ago to investigate the position, and that a report was made; and I am led to believe by the petitioners that if the recommendations then made had been acted upon the University would not have been in the unfortunate position in which we find it. At any rate, so I am led to understand. There are one or two small matters I desire to refer to and clear up. First of all, I wish it to be quite clearly understood that there is no suggestion on the part of the authors of the pamphlet that evening classes should be dispensed with. On the contrary, the authors of the pamphlet believe that evening classes are necessary; but they hold the view that the system of conducting these evening classes should be retained, and improvements in the opportunities of the day students attending the University should be brought about. It has been stated by one witness at all events that the pamphlet contemplates doing away with evening classes. To that statement I give an emphatic denial, and say that if the pamphlet is read through, and the whole of the observations made upon the subject of evening classes are carefully read, no fair inference can be drawn that an attempt is made to do away with evening classes. It is most unfair to suggest that the pamphleteers take the view which the witness imputes to them. Secondly, one witness declared that the pamphleteers are of opinion that the exempt-student system should be done away with. Again I say that no person with a fair mind who reads that pamphlet can after perusal say that they want to abolish exempt students. It is grossly unfair, I suggest, to state that the authors of the pamphlet advocate doing away with exempt students. It was also hinted by one witness that the authors of the pamphlet suggest that the endowments which are at present enjoyed by Canterbury College and the Otago University should be taken away from them. I admit that they wish to reform University finance, but such a statement or suggestion if left uncontradicted might do incalculable harm; and I wish it to be clearly understood by the Committee that the authors of the pamphlet never suggested that the institutions which control those properties in the South—in Canterbury or Otago—should be deprived of their absolute rights. They go no further than to suggest that the financial position of the University and four colleges is so unsatisfactory that it is the duty of the State now to make some provision which will put the whole of the four colleges in the Dominion on some substantial and satisfactory basis. In any scheme for financial reform, I should take it, Canterbury College and the Otago University would still retain the whole of their endowments. It would be a piece of impertinence to suggest that those institutions, which have enjoyed from the Provincial Government so long these valuable properties, should be deprived of them as a result of any investigation into our university system. Now I wish chiefly to address the Committee on the constitution of the proposed Royal Commission. Reform is necessary, and if reform is necessary, it can be got in three different ways. It can be got by the Government and the Education Department taking the matter in hand; it can be got by appointing a Commission to inquire into the whole question of education throughout the country; and, thirdly, it can be got by a Commission simply appointed to inquire into the system of university education alone; and it is that third proposition that I advocate. As to the first two, whilst everybody respects the view

Mr. Hogben takes, I venture to believe that if the Department took the matter in hand it would not be so satisfactory as if a Commission were appointed—an independent Commission of impartial persons.

Mr. Hogben: I did not suggest that the Department should do it at all.

The Chairman: I think Mr. Hogben said that if Parliament actually reformed the constitution, then he thought the other reforms would follow and there would be no necessity for a Royal Commission.

Mr. Herdman: Then I misunderstood him. I thought Mr. Hogben meant that if we establish a case here for reform there would be no need for a Royal Commission at all, and that the Government would probably pass legislation which would accomplish everything.

Mr. Hogben: I think I said "Parliament." I do not mean that the Education Department would come into it, except that it might frame a Bill for the instruction of the House.

Mr. Herdman: I say that no satisfactory system of reform can be brought about by any Commission to inquire into the whole system of education. As far as this Committee is concerned, we have had no evidence at all about our educational system or that branch of it which deals with primary or secondary schools, and it is not germane to the subject before the Committee. I think the subject is so vast that no investigation would be satisfactory which had to investigate the state of our primary and secondary schools. If there is any necessity, the subject should be split up, and different Commissions should be appointed to investigate its different parts. The subject is highly technical, and any inquiry to be made should be of a non-political character, and be made by impartial persons who are skilled and deeply interested in university education. I would suggest that members of the Senate should not be put on any such Commission; and, above all, the inquiry should be thorough, and that as the result of the inquiry our university system should be put on a substantial and permanent basis. Now, as to the constitution of the Committee, I beg to submit this proposal: that the Royal Commission should consist of three different individuals, one an expert from outside of New Zealand, and two business men in New Zealand who have interested themselves in education in the past. I suggest that from outside of New Zealand a man of this type should be procured—say, Dr. Hill, or Professor Gregory Foster, Professor Saddler, or Principal Headlam, Lord Reay, or the Hon. Mr. Fink, who took part in a Commission appointed by the Victorian Government to inquire into the Melbourne University, and who was really responsible for the report—one of the most valuable educational documents ever presented to a colonial Parliament—Professor Tucker, Professor J. T. Wilson, or Professor Orme Masson. Now, of the two New Zealand business men I suggest that one should represent the North Island and one the South Island. The type of business man I would suggest may be gathered from the following names I shall mention: Mr. R. McNab; Mr. Hosking, K.C., of Dunedin; Mr. Arthur Myers, of Auckland; Mr. William Ferguson, of Wellington, at one time secretary of the Harbour Board; Mr. Parr, of Auckland, the present Mayor; Mr. John Roberts, of Dunedin; and Mr. Fowlds, formerly Minister of Education. I hope it will be understood what I mean—that there should be one man from outside, one from the North Island and one from the South Island, and that these three men should be appointed to investigate our system of university education, and be allowed to go to Australia to visit the universities there, and call evidence if considered desirable; that every facility should be given to them to take evidence in New Zealand and Australia, and afterwards to make their report. Now, a good deal will depend upon the man you get from outside. I say that if you get a man of the type of Dr. Hill, who has been appointed on several occasions by the British Government to investigate the question of university reform in England—and I believe there is a possibility of his being able to come out here—and you join with him such men as Mr. Hosking, of Dunedin, Mr. Fowlds, or Mr. McNab, their report would be so authoritative and of such weight and importance in the whole community that their suggestions would be carried into effect without any difficulty at all. If I may I will quote a statement made by Dr. Hill on page 143 of the pamphlet, which will give you some idea of the trust that has been placed in him: "In 1901, and again in 1906, I was appointed one of two Commissioners to report to Parliament upon the universities and university colleges in England which received grants from the Treasury. In 1907–8 I served on a small committee which examined and reported on the University—and its three constituent colleges—of Wales. In the blue-books which we prepared are contained complete but succinct accounts of the organization of teaching and examining adopted by all the newer universities—viz., Manchester, Liverpool, Leeds, Sheffield, Birmingham, Bristol, London (in part), and the Welsh University." You will see from that he has been connected with university organization in England, and is recognized as an authority. The report of such a Commission would be so worded, so influential, and so valuable, that you would be able to erect upon it a system of university life in this country which would have a permanent and enduring effect, and be of infinite service to the community. President Eliot, of the famous Harvard University, declares that "The kind of man needed in the governing Board of the university is the highly educated public-spirited business or professional man, who takes a strong interest in educational and social problems, and believes in higher education as the source of enlightenment and progress. He should also be a man who has been successful in his own calling, and commands the confidence of all who know him. The faculty he will need most is good judgment." So that in regard to what I might call the lay members of the proposed Commission, the gentlemen I have named, I suggest, would conform to the definition that President Eliot lays down as the kind of man needed on the governing bodies of universities. A man like Mr. Ferguson, of Wellington, or a man like Mr. Parr, of Auckland, or Mr. John Roberts, of Dunedin, with Dr. Hill, would be just the kind of Commission required to investigate this subject. Members of the Committee will recollect that when our system of defence was in the air this country did not know where to look for men to inaugurate the scheme. Lord Kitchener came round, and after investigating our defence conditions here made a report to the Government, and that report was so authoritative,

and he spoke with such influence, that the Government and the country immediately decided to embark upon the new defence scheme. I might suggest that a similar result might be obtained if you got from England a Kitchener in educational matters, such as Dr. Hill, who will speak with such authority as Lord Kitchener does on defence matters. We shall be getting the best advice, the best wisdom, and the highest talent, and there will be no difficulty in getting the people of this Dominion to put our University on a much better footing. Investigations have been made from time to time recently into the university systems in different parts of the world, and these investigations have been made quite apart from other branches of education. The various Commissions appointed have not inquired into the scope and position of primary or secondary schools, but into the university life only, it being, no doubt, recognized that the men who are competent to express an opinion on university organization are not necessarily competent to express an opinion on primary or secondary schools. Probably men like President Eliot and the Hon. Mr. Fink, of Melbourne, would say it would be a huge mistake, a great blunder, to join in an inquiry into a university system an inquiry into primary and secondary schools. The type of man you would require would be quite different for the several inquiries. The Commissions to which I shall refer in support of the statement above are these: The Commission appointed to inquire into the Scottish universities—in fact, there were two Commissions; the Commission appointed to investigate the Irish universities and also the Welsh universities; and the three Commissions appointed by the British Government to inquire into the state of the London University. One Commission, I think, is sitting to-day, with Lord Haldane as chairman. A Commission was appointed in South Africa to inquire into the system of university education only; and, as I have already mentioned, a very valuable Commission was appointed some years ago to inquire into the state of the Melbourne University, whose duties were confined to the university only, and had nothing to do with primary or secondary education. The matter, I submit, is quite large enough for one body to undertake. No doubt the question of expense will weigh with the Committee in determining this matter. I should say that if you appoint three gentlemen, and they have to travel through Australia and perform their duties also in New Zealand, the cost to the country should not exceed £3,000. It has been suggested to me that so keen is Dr. Hill in educational matters that he would probably undertake the duty without payment. However, I think £3,000 would cover the whole expenditure, and for that you will get a very valuable report if you get the type of men I referred to. Now, there is only one other matter I desire to deal with. A conference of the Australasian universities was held the other day in Sydney, although New Zealand was not represented.

Mr. Hogben: No invitation was sent to the Education Department.

Mr. Herdman: I understand it was an Australasian Conference. At that conference the following resolutions were passed: "1. That in the interests of university education it is desirable that the organized body of professors should take a definite and systematic part both in the drawing-up of degree curricula and syllabuses and in the degree examinations. 2. That the purely external system of examination is detrimental to university education." Then, the Students' Association have handed me a letter, which reads as follows: "I am directed to inform you that the following motion was passed by my executive in connection with the university reform movement: 'That, in the opinion of this executive, the time is ripe for reform in the university system, with particular reference to the arts and science courses.' At the same time, I am directed to inform you that my executive is strongly opposed to any radical change in the law examinations." No doubt you will want some sort of indication as to the order of reference supposing a Commission were appointed. We have drafted this out, and perhaps the Committee might like to consider it: "Draft order of reference: To inquire and report upon (*a*) The constitutions of the New Zealand University and the four affiliated colleges; (*b*) the financial position of the New Zealand University and the four affiliated colleges; (*c*) the administration and the teaching-work of the four affiliated colleges; (*d*) the examining-work of the New Zealand University and the four affiliated colleges: and generally to make recommendations as to the best means to be adopted for the efficient government and financing of the University and colleges, so as to bring the methods of these institutions into line with those of the most efficient and up-to-date modern universities." I do not desire to say anything more excepting this: that I consider this matter to be of enormous importance so far as New Zealand is concerned. Our system of government is democratic, and for a democratic Government to be successful it must have an enlightened democracy, and the only way of getting an enlightened democracy is by efficiency in the education system, including the primary and secondary schools, and, above all, in university training. It is admitted that our system is quite out of date; it is admitted that it needs reform; and our suggestion is that that reform can best be attained by the appointment of a Royal Commission on the lines I have suggested.

The Chairman: I suppose you do not agree with Mr. Hogben when he says that if Parliament were to amend the constitution of the University there would be no further necessity for a Royal Commission to inquire into our University system, because the other things would right themselves?

Mr. Herdman: It would entirely depend upon the form of amendment Parliament would make. I do not think Parliament could satisfactorily deal with such a highly technical and scientific question, and unless it was armed with a scheme which was framed by a Royal Commission I am afraid that in the rough-and-tumble of politics a satisfactory scheme would not be drawn up. To effect this reform satisfactorily I think it should be as much as possible taken out of the arena of politics and intrusted to experts, as has been done in England, Scotland, and other places—intrusted to men of wide experience and of expert knowledge. If the Commission brings forward a scheme I feel sure the Government and our local educationalists will assist to bring it into practice here to meet our local requirements, and that, speaking with authority as they will speak, the scheme will be adopted intelligently and without any discussion.

The Chairman: You are aware that it is very often possible to get from Royal Commissions the kind of report that is wanted by the appointment of men whose views are known.

Mr. Herdman: Yes.

The Chairman: For instance, supposing you were to take Professor Oman and associate two others with him, you would probably get a very different report to that you would obtain by appointing Dr. Hill. Persons whose views are in a certain direction frequently in connection with the evidence brought before them give more weight to things that fit in with their preconceived ideas.

Mr. Herdman: No doubt; but with regard to Dr. Hill, his work speaks for itself. By reason of the fact that he has been so often appointed by the British Government he has been recognized as an authority, and if his work had not been successful he would not have been repeatedly reappointed. My view is that the matter is of such importance to the community of this country in the future that it ought to be taken up by a man who has no bias or any political leanings—whose whole soul is identified with educational work, whose past experience points to him as a man of ability and practical judgment, and a man who undertakes the task because he loves it and desires to see university education built up on sound practical lines. I hope the Government will not appoint any man with leanings on one side or the other, but one who is really desirous of getting at the truth.

Mr. Stallworthy: You thought it wise to name certain people in New Zealand who you thought were fit to undertake the duties: are those people known to you, or have their names only been given to you?

Mr. Herdman: I know the Hon. Mr. Fowlds, and Mr. Hosking, of Dunedin. I only mentioned them as types of the men required.

The Chairman: Mr. Bell's name was mentioned: what do you think of him as the type of man required?

Mr. Herdman: I think he would make a very good man indeed.

TUESDAY, 10TH OCTOBER, 1911.

Examination of Mr. G. HOGBEN, Inspector-General of Schools, continued. (No. 25.)

1. *The Chairman.*] Will you continue your remarks, Mr. Hogben, on the general question?—I was asked last week what the practice was at the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge with regard to local examiners. I have examined the calendars for 1910 and 1911 of these two universities, and in the case of the Oxford University I made a complete examination of all the public degree examinations of that university. The total number of examiners was eighty-six, and out of the eighty-six, sixty-one are either professors or lecturers, or persons whose duty it is to direct the studies of the students. It is impossible for me to say whether they were teaching immediately before the examination or not, because the rules that apply to them both in Oxford and Cambridge are confidential rules with regard to the examinations handed by the Vice-Chancellor to the several examiners. In the case of Cambridge, I had some difficulty in making a complete examination of the facts, but the general principal seems to be well illustrated by taking the three principal triposes or honours examinations. The triposes I took were the Mathematical Tripos, the Classical Tripos, and the Natural Sciences Tripos: the total result is that out of the forty examiners twenty-one were teachers—that is, professors or lecturers.

2. *Mr. Stallworthy.*] You do not know whether they were teaching immediately before the examination or not?—No. Probably in a good many cases, if not in all, they were not. The rules are confidential, and are not therefore published in the calendar. The main point is this: that these people, even if not teaching immediately before the examination, are closely associated with the whole teaching and life of the university, and therefore are not external examiners in the same sense as the examiners for many of our degrees. Our external examiners are not living in the University, and are not immediately associated with the teaching or the life of our University.

3. *The Chairman.*] Would these examiners have any knowledge at all of the work the students, when examined, have been doing in their class?—They would not have the same kind of knowledge that the actual teachers of the students would have; they are not wholly internal examiners. But their position as examiners is not the same as that of our external examiners.

4. They are not so completely dissociated from the institution?—Yes, that is my point. I do not think the arrangement is perfect. I am a graduate of Cambridge University, and I think that the influence of the examinations in my time was vicious; at all events, I think a large part of the influence was bad.

5. Were all the examiners old students of the respective universities?—Not in every case, but with a few exceptions they were. There were five or six out of the eighty-six at Oxford who had not been students at Oxford, and two or three of these were Cambridge men used to the same class of work; and at Cambridge I think there were about three out of forty who were not Cambridge men. One at least was an Oxford man who was once for a short time as a lecturer at Cambridge, but he was not a Cambridge man. It has been said that they were all external examiners; but, as I have pointed out, there is a difference in the sense in which we are using the term "external examiners." In my time at Cambridge the effect of the triposes was most harmful.

6. That is because of the system of external examination?—Yes; although we had never had external examinations of the kind that London had.

7. I want to ask you whether you have any objection to express your opinion as to whether you consider there is any necessity for the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into the question of university reform?—I do not wish to volunteer my opinion.

8. But have you any objection to express your opinion on the point?—My opinion would be a qualified opinion in any case, because, of course, it is a personal opinion, not an official opinion.

9. I will ask you what your personal opinion is, then?—Well, it is this: that if the constitution of the University is altered—say, as the consequence of the report of this Committee—I do not see any need for a Royal Commission. I cannot see that a Royal Commission could do anything in the direction of advising reform of the constitution of the University that a Parliamentary Committee could not do.

10. All that this Committee is asked to do is to report upon the necessity of a Royal Commission or otherwise?—My personal opinion is that there is no need for a Royal Commission, because the evidence that has been produced before this Committee is sufficient. It is a question of evidence—that given in the pamphlet and that obtained otherwise—and I do not see how you can get any more evidence than is available to the Committee. If the question of the constitution is once settled I believe most of the other points referred to in the petition and the pamphlet will settle themselves.

11. Would you express the same opinion with regard to a Royal Commission to consider the whole of our university system from the top to the bottom?—I say *most* of the other things—of course, the finance is a different matter—would be settled, and I do not see what a Royal Commission could do. The finance all depends upon the will of the Government and of Parliament. With regard to studies, degrees, and examinations, if you had an academic body to give the initiative, subject to final veto and control of what is now called the Senate, I think all these other things would settle themselves.

12. Some of the proposals which have been made here would mean the surrender by the local Councils of powers which they have enjoyed for some years: I refer to the questions of appointment of professors and the institution of new Chairs?—Those are two distinct questions.

13. My point is this: do you think that, even supposing a Royal Commission were to report in favour of proposals which would have the effect of taking away powers from the local Councils, there would be any great difficulty in giving effect to them?—The questions are so different that I could not give the same answer to them. With regard to the foundation of new Chairs, I think it would be to the interest of the several colleges to allow their powers to be limited, because it is to the interest of every college that there should not be unnecessary overlapping between the colleges. If called upon to compete with the other colleges in other lines, a college would to a certain extent be crippled in lines it had already taken up.

14. How about the appointment of professors for the Chairs already established? I think you expressed your opinion that even the appointment of a professor to a Chair should not be exclusively in the hands of the local Council?—I do not think I said that. I said I thought the advice of professional men should be available. My mind is entirely made up on the question of the foundation of new Chairs. I have a clear opinion, whether right or wrong; but I am not very clear as to what should be done with regard to the power of appointment. I hold that professional experts should be consulted with regard to the appointment of professors; but my idea is not so clear about that as the foundation of new Chairs. There are several ways in which you might do it, and I am not at all certain in my mind as to which would be the best way.

15. With regard to a Royal Commission, you see no necessity for the appointment of one?—No; but there is a proviso to that opinion—that is, that if this Committee recommended an amendment of the constitution of the University, and the constitution was amended, then there would be no need for a Royal Commission. I regard a Royal Commission as a lever to get this reform as a first step, but I do not see that a Royal Commission could get any more evidence on that point than the Committee has.

16. Do you think there has been sufficient evidence put before the Committee on both sides to enable it to express an opinion on that question?—As to the question of the constitution of the University, Yes, sir. I do not know any other evidence that could be produced—the rest would be only personal opinion, not evidence of fact.

17. I want to be quite clear on the point of your recommendation as to what form the examination should take here for our degrees. What I gathered was that you are in favour of a Board of the four professors in each subject being set up?—Yes, they should be the examining committee.

18. Take the examination in Latin: you would set up a Board of four professors in Latin?—Yes, with an external examiner, if the Senate appointed one.

19. How would the examination be drawn up?—I would like to say with regard to this and other matters I have referred to in regard to the men that these are questions of detail, and I merely suggest this as possibly one solution. There would be an examining committee—namely, the professors concerned with the teaching of the subject in the several colleges—with an outsider if the Senate so decided. At each college there would be the professor of the subject at that college, and also an external examiner appointed by the Senate from the examining committee. The external examiner for any one college might thus be a professor from another college, who would be an *external* examiner as far as the former college is concerned.

20. What would be the functions of the Board of four—the examining committee?—They would have to pass on to the Board of Studies—the academic body—the results made up by the two who actually did the examining.

21. The two who actually examined would report to the Board of four (or five, if there were an assessor)?—Yes.

22. Would you suggest, if there were an external assessor, that he should be the one who should examine with the professor of the college?—I do not think it is necessary at all; the mere interchange of professors would keep the standard nearly uniform enough. A uniform standard would never be absolutely attained, nor is it necessary that it should.

23. You think there would be difficulty in getting assessors?—Yes, in some subjects; but I do not think that an external assessor is a necessary element. The public of New Zealand would probably, however, expect you to have a certain amount of the external element.

24. You referred to your visit to the Old Country, and said that your impression from meeting different educational authorities was that the prestige of our degree was not raised by having home examiners?—Yes.

25. Did you have any opinions expressed by the same authorities with regard to the Australian degrees?—I did with regard to the Sydney degrees.

26. In what way did they compare?—I do not think the judgments were comparative. These people mentioned simply said they held the Sydney degrees in high estimation because they knew the men were of high standing. They founded their opinion upon the knowledge of the teachers in Sydney.

27. Referring for a moment to the question of free education, you expressed the opinion that free education should be given to all those students who had completed a satisfactory four-years course at a secondary school: would you distinguish between country and city students?—No. I said, a satisfactory education ending with a four-years course in the high schools. If a country student reached that he should be entitled to enter the University. Some of the country-school students (in district high schools), to my knowledge, have reached that standard.

28. Would you give free education by means of bursaries?—Yes; I would extend the bursaries now opened to those who gain credit in the University Junior Scholarship Examination to any who have done four years' satisfactory secondary work.

29. Would you give any additional payments to students whose parents live in the country?—Yes, if I could get the money allowed for it. I do not believe in competitive scholarships.

30. You would increase the amount of the bursary for students who live in the country?—Yes. The distinction between the bursaries and scholarships would disappear. There would be bursaries for all qualified students, and boarding-allowances in addition for students who had to live away from home.

31. With regard to the satisfactory four-years course in a secondary school, would you include a day technical school?—Yes; I would give its students senior leaving certificates, but they would be for four years' full work.

32. You referred to the examination for free places in the secondary schools, and I think you said you were giving promotion on examination of the actual work done during a considerable period?—We are giving it on the recommendation of the principals, and for the purpose of seeing that a uniform standard is maintained we conduct certain informal examinations, which are held on the work actually done in the school.

33. Is that on the occasion of the Inspector's visit?—Yes, the visit by Inspectors of the Department.

34. How do you make that inspection fit in with the time?—On this plan it does not matter so much about the time. Those who are about to get the Senior Free Place in this way have already at the time of the Inspector's visit been there one full year, and probably more than half another year. Therefore there would be at least three parts of their intermediate course finished. And there is besides the judgment of the principal as a guide.

35. *Mr. Stallworthy.*] In extending the bursaries to those who have had a four-years course would you not very largely increase the expenditure?—Of course, it would increase it, but not very largely. You must take one part of my evidence with another. I do not say we should keep on the present scholarship and the bursary system as well. I would replace the present competitive system and the partial bursary system we have now by a complete bursary system, and the complete system would not cost us very much more.

36. And the competitive system does not keep out a very large number?—The fault of the competitive system is more educational than in the number it keeps out: it has the evil effects of examination in a most pronounced degree. The evil is educational rather than otherwise. Its effect upon those preparing for scholarships is harmful. From the time they enter the University the students have their whole attention fixed upon examinations.

37. You think the public would be more satisfied with external examiners in university examinations?—Not with external examiners alone, but if there were one external examiner added. I hold that that feeling is to some extent natural.

38. The public would be likely to hold some suspicion as to the fairness if the professors were the only examiners?—I hold that such a suspicion would be more or less superstitious. But, still, if you look to Parliament for money, you must make the examinaton above suspicion. In our public departmental examinations we employ external examiners almost exclusively, partly because our officers are too busy to undertake the work, and partly because we are not prepared to do anything that the public would have the slightest doubt about; but I do not agree with the desirability of having so many external examinations.

39. You think there is sufficient evidence before this Committee and the Minister of Education to come to a conclusion whether it is desirable or not to have a Royal Commission appointed?—I think the first step would carry all the other reforms with it eventually. The reform of the constitution may be settled on the evidence available before the Committee: the evidence is tolerably full—with regard to the British universities, at all events.

40. *Mr. Herdman.*] Do you not think the Government and your Department, of which you are the head, would be very much assisted in this problem of university reform were you to have

the finding of some satisfactory Commission?—I think that is quite possible. The hypothesis I made was that if this Committee recommended a reform of the constitution, and if in consequence the reform was made, a Royal Commission would not be necessary.

41. *The Chairman.*] But supposing that does not take place?—I hold that the reform is most essential, and that any means adopted by which it could be secured, and which were straightforward, would be justifiable.

42. If the Committee does recommend Parliament, and Parliament does not give effect to the recommendation, you think the Royal Commission might be of some use?—Yes, as an instrument; but I do not think that on the point of the constitution you would get much more evidence.

G. HOGBEN, Inspector-General of Schools, recalled.

43. *Mr. G. M. Thomson.*] In connection with the suggested Board of Studies, do you not think that the Technical School Boards should have some direct representation?—If day technical schools, I think they might; but at present I will give this answer: Their connection with the other branches of education is rather loose. It ought to be closer, and if it were closer I think they might have representation.

44. External examinations test book-knowledge, but neither encourage observational work nor scientific deduction: is that your opinion?—Yes, certainly.

45. Do you consider that the method adopted by the Education Department for Senior Free Places in secondary schools could be adapted to the New Zealand University?—Yes, I do, requiring four years' work at the secondary school, and assuming that the University reserves to itself the right of examination as an alternative. In any doubtful case the candidate should go through an examination.

46. Would you be in favour of a scheme by which the University could grant diplomas to exempted students (say on the lines of the associateship of the Otago School of Mines) instead of degrees?—Eventually, I think, we ought to get to that; but I would not take away the rights of exempted students until there is something substantial to replace their present rights.

47. You would be, I understand, favourable to allocating University scholarships to the several colleges, instead of opening them to competitive examinations: would you leave the colleges themselves to decide as to their allocation?—Yes.

48. *Mr. Allen.*] You suggest an alteration in the New Zealand University Act by the establishing of another Board—a Board of Studies—to be composed mostly of the professional elements?—Yes.

49. At present the University is working under an Act of control?—Yes.

50. How do you propose to bring about the alteration you suggest—would it need an alteration of the law?—To embody it in the constitution of the University formally, as it ought to be embodied, would need an alteration of the law.

51. Do you think the change you are advocating might come about by a process of evolution—a process which is already manifesting itself in the New Zealand University—or would you rather see the change made direct and abrupt?—I had a hope that it would grow by a process of evolution within the Senate. After some years of waiting I thought it might evolve in such a thing as a conference of the professors, and one took place last year, but the action of the Senate in practically disregarding the conference and reverting to its old method of referring the question to the four separate colleges has rather tended to destroy my hope. At any rate, it is desirable, if it should grow up, that it should have the sanction of formal law.

52. I want to know if you think the law should be altered now to make provision for such a constitution as you suggest?—Yes.

53. Do you propose any alteration in the Senate itself under the new conditions?—I do not think it needs much essential alteration. There are one or two things in it that do not appeal very much to me, but, generally speaking, I think the Senate as a business body—as at present constituted—would tend to become satisfactory if it had the other body to deal with the academic questions.

54. Would you care to say what are the things that do not appeal to you now? I do not press it?—I feel perfectly free to give my opinion, but it is my personal opinion, not official. I do not believe in the particular form of nomination by the Governor in Council. I would have instead of Government representatives *ex officio* representatives.

55. In the Education Department?—No, quite irrespective of the person. I would have one representative of the Bench of Judges.

56. Have you any others to suggest?—I think the Inspector-General of Schools should be one. That is the only representative of the Education Department I should have. I would have one or two others, as, for instance, the President of the British Medical Association in New Zealand.

57. You would have them rather than Government nominees?—Yes. I am referring not to the appointments that are already made, but to the principle.

58. Your proposal is that a larger professorial element should constitute this new Board of Studies?—Yes.

59. Is it conceivable that such a Board might become more conservative with respect to the introduction of new Chairs, for instance, and block them? Is it not conceivable that they might have blocked the introduction in Otago of the School of Home Science and Domestic Art?—With reference to that, I think such a body ought to have a voice in the question.

60. Is it your idea that the new Chairs should be left to the Board of Studies?—No; I do not think any of those policy questions should be left to them entirely. The final voice should be

left to the Senate; the only questions I would leave to them entirely would be such as that of the actual conduct of the examinations, upon principles approved by the Senate after consultation with them.

61. Where would the initiative be with regard to the establishment of new Chairs?—I think that might be with either.

62. Either with the Professorial Board, the Board of Studies, or the Senate?—In any case I think it would come from the local Council.

63. Do you suggest that the initiative should still be with the local Council?—I am not particular about where the movement begins. I think the local Council should certainly have the power to move in regard to a new Chair; but I think that question should come before the general Board of Studies, and be finally determined by the Senate of the University. It was in this case of Home Science practically determined by the Senate. I was chairman of the committee that drew up the syllabus. I considered it would have been much better to have had the syllabus drawn up by the academic body.

64. As regards the syllabus, but as far as regards the establishment of a new Chair, what is your opinion?—That is a mixed financial and academic question; therefore you could not keep the financial body out of it, and I think it ought to have the final say. But the general body ought to agree on the establishment of a new Chair—not merely the local body.

65. *The Chairman.*] Do you approve of the *personnel* suggested by Mr. Herdman?—Without naming any persons, I think the principle is one that I should agree with. What Mr. Herdman said was that you should get a university expert from outside of New Zealand to act with two business men—if possible, two university graduates who were business men.

66. *Mr. Allen.*] Do you think the organization with regard to technical education is satisfactory—do you think we are getting value for the money spent?—Yes, I think you are—a great deal more than I believe people are aware of, immensely more value than people in the country imagine.

67. Do you think it is organized properly?—I think it is growing up in a healthy way, in the way in which technical education should grow up. If you try to manage it from the centre you will defeat the objects you are trying to attain.

68. Is it not formless?—You might almost make the same remark about technical education anywhere else—in Germany itself. It seems to be formless simply because it is dependent on local effort. I think, where a sufficient distinction is not made is between technical and manual instruction.

APPENDICES.

APPENDIX A.—UNIVERSITY COLLEGE COUNCILS.

RETURN showing for each University College Council—

(1.) The institutions controlled by the Council, including in the case of the actual University institution the various schools carried on under the administration of the Council.
(2.) The annual cost of carrying on each institution and school, and the total expenditure.
(2A.) The excess of monetary assets over liabilities.
(3.) The revenue of each College Council, specifying the sources of revenue.
(4.) The fees for college classes, the total fees received, and the disposition of the same.
(5.) The value of all endowments—showing the object for which the endowment was set aside.
(6.) The total moneys received by the Councils from benefactions, private donations, and subscriptions.
(6A.) The total moneys received by the Councils from parliamentary grants.

(1.) THE INSTITUTIONS CONTROLLED BY EACH COLLEGE COUNCIL.

Auckland.

University College; School of Commerce; School of Mines.

Wellington.

Victoria College; Law specialization.

Christchurch.

Canterbury College; School of Engineering; Astronomical Observatory; Boys' High School; Girls' High School; Museum; Public Library; School of Art.

Dunedin.

Otago University; School of Mines; Dental School; Medical School; Museum; School of Home Science.

(2.) THE ANNUAL COST OF CARRYING ON EACH INSTITUTION AND SCHOOL, AND THE TOTAL EXPENDITURE.

Institution.	Administration.	Salaries.	Sites, Buildings, &c.	Equipment and Apparatus.	Material and Renewals.	Expenses on Endowments.	Interest.	Libraries.	Scholarships.	Miscellaneous.	Total.
Auckland University College.											
Recurring Expenditure.	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
University	72	6,898	..	..	188	16	..	..	..	396	7,570
School of Commerce and Mines	27	1,743	..	..	217	..	3	..	19	79	2,088
Totals	99	8,641	..	..	405	16	3	..	19	475	9,658
*Non-recurring Expenditure.**											
University	..	..	119	..	..	..	..	126	..	..	245
School of Commerce and Mines	..	..	22	..	..	..	..	37	..	..	59
Totals	..	..	141	..	..	..	..	163	..	..	304
Grand totals	99	8,641	141	..	405	16	3	163	19	475	9,962
Victoria College.											
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Recurring expenditure	590	8,187	..	..	153	..	..	..	..	513	9,443
Non-recurring expenditure*	..	..	847	674	..	..	..	358	..	..	1,879
Totals	590	8,187	847	674	153	..	..	358	..	513	11,322
Canterbury College.											
Recurring Expenditure.	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
College	968	7,247	..	..	355	137	395	..	323	580	10,005
School of Engineering	168	3,037	..	..	60	..	..	..	..	169	3,434
Astronomical Observatory	..	50	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	14	64
Boys' High School	229	3,914	..	..	92	275	235	..	62	670	5,477
Girls' High School	77	2,315	..	..	78	92	..	..	117	131	2,810
Museum	32	1,133	..	..	70	..	6	..	..	71	1,312
Library	32	849	..	..	576	..	231	..	..	393	2,081
School of Art	121	1,902	..	..	108	..	..	..	43	216	2,390
Totals	1,627	20,447	..	..	1,339	504	867	..	545	2,244	27,573
*Non-recurring Expenditure.**											
Canterbury College	..	..	4,498	1,526	..	..	..	..	..	251	6,275
School of Engineering	..	..	27	567	..	..	..	..	..	22	616
Astronomical Observatory	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Boys' High School	..	..	224	54	..	..	..	..	..	75	353
Girls' High School	..	..	86	102	..	..	..	..	..	9	197
Museum	..	..	47	89	..	..	..	..	..	19	155
Library	..	..	40	..	36	..	..	..	..	4	80
School of Art	..	..	31	28	..	..	..	..	..	100	159
Totals	..	..	4,953	2,366	36	..	..	..	..	480	7,835
Grand totals	1,627	20,447	4,953	2,366	1,375	504	867	..	545	2,724	35,408
Otago University.											
Recurring Expenditure.	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Otago University	647	6,249	..	..	65	170	560	81	..	3	7,775
School of Mines	99	1,117	..	..	71	..	..	30	..	..	1,317
Dental School	153	1,163	..	..	308	..	..	19	..	..	1,643
Medical School	125	5,132	..	..	140	..	..	18	..	47	5,462
Museum	139	518	..	..	10	..	..	..	..	..	667
School of Home Science	..	83	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	341	424
Totals	1,163	14,262	..	..	594	170	560	148	..	391	17,288
*Non-recurring Expenditure.**											
Otago University	..	..	96	336	..	..	..	..	..	..	432
School of Mines	..	..	81	688	..	..	..	..	..	..	769
Dental School	..	..	538	163	..	..	..	..	..	..	701
Medical School	..	..	42	150	..	..	..	..	..	..	192
Museum	..	..	36	40	..	..	..	..	..	..	76
School of Home Science	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Totals	..	..	793	1,377	..	..	..	..	..	..	2,170
Grand totals	1,163	14,262	793	1,377	594	170	560	148	..	391	19,458

* Excluding trust accounts.

(2A.) THE EXCESS OF MONETARY ASSETS OVER LIABILITIES.

Auckland University College.

STATEMENT OF BALANCES, 31ST DECEMBER, 1910.

	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
Cr.		
College Account	6,419 14 3	
Sinclair, Gillies Account	3,773 12 8	
Sinclair Bequest	26 9 4	
		10,219 16 3
Dr.		
Specialization Account		499 18 8
		£9,719 17 7
Bank and Investments.		£ s. d.
Bank of New Zealand		3,729 3 10
Auckland Savings-bank		358 8 9
Post-Office Savings-Bank		932 5 0
Mortgages (freehold)		4,300 0 0
Debentures (Auckland City Council)		400 0 0
		£9,719 17 7
Liabilities.		£ s. d.
Choral Hall Purchase Account		4,000 0 0
Specialization Account (overdraft)		499 18 8
		£4,499 18 8
		£ s. d.
Excess of assets over liabilities		£5,219 18 11

Victoria College.

STATEMENT OF BALANCES, 31ST MARCH, 1911.

	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
Cr.		
General Account		2,180 6 11
Deposit Account		19 19 0
Jacob Joseph Scholarship Account (income)		264 10 0
Union Prize Fund (income)		6 17 10
Biological Observatory Station		9 0 0
Actual balance available		£2,480 13 9
Balance as per bank-book		2,480 13 9
Plus unpresented cheques	160 5 5	
Plus library deposits	19 19 0	
		180 4 5
Actual balance at bank		£2,660 18 2
Assets.		£ s. d.
General Account		2,389 10 4
Jacob Joseph Scholarship		264 10 0
Union Prize Fund		6 17 10
		£2,660 18 2
Liabilities.		£ s. d.
General Account		372 17 2
Jacob Joseph Scholarship		30 0 0
Union Prize Fund		4 7 6
		£407 4 8
Excess of assets over liabilities—		£ s. d.
General Account		2,016 13 2
Jacob Joseph Scholarship		234 10 0
Union Prize Fund		2 10 4
		£2,253 13 6

(2A.) THE EXCESS OF MONETARY ASSETS OVER LIABILITIES—*continued.*

Canterbury College.

STATEMENT OF BALANCES, 31ST DECEMBER, 1910.

Accounts.

Cr.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
Astronomical Observatory Account	411 8 6	
School of Engineering and Technical Science Account	334 12 1	
Boys' High School Maintenance Account	543 10 5	
Boys' High School Preparatory Department	4 4 4	
Girls' High School Capital Account	5,002 8 1	
School of Art Account	121 10 11	
Museum Guide Book Sinking Fund	40 0 0	
Public Library (Postle Bequest) Capital Account	1,666 8 6	
Public Library Sinking Fund	358 3 2	
Museum, Library, and School of Technical Science Capital Account	18,941 8 4	
Museum, Library, and School of Technical Science Endowment Account	202 17 0	
Medical School Reserves Account	4,379 6 6	
Emily S. Foster Memorial Fund	66 11 6	
Helen Macmillan Brown Memorial Fund	98 8 4	
Thomas Miller Prize Fund	100 0 7	
Joseph Haydon Prize Fund	221 7 7	
		32,492 5 10
Dr.		
College Maintenance Account	5,027 18 9	
College Buildings Loan Account	5,587 3 6	
Boys' High School Buildings Loan Account	4,500 0 0	
Girls' High School Maintenance Account	1,365 0 7	
Museum Account	46 16 3	
Public Library Maintenance Account	1,028 9 6	
		17,555 8 7
		£14,936 17 3

Bank and Investments.

	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
Drawing Account	731 15 0		
Less outstanding cheques	244 17 9		
		486 17 3	
Mortgage of freeholds		8,000 0 0	
Mortgage of debentures		5,700 0 0	
Debentures (Foster and Brown Memorial Funds)		150 0 0	
Debentures (Observatory)		300 0 0	
Debentures (Miller Prize Fund)		100 0 0	
Debentures (Haydon Prize Fund)		200 0 0	
			14,936 17 3

Liabilities.

Public Trust Department loan	4,000 0 0	
Public library scrip	98 10 2	
Emily S. Foster Memorial Fund	66 11 6	
H. Macmillan Brown Memorial Fund	98 8 4	
		4,263 10 0
Excess of assets over liabilities		£10,673 7 3

Otago University.

STATEMENT OF MONETARY ASSETS AND LIABILITIES, 31ST MARCH, 1911.

Assets.

	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
Various debentures held by University	14,589 9 0	
Cash in bank	2,126 15 2	
Government grant owing	170 11 0	
Due by Beverley Trust	145 6 0	
Various	0 13 7	
		*17,032 14 9

Liabilities.

Moneys due to Home Science School	1,091 2 2	
Moneys due to Students' Building Account	500 0 0	
Overdraft on Dental School Building Account	503 10 11	
Debentures owing by University	11,000 0 0	
		13,094 13 1
Excess of assets over liabilities		£3,938 1 8

* Including Wolff Harris Trust, £2,100.

(3.) THE REVENUE OF EACH COLLEGE COUNCIL, SPECIFYING THE SOURCES OF REVENUE.

Institution.	From Government.						Endowments and Interest.	Fees.	Donations, Trust Account.	Miscellaneous.	Grand Total.
	Statutory.	Subsidy on Voluntary Contributions.	Special and other Payments.	Total.	Buildings.	Total from Government.					
Auckland University College.											
Recurring Revenue.	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
College	4,000	..	1,200	5,200	..	5,200	659	2,253	..	22	8,134
School of Commerce and Mines ..	..	..	2,191	2,191	..	2,191	..	..	..	..	2,191
Totals	4,000	..	3,391	7,391	..	7,391	659	2,253	..	22	10,325
Other Revenue, excluding Trust Accounts.											
Nil.											
Totals	4,000	..	3,391	7,391	..	7,391	659	2,253	..	22	10,325
Victoria College.											
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Recurring revenue—College ..	4,000	..	3,500	7,500	..	7,500	162	1,955	..	10	9,627
Other revenue, excluding trust accounts	..	450	..	450	32	482	..	..	252	..	734
Totals	4,000	450	3,500	7,950	32	7,982	162	1,955	252	10	10,361
Canterbury College.											
Recurring Revenue.	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
College	..	..	20	20	1,000	1,020	8,913	2,479	..	33	12,445
School of Engineering	..	..	2,000	2,000	..	2,000	898	663	..	55	3,616
Astronomical Observatory ..	..	..	..	..	..	..	17	..	..	..	17
Boys' High School	..	..	722	722	..	722	4,339	841	..	..	5,902
Girls' High School	..	..	2,735	2,735	..	2,735	634	271	..	39	3,679
Museum	..	..	..	..	..	..	1,500	..	..	10	1,510
Library	..	..	..	..	..	..	1,287	..	..	982	2,269
School of Art	..	..	976	976	..	976	314	567	..	6	1,863
Totals	..	..	6,453	6,453	1,000	7,453	17,902	4,821	..	1,125	31,301
Other Revenue, excluding Trust Accounts.											
College	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	723	723
School of Engineering	..	..	240	240	355	595	..	..	..	..	595
Astronomical Observatory ..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Boys' High School	..	..	9	9	..	9	..	..	..	..	9
Girls' High School	..	..	..	..	53	53	..	..	..	..	53
Museum	..	..	..	..	400	400	..	..	..	18	418
Library	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
School of Art	..	..	48	48	123	171	..	..	..	..	171
Totals	..	..	297	297	931	1,228	..	..	..	741	1,969
Grand totals ..	..	..	6,750	6,750	1,931	8,681	17,902	4,821	..	1,866	33,270
Otago University.											
Recurring Revenue.	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Otago University	..	..	..	..	..	..	7,433	2,620	764	1,800*	12,617
School of Mines	..	..	750	750	..	750	..	178	140	..	1,068
Dental School	..	..	500	500	..	500	..	685	..	..	1,185
Medical School	..	..	1,250	1,250	..	1,250	..	2,118	104	..	3,472
Museum	..	..	..	..	..	..	400	..	..	..	400
School of Home Science	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Totals	..	..	2,500	2,500	..	2,500	7,833	5,601	1,008	1,800	18,742
Other Revenue, excluding Trust Account.											
Otago University	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	3	3
School of Mines	..	..	..	..	499	499	..	..	..	192	691
Dental School	..	..	..	..	725	725	..	..	..	..	725
Medical School	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Museum	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
School of Home Science	..	660	..	660	..	660	..	..	660	220	1,540
Totals	..	660	..	660	1,224	1,884	..	..	660	415	2,959
Grand totals ..	..	660	2,500	3,160	1,224	4,384	7,833	5,601	1,668	2,215	21,701

* Presbyterian Church Fund.

(4.) THE FEES FOR COLLEGE CLASSES, THE TOTAL FEES RECEIVED, AND THE DISPOSITION OF THE SAME.

FEES FROM UNIVERSITY CLASSES ONLY.

Auckland University College.

Income.	£ s. d.	*Expenditure.*	£ s. d.
Students' fees	2,136 11 0	Paid to professors	.. 2,136 11 0
Music examination fees	113 10 0	For general purposes	.. *115 12 0
Annual examination fees	2 2 0		
	£2,252 3 0		£2,252 3 0

* Music examination expenses, £75; annual examination expenses, £5.

Victoria College.

Income.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	*Expenditure.*	£ s. d.
Students' fees	1,752 1 0		For general purposes	.. * 1,942 10 6
Less fees refunded ..	10 10 0			
		1,741 11 0		
Examination fees ..	203 1 6			
Less fees refunded ..	2 2 0			
		200 19 6		
		£1,942 10 6		£1,942 10 6

* The expenses of the college examinations were £95

Canterbury College.

Income.	£ s. d.	*Expenditure.*	£ s. d.
Canterbury College—		For General purposes	.. 3,113 0 0
Students' fees	2,375 0 0	Paid to professors	.. 32 0 0
Music fees	70 0 0		
Fines	2 0 0		
Fees, exempted students'	32 0 0		
School of Engineering—			
Students' fees	663 0 0		
Fines	3 0 0		
	£3,145 0 0		£3,145 0 0

Otago University.

FEES FROM COLLEGE CLASSES.

	Receipts. £	*Expenditure.* £	£
Arts and general—			
Fees received	2,620	..	
Paid to professors, &c.	..	1,623	
School of Mines—			
Fees received	178	..	
Paid to professors, &c.	..	59	
Dental School—			
Students' fees received	343	..	
Patients' fees	342	..	
Paid to professors, &c.	..	79	
Medical School			
Students' fees received	2,118	..	
Fees to professors, &c.	..	1,548	
Fees held over	..	..	35
Totals	£5,601	£3,309	£35

	£
Total fees received—	
From students	5,259
From patients	342
	£5,601
	£
Paid to professors	3,309
Held over	35
For general purposes	2,257
	£5,601

(5.) THE VALUE OF ALL ENDOWMENTS—SHOWING THE OBJECT FOR WHICH THE ENDOWMENT WAS SET ASIDE.

Auckland University College.

Endowment.	Acreage.	Capital Value.	Rent payable.*	Rent received.
		£	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
Taupiri—five grazing-runs	7,536	1,797	89 17 0	28 8 2
Taupiri—small sections, 1–24	2,031†	946	47 6 3	42 6 3
Karamu—nine grazing-runs	10,060	2,809	140 9 4	139 7 7
Whakatane—six grazing-runs	9,918	2,480	124 0 0	123 19 6
Waitemata—one run	354	80	4 0 0	4 0 0
Totals	29,899	8,112	405 12 7	338 1 6

*Calculated from the "rent payable" on a 5-per-cent. basis. †Also a reserve of 322 acres sold by the Receiver of Land Revenue.

By the terms of the Auckland University College Reserves Act, 1885, the above endowments are "upon trust for the Auckland University College."

Victoria College.

Endowment.	Acreage.	Capital Value.	Annual Rent.
		£	£ s. d.
Section 1, Block 1, Nukumaru	2,185	1,990	74 7 0
Section 16, Block 1, Nukumaru	1,780		
Totals	3,965	1,990	74 7 0

Above endowments were set aside by Victoria College Act, 1897.

Canterbury College.

Endowment.	Acreage.	Annual Rent at 1st May, 1910.	Annual Rent at 1st May, 1911.	Capital Value.
College—	A. R. P.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£
Agricultural reserve	8,085 3 36	5,510 15 0	5,510 15 0	110,215
Town reserves	9 0 20	433 10 0	433 10 0	8,670
Pastoral runs (superior education) ..	99,934 0 0	2,226 1 0	2,602 11 2	52,051
Coldstream reserve (physics and chemistry)	1,487 1 10	223 2 0	223 2 0	4,462
	109,516 1 26	8,393 8 0	8,769 18 2	175,398
Girls' High School	2,578 3 10	479 8 4	479 8 4	9,588
Boys' High School	8,938 3 15	4,266 0 10	4,462 7 8	89,248
Medical School	5,000 0 0	436 10 0	436 10 0	8,730
Museum, Library, and School of Technical Science endowment	93,787 0 0	2,100 0 0	2,290 0 0	45,800
Totals	219,821 0 11	15,675 7 2	16,438 4 2	328,764

Capital values computed on a 5-per-cent. basis.

Otago University.

Endowment.	Purpose for which Reserve set apart.	Acreage.	Capital Value.	Annual Rent.
			£	£ s. d.
Burwood and Mararoa	General purposes	70,000	35,000	1,300 0 0
Barewood	,,	30,759	17,580	900 0 0
79c Barewood	,,	582	339	16 19 6
Forest Hill	,,	7,844	1,134	56 13 4
Benmore	,,	94,230	50,000	3,000 0 0
Museum	,,	11,000	11,000	400 0 0
Totals		214,415	115,053	5,673 12 10

Less 2½ per cent., cost of administration by Lands and Survey Department, who collect the rents, undertaking to make good any deficiency which might occur between the rents actually received now and those received prior to 1904.

(6.) THE TOTAL MONEYS RECEIVED BY EACH COUNCIL FROM BENEFACTIONS, PRIVATE DONATIONS, AND SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Auckland University College.

(Founded in 1883.)

Purpose for which Benefactions, &c., given.	Capital Value.	Interest.
	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
For scholarships (Sinclair and Gillies)	3,000 0 0	150 0 0
For music exhibitions	210 0 0	..
For library—		
Books bequeathed by Professor Pond (valued)	250 0 0	..
Books bequeathed by Mr. J. L. Sinclair (valued)	100 0 0	..
For School of Music—Medals 1891–1903	45 0 0	..
Totals	3,605 0 0	150 0 0

Victoria College.

(Founded in 1897.)

Benefactions, &c.	Amount.
	£ s. d.
Donations to College Building Fund	1,825 0 0
Donations to Library Fund	417 17 6
Donations to physics and chemical apparatus	255 0 0
Bequest of Jacob Joseph for founding two scholarships	3,000 0 0
For the Union Prize	100 0 0
For Biological Observing-station	9 0 0
Total	5,606 17 6

Canterbury College.

(Founded in 1873.)

Department.	Donor.	Year.	Purpose for which given.	Capital Value.	Annual Interest received from Benefactions.
				£ s. d.	£ s. d.
Canterbury College	Late James Townsend	1891	Equatorial telescope	Not known	..
	Astronomical Society of Christchurch	1891	Balance of funds presented towards cost of erection of observatory	423 11 9	..
	Late Joseph Haydon	1906	For providing annually two prizes (one for physics and one for chemistry)	200 0 0	8 0 0
	Various	1907	Public contributions towards fund for erection of new chemical laboratory	81 1 9	..
Boys' High School	Widow of late headmaster (Mrs. Miller)	1903	For endowment of Thomas Miller Memorial Prize	100 0 0	4 0 0
	Boys' High School Old Boys' Association	1908	Donations towards cost of erection of gymnasium	601 8 6	..
Museum	Various	1908	Public contributions towards purchase of Okarito whale skeleton	202 3 6	..
Public library	Late James Gammack	1898	Bequest of residue from estate, to be applied for benefit of circulating department (average revenue per annum)	..	443 0 0
	Late Arthur Postle	1900	Bequest for purchase of books for library	1,666 8 6	66 12 9
			Totals	3,274 14 0	521 12 9

(6.) THE TOTAL MONEYS RECEIVED BY EACH COUNCIL FROM BENEFACTIONS, PRIVATE DONATIONS, AND SUBSCRIPTIONS—*continued.*

Otago University.

(Founded in 1869.)

Date of Benefactions, &c.	Purpose for which given.	Amount.		
		£	s.	d.
1875–76	Library	1,000	0	0
1882–1905	Otago Institute, for Museum	275	6	6
1891	Late Professor Brown, for books	105	0	0
1903	*Evening Star* and *Daily Times* Fund	919	5	0
1903	Dunedin Savings-bank	6,500	0	0
1904	Wolff Harris, Esq.	2,100	0	0
1904	Mrs. Lothian	600	0	0
1905–06	*Otago Daily Times* Fund	2,120	0	0
1905–06	Citizens' Fund	2,249	0	0
1906	New Zealand Dental Association	1,000	0	0
1907	A. Beverly, Esq.	15,400	0	0
1908	Private subscriptions for Hocken wing	2,820	0	0
1909–10	Subscriptions towards students' building	3,600	0	0*
1910	Dr. Hocken	10,000	0	0†
1911	Various donations for scholarships	3,879	7	2
1911	Domestic science	660	0	0
	Total	53,227	18	8

* Not yet handed over to Council. † Subject to life interest.

(6A.) THE TOTAL MONEYS RECEIVED BY THE COUNCILS FROM PARLIAMENTARY GRANTS.

University Colleges—Return of all Parliamentary Grants made to University Councils.

Institution.	Statutory.	General Purposes.	Specialization.	Buildings and Apparatus.	Subsidies.	Material.	Library.	Total.
Auckland University Council. (Founded in 1883.)	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
University	114,750	2,400	..	5,000	..	..	..	122,150
School of Commerce and Mines	..	25	11,500	500	..	166	..	12,191
Totals	114,750	2,425	11,500	5,500	..	166	..	134,341
Victoria College Council. (Founded in 1897.)								
College	53,096	3,375	12,000	39,039	450	..	..	107,960
Canterbury College Council. (Founded in 1873.)								
College	..	20,424	..	4,642	658	..	..	25,724
School of Engineering	..	2,382	11,740	3,630	244	563	..	18,559
Boys' High School	..	2,724	..	72	608	..	..	3,404
Girls' High School	..	11,328	..	3,078	17	..	..	14,423
Museum	..	..	..	400	..	..	..	400
Library	..	157	..	..	400	..	..	557
School of Art	..	7,168	..	813	534	155	..	8,670
Totals	..	44,183	11,740	12,635	2,461	718	..	71,737
Otago University Council. (Founded in 1869.)								
University	..	5,100	..	745	3,650	500	500	10,495
School of Mines	..	991	17,000	5,999	2,000	..	..	25,990
Dental School	..	429	2,600	2,401	..	..	..	4,830
Medical School	..	110	5,750	..	..	..	..	5,860
Museum	..	..	..	..	2,820	..	..	2,820
Home Science	..	..	..	..	660	..	..	660
Totals	..	6,630	24,750	9,145	9,130	500	500	50,655
Grand totals	167,846	56,613	59,990	66,319	12,041	1,384	500	364,693

APPENDIX B.—UNIVERSITY COLLEGES: EXAMINATIONS FOR TERMS AND DEGREES.

RETURN showing the following information:—

(1.) What classes must be attended and what examinations must be passed by students of the University Colleges who are candidates for degrees in the University of New Zealand before the certificates mentioned in section 1 of the University Statute "Terms and Lectures" (University Calendar, 1911–12, p. 65) are issued?

(2.) Must a student enter himself for the New Zealand University examinations only in subjects in which he has satisfied the conditions of the University College as to the keeping of terms?

(3.) Is a student who has failed in the examination in any subject held by the professor in that subject in the University College allowed to sit for that subject in the University degree examination? or can he sit for the examination (University degree) in subjects in which he has not fulfilled the requirements of the University College?

(4.) How far are the rules indicated in the replies to the above questions carried out in practice? Are any exceptions made thereto: for instance, are students who would otherwise fail in their college examinations allowed in any case to pass in order to enable them to sit for the University degree examinations?

University Colleges—Terms, etc.

(Being a *précis* of the accompanying letters received from the various University Colleges.)

University College.	Term Examinations.								Degree Examinations.				Remarks.
	Is Examination necessary in all Cases?	If not, when unnecessary?	First Year's Terms.		Second Year's Terms.		Third Year's Terms.		Entering for Degree Examinations.	Sitting for Degree Examinations.		Are these Rules strictly enforced?	
			Percentage of Lectures necessary.	Number of Subjects required.	Percentage of Lectures necessary.	Number of Subjects required.	Percentage of Lectures necessary.	Number of Subjects required.	Must Student enter only in Subjects in which he has first satisfied College Conditions?	May he sit in a Subject in which, in the Terms Examination,* He failed?	He did not sit?		
Auckland University College	Yes	..	¾	3	¾	3	¾	Remainder	Yes	Yes	No	Yes, subject to ægrotat certificate	Remarks apply to all subjects except law, which is not subject to college examinations.
Victoria College	Yes	..†	¾	2	¾	3	¾	Remainder	No; but in practice almost all students do	Yes	Yes	Some latitude	Remarks apply to all classes except certain honours classes and law.
Canterbury College ..	Yes	..	⅔	3	⅔	3	⅔	2	Yes	No	No	Yes, subject to ægrotat certificate	Remarks apply to all subjects except where University regulations exempt from college examinations.
Otago University	Yes, even for technical degrees‡	..	See p. 107 of Otago University Calendar	2	See p. 107 of Otago University Calendar	2 Must not be same as 1st year	See p. 107 of Otago University Calendar	2 Must not be same as 1st or 2nd year except in repeat subjects	Yes, for technical degrees; No, for other degrees, subject to Statute "Terms and Lectures," IV	Yes§	[Not mentioned — apparently an impossibility]	Yes, subject to ægrotat certificate	..

* Provided, of course, student has kept terms. In arts; cannot occur in medicine, mining, or dentistry.

† For classes in which terms need not be kept see Chairman's letter of 2nd October, 1911.

‡ Exempted by Statute "Terms and Lectures," I.

§ Extremely rare.

SIR,— University College, Auckland, 3rd October, 1911.

In reply to your specific questions (28th September) :—

(1.) None of our students have as yet come within the proviso of CVII, section 1 (p. 65), of the New Zealand University Statutes (this section seems ill-worded), so that no certificate has been issued. (Two candidates in agriculture are this year sitting for terms in the ordinary way.) As to candidates for the more usual degrees, all information is given by the subjoined college regulations :—

"*The Keeping of Terms.*

"N.B.—The following regulations apply to undergraduates who desire to keep terms with a view to examination by the University of New Zealand.

"11. Undergraduates shall be held to have kept terms for the year in any subject who shall have (*a*) attended during the year at least three-fourths of the prescribed lectures, and (*b*) passed the annual examination in that subject.

"12. (1.) Undergraduates must, to complete their first year, keep terms in three subjects. For their second year they must offer for examination such subjects as they intend to take for the first section of their degree, but may be credited with the year by keeping terms in three such subjects. For their third year they must keep terms in such subjects as they intend to take to complete their degree. In the case of a subject repeated for the second section of a degree examination, separate papers shall be set on the work prescribed by the University for the repeated subject.

"(2.) Graduates proceeding to another degree, if required by University statute to keep an additional year's terms, must keep those terms in such subjects as are necessary to complete that degree.

"(3.) But students exempted by University statute from attendance upon lectures shall be credited with their terms if they shall have passed the examinations for the year in the required subjects."

(2) and (3.) It may happen (and has happened, though rarely) that a student in his second year, offering an additional (fourth) subject for the first section of his degree, may fail in that subject in his College terms, and yet, obtaining his terms on the three others (see above Regulation 12 (1)), be permitted by the University statutes, which regard terms not individual subjects, to sit for his first section in all four. In this case only a student may sit in a subject in which he has not satisfied college conditions (apparently he may offer such a fourth or extra subject only after a college examination in it, though he need not succeed in such examination).

(4.) These rules are carried out in practice ~~with the utmost~~ strictness, and no exception is ever made. In no case, so far as I am aware, has a candidate been allowed to pass who has not, in the opinion of the examiners, reporting to the Board, attained a reasonable standard of proficiency in the subject. In the event of sickness a student might be granted terms (*quod aegrotabat*) on a medical certificate, but only provided that his teachers are prepared to certify to his general fitness without the evidence of examination.

So far as I can discover (at short notice and in view of the need for haste) these answers apply to all the work of the college. The law students, however, are not subject to college tests in professional subjects, partly through the present lack of lectures.

Yours faithfully,

H. S. DETTMANN,

The Inspector-General of Schools, Wellington. Chairman of Professorial Board.

Victoria College (University of New Zealand),

SIR,— Wellington, New Zealand, 2nd October, 1911.

I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your memorandum of the 28th ultimo, and give the desired information herewith.

(1.) I attach hereto a copy of the terms regulations at Victoria College, giving a list of subjects in which terms may be kept, and the general conditions governing the keeping of terms.

Provision for teaching is made in the following additional classes in which terms are not kept :—

(*a*.) Honours classes in Nos. 1–13 and 15 of list attached.* In Nos. 10, 11, 12, and 15 the teacher must certify to the practical work and to the thesis where such is required.

(*b*.) Subjects 5, 6, and 7 of first division LL.B., and all the subjects of second division LL.B. (See New Zealand University Calendar, pp. 243, 244.) NOTE.—Scholarship-holders who, by special regulation, are permitted to sit for the first section at the end of their first year are allowed to keep the second year's terms in any three of these subjects.

(*c*.) All the subjects of the LL.M. degree. (See New Zealand University Calendar, p. 252.)

(2.) No ; but in practice almost all students do.

(3.) Yes, provided he has kept terms in other subjects specified in the Calendar.

(4.) Each teacher controls his own class examinations, but the Professorial Board grants terms and allows some measure of compensation : *e.g.*, a student sitting in three subjects, A, B, C, and being below the minimum in A, but well above the minimum in B and C, may be allowed to pass in A and given terms. A few cases of this kind occur every year, and each is judged on its merits.

I am, &c.,

THOS. H. HUNTER,

Chairman of the Professorial Board.

The Inspector-General, Education Department.

---

* Not reprinted. See page 23 of Victoria College Calendar, 1911.

SIR,— Canterbury College, Christchurch, New Zealand, 3rd October, 1911.

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 27th September. The information you require will be found, in detail, in the College Regulations, a copy of which I enclose herewith. Regulation VIII has just been redrafted, and the new regulation, which is more stringent as regards 3 than the present one, will come into force next year.

Answers to questions set out in your letter :—

(1.) Fully answered in regulations.
(2.) Yes.
(3.) No ; no.
(4.) The regulations are strictly carried out. A conditional pass may be given in a weak subject, and in case of illness the Professorial Board may grant an ægrotat (medical certificate necessary).

The answers apply to students in other branches (law, commerce, &c.) unless the University Regulations exempt such students from college examinations ; but naturally, owing to the rapid changes in statutes dealing with comparatively new degrees, more latitude has sometimes to be given than in arts and science.

I have, &c.,
W. P. EVANS,
Chairman, Professorial Board, Canterbury College.

The Inspector-General of Schools, Education Department, Wellington.

SIR,— University of Otago, Dunedin, 30th September, 1911.

The following are the replies to the questions contained in your letter dated the 27th September, 1911 :—

(1.) In order to keep terms a student must pass in two subjects in each year of his undergraduate course. The subjects that qualify for terms are given in the Otago University Calendar, 1911, p. 137 (? 107). For technical degrees mentioned in "Terms and Lectures," I, students have to pass an examination in each subject conducted by the professor or lecturer in that subject.

(2.) A student may enter in other subjects except those mentioned in Statute "Terms and Lectures," IV. In all classes students who present themselves in French or German must pass an oral examination. Students must pass the college examinations in all subjects for which they present themselves for the technical degrees.

(3.) A student may sit for the New Zealand University examination in a subject in which he has failed to pass in Otago if he has kept terms for the year in other subjects. This, however, is extremely unusual in the arts course. It cannot occur in medicine, mining, or dentistry.

(4.) These rules are adhered to rigidly. An ægrotat pass is occasionally granted on production of a medical certificate, and if the professor or lecturer in a subject states that the students' attendance has been regular and his work of a satisfactory standard.

Yours faithfully,
P. MARSHALL,
Chairman of the Professorial Board.

G. Hogben, Esq., Inspector-General of Schools, Wellington.

APPENDIX C.—RESOLUTIONS OF COLLEGE COUNCILS.

CANTERBURY COLLEGE.

Canterbury College, Christchurch, New Zealand, 15th September, 1911.

THE Minister of Education has been good enough to send to the Chairman of the Professorial Board of Canterbury College a copy of a petition praying that a Royal Commission be appointed to consider the state of the University and University Colleges of New Zealand.

While not necessarily assenting to any particular statement of the petitioners, the undersigned professors of Canterbury College are of opinion that the appointment of such a Commission would be in the best interests of higher education in the Dominion.

W. G. EVANS, Professor of Chemistry.
J. P. GABBATT, Professor of Mathematics.
J. HIGHT, Professor of History and Economics.
ROBERT J. SCOTT, Professor of Engineering.
ARNOLD WATT, Professor of English.

To the Education Committee of the House of Representatives.

VICTORIA COLLEGE.

DEAR SIR,— Victoria College, Registrar's Office, Wellington, 21st September, 1911.

I am directed to forward to you for the information of the Education Committee the following resolutions passed by the Council at a meeting held last evening :—

1. That this Council calls the attention of the Education Committee of the House of Representatives to the urgent and immediate need of a substantial increase in the capital grants to, and the annual income of the University Colleges in the North Island, and points out that the Education Department is in possession of all the necessary information on this question, and refers the Education Committee to the memorandum submitted by this Council to the Minister of Education on the 23rd September, 1910.

2. That this Council, while not expressing any final opinion on the points raised by the University Reform Association, is of opinion that the need has been established for a Royal Commission to inquire into the subject of university reform.

Yours truly,

CHAS. P. POWLES, Registrar.

The Chairman, Education Committee, House of Representatives.

AUCKLAND UNIVERSITY COLLEGE.

SIR,— University College, Auckland, New Zealand, 19th September, 1911.

Your letter of the 30th August was laid before my Council at its meeting held yesterday, and I was instructed to write thanking you for the same.

Also, in the event of the appointment of a Royal Commission being asked for in connection with the petition (Professor Laby and others), to convey to you the following resolution of Council : " That, in the opinion of this Council, there are at present no special grounds for an inquiry into the state of University administration and education in New Zealand."

I have, &c.,

CHAS. M. NELSON, Registrar.

The Chairman, Education Committee, House of Representatives, Wellington.

Approximate Cost of Paper.—Preparation, not given; printing (1,500 copies), £80.

By Authority : JOHN MACKAY, Government Printer, Wellington.—1911.

Price 2s. 3d.]