

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," it 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