

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