

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 opportunity 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