

programme of the University. Having already got the best men you must throw the responsibility on them to live up to their responsibilities. You do not do that with the external system—that system robs the professor of responsibility. In classics I think the claim for external examination is stronger perhaps than in many other subjects, because classics is nearly always taught in the same way, but external examination does harm in classics.

20. *Mr. Sidey.*] Do I understand you to say that when a student fails the responsibility would be on the teachers under the external examination?—No; if the teacher “fails” a student the teacher is responsible for the judgment he passed on the student’s work. If, for example, he “fails” a man and the man shows afterwards he has got brilliant ability, then that shows lack of judgment in the teacher.

21. Will you illustrate your statement that if a student fails under the system of examination which you propose, where the professor is associated with other examiners internally, that the responsibility in that case is on the professor?—Undoubtedly, because you will find that when four men meet together to discuss the candidates the number of cases in which there will be a difference of opinion will be small, and in these doubtful cases it will be the judgment of the teacher that will carry weight.

22. Do you consider, with a larger proportion of failures in a class, that the governing body would have greater cause of complaint with the professor than he would under the existing system?—No; I think that a governing body that has complained without considering the kind of material has shown itself not fit for the position.

23. From that point of view there is no difference between the two systems?—No, only this: that what the governing body does is to depreciate the standard of the teacher and to exalt the examiner. There is a tendency in this way for the governing body not to feel the supreme importance of making good appointments to teaching posts.

24. Do you think the work of the professor should be estimated by the number of students he gets through his examination?—No, certainly not.

25. Neither in one case nor the other?—No.

26. I was not quite certain of what your explanation was on the subject of teaching psychology. We have had in the Otago University for years a Chair of Mental Philosophy. Have you not that here?—Yes; but my point is this: that in psychology in the last thirty years there has been developed an absolutely new science, and that science is not taught anywhere in the New Zealand University.

27. Is the fact that you have external examinations such that it is impossible to have the subjects taught?—No, not at all. The tendency under external examination is to limit the subjects, for if you break the subjects you multiply the external examiners and increase the expense.

28. You mean the subject is too large to be under one person?—I think it is, but I doubt whether the colleges here are financially strong enough to bear the additional burden. What I suggest is that the colleges should be allowed in these wide subjects to specialize along those lines, but that is very difficult under a system of external examination.

29. *Hon. Mr. Allen.*] I understand that you base your demand now for a Royal Commission upon the additional evidence which you adduce that the Senate itself has not reformed itself?—Yes, sir, I think that is the logical deduction from the last decision of the Committee.

30. Well, is it the logical deduction from what the Senate proposes to do? I do not know whether they mean to do it, but they have made certain proposals for the reform of the Senate itself?—Yes, their proposal is this: they are sending out three schemes to sixteen or seventeen hundred people, and also to the Courts of Convocation, and so on, and inviting choice and comment, and if there is an agreement they are going to draft a Bill. I take it that is the same thing as doing nothing.

31. But it is specified that there must be agreement?—That is according to the resolution of the Senate.

32. You are a member of the Senate?—Yes.

33. I should like to know whether the Senate is in earnest in these suggested proposals?—There are two parts combined in the resolution. The second part was tacked on to the first part, and I think Dr. Fitchett was absolutely in earnest about it, but I think that the method of doing it shows that they do not realize the difficulties of the situation at all.

34. Are you prepared to tell the Committee that you do not think they really do mean to adopt any of those suggestions or any other suggestions for reform?—I cannot say that, but I do not think, as the Senate is at present constituted, we shall get any reasonable reform from it.

35. You mentioned something about the London Royal Commissioners’ report on the university. Could you briefly tell the Committee how the report of that Commission affects the question that is now before us?—Professor Von Zedlitz is going to deal with that.

36. *The Chairman.*] Why was the professorial conference suppressed?—The reason given for it was this: the mover of the motion, Mr. Von Haast, said that the professorial conference had no legal standing, and, as the Senate had thrown out all the proposals of the professorial conference, it was illogical to have it.

37. Was it legally set up?—It was set up by resolution of the Senate. The conference was set up on the motion of the Hon. Mr. Allen.

38. *Hon. Mr. Allen.*] It was legal enough?—I should have said it had no statutory standing. The idea was that, the Senate not having followed the suggestions of the professorial conference, it was useless to have the professorial conference.

39. *The Chairman.*] Assuming that these three schemes have gone out to all the members of the University, do you consider it would be a very difficult and expensive matter to summarize the information and opinions that will be derived from them?—I do not think you will get any agreement. I know in some instances the graduates have sent their forms to other people to fill in. It does not seem a reasonable method of reforming a university.