

Congregational, Baptist, and so on. Well, we have not the same thing here. We differ in this respect: we have what are termed "external students," but they are not external students in the London sense, because they have what is called to keep terms at one of our University colleges. That means that every year they have to be examined by the teacher in the subject and passed by the Professorial Board. That is what is called "keeping terms." They do not attend the colleges and do not get the benefit of the teacher. So that our external students would be in a different position. The London University has held examinations in New Zealand, and it holds continually examinations in India. It holds examinations also in various parts of England, Scotland, Ireland, and wherever they are asked, and that is purely for external students. In the report which deals with this question of the abolition of external students the report does not propose absolutely to abolish the external student, but to greatly modify the system, and even that modification is objected to. Therefore you cannot get much aid from the London University in that respect. I understand that one of the main things asked for by some of the professors is that the examinations for degrees should be held by themselves. So far I have not read the full report of the Commission—I have only read the condensed report that appeared in the *London Mail*. There is nothing in the report that teachers shall examine their own pupils, and I am not aware of any university that does that. The Universities of Scotland have assessors along with the professors, and in Oxford and Cambridge the Board of Examiners varies almost from year to year or every three years, and it is recognized both in Oxford and Cambridge that the teacher shall not examine his own pupils in the subject in which he teaches them. There are cases in which some teachers are on the examining Board, and some of their students would then be examined by them; but in Cambridge—and I will speak of that which I know about, namely law—it is usual to have from three to five and sometimes seven examiners on that Board. If there is a teacher on that Board who taught contracts he would not examine in contracts for that year, but examine in torts or criminal law. They vary like that. However, I am not going to deal with that question, and only wanted to mention that point. I have pointed out that it is exceedingly sad to me to see that our science is not popular in our universities, and I would point out what they are doing in America in order to popularize it. The Wisconsin system, as it is called, has been introduced there, and they now have thousands of students attending science. They are not seeking degrees, but education, and the result is that thousands are attending the University of Wisconsin who do not work for a degree. Any one can attend for chemistry or biology or physics if they like, and I have here an article in a paper called the *Fra* which describes how many of the students are past forty years of age who are studying chemistry, soil, analysis, history, and economics. They say there that the university ought to be a teaching body and examinations are a secondary matter. I believe that if we had efficient teachers in our colleges, and that our colleges chose to say that their doors were open to any person who chose to attend, and they had practical teachers, instead of the paltry number attending the science courses in the universities you would have the number trebled and quadrupled. If you get a popular teacher you will get plenty of students to attend. We know what happened in the earlier days of the Otago University: they received any person who chose to come, and they had a large attendance. We know also what happened in Canterbury, when Professor McMillan Brown used to have Saturday classes in English, the number attending going up to, I believe, three hundred. It seems to me there is a great danger in New Zealand of some people setting up that the main thing you require in a university is what is called "research students." Now, in regard to research students, you cannot get one in twenty thousand to be a real research student, and the University has to provide for the mass of the people just as the primary schools provide for the mass of the people. The great thing in the University is to popularize education so that you can get as many educated people in science as possible. You will never get it by simply having a professor sitting in his chair and directing the students in the laboratories. It is necessary the universities should have research students, but to make that the end-all and aim of the University is a huge mistake. You must—to use a word that is now in use—democratize your universities. You can only do that if your teachers are popular. I mean popular not in the sense of being a "hail fellow well met," but that they are able to impart knowledge in an effective popular way. I want to say a word or two only in regard to the University. If you want to change the constitution of the University Parliament is capable of doing that without inviting the opinion of five or six different odd men. If you think the professors should rule—and that is the real object of the Reform Association, because you can see that from the schemes proposed—very well, let the professors rule, and let the people understand what that means. If you think that the local bodies should have some say in the government, and that the local colleges should have some say in their own management, then you ought to keep your present system. At any rate, I do not see the need of going to the expense of a University Commission to settle a question which Parliament could settle—namely, how should your university institutions be ruled? You know how the public schools and the secondary schools are ruled; they are not ruled by the teachers, and I do not see why the universities should be either. I think it would not be advisable in the interests of higher education nor of the professors themselves. Secondly, in all institutions you ought to have a constitution that would enable the public to know how the University is performing its functions, and you cannot have that if you leave everything to the professors any more than you could have it in the primary schools if you have no Inspectors and no examinations. I have here copies of my criticism on the proposed schemes, and I will hand them in. I should also like to refer to Sir Rider Haggard's book on Denmark, in which you will see that the system which is carried out in Wisconsin is also carried out in some respects in Denmark. The farmers there attend the university, and one has only to read to see the enormous advantage it has been to Denmark of having her settlers scientifically trained. There the university is made popular—it is not confined to a few students. I have all the details here