

examination even—be retained. But while doing the fullest justice to this ideal they lay down in the most uncompromising way that it is totally incompatible with the teaching ideal, and that all attempts at combining the two or compromising between them have been and necessarily must be fatal. For London they recommend creating two totally independent organizations. That is a recommendation which, as you will see at once, would be an absurdity in this country. But we are compromising now, and if we do not move by means of a Royal Commission, which will start on the findings of the London Commission as a basis, what else but further compromising is possible? As practical men and politicians how would you, or Parliament, or the Senate settle this question except upon the basis of a compromise between the conflicting parties? But compromise here is as absolutely fatal as it would be—I speak with infinite deference in the presence of Mr. Allen—in defence. Here also you have two totally incompatible ideals, each of which may be supported by powerful arguments, and each of which will always have adherents. You may believe in efficient armies and navies, or you may believe in conciliation, concession, and arbitration. The one fatal thing would be to spend money on an army and navy and entrust the management of them to a body of men who do not believe in the need of them. That is just the sort of compromise under which we are suffering now in the University of New Zealand, as they are in London. The Commissioners, after laying down what they hold to be the essentials of a university, say, “If the university is so organized as to provide the conditions necessary for its proper working in accordance with the principles we have described, the teachers of the university ought under proper safeguards to have control of the education and examination of their students, and the university ought to be so constituted as to give it them. It will be explained how this should be done in the next part of our report. The Professorial Board of University College say in the memorandum presented to us ‘that to secure freedom of the university teacher to teach as he thinks best, and not by a hard-and-fast syllabus, should be in the forefront of the problems to be solved by the present Commission. If freedom can be obtained for the teacher freedom for the learner will follow,’ and we think the Professorial Board are right.” Further on they say, “So strongly indeed do we hold the view that the method of working we have described, and the conditions upon which alone such work can be done, are essential to the existence of a real university in London, and such a university is a national and Imperial as well as a merely local need, that it would be better not to interfere at all with the existing constitution than to attempt anything less fundamental.” The lesson there is that it would probably be better to leave things alone as they are than to attempt a sort of half-hearted reform in order to combine the two totally incompatible ideas. There is no suggestion on my part that Sir Robert Stout or the Senate or their supporters are wrong in their views, and it does not follow from that in the least that our views as university reformers are wrong.

3. *Mr. Malcolm.*] You are not particularly set on a Royal Commission, I take it, professor?—No, I cannot say that the word “Royal” means anything to me.

4. What is in my mind is this: that on this Education Committee you have the executive of the Education Department of the Dominion—that is, the Minister of Education—and you have members of Parliament. In your opinion, would an inquiry by this Committee be of as much value as an inquiry before a Commission?—Well, if I may say so, it is a very difficult thing to word; but let me remind you of Lord Kitchener. Here is a man of outstanding eminence which you will all admit transcends the capacity of other military men. Out here we have the same sort of feeling with regard to education, that there is great value in getting a big man, and I hope it is not impertinent to the Committee to suggest that there is no one like that on the Committee. A big man of European reputation and standing is an asset in such an inquiry.

5. How long do you consider it would be necessary for the Commission to sit?—I should think, certainly not more than six months. I should think it might be less.

6. And that means continually sitting?—Very nearly so. I am putting an extreme limit. I should think four months would be nearer the mark, with a month in each centre with twelve or fourteen working-days would amply suffice.

7. Would it not be better to submit your case to such a Committee as this, with all its deficiencies, and succeed in convincing it and get some executive action, rather than to submit it to a Commission with no executive authority, and when the finding, as with most Commissions, would probably be ignored?—Well, that is a most beautifully searching question, Mr. Malcolm. What we feel is, as you could easily see from the whole tone of Sir Robert Stout’s evidence, that with the community as a whole we professorial and educational people do not carry very great weight, and we are afraid that our opinions would not bear down the sort of opposition. You see, in the case of the London Commission, that the moment the Commission was out and before it was out all sorts of bodies, graduates, County Councils, and every description of people who had interests vested and otherwise in the present system began their protests; but with the great authority of the composition of that Commission, with the names of Lord Haldane and Lord Milner, people realized that that opposition did not amount to anything, and all the protests will not be sufficient to make any difference to the result in this case. That is our feeling, and we feel we are such small people, and that, having got big men on our side, if we could only get one of them to speak for us it would help us materially.

8. But after all said and done it is the plain man you have to consider—that is, the taxpayer—and the members of the Committee represent those people. They are plain men themselves just because they have no particular standing in education. We are perhaps less prejudiced, and do you not think on these grounds, and also on the ground of expense, which does not concern you, that an inquiry before such a Committee as this might be just as satisfactory?—Well, I am representing the Professorial Board of Victoria College, and the only answer I can give to that is that as far as I know the Professorial Board of Victoria College would prefer the Royal Commission if possible of the two. If I may expand that a little, what we would really like is a body