

tight. They have exceeded their period, and nobody has said or done anything, so that it would be very difficult to say what the conditions are.

28. I would like to know whether you could suggest anything that would popularize lectures?—Well, that is a thing I feel very strongly on. Here you will probably think I am vainer than you thought before, but I think I am a man who is capable of giving lectures which would be of considerable interest to quite a body of people not at all concerned with university study, or in a less degree—that is, lectures on literary and linguistic subjects—and one of the things I am fighting for by hook or by crook is to get the chance of seeing what I can do; but my time is taken up with the large number of classes of students whom I am supposed to prepare for examinations. With this idea of the professor being tied to the curriculum of examinations the University provides me with fourteen distinct examinations, and therefore fourteen possible classes. Fortunately they have not all turned up in any given year, but ten or twelve did. Two or three years ago I was lecturing for five hours successively. I had five classes straight on end, and they ran from 3 o'clock till 8 o'clock, and therefore you can see there is no room for lectures not bearing on the curriculum and degree. I think you would popularize the thing as soon as you get free from the examining ideal in the genuine sense of the word.

29. You have no particular suggestions to make in regard to popularizing lectures?—Very briefly I suggested at the professorial conference that they should recognize half-courses, but it was thrown out by the Senate. Until we get the whole degree revised they might recognize half-courses as counting towards the degree. Everything that has to be laid before the Senate in New Zealand must be expressed in terms of syllabus and degree requirements.

30. *Mr. Sidey.* You have expressed the opinion that you are not free to teach on the lines you think are right?—Yes.

31. Why are you not free to teach on the lines you think are right?—I will mention one thing that ought to be clear. The University of New Zealand in its examinations requires from the students in modern languages practically this: translation from French into English, translation from English into French, translation of certain prescribed books from French into English; and the professional idea of teachers of modern languages is that you want to get rid of the translation notion in teaching, and you want to destroy that. You want to build up altogether a knowledge of every language in the same way, and the only way is the way the mother language is built up. You do not want to be constantly dealing with turning one into the other and *vice versa*. I have a lot of students, and it takes me all my time bringing them up to the required standard of turning English into Latin, and what else can I do? It is in the syllabus. It seems to me I am downed by the syllabus, and it takes me all the time to do the wrong thing.

32. Supposing local examiners are appointed, in what respect do you anticipate the syllabus would be altered—would the examinations be largely oral?—Yes.

33. Is philology in your teaching?—Yes.

34. And what other teachers?—The professors of English.

35. And in the other Universities in New Zealand?—There is Professor Blunt in Christchurch, Professor Walker of Auckland, and Mr. Thompson and Mr. Campbell in Dunedin.

36. Those gentlemen would be associated with you as examiners?—Yes.

37. In regard to the Royal Commission, I understand your idea is that you will get a step further forward if you get a Royal Commission?—Yes.

38. You think that with the weight of their finding you will persuade the Government?—Yes.

39. You say that you will be content with only one man from outside?—Absolutely.

40. And you say it is not essential that that man should be an educationist?—No. I think what you want in that one man is a thorough grasp of how a university should train. He must be a man who is connected with a university. The only name we ever suggested of a man who had not been a university teacher in Great Britain was Lord Reay, and he sat on several Commissions.

41. As regards the number on the Commission, you heard Sir Robert Stout's suggestion that there should be at least nine members?—Yes. I think with that number there would be less likelihood of anything being done, and more likelihood of a compromise.

42. You think nine members would be too many?—I think Sir Robert suggested a large number as being likely to leave things as they are.

43. You suggested that there should be three?—Yes, that is what I think.

44. Do you favour Sir Robert Stout's suggestion that there should be a business man on the Commission?—Yes. We thought one man should be an educationist. I did not think of Professor Shand or Professor Sale.

45. Do you not think that if you appointed one educationist on the Commission the finding is almost certain to be in the direction of his views?—It is rather his views you want on the theoretical side. You have got the principle which the Home man can give you better than any one else out here, and you have the application of it, which are two distinct things. The same thing happened in London. The Commissioners laid down certain principles, but when it came to the question of application they were very moderate.

46. Do you not think it would be better to have some one associated with him who would appreciate the question from an educational standpoint?—Possibly, but I confess that I think it would be a mistake to have an *omnium gatherum* of representatives of primary-school teachers and other classes.

47. You would not object to having experts on the Commission?—No, certainly not.