

1. *The Chairman.*] Are you connected with the Law Society here? Do your students have the use of the law library?—No, the students have no right to use the law library.

2. *Mr. Sidey.*] How many students are there in your class?—I have not got the return. The number varies from year to year. I have so many classes. I have about nine classes, I think. The numbers have certainly gone down this year. Last year I had sixty in one class. I think I have about forty-five this year.

3. Do you find that many students come from other centres at all?—To my knowledge students do come. I can never tell, of course, whether they come for that purpose, but I have had graduates from other colleges.

FRIDAY, 22ND AUGUST, 1913.

Professor GABBATT examined. (No. 14.)

1. *The Chairman.*] What are you?—Professor of Mathematics.

2. Whom do you represent?—I represent Canterbury College.

3. Do you wish to make a statement to the Committee?—I do not know at all what line you are taking. I came up at short notice and did not prepare any written statement, because I had no notion of the line the Committee were taking. Really I came to show myself, and to say that the University reform movement is by no means confined to Wellington, as has been generally understood. In Christchurch, Canterbury College has been a reforming college for many years before I came to New Zealand, and on many questions it has taken the first step in the way of reform. I really came up here rather to be examined than to make a statement. I had very little time, and it seemed to me that any statement I might make may be utterly off the lines. If any member of the Committee cared to ask me questions about our reasons for petitioning I should be glad to answer them.

4. *Mr. Guthrie.*] I should like to know, Professor Gabbatt, if you are prepared to support the need for reform, and in what respect?—Well, sir, it seems to the people who have thought of the matter at Canterbury College that, as the petition states, reform of the constitution of the University is absolutely vital in the first place. We think that sole control of the University by a body which is to a certain extent predominantly lay is quite an impossible situation. What we want, as a matter of fact—and I think I may say that if those who signed the petition got this they would no longer want a Royal Commission—is a Senate which we think should be absolutely predominantly lay, which should be the supreme Court of the University, and should have sole control of the finance. On that Senate we think there should be no more than four professors, one elected by each Professorial Board. The Boards of Governors, on the other hand—the governing body of the colleges—should be largely represented; there should not be fewer than three representatives of each Board of Governors in the Senate. I want to make it clear that no professors should be elected to the Senate save a sole representative from each Professorial Board. The Senate should be the supreme Court of the University, and have direct control of the finances of the University. We do not want anything to do with the finance. That body should also have the right of veto over the Board of Studies, but that right should only be exercised in extreme cases. Then we want a statutory Board of Studies, which should be entirely academic—a Board of Studies of not less than twenty members elected by the Professorial Boards of the four colleges. This Board of Studies should have the duties that devolve on the corresponding Boards in the modern English universities—that is to say, it should have sole control, subject to review by the Senate, of the curriculum, recommendations for degrees, and suchlike matters. I want to make it clear that while that body would have no control whatsoever of the finances, on the other hand the suggested Senate would not have the direct control of the academic side of the University. The Board of Studies, I think, should have, subject to review, the complete control of the academic side. The Senate should be unable to move, without the recommendation of the Board of Studies, on any matter directly affecting the academic side of the University. That is the nature of the constitution we want. We think if we could get that anything else, such as Faculty Boards, could be allowed to settle themselves. I say that because some plea has been made that the effect of two of the schemes that are being considered is that twenty or twenty-two Boards would be set up. We want to make it clear that in our opinion at Canterbury College the vital parts of the scheme are those I have indicated—that is, the Senate and the Board of Studies.

5. In regard to the Board of Studies, does that include the arrangement of the curriculum for degrees and also examinations?—Absolutely and entirely. That would not necessitate the appointment of examiners solely from the Board of Studies. I dare say you know that in the Home universities—the Liverpool University, for instance, with which I am familiar—that sort of thing is done; and, subject to the review by this lay body, the Board of Studies should have the control of all such things—namely, the recommendations for degrees, methods of examination, and so on. Of course, as I dare say you know, in the modern universities at Home generally the teacher or teachers of the subject sit along with an external assessor. When I say that the Board of Studies should have control of the examinations that does not bar the appointment of external examiners, but such appointment would be subject to the recommendation of the Board of Studies.

6. Then I understand from you that you want the constitution of the Senate changed from what it is at present?—Yes, a change would be necessitated in several respects. For example, each Professorial Board elects one representative to the Senate annually—invariably one of its own members—and then professors can stand for other constituencies. I believe there are about ten professors or ex-professors at present members of the Senate. I would have that cut down.