

The Senate having no longer control of academic matters would not need to have a considerable professorial element. I would suggest that there should be only four professors on the Senate in all, whereas the representatives of the Board of Governors of the College should be increased to about twelve. That would necessitate considerable alteration in the present personnel of the Senate.

7. I understand your statement is this: that the Senate as at present constituted has got to be materially changed?—Yes.

8. That out of that Senate a Board of Studies is to be set up?—Not out of the Senate, no. The Board of Studies would not be set up by the Senate. I think that is vital. If the Senate had the right of setting up and knocking down the Board of Studies the same thing would happen as has happened to the professorial conferences.

9. Then the stand taken up by the professors of Canterbury College, according to the petition, simply means this: that you stand for a Board of Studies which is to control all the curriculum of the college and also the examinations, and to remove that entirely from the control of the Senate?—"Subject to review by the Senate" is the phrase used in the English statutes—that is to say, the Senate would have the right of veto in regard to any recommendation of the Board of Studies, but that right of veto would presumably only be exercised in extreme cases.

10. A motion has been before the Senate for the establishment of an annual conference of Professorial Boards?—Yes.

11. That conference, I understand; held one meeting?—The conference held one meeting.

12. And it made certain recommendations?—Yes.

13. Which were turned down by the Senate?—Yes.

14. Consequently, then, the professors of the colleges take the stand that because they were turned down that now they want the constitution changed so as to allow of an adjunct to their Senate which has never been known before, and that is a Board of Studies?—Not because they were turned down. They think the turning-down was only a symptom of the friction that does exist at present between the Senate and the professors.

15. And do you think that by a change in the Senate as it exists now your ideas would be made acceptable by the establishment of a Board of Studies?—Yes. I think that having one body directly responsible for both the finance and academic side of the university work is absolutely wrong, and I think you will find that that does not obtain in any modern university at Home. What I am sketching is no new thing; it is a scheme which has been found to work perfectly in the universities at Home since the year 1900.

16. Will not this proposal remove from the control of the Senate a very important function of the Senate of a university?—It is not a proper function of a lay Senate.

17. *Mr. Statham.*] You said that the Board of Studies would have complete control of the academic side of the College or University. Have you any provision for ensuring uniformity in the different colleges?—The Board of Studies would be a joint body which would contain an equal number of representatives of all the staffs of all the colleges.

18. The proposal is not that there would be four Boards?—No, only one. The Board of Studies for the University would be elected by and from the staffs of the four colleges.

19. And the question as to whether you should have external examiners or not would not affect the policy—that would be a matter to be decided by the Board of Studies subject to the veto of the Senate?—I think that would probably be the best plan. It seems to me that far too much stress is laid on the examination altogether. The examination is not an important part of the work of a university—the teaching is the important part.

20. You said that on the Senate at the present time there were ex-professors, and that you proposed to have only four professors on the Senate. Would you bar ex-professors getting on the Senate?—Well, I have not thought much about the question, but I do not think ex-professors on the Senate are at all likely to be unduly partial to their successors. That seems to be the case at present. I do not think it is really a very vital point. A professor does not usually retire until he is pretty old, and it seems to me quite immaterial whether an ex-professor should be a member of the Senate or not. I should have no objection to his being on the Senate and no objection to his being off.

21. As far as the professors on the Senate are concerned you think there should be four?—Yes. We do not want to control the finance. If we have an academic Board of Studies we want to control that. That Board of Studies should have the right of representation.

22. *Mr. Malcolm.*] I understand you object to the Senate because it is so largely a lay body?—By no means. I think the supreme Court of the University should be a lay body, but I do not think the supreme Court of the University should have direct control of the academic side.

23. It is not the composition of the Senate you object to but its powers?—Practically that, yes.

24. You said you would limit the powers of the Senate to dealing with finance?—It would have to direct finance and have the right of review over the whole of the work of the Board of Studies.

25. The right of review, I understand, would consist only in the power of veto?—Yes.

26. It would have no power, then, to originate?—Except by way of suggestion. It would have no power to originate changes unless it had the recommendation of the Board of Studies. It could, of course, suggest to the Board, and if the Board made no recommendation the Senate would have no further power.

27. In whose hands would the appointment and dismissal of professors then be?—I do not know. That, again, seems to me a point that is not in some senses particularly vital; but the right of recommendation of professorships at Home is always vested, as far as I know, in the body corresponding to the Board of Studies. The Council or Court appoints on the recommendation of the Board of Studies.