

55. You have not objected to the Governor in Council appointing four, eight from the governing bodies, and four from the Professorial Boards—which disposes of sixteen of the twenty-four; and then we get to the graduates, who elect their two each if they roll up as you say?—I tried to make it clear that what I was objecting to was not so much the constitution of the Senate as the functions possessed by the present Senate. I do not believe that the sole control of both the financial and academic side of the University should be vested in a single body.

56. But the Senate has nothing whatever to do with the finances of the colleges?—I meant the finances of the University.

57. But the finances are entirely with the examinations?—Yes.

58. They have nothing to do with the finances of any college?—Nothing.

59. Should there not be some connection between the two?—Possibly there should be.

60. Why do you object to old professors being on the Senate—surely they are experts?—I did not say that I objected to old professors.

61. You say they are not partial to their successors?—I thought it might have been understood when I did not mention them that I wanted to get in ex-professors by a side-wind. I tried to make it clear that I did not care whether ex-professors were members of the Senate or not. As a matter of fact, from the question asked me by one of the members of the Committee, it seemed to me to be thought that professors or ex-professors might acquire predominance on the Senate although they had a body of their own, and I said that some professors were not partial to their successors at present. I do not think there is any danger of ex-professors swamping the lay element in favour of their successors.

62. They do predominate now, mainly professors of to-day. I could name seven or eight?—I believe there are ten.

63. Is it not highly desirable to have this percentage of professors and ex-professors on that body?—So long as the Senate is the sole administrative body of the University I suppose it is, but I believe that is a bad scheme. That is what I am trying to show.

64. What do you suggest to take their places?—I suggest a Senate and Board of Studies.

65. You are dividing the thing up. You are going to make the four governing bodies the future Senate, and the present-day Senate will develop into the Board of Studies?—Not the present-day Senate, because the Board of Studies would not have any lay element at all.

66. It seems to me that the present Senate has no lay element about it—it seems to me they are all highly experienced. Is there one member of the twenty-four whom you can call a layman?—When I use the term “lay” I mean in the sense that they are not at present teachers of the four constituent colleges.

67. Seven or eight of them are?—Yes, I know. I am not objecting to that, but I say the Senate is the wrong sort of body. It has control of the whole thing, whereas the control of the academic side of the University should be vested in an academic body subject to review by the supreme Court of the University.

68. It seems to me your complaint is against the constituencies for the Senate?—No, I am not complaining in any way about the constituencies.

69. You are rather complaining about the District Courts of Convocation sending old professors?—No, I am not complaining of that.

70. *Mr. Sidey.*] How long have you been in New Zealand?—I came here in January, 1909. It is merely by accident that I represent the College here to-day. I happen to have practically no classes on Friday and could come up, whereas the senior arts professor, who would readily have come up, could not arrange to get away.

71. How long did you belong to the University of Liverpool?—I was a student at the Liverpool University, and afterwards went to Cambridge.

72. Your only association with the University of Liverpool was that you were there as a student?—Yes, I was a student there. My people live there, and I have kept in touch with the University ever since.

73. It is practically the constitution of the University of Liverpool that you suggest for this country?—The constitution of all the modern universities at Home are on practically the same lines.

74. Do you not think you are more inclined to be in favour of those universities at Home with whose constitution you have been familiar?—I do not think so. I think I can take my stand on the experience I have had in New Zealand.

75. What has been your chief difficulty in practice under the present system of the New Zealand Universities?—Well, I suppose the chief difficulty in practice is probably connected with the external examination.

76. How have you found that work adversely to the proper carrying-on of the work?—The proper carrying-on of my work means teaching on what I believe to be the right lines. I have to bind myself down to a syllabus of which I do not altogether approve.

77. So that it comes to this: that the only objection you really have found so far is to the external examination?—No, not altogether. I find a very great difficulty in making our opinions on any subject effective. The great difficulty in my actual teaching has been in connection with the external examination.

78. I am not quite sure of the distinction. I understood you to say that in the carrying-out of your work in regard to the actual teaching you found the external examination is the chief difficulty?—That is one of the difficulties. Another difficulty is that there is only a single examination for the degree, so that the majority of the students do not get to any decent standard in any subject at all.

79. If a system of examination such as is suggested by the Reform Association, with which I suppose you agree—namely, that there should be local assessors examining with the professor