

in each subject—if that system were adopted would you have anything further to complain of?—If that system were adopted probably my successor in thirty years from now would find himself in the same position as I am in now—he would be unable to make his voice heard on any subject. I do not say that the system we want now should obtain for all time. When I say the present system is radically wrong I mean it is out of relation to the needs of the present time.

80. That is, the present external examination?—The whole thing.

81. Generally speaking, what you want is to ensure that the professors shall have a larger share in the whole University work, exclusive, say, of the finances?—Yes, on the whole academic side.

82. And even there you want to give them some control over the appointment of professors, I understand?—I did not say they should have control—I merely say what happens at Home, that the Board of Studies has power to recommend. The Court or Council is not bound to accept the recommendation of the academic body, but it usually does so.

83. The Board of Studies would be composed exclusively of professors?—The responsible teachers of the subject. One may be called a “professor” and another a “lecturer.” For example, the head of the department of mental science at Victoria College is called a “professor,” and at Canterbury College he is called a “lecturer.” Both would be members of the Board of Studies.

84. Under the existing conditions do not the professors who are on the Senate have a very large voice in the framing of the curriculum?—A resolution for the abolition of external examinations was carried at the professorial conference by seventeen to six, but it was thrown out by the Senate by seventeen to six.

85. That is a different point. Is the Senate not very largely guided by their recommendations?—In particular subjects to some extent, yes; but since the professorial conference has been abolished it will now be almost impossible to get the professors together and know what they want about the particular subjects. At the professorial conference they could hammer away at things till a *modus vivendi* had been found.

86. With a body composed exclusively of professors might there not be a danger of such a body getting out of touch with the practical side of the community?—Well, it depends on the definition of “practical.” I mean, the professors have to keep themselves in touch not only with the trend of their own subject, but the general trend of educational matters, in a way which lay senators cannot possibly do.

87. And you think the Senate as at present constituted is not likely to give sufficient weight to the recommendations of the professors?—I think so. I think the experience of the professorial conference proves that up to the hilt.

88. Now, in order to bring about some reform you suggest that a Royal Commission be set up?—Well, a Royal Commission is the last thing. We have suggested a Royal Commission in desperation practically, because we found it impossible to get anything we wanted in any other way.

89. If this Committee were to make any recommendation in the direction of a change in the constitution of the Senate, then you would consider a Royal Commission would not be necessary?—As I said at the beginning, if the Committee were to tell me that they would get the Senate and Board of Studies as statutory bodies set up by Parliament and constituted in the way I have tried to sketch, most of the other difficulties could be left to solve themselves.

90. You want a Royal Commission because you think a Royal Commission is bound to come to the same conclusion as yourselves?—Not necessarily. If I am wrong I should like it to be proved that I am wrong. I suggest a Royal Commission because it is the only thing I know left to suggest.

91. Who would you suggest should compose the Commission?—The terms of the petition of Canterbury College are the same as those of that of Victoria College. We said we wanted one English educationist of experience.

92. How many do you think should be on the Commission?—I have not really considered how many. I think a small number would probably be as good as a large number.

93. Would five be sufficient?—I think so, if it were the proper kind of Commission.

94. Do you not think the finding of the Commission would very largely depend upon the views of the men who are on it, apart altogether from the evidence that they are likely to receive here?—I do not know. If you chose the right men I do not think that would be the case. I suppose the right men would begin with an open mind on the subject.

95. Do you not think that the man whom you choose in England is likely to have a pre-dominating influence on the Commission?—I think possibly he might—I do not know.

96. Do you think there is a danger of his being influenced somewhat by his preconceptions of the conditions at Home to take into account sufficiently the altered conditions that exist here?—I suppose the suggestion is that the present system has grown up gradually to meet the needs of New Zealand?

97. Well, to some extent?—I do not think there is any foundation for that suggestion—at all events, so far as the curriculum is concerned.

98. How about the question of the external examination?—That has not grown up gradually.

99. Are you not aware that one reason for the original institution of that system is the fact that the University was young and it was thought desirable to have the more eminent examiners in the Old Country?—Very likely. But now the University is older than most of the provincial universities at Home. In the old days when there was only one teacher of a subject, or two at most, there may have been something to say for external examinations, but now that there are four I think the argument for them falls to the ground.