

100. I do not say the time has not arrived for an alteration, but I am pointing out that the conditions are different from what they are in the Old Country?—To some extent, yes. They are not very different from the conditions that obtained in the Victoria University and the University of Wales. These colleges were affiliated to a central university, as we are. We want to make it clear that while we have proposed that the examining Boards should normally consist of the four teachers of the several subjects, we should have no objection whatsoever and should welcome the appointment of an assessor if a competent assessor could be found.

101. *Mr. Guthrie.*] You mean from each college?—Four professors, one from each college, sitting together, would constitute the Board of Examiners. If one competent external examiner could be found we should welcome him as an impartial chairman. That is the point I wanted to make.

102. You read the pamphlet that was issued by the University Reform Association?—Yes.

103. Do you agree with that pamphlet?—Yes, in the main.

104. *Hon. Mr. Allen.*] I understand what you want to do is to some extent to clip the wings of the Senate as it exists, with the object of giving more power on questions of syllabus and examinations to the teaching element in the University?—Yes.

105. Now, do you suggest that in clipping the wings of the Senate there is any necessity to alter the present constitution of the membership of the Senate?—No. I do not see there is any real necessity.

106. I understand from you that you would leave with the Senate the power of veto upon questions of syllabus or any question that came up from the Board of Studies?—Yes.

107. Then would it be wise, in view of the fact that the Senate is to have the power of veto, that it should be constituted on what you call too large an element of lay members?—I do not fear the lay members at all.

108. You would not fear their power of veto on the question of syllabus?—It has been found to work perfectly well at Home, and I see no reason why it should not work well here. There has been only one university in which there has been trouble, and that is not because the Board of Studies has more power in that university, but because it has less.

109. You do not suggest any alteration in the personnel of the Senate?—Not necessarily, save that I say there would be no need for a large professorial element.

110. Why do you say that in view of the fact that they have, after all, the ultimate decision upon questions of syllabus and examination?—Well, one of the main objections to our proposals is that it is said that we want to have entire control of the whole thing—that we want the sole power put in the hands of the professors.

111. That is not what you have suggested. What you have suggested is that the power should be with the Senate—the power of veto?—Yes, that was our proposal.

112. Well, if that ultimate power is to be there, would it not be wise that a good proportion of them should be experienced in university work and university teaching, otherwise how could they exercise sound judgment on the question of veto?—Possibly it would. I said I should be quite content to have only four.

113. As far as the personnel of the Senate is concerned it is immaterial to you as reformers what it is?—Yes, to me.

114. You suggest that the power should be taken from them, except the power of veto, and should be placed in the hands of what you call a Board of Studies?—Yes.

115. You know what was done in the Senate in regard to the annual conference of professors?—Yes.

116. If that annual conference of professors had been continued would it, in your opinion, have ultimately developed into what you want—a Board of Studies?—It might have. The Board of Studies should be a statutory body.

117. What you want is a statutory body?—Yes.

118. Certain questions were asked you about the relationship of the local colleges here and the University. I want to know, in regard to the constitution of the statutory body, what power you want to give them. Do you suggest any power should be taken away that is now existing in the local University colleges and given to the Board of Studies?—I do not think so. Nothing has occurred to me as of vital importance, at any rate.

119. The appointment of professors?—Well, the appointment of professors in a federal university and in a single-college university are different matters, of course. It seems to me that the only sound plan would be to do as I suggest—that is, to give the Professorial Boards of the individual colleges power to recommend in the case of all appointments to the Boards of Governors of the University colleges.

120. Do you desire as a reformer to take away the power that now exists with the local administration of the appointment of professors and place that power in the hands of the Board of Studies?—No.

121. Do you suggest that the question of finances should be placed in the hands of your proposed Senate?—The suggestion in the reform pamphlet is practically that the Senate should be composed of the Boards of Governors. That would involve considerable reconstitution of the present Senate.

122. But I want your opinion as representing Canterbury College. Do you consider that the question of the finances of the local institutions should be put in the hands of the reformed Senate?—I do not think so. I have not come to that conclusion. As a matter of fact, I have not thought much about the financial side. I do not regard myself as very competent to do so.

123. Then what your proposed Board of Studies would deal with would be the syllabus of the whole of the affiliated institutions?—It would deal with the syllabus of the University.