

3. I understand you prefer not to answer the question—you think it is too big a question for the professors to answer?—I think a Royal Commission should determine it; it is far too big a question for the professors to decide without a full inquiry.

4. If we cannot get guidance from the professors we must get it elsewhere?—Our advice would be practically the advice of the Right Hon. James Bryce, that the matter should be gone into very carefully.

5. We look for careful advice from the professors?—I think that is the most careful advice that could be given. You have the opinion of Victoria College in regard to science and law.

6. I want to understand what you mean by "specialization in science"?—I should prefer the science professors should explain that.

7. Perhaps they would send to the Committee a written answer as to what they mean by "specialization in science"—what is in the professors' minds?—I think it would be better for the science professors to do that, and I will see the Committee gets it.

8. Now, have you any idea about specialization in commerce, or music, or anything of that kind?—No. The general idea is that this question of specialization should be looked at from the point of view of the country as a whole, upon the principle that it is absolutely essential that a subject should be taught thoroughly in one centre. We want to make it possible for any New-Zealander to find somewhere in this country an efficient training in the subjects of the University. That is the guiding principle.

9. Exactly, that is what the Committee want to get at. We want to know what subjects should be specialized in, and how they should be divided up between the different colleges?—Our opinion regarding that matter is that it is a very big problem, and the problem can only be got at after public inquiry to which all the interests would be presented. I could give my opinion, but if it carried weight none of the other centres would know what was being done; that would not be fair.

10. You first of all said that the question should be relegated to a Royal Commission, and now I understand from your last remark that you have some other idea in your mind?—No.

11. Do you advise us that a Royal Commission is the best means of our obtaining this information, or whether representatives from the various teaching institutions and affiliated institutions could best advise us?—A Royal Commission.

12. What force would the gentleman from outside New Zealand represent upon that Royal Commission on this particular question of specialization here—would he know sufficient of our needs and necessities to speak with that certainty that one might hope for?—If our proposal were carried out he would have the support of two New-Zealanders, so the local conditions would be considered, and he would have all the evidence. I take it there is a very good example of that in Lord Kitchener's report on defence.

13. *Mr. Hanan.*] Would it be necessary for the Commissioner to visit New Zealand?—Undoubtedly, he must know the local conditions.

DR. IRWIN HUNTER examined. (No. 22.)

1. *The Chairman.*] What are you?—M.A., B.Sc., New Zealand University, and F.R.C.S. England.

2. I understand you wish to make a statement to the Committee?—Yes. I understand that there is a proposal before this Committee to increase the grant to the Otago Medical School. From what I know of this school I am of opinion that no more money should be spent there until a searching inquiry has been held into its constitution and methods. The gist of what I have to say has already appeared in the columns of the *Dunedin Press* during the past eight years. These attempts at reform have clearly shown that those who are governing the Medical School have not a due sense of their responsibilities to the people of the Dominion in the training of those in whose hands the physical welfare of the people largely rests. Therefore it seemed to me advisable that these facts should be presented to this Committee to be put on record as evidence of the necessity of a Royal Commission. My criticism will demonstrate the truth of the opinion expressed by the late Professor MacGregor, who, in giving evidence before the Commission of 1878, said, "I have all along been opposed very strongly to any attempt to give a complete medical degree in this country as being a sheer impossibility and absurdity. It may be said, in towns like Dunedin and Christchurch you have large hospitals and a large body of medical practitioners, why not give a complete medical education there? In the first place I hold that no general practitioner, who has to practice, like most medical men in this country, in a very promiscuous fashion, is capable of giving teaching that would be recognized, or ought to be recognized, by a degree-giving body, except in very exceptional circumstances. On the other hand, the medical men themselves would be anxious to get such positions, and the whole thing would be jobbed. I believe that would be the practical result." "*Dr. Hector.*] Do you agree with the course adopted hitherto by the New Zealand University in refraining from prescribing a medical curriculum?" "*Dr. MacGregor.*] Yes, I think it would be the most mischievous sham of all possible shams."

In this statement Professor MacGregor emphasized three points: (1) The whole thing would be jobbed, and the medical men appointed would use their positions to feather their own nests to the detriment of the real interests of the Medical School; (2) that men would be appointed to teaching posts for which they had no qualifications; (3) that as a result the Medical School would become "the most mischievous sham of all possible shams." The prophecy of Dr. MacGregor has been fulfilled. The passage to this condition of affairs has no doubt been facilitated by the fact that the Medical School began and continued its career under dual control—(a) The University Council;