

1913.
NEW ZEALAND.

EDUCATION COMMITTEE

REPORT OF THE) ON THE PETITIONS OF JAMES ADAMSON AND 27 OTHERS, LEONARD J. WILD AND 90 OTHERS, ROBERT CHURCH AND 23 OTHERS, KENNETH J. DELLOW AND 84 OTHERS, HON. SIR G. M. O'RORKE AND 21 OTHERS, AND ARNOLD WALL AND 5 OTHERS.

(MR. G. M. THOMSON, CHAIRMAN.)

Report brought up on the 30th September, 1913, together with the Petition and Departmental Report, and ordered to be printed.

ORDER OF REFERENCE.

Extract from the Journals of the House of Representatives.

THURSDAY, THE 3RD DAY OF JULY, 1913.

Ordered, "That a Committee be appointed, consisting of ten members, to consider all matters relating to school-teachers, education, and public instruction generally, public school training of teachers, higher education, technical education, manual instruction, and such other matters affecting education as may be referred to it; to have power, to call for persons and papers; three to be a quorum: the Committee to consist of Mr. Guthrie, Mr. Hanan, Mr. Malcolm, Mr. McCallum, Mr. Poland, Mr. Sidey, Mr. Statham, Mr. J. C. Thomson, Mr. G. M. Thomson, and the mover."
—(Hon. Mr. ALLEN.)

PETITION.

To the Honourable the Speaker and Members of the House of Representatives of the Dominion of New Zealand in Parliament assembled.

THE petition of James Adamson and some members of the Council and staff of the Victoria (University) College, Wellington, humbly sheweth:—

1. That in 1911 the Education Committee of the House of Representatives, reporting on a petition for a Royal Commission on University education in New Zealand, agreed that a case had been made out for reform in the constitution of the New Zealand University, but affirmed that a Royal Commission was not necessary, as there was "evidence that the University is itself moving in a direction which will gradually evolve a scheme of reform on the lines indicated, and this is borne out to some extent by the fact that in November, 1910, in accordance with a resolution of the Senate, a conference of representatives of the Professorial Boards was held in Wellington to consider certain academic questions referred to it by the Senate."

This report of the Committee of the House of Representatives was mainly responsible for the adoption by the Senate, in 1912, of the following motion moved by the Hon. James Allen: "That the Senate arrange for an annual conference of representatives from the Professorial Boards of affiliated institutions, to be held in Auckland, Wellington, Christchurch, and Dunedin, at times to be fixed by the Senate."

The first of these conferences met in 1912, and submitted to the Senate a series of proposals, including a scheme for pass degrees in arts and science—a problem that the Senate has been definitely trying to solve for at least five years.

At its annual meeting in 1913 the Senate not only rejected the proposals of the conference, but also rescinded the motion by which an annual conference had been instituted. Thus the Senate first set up an expert body with definite responsibilities, and then proceeded to disregard its carefully considered proposals and to abolish the body itself. It is clear that either the Senate or the Professorial Conference must be gravely at fault, and that an impartial inquiry into the facts is a necessity to the welfare of the University.

The Senate, at the same meeting, agreed that reform of the constitution of the University was necessary, but could suggest no other means of bringing this about than those methods which have proved abortive in the past.

Since there is general agreement as to the main fact of the need for reform of the University, but no hope of agreement, among the bodies involved, as to the means of reform, we, the undersigned, petition for an inquiry into University education in New Zealand by a Royal Commission, on which shall sit at least one British educationist of repute who has had experience of similar inquiries.

REPORT.

REPORT ON THE PETITION OF JAMES ADAMSON AND 27 OTHERS, AND FIVE SIMILAR PETITIONS, PRAYING FOR AN INQUIRY INTO UNIVERSITY EDUCATION IN NEW ZEALAND BY A ROYAL COMMISSION ON WHICH SHALL SIT AT LEAST ONE BRITISH EDUCATIONIST OF REPUTE WITH EXPERIENCE OF SIMILAR INQUIRIES.

THE Education Committee has the honour to report on the petitions of James Adamson and 27 others, Leonard J. Wild and 90 others, Robert Church and 23 others, Kenneth J. Dellow and 84 others, Hon. Sir G. M. O'Rorke and 21 others, and Arnold Wall and 5 others—

That the Education Committee, to which these petitions were referred, having considered the prayer of the petitioners, having heard evidence in support of their claims, and having also reconsidered the evidence on the same subject brought before the Education Committee of the House in 1911, begs to report as follows:—

1. That the University of New Zealand should be brought more closely into touch with the affiliated teaching institutions.

2. That the question of dealing with the subject of University reform in New Zealand was postponed in 1911 in the hope that the University Senate would itself evolve a scheme of internal reform. The Senate has recently issued to the graduates three schemes for their consideration. It is, however, very doubtful whether this course of action will lead to any practical result.

3. That while day teaching is essential for the prosecution of all higher University work, the continuance of evening classes is necessary under present conditions to insure the correlation of the University with the technical work of the country and the general life of the people: any scheme, therefore, for improving and extending the work of the University should endeavour to provide for both.

The Committee does not advise the setting-up of a Royal Commission, but recommends—

(1.) That the Government be asked to bring down legislation to alter the constitution of the Senate so as to make it consist mainly of members elected from the Councils of the affiliated colleges.

(2.) That a body representative of the Professorial Boards be constituted, and that it possess advisory powers in all academic matters.

(3.) That provision be made in accordance with the recommendations of the Inspector-General of Schools in his report on the University Colleges of New Zealand (E-7A, 1912) for—

(a.) Strengthening the various faculties of the affiliated colleges, including grants for specialization in Victoria College and Auckland University College;

(b.) For better equipment of the libraries; and

(c.) For the prosecution of research.

(4.) That to meet the immediate needs of the colleges for the current financial year the sum of £4,500 be granted as follows:—

To Auckland University College, for strengthening the faculties of arts, science, and commerce, £1,500 in addition to grants hitherto made:

To Victoria College, to meet the deficit in the current year's finances, to enable the Registrar's office to be put on a proper footing, and to strengthen the teaching staff, £1,500 in addition to the grants appearing in the appropriation of 1911-12:

To Otago University, for strengthening the Medical School, £1,500 in addition to all grants appearing in the last appropriations.

30th September, 1913.

G. M. THOMSON, Chairman.

REPORT OF INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF SCHOOLS.

SIR,—

Education Department, Wellington, 17th July, 1913.

In regard to the petitions on the matter of University reform—namely, No. 13, petition of Adamson, James, and 27 others; No. 14, petition of Wild, Leonard J., and 90 others; No. 15, petition of Church, Robert, and 23 others; No. 16, petition of Dellow, Kenneth, J., and 84 others; No. 17, petition of Hon. Sir G. M. O'Rorke and 21 others; No. 18, petition of Wall, Arnold, and 5 others—I have the honour to reply as follows:—

In 1910 Professor Thomas H. Laby and 25 others petitioned Parliament for an inquiry into the state of University administration and education in New Zealand.

In regard to the matter of that petition I had the honour to address a reply to the Clerk to the Committee, as follows:—

“SIR,—

“20th October, 1910.

“In reference to the petition of Thomas H. Laby, H. B. Kirk, and others, I have the honour to say that as the whole matter of the B.A. and B.Sc. degrees is now under the consideration of a special recess committee of the Senate of the University of New Zealand, which has power to call a conference of professors of the four University Colleges, and as the question of these degrees involves also most of the matters that form the subject of the petition, I hardly deem it expedient at present that an inquiry should be held into the state of University administration and education in New Zealand, but suggest that time should be given to see what may be the result of the labours of the recess committee and of the conference of professors referred to.

“I have, &c.,

“G. HOGBEN,

“The Clerk to the Education Committee.”

“Inspector-General of Schools.

Subsequently, by the permission of the House, the petition was deferred until the session of 1911 for fuller investigation.

On the 11th August, 1911, I was requested to furnish the Education Committee with any further information bearing on the matter which might be in my possession. I replied in the following letter:—

“*Petition of Thomas H. Laby and Others.*”

“SIR,—

“Education Department, Wellington, 17th August, 1911.

“In reply to your letter of the 11th August, 1911, I have the honour to attach, for the information of the Committee, the report of the recess committee of the Senate of the University of New Zealand on B.A. and B.Sc. degrees presented in January last. The report was based on the recommendation of a conference of Professorial Boards; it was considered by the Senate at its last meeting in January, 1911, when the following resolution was passed:—

“That the consideration of the scheme proposed in this report be postponed till next annual meeting of Senate, and that in the meantime copies of the scheme be forwarded to the Professorial Boards and the Courts of Convocation for their advice thereon, with a request that they should express their opinions on the following points in particular:—

“(1.) Whether the present degrees of B.A. and B.Sc. be amalgamated.

“(2.) The repetition of two subjects.

“(3.) The desirability of the Professorial Boards approving of the courses to be taken by students.

“(4.) The several limitations of the selection of subjects in the report.

“(5.) If amalgamation is approved of, ought the B.Sc. degree to be retained as a special science degree?

“(6.) What, if any, subjects should be compulsory?”

“I shall be happy to give any further details the Committee may require.

“I have, &c.,

“G. HOGBEN,

“Inspector-General of Schools.

“The Clerk of the Education Committee, House of Representatives”

On the 25th October, 1911, after hearing evidence, the Committee reported (I.—13A, 1911), and the report was ordered to be printed:—

“REPORT.

“Petitioners pray for the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into the question of reform in University administration and education in New Zealand.

“I am directed to report that the Education Committee, having considered this petition, and the evidence of the petitioners and others in relation thereto, is of opinion—

“(1.) That a case has been made out for reform in the constitution of the New Zealand University, more particularly in the direction of the utilization in a larger measure than at present of the professorial staffs of the colleges in the framing of curricula and syllabuses, and in the conduct of examinations.

“(2.) That the appointment of a Royal Commission is not necessary at present, as the Committee believes there is evidence that the University is itself moving in a direction which will gradually evolve a scheme of reform on the lines indicated, and this is borne out to some extent by the fact that in November, 1910, in accordance with a resolution of the Senate, a conference of representatives of the Professorial Boards was held in Wellington to consider certain academic questions referred to it by the Senate.

"(3.) That, with regard to finance,—

"(a.) The fees charged in the various colleges should be uniform;

"(b.) All the colleges should be adequately endowed, and where grants of a permanent character are made by Parliament, these should be statutory; and

"(c.) The financial position and requirements of each college should be inquired into, each college being considered on its merits, and provision made accordingly. (The Committee think that this inquiry might be conducted by the Inspector-General of Schools.)

"(4.) That—

"(a.) The library equipment of the colleges should be strengthened, especially in the interests of research.

"(b.) The Inspector-General should be asked to report on this matter. (In preparing his report the Inspector-General should consider whether a system of interchange of books between the libraries could be given effect to.)

"(c.) The reports of the Inspector-General under this and the preceding paragraph should be referred to the Education Committee of the House next session for consideration.

"(5.) That, considering the age of the institution and the geographical and other difficulties with which it has had to contend, the University has done very good work, and is justifying the expectations and accomplishing the objects of its founders. University education is free to all holders of scholarships, studentships, and bursaries, the number of these current last year being 557. If a student does not obtain a scholarship, but gains credit in the University Junior Scholarship Examination, he is entitled to a bursary which carries with it the payment of college and University fees for three or four years. The University has thus opened the doors of the professions to all classes of the community, and its graduates are taking leading positions in all walks of life. The Committee believes, however, that with reform on the lines above indicated the University will extend its usefulness as an educational agent, and become increasingly identified with the practical life and work of the community.

"(6.) That—

"(a.) This report be laid on the table of the House, and be referred to the Government for consideration.

"(b.) That the minutes of evidence, together with the pamphlet of the petitioners entitled 'University Reform in New Zealand,' and the 'Opinions of some New Zealand Educational Authorities,' be laid on the table of the House, and that the minutes of evidence be printed.

"25th October, 1911."

"T. K. SIDEX, Chairman.

During the parliamentary recess I inquired, as directed, into the matters referred to in paragraphs (3) and (4) of the Committee's report just referred to. My report (E.-7A, 1912), dated 17th October, 1912, was laid on the table of the House of Representatives by leave, and referred to the Education Committee, which, however, was unable to deal with it last session.

Paragraphs (1) and (2) of the Committee's report were not referred to me; they deal to a certain extent with the subject-matter of the present petitions.

For the information of the Committee I give below a summary of the action taken by the Senate of the University of New Zealand subsequently to the presentation of the Education Committee's report in October, 1911.

At its annual session in January, 1912, the Senate established an annual conference of representatives of Professorial Boards, and passed the following resolutions:—

"(1.) That the Senate arrange for an annual conference of representatives from the Professorial Boards of affiliated institutions, to be held in turn in Auckland, Wellington, Christchurch, and Dunedin, at times to be fixed by the Senate.

"(2.) That the first conference consist of seven representatives from each college, and in addition the head of the mining, medical, engineering, and dental schools.

"(3.) That at the first meeting of the conference a chairman be appointed, and that he have a deliberative and a casting vote.

"(4.) That the conference be empowered to consider—

"(a.) Any matter referred to it by the Senate;

"(b.) The courses of instruction for the degrees, diplomas, and certificates of the University, and the various examinations conducted by the University; and to report the results of their deliberations to the Senate for its consideration.

"(5.) That the expense of the conference be paid out of the funds of the University of New Zealand."

And also, later, the following resolution:—

"That to the first meeting of the professorial conference the following questions be referred:—

"(a.) Courses for B.A. and B.Sc. degrees, and essentially connected subjects;

"(b.) The best method of giving a permanent shape to the conference."

The first professorial conference thus constituted accordingly met, and held sessions for the four days from the 19th November to the 22nd November, 1912, discussing chiefly the matters referred to it by the Senate. The report of this conference is to be found on pages 10 to 18 of the minutes of the Senate for 1913.

The two chief recommendations of the conference were the amalgamation of the B.A. and B.Sc. degrees, for which a programme was suggested, and the gradual abolition of the external system of examination for degrees in arts, with a provision for substitutes for external examinations.

The first recommendation was rejected by the Senate by fourteen votes to eight.

The Senate then, by fifteen votes to seven, rescinded its motion of January, 1912, constituting the conference, so that the remaining debatable matters in the report of the conference were not discussed. At a later time in the same session (1913) the Senate passed the following resolutions:—

“(a.) That a committee (to be appointed) confer with governing bodies and teaching staffs of the colleges, also with the Convocation, on the expediency of a Bill to reconstitute the University on lines that, while in no way affecting the corporate entity of the colleges, their autonomy or finance, will associate them more directly with University government.

“(b.) That if a working agreement is arrived at, the committee draft such a Bill and submit it to the Senate and the colleges for consideration.”

The committee has received suggestions for the reform of the constitution of the University, and has forwarded three schemes to the graduates and constituent bodies of the colleges and of the University for consideration. These schemes are marked “A,” “B,” “C” on the enclosed memorandum.

I have, &c.,

G. HOBGEN,

Inspector-General of Schools.

The Clerk of the Education Committee, House of Representatives, Wellington.

SCHEMES FOR RECONSTITUTION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW ZEALAND.

SCHEME A.

1. THE SENATE.

Constitution.

- (1.) Chancellor, elected by the Senate at its meeting next before the date of the triennial elections of members of Senate;
- (2.) Vice-Chancellor, elected by the Board of Studies; and, in addition—
- (3.) Two appointed by the Governor in Council;
- (4.) Four members elected by the Councils, one by each of the affiliated colleges;
- (5.) Eight elected by the District Courts of Convocation, two by each;
- (6.) Four elected by the General Board of Studies;
- (7.) The Chief Justice; or, if he be Chancellor or Vice-Chancellor, the next senior Judge;
- (8.) The Inspector-General of Schools; or, if he be Chancellor or Vice-Chancellor, the Assistant Inspector-General of Schools;
- (9.) A representative of the New Zealand branch of the British Medical Association;
- (10.) A representative of the New Zealand Society of Accountants.

(NOTE.—(9) and (10) are included to secure representation in the special branches of studies for degrees in medicine and commerce.)

Powers.

As the supreme governing body of the University, to make statutes, appoint officers, expend funds, and generally manage the affairs of the University: Provided that it shall not pass any statute or regulation touching schemes of studies or examinations for degrees, diplomas, scholarships, or prizes without a recommendation from the Board of Studies, unless the latter has had reasonable opportunity to consider and report thereon; nor shall it, except with the same limitations, appoint examiners.

The Senate may delegate to the Board of Studies, as it thinks fit, either generally or for any specified time, such powers of conducting examinations, and conferring degrees, diplomas, scholarships, or prizes and (after report from the Boards of Faculties concerned) of drawing up courses of study in any subject or subjects, and appointing examiners.

2. THE BOARD OF STUDIES.

Constitution.

- (1.) Vice-Chancellor (Chairman);
- (2.) One member elected by each of the Boards of Faculties;
- (3.) (a) Twenty members, five elected by each of the four Professorial Boards; or (b) twelve members, three elected by each of the four Professorial Boards.

Powers.

To make recommendations to the Senate as to degrees, diplomas, scholarships, and prizes, courses of study and examinations; to receive recommendations as to any of these matters from the Boards of Faculties or the Professorial Boards; to exercise any of the powers delegated to it by the Senate.

(NOTE.—The Senate and the Board of Studies may appoint their own standing committees, with certain executive powers.)

Faculties.

- (a.) Arts, including music and commerce (except law subjects);
- (b.) Science (namely, mathematics, physics, chemistry, botany, zoology, physiology, geology);
- (c.) Law, including law subjects in commerce course;

- (d.) Medical, including dental surgery and veterinary science;
 (e.) Technology, including engineering, mining, architecture, and agriculture;
 And such other faculties as the Senate on the advice of or after consultation with the Board of Studies shall decide; and the Senate in like manner shall, except where they are defined herein, decide what are the subjects of each faculty.

3. BOARDS OF FACULTIES.

Constitution.

The Board of each faculty shall consist of the Dean of the faculty (elected by the Board of the faculty), who shall be chairman of the Board, of the professors in the subjects of the faculty, or such lecturers in charge of these subjects as have seats on the Professorial Boards of the colleges, and of such others professors, lecturers, or other persons as the Senate, on the advice of the General Board of Studies, shall add. (For instance, a Professor of Mathematics and a Professor of Physics, or the Principal of an agricultural college, might be added to the faculty of technology; one or more Professors of Biology and the President of the New Zealand Branch of the British Medical Association, or the Chief Officer of Health, to the faculty of medicine; a barrister in practice, or a Judge, to the faculty of law, and so on.)

Powers.

To recommend to the Board of Studies programmes of work in the subjects of the faculty or changes therein; to recommend to the same body examiners in the several subjects; and to make recommendations or suggestions to the Board of Studies as to any other matters relating to the faculty.

4. DISTRICT COURTS OF CONVOCATION.

As at present.

RIGHT OF APPEAL TO SENATE.

Any Professorial Board or Board of a faculty shall have the right, if its recommendation be not adopted within three months by the Board of Studies, to put such recommendation directly before the Senate, which shall deal with it in accordance with its powers as defined above; but except in the case of such appeal no Professorial Board or Board of Faculty shall approach the Senate except through a Board of Studies. Every College Council and every Court of Convocation shall have the right to make recommendations directly to the Senate.

NOTES TO SCHEME A.

Much of the work of the Boards of Faculties could be done by correspondence, and they would not have to meet very often.

The Board of Studies would receive much of the matter for its consideration in a definite form from the Boards of Faculties, and its meetings would therefore probably occupy less than a week in each year.

Most of the Senate's work would also be presented to it in precise form by the Board of Studies, and its meetings need not occupy more than half the time they do now. The work of the committees of the Senate that now occupies so much of the annual session would be so simplified as in some cases to be little more than nominal.

The whole work of government of the University being thus organized, much more of the formal work could be done by standing committees of the Senate and Board of Studies. The expense of full meetings of these bodies would be thus largely reduced.

SCHEME B.

1. The University should be constituted of the four colleges, instead of being, as at present, an examining body with teaching institutions affiliated to it.
2. It should be controlled by the following bodies, with the powers specified:—

A. FOUR COURTS OF CONVOCATION.

One for each University district.

Constitution.

The Court of Convocation in each University district should include—All persons of not less than six months' residence who are graduates of any British university holding a charter from the Crown or of any other university recognized by the Senate for this purpose; Judges and Stipendiary Magistrates; Mayors of boroughs and towns; presidents of learned societies; members for the district in both Houses of Parliament; members of Education Boards; members of the governing bodies of secondary schools; heads of secondary schools and of primary schools above grade (?); Council of the Accountants' Society; presidents of law and medical societies, of agricultural and pastoral societies, and of Chambers of Commerce; and such other classes of persons as the Senate, with the approval of the Governor in Council, may from time to time determine.

Powers.

To elect six representatives to the College Council; to make representations to the College Council and, through it, to the conjoint Professorial Board and the Senate, on any matters affecting the college or the University.

B. FOUR COUNCILS.

The governing body of the colleges—one for each college.

Constitution.

- (a.) One member appointed by the Governor in Council.
- (b.) The chairman of the Professorial Board and one other selected by the Board.
- (c.) Six elected by the Court of Convocation.

(NOTE.—No member of the teaching staff to be eligible for election under (c).)

Powers.

To manage the college as at present, provided that no appointment to a Chair shall be made until the Council has had a report on the matter from the committee of selection appointed by the conjoint Professorial Board, and until the approval of the Senate has been obtained.

C. FOUR PROFESSORIAL BOARDS.

As at present.

D. CONJOINT PROFESSORIAL BOARD.

Constitution.

All the professors of the University.

Powers.

To make recommendations to the Senate as to degrees, diplomas, scholarships, prizes, examiners, courses of study and examinations; to receive recommendations on any of these matters from the Councils, Professorial Boards, or Boards of Faculties; to recommend to the Councils Committees of experts to advise the Councils in the appointment of professors; to exercise any powers delegated to it by the Senate or Councils.

E. BOARDS OF FACULTIES.

Constitution.

The Board of each faculty should consist of the Dean of the Faculty (elected by the faculty), of the professors of the subjects of the faculty, of lecturers in independent charge of subjects of the faculty.

Powers.

To make recommendations to the conjoint Professorial Board on the programmes of work in the subjects of the faculty, on the appointment of examiners of the several subjects, and on any academic matters affecting the faculty.

(NOTE 1.—Faculties would be—Arts, science, law, medicine and dentistry, commerce, engineering, mining, agriculture, home science.)

(NOTE 2.—The Boards of Faculties would meet, whenever it should be necessary, just before the regular meeting of the conjoint Professorial Board, thereby preventing undue expense in these meetings.)

F. THE SENATE.

The supreme governing body of the University.

Constitution.

- (1.) The twenty-eight non-professorial members of the Councils (seven from each).
- (2.) The chairman for the time being of each Professorial Board.

(NOTE.—The Senate to elect its own Chancellor; the chairman of each College Council to be a Vice-Chancellor of the University.)

Powers.

To make statutes, appoint officers to carry out the work of the Senate, expend funds, and generally manage the affairs of the University: Provided that no statute or regulation dealing with degrees, diplomas, scholarships or prizes, or courses of study or examinations shall be passed without a recommendation from the conjoint Professorial Board, or unless the latter has had a reasonable opportunity to report thereon; nor, except with the same limitation, shall any examiners be appointed, degrees or diplomas be conferred, scholarships or prizes be awarded.

SCHEME C.

1. SENATE.

Constitution.

Twenty-four Fellows—Eight appointed by the four College Councils, eight appointed by the four District Courts of Convocation, four appointed by the four Professorial Boards, four appointed by the Government.

Powers.

As at present, the only legislative and administrative body.

2. GENERAL PROFESSORIAL BOARD.

Constitution.

One representative of each of the four College Professorial Boards, and one representative of each of the faculties as defined in Scheme A.

(NOTE.—The whole of the staffs would make an unwieldy and inefficient body.)

FUNCTIONS AND POWERS.

- (a.) To form the official medium between the Senate and the teaching staffs individually in their separate faculties or as a whole; to ascertain the opinion of the latter as necessary on proposed changes in the degrees, in courses for degrees, in individual subjects and their definition, and in the lists of the examiners.
- (b.) To arrange the meeting of the teachers of a subject or of a faculty when conflict of opinion makes it necessary.
- (c.) To report to the Senate the result of deliberations and the amount of the agreement reached.

3. GENERAL ADVISORY BOARD.

Constitution.

- (a.) The chairman of the four College Councils.
- (b.) The chairman of the four College Professorial Boards.
- (c.) The chairman of the four District Courts of Convocation.

Functions and Powers.

- (a.) To ascertain the opinion of the College Councils, Professorial Boards, and Courts of Convocation on all proposed radical changes in the constitution or working of the University.
- (b.) To discuss these proposals in the light of the voting on them by the Councils, Boards, and Courts, so as to find some basis of agreement; to resubmit this to the Councils, Boards, and Courts, and, if a majority of these bodies endorse, to recommend it to the Senate.

(NOTE.—The Senate decides what is an academic question for the General Professorial Boards, and what is a radical constitutional question for the General Advisory Board.)

4. CONVOCATION.

All graduates.

Functions.

Elective.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

FRIDAY, 25TH JULY, 1913.

JOHN STUDHOLME examined. (No. 1.)

1. *The Chairman.*] We understand, Mr. Studholme, that you have some information to give us with regard to the home-science course at the Otago University, and we should be glad if you would make a statement now and members might afterwards ask you any questions upon the subject?—It is in connection with the Chair of Home Science at the Otago University that I wish to give evidence, and I should like to point out that the objects of the promoters of the establishment of this Chair were two: one was that they hoped that the recognition by the highest educational authority—the University Senate—that this teaching was sufficiently scientific and of sufficient importance to be included in a University degree course would give a stimulus and greatly increased prestige in the eyes of the public to this part of a woman's education. That was one object they had in view. The other was that they hoped it would enable the necessary number of teachers for the teaching of this subject in our primary, secondary, and technical schools to be trained in the Dominion. Well, the establishment of this Chair has met both these hopes. In my opinion one Chair is sufficient for these two purposes: the establishment of another Chair would only mean two weak Chairs instead of one strong Chair. As to the Chair being at the Otago University, much of the domestic work is connected with health, and the fact of there being a Medical School at the Otago University, and much of the teaching being of a similar character for the Medical School as for home science, makes the University College the best of the four colleges for this Chair of Domestic Science. What I want to point out also is that this Chair of Domestic Science has not got an assured finance. It was in the way of an experiment, and it had to justify itself. The Government are only supporting this Chair by means of a subsidy on voluntary contributions. The Otago University itself has not the means to make provision for this Chair. The whole of the funds for this Chair are provided by two contributions, one of £200 a year by a Citizens Committee, and one of £300 a year by myself. Those two contributions are guaranteed for five years, two years and a half of which have matured, and there are still two years and a half to run. Those contributions are guaranteed solely for the purpose of meeting the expenses of the professor and lecturer and other expenses of the Chair itself. Those contributions are supplemented by the Government at present, the usual subsidy of £1 for £1 being given. To put it on a sound basis the Chair needs an assured finance for all time after these guaranteed contributions cease, because these contributions will cease at the end of 1915. But in addition to an assured finance it very greatly needs a hostel. There is no residence for the women students from outside who attend this course, and without a hostel the machinery for giving complete teaching is altogether incomplete. Wherever this teaching is thoroughly carried out—in America, and also in London, connected with the university—there is always a hostel for women in conjunction with it; in fact, it is looked upon as an absolutely necessary adjunct or complement to the teaching. I would suggest that this Chair has justified its existence; it is no longer in the experimental stage in which it was, because the students have steadily increased. There are now forty-two students taking this course, twenty-four of whom are doing so for diploma and degree courses, and the balance for shorter courses. I would urge upon this Committee that they should endorse the Inspector-General's report in advising the Government to make a grant of £1,000 a year towards the permanent establishment of this course. If the Government did that there would no longer be any need for the voluntary contributions that are promised for the maintenance of this course, because the Government grant of £1,000 a year, plus the fees, would cover, or possibly more than cover, the actual expenses of the Chair. But the Citizens Committee and myself do not want in any way to shirk our engagements, and if the Government will make this grant of £1,000 a year and so put the finance of the Chair on an assured footing our guaranteed contributions up to the end of 1915 could be utilized towards building a hostel or the necessary workrooms for the proper equipment of this Chair. I hold in my hand a resolution that was passed by the Citizens Committee, which the Inspector-General has in connection with the other papers on this matter. I do not know if it has been placed before this Committee.

The Chairman: No.

Witness: I will read it and it will explain the position to this Committee. This is a letter to the Professor of Home Economics: "Dear Madam,—Referring to the meeting of the Citizens Committee this afternoon I have now pleasure in advising you that the following resolution was approved of: That this Citizens Committee agrees to pay the balance of its obligation—namely, £400—being subscription of £200 for years 1914 and 1915 each, to assist in the building of a laundry and kitchen, on condition that Government takes over the financing of the Chair of Domestic Science as from January, 1914, and relieves the Citizens Committee from any further liability, and that Mr. John Studholme concurs in this course." My main object in coming here is to acquaint the Committee with that resolution, and to state that I am prepared to fall in with that proposal, provided that these voluntary contributions are devoted towards the erection of a hostel. It is immaterial to me whether the money is spent immediately on a kitchen and laundry as proposed, provided that that kitchen and laundry and other workrooms are erected on the site of the ultimate hostel and are to be a part of an approved complete hostel,

so that they would merely be the first instalment of a hostel. What I am particularly anxious is that this money should not be frittered away and have to be spent over again when a hostel is built. The hostel, to my mind, is absolutely necessary for the proper teaching of home science, and any money spent on a kitchen or laundry should be spent on part of an ultimate hostel. This money should be spent only after very full consideration by the parties interested, and I should like it to be arranged that the plan should be approved by the Inspector-General. There is just one point I should like to add—I think it would be a very fair provision for this Committee or the Government to make if £1,000 were granted—and it would be this: that should this £1,000, plus the fees derived from the students for this course, more than cover the expenses of the Chair, any surplus over and above these expenses should be earmarked to go towards the building of a hostel or further equipment and further extension of the teaching of home science. That is all I have to say.

2. *Hon. Mr. Allen.*] Perhaps Mr. Studholme would explain a little clearer to the Committee what he means by a "hostel." Does he mean a boarding-place?—"Hostel" is to my mind merely another name for residential college. It is a place where the women students could live and have their meals, just like the hostel for the male students at the Otago University.

3. Do I not understand that you have in your mind a little more than that—a place where the women students would gain experience in housekeeping?—That is the main reason why I think a hostel is necessary in connection with home science. It is a place where the students who take the course can be given practical teaching in the proper maintenance of a house, in the cleaning of the rooms, and the marketing and all the work connected with the running of the home.

4. *Mr. Hanan.*] Can you tell me what personal instruction has been given by the professor during the time she has occupied that Chair?—I do not live in Dunedin. I have not been there very much since Miss Boys-Smith has taken the Chair, and I am not quite certain how the actual teaching has been divided. There is an assistant—Miss Rawson—who is a Cambridge graduate. She came out very shortly after Miss Boys-Smith arrived. I know that Miss Boys-Smith takes the hygiene and part of the biology. Some of the science-teaching is taken by the professors at the University, and a certain part of the teaching is done at the Technical School. They only allowed the professor to have the use of certain of the rooms on that condition. I am afraid I cannot give you detailed information.

5. Is it true that her health is such that she is unable to give much personal instruction?—Her health is not robust; it never has been very robust.

6. Is it true that most of the instruction is given by the assistant you mentioned, Miss Rawson?—I would not like to state definitely one way or the other. I am not in a position to be quite certain.

7. What report is obtained as to the nature of the work that is carried on there?—I think the Inspector-General could give the Committee better information on that point than I could.

8. You are not aware of any supervision being exercised or report obtained as to the work which is being done there—the value of the work?—No. Unfortunately I have not got the papers connected with this course with me, because I did not anticipate having to give any information in connection with this Chair.

9. Have you made any inquiries, and, if so, from whom, as to the nature of the work and the value of the services?—I have made inquiries from any Otago residents that I happen to have met.

10. Of any students?—No, I have not met any students.

11. Can you say what is the progress there that these students have made—how many have been up for examinations and what examinations they have passed?—The course has not been sufficiently lengthy to enable any degree students to go up for the examinations. It is a three-years course—the full degree course.

12. You say there are forty-two students: how many students were there last year?—There were not many more than twenty last year, I think.

13. Can you say what work has been done by the forty-two students—the class of work?—I only know that twenty-four are diploma and degree-course students; the balance are shorter-course students.

14. Where is the practical work given, or where does it take place?—Part of the practical work takes place at the Technical School—the Technical College.

15. Do you know what is done there—how many students go there and actually do practical work?—I am afraid I do not.

16. Do you know if any students live with the professor, and, if so, how many?—I believe that some are living with the professor, or were.

17. Do any members of the staff?—I think Miss Rawson lives with her.

18. Are you aware that in New Zealand there are a number of girls' high schools that have no boarding-school associated with them?—Yes. It would be a very good thing if they had.

19. The girls come to town and live with private residents. It would be very much better, in your opinion, if they were housed at a boarding-school—at a hostel, in other words?—Yes.

20. *Mr. Statham.*] Do you know that Professor Boys-Smith does conduct a hostel at her own house? But what you would like would be a sort of official-recognized hostel?—A very much bigger one. There can only be room for very few with Miss Boys-Smith.

21. *Mr. Malcolm.*] I understand that after you made your very generous provision for this Chair you left control in the hands of the authorities?—Entirely.

22. Consequently you are not in a position to give us details of the conduct of the Chair?—No, not such details as Mr. Hanan wished to know.

23. If a hostel were established by the State is it your opinion that a head, apart from the professor, would be needed?—I do not see that it is necessary. From what I saw at universities

in America where home science was taught as a general rule the Professor of Home Science was also the Dean of the women's department, and had general supervision over the hostel.

24. Do you not think it would be advisable that while you kept the professor to teach the science you should have some one else to teach the art? I take it that it would be the art of house-keeping that would be taught in the hostel, whereas it is domestic science that is taught from the Chair?—A capable professor should be able to do both—should have sufficient knowledge of both to be able to see that it was properly done.

25. Has it ever occurred to you that it might be an advantage to have a crèche in connection with the hostel so that women could be educated in the duties of motherhood as well as in the duties of actual housekeeping?—I think it would. I think the hostel should be the centre of the teaching of everything concerning the home duties of women.

26. I take it I am only expressing the opinion of those interested in education generally when I say that your own action has been very greatly appreciated. What I want to know is, can you give us any idea whatever as to how we might secure the same practical interest of others in New Zealand that you have shown?—I do not know that I can make suggestions. I think it would be a very good thing if more Civil servants or others who were able to further this kind of teaching could have personal knowledge by seeing what is being done in Canada and America. If they could see the colleges that have been created by Sir William McDonald and carried out by Professor Robertson at St. Ann's College near Montreal, and at the McDonald Hall at Guelph, I think it would be a revelation to many.

27. *Mr. McCallum.*] You were first asked for £300 a year for three years to give this thing a trial?—Yes, it was at first £300 for three years, then £300 was asked for four years, and then the University authorities wanted to have more assurance (for five years) in what they were doing as to taking any degree students for a course of three years.

28. You then got the Dunedin people to join you, and the contributions were made up to £500?—Yes.

29. And that was guaranteed for four years—that is, £2,000 was contributed privately for the purpose of giving this a trial?—It is guaranteed for five years.

30. That makes it £2,500. You say that it would take £1,000 a year now, practically, to put this on a fair footing: that means £20,000 capital. Do you think the experiment so far justifies the Government in practically putting £20,000 into this scheme? From the knowledge you have gathered in the experimental stages of this class, do you as a business man think the Government would be justified in doing what you have asked us to do? Is it a business proposition for the Government?—I have gone very closely into the work that has been done in America and Canada and England, and the results that are so far apparent from the work of home teaching in those countries. I put in two months in America in doing little else but seeing where the teaching had been carried out and getting into personal touch with the leaders of this movement. And from what I have seen in America and Canada and England I think that £50,000 would not be too much for the Government to spend to put one Chair on a thoroughly sound basis, and to encourage the students to go to that Chair and to get the teaching firmly established in this country. I do not think we shall get it put on a thoroughly firm footing until we have a Chair of our own and give training by our own teachers, because we shall need a great many teachers in our technical and other schools, and they are more likely to be satisfactory to this country if we can give them a sound training in New Zealand. And what I should like to see occasionally would be the head or some Civil servant taking a periodical trip to keep himself in touch with the best teaching in other countries. If we judged simply from what has gone on in New Zealand—from the two or three years' experience in New Zealand—I do not think that either the results or what we can see from New Zealand alone would justify an expenditure of £20,000 or perhaps less, because it would then be purely in the nature of experiment. But it is altogether beyond the stage of experiment elsewhere.

31. You are advising us rather on what you know outside of New Zealand. You do not seem to know a great deal of the working of this particular school, but you have a knowledge of the American system. All we have got before us is this: Mr. Hogben tells us that "this department"—home science—"is found at present only in the University of Otago, and the staff consists of one professor"—and we are told she is ill most of her time—"and one lecturer. There should also be a chief demonstrator of the practical work in cookery and other applied branches of the science, and, as the number of students increase, junior demonstrators for the science laboratories." That is all the information we have got. What you are putting to us, I take it, is this: that from your knowledge of the value of this outside New Zealand altogether you think the Government would be well advised to spend £50,000?—Yes.

32. You do not think, from what we have gleaned from New Zealand, that it would be advisable to spend the £20,000?—If I had not had knowledge elsewhere I would not. But I should just like to point out this: I do not think Miss Boys-Smith has been ill all the time. I do not know that she has not been able to carry out her duties; but she is not of robust health, and, of course, Miss Boys-Smith is not necessarily permanently there. If her health were so bad that she could not carry on the work some other professor would come. There are some very able women who would be available from America.

33. *Mr. Sides.*] I understand that you are not in a position to express an opinion as to how the work done at the Otago School, so far as it has gone, compares with that at similar schools which you had the opportunity of visiting in America?—The course is very similar to what is being done in England—as to the general syllabus.

34. What school did Professor Boys-Smith come from?—She was teaching part of the course at the Cheltenham Ladies' College in England.

35. Did she have any American experience at all?—No.

36. Was it the American or the English school that impressed you the more?—On the whole the American, because the Americans have made a strong point of this teaching in universities for a very much longer period than the English people. It is only of recent years that England has been taking it up.

37. You were responsible, were you not, for the selection of Miss Boys-Smith?—Yes.

38. You had some difficulty at the time in getting a professor?—A very able lady undertook the appointment from America, and it was all arranged, but her health broke down. Then I was asked to endeavour to find a substitute for her either in America or in England. I think the wish was that if possible I should find somebody in England.

39. Was that wish expressed by the Committee?—It was only a sort of feeling I had that some one from England would be more acceptable from a national point of view.

40. Now, the amount that you suggest should be applied towards a capital fund is, I think, two years' contributions: they would amount to £1,000?—Yes. That would be the two years after the 1st January next.

41. You now tell the Committee that you would agree to the suggestion of the Citizens Committee as to the application of that money to a laundry and kitchen only on condition that the laundry and kitchen should form part of what is to be ultimately a hostel: is that so?—Yes, that is my present view. I do not care how this money is spent so long as it is spent in a way that will best further the interest of the Chair. My present view is that any buildings that are put up ought to be, at any rate, the nucleus or a part of a hostel the whole plans of which have been thought out and approved.

42. Could you give any idea at all as to the possible cost?—I know that the Christchurch hostel, which is a little smaller so far as accommodation is concerned than I should like to see at Dunedin, but which is very complete, being a brick building beautifully carried out in all its details, cost, with drainage and one thing and another, nearly £5,000.

43. Would that include a kitchen and laundry?—Yes.

44. How many students would it accommodate?—Fifteen.

45. You think that would be sufficient?—No. I think that is the only criticism I could make on the Christchurch hostel. It is a pity it was not built big enough for at least twenty or twenty-five students.

46. With what institution is the Christchurch hostel connected?—It is for the students of the Technical College there. A certain number of students live there, and all the other students of the home-science department come to the hostel for certain parts of their course.

47. I think there is a suggestion that another hostel should be established—if it is not already under way—in connection with the Presbyterian Church at Dunedin. Do you think it would be desirable that the hostel which was used by the students for domestic economy should be exclusively used for them?—No, not necessarily, only I think it would be in the best interests of the University and the Chair itself that the hostel should be a part of the organization of the University. I was looking at it solely from the point of view of the University. What we want to avoid is overlapping or unnecessary expenditure.

48. *Hon. Mr. Allen.* You were two or three times in America, were you not?—Yes.

49. Do you remember the time you went there subsequent to your offer to Canterbury?—Yes.

50. Can you let the Committee know, shortly, what you found to be the development in scientific opinion and public opinion with respect to the teaching of home science and the domestic arts from the time of your offer to Canterbury to your subsequent visit?—I only know that the value of this teaching is becoming more and more appreciated, and that more universities are taking it up. It is a movement that is going steadily forward.

51. Was there a marked growth in it in America between those visits of yours?—I think there was.

52. Did you notice any growth in England?—Yes, there is a distinct growth in England. The home-science department of the King's College has grown from very small beginnings to quite a large part of the University. It has now been attached to and forms part of London University—I mean, the teaching of home science at King's College. They have lately raised a very large sum and put up magnificent buildings in the way of hostel and workrooms. When I first saw it the accommodation was poor, but it has been steadily growing. I may say that certain professors at the Leeds University have been anxious for a long time to get a university course established there. The teachers at the School of Domestic Science in Leeds go to the University and get a good deal of their training there.

53. Did you come into contact at all with educational authorities and discuss the question with them in England or in America?—Yes, I came in contact with the head of Cornell University, the head of Teachers' College, Professor Bailey, Professor Robertson, Sir William McDonald, the head of the Guelph University, and the head of the home-science department at the Toronto University. There is a complete department of home science attached to the Toronto University. I understand that St. Anne's College is now affiliated with the McGill University. It was not to begin with.

54. What is the opinion of these educational authorities?—They are enthusiastic about it.

55. In England did you come across any?—I came across the Director of Inquiries of the English Education Department, the chief lady Inspector of the English Education Department (Miss Lawrence), Professor Smithells, who is looked upon as a leading male authority on the teaching of home science in England, the head of the King's College department of home science, and several professors there. They are all enthusiastic about it.

56. What induced you to take an interest in it?—I went to America first to study what was being done in the way of agricultural education, and in going to the universities to see what I could of the teaching of agriculture I happened incidentally to see what they were doing with

regard to home science. I had no knowledge of it before. I was so impressed with what I saw that I made further inquiries, and from that became anxious that similar teaching should be carried out in New Zealand. I had no idea of the extent to which it was being developed in America, and I found they had been going on with that kind of teaching for ten or fifteen years or more before I got there. Getting into touch with Professor Robertson gave me a stronger idea of the value of this teaching than anything else. If I had done nothing else on my trip to Canada than get in touch and become acquainted with Professor Robertson I should have looked upon the trip as well worth having been taken. He is a wonderful man.

57. *Mr. Malcolm.*] What town and college is Professor Robertson at?—He was under the Government of Canada for a very long time. He was the Chief Agricultural Officer of the Canadian Government in London, and he gave up his official appointment in order to have the carrying-out of Sir William McDonald's plans with regard to education. Sir William McDonald is not an expert in education. He is a tobacco-manufacturer, but he is very much impressed with the value of what they call the newer education, and he looked about for some one who had the requisite knowledge and would carry out his wishes and to whom he could entrust the expenditure of his money, and he offered the position to Professor Robertson, who gave up his official position and spent several years in carrying out Sir William McDonald's schemes of consolidated schools and schemes of teaching home science and manual training.

58. *Hon. Mr. Allen.*] May I take it that Professor Robertson has strong ideas about the training for home science?—The main object of Professor Robertson is to provide the necessary equipment for training teachers who will be able to give teaching in the primary and secondary schools of Canada in home science, manual training, and nature-study. Another of Sir William McDonald's and Professor Robertson's main ideas is to get country teachers. To produce efficient rural teachers with a love for the country you ought, so they say, to have your normal schools in the country closely associated with agricultural colleges, so that, living in touch with farmers and farm students and country surroundings, they will get an interest in and a sympathy with the country life and be able to make better rural teachers. St. Anne's College, near Montreal, is on the junction of the St. Lawrence and the Ottawa, and that is a combined normal college and agricultural college for the training of ordinary school-teachers and the training of agricultural students.

59. Can you give an opinion yourself, or have you heard an opinion, as to this possible result from scientific training and home science and domestic arts, that it will put the position to those who are running the home upon a higher basis—cause them to take a little more interest in their work because it is based on science?—It is difficult to estimate the result. Teachers have told me that after they had been some time at a school like the one Sir William McDonald founded at Guelph it was a perfect revelation to them—the increased interest it has meant in their home duties and in country life; that they would go back to their work with an absolutely enlarged conception of what they are and what their possibilities are.

60. Would it, for instance, in your opinion remove the idea of drudgery?—That is certainly what it does. It raises the whole thing from a drudgery to a science. And that is what the aim of this Chair in Otago is—to give the general public a higher conception altogether of the dignity of home-work and the possibilities of it, and the way it appeals to the intellect and gives play to all scientific knowledge. It is making practical, home, everyday use of the increased scientific knowledge and the various scientific experiments that are carried out. It is bringing the scientific knowledge of the day into the homes of the people, making use of it in everyday life. That is what is in the minds of these leaders of the home-science movement—to give it that enlarged idea; to make the use of the home interesting; to economize time and to give the women of the country more leisure; to make them masters of their work and get through their work with greater ease and knowledge, and then they will have more leisure for other culture.

61. You said that you were impressed with what you saw in America of home science?—Yes, very much.

62. You backed your impressions out of your pocket to the extent of £300 a year for five years?—Yes.

63. Do you see any reason to regret that?—No, I certainly see no reason to regret it. If that Chair can become an assured establishment, and the thing become thoroughly equipped and on a sound basis, it will be infinitely the most satisfactory expenditure I have ever made—without comparison.

64. Do you know from your own experience whether there are some intelligent men in Dunedin who hold similar views to yourself on this question?—I believe there are a good many. You yourself can speak better on that point than I can.

65. Do you know whether the citizens of Dunedin—some of them, at any rate—have backed their opinions out of their pockets too?—Yes, they have to a considerable extent—a good many of them.

66. Do you think it is at all likely that a sensible Scots community like Dunedin would put their hands in their pockets unless they were satisfied they were spending their money on a good object?—I think they are the most cautious people in New Zealand. They are most generous, too, when they get "enthused" sufficiently.

67. *Mr. Malcolm.*] Can you tell us whether the students who take this home-science course are taking it with a view to becoming teachers of the science, or are taking it in order to practice it in their homes?—I think that for the degree course most of them are taking it with the idea of becoming teachers. One student has lately come from Victoria. She saw what teaching was available in Victoria, and she was not satisfied with that, and she has come to take up the degree course in Dunedin. She is getting one of the Government bursaries, and has in consequence bound herself to give so-many years' teaching in New Zealand at the end of her course.

68. Would you judge, then, that most of the students simply take it up with the idea of making it a profession?—I think the majority of the degree students will take it up with the idea of becoming teachers in this country.

69. What percentage would you say take any of the classes simply with the idea of improving their own homes?—Taking them as a whole I should think the majority would. That is the case in America.

70. Have you any idea as to whether these classes have greatly affected the life of the people in America?—People there consider that they have. From my own personal experience I am not in a position to say. I was just passing through.

71. Did you hear any comments as to whether the social and domestic life of the people had improved as the result of these classes?—All I can say is that I never heard the existence of these classes or courses criticized. I never heard any one objecting to them, and I know that the feeling in favour of them has been steadily growing.

72. You could not, I suppose, give us any idea as to how many students afterwards marry?—No, I am afraid I could not.

73. Was it your own impression that most of those who took the degree course, at any rate, remained single?—No, I do not think they did. I know several cases where they did marry.

74. It seems to me that this whole question is one that is worth our following up, and naturally we want to have details from men who have seen the thing in operation for years. To whom could we apply for this detailed information?—I do not think you could do better than apply to Professor Robertson.*

75. What is his address?—His address was the McDonald College at Montreal, but he has left there. He was the head of that for some time until he had put it on a good working basis. I should think that "Professor Robertson, Ottawa," would find him, or "Care of the Agricultural Department." He is such a very well-known man in Canada that a letter sent to any of the Departments would get to him.

FRIDAY, 8TH AUGUST, 1913.

Professor PICKEN examined. (No. 2.)

1. *The Chairman.*] Do you wish to give evidence in connection with the petition you have presented from the College?—Yes.

2. I should like to say that all the members of the Committee have before them the minutes of evidence taken two years ago, in which Professors Hunter, Von Zedlitz, Laby, Kirk, and Easterfield gave evidence on this subject, and I should like you to avoid if possible traversing the ground covered. Do you wish to make a statement?—Yes. Our main object this morning is to put the case as forcibly as we can for the setting-up of a strong Royal Commission to investigate into university education in New Zealand, and provide the Legislature with a scheme for reforming it upon the most modern lines possible under the conditions of this country. It is impossible for us to enter into the question of the Inspector-General's report to-day; our evidence in that connection is in course of preparation, but it cannot be put before you until next week. My colleague, Professor Hunter, will speak on the development of the university reform movement since evidence was last put before this Committee, and Professor Von Zedlitz will put before you some principles drawn from the most recent Royal Commission report on university education—viz., the report of the Haldane Commission on the University of London. It is our object, so far as may be possible, to avoid in any way repeating evidence put before the Education Committee in 1911. I shall take it that copies of that evidence, and copies of the pamphlet "University Reform in New Zealand," are available for the information of members of this Committee. I trust also that steps will be taken to provide members of the Committee with copies of the publications of the Haldane Commission on University Education in London. The contention to which I wish to confine my statement is that a Royal Commission is the only possible way of dealing with this question, and that a Royal Commission will only be effective if it includes one eminent man who has had experience on some of the Royal Commissions that have in recent years inquired into British university education. There can be no doubt that if the New Zealand Government approached the matter through the Imperial Government the right man would be found to preside over such an inquiry. The problems that have to be solved are of such a kind as can only be solved by a special tribunal, absolutely impartial and specially qualified for the work, concentrating entirely for a certain period on the task. Each of the colleges has been allowed to grow up as local circumstances might direct, quite independently of the others, and only checked by extremely straitened finances and by the influence of the University examinations—both checks of such a kind as to nullify all the undoubted advantages of independence. Lack of funds has induced governing bodies at times to make inferior provision for the teaching of important subjects, a practice which is encouraged by the fact that the only recognized test of the work done is the degree examination of the University. The colleges have been tempted rather to provide that for which there is always strong demand—viz., coaching for external examinations—than to give a much-needed lead to the public in intellectual matters. Their solvency—indeed, their very existence—has been involved in the relation of their students to an examination which might be (or, rather, necessarily is) highly inimical to the best class of university work being done by them. If it appears at any

* The best authorities on home-science teaching to apply to for information in the United States of America would be Mr. Richards, School of Technology, Boston, or Dr. Russell, Head of the Teachers' College, Columbia University, New York. In England I would recommend Professor Smithells, Leeds University, or Professor Cyril Jackson, London University.—JOHN STODHOLME.

centre that there will be a considerable number of students ready to take up a subject not taught at that centre, there is always the very gravest danger that a governing body may provide for the teaching of that subject without putting it upon a proper financial basis—a course which is not only bad at the time, but may have the effect of preventing that subject from having its due in that college for a very long time to come. Again, while the principle of establishing special schools each only in a single centre is admitted and tacitly recognized, there is nothing at present to deter other colleges from providing some kind of teaching in the subjects of these special schools, if only they can get a sufficiency of students to attend, and there is even a danger that they may in that way establish by lapse of time a spurious claim for support from the Government in such work. With the means at the disposal of this country for university work it is quite obviously necessary that some very definite national control must be exercised over the development of that work. The relation of the colleges to one another and to the University must be clearly defined, and the University must be given some considerable voice in the policy of the colleges. It may be necessary to strengthen one college in certain departments at the expense of another; to lay down very stringent regulations as to the confining of special schools each to a single centre, and to ensure that each college shall give teaching only in those departments in which it is thoroughly well equipped. And this question of the welding of the colleges into one coherent whole with the University immediately raises the question of the constitution of the latter body. I may say that I, for one, would be very sorry indeed to see the Senate as at present constituted exercising an important voice in the work of the colleges. Again, with regard to the present agitation for raising the status of the school-teacher, the relation of the University and the colleges to the training of teachers is one that needs most urgent attention. Broadly speaking, nowadays the quality of the teaching profession in any country will be very directly dependent upon the quality of the university education in that country. The secondary-school teacher must almost essentially be university-trained; but the question of giving the primary-school teachers the fullest possible advantage of even temporary proximity to a university college is also a most important question. It is important that the university work of those preparing to teach in the secondary schools should not deprive them of a training-college course, and it is equally important that those who are preparing through the training colleges for primary-school teaching should not be deprived of such better opportunities in particular departments of knowledge as they cannot get apart from the university colleges. And it may have to be considered whether arrangements cannot be made whereby the ablest teacher-students may be left free for university work during terms, but given opportunity (as engineering students at most British universities are) to do practical training for their profession during part of the long vacation. It will be seen that the relationship between the training colleges and the University colleges is of the most vital importance to the whole education system of the country. This relationship has never been placed on a proper footing, and cannot be so placed under the existing University conditions. I am quite certain that, as a matter of principle, the University should have a large share in the training of the teaching profession, but apart from strong measures of university reform I would not be prepared to advocate a closer relationship as being in the best interests of the profession. The relationship with the technical colleges also wants careful defining in order to avoid waste by overlapping of courses and equipment. It might be found that judicious co-operation would make it possible to lessen the great burden of activity at present carried by the technical colleges without sufficient means for carrying it on. The question of the method of awarding university degrees is a very contentious one. On the one hand there is a considerable body of men and women who are identified, as university teachers and graduates, with the present system of deciding by external examination. On the other hand those who most strongly advocate a change, and have the best qualification for giving an up-to-date opinion on the question, are too intimately involved in it to be in the best position for bringing about a change. From all these considerations it will appear that the situation is a very complex and difficult one, and that in some ways it is a matter of great delicacy. The public and the various bodies involved must be assured that any process of reform is perfectly impartial and free from the remotest suspicion of fear or favour as to local interests; it must be convinced that only one consideration is being taken into account—viz., the efficiency and economy of our national expenditure on higher education. It is now admitted on all hands that university reform is an urgent question. The Education Committee has endorsed that view, and Parliament has to face the question of putting university work on a sound financial basis. An inquiry has been made into the financial position of the colleges, and proposals have been put forward which, we propose to show, are quite inadequate to the situation. If Parliament were to give effect to any such proposals without first reconstituting the University and the colleges it could be convicted of wasting public money. The time is ripe for heroic measures of policy in higher education, and these can only be adopted on the recommendation of such a Royal Commission as we suggest. We most strongly urge the desirability of such a course upon this Committee, and trust that it will see its way to recommend in that direction to the House of Representatives. That is all I propose to say.

3. *Mr. Malcolm.*] I understand you suggest that some British representative should preside over the Royal Commission?—Yes, sir, that was the idea I had.

4. Do you not consider that the mere fact of his being unacquainted with colonial conditions may militate against his being a success?—I think if he was adequately supported by the local men no difficulty of that sort would arise at all. I think the fact of his coming fresh to the local conditions would be one of the strongest reasons for giving him such work to do.

5. Of course, you recognize he would have to be very handsomely remunerated for taking up that position?—I do not think you need look for it costing an excessive amount. The matter can be looked at to some extent as an Imperial one, and I am certain that you would get a very first-class type of man to come for a very reasonable remuneration.

6. How long do you consider the Commission would need to sit?—Perhaps three or four months would cover it.

7. I notice you state that you personally would be very sorry to see the Senate permitted to exercise control over such a university as you suggest. What are your objections?—The present Senate, do you mean?

8. Yes?—Well, I think it is shown in all the evidence put before you that in our opinion the University Senate is constituted in a very unsatisfactory way for dealing with such a situation.

9. You do not wish to enter into the particulars of that situation?—I think it is covered by what the Chairman of the Committee asked us not to enter upon, the information that is contained in the pamphlet on university reform in New Zealand, and the evidence taken before the Education Committee in 1911.

10. Do you consider, professor, that the future relationship of technical schools and the University should be changed altogether, or in what direction?—I think it is generally recognized that technical education has to be put on a better footing, and, as far as I know myself about technical colleges, it seems to me they are doing a very great deal and are not adequately provided with means for doing it. All their teachers are, so far as I have been able to gather, killed with overwork, and I suggested that that was a point that might be raised in connection with the teaching in universities. It is done in other British centres, where the relationship between the technical college and the university college is being strengthened.

11. You appreciate and admire the work that the technical colleges are doing?—Yes, it is of the most vital importance.

12. *Mr. McCallum.*] Can you suggest whom you would like on this Royal Commission?—I think it would be the greatest possible mistake for us to suggest.

13. You do not suggest?—No.

14. Neither the Home appointees or the local ones?—No; we have suggested types as an illustration of what type of man should be used in this connection.

15. There are two sides in this fight, those who are contending that if we give in to the reform party and allow the internal examination it would cheapen our degrees, and those who contend otherwise. I have read all the literature, but you have not satisfied me that you are not going to cheapen our degrees down to the level of the American degrees. That is what I want you to show us more concisely, or reasons in favour of a modified system. I think you are going to lower our degrees and make us the laughing-stock throughout the British Dominions if we give in to you. I do not say, professor, that the time will not come when we will be able to get able New-Zealanders, retired professors, outside of the University colleges, able to take up these papers and examine as they examine at Home just now, but we say the time is not ripe to give in to you people, and that you are going to cheapen our degrees entirely?—Of course, Mr. Chairman, you understand that the great body of past evidence is in relation to the questions raised, but Professor Von Zedlitz is going to bring up some up-to-date evidence on the question. I should like to answer one or two questions that Mr. Malcolm has suggested. He raised the question of your giving in to us. You will understand that is essentially not the position.

16. I think you are quite right—I never blamed anybody for what you are doing?—You understand that we are not trying to get you to give in to us, but we are anxious for the most impartial inquiry that can possibly be made in such a manner as to determine whether we are right or the Chancellor is right. With regard to what Mr. McCallum said about our University becoming the laughing-stock of the world in general, I think a very strong case can be made out for the fact that it is at present the laughing-stock of those who know most about university questions.

17. You should not say that—our degrees are well thought of?—Mr. McCallum has further said that he considers the time will come when we shall have graduates of our own in this country able to take a share in the conduct of university examinations. Well, my own feeling is very strongly that if we proceed on our present lines we are putting that time off as far as possible. The best way to prepare for the time when we can get our examinations conducted in such a manner is to do the best we can under the present circumstances. I do not know whether it is quite clearly understood, but in England in each university subject the examination is conducted partly by the teacher and partly by an assessor who is almost invariably a professor in some other university. What we propose in our suggestion is that practically the same system should be carried on in New Zealand, that the teachers should examine, and that they should be assisted in their examination of the students by teachers of other institutions. If the University is to be maintained as one University, which we consider to be the right course for the present, then all that would be necessary would be that each of the four men should have his students examined partly by himself and partly by the other three men. It seems to us the logical way of applying here the principle upon which they examine students in every part of the British Empire. I think that is all I need say in reply to Mr. McCallum.

18. *Mr. Sidey.*] Your opening remark particularly struck me as being a wholesale condemnation of the work being done by the University as hitherto carried on, and I want to know whether you intended that impression to be conveyed?—Well, I should say that I would condemn very strongly the perpetuation of the existing system. I think the University system was in accordance with the ideas of the time when it was instituted, but that we are already twenty or thirty years behind the times in the matter of the development of university work.

19. Are you forming your opinion on past work upon the results attained?—I made no reference at all to past work that had been done. I spoke entirely of the method of university education at present in vogue in this country.

20. Do you wish it to be understood that the University, so far as its work has gone up to date, has not been successful?—I should be the last person to raise that question, Mr. Chairman.

I think the University has probably done splendid work in the past, and that is one of the very best reasons for our desire that it shall do its best possible work in the future.

21. Then it is not because of past failures that you ask us to make this change?—I do not quite understand what you mean by “past failures.”

22. I wanted to know whether there are any evidences, either in the work of the students that have gone through the colleges or in the work of the University or other ways, that it has been defective in its results?—Well, Mr. Chairman, the kind of evidence that Mr. Sidey wants is exceedingly hard to get. I was speaking entirely as to principles. I think this is a matter that can be discussed entirely on the basis of the principles involved.

23. Are you aware of instances where our students have not been able to hold their own with the students of other universities in every department of industrial life?—I think that is almost an impossible question to answer, because it is the sort of thing upon which you cannot get evidence. I reply in this way: that it does not matter what system of education a man has gone under, if he is an able man he comes through it an able man; no system of education seems to harm the best type of student permanently.

24. How long have you been in New Zealand?—A little over five years.

25. Are you aware that our students have taken leading positions in almost every department of university work?—Yes, I am aware of that.

26. Then I may conclude that it is not at all because of the failure of the University to supply what the students require that you think the alteration should now be made?—I do not think you are entitled to that assumption.

27. If I am not entitled to that assumption I should like you to give us some concrete instances where the University has not been equal to what might reasonably have been expected of it?—It is a matter of comparison with other universities to a very great extent, what other universities are doing, and what they consider right to do in the matter of university education.

28. I do not suppose there is any use in pressing that further, but I should like to say that the students of our University, as far as I have been able to gather, have been able to hold their own with students of other universities whenever they have come into competition with them. Now, I understand you to say that before any reform whatever should be undertaken in connection with the University the first thing that should be done would be the reconstitution of it?—That is not quite the statement of what I said. I practically said that before more money was spent on the University the first thing to be done was to reconstitute it. I believe in that most strongly.

29. And the reconstitution you suggest is on the lines suggested in the pamphlet?—I say we are advocating that the most impartial possible inquiry should be brought to bear on that question. We are absolutely content that any scheme should be adopted which is put forward by the right type of tribunal.

30. I do not suppose you suggest that even the urgent needs of the University should not be met until then?—No, that is obvious, I think, unless you intend, of course, to let the system fall to pieces.

31. Now, is it not a fact that in Royal Commissions one can almost always approximate very closely as to what the finding of the Commission will be when you know the personnel of it?—I should think there was something to be said for that opinion. But if you take the best means of getting the personnel on a Commission such as would be recommended by an utterly outside body with great experience in these matters, and only interested in the thing from the point of view of doing the best possible for New Zealand, I think you would be getting the right personnel on the Commission to make sure of getting the right kind of report; but at the same time it must be obvious that if you brought a man from outside who was not familiar with the actual local conditions his views would very considerably change if he made a thorough inquiry into the local conditions.

32. Well, would it be possible to choose a man from outside such as you suggest whose views on the subject of examinations are not known?—I should think it would be very hard to.

33. You would know beforehand what his views on that question are?—I think the point is that there is practically no view in favour of external examinations in other countries nowadays.

34. Do you think he is likely to modify his views after he has a knowledge of the local conditions?—I do not think personally that he is the least likely to modify his views, but Mr. McCallum does think so. I am content to abide by the decision.

35. Where do you suggest this Commission should go for its evidence?—It should visit particularly the four centres in New Zealand, and we would suggest if possible that it make some inquiry in Australia, where the conditions are probably more similar to ours in the matter of university work than anywhere else in the world.

36. Do you think that a Royal Commission is likely to get more evidence in New Zealand than this Committee?—I think it is practically certain to, because all the evidence taken publicly has been taken in Wellington, whereas this Commission would visit every quarter and give every man an opportunity of putting his evidence before it.

37. Have you had any knowledge of what the result of previous Royal Commissions set up in this country has been?—I have had no such knowledge. I think it would depend to a great extent upon the type of Royal Commission set up.

38. You know there was a previous Commission set up to go into the question of university reform?—Yes, it was set up in the year I was born, and it recommended most of the things that we are asking for now.

39. Were they all given effect to?—No, they were not, but the reasons are perfectly clear. Some of those recommendations, for instance, were recommendations that should take effect upon certain other things being done, particularly the establishment of colleges in the North Island.

and when a period of about eighteen years elapsed before certain specified preliminary conditions were satisfied it is not surprising that the main part of that report lapsed; and it also was the case, I believe, that there were quite extraneous circumstances that interfered with the findings of that Commission being adopted.

40. I suppose you do not know that that has been the general result of the findings of Royal Commissions in this country?—I have heard it so stated. I do not wish to express any opinion on that subject.

41. At any rate, you expect better results from the setting up of another Commission in this case?—I am perfectly certain that you could get good results.

42. *Hon. Mr. Allen.*] I should like to ask what your idea is with regard to this Royal Commission—whether it is to be a Commission to inquire into the question of University education or the whole scheme of education in New Zealand from the primary school right up to the University?—Well, the idea is for a Commission to inquire directly into the University problem. Of course, you cannot touch upon the University problem without touching upon its relationships with other branches of education, but I should say that keeping the University question in full view, and dealing with other things in so far as they broach on the University question, it would work out well.

43. I want to know whether you are asking for a Commission to examine into the question of university education alone?—Yes, that is so.

44. Then you are not asking for a Commission to go into the whole question of education?—No.

45. Do you think it would be possible for any Commission to come to any satisfactory conclusion with advantage upon the question of university education without going into the whole problem right from the start?—Yes. Quite the best and first step is to get the University put upon right lines, because your education system depends vitally on the training that your teachers are going to get. That is the ultimate problem of school education, and if you get your University put on the soundest possible lines you have done a very great deal towards the other parts of the scheme.

46. Then, do I understand from that that you look upon it that the training of the teachers should be purely a University affair?—No, certainly not—not purely; but I think there is room for bringing it very much more closely into touch with the University than it is at present.

47. Well, how could a Commission inquire into the training of teachers if the training of teachers is not to be a University affair, and if the Commission is only to inquire into the University?—My idea of that is this: that under present conditions the University is not suitable for taking its proper share in the training of the teachers. If you put the University on the best possible lines for training the people intellectually, and not merely for getting them ready for examinations, you will make it possible for them to work with the training colleges in a way which is not at present possible.

48. Then that would involve an examination into the training colleges?—No, I do not think that is a necessary corollary. At present we constantly find that many training-college students do not take our University course because those courses are associated with the University degrees.

49. *The Chairman.*] Without touching on the main problem, Professor Picken, you said just now that the University is not suitable for training teachers?—No, I do not think it is.

50. In what way?—That goes right to the root of the problem. I do not think that under the present conditions of external examinations and under the imposed syllabus that the University is suitable for training for any profession except in the definitely professional schools.

51. Well, it has been very successful in the past in training?—It always comes back to the reply that it is very hard to get facts about that, and that if you have the really able man he goes through any type of training remarkably well.

52. Then from your argument we must have a very large number of able men in New Zealand going through?—I am not sufficiently cognizant of the facts to express an opinion upon that.

53. Because they do take very prominent positions in many respects?—Do you mean the graduates of the University do?

54. Yes, considering the population?—I think from my own experience that there is a remarkably high standard of ability among the New Zealand people—I mean the conditions of this country all tend in that direction; but I do not think that the schools in New Zealand are doing the work they ought to be doing, judging from my own experience of what is sent to us.

55. You mean the secondary schools?—We get them from all types of schools.

56. What provision does your own University College make for coming into touch with the primary-school teacher?—Our own College has practically no function in that way. We are so much bound by the degree arrangements that really the University controls all our academic questions. We have practically no academic powers associated with our University College.

57. I understand you wish your own College to become a day-teaching institution mainly?—I do not say "mainly." I say we will never do the best class of university work until we can have day-teaching for all students who can give the time to it.

58. Would not that bar the day-school teacher from taking advantage of the training?—No. I think it is possible to have good arrangements made for evening-work. We have advocated that all along. I am a great believer in evening-work for those who cannot take up the work during the day, but I am convinced that you cannot conduct the two things together—that each will mar what is being done for the other.

59. Do you mean that if you have men teaching during the day that you cannot do evening-work? Can you not provide proper tuition?—We have put forward a scheme by which we can carry on both if we can get sufficient financial assistance. It would not mean nearly double the cost to run the institution in that way.

60. Has your University assisted the local primary school or has it come into collision with it to some extent—I mean, has it crossed its work, as it were?—I have no knowledge at all of it having come into collision in any way with the primary-school work.

61. Let me give you an instance: we find in Dunedin that our technical-school students who are of the best class cannot carry on work at the University under the present existing arrangements. We pass the students who are ready to go on to university work, but the University makes no provision to meet them, and their education, so far as the University is concerned, stops at that point?—So far as our University is concerned we have made all provision to meet them, because practically all our work is conducted after 5 o'clock in the afternoon, when it is available for every one.

62. Then, if you came to do all the work during the day you would be in the same position as the Otago University?—Yes, if we did all the work during the day. That has not been advocated as the policy of our University College.

63. *Mr. McCallum.*] I understand, Professor Picken, it is the average student you are thinking of when recommending internal examinations?—No, certainly not. I mean to say the argument applies to every student, but the idea was that so far as external evidences are concerned no system of education prevents the really able man from coming out on top.

64. But I understand you have only had five years' experience. Even in that time have you found that occasionally one of your students who is well equipped will fail in his degree examination, whereas another student not so well equipped will succeed?—I have not personally conducted any detailed investigation into that matter, but I do know this: that the whole University system and the method of conducting these external examinations militates against my whole work. It works against what I regard as most important—the original ideas I might bring to bear upon my work.

65. Have you had no experience of that—that students who you considered were entitled to pass failed, whereas others who were not so well equipped or entitled to pass succeeded?—I think both Professor Hunter and Professor Von Zedlitz can give you actual facts upon that. I might say I have personally tried to forget the existence of the external examination as regards its effect upon my students as far as I can. It seems to me a hopeless thing to be up against, and I think the best thing is to forget it if one does not want to get into the depths of despair.

66. And you think if the professor was able to give the degree it would strengthen his hands and leave his student to devote his time to the work more earnestly?—We do not propose that. The colleagues in other universities and the colleagues in other subjects would all influence the passing of the student, and the whole system would be the means of getting the very best possible out of our students.

67. You strongly urge that?—Yes.

68. It has been urged in opposition to your views that you have no opportunity of judging of the professor's work?—You should determine that before you appoint the professor. If you appoint a bad professor nothing will cure that. The most deadly sin that you can commit against the University is to appoint the wrong man. You should exhaust every possible means of choosing your men with the utmost care before they are appointed, and we say it does not matter whether there is a delay of six months or a year so long as you get the best men.

69. You are of opinion that the present system does not lead to a review of the work of the professors?—I am perfectly certain it does not. It succeeds generally in concealing all the good work the professor may be able to do.

70. *Mr. Guthrie.*] You make that statement because some of the professors proceed perhaps upon original lines which they feel adaptable to their surrounding circumstances?—I think the main function of the university teacher is to present an original point of view on his subject, and that it should be determined before he is appointed whether he may be trusted to do that.

71. Have you any objection to the external examination bringing out the best points of the academical training?—I do not think it does do that. I do not think that is the way to bring out the best points of the academical training. I think it brings out the worst points.

72. According to your opening statement I notice that you are very strongly of opinion that if a Royal Commission is set up to inquire into this matter that it should be presided over by some one of Imperial university experience?—I am not tied to the phrase "presided over." I do not know if that would be the best. That is my own opinion, but I think if you brought in a man of that kind it would be impossible to do other than make him Chairman of the Commission.

73. A Royal Commission set up to inquire into university education here would have to a large extent to be guided by local circumstances?—Certainly.

74. Well, do you think that any one brought in from outside would have any idea at all of the local conditions that exist here?—His function is to take evidence on that. These men are used to consider local conditions of which they have no knowledge until they get amongst them. They are taken from one place to investigate into the conditions of another place, and they are men qualified to do it, if, of course, you have them properly supported by local men. We suggested a Commission of three on a previous occasion, one to be the external man and two local men.

75. Is it your opinion that we have no one in New Zealand capable of presiding over such a Commission who has the external experience and knowledge?—I am very strongly of that opinion.

76. With regard to the connection between our primary work and the University work, is it your opinion at the present time that the proper connection is not recognized?—I am perfectly sure that there is no proper connection at present. The University arrangements to some extent exercise as bad an influence on the school-work as the external examinations exercise on the University work. We are far too much related to the schools by the Matriculation Examination,

Junior Scholarship Examination, and such things to have the work carried on properly. There is far too much time given in the schools to cramming in preparing pupils for examinations of that type.

77. Do you think that with certain prizes as the goal in front of students and teachers you would ever get rid of that?—I think they could get rid of it to some extent, but I do not know whether it is desirable to get rid of it absolutely. The important thing is that it should not dominate the situation.

78. In response to a question you said you recognized the necessity of a system that connects the University with primary education, with the secondary schools and technical schools, and that you admired their work and recognized their work as of value to the University?—Yes, quite so. I recognize the importance of the connection between those various branches of the education system. It seems to me to be vital.

79. In our technical colleges you are aware of the value of a degree man at the head?—Yes.

80. Now, is it your suggestion that there ought to be a continuous system of education that should lead up to the University education altogether?—Yes.

81. That is your idea?—Quite.

82. If you had that, do you not think there is a danger of discounting the advantages? For instance, in technical colleges the students who are going on technical lines might never reach the University?—I do not think it need lead to that. My idea is certainly not that it should be continuous in the sense that all people should pass through all stages. My idea of continuity is that there should be no overlapping, and that it is possible for each stage to benefit from those before it.

83. I was struck by one statement you made, that the University examinations are not up to date in New Zealand. Do you mean to say we are behind the times in New Zealand with regard to them—that is, comparing the external with internal examinations?—Yes, with regard to the whole system of our giving degrees we are not up to date.

84. Will you tell us in what respect we are behind the times in that matter?—There is a reference to it in the final report of the London Commissioners in regard to university education. It states, "The University of New Zealand, one of the last of the universities to retain this form of examination, adopted under the influence of the old University of London, is at present agitating for reform."

85. That is the opinion of the London University Commissioners on our system here?—Yes.

86. It struck me as a very important statement to make that the New Zealand University was behind the times in regard to the examinations they are conducting for degrees?—It is a statement we have made as strongly as we could for some time.

87. Provided that you substituted the internal examinations for the external examinations that we have at the present time, do you think that would be the panacea for all the trouble?—I am quite certain it is not the panacea for all the trouble. It is one of the absolute essentials. If you deal with the situation thoroughly that is one of the things that will go with it as a matter of course.

88. Do you think that substituting the internal for external examinations will improve the status of the degree man who gets through?—It will improve the training they get, and that will be found to tell.

89. Simply that the professors at present are forced to act upon lines that they would not act upon if they had internal examinations?—To some considerable extent that is true, and if they do not act on those lines the student is divided between two things, which is a most serious problem—the loyalty he wants to give to his teacher, and the work from the totally different point of view of the examination he must meet if he is not to harm his own career.

90. Well, in a lesser degree we had external examinations as compared with internal examinations in our primary schools, and are you aware that there is a very mixed opinion at the present moment as to the advantage that has been gained by doing away with what might be termed the external examination in the primary schools?—I should like to hear on what the opinion is based. I am not aware of the facts with regard to that to any extent. I should think it is very much a question that many persons identified with the old arrangements have got used to it and cannot adapt themselves to the change. That very much modifies the opinions expressed on those things. There is the old school and the new school.

91. Has the day arrived that our Professorial Boards in New Zealand are composed of such men that the University instruction and examination can be placed in their hands without any outside jackpot? I am asking this as a politician who has to provide for the expenditure of the money?—I am not suggesting that each Professorial Board should conduct its own examination, but that it would be a united system. My reply to your question is that if the professors are not fit for that class of work they are not fit to be attached to any of the universities in New Zealand, and the sooner they are cleaned out the better, so that others can be put in their places.

92. That is not my question. You are making the suggestion that we should place in the hands of the Professorial Boards internal examinations for University degrees?—I think, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Guthrie does not understand my position. We are asking for an inquiry. If you want a personal reply to the question I say Yes. You should give them the right to examine, as you have given them the right to teach.

Professor HUNTER examined. (No. 3.)

1. *The Chairman.*] Whom do you represent?—I represent the Professorial Board of Victoria College.

2. Do you wish to make a statement?—Yes. The main point I wish to refer to is in regard to the previous inquiry. The Committee came to a certain result, and I want to show that the natural corollary to that conclusion is that a Royal Commission should be appointed. In 1910 thirteen members of the teaching staff petitioned for a Royal Commission, and put in as evidence the opinions of sixty-five educational authorities abroad, who in the main condemned the organization of the University, which made no provision for the collective voice of the staffs of the colleges being heard on academic questions. Among those authorities should be noted the following New-Zealanders—Professors Beattie, Connall, Dendy, Gilruth, Inglis, R. C. Mac-laurin, Robertson, Tucker, and many examiners of the New Zealand University, besides such world-wide experts in university organization as President Eliot and Dr. Alex. Hill. A point I want to make is that at that inquiry, according to the evidence, certain aspersions were cast on the *bona fides* of those opinions. It was urged that you could get opinions on the other side just as easily. In the meantime I happen to have been elected to the Senate, and I moved at the last meeting that the Senate itself should draw up a circular letter descriptive of our examination system in arts, science, commerce, and law, and that the Chancellor, Mr. Hogben, and Dr. Collins should be the committee. Nobody seconded the motion, so that I take it we can say that those opinions which were gathered from men whose views were not known before did represent the academic opinions in Great Britain at the time, especially as we show that every New-Zealander who had passed through this University and gone abroad to a university post when he replied condemned the system. Then the Committee heard the evidence of and cross-examined the following witnesses—Messrs. A. R. Atkinson, Professor Von Zedlitz, Mr. A. Webster, Professor Hunter, Dr. McDowell, Professor Laby, Professor Kirk, Professor Easterfield, Dr. J. A. Allan Thomson, Mr. P. G. Morgan, Sir Robert Stout, Mr. C. Wilson, Mr. J. O'Shea, the Inspector-General of Schools, Mr. A. L. Herdman; and, although there were some witnesses who expressed the opinion that a Royal Commission was not necessary, if you read the evidence you will see that practically the whole of it showed that some inquiry was needed. The Court of Convocation of the Victoria College District, the Graduates' Association of Victoria College, and the Victoria College Council passed resolutions in favour of inquiry, and five professors of Canterbury College—Professors Evans, Gabbatt, Hight, R. J. Scott, and Wall—supported the request for a Royal Commission. Now, the evidence was so convincing that the gist of the Committee's report was that the case for reform was made out, but that a Royal Commission was not necessary, as the Senate, by setting up a Professorial Conference, had given evidence of a desire to reform the University. At the next meeting of the Senate the Hon. Mr. Allen succeeded in getting the Senate to establish an annual conference of professors, and the first meeting was held in November, 1912. It drew up proposals both for B.A. and B.Sc. degrees, and for a method of internal examination. The Senate threw out the proposals of the conference, and decided by fifteen to seven that the conference was not to sit again. Further, the Education Committee decided that the Senate ought to utilize the professorial staffs in the way of getting suggestions for curricula, &c., and in examining. The Senate dealt with those two points as follows: It threw out the proposals of the professorial conference on the method of examination by seventeen to six. The professorial conference agreed that the best way of introducing into New Zealand the recognized British method of having the teacher and some outside assessor, say the professor in some other university, was by combining the teachers on any subject in the four colleges as an Examining Board, so that every professor would examine his students with three other professors, and that becomes necessary so that the standard throughout the Dominion may be uniform. The Senate threw that out by seventeen to six. It is true that, having recognized it had done something for which it would probably be called to account, it passed a resolution to have reports sent to the English examiners, but it refused to allow that proposal to be discussed by the professorial conference. Then, as to the other point, the utilization of the staffs in framing the curricula, the Senate threw that out by fourteen to eight. It is plain, therefore, that the Committee's reason for withholding a Royal Commission has been shown by experience to rest on a poor basis. Without a division the Senate has itself agreed that reform of the constitution of the Senate and its methods are desirable. The resolution of the Senate appears on page 64 of the minutes. It was moved by Professor J. M. Brown, and is as follows: "(1.) That before coming to a decision on any question relating to the definition, scope, or treatment of any subject in a University examination, or its relationship to other subjects, if beset with difficulties the Senate ascertain the opinion of the members of the college staffs who teach the subjects, and if the question relates also to the entrance examinations it ascertain the opinion of the heads of the secondary schools. (2.) That before coming to a decision on vital questions relating to the constitution or working of the University it ascertain the opinions of the various bodies connected with the University whose interests are involved in the result, such as the governing bodies and the staffs of the colleges, and the Convocation. (3.) That a committee be appointed to suggest methods of ascertaining the opinions efficiently." To that was added, on the motion of Dr. Fitchett, "(4.) That the committee confer with governing bodies and teaching staffs of the colleges, also with the Convocation, on the expediency of a Bill to reconstitute the University on lines that, while in no way affecting the corporate entity of the colleges, their autonomy or finance, will associate them more directly with University government. (5.) That if a working agreement is arrived at the committee draft such a Bill and submit it to the Senate and the colleges for consideration." This Committee may think that this is evidence of the Senate's desire to reform itself; but when you are told that the method adopted is to send out to some sixteen hundred or seventeen hundred graduates, to the Courts of Convocation, to the Professorial Boards, and to the Councils of the

colleges three schemes out of the hundreds that might be suggested, and, without in any way endeavouring to educate opinion on this difficult matter, to invite choice of scheme, opinions, and comments in order that, according to the terms of the Senate's resolution, "if a working agreement is arrived at the committee draft such a Bill and submit it to the Senate and the colleges for consideration," you will recognize that the Senate as a body neither appreciates the seriousness of the situation nor the difficulty of the task. One has to remember that this is the same Senate that after six years' work on the B.A. and B.Sc. courses has really given the matter up. It has refused to accept the opinions of the professorial conference, and has practically given the work up. This Education Committee was told at the previous inquiry that the Senate had always consulted the professors on these questions, and that the only reason why the B.A. and B.Sc. courses were not modified to bring them into line with those of other universities was because the professors could not agree. The professors had one conference; they agreed, and the Senate threw out their proposals. The Senate understands, however, that something must be done, but makes no reasonable suggestion of how it should be done. The sending-out of three schemes to sixteen hundred people cannot be looked upon as a reasonable method of dealing with the matter. As far as the preceding inquiry was concerned, the main agitation for a University Commission came from this University district. There were, as I have mentioned, some opinions from Canterbury in support of the demand, but since the Senate's action at its last meeting the other centres have realized that reform by the Senate itself is out of the question, and consequently you have petitions from all the centres. The Auckland petition is signed by six of the eleven members of the Council, including the Chairman and Vice-Chairman, the Mayor of Auckland, and Chairman of the Education Board, by five out of seven professors, by eight out of ten lecturers and assistants, and by eighty graduates. The Wellington petition is signed by five of the sixteen members of the College Council (doubtless others would have signed, but it was thought unnecessary, as the Council had passed a resolution in favour of a Commission), by the whole of the College staff—ten professors and thirteen lecturers and assistants—and by between seventy and eighty graduates. The Canterbury petition is signed by five out of nine of the professors and by the acting-professor of the Engineering School. The weakness of the petition from Canterbury is fully explained by the fact that Canterbury College is not a University college only, and its constitution does present a difficulty in any reorganization of the University; but it is a difficulty that will have to be faced, and it seems to us that it can be faced only by a Royal Commission. The petition from Otago, where the proposal for a Commission was previously strenuously opposed, was signed by three members of the Council, by eleven out of nineteen professors, and ten out of seventeen lecturers; so that you find in the whole of the University 75 per cent. of the professors and 75 per cent. of the other teachers in the University have now asked Parliament for a Royal Commission. I take it there is no other university in the world in which the staffs have been so unanimous in their demand for a Royal Commission. I think, too, that members of the Committee will be able to see from Mr. Hogben's report itself that that leads to the same conclusion. I am not going to discuss Mr. Hogben's report, but I would like to direct the attention of members to the opinion of one whom I think has had a certain amount of knowledge of local conditions, and one whose opinion stands high in the academic world—I refer to the Right Hon. James Bryce. When he was here he was, as a critic of our institutions, in a very delicate position, but he said at a University ceremony, "Having the Examining Board of the University, which was not in such close touch with the work of the colleges as some of them could desire, was another matter that presented difficulty. Before them there was a great deal of difficulty in endeavouring to adjust their University teaching to the peculiar needs of the Dominion. He earnestly hoped, and indeed knew, that the Government, and the public opinion which should guide the Government in a country such as this, would address themselves in all seriousness to consider what should be done to put university education in New Zealand on the most permanent and best footing. He trusted that public attention would never be diverted from this subject until these problems had been solved in some satisfactory manner." I think you could not get a stronger statement from a guest of New Zealand. Another point, of course, that does arise is the question of expense. What I want to suggest to the Committee is this: that the expense of a small Royal Commission such as we have suggested is going to be very much cheaper for this country than the continual agitation which has gone on for a number of years. Professor Von Zedlitz will explain the kind of agitation which has been going on in London, where the University has been trying to combine different ideals. When you consider the cost and time of the members of this Committee, the cost of the preceding inquiry, the expenses of the Senate in dealing with this matter piecemeal, it will be seen that it will be cheaper in the long-run to have a Royal Commission set up. The Senate has already had two meetings of committee in Wellington, and its present method of trying to deal with the matter is utterly ineffective. So that it seems to us that not only would the setting-up of a Royal Commission be the most effective method, but it would be by far the cheapest method of dealing with the whole issue. Another point is this: that the Dominion of New Zealand has endeavoured in various ways to stand well in the eyes of the British public, but this is the kind of advertisement your University gives you. The recent report of the Haldane Commission states, "The University of New Zealand was modelled upon the constitution of the University of London as it existed before its degrees were thrown open, in 1858, to candidates irrespective of their place of education, for students are admitted to the degree examinations from certain affiliated colleges only. In this university candidates for the B.A. and B.Sc. degrees must, as a rule, have kept terms for three years in one of the four affiliated institutions within the Dominion. Candidates for other degrees must in all cases have kept the necessary terms. On the other hand, the method by which the examinations are conducted is more external than that of any British university, for the papers are set and the answers corrected by examiners

in England appointed by the University of New Zealand for the purpose. Of recent years there has been a strong agitation in New Zealand in favour of a reconstitution of the University so as to make it a teaching university of the federal type." In view of the wider interests of the Dominion you may say this has little effect. I think probably it has more effect than most people imagine, but there is one way in which it does seriously affect this country, and most seriously affect it, and that is in the scope that it gives the colleges in the selection of professors. At the present time the Auckland University has three vacancies on its staff and Otago University has a vacancy, and as the older men are compelled to give up the work in New Zealand other vacancies will arise. One of the most important things is that these vacancies should be filled by the best type of men, and if Professor Laby were here he would be able to give you evidence of the fact that the good type of men is absolutely refusing to leave positions of less remuneration because of the conditions under which they would have to work here; particularly is this so with science men. There are one or two points I should like to mention with a view of shortening any questions members may wish to ask. One matter which has been urged by members of the Committee is that good men have been through the University. That is perfectly true, but that does not imply that the methods of the University are sound. I think it would be just as logical to say that because certain people who are not vaccinated escape smallpox there is no need for vaccination. Good men do go through a lot of trouble, but it is not reasonable to risk putting them through it, and certainly for the rank and file it is a very bad thing. In reference to the effect of the external system on university education may I be allowed to give an instance. If you take the training that the teacher has to-day I think you will find that it is recognized that experimental psychology is the recognized basis of that training, and yet it is not taught in the University of New Zealand. Victoria College has set up a laboratory, but the University does not recognize the work. This is one instance in which we have fallen hopelessly behind, and we have done so because of the fact that with external examinations in the subject of mental and moral philosophy, where you have a large group of subjects, it is impossible to get any man expert in them all. In many British universities there are two Chairs on the subject, and at the present time the examiner for the New Zealand University does not teach psychology and logic, the subjects of the pass degree. I do not say that man is incompetent to examine, but I say it is not the best way of providing that the University teaching shall be as far as possible up to date. Then the question was raised about the good teachers we have had, but it is interesting to note that in very many cases some of our most outstanding teachers—those who have been looked upon as the outstanding men in the University—have not achieved what may be considered a great success as measured by the external examinations. The students of Professor Sale did not achieve great success in classics, and then, again, you will find that the students of a professor of eminence, those of the late Dr. Jeffrey Parker, did not achieve great distinction in University examinations. In science, too, there is greater opportunity because of the original research work that is required by the syllabus in the New Zealand University, but this is absent in a large number of subjects. The same thing is true in the case of Professor Maclaurin, of Victoria College. His students did not achieve great success from the point of view of examinations, and there are many men in the University of quite inferior calibre to any of these men whose students have achieved much greater success measured by mere examination results. One member of the Committee asked for an actual instance in which we found that men we considered to be good had failed and men we considered perhaps not so good had passed. I think you can find many such cases in the history of the University.

3. And you might find the same under the other system perhaps?—Exactly. The great advantage of the system we advocate is that we fix the responsibility on some one. If it is shown that a professor passes people who subsequent experience shows are inferior, then it is a real reflection on him. At present there is no reflection on anybody. The English examiner in a way removes the responsibility from the teacher, and at the same time the net result is that he really cramps the ability of the teacher. A point was raised, I think by Mr. Thomson, in regard to the training of good men. I should like to give a striking illustration of that, which Mr. Thomson will appreciate. If you take the Otago Mining School you find there a school that, judged by the demand there has been for its graduates, is a school that occupies a good name over a very wide area. Students from Otago School of Mines have gone to many parts of the Empire, but you do not find that the majority of these men are graduates of the University. The man who laid the foundation of that school—the late Professor Ulrich—was wise enough to see that external examination would not give him the result he desired, and he started a diploma of his own, and that is the diploma that most of these men have taken. If you look at the University results you will find that very few of the associates of the Otago School of Mines have taken the University degree. That is a good illustration of the difference between the teaching and examining of the University. In regard to the point raised by Mr. Sidey that Commissions are not always successful, we know they are not, but there is one very striking illustration in New Zealand at the present time, and that is the immense value of the report given to this country on the question of defence by Lord Kitchener. I think that is a striking illustration of what can be done if you choose the right type of Commission.

4. *Mr. Statham.*] You said that under the present system there is no reflection cast upon the teachers, but is it not a fact that before the students sit for the Home examinations they have to pass the local examinations?—That is not universally so. There are certain subjects where it is not so, and some subjects where it is so. Generally speaking, that is correct. Since this agitation started the University has been very much more stringent in this respect in arts and sciences.

5. *Mr. Malcolm.*] Is it not a fact that, knowing the student has afterwards to sit for his examination in degree work, the professors are very reluctant to turn a man down in his class

examination?—In the evidence of the former inquiry you will find an illustration from the Welsh system of examination. Generally the position adopted in most universities under this system is that if a teacher felt that a man had a reasonably good chance of passing the examination he was sent up. I do not think there is any doubt that that was the position in London, and I think it is the position here.

6. Knowing your own students intimately and their work throughout the year, you would have no difficulty at all in distinguishing between deserving men and others?—No. I think that, having had four years' acquaintance with a student, I am in a better position than the man at Home who judges him on a three-hours paper.

7. And that with the internal examination rather than the external examination there would be much less likelihood of a man making a bad pass?—Undoubtedly.

8. You would judge him on the results of the whole work rather than on the results of the one examination?—Yes, undoubtedly.

9. *Mr. McCallum.*] Can you give the Committee, Professor Hunter, any instance of the University Council expressing dissatisfaction as to the work of a professor by reason of his not having obtained a fair proportion of passes in the examinations?—I cannot give evidence of my own knowledge, but I know of cases from hearsay.

10. Take Victoria College: have you ever heard of any dissatisfaction being expressed by your own College?—No. The only case that I can call to mind was the case of a Professor of Law.

11. Now take his case: was it because he did not succeed in getting passes?—No, I do not think it had anything to do with that. I should say in that case that it had nothing to do with not getting passes, but there are other cases in New Zealand where it has been said.

12. The answer to that, of course, would be that they would not renew his appointment. The College Council would make no complaint probably such as the Inspector of Schools would, but at the end of five years he would not be reappointed?—That is a very serious thing for a University to do.

13. I quite see you are not getting justice in regard to past examinations, but what argument can you give to this Committee if it is not a correct representation of your work?—Our point is not that the present system of examination may be used as a reflection on the teacher, but we do not think that any system of examination ought to be used for testing the teacher.

14. Is it because you fear you will be wrongly judged by the results of this external examination?—No, not at all. Speaking from my own point of view, if I were to consider my own interests I would not be in this movement at all; I would be on the other side. I only mention that in answer to your question. The whole point you will find is that it is a matter of the education of the students.

15. Could you professors suggest a differentiation in certain degrees? Certain degrees must come from the Home professors until we have our own professors from the four colleges, but could we not have a compromise in that way? You mentioned that Professor Ulrich, of Dunedin, had given his own degree. Can you not give us a list of subjects in which we could have both external and internal examinations?—We have that already in a way, but it is not a very desirable way. Take, for instance, domestic science: there is a degree for domestic science, but then they have a diploma for a certain course and a diploma for another course. The diploma is given purely by the teaching staff, and the degree by the teachers acting with assessors. If there is a feeling, and that feeling may be sound, that it is unwise to have an examining Board of four professors in any subject to do the work, the best way would be to have a Board composed of the professors and an outsider, and give the outsider the power of veto the same as he has in Wales. I do not think there would be any objection to that. The only question is that you are increasing the expense, and we think it is a reflection on the appointments of the past if, having got four men, it is impossible to trust them without associating another man with them. I do not object to that system, but there is the extra expense. I am speaking only for myself on this point.

16. I want to be satisfied before supporting the setting-up of a Royal Commission that the standard of our degrees is maintained?—Might I convince you in this way: I take all those men I mentioned—Maclaurin, Connall, and others; most of them hold New Zealand degrees, and I ask, is it reasonable to think that they themselves are going to undermine the New Zealand degree? I take Dr. Allan Thomson, the first Rhodes scholar here: is he going to undermine his own degree? I take my own case: I hold only a New Zealand degree, and is it likely that I am going to undermine my own degree?

17. But you will have a standing, and you can turn round and say, "I got my degree in the severe days"?—I believe that argument has actually been used by some people in London. But the point is that I do not believe the University is going to fool the general public; the public is going to judge the University in the same way as it judges anything else, not by the label on the goods but by the quality.

18. I do not appreciate that argument. You must take the face value—we have not the time to go into each man's qualifications?—I feel that if you were wise in appointing your professor you would consider who have trained him—you do not consider his degree mainly. A man, for example, in a big university might get the degree of the university and might be trained by famous teachers or by very inferior teachers.

19. It is a spur to the professor—you are putting your professors on far too high a standard of human nature?—I can say absolutely that the external examination is not a spur to any man. Let me take the illustration of the teaching of physics in a University college in New Zealand under the external examination. That examination in physics does not require any manipulation at all. The student passes a paper examination in physics, and I say that in the internal examination that is impossible. I take my own case, and I say that it is not the external system that induces me to deal with the newer development in psychology which is not dealt with in the

programme of the University. Having already got the best men you must throw the responsibility on them to live up to their responsibilities. You do not do that with the external system—that system robs the professor of responsibility. In classics I think the claim for external examination is stronger perhaps than in many other subjects, because classics is nearly always taught in the same way, but external examination does harm in classics.

20. *Mr. Sidey.*] Do I understand you to say that when a student fails the responsibility would be on the teachers under the external examination?—No; if the teacher “fails” a student the teacher is responsible for the judgment he passed on the student’s work. If, for example, he “fails” a man and the man shows afterwards he has got brilliant ability, then that shows lack of judgment in the teacher.

21. Will you illustrate your statement that if a student fails under the system of examination which you propose, where the professor is associated with other examiners internally, that the responsibility in that case is on the professor?—Undoubtedly, because you will find that when four men meet together to discuss the candidates the number of cases in which there will be a difference of opinion will be small, and in these doubtful cases it will be the judgment of the teacher that will carry weight.

22. Do you consider, with a larger proportion of failures in a class, that the governing body would have greater cause of complaint with the professor than he would under the existing system?—No; I think that a governing body that has complained without considering the kind of material has shown itself not fit for the position.

23. From that point of view there is no difference between the two systems?—No, only this: that what the governing body does is to depreciate the standard of the teacher and to exalt the examiner. There is a tendency in this way for the governing body not to feel the supreme importance of making good appointments to teaching posts.

24. Do you think the work of the professor should be estimated by the number of students he gets through his examination?—No, certainly not.

25. Neither in one case nor the other?—No.

26. I was not quite certain of what your explanation was on the subject of teaching psychology. We have had in the Otago University for years a Chair of Mental Philosophy. Have you not that here?—Yes; but my point is this: that in psychology in the last thirty years there has been developed an absolutely new science, and that science is not taught anywhere in the New Zealand University.

27. Is the fact that you have external examinations such that it is impossible to have the subjects taught?—No, not at all. The tendency under external examination is to limit the subjects, for if you break the subjects you multiply the external examiners and increase the expense.

28. You mean the subject is too large to be under one person?—I think it is, but I doubt whether the colleges here are financially strong enough to bear the additional burden. What I suggest is that the colleges should be allowed in these wide subjects to specialize along those lines, but that is very difficult under a system of external examination.

29. *Hon. Mr. Allen.*] I understand that you base your demand now for a Royal Commission upon the additional evidence which you adduce that the Senate itself has not reformed itself?—Yes, sir, I think that is the logical deduction from the last decision of the Committee.

30. Well, is it the logical deduction from what the Senate proposes to do? I do not know whether they mean to do it, but they have made certain proposals for the reform of the Senate itself?—Yes, their proposal is this: they are sending out three schemes to sixteen or seventeen hundred people, and also to the Courts of Convocation, and so on, and inviting choice and comment, and if there is an agreement they are going to draft a Bill. I take it that is the same thing as doing nothing.

31. But it is specified that there must be agreement?—That is according to the resolution of the Senate.

32. You are a member of the Senate?—Yes.

33. I should like to know whether the Senate is in earnest in these suggested proposals?—There are two parts combined in the resolution. The second part was tacked on to the first part, and I think Dr. Fitchett was absolutely in earnest about it, but I think that the method of doing it shows that they do not realize the difficulties of the situation at all.

34. Are you prepared to tell the Committee that you do not think they really do mean to adopt any of those suggestions or any other suggestions for reform?—I cannot say that, but I do not think, as the Senate is at present constituted, we shall get any reasonable reform from it.

35. You mentioned something about the London Royal Commissioners’ report on the university. Could you briefly tell the Committee how the report of that Commission affects the question that is now before us?—Professor Von Zedlitz is going to deal with that.

36. *The Chairman.*] Why was the professorial conference suppressed?—The reason given for it was this: the mover of the motion, Mr. Von Haast, said that the professorial conference had no legal standing, and, as the Senate had thrown out all the proposals of the professorial conference, it was illogical to have it.

37. Was it legally set up?—It was set up by resolution of the Senate. The conference was set up on the motion of the Hon. Mr. Allen.

38. *Hon. Mr. Allen.*] It was legal enough?—I should have said it had no statutory standing. The idea was that, the Senate not having followed the suggestions of the professorial conference, it was useless to have the professorial conference.

39. *The Chairman.*] Assuming that these three schemes have gone out to all the members of the University, do you consider it would be a very difficult and expensive matter to summarize the information and opinions that will be derived from them?—I do not think you will get any agreement. I know in some instances the graduates have sent their forms to other people to fill in. It does not seem a reasonable method of reforming a university.

TUESDAY, 12TH AUGUST, 1913.

SIR ROBERT STOUT, K.C.M.G., C.J., examined. (No. 4.)

1. *The Chairman.*] I might say, Sir Robert, that we have already before us the whole of the evidence you gave before the Committee two years ago, and that will be taken as evidence before this Committee?—In order to shorten the matter I would also hand in to the Committee the views I expressed on the proposed amendments of the constitution of the University. I understand that what the Committee is considering now is only the question of whether a Commission is to issue or not. That is so, is it not?

2. Yes. We are going to consider Mr. Hogben's report which was put in last year, but which we had no opportunity of discussing. That will be discussed in detail, and we have decided to take evidence in regard to that?—Well, I do not know that there is anything I have to say. All I wish to say is this: that if a Commission is necessary I apprehend that the Commission should not be confined merely to the constitution of the University; it should investigate the whole education of the University and see whether it is fulfilling its object. There is no doubt that the University has been exceedingly disappointing in some respects. I am speaking as one interested in all the University colleges as a whole. What has disappointed me most is the small number of students who take science. The statistics will show that. I have not the report for this year, but the report for last year shows that so far as science is concerned there has been a very small number that took science compared with other subjects. Another thing is that mathematics is dropped. Of course, in the last two years mathematics is not compulsory now in the arts degree, as it was before. That no doubt will affect the number, but independent of that there is a drop. I think you will get from Mr. Hogben's report of last year on higher education the numbers that have taken mathematics, physics, biology, and geology, not necessarily for taking degrees but attending lectures.

3. You mean the report by the Inspector-General of Schools?—Yes. If you turn to page 3 you will see there the number of students taking the several subjects in arts, science, law, commerce, music, medicine, dentistry, engineering, mining, agriculture, and home science for 1912, and you will see the small number comparatively of the science courses that have been taken. I have a very strong opinion that no one should get a degree unless he has taken some course in science. I have always held that, because I do not think a man is educated unless he understands scientific methods. But for some reason or other science is either unpopular or has become unpopular. I think from the table you have before you you will find that in pure mathematics for the whole Dominion there were 195 students, and for applied mathematics 167. Considering the number of our students that is exceedingly small. Then, treating mathematics as a scientific subject, if you take mathematics, physics, chemistry, biology, and geology, I think the figures will show that Auckland had 255 students—that means those attending lectures, and they may be the same names; Victoria College, 160; Canterbury College, 197; and Otago University, 274. I have taken those figures from Mr. Hogben's table. I should imagine you would need a Commission to deal with what the constitution of the University should be, because our University is different from other universities—different in every way. London is no guide to us. There has recently been a Commission in London, and I would point out to the Committee that, so far as London is concerned, the recent Commission's report has not been received with favour by everybody connected with the London University. The Graduates' Association has protested vigorously against the external students being prohibited, and if you look at the *Times* Supplement on education you will see that the head of the University College objects to the absorption of his college in the way proposed. In the appendix to the final report of the Commission it is rather interesting to see what the report says about the maintenance of external examinations. At page 270 it states, "Since the beginning of July, 1912, the Royal Commission has received letters from various bodies which have passed a resolution in the following or similar terms: This committee (educational authority) protests against any alteration in the statutes and regulations of the University of London which would close it to external students or diminish the opportunities for obtaining an external degree. Some of these bodies also forwarded a copy of a further resolution to the following effect: That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Prime Minister (Downing Street), the President of the Board of Education (Whitehall), the Secretary of the Royal Commission (Westminster), and the Registrar of the University of London (South Kensington)." And then there follows the names of about two hundred local education bodies all over England, and several pages of bodies protesting against the abolition of external students. Since the issue of the report the Graduates' Association of London University had a meeting and protested against the abolition of the external students, and I think about nine-tenths of the colleges who are recognized as teaching institutions have also protested.

4. *Hon. Mr. Allen.*] Perhaps you will explain what is meant by "external student"?—In London there are two classes of students, external and internal. The external students may attend an institution of which the London University has no cognizance. They may be taught by private teachers. All they have to do is that they must pass the Matriculation Examination and various other examinations required to a degree, and they cannot pass their final examination until generally three years have elapsed. In the case of medicine it is five years. In medicine they must also attend for their practical work a recognized medical institution. I have here the regulations for the external students in London in 1908, and I will leave them with the Committee. Then they have the internal students. The internal students are those who attend what are termed the teaching colleges of the University. They have, as you are aware, started teaching colleges in London. Formerly London had no teaching colleges, but recognized certain institutions as teaching colleges—namely, University College, Queen's College, Holloway College, and Bedford College, and certain denominational colleges of the Church of England.

Congregational, Baptist, and so on. Well, we have not the same thing here. We differ in this respect: we have what are termed "external students," but they are not external students in the London sense, because they have what is called to keep terms at one of our University colleges. That means that every year they have to be examined by the teacher in the subject and passed by the Professorial Board. That is what is called "keeping terms." They do not attend the colleges and do not get the benefit of the teacher. So that our external students would be in a different position. The London University has held examinations in New Zealand, and it holds continually examinations in India. It holds examinations also in various parts of England, Scotland, Ireland, and wherever they are asked, and that is purely for external students. In the report which deals with this question of the abolition of external students the report does not propose absolutely to abolish the external student, but to greatly modify the system, and even that modification is objected to. Therefore you cannot get much aid from the London University in that respect. I understand that one of the main things asked for by some of the professors is that the examinations for degrees should be held by themselves. So far I have not read the full report of the Commission—I have only read the condensed report that appeared in the *London Mail*. There is nothing in the report that teachers shall examine their own pupils, and I am not aware of any university that does that. The Universities of Scotland have assessors along with the professors, and in Oxford and Cambridge the Board of Examiners varies almost from year to year or every three years, and it is recognized both in Oxford and Cambridge that the teacher shall not examine his own pupils in the subject in which he teaches them. There are cases in which some teachers are on the examining Board, and some of their students would then be examined by them; but in Cambridge—and I will speak of that which I know about, namely law—it is usual to have from three to five and sometimes seven examiners on that Board. If there is a teacher on that Board who taught contracts he would not examine in contracts for that year, but examine in torts or criminal law. They vary like that. However, I am not going to deal with that question, and only wanted to mention that point. I have pointed out that it is exceedingly sad to me to see that our science is not popular in our universities, and I would point out what they are doing in America in order to popularize it. The Wisconsin system, as it is called, has been introduced there, and they now have thousands of students attending science. They are not seeking degrees, but education, and the result is that thousands are attending the University of Wisconsin who do not work for a degree. Any one can attend for chemistry or biology or physics if they like, and I have here an article in a paper called the *Fra* which describes how many of the students are past forty years of age who are studying chemistry, soil, analysis, history, and economics. They say there that the university ought to be a teaching body and examinations are a secondary matter. I believe that if we had efficient teachers in our colleges, and that our colleges chose to say that their doors were open to any person who chose to attend, and they had practical teachers, instead of the paltry number attending the science courses in the universities you would have the number trebled and quadrupled. If you get a popular teacher you will get plenty of students to attend. We know what happened in the earlier days of the Otago University: they received any person who chose to come, and they had a large attendance. We know also what happened in Canterbury, when Professor McMillan Brown used to have Saturday classes in English, the number attending going up to, I believe, three hundred. It seems to me there is a great danger in New Zealand of some people setting up that the main thing you require in a university is what is called "research students." Now, in regard to research students, you cannot get one in twenty thousand to be a real research student, and the University has to provide for the mass of the people just as the primary schools provide for the mass of the people. The great thing in the University is to popularize education so that you can get as many educated people in science as possible. You will never get it by simply having a professor sitting in his chair and directing the students in the laboratories. It is necessary the universities should have research students, but to make that the end-all and aim of the University is a huge mistake. You must—to use a word that is now in use—democratize your universities. You can only do that if your teachers are popular. I mean popular not in the sense of being a "hail fellow well met," but that they are able to impart knowledge in an effective popular way. I want to say a word or two only in regard to the University. If you want to change the constitution of the University Parliament is capable of doing that without inviting the opinion of five or six different odd men. If you think the professors should rule—and that is the real object of the Reform Association, because you can see that from the schemes proposed—very well, let the professors rule, and let the people understand what that means. If you think that the local bodies should have some say in the government, and that the local colleges should have some say in their own management, then you ought to keep your present system. At any rate, I do not see the need of going to the expense of a University Commission to settle a question which Parliament could settle—namely, how should your university institutions be ruled? You know how the public schools and the secondary schools are ruled; they are not ruled by the teachers, and I do not see why the universities should be either. I think it would not be advisable in the interests of higher education nor of the professors themselves. Secondly, in all institutions you ought to have a constitution that would enable the public to know how the University is performing its functions, and you cannot have that if you leave everything to the professors any more than you could have it in the primary schools if you have no Inspectors and no examinations. I have here copies of my criticism on the proposed schemes, and I will hand them in. I should also like to refer to Sir Rider Haggard's book on Denmark, in which you will see that the system which is carried out in Wisconsin is also carried out in some respects in Denmark. The farmers there attend the university, and one has only to read to see the enormous advantage it has been to Denmark of having her settlers scientifically trained. There the university is made popular—it is not confined to a few students. I have all the details here

of what is happening in New Zealand. The Inspector-General's report, for example, shows that the students in science number 72; the students in commerce (I am speaking of the whole of New Zealand) number 255; students in law, 273; and students in arts, 624. Well, that, of course, is ridiculous; it ought to be 624 students in science instead of only 72. Then I say that if you are going to have an exhaustive Commission on University matters you will have to deal not with the New Zealand University alone, but with the colleges and with the individual teachers to see how the work is being done. Anything short of that will not be an effective Commission if you are going to investigate University matters properly. I have been told that there are professors in New Zealand where the students do not rely upon the teaching at all and have coaches. Of course, that is very unfortunate, and a Commission would be able to investigate that.

5. *Mr. Malcolm.*] I notice that you are very anxious to have popular teachers or professors?—Yes.

6. How would you obtain them?—By appointing them.

7. What methods would you take in appointing them?—Make sure that no man should be appointed merely for his knowledge alone, but for his teaching qualities.

8. How could you discover that?—By what he had done; by finding out about him.

9. Would that mean that you would object to receiving professors from Home?—Not necessarily. I would take the best man I could get wherever he was.

10. But how would you discover that with a professor at Home?—I would find out whether he was able to teach. You would have to obtain your information from other people.

11. Has your experience led you to believe that we can depend upon the information we get in those cases?—Not always.

12. You have nothing practical to suggest?—With the present law in force in Victoria College the professors are appointed for a certain number of years, but they ought not to be reappointed unless they are proper teachers.

13. Then it is the reappointment rather than the appointment you are referring to?—Yes.

14. I have suggested myself that it might be wise to confine all appointments of professors to men who have gone through the primary-schools training and practice—men of that sort?—Other things being equal I should approve of that. There is another way of dealing with it which I dealt with in one of my addresses—that is the German system of having what is called *privat docenten*. That is what may be called teachers and not professors. The students in the German university may attend those people if they like and pay them, I understand. If they show their ability to teach by the number of students who attend their classes they would then be eligible for the professorate afterwards. Something like that may be adopted.

15. You said that some students did not believe in the professors, and were compelled to go to coaches?—I did not say "compelled," but they do it. Why I do not know.

16. I notice in the report of your address you have a very high opinion of Professor Sale of the Otago University?—Yes, I think he was a very fine man.

17. Do you not know that it was his custom not to teach students, but that they were to go to coaches?—I did not know that, but I know some went to coaches. That is the English system.

18. What is your object in wishing so many students to take science?—Because I think it is the best training for people who have to do as our people have to do—to be industrious. I think it would be an enormous advantage to all the farming classes if they knew something of science. It would also be an advantage even from the more intellectual development of men if they knew something of the scientific spirit and scientific manner.

19. I understood you said—and I agree with you—that not one in twenty thousand has the scientific faculty?—I mean the scientific faculty to become research students. I do not say this should be ignored. I would have provision for research students and research scholarships, but I do not want to see the aim of the University to prepare one or two bright men every two or three years.

20. So that the course in science you would recommend for the students you refer to would be of a very general and very elementary character?—Of a general character, and gradually get better as it went on. To give an example, I would mention what took place at the Otago University in 1871. I was there as a student myself, and I went for the purpose of education and not a degree. A great number went there, but had done very little chemistry at all, and when Professor Black came out it was wonderful how they took it up. The same with mathematics and with science.

21. You would not ask them to pass a Matriculation Examination?—No. If they went there merely for scientific purposes or any other purpose, and did not want a degree, they should not be asked to pass an examination at all.

22. Is not the work you are advocating largely done by the technical schools at present?—There is too much overlapping between the technical schools and the universities.

23. But is it not necessary to keep distinct the work required from men who are taking science for a degree and the work required for men who are taking it as a hobby?—You can even have that by having two different classes. It would be far better to have that than one professor with a class numbering only thirty students in the year.

24. Is not the general student provided for already in our technical schools?—I do not know. I cannot speak of that personally because I do not know the work done in the technical schools, only I am told that some technical schools are actually doing university work, and that is a waste.

25. *The Chairman.*] Very few of them?—I was told so in Auckland.

26. *Mr. Malcolm.*] You spoke of the professors ruling the University. There is no proposal that the professors alone should do so?—Practically there is. The professors are to be the

examiners, and if you look at scheme B you will see, except there is a registering body, the professors are to have practically the initiative, and if you bring in such a scheme as B, for example, what will be the result? The expense will be enormous—it will be three times the amount of the expense now. You must understand that we are differently situated from other universities. Take, for example, an analogous university, the University of Wales. I had a letter from the Registrar detailing what they did there. They are within a few hours of each other, and supposing they wanted to meet at Aberystwith the people from Bangor and Cardiff could go to Aberystwith at small expense, and they would only need to meet for one or two days perhaps twice a year. You could not do that in the case of Auckland or those coming from Otago. The expense would be very great. I venture to say that if you had the B system in force your administration would cost you at least double or treble what it is costing now, and I think it is costing now quite enough.

27. Do you think the present system of examination by British professors is satisfactory?—I think it is, but I am not wedded to that. I have never said I am not willing that the examinations should be conducted by any one fit to conduct them—I do not care whether in England or elsewhere. I have never said we should confine our examinations to England. If we had proficient men in New Zealand I should prefer to have the examinations here, but my point is that the teacher should not examine his own pupils.

28. Do you not think that the teacher's knowledge of what the student has done in his class enables him to form a better opinion of that student to pass an examination?—No, because if a man cannot pass an examination he ought not to get his degree, if he has not the knowledge that he can utilize, because that is what an examination means. If a man was on the border-line then we would allow the professor's record of his work to count, and we allow it now. If a man was on the border-line with his pass work I would allow the report from the professor to count, but I would not go further than that.

29. You believe the test of the student's ability is his ability to pass an examination?—No, it is the only public test we know. We know perfectly well that a pupil who cannot pass an examination may be a very fit man, but he is not entitled to a degree merely because he is fit and proficient; he must prove to all the world that he is fit and proficient, and you can only say that by seeing he has the knowledge, and the examination brings that out.

30. And one man on behalf of the world tests his knowledge—that is the examiner?—No doubt.

31. Well, would not the professor be best fitted?—No, because he is judging his own work, and I do not think it is fair to put him in that position; and a high-minded professor would like not to do it, as Professor Oman said in regard to what happened in secondary schools. I will give you an illustration: I had a letter from Dr. Giles, who is Master of Emmanuel College, Cambridge. He was speaking to me about other things, and I never asked him about examinations; but he told me the reason he had not answered my letter was that he had been in Greece and had come home and was going to lecture on some phase of Greek archæology during the term, and he said, "I have had some trouble and have been searching for an examiner. As I am the lecturer I could not be the examiner, and I had to go up to London, and at last I got one from the Indian Office." That is his view of his duty.

32. Your feeling is that the professors could not be trusted?—I do not think it would be satisfactory to the public. If you are to apply the principle of teachers being examiners, then you will have to apply it in both the secondary and primary schools.

33. The practice has for some years been followed in the primary schools?—Yes, but that is no test of the teacher's work, only so far as passing the pupils into a higher class; and Inspectors have not been abolished.

34. *Hon. Mr. Allen.* I gather from what you said, Sir Robert, that you are not satisfied with the results of the University work, especially with regard to the number that are taking the science course?—No, I think it is very disappointing. I think something should be done to encourage more to take up science.

35. Then may we take it that you agree or disagree with the Senate when at its last meeting it resolved to submit the question of the constitution to a committee of the Senate itself?—I do not think the altering of the constitution of the Senate will have any advantage. I do not agree with the Senate in that respect. I do not object to it hearing what is to be heard from the various bodies and students. My opinion is that the Senate constitution is good enough—it does not require any alteration.

36. You recollect what was done two years ago in appointing a conference of Professorial Boards, of which the Senate in the next year disapproved?—Yes, because what did they do? Instead of drawing up a syllabus of the studies and doing what they were supposed to have done, they first of all wanted to abolish the Bachelor of Science degree, which would have been another blow to science; and then, what next? They went on to deal with what they thought practical alterations in the constitution. They also did not give us any record of their votings—they carefully kept that from the Senate. The report from those who were present at the conference was not adopted. It was only a waste of money. The cost was about £157 for nothing, and I do not see why the funds of the University should be spent in that way.

37. Is the question of Bachelor of Science and Bachelor of Arts degrees satisfactory from your point of view at present?—Well, I think it is satisfactory in this manner: that if you were to have no Bachelor of Science degree you would lower your science pupils to what you have now. It has worked very well in the past, but I do not say it is a perfect system. If you propose that each Bachelor of Arts should take a science subject then it might work.

38. Do I take it, then, your opinion would be that with the Bachelor of Arts degree alone it should include a scientific subject?—I do think so.

39. Are you satisfied with the position of the Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science degrees as they exist now?—I do not say that the terms are absolutely perfect, but I believe with President Lincoln that if you get the second-best you are very fortunate.

40. Then, with regard to the question of the external student, does that come up prominently before us as a question of reform in New Zealand—as prominently as in London, for instance?—No, because we have not the London system. If you look at the regulations for external students in London you will see they have a book on the external alone and another book on the internal students. All I wanted to say was that the London report cannot aid us because the London system is so different from ours. You will find, then, that if Parliament carries out the abolition of the external student and external examination they will have to set up some other body that will perform the same function—that is absolutely certain.

41. Are there many external students in our affiliated colleges?—I could give you a list. There is always a few. I will give you an example of the students at terms in Victoria College in 1912. There were thirty-four in English, thirty-four Latin, seven French, three German, eleven mental science, seven economics, nine English history, two geography, twenty education, twelve jurisprudence, seventeen constitutional history, fourteen mathematics, and one mechanics. Of course, that does not mean separate individual students—that means the subjects taken. There may only have been forty altogether. But you see the number, for example, in English—102 sat for examination of the students attending, and 34 external: that was altogether 136 in English.

42. Would you suggest it would be wise to have external students who were taking scientific subjects that required laboratory experience?—In certain subjects we cannot have external students—they must have laboratory experience; but you have external students in mathematics. I do not think you could in physics and chemistry.

43. Or engineering, or medicine?—That is a totally different thing altogether. Of course, even in London the external student had to attend in medicine at a college approved by the University before he was allowed to sit.

44. Do you know the report of the Commission on external students?—I have not seen the full report—only the digest.

45. They do not propose to do away with external students right away?—No, not the whole of them; they propose to modify it. The Graduates' Association of the London University met and condemned it for that reason. I think you will see that mentioned in the *London Times*, but I do not know whether it was in the educational number or not.

46. I want to sum up the questions I have asked. I understand you to say that you are disappointed with the results of the University work as far as it has gone, especially in science and mathematics?—Yes.

47. And I understand you to say that there is a considerable difference of opinion as to the constitution of the Senate itself, although you do not agree with it?—Yes.

48. You think the constitution of the Senate is all right?—You can get perhaps hundreds of variations, but I do not think you will get any better result. In the Senate there are these classes represented: the Government, which ought to be represented; the teachers, which ought to be represented; the three local colleges, and they ought to be represented; and, fourth, the graduates. What else can you suggest? There are the four different selectors, and I do not think you can get any better than that.

49. Then there is a difference of opinion and a difficulty in settling questions like degrees of Bachelor of Science and Bachelor of Arts?—I do not think we have had any difficulty in the past. The position is this: generally speaking, although there may be exceptions, but as a general rule no alteration has ever been made in the syllabus without consulting the experts in that syllabus. If we wanted to deal with the English syllabus we always asked the English professors, and in mathematics we asked the professors in mathematics.

50. I would ask you whether, in obtaining the opinions of those professors, it has been very satisfactory?—Sometimes they differ. I know the last time the matter came up in regard to mathematics there were two on one side and two on the other, and then there was a compromise effected. That is generally what happens, I suppose.

51. Now, what I want to ask is this: taking your own admission that the results are unsatisfactory from the point of view of science, and mathematics, and different other things in which you do not agree with those who are asking for reform, what do you suggest is the best way for Parliament to obtain the knowledge which would justify it in making some change to produce better results?—I do not think you can produce better results except by leaving it to the local bodies; and, seeing that their circumstances are similar and that they are continually asking for money, you have to find out how they are spending the money. You can test it without any Commission. We know that in science there are a number of assistants. A professor with thirty students has an assistant and sometimes two assistants.

52. Then, by the "local body" you mean the Councils of the University?—Certainly.

53. The Councils of the University apparently, from your point of view, have adequately equipped schools from the teaching standpoint?—Yes, more than adequate—extravagantly.

54. Would they be able to advise us on the question of why there are not more students attending those schools?—Except you go to the students and go into an investigation you could not get a Council in this case which would help you; but to confine your attention as to who should be in the Senate would not help you.

55. It is a question of reform which you admit is necessary?—The only reform I admit is necessary is that you—and by you particularly I mean Parliament—have before you reports, and you ought to see that there are efficient results from the expenditure of the money.

56. That is the whole point?—When they come to you for money the question would be, How many students have you, and how many assistants? Have your students gone up or gone down—how do they stand?

57. When we have got those particulars what is Parliament to do?—Parliament should say, until you are more efficient and have more science students we cannot give you more assistance.

58. Would you suggest cutting the money off?—If you have only thirty students in a class, and you have perhaps two assistants in a class, that is an undue expenditure of money.

59. That is not the point I want to get at. I have a perfectly open mind on the subject?—I have a lot of figures here.

60. What I want to get at is your views, how we should get to know what steps we ought to take to reform what you admit is a weakness?—I think the Department is quite competent to do it without outside assistance. You have your experts, and you could ask the University Councils to work out the difficulties and point out how they should be remedied, and you have your representatives on the College Councils.

61. Do you think the College Councils as constituted are able to give us advice on the question of teaching science and why it is not successful?—I say that the way I should deal with the matter is this: here you have science being taught; your science students instead of increasing are decreasing in some of the University colleges, and why is this? Must you not take steps to remedy this before you come to us for assistance? I know what I would say if I had to deal with it.

62. Then, to settle the unrest?—I deny there is any unrest in the mind of the general public. I say the whole unrest has been created by a few calling themselves "reformers" in Wellington. They have got some professors from Canterbury to come along with them—perhaps a majority, but not all—a few from Otago, and a few from Auckland, but the majority of those in Otago are the other way, I am told.

63. Well, I will not call it "unrest"—there is an agitation?—Yes, but the agitation does not touch the point of want of attendance in the students. The whole agitation is aimed at two things: first, that the professors should be the examiners; and, second, that the professors should be the dominant party in the University so far as the course of study is concerned under the original programme of the Reform Association. You will see that is the whole object. They have not touched these other points I have mentioned with their little finger.

64. I am not alluding to teaching science—I am alluding to the demand of some for reform of the constitution of the Senate, and the question of examination and syllabus, and the professorial position in the question of examinations. Those are the questions?—That is so.

65. So far as this Committee is concerned we have had one side representing their case and another side representing their case to us, and if we find a difficulty in coming to a conclusion what is the right course to pursue with this evidence before us? Do you think we could be helped in any way by advice from a Royal Commission?—I doubt it very much. It would depend a very great deal on whom you select. Last year it was proposed that you should get Dr. Hill. I am not saying a word against him—I believe he is an eminent and able man—but he has expressed his opinion of what a university should be before you make your selection, and that is like selecting your judge. Then you have Mr. Hosking, Mr. McNab, and Mr. Fowlds suggested. Do you imagine that they know more about University matters than members who have been in the Senate for thirty or forty years? If this whole idea of reform had come from outside it would be different, but when it comes from men who are wanting to get control themselves what attention should you pay to it? If the teachers were by resolution to demand that they should be on the School Committees and had the dominating power of the syllabus, and the Education Board was to take advice from them, would Parliament listen to them? That is analogous.

66. I gather from the first part of your answer that you could conceive it possible that a Commission or Board might be appointed that would be able to assist us?—I do not deny that you may be able to get experienced men. There is one man who has retired from the professorate, a man like Professor Sale or Professor Shand. But to appoint men as Commissioners who have taken no interest in education seems to me to be a great farce. What knowledge can a man from England have of our history and surroundings to be able to impart knowledge to us?

67. Then we have got this far: you could conceive it possible to appoint a Commission that would be of value?—So far as I am personally concerned I can tell you frankly that I have remained on the Senate for the last two or three years and have had no holidays, because the Senate always sits in January when a Judge has his holidays. I have only had nine days' holiday within the last two or three years, and I would not have remained on but for the fact that I thought a great injury was going to be inflicted on the University, and I did not want to run away from the fight. I never do that.

68. I do not know what it may be, but we want your advice?—I doubt honestly very much whether you could get more knowledge than you have now. You have the report of your Inspector-General of Schools and the statistics. It is for you to consider whether you can conceive as a Committee an improvement in the constitution of the University. I do not mean to say you may not alter it, but I doubt very much whether you will get better men than you have had in the past. There are always weak men in every body as there are weak men in Parliament. You have to look at what you are likely to get. I have no object to serve but to forward education, and I will do anything I can to help. If I thought it was going to do any good in the way of education I would not stand in the way. It is nothing to me.

69. My mind is absolutely open. Last year I was opposed to setting up a Commission, but supposing the Committee did come to the conclusion that it was wise to appoint a Commission I understand you to say that it would not be wise to appoint some English expert who did not know the New Zealand local conditions?—I do not think so.

70. Can you suggest to us what sort of Commission in your opinion would be most able to help us?—We had a Commission appointed in 1879, and I was a party to appointing that Commission. You will see the names there, and some of them are still alive.

71. Do you suggest something like that?—If you have a Commission like that I do not object to it. If you have a Commission you should make the Commission exhaustive and not deal with

the constitution alone. There have been different Commissions at Home. Take the Scotch University Commissions or the Cambridge or the Oxford Commissions. In the case of the Scotch Commission you will find there what class of men they appointed; they did not leave it to mere professors.

72. Then, supposing we did agree to a Commission, do you think it would be of real material value to us to get the advice of the Commission simply upon university education alone without going into the whole question from the primary point of view?—If you are going to have a Commission let it go from the top to the bottom, and have it all investigated if you think that is necessary.

73. That is what I want to have your opinion upon. Do you think it would be any use to us to have a Commission reporting on education alone?—I think they might have to deal with the relationship of secondary education to the University.

74. Can you give us some definite advice on the matter? Say you were going to appoint a Commission yourself?—I would deal with the University alone. I think that is sufficient for it to deal with at one time, but let it be a thorough Commission and an impartial Commission.

75. *Mr. Sidey.*] I should like to know, Sir Robert, whether you think that the class of men who might be suitable to act on a Commission to inquire into the University might be different from those who might be chosen to consider the whole question, including the primary question of education?—I could not say that. If a man has taken an interest in education he ought to be able to deal with the relationship of the primary and secondary and higher education.

76. Are you not more likely to find men who have made a specialty of the higher education without being familiar with the lower, and *vice versa*?—That is so. Some may have paid more attention to higher education than others. You have to get fair-minded men who would be reasonable.

77. How many men do you think should compose the Commission?—You should have a large Commission, I think.

78. How many do you suggest?—From six to nine.

79. Do you suggest that they should be men who are interested in education or only those who have an interest in certain matters?—I think perhaps it would be as well to have one or two business men on it who would look at it from that point of view as bearing on our Universities. I would not confine it to the educational expert alone.

80. Do you suggest Professor Sale as one?—I do not know whether he is eligible and whether he would act. He is a very old man, but he is a very level-headed man. I only mentioned him as an illustration. I do not think it would be proper for me to suggest names.

81. *The Chairman.*] You have replied so fully that I have only one or two questions to ask. First, in regard to the unpopularity of science in our University colleges. Does not that arise to a large extent from the fact that most of the students go to the University for the sole purpose of procuring the hall-mark and pass the degree?—Well, there is more of that than there used to be. Of course, we know that in the ancient times, going back sixty years, in Scotland the majority of those entitled to the University degree did not take it, but nowadays I agree that the hall-mark is thought of more value than the knowledge.

82. But it is a fact?—I know that; but you see the position is this: that if you get a strong teacher who can make the subject popular he will get a large class. For example, the best illustration is what took place in Professor McGregor's class. Philosophy was not a popular subject, but he made his class so popular that a large number attended it. He was a born teacher; he created enthusiasm.

83. Does our University open its doors to the non-matriculated student?—I understand so. The colleges do not object to students whether matriculated or not; they can attend the classes.

84. Do many take advantage of that?—Some go who are not matriculated.

85. But not to the same extent as before?—No. The Otago University started without any matriculation at all. That was the ancient Scottish system. I think I was the first student who entered in 1871. I went on for what is called honours in mental science.

86. And those exempted students to whom you referred do not take science subjects?—They cannot, because they have not a chance of what is called laboratory practice.

87. And I take it they are mainly teachers desirous of improving their studies?—Yes, mostly, but some are not. I had a letter from one of the teachers in a secondary school who was doing some coaching, in which it was said that they were afraid there would be far less external students than before, especially in mathematics.

88. I do not know whether you are aware of the fact that in many training colleges science is not taken to any extent?—I think that is a great pity. I think every teacher should know some science.

89. That affects the students who go up to the University later?—No doubt. I never did very much in science although I did study it, but I think the value of science is not the result so much as the method of science; that is the great thing.

90. There is one question I should like to ask which, as Chancellor, you may be able to answer. Is there any tendency on the part of the University colleges to keep the teaching in the hands of the degree men only—to make it a close corporation for degree men?—I do not think so. I think, of course, that the fact of the hall-mark always has some effect, but I think they look to the men who can do the work. That is my attitude. I do not know what it is now. I was on the Otago University Council for some years, and also I am on the Victoria College Council.

91. You will remember that Captain Hutton, a man without a degree, was appointed?—Yes.

92. Would he have a chance to-day?—As far as I am personally concerned he would, because I was a member of the Executive that appointed him first in Otago.

93. Would he have a chance to-day in the University colleges?—I think he ought to have. I cannot speak for those outside, but we know what he had done. There is no doubt he was a great geologist and great scientist.

Professor VON ZEDLITZ examined. (No. 5.)

1. *The Chairman.*] Whom do you represent?—I represent the Professorial Board of Victoria College.

2. Do you wish to make a statement to the Committee?—Yes; but before coming to the statement I wish to make, gentlemen, I would like to deal with two points raised by Sir Robert Stout, and to say that we have all heard to-day the words of a man who honestly and sincerely desires to benefit the University of New Zealand. I think we can realize that from every word he said, and also that he is pitifully unable to realize that we too are aiming at exactly the same thing, and that it is only the question of means by which that end can be attained that is at issue between us. As for the suggestion of Sir Robert Stout that if a Commission is to issue it should be one that inquires into the work of the professors in the various colleges and how they are carrying out that work, that is what we most hope from the Commission. We do not like to come forward and say that our work is sufficiently important to have an expensive Royal Commission to inquire into it. Our point is that under the existing constitution and system we cannot do the work properly, and that we want to get some system to enable us to do it properly. There must be an inquiry into the way we do it, and we would not like to bother the Committee with that until they can find out that it is not being properly done. In regard to the second point, about the small number of students taking science, Sir Robert did not put forward the main reason for that, which I am perfectly certain is the reason, and that is that the majority of the students are encouraged to aim at a degree, and to aim at a degree as apart from education proper, and that the other subjects, mainly the arts subjects in this case, have been brought to such a low level by the policy of the Senate in their standards that it is a very much easier way to get the degree without taking science, and it is just on that account that we protest against the low level of other subjects. We protest that the other subjects ought to be raised to a higher level, and if all the subjects were raised to a similar level it would be easy enough to make it possible for the students to take the science subjects without feeling they were handicapped in pursuit of a degree by them. Of course, there is another point, as Sir Robert Stout truly said—that the method of science rather than the result is the essential thing; and what we would like would be to help to apply that method in the teaching of all the subjects in the University. That is going a step further, because then our students would get what Sir Robert Stout was anxious they should get—that is, some scientific spirit. They would get that not only in the science classes but in the other classes which they attended in the University. That is the whole point we are working for—to teach the subjects in the way we like. The statement I propose to make to-day, I am afraid, contains a terrible amount of ego. I do not see that it is avoidable, and it seems to me it is really the quickest way. My statement is really directed to a question asked by Mr. McCallum. Mr. McCallum expressed a wish to get at what is “at the back of our minds” in carrying on this agitation. I believe it would save time if I try to follow out that suggestion, if the Committee will excuse the free use of the first person. I can only speak for myself, but in the belief that what I say applies to my colleagues as well. Our motives are mixed ones, as in most human beings. Putting the most creditable side first, I believe the changes we propose tend to improve the training of teachers and other professional men, and so to increase the usefulness of the University. Secondly, there are the students. From my first arrival in New Zealand I have thought highly of our students as a class, and felt that they were not receiving fair treatment. It is true they are usually ill prepared for university work, but they are intelligent and singularly willing and teachable. We have all that is indispensable in the way of staffs, buildings, equipment, and money to give them good teaching and good value on a less ambitious scale than the present unreal programme pretends to reach. So far as I know nothing but the well-meaning ignorance of the University authorities blocks the road, and in its effect on students I think this is a pity and a shame. This motive weighs heavily with me. It is generally supposed that we professors are thirsting to get control of examinations and curricula. I can assure you that I would only be too thankful to let other people do all the examining and all the work of University government if there is any other way in which students can get justice. I would give up every other demand if you devise a scheme by which students are free to study and I am free to teach, according to methods considered right in the rest of the world, and to give up my present methods, which have long been abandoned elsewhere as mistaken. If you think I am free to do so now I could probably convince you that I am not; in any case I am begging persistently for a Royal Commission to inquire into the degree of freedom we possess, and I should have reason to dread such an inquiry if I were teaching on wrong lines and could help myself. This injustice to students is why, when I hear the standards and achievements of the University of New Zealand praised, it seems cowardly to keep an ironical silence. The reform movement actually broke out because of some extravagant language about the standard of our degrees in a local newspaper editorial, and because half a dozen Victoria College professors, each of whom had thought that his own subject was specially handicapped, found on comparing notes that they were all in much the same position. This is not depreciation; it is appreciation of the qualities and possibilities of our students. And it is only fair to add that in writing and speaking to outsiders, if they are interested in our system, I can honestly assure them that, as Mr. Sidey knows, the results of the system are by no means always bad. To outsiders, who would naturally look down upon our University, I can say that quite a lot of good work is being done considering all things. The third motive we have is more of the mixed order. It is pride or vanity—professional and personal vanity. You can easily realize that, in respect to the subject I teach, I live in almost absolute intellectual isolation. In Europe and America there are many hundreds of my fellow-teachers and many thousands of people interested. There are well-stocked libraries and about eighty technical periodicals. Here I rarely speak to any one about my work. Not a soul knows or cares whether I spend my day in

working at my subject or, say, in sleep. It is a dangerous temptation to which to expose any class of human beings, and not every New Zealand professor has been proof against it. The test by external examination is miserably unable to prevent this evil—in fact, actually encourages it—and we possess none of the safeguards against slackness which other universities apply. Consequently there is nothing in New Zealand but one's own conscience to keep one straight, and no tribunal but the invisible and imaginary tribunal of the opinions of the university teachers and workers outside New Zealand. It is with them I should like to stand well. You will understand that, if I am satisfied that they would approve my course of action, I do not care in the least what any one in New Zealand thinks of me. Besides, there are my old teachers, some of them left; there are the many old friends and acquaintances in Europe who are now making their mark in or out of universities; there are the leading statesmen and thinkers of the world—I may never see any of them, and they may never hear me—still, it is in their judgment that I would like to stand well, even if it means incurring the displeasure of many influential New-Zealanders. Then one always lives in the hope of a trip Home, and there is always a possibility of having to look elsewhere for a job. In either case my best recommendation in the opinion of university authorities or valued friends outside New Zealand would be that I had done my duty by calling attention to the remediable evils of our University system. If you have the least doubt that educated opinion outside New Zealand would side with us you could easily cause wider inquiries to be made. You already have sixty-five opinions in the pamphlet; you have the unanimous report of the London Commissioners; you have our eagerness for a Commission, provided any one man whatsoever, such as the Imperial Government would recommend as suitable, be given a seat on the Commission. You may think our conduct is cocksure or arrogant—certainly Sir Robert Stout does. Really it is in a humble sense that we must follow, rightly or wrongly, in the wake of the civilized world. Our only claim on your attention is if we give you, not our own opinions, but those of the leading men in our various specialities. In all modesty and humility the best hope of the New Zealand University is if its professors follow the trend of thought in the great world outside without caring two straws for the criticism of local bigwigs. You have the motives, so far as I know them, that cause this agitation. The last—the selfish one—is completely satisfied. We felt that if we kept silence we should disgrace ourselves in the opinion of the men whose opinion we value most, and we have avoided that stigma. We have nothing left to gain by the success of this agitation and much to lose. There is the danger of half-hearted reforms worse than the present. If we succeed completely we shall have a lot more work, worry, and responsibility, instead of the easy job of irresponsible criticism. Do not suppose that I underestimate the real difficulties of the problem to be solved, or the objections raised, among others by Mr. Sidey—"local conditions," and the "unripeness" of the University for the proposed changes. After years of reflection I feel unable to settle to my own satisfaction several of the points of detail involved in reconstructing our University, and I always bear in mind that I may be mistaken as to all and any of the issues. It may be perfectly true that our wisest plan is to leave things as they are. But surely not without such preliminary investigation as a Royal Commission of the type suggested would give: some one who understands what is essential to a university, and how the essentials can be guaranteed, coupled with New-Zealanders who understand local opinions and conditions. The "unripeness" of the University, I take it, means the unfitness for greater responsibilities of some at least of the teachers. That is, in my opinion, perfectly true. For that very reason we propose that, both as regards the examinations and the syllabus, the teachers should be compelled to act together, and ultimately under the control of the whole body of teachers, subject to the Senate in the last resort. But it seems to us a very strange suggestion that, because the existence of a bad system has in some cases led to the appointment of inferior men, and in others to the degeneration of good ones, therefore the system must be continued for all time. You will find that there are few or no subjects in which all the teachers in the four centres are bad. We want the better ones to have a fair chance of making their influence felt. And the more true it is that teachers are unfit the more need, it seems to me, of authorizing a searching inquiry. If there are unsatisfactory men in positions of trust the sane, honest course is to throw as much light upon their doings as possible, when you get such a splendid chance as three-fourths of them petitioning for that very thing. Lastly, there is the question of the unsatisfactoriness of Royal Commissions. Alas, I know it only too well! The acute agitation about London University has lasted nearly thirty years, and there have been in that time four Royal Commissions, sitting altogether over ten years. If you give us a Commission it is probable that its recommendations may be neglected or distorted. But the experience of London also shows sufficiently that no other way is possible. The final report of the last Commission traces the whole history of the agitation, and lays down with convincing lucidity the cause of the failure of London University, the agitation for reform, and the failure of successive Commissions. Hitherto it has always been attempted to establish a compromise between two totally irreconcilable ideals. I am going to resist absolutely the temptation to read you a lot of passages which favour our contentions, in order to stick to one point. The Commissioners set forth the two ideals: the ideal of an examining university "which believes that examinations based upon a syllabus afford 'a guidance of test' which is an adequate means of ascertaining that a candidate has attained a standard of knowledge entitling him to a university degree," and the ideal of a teaching university which "believes that training in a university under university teachers is an essential and by far the most important factor in a university education." The Commissioners do full justice to both these ideals. They state forcibly the arguments suggested at this table by Mr. McCallum and Mr. Sidey. They state—Mr. Sidey will get good quotations from them—that inferior teachers and inferior institutions may prefer and even benefit by the examining-university ideal. They finally recommend that all the features we share with London University—the evening work, the exempted candidate, the external

examination even—be retained. But while doing the fullest justice to this ideal they lay down in the most uncompromising way that it is totally incompatible with the teaching ideal, and that all attempts at combining the two or compromising between them have been and necessarily must be fatal. For London they recommend creating two totally independent organizations. That is a recommendation which, as you will see at once, would be an absurdity in this country. But we are compromising now, and if we do not move by means of a Royal Commission, which will start on the findings of the London Commission as a basis, what else but further compromising is possible? As practical men and politicians how would you, or Parliament, or the Senate settle this question except upon the basis of a compromise between the conflicting parties? But compromise here is as absolutely fatal as it would be—I speak with infinite deference in the presence of Mr. Allen—in defence. Here also you have two totally incompatible ideals, each of which may be supported by powerful arguments, and each of which will always have adherents. You may believe in efficient armies and navies, or you may believe in conciliation, concession, and arbitration. The one fatal thing would be to spend money on an army and navy and entrust the management of them to a body of men who do not believe in the need of them. That is just the sort of compromise under which we are suffering now in the University of New Zealand, as they are in London. The Commissioners, after laying down what they hold to be the essentials of a university, say, “If the university is so organized as to provide the conditions necessary for its proper working in accordance with the principles we have described, the teachers of the university ought under proper safeguards to have control of the education and examination of their students, and the university ought to be so constituted as to give it them. It will be explained how this should be done in the next part of our report. The Professorial Board of University College say in the memorandum presented to us ‘that to secure freedom of the university teacher to teach as he thinks best, and not by a hard-and-fast syllabus, should be in the forefront of the problems to be solved by the present Commission. If freedom can be obtained for the teacher freedom for the learner will follow,’ and we think the Professorial Board are right.” Further on they say, “So strongly indeed do we hold the view that the method of working we have described, and the conditions upon which alone such work can be done, are essential to the existence of a real university in London, and such a university is a national and Imperial as well as a merely local need, that it would be better not to interfere at all with the existing constitution than to attempt anything less fundamental.” The lesson there is that it would probably be better to leave things alone as they are than to attempt a sort of half-hearted reform in order to combine the two totally incompatible ideas. There is no suggestion on my part that Sir Robert Stout or the Senate or their supporters are wrong in their views, and it does not follow from that in the least that our views as university reformers are wrong.

3. *Mr. Malcolm.*] You are not particularly set on a Royal Commission, I take it, professor? —No, I cannot say that the word “Royal” means anything to me.

4. What is in my mind is this: that on this Education Committee you have the executive of the Education Department of the Dominion—that is, the Minister of Education—and you have members of Parliament. In your opinion, would an inquiry by this Committee be of as much value as an inquiry before a Commission?—Well, if I may say so, it is a very difficult thing to word; but let me remind you of Lord Kitchener. Here is a man of outstanding eminence which you will all admit transcends the capacity of other military men. Out here we have the same sort of feeling with regard to education, that there is great value in getting a big man, and I hope it is not impertinent to the Committee to suggest that there is no one like that on the Committee. A big man of European reputation and standing is an asset in such an inquiry.

5. How long do you consider it would be necessary for the Commission to sit?—I should think, certainly not more than six months. I should think it might be less.

6. And that means continually sitting?—Very nearly so. I am putting an extreme limit. I should think four months would be nearer the mark, with a month in each centre with twelve or fourteen working-days would amply suffice.

7. Would it not be better to submit your case to such a Committee as this, with all its deficiencies, and succeed in convincing it and get some executive action, rather than to submit it to a Commission with no executive authority, and when the finding, as with most Commissions, would probably be ignored?—Well, that is a most beautifully searching question, Mr. Malcolm. What we feel is, as you could easily see from the whole tone of Sir Robert Stout’s evidence, that with the community as a whole we professorial and educational people do not carry very great weight, and we are afraid that our opinions would not bear down the sort of opposition. You see, in the case of the London Commission, that the moment the Commission was out and before it was out all sorts of bodies, graduates, County Councils, and every description of people who had interests vested and otherwise in the present system began their protests; but with the great authority of the composition of that Commission, with the names of Lord Haldane and Lord Milner, people realized that that opposition did not amount to anything, and all the protests will not be sufficient to make any difference to the result in this case. That is our feeling, and we feel we are such small people, and that, having got big men on our side, if we could only get one of them to speak for us it would help us materially.

8. But after all said and done it is the plain man you have to consider—that is, the taxpayer—and the members of the Committee represent those people. They are plain men themselves just because they have no particular standing in education. We are perhaps less prejudiced, and do you not think on these grounds, and also on the ground of expense, which does not concern you, that an inquiry before such a Committee as this might be just as satisfactory?—Well, I am representing the Professorial Board of Victoria College, and the only answer I can give to that is that as far as I know the Professorial Board of Victoria College would prefer the Royal Commission if possible of the two. If I may expand that a little, what we would really like is a body

which will go into the colleges and take each subject and see how the teaching is being carried on, and how it compares with the recognized standard; also to look into the standard obtained by the students and see whether the work done is reasonably good; also to see what the work indicates and the degree indicates, and see whether the work done in the individual cases justifies the expenditure of the public money. I have not the slightest doubt that this Committee would judge as sensibly as any other, and all the time what we have been thinking of is an appeal to the simple practical man who had no educational fads. We want him to compare the sort of evidence we can give and the sort of evidence Sir Robert Stout can give, and judge between the two; but when it comes to the question of the reorganization of the University the difficulties are great. I am talking after having thought out the details of it for years.

9. You spoke of the standing of Lord Milner and Lord Haldane. Would you tell us what their standing is in university matters, especially Lord Milner's?—He has been a member of the London University Commission, and he is a man whose name is big before the public.

10. As an educationist?—No, as a statesman.

11. Then why suggest him as a big man on this question whose opinion is worth getting?—Well, I think that if you took any leading statesman in England you would get much the same sort of opinion. It is simply because he happens to be such a man as gives weight before the general unthinking public, and before thinking people for that matter.

12. And possibly without having any sufficiently good reason for that opinion?—Quite possibly.

13. Lloyd George is also a man who stands prominently before the public?—Yes.

14. Would he be a man whom you would suggest?—As far as I am concerned I would just as willingly take him, only the unfortunate thing is that Lloyd George would not be so acceptable to the whole of the public because he is Lloyd George.

15. Do you think Lord Milner would carry more weight because he is *persona grata* with the people?—Well, not on university matters.

16. As far as your knowledge goes is any university well governed in any part of the Empire?—Comparatively, Yes; absolutely, No.

17. Where?—I should say that the constitution and methods of the newer English universities have been very much more successful than was anticipated.

18. Such as Manchester?—Yes, Manchester, Birmingham, and Leeds—that is to say, they have done what we, unfortunately, with our hands tied like this, have not a chance of trying to do: they have attracted large donations and subscriptions.

19. Do you consider the conduct of those universities has been very satisfactory?—Well, of course, there are exceptions, and things have gone very wrong with the University of Bristol recently. You cannot speak absolutely about that, but relatively the British people have every right to be proud of the university development in the last generation.

20. They have a short history to draw on?—Yes.

21. You would not refer us to any older universities?—I am Oxford myself, and I try to get rid of the Oxford predisposition when dealing with a New Zealand question. I think the fact that there is such a thing as a predisposition in favour of a residential university, and the opinion that a university can do no good unless it is residential, can do us a lot of harm. I have no such prejudices myself.

22. When referring to our own University work I think you used the phrase "might be better." Can you tell us how you think it might be better?—I did say that with the same money they might be doing more useful work.

23. In what way?—Do you mean me personally?

24. No, the University?—It simply amounts to this: if each professor in the different subjects was free to teach in the manner that he considered most desirable, and, in the second place, if we restricted ourselves somewhat—I will try and give you a practical illustration of the sort of thing I mean. In the present system there are a large number of subjects which the student can choose absolutely at his own discretion as to which he will take. Six of them taken together makes up a degree. Well, a small and poor institution cannot possibly run a degree on those lines; they must limit themselves to teaching a certain number of combinations or else the teachers cannot work together. The different teachers have different interests, and instead of supporting each other and playing into each other's hands, as if the students were limited in the arts course to certain sets of combinations—instead of being able, as at present, to take any combination they please, now each professor is alone and there is no co-operation possible, and it is a waste of the efforts of the teachers and of the resources of the institution. That is a practical instance.

25. I may say that I am with you in desiring greater independence of the professors in examination, but you speak of safeguards against slackness. What do you suggest in that direction?—Well, the most important safeguards—in fact, the only ones—are the pressure and opinion of colleagues, and, for that matter, of students; but in the case of fifteen or twenty university men all being together in the same place the most important safeguard with regard to each individual is the criticism of his fellows. If, as in New Zealand, there is no combination of the teachers in a consulting and examining professorial body, but each one is independent, then that safeguard is gone.

26. I understand in this Examination Board, of which you suggest the professor of the class is a member, he would feel much ashamed if his students as a body exhibited gross ignorance of the subject?—Yes, and not only that. Wherever you find three or four men together, and where one understands his job and the others do not and there are weaknesses in their ability, the weak ones are not prepared to make a fuss and appeal to another authority, but will give in and submit.

27. What are the terms of appointment in Victoria College?—They are limited to five years, but I think the majority of the professors are holding without any reappointment—just sitting

tight. They have exceeded their period, and nobody has said or done anything, so that it would be very difficult to say what the conditions are.

28. I would like to know whether you could suggest anything that would popularize lectures?—Well, that is a thing I feel very strongly on. Here you will probably think I am vainer than you thought before, but I think I am a man who is capable of giving lectures which would be of considerable interest to quite a body of people not at all concerned with university study, or in a less degree—that is, lectures on literary and linguistic subjects—and one of the things I am fighting for by hook or by crook is to get the chance of seeing what I can do; but my time is taken up with the large number of classes of students whom I am supposed to prepare for examinations. With this idea of the professor being tied to the curriculum of examinations the University provides me with fourteen distinct examinations, and therefore fourteen possible classes. Fortunately they have not all turned up in any given year, but ten or twelve did. Two or three years ago I was lecturing for five hours successively. I had five classes straight on end, and they ran from 3 o'clock till 8 o'clock, and therefore you can see there is no room for lectures not bearing on the curriculum and degree. I think you would popularize the thing as soon as you get free from the examining ideal in the genuine sense of the word.

29. You have no particular suggestions to make in regard to popularizing lectures?—Very briefly I suggested at the professorial conference that they should recognize half-courses, but it was thrown out by the Senate. Until we get the whole degree revised they might recognize half-courses as counting towards the degree. Everything that has to be laid before the Senate in New Zealand must be expressed in terms of syllabus and degree requirements.

30. *Mr. Sidey.*] You have expressed the opinion that you are not free to teach on the lines you think are right?—Yes.

31. Why are you not free to teach on the lines you think are right?—I will mention one thing that ought to be clear. The University of New Zealand in its examinations requires from the students in modern languages practically this: translation from French into English, translation from English into French, translation of certain prescribed books from French into English; and the professional idea of teachers of modern languages is that you want to get rid of the translation notion in teaching, and you want to destroy that. You want to build up altogether a knowledge of every language in the same way, and the only way is the way the mother language is built up. You do not want to be constantly dealing with turning one into the other and *vice versa*. I have a lot of students, and it takes me all my time bringing them up to the required standard of turning English into Latin, and what else can I do? It is in the syllabus. It seems to me I am downed by the syllabus, and it takes me all the time to do the wrong thing.

32. Supposing local examiners are appointed, in what respect do you anticipate the syllabus would be altered—would the examinations be largely oral?—Yes.

33. Is philology in your teaching?—Yes.

34. And what other teachers?—The professors of English.

35. And in the other Universities in New Zealand?—There is Professor Blunt in Christchurch, Professor Walker of Auckland, and Mr. Thompson and Mr. Campbell in Dunedin.

36. Those gentlemen would be associated with you as examiners?—Yes.

37. In regard to the Royal Commission, I understand your idea is that you will get a step further forward if you get a Royal Commission?—Yes.

38. You think that with the weight of their finding you will persuade the Government?—Yes.

39. You say that you will be content with only one man from outside?—Absolutely.

40. And you say it is not essential that that man should be an educationist?—No. I think what you want in that one man is a thorough grasp of how a university should train. He must be a man who is connected with a university. The only name we ever suggested of a man who had not been a university teacher in Great Britain was Lord Reay, and he sat on several Commissions.

41. As regards the number on the Commission, you heard Sir Robert Stout's suggestion that there should be at least nine members?—Yes. I think with that number there would be less likelihood of anything being done, and more likelihood of a compromise.

42. You think nine members would be too many?—I think Sir Robert suggested a large number as being likely to leave things as they are.

43. You suggested that there should be three?—Yes, that is what I think.

44. Do you favour Sir Robert Stout's suggestion that there should be a business man on the Commission?—Yes. We thought one man should be an educationist. I did not think of Professor Shand or Professor Sale.

45. Do you not think that if you appointed one educationist on the Commission the finding is almost certain to be in the direction of his views?—It is rather his views you want on the theoretical side. You have got the principle which the Home man can give you better than any one else out here, and you have the application of it, which are two distinct things. The same thing happened in London. The Commissioners laid down certain principles, but when it came to the question of application they were very moderate.

46. Do you not think it would be better to have some one associated with him who would appreciate the question from an educational standpoint?—Possibly, but I confess that I think it would be a mistake to have an *omnium gatherum* of representatives of primary-school teachers and other classes.

47. You would not object to having experts on the Commission?—No, certainly not.

FRIDAY, 15TH AUGUST, 1913.

Professor VON ZEDLITZ further examined. (No. 6.)

1. *Hon. Mr. Allen.*] I understand, Professor Von Zedlitz, that you are coming to the Committee now with this additional argument in favour of a Royal Commission that the Senate itself has given evidence that it does not want to reform itself?—It seems so to me, sir.

2. Then, may I ask what you think of the apparent endeavour of the Senate to reform itself by its own resolution—the ABC proposal: do you think they are in earnest about that?—Well, I should call it evidence that they realize something will have to be done, and that they would rather it was done by themselves if possible than by any outside interference. The situation was similar in London after the Commission which sat between 1891 and 1894, when the University authorities agreed to effect a compromise with the reformers provided they themselves could have the carrying-out of the arrangements.

3. Then, do you think the Senate is competent to reform itself?—No.

4. Why?—Well, for this reason: that the majority have denied the principal planks in the reform platform persistently; and if I may I will read a paragraph from the *Westminster Gazette* bearing upon the report of the London University Commission. It states, "The two most important questions before the Commission were the dual character of the University and the heterogeneity of its constitution. The former has excited great and, we fear, bitter differences of opinion within the University itself, and the Commission have very rightly laid stress on the fundamental incompatibility of educational ideals between the 'external' party, who regard it as the chief and almost the only function of the University to examine students, and the 'internal' party, who contend that the primary duty of a university is to educate them. In adopting the latter view the Commission have, in our opinion, taken the only view possible, and no one acquainted with the progress of education, either in theory or in practice, whether at home or abroad, can doubt for a moment that they will have the whole weight of modern tendency behind them. We have suffered from the curse of examinations in this country to a degree for which no comparison can be found outside the sheepfolds of China."

5. How do you apply that?—I apply that to the Senate, who deny that the majority of whom hold with the Chancellor of the University that the main and ultimate aim in the course of a student's training is what the Chancellor called the power of applying knowledge—that is to say, the examination test. You remember the evidence he gave and the exact language he used. I cannot quote the words exactly, but they were to that effect. The majority of the Senate which holds those views is not a fit and proper body to reform the University. They have given the fullest evidence that it would be foolish to trust them in that respect.

6. Then you suggest that some other body should be brought in to advise as to the reform of University work in New Zealand—some other body than the Senate itself—a Commission, for instance?—Yes.

7. Whom are they to advise?—Parliament and the Ministry—yourself.

8. That would mean ultimately legislation to reform the Senate whether the Senate is willing or not?—I think so.

9. And reform the University work on the report of the Commission?—I think so.

10. Now, as to the constitution of the suggested Commission, I think you have all been arguing in favour of an external member of the Commission—some one from outside?—Yes.

11. Where do you propose to get him from?—Well, we greatly hoped that you, sir, when recently in England would have had time to make some inquiries as to the possibility of getting such a man.

12. Do you suggest he should be got from England?—I think that would be the wisest course, because of the close connection between this Dominion and the English institutions.

13. Can you tell the Committee what the position is in England, Germany, and America, for instance, with regard to university education—are the ideals of those places the same?—No, not exactly.

14. Can you briefly give us the difference in the ideals between the three?—The German universities are weak in neglecting the teaching of the junior students. They lay essential stress upon the advanced work, and largely leave the ordinary undergraduate to get along as best he can. The English universities attempt to combine both ideals. I think one could say that they attempt to combine the ideal of advanced work and research with the teaching of the student who has just left school. Probably the weakness of the English universities is due to the chaotic state of secondary education more than to anything else, and to the desire of attempting to do more work than the money provided really renders advisable in many cases; and the feature in the American universities which finds least favour with the British world is the presidential system, I think.

15. Which of the systems do you think most nearly approximates the conditions in New Zealand?—I do not think we can possibly escape from the English system on the whole. We can deviate from it in important details, but we have to reckon upon drawing our staffs largely from there, and there are reasons why we cannot draw the majority of our outsiders from America and the Continent of Europe. It is extremely unlikely we could, and we are bound consequently to the ideals that are on the whole prevalent in the Mother-country.

16. And do you look to our permanently drawing our staffs from the Mother-country, or is the time approaching when we can have some hope of drawing our staffs from our own country?—The absolutely desirable thing is when we get a man like Professor Maclaurin, who is a New-Zealander, understands New Zealand, has been educated here and also at Home; but the time is beyond the lifetime of any person present here, at any rate, when a man solely educated in the University of New Zealand in any subject will be fit for a professorship in the University.

17. I am not asking the question as to a man solely educated in New Zealand: my question refers to the New-Zealander partly educated in New Zealand, or either wholly or partly in England or elsewhere. Can we hope to draw from such resources the supply of professors in the comparatively near future?—Certainly. I think there is great hope from the fact that there are even now about a dozen graduates of our University who are employed in teaching-posts in universities elsewhere.

18. And who might be brought back here?—Yes. At the same time you must understand that anything short of absolutely free competition would be a mistake in making the appointments.

19. I am not suggesting there should not be free competition. It comes to this: that there are different ideals in the three great countries, America, England, and Germany, as compared with our ideals. I think you have admitted that our ideals are not quite in line with even the British. Are we not compelled from our necessities to carry on our University education on somewhat different lines from those of other countries because of the circumstances?—Frankly, I think we are compelled to have university teaching in the four centres. I cannot see any escape from that, which imposes upon us the necessity of a Federal University, and a Federal University is never quite as satisfactory as one with the ordinary constitution—that is to say, it is a *pis aller*. After a very considerable lapse of years our Federal University might divide into four distinct ones, but that is in the very distant future. It would depend upon a very large increase of population indeed before that was possible; but apart from the necessity of a federal constitution I see absolutely no reason whatever why the conception of training young men and women to the scientific spirit, and attempting to give them that kind of knowledge which is power—because it trains the judgment and the power of reasoning—should not be the aim of our Federal University as it is of every normal university. That is to say, we should trample under foot the old hydra of trusting almost entirely to the magic of examinations.

20. You have in your mind, so far as I can gather, rather the question of examinations and the constitution of our University under its existing circumstances. What I want to know is, can we not amongst ourselves, with the knowledge we have here and which we can get outside, settle this question of examinations—can we be helped in the solution of this question by outside opinion?—Well, for what my experience of life is worth, I dread short cuts. I think the attempt to solve this whole difficult question quickly without recourse to the usual method, which in all universities has been the method of inquiry by a Royal Commission or by a parliamentary Committee with the assistance of outside experts, as in the case of the University of Wales, is a short cut which will probably plunge us into worse troubles, or as bad troubles as we are in.

21. Might not the Commission direct us on the road of the short cut and the very short cut? I mean, is it not possible that the Commission, especially if we got an outsider, may say, "We recommend you to at once do away with external examinations" and wipe the whole thing out, and go in at once for such kind of examinations as you have yourselves suggested? That would be a very short cut, would it not? Would that be better than the evolutionary progress of gradually getting that?—I almost think we are at cross purposes. I may not have been following the exact meaning of your questions. I thought you were referring to the method of inquiry.

22. I am referring now to the question of examinations. I want presently to get to the question of the constitution of the Universities?—The two are inextricably bound up. Had the professors as a whole been recognized as a consultative body they would have long since brought pressure to bear on the Senate in the matter of examinations, and there would have been a continuous pressure year after year until at last the Senate had to give in. Given a constitution which affords the professorial body a *locus standi* even without any great authority, and even without a fixed position in the constitution, as long as they have got that regular conference that you yourself advocate they will exercise pressure in the course of time, and the question of how examinations are run, which ultimately is a minor question although it has been put very much in the forefront, will solve itself. We should greatly grieve if Parliament or any outside body of men bound the University for ever to a particular scheme of conducting these examinations. The University should be free. The first requirement of a university is freedom—free to fix its own fate.

23. Well, I am not quite sure what your attitude is. Do you place more importance upon amending the constitution of the University than upon this other question of examinations?—Unquestionably that is the essential.

24. I want to know whether you think an outsider can advise us, seeing how different our circumstances are—whether an outsider can advise us satisfactorily upon the constitution of the University here, taking into consideration all our circumstances? He does not live here, does not know us, and does not know what the ideals are. Can he be much help to us?—Well, it has been thought so by the Imperial Government in regard to the inquiry into the University of Wales.

25. You can hardly call the University of Wales a university in which local British men are not acquainted with the circumstances?—You know Cambridge yourself, and the head of Downing College would have as much knowledge or as little knowledge of and sympathy with the position of the Welsh student in Aberystwith College as he would of the New Zealand student. You know how entirely alien the thoughts and training of a master of a Cambridge college would be. You could not have a clearer example of whether it would be valuable to bring in a man entirely from outside.

26. I want your reason for suggesting to us that an outsider should be on the Commission—our circumstances do differ very materially from the British?—Yes, but what it does not differ in is the essentials of a useful university. If you have an outsider when two or three proposals are being considered for the constitution of the University he can speak with authority on those two proposals, and say whether either of them is capable of providing a nucleus for a genuine university education. Now, I think the whole history of the University of New Zealand shows

that it would be very dangerous to trust to any one here without that clear grasp of what is and what is not important, or what is and what is not essential, in making a university successful, without which the deliberations of a Commission or Committee of inquiry would be useless. Frankly that is it. I do not think we have the material for having that knowledge, or, at least, for having that knowledge with the same clearness and power of exposition. You yourself, sir, might perfectly well understand—I do not know whether you do or do not—what are the methods by which certain ends are attempted to be attained in universities, but you would not have the power of illustration and experience of the working of other universities to draw upon, and consequently you would not have the power of putting before other members of an inquiring body with the same lucidity and force the whole situation as would a man whose experience of life had specially fitted him and trained him for that.

27. *The Chairman.*] You said previously, professor, that your students came to you ill-prepared?—Yes.

28. In what respect?—Well, because on the whole the secondary-school teachers in New Zealand are not well equipped for teaching modern languages, and that the University, as far as I know, does not equip the graduates who have taken modern languages to be good teachers. I myself have had in my classes now well over a hundred persons who are now engaged in teaching, and I have not trained them to know how to teach properly. One of the most urgent needs, in my opinion, for me is to be allowed to give instruction to intending teachers in the methods of teaching modern languages.

29. Your remarks, then, only applied to the teaching of modern languages—you are speaking of your own students?—When I say they come ill-prepared I am speaking of my own students in my own subject.

30. And what would you suggest as a remedy for that?—In modern languages—in French mainly—there is no remedy except the very slow one of gradually training adequate teachers in the University. There is no other remedy that I know of.

31. Then is the defect in the University or in the secondary school?—The University has been in existence for forty years or so. If during that time it had turned out any considerable number of well-equipped teachers the difficulty would, at any rate, not be so great now as it is.

32. Then you think the University is at fault in that respect in the past?—Yes, unquestionably. It is my reproach against the University that, whereas it should have aimed among other things at the thorough equipment for their task of a body of men who were going to be teachers, it has mainly concerned itself with testing them by examination. That is the point.

33. You further stated that your students were not free to study: what am I to understand from that?—I think I will make clear to you what is in my mind best by giving you my own experiences when I came here. When I arrived in New Zealand I found that the degrees of the University were at that time being bestowed on students without any sort of evidence that they had any knowledge of French as a living language, and any power to speak it or understand it as spoken. I found that whereas a University lecturer in modern languages is supposed to lecture in the language he is teaching that it would appear an absolute farce, because very few if any of the members of the class would have understood it.

34. *Mr. McCallum.*] Does that apply to all colleges?—I am speaking of my own experience here.

35. But with your knowledge of other colleges?—As far as I know it is the same—that is to say, on this point I believe Professor Blunt sympathizes with me altogether. The first necessity seemed to me to be to organize the classes quite apart from the degree work in which I would train those students, and they were very eager and willing to be trained in the speaking and reading and oral use of the language. I did so, and the immediate result was this. One of my senior colleagues came to me and said, "You must not do that sort of thing, because that interferes with the whole idea and system of our University. Understand, you are a stranger here. These students are mostly engaged in teaching or in office-work throughout the day—the majority of them. They reach the College, which was then in the old Girls' School, at 5 o'clock, and they usually have two and sometimes three lectures to attend. That shows you how much time is left for private study or recreation, and a teacher needs this. He has hard work to do which is a stress on the nerves. Each subject is therefore on a low level, because that is all the time the students on the average can give, and all the energy they can give is that spare time. Each of us would like to improve the teaching in our own subject, but we must limit the hours to the absolute minimum in the training of our students, because with each student taking a number of subjects each professor would equally like to raise the standard. We would each of us like to do it, and if we all did it what would become of the student and his time! The already overburdened student would be further overburdened. Therefore the professor must limit himself to what is requisite for getting the students up to the degree standard." Now, I say that not as referring specially to my own subject, but to give this Committee the clearest possible illustration of the sort of result which is worked by the University of New Zealand.

36. Is it not common to all teachers of special subjects even in the secondary schools—they all want more time for their work and more effort from their students than they can get?—Yes, but they pull together.

37. The same limitation, though?—Yes, but in a school the headmaster organizes the whole thing, and it enables the effort to be directed. In a university, where there is as one legislating and examining body a joint union of all the professors, that body acts—perhaps less well than the headmaster—but does act as an organizing force for the concentration of efforts, so that the teachers as little as possible pull against one another. Our difficulty is that where there is no joint body of professors in that way inevitably the individual professor tends to pull separately—that is to say, that the Dominion pays about £30,000 a year for the salaries of about forty

professors, and instead of them being a concentrated and united force pulling together in the interests of higher education in the Dominion they are encouraged to pull each his own way.

38. Do the professors of modern languages in the Home universities lecture in their own language to their students?—So far as I know; not always.

39. But usually?—Yes. I do not personally know, and it would take too long to give you the reasons why I am not sure, but I would refer you to the report of the Melbourne University Commission which investigated the actual work of the classes and how it was conducted, and laid down what they found to be the general practice. They found it to be the rule as far as possible except with the absolutely junior classes—that is, in all the senior classes. But that is not in a way the central point. The central point is that in the English universities they now have not only for modern languages but for many subjects what is called the “seminarial” system—that is to say, the students of the subject are brought together at certain times for practical instruction by the teacher in the manner of doing the work, and not merely instructed by lectures. I take it that seminarial work would be the greatest improvement that could actually be made by me in this place.

40. Such, for example, as teaching the language through the gramophone?—No, that was not directly in my mind. Some good can be done by that, but it is not very much. It is one point, but the main point is that you get the students together in a room stacked with the most important books of reference that they require, and you direct them in the way to read critically—that is to say, for, say, two mornings in a week private work which the student is usually supposed to do at home is carried out under the immediate direction of the teacher. That is what it comes to.

41. You complained that the research men here were so isolated in their studies, but would any reform of the University give you less isolation than you suffer from at present?—In the matter of research of advanced studies?

42. I know perfectly well what isolation and research mean. I have done my work, such as it is, without the co-operation of any one here—I have had to do it by correspondence with others at Home?—But I have in my mind various ways in which to some extent this difficulty can be met in a quite indirect way. I mean, for instance, that in certain subjects, such as some of the law subjects, jurisprudence, economics, and history, we should probably gain by attempting to draw young men for really temporary appointments—that is to say, men who are only going to pass through this country as University teachers. I do not say it need be done in all subjects in all the centres, but if the governing body could determine the possibility of getting in certain subjects young men to whom the problems and conditions of New Zealand would afford opportunities of work in that subject for a time we could in some subjects improve the situation.

43. Is it not the case that young men of promise, say, in the Old Country are afraid to come to a place like New Zealand in case they get into a *cul de sac* and get out of the reach of work at Home?—That would be perfectly true in certain subjects, and that is why I specially limit that suggestion; but a subject in which that would not be the case, for instance, would be the subject of economics. Every year Oxford and Cambridge alone turn out a certain number of brilliant young men who look to their future ultimately more to political distinction than anything else. There are men who often take a university fellowship and reside in the university and teach for a time, and I think the most reasonable attempt would be to make arrangements with the universities which would make it possible now and again to secure the services of such men. It is a case of keeping one's eyes open and looking out. A governing body would have to be alive to possibilities all the time—alive in a way that they could only be if they would take the Professorial Boards to some extent into their confidence in such a matter. But I am perfectly certain that even from an Imperial conception it would have some weight with some men of real promise if they were coming out here for a known limited period of, say, three or five years.

44. *Mr. Hanan.*] I understand that Professor Saddler is coming out here to Australia?—I was not myself aware of it. I believe I did hear something of it, now I come to think of it.

45. And I understand the Victorian State Department intends to ask him to furnish a report on their schools?—I did not know that.

46. Now, would he be a satisfactory man to you?—I think he was one of the seven or eight names suggested as typical of satisfactory men that we submitted two years ago.

47. It has occurred to you that he would be a suitable man on any Commission?—Of my knowledge of his reputation, certainly.

48. I understand he is to arrive next month in Australia, and should the Government be inclined to do anything in the direction you suggest perhaps they could communicate with him and see whether he is coming to New Zealand, and whether he would undertake this work you desire?—He is a man who in my opinion has very high qualifications.

49. And no exception could be taken to him; his knowledge is not simply confined to one sphere, because he has really been a student of all branches—an educationist from top to bottom?—Yes.

Professor LABY examined. (No. 7.)

1. *The Chairman.*] You are also here to represent Victoria College?—Yes. Personally I find it a very disagreeable task to have to criticize the Inspector-General of Schools' report. I agree with Professor Picken in thinking he was given an impossible one. While the Professorial Board has had a large number of meetings, and a sub-committee has also had a number of meetings, and our criticism is based upon the discussion that arose in that way, the Inspector-

General of Schools has had to arrive at important and detailed conclusions without having the assistance of discussing it with others acquainted with the problem. But, still, it is necessary to give evidence on the subject. There are certain principles underlying this report, or, at any rate, those principles are not departed from. The first of these is that a view has been taken as to whether it is more necessary to increase the standard of the work done in the colleges as opposed to increasing the number of subjects taught in the colleges, and with some important exceptions the report appears to accept the principle that it is more important to increase the number of subjects taught than to increase the standard of the work.

2. *Hon. Mr. Allen.*] Where is that shown in the report?—I propose to support that at once. The important exceptions are that in Dunedin the Medical School will be able to do much better work, and in Auckland there would be a distinct improvement in teaching physics, and mental science at Auckland and Canterbury, and classics at Dunedin; but at the same time the report proposes that commerce and law should be taught at all four colleges. At the present they are taught at the four colleges, but in the teaching of law Victoria College is the recognized school, and the Government gives it a special grant, which presumably implies that it is doing work of a higher character; but the effect of introducing the teaching of commerce and law into all four centres, if it is to be put on the same standard as the teaching of arts and science, will mean in the long-run that the demands on the finances of those four colleges will be such that an improvement in the standard of teaching in the other colleges will be impossible.

3. But that is not suggested, is it?—You will see it on page 10 of the report. “Proposed Staff.” The underlying principle of the report is that the teaching of arts, science, law, and commerce shall be on exactly the same basis in all the four colleges.

4. Oh, no?—That, I think, is certainly correct.

5. No, you have two professors in Victoria College and only two lecturers in Auckland, Canterbury, and Otago?—The only differentiation is between Victoria College and the other colleges. Three of the colleges are to be exactly alike, and, what is more, the special grant to Victoria College for teaching law is removed, and I shall give evidence that it is impossible to carry out the staffing on page 10 in Victoria College with the financial assistance proposed. It will leave us with a deficit of £4,000 a year. I think that is a point that members of the Committee might keep in mind. No proposals are made which would enable the staffing on page 10 to be carried out. The second principle which appears to underlie the report is that the population of the University district, the existing provision of revenue in the form of endowments, the number of students attending the College, and the standard of its teaching are not considered in the report as in any way affecting the granting of new revenue. These factors are ignored in the proposed provision for arts, science, law, and commerce. As showing that I would point out that the staff suggested for the four colleges to teach arts, science, law, and commerce is practically identical—in Otago there are to be twenty-six, Canterbury twenty-six, and Victoria College and Auckland twenty-seven.

6. That is the minimum suggested?—Yes. But the revenue provided to Victoria College is not sufficient to pay that minimum. While the staffs suggested are practically identical, the populations of the university districts are as follows: Auckland University District, 265,000; Victoria College (Middle University), 379,000; Canterbury, 173,000; and Otago, 191,000. The proposed expenditure on the colleges is: Auckland, £13,800; Victoria College, £13,800; Canterbury College, £17,450; and Otago University District, £22,950. The number of people in those districts per £1 of proposed expenditure is: Auckland District, 19; Victoria College District, 27; Canterbury, 10; and Otago, 8. In other words, there are three times as many people per £1 of expenses in the Victoria College District as in the Otago University District. The North Island districts contain 64 per cent. of the population of New Zealand, and South Island districts 36 per cent. The proposed national expenditure on university education would be 40 per cent. in the North Island and 60 per cent. in the South Island districts.

7. But you have your special schools?—There are to be no special schools in the North Island.

8. It is a Dominion school?—The number of people per £1 of expenditure in the North Island districts would be 23, and in the South Island districts 9. As showing the provision that is made in primary and secondary education in these same University districts, I can point out that of the number of school-children provided for 39 per cent. are in the Wellington District; Auckland, 21 per cent.; Canterbury, 18 per cent.; and Otago, 22 per cent. Of the district high schools, 17 per cent. of the pupils are in the Auckland District; Wellington District, 50 per cent.; Canterbury District, 15 per cent.; and Otago District, 18 per cent. The next point is that the existing endowments have not been taken into account in the proposed allocation of revenue. The provincial endowments in the Auckland University District are £460; Victoria College, £70; Canterbury, £9,300 per year; and Otago, £7,100 (in later parts of this statement put as £6,200). The proposed alterations in the statutory grants are as follows (I am leaving out of account the national endowment): For Auckland a decrease of £224, for Victoria College a decrease of £500, Canterbury £261, and Otago £3,000. If the grant proposed from the national endowments is included, then the revenue from the State to be given to each college is as follows: Auckland, £2,276; Victoria College, £2,000; Canterbury College, £2,200; and Otago, £5,500. The endowments included here are those given by the Provincial Governments in the form of land at a time when similar provision in the North Island was impossible, as there was no Provincial Government to make them, nor, on account of the Maori War, the necessary settled conditions.

9. Do you mean that that applies to all endowments?—It is to be observed that the South Island endowments will increase in value on account of public works paid for by the whole people of New Zealand. The proposals of the report have the demerits of a single university without

its merits. As regards the number of students and proposed staff, I think it is dangerous to draw deductions from the figures contained in the report, because in many cases they are inaccurate and necessarily out of date, and they should be drawn up for this year. For example, there were 135 students of commerce at Auckland last year, but I think you will find they have dropped very considerably this year, and in applying the figures of the report one has to be very careful. While the staffs proposed for the three colleges for the subjects of arts, law, science, and commerce are practically identical, the number of degree students in arts, law, and science differs considerably at the different colleges. (I exclude commerce because I believe the figures in the report relating to it are not correct for this year. It is not the fault of the Inspector-General of Schools, but the number of students was inflated for the same reason in all the colleges last year.) The number of degree students in arts, science, and law at Auckland is 140; Victoria College, 402; Canterbury, 140; and Otago, 287. So the staffing per degree student in Victoria College would be from one-half to one-third of that at Auckland or Canterbury College. On page 15 of the report you will find that it is proposed that the colleges should be financed to a considerable extent by fees. The passage reads, "I see no reason why the fees for the arts, science, commerce, and law courses should not be the same or nearly the same in all the colleges, and also high enough to ensure that the additional cost of staffs and administration for an increase in the number of students would be met by the increased receipts from students' fees." It is proposed in the report that any addition to staff above a certain minimum, which is not stated, should be wholly paid by fees. I know no university where that is done. At the same time that it is proposed here to throw the whole burden of the cost of increases in the staffs for certain degrees, the New South Wales Government has put into effect a system of exhibitions which makes university education free to some hundreds of students. I think it can be shown that it is not practicable to finance the colleges by fees. I will give an instance of how it is impracticable in the case of a science subject. Before the beginning of this academic year the Secretary of the Post Office approached Victoria College to admit certain officers of the Post Office to the physics course. The arrangements arrived at between the Post Office and College were these: A minimum of seven students were to be sent (and that number was sent). They paid full fees, and the fees this year for new students are practically the same as those in any other University college. In addition to that the Post Office made a grant of £80 a year for increased teaching, and a grant of £125 for apparatus, so that we received from the Post Office a total of £205 plus the students' fees. The fees formed about one-sixth of the total paid. Thus to state that it is possible to increase the staffing of a college above a certain minimum from fees is demonstrably impossible—at any rate, it is impossible in physics. The money we received was none too much for the purpose, and the students were only being taught physics and no special course. I may point out that in the report it is not proposed that any special schools should exist in the North Island. I should now like to discontinue my statement for a moment to allow Professor Picken to speak on the question of financing by fees.

Professor PICKEN made a statement. (No. 8.)

Witness: I have been asked to draw up a report on the question of financing by fees. One of the cardinal proposals of the report is that beyond a certain minimum equipment the colleges are to be financed by fees. This proposal involves such very difficult problems as (1) what the minimum equipment ought to be; (2) what that minimum equipment will properly provide for; (3) how such a very inelastic body as the staff of a University college is to be adjusted to such variable quantities as the number of students and the fees paid by them. These are problems which could only be dealt with superficially in such a report. I wish briefly to indicate some of the difficulties that lie beneath the surface. But, first of all, I wish to draw attention to the fact that the proposal is a resurrection, in a new form, of a principle which we thought to have received its death-blow in New Zealand and to be in course of decent burial—viz., the principle of an intimate relationship between fees and teaching in university education. It must not be assumed that the only objectionable feature of this principle is the remuneration of university teachers by fees: that is the worst feature, and is, I am glad to say, by way of disappearing in New Zealand; but there are such other serious consequences as the encouragement to treat each subject as a separate entity, and the probability of commercializing the colleges in the direction of the "coaching" establishment. It is only necessary to look at the case of the second-rate universities of America (referred to by Mr. McCallum) to realize how very grave this danger is. We believe that the highest opinion upon university education would be found unanimous upon the necessity of keeping the teaching of a subject scrupulously free from any direct relationship with the fees paid by the students of that subject. The relation between number of students and number of teachers can be best dealt with, as I shall show, in a different way. An important statement appears on page 8 of the report as follows: "The staff necessary for the teaching of a subject in a university depended, *inter alia*, upon (1) the number of students taking the subject, (2) the number of classes required for the different parts and different stages of the course, (3) upon the nature of the subject, (4) the style of teaching it, and (5) upon whether there are both day and evening lectures in the subject"—i.e., five factors are specified and others suggested. But the Table H on page 10—which is the central element of the report—cannot claim to embody a sufficient analysis of these considerations. They are to some extent represented in it—and I believe as fully as was possible in such a report—but not adequately—e.g., with one or two

exceptions the maximum staff at present provided by a college for the teaching of a subject is taken to be a uniform minimum for the four colleges. This is obviously a simple practical way of meeting the case, but it does much less than justice to the college which has tried to do things well as compared with the college which has spread its butter as thin as possible over a large area—*i.e.*, it rewards College Councils with financial provision for the future in inverse proportion to the efficiency of their administration in the past. And, again, it is unfair as between subject and subject, because it tends to stereotype inequalities which have arisen quite accidentally in the past—as between history, economics, philosophy on the one hand, and English, classics, mathematics on the other; the distinction between the “suggested minima” for these two groups does not bear analysis on the principles quoted above from the report. The two-sided proposal (1) to institute a minimum for the colleges on the basis of the present maximum in each subject, (2) to leave the subsequent running of the concern to fees, introduces one other anomaly between the colleges in that it does not take into account the fact that a college has in the past “pooled” its fees into the general funds of the college. It therefore makes no provision for meeting the existing needs of those college departments which have the greatest claims on account of number of students—*i.e.*, it proceeds on the assumption that no subject in any college has yet got beyond the (undefined) limits provided for by the “suggested minimum”—this in face of such facts as the following (quoted from the report): Number of students in classics—Otago University, 120; Victoria College, 170. Number of students in philosophy—Canterbury College, 47; Victoria College, 115. Number of students in biology—Victoria College and Otago University, 30; Auckland University College, 95. It would obviously have been the logical application of the principle to state a minimum in accordance with the *smallest* number of students of a given subject in one of the colleges, and then to have provided each of the colleges with a nucleus fund, for development in that subject, proportional to its existing excess of numbers over the minimum. I am not arguing for such a policy, but merely stating an important criticism of the report's proposals. I do not believe that it is a sound policy to earmark the fees in a subject for the peculiar use of that subject. I do not think it possible to determine in any hard-and-fast way at what point additional assistance will have to be provided, and I do not think that adequate financial provision for the staffing in a subject can be made in this way. One further instance, associated with the difference between subjects, may be given. While it is an obvious matter of practical convenience to charge a uniform fee for lectures throughout a faculty—and to a lesser extent over several faculties—the principles stated in the report itself (and quoted above) debar the assumption that there is anything like the same uniformity in the law of increase of staff with students. It is, in fact, contrary to the spirit of university work to establish too definite a relation between fees and teaching staff. To emphasize this it is only necessary to call attention to the fact that one or two able students may make demands upon a professor's time and energy—and may on the other hand give a return to the country—out of all proportion to the fees paid either by or for them. There is, of course, some relation between strength of staff and number of students—a relation into which the fees must enter—but the working-out of such a relationship must be left to a wise governing body; it cannot be determined by Parliament or put upon anything like a statutory basis. The governing body will deal with its finances as a whole, and will make arrangements to give assistance to professors as that may prove to be necessary, but it cannot be done in a mechanical way. Parliament is responsible for so constituting the bodies which control the University and the colleges as to ensure the wisest possible administration; these bodies must have the confidence of Parliament, and must be relied upon to use funds committed to them efficiently and economically. The whole of my argument is based upon our belief that this question of reconstitution of the University system is the fundamental question involved.

Professor LABY made a statement. (No. 9.)

Witness: The fourth point I should like to make is that at present Victoria College is given an amount for specializing in law and science. In the case of law it means that higher provision is made for teaching it in Victoria College than in any of the other four centres. In the case of science it is difficult to make out what is meant by the term, because it does not give the College, as is the case for medicine and engineering, the exclusive right to teach science. I do not think that is desirable, nor does it mean that we teach it on a higher standard than it is taught in other universities, but it does mean that if the fees of Victoria College are affected the £2,000 remains to provide the teaching in science and law—the teaching in those subjects is guaranteed so long as the grant continues. Under the proposed report that advantage will be removed. No specialization will be given to Victoria College, nor is any to be given to Auckland, so that there will be no special schools in the North Island district, which contains about 60 per cent. of the population of New Zealand. I might mention the principles which we think should underlie such a report. It may be inferred from the report of the professorial conference which was held in Wellington a little while ago that the opinion of the New Zealand professors is that the great need is for raising the standard of the work both in the subjects of arts and science curricula. The report proposes to introduce considerable additional teaching in commerce and law, and we believe that the money actually available for teaching will be such as not to meet the demands for teaching those subjects, and it is desirable to raise the teaching here and make it of a university character rather than spread it over more subjects. There is one other principle which we think should underlie the report, and that is, in determining the financial arrangements of the colleges,

some account should be taken of the existing resources of the colleges in the form of endowments, the population which they serve, the standard of their existing work, and the number of their students, but above everything the financial arrangements can only be determined after a policy has been laid down in university education for New Zealand, and it is only then that the financial arrangements can be attacked. It is the wrong order to attempt to determine the financial arrangements first and obtain the policy next. I think this report, by its financial arrangements, undoubtedly determines what subjects are to be taught. The third point is that it is absolutely essential to have economy in university education, and so it will be possible for all colleges to teach the large number of subjects proposed. As regards the finances of Victoria College, I have a table here which shows the income of the College as estimated from the Victoria College accounts. It also states the income as proposed by the Inspector-General of Schools' report, and the expenditure as we estimate it.

VICTORIA COLLEGE INCOME AND EXPENDITURE FOR YEAR 1914.

<i>Income.</i>					Estimated from College Accounts and Report.	As proposed by Report (see pp. 15 and 17).
					£	£
Government statutory grant	..	..	..	..	7,000	7,000*
Fees	..	..	..	..	3,000	4,455
Examination fees	..	..	..	..	180	..
Rent of reserve	..	..	..	..	74	..
Society of Accountants	..	..	..	..	300	..
Sundries	..	..	..	..	47	..
Totals	..	..	..	..	<u>£10,601</u>	<u>£11,455</u>
<i>Expenditure.</i>					Estimate by Witness. £	Estimate of Report (see Table 4, p. 14). £
<i>Salaries—</i>						
Ten professors	..	..	..	..	7,100	..
Eleven lecturers	..	..	..	..	3,300	..
Six demonstrators, &c.	..	..	..	..	900	..
Caretaker	£126,	mechanic	£200,	laboratory		
assistant	£122	..	..	..	448	..
Registrar	..	..	..	..	300	..
Librarian	..	..	..	..	150	..
					12,198	11,000†
Library	..	..	..	..	300	250
Administration	..	..	..	..	981	2,000
Apparatus and chemicals, &c.	..	..	..	..	630	550‡
Total expenditure	..	..	..	..	<u>£14,109</u>	<u>£13,800</u>

Page 15 of the report says, "If the fees at Victoria College and Auckland University College were brought up to the same scale as obtain, say, in the University of Otago, the amount of fees, assuming the number of students to remain the same, would be increased by about £3,360 and £385 respectively. Allowing for the falling-off of casual students if the fees were increased, it might probably be estimated that the revenues of the two colleges in question would be increased by £2,500 and £200 respectively. . . ." Adding the present fees, £2,200 (see Table M), to this £2,500, then according to the report the fees will yield £4,455, and that is the amount I put as Mr. Hogben's estimate. It became evident to some of us who appeared before this Committee previously that we would be under a very great disadvantage if we came here again without having raised our fees, and that has been done. The desire of the Council was to raise the fees for all students, but on applying to the Minister of Education for permission—Mr. Allen was away at the time—we were informed that the Minister had decided that the fees could only be increased in the case of new students; so that we are unfortunately not in the position of being before you now on exactly the same basis as other colleges in regard to fees, but so far as new students are concerned we are on the same basis. I am not prepared at the moment to state what is going to be the future yield from fees, but I can put before you certain information we have. The actual fees raised in 1912 were £2,167, and the Council's estimate for 1913 is £2,400. In other words, by increasing the fees for all new students we have an increase of £233 per year. It is clear, therefore, that the increased rate of fees has yielded a very slight increase of revenue, and the reason for that is that increasing the fees has decreased the number of students at Victoria College.

* Re £2,500 from national endowment see below.

† Does not include salaries of Registrar and librarian, which are included under "Administration."

‡ Includes salaries of mechanics and laboratory assistants.

STUDENTS (1912).—PROPOSED STAFF.

Subject.	Auckland University College.		Victoria College.		Canterbury College.		Otago University.	
	Stud.	Stud.	Stud.	Stud.	Stud.	Stud.	Stud.	Stud.
	Prof.	Teach.	Prof.	Teach.	Prof.	Teach.	Prof.	Teach.
Latin, Greek	129	65	171	86	125	63	119	60
French, German	45	23	73	37	37	18	46	23
English	197	98	173	87	146	73	118	59
History, economics ..	..	29	..	22	93	47	..	22
Mental science, education ..	63	32	115	58	47	23	78	39
Pure mathematics, applied mathematics	56	..	59	..	66	..	81	..
Physics	33	11	33	11	37	13	74	25
Chemistry	36	12	34	11	26	9	59	20
Biology	95	32	30	10	51	17	31	10
Geology	..	15	..	12	..	17	29	29
Commerce	..	68	..	32	..	9	..	21
Law	..	38	..	55	..	13	..	13
Arts, science	17.5	5.6	40	16	15.5	5.8	32	12
Law (degree)	140/8	140/25	402/10	402/25	140/9	140/24	287/9	287/24
Arts, science, law ..	/8	/25	/10	/25	/9	/24	/9	/24

The report states: "I have no intention of discussing the question of day or evening work. I merely assume that, as at present, the regulations of the University will permit the work to be done either in day or in evening classes. It is only fair to admit that the standard of work should be set by the day students; and, if this be so, those who are occupied during the day and are thereby prevented from attending any other than evening classes should be allowed to take a smaller group of subjects at one time, and so consequently to spread their degree work over a greater number of years. This would not, however, do away with the whole or partial duplication of the staff that would be entailed by the carrying-on of both day and evening classes in the one college. I could hardly, therefore, make any other assumption for the purpose of the present inquiry than that the present arrangements as to day and evening classes are to be continued." The present arrangement in regard to day and evening classes is that teaching at the Otago University is finished before 7 o'clock, and also the same at Christchurch. The teaching in Auckland and Victoria College can be described as practically wholly night teaching. There is comparatively only a small number of students who attend before 5 o'clock, so that the teaching in the North Island colleges is wholly in the evening, and the teaching in the South Island colleges is wholly in the daytime. The point I wish to make here is that the most important matter that can be improved in the teaching of arts and science at present in the North Island colleges is undertaken at night; in fact, it is a recognized principle amongst university authorities that university teaching which is conducted only in the evening does not reach the university standard. That opinion was expressed by the Royal Commission on the Melbourne University. I can speak very definitely on that point in regard to science, being a science teacher. It is not to be supposed that it is not equally true in the case of the arts subjects, and my only reason for stating the case that exists for day teaching in science is because I am more intimately acquainted with that. The effect of evening teaching of science in the North Island colleges has been practically to prevent any one taking the B.Sc. degree. It must be evident to the members of the Committee that there is a real need for science graduates in New Zealand, and the University colleges should supply those graduates.

Professor PICKEN further examined. (No. 10.)

1. *The Chairman.*] Do you represent Victoria College?—Yes. I regret very much, Mr. Chairman, that the fact that I happen to occupy the official position of Chairman of the Professorial Board makes it necessary for me to appear before you a good deal oftener than I should personally like to. With regard to this particular matter of the evidence on the Inspector-General's report, the Board has had to divide the evidence among the members of the Board, and I think it would probably save your time were you to hear practically all the evidence before you examined us on it, because you would otherwise probably find that the questions raised in examining one of us would be taken up by another in his evidence. I offer that as a suggestion of a possible way in which your time may be saved, because I feel that we are occupying a good deal of your time. Professor Laby was the convener of the Board's committee in getting up this evidence, and he and I have shared between us the different parts of the main question. The chairmen of the faculties of arts, science, and law will speak with regard to the details which specially affect their departments. We want to take up this matter of the Inspector-General's report in its relation to our petition for a Royal Commission on university education. It seems to us that four courses are open to this Committee in reporting to Parliament: (1) It may

recominend that a Royal Commission be set up, and that effect be given to the Inspector-General's report or some modification of that report; (2) that a Royal Commission be refused and effect given to the Inspector-General's report or some modification of it; (3) that a Royal Commission be granted and no action taken on the Inspector-General's report; (4) that no action of any sort be taken. Of these I need only consider (1) and (2), seeing that we have already urged as strongly as we can the case for a Royal Commission as being in our opinion the only way to meet the position. But I may reiterate what I have practically said before, that in my opinion—and I think my colleagues agree with me in this—the proper use to make of the Inspector-General's report is to put it in as a substantial piece of evidence before a Royal Commission. We wish to express our appreciation of the painstaking way in which the Inspector-General undertook his difficult task, and of the tactfulness with which he made his inquiries. We shall have to put forward a considerable amount of criticism of the report, but we wish it to be clearly understood that we attach no blame to the Inspector-General for the defects to which we find it necessary to direct attention. We believe that the task committed to him was one which it was impossible for him to accomplish, and that under the circumstances he produced a very able document. With regard to the first course which this Committee might recommend—viz., that effect should be given to this report, but that a Royal Commission might also be set up—we would point out that to determine the finances of the colleges is to determine the major part of their policy, especially as this report itself proves conclusively that the question of policy cannot be severed from that of finance. The financial needs cannot be determined until the future policy has been determined, and determination of finance would mean that nothing of importance remained to justify the appointing of a Royal Commission. I take it, therefore, that the first of the four possible courses I have suggested is not likely to be followed by this Committee. It remains, therefore, to consider the second possible course—viz., that this Committee, instead of recommending a Royal Commission, should recommend that the Inspector-General's report be put into effect. That, we submit, would be tantamount to giving to this report the value of a Royal Commission on university education, for it would be equivalent to saying that the strong appeal which has been made for inquiry by a Royal Commission has been adequately met by the inquiry of the Inspector-General. Yet I may remind you that the Inspector-General's inquiry was instituted by this Committee on the hypothesis that a Royal Commission was not necessary, because, although a case had been made out for reform, the University was believed—for reasons which have since been proved ill-founded—to be carrying out its own reform. As there is this possibility of the Inspector-General's report being regarded as equivalent to that of a Commission, we would suggest three important respects in which it is not adequate to that end: (1.) It is not adequate in the constitution of the Commission of inquiry; the departmental head of the primary-education system cannot fairly be constituted a Commission of one upon university education; modern University Commissions invariably include men of the widest and most intimate knowledge of university administration. (2.) The method of inquiry was not that adopted by a Commission; the Inspector-General points out that he had "no power to call for evidence," hence there was no systematic inquiry, with opportunity for all concerned to give evidence under cross-examination. (3.) Consistently with (2), the "representations" and "recommendations" made to the Inspector-General during his inquiry have not been published. I take it, therefore, that this Committee would not be justified in expressing the view that the Inspector-General's report does away with the necessity for a further searching inquiry into the case for reform which Parliament agrees that we have made out. Turning now to some of the principles embodied in the report, we note that the financial proposals of the report are based upon very definite detailed assumptions as to the work which is to be done by the colleges and the staffing which is to be provided for that work. If effect were given to this report it seems almost inevitable that the financial provision granted by the Government should be definitely earmarked for the objects by reference to which the estimates were made. It is true that the Inspector-General very rightly expresses his personal wish that the freedom of the colleges to develop along their own lines should not be interfered with, but it is difficult to see upon what grounds the financial proposals of the report could be adopted if the very definite details upon which they are based are not to be endorsed. If the detailed policy is not sound then the report falls to the ground, a point to which my colleagues will give some attention. If, on the other hand, the detailed policy behind the financial provision is enforced by the Government's power of the purse, then all that would tend to attract men of standing into the college governing bodies is removed, and these bodies are reduced to committees for watching the public financial interests in the colleges. We submit that that would be a very undesirable result, and that a well-constituted College Council is very much better able to develop policy in university education than the head of the Education Department can possibly be. We believe that it is of the utmost importance that the College Councils should be strengthened in every way to the fullest possible extent, and given freedom to administer the finances which are placed at their disposal; and one of the matters we think it most important to refer to a Royal Commission is how these bodies may be so constituted as to perform their functions with the greatest possible efficiency, and how the University may be so constituted as to bring the College Councils into the closest possible relations with one another and with the University. The question of the constitution of the University is also raised by the important proposal in the report that the University of New Zealand should be put in the position of administering a large sum of money for the benefit of the colleges. The principle of this recommendation is one with which I believe we all agree—that is, we are agreed upon the necessity for some efficient national control over university education—but where we differ most emphatically from the proposal of the report is in the tacit assumption that the University as at present constituted might be entrusted with such powers. We submit that the University has been constituted to exercise the functions only of an examining body (on the model of the

old University of London); that even in that very restricted range of activity it has laid itself open to very severe criticism; and that it would be the greatest possible mistake to endow this same body with powers which ought under proper exercise to be the most important factor in the future development of university education in New Zealand. This proposal, therefore, follows the others in making the case for a Royal Commission almost unanswerable. And it provides a second strong argument for the consolidation of University and colleges into one strong organization by uniting the four bodies which control the colleges into the body which controls the University.

TUESDAY, 19TH AUGUST, 1913.

(No. 11.)

The Chairman: I have here a statement from the University of Otago which has been forwarded as evidence to be put before this Committee, and it will be treated as such.

UNIVERSITY REFORM.

In this statement an endeavour will be made to answer three questions:—

- (1.) What is a university, and what should be its functions?
- (2.) To what extent does the University of New Zealand fulfil these requisites and functions?
- (3.) In what manner are modern universities elsewhere organized so as to fulfil their proper functions?

(1.) *What is a University.*

The term has been defined in various ways, such as “a school where all arts and faculties are taught” (Johnson); “an institution which teaches universal knowledge” (Newman). In Roman law the term originally meant a “corporation.” Combining these definitions we may say a university should be a “corporation for teaching universal knowledge.” It consists essentially of a body of men banded together for a definite purpose, each individual having a separate and distinct function to fulfil in order that the purpose and function of the whole may be complete.

It will be observed that teaching and the acquisition of knowledge constitute the chief function of a university. The recognition of this fact is shown by the change in the spirit of university education during the last twenty years, and especially by the great increase in the number of teaching universities and the abandonment of purely examining universities. It would be difficult to find any competent authority who would maintain at the present day that the function of a university should be merely inquisitorial—that it should be a body elected only to find out what and how much certain members of the community knew. A university should be more: it should be the brains of the body politic. It should be an institution, a corporation, for teaching the individual members of the body politic to think and act for themselves, and at the same time to point out what has been done for the advancement of knowledge by other thinkers and workers past and present. It is to the university that the community should look for light and guidance in all matters that are concerned in the advance of human knowledge and happiness. The community is increasingly looking to the university to provide for its younger members a better training for the various professions and for commercial and even domestic pursuits than they can obtain elsewhere. It therefore behoves the university not to betray this growing trust, but to see that it keeps intimately in touch with the necessities, aims, and aspirations of the community, in order that these may be provided for, guided, and developed in the best possible manner. For the fulfilment of these requirements a university must be a visible, living, growing organization, correlated in all details and co-ordinated in all its parts, so that it may form one homogeneous whole.

A university must consist of governors, teachers, graduates, and undergraduates; but there should be a complete and automatically-acting organization pervading and welding all, so that the whole will act as one mechanism. Only thus can a university fulfil its duty to itself and to the community.

(2.) *To what extent does the University of New Zealand fulfil these Requisites and Functions.*

Under the University Acts the University was established not for the purpose of teaching, but for the purpose of examining and of awarding degrees. It therefore does not conform to the definition of a university in that it does not teach anything. Examination is its chief function—it places examination in front of everything else. Now, this is quite contrary to both ancient and modern views of the aims and objects of a university. True, for a comparatively short time during the latter half of last century “examination” had an enormous vogue; it was made the be-all and end-all of teaching (or should we say “cramming”?) in schools and universities. Happily, however, the error has now for some time been recognized by every one, even by that university which was chiefly responsible for its exaltation. We refer, of course, to the University of London.

It is now universally recognized by those who are engaged in university work that the older ideals are correct—that it is teaching and training which are of paramount importance, and that examination is quite a secondary matter. That a university should be merely a branding-machine for artificially grading the country's mental products is to degrade and stultify the name and object of a noble and honourable institution.

The University of New Zealand is equally defective as regards organization, of which indeed it has but little. In practice it consists during the greater part of the year of Chancellor, Registrar, and undergraduates: there exists the utterly strange and anomalous position that the teachers of the undergraduates (*qua* teachers) are not even members of the University, neither have they any official status within the University, nor have they as teachers of New Zealand University students any organization whatever.

It is true that the teachers are represented on the Senate to a very limited extent, but it is in a most inadequate, ineffective, and unorganized manner. There is not the slightest official or recognized co-ordination between the various colleges or between teachers of cognate subjects, nor is the principle of representation of subjects admitted or provided for in election to the Senate. It therefore happens that important subjects or whole schools or faculties may not be, and in fact are not, represented on the Senate at all.

With its present constitution the Senate may and does refer questions of detail in any subject to the teachers of that subject, but the Senate itself deals with all the broader issues without consulting the teaching staff as a whole. Obviously, however, the teaching staff, since its members are responsible for the different subjects concerned, are better able to appreciate the bearing of the subjects upon one another, and it should therefore be consulted on all the broader issues, such as the general nature of the statutes for degrees. It is often stated that the large number of professors on the Senate gives the staff a sufficient voice in academic matters, but at the present time, though nearly half the members of Senate are professors, only four of them hold office as representatives of the Professorial Boards. It is possible, therefore, for the other professorial members to outvote the Board's representatives. Then, again, the interests of each Professorial Board are so wide that one man cannot adequately represent them all. The various subjects are at present not rationally represented, the members may all be professors of languages without any representative of science, or arts and science might be represented to the exclusion of medicine and mining.

The University of New Zealand possesses, in fact, no organized machinery for dealing with the complex courses of study provided by a modern university. Matters relating to policy, government, finance, examinations, and curricula are referred indiscriminately to the office of the Senate by graduates, undergraduates, individual professors, Professorial Boards, faculties, and individual members of the community; there they accumulate for many months; the Senate meets, and a long list of these heterogeneous accumulated matters is submitted to it by the Chancellor, and they are referred to different committees to report on within a week or ten days. The acquaintance of the members of these committees with the subjects referred to them may be and often is of the remotest, yet the subjects frequently require the most intimate knowledge both in their technical aspects and in their relation to the community as a whole.

In short, the Senate is a body which in its composition corresponds exactly to a College Council, but which presumes to carry out the duties and functions of a Professorial Board and of all the faculties, which allows business to accumulate for months, and then hurriedly disposes of it in ten days. This organization may be simple, but no one could suppose it to be effective or to give satisfactory results. Probably the method was adequate in the early days of the University—twenty-five or thirty years ago—but with the present growth and development of University courses and methods of teaching it is obviously quite inadequate. As regards organization, then, we conclude that there exists no trace of any automatically operating organization which any body or corporation must possess to be vital and to be capable of living, surviving, and developing.

The need of reform in the constitution of the New Zealand University was admitted by the Education Committee of the House in 1910. It was at that time hoped that certain changes which had been proposed in the Senate, such as the institution of a professorial conference which was to meet annually, would lead to lasting improvement. But the Senate in 1913 rejected all the recommendations that had been sent up by the conference, and abolished the conference itself, which had only met once. Nevertheless the Senate admitted that there was need for some change in its constitution, and set up a committee to consider the subject and submit its proposals to the graduates of the University, to the College Councils, and to the Professorial Boards. Most of the graduates have had no experience of the conditions in other universities, and not having paid particular attention to university organization are not competent to decide whether the present system is satisfactory or whether it can be improved by following more closely the system used in other universities. Nevertheless the method now being followed by the Senate gives such men a greater voice than is given to those who by their experience are really better qualified to express an opinion. For whereas each graduate has received a copy of the schemes proposed by the committee of the Senate and a voting-paper, the professors individually have received neither.

(3.) *In what manner are Modern Universities elsewhere organized so as to fulfil their proper Functions?*

In the first place it is necessary, both from the point of view of organization and in order that the University may concern itself much more than it has done in the past with teaching and training, that all those who are engaged in instructing its undergraduates should be members of the University. Secondly, it is necessary that such teachers should be organized and their work co-ordinated and then correlated. This can best be attained, as in other universities, by grouping together the teachers of cognate subjects into various faculties. Thus the University would establish faculties of arts, science, law, medicine, and so on. Each faculty would be composed of all those professors and lecturers in each of the four affiliated colleges who were concerned in teaching subjects in that faculty.

It is the function of faculties to organize details of teaching-work, to originate if necessary new branches of study, and after discussion to communicate the views of the teachers to the Senate. The Senate in most modern universities is a body dealing exclusively with academic affairs, statutes, and regulations; it controls teaching and examinations; it acts chiefly on the advice of the faculties, and if necessary originates, alters, or repeals statutes, but only after such measures have been submitted to the faculties concerned. Of necessity, therefore, the Senate elsewhere consists of those senior and responsible teachers who are actively engaged in university work and daily in touch with the academic needs, possibilities, and ideals of the university, of the community, and of universities elsewhere.

It is one of the fundamental principles of the genius of the British race for government and organization that the supreme control of any body or institution, however technical or professional in its details, should be vested to a preponderating degree in laymen, and that such laymen should be directly responsible to the community which finds the money to finance that institution. And this principle is recognized in nearly all modern British universities. The members of this body are partly elected and partly nominated; they are sufficiently numerous to represent the Crown, the professional and commercial sections of the community, and such other bodies as are more directly interested in university development. This governing body exercises full control over all matters involving finance; it is responsible for the general supervision and direction of all university matters, and all academic statutes and regulations require its sanction. Nevertheless, such sanction is given or withheld on general principles alone; it does not fall within the province of such a body to modify, veto, or originate details of academic measures, because from its very constitution there is no guarantee that such would be either practicable or desirable. Such an organization furnishes an automatic machinery for university control and development.

As regards designation, the supreme governing body is variously termed the "Council of the University," or the "Board of Governors of the University," or the "Court of Governors of the University." The term "Senate" is more frequently reserved for the body dealing exclusively with academic matters.

Methods of Examination.

The fundamental difference between an internal and an external system of examination is that in the former case the training is recognized to be quite as important as the passing of an examination. Our present system results in papers being set which often do not give the student sufficient scope to show how thorough his training may have been. A New Zealand student in arts and science has to sit (a) a purely internal examination—his annual college examination for keeping terms—and (b) a purely external examination. These two examinations are absolutely distinct from each other, and, provided the student has kept terms, his training is not taken into account at all when the results of the external examination are considered. In other universities the degree is granted on examinations conducted jointly by the teacher and an assessor. The New Zealand system is therefore totally different in character from that followed elsewhere, except that in the examinations for degrees in medicine the teacher as examiner is associated with an assessor who is resident in New Zealand.

Although for examinations in arts and science it may not be possible in all the subjects to obtain New Zealand assessors who are not teachers, the teacher in one college is obviously capable of acting as assessor in another college. If a candidate's answers are "in no case examined solely by his teacher" (recommendation of the professorial conference), but are examined in addition by a teacher from another college, the method of examination is similar to that of other modern British universities.

In conclusion, we are of opinion that, owing to the great amount of controversy that has already taken place in regard to university reform, it would be difficult, if not impossible, for any one living in New Zealand to give an unbiased judgment on the conflicting opinions that have already been expressed and to draw up an efficient scheme of reorganization. We have therefore asked for a Royal Commission to investigate and report upon the questions involved, with a request that the Chairman be a man of wide university experience chosen from outside New Zealand.

Professor LABY made a statement. (No. 12.)

Witness: There is a matter which should have been raised at the opening of the evidence on the Inspector-General of Schools' report. I wish to ask on behalf of Victoria College Professorial Board that the Committee should allow the evidence to be reported in the Press. There appears to be no uniform rule in regard to the admission of the Press to proceedings of a Committee such as this. The Committee can admit the Press, and I wish to submit that the Committee will be assisted in arriving at the truth if the evidence taken from day to day becomes known to the responsible authorities at the four University centres, to members of Parliament not on the Committee, and to the public. You are conducting an inquiry which is going to have a most far-reaching effect upon our University, and consequently upon our national education system. I am aware that your function is to report to the House, and that the theory is that the full evidence is then made public, and your report is then fully and adequately discussed. Our experience, however, shows that the actuality is very different from the theory. On the last occasion there was no discussion of your report to Parliament, or, rather, I should say there was a discussion while your report was before the House on the question as to which side of the House was wasting time.

The matter before you is so complex and so full of technical detail that I venture to say that the House cannot profitably discuss it without the evidence has appeared from day to day instead of, as on the last occasion, in the form of a report of 114 closely printed pages. It is clear that all the members of this Committee cannot be present at its deliberations, and I think it would be of assistance to them if the evidence was reported from day to day in the Press, or so much of it as the Press thought fit. Further, it is very evident that one of the questions before the Committee is a very delicate and difficult question—namely, that of making allocations to the different provinces and treating them fairly.

1. *The Chairman.*] What do you mean by "fairly"?—It is used in the ordinary sense of the word.

2. Do you mean that this Committee is not competent to make a recommendation?—I mean fair in regard to the allocations. I did not say anything about the Committee. On the last occasion twelve witnesses stated that a Royal Commission should be appointed, two were against, and one (Mr. Hogben) proposed a different solution, and five professors wrote supporting a Commission. It was not open to this Committee to report so against the weight of evidence had they not believed that those in favour of a Royal Commission were unduly represented—in other words, that the evidence was one-sided. If these proceedings are thrown open to the Press that cannot occur. The evidence will be representative, and the finding of this Committee will have greater weight and be more satisfactory to every one concerned. I should like to know the decision of the Committee on that point.

[The Committee then deliberated, and after discussion agreed to permit the Press to be present at the meetings of the Committee.]

Witness: I should now like to return to the point where I left off and to cover some of the ground I mentioned before, because I have more correct figures to put before the Committee. The question is in regard to a comparison of the endowments and grants from the Government. The provincial endowments at present are—Auckland, £460 per annum; Victoria College, £74; Canterbury, £8,900; and Otago, £6,200. The decreases in the Government grants proposed by the Inspector-General of Schools' report are for Auckland, £200 a year; Victoria College, £1,500. It is proposed not to alter the grant to Canterbury, and the increase for Otago is £2,300. That is the change in the Government grants. If we also include the £2,500 proposed to be paid from the national endowment the changes are—Increases of Auckland, £2,300 a year; Victoria College, £1,000; Canterbury, £2,500; and Otago, £4,800. The total for the North Island districts, which includes certain parts of the South Island, is £3,300, and for the South Island—that is, Canterbury and Otago—the increase is £7,300. As to the £6,200 of provincial endowments, it is a very difficult matter to determine what are provincial endowments and what are not. All the college accounts are in that position: they are not kept on a uniform system. I think it would be desirable that the Education Department should require in parliamentary returns that accounts should be uniform. As regards the proposed grant of £2,500 from the national endowment, according to Mr. Hogben's report, it states, "I have already expressed the desirability of giving the colleges additional endowments, the revenue of which would be likely to increase with the progress of the Dominion. The national endowments appear to me to furnish such conditions, and I know of no better use to which they could be put. The proportion of the revenue from these endowments that is devoted to purposes of education amounts at present to £45,000 per annum. It was suggested in a Land Bill introduced, but not passed, two or three years ago that 20 per cent. of this portion of the national-endowment revenue should be allocated to university education. I suggest that it would be a wise thing to set aside one-quarter or even one-third (at present £11,500 or £15,000) for university education. Out of this I would suggest that £2,500 be given to each of the four colleges." The £2,500 so allocated to the colleges is on a different basis to the statutory grants, because while a statutory grant could probably be carried in Parliament immediately this report was adopted—if it were adopted, but I hope it will not be—the national endowment would be on a different basis, as it would require, I understand, a Land Bill to make the allocation, so that any college dependent on national endowments for its revenue would not receive it probably so soon as one dependent on statutory grants. You can see the position Victoria College will be in if this report is put into effect. I will read a statement which compares the income as estimated by myself and the income as proposed by the report. The statements are as follows:—

VICTORIA COLLEGE INCOME AND EXPENDITURE FOR YEAR 1914.

<i>Income.</i>					
				Estimated from College Accounts and Report.	As proposed by Report.
				£	£
Government statutory grant	..	..	..	7,000	7,000†
Fees	..	..	..	3,000*	4,455
Examination fees	..	..	..	180	..
Rent of reserve	..	..	..	74	..
Society of Accountants and subsidy	..	..	..	300	..
Sundries	..	..	..	47	..
Totals	..	..	..	£10,601	£11,455

* Provisional estimate.

† Re £2,500 from national endowment see below.

<i>Expenditure.</i>					Estimate by Witness.	Estimate of Report.
					£	£
Salaries—						
Ten professors	..	..	..	..	7,100	..
Eleven lecturers	..	..	..	..	3,300	..
Six demonstrators, &c.	..	..	..	..	900	..
Caretaker £126, mechanic £200, laboratory assistant £122	..	..	..	..	448	..
Registrar	..	..	..	..	300	..
Librarian	..	..	..	..	150	..
					12,198	11,000*
Library	..	..	..	..	300	250
Administration	..	..	..	..	981	2,000
Apparatus and chemicals, &c.	..	..	..	..	630	550†
Total expenditure					14,109	13,800
Income					10,600	11,455
Deficit					£3,509	£2,345

3. *Hon. Mr. Allen.*] That shows a difference of £200?—Yes; but the income differs by a considerably larger amount than £200: the total expenditure according to our estimate is £14,000, while the income is £10,600, making a deficit as regards Victoria College of £3,509. According to Mr. Hogben's report it is £13,800 for expenditure and £11,450 as the income, showing a deficit of £2,345.

4. *Mr. Sidey.*] Is not the chief difference between you and Mr. Hogben made up by the difference in fees?—Yes. I propose to go over the items now. We are agreed about the grant, and Mr. Hogben says the fees would be £4,455. The report states, "If the fees at Victoria College and Auckland University College were brought up to the same scale as obtain, say, in the University of Otago, the amount of fees, assuming the number of students to remain the same, would be increased by about £3,360 and £385 respectively. Allowing for the falling-off of casual students if the fees were increased, it might probably be estimated that the revenues of the two colleges in question would be increased by £2,500 and £200 respectively. . . . The raising of the fees for a degree course somewhat less than in the manner indicated to an average fee of £12 10s. would give Victoria College an increased amount of nearly £2,800." You will see that the present fees (page 14) are £1,955, so that according to the report the total fees received at Victoria College would be £4,455. Well, my estimate is £3,000. Then, Mr. Hogben has left out of account the small items of revenue mentioned. He gets the expenditure as £11,000, and we get it as £12,198. If you add up the various items for salaries alone you obtain a total of £11,200, and Mr. Hogben puts the total as £11,000, so that on his own figures there is a difference of £200. The report includes the salary of Registrar and librarian under the item of administration. Its figures are seriously wrong on the question of apparatus and chemicals: see page 12, where it is stated, "Allowing for the employment of mechanicians and laboratory assistants where they are not now employed, . . . we may fairly consider that the following sums will be sufficient to meet the annual needs (for new apparatus, renewals, and materials) of the several colleges for the laboratories connected with the courses provided thereat: Arts and science, £550." £550 is stated to be the amount for Victoria College. In 1912 our expenditure on apparatus and chemicals, including no salaries, was £546. The estimate for 1913 at Victoria College is £630. To get the total Mr. Hogben is dealing with you have to add to that £200 for the salary of a mechanic and £122 for wages of certain attendants, making a total for Victoria College of £952.

5. *Mr. J. C. Thomson.*] Mr. Hogben does not include the salaries of mechanics?—Yes. Table J says, "The salaries of mechanicians and laboratory assistants other than demonstrators are included." So that the sum he proposes would reduce our expenditure on the laboratories by 40 or 50 per cent. The teaching of science would become impossible at Victoria College under those figures. The only other thing we have to comment on is the question of the estimation of the fees in that table. You will see on page 15 how the fees have been estimated. I think this is a most important point, and throws a great deal of light on the way Mr. Hogben proceeded in the matter, and the work of the different University colleges. He states, "The fees vary a great deal now in the several colleges. Taking the fees paid by the Government on behalf of the holders of Senior National Scholarships and bursaries as an approximate indication of the fees payable by students taking degree courses in arts, science, commerce, and law, we find the average fees paid by such students to be—Auckland, £12 10s. 5d.; Victoria College, £5 15s. 10d.; Canterbury College, £14 18s. 3d.; Otago University, £14 11s. 6d." Mr. Hogben, in order to estimate the fees, has taken the average fee paid by a small selected group of students, the students in question for 1911 being—Auckland, 16; Victoria College, 27; Canterbury, 16; and Otago, 31. They are picked students, and therefore are capable of taking more courses than other students. If you take the average fee paid by all students at Victoria College and Otago you will find the average fee was £4 in the case of Victoria College and £12 in the case of Otago. Mr. Hogben proceeds to argue that the fees at Victoria College should be increased until the average student

* Does not include salaries of Registrar and librarian, which are included under "Administration."

† Includes salaries of mechanics and laboratory assistants.

at Victoria College pays as much as the student at Otago, but he has left out a very important consideration, and that is what the student obtains for the fee. While a student at Otago can take up mining and medical courses, and so on, the student at Victoria College is not so privileged. The work we do at Victoria College is confined to the teaching of arts, science, law, and commerce, and the student has not the privilege of obtaining a medical course at Victoria College. The result is that he cannot take these expensive courses, and what Mr. Hogben proposes is that the student who takes a course at Victoria College should nevertheless pay a fee equal to the average fee, which includes some students who do take the expensive courses in medicine and engineering. Another factor is that we are unfortunately only a night school. No student working at night, however great his energies, can cover the same number of courses as one working in the day. Dunedin students are all day students, and naturally take more courses than the students at Victoria College, so that the proposal here amounts to punishing evening students. Although they have the disadvantage of attending in the evening it is proposed to charge as much for the poorer work that the teachers are only able to give them as the students who attend in the daytime in Dunedin or Christchurch. The student at a college which only teaches in the evening, of course, has a very restricted time during the evening in which he can attend the lectures, and therefore he cannot cover so many subjects. The correct way of arriving at this is just to obtain a table of fees showing what each student pays for a given subject in the two centres. You will see that before this year the fees at Dunedin were not two and a half times as great as at Victoria College, but the fees for students taking the same course were twice as much at Dunedin as at Victoria College. At the beginning of this year we raised our fees for all subjects to the same as at Dunedin, with some minor exceptions. The fees are, I believe, practically identical for new students at both Victoria College and Dunedin University. We can now see whether Mr. Hogben's estimate of £4,455 is correct or whether the £3,000 is correct. I venture to say that the £4,455 is simply a ridiculous estimate. There is no sound basis for it. The effect of the increased fees at Victoria College has been to seriously diminish the number of students attending the College. I suppose that implies, among other things, that the students are not prepared to pay the same fees for the courses in the evening. There is no doubt that some of the students we lost were good students, although I do not say all were. We had seen that we had to increase our fees if we were to come before this Committee on an equal basis with the other University colleges. The doubled fees for new students only yielded an increase of £160. What will be the increase in the fees if all the students pay at the higher rate? At most the increase for second- and third-year students will be £320. It will probably be less, because there are not so many second- and third-year students as first-year students. Mr. Hogben, on a basis which is theoretically unsound and opposed to our experience, estimates the increase will be £3,500. The fees paid this year were £2,167, and if you add on £320 for the increase in the fees of second- and third-year students a total of £2,647 is obtained, which is well below the estimate I made of £3,000. I do not think there is any warrant for the £4,455 in the report. At the conclusion of the last table you see there was a deficit of £3,500 according to our estimate, and £2,300 according to Mr. Hogben. Mr. Hogben lays down certain proposals for meeting that deficit, and they are stated on page 15 of the report. If you assume, for the sake of argument, that Parliament increases the proportion of national endowment devoted to education to one-third—Mr. Hogben proposes to allocate £10,000 equally between the four colleges, which makes £2,500 for each college—even then, according to our estimate, the deficit for Victoria College would be £1,000, while according to Mr. Hogben it would give a credit balance of £155. On the estimates it is proposed to increase our grant from Parliament to £8,500 per year. Mr. Hogben proposes that we should only receive £7,000 from Parliament.

6. *The Chairman.*] I do not think that is right—that is only for this year. That was a special grant to meet the wants of the College for this year?—It seems to me that would be very important information to the Committee, that the Minister recognized we should have a statutory grant of £8,500 this year, and therefore recognized the accuracy of the figures which the Council has placed before him.

7. You are putting it wrongly?—The Minister of Education recognized that Victoria College required £8,500 this year, while Mr. Hogben lays down that in the future it will only be necessary to give an additional grant of £2,500, which is problematical, from the national endowment. So that the effect of Mr. Hogben's proposal would be only to give an additional revenue of £1,000 above what we will get this year.

8. I think you are working on a wrong basis. The position put before us was that you were £1,500 to the bad, and therefore we suggested that the Minister in his estimates should make provision for that. You must not treat it as a statutory grant?—I am not putting it as that. The position which the Victoria College Council put before you is that we have an annual, not an accumulated, deficit of £1,000. The increased expenditure proposed by Mr. Hogben's report amounts to something over £2,000 according to the table on page 10 of the report, and consequently £3,000 new revenue is required to meet it. You will see it is stated in the report that it is not proposed to alter the present arrangements as to day and evening classes. On page 9 it says that the "present arrangements as to day and evening classes are to be continued." The decision of both the Professorial Board and the College Council at Victoria College is that the most urgently required improvement is the introduction of day teaching, and I propose to give evidence in regard to the effect of evening teaching with reference to science. I am not so familiar with the details of its effect on other subjects such as arts and law, but it is well known to any university teacher that the effects are similar.

9. The statement in the report is not a definite statement that it is to continue. You must read the context. It states, "I could hardly, therefore, make any other assumption for the

purpose of the present inquiry than that the present arrangements as to day and evening classes are to be continued"—Shall I put it this way: that while the report actually provides the finances to make various alterations, including considerable improvements in the Medical School, which we have always said were very necessary, it makes no provision for the introduction of day teaching in the North Island colleges, which we have also contended is equally necessary. I should like to point out why we think it is necessary. The salaries for teaching a single science subject according to the report will be £1,150 per year, and for the three science subjects £3,450; in addition to that grants for apparatus, laboratory, and assistants amounting to £700 or £800 are made, so that the expenditure at each college would be about £5,500 a year on the teaching of science. Consider what return you get in the North and South Island colleges for that expenditure. It is a pretty considerable expenditure, and I think an adequate return from it may be expected. One test, and a pretty fair test, for getting at what is the actual return for that expenditure is to examine the average number of graduates at the different colleges. It is shown in the following table:—

College.	Average Number for Three Years.	
	B.Sc.	M.Sc.
Auckland ...	2½	1
Victoria ...	1	1
Canterbury ...	2	2
Otago ...	4½	3½

That seems a very inadequate return for the expenditure in New Zealand on the teaching of science, and it is not very difficult to find the cause at Victoria College for the poor number of students who avail themselves of the teaching of science. Before going into that there is one misapprehension which I should like to remove, and that is that the science teachers at Victoria College are not fully occupied. The number of students they have at present I think is as much as they can teach, but those students are taking the unco-ordinate courses which do not qualify them for any profession. Our finished students often are not qualified to be teachers in secondary schools or teachers in technical colleges, or analytical chemists, or to take up any other specialized work in science after they have graduated. One of the reasons for that is the students are unable to cover in the evening during six months of the year a course which would be adequate for the proper degree in science. As a result of having only evening lectures in science it is impossible for students to attempt in the time available to undertake the present course for the science degree. If the Dominion is to get an adequate return for its present expenditure on the teaching of science then it must have day teaching in science in the North Island colleges, in order to enable many more students to take the science degree and thereby benefit by the teaching which is available at the College. That some improvement is necessary in the present arrangements of teaching science is shown by the resolution of the Professorial Conference at its meeting in Wellington last year. At the conference of professors it was decided—and they were quite unanimous about it—that it was necessary to introduce entirely different science-teaching, and to introduce a degree that would give a professional qualification. The report says, "The following report on the institution of a new degree in science was referred by the conference to the teachers of the subject involved and the heads of the mining, engineering, and medical schools for consideration, to be reported upon at the next conference: 'Whereas it is desirable to institute a degree suitable for the requirements of persons intending to engage in scientific work in connection with agriculture, manufacture, and other technical pursuits, this Committee recommends that a special degree in science be established, the subjects of study for which shall be—(1) Mathematics (pure and applied); (2) physics; (3) chemistry; (4) physiology; (5) geology; (6) zoology; (7) botany.' " I think that that expression of opinion by the whole body of science professors is one to which some weight should be attached. The teaching for that degree would be quite out of the question in the evening, so that if any student is ever to be able to proceed to such a degree as those professors regarded as a desirable degree then there must be day teaching in Victoria College; but, as I have already pointed out, Mr. Hogben's report makes no provision for that improvement in our work. I think one can say generally that teaching of a university character is impossible in a college which merely teaches in the evening. As evidence of that I will give you the opinion expressed by a Royal Commission in Victoria on the work done at Victoria College and at Auckland. That Commission said that neither in scope nor in character was it the same as is done in other universities. You will see from the first page of Mr. Hogben's report that he was directed by the Minister of Education to inquire and report how "the library equipment of the colleges should be strengthened, especially in the interests of research." I should like you to notice how Mr. Hogben proposes to strengthen the libraries in the interests of research. On page 14, Table L, he proposes that the expenditure on libraries should be £250 at each of the four colleges. We can test what that will do for the libraries by considering it in comparison with what is at present done at some of the colleges. You will see from the top of page 14, Table K, that at Victoria College for the year ended 31st March, 1912, we spent £307 on the library. Therefore, according to Mr. Hogben, the library at Victoria College should be strengthened, in the interests of research, by decreasing the expenditure on it by £50 a year.

10. *Mr. Sidey.*] That is just the expenditure for one year: it is not the annual amount, is it?—It is the regular amount. The expenditure for the coming year has been set down at £300.

11. *Mr. McCallum.*] That includes, does it not, the salary of the librarian?—No. That is mentioned separately as £150. The £300 is divided up, roughly, as follows: about £100 is spent on journals, £50 on binding, and £150 on books. I submit to you that Mr. Hogben does not carry out the instructions of the Minister, and that his proposals must be amended in order to accord with the Minister's instructions. You may say that research is provided for at Victoria

College. I will test that by consideration of some of the science subjects. You will see in the appendix, page 20, to Mr. Hogben's report the list of periodicals taken at our College. There are two periodicals there which relate solely to physics, two others relating partly to it. I may mention that there are fourteen hundred journals published that relate to physics, yet the way in which we provide for that in Wellington is that we take four. The effect of that you may think will not be very serious. One of the effects is that you prevent many good students in science from accepting a New Zealand professorship. When I appear on behalf of the Reform Association to give you evidence I propose to actually show you letters in which it is said by the writers they would not accept a New Zealand appointment. I withdrew from an appointment in South Africa because I found there were no libraries there, and that in accepting this appointment I was misled as to the libraries in New Zealand.

12. Who misled you?—Quite unintentionally the committee in London, consisting of the High Commissioner, Professor Rutherford, and Professor Callendar. I asked them what libraries there were in Wellington, and they stated that they believed the Parliamentary Library contained a number of scientific periodicals. Be that as it may, the point is that we are supposed to teach science in University colleges without being acquainted with the progress of it in the world. Science is a subject which progresses rapidly, and if a teacher is unable to keep in touch with its progress I venture to say that his teaching will become valueless. The remedy that we have found is to buy our own scientific periodicals. There are Professors of Science at Victoria College and in other parts of New Zealand who spend from three to four times as much on their own scientific libraries as the national University library spends—I regard Victoria College as the national institution—and it seems scarcely worthy of a national institution that it can do so little. I know of one professor who spends about £40 a year on science books, and the expenditure at the College on the same subject is about £12 a year. Thus the absence of the periodicals tends to prevent the professor from keeping in touch with the progress of knowledge, while if he does keep in touch it becomes a charge on his salary: he is made to pay for things which the State ought to pay for. Further than that, the position of the libraries in New Zealand is such with regard to science that it is impossible to find in any of them throughout the length and breadth of New Zealand the books which record the progress of thought and discovery. Being a professor you may think that I take an extreme view on this subject, and that I am interested in things that have no practical importance for the people of New Zealand. I have here a little pamphlet called "The Interpretation of Milk Records." It was submitted to me by the Agricultural Chemist for my opinion as to whether the conclusions in it were correct. The purpose of the author is to find out how a farmer can test a cow during its first year of milking, and from the results that he obtains in the milking during that year to argue as to the yield of milk that the cow will give later in its life. So you can see the obvious utility of it to all dairy-farmers in New Zealand. It was awarded the gold medal for research by the Royal Agricultural Society of England. The footnotes contain references to the *Philosophical Transactions* of the Royal Society, "*Biometrika*," the *American Analyst*, and a number of other journals, Dutch as well as English. Now, the obviously utilitarian result that this pamphlet arrives at cannot be adequately tested or understood unless you have access to the literature referred to in the footnote—unless the reader does that it is impossible to test the accuracy of some of the conclusions, because the writer of the pamphlet merely mentions the conclusion and gives the footnote in order that you can get all the material supporting it. The paper is unintelligible unless you can get access to that material. Of the papers referred to I do not think we have one-half. The starving of our libraries is actually foolish from an economic point of view, even if we leave out of consideration that New-Zealanders should at least desire to be acquainted with the progress of thought in various subjects. There are only two matters further that I should like to refer to, and I wish now to give evidence on my own account and not on behalf of others. You will notice that in Mr. Hogben's report no provision is made for research at all in any college. By his reduction in the amount of the grant for libraries he would injure research, and there are no means provided to encourage it. One recommendation was put before the Education Department by the professorial conference, but I do not think any action has been taken on it. It was this: "That it be a recommendation from the professorial conference to the Minister of Education that the Government research scholarships be not restricted to subjects which are of immediate economic value, and that in cases when the scholarship lapses for one year the value of the scholarship for the following two years shall be increased to £150." The purpose of that was to enable research to be carried out in subjects which are not of immediate economic value. At the present time there is no provision for research in any subject which is not of an economic character in science, and if our teaching-work in New Zealand is to become of a really university character then some provision should be made for research which is not of an economic character. As far as I am aware the Government and the Education Department have taken no notice of the recommendation of the professorial conference on the subject. Presumably the professors' recommendation is not worthy of consideration. Practically all the science teachers in New Zealand were present when that recommendation was made. I would just like to call your attention to a personal experience of my own in the matter in which I think I have been unfairly treated. With a view to encouraging research in pure science I offered £50 to the Victoria College if they would establish a research scholarship in physics, on condition that the Government paid a £50 subsidy. I paid over the £50 to the College, but the Government up to the present have not paid the subsidy over. I will put before you a letter dated 30th October, 1912, which I wrote to Mr. Herdman on the point: "Victoria College has been endeavouring for the last eighteen months to obtain a subsidy from the Education Department on a donation it has received. As repeated applications for the subsidy have been unsuccessful, may I ask you, as member for the district in which the College is situated, to obtain from the Education Depart-

ment—a reply to these applications, and, if a refusal, the grounds for the refusal. In May, 1911, I offered, and have subsequently given, Victoria College £50 for a research scholarship on the condition that the Government gave a £50 subsidy. The College Registrar, Treasurer, and I have applied at intervals since then for the subsidy, but without avail. In not subsidizing this donation the Education Department are departing from Mr. Fowlds's promise that donations to the College would be subsidized. It is, further, the first time during the last three years that a subsidy has not been paid to Victoria College. Since the subsidy to Victoria College was applied for one of £1,000 or more has been paid to Otago University." Mr. Herdman wrote back to say, "I am in receipt of your letter of yesterday's date, and have seen the Minister of Education in reference to its contents. Mr. Allen knew nothing about the gift to the College of £50, and also knew nothing about the subsidy that was promised to be made by the Hon. Mr. Fowlds, but he has undertaken to have the matter looked into at once. I am communicating with him officially in the matter to-day, and as soon as I receive a reply I will write you again."

13. *Mr. Sidey.*] What is the date of that letter?—The 31st October, 1912—about ten months ago. It is about two or three years since I made the offer. I may state that subsidies usually are given. Mr. Turnbull gave £100 to Victoria College for the laboratory, and Sir Joseph Ward paid a subsidy on that. I myself gave £60 worth of apparatus to the College, and a subsidy was paid on that. But I paid over this £50 and no subsidy was given on that. Then, again, Mr. McCallum refunded the expenses he received as a member of the College Council, and no subsidy has been paid up to the present. In the case of some donations to Otago University, however, not merely has a pound-for-pound subsidy been paid, but something over.

14. *The Chairman.*] Is that not due to some fault on the part of your Registrar?—I do not think there is anything in that. I have here the correspondence relating to the £50 that I gave. I have drawn their attention to it at periods of about three months.

15. *Mr. Sidey.*] This £50 that you gave was for a scholarship?—Yes.

16. Do you know of any instance where a similar amount was paid to Otago University for a similar purpose and a subsidy was given?—No. The inference to be drawn from your question is that it is undesirable to subsidize scholarships for research. That is just what I wish to bring before the Committee—that the Education Department is not prepared to subsidize grants when they are given to encourage research; and I would ask that when any one gives a donation to encourage research that this Committee should report in favour of subsidies being paid on that money as well as on money for buildings. I believe that the encouragement of research is more important in New Zealand at present than the erection of buildings. I should just like to summarize the effects of Mr. Hogben's report on Victoria College. The total effect of it, according to our estimate, is that we should be £1,000 to the bad in our finances. We say that that table of proposed staffing, on page 10, has no reality, because it would be impossible for the College to institute such a staff, as the funds would not be available. Secondly, we would be deprived of all specialized teaching. There would be no specialized teaching in law or science at Victoria College after this report came into effect. It is not merely the fact of depriving us of that specialization that we complain, because in the case of science the statement that we specialize in it is rather meaningless, but I think we have a right to complain of the effect it would have on the whole standard of our work. The fact that we are an evening school has had already the effect of sending junior scholars and other good students—the best students—elsewhere. When they wish to select a university, if they come from a district such as Taranaki, often they do not come to Victoria College but go to Dunedin. Another effect is that through raising the fees a certain number of good students, who did benefit by the teaching which the College affords to them, are unable to continue their work. Finally, the report proposes to introduce commerce-teaching in all four centres; and the teaching will not be under the control of professors, it will be under the control of lecturers, and will be merely of the cramming kind—one or two men will try to cover a whole range of subjects which they will be incapable of treating at a university standard. The effect of the proposal, then, to teach commerce in every centre will be to lower the standard of work in all subjects, because if in a college you have certain subjects which are taught below a university standard the tendency is for that effect to be conveyed to other subjects and for them to fall to a lower standard. I have tested the report in connection with the Victoria College finances. You have seen that while the Inspector-General is directed to increase the provision for libraries he actually proposes a reduction of expenditure on the Victoria College basis, which itself is quite inadequate. He estimates the fees that we should get at Victoria College at £4,455 a year. There is no reason to assume that we can get more than £3,000. On page 12 he states that the amount required for salaries of mechanics, laboratory assistants, and apparatus should be £550, while as a matter of fact there is no reason to suppose that the present work can be carried on for less than £900 a year. And so on throughout the report you will find that it is inaccurate. I have tested it for Victoria College; I have not tested it for the other colleges. I think the duty devolves upon this Committee of having it tested for the other colleges; if they do not and it is put into effect the responsibility for mistakes will fall upon this Committee. If you test it in the places where I have and it is found so very inaccurate, then I think you will have found that it is a document that will have to be treated with very great care. You will not be able to assume that because a thing is stated in the report therefore it is a fact.

17. *The Chairman.*] You say you are coming up again on behalf of the Reform Association?—Yes.

18. What evidence are you going to give then?—On the general question.

19. *Mr. Guthrie.*] You say that what Mr. Hogben suggests as sufficient for the four libraries—£250 a year each—is absolutely insufficient?—Yes.

20. How on earth is it, then, that Auckland and Canterbury and Otago can get through on £153, £69, and £56 each?—In the case of Otago until recently the students did not use the library. It was not accessible to them.

21. For Victoria College £307 is put down, while two of the others do not spend anything like half of that?—That is simply because they never attempted to provide a library. That is one of the effects of our system of external examination. A library is not necessary in cramming for external examinations. You use cram text-books instead of a library.

22. Then until the question of internal or external examination is settled the libraries can go on just as they are, and the money will be sufficient?—Not at all, because if you provide a library as we have done at Victoria College and make it accessible to the students you will find that it is used. Our difficulty at present is to find enough room for the students who wish to use the library.

Professor ADAMSON, Dean of the Faculty of Law, Victoria College, made a statement. (No. 13.)

Witness: I wish to criticize the Inspector-General's report on the following grounds: The report makes no provision for specialization in any subject or group of subjects at Victoria College. Without assigning any reasons the report proposes to withdraw the annual grant of £2,000 hitherto assigned to Victoria College for the purpose of specializing in science and law. On the other hand he recommends, in addition to the amount of £11,000 to be spent yearly by each college on its staff, the expenditure at Otago University of an additional annual sum of £8,000 for staffing in home science, mining, medicine, and dentistry, and at Canterbury College of £3,000 in engineering. Home science is given a special grant for the first time. That is the first objection. The second objection I have is to the staff which the Inspector-General proposes for law. You will find his suggested type on page 10. I assume it is his ideal type. He calls it his "suggested type." It consists of one professor, two lecturers, and one assistant. Such a staff is entirely inadequate if anything like a properly equipped law school is ever to be established in New Zealand. For the purpose of comparison the staffing at a few other universities may be given. I quite admit that they are not on all-fours with the New Zealand University, but I think we ought to have them. I take, for example, Oxford. There are four professors, four readers, and fourteen lecturers, two being university and twelve inter-collegiate. At Cambridge there are three professors and one reader and ten lecturers. At Edinburgh there are six professors, five of whom have assistants, and there are seven lecturers. At Glasgow there are three professors, two of whom have assistants, and six lecturers. At Harvard there are ten professors and five lecturers. At Yale there are nine professors and five lecturers. At the Stanford University in California there are five professors, one assistant professor, and one lecturer. The Inspector-General's report has to be corrected in one respect. On page 2 he states the staff at the Sydney University to consist of one professor and four lecturers. There are also three readers. The next point is that the number of law students at each university mentioned is not given. The number of students at Edinburgh is 298, Glasgow 174, Harvard about 800, Yale 286, and Stanford 127. I have taken the figures for Edinburgh from the calendar, and I have reason to believe that the number has dropped since then. It was the latest calendar I had. When I was in Scotland last winter I was informed by the Professor of Scots Law at Edinburgh that the law students had dropped by about 25 per cent. Taking the universities mentioned by the Inspector-General, at Leeds the law students are included in the arts; at Manchester the number I got from the Professor of Law there is fifty-three students. Besides these, however, it is right to mention that he tells me there are two hundred students attending courses at what he calls the Bankers' Institute. Then at Adelaide the number I got from the professor was, say, fifty students; at Sydney the number was eighty-five; and at Melbourne twenty to thirty LL.B. course, thirty to forty articulated clerks' course. So long as it is attempted to provide legal education at four separate colleges so long will it be impossible to have a thoroughly efficient law school in the Dominion. This end can only be attained by concentrating all efforts on one centre. The proposal to establish four law schools, if carried out, would perpetuate a vicious system which has been practically condemned. I wish to put on record an excerpt from an address given by the Right Hon. Mr. Bryce in an address at the Victoria College graduation ceremony in 1912. He said, "In New Zealand they would be obliged to try to specialize in each of the four colleges. The difficulty of concentration of teaching-power, efforts, and finance upon one fully equipped and complete University was found in a country where there were four centres of population each having independent and separate claims. If that could not be done surely the next best course would be to allot to each college some special field of activity in which it could attain the highest standard of excellence, so that instead of four colleges imperfectly equipped they could have four colleges equipped to the highest point of efficiency in one department. It was not essential that a man should continue at the same University for the whole of his career. . . . They might have, as they now had at Otago, a highly equipped medical faculty; at Auckland a faculty of mechanics and allied sciences; at Canterbury agriculture; and at Wellington law, economics, and finance. These were only illustrations." The money required for the payment of lecturers and for the foundation and upkeep of libraries at the other colleges should be devoted to scholarships, which would enable local students to attend the one law school, just as other students have to attend the one school for medicine, engineering, or mining. I might add that law students may keep their first and second years' terms at any of the four centres. I should like also to mention this: the library at Victoria College contains 1,258 law books and periodicals. At the other three colleges there are 111 altogether. The University at Yale has 32,000 law volumes.

1. *The Chairman.*] Are you connected with the Law Society here? Do your students have the use of the law library?—No, the students have no right to use the law library.

2. *Mr. Sidey.*] How many students are there in your class?—I have not got the return. The number varies from year to year. I have so many classes. I have about nine classes, I think. The numbers have certainly gone down this year. Last year I had sixty in one class. I think I have about forty-five this year.

3. Do you find that many students come from other centres at all?—To my knowledge students do come. I can never tell, of course, whether they come for that purpose, but I have had graduates from other colleges.

FRIDAY, 22ND AUGUST, 1913.

Professor GABBATT examined. (No. 14.)

1. *The Chairman.*] What are you?—Professor of Mathematics.

2. Whom do you represent?—I represent Canterbury College.

3. Do you wish to make a statement to the Committee?—I do not know at all what line you are taking. I came up at short notice and did not prepare any written statement, because I had no notion of the line the Committee were taking. Really I came to show myself, and to say that the University reform movement is by no means confined to Wellington, as has been generally understood. In Christchurch, Canterbury College has been a reforming college for many years before I came to New Zealand, and on many questions it has taken the first step in the way of reform. I really came up here rather to be examined than to make a statement. I had very little time, and it seemed to me that any statement I might make may be utterly off the lines. If any member of the Committee cared to ask me questions about our reasons for petitioning I should be glad to answer them.

4. *Mr. Guthrie.*] I should like to know, Professor Gabbatt, if you are prepared to support the need for reform, and in what respect?—Well, sir, it seems to the people who have thought of the matter at Canterbury College that, as the petition states, reform of the constitution of the University is absolutely vital in the first place. We think that sole control of the University by a body which is to a certain extent predominantly lay is quite an impossible situation. What we want, as a matter of fact—and I think I may say that if those who signed the petition got this they would no longer want a Royal Commission—is a Senate which we think should be absolutely predominantly lay, which should be the supreme Court of the University, and should have sole control of the finance. On that Senate we think there should be no more than four professors, one elected by each Professorial Board. The Boards of Governors, on the other hand—the governing body of the colleges—should be largely represented; there should not be fewer than three representatives of each Board of Governors in the Senate. I want to make it clear that no professors should be elected to the Senate save a sole representative from each Professorial Board. The Senate should be the supreme Court of the University, and have direct control of the finances of the University. We do not want anything to do with the finance. That body should also have the right of veto over the Board of Studies, but that right should only be exercised in extreme cases. Then we want a statutory Board of Studies, which should be entirely academic—a Board of Studies of not less than twenty members elected by the Professorial Boards of the four colleges. This Board of Studies should have the duties that devolve on the corresponding Boards in the modern English universities—that is to say, it should have sole control, subject to review by the Senate, of the curriculum, recommendations for degrees, and suchlike matters. I want to make it clear that while that body would have no control whatsoever of the finances, on the other hand the suggested Senate would not have the direct control of the academic side of the University. The Board of Studies, I think, should have, subject to review, the complete control of the academic side. The Senate should be unable to move, without the recommendation of the Board of Studies, on any matter directly affecting the academic side of the University. That is the nature of the constitution we want. We think if we could get that anything else, such as Faculty Boards, could be allowed to settle themselves. I say that because some plea has been made that the effect of two of the schemes that are being considered is that twenty or twenty-two Boards would be set up. We want to make it clear that in our opinion at Canterbury College the vital parts of the scheme are those I have indicated—that is, the Senate and the Board of Studies.

5. In regard to the Board of Studies, does that include the arrangement of the curriculum for degrees and also examinations?—Absolutely and entirely. That would not necessitate the appointment of examiners solely from the Board of Studies. I dare say you know that in the Home universities—the Liverpool University, for instance, with which I am familiar—that sort of thing is done; and, subject to the review by this lay body, the Board of Studies should have the control of all such things—namely, the recommendations for degrees, methods of examination, and so on. Of course, as I dare say you know, in the modern universities at Home generally the teacher or teachers of the subject sit along with an external assessor. When I say that the Board of Studies should have control of the examinations that does not bar the appointment of external examiners, but such appointment would be subject to the recommendation of the Board of Studies.

6. Then I understand from you that you want the constitution of the Senate changed from what it is at present?—Yes, a change would be necessitated in several respects. For example, each Professorial Board elects one representative to the Senate annually—invariably one of its own members—and then professors can stand for other constituencies. I believe there are about ten professors or ex-professors at present members of the Senate. I would have that cut down.

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.

28. There again our Senate would have no power of originating a proposal to appoint or dismiss?—The Senate has not that power at present. That power is vested in the governing bodies of the colleges.

29. You propose to change the constitution so as to set up a Board of Studies with the powers at present held by the Board of Governors or Council?—No, my proposal was definitely directed to changing the constitution of the University. I have not suggested any alteration so far in the constitution of the colleges.

30. You would leave the Council in Victoria College, for instance, unchanged?—I do not see any reason why it should be changed. I think in every case the Professorial Boards should have direct representation on the governing body of the College.

31. Does not the Council at present have some cognizance of the curriculum?—The governing body of the College?

32. Yes?—Practically not. It has nothing to do with the curriculum of the University at all, and I have never known the Board of Governors at Canterbury College make any direct suggestion about the classes. Of course, they have sometimes founded professorships without the recommendation of the Professorial Board, but the Board of Governors at Canterbury College practically does not interfere with the curriculum at all.

33. You would still leave the power of appointment and dismissal of the professors in the hands of the University College Council?—Yes, the College governing bodies. I think the Professorial Boards of the colleges should have the same right as is possessed by the corresponding bodies at Home. They should have the right to recommend.

34. Then practically you are suggesting that the Board of Studies should have the right of appointment and dismissal?—No, not the Board of Studies—that is a different body. The Professorial Board of a College should, in my opinion, be consulted before a professor is appointed by the governing body of that college. The University has at present, I believe, no voice whatsoever in anything of that kind, only the colleges.

35. But you are using words without defining them. You talk of “the University,” then you talk of “the governing body,” and then of “the Senate,” and it is rather difficult to follow you?—I am using them in the ordinary sense. I talk of the University of New Zealand. Are you an Otago man?

36. Yes?—Well, we never think of Canterbury College as a university—we always talk of it as a college. When I say “the governing body” I mean the governing body of the College.

37. The governing body of the College is the Board of Governors of the College?—Yes.

38. Is there not a confusion of terms there?—I say “the governing body” because the nomenclature is different in different centres.

39. Is not the Board of Governors the governing body?—Yes, at Canterbury. The Council is the governing body at Victoria College. I will say “the Board of Governors” if you think it makes it clearer. When I say “the governing body” I mean “the Board of Governors.”

40. You would allow the appointment and dismissal of the professors to remain wholly in the hands of the Board of Governors?—I say the Professorial Board should be consulted, but the final decision should be in the hands of the Board of Governors, certainly.

41. Do you advocate the power of veto on the part of the Professorial Board?—That I have not considered. I have considered the constitution of the University of New Zealand rather than all the separate colleges.

42. You referred to the University of Liverpool. Is it not a fact that the University of Liverpool has only had a life of about eight or nine years?—The University of Liverpool was founded in 1904, but the University College of Liverpool has been going on since 1881.

43. That is only about nine years?—The University College of Liverpool had great experience as a constituent college of the Victoria University, to which it was admitted, I think, in 1884.

44. You referred us to this Board of Studies of the University: when did it take control in Liverpool?—Of course, when the University was founded.

45. That was when?—In 1904, I think; but there had been a similar Board in the Victoria University, which preceded the Liverpool University. That Board existed for twenty years before 1904.

46. *Mr. McCallum.*] When you use the expression “predominantly lay” do you refer to the existing Senate or the Senate as you desire it to be when you reform it? I take it you referred to the present Senate as being a body predominantly lay?—I may have done so.

47. You desire to have a Senate in future predominantly lay, with an advisory body to be called the Board of Studies?—Yes.

48. To advise that predominantly lay body, which is the Senate?—Yes.

49. Now, as to the constitution of the Senate, what objection have you or the reformers to the form of appointees by the Government? The Governor in Council appoints four: is there any objection to that?—No, I do not express any opinion on that.

50. You want us to extend the representation held by the governing bodies on the Senate?—Yes.

51. We have the greatest representation, two each. There are eight altogether?—Yes.

52. What objection have you got to the Professorial Boards sending one each?—None. I said they should send one each.

53. Now we get down to two apiece from the District Courts of Convocation—the graduates. That brings you into touch with the educational thought of New Zealand?—I do not know about the educational thought of New Zealand. I know what happens in Christchurch about the appointment of these representatives, and that is that it is in the hands of about twenty people. If a professor stands practically no one will stand against him, and that seems to me a bad thing.

54. Your main objection is the District Courts of Convocation?—No, I am not objecting to that. I do not express any opinion on that.

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

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.

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.

124. Those are the affiliated institutions?—Each Professorial Board would have, as now, to make its own time-table, but, of course, the lines of study would be to a great extent determined by the Board of Studies.

125. What do you mean by the "lines of study" that would be determined by the Board of Studies?—The curricula in the various subjects for degrees would be laid down by the Board of Studies.

126. And make them uniform in each university?—I do not know whether they should be more uniform than now. The curriculum is now laid down by the Senate in the same way.

127. Is there not a variation in the different colleges? Take your own subject: are you all teaching mathematics in the same way?—I hope not.

128. If the question of teaching the mathematics curriculum is to be decided by the Board of Studies, will it not be brought more into uniformity in the four colleges?—No, I do not think so.

129. Well, what is the use of giving them the power to determine the curriculum?—A reasonable measure of progress would be possible. We do not find it possible at present. For example, when I came to New Zealand Professor Seager had been fifteen years in Auckland, and had never been to Christchurch. I do not think he had met a single one of his colleagues. There could be no uniformity there. Each teacher would be allowed to go his own way while following the main lines of the degree syllabus, as he has to now.

130. If Professor Seager and some other teacher of mathematics of sixteen years' experience were upon the Board of Studies, and the Board of Studies had to decide the curricula, would there not be a danger of their deciding a curricula that would be out of date?—We met for that purpose last year. Professors Seager, Richards, Picken, and myself met, and we were able to hammer out a new syllabus from beginning to end.

131. *The Chairman.*] How many professors are there in Canterbury College?—There are nine actual professors. There are five lecturers, four of them being part-time.

132. Your petition is signed by only six?—Yes.

133. Are we to assume that the others are not favourable to your petition?—Professor Hight last year signed the memorial in favour of Professor Laby's petition. He did not sign this year because he is a member of the Senate, and the Senate has set up a committee to deal with the question of the reconstitution of the University. Professor Farr, Professor of Physics, did not sign because he wanted more Englishmen on the Commission—he wanted two instead of one. Professor Scott is away. He also signed the memorial; he was one of the prime movers in the matter. The only other professor is Professor Chilton, who rather prefers not to make a frontal attack, so to speak, but he is as keen on some points of reform as any one could possibly be. For instance, he has been one of the prime movers in the suggested system of intermediate examinations.

134. In connection with the proposed Board of Studies would you leave the curriculum of the degree of faculties in the hands of that Board? I refer, for instance, to degrees in engineering in Canterbury and the degrees in medicine in Otago, and so on?—Well, of course, purely technical questions would have to be left in the hands of the professor of the subject, except in so far as the curriculum affected other subjects. For example, the engineering syllabus necessarily affects mathematics and physics. The professors of mathematics and physics would therefore have to be associated with the professor of engineering.

135. And you think that could be left to their respective faculties?—Yes, the technical side.

136. You realize, of course, that the conditions in New Zealand are quite distinct from that of any other university in the Empire, I think?—In respect of distance?

137. The distance and difficulty of communication, to some extent?—Yes.

138. And which will still exist for years?—Yes, but that was one of our main reasons for proposing the annual professorial conference.

139. Yes, but your Board of Studies would have to meet several times a year, would it not?—Not necessarily so.

140. Would it not for degrees?—It would have to meet to make recommendations for degrees, but I think it could probably do all its business at one session. Of course, separate Boards would have to have some meetings about papers, but the whole Board of Studies need not meet more than once a year.

141. And the decision regarding the granting of degrees, could that be accomplished at the same annual meeting?—That was done in the federal Home universities. The examiners' reports were taken at the meeting, and reports on degrees issued from the same meeting.

142. When you say the federal universities at Home you refer to Wales and Victoria?—Yes. It used to be done at Victoria, but Victoria is dissolved now.

143. But they are all within two or three hours of each other?—Yes.

144. And they could meet any day and at any time?—Yes.

145. The geographical difficulties are much greater here?—Yes.

146. Do you not think that there should be in connection with the whole University uniformity of remuneration for professors, lecturers, and demonstrators as far as possible?—I should think that would probably be a good thing.

147. At present the respective governing bodies fix their own rates?—Yes.

148. That is a matter which would have to be left still to the governing bodies unless that power were taken out of their hands?—Yes, presumably. That is a question I have not thought much about. It has been purely on the academic side I have done my thinking.

149. Do you think, if the suggestions you have made were carried into effect, that the bottom, as it were, would fall out of the agitation?—I think so. I cannot speak for the Wellington men, but I think it would so far as Christchurch is concerned.

150. *Mr. Sidey.*] Would the Board of Studies have the sole appointment of examiners?—Yes. The Board of Studies would recommend, and the Senate would pass the recommendation I do not say they would be bound to.

151. How would you provide for deadlocks? Supposing the Board of Studies make a recommendation which the Senate declines to accept?—That sort of thing does not happen at Home. I have only heard of one case.

152. *Mr. Guthrie.*] The Board of Studies, I understood you to say, would arrange the whole curricula of the whole of the degrees?—Yes, it would be the final authority. No doubt some of its functions would afterwards be delegated to Boards of Faculties, as suggested in the schemes.

153. Then you would retain the right of having a fixed curricula. You would say that any function that would naturally follow would be the examination for those degrees?—Yes.

154. Entirely in your hands?—That does not exclude the appointment by the Board of Studies of external examiners.

155. Has it been suggested to your mind in connection with the consideration of this matter the position New Zealand is placed in with regard to its University—how it is supported, from whom the support comes—that it is a public thing to a very large extent?—Yes. That is, of course, the same to a great extent at Home. For example, besides the Government grant of £10,000 a year, Liverpool University gets a grant from the City Council of £10,000, and the Council also sets up a large number of scholarships. I think you can call that a public thing. There have been very many benefactions as well, but the University depends on public money to a large extent. That is the state of affairs that obtains in all the modern universities at Home at present, I believe.

156. *Hon. Mr. Allen.*] You suggested that the Board of Studies should, practically speaking, control the curriculum?—Yes.

157. Do you also suggest that the Board of Studies should control the subjects taught in any particular University college?—I do not think so. The particular University colleges would teach, as at present, what subjects they are able to teach.

158. If an affiliated college or University college desired to establish special schools, would your Board of Studies in any way interfere with them?—If they wanted the University to set up a degree.

159. I am not talking about degrees, I am talking about schools themselves and the opportunities to teach—for instance, mining?—Well, if they liked to set up mining they could do it on their own account.

160. Take domestic science: you do not suggest that the Board of Studies would in any way interfere there?—No, not unless they wanted a degree.

161. If they wanted a degree in domestic science you think the Board of Studies should decide that?—Yes, should report.

162. And lay down the curriculum?—With expert assistance.

163. Where would you get your expert assistance from?—If there were no teachers of domestic science in New Zealand it would be no use setting up a degree.

164. I am talking of a case which exists now in which the subjects are taught. The Board of Studies would have nobody except those whom they draw from local institutions, and who could advise them?—The Senate have no one now who can advise them. The Board of Studies would be in much the same position as the Senate in that respect.

165. *Mr. Sidey.*] Are you not aware that the reform pamphlet suggested that no new Chair should be established by any local college without the recommendation of the Senate?—I had nothing to do with the pamphlet. I do not pin myself down to that.

166. You are not prepared to endorse that?—I am certainly not at present prepared to endorse that.

167. I think you will find they expressed an opinion very much like that if that is not exact?—They can speak for themselves. I take no responsibility for that.

168. You are not at the present time prepared to endorse it?—No, I am not.

Professor RANKINE BROWN examined. (No. 15.)

1. *The Chairman.*] What are you?—I am Chairman of the Faculty of Arts in Victoria College.

2. What are you a professor of?—Classics. I should like to say to the Committee that I hope it will not take any serious steps in connection with university education in New Zealand as a result of Mr. Hogben's report, but will rather recommend that a Royal Commission should be set up. I am in a somewhat interesting position with regard to the question of a Royal Commission. I did not sign the original request for a Royal Commission sent in by Victoria College because I had other views at the time. I have to some extent actually opposed the reform movement, but I have now decided to support it owing to certain things which have happened lately, and also because of the thought I have given to the matter which has led me to change my mind. I have signed the last petition for the setting-up of a Royal Commission. If the Committee likes to cross-examine me on the subject I shall be very pleased to give my views on the matter. I might prove an interesting witness, because I have been a member of the University Senate for ten years, and know perhaps better than any witness whom you have yet examined exactly how the University Senate works in New Zealand. I shall now read you my statement, which is more of an academic character than other criticisms of Mr. Hogben's report. Economics and history: I should like to call attention to the poor provision suggested

for the teaching and study of these two important subjects. Mr. Hogben does not ignore their importance: see his general remarks under the head of "Economics" on page 5. In the suggested type on page 10 he proposes a professor and lecturer for the two combined, but the minimum suggested for each college only proposes two lecturers, except in Canterbury College, where a lecturer is added to the already existing professor. His suggested minimum thus falls far short in these subjects of the suggested type. In the case of mental science he proposes the suggested type as the minimum. This involves the conversion of lectureships—poorly paid in two colleges, Auckland and Canterbury—into professorships, and the addition of four assistants. The proposal for history and economics (two subjects) involves the addition of only four lecturers to the present staff. In the case of the sciences—physics, chemistry, biology, geology—it is also proposed to establish the suggested type in all four colleges as the minimum, with the altogether minor exception that instead of two assistants in biology, as suggested in the type, one assistant is proposed. A consideration of the present staffs of the colleges will show that to bring them up in science to the minimum the report proposes to add one professor, nine lecturers, and six assistants to the present staffs. I do not mean to imply that the additions proposed in mental science and science are unnecessary: I have made the comparison merely to show that justice has not been done to history and economics. Without denying the importance of the study of mental science and the sciences proper, I think that a good case might be made out for the equal importance of the study of history and economics, which the report comparatively leaves out in the cold. The position of history and economics in many universities is not satisfactory. The main reason for this is an historical one—namely, that these subjects were not included in the trivium and the quadrivium, on which mediæval university education was based, and which to some extent still dominate university arrangements in the Old Country. But of the great importance of the study of history and economics in New Zealand there can be no doubt. One of the great defects of New Zealand education at present is the small attention paid to history in the schools; and in an isolated country like this, removed from the main stream of European history, and with no history "in the air" as it were, without old castles or historic towns—with a scenery absolutely devoid of legend and human interest so far as the white inhabitants of the country are concerned—the necessity of cultivating the historic sense and imagination is even more clamant than in Europe, where any child of average intelligence is surrounded, in a sense, by history. We cannot understand ourselves unless we understand how we have come to be what we are, and we can only do that by the study of history. For the study of economics in New Zealand the case is quite as strong—from a university point of view almost stronger. The semi-socialistic legislation of the last twenty years in New Zealand has made this country the *corpus vile* on which a considerable number of social experiments have been tried, and is bringing about a state of things which is highly interesting to the economist, and will abundantly repay investigation. That this is so is shown by the fact that economists visit New Zealand from other countries merely to study the economic conditions here, and there is a wide field of virgin soil for investigation by trained economists on the spot. Such investigations would prove interesting and valuable not only to those who are most concerned in them—that is, the inhabitants of New Zealand—but to the world at large, either by way of encouragement to embark on similar experiments or as a warning against them. In this respect the study of economics in New Zealand is in much the same position as the study of biology. In both subjects there are certain aspects which can only be studied here—certain forms of animal and plant life in the case of zoology and botany, and in economics certain trends and tendencies in the relation of capital and labour, and the effect of legislative interference on the free contract between employer and employed. In this respect economics and biology and geology seem almost to stand on a different footing from the other sciences. It is not necessary to labour this point. One of the things Mr. Bryce recommended in an address he delivered in Wellington about a year ago was the establishment of something like a school of economics. Such an arrangement as appears in the suggested type would probably be sufficient in the meantime—that is to say, that each college should have a professor either of economics or of history, as the case might be, and that there should be associated with the professor a competent lecturer to deal with the subject in which the professor is not a specialist. Arrangements could be made in this way so as to secure two Professors of History and two of Economics in New Zealand. Mental science: On page 5 the report rightly lays stress on the importance of this subject, and refers to the new development in the direction of experimental psychology. Mr. Hogben does not, I think, suggest that experimental psychology ought necessarily to be taught in all the colleges, and if this is his point of view I think that it is a wise one. Experimental psychology is to some extent a specialty, and there are many admirable teachers and students of mental science—or, to employ a better title, of mental and moral philosophy—who feel no profound interest in it, but devote themselves to other aspects of this very wide subject. But if experimental psychology is to be taught, the provision suggested, that of an assistant in addition to the professor, is quite inadequate. The association of experimental psychology with mental science at once puts mental science in the same category as the experimental sciences proper, and a similar staff would be required. This is the view of Professor Hunter, who has devoted considerable time to this special branch of his subject, and I think it will recommend itself to the Committee as a reasonable one. The Professor of Mental Science is almost certain to be overburdened with work. His classes will probably be larger than those of the average Professor of Science, and if teachers are encouraged to take this branch of study it will be mainly for its psychological and experimental side, so that the amount of laboratory work will be very considerable. Higher teaching in arts: The report has been already criticized from the point of view that, whilst it provides a greater amount of teaching of an ordinary type suitable for the average pass and honours student, it makes little or no provision for higher or more concentrated study, which

is now almost universally regarded as the most important function of a university. I do not desire to undervalue the ordinary pass student. The subjects which I teach, when handled by a competent man, are just such as have a great value to a pass student, and open up his mind to trains of thought and give him such vistas of knowledge as often profoundly influence his mental attitude. I should be the last to push the ordinary man into the background, as it seems to me that a good deal of "tall talk" about university ideals tends to do. The vast majority of the population consists of average men, and you can only make the lump good by making the atoms which compose it good. But at the same time the highest function of a university is undoubtedly the encouragement and propagation of what may be called the higher learning, either by disseminating it or by adding to it by original work on the part of the teachers or the taught. So far as this aspect of university work is concerned the report leaves New Zealand very much where it is at present. I am speaking solely from the arts point of view, but I believe that what I am going to suggest would prove acceptable to science, and might solve the problem of higher teaching and specialization, which so far in New Zealand has been urged entirely from the point of view of science. I do not suggest that all the colleges should be strengthened in this direction in all subjects equally—the expense of doing so would be considerable, and I do not think that it is at all necessary; but I do think that each college ought to have a homogeneous section of the arts curriculum more highly developed than the report suggests. If one college had the teaching of languages fully provided for, so that it had five Professors of Languages—Latin, Greek, French, German, English—or if one college had Latin and Greek, another French and German, both having English adequately taught, it would be possible for a New Zealand student who desired to specialize in these subjects or group of subjects to get adequate instruction. Another college might have mathematics provided for by the institution of two professorships, one of pure the other of applied mathematics, and the same principle could be applied to the other subjects in the arts group. The result would be that in New Zealand, though not at every college, there would be facilities for the highest work, and these facilities could be secured at some expense certainly, but not by an inordinate expenditure. The student would have to go to the centre where his specialty was taught, but the present Senior Scholarships would be available for the purpose, and if necessary some system of higher scholarships could be instituted to supply the means. I believe myself that the country would gain in the long-run if some portion of the money which is at present being spent on free places and the like in secondary schools for pupils who are really not fitted for secondary education were devoted to some purpose like this. It is essentially the system which prevails at Home, where Oxford and Cambridge are the universities to which the students of the provincial colleges of England and of the Scottish universities proceed for higher work. This was, for instance, what happened in the case of Professors Easterfield, Picken, and myself, and of other New Zealand professors. One result of such a scheme would undoubtedly be that the output of original work on the part of the art professors and their pupils would be increased. There are several reasons why such output both here and in Australia is at present low, but one of them undoubtedly is that the teachers are overburdened with work. The Professors of Classics and Modern Languages in New Zealand, for instance, all teach two subjects. The hours required for lectures are considerable, but that is really the smallest part of the difficulty. Far the greater portion of their time is taken up with preparing their work; and as one who for five years had Latin and Greek classes going at all grades—from pass to honours—I can say that the mere preparation of lectures in a subject when the work varies from year to year took up the greater part of my summers. This applies to all the Arts Professors, even more, I think, than it does to the Professors of Science, who are not now double-banked as far as physics and chemistry are concerned. If at some one or other of the colleges two professors were appointed to do what at present is done by one it is almost certain that the time gained and the concentration secured by the professors having to attend to one subject only would result in a greater amount of original work being done. The same applies to the relations of professor to student. At present an Arts Professor has little time to give to old students who desire post-graduate work. I have had a case of this quite lately myself. Fees: The carrying-out of the proposals of the report depend to a great extent on the increase in the fees of the different colleges. This point has been dealt with by a previous witness, and I should like to say something about it from an arts point of view. I certainly do not think that the fees earned by each class ought to be earmarked for that class—an idea which seems to be implied in some portions of the report—nor do I entirely approve of the other alternative, that they should form a common-fee fund on which the whole college should be able to draw without discrimination. Such a course undoubtedly tells against the faculty of arts, which is the great fee-producing element in the college, and which, in a college dependent on its fees for its development, is apt to be "milked" for the benefit of the faculty of science. I am not in any way inimical to the development of that faculty, but I think that its development must mainly, if not entirely, come from funds provided by the State or by outside sources apart from the revenue of the college from fees. Taking the number given for Victoria College in Table C, page 3, and assuming that the fee is £3 3s., the fees produced by arts subjects, including mathematics, would be £2,200, while the fees produced by the science subjects, excluding laboratory fees, would be £345. The expense of salaries for the arts subjects is, roughly, at present, £4,400; that of salaries on the science side is about £2,800. In the case of the faculty of arts the fees do form an appreciable portion of the expenditure on teaching. They are sufficient to pay almost one-half of the present staff; in the faculty of science the fees are a negligible quantity. I do not grumble at this; it is the universal experience of all universities. Science is admittedly expensive to teach, but the ulterior gains to the State from the commercial value of discoveries alone probably justifies the expenditure. This

is putting the arguments in favour of science from the lowest point of view: there are other gains of a higher type which cannot be reckoned in value of money. A point in which science is perhaps unfairly treated is the imposition of a laboratory fee. In Victoria College this is £3 3s., so that a student taking science pays a total fee of £6 6s. as against £3 3s. for an arts subject. There is a great deal to be said for the abolition of this imposition; but if laboratory fees were abolished, and the sum at present produced by them taken for the common-fee fund, arts and law would contribute in Victoria College in the proportion of at least eight to one—that is to say, the undoubted benefit to the faculty of science might prove to be at the expense of the legitimate development of the faculties of arts and law. I give this solely as an illustration of my meaning. What I should like to make quite clear, then, is that, whilst I believe in something like a common-fee fund, I do think that arts will suffer if it is expected to contribute largely to the development of science. For one thing, the word “science” in these days is something like the blessed word “Mesopotamia”; and science, after having been, I admit, unjustly held down by the brute force of the older arts subjects, is now threatening to exercise some oppression in its turn—it has a capacious maw, it is somewhat noisy, and very keen and enthusiastic—whilst the average Arts Professor is a quiet, studious creature whose work is sometimes undervalued in these material days. I think that it should be clearly understood that arts should have something like a first call on arts fees for the improvement of the teaching in arts. Library: Here, too, I think that the arts faculty is apt to be treated unfairly owing to the absence of a clear conception of its needs. To an Arts Professor a good library is all-in-all; it furnishes him with the material on which he works, and is to him very much what his laboratory is to a scientist. A scientist, of course, requires a good library too, but not in the sense in which an arts man needs one. A language-teacher, for instance, cannot do any work at all without access to an extensive collection of books. That is another reason why original work in languages worth publishing is not common in Australia or New Zealand. It is undoubtedly possible for a scientist to do original work, not entirely without books, of course, but certainly with less dependence on them than the arts man. I do not suppose, for instance, that the researches in X rays, for which Professor Laby and his students are rightly distinguished, require a large library. They require, I take it, mainly aptitude or genius for research work in that particular direction, and an adequate laboratory, combined with access to recent scientific literature on the question. Syntactical work in Latin, on the other hand, in which I am personally interested, I find exceedingly difficult to bring to any definite conclusion owing to the absence of books, and I have to do a great deal of preliminary work myself in studying any problem which I know to have been already covered by some other student. All original workers in arts are really faced by similar difficulties. The point I wish to make, therefore, is that in respect of library provision the arts subjects ought to receive special consideration by reason of their close dependence on libraries; and I should like to strengthen this general argument by two facts—one, that the arts subjects are the large fee-producing subjects, and so provide a fund from which, to some extent, such increased grant might be taken; and the other, that arts subjects are not expensive to teach, as they do not involve laboratory expenditure and therefore do not draw largely on the common funds of the college. I quite agree as to the inadequacy of the proposed expenditure of £250 per annum to do anything in the way of equipping the college libraries in the direction of research. The annual expenditure of a larger sum in Victoria College is insufficient to provide the ordinary books required in each subject—in my subject quite inadequate, as there is so much back literature to be procured.

FRIDAY, 29TH AUGUST, 1913.

Professor EASTERFIELD examined. (No. 16.)

1. *The Chairman.*] What are you?—Chairman of the Science Faculty at Victoria College.
 2. Will you make your statement to the Committee?—Yes. Before dealing with the report itself I wish to protest against the principle that such a report shall be taken as the basis for fixing the finances of our University institutions. If the precedent is once established I foresee great danger that the Education Department will eventually override the four University colleges, and their independence will remain in name only. So long as the present Inspector-General remains in office friction would be reduced to the minimum, because he is in sympathy with the University institutions, but no one can guarantee that his successors will be equally sympathetic. In any case the function allotted to him forms only a portion of a far wider inquiry which can only be conducted by a Royal Commission of the type which witnesses from Christchurch and Wellington have already suggested. Urgent as it is that the financial straits which are crippling the colleges should be relieved, it is, I consider, most improper that the rigid fixing of the finances should be attempted on a one-man recommendation and without any reference to the reform of University education in New Zealand. Coming to the report itself, I enter my protest as a private citizen against the special reference to the wealthy citizens of Wellington (page 17, line 1). No part of New Zealand has reason to be proud of the liberality of the private citizen in the support of University education, and it seems out of place to select the citizens of that district in which a college has existed for the smallest length of time for a reproof which, if administered at all, should be applied to New-Zealanders as a whole rather than those in any particular centre. In this connection I would point out that University teaching has existed in Wellington for only one-half the number of years that it has existed in Auckland, and only one-third of the length of time that it has existed in Dunedin. The general principle underlying the report appears to be a pious attempt to enforce the scriptural precept, “To him that hath shall be given and he

shall have more abundance, but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that little which he hath." Victoria College has worked hard to establish a law school, and is the only college which has apparently considered the subject of law worthy of serious study, for at each of the other centres law is, according to Mr. Hogben's tables, left in the hands of a lecturer. The fact that Wellington is regarded as the legal centre of New Zealand further forces upon the College Council the duty of providing for specialization in this important subject, and unless a special grant is forthcoming for the law department not only will this department be itself hampered, but all the other departments of the College will suffer, since each will have a portion of its expenditure curtailed so that the special school may receive as much as possible. If it is found advisable to contribute £1,000 annually to one college for home science, which as a university subject is only on its trial, the granting of at least £2,000 annually for the maintenance of a special school of law cannot be denied. In the words of Charles Dickens, "Let us try to be reasonable, let us try to be good-natured, let us try to be fair in this matter." The sum of £550 which it is proposed that each college shall be allowed to expend on its laboratories annually (page 12) appears to me to be too low, more particularly as this includes fees of mechanics and laboratory assistants. If each professor in Victoria College who has laboratories in his charge had a laboratory assistant at £50 per annum, the assistants would receive £200 and the mechanic receive £220, so that £130 would be left to provide materials, renewals, repairs, and, apparently, new apparatus. For the five teachers in experimental science this means £26 per annum. I believe that Canterbury College is spending £200 annually on the repairs, renewals, and new apparatus for its chemical laboratory alone, and this expenditure is not excessive if the institution is to be kept in touch with the latest developments of the subject in Europe and America. It must be admitted that the providing and keeping up the equipment for a few advanced science students is of necessity a heavy expenditure, but the direct return in material value to the community is more than proportionately large. I will put two instances before you from our own Victoria College experience. Mr. B. C. Aston, Dominion Agricultural Chemist, was trained in research methods in my laboratory. The application of chemical research by him has apparently solved the difficulty of bush disease in the Tauranga district, so that nearly a million acres of unprofitable land will become available for cattle. A tax of 1d. per annum on that million acres would provide nearly twice the sum that it is proposed to spend upon the annual upkeep and maintenance of the whole chemical, physical, geological, and biological laboratories of the four University colleges, and the Dominion still has the services of Mr. Aston, who will undoubtedly solve a number of other agricultural riddles in the near future. Another investigation from my laboratories dealt with the conversion of fats into waxes. This was by Miss Clara Taylor, who held a Government research scholarship, but had begun the work before being appointed to it. This investigation will, I am certain, lead to the establishment of a great industry, though economic conditions may of course prevent the local establishment of the industry. I ought perhaps to add that neither Miss Taylor nor Mr. Aston, nor the greater number of my research students, have taken a B.Sc. degree, an indication that the value of the science work in a college cannot be measured in terms of the number of B.Sc.s trained in that college. I believe that inquiry would show that the average B.Sc. could not carry out a scientific investigation in any subject; hence no doubt the attitude of the recent professorial conference in desiring to abolish the name B.Sc. for the present degree and to call it a B.A. degree. The term B.A. is rightly applied to a degree which implies general culture rather than scientific proficiency. Considering the great importance to the community of having highly trained specialists amongst us, it is imperative that in connection with the financing of our colleges additional help shall be available for institutions which show that a high standard of research work is being maintained. An additional argument in this direction is introduced by the fact that the Civil Service Commissioners are imposing efficiency bars to increases in salary in the scientific departments; these Civil servants will find it necessary to study experimental science in a college in such a manner as to qualify as experts. The expenditure proposed in the report upon libraries is, I consider, quite inadequate: I am told by a member of one legal firm in Wellington that considerably over £1,000 has been spent upon the firm's law library. To propose a capital expenditure of £500 to be divided between the fifteen or more subjects in each college cannot make the college libraries efficient, nor is £250 per annum sufficient for an annual grant. One of my colleagues has spent £250 within the last two years in order that he may have a library which will keep him abreast of his subject. Many professors both in Wellington and the other centres have spent and are spending very heavily upon books and journals, and I know that in not a few cases the private library of the professor is placed at the convenience of the advanced student. Some time before the Inspector-General was deputed to report upon the subject the Victoria College Professorial Board reported to the College Council on this very matter. We considered that in the case of our own library a capital sum of £2,000 and an annual expenditure of £500 for books, journals, and binding was the minimum we could ask for, and the Council was convinced that the Professorial Board was not asking for too much. I wish to emphasize three points in connection with college libraries: (1.) Unless a professor is provided with the latest literature he has little chance of remaining efficient. His loss of efficiency will not be discovered by the governing body so long as his students pass their examinations. The preparation of students for examination is, however, no part of the duty of a professor, whose function should be to teach his subject thoroughly and to stimulate students with a desire for the highest form of scholarship. However great the examination successes of a professor, the man is, from the University standpoint, a failure unless he succeeds in stimulating his student with a desire to study his subject further after the examinations are over. (2.) It is very hard to get a spirit of scholarship into a student unless he is constantly being brought into contact with the best literature; and this can only be done in a properly equipped library. His studies should centre round the library, and even the elementary student should be practically forced to work in the library so as to acquire the

habit of using the same. There are, indeed, great arguments in favour of reducing the number of lectures and making students amplify the lecture outlines by a regular course of reading in the library. It is harder for the professor and for the student, but the general effect will be to create a university instead of a sausage-factory. I verily believe that the extraordinary success of Victoria College in making for itself, in the face of all its difficulties, a reputation for efficiency of teaching and soundness of scholarship which is unsurpassed by any other of our University institutions is largely due to the fact that the library is used by the students to a greater extent than in any other of our University colleges. (3.) It is obvious that without a good reference library the carrying out of high-class research work is extremely difficult. The first point in an investigation is to find out what has already been done upon the subject, and to repeat the fundamental experiments of previous observers. Unless the full account of these earlier researches can be consulted, much time will be wasted which might have been saved by a few minutes' reference to the necessary literature. It cannot be too severely emphasized that the difficulty is not met by providing the library with text-books or ordinary treatises. It is to the original literature, the scientific journals, that the investigator always has looked and must look for the information upon which his further experiments and observations are to be based.

3. *Hon. Mr. Allen.*] You have seen the suggested scheme of staffs on page 10 of the Inspector-General of Schools' report?—Yes.

4. You have read the two headings, "Suggested Type" and "Minimum suggested for each College"?—Yes.

5. You have also read the paragraph preceding that?—"Every College should have full liberty, as at present, to evolve its own programme, although I do think that the University should have some voice in the establishment of new Chairs, and perhaps some power to say whether the occupant of any particular Chair should be recognized as a qualified member of any academic body that might be set up to advise the Senate."

6. Well, do you mean to tell the Committee, in view of that paragraph, that the minimum suggested here is a fixed and definite minimum, and with no liberty left to the colleges?—The liberty left to the college is so very largely determined by its finances.

7. I want to know whether you think that paragraph preceding the proposed suggested scheme does not point to the fact that the writer had in his mind considerable freedom for the colleges to do what they liked, limited, of course, by the finances?—Taken by itself it certainly means that, and I have no doubt Mr. Hogben meant that; but at the same time, if a recommendation is carried by the Committee and is endorsed by the House, I am by no means certain that it may not be subsequently said that the money was given on the suggestion that particular things would be done, and that there shall be no liberty of action outside of the conditions upon which it was granted. The report surely presupposes that the money will be expended in the manner suggested by the report, otherwise there can be no basis for the report.

8. Now, with regard to specialization, you say there is no provision for specialization in law in Victoria College. On what grounds do you base that statement?—I see that the same sum is proposed for the total number of subjects in the upper part of Table H.

9. I am referring to the staffing—the minimum suggested: why do you say there is no provision for specialization when the provision is for two professors and one assistant lecturer?—But for efficient specialization I take it we must increase our staff beyond that, and such specialization can only be done, on the financial basis of the report, at the expense of the faculties of arts, commerce, and science in our College.

10. By how much for law alone?—I think probably an additional professor and two more lecturers would be required; but the Dean of the faculty of law is here awaiting cross-examination, and I must refer you to him for the detailed information.

11. Do you know anything about the Mining School?—No, I know nothing about the Mining School.

12. You have not a special school in physics?—No.

13. Now, in regard to the suggested provision made for finances, do you agree with Professor Laby about the amount that is likely to be derived from fees?—I have not gone into the question of fees.

14. You cannot give us any definite evidence about fees?—No.

15. Now, what do you understand is the suggested provision to be made with respect to finances out of the moneys derivable from endowments on page 15 of the report? How much do you understand each University college is to get out of the national endowments?—Well, it says there that £2,500 is to be given.

16. To each of the four colleges?—Yes.

17. That is out of £11,500 or £15,000 in all to be provided by national-endowment money—that is to say, there will be anything from £1,500 to £5,000 available still out of national-endowment money for University purposes?—That is to say, if the Land Bill got through.

18. Do you understand that that £1,500 or £5,000 would also be available for University education?—I really have not gone into those figures.

19. Then I do not see what is the value of your evidence about staffing?—It seems to me that the staffing proposed is insufficient. There is a special amount allocated for special schools, and I maintain that law is of such importance that it should be included as a special school with a further grant beyond the minimum in the other cases.

20. That is what I am coming to, and if you have not studied the finance you do not know where the special grants may not come from. Will you read the paragraph at the bottom of page 15 of the report?—Yes. "Out of this I would suggest that £2,500 be given to each of the four colleges—£10,000 in all—and that the remainder should be paid to the University of New Zealand in trust for the following purposes, as might be required from time to time, namely:

(a) To meet, if necessary, in whole or in part, the cost of staffing of any new faculties or Chairs

or lectureships that might be established in any of the colleges with the approval of the Senate; (b) to meet the cost of buildings required in consequence of the establishment of such new faculties or Chairs, or in consequence of the increase of students, either by grants or by loans repayable over a term of years; and (c) for grants in aid of college libraries." Yes, that is to be given to the University of New Zealand.

21. For what purposes?—In trust as might be required from time to time to meet the cost of staffing of any new faculties or Chairs of lectureships, cost of buildings, and in aid of college libraries.

22. Do you not think that could be interpreted to make provision for further specialization or for assistance to existing specialization?—I should be sorry to think so with the present constitution of the Senate and under the University of New Zealand Act. With the University established by Act of Parliament as being an institution which is to encourage higher learning by passing examinations and setting up of examinations and granting of degrees, it would be outside the function of the present Act to administer this sum in the present way. I am by no means satisfied that the Senate as at present constituted would be the right body to have it.

23. Well, I would like you to banish out of your mind for the time being the constitution of the Senate and deal with the finances apart altogether from the Senate. I want to know whether provision is made here for finances in this suggestion for further specialization or for assisting existing specializations?—I take it that the object might be to assist any specialization.

24. Is there not provision made for the finances to be placed in the hands of the Senate which may be used for further specialization at the College or to assist existing specializations?—It may apparently be used by them, I admit, for one or all of these purposes.

25. Would that be an increasing amount as the national-endowment revenues increase?—It could, but I think this is outside the portion of my evidence.

26. You connected the finance with the staffing, that the staffing is only the suggested minimum, and you have already said that it is supplemented by the heading "Staffing" in the report?—That is what provision is made for in the total finance, and Professors Picken and Laby can give very complete evidence on that question.

27. Now, in regard to libraries, how much per annum do you think ought to be given to each of the colleges for libraries?—A University college should, I consider, from our experience of the needs, be spending £500 a year.

28. Was any evidence taken by the Inspector-General of Schools in regard to this need for library money at Victoria College?—Yes, he got some.

29. What was he told would be necessary?—We certainly understood we were only dealing with the absolute immediate requirements, which would be only for a year or two.

30. I want to know whether in the report there is not provision made for the immediate expenditure of £500 and £250 per annum?—Yes, but £250 per annum is much below our present expenditure.

31. Is there any further provision suggested for libraries out of moneys that may be in the hands of the Senate?—Yes, a possible provision only.

32. Are not these words at the bottom of page 15: "For grants in aid of college libraries"?—Yes; that is, if they like to do it.

33. *Mr. Sidey.*] With regard to the subject of law, you suggest that there should have been two additional professors and one lecturer?—I said one professor and two lecturers, but I decline to make any specific proposals with regard to the law faculty.

34. If that provision were made in Mr. Hogben's suggested scheme of staffing for each college, would you be satisfied with Mr. Hogben's report as regards the law?—I should certainly require a special report brought down by the law faculty for consideration.

35. If that provision is made for Wellington you are not objecting to the provision of a lecturer at the other colleges?—If the lecturer is doing really sound law work I cannot see that that affects the matter. It only seems to be a fleabite on the total finances; but if it is going to mean that each of the centres will try to get a law school—and that is what one is always afraid of—then I should be against it. But I say that the law school in Wellington is a totally different thing from this provision of a lecturer in order to help law students in the other centres to get through the elementary law examinations. Such provision may not mean University work at all.

36. *Mr. McCallum.*] Our University Act was established not for the purpose of teaching, but for the purpose of encouraging in the manner hereinafter provided in pursuit of a liberal education, &c., and your best answer to the Hon. Mr. Allen would have been that we are bound by section 27, which sets out the degrees, and it means that an amendment of the University Act would be necessary?—Yes.

37. *Hon. Mr. Allen.*] Have you read the report of the Inspector-General of Schools?—Yes.

38. On page 15 it states "that the remainder should be paid to the University of New Zealand in trust for the following purposes." Do you mean to tell me that it needs an amendment of the Act to permit Parliament to pay over to the Senate a sum of money in trust for certain purposes?—Of course, I am not a lawyer. Whether if paid out in trust to them they would legally be entitled to get rid of it in the way suggested here without an amendment of the Act I do not know. I think it is possible that they could not. I trust that the other witnesses will be cross-examined on the points of law and finance in order that the whole position may be made clear; but the point I was making in that connection is this: that if I am right in believing that the development of the law department is going to be hampered, then the whole College will suffer with it, and I should like that to be placed on record.

39. If you are right?—It may be my views are right, and if the law department is to suffer then the whole College will suffer with it, and the standard of University education will be brought to a lower level than at present.

40. How many professors in law are there now?—Two professors and one lecturer. The efficiency as a school must certainly be hampered unless a special grant for the law school is forthcoming.

Professor ADAMSON further examined. (No. 17.)

1. *The Chairman.*] There is one question I should like to ask you in regard to the law students. Do your law students here make use of the Law Society's library?—The students of Victoria College as such have no right to use the law library, but I understand, though I am not a barrister of New Zealand, the practice is that the barristers in practice are allowed to give their assistants permission to use the law library, and that some of those assistants who are students at Victoria College do make use of it.

2. You do not know whether they use it regularly?—Not of my own knowledge. I do know, as a matter of fact, that some do use it.

3. Is the Law Society's library more fully provided with later works than yours?—I cannot say personally. I have not been inside the Law Society's library, but I should think it is much more fully provided.

4. Then is it not desirable that your students should be encouraged to go there as much as possible?—I think not. I doubt very much if the Law Society would permit of a large number of students going down and using their library while members required it. I can understand in a small place where there are few students or assistants that that would be quite a good system, but where we have many students coming from many parts of our province who are not law clerks that system would not work. There is also the further objection that to make the law library properly efficient it must be at hand to the students, for this reason: that the law students attend Victoria College in the evening, and it would break up the whole of their time if they had to go down town to the Law Society's library.

5. Even during the day?—I quite agree that if they had time during the day it would be advisable, but 90 per cent. of them have not the time, as they are occupied earning their living.

Professor LABY examined. (No. 18.)

1. *Mr. Sidey.*] I think you and your colleagues wish the Committee to take up this attitude, that we should not spend any money in giving effect to the report of Mr. Hogben until we have had a Royal Commission?—Yes, that is so.

2. Do you not understand that the report of Mr. Hogben is supposed to be based upon the minimum requirements of those colleges?—Yes, that is so—it is supposed to be based. The money he provides does not meet what he states to be the minimum requirements in the case of Victoria College.

3. But do you not think the minimum requirements ought to be met at the present time apart altogether from the delay in obtaining the report of a Royal Commission?—No. If the College were going into debt I think under its existing commitments that ought to be provided for; but, since the finance fixes the policy, to allow further expenditure to be incurred by the colleges before a Royal Commission was set up would largely spoil the value of the Commission's report.

4. But the minimum requirements are based upon the colleges as the needs exist to-day?—The minimum requirements are as much a matter of opinion as the maximum requirements.

5. Do you mean that a Royal Commission would alter the existing institutions so far as policy is indicated in the work they are doing to-day?—I trust so. We would never have advocated a Royal Commission if we had not hoped that a greater degree of specialization would be introduced.

6. One of the complaints you made in the pamphlet was that Otago University had not enough money for its medical school?—I think Otago University has never had enough money for its medical school.

7. And do you object to the Committee now giving effect to a report which will tend to improve and strengthen that school?—Yes, I do. I object to a piecemeal solution.

8. Do you suggest that there should be another medical school established outside Dunedin?—No, I think that would be most undesirable.

9. And yet you think no more money should be given by the Government to make that school more efficient?—No, I think a Royal Commission ought to be appointed. I trust it would report very quickly, and report also in favour of Otago being given enough money to make the medical school thoroughly efficient.

10. Then you say there would be no specialization in law if Mr. Hogben's report were given effect to?—No, there would not.

11. Now, are you not aware that there is an Institute of Accountancy in New Zealand?—Yes.

12. Are you not aware that in order to qualify for the Accountants' Examination a certain amount of knowledge of law and commerce is necessary?—Yes.

13. Now, are you aware that the branches of the Accountants' Society in New Zealand have asked each of the colleges to undertake the preparation of their students in those centres for the examinations that they have to pass?—Yes. If I may add something to that I would say that I have been informed that at present the coaches can compete against the University colleges in preparing students for the Accountancy Examination. The reason for that is, first, that the University degree is of such a character that the students do not prefer to obtain it as a qualify for their profession. There are two qualifications, first a professional qualification, and also the degree. The professional qualification is as valuable as the degree, and it is found by students that the coaches can prepare them quite as successfully for the former qualification, with the result that the number of students has decreased in all the colleges. We are merely competing with the coaches.

14. That is rather beside my question. You know the colleges have been asked to provide lecturers for the accountancy students?—Yes.

15. And are you also aware of this, that the Accountants' Society have voted money for that purpose?—Yes.

16. Are you also aware of this, that the Law Societies in the four large centres have also voted money for the purpose of teaching?—Yes, but I do not think they have done it in all.

17. Do you think, for the purposes of the Accountants' Society, if the University colleges are requested by the society, and that request is backed up with a promise of £200 per annum to undertake to do the minimum that may be required for the purpose of accountant students in commerce and law, which means the provision of one lecturer, do you think the colleges should be prevented from doing that?—I think that provision only provides coaches, and if the principle you lay down is to be followed we will have ultimately an engineering and medical school in each of the four centres. We will establish schools in each professional subject in each centre.

18. Do you say that result would follow from the establishment of a single lectureship?—Why apply the principle to law and commerce and not to other subjects?

19. Those who want the teaching are finding most of the money?—There are students who want teaching in medicine in Wellington.

20. Can there be any comparison?—I think there would be very good grounds on the principle you mention for establishing a medical school in Wellington, but I think it would be very disastrous.

21. Are not some of the subjects which now form part of the medical course taught in other centres, such as biology?—That does not mean that medicine is taught in other centres.

22. Supposing you take what will ultimately, no doubt, be aimed at and secure in Wellington the establishment and equipment of a large law school on the lines indicated by Professor Adamson as existing in America, like Harvard and Yale?—That would not be possible under Mr. Hogben's report. I think such a thing would be rendered impossible by Mr. Hogben's report. A certain amount of money is available for University education in New Zealand; the amount is determined by the number of people in New Zealand, and it cannot exceed a certain amount. Let us assume that the people of New Zealand will spend more on University education than any other people in the world—they are not doing so—that would give a certain total sum, but that total sum would be quite inadequate to establish good schools in law, commerce, and so on, in all the four centres, and that is why it is necessary to have specialization at the different University centres.

23. I quite understand that; but you have the accountants and others who are asking for a minimum of teaching in legal subjects sufficient to enable the students to qualify in law for the purposes of the Accountancy Examination, and should that not be given in the four centres?—No, I think it should not be given, because such work is merely coaching for examinations. I think it could be better done by professional coaches, and directly the University does that work true university work disappears from the University, and not only does it disappear from the particular subject in which it is done, but it affects all other work of the University and lowers the whole character and tone of the University. I think Mr. Bryce's advice on the subject is such that great weight may be attached to it. He gave specific advice on the point you mention, which was that a law and commerce school should be placed at Wellington as a special school, and Mr. Hogben's report makes no provision for any such specialization.

24. You understand that Mr. Hogben's report is only based upon the minimum requirements of the University as they exist?—He does not provide finances adequate to meet the minimum he himself lays down, and therefore I think his report will be the maximum, anyway for many years to come. It would give Victoria College a deficit.

25. In estimating the money that is required for Victoria College, is not the chief difference between your estimate and Mr. Hogben's one of the probable amount of fees to be paid by the students?—Yes, Mr. Hogben's estimate of fees is the main difference. I think his estimate cannot be supported at all.

26. There is a difference of about £1,000 between you?—More than that—about £2,000 or £3,000.

27. *The Chairman.*] Did I understand you to say just now that you would not recommend teaching of law and commerce subjects in any but the one centre?—That is my personal opinion—that until the standard of work has been very much raised in all the existing subjects that are taught the teaching of law and commerce in the other centres should not be introduced. When all subjects had reached a University standard, then I see no objection to the introduction of law and commerce teaching in other centres. At present the majority of subjects are a long way below the University standard, and the effect of teaching of all those subjects in all the centres would be to keep them there.

28. You would be inclined to put law and commerce in Wellington on the same footing as mining in Otago?—Yes, because we are in a community that cannot afford to pay for University teaching in all centres.

29. Then what are you going to do with the numerous young men who are already learning law practically in the various centres and earning their living by that means—what opportunities are you going to give them?—It seems to me they would be under no greater hardships than the students in the various States of Australia, which I think are comparable to New Zealand, where there is a single university, and the solution has been in some of those States to found scholarships to enable them to go to the place where the university is. Mr. Hogben in his report says that is impracticable. I think if he went on his own figures he would have arrived at the conclusion that it was quite practicable. I think it is an economical proposal.

30. You advanced somewhere in your evidence figures regarding the districts served by the various University colleges?—Yes.

31. But if you desire to specialize to the extent that you are proposing now, does it make any difference at all whether your College serves a big district or a little district?—What I complained of was that our provision in arts, law, science, and commerce in Mr. Hogben's report was the same for all University districts although their populations differ, and the inequality was not made up by giving the colleges which served the big University districts special schools. The two colleges which served the biggest University districts were given no special schools. Sixty per cent. of the population of New Zealand live in a district served by the Auckland University and the Victoria College, while those two colleges it was proposed should have no special school.

32. Supposing there is a young man in Palmerston North, it does not matter to him whether he boards in Auckland, Wellington, or Otago—it is the same to him as far as the cost of living is concerned?—Yes.

33. It does not matter, then, where your University college is in that sense?—Yes, and the logical result of that argument is a thing which I personally believe but which I can get no support for in New Zealand—that is, you ought to have a single university. If there is any flaw in the argument for a single university then the flaw also exists in the position that these special schools should not be put where the population is.

34. Then you do not consider the University should be in touch with the up-to-date communities, which it would not be if you had it centralized?—I do not see how it is out of touch.

35. Well, it is not proposed in all our University centres that we shall if possible retain the system of night classes as well as day classes, or would you abolish the night class system absolutely?—I might say on that point that I was an evening student myself in the Sydney University, so I fully appreciate what the advantages of evening study are, and I think evening lectures should exist wherever possible; but I think first you must have university education which reaches a university standard, and the next thing you would introduce would be evening work. Both are very desirable, but if you have to make a choice then you have to ensure that you have work of a university character somewhere, otherwise the whole university system will fail to fulfil its purpose. In trying to give a great many people something you will give none of them anything of any value.

36. Did the night classes you attended not reach the university standard?—They did reach the university standard because the University had been built up as a day institution and night classes had been added; but my experience then was to show what I contend now, that it is only under the greatest difficulty that any one can do the best work in the evening. I remember attending lectures on geometrical conic sections from 9 to 10 p.m., and working at a distasteful mathematical subject it is only those students who are keen that would do any good work at all; and I see the same thing happening here, that the work is not of a high character which is done at night, especially late at night.

Professor PICKEN examined. (No. 19.)

1. *The Chairman.*] I want to know whether the Professorial Board of Victoria College approached the Macarthy Trustees with regard to receiving a grant?—Yes.

2. For what purposes?—The main thing that the Council asked for was provision to help it in introducing day teaching in science. They asked as an alternative for means to set up a Chair in economics or history.

3. It was not an application to them for funds for research work?—No. That was not specially put forward, but a printed memorandum was sent to the Trustees, and that included a variety of proposals.

4. I wanted to find out whether, in considering the proposal to apply to the Macarthy Trust for assistance, your Professorial Board had not had some confusion of opinion in regard to what you were going to seek?—There are in the memorandum suggestions of considerable variety, and some were naturally supported more strongly by some members of the Board and other proposals by others. The printed document was drawn up at the request of the Council by a committee of the Professorial Board, but it was endorsed by the Professorial Board. It is regarded by the College Council as a fair statement of the way in which the College ought to expect to develop in the near future.

TUESDAY, 2ND SEPTEMBER, 1913.

Professor ADAMSON further examined. (No. 20.)

1. *Hon. Mr. Allen.*] I would like you to explain to the Committee what you consider the minimum necessary for specialization in a law school?—In the first place, if you look at Table H on page 10 you will see that only one assistant is allowed to two professors, whereas in every other case an assistant is allowed to each professor, and that without any specialization at all in the special sense of the word. For instance, you have Latin, English, and Greek.

2. But then there is only one professor?—No, there are two, and we are specializing. If there are two professors in law, why should not each have an assistant?

3. You apparently do not agree with the minimum suggested by the Inspector-General. What do you suggest?—I answer that by, first of all, a reference to the memorandum which was presented by a committee of Victoria College to the Macarthy Trustees. You will see it is there suggested that there should be an assistant to the professor—that is, in addition to the present assistant.

4. How many professors in law have you now?—Two professors and one assistant.

5. You suggest, then, one more assistant?—One more assistant; and I suggest a lecturer in procedure and evidence.

6. You suggest what is in the report?—No. I say those are the minimum needs of the law school. I suggest, in order that you should put it on a proper footing, that you should have a lecturer in conveyancing.

7. And a lecturer on procedure and evidence?—Certainly.

8. Two more lecturers?—Certainly. I suggest that as the minimum.

9. You suggest those two professors in the minimum suggested by the Inspector-General and a lecturer on conveyancing?—Yes.

10. And a lecturer on procedure and evidence?—Yes.

11. And what else?—And an assistant to the professor.

12. That would be two professors, two lecturers, and two assistants?—That is so. Would you allow me to qualify that by saying that I do not regard that as an ideal school, and for that purpose I refer to my evidence in chief.

13. Now, you know, of course, that there is a good deal of law taught at the other University colleges besides Victoria College?—I do.

14. In one University college there is specializing in law, but I want to know how far that work can be carried on at the other University colleges?—I answered that question in my examination in chief. I repeat that I consider the proper course would be to have one law school, and that the money which is devoted to teaching the law in other colleges should take the form of bursaries to enable the law students to attend the principal school until we have a thoroughly efficient law school in New Zealand.

15. Then do I understand you to say that you do not think part of the work can be done at other colleges than the one where the specialization is?—My opinion is that the public money should not be devoted for this purpose. I may add that I can see no objection to special lectureships financed by local bodies. I would illustrate it in this way: Engineering is specially provided for in Canterbury—a special grant is given for it; but it is possible that the local Engineers' Institute in Wellington might institute a lectureship at Victoria College, and in the same way lectureships might be instituted by local bodies at other colleges.

16. Is not that what is done now to some extent?—I have no objection to that if that is so, but what I object to is that provision is made for them out of public money.

17. On what ground do you object to public money being so spent?—I repeat again that the scheme of this report as gathered from page 10 is to have in each of the four affiliated institutions departments of arts, science, commerce, and law, and by that policy you will have four inefficient law schools in each of the four different centres instead of having a properly equipped law school in one centre.

18. And then I understand you to say that you do not approve of these two lecturers in Canterbury, Otago, and Auckland?—I do not approve of the public money being devoted for that purpose, if you will take my qualification, until a proper law school has been thoroughly equipped at one centre.

19. How are you to get over this difficulty as it presents itself to us in New Zealand—that you have a number of young men who are attending offices and gain their practical experience who could not, I imagine, leave to go to a central school, but who could supplement their practical knowledge with a certain amount of theoretical work if opportunity was given to them: how would you get over that difficulty?—I say the same difficulty applies in every country. It applies in Scotland.

20. Well, I want to know how they get over it?—They go to Edinburgh. Three-fourths of the law students have to leave their native towns and go to Edinburgh to study. There is a law school in Glasgow. From the west of Scotland a great many go to Glasgow.

21. But the position is rather different there, is it not, from New Zealand, where young men are living in three other centres where the Law Societies themselves help to provide a certain amount of teaching for them?—Yes, I quite agree. I have no objection to that, and I think I have already said so.

22. You do not object to the principle, but object to public money being applied to the principle?—No, I do not. I wish, first of all, to see a well-equipped law school in New Zealand before public money is devoted as is proposed in the report.

23. Now we come to this: assuming that there was a well-equipped law school at Victoria College you would not object to a certain amount of public money being spent for the purposes we have been talking about in other centres?—Certainly not.

24. Then you do not object to the principle of the thing?—No.

25. You have the principle before you—that is, the better equipment of one great law school?—My principle is this: that I should, first of all, like to see a well-equipped law school in which specialization is carried on, and once that is established I have no objection to a certain amount of law teaching in all the centres. I would not have specialization in all the centres.

26. I do not suggest that?—I quite agree.

27. How many law students are there now at Victoria College?—I could not say. You will find them in the Inspector-General's report—there are 164.

28. Does that include the post-graduate students?—I presume so.

29. How many post-graduate students are there?—I could not tell you just now. I have three going in for honours in law, and I have others taking what are really law subjects but which are also part of the arts curriculum. There are four taking jurisprudence and constitutional history, and there are two others for constitutional history only.

30. Those are all post-graduates?—Yes.

31. Where do they come from?—I could not say offhand. Two of them are in lawyers' offices in Wellington, and one is in the Civil Service.

32. Are you drawing any students from outside your own district?—We are drawing one or two, but I could not say how many. We have had arts graduates.

33. Can you explain to us why you are not drawing more? Is it because the school is not thoroughly equipped, or because the conditions will not allow the men to come?—I think it is probably because it is not well enough known.

34. You mean the law school is not well enough known?—It is not well known that an attempt has been made to specialize in law.

35. I should have thought that the undergraduates knew—the Law Societies know, do they not?—Well, the information is to be found in the University Calendar and the local calendars.

36. I do not know whether it is because it is not known, but do you not think it is rather because the conditions in New Zealand are such that it is very inconvenient for students to come?—My answer is that it is not more inconvenient than in other countries. I have had experience of Scotland.

37. *Mr. Sidey.*] Can you tell us what you would add to the staffing in order to make it what you consider a properly equipped school?—What I would consider my ideal law school?

38. Yes; how many professors would you add on?—My ideal law school is Edinburgh.

39. Taking the conditions as they are here to-day, and knowing that the Minister wants to find out how he is going to thoroughly equip this school in accordance with the present conditions and requirements of New Zealand, what would you ask for?—My answer would be that "Rome was not built in a day."

40. I want to know what you would ask for under these circumstances?—Besides what I have already mentioned I should say we should have a lecturer in conflict of laws; I would have other subjects which are not taught at present, and a lecturer on administrative law; and, limited to the present circumstances of New Zealand, I should say that that probably would suffice.

41. Two additional lecturers for what might be regarded as a properly equipped school?—Yes, in addition to what I have said.

42. Two professors, four lecturers, and two assistants?—Yes, that is the total, and subject to this qualification, that I should make the law degree selective—that is to say, you might have an option of subjects. You need not have all the subjects that are on the list, but you may select them, as is done in most countries.

43. *Hon. Mr. Allen.*] Specialize in law?—That is specializing in law.

44. *Mr. Sidey.*] Supposing you got what you say is necessary—that is, you get another four lecturers and another assistant, which would give you a completely equipped school—you would then, I understand, have no objection to what is provided for as the minimum for the other colleges?—None whatever.

45. Then your only objection is to spending public money before Wellington is properly equipped?—Yes; and you will allow me to add that while you earmark sums for specialization in other subjects no sum is earmarked for law.

46. You mean in the estimates?—No, in the report.

47. There has been a special vote granted in the estimates for years for specialization?—Yes.

48. You are referring to Mr. Hogben's report?—Certainly.

49. That there is no mention of specialization in any subject?—I take Table I on page 11 of the report. Each of the colleges gets £11,000. I see that Canterbury gets £3,000 for engineering; Otago gets £1,000 for home science for the first time, £1,000 for mining, nearly £4,900 for medicine, and £1,100 for dentistry. I say, why should Victoria College in respect to law be the Cinderella?

50. Now, until Victoria College is thoroughly equipped in the matter of law, supposing the Law Societies and others interested find money for teaching in law, do you say that the State should not subsidize in the meantime?—Yes.

Professor HUNTER examined. (No. 21.)

1. *Hon. Mr. Allen.*] I should like to ask a question about the specialization. The professors know that specialization in engineering is established and is a going concern in Canterbury, and that specialization in medicine, mining, and dentistry is also established in Otago, and, practically speaking, home science. They know those are established, and that there is not much possibility of those being specialized in elsewhere. I want to know from you what suggestions you have got to make with regard to other specializations which might be taken up at Victoria College or in Auckland; because, as far as I am concerned, I am very anxious to see the specializations spread, and if you can suggest that which would be useful to the Committee to enable it to come to a conclusion in the way of specialization in Auckland or Victoria College I should be glad. I understand, for instance, you wish law in Victoria College. Have you any other suggestions to make?—We think a Royal Commission should inquire into this matter. The only other thing we say is that we have had specialization—the word "specialization" means very different things, but we have had grants for specialization in Victoria College.

2. For what purposes?—For science and law; and Auckland, I understand, has had a special school of mining, and wants to change to engineering. What we say is that the whole question of specialization in this country is of such paramount importance, considering the limited amount of public money there is for this purpose, that there ought to be a thorough inquiry before that point is determined. That is one point on which a Royal Commission could speak with authority.

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;

(b) the Hospital Trustees (in recent years the Charitable Aid Board). In a few instances only—*e.g.*, Professor of Anatomy, Professor of Physiology, and the like—is the Council not restricted in its choice of its teachers. The whole of the University teaching staff at the Hospital must be selected by the Council from the medical men appointed to Hospital posts by the Charitable Aid Board—a heterogeneous body of laymen. The obvious result is that the University Council becomes microscopic, and the Charitable Aid Board fills the landscape. Appointments made by the Charitable Aid Board are for one year only, and the relations between the Council and the Charitable Aid Board were for many years the reverse of amicable. Every year there were strenuous canvassings for Hospital appointments; it became a question of getting votes rather than possessing capability; the members of the Hospital staff and their friends entered into the thick of the battle and became supporters or opponents of the faction dominant for the time being of the appointing Board. Good work in a medical school is impossible with such earthquakes yearly. In this connection I should like to read two letters written to the newspapers by members of the Hospital staff, Drs. W. M. Macdonald and W. Newlands, at the time when Dr. Batchelor offered himself as a candidate for a seat on the University Council:—

THE UNIVERSITY ELECTION.

SIR,—In your very fair and reasonable article this morning on the University election you express regret at the introduction of the personal element, and I therefore wish to make it clear that my opposition to Dr. Batchelor is in no way personal. Dr. Batchelor claims the suffrages of the graduates on account of the quality of the work that he has done on public bodies, and it is precisely on account of the quality of that work that some medical men are strongly opposed to his election. The *quorum paucis magna fuit* attitude that Dr. Batchelor adopts towards all the reforms that have been achieved in the Hospital and Medical School may be attributed to the pardonable exuberance of an electioneering manifesto, but we all readily recognize that he has accomplished a great deal by his zeal and persistence. If for nothing else than the prominent part he took in persuading the trustees and staff to give up their respective shares in the students' fees in order to establish the laboratory fund he is entitled to the deepest gratitude of all true friends of the Medical School.

But, unfortunately, while Dr. Batchelor has done a great deal of good, he has also done a great deal of harm. It is part of his scheme of reform that he should control all the medical appointments in the city, and he has been largely successful in his endeavour. I make no suggestion that Dr. Batchelor has been actuated by any but the highest motives in controlling these appointments; I believe that he has honestly tried to put the best men into the various positions; but I do say that while the present system of appointment by bodies of laymen obtains it should be faithfully carried out, and it is intolerable that we should have to submit to a sort of medical dictatorship. Neither in Dunedin nor anywhere else would the medical men acquiesce in the appointment of one of their number as sole selector for all medical vacancies. Dr. Batchelor has arrogated to himself his position, and for that reason alone I consider that his presence on any public body controlling these appointments is a menace to the peace of the medical portion of the community. In making a statement of this kind it is necessary to give specific instances, but I wish to make it clear that I do not intend to cast any reflection on those who were appointed to the posts. What I wish to insist on is that other perhaps equally good men were prevented from applying, and I need hardly add that I was not personally interested in any of the appointments.

At the end of last year, after thirty years' service in the Hospital, Dr. Batchelor retired without acquainting his colleagues of his intention. The result was that a position carrying indirectly a very high emolument was never really thrown open to competition. While Dr. Batchelor was a member of the Hospital Board, the Board, on his recommendation, made a medical appointment to a salaried position without advertisement. Dr. Batchelor's active canvassing on behalf of one of the candidates for another Hospital Board appointment led to a great deal of ill feeling, and some regrettable incidents took place in connection with the election.

Some months ago Dr. Batchelor, without consulting the medical faculty, went to the University Council and announced his intention of retiring. He asked the Council to divide his lectureship into two sections, and, while he may not have intended to nominate his successors, he mentioned the names of two medical men who were, in his opinion, well qualified to carry on his work.

During the time that Dr. Batchelor has sat at the Board of Trustees, and even while he was still a member of the staff, he has taken an active and prominent part in the selection of the honorary medical staff, and his action in this respect has given rise to much heart-burning and discontent amongst the junior members of the profession. I do not think that any member of the medical staff who is also a trustee should sit in judgment on his colleagues—I will go further and say that I do not think that any medical member of the trustees should take an active part in making the medical appointments.

I might quote further instances, but I think I have said enough to justify the medical opposition to Dr. Batchelor's candidature. Private appeals to Dr. Batchelor to discontinue his interference in medical appointments have resulted in his adopting an attitude of defiance, and have made a public appeal necessary.—I am, &c.,

Dunedin, 5th July, 1909.

W. M. MACDONALD.

THE OTAGO UNIVERSITY COUNCIL ELECTION.

SIR,—Much recrimination and many red herrings have resulted from the correspondence in your paper, begun by Dr. Batchelor, in connection with the University Council election. For the graduates, however, the issue is sufficiently clear-cut. They have to decide on Saturday whether Dr. Batchelor is a fit and proper person to represent, faithfully and intelligently, on the Council, their various interests.

I take it, sir, that when an individual puts himself forward as a candidate for public office, it is pertinent and of prime importance to consider the conduct of that candidate as a member of other public bodies. Dr. Batchelor's integrity as a public man has been repeatedly challenged in very definite fashion; and, notwithstanding his voluminous replies, those challenges have not been met, but have rather been palpably and laboriously evaded. In his latest production of "wild and whirling words," Dr. Batchelor simply runs amok, like any mad Malay courageous with bhang.

Until Dr. Batchelor furnishes categorical disproofs of these charges against his public actions, it is needless for any opponent to challenge his capacity for a seat on the University Council in other respects.—I am, &c.,

29th July, 1909.

W. NEWLANDS.

These letters speak for themselves. They show that, under such circumstances as we have depicted, a small number of men, lay or professional or both, connected by ties of blood, association, or interest, band themselves together to control appointments. Naturally no man could be engaged in this sort of intriguing and canvassing without losing that self-respect and keen sense of honour that must be looked for in a University teacher. Again, the influence of such annual spectacles on young medical students must be disastrous. Nor is it surprising if, under such circumstances, we find those holding the higher posts stooping to questionable methods of extending their influence and interests. Here is a box of pills which you will observe bears the superscription, "Dr. Batchelor's Tonic Iron Pills." I believe, though I have not had an analysis

made, that these are the ordinary iron pills of the British Pharmacopœia. But without reference to this feature, the sale of these pills, which has been going on for many years in Dunedin, is the last thing that one would expect to be associated with the name of a professor in a medical school. The thing would be impossible in England. Again, men who have long practised swimming in this element, and have established a secure position with the selectors, are naturally inclined as their private practice grows to neglect their Hospital duties. *E.g.*, about 1905 I reported to the Hospital Board that Dr. Ferguson was introducing his private assistant to do his out-patient work at the Hospital. Dr. Ferguson was challenged by the Hospital Board, and his Delphic reply was that he had done nothing that the Hospital Board was not cognizant of or words to that effect. This was accepted as satisfactory by the Board. As sequel a few months afterwards an assistant to Dr. Ferguson was appointed. Again, about three years ago Dr. Barnett, Professor of Surgery, had arranged to leave for America in July. He resigned from the Hospital for the whole of that year, doing his private work and lecturing at the University. He arranged with the University Council that from July Dr. Allen, who had no beds in the Hospital, would continue his lectures. The result was that during the whole of that year the lecturer on surgery did nothing for his students but deliver the formal lectures. Finally, the students who have waited for Dr. Ferguson's class in ophthalmology have probably put up something in the nature of a record in patience. These few examples will show what little consideration is paid to the proper training of the students and their interests.

Now for Professor MacGregor's second point—incompetent teachers. The University Council and Hospital Trustees both seem to have the idea that if they appoint a man to a special post they make him a specialist. A few instances: (1.) About 1904 Dr. Roberts, the pathologist to the Hospital, started a class in bacteriology. The whole thing was such a farce that fees having been collected, and certificates having been issued for work not done, the lecturer apologized to the class and told them he would read it for next year. Bacteriology! read it up next year! a year that would never dawn in their curriculum! (2.) Dr. Fitchett, who was physician to the Hospital, was appointed to a vacancy on the gynecological side. After a few weeks he was allowed to give it up and return to his old position on the medical side. (3.) Dr. Ritchie first appeared on the Hospital staff as the teacher in anæsthetics. When Dr. Fitchett vacated the gynecological appointment Dr. Ritchie was translated to that position. Shortly after he was made tutor in midwifery, a salaried post; later on he gave up the gynecological appointment and was appointed on the medical side, but was allowed to retain his midwifery tutorship, the position with a salary. I believe that Dr. Ritchie has had no special training in any of these departments. (4.) Dr. Cameron was appointed as specialist in pathology; he was assistant to Dr. Roberts. The position of radiologist fell vacant. The Hospital staff had a meeting, and this somewhat despised appointment seemed to be going abegging when, so I am informed by a member of the staff, to every one's surprise Dr. Cameron offered his services. His offer was accepted. He went at once to Sydney for a few weeks and came back an X-ray specialist. Within a few months he had done better; he was actually appointed as teacher in radiology in last year's post-graduate courses. Needless to say the post-graduate course met the fate that it deserved. Only one student materialized, I understand, to face the half-score or so of teachers. This would have been an *impasse* for less ingenious gentlemen. However, the Dean of the Faculty was able to report that the post-graduate classes had been satisfactory. One trembles at the thought of what "unsatisfactory" would mean. Consideration of these cases make it quite obvious that in the Otago Medical School there is no idea of men preparing themselves for positions on the teaching staff.

My first experience of the school dates from 1903, when I applied for a position on the surgical side. I was, of course, put on the medical side in charge of medical out-patients. The out-patients were formerly looked after by the resident staff. But when Dr. Batchelor's son arrived in Dunedin something had to be done, so he was made surgeon to the surgical out-patients, and at the same time Dr. Macdonald took charge of the medical out-patients. I succeeded Dr. Macdonald. The condition of affairs was extraordinary. I soon found that the students were more or less lectured to, but were taught to do nothing. They were treated as if they had one sense instead of five. Of eleven students going up for their final examination not one had used an ophthalmoscope, but all had had a course of lectures in ophthalmology. The thought of looking into an eye to see if those things were there of which they had heard in the lectures had never been born in them. There were no notes taken in the out-patient department. What was done in the out-patient department was evidently a piece of information not valued by the in-patients staff. Such notes as were taken in the in-patient department were not considered valuable as Hospital records. The surgeon, after a few years on the staff, was allowed to take away the notes of cases in his beds during the period; they were his private property if he wanted such useless lumber. No surgical anatomy was taught, and I found that the so-called clinical lectures were merely boiled-down private lectures delivered in the wards instead of in a lecture-hall. There were no tutors to teach students physical signs and run over cases with them. Later, when they did appoint a tutor, they would not let him into the Hospital to work from the cases. It was whispered at the time that if tutors were admitted they might disagree with the diagnoses of the senior members of the staff, and that would breed a spirit of distrust in students. Most amazing of all, the medical student had to do five or six cases of midwifery to entitle him to sit for his final examination. That constituted his total acquaintance with the child till it arrived at the age of two years. For the first two years of life a child is not a child for the purposes of the Dunedin Medical School. Lately, this question having been forced upon the attention of the authorities, they appointed a specialist on diseases of children. Do you think they tried to get a man of any experience? For twelve years Dr. Evans has been practising in Dunedin. He was for two years resident at the Shadwell Hospital for Children; was on the surgical side, then on the medical side, and finally Resident Medical Officer. For two years he was associated with

the leading Paesiatrists of London, and left there with the most excellent testimonials. A wide-awake Council would have wished to get his services, but the Otago Council is wide awake for other things, and appointed Dr. Williams, who is a graduate of their own Medical School, and who has therefore had no training in the diseases of children whatsoever. In 1905 I sent in a report to the Charitable Aid Board and drew attention to the fact that the porters and window-cleaners were passing catheters on patients, and that I had under my care a patient who had suffered very severely from these unskilled attentions. The Auckland Hospital Commission had condemned this practice most severely some months before. The amount of interest taken in hospital affairs at the Dunedin Hospital was not sufficient to accept this hint and drop the practice. My complaint was referred to the staff, who reported that they quite agreed with the passage of catheters by porters, in spite of the Auckland finding. The practice was, however, immediately stopped. A dresser in a London hospital would stay for hours to have the opportunity of passing a catheter. In the Dunedin Hospital this bit of surgery was handed over to the porters, practical instruction evidently not being deemed important for the students.

In 1906 the Council were approached by the students asking for clinical instruction. I understand from house surgeons who have been recently in the Hospital that it is still unprovided. Without it medical education is a sham and a fraud. Clinical teaching has one drawback; it discloses all the weak places in the armour of the teacher, and the teacher in the Dunedin Hospital avoids differential diagnosis and bedside teaching generally, as he is not in accord with the maxim that a good teacher always lets his students see his limitations—*i.e.*, he is honest with them. About London hospitals one will find many young men lately qualified and doing odd jobs about the hospital waiting to get appointments on the resident staff. Very often a man will wait two years to get these positions to which no salaries are attached. In Dunedin you have to give a bait of some £200 a year to entice just-qualified students to join the resident staff. They either do not value clinical experience or do not value the kind they get at the Dunedin Hospital.

To conclude: My evidence shows—(1) That the system of appointment of teachers at the Dunedin Hospital has lent itself to grave abuses, so that (a) the duties of many teachers have been laxly performed; (b) the Otago University Council has not recognized the supreme importance of special training for University posts in medicine, but has been content to make experts with a mere stroke of the pen: (2) that there has been a criminal neglect of clinical teaching, the *sine qua non* of all decent medical education: (3) that the medical students in the Otago University receive no training in the diseases of children. It thus appears that the third point in Professor MacGregor's prophecy has been fulfilled, and my opening statement, that to spend further moneys on our Medical School without a full inquiry would be unwise, is justified.

3. *Mr. Hanan.*] You have given us a very severe indictment of the Medical School in Dunedin. Do I understand that you suggest it is necessary that a Royal Commission should be appointed in order to investigate the conditions that you allege exist, with a view to reforms being effected?—Yes.

4. Do you think that we can establish an efficient medical school in New Zealand?—You could if an attempt was made in New Zealand to include all the men practising in New Zealand—that is to say, get the best men from all the centres and try to assemble them in one town. In that case it would be possible at present to get a medical school to turn out a thoroughly good, sound practitioner in New Zealand. But I do not think that for many years to come any one who wished to learn the more special parts of medicine would ever dream of staying on this side of the line at all. He would go to Europe or America.

5. The diplomas issued by the Otago Council are of little value as to competency?—Certainly—that is to say, from the point of view of training, the students down there get practically no training at all.

6. In other words, they are not what you consider duly qualified men?—It all depends how you use the word “qualified.” If “qualified” means having taken a diploma, they certainly are qualified.

7. Would you say that these men who simply pass through the University down there, and pass the examinations such as they are, are duly qualified medical men?—I should say they were badly educated in medicine.

8. In other words, they are not duly qualified?—If you take a leading surgeon or physician and call him duly qualified, and then you put up against him a very good young man who has done a couple of years' work, compared to the former he is very badly qualified.

9. I am not speaking of the man who has been in practice some time, but the man that you would allow to hold himself out as a duly qualified man—as a man capable of practising medicine in the community?—You see there are a number of students that leave the Otago Medical School. Some men will become good medical men in spite of a bad training, but that is not an argument for bad training. I cannot say that nobody leaves the Medical School of Otago who is going to do any good as a medical practitioner. A man may rise superior to his training.

10. But what do you say, speaking of the majority who pass through?—I cannot speak of the majority, because to do so I would have to know everybody intimately.

11. Have you seen any work done by those who pass through the school which in your opinion shows them not to be duly qualified?—That is hardly a fair question. Naturally you get cases where very bad mistakes are made. I do not expect a general practitioner to know as much as I do about my specialty.

12. Your complaint is in regard to the training?—Yes, and in regard to the extremely corrupt methods that are at the back of the training.

13. So far as the lecturers are concerned, generally speaking, are they capable to do the work they undertake?—I have never heard them lecture. The modern attitude with regard to

medical training has gone away from the idea of lecturing. The question is rather one of doing work—coming in contact with the actual work.

14. Could you improve that in New Zealand by getting other professional men to take up this work?—You might improve that very much by getting men there who would go in for clinical teaching.

15. Do you know men in New Zealand who could take on that work?—I do not. It is obviously a very difficult thing to arrange.

16. It would be difficult to get the class of men you refer to?—It would be difficult, but it is made very much more difficult by the corrupt methods. I have given an instance of a thoroughly capable man who came out here and was very much needed in connection with the diseases of children, yet when they make an appointment in the Dunedin Hospital they appoint a man who has had absolutely no experience of diseases of children at all. He has been brought up in a hospital that does not admit children.

17. Your charge is one of favouritism?—Certainly.

18. It is rather against the management, is it not, than the class of work performed by the lecturers?—We should attempt, as is the case in London, to get men who are highly paid for their work. In London, from the point of view of wage-earning, they are not employed for many hours in the day. The balance of their time is spent in research, reading, and teaching at the hospital. Take the men in Harley Street: they do not work after 1 o'clock. After that they can go to the hospital or read or anything else they wish to do. In Dunedin nearly all the staff are general practitioners, and the result is that they are tearing about making their living. All they give to the hospital is their spare time. You should first of all say to a man who is going to take a hospital appointment, "The hospital is to have the first call on your time. Here is what you have to do; that has to be done. If you will not sacrifice your private practice to that extent we do not want you."

19. Does the question of money come in?—Certainly. Any man who gets a hospital appointment at once indirectly increases, or hopes to increase, his income tremendously. People who have any special trouble will naturally go to the man who is the specialist for that at the hospital.

20. Can you get the men in Dunedin?—I think you could. You could get them slowly, but you would have at first to see what you wanted for the proper supervision of the Hospital. The Hospital wants to be in the hands of somebody—not a Charitable Aid Board, for instance. That is mischievous at once.

21. Can you say it is a subject of general complaint?—There are always complaints about hospitals. There are any number of complaints about the Dunedin Hospital. If a hospital once begins to do good work from the point of view of the man who knows best—that is, the man who is trained there—he is only too willing to do some work at the hospital. I am sure that if you were to ask the dozens of people who have gone from this country to the Old Country after they have qualified in medicine here what they thought of it they would—every one of them—tell you they regretted every hour they had spent at the Medical School in Dunedin. I admit that that would be so under even the best possible conditions in New Zealand.

22. You say that the New Zealand diploma in arts, in medicine, or in science is not valued in the Old Country—the diploma that is granted by the New Zealand University?—I have no experience of arts and science degrees in the Old Country.

23. Well, as to medicine?—As to medicine the New Zealand degree is of no value in the Old Country. In the London hospitals it is absolutely impossible to get an appointment on the surgical side unless you are a Fellow of the Royal College of Surgeons. You might have another degree as good, or perhaps even superior.

24. Do they regard a man with our diploma as competent to practice?—Yes, he is admitted as competent. They have decided to recognize the New Zealand diploma in medicine for the purposes of practice in England.

25. In your opinion that is merely a matter of form—it is recognition of the paper, not of the equipment of the individual?—I remember when Dr. Batchelor was trying to get a maternity hospital in New Zealand he mentioned as a reason that if the people at Home knew what our training in midwifery was they would not recognize us.

26. Before the University gets the right to confer these degrees and diplomas the Home authorities are aware of the regulations?—But they only see the syllabus. The syllabus is a very different thing from the course of study.

27. From your observation the work done at the Medical School does not come up to the conditions laid down upon which the University get their authority to issue diplomas?—That is quite obvious from what I have read. I have pointed out that a man who has never studied bacteriology is appointed to be professor in it, and what happens in his class.

28. Are you referring to Dr. Champtaloup?—No, Dr. Roberts.

29. Who do you say is Professor of Bacteriology?—Now Dr. Champtaloup is.

30. Do you know anything about his work?—No.

31. Do you know anything about the work done by him for the Public Health Department?—I do not know that there has been much work done by the Public Health Department. Dr. Champtaloup is giving up that position, I understand. I do not think a great deal of work has been done in connection with the Public Health Department.

32. The work has really been done by the office, then, as far as you know?—I am not in a position to state; the work done by the Public Health Department does not cross my line.

33. As to Dr. Batchelor, I gather from your remarks that he has been the philosopher, guide, and friend?—Dr. Batchelor has had very great influence and has acted with the Hospital Trustees, and has been very active controlling appointments mainly, I believe, through the lay

Board of the Hospital. Eight years ago I first wrote to the Charitable Aid Board (and they did what I expected they would do) with regard to the conditions of the out-patient department, of which I had charge—that is to say, they did not appoint me again, and took no notice of my suggestions, which I afterwards had published in the paper. The Charitable Aid Board at that time was under Mr. Peter Miller, who had been Chairman for eighteen or nineteen years. It was a straight-out despotism. Mr. Miller did what he liked, and there was no second opinion. Naturally my attack on what was going on there weakened the position of Mr. Miller, and Mr. Miller left in two years.

34. You have made public most of the criticism you have given us to-day?—Practically all of it.

35. Since then have elections taken place to the Board?—Elections take place every year.

36. Since your criticism appeared in the papers elections have taken place for membership of the Board?—Yes.

37. And has no effort been made to deal with the points you have raised in your criticism?—There has been a certain amount of effort, no doubt—that is to say, more has been done in some respects since I started writing than had ever been done before.

38. It has shaken things up?—Certainly. At the present time the Dunedin Hospital has a staff of about twenty-three, and you never know in what positions on the staff you will find these people. Take, for instance, what would have been a proper attitude: the Medical School should have said to itself, "We want training in a certain subject. We will say to a promising young man, 'Go away to Europe; come back at the end of three years with testimonials from a good man to show that you have been doing work in this subject satisfactorily for three years, and we will give you an appointment.'" If they had an exceptional student who had done special work and could get hold of him they should not wait, but they should say, "Here is an exceptional man; come at once."

39. Would you advise that the issuing of these diplomas be discontinued until the work that is done is of a higher character?—No, I should advise that a Royal Commission be appointed.

40. But what is your individual opinion?—My individual opinion is that the thing requires a searching examination and a fresh start on new lines. It is quite impossible to consider all the multifarious considerations that come up in such a connection. For instance, take Auckland: Auckland promises, so I am told, to become a very much larger town than Dunedin. Auckland has a very much closer relationship with the Islands and with island diseases. Therefore if things go as they are going I have no doubt that one of these days they will have a better Medical School in Auckland, because it will be a larger town and they will have a better chance of getting diseases of a sort that you would never expect and never will get in Dunedin; and, besides that, they are in close connection with the Islands, where a great part of New Zealand's original work should lie.

41. Let me put my question to you again regarding the condition that you disclose in connection with the training given at the Medical School in Dunedin: from what you have seen of the training given there is it desirable in the public interest that the granting of these diplomas should be continued at that University?—I would not answer that question. In a lot of these things that I have spoken about I am telling you what was the position of affairs in 1903 to 1905, when I was on the Hospital staff. There has been improvement in many respects since: for instance, there is a tendency to get assistants into the Hospital now. Before that assistants were very sternly pushed aside. When a man comes out to Dunedin and wishes to get on the Hospital staff there ought, first of all, to be some means by which the University Council may get in touch with him. A man ought not to be asked to go down on his hands and knees and grovel in the mud round about the town in order to get an appointment. All he ought to have to do is to lodge his testimonials, and to lodge them with a Council that understands what a good testimonial consists in. The only testimonial that is worth anything is the testimonial of a good man who says, "This young man has worked under me satisfactorily."

42. What lines should reform take in regard to the Council itself?—That is a tremendous question. I would never attempt to answer that. I could only make general statements.

43. How could you bring about a better system of making appointments?—The best system of making appointments, where there is a good sense of honour with regard to these things, I think, is to let the staff make the appointments, as is done in the schools at Home.

44. Would you not have favouritism exercised then—would they not have their favourites and assist one another? Would the candidates get a "square deal"?—The position of hospital staffs in London is that a man may be on a staff as a visiting surgeon for twenty years, and may not know another man who has been there for twenty years also.

45. Of course, ours is on a smaller scale?—A very much smaller scale, without a doubt. I am pointing out that passing from the present condition to a more satisfactory condition is so complex a question that you want a Commission, and on that Commission you want men who have first-class capacity.

46. It would be largely a question of money: to put that institution in the position you desire would require a large sum of money, would it not?—No doubt. There will always be a lot of money required for these things. In 1878 it would have been a far better thing for New Zealand if New Zealand had been content, by means of scholarships, to send promising students to England or Australia, and in the meantime have got ready for the founding of a school later on. But at the present time New Zealand has over a million of people, and I think New South Wales has something under a million and a half, yet New South Wales runs a very satisfactory school.

47. Have they got a school in Melbourne?—I do not know much about the Melbourne school.

48. Can you say what opinion is held in England of the diploma granted by the Australian universities?—I do not know. If a young Australian goes Home and shows capability they do not worry what diploma he has got. A man may have a high degree and be a very helpless man with his fingers.

49. How does the examination set at Home compare with the examination set in New Zealand?—I do not know. I have had no experience of medical examinations in New Zealand.

50. Have you seen the papers?—Yes.

51. How do they compare with the papers at Home?—The papers are all very much on the same lines.

52. The Home examinations are not more difficult?—It all depends what examination you are going for. For instance, there can be no comparison between the degree in medicine of the London University and that of the New Zealand University. But I am not one of those who lay such stress on the examination. It is not a question of examination—it is a question of training.

53. But does not the examination test the training largely?—It depends on the nature of the examination. I do not believe in a mere written paper—an answer to four or five questions. I believe it is the wickedest thing that was ever done in the way of examinations. A very good man might be failed, and a very poor man might pass.

54. The same system obtains in New Zealand as obtains in England as regards examination, whether it is oral or written or practical, is not that so?—It all depends what examination you go for. The practical examination for Bachelor of Medicine of London is very much more severe than the examination here.

55. Take Edinburgh?—I do not know Edinburgh.

56. You were saying that it was run as a charitable-aid institution: what do I understand you to mean by that?—The point is this: you have got a University, and the University has laboratories. The laboratory of the Medical School is the Hospital. The University Council is placed in this position: it has got to accept as its teachers people who are selected by the Charitable Aid Board, which is composed of men who are not in a position to select teachers at all, as they have shown in the past by the hopeless way in which they have thrown people all over the place. They just take the generic term "medical man" and think a man is good anywhere.

57. *Mr. Sidey.*] Your chief object in coming here to-day, I understand, is to give evidence in support of a Royal Commission?—Yes.

58. What work do you suggest the Royal Commission should undertake?—It should be a Commission of inquiry.

59. Into what?—It should make full inquiry. I am speaking particularly of the Medical School, but I am also a graduate of the University in arts and science, and I think, from what I recollect of the University, that great improvement could be made all through. Of course, that is a matter of twenty years ago.

60. The main purpose in the setting up of a Royal Commission, in the opinion of the Reform Association, is to inquire into the constitution of the University with a view to giving the professors a rather larger share in the framing of the curricula?—I should think it would be a good thing to have the scope of the inquiry enlarged if that is the only thing that is to be considered.

61. At any rate, what you think is probably the most urgent thing is an inquiry into the Otago University Medical School?—No. An inquiry into the Law School may be more urgent. All I say is that it is urgent.

62. You gave us Professor MacGregor's opinion: how long ago is it since he gave that opinion?—Twenty-five years ago.

63. Do you mean to suggest that the conditions as they exist to-day are the same as they were twenty-five years ago?—It was a prophecy of what would happen if they had a full medical course. They had no full medical course then.

64. When Dr. MacGregor spoke he suggested that there should not be a full medical course?—Yes.

65. Do you wish us also to infer that the same argument could be applied to the conditions to-day—that there should not be a Medical School?—No; I have already disclaimed that.

66. Then you are entirely of opinion that there should be a Medical School in New Zealand?—Yes, I think there should be. But if there was a Royal Commission and that Commission brought out a man who had had great experience, and that man came to the conclusion that it would be better for us to wait for a period of years, I should be quite willing to fall in with that idea.

67. The general impression that would be gathered from your evidence is that the present Medical School is turning out a large number of incompetent men: that is what you wish us to understand?—No. My evidence with regard to those matters specially relates to 1903–1905. I say things have improved since. To get me into saying that it is turning out incompetent men is to put me in a false position.

68. What is the use of giving us evidence about conditions as they were ten years ago?—What is the good of asking me what sort of man is turned out from the Dunedin University when I am not in close contact with these people?

69. You see what the effect of your evidence to-day is—wholesale condemnation of the whole institution?—With regard to that wholesale condemnation nobody has ever been able, during the course of eight years, to deny one point that I have raised.

70. What can you tell us about the institution to-day: that is what we want to know?—Surely, in order to find out the position of anything, the proper thing to do is to start off giving its history.

71. You told us about the bacteriology. We know very well that that cannot be said of the conditions to-day: you must admit that?—But you know very well that when these things are

done in such a belated fashion there cannot be that enthusiasm in connection with the Medical School that is necessary if the Medical School is to be a success.

72. But do you not see that what we want is to know the present conditions? Are we to be given to understand that the men who are at present qualifying at the Medical School in Otago are being turned out incompetent to do their work?—You come back to the same question again. I have already said that I am not in a position to judge of that.

73. Then let us clearly understand that you do not wish that to be understood from your evidence?—You cannot get anybody who can give you an opinion on that. All that can be said with regard to a matter like that is, What is the nature of the training? If somebody says that the training is bad, and then comes to the conclusion that the men that will be turned out will be all right, well and good; but the natural result of bad training is that the men that are produced are not good, though there may be many exceptions.

74. Do you say that the training to-day is bad?—It is still bad in many respects.

75. In which of the classes is it bad?—I have pointed out these things. First of all, there is no teaching in the diseases of children.

76. You say that in the diseases of children the professor is incompetent?—I say that he has had absolutely no experience of the diseases of children.

77. You admit that the University has, at any rate, made an effort to increase its efficiency by the institution of a separate lectureship in that subject?—No, I do not see how that does any good whatever.

78. You must admit that the institution of the class, at any rate, was a right step?—That was a right step.

79. Your objection is to the man who has been appointed to it?—Exactly. My objection is that in connection with these appointments the University Council and the authorities do not try to get the best men on the staff.

80. Tell us another fault?—Another thing is the want of clinical teaching. Everybody who leaves the school complains of it.

81. Have you any fault to find with any of the lecturers other than the one on diseases of children? Are there any other lectureships in respect of which you think the teacher is not properly equipped?—It is not a question of lectureship; it is a question of teaching.

82. You have told us in this case that the lecturer has not got the qualifications?—Yes; I say that the lecturer is a graduate of the Dunedin Medical School, where they do not attempt to do anything with the diseases of children. I say therefore that it is an absurd thing to appoint a man who has been brought up in such a Hospital and has had no experience of diseases of children.

83. Is there any other professorship or lectureship in respect of which you can make the same criticism?—No, not at the present day.

84. Then we come down to the subject of clinical teaching: what is your chief complaint with regard to that?—I have given all my complaints with regard to it. They relate to 1903–1905.

85. I want them up to date. It is no use telling us about what happened ten years ago. We want to know what the conditions are as they exist to-day with regard to clinical teaching?—All I can say with regard to the conditions at the present day is that I find that the house surgeons and New Zealand graduates who leave the Hospital as qualified and go Home, when they come back notice that the great distinction between the teaching in England and the teaching here is the lack of clinical teaching in Dunedin. I am not on the Hospital staff. I cannot say exactly what is going on down there.

86. You cannot speak from your own personal experience?—Certainly not. You asked me about the lecturers. I have never heard their lectures.

87. You cannot say from your own experience anything about the clinical teaching at the University?—No. I can only say what it was when I was there.

88. You referred again to the students going Home, and you said that they regret the time spent at the University here?—Yes.

89. Are you aware of the exceptionally high position that students going from the Otago University have taken in the examination lists at schools in the Old Country?—Which students, for instance?

90. I am not able to give their names?—Are you speaking of students who go Home to Edinburgh to do all their work?

91. No, some of those who take part of their work here?—What part?

92. Hospital and otherwise?—Most of the students who go to Edinburgh may do a year's anatomy here and botany, and then they go to Edinburgh to do the rest.

93. Will you not admit that the students who have gone Home, having taken part of their course at Otago University, have done exceptionally well in the Old Country? My experience has been the very reverse of what you told the Committee?—Your experience is quite different from mine.

94. You are only speaking from hearsay, are you not?—That is the only way in which I can get such a statement. If I ask a man who was trained in Dunedin and has been at Home for a couple of years what he thinks of the whole thing I find they all say at once that they regret very much they did not go Home to begin with. No one suggests for a moment that it is advisable for a man to stay in Dunedin to study medicine, surely!

95. I have heard it advised?—Well, in my opinion it is very bad advice.

96. You have gone into past history with regard to Dr. Batchelor: who wrote those letters that you quoted to us?—Dr. William Macdonald and Dr. Newlands.

97. They were written in connection with an election contest, were they not—at the time of an election contest?—Yes.

98. I suppose there was a good deal of feeling then on both sides?—Obviously.

99. Are you aware that proposals are at present before the Government to so increase the salaries of the lecturers at the University as will make the lectureship the first consideration for the lecturer: are you aware that that is the object of the increase?—No, I do not know that.

100. I gather from your evidence that you say it should not be done in the meantime?—I should think the better way to do it would be to take away the right of private practice if you propose anything of the sort.

101. Do you not think that if a very considerable addition is given in the way of salary on the understanding that the work of lecturing is the first claim on the lecturer it will have that effect?—It will have that effect if the conditions are resolutely enforced.

102. If the lecturing is the source from which he gets most of his remuneration is he not likely to regard it as having the most claim?—If that is the main source of his revenue naturally he will attend to that rather than work returning a smaller remuneration, in case he should lose the greater part. Of course, I do not agree with the suggestion; it is chimerical.

103. What experience have you had in other universities?—I have had no experience of universities except my experience here and my training in medicine in London.

104. Did you go Home to London from here?—Yes.

105. Is the London University the only one into the working of which you have an insight?—I am not talking about the University, I am talking about the London Hospital.

106. At what university did you take your medical degree?—In the College of Surgeons in London—not a university.

107. Do you know anything about the Edinburgh University?—Very little. I never was in Edinburgh.

108. You know very little about the universities in the Old Country, with the exception of the London one?—No, I do not know anything about them beyond being in them and seeing people who had worked in them.

109. Do you know anything about the constitution of the other universities in the Old Country?—No.

110. How did you get the impression that there has been friction between the Otago University Council and the Charitable Aid Board?—From the newspapers.

111. Can you give us the details?—You will surely recollect the time when the attitude of the trustees was that this was their Hospital for the treatment of the sick, and there has sometimes almost been talk as to whether they would not fling the student out. Nobody surely wishes to suggest that there has not been friction between the Council and the Board.

112. *Hon. Mr. Allen.*] With regard to this box of pills, what did you produce this for—what was your object?—My object was to show the condition of affairs in the Dunedin Medical School—what is being done there—what can be done without any notice being taken. From an ethical point of view that is a scandalous state of affairs.

113. But what has this got to do with the Medical School in the University?—Surely the tone of the teachers in the University is of importance.

114. I want to get at the specific reason for your producing this box?—That is my whole reason.

115. Was it your intention to discredit Dr. Batchelor, who at one time was lecturer in the University?—My intention was to draw attention pointedly to the condition of affairs at the present time in Dunedin which permits that sort of thing being done.

116. I want to know whether you did it with the object of throwing discredit upon Dr. Batchelor?—I have told you my reason—to draw attention to the fact that this sort of thing is being done in Dunedin, and to show what is the condition of affairs with regard to the medical profession in Dunedin when this sort of thing is permissible.

117. Is it a discreditable thing to have your name on a box of pills?—Certainly, for a medical man.

118. I understand you to suggest that it is still more discreditable because it is the name of a professor in the University?—I think it is very much more discreditable. The more highly placed a man is the greater is his responsibility.

119. And that having his name on the box is injurious to the school?—I think it is injurious to the school.

120. Do you know whether he gave permission for his name to be put here?—I could not tell you whether he did or not. I know that these things have been selling in Dunedin for twenty years or so.

121. With his name upon them?—Yes.

122. Do you know of other medical men having their names upon pills or medicines?—No.

123. Not a single instance of prominent medical men?—No.

124. You never saw one?—Oh, yes; I have seen the names of medical men.

125. I mean a prominent medical man. Have you ever seen the name of a prominent, respectable medical man upon a box of pills or upon some medicine?—No.

126. Never?—No. It is not permissible in medicine. It is quite unallowable for a man to do anything of that sort in medicine.

127. You got some training in anatomy and matters pertaining to a medical degree at the Otago University, did you not?—I was there one year.

128. What did you get in your one year?—Anatomy and physiology.

129. Was that good?—No.

130. Which was bad?—Physiology was bad.

131. What year are you talking of?—1893.

132. That is twenty years ago?—Yes.

133. Do you know whether there has been an alteration in the teaching of physiology in those twenty years?—I have not said anything about the teaching of physiology. Physiology at the present time is one of the brightest spots in the University teaching.

134. In 1893 it was bad; in 1913 it is one of the brightest spots in the University teaching?—Yes.

135. Then the teaching of physiology has materially changed in twenty years?—Yes, but I am speaking about the Hospital and the clinical teaching.

136. Was your anatomy teaching good in 1893?—Anatomy teaching was good, but it would have been better if there had been demonstrators.

137. With regard to bacteriology what is your experience?—I have had none.

138. You do not know anything about it?—No.

139. You do not even know that there has been a new Professor of Bacteriology appointed?—Yes, I do know that. I thought you were asking me about the bacteriological teaching.

140. I want to know what your opinion is of the bacteriological teaching in 1913?—Very good, I should think.

141. Anatomy?—Good.

142. Anatomy good, and bacteriology good, and physiology good. Has there been a vast improvement all round since 1903-5?—Except in those things that I have drawn attention to.

143. You have drawn attention to the diseases of children and the clinical teaching in the Hospital: those are the only two grievances you have, are they?—The clinical teaching and the conditions of appointment to positions on the Hospital staff—the divided authority.

144. You were drawing attention to these, I think, as they were in 1903-5? Is there any difficulty now with regard to them?—The position is exactly the same.

145. Are you a member of the Hospital staff?—I am not.

146. Have you ever been?—Yes.

147. Are you a member of the University teaching staff?—No.

148. Have you ever been?—Only in so far as I was one of the tutors at the Hospital.

149. Have you ever applied for a post at the University?—No.

150. Have you applied for positions on the honorary staff of the Hospital?—Yes.

151. Were you appointed?—No. I was appointed the first time.

152. Were you disappointed because you were not appointed?—No.

153. You have no grievance against anybody else because he was?—Not a bit. After I had been two years at the Hospital I sent in a report on the condition of the out-patient department, and I also sent in a complaint with regard to certain irregularities. Those went under the same cover as my application for reappointment, because I did not wish it to be said afterwards that I was merely grumbling because I had not been appointed. I complained at the time, and the result was that no notice was taken of my complaint and my reappointment was not ratified.

154. You have a grievance against the teaching as given by Dr. Williams in the diseases of children?—Yes.

155. And you say that he has no experience: how do you know?—Because he is a graduate of this Hospital and has held no other hospital appointments.

156. Has he been Home?—Yes, but he has held no other hospital appointment.

157. Has he had no experience in the diseases of children in New Zealand?—Very likely, but I do not count that.

158. Do you know whether he goes to Karitane Home? Do you know the Karitane Home?—I have heard of it.

159. Have you ever been there?—No.

160. You do not know much about it?—No.

161. Are there children taken in there?—I dare say.

162. If a doctor went to see children at Karitane Home would he get any experience of the diseases of children?—He would get opportunities for experience. It is a question of education. When one speaks of a man having had no experience it means that he has held no positions under a good man—that is to say, he has not got the imprimatur of having been with a good man.

163. Are there no good men in Dunedin in the diseases of children?—I think there are two men now who have had special training.

164. Who are they?—Dr. Evans and Dr. Allen.

165. Has Dr. Truby King not had experience in the diseases of children?—No; he never had any.

166. You say that the clinical teaching in the Hospital is now bad?—Yes.

167. Now?—That is what I gather from the students who are leaving the Hospital.

168. Where is the clinical teaching weak—in the teaching, or in the opportunities as far as the Hospital itself is concerned?—There is no clinical teaching done. What was being done, and I believe what is being done still, is that a man will get hold of an article and will read a little condensed piece out of a text-book. What we mean by a clinical lecture is for a man to go to a patient and examine the patient, and let the student see what is going on in his mind; he just tries to let the student see how he goes into the case and comes to a conclusion.

169. Do you mean to say that that is not done in the Dunedin Hospital at the present time?—It is not being done as it should be done.

170. Is it done at all?—I understand from people leaving the Hospital that the chief defect is the want of proper clinical training.

171. That is hearsay evidence, is it not? Have you experience of your own by which you can guide us?—How could I get information otherwise? It must be hearsay.

172. Do you know what has been done of late years to improve the clinical teaching in the Hospital?—Yes. There was a clinical tutor appointed in surgery, and when he was appointed he was not allowed to enter the wards.

173. Was there one in medicine?—There was afterwards.

174. Is there now a tutor in medicine and a tutor in surgery?—Yes.

175. Are there now three physicians and lecturers in clinical medicine?—Yes.

176. Are there three surgeons and lecturers in clinical surgery?—Yes.

177. Are there three assistant surgeons?—Yes.

178. A gynecologist?—Yes.

179. And two assistant gynecologists?—Yes.

180. Three assistant physicians?—Yes.

181. An ophthalmic surgeon and two assistants?—Yes.

182. A radiologist?—Yes.

183. Two anæsthetists?—Yes.

184. And a dental surgeon?—Yes.

185. Is not the teaching of most of those men clinical teaching?—No.

186. Which one's teaching is not?—I will take one of your examples. How can a man hope to teach radiology on the strength of a few weeks' treatment? When I was in London and working with Mr. Harry Fenwick, for five years he would not look at the English radiographs, because he said he could not trust them. Now he has written a book on the subject. These subjects cannot be learned in two or three weeks.

187. I understand that you have discovered one other weakness. The first weakness was the lecturer in the diseases of children, and the second is the radiologist?—No; I have spoken about the clinical teaching.

188. But the radiologist is a clinical teacher, is he not?—Yes.

189. Is he weak?—I think so. I do not see how he can be otherwise.

190. Are there any others weak of those I have read out?—I say that any man is weak who has not had some hospital experience.

191. Are any of these weak?—I say that any man who has not had hospital experience is weak. You wish to put me into the position of making it a personal matter against a particular man. I do not propose to do that.

192. You have made it a personal matter against Dr. Williams, Dr. Batchelor, and Dr. Cameron: have you any others that you want to put on the list?—I have only made it a personal matter with them in so far as they have fallen into the position.

193. Can you name any others that you think are not competent?—I answered the question in this way: I consider anybody who has not had hospital experience is not qualified as a teacher.

194. About the connection between the University and the Charitable Aid Board: were you in your evidence speaking of 1903 or now?—I was speaking of 1903-5.

195. Do you or do you not know that the condition has entirely altered since 1903?—I know it has.

196. Is there the same reason to be dissatisfied in the matter of the connection between the Hospital and Charitable Aid Board and the University to-day as there was in 1903-5?—There will be so long as a Board of laymen control the appointments to the Hospital.

197. Is there the same reason to-day for saying that matters as between the Charitable Aid Board and the University Council are unsatisfactory?—I think the arrangement is unsatisfactory.

198. Which arrangement?—The arrangement of dual control.

199. As regards the practical working of the present scheme, are there improvements to-day as compared with 1903?—Any arrangement by which the Council, guided by people who understand the position, have a larger proportion of power with regard to the University appointments in the Medical School would be a good one.

200. Do you know that prior to the alterations made a few years ago the Hospital and Charitable Aid Board consulted the Council before making their appointments, or, rather, that they accepted their advice with regard to appointments? And do you know that the University Council is now represented on the Hospital Board, and the Hospital Board on the University Council?—Yes.

201. Does that not make a material alteration in the conditions?—I think it may lead to more trouble than ever.

202. When you spoke about the "mischievous sham" were you talking of 1893 or 1903 or 1913?—I was referring to the time of my experience—1903—when I was in the out-patients department. I do not refer to 1893 at all, except in so far as I have replied to your questions.

203. What do you mean by "mischievous sham" in 1903-5: what was there mischievous in the training of the students?—"Mischievous sham" is a quotation from Professor MacGregor's report.

204. Which you adopt?—No, I do not adopt the phrase. What I say is that the truth of that statement has been exemplified. I go on to state that the condition of affairs verifies to a very great extent the correctness of his report as to what would happen—that is to say, that it would be a mischievous sham. Because you must recollect that a great deal of the improvement in connection with Hospital and University affairs has been due to outside pressure; nothing was done till there was outside pressure.

205. Are we to understand that it is your agitation that has created all the improvement?—I think my agitation has had a great deal to do with it.

206. You ought to be pleased?—I am.

207. That was a prophecy of Dr. MacGregor's—"mischievous sham"?—Yes.

208. Has the prophecy been borne out, in your opinion?—I think so. In 1903-5 I think the condition of affairs down there at the Dunedin Hospital was simply lamentable.

209. Was the Medical School a "mischievous sham" in 1903-5?—Take an instance: You have an ophthalmic school. Here is a man with an eye; at the back of that eye you can see certain things; the student has lectures, but cannot look into the eye to see. That is not knowledge; it is sham knowledge.

210. Do you know to-day whether the Medical School is a "mischievous sham"? Would you be prepared to say?—No, I could not speak about it to-day.

211. Then you cannot say whether the prophecy has been fulfilled, or not?—It was fulfilled in 1903-5.

212. I am talking about the school now?—I have had no experience of the school, except hearsay, since I left it in 1905.

213. Do you know that the preliminary medical examination of the University of New Zealand is recognized by the General Medical Council of Great Britain and Ireland?—Yes.

214. Do you think they would be fools enough to recognize us if we were not good enough?—The preliminary medical examination has nothing to do with the clinical training. That has nothing to do with the Hospital at all. I am discussing the Hospital, not the pre-hospital work.

215. Do you know that the University of Cambridge recognizes two years of our medical course?—Yes, the pre-hospital part of it. That does not come into the discussion. I have not made any charges against it.

216. Yes, you did?—Not a word.

217. You said the whole thing was a mischievous sham?—Professor MacGregor was in favour of them doing anatomy and physiology. He thought they could do that, but he thought that if they attempted to do a full course in medicine it would prove a mischievous sham.

FRIDAY, 5TH SEPTEMBER, 1913.

Professor LABY examined. (No. 23.)

Witness read the following statement:—

Statement by Professor T. H. Laby on behalf of the University Reform Association.

The statement I am about to make is based on the assumption that this Education Committee accepts the report of the previous Education Committee, which was adopted by the House of Representatives. That report states—

"(1.) That a case has been made out for reform in the constitution of the New Zealand University, more particularly in the direction of the utilization in a larger measure than at present of the professorial staffs of the colleges in the framing of curricula and syllabuses, and in the conduct of examinations.

"(2.) That the appointment of a Royal Commission is not necessary at present, as the Committee believes there is evidence that the University is itself moving in a direction which will gradually evolve a scheme of reform on the lines indicated, and this is borne out to some extent by the fact that in November, 1910, in accordance with a resolution of the Senate, a conference of representatives of the Professorial Boards was held in Wellington to consider certain academic questions referred to by the Senate."

At the meeting of the Senate (January, 1912) following the publication of the above report, the Senate, thanks largely to the influence of Mr. James Allen, set up an annual, and it was called "permanent," professorial conference. The professorial conference, consisting of thirty representatives of the four Professorial Boards, met for four days in November of 1912. Throughout the preceding year the Professorial Boards had before them the questions which were to come before the conference, and two of the Boards at least devoted a great deal of time to the solution of these questions, and were finally in agreement on all important principles. The report of the professorial conference will be found on page 10 of the Senate's minutes for 1913. It will be seen that the conference arrived at conclusions which could have been put into force at once on the following matters: The B.A. degree; degree examinations; constitution of the conference for 1913; research scholarships; a syllabus in mathematics and in honours chemistry. Recommendations were also made upon—A special degree in science; Government research scholarships; visit of the British Association. I venture to say that a deliberative body of thirty members rarely accomplishes in four days such a volume of work as the professorial conference did, and that the curriculum for a degree (B.A.) in arts and science subjects proposed by the conference was a carefully thought-out and workable solution of a problem difficult both in principle and detail.

The report of the conference came before the Senate at its meeting two months later (January, 1913). The recommendations of the conference were dealt with as follows:—

(1.) That there be one pass degree in arts and science.—Rejected by the Senate by fourteen votes to eight.

(2.) That the external system of examination be abolished within five years, and that the examinations in any subject be conducted by a Board of the responsible University teachers of that subject.—Rejected by seventeen to six.

(3.) That the course of study of a candidate for the B.A. degree and the B.Sc. degree should be approved by the Professorial Board of his college.—Rejected by the Senate by thirteen votes to nine.

(4.) That a candidate be allowed to "repeat" two subjects in the final section of his pass degree.—Rejected by the Senate by twelve votes to ten.

(5.) That the Government research scholarships be not restricted to subjects which are of immediate economic value. Although this was not a recommendation to the Senate, but to the Minister of Education, it too was "rejected" by the Senate.

(6.) That University scholarships be established for the encouragement of research upon certain conditions. The conditions proposed by the professorial conference were not accepted; the Senate set up a committee of three* to draw up a scheme.

(7.) The syllabuses in mathematics and chemistry were accepted.

(8.) And finally, on the motion of Mr. Von Haast, the Senate, by fifteen to seven, decided to discontinue the "annual" professorial conference established only the year before.

I wish to submit on behalf of the Reform Association that this Education Committee has now to come to a decision upon a single and very simple issue. That issue is: Has the belief of the previous Committee that "the University is itself moving in a direction which will gradually evolve a scheme of reform on the lines indicated" proved to be correct? This belief was the single ground assigned for not giving a Royal Commission. We submit that this belief has been proved incorrect, and as a consequence that this Committee has now no other course open to it than to grant a Royal Commission: that is, if we can establish that the Senate refuses to utilize "the professorial staffs of the colleges in framing curricula," then it follows from the previous Committee's report that we have established a case which they would have accepted for a Royal Commission. As we understand you accept their report, which was adopted by Parliament, it is only necessary for us to give evidence on this single issue. I submit that the Senate, in its decisions (stated above) on the recommendations of the professorial conference, not only refused to accept the advice of the conference upon every point of importance, but abolished a conference which in the previous year it had called "permanent." We submit that it is not open to doubt that the Senate has failed to utilize the professorial staffs in a larger measure for the framing of curricula. It cannot be argued that since the Senate has circulated schemes of University reform for discussion it has merely delayed the reforms which the Education Committee look for, and the delay is unimportant. The Senate recognized in 1908, five years ago, the need for improvements in the arts and science curricula. It set up a committee to "consider and report upon Dr. Starr Jordan's suggestions, and generally the revision of the University system, so as to bring the University education of New Zealand into line with modern developments in the leading universities of Europe and America." And certain members of the Senate have been endeavouring ever since to introduce those improvements. The Senate has called two professorial conferences, but as it refused to accept the conclusions of either, and abolished the last for having put workable proposals before it, no advance has been made. The defect of the present curricula in arts and science, recognized as such by the Senate in 1908, have been allowed to continue to the injury of some thousands of students. The effect on the teaching of science has been disastrous.

The Senate has failed to improve the B.A. degree in five years, either because the majority of its members are not in earnest or because they are incapable. If it is incapable of improving a curriculum, what hope is there of its accomplishing the very much larger task it is now concerned with? Even if it is assumed that the Senate is a highly competent and earnest body, when it has completed the large task it is now embarking upon it will still have the arts and science course to improve, and with the advice of the same professors that it now treats with contempt. There is no escape from the conclusion that the Senate, taken as a whole, has no intention of consulting the professors and lecturers, or it would have either accepted the conclusion of the last professorial conference or referred those conclusions back to the conference for alteration in specific directions. The Senate's actual action of abolishing the conference can be described in no other words than irresponsible and reactionary. It was irresponsible inasmuch as it wasted its own time, that of the professors and lecturers, and the funds entrusted to its care, to no effect.

The Constitution of the Commission.—If the Committee reports in favour of a Royal Commission then it will be necessary to decide on the constitution of the Commission. The Hon. Mr. Herdman gave evidence at the last inquiry on behalf of the University Reform Association on this point. We desire that evidence to be repeated. He said,—

"Now, I wish chiefly to address the Committee on the constitution of the proposed Royal Commission. Reform is necessary, and if reform is necessary it can be got in three different ways. It can be got by the Government and the Education Department taking the matter in hand; it can be got by appointing a Commission to inquire into the whole question of education throughout the country; and, thirdly, it can be got by a Commission simply appointed to inquire into the system of university education alone; and it is that third proposition that I advocate. As to the first two, whilst everybody respects the view Mr. Hogben takes, I venture to believe that if the Department took the matter in hand it would not be so satisfactory as if a Commission were appointed—an independent Commission of impartial persons.

"Mr. Hogben: I did not suggest that the Department should do it at all.

"The Chairman: I think Mr. Hogben said that if Parliament actually reformed the constitution then he thought the other reforms would follow, and there would be no necessity for a Royal Commission.

"Mr. Herdman: Then I misunderstood him. I thought Mr. Hogben meant that if we establish a case here for reform there would be no need for a Royal Commission at all, and that the Government would probably pass legislation which would accomplish everything.

* Professors Chilton, Hight, and Farr. Professors Hight and Farr took part in drawing up the details proposed by the conference. With Professor Chilton they are now to revise the work of the whole conference of thirty professors—work which was neither hurried nor ill-considered.

"Mr. Hogben: I think I said 'Parliament.' I do not mean that the Education Department would come into it, except that it might frame a Bill for the instruction of the House.

"Mr. Herdman: I say that no satisfactory system of reform can be brought about by any Commission to inquire into the whole system of education. As far as this Committee is concerned, we have no evidence at all about our educational system or that branch of it which deals with primary or secondary schools, and it is not germane to the subject before the Committee. I think the subject is so vast that no investigation would be satisfactory which had to investigate the state of our primary and secondary schools. If there is any necessity the subject should be split up, and different Commissions should be appointed to investigate its different parts. The subject is highly technical, and any inquiry to be made should be of a non-political character, and be made by impartial persons who are skilled and deeply interested in university education. I would suggest that members of the Senate should not be put on any such Commission, and, above all, the inquiry should be thorough, and that as the result of the inquiry our University system should be put on a substantial and permanent basis. Now, as to the constitution of the Committee, I beg to submit this proposal: that the Royal Commission should consist of three different individuals, one an expert from outside of New Zealand, and two business men in New Zealand who have interested themselves in education in the past."

And further on: "I hope it will be understood what I mean—that there should be one man from outside, one from the North Island and one from the South Island, and that these three men should be appointed to investigate our system of university education, and be allowed to go to Australia to visit the universities there and call evidence if considered desirable; that every facility should be given to them to take evidence in New Zealand and Australia, and afterwards to make their report. Now, a good deal will depend upon the man you get from outside. I say that if you get a man of the type of Dr. Hill, who has been appointed on several occasions by the British Government to investigate the question of university reform in England—and I believe there is a possibility of his being able to come out here—and you join with him such men as Mr. Hosking, of Dunedin, Mr. Fowlds, or Mr. McNab, their report would be so authoritative and of such weight and importance to the whole community that their suggestions would be carried into effect without any difficulty at all."

And again: "The report of such a Commission would be so worded, so influential, and so valuable that you would be able to erect upon it a system of university life in this country which would have a permanent and enduring effect, and be of infinite service to the community. President Eliot, of the famous Harvard University, declares that 'the kind of man needed in the governing Board of the university is the highly educated public-spirited business or professional man who takes a strong interest in educational and social problems, and believes in higher education as the source of enlightenment and progress. He should also be a man who has been successful in his own calling, and commands the confidence of all who know him. The faculty he will need most is good judgment.' So that in regard to what I might call the lay members of the proposed Commission the gentlemen I have named, I suggest, would conform to the definition that President Eliot lays down as the kind of man needed on the governing bodies of universities."

I would like to add that you might notice that the functions of a Royal Commission such as we desire to have set up would be, amongst other things, (1) to reconstitute the University Senate and College Councils, (2) to constitute an academic Professorial Board, and (3) to introduce schemes of specialization for the different colleges. We submit that such work requires on the Commission men who would be judicial-minded, inasmuch as they would have to reconcile conflicting interests. It would require a chairman of proved ability in this work. If a Royal Commission is appointed the authorities responsible for appointing it should apply either to the Imperial Government or to Lord Haldane, who has just completed similar work on a Royal Commission which has taken some years, for a suitable man to be chairman of the Royal Commission. In that way I think a man of proved ability for such work would be guaranteed. I would suggest also that the actual scope and character of the inquiry should be placed before the Imperial Government or Lord Haldane if they are asked to appoint a Commissioner.

1. *Mr. Sidey.*] Your statement to-day is based upon the assumption that this Committee will come to the same conclusion as did the former Committee, from whose report you have read?—We were informed when we started to give evidence that you would accept the conclusions of the last Committee.

The Chairman.: No; we stated that we would accept the evidence given before the previous Committee.

Witness.: I understood that this Committee would adopt the report of the last Committee which was made to the House of Representatives.

2. *Mr. Sidey.*] At any rate, I want to make clear the assumption upon which you make your statement to-day?—I assumed that you would proceed from the point where the previous Committee left off, and accept the findings of that Committee.

3. But then there is another assumption that you also make: that the only reason why the former Committee did not recommend the appointment of a Royal Commission was the one mentioned in their report—"That the appointment of a Royal Commission is not necessary at present, as the Committee believes there is evidence that the University is itself moving in a direction which will gradually evolve a scheme of reform on the lines indicated, and this is borne out to some extent by the fact that in November, 1910, in accordance with a resolution of the Senate, a conference of representatives of the Professorial Boards was held in Wellington to consider certain academic questions referred to it by the Senate"—That is so. I take it that that is the only reason assigned by the previous Committee for not recommending a Royal Commission.

4. You will agree that it is quite possible for this Committee to come to the conclusion that reform is necessary without concluding that a Royal Commission should be appointed?—No, I

cannot. That could only be done if this Committee does not accept the findings of the previous Committee, and those findings were adopted by the House of Representatives.

5. That is, unless this Committee adopts everything?—I think it would be a waste of the time of the witnesses who have appeared before this Committee if it does not adopt the whole of the findings of the previous Committee.

6. But this Committee has not been sitting in the same way as the other?—Well, you have accepted its findings in other directions, and so I submit you should accept its findings in this respect.

7. This Committee is considering Mr. Hogben's report now?—I would respectfully submit that the proceedings of this Committee are likely to involve a waste of time and repetition if what I mention is not done.

Mr. Sidey: The understanding was that we would take the whole of the evidence given formerly by the Reform Association and place it before this Committee for consideration.

The Chairman: Yes.

Witness: I think that it was only due to the witnesses that you should adopt the report presented to the House of Representatives by the previous Committee, because I do not think they would have wasted their time in giving evidence if they had known you intended to do otherwise.

8. *Mr. Sidey.* At any rate, you will admit this: that this Committee may come to the conclusion that reform is desirable, but may not come to the conclusion that a Royal Commission should be set up, and they would be quite logical in that?—I would submit that they would be reporting entirely against the whole weight of the evidence that has been given if that is done.

9. But I submit that the Committee might come to the conclusion that while reform is necessary a Royal Commission may not be necessary?—If so they would not be finding in accordance with the evidence.

10. You support entirely the suggestions made by the Hon. Mr. Herdman on the previous occasion as to the constitution of the Royal Commission?—Yes.

11. Do you not think that with only one educational expert on the Commission his views would dominate the findings of the Commission?—I can see no point in putting him there if his views were not to have considerable weight.

12. But do you not think that a local expert should be put with him?—If you can find a local expert who is familiar with the different educational institutions in New Zealand, and with those outside the Dominion as well, then I think he would be suitable; but if he were not intimately acquainted with the organization of at least one University outside New Zealand then he would be quite unsuited to be a member of the Commission.

13. You would not object to a Commission of five?—I do not think the number is essential, but the qualifications of the men are most essential.

GEORGE HOGBEN, Inspector-General of Schools, examined. (No. 24.)

1. *The Chairman.* I understand, Mr. Hogben, you have a statement to make regarding the criticisms which have been passed upon your report by the Professorial Board of the Victoria College?—Yes. I am sorry that it is not a short one. I have not dealt with any criticism of my report from any of the other colleges, because I have not seen any. My statement is as follows:—

Before dealing in detail with some of the objections to certain statements and recommendations in my report upon the University colleges made by the professors of Victoria College I should like to point out some of what I may describe as misconceptions as to the purpose and scope of that report, and some assumptions made by the professors which seem to me to be hardly warranted by the facts.

(1.) Professor Picken, giving evidence on the 29th July, said that the Professorial Board of Victoria College "differs very largely from the Inspector-General's report in its views of what should be the future policy of New Zealand in the matter of University education." I would point out that the report was limited to a narrow range. I was not directed to report upon the reforms that might be made in the policy or the organization of the University; in fact, it is, I think, unmistakably implied in the report of the Education Committee of 1911 that I was not to deal with such matters. I was to report upon its needs—practically upon its immediate needs. I was not free to assume any other university policy or organization than that existing at present. My report, therefore, was not intended to, and could not, take the place of an inquiry by a Royal Commission, or by any other body or person, into the constitution, policy, and organization of the University. Personally I believe that these need a considerable amount of reform, and my attitude thereon and the battle I have, along with others, fought for reform on the Senate for many years ought, I think, to have prevented the Victoria College professors from imagining that I held such views as they have attributed to me, or from reading such views into the report. With regard, for instance, to the question of day and night classes, I was not free to assume any other arrangement than the present one; my personal attitude in regard to the question is surely sufficiently indicated by the following sentences on page 9 of the report: "It is only fair to admit that the standard of work should be set by the day students, and, if this be so, those who are occupied during the day and are thereby prevented from attending any other than evening classes should be allowed to take a smaller group of subjects at one time, and so consequently to spread their degree work over a greater number of years. This would not, however, do away with the whole or partial duplication of the staff that would be entailed by the carrying-on of both day and evening classes in the one college." I had to deal with present financial needs on the present basis of policy, and I went outside this only when additional light

could be thrown upon the various questions by consideration of certain possible future needs, as in the matter of the provision of the increased number of assistant lecturers or demonstrators required for an increased number of students.

(2.) Another misconception is contained in the words used by Professor Laby in his evidence given on the 15th August (page 19, typewritten copy of evidence): "The report appears to accept the principle that it is more important to increase the number of subjects taught than to increase the standard of the work." I do not accept that principle, nor do I find in the report anything that gives colour to the statement. The schemes of staffing suggested for the four University colleges are set forth as what in my opinion constitutes the minimum for efficiency. If a comparison is made of Table A on page 2, which shows the present teaching staffs of the University colleges (as existing in June, 1912), and Table H on page 10, which gives the suggested minimum staff for each college, it will be seen that of the subjects named in the first list two—Hebrew and military science—are omitted altogether on the second list, and no new subject whatever is introduced. It is true that in the suggested type scheme in Table H the minimum that would be required for the teaching of architecture and of veterinary science is set down. The reasons for these two subjects appearing at all may be easily explained. In both subjects provision for degrees has been made by the University, in both subjects there has been a demand for teaching, in both subjects there has been a request to the Government for the necessary grants; the University of Otago already provides a large part of the scientific teaching required in veterinary surgery, and Canterbury College much of what would be required for architecture; moreover, I have had the advice of experts of high standing in each of these subjects, not only in New Zealand but elsewhere, as to what would be necessary for their proper teaching, and have accordingly set it down here for future reference if required. But I have not proposed the provision of any staff for these branches among the suggested immediate minimum needs of the colleges; I have preferred to strengthen the existing subjects, not so much indeed as I should like, but as far as it seemed reasonable to go now. In fact, I believe that there is not a single subject except education and music in which I have not suggested an immediate strengthening of the staff in one or more of the colleges.

(3.) Professor Laby made several comparisons of the proportion of population in the several University college districts and the proportion of the proposed grants assigned to the University colleges. This assumes that the nominal constituencies or districts of the several University colleges, as defined by the University Act, are the real or actual constituencies from which students are drawn. This omits altogether the effect of the special schools of medicine, dentistry, mining, home science, and engineering, each of which has the whole Dominion for its constituency. But it appears to be an erroneous assumption in other respects also. The real constituencies consist of the population from which the students actually come. It is difficult to find an exact measure of these actual constituencies. If we take as a measure the number of students in the faculties of arts and science at the date (June, 1912) to which the report refers, we find that Otago had 247 students and Victoria College 238 students, the numbers being nearly equal. If it were correct to take the populations (191,000 and 379,000 respectively) of the University districts as defined by the New Zealand University Act, and quoted by Professor Laby, Victoria College ought to have twice as many students as Otago; in fact, if evening students take longer to pass through the degree course than day students (as they should, and probably do) then the number of students in attendance at any one time will be greater accordingly. For instance, if they take four years for the B.A. course, then the number of B.A. students in attendance at any given time will be one-third greater than if they took three years only. So that, with the assumed constituencies based on the population of the University districts, Victoria College should have $2\frac{2}{3}$ times the number of arts and science students that Otago has. But it has not. It appears to me, therefore, that all the comparisons of population, endowments, grants, and expenditure based upon the assumption that the nominal constituencies are the actual constituencies are misleading and valueless.

(4.) It was assumed by several of the witnesses, more especially Professors Laby and Picken ("if this new principle is to be introduced of the payment of the extra people by fees," &c.), that the report suggests the payment of the additional lecturers and demonstrators required for an increased number of students by fees. I did not intend my remarks on page 9 or anywhere else in the report to be taken in this way, nor do I think that that is the natural meaning of the words I have used. As the paragraph in which this matter is mentioned implies, there is for each subject or branch a minimum staff required for efficiency, however small the number of students, and it is obvious that an increase of students beyond a certain limit will entail an increase in the staff. If I say that, with the scale of fees in force at any college it is found that the increased fees do actually provide enough money to pay the recognized standard of salaries for the increased staff, I am merely stating a fact, surely the fees must be taken into account in arriving at the total revenue of the college. I would certainly not regulate the salary of a lecturer by the amount of fees available, nor the staff in any subject according to the fees received from the students taking it, much less would I pay any professor or lecturer by fees.

(5.) Professor Picken made the remark "that it seems that the University is to be under the head of the primary schools." Presumably the Inspector-General of Schools is meant. If so, the description is not a good one; he has as much or almost as much to do with secondary schools, technical schools, Native schools, and industrial schools as with primary schools, and may even be called upon to advise the Government in certain matters affecting the University when there is a question of legislation or of the expenditure of public money. Professor Adamson also says, "The Education Department would control the University." The Education Department is innocent of any such desire. But I agree with the witness if he means that the University should be as independent as possible of any Government control—it should be self-contained and free to move along its own lines without dictation from any official source. The words I have used on page 10 of the report, "But I do not desire," &c., were intended to have this meaning. The

same quotation will suffice, I trust, to remove two other misconceptions of the same witness, namely—(a) “The funds were to be earmarked by Parliament”; (b) “Too definite a relation between the strength of the staff and the number of students should be left to the college itself.”

(6.) There is some confusion in the use of the word “specialization”: it means sometimes “professional courses,” sometimes “higher or post-graduate work, especially research.” I think the report is clear enough in respect of professional schools. Because Auckland is supposed to specialize in commerce and Victoria College in law it is argued that the university work done by the ordinary lawyer or the ordinary accountant should not be provided for at more than one college. Unlike other evening students, these students are for the most part following during the day an occupation cognate with their studies; they are earning in whole or in part a livelihood; they are living for the most part at home; in short, the smallest consideration will show that it would not, as was supposed, be more economical to found law and commerce scholarships than to provide tuition in four places. It was contended by Professor Laby that “the effect of introducing the teaching of commerce and law into all four centres” (it has already been introduced, I may say), if it is to be put on the same basis as the teaching of arts and science, will mean the introduction of propositions which will in the long-run mean that the demands on the finances of those four colleges will be such that an improvement in the standard of teaching in the other colleges will be impossible (probably what is meant is that “an improvement in the standard of the other teaching in the colleges will be impossible”). This is met by the passages in the report on page 7, “Professional Schools or Faculties.” I have not overlooked the specialization—that is, the provision for higher work—that should be made for commerce at Auckland University College and for law at Victoria College, but I understand that a student who desires to do higher work in law at Victoria College is still a *rara avis in terris*, and at the Auckland University College there is apparently as yet no demand for higher work in commerce or economics at all. Therefore further provision for these could hardly be considered as immediate needs. It is true that the number of commerce students last year (273) was very much larger than it is likely to be again for some time to come, but putting the number down as normally a hundred and twenty or a hundred and thirty at each college, and the amount necessary for scholarships to put them in even approximately as good a position as they are now at £50 each in addition to fees, we should require, say, eighty scholarships at £50, or £4,000 for those commerce students at the three centres where the course in commerce was not taught. This is much greater than the amount needed with the fees and other income to run separate schools. Moreover, the insurance and other mercantile houses in the three centres would still need clerks. Where, then, could the commerce students find posts when they had finished their course? The same arguments apply even more strongly to the college courses provided for the ordinary professional training of lawyers. It would be a bad thing for the country if the majority of its lawyers and accountants were altogether cut out from the advantages of some degree of university education. The suggestion that the instruction in these subjects would be of the nature of cramming seems to me to be an unworthy one. Why should it not be of as truly educational value as the training of doctors or engineers? I am speaking, it will be understood, of the ordinary professional training, not of higher courses in law or commerce. The school of home science is already in existence. It is the only school which provides directly for what I may call the professional training of women. It cannot much longer be maintained, as it is to a large extent now, by voluntary contributions; the number of students taking the full course is rapidly increasing, and the proposal to put the existing school on a sound basis appears to me reasonable.

(7.) I come now to the vexed question of fees, which is dealt with on page 15 and elsewhere in the report. First, let me try to remove one or two misconceptions that seem to exist in the minds of the professors, or, at all events, in the mind of Professor Laby: (a.) He says that it is unfair to compare the fees at Otago or Canterbury and at Wellington because at the former there are expensive courses like medicine, engineering, dentistry, and mining. Reference to page 15 will show that the fees for these subjects have not been included, but only those for arts, science, commerce, and law. (b.) He says that only the fees paid by an inconsiderable select body of students, national scholars and bursars, have been taken; these take more subjects, and the average fees are lower.

The following (Table M) shows that the number of holders of scholarships and bursaries of all kinds is by no means inconsiderable:—

Scholarships, Bursaries, Exhibitions, and Studentships held at Affiliated Institutions: Estimate for 1913.

Scholarships.	Auckland.	Victoria.	Canterbury.	Otago.	Totals.
Junior University Scholarships	9	3	3	13	28
Senior National Scholarships	6	12	14	24	56
Taranaki Scholarships	..	2	..	2	4
Senior University Scholarships	3	4	1	8	16
Bursaries under University Bursary Regulations	31	42	27	82	160
Home Science Bursaries	..	..	..	13	13
Sir George Grey Scholarships	1	1	1	1	4
Other exhibitions, &c.	2	2	12	8	24
Training college studentships	108	108	111	119	446
	160	174	169	270	773

2. *Mr. Malcolm.*] Do those bursaries cover the whole course or only a year?—They are for more than one year, perhaps three years.

3. Then there are a number for one year only, such as the “Grey” and the “Russell”?—Yes.

Witness (continuing statement): He says that evening students take fewer lectures than day students, and so the fees paid each year by them will be lower than those paid by day students, but this will not affect the total amount received in fees for any given number of persons in a district taking degree courses. Let us take an example. Let us suppose that a certain number of day students take three years for the B.A. course, and an equal number of evening students take four years. If the total fees for the course were £36 we might for the sake of the present argument assume that the day students pay £12 a year in fees, and the evening students £9 a year. But at the college where the day students are there would be among them at any one time students of the first year, second year, and third year, while at the other college where the evening students are there would be first-, second-, third-, and fourth-year students, or $1\frac{1}{3}$ times as many in attendance for the same number of persons in the community taking B.A. courses. The total annual fees would thus come to exactly the same for the evening students as for the day students.

Before discussing the probable effect of the raising of the fees at Victoria College I should like to point out the dilemma in which those who urge the argument of the population of the nominal constituencies (or University districts) and the argument of the alleged extravagant estimate of fees contained in the report will find themselves placed. If the arts and science students at Victoria College were equal in number to those in Otago the amount of fees received for them alone would have been, in 1912, £3,469 on the Otago scale, and to this to find the total income from fees we should have to add the fees of all the other students, making more than the total of £4,455 considered to be so extravagant an estimate. If the number of students were in proportion to the population the total fees would be at least £8,000 or £9,000, and finance would cease to be a problem for the Victoria College Council. Again, taking the number of matriculated students at Victoria College this year, 312, and assuming that the fees were at the same rate as at Auckland, where also most of the lectures are given in the evening (say, £12 10s., average), the total amount would be for these students £3,906; adding the fees actually payable by the unmatriculated students, £585, and, say, £300 tuition fees (if the legal difficulty were got over), we should have a total of £4,785, or £340 more than my estimate. The circumstances under which the fees at Victoria College were raised make it extremely difficult to form a correct estimate of what they are finally likely to produce. The fees for the first-year students were raised at short notice, and many to my knowledge have in consequence postponed their entrance into the college, therefore the number of first-year students is not likely to be so low again as ninety-two. Also, the authorities of Victoria College did not show the same energy in making known the extended bursary scheme that, for instance, Otago did, consequently Otago has eighty-two bursars (or ninety-five with the home-science bursaries) this year to forty-two at Victoria College. To take the entry of students this year as a true index is, therefore, in my opinion misleading, and after a few years I believe my figures will be found to be not far short of the truth. Meanwhile I would suggest that Victoria College and Auckland should be secured against loss by guaranteeing to them for a certain time a minimum income from fees, endowments, and grants taken together.

(8.) Libraries and laboratories: A basal mistake in the criticisms on these points is the confounding together of annual or recurring expenditure and capital expenditure or expenditure intended to overtake arrears of requirements not previously satisfied: for instance, considering how many books appear on the library shelves in their original bindings, £100 cannot be the ordinary expenditure for binding £50 worth of periodicals and £150 worth of books. The best answer I can give to the criticism on my proposals in these matters is to point to the actual expenditure. I do not myself think it is enough, but I think the funds proposed to be placed in trust with the University will allow of its increase. Part of the law fees might provide partly for the law library; this I have already suggested in the report (page 7). For honour students surely the Law Societies' libraries might be made available, if they are not so already. I find it difficult to follow Professor Laby in his financial statements: in one place he says the additional revenue proposed to be given to Victoria College is £1,000, in another £2,000, in a third £3,300, and, I think, something different elsewhere. Sometimes he takes as his basis of comparison the grants of last year, sometimes the grants as appearing in the estimates of the present year, the figures of which naturally were not available to me in 1912. After my report was printed Parliament last year voted an extra £1,000 a year to Victoria College because of its urgent needs; accordingly my proposed increase is cut down by £1,000 by the professor!

I think the best way is for me to revise and restate the proposals in regard to Victoria College even more fully than in my report, showing its actual position and its position under the proposals.

Table N.—Estimates of Annual Revenue and Expenditure (as in June, 1912).

	EXPENDITURE.				Proposed (a).	Actual (1911).
					£	£
Salaries of staff	...	...	...	...	11,200	...
Libraries	...	...	...	...	300	...
Laboratories	...	...	...	...	750	...
Administration	...	...	...	...	1,750	...
Total	...	...	...	...	£14,000	£10,592

Table N.—*Estimates of Annual Revenue and Expenditure (as in June, 1912)*—continued.

REVENUE.	Proposed (b).	Actual (1910-11).
	£	£
Grants from Consolidated Fund	7,000	...
National endowments	2,500	...
Fees (d)	4,000	...
Taranaki Reserves	500	...
Voluntary contributions and subsidy (commerce) (c) ...	300	...
Miscellaneous (income from reserves, technical capita- tion, &c.)	150	...
Total	£14,450	£9,700

Increase in income, £4,750.

Notes to Table N.—(a.) Proposed expenditure: I have set down the full cost of the suggested minimum staff, have increased the estimates for libraries and laboratories, and have reduced that for administration. (b.) I have given full details of the estimated revenue under the proposals in the report. If the national-endowment revenue is not allocated as suggested the sum might be voted by Parliament. (c.) The New Zealand Society of Accountants contributes £150 a year, on which a subsidy of pound for pound is payable. The technical capitation amounted last year to £40. (d.) I have reduced the estimate of the income from fees; but to guard against an uncertain revenue during the period of transition I would guarantee for three years to Victoria College (and perhaps also to Auckland) a revenue of £14,000 from grants, endowments, and fees.

A suggestion was made by Professor Laby that the Education Department was opposed to giving subsidies on voluntary contributions made to promote research. This is far from the truth. In the instance quoted by him there was at the time the application was made no vote on the estimates out of which subsidy could legally be paid; a special vote is required, because there is no statutory provision for such subsidies. In my opinion, subject to necessary conditions, subsidies should be paid on voluntary contributions made to a college in the same way as they are paid in the case of a secondary school. It was said (i) that the specialization grants were abolished, and more particularly (ii) that no provision was made for specialization in law at Victoria College.

(i.) The proposals are that all the Government grants should be consolidated and not earmarked, thus leaving the colleges greater freedom. (ii.) A careful examination of Tables H and I will show that specialization in law has not been overlooked either as regards the staffing or the financial provision for it. The cost of two lecturers in law at the rate assumed would be £600 per annum, but instead of that arrangement two professors and one assistant lecturer are provided with total salaries of £1,550; the extra provision, therefore, as compared with that, say, at Canterbury College is £950, and this is the amount allotted at present for specialization in law. (The word "specialization" is purposely not used either in Table H or in Table I.) The amount named is certainly not enough to reach even a most moderate ideal, but it seems as much as could be allowed for the immediate needs when there are only three advanced students.

Specialization in Science at Victoria College.—The meaning of this in the vote when it was first given was that at that time there was no separate Chair of Physics, and the intention was to earmark a sufficient sum to establish a Chair of Physics.

Objection was made to granting money to the University in trust for the colleges: my reply is that this suggestion of mine to some extent anticipated the recommendations of the Commission on the University of London.

Again, objection was made to the attitude of the Government in regard to the research scholarships inasmuch as one of the conditions is that the subject of the research shall have some bearing on the industries of the Dominion. This appears to me to be a very fair condition for a Government research scholarship. Pure science research scholarships should, of course, be founded also; but why should not the University found such scholarships out of its annual grant or out of its scholarship fund?

Finally, we have the general statement by Professor Laby: "Above everything the financial arrangements can only be determined after a policy has been laid down in University education in New Zealand." I have seen a long effort to reform and define University education policy in New Zealand; I do not know how long it may be before it is settled. But even now some good work is being done; we should not let the horse starve while the methods of agriculture are being discussed and the architecture of the stable is being designed. Enough money for the immediate minimum needs should be given. And let the finance be readjusted, if necessary, when a reorganization of the University and its colleges takes place.

4. *Mr. Malcolm.* In regard to research scholarships, Mr. Hogben, has the Department or the Senate considered the question of asking students to investigate particular subjects? I am thinking just now of the flax question. Research scholars, I understand, are allowed to devote themselves to whatever line of research they are interested in?—No, hardly. We make the suggestions. As a matter of fact, we suggested the investigation into flax, and a very valuable research was made into it two or three years ago. Some subjects were suggested which it was considered did not have a sufficient bearing on the industries. We had an interdepartmental conference with the experts of the Agricultural Department, and as a result we suggested to Canterbury College that it would be desirable to deal with the flax question. It was a lady who took it up, and the report was a very valuable one. It has not been printed—the printing would be too costly.

5. Then you give advice at present as to the course of work which should be taken up by research scholars?—Yes, we make suggestions. The Research Scholarship Board of the College sends in recommendations, and the Government appoints some expert outside the colleges, and he is consulted.

6. That is, in setting the course of study?—Yes.

7. Of course, the Government will keep in mind the benefit to be derived from research in particular subjects?—Yes. There is a list of suggested subjects in the regulations, and they also say, "and such other subjects as the Minister may approve." The subjects are connected with different Departments, and we have consulted the officers of the Agricultural Department and the Mines Department.

8. *Mr. McCallum.*] I am only going to ask you a few questions regarding Victoria College. If you will turn to page 15 of your report, and add the suggested deficiencies to the present annual income, you will find that Auckland and Victoria College work out at £13,800, Canterbury College £17,450, and Otago University £22,950. If you compare Victoria College and Otago University there is a difference of £9,000. The people of Auckland and Wellington think you are favouring Otago. We recognize that the medical section is the most costly, and we allow from £4,000 to £5,000 extra for that, but there is a difference of £9,000. Otago will be allowed £9,000 more than Auckland or Victoria College?—Well, if you will turn to page 11, Table I, you will see how that amount is arrived at.

9. Then, the fact that you did not put in the word "law" as a special subject has been commented upon?—I did not cut it out; the word "specialization" is not mentioned in that table.

10. But you put in "engineering" as a special subject?—Because everybody thinks of it as a special subject.

11. You allow "dentistry" and three other items, but you cut us out in law?—I took the existing schools. I have not cut you out of law. If you take the minimum staffs suggested for each college on page 10, there are eight at £700 (£5,600), eleven at £300 (£3,300), five—without the law man—at £150 (£750). Then you must add the estimated cost of two law lecturers, £600. That should give a total of £10,250 for the ordinary courses in arts, science, commerce, and law. If we strengthen the Law School by substituting two professors at £700 for the two lecturers at £300, and by adding an assistant lecturer at £150, we are adding £950 to secure a certain degree of specialization in law. The total now becomes £11,200, including the amount allowed as immediately required for specialization in law. This agrees with the figures in the revised table of proposed expenditure set out in the statement I have just read.

12. I just wanted to point out that the framing of Table I is defective, and has caused some trouble?—The difficulty is that "law" would have had to appear in two lines, because it was a special subject in one college and an ordinary subject at others.

13. You do not go into the larger question as to the efficiency of the staffs?—Oh, no; I had to avoid that point carefully.

14. *Mr. Sidey.*] Speaking generally, Mr. Hogben, you practically adhere (with the exception, possibly, of the provision for three years until the additional fees will be received) to the report which you have made?—Yes, as regards the revenue, except that I have brought the fees down £450. I have taken £450 off my estimate of the students' fees for Victoria College, and I have added the sources of revenue not included before, so that the statement of revenue is more complete.

15. And with that modification you do not propose to make any alteration in your report as the result of the criticism to which it has been subjected?—I have made three other alterations. I have put the annual amount for laboratories up to £750, and that for the libraries up to £300—that is, out of the College fund. I want it to be distinctly understood that the money proposed to be placed in trust with the University Senate is available in part for library grants to the colleges. At the same time I have cut down the administration to £1,750; I think that is sufficient.

16. You make no difference in the ultimate total which should be paid to each of the colleges?—No.

17. It remains as it was?—Yes; but I have put into the estimate for Victoria College the £500 to be paid from the Taranaki higher education reserves. If you will refer to page 16 of the report you will see that I say, "It would be, in my opinion, a very just thing for Victoria College to receive £500 a year from these reserves until such time as a University college was established in Taranaki."

18. I think you expressed agreement, to some extent, with the Reform Association in some of the requests that they are making with regard to the constitution?—Well, I have not touched upon that because I did not consider it was referred to me.

19. But you did express some agreement with their views?—Yes. If the general question of reform comes up I am fully prepared to answer any questions.

20. The reason I ask that question is that those who gave evidence from Victoria College were very emphatic that no effect should be given to your report until the question of the constitution or the alteration in the constitution is settled?—I do not know how long it is going to be before there is an alteration.

21. Supposing this Committee were to recommend the Government to set up a Royal Commission, would you consider that no effect should be given to your report until the recommendations of that Commission were brought down?—No, I think at least some portion of the report should be given effect to at once. I think you are wasting money while the colleges are inefficient.

22. Your scheme is based upon what you call the minimum requirements for the present policy?—Yes, I cannot conceive a Royal Commission taking the money away from the colleges, or recommending that that should be done.

23. So that if the whole of the money recommended by you in this report were given to the various colleges you cannot conceive that any Royal Commission that might be appointed would interfere with these grants?—No. I think that if a Commission were set up the result would be that their recommendations, as far as finance is concerned, would involve a large sum of money. It would not mean taking away money from any of the colleges.

24. But rather to give them more money?—Yes. Then again, even if you had a Royal Commission you would have to consider their report, and then after this Committee or the House had considered their report there would have to be legislation brought down, and it seems to me that it would be three or four years at least before you got matters settled.

25. Then your opinion is that even if a Royal Commission were recommended this year the whole of the recommendations in your report should be given effect to?—Yes, leaving questions of policy open to the colleges.

26. Coming for a moment to the question of law, you will remember that Professor Adamson and some other professors considered that you should have made greater provision for the teaching of law at Victoria College?—I have not made the adequate provision that there should be if there were an adequate number of students. But, of course, I know that the professors said that.

27. Very well, your reply to that is that they wanted the extra teaching at Victoria College to do advanced work?—Yes.

28. Well, now, is it not a fact that Professor Adamson suggested additional teaching, and not advanced work in other subjects, such as conveyancing?—Yes.

29. If it can be shown that there is other work, which does not come under the designation of advanced study for legal work, which it can be shown should be done at Victoria College, you would not be inclined to alter your report and make a further recommendation as regards subjects not including advanced work?—Yes, if that were shown. But this represents £600. Some universities spread that over four lecturers. I have taken the LL.B. course myself. I attended an extremely good course at Canterbury College, and my experience of that was that a good many barristers are willing for a comparatively small fee to give, say, three hours a week to help really to put on a broad basis the teaching of their own clerks.

30. In this suggested scheme you did not include any provision for the teaching of conveyancing at Victoria College?—No; the opinions of two colleges were against procedure or conveyancing outside of Victoria College.

31. Seeing that it is intended to specialize in law at Victoria College they should have a claim for consideration in the establishment of that subject?—I am afraid my idea of the teaching of law would be to entirely reorganize it, as it is in New Zealand. I should like to see the method introduced which they have at Leland Stanford University. I came over from America with the Dean of the Faculty of Law of that University, and from what I learned from him it would not be difficult to establish it here on similar lines to theirs. It is not one of those Americanisms we hear so much about—it is really a Germanism. It would require the entire reconstitution of the whole system. Of course, it would mean a larger staff.

32. You will admit this: that since articling was abolished in New Zealand there has been no test of the practical work required of students?—Yes.

33. And do you think it would be desirable that a school of law should be established which would be training students in practical work?—Well, the course of work in the Leland Stanford University gives the practical work first; they teach the theory afterwards.

34. Do you not think that provision should be made now in the outline of the work you give here for the institution of practical work in law at Victoria College?—I do not know. You mean in conveyancing, and practice and procedure, and part of evidence? Well, my opinion is that it would have to be very carefully done to avoid cramming.

35. Professor Laby referred to that?—He said it would be pure cramming. I am quite satisfied that if you are going further than they have been going, say, at Canterbury College you will require greater provision.

36. You refer to what Canterbury College was doing in the matter of law?—Yes; they are doing about the same now with two men instead of one.

37. Of course, you recognize that it is intended to specialize in law at Victoria College?—Yes, I have made provision for that, but I say that provision will have to be increased if there is a substantial number of students.

38. Do you recommend that it should be increased if the teaching of law is to be extended?—That is one of the things a Royal Commission might do.

39. Are you prepared to recommend this Committee to make larger provision for law at Victoria College?—Well, the total gives them a sufficient margin to enable them to go in more for law if they like to have less in some other subjects. I quite agree that the law course should be completed, but that is one of the things which depends upon the methods by which you are teaching it.

40. Now, in your estimate with regard to the Otago lecturers, you put down one lecturer and one assistant?—No, two lecturers in law.

41. That is your suggested course, but at the time you drew up your report you said they had one lecturer and one assistant lecturer?—Those figures were given me by the staffs themselves, and were corroborated by the Registrar's officers.

42. Were you aware that the Otago Law Society was providing a grant of £100 a year?—Yes.

43. And that the Accountants also were giving £100?—Yes, and £150 in Wellington, £100 in Canterbury, and £150 in Auckland.

44. Then you make a larger allowance for the grant for Otago University: you do so, I take it, because of the actual expenses of the classes there?—Yes. You could not neglect the home-science classes with something like seventy full-time students.

45. You are aware that another University college had the opportunity of establishing a home-science course?—Yes.

46. Apparently the Otago University has shown itself to be more enterprising?—Yes. It was probably easier for them; they have a physiology and other courses already.

47. Would you make any reference to Professor Laby's statement as to why no subsidy was granted when he offered £50 for a research scholarship?—I have already referred to that in my statement. You will find the reference on page 15 of the typed statement. I say, "A suggestion was made by Professor Laby that the Education Department was opposed to giving subsidies on voluntary contributions made to promote research. This is far from the truth. In the instance quoted by him there was at the time the application was made no vote on the estimates out of which subsidy could legally be paid; a special vote is required because there is no statutory provision for such subsidies. In my opinion, subject to necessary conditions, subsidies should be paid on voluntary contributions made to a college in the same way as they are paid in the case of a secondary school."

48. The refusal of the Department to subsidize that £50 was placed in contrast to the subsidy which the Department had given, I think, to the Otago University for moneys raised for another purpose?—Yes, but there was a vote put on the estimates for those subsidies; the money was voted by Parliament.

49. Was the money that was voted by Parliament not by way of subsidy on voluntary contributions for other purposes?—Yes, that was so—on buildings. But also on a previous occasion, when there was a vote for buildings and equipment at the Victoria College, a subsidy was paid on the voluntary contributions in aid of buildings and equipment.

FRIDAY, 12TH SEPTEMBER, 1913

Rev. ANDREW CAMERON, Chancellor of the University of Otago, made a statement and was examined. (No. 25.)

Witness: Before I give my evidence I may say that in my statement I make no reference to Dr. Hunter nor to his charges, for two reasons—namely, Dr. Colquhoun and I have come up to state the needs of the Otago University; and, second, that I have no official intimation of what Dr. Hunter's charges are. I have seen nothing but what appeared in the *Otago Daily Times*. I believe that is much less than what appeared in the *Dominion* newspaper here. And I think that the Otago University Council has been badly treated in that charges have been made against the Medical School, and no intimation has been sent to the Council of these charges. I may say, however, that Dr. Colquhoun and myself will be pleased to answer any questions that we can upon the points that have been raised.

The Chairman: I am sorry that I cannot place a copy of Dr. Hunter's evidence before you, because it has gone down to him for signature.

Hon. Mr. Allen: We can get over that by sending the Council a copy of Dr. Hunter's evidence as soon as we get the copy, and then if the Council want to make any further statements in writing they can do so, but I do not think they will need to.

Witness: There is one part, if it is correctly reported, to which I am prepared to give a very emphatic denial, and that is in regard to the appointment of teachers. As the statement appeared in the *Otago Daily Times*, Dr. Hunter attributed very largely what he called the bad teaching to the bad system of appointment. I am quite prepared to meet that. However, I will read this statement first. This deals with the financial requirements of the College—not only of the Medical School, but also of the other departments. The Council of the Otago University has deputed Dr. Colquhoun and myself to appear before you in support of the claims of that College for grants both for the extension of its buildings and for the strengthening of its teaching staff. The needs of the Otago University have been fairly set out by the Inspector-General of Schools in his report on the University colleges of New Zealand, which I understand is now before this Committee, and our Council hopes you will give the recommendations made therein your favourable consideration. In May last the University Council appointed a committee to confer with the teachers in the Medical School as to the pressing needs of the same. After conference with them on the 22nd May, and with Dr. Valentine on the 30th of that month, a report was presented to the Council embodying the recommendations of the faculty and the Inspector-General of Hospitals, Dr. Valentine. The Council also received reports from the teachers in the arts and science department and from Professor Boys-Smith, the head of our home science department, stating some of their more immediate requirements. At the Council meeting on the 15th July a resolution was passed directing the Chancellor to lay before the Minister of Education a statement of the pressing needs of the Otago University. A copy of that letter has, I believe, been sent to this Committee. The Medical School: In enumerating the requirements of the Medical School I wrote to the Minister as follows: "It goes without saying that as there is only one Medical School in the Dominion it should be made as efficient as possible. On the quality of the medical practitioners graduating here the health of the whole community will largely depend." The result of our conference with the medical faculty and with Dr. Valentine is stated thus:—

"The following is the report of the faculty: (1.) That the faculty considers the most urgent need of the Medical School to be the provision of buildings to afford accommodation for full pathological and bacteriological departments, public health, and materia medica rooms, and enlarged premises for anatomy, chemistry, and physiology. (2.) That the faculty considers that the next most urgent need be the appointment of a whole-time Professor of Pathology, and that Dr. Roberts should be offered the position. (3.) That assistants be provided for the Professors

of Anatomy, Physiology, and Pathology. (4.) That the faculty report to the Council that in their opinion a Medical School block should be erected on a site in the immediate neighbourhood of the Hospital to afford sufficient space to meet the requirements of the more purely medical subjects, and that the faculty approves of the extension proposed in connection with the medical buildings of the University. Dr. Valintine supplements this by recommending that there be a whole-time Professor of Bacteriology, and that the principal lecturers in the Medical School be paid such a salary as will induce them to regard their University work as of primary and not, as at present, of secondary importance. Thus the present needs of the Medical School may be summarized: (1.) Buildings: (a) Extension of the present block north and south so as to give accommodation for anatomy, physiology, and chemistry; (b) a new medical block near the Hospital for purely medical subjects. (2.) Full-time Professors of Pathology and Bacteriology. (3.) Appointment of assistants to the Professors of Anatomy, Physiology, and Pathology, and Lecturer on Diseases of Children. (4.) Increase of the salaries of the principal lecturers in the Medical School."

In support of our request that money may be voted to enable us to house and to equip our Medical School more adequately I desire to present the following facts: (1.) As regards buildings. (a.) The extension of the present medical block: The first part of this block was erected in 1878, when we had only five medical students in the University. It was intended to provide rooms on the ground floor for chemistry and on the upper floor for anatomy. Since that year the number of the medical students has risen from five to 141, and the number in the class of anatomy this year is sixty-two, not including the class in surgical anatomy. The result is the anatomy-room is utterly inadequate for the requirements of the school, and temporary accommodation for some of the students had to be made this year in an adjoining room, which is, however, required for its own proper purpose. In 1904, by the generosity of Wolff Harris, Esq., supplemented by a grant from the Government, we were enabled to appoint a Professor of Physiology, and for him accommodation was provided by extending the Medical School southward. At that time the students in physiology numbered—junior, sixteen; senior, eleven; while this year there are sixty-one students attending Professor Malcolm's classes. In 1910 the laboratory accommodation was increased, but now it is quite insufficient even for present needs. In the physiology laboratory this year there are thirty-five students at work where there is room for only thirty-two. At first sight this may not seem serious overcrowding, but it must be remembered that we provide only $2\frac{1}{2}$ ft. desk-space for the students instead of 4 ft. On this point Professor Malcolm says, "The newer developments of practical physiology render it imperative that we should provide 4 ft. desk-room for each student." Then, store-rooms and preparation-rooms are non-existent, and owing to the increased amount of preparation to be done, the material and apparatus to be stored, great loss and inconvenience is experienced. The Council of the University is getting plans prepared for the extension of the medical buildings north and south, as recommended by the faculty, that it may meet the needs of Professors Scott and Malcolm, and it hopes that a vote for this work will be made without delay, so that, if possible, the enlarged building may be ready for next year. (b.) A new medical block near the Hospital for purely medical subjects: In urging the Committee to recommend a grant for this work I content myself by saying that Dr. Valintine and the whole staff of the Medical School are most emphatic in making this recommendation to our College Council. I shall leave it to Dr. Colquhoun to give the reasons in detail. The staff: The time is more than due for the appointment of full-time Professors of Pathology and Bacteriology. It was interesting to see how emphatic the members of the faculty and the Inspector-General of Hospitals were on this point. The need for assistants to the Professors of Anatomy, Physiology, and Pathology is being painfully impressed on the University Council by the breakdown in health of one of our professors. Surely it is not becoming that the men who occupy important Chairs in our University should be so overworked that the breaking-point comes all too soon. Further, the Council looks to you to help it to such an increase in its annual grant as will enable it to appoint a lecturer on the diseases of children. That the principal lecturers in the Medical School should be so paid that they may be expected to give their University work the first and not the second place in their thoughts is Dr. Valintine's recommendation, and must surely commend itself to every one who desires to see the work of the school made as efficient as possible.

Arts and science: In my letter to the Minister of Education I wrote regarding the report of the teachers in arts and science as follows: "Some of our Arts and Science Professors are miserably paid and overworked, and much will be done to increase the efficiency of the work in this department if you can meet the needs stated in this report." Here is the report presented to the Council by the Professors in Arts and Science:—

"(1.) This meeting of members of the faculties of arts and science wishes to draw the attention of the Council to the following resolution passed unanimously at a meeting of the Professorial Board held on the 6th May, 1913: That all those members of the staff who have to devote the whole of their time to University work and to take honours classes should be paid adequate salaries. (2.) That the attention of the Council be drawn to the fact that the Inspector-General of Schools, in his report on the University Colleges of New Zealand—E.-7A, 1912, page 10—recommends that the average salary of professors be £700, and on the same page he makes definite recommendations as to the allotment of professorial Chairs. Further, that this meeting considers that such recommendations should be regarded as a minimum. (3.) That the Council be reminded that the salaries paid to the professors who were first appointed represented a far higher purchasing-value than the same salaries at the present day. (4.) That a trained assistant should be provided for the Professor of Biology, at a salary of £200 or £250, to assist specially in the botanical work. (5.) That an assistant be granted to the Professor of Mathematics, at a salary

of £100. (6.) That the extension of the biological department, as recommended in the Inspector-General's report, page 17, be considered."

In support of our plea for a grant for the arts and science department of our College I may mention the following facts: First, the Council has to pay £300 per annum each to two of its retired professors. These professors did splendid service to the cause of higher education and well deserve their pension, and we hope they may be long spared to enjoy their well-earned rest. But we contend that this is a charge which should now be provided for by Government grant. (2.) The Council is charged with the upkeep of the Museum in Dunedin. For this we get £400 per annum as rent from the Museum Reserve. The annual loss to the University on the Museum account during the past three years has been as follows: 1911, £343; 1912, £298; 1913, £232. The loss to the University during the last two years was reduced because we received small grants from the Dunedin City Council for the Museum. To this has now to be added the charges connected with the care of the Hocken Library—that rare collection presented to the people of the Dominion by our late Vice-Chancellor, Dr. Hocken. Surely a grant should be made to the University Council equal to the total cost of the upkeep and care of these valuable collections. (3.) Some of our professors are miserably underpaid, and some of our lecturers are doing work of so high a character that it ought to be recognized by their elevation to the professoriate, with adequate salaries. Let me mention some of the payments now made. First, the Professor of Geology gets £400 per annum and part fees—total, about £500. The Lecturer in French, £250 and fees—about £400. The Lecturer on Political Economy and Accountancy, Law, and History, £180 and fees. The Latin Lecturer receives only £375. (4.) Assistants should at once be provided for the Professors of Mathematics and Biology. (5.) Dr. Benham earnestly desires the extension of the biological department in the interests of efficient work. He estimates the cost of the new building at £3,000.

The third department for which we ask help is the Home Science School. This school owes its existence to the enlightened generosity of Mr. J. Studholme and a few liberal citizens of Dunedin. Mr. Studholme contributes £300 per annum, and the Citizens Committee in Dunedin £200, while the Government give pound for pound on the above, thus giving us an annual income of £1,000. This has enabled us to make a beginning, and to prove to some extent the value of the work. The Medical School began in 1875 with two students, and eight years later it had only eleven students. Our Home Science School began in 1911 with two degree students. This year it has nine students taking the degree course, fourteen studying for a diploma, eighteen taking a short course; while fifty Training College students have a practical class with Miss Rawson, the Lecturer in Chemistry, and eight massage students are studying biology and physiology with Professor Boys-Smith. Mr. Studholme and his Dunedin co-workers promised assistance to the school for four years, or if necessary for five years. We now look with confidence to the Government to take the responsibility of carrying on this important work, and thus showing their appreciation of the sacrifice made by the founders of the school. That this department of the higher education of women has been so long neglected is a scandal. Surely it is of the utmost importance that our colleges should do their part in helping to make our women students not merely scholars, but also true home-makers. At present the Government gives a subsidy of £500 on the free contributions of Mr. Studholme and the Citizens Committee. We ask that the grant be raised to £1,000 per annum, and that something be put on the estimates for necessary buildings. I append Professor Boys-Smith's report to the Council:—

"To the members of the Otago University Council.—Gentlemen, I want to bring to your notice the urgent needs of the home science department, and to beg you to ask the Minister of Education to decide as quickly as possible what sum the Government will allot to Otago University to establish a home science course permanently. One of the urgent needs at the present time is a place in which to teach the practical laundry-work and housewifery. The syllabus laid down for the degree and diploma courses, and approved by the Council and the New Zealand Senate two years ago, undertook to give the students a course in practical laundry-work and housewifery as well as in cookery. At the time temporary provision was made for the teaching of cookery by asking the Education Board to grant us the use of the North Dunedin Technical School kitchen, which they agreed to do at a rental of £100 upon condition that the Board's cookery teacher gave the classes. No provision was made for the teaching of laundry-work at that time, but the consideration of suitable quarters was postponed until the question of the projected hostel came up for discussion. Last summer (as the number of students who had started the work in 1911 was small) I was able to make temporary provision in my own house. Now that the number of students has so much increased it will be impossible to go on with this branch of the work unless provision is made for the laundry and housewifery classes, in which case the students would be unable to complete their practical work and obtain a degree or diploma. The Inspector-General, in his report on the University colleges of New Zealand, has pointed out that a chief demonstrator of the practical work in cookery, laundry-work, and housewifery is at once necessary to enable myself and my assistant to carry on the total work of the department, and we shall never be able to show the value of teaching these subjects on scientific lines until we have our own kitchen, laundry, and demonstrator. If Government decides to make permanent provision for the home science course, and to allot a given sum to Otago University for this purpose (see pages 6, 7, and 11 of the Inspector-General's report), the Citizens Committee would, I understand, agree to hand over the remainder of the subscriptions, which were given expressly for improving the teaching of these practical subjects, for the purpose of erecting a model kitchen and laundry if the University would provide a suitable site and Government subsidize the amount subscribed. The question of permanent laboratory and lecture-room accommodation at the University also presses. With twenty-four students reading for the full degree or diploma course, and eighteen other students taking single courses or groups of courses, we have barely sufficient accommodation for our

needs, and there is reason to hope that next session we shall have as large an increase of students as we had this year. In conclusion, gentlemen, I would therefore beg you to ask the Minister of Education to consider these facts at the earliest possible moment, and decide to allot £1,000 per annum to establish the home science course permanently. I would point out that already Government is subsidizing Mr. Studholme's contribution and that of the Citizens Committee to the extent of £500 per annum, so that we are only asking that this provision be raised to £1,000 per annum and made permanent."

In considering our plea for help for the various departments of work in our college it may not be unfitting that I should remind you of the generous way in which the citizens of Dunedin have helped the Otago University from time to time. We have received from various sources by way of subscriptions, gifts, and bequests over £56,000. Add to this that the Presbyterian Church pays £1,800 per annum for the salaries of the Professors of English, Physics, and Mental and Moral Science, and it will at once be seen that we have done much in the way of self-help, and that our present asking is not the result of public indifference to the claims of our College. In no part of the Dominion has so much been done by the people, apart from the Government, for University education. With confidence, then, we urge upon the Committee the claims of the Otago University, and ask that liberal provision be made for meeting the needs of our Medical School, our arts and science department, and the Home Science School. I also desire to read the following letter which I have received from the professors and lecturers of the University:—

"10th September, 1913.—The Chancellor, University of Otago, Dunedin.—Dear Sir,—Knowing that you are about to give evidence before the Education Committee of the House we wish you to understand clearly our attitude towards University reform. We need hardly say that we are in no way privy to Dr. Irwin Hunter's attack on the Medical School, and that we thoroughly disapprove of the one-sided account of his evidence that was supplied to the Press. In explanation of the Otago petition for a Royal Commission we may state that we felt that, after the arbitrary way in which the Senate treated the proposals of the conference and abolished the conference itself, it was impossible to secure reform by any other means than a Royal Commission. We consider, however, that if we can secure the acceptance of the principle of academic control of purely academic matters (for instance, of regulations for degrees and conduct of examinations for degrees and scholarships) subject to review by the Senate, the University may be satisfactorily reformed from within. We shall be grateful if you will make this statement on our behalf.—Yours faithfully, John Malcolm, D. B. Waters, E. Pinder, C. G. White, D. J. Richards, W. S. Roberts, J. K. H. Inglis, H. P. Pickerill, W. L. Boys-Smith, G. H. Rawson, Geo. W. Reid, H. L. Ferguson, W. M. Macdonald, James Park, Wm. B. Benham, H. D. Bedford, T. D. Adams, Geo. E. Thompson, Sydney T. Chantloup, F. Fitchett."

The Chairman: I have received the following letter: "Otago Boys' High School Rectory, Dunedin, 10th September, 1913.—To G. M. Thomson, Esq., M.P., Chairman, Education Committee, Wellington.—Dear Sir,—I was asked this afternoon by Dr. Inglis to sign a petition in connection with University reform. I declined to do so, as I objected to the second paragraph, which stated, 'We need hardly say that we are not privy to Dr. Hunter's attack on the Medical School,' or words to that effect. I told Dr. Inglis that I thought it was an insult to us as a staff to suggest such a thing, but he assured me that certain suggestions to that effect are being made by responsible people, and he told me that if I did not sign the petition it might be suggested that I approved of Dr. Hunter's attitude. I prefer to take up what seems to me to be a more dignified attitude, and to believe that nobody would publicly make such a statement. That is my sole reason for declining to sign. With the rest of the petition I am quite in sympathy.—Yours faithfully, F. H. CAMPBELL, Lecturer in German."

1. *Mr. Hanan* (to witness).] I understand you have made a study of University administration and education in New Zealand?—Well, I have been intimately connected with it as a student or as a member of the Council of the Otago University and as a member of the Senate of the New Zealand University since 1875. I have also studied in Edinburgh, Jena, Leipzig, and Berlin. That is my only claim.

2. You have read the case submitted to this Committee, and also really to the public, for University reform in this country?—I read it when it came up before. I was not aware that I was coming to give evidence before this Committee until a few days ago, and I had no expectation whatever of giving evidence on this large question of University reform, and therefore I have not refreshed my memory as to the statements in the pamphlet since about two years ago.

3. *The Chairman.*] The University asked if you could come up and lay a statement before us regarding the financial needs of the University?—Yes. I am quite prepared to answer the questions on the larger question of University reform. What I mean is that I could not profess to answer questions on the pamphlet offhand, as I have not looked it up for two years.

4. *Mr. Hanan.*] From what you have read in regard to the allegations contained in this petition, do you think it necessary to have a Royal Commission appointed?—No, I do not. I think that the needs of reform are so well known—all that can be said for and against the present condition of University education—that the Senate may safely be left, with any pressure that is necessary from outside, to do all the necessary reform itself. I do not think that in regard to University reform the movement should be rapid. It is just as well that reforms should take place gradually, and I think that a Commission is quite unnecessary. Of course, I do not say that reform is not necessary. I think there is no institution in which reform is not needed in many directions, but I believe that the Senate can do what is necessary itself.

5. Are there any outstanding reforms that you would suggest?—The most outstanding is the one I am at present here about—that is, to furnish the various colleges with more funds to enable them to do the work that is required of them.

6. The "sinews of war"?—Yes, I think so.

7. Can you express an opinion on the vexed question of external examinations?—I have always voted against abolishing the external examiner. I would like to point out this: in most cases where we have only one school the examinations are conducted by examiners residing in the Dominion. Some engineering examinations are set at Home. But I think that in law and medicine, and in most of the subjects in home science and the School of Mines, the examination papers are set by New Zealand examiners. But where you have four colleges teaching the same subjects I have not yet heard of any scheme of internal examination that has commended itself to me. I have taken up this attitude in the Senate—that I am prepared favourably to consider any scheme of examination on which the reformers are agreed. At the last meeting of the Senate I think every professor on the Senate who spoke in favour of the internal as against the external examiner had a different scheme. I think I am correct in saying that. The difficulty is to know what should be substituted. A board of examiners composed of the four teachers in any subject is the scheme which now seems to be most in favour, but some of the reformers wish an outsider associated with the teachers, as they have in Wales. In Wales the outsider has the right of veto against the three professors. There are three colleges there, and the three professors may agree to pass a student, but if the outside examiner says "No" the candidate cannot be passed. The proposal here is that the four teachers, without an outsider, should examine their own students. Well, I do not know that that exists anywhere. I am not an authority on the system of examinations in other universities, but what I have felt is that we are not yet ripe for the abolition of the external examiners.

8. As to the curriculum and management, should that be in the hands of the Senate?—It is so at present; but ever since I have been a member of the Senate—I joined it in 1902—when any serious change in the prescription for any particular subject is proposed, we refer the question to the four teachers concerned, and it seems to me that in most cases you are likely to get better expert advice from the four professors than you are from a joint Professorial Board. Take, say, the question of mathematics: when it was before the conference of professors they could not agree as to the curriculum they would recommend, and so referred it to the four professors, together with some others in allied subjects.

9. *Mr. Hogben.*] Professor Scott was another, I think?—Yes, the conference of professors felt incompetent to deal with it, and referred it to the experts. I hold that the Senate at much less expense to the community can do that, and where the teachers have been unanimous the Senate always, without exception, has adopted their recommendations.

10. *Mr. Hanan.*] Do you approve of the professors of the Professorial Board being members of the governing body of their colleges?—Yes, we have always had that in Otago, and it has worked well and given satisfaction. I may say that in Otago, whenever the question of teaching comes before the Council, it is at once referred to the Professorial Board, and we find that the presence of two professors on the Council is very desirable; we value their advice very much.

11. In your opinion each subject should have representation?—Not each subject, but each faculty. Representation on the Council is not so necessary if every question relating to the course of instruction is at once remitted to the Professorial Board for a report.

12. You approve of the constitution of the Senate as at present?—Oh, yes, I do. I cannot speak for the Senate, but speaking for myself I am inclined to agree to give the professors a recognized place in dealing with purely technical matters. But if that is done I do not think there should be so many professors on the Senate. You cannot have them governing in both bodies. That is what I think the Senate itself should reform.

13. There is another point: would it not be possible to correlate our Universities better, instead of having them isolated as they are?—I do not know how you are going to do it without interfering with the autonomy of each, and I am quite sure that would be resisted. How are you going to relate them in any very close way without invading the independent rights of each college? For instance, here is a proposal which is being put forward: Before a college can appoint to a Chair there should be a joint meeting of all the professors of all the four colleges, and they should make a recommendation as to a committee of advice in each case. Now, if we in Dunedin want to appoint a Professor of Physics, as we are doing just now, does any one think the Council of the Otago University is to wait until the professors of Auckland, Wellington, Christchurch, and Dunedin meet and recommend a committee of advice? That would mean that forty-eight professors would have to gather together from the four centres before we could take a step forward. The present number of professors is forty-eight, but it will be always increasing. Do you think that those forty-eight or more professors should gather together, and as a council of advice nominate to us persons with whom we are to consult? I think the thing would not be looked at for a moment by any one of the colleges.

14. You think they are working well now in their different spheres?—I do.

15. Without any alteration in regard to the machinery?—The resolution that was carried at the Senate on the motion of Dr. Fitchett was to the effect that the colleges should be made constituent parts of the University, but without affecting the independent authority of each. If that can be done I think the colleges should constitute a part of the University, but it must be done in such a way as not to invade the rights of each individual college. If that were done it would do away with the reproach that has been hurled against the New Zealand University that it is only an examining and not a teaching body. I approve of that entirely; only it would have to be guarded, as I say, otherwise I am quite sure the colleges would resist.

16. What percentage of income is received from the students?—Last year we received £6,327.

17. Could you give us the percentages from benefactions last year?—I do not know that I could do that.

18. The percentages of private benefactions and endowments. I want to make a comparison with our University?—We received from the City Council a donation of £75, the Law Society £100, the Society of Accountants £100.

19. I want to show the generosity shown in Otago and Southland—the way the people come forward and help the University—the patriotism and public spirit displayed?—Since 1903 we have received donations and benefactions amounting to over £50,000. Gifts prior to 1903 bring the total to over £56,000. In addition to this we receive from the Presbyterian Church £1,800 per annum for the salaries of three Professors of English, Physics, and Mental and Moral Science. Then, through the generosity of the Presbyterians north and south, we have built a residential college in Dunedin which provides accommodation for students at the University to the number of eighty-six. Then there is Selwyn College, which has been provided by the Anglicans of Dunedin, and there is St. Margaret's Hostel for Women. All these have been provided by the generosity of the community.

20. Speaking in regard to the Medical School, have changes taken place since 1903?—Yes, we have been increasing the staff continually, and we have also been increasing the Hospital accommodation very largely by the generosity of the people. For instance, large additions to the Hospital have been made through the gifts of the people, and while the University has made considerable additions to the staff in the Medical School the Board has increased the teaching staff at the Hospital.

21. In regard to the training?—I would prefer to leave Dr. Colquhoun to speak on that.

22. As to research work?—That is a department that needs cultivating. I think a great deal of credit is due to the Government for the institution of research scholarships. We have not been able to do much in the way of original research, but I think that is due largely to the fact that we are a young country.

23. Do not you think you ought to do more?—Yes, undoubtedly.

24. Have you any practical knowledge of the work of the Home Science School or department—do you visit it?—I think perhaps I have as intimate knowledge as any one, because one of the two first degree students was my own daughter, and I should know something about it.

25. Do you know who does the lecturing?—Professor Boys-Smith and Miss Rawson.

26. How many lectures were given this year by Professor Boys-Smith?—I cannot say.

27. Has she given twenty or ten?—I have not the least idea.

28. Has she been able to carry out the work, so far as lecturing is concerned, that you would expect from her?—I think that Professor Boys-Smith has shown herself a most capable organizer. I think she has done remarkably well in that way.

29. What do you base your opinion on?—On the whole effect of her work. Of course, we have made mistakes, and the Senate has made mistakes and has had to alter the course here and there. But we are pioneering, and have had to feel our way.

30. Have you any knowledge of the particular features of the organizing work?—Just the state into which the school has been brought.

31. You have a high opinion of what work has been done?—Yes, of the whole of the work.

32. What do you base that opinion on?—Very largely upon my daughter's experience.

33. How long has she been there?—I hope she will complete her degree this year. She began with the beginning of the school—in fact, really before that. She had matriculated before the school was opened, and in order to implement the first regulations had to pass in chemistry and physics in the Matriculation Examination. Thus this is her fourth year.

34. How many pupils are there now?—There are nine degree students, fourteen diploma students, eighteen taking a short course, and fifty students in the Training College taking a practical class with Miss Rawson, while eight massage students take biology and physiology with Professor Boys-Smith. This is a new department, instituted almost at the request of the Senate, the Senate having passed a resolution in which it said it would approve of the Otago University granting certificates for proficiency in massage. The Council finds that the massage students can take their biology and physiology to greatest advantage in the Home Science School.

35. Can you give any illustration of opinion as to the training of our medical students?—I can only give a general one. Coming up in the train we travelled with a young medical student who took his course in Dunedin. He came to the Wellington Hospital. He was in the Hospital as a junior for two or three years. When Dr. Hardwick-Smith went Home he was left in charge of all the departments, I understand, that Dr. Hardwick-Smith has charge of.

36. Have you ever heard any complaint until recently with regard to the equipment—the training, equipment, and qualifications—of medical students who have passed the University?—No, I have not.

37. Can you say, in regard to the examinations set and tests, whether they are as high and exacting as what obtains in connection with other universities?—I could not express an opinion.

38. Have you seen the papers set?—No.

39. *Mr. McCallum.*] Do you think the old professors on the Senate—ex-professors—are treating the question of reform sympathetically?—It is very difficult to say who is old.

40. Ex-professors?—There is only one.

41. I have been given to understand that the ex-professors and the older professors are not in sympathy with the reform movement as promulgated by the younger professors?—So far as I can judge there are only two of the professors who may claim the honour of years. It is difficult to say who is old. No doubt one of these has taken what would be described by a section of the reformers as a very conservative position.

42. As to external and internal examinations and tests, you would prefer setting up a Board of four, provided a power of veto was with the external examiner?—The question is, where are you going to get these assessors? I am prepared to favourably consider a recommendation upon which the professors are agreed, and if I think it can be worked to adopt it, but at present I do not see anything to be substituted that will be an improvement on the present system. But I believe the time will come, perhaps soon, when we may be able to do this work, and when we can we ought to.

43. *Mr. Sidey.*] You have been asked some questions on the subject of reform in the constitution of the University. Can you express an opinion upon the proposal that the Senate should consist of the members of the four Councils—of the governing bodies?—It would be altogether unwieldy, and members who may be elected for one class of work may not be the right men for other work. I have already stated that I approve of the present constitution.

44. You would object to an alteration?—Look how many men you would have.

45. Would you approve of a modification of that principle under which, although the whole of the members of the Senate would come from the Councils, the Councils would elect a portion of their number instead of sending the whole of them?—You would not get such wide representation as you have at present. I have not thought of that. I could not give a definite opinion.

46. You expressed the opinion that it is desirable to have the various affiliated institutions co-ordinate in some way?—Yes.

47. Would not that be a step in that direction?—Not that alone.

48. I do not say it would be complete co-ordination, but would it not be in that direction?—Yes, largely.

49. How do you think it would be accomplished?—By an Act of Parliament. It would be very difficult. You would have to guard against invading the individual rights of the University colleges.

50. What would be the advantage?—It would take away the reproach that the University is merely an examining body.

51. But how are you going to co-ordinate more closely: have you any suggestion to make on that point?—No, I have no scheme whatever on that subject. I am not so advanced a reformer as to have a whole scheme prepared.

52. Do you not think that if the Councils of the individual colleges were also members of the Senate the position of Councillors of the local institutions would be more sought after than they are just now?—That is quite possible; I cannot say.

53. *The Chairman.*] You have not considered it?—No.

54. *Mr. Sidey.*] Coming to the question of the Medical School, you do not profess to speak specially on that?—No.

55. What is the method of appointment of your professors and lecturers? How do you appoint your lecturers?—We appoint after advertising for applications.

56. Do you consult the Hospital and Charitable Aid Board?—Not in the appointment of our staff—never.

57. In what way do you consult the Hospital and Charitable Aid Board?—We send them a list of the names of the men on our staff doing the work requiring a place on the Hospital staff, and we ask them to appoint our teachers, and they appoint them.

58. As the honorary medical staff of the Hospital?—Yes.

59. For how long are your lecturers appointed?—We appoint them, I think, for three or five years. I may say that one of our lecturers has held his position since 1884, one since 1885, and two since 1886. These are men who must be on the staff of the Hospital.

60. Has there been any friction between the Otago University Council and the Hospital and Charitable Aid Board?—There were two cases.

61. When were they?—There were two cases, and in each case the independence of the Council was asserted and carried out. One case occurred before I joined the Council, about twenty-five years ago. Dr. Colquhoun will be able to speak more definitely on that.

62. What was the other case?—The other case occurred a few years ago—in 1909.

63. What occurred on that occasion?—Dr. Batchelor, who was the teacher of gynaecology, resigned. He was also in charge of the Maternity Hospital, at which our students received their practical training. The Hospital and Charitable Aid Board proceeded to make an appointment, notwithstanding the request of the University Council that they delay until we had made our appointment. Without waiting they made an appointment. We advertised for a lecturer on gynaecology, and appointed, not the person appointed by the Board, but another person. The question then came to be, How were our students to get their training in the Maternity Hospital? It was mutually agreed by the Council and the Board that the doctor who had been the assistant to Dr. Batchelor, and who was eminently qualified, should receive a small salary from us, and that he should do the practical training. Our own lecturer continued to give the lectures on women's diseases and still does so, and he is now in charge of the Maternity Hospital. These are the only two cases that I know of during the whole existence of the school—thirty-eight years.

64. Would it be correct to say that there was any feeling existing?—At present the feeling is of the most harmonious kind. The Hospital people seem prepared to help us in every way that is possible, and I am quite safe in saying that that feeling has been growing, and I do not know that it could be really more favourable than it is now.

65. And a member of the Board is a member of the Council?—Yes, the Chairman of the Board.

66. What lectureship has Dr. Williams got?—He is assistant physician in the Maternity Home.

67. At the present time is there no lecturer on the diseases of women and children?—There is no lecturer who deals with that specifically, but there are lecturers who deal with the diseases of children; but we are asking that fuller provision be made in that respect.

68. There were references made to the capacity and qualifications of Dr. Williams for that position?—Yes.

69. With regard to the standing of the medical students in the Old Country, can you tell us anything about that?—I can only say that students who have gone Home after finishing here, and who have been asked the question whether they thought it was a wise thing to have done,

declare that it is better for the student to remain here and finish his whole course, and when the opportunity comes to go Home for post-graduate work.

70. That has been the experience so far as you know?—Yes. I have heard no one say he regretted taking his course here.

71. You said that you regard Professor Boys-Smith as having done excellent work as an organizer?—Yes.

72. I suppose you take into account the fact that, being the first professor, the whole of the initial arrangements in connection with the founding of the school fell upon her shoulders?—Yes. I might also say that during the past year Professor Boys-Smith has been in very indifferent health for a good portion of the session. That I know from communications from herself.

73. *Hon. Mr. Allen.*] I want to say this: that the report of the Rev. Mr. Cameron as put in, and the cross-examination as conducted by the members of the Committee, has really covered the ground very fully, and I do not want to ask any questions except on one point which Mr. Hanan was asking about, and that is with regard to Professor Boys-Smith and her work. I would like to ask the Rev. Mr. Cameron if he will quote what is laid down in the Calendar as the work of Professor Boys-Smith?—Yes. In respect to "household economics": "A short course of about twenty lectures, half of which may be taken in the student's first winter session, while the more advanced half should be postponed until the second winter session, in order to synchronize with the English course." Then, she has "household business affairs": "This course consists of about ten lectures, and forms part of the course in household economics, but should be taken in the student's first year. Instruction is given in methods of keeping household accounts, banking accounts, and other business matters connected with the management of the household."

74. Then, as to physiology?—"Physiology, with a short introductory course in biology: The course consists of about sixty lectures and 120 hours' practical work, and covers part of the same ground as the degree course, but the subjects will be treated in less detail, and the examination standard will be lower." Then she has—"Hygiene: General elementary study of the principles of warming, lighting, and ventilating dwellings, schools, and other buildings; water—its sources, storage, delivery, impurities, and purifications; soil and air as affecting health; exercise, rest, and sleep; the infective diseases; clothing; food and dietetics." Then there are short courses which involve still more work, including elementary physiology and hygiene, &c.

75. In addition to the work which is laid down for her, can you say what she is doing?—Miss Boys-Smith has had a great amount of extra work in connection with the organization of the school, and I think this work has been well done. I will tell you what she has been doing to some extent: instead of lecturing on some days she has prescribed parts of books to be read and papers to be written. I do not think she has been able to overtake all her work, but that has been due to some extent to her ill health. I can speak as to the work she is doing, because I have a daughter studying there, and I make no complaint.

76. I would like your opinion as to the work in addition to the lecture work—whether the organization of the new scheme does not require a great deal of time, labour, and thought?—Yes, I think it does require a great deal of time, labour, and thought.

77. Do you think Professor Boys-Smith has really fulfilled—so far, at any rate, as organization is concerned—the expectations that one could possibly have?—Yes, she has really impressed me. As an organizer I have been very favourably impressed with her indeed.

78. *The Chairman.*] In connection with that, are you as a parent thoroughly satisfied with the provisions made for your daughter's training in domestic science?—Yes; I hope the school may be improved as we go on. I believe a great deal can be done to improve it if we get the money we need. I think that in Miss Rawson the College has also a real gift.

79. In connection with the grants which have been received from outside sources this year, you might inform me whether I am correct in the following: Presbyterian Church Board, £1,800; Mr. Studholme, £300; Citizens Committee, £200; Law Society, £100; Society of Accountants, £100; City Council, £75; and Medical Association, £10?—Yes; but that does not represent all that the Medical Association gives. The honorary medical staff of the Hospital has for years—I do not know how many—given all the fees that come to them as instructors back to the Hospital for the benefit of the school. That is a very large annual gift from the medical staff.

80. *Mr. Sidey.*] Have not the dental staff done the same?—Yes. The dental staff last year received the fees, and they returned them to the Council to enable them to get an X-ray apparatus to equip the school. And we hope the Minister of Education will give us 24s. to the pound for it.

81. *The Chairman.*] I want to ask one other question, but this is outside the University. Can you give me an idea how much has been subscribed for Knox College?—For Knox College, about £36,000. Towards this we received some liberal donations from the north—thus £2,000 from Mr. Bullen, £2,000 from Palmerston North, and £1,500 from a gentleman in Canterbury. In addition to this large sum there is the gift from the Church of a site of 10 acres, just on the other side of the Botanical Gardens, for the College. Then the Church provides the salary of the master, who is also a professor in the Theological College; but you may safely take half his salary as for the mastership of the College—that is, £300 a year is given by the Church in the interests of University education.

82. *Mr. Sidey.*] This College is open to all students?—Yes, there are eighty-six students in residence, and over thirty of them are medical students.

83. There is no religious test whatever?—No.

84. How is it taken advantage of?—It is full, and we have had to refuse applications. There are eighty-six students now. And Selwyn College is also full. The same may be said of St. Margaret's Hostel for Women.

85. *The Chairman.*] You have at present a scheme to raise £6,000 for St. Margaret's?—Not all from subscriptions.

86. *Mr. Sidey.*] Should you not include the Endowment Fund in connection with Knox College?—Yes, I omitted to mention that, in addition to the £36,000 which was expended on building and furnishing the College, we have raised between £3,000 and £4,000 of an Endowment Fund. We are aiming at raising an Endowment Fund of £15,000.

Dr. D. COLQUHOUN, Professor of Medicine, Otago University, made a statement and was examined.
(No. 26.)

Witness: Before I read the statement that I have here I should like to say that I have the authority of the faculty of medicine of the Otago University to say that I am expressing their sentiments. It is not simply a personal opinion that I am giving you; I am expressing the sentiments of the faculty of medicine of Otago University, and everything that I have written here has also the approval of the Dean of the School, Dr. Scott, who was unable to come up before this Committee, a fact which he very deeply regretted. This is the statement I have prepared: I was appointed to the Chair of Medicine at Otago in 1884, began to lecture in the winter of 1885, and have lectured each winter since then except in 1893, 1903, and 1911, when I was absent from the colony. The Medical School has given a complete education, up to graduation point, to about one hundred and fifty men and women, most of whom are now practising in this Dominion. Many of these could not have afforded the expense of travelling to and living in Great Britain for the purpose of study, and in the absence of a local school could not have qualified as doctors. All of them have had the advantage of living in their own country during their time of study, and being within reach of home influence. They have also been able to study human diseases under the conditions, social, racial, and climatic, in which subsequently as practitioners they have been called on to treat them. Of more importance than the mere number of students and graduates is the efficiency of the education given to them. The following facts bear upon this point. The history of the school has been one of steady growth. The number of students is increasing, and with this the number of those engaged in teaching has also increased. Fewer students join for a part only of the course—most of the present students are going on to graduation. There has also been a steady growth of the facilities for teaching and learning. Since the foundation of the school nearly the whole accommodation for patients in the Hospital has been renewed on strictly modern lines. The system of nursing has been remodelled in conformity with the best knowledge and experience of our time. The Governors of the Hospital have for many years recognized the importance of the school, both from a national point of view and in the interests of hospital efficiency, and have worked harmoniously with the University authorities, giving practical security of tenure to its teachers, and constantly consulting them in all technical matters and carrying out their views as far as circumstances permit. The fact that the school has the confidence of a large number of the medical profession is shown by the increasing number of sons and daughters of doctors who are being or have been educated there. In regard to that I have a note from one of the professors at the University to say that there are at the present moment eight students who are sons or daughters of New Zealand medical men receiving their entire education at the Otago University. In Dunedin, out of forty-two medical practitioners, twelve are graduates of New Zealand University. Eight of these are on the Hospital staff. This includes the Medical Superintendent, but not the three house surgeons, who are all local graduates. One lady graduate is at the head of St. Helens Hospital. The school has also supplied house surgeons to most of the hospitals in the Dominion, and to the mental hospitals. Several of our graduates went with the contingents to South Africa. The surgeon to Mawson's Antarctic Expedition was a New Zealand graduate. In every part of the Dominion our graduates are to be found in practice, and at the present moment twelve of our senior students are on special duty in the smallpox districts in the North Island. In this connection I should like to say that one or two look upon it as an immediate advantage to this country that there are those men who not only fill a gap in the case of an epidemic, but are a permanent army which can be called upon at any time against the invasion of infectious diseases. I will lay on the table for your information some notes that I have received on the subject of those men. The Mayor of Auckland telegraphs, "Your students doing excellent work. I hope we may retain them." Dr. Valintine wires, "Would you please convey my thanks to the Medical School authorities for prompt assistance." The Hon. Mr. Heaton Rhodes writes, "I desire to thank you and the medical faculty for the ready and prompt assistance given the Public Health Department in connection with the sending of twelve medical students to the northern districts to help in the battle with the smallpox epidemic. We have found great difficulty in obtaining the entire services of doctors in those districts where population is widely scattered." Then I have this from Dr. Valintine: "I have already asked Dr. Champtaloup to convey to the teaching staff of your Medical School my grateful thanks for so promptly acting on the Department's request for the assistance of six fifth-year medical students in connection with the campaign against smallpox. After a week's experience, and from reports in the north, I may say that the twelve students are doing very well indeed. They seem to be thoroughly reliable, and carry out instructions to the letter." I think I am justified in saying that this demonstrates one of the uses of a Medical School in the Dominion. It cannot be too emphatically stated that our graduates have never taken a position in any way inferior to that of practitioners educated elsewhere. In some respects they have had superior advantages. From the first it has been constantly the policy of their teachers to advise them to supplement the knowledge gained as pupils in our school by post-graduate study in Europe or elsewhere. Most of our students have followed this advice—some immediately on completing their course here, many of them after working at their profession in this country for some years in order to acquire the

money necessary for that purpose. By this means New Zealand is the richer in the extended experience of its medical men, and we have also been able to test the efficacy of the instruction given here by the results of the examination open to our students in Great Britain. Writing on this subject in 1910 I made the following statement: "Eighty-three or eighty-four out of one hundred and thirty graduates have gone to Europe for post-graduate study. Of this number twelve have become Fellows of the Royal College of Surgeons of England, one that of Ireland, and two that of Edinburgh. In addition to the Fellowship of the English College one became a member of the College of Physicians of London. These are the highest qualifications open to our students, and the result—one to about five and a half who have gone Home—is astonishing. I do not think any British school can equal it. Most of the others have secured the conjoint qualification of the Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons—the usual one of London students. Several have taken the Diploma of Public Health of Cambridge." Not only have our students done well in academical work, but they have been successful in obtaining posts in many public institutions. Several Home hospitals have year after year been staffed by New Zealand graduates. Middlesex Hospital has established a special scholarship for them. This is partly due, no doubt, to the good will towards New Zealand which has been so prominent in England of late years, but I think we can claim that it is also in part due to the zeal and efficiency of the men themselves. Looking back on our twenty-eight years' work, the teachers of the school feel that it is a good record. We are proud of our pupils, and confident of the future of the school. We have had many disadvantages to contend with. The teachers have been poorly paid; some have worked for years with no payment at all. It is a simple fact that not one of them but would have done better for himself, from a money point of view, if he had devoted to his own practice the time spent in teaching. For several years all the students' Hospital fees have been thrown into a common fund to secure laboratories for Hospital work and teaching. The public of Dunedin has given the Hospital, among other things, a very perfect X-ray plant, and money to build wards and nursing accommodation. The Hospital and school have never stood still, but if progress is to be continued the Medical School must be recognized as a national and not a local institution. The staff is in many ways overworked and underpaid. I would refer especially to one department—that of bacteriology. Dr. Champetaloup is at present Bacteriologist to the Hospital, professor and teacher of students in bacteriology and public health, and Officer of Public Health for a large district. We want more money for teachers generally, so that those who have to devote much time to their work may be free from the distractions of general practice. My own career is near its close, so that I can speak freely on this subject. The Professors of Medicine, of Surgery, of Gynæcology, and of Pathology should have such a salary that, with consulting work, they should not have to do the work of a general practitioner. New buildings are needed for the laboratory work of the Hospital and the University. The expense of these ought to fall partly on the local institution and partly on the University. Medicine is a constantly expanding science, and we must expect in the future, as in the past, that new departments will be added to the Hospital and Medical School. Hitherto Otago has borne the main part of the expense of a school which has educated students from and supplied doctors to every part of the Dominion. This state of affairs is obviously unjust, and should not continue.

1. *Mr. Hanan.*] Have you any observations to make in regard to clinical work?—No; the clinical work is quite good. We have quite a large enough number of beds—much larger in proportion to our students than, say, a place like Edinburgh. We have one hundred and fifty beds now constantly filled—very often there are one hundred and sixty or one hundred and seventy beds; and we find that the material is ample for all the clinical work that is needed.

2. Going back as far as 1903, have conditions improved in regard to clinical work?—Yes, they have improved considerably. Since that time we have had appointed paid tutors in medicine and in surgery. It is their business specially to teach students details that were formerly left to the physicians and surgeons in the wards. This is now done systematically, and clinical lectures are now given three times a week, winter and summer, by both the surgeons and the physicians on the staff—lectures on the cases as they occur in the Hospital, pointing out to the students the noticeable points in each.

3. You think that the nature of the clinical work done and the training in connection with that work is satisfactory?—Yes. As with other institutions, I have no doubt it can be improved. Much depends upon the zeal and application of the students themselves. An idle man can very often evade doing the work. On the other hand, a man who is eager to do the work will find plenty to do, and plenty of instruction as to the methods of doing it.

4. With regard to the course of study prescribed for a medical course in connection with our University, how does it compare with courses of study in Australia?—All the great universities in the world now follow one course. If you consulted the curricula of a great many different schools you would find that they all practically go upon the same lines.

5. In other words, the course prescribed in connection with the Medical School is not inferior to that which obtains in connection with other constituted colleges?—It is inferior in no way.

6. Regarding the examinations and tests applied in connection with the Otago School, are they inferior to examinations and tests applied for similar work in connection with other University colleges?—I should say they are above rather than below the average. We had in view, especially in the early days of the school, the fact that we were a new school, and that any slackness on our part in the matter of examinations would undoubtedly cause our degrees to get into the hands of unsuitable men, and we purposely made our standard as high a one as we possibly could. Of course, individual examiners differ; but that has been on the whole steadily kept in view by all the Dunedin examiners—that we could not afford to have a low standard of examination.

7. You have been Home frequently since the Medical School started?—Yes, three times.

8. You have no doubt met many men connected with the colleges at Home and in other parts, also professional men: have you heard any discouraging remarks made in regard to the diploma or the qualification of medical students of the Otago School?—Never a hint of it.

9. Has it been commented on favourably?—I have heard individual men spoken of favourably, but you must remember that New Zealand is a very small speck in the Empire. I know, for instance, that at the Cancer Hospital at Brompton for year after year they have preferred New Zealand men to those holding the ordinary London diplomas. In one of the infirmaries in London the same thing has prevailed. They were so satisfied with their first New-Zealander that when he left they took another New-Zealander, and it went on like that for years.

10. They have a good opinion of our school and the students who go through?—They have an excellent opinion of New-Zealanders. At Guy's Hospital, at the Westminster Hospital, at the University College Hospital I was told that the New Zealand students were among the best they had, and I heard the same thing in Edinburgh. That applies to men who, as a rule, in Edinburgh have had two years only at the Otago University.

11. You are authorized to confer the degrees of M.B. and C.M.?—Yes, and M.D.

12. In your opinion those who have obtained those diplomas are duly qualified?—Yes, as far as diplomas can qualify any man in a profession which above all things needs experience.

13. Can you speak as to the work done by other professors in the University?—Yes, I can speak of the work. I have been intimately associated with it since ever the school was completed, and I have formed a very high opinion of the work of my colleagues, and especially of the way in which they have been willing to sacrifice time and money for the sake of the teaching of the school. There is none of them who has not made great sacrifices both in time and money for the school.

14. The work has not been of a perfunctory nature?—Never in my experience of it.

15. Would you say as much interest is taken in the students by the professors as you noticed in connection with your own university at Home?—I should think the personal interest in them has been greater than in the large schools. Especially was this so when the school was small and when every student was known to every teacher intimately. There was a sense of individual interest then that could not exist in the larger schools. Now that the school is getting larger it is becoming more difficult to know the individual students, but I have good reason to believe that the keen personal interest in teaching has not in the slightest degree suffered.

16. Have you any observations to make regarding the appointments to the Hospital staff?—Nothing beyond saying that the attitude taken by the Trustees of the Hospital under the old regulations and the Committee of the Hospital under the new regulations has been absolutely correct. There have been no warmer friends of the Otago Medical School than the old Hospital Trustees and the present Hospital Governors. I think that is a testimony to their good sense and also to the efficacy of the school, because many of them began with a strong prejudice against us. Many of the old Trustees started their career with the deliberate intention of having the Medical School stopped, because they believed it caused unnecessary expense to the ratepayers.

17. Do you know any instance of favouritism in regard to any appointment on the staff?—I have known of no such thing. As far as my experience goes the appointments have been carefully considered and made on the merits of the applicants. No doubt mistakes may have been made—they are made in all human institutions; but there has been no wilful favouritism, or anything approaching corruption or anything of that kind.

18. No one has been passed over?—Not if they thought he was a better man than the other candidate.

19. Do you know Dr. Evans?—Yes.

20. Do you know his special work?—He was House Surgeon at the Evelina Hospital in London—one of the very good children's hospitals—and is a Fellow of the College of Surgeons of Edinburgh. He is an old Otago boy.

21. Was an appointment made in connection with such work?—Not that I know of. The only instance of favouritism that I know was this: soon after Dr. Evans came out a special appointment was made for him on the Hospital, through the influence of some of his friends, and he was put in charge of the skin department, and I think he then became a full physician and continued for a year or two and then gave up the post. I am speaking from my recollection and not by the book.

22. He has not been passed over in any way in favour of an inferior man?—Not to my knowledge.

23. *Mr. McCallum.*] As to the surgical side, have you a field to work upon in Dunedin in surgery as they have in Sydney and Melbourne? You know the distinction between Edinburgh and Glasgow: the Scotchman wanting his son to go in for surgery sends him to Glasgow, and for medicine sends him to Edinburgh. Does that apply to Dunedin?—I think our surgery is particularly strong in Dunedin. The teacher of it—Dr. Barnett—has for many years devoted an extraordinary amount of attention to it. He has visited England, and the Continent, and America, and the consequence is that we get a very large amount of surgical work. Our surgical work has gone up by leaps and bounds within the last ten years—so much so that we have difficulty in getting days for our operations.

24. The question is, has Dr. Barnett the field to work upon in a small place like Dunedin, where you have not a great many accidents happening?—From the student's point of view I think we have as much as he can treat. No doubt you get more cases in London, let us say, than you do here, and more cases in Edinburgh and Glasgow; but here, owing to the comparatively small number of our students, the students are brought into closer contact with the actual operations. They have to handle the cases, they have to do things very often that in the larger

centres would be done by the house surgeons or even assistant surgeons, and they get a better practical education than they would get in many of the larger schools.

25. Not like the Edinburgh boy, sitting five or six forms back?—No. An Edinburgh man told me that the student in Dunedin did what the Edinburgh student saw from the fifth row of benches.

26. The surgical work that he gets in Dunedin will fit him for almost any New Zealand position?—I think so, as far as any training can fit a man for those things. As I said before, much depends on the man himself. If he is eager and willing to learn he has facilities for learning.

27. I am only asking as to the surgical side. If you had a son and you thought he had an aptitude for surgery, what would you do with him, or suggest that he should do, when he matriculated?—I have often had to consider that question and advise upon it, and my deliberate opinion, formed many years ago and still maintained, is that if the boy were a New-Zealander and were going to spend his life in New Zealand—as I hoped he would spend it—I would train him during the most impressionable years of his life in the country in which I hoped he would live. I would know that he would get the ABC of his work as well there as he would get it anywhere else. I am satisfied of that. After graduation I would send him Home for special study to some of the larger centres. By the time he graduated one would be able, of course, to judge whether he was fitted to take advantage of those opportunities. On many young men they would be wasted. If he showed any ability I would send him Home for a year, or two years, or three if possible, for post-graduate study.

28. Do you agree generally with Dr. Valintine's report—you heard it read this morning?—I have read Dr. Valintine's report. I think he rather damns us with faint praise. There are, for instance, some things there which I think are not very just. He talks about the lack of clinical material available in the Dunedin Hospital. I do not admit there is a lack of clinical material. There are some things we cannot do: we cannot teach the students tropical diseases, because we have not got them. We have perhaps the lowest death-rate in the world amongst children, therefore we cannot teach children's diseases as they can elsewhere. We have a clean and healthy population, and we have very few skin-diseases. You will see more skin-diseases in an afternoon in the Blackfriars Hospital in London than you will see in three years in Dunedin, and if you go to the St. Louis Hospital in Paris you will see a whole hospital full of patients suffering from skin-diseases and syphilis; you will see more there in a day than you will see here almost in a lifetime. We cannot teach those things as they can in large centres. But of the ordinary general diseases that are met with in this country we have quite an ample supply of cases. Dr. Valintine mentions that the inadequate remuneration offered the professors is insufficient to secure the choice of suitable teachers. I do not object to that. But I say that, so far as we have gone up to the present, the question of remuneration has not in the slightest degree affected any of the teachers that I know of. They have taught their subjects as thoroughly and as well as they could; if you had given them ten times the remuneration they could not have taught any better than they have done. If they have been paid poorly I can say for my colleagues whose teaching I know that it has not been inferior teaching on account of that. This is the part where I think Dr. Valintine damns us with faint praise: he says, "Some of the students trained in the school, after supplementing their knowledge by experience in the medical schools of Europe, have attained very creditable positions in the ranks of the profession." I think that is quite an unjust description of our students. I would call attention, for instance, to the case Mr. Cameron mentioned to-day: one of our students came up here to Wellington three years ago as House Surgeon, with no training beyond what he had had in our school in Dunedin, and after being three years here he was considered good enough to be left in charge of all the multifarious institutions under the care of Dr. Hardwick-Smith. If Dr. Valintine were to say that some of the students trained in every school, after supplementing their knowledge, had attained very creditable positions in the ranks of the profession I would agree with him, but when he picks out our school specially for that particular kind of faint praise I certainly object to it. In regard to his suggestions, I did not know that he had made those suggestions at the time in regard to the payment of the men, and I am quite in accord with them.

29. *Mr. Sidey.*] When it was suggested that some of those students who had gone Home to the Old Country and had taken the whole of their course there had not turned out good men, that may have been the result of their being so far removed from home influences?—I think when a man comes to grief he is generally built that way, and he would probably have come to grief if he had stayed here. But I think that in most of these cases the parents would have had some knowledge that the young men were going wrong and could have stepped in and prevented it. I know of one man at Home who sent out a report that he had passed his examinations in Edinburgh, but it was purely a bogus report. Those young men who have come to grief at Home would, as I say, probably have come to grief anywhere, but they would have been checked sooner, and their parents would have been saved a great deal of money and anxiety.

30. Can you tell us how long ago it is since there was a separate lectureship established in the diseases of children?—It has not been established yet.

31. Did Dr. Williams not take that lectureship?—No, there has been no lectureship. Dr. Williams, with very great zeal and self-denial, for some years lectured on diseases of children without payment of any kind. But he is an Assistant Physician to the Hospital. For one year I think he had charge of the children's ward. There are very few cases indeed now. I may say that in regard to children's diseases there is a good deal of misconception. It does not follow because there is no lecturer in diseases of children that there is no instruction given in diseases of children. Take Dr. Barnett in surgery, or myself in medicine, and take, for instance, a given disease like stomach trouble or lung trouble, we must take it as it affects different ages—infants,

children, young people, and old people. It is quite an erroneous notion to suppose there is no teaching in children's diseases because there is no lectureship in that subject.

32. It was suggested, I think, that some time ago there was an appointment made for a position in which diseases of children were to be taught. What position was Dr. Williams appointed to?—He was appointed as Assistant Physician to the Hospital. He is the Senior Assistant Physician. He has been Honorary Assistant Physician to the Hospital for ten years, and he has paid special attention to children's diseases.

33. How would that appointment be made?—Appointments are advertised annually, and both the Trustees and the present Board have—I think very wisely—discouraged the practice of replacing one lot of men by another lot. They have given all the staff a security of tenure during good behaviour, practically.

34. Dr. Evans's name has been mentioned: do you know whether he was an applicant for the position at the time Dr. Williams was appointed?—No, it is not within my knowledge. Those applications would go in to the Hospital Trustees during their time, and to the Hospital Board now, and only the successful candidates' names are published. They do not say that "So-and-so also applied."

35. You say, I understand, that the clinical teaching at the University is thoroughly efficient?—Yes. I think it might be improved in many ways. Compare us with the London School. There there would be usually half a dozen young men waiting about hoping to get appointments on the staff, and these men very often employ their years of waiting in various kinds of teaching—grinding and demonstrating, and things of that kind. We have not got that class with us at all. I am quite sure that any student who wants to learn can learn all the elements of his profession as well, or in some cases better, in a small Hospital like ours than he can in the very big ones.

36. I have information that Dr. Evans did not apply at the time Dr. Williams was appointed?—I have never heard of it. I had never heard there was any rivalry in that direction at all.

37. Dr. Williams is, in your opinion, perfectly qualified to carry out the duties for which he was appointed?—I should like to say this about Dr. Williams, since his name has been brought in: that he is one of our own students, a graduate of the New Zealand University. He did well as a student, and he went home to London and spent two or three years in study and in practice. He was House Surgeon at one of the large infirmaries for a considerable time, where they are constantly dealing with children. He took the diploma of public health at Cambridge, which is a sign that he has paid special attention to hygienic conditions. When he came out and applied for a position on the staff his old teachers were very glad and proud to have him as a colleague.

38. With regard to clinical teaching, when Dr. Valintine suggests that the students should be sent to Auckland, is that because they may have a certain class of work there that might not be available at Dunedin?—If any workable scheme could be evolved by which our students could utilize Auckland, Wellington, and Christchurch experience in clinical work we should all of us welcome it. The unfortunate thing, however, is that we have a five-years curriculum, and in the fifth year the students have all to attend systematic lectures as well as do clinical work, and it seems to me almost impossible to get to some working arrangement. If Auckland, Wellington, and Christchurch were to establish lectureships in the practical subjects, so that the men could carry on the theoretical as well as the practical work, the difficulty would be overcome, but that would mean very considerable sacrifice of time and money on the part of the teachers in those places. It is not such an easy thing as you might think to give a systematic course of lectures. It requires great and continuous labour on the part of the teachers.

39. Do you think it would be impracticable to carry out the suggestion?—In the meantime; ultimately I think it might be carried out. No one would welcome it more than the teachers in Otago, because we should be glad to get all the available material possible.

40. Are there any cases in the Auckland Hospital that you do not get in the Dunedin one?—No, I do not think so. They have a great deal more typhoid than we have, and a great deal more children's ailments.

41. I am referring to their proximity to the islands—to tropical diseases?—I do not think so. The main disease is what they call *coko* in Fiji, and they hardly ever get that on the mainland. Now and again a case comes to Auckland, but not very often.

42. You have seen the published reports of statements that have been made reflecting upon the training given to the medical students of the Otago University: do you give these statements an emphatic denial?—The position, it seems to me, that I have taken up in the matter is this: certain statements have been made—I am speaking for the faculty, and we are not going to enter into any controversy, but I have been empowered to lay before you a plain statement of what the Medical School has done. The answer to the statements that have been made is contained in the statement that I made to you.

43. *Hon. Mr. Allen.*] You know something about the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons in England, do you not?—Yes. I am a member of the Royal College of Surgeons and a Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians.

44. Do you think them tolerably conservative bodies, in this sense: would they be likely to open their doors to students from other institutions without very great care?—They have certain definite rules and regulations. They demand to be satisfied that the education given in a place is satisfactory—is good—and they admit them to their examinations.

45. In the demand for satisfaction are they likely to be easy?—I do not think they are extreme. They will take the word of any decently bred English-speaking man that he is telling the truth when he says that they are giving the students a fair education.

46. I am speaking about other institutions that are training for the medical profession: would they be likely to make the demands upon these institutions in the way of teaching less than their own demands?—No. Neither the Royal College of Physicians nor the Royal College

of Surgeons is a teaching body. They are purely examining bodies, and they will examine anybody who comes to them with a certificate that he has gone through their prescribed course of training. They prescribe a course of training and certain conditions under which that training may be obtained.

47. About the prescribed course of training, would they be likely to accept a course of training inferior to that which they have adopted for Great Britain, for instance?—No, not for a moment.

48. What position do the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of England take up with regard to this Dunedin Medical School?—They admit our graduates to their final examination without asking them to go through the earlier preliminary examinations.

49. What position have they taken up with regard to the instruction in medicine?—They recognize the Otago University as a school in which a student may get an efficient course of instruction in medicine.

50. Do you know anything of the General Medical Council of Great Britain and Ireland?—In a general way. It is the Council which has control over all the examining bodies in Great Britain and Ireland.

51. Is it a fact that they recognize the preliminary medical examination of the University of New Zealand?—Yes.

52. Then, with regard to the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons, is it a fact that the registered students here who pass two years of their medical course at the Otago University are recognized?—That is so. It is recognized practically as a British medical school.

53. Do they recognize the complete course?—Yes.

54. That is, qualifying for examination for their diploma?—Yes.

55. Would they be likely to do that if they were not satisfied with the teaching here?—I do not think so. I think they would very soon find it out. Several of our students who have gone Home for examination have told me on returning that they have been complimented by the examiners—that they have been asked, “Where did you learn such-and-such?” which is a most unusual question to be put to students, and implies, I think, a higher grade of knowledge than the examiners were accustomed to.

56. With regard to the clinical teaching, I wish you would explain to us what the nature of the clinical teaching is in this respect: is it perfunctory, or is it definite clinical teaching in which the student comes into contact with the subject he has to deal with, and feels it and touches it, and so on?—We have a teacher whose business it is to take the students in small classes, according to the number, and teach them all the different methods of examination. Those are partly by percussion, by the use of the stethoscope, by chemical examination, such as examinations of urine and analysis of the contents of the stomach. They get that preliminary teaching, and while that is going on, and sometimes afterwards, they are appointed in due course as clerks to a physician. A man who is a clerk to a physician is assigned certain beds—that is, certain patients—and it is his duty to examine those patients, to take a careful history of them and write out the condition of the patient's different organs, which he hands to the physician. It is his duty also to go round on set days with his physician in the morning and with the house physician. They go round together. He sees his physician examining the case, and hears what his opinion is. He is called upon very often to examine the patient to see that his methods of examination are the right methods. He is questioned as to his reasons. When he has done that work—he is appointed for three months—he usually goes on to another physician, and the next year he probably goes on as senior clerk who has control of the juniors. So that most of the men have two terms of three months as junior clerks, and one or two terms as senior clerks. Consequently they are actually handling the cases and examining the patients for themselves constantly. If you compare that with what occurs in many of the larger hospitals, with a larger number of beds and a very great number of students, you will find that our students often have more patients than they can attend to, whereas in some of the larger hospitals a man is considered lucky if he gets one case or two cases at a time.

57. With regard to the physician's opinion and treatment of a case, is that all explained to him too?—That is explained. There is a card to each bed, with the diet on one side and the treatment on the other, and the student has an opportunity of seeing the treatment. I would ask a student to write out a prescription, for instance, testing his knowledge as to the drugs and the doses that he would administer. These examinations are constantly going on throughout the year. The work goes on all the year round.

58. You are talking more of your own particular branch—medicine?—Yes.

59. Tell us, if you can, the story, as far as you know it, with regard to surgical operations?—It is about the same, except that a man begins as a rule a year earlier on the surgical side. We do not like them to go in to medicine until they have gone through a course in physiology, which we look upon as the foundation of all medicine—the working of the human body. With regard to the dressing of wounds and that kind of thing, the students of a junior year are admitted to that work, and they have to attend in the casualty-room, dress wounds, and put on splints and bandages, and in the wards they have to go round with the surgeon, and when the surgeon is not there they go round daily and see that such dressings as are required are done. That is the regular routine in every hospital in the world where teaching is carried on.

60. Now tell us about surgical operations: do you think the advantages for students here are as great as in any other hospital?—I think they are very good. The student goes down on to the floor. In many parts at Home the dresser is not admitted to the operating-floor—he stands outside; but in our Hospital the clerks go on the floor of the operating-room, and the dresser for the case usually assists the surgeon in minor ways. In big operations and serious operations the House Surgeon and the Assistant Surgeons assist, but the dresser for that particular case is always on the floor in close contact and sees actually every step of the operation.

61. Tell us, if you can, what experience the student gets in the out-patient department?—I do not know so much about that. Formerly the out-patient department was very perfunctorily carried on by the House Surgeon, but now there are Assistant Physicians and Assistant Surgeons who attend regularly every day, and the students attend pretty well, I believe. But part of the work is carried on while University lectures are going on, and the students have very often to leave early. I can say nothing from my personal knowledge.

62. Do you know whether there has been reform in regard to that in late years—that the out-patients' department has been made more available for students than it was?—A new out-patient department has been built, so there is much more accommodation. The old accommodation was very poor indeed, and the work of it was carried on under very great disadvantages; but now a very good and complete out-patient room has been built, so there is much better opportunity for doing this work.

63. Do you know if the students use the out-patient department more than they used to?—I cannot answer that from my own knowledge.

64. With regard to Dr. Cameron and the work that he does at the University—X-ray work—will you tell us what you can about him and his work?—Dr. Cameron came to us as quite a young man with a good reputation for heart work at Home. He had gone to America and done special work in heart trouble, and he came with the reputation of being a good mechanical man. For heart work you need to work with fine instruments. When he applied for the position of radiologist he had an ordinary knowledge—no special knowledge; but he went over to Sydney and studied there for some two or three months. Since Dr. Cameron has been in charge of the X-ray department he has taken many thousands of X-ray photographs, and there is not a member of the staff who does not place the greatest possible confidence in his judgment, and who does not use his skill and experience practically every day, both in medicine and in surgery. We find his work is excellent. This matter was brought up at a meeting of the medical faculty the other day, and I was empowered to say specially that the members of the staff have the greatest confidence in Dr. Cameron's skill and knowledge, and are constantly consulting him about their cases.

65. I presume we may take it that in a young country like this a school must of necessity have been small at the start and must grow as the place grows?—Quite so.

66. Now, speaking with your experience of the whole thing, do you not think that those who started this school in the early days were thoroughly justified in doing so?—I do. I think it showed both courage and foresight.

67. What do you believe to be the effect of this school upon the community generally and upon the medical profession?—As far as the profession itself is concerned I think it has had a distinctly elevating effect on the whole profession in New Zealand. I am sure it has had that in regard to our own community in Dunedin. It has made men do much more and much better work, and it has, I think, encouraged them to respect other men for knowledge that perhaps they themselves did not possess. The surgeon recognizes perhaps that the physician knows a little more about medicine than he does, and the physician recognizes that the surgeon has a skill and an aptitude which he does not possess, and I think that has been altogether for the good of the profession and the community generally. In regard to students I am of opinion that we have the pick of young New Zealand, and I would say that the quality has never been better than it is at present. That means that we are getting the best men that New Zealand can give us.

68. I do not suppose you want to lead the Committee to think that the school is perfect?—I hope not.

69. And that there is not room for further development?—When it is perfect we may order its coffin, I think. There are many faults. It has not been my business to recite those faults, and I do not think it is a wise thing to do. What seemed to me to be my business was to put before you the positive work that the school has done. There it is in the record of those one hundred and fifty men and women who are practising medicine up and down New Zealand.

70. You know what the school has done; you know it is not perfect and that it must develop: do you think that the State is justified in providing means to develop this school as necessities arise?—I think that in common honesty the State ought to step in and do it. The State has allowed one small part of the community to pay out of its pockets to a large extent the expenses of the Medical School. We have educated men from every part of New Zealand, and we have sent doctors to every part of New Zealand, and I think that in common honesty the State ought to step in and say, "This is a national institution, although it has been mainly supported locally, and we will pay our share of the bill."

71. We do draw our students, do we not, from all over New Zealand?—Yes, from Auckland to the Bluff.

72. Do you think the people in the City of Dunedin have been specially generous towards this Medical School in the way of putting their hands in their pockets?—They have put their hands in their pockets freely. We have never asked them for anything that we did not get. I think that is a testimonial to the people and also to the school. They would not give us that help if they did not believe that we were doing good work, and they would not do it if they were not a generous people.

73. *The Chairman.*] You said, I think, that we have one hundred and fifty students: you mean, just now?—One hundred and fifty graduates who have passed through. I think I am understating rather than overstating it. I mean full-time graduates, and do not include those who have taken a part of the course. It was one hundred and thirty, I think, in 1910. We have, I am sure, had more than twenty since then.

74. Does the presence of the Medical School there draw many patients from outside the Otago District?—It is always very difficult to say. If a man gets a reputation for skill in any par-

ticular department he will draw patients to him from all parts. It is a kind of double-edged tool, however. I do not think any of us ever attracted such audiences as the golden chariot did, for instance. I have seen a crowd outside a quack's blocking up the street.

75. Is the gynæcological work well carried on in the University?—The gynæcological work is always very difficult to teach. The work is excellently carried out. It has been carried out by Dr. Batchelor in a most admirable manner, and well carried out by his successor, but it is always an exceedingly difficult subject to teach on account of the nature of the trouble. Only the one or two students who are clerks in these cases can get anything like practical instruction in that department, and that applies to medical schools the world over. It is not peculiar to ourselves; it is peculiar to the nature of the case.

76. Every graduate has to certify that he has attended a certain number of cases?—Mid-wifery cases, yes.

77. Is there any difficulty in accomplishing that?—Yes, there has often been great difficulty. I think it has been less since the establishment of the Maternity Hospital in Forth Street; but even now we have difficulty sometimes in getting the full number of cases.

DR. PHILIP RANDAL WOODHOUSE examined. (No. 27.)

1. *The Chairman.*] What is your position in the Wellington Hospital?—My present position is Resident Medical Officer. Up till a fortnight ago I was Acting Medical Superintendent.

2. Taking the place of?—Dr. Hardwick-Smith.

3. I understand that you received all your medical training in the Dominion?—Yes.

4. How were you appointed to the Wellington Hospital?—I applied for appointment when I heard there was a vacancy, and the Board appointed me as Junior House Surgeon.

5. Did you step from that position to the higher one directly?—Through the intermediate ranks.

6. Has your work included surgery as well as medicine?—Yes.

7. You have no degree outside of that of the New Zealand University?—No.

8. *Hon. Mr. Allen.*] You find yourself, I suppose, in contact with other medical men who have degrees granted elsewhere?—Yes.

9. Do you feel that you are in any way inferior because you have been educated in New Zealand?—No, certainly not.

10. How old are you?—Twenty-seven.

11. You were trained in the Otago University entirely?—Yes.

12. You were left in charge of the Wellington Hospital when Dr. Hardwick-Smith went away?—Yes.

13. Did you find yourself in any difficulties in the administration of the Wellington Hospital when Dr. Hardwick-Smith was away, or were you able to carry out the work successfully?—I hope I carried it out successfully.

14. *Mr. Sidey.*] How long is it since you left the University?—I left in January, 1910.

15. Did you find that the training you got in Otago was equal to anything that you required in your practice afterwards: did it fit you for it?—I believe it fitted me for my work.

16. Was the clinical teaching sufficient to thoroughly equip you for the work that you had to do in the Hospital in Wellington?—I believe so. I can hardly answer a question like that. It is for others to say whether they consider my work satisfactory.

17. You believe that you came well equipped for everything that you had to do?—I believe so.

18. Looking back upon the training that you received in the Otago University, is there anything that you have to find fault with?—No, I cannot say that there is.

19. *The Chairman.*] Have you in any way been treated by outside medical men as inferior to them on account of your having only a colonial degree?—Never.

20. *Mr. McCallum.*] Have the students from the Otago University attended the Hospital in Wellington? You have been six months in charge?—Seven months.

21. Have they taken advantage of the Hospital Board's intimation that while away from their classes they may attend and receive clinical instruction at the Hospital in Wellington?—Yes.

22. Do the Otago students learning in Wellington attend when important operations are on: are they allowed to?—They are allowed to observe them.

23. Do they get instruction?—There is no course of instruction at Wellington Hospital.

24. They merely attend?—At their own wish.

25. *Hon. Mr. Allen.*] Does the operator give them any instruction?—They frequently have the cases explained to them.

26. *Mr. McCallum.*] They attend the surgical cases?—Yes.

27. Just look on?—Yes.

28. *Hon. Mr. Allen.*] They get explanation of the case, is that it?—Yes. There is no system about it, but those cases are explained to them when they are there.

CORRESPONDENCE.

DEAR SIR,—

University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand, 21st July, 1913.

At the monthly meeting of the Council of the Otago University held on Tuesday, the 15th instant, I was instructed to lay before you the pressing needs of the Otago University. These have been set out by the Inspector-General in his report to Parliament on the University Colleges of New Zealand, and have been directly reported on to the Council by the teachers of the various departments of this College.

We feel that the time has come when defects which have been impairing the usefulness of our University work should be remedied, but this can be done only through your help. I submit the following reports in the order in which they came before the Council:—

Medical School.

a. It goes without saying that, as there is only one Medical School in the Dominion, it should be made as efficient as possible. On the quality of the medical practitioner graduating here the health of the whole community will largely depend. The Council has conferred separately with the medical faculty and with Dr. Valintine, with the following result:—

The following is the report of the faculty:—

(i.) "That the faculty considers the most urgent need of the Medical School to be the provision of buildings—to afford accommodation for full pathological and bacteriological departments, public health and materia medica rooms, and enlarged premises for anatomy, chemistry, and physiology."

(ii.) "That the faculty considers the next most urgent need to be the appointment of a whole-time Professor of Pathology, and that Dr. Roberts be offered the position."

(iii.) "That assistants be provided for the Professors of Anatomy, Physiology, and Pathology."

(iv.) "That the faculty report to the Council that in their opinion a Medical School block should be erected on a site in the immediate neighbourhood of the Hospital, to afford sufficient space to meet the requirements of the more purely medical subjects, and that the faculty approves of the extension proposed in connection with the medical buildings at the University."

Dr. Valintine supplements this by recommending that there be also a whole-time Professor of Bacteriology, and that the principal lecturers in the Medical School be paid such a salary as will induce them to regard their University work as of primary and not, as at present, of secondary importance.

Thus the present needs of the Medical School may be summarized:—

- (1.) Buildings: (a) Extension of the present block north and south so as to give accommodation for anatomy, physiology, and chemistry; (b) a new medical block near the Hospital for purely medical subjects.
- (2.) Full-time Professors of Pathology and Bacteriology.
- (3.) Appointment of assistants to the Professors of Anatomy, Physiology, and Pathology, and Lecturer on Diseases of Children.
- (4.) Increase of the salaries of the principal lecturers in the Medical School.

Arts and Science.

b. The following is a report presented to the Council by the professors in arts and science:—

(1.) "This meeting of members of the faculties of arts and science wishes to draw the attention of the Council to the following resolution passed unanimously at a meeting of the Professorial Board held on the 6th May, 1912: That all those members of the staff who have to devote the whole of their time to University work and to take honours classes should be paid adequate salaries."

(2.) "That the attention of the Council be drawn to the fact that the Inspector-General of Schools, in his report on the University Colleges of New Zealand, E.-7A, 1912, page 10, recommends that the average salary of professors be £700; and, on the same page, he makes definite recommendations as to the allotment of professorial Chairs. Further, that this meeting considers that such recommendations should be regarded as a minimum."

(3.) "That the Council be reminded that the salaries paid to the professors who were first appointed represented a far higher purchasing-value than the same salaries at the present day."

(4.) "That a trained assistant should be provided for the Professor of Biology at a salary of £200 or £250 to assist, especially in the botanical work."

(5.) "That an assistant be granted to the Professor of Mathematics at a salary of £100."

(6.) "That the extension of the Biological Department as recommended in the Inspector-General's report, page 17, be considered."

Some of our arts and science professors are miserably paid and overworked, and much will be done to increase the efficiency of the work in this department if you can meet the needs stated in this report.

Home Science.

c. The following is a report from Professor Boys-Smith with reference to the needs of the School of Home Science:—

“To the members of the Otago University Council.
“GENTLEMEN,—

“I want to bring to your notice the urgent needs of the home science department, and to beg you to ask the Minister of Education to decide as quickly as possible what sum the Government will allot to Otago University to establish the home-science course permanently. One of the urgent needs of the present time is a place in which to teach the practical laundry-work and housewifery. The syllabus laid down for the degree and diploma courses, and approved by the Council and the New Zealand Senate two years ago, undertook to give the students a course in practical laundry-work and housewifery as well as in cookery. At the time, temporary provision was made for teaching of cookery by asking the Education Board to grant us the use of the North Dunedin Technical School kitchen, which they agreed to do at a rental of £100 per annum, upon condition that the Board's cookery teacher gave the classes. No provision was made for the teaching of laundry-work at that time, but the consideration of suitable quarters was postponed until the question of the projected hostel came up for discussion. Last summer (as the number of students who had started the work in 1911 was small) I was able to make temporary provision in my own house. Now that the number of students has so much increased it will be impossible to go on with this branch of the work unless provision is made for the laundry and housewifery classes, in which case the students would be unable to complete their practical work and obtain a degree or diploma.

“The Inspector-General in his report on the University colleges of New Zealand has pointed out that a chief demonstrator of the practical work in cookery, laundry-work, and housewifery is at once necessary to enable myself and my assistant to carry on the total work of the department. And we shall never be able to show the value of teaching these subjects on scientific lines until we have our own kitchen, laundry, and demonstrator. If Government decides to make permanent provision for the home-science course, and to allot a given sum to Otago University for this purpose (see pages 6, 7, and 11 of the Inspector-General's report), the Citizens Committee would, I understand, agree to hand over the remainder of the subscriptions which were given expressly for improving the teaching of these practical subjects, for the purpose of erecting a model kitchen and laundry, if the University would provide a suitable site, and Government would subsidize the amount subscribed.

“The question of permanent laboratory and lecture-room accommodation at the University also presses. With twenty-four students reading for the full degree or diploma course, and eighteen other students taking single courses, or groups of courses, we have barely sufficient accommodation for our needs, and there is reason to hope that next session we shall have as large an increase of students as we had this year.

“In conclusion, gentlemen, I would therefore beg you to ask the Minister of Education to consider these facts at the earliest possible moment, and decide to allot £1,000 per annum to establish the home-science course permanently. I would point out that already Government is subsidizing Mr. Studholme's contribution and that of the Citizens' Committee to the extent of £500 per annum, so that we are only asking that this provision be raised to £1,000 per annum and made permanent.

“W. L. BOYS-SMITH.”

Here we are pioneering—and that in a department of education which, though of supreme importance to the community—the higher education of women—has been scandalously neglected. For the start already made we are indebted to the enlightened generosity of Mr. Studholme and a few of the liberal citizens of Dunedin. The school has now proved its value, and the Council looks to you to put our School of Home Science on a stable foundation as regards buildings and finance. The grant we now receive from Government is £500 per annum: we require double that amount, and a small grant for the necessary buildings.

The Veterinary College has long been in the air. The time for establishing it is due, and a site has been recommended by Mr. Reakes and approved by the Council. We hope you will enable us to receive it at once.

The small debt on the *Dental School* of £560 is a serious burden, and we were glad to have the assurance of the Premier, when in Dunedin last month, that this burden will be removed by Government grant.

In submitting the above reports on the needs of the University as a basis of consideration the Council desires to remind you of the value of the special schools in our College, and the consequent heavy burden laid upon the Council to make them efficient. I need not remind you of the liberal fashion in which the people of Dunedin have in the past contributed to the funds of the College. The Council urges the claims of the College in the favourable and liberal consideration of yourself and your colleagues.

I have, &c.,

The Hon. the Minister of Education, Wellington.

ANDREW CAMERON, Chancellor.

DEAR MR. THOMSON,—

77 Lower Stuart Street, Dunedin, 5th September, 1913.

I notice in yesterday's *Times* that Dr. J. W. Hunter is having another tilt at the Otago Medical School. I think I can throw some light on one of his statements.

Between twenty and thirty years ago, when treating cases of anæmia, my favourite prescription for that condition was Bland's iron pills. . . . About fifteen or sixteen years ago

my attention was drawn to the fact that one chemist at least was selling these pills with a printed label on the box, "Dr. Batchelor's Iron Pills." I was very much annoyed at this, and called on the chemist at once; his explanation was that a number of patients asked for these pills under that name, and for his own convenience he had the label printed. I pointed out to him how objectionable this was; he promised to withdraw the label, and I believe did so. I have heard nothing more of the matter since.

This, so far as I know, is the sole foundation for Dr. Hunter's charges on this point, if they refer to me, which I imagine they do.

Sincerely yours,

FREDK. C. BATCHELOR.

SIR,—

University College, Auckland, 9th September, 1913.

I have delayed a few days in answering your communication of the 2nd instant in order that I might consult the Professorial Board at their meeting held yesterday.

The Board recommends that proper provision be made in Auckland for schools of architecture (including town-planning) and law, and that the present provision for teaching certain engineering subjects be retained. Personally I approve of this recommendation, and in its support, and with reference to specialization in general, beg to urge certain considerations.

1. There are some hundred and twenty or more law students attending the law lectures at this College. If there were no instruction in law given here probably not 1 per cent. of these would attend any law school out of Auckland. Law is different to medicine; attendance at a law school is not necessary for, though it may be a valuable aid to, a career in law, and law students in New Zealand generally prefer or find it necessary to carry on their law studies concurrently with their office practice. The number of law students already existing here seems to thoroughly justify better provision being made for their proper instruction.

2. Auckland, as being both much the largest and the most rapidly increasing centre of population in the country, has a special claim to a reasonable share of the professional schools. I think it will be found that in all our special schools, with the possible exception of medicine, each school is patronized mainly by the community in which it is placed. Even in the case of medicine I think it will be found that the proportion of students relatively to population that the Otago School attracts from the rest of the country does not compare with the proportion supplied by Dunedin itself. (A properly compiled report giving the statistics of this character for each of our professional schools would be of interest and might supply valuable lessons, and I hope such a report will be obtained.) If this be so it follows that, other things being equal, the greater will be the utility of any school the larger the community in which it is placed. This argument strongly favours Auckland as the locality for the new school of architecture if such be founded.

3. Reasons are numerous in favour of distributing such professional schools as cannot at present be multiplied more or less equally, as may be practicable, amongst the four University centres, but such concentration as is unavoidable would be more effective in the larger and not in the smaller centres.

4. Duplication may be advisable over a portion of a course even when the time is unripe for the duplication of the whole. The classes held in Auckland in certain engineering subjects meet a want, and, if the course were recognized by the Senate and by Canterbury College as far as it goes, would tend to feed the School of Engineering at Canterbury. Many would go to Canterbury to finish that at present cannot face the financial strain involved in the longer course away from home. Some others, who now having to leave home for a long period in any case prefer to go to foreign schools of greater celebrity, would be induced to take their course in this country. There are many others also who, like the law students, must have their instruction concurrently with their workshop practice, and the workshops are not confined to one centre. Suitable engineering courses where there is sufficient demand would serve the same purpose in the same way as do the various schools of mines at the several mining centres. Further, if provision be made for a school of architecture in Auckland very little additional provision is necessary—and none in the way of equipment—to continue the classes in engineering subjects at present conducted in Auckland.

Yours faithfully,

Mr. G. M. Thomson, M.P., Chairman, Education Committee.

H. W. SEGAR.

Victoria College (University of New Zealand),

Wellington, New Zealand, 10th September, 1913.

SIR,—

In reply to your letter of the 2nd September *in re* the memo. of the Minister of Education on the subject of specialization at the University colleges, I am now instructed by the Professorial Board to write you as follows:—

1. The Board makes this statement in compliance with your request, but desires to preface the statement by reasserting its opinion that the question of specialization is one which cannot be properly determined otherwise than by a Royal Commission, after a thorough inquiry into all the factors which ought to influence policy on such a question.

2. Subsequent proposals in this letter are based upon the assumption that effect is given to the findings of the Inspector-General's report, and that this College is guaranteed the full sum of £14,000 per annum necessary to finance the report's scheme. The Inspector-General, in his evidence before your Committee, gives as a revised estimate of revenue from fees at Victoria College the annual sum of £4,000. We do not agree with that estimate, believing it to be much too high. Our fees have already been raised to the same level as those of Otago University—viz., £3 3s. per annum for a full course in a lecture subject (with £3 3s. additional for a practical

course in an experimental science), and the increase will take full effect in 1915. We presume that it is not expected that we shall raise the level of fees per subject higher than that of the other colleges. The revenue from fees in 1912 was £2,070; the treasurer of the College estimates it for 1913 at £2,400; increase, £330. Taking all the factors into account we are of opinion that the further increase of revenue from fees cannot exceed twice this amount—viz., £660—an increase of £330 in 1914, making £2,730 as total for that year, and a further increase of £330 in 1915, making the maximum £3,060. A more accurate estimate cannot be made without more data than is available. If the Committee accepts the Inspector-General's estimate as against that which we have given it would only be fair that they should guarantee the College against a deficit due to fees falling below £4,000. Such a guarantee is suggested by the Inspector-General in his notes to Table N, note (d): "To guard against an uncertain revenue during the period of transition I would guarantee for three years to Victoria College . . . a revenue of £14,000 from grants, endowments, and fees"; and (on page 13) where he says, "Meanwhile I would suggest that Victoria College and Auckland should be secured against loss by guaranteeing to them for a certain time a minimum income from fees, endowments, and grants taken together."

3. Special School of Law: The Board urges that the Law School at Victoria College be efficiently equipped as a special School of Law for the Dominion. To this end the Board proposes, in addition to the minimum suggested for Victoria College (viz., two professors and one assistant as at present), an assistant to the Professor of Roman Law, &c., and lectures on special law subjects; also a considerable additional grant for the law library. It is estimated that the total cost of this special school would be £1,000 per annum beyond what is provided for under the above-mentioned estimate of £14,000 per annum for all purposes.

4. Special work in science: In pursuit of the policy of this College a special grant is necessary to enable science teaching to be fully provided in the daytime along with the present arrangements for teaching evening students for a degree in science. It may be put as a special grant to enable this College to add evening teaching in science to the normal teaching by day which must in any case soon be instituted. Day teaching is necessary in order that the College may be able to offer such a course of training in science as was unanimously endorsed in the following terms by the science professors present at the 1912 Professorial Conference (minutes of the University Senate, 1913, page 18): "Whereas it is desirable to institute a degree suitable for the requirements of persons intending to engage in scientific work in connection with agriculture, manufacture, and other technical pursuits, this committee recommends that a special degree in science be established, the subjects of study for which shall be (1) mathematics (pure and applied), (2) physics, (3) chemistry, (4) physiology, (5) geology, (6) zoology, (7) botany." Such a course is peculiarly necessary at the present time in this College because, under the regulations which are about to be brought into force in the Public Service, many of the ablest men in the scientific branches of the service will be required to undergo such a course as a condition of advancement to the higher grades. This special work in science, as well as work for evening students, can be carried on if the "minimum suggested" by the report be supplemented as follows: An additional £50 per annum to the salary of the proposed lecturers in mathematics, physics, chemistry, and biology, so as to provide the sum of £350 necessary to obtain the type of man who can share full responsibility with the professors; an additional £100 per annum to the salary of the (independent) lecturer in geology; a demonstrator in geology, and an anatomical mechanic for the biological department. The total additional cost thus entailed, together with the additional library expenditure which would be involved, is estimated at £900 per annum.

Further, for aid to research work in the experimental sciences (mainly for apparatus) a sum of £200 per annum is required, and it is proposed that this should be administered by the College Council as a separate fund for that object.

5. The fuller equipment of the law and science schools will increase the urgency of capital expenditure on buildings. The main building must be extended at the north end, as recommended in the Inspector-General's report (at a cost of £7,000); but an extension of the science building, to provide a physics lecture-room and a biological museum, is equally urgent—cost, about £5,000.

6. The Board further considers that the matter of special schools in agriculture and commerce for the Dominion is one which must be decided. But these are questions which it has not yet discussed with the College Council, believing that the time to do so would come when a Royal Commission of inquiry had been set up. It will proceed to do so at once, as it believes that a good case can be made out for having such schools at this College; it recognizes, however, that other colleges have also claims in this connection. The Council meets on Wednesday, 17th September, and I shall see that a letter is written to you on the following day.

I am, &c.,

D. K. PICKEN,

Chairman of the Professorial Board.

The Chairman of the Parliamentary Education Committee.

DEAR SIR,—

University College, Auckland, 11th September, 1913.

It has occurred to me that there being no reference in my previous letter with respect to the founding of a school of agriculture in Auckland Province might be misinterpreted. As a matter of fact, we regard this as already assured by reason of the Campbell bequest, combined with the known intentions of the Government. The question of the site, however, seems to be in some doubt. We feel strongly that to establish the school in a country district would be to diminish considerably the utility of the school, as well as to involve the establishment of a larger additional staff and more extensive laboratories. The school ought to be established as an actual

part of the University College here, with some land provided within reasonable distance for purposes of experiment and demonstration. An extensive area for the carrying-out of the ordinary routine of farming is not necessary, such being no part of the proper work of such a school. The school would be of great service to the farming community for purposes of consultation if placed in the trade and transit centre of the province. This centre farmers could easily reach, and many would often visit in the ordinary course of pleasure and business. Placed in any country district the school would be comparatively inaccessible to the great mass of farmers.

The Auckland Farmers' Union have just decided in favour of establishing a laboratory of their own, and, it should be noted, they choose for the locality of its site the City of Auckland. Such a laboratory ought to be unnecessary with a school of agriculture established here.

In conclusion, I may point out that at present Auckland has really no distinctive professional school, for schools of commerce have been established in other centres, and in any case students are not likely to be attracted from a distance by a school of commerce. It appears inevitable that schools both of commerce and of law must be regarded, either immediately or very soon, as a necessary part of each University College.

Yours faithfully,

H. W. SEGAR.

Mr. G. M. Thomson, M.P., Chairman of Education Committee.

SIR,—

University of Otago, Dunedin, N.Z., 15th September, 1913.

I have been instructed by the Professorial Board of the University of Otago to forward you the following resolutions, which were unanimously adopted by the Board at a meeting held on Saturday, 13th September:—

1. "That the Professorial Board of the University of Otago considers that reform of the University of New Zealand is desirable, in that the teachers of the colleges have no official standing in the University.

2. "That the Board is in opinion that any satisfactory scheme of reconstruction should embody the following principles:—

(a.) "That there should be a properly constituted academic authority consisting solely of University teachers.

(b.) "That, subject to review by the Senate, this academic body should draw up the curricula of studies; make regulations for degrees; conduct examinations; and recommend candidates to the Senate for degrees and scholarships.

(c.) "That the supreme governing body, at present called the Senate, should consist of (1) nominees of the Government; (2) representatives of the College Councils; (3) representatives of the professoriate; (4) representatives of the Courts of Convocation."

I may add that these resolutions were first considered and unanimously agreed upon at a very full meeting of the Professorial Board in committee, and afterwards confirmed at the ordinary meeting.

I remain, &c.,

JOHN MALCOLM,

Chairman of Professorial Board.

George M. Thomson, Esq., M.P., Chairman of Education Committee.

SIR,—

Victoria College, Wellington, 18th September, 1913.

I think I can claim to be voicing the opinion of the majority of thinking men in the Dominion when I say that the most important subject in the University curriculum is economics. New Zealand has been called "the world's economic laboratory," and if that name be deserved it means that every day some problem occurs to which, in order that a true opinion may be formed, it is necessary to apply a knowledge of economic principles. Without elaborating the point I may say that unless a knowledge of such principles is widespread opinions will be formed by mere empiricism; immediate and not ultimate results will occupy the attention, and the country will be led into experiments promising an immediate harvest, but producing an ultimate famine. This is sufficiently shown by the growing activity and increasing strength of the syndicalistic movement. Our University colleges should produce men trained to analyse economic phenomena, men who will in years to come be the leaders of public opinion.

If this view be accepted it is impossible to admit the wisdom of a policy which relegates, even temporarily, this most important subject to a secondary place. The Inspector-General in his report on University colleges (page 6) says of education: "If an advanced or honours course were recognized by the University, there should be not less than two lecturers in each college, or a lecturer and a professor." Of economics and history he says (p. 5), "Perhaps the arrangement made in Melbourne of having one professorial Chair and one lectureship is the best that can be made at present in any New Zealand University college, and I recommend that accordingly." Here I should say that Melbourne University, which has for many years had a Chair of Economics, has this year created a Chair of History.

Under the heading "Minimum suggested for each College" (p. 10), however, it is proposed that only two lectureships should be provided for the two subjects (except at Canterbury College, where there is already a Chair), while in all other arts subjects except mental science a professor and a lecturer are provided for. Surely, as the Inspector-General himself says (p. 5), "Whether they are regarded from the point of view of politics, sociology, and commerce, or from that

of a general human interest consequently as elements of a humanist training and culture, history and economics appear to be subjects of sufficient importance to deserve two separate Chairs in a University college."

I should point out that although these subjects are to be provided only with lectureships in three of the four colleges, the demands upon the lecturers are not less exacting than those upon the professors of other subjects, for the lecturer must carry his work to as high a standard as they. Whilst in Victoria College each professor carries out only one full honours course, I as lecturer on economics and history have without assistance two full honours courses to provide, in addition to special courses for the Bachelor of Commerce degree. When the Victoria College Council was asked a few years ago to define the difference between a lecturer and a professor it replied that the only distinction was one of salary.

I trust, therefore, that your Committee will recognize the weak position in which these important subjects may be placed, and make adequate provision for placing them on an equality with other subjects.

Assuming, however, that the proposed system of lecturers is to be adopted, I take it to be fundamental that the lecturers are competent to carry out the work assigned to them. In the past several lecturers have been raised to the status of professors, and have in each instance proved signal successes. The work of the New-Zealand-trained professor will compare favourably with that of his English-trained colleagues. The unfortunate state of college finances has at times, however, prevented due recognition of the work of the lecturers, whose emolument and responsibility have been in inverse ratio, and whose position is therefore anomalous. In New Zealand there are few University posts offering, with the consequence that one who accepts a lectureship has little prospect of finding a Chair unless his own status be raised. In some cases the University work is only secondary, the lecturer obtaining the greater part of his livelihood from some other occupation. This system, advantageous in some subjects such as law, is in others pernicious. At Victoria College the lecturers in economics and geology are rightly required to devote their whole time to their University work. The salaries, however, whilst as high as the College in its present financial position can afford, are hopelessly inadequate to the work involved. The highest is only half that paid to a professor. This, for a married man with no other source of income, is insufficient, leaving no margin for saving. It is desirable that all University teachers should at intervals visit the Home universities, but the unfortunate lecturer can do so only at great sacrifice. If, then, the Committee adopts the Inspector-General's report as to staffing, provision should be made for more adequate remuneration to lecturers who devote their whole time to their University work. Without departing from my opinion that he who does a professor's work should have professorial rank and receive professorial salary, I consider that not less than £500 should be the salary attaching to such positions.

I have, &c.,
F. P. WILSON.

The Chairman, Education Committee, House of Representatives.

STATEMENT SUBMITTED IN SUPPORT OF UNIVERSITY REFORM IN NEW ZEALAND BY THE PRESIDENT
OF THE VICTORIA COLLEGE GRADUATES' ASSOCIATION.

The Victoria College Graduates' Association, the body which I represent, was formed in 1906. Its membership is open to any graduate whose name appears on the electoral roll of Victoria College, and now consists of some one hundred and thirty graduates. One of the functions of the association is stated in its constitution to be "to enable graduates to express a collective opinion on matters affecting them educationally and academically." It is only natural that men and women who have passed through the University not only should take a lively interest in its welfare, but also should be well qualified to judge of the merits and demerits of its methods and systems, its organization, and its teaching. That the graduates of Victoria College have taken such interest and in which direction their opinions would seem to point the following facts will show:—

In general terms the Victoria College Graduates' Association agrees with the principles laid down in the pamphlet entitled "University Reform in New Zealand," published in 1911 by the New Zealand University Reform Association. That it favours reform it has shown in many ways. For instance, the executive committee of the Graduates' Association, elected annually at its general meeting, has for the last two years, when the question of reform has loomed so large in the minds of those interested in the University, consisted entirely of graduates in favour of reform whose opinions on the subject must have been known to the general body of electors. Again, at the annual general meeting held in 1911, the following resolutions were moved by the president and carried by the meeting: "That this meeting of the Victoria College Graduates' Association is of opinion—(1.) That the functions of the governing body of the New Zealand University should be redefined in order that purely academic functions (as, for example, the arrangement of curricula) should be handed over to the Professorial Boards, with a power of veto to a Senate, whose chief function should be the business management of the University. (2.) That the present system of purely external examinations is archaic and highly inimical to the character and reputation of the New Zealand University. (3.) That, in order to satisfy the public (whose money is spent in University education and must continue to be so spent in increasing sums), and in order, if necessary, to suggest a revised scheme, a Royal Commission should be appointed to consider and report on the University system." Thus, already in 1911 did the association express in no uncertain terms its opinion that radical changes

were required in the University, and especially as to the necessity of a Royal Commission to go into the whole question. Of this opinion they gave further concrete evidence in 1912, when they nominated and vigorously supported in his candidature for election to the University Senate Professor T. A. Hunter, a man well known to them, as perhaps also to you, as no mean enthusiast in the cause of reform. Professor Hunter now represents the graduates of this district on the Senate, and has as yet apparently seen no good reason for diverging from those opinions to which he gave such vigorous expression before his election. In these and other ways have the graduates given evidence of their genuine desire for changes which they honestly think will be of benefit to the University, and through it to the community as a whole. A few of the defects and inconsistencies which they attribute to the present system I shall now set out in brief.

(a.) Organization of the University.

One reason for the graduates' discontent with the present organization of the University is that under the existing split system of representation the influence of the graduates is ineffective. The graduate bodies that are officially recognized are the four District Courts of Convocation and the General Court of Convocation, consisting of the four District Courts. The only effective power the District Courts have is that of electing eight members to the Senate, two from each Court. The General Court of Convocation has no effective powers of any kind, and has not met since 1902. On academic questions the influence of the graduates on the University is negligible. It is true that on one or two occasions the Senate has sent out a series of questions to the various District Courts asking for answers and suggestions. Quite recently it has sent to individual graduates a table of three suggested schemes for the reconstitution of the University, asking each graduate which of the schemes he or she prefers, or to suggest modifications. But what effect can suggestions which have the sanction of no officially recognized authority hope to have? In any case, if these schemes have been submitted to, say, a thousand graduates, a thousand replies may be received differing in details, and the Senate can then fall back upon its trusty weapon "lack of unanimity," and continue comfortably along its old groove. The Senate's position is almost analogous to that of a Legislative Council which, while vaguely promising to reform itself in the future, strenuously opposes any active external aid in the present, and lays to its soul the flattering unction of its past.

Another defect in the present organization is what is generally referred to as the divorce of the colleges from the University. The professors and students are professors and students not of the University, but of their respective colleges. Theoretically the University has no direct control over the colleges. Its only influence is indirect and in so far as it lays down the curricula according to which the students of the colleges shall be examined. It is like a State which, owning the right-of-way, lays down narrow-gauge rails and leases the running-rights to private companies who must build their rolling-stock to fit the gauge laid down. Theoretically the colleges need not teach any of the subjects laid down by the University. Practically, however, as far as academic functions are concerned, the control is of iron, for by determining all the conditions requisite for obtaining degrees, and by appointing all examiners and controlling all examinations, it restricts academic activity to the narrowest confines. With regard to the disposal of its funds, the appointment of its professors, and the general conduct of its affairs each college is its own master. So where it should be most free it is most tied down, and where it should be under most restraint it is most free.

All this would be remedied were the University a federal one in which the Governors of the colleges became *ipso facto* Governors of the University, and the colleges themselves thus integral parts of the University.

The graduates of Victoria College would be the last to deny that there are men on the Senate to-day to whom the cause of University education in New Zealand owes an infinite debt of gratitude. But they would also be the last to admit that any body of men, however enthusiastic and benevolent, constituted as the Senate is, could be expected to conduct all the functions of University government satisfactorily. The two functions of University government are financial administration and academic control, and the men who are best qualified to carry out the former are not infrequently worst qualified to carry out the latter. The New Zealand University Senate, however, bravely endeavours to carry out both almost without assistance, and it would be unkind to judge too harshly of one who is endeavouring to achieve the impossible. The Senate, as constituted by the Act, is almost entirely a body of laymen, and, left with it, the financial affairs of the University would be in good hands; but for academic affairs there should be another body, a consulting Board, an academic Senate, whose permanent functions should be to make recommendations to the Senate as to degrees, diplomas, scholarships and prizes, course of study, and examinations. For this none could be better qualified than the professors of the University. These men have presumably spent their lives in pursuit of knowledge in an atmosphere of scholarship. They have made it their profession, their business, first to master their respective subjects, and then to master the art of teaching them. Teaching they have learnt. The frequently made statement that a professor is an employee of the University or college, and should therefore have no voice in its government, is so absurd as hardly to merit contradiction. Here is no mere stonebreaking navvy working with his hands only, but a man whose mind has undergone years of training for the profession he has undertaken. It would be just as ridiculous to say that, because a manager of railways is in the pay of the people, the lines on which he should conduct his work should be laid down by the people's representatives without his being consulted. The comparison is not an unfair one. The professors have doubtless been consulted on occasions in the past, and there has even been a professorial conference, but in the one case the advice given was individual and informal; in

the other the conference, established as an annual affair by the Senate of one year, was dis-established as an affair of any kind by the Senate of the next. The only remedy seems to lie in a permanent academic body with the functions above stated, having official recognition from the Senate proper, who also have the right of discussion and veto.

(b.) Methods of the University.

Under this head come the arrangement of degree courses and methods of examination. With regard to the arrangement of courses I shall only say that I think cases should be dealt with individually, and the natural talents and requirements of each student should be the main consideration in determining the course he should take at the University. In each case a homogeneous correlation of subjects should be insisted on. In addition to a main line of study complementary branches should be studied, and the whole course subordinated to a definite end and the various parts blend harmoniously together. Under the present method the choice of subjects is more or less a haphazard one, the student not infrequently selecting a subject rather on account of its easiness than because it is in any way correlated to the other subjects of his course. The result is that the student who aspires no higher than the pass degree often knows, when he attains that height, a little of many things and nothing of anything. As a hall-mark of general culture, which our B.A. degree purports to be, it is, to say the least, unreliable.

However grave this and other evils enumerated may be, the gravest and most dangerous evil of all is the method of purely external examination. This is a millstone around the neck of the University which is alone sufficient to prevent absolutely any upward progress. The dangers of the system, the tendency it exercises towards cram on the part of the student, its tendency to undermine the initiative and individuality of teacher and student alike, and many others, have been fully dealt with in the reform pamphlet, and I shall not enumerate them here. A system of examination which does not take into account the year's work of the candidate presenting himself must on the face of it be unjust and no fair test of the candidate's qualifications for a degree. It may be said, in answer to this, that the year's work has been taken into consideration by the teacher in the terms examination. That may be so, but the teacher's powers in such examinations are merely negative; he can fail the candidate. Once he has let him pass, however, the teacher's evidence becomes worthless, for the matter is then out of his hands, and the external examiner has nothing to judge by except the papers before him. As a matter of fact, under the present conditions a professor will let a student pass his terms examination if he thinks he has the slightest chance of scraping through his degree examination, for he is naturally very loth to deprive a man of even a frail chance when he knows that the final responsibility lies in the hands of another.

A flagrant instance of the futility of the present system has recently been brought under my notice. A student sat for a section of his B.A. examination four times, and his record for the examination reads as follows: Latin—Pass, fail fail, pass; education—Fail, fail, pass, pass; mental science—Pass, pass, pass, fail. The first time he failed in education he had obtained first class and special mention in that subject in his college examination. This student has therefore passed twice in both Latin and education and three times in mental science; University result, nil: a state of affairs which hardly requires any comment to demonstrate its absurdity. Another instance is that of a candidate who presented himself for the Senior Scholarship Examination in German. He was known to his professor to have read very widely in his subject—in fact, was probably the best-read student that had ever presented himself from that college. He obtained the highest marks in the examination, and yet no scholarship was awarded him, the reason, as stated by the examiner, being to the effect that, though the candidate could write good and idiomatic German, his acquaintance with the language was evidently not one of wide reading. Yet another candidate presented himself for honours in German. His marks were not very high, but the comment of the examiner was reassuring. "This candidate," he said, "seems to be better than his marks indicate." So here we have a system which admittedly reduces everything to a question of marks, bases everything on a foundation of marks, and yet the divinity that shapes the marks candidly admits that they do not indicate the merits or position of the candidate. Truly a system that cannot even be called perfect in its imperfections.

Such cases could not occur if the teacher had a share in the examination, and in no other university except the old University of London is the teacher deprived of his share in the examining. As far as London is concerned the external examination has received its death-blow in the report of the Royal Commission on University Education in London, which recently concluded its sittings under Lord Haldane. There, amongst other things, it is said of the external examination, "As far as it tests his knowledge or information alone it can obtain evidence only of memory and not even of lasting memory, because in the case of some subjects, at any rate, cramming is the most successful way of preparing for the test, and it is notorious that a good coach can enable a candidate even to dispense with cramming more than fragments of a subject prescribed." And again, "No doubt the degree is an incentive to work, and there are very few who can dispense with some incentive, but the external examination does not test the quality of the work. It can be more easily and more effectively prepared for by means that are not educational. It is in spite of and not by means of the so-called principle of guidance by test if the great majority of the candidates do not belong to the class which Newman describes as 'those earnest but ill-used persons who are forced to load their minds with a score of subjects against an examination, who have too much on their hands to indulge themselves in thinking or investigation, who devour premiss and conclusion together with indiscriminate greediness,

who hold whole sciences on faith and commit demonstrations to memory, and who too often, as might be expected when their period of education is passed, throw up all they have learned in disgust, having gained nothing really by their anxious labours except perhaps the habit of application.' " These arguments not only hold good of London, but are of universal application, and coming with the weight of such authority should not be lightly passed over in New Zealand.

It is by no means suggested here that the teacher should be the sole examiner of his students. What is suggested is a board of examiners for each subject, consisting of the four teachers in that subject acting in conjunction with one another and with an assessor, if necessary, who shall not be a member of any of the teaching staffs. This method will combine the internal with the external system, for as far as the student of any college will be concerned he will be examined by four external examiners and his own teacher. To him the teachers from the other three colleges are external examiners. The question of bias or favouritism cannot possibly enter where a board is constituted as suggested, and the board, jealous of the good name and status of its University, is not likely to err on the lenient side.

Opponents of this scheme aver that for the subjects of such a course, for instance, as that required for an arts degree suitable men could not be found in New Zealand to conduct the examination. The obvious reply to this seems to be that if the teachers of the University are deemed worthy of being entrusted with the important function of teaching they ought surely to be entrusted with the subordinate one of examining. As for one external assessor he should not be difficult to find. Under the present system our examinations in law are conducted locally by practitioners who are not necessarily specialists in the particular branches of the subject in which they examine. The law examiners for this year are, according to the University Calendar, as follow: Contracts, H. H. Ostler, LL.B.; property, Part I, H. F. von Haast, M.A., LL.B.; property, Part II, F. Fitchett, M.A., LL.D.; evidence, P. Levi, M.A.; criminal law, Hon. J. A. Tole, B.A., LL.B., K.C.; torts, H. D. Bamford, LL.D.; procedure, J. L. Stout, LL.B.—with one exception, general practitioners who would doubtless not claim to be specialists in the subjects on which they examine. In the case of most of them, too, they are past students of the New Zealand University. Hence they have been taught the subjects on which they are examining by those very teachers, specialists in their subject, who under the present system are themselves not entrusted with the examination—indeed an anomalous position.

Much more could be said on the subject of external examinations, but it has all been said before, and little can be gained by mere reiteration. The difficulties in the way of a change seem so vague and phantastic, and the dangers of the present system so real and pressing, that, in my opinion, the sooner steps are taken to bring about such change the better will it be for the welfare and progress of the University.

SIEGFRIED EICHELBAUM, M.A., LL.B.,
President, Victoria College Graduates' Association.

Approximate Cost of Paper.—Preparation, not given: printing (1,500 copies, including diagrams), £78.

By Authority: JOHN MACKAY, Government Printer, Wellington.—1913.

[Price 2s. 3d.]