

know all the details about its work, and who, with Mr. Tole and Mr. Von Haast, being all lawyers, are able to advise the Senate with regard to the legal curriculum of the University. In addition there is Professor Scott and Mr. Gordon, who are acquainted with engineering. Out of the whole membership of the Senate there are only three who are not men with University degrees. Therefore I think the Reform Association were a little hard when they dubbed us a lay body. My attention has been drawn to the fact that I used the wrong expression—that it is “preponderating” instead of “pre-eminently lay body” that the association uses. I would like also to say it is not this “lay element,” as it is called, upon the Senate, that the chief objection in regard to their platform comes. It is largely from the professorial members of the Senate as well as from the graduates’ representatives. We do not take up that attitude for a moment, gentlemen, because we do not think the professors are competent to carry out the system, but it is solely or mainly on account of the jealousy which exists between the four colleges and the difficulties there are of evading that in a satisfactory way in connection with the University examinations. I must thank you for the patient way in which you have listened to me.

1. *Mr. Herdman.*] You are a member of the Auckland University Council?—Yes, and have been for twelve years.

2. Of course, you know the object of this petition: we are not desiring legislation, but require an inquiry into the whole university system of the Dominion?—I do not quite understand that part of your proposals.

3. Am I to understand that you consider the present system in New Zealand in every way satisfactory and not calling for any inquiry?—We find that it is generally satisfactory. Improvements can be made in a number of particulars, but I do not think it is necessary to set up a Commission to inquire into them. For a long time in Auckland we have thought it would be desirable to have professorial representation on the Council, and I moved in that direction about six weeks ago. In consequence of that we applied to Parliament to bring in an amending Bill. We also wished to add to our graduates’ representation, on account of the number that belong to our college now. This Bill has been introduced, and I understand from Mr. Hogben that the Government proposes that it shall be on the lines of the Otago University Amendment Bill. I think there should be uniformity in regard to the constitution of our College Councils. I shall be quite willing to support that idea.

4. If you are of opinion that it is desirable that these College Councils should be brought into line, would it not be in the interests of the country to have an investigation made by some Commission?—I do not think it is necessary, but I think it might be desirable for the other colleges to make representations to the Government to secure uniformity. So far as I know the Auckland Council, it does its work very satisfactorily.

5. You are of opinion that all should be brought into line?—I am.

6. In order that it should be done satisfactorily, do you not think there should be an examination by some independent body—some Commission?—I do not think so.

7. Do you think the matter of finance is satisfactory?—I cannot say that it is satisfactory.

8. The success of the University Colleges and the New Zealand University very largely depends upon having a satisfactory finance—that is quite obvious?—Yes.

9. You will admit that to get a satisfactory financial policy is a matter of very great difficulty?—Yes, owing to the demands of the four colleges.

10. You know that one of the objects of the petitioners is to have an inquiry into the working of the system so that a satisfactory method can be devised for the four colleges: do you not think that would justify the appointment of such a Commission?—I might say that with regard to these questions I have not had a sufficient opportunity of studying them. I should like to say that I am in entire sympathy with the Reform Association in their plea for the establishment of libraries.

11. So that, so far as libraries and finance are concerned, on those two questions, at any rate, you agree that there might be a very great improvement, which perhaps would justify the Government appointing a Commission to investigate them?—Yes. The only fear I have in regard to the Commission is that the present constitution of the New Zealand University would be endangered and thrown into the melting-pot.

12. You said in the course of your evidence that the matter of external examination had been discussed in the University Senate, and the proposal to have external examinations had been rejected by a large majority?—I said it had for years. Last year some recanted and there was a very narrow division. Before that there was a preponderating majority.

13. Last year it was rejected by one vote?—Yes, but I know that the battles for years had been very great.

14. *The Chairman.*] I think you said the graduates’ representatives were always opposing the change?—Yes, consistently so.

15. Is that shown in your division-list?—Yes, and I think the majority of the professors on the Senate opposed it. [Division-list referred to.] I find I am wrong: Mr. Tibbs, who represented the graduates, voted with the Ayes.

16. Whom did he represent?—The Auckland graduates.

17. *Mr. Herdman.*] Are you aware that the Wellington graduates declared in favour of the examination by the professors?—I was not aware of it.

18. I understand that the Medical School examinations in Dunedin are conducted locally?—Yes.

19. Do you think that in the case of the Medical School there should be an external examination, or are you content with the examinations by the local professors?—I am in favour of that. In clinical and laboratory work there is so much to be done by the student.

20. Is not that necessary also in engineering?—Not to the same extent. I do not think the engineering training is quite on a par with medicine, on which life and death hang.