

**UNIVERSITY EDUCATION**

**INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE.**

**EXTENSION OF ACTIVITY.**

(From our Special Correspondent.)

London, February 24.

Amongst the motions passed by the Scottish Inter-Universities' Conference, held at Edinburgh in January last, was one which should be hailed with much satisfaction by the British Dominions in general and the academic world there in particular. This motion reads as follows:—

"That this conference is of opinion that the time has now come when the work done on behalf of the Scottish Universities on the Continent of Europe by the international academic committee should be extended to the British Dominions beyond the seas, and requests the Edinburgh Students' Representative Council to take the necessary steps."

Now, the Students' Representative Council is an organisation composed of the representatives of the matriculated students in the Universities, and of University societies, associations, or clubs, mainly composed of such matriculated students. The council has not confined its useful activities to the students of the Scottish Universities, but it has also taken the initiative and a most prominent part in the organisation of an international academic committee, whose purpose is "to give information and introductions to British students going to foreign Universities and to foreign students coming to British Universities." For this purpose it has appointed certain gentlemen—most of them University professors—who seem to have been selected with great care and good judgment as honorary academic consuls at nearly all foreign Universities. These consuls act without pay and give immediate attention to any enquiry received relative to the University under their special view. In some countries Consuls-General have been appointed who attend to more general questions and act also in an advisory capacity to the international academic committee in academic questions affecting all Universities and the academic Consuls of their particular State. It is plain that an organisation so useful as that of the international academic committee has the ability to be of great service not only to British students but also to all English-speaking students, and this appears to have been early seen and acted upon by the untiring convener of the committee, Mr. H. J. Darton-Fraser, of Edinburgh. He was educated at Brussels, and subsequently at George Watson's college. At present he is aiming at the bar. He became convener of the international academic committee in 1906, and by his efforts he has made the reputation of that committee world-wide, while he also edited its well-known "Handbook of Foreign Study," which is prefaced by an introduction by the Right Hon. R. B. Haldane, K.C., M.P., Secretary of State for War. A keen Liberal, Mr. Darton-Fraser has been for some years the best university union debater. An enthusiast in everything with which he is connected, brilliant and yet coolheaded, Mr. Darton-Fraser has piloted the international academic committee from almost its infancy to its present commanding position. The universities and colleges for which the I.A.C. acts are Edinburgh, Glasgow, Aberdeen, and St. Andrews; London, Liverpool, Manchester, Durham, Leeds, Sheffield, Bristol, Birmingham; Dublin, Belfast, Lampeter, Cardiff, Bangor, and Aberystwith.

Besides putting academic information at the disposal of students desiring to study abroad, and giving them a chance of obtaining expert advice from the academic consuls residing in the university towns chosen for study the I.A.C. has well-founded hopes that this endeavor to bring students of different universities into closer relations with one another, at that period in their lives when the character is still plastic, may be productive of substantial results in removing racial prejudices and misunderstanding between the cultivated people of different nations. For there is no doubt that the masses do not desire international complications. It is mostly the educated classes who are at the bottoms of wars. The International Academic Centre has already a thoroughly efficient organisation all over the Continent of Europe and the United States of America. In accordance with the aforementioned motion, the British dominions will receive now due attention, and the appointment of academic consuls at the various university centres should be proceeded with forthwith.

The success of the whole scheme is shown by the remarkable increase in the amount of business transacted last year over the preceding year, the number of applications from students desirous of obtaining information in regard to universities having more than doubled itself each succeeding year. As already stated, a handbook of foreign study has been compiled by Mr. Darton-Fraser. It contains far more information respecting universities than any handbook hitherto published. It may here be mentioned that several foreign Governments have officially recognised the International Academic committee, and notices of the appointments of new academic consuls or the resignation of one of these officials are now published in the Continental press as a matter of course. But not alone in respect to university information have the academic consuls on the Continent rendered valuable assistance. Parents desiring to place their children in Continental boarding schools or other educational establishments abroad make now frequent use of the services of the consuls to obtain information in respect to the bona fides of such institutions. Although the academic consuls' duties do not include such non-university matters, they have in all instances most courteously supplied the information asked for, and there are a goodly number of young people—including several from Australia—who have benefited by the advice tendered by the officials of the International Academic Committee.

Amongst those who have assisted Mr. Darton-Fraser in making a success of the work of I.A.C. are also two Australians. It is to be hoped that the matriculated students, graduates, and teaching staff of the universities in the Commonwealth will take up this extension of the I.A.C.'s activity in a whole-hearted manner, and are worthy of the success which this scheme has already achieved in the mother country and foreign parts.

*Register, March 29/11*

**EDUCATION COMMISSION.**

**SYDNEY UNIVERSITY VISITED.**

Sydney, March 29.

The principal object of the South Australian Royal Commission on higher education now meeting in Sydney is to enquire into the best means of extending the advantages of the Adelaide University to the greatest number. It is chiefly for the purpose of becoming acquainted with the facilities afforded at the Sydney University, and of learning the extent to which they are availed of, that the Commission has come to this State. This afternoon its members were afforded an opportunity of inspecting the University buildings in company with the chancellor, the registrar, and most of the members of the professional staff. Over three hours were spent in going through the various schools and departments, each professor taking charge of the party as his school was reached. The visitors were entertained at afternoon tea by Sr Normand McLaurin. Afterwards the chairman of the Commission (Mr. T. Ryan, M.P.), the Minister of Education (Hon. F. W. Coneybeer), and the Hon. A. H. Peake expressed their thanks for the opportunity which had been afforded them of seeing so fine an institution. The members of the Commission were particularly impressed with the fine situation of the University, with its extensive ground and the splendid manner in which some of the schools, notably those of medicine and engineering, are equipped. The Chairman said it would be well for New South Wales if the facilities provided at the University were more largely availed of.

**EDUCATION COMMISSION.**

**MORE EVIDENCE IN SYDNEY.**

SYDNEY, March 29.

The South Australian Royal Commission on Education took further evidence to-day.

Mr. J. Dawson (Chief Inspector and Acting Director of Education) said the number of pupils in all the schools was 218,533, and the average attendance was 151,270.

Mr. Ryan (Chairman)—You have then the largest enrolment and the lowest percentage of attendance in the Commonwealth?—Yes, it is partly attributable to our compulsory legislation, and also to the fact that our people are widely spread out, so that the conditions cannot be compared with those of Victoria and South Australia.

Mr. Dawson said the railway concession to students was a free pass to the high school nearest to the pupil's residence. Tramway concessions were equal to all pupils—three sections for a penny—but probationary students got free passes in their first year to the nearest district school, and any pupil sufficiently advanced obtained a free pass to the nearest public school.

A Member—You go further than we do. Are the State school inspectors empowered to enter private schools?—No, but it is the bounden duty of the Government to ensure that every child is receiving a good education.

Are your young people entering willingly into the teaching profession?—Young men find more remunerative or less exacting employment elsewhere, but the supply of women teachers is quite adequate to our needs. There was, witness continued, good accommodation with respectable people. A woman teacher was withdrawn from out back, and the people were told that they could not have her unless they found suitable quarters. There were no galvanized school buildings, except perhaps in the most remote and poverty-stricken districts, and certainly none built by the Government.

The members of the commission visited the Sydney University to-day, and spent over three hours in going through the various schools. Each professor took charge of the party as his school was reached. The members expressed themselves as greatly impressed with what had come under their observation.

# THE UNIVERSITY.

"IN TOUCH WITH THE PEOPLE."

LIFE TENURE OF THE SENATE.

ADVOCACY BY CHANCELLOR.

Sir Normand MacLaurin, Chancellor of the University of Sydney, gave evidence yesterday before the South Australian Royal Commission on Higher Education, which sat at the University.

In reply to Mr. Ryan (chairman) Sir Normand said he considered it a very good system indeed to have members of the Senate elected for life. There had always been a considerable number of Judges of the High Court and Supreme Court on the Senate, and they were most valuable men. It was impossible to conceive of these gentlemen being willing to submit themselves for election if they were to be re-elected at stated periods. Judges would not submit themselves to a contested election, and with elections at short periods the control of the University would fall almost entirely into the hands of professors, as they would be always on the Senate, while the elected Fellows would have, say, only a four-years' tenure. Contested elections would perpetually turn the University upside down, and would interfere with the business of the University, because about a month would be occupied in arguing and canvassing in connection with the election. The effect would be injurious.

The chairman stated that in South Australia a member of the Senate faced his constituents every five years. There the Chancellor had to contest his election, and no complaints had been heard.

The Chancellor said he thought nothing was to be gained by that system. What was the use of periodical elections if a man was always re-elected? On the other hand, if there were a bonafide election a good number of the members of the Senate would not stand for re-election. He was strongly opposed to any Government representative being on the Senate. Sir Patrick Jennings, when Premier, had considered it unwise to appear at the Senate, lest anything he might say would have undue influence on other gentlemen. Ministers of the Crown had also refrained from attending except in a formal way in order to retain their seats. The Senate acted under an Act of Parliament, and there was no reason why the Government should interfere; the first essential of the Senate was that it should be absolutely free from influence of any kind. There had never been any suspicion that the Senate had not acted in accordance with the Act.

The most important duty of the Senate was the selection of professors. In his opinion they should be elected for life. Otherwise the best men would not come forward. A professor's appointment was for 20 years, or until the age of 50 was reached. A professor could then retire on a pension of £400 a year. Experience had shown that after a man had worked at the University for 20 years he was pretty tired, but if he felt strong and vigorous and desired to go on, he was allowed to do so.

The Government should see that the University was supplied with sufficient funds for the purposes required, and the Senate should be perfectly free from any domination. Given these two things, the University should be exceedingly successful. It was very much in touch with the people, and was willing to admit any person who was sufficiently trained to receive its advantages. Never yet had the University turned away a man or a woman from the Faculties of Arts or Science because he had no money.

The Senate had at its disposal certain bursaries carrying from £25 to £50 a year and giving exemption from fees. It also of its own motion allowed a certain number of exemptions from fees. The Chancellor had a right to give exemption, provided there was evidence that the applicant was not able to pay the fees. He thought this system was a mistake, and instead of giving exemption he would favor a certain number of bursaries being given for competition in the Faculties of Arts and Science. It would then be an honor to gain a bursary instead of something approaching a charity.

Mr. Ryan: Are you doing anything that we would do well to copy?

Sir Normand MacLaurin: The first thing is to increase the number of secondary schools. The greater number of our students come to prepare for a profession, and there are a good number of people in professions who are poor. I don't suppose you would do much to increase the numbers of gentlemen studying law. As for engineering, I think a great deal might be done to encourage students. As for the Faculty of Arts and the Faculty of Science, I think we are about to extend the domain of scientific study by the introduction of such things as economics and applied chemistry. This would draw a number of worthy people to the University.

Mr. H. E. Barff, Registrar of the University, gave information as to the internal management of the institution. Replying to Mr. Ryan, he said New South Wales was not spending enough on its University. The University had many requirements which could be met if the money were available.

Mr. Ryan: Are you in favor of extending scholarships so as to bring in everybody?—I am in favor of extending scholarships so as to include as many people as possible who are fit to come to the University.

Professor Holme, Assistant Professor of Modern Literature, also gave evidence.

Professor Anderson Stuart, Dean of the Faculty of Medicine and Professor of Physiology, in expressing his opinion in favor of life tenure of the Senate, remarked that if members had to contest their positions at elections the Chief Justice of the Commonwealth might be defeated by a sucking barrister.

## EDUCATION COMMISSION.

### NEW UNIVERSITY SENATE SUGGESTED.

#### PROFESSORS ENDORSE PRINCIPLE.

Mr. T. Ryan, chairman of the South Australian Higher Education Commission, is keenly opposed to life-tenure of University senates, and yesterday he succeeded in getting qualified approval from two Sydney professors of a scheme of his own for a reconstituted senate.

Mr. Ryan's scheme is elastic. It will stretch either way a bit. He asked Professor David whether he could see any danger in a senate composed of about 25 members, five appointed by the professorial staff, eight by the graduates, five by the two Houses of Parliament at a joint sitting, the chairman of the Chamber of Commerce, the chairman of the Chamber of Manufactures, the president of the Trades and Labor Council, and three men to be elected by the people of the State at the Federal Senate elections.

Professor David: In the main, I think it is a good scheme, but I don't know how it would work to have the non-University members in slightly superior numbers to the academic members. That is contrary to precedent. Otherwise it seems an admirable scheme.

Mr. Peake (ex-Premier of South Australia) disapproved of Mr. Ryan asking could Professor David see any danger in the proposal. He asked could Professor David see any advantage in it.

Professor David replied that he would like to see the academic section of the senate given a slight preponderance of power at first. He would suggest that they be given 14 members to 11. He would like to see the senate more widely representative of the people than it was at present.

Mr. Peake: Do you see any reasons why the Chambers of Commerce and Manufactures and the Trades-hall should have preference over such bodies as the Medical Board and the Teachers' Association?

Professor David: It might be preferable to have other bodies represented in place of one of those bodies. The chairman of the Trades-hall I think most essential, also the chairman of the Chamber of Commerce. They are sure to be good men.

After further interrogation, Mr. Peake asked was it not the general principle suggested by Mr. Ryan that Professor David was prepared to assent to, rather than to commit himself to details.

Professor David: Yes, certainly. When Professor Anderson-Stuart was giving evidence Mr. Ryan asked would he give his blessing to a similar proposition, only in this case Mr. Ryan included the Lord Mayor in his proposed Senate.

Professor Anderson-Stuart said he would favor the scheme, provided there was provision for the election of any other representatives whom it might be considered desirable to include.

Sydney Daily Telegraph,  
March 31st, 1911

409

## FREE UNIVERSITY.

### PROFESSOR DAVID SUPPORTS.

"EVERYONE'S INNATE RIGHT."

At the sitting of the South Australian Higher Education Commission yesterday Professor David was asked by the chairman (Mr. T. Ryan) if he would have any objection to the University being free, provided the entrance examination was not in any way lowered, and that the State kept the University efficient.

Professor David replied that he had had experience of two universities in California where the fees were altogether remitted except in the professional schools. At Leland-Stanford there were something like 3000 students, and at Berkeley between 1500 and 1800. Education at Leland-Stanford was paid for by private endowment, and at Berkeley chiefly by the State. At Leland-Stanford, which he knew best, he found there was very great competition to get in among intending students, and the accommodation of the lecture-halls was applied for twice over. That enabled the university authorities to choose the best students—those most likely to profit by the education they would receive. The standard of teaching was very high, particularly in science subjects. It did not yield to any other university in the world with which he was familiar.

The teaching staffs were most efficient, and the standard of graduates was very high.

"I am not aware," Professor David went on, "of any drawback to free education at the University. Providing the standard of entrance examination is kept up and the efficiency of the teaching staff and adequate lecture-hall and laboratory accommodation is maintained, I can see no objection at all. On the other hand, I see an advantage. From time to time, under our present system, we admit students free of cost, but those students must first have an interview with the Chancellor and the Registrar and put their private affairs before them. That places students in a delicate position. It seems to me that it is the innate right of everyone in the country who is worthy of the highest education the country can give to get that education free. But if the standard of the entrance examination is lowered, a lot of good money is being wasted in trying to train students who were not really worthy of the education."

A commissioner: And they would not keep on?

Professor David: No; and if they did they would not make good students.

people in other occupations being equally sensitive with their Honors in regard to what is due to themselves and their positions. Sir Normand MacLaurin is also opposed to any Government representation on the Senate. As, however, the Government has contributed very substantially to University building funds, as well as to the regular upkeep, it may reasonably demand representation, apart from its other claim as high committee of the community. Besides, the Government is expected to give much greater assistance, which it has practically promised. The Chancellor is mistaken, we fear, if he thinks that the State is going on to assist in financing the University without ever having any share in its government. What is really needed is

that the Government should take a much keener interest—always, of course with expert help. It does not follow that there would be any of that "domination" which Sir Normand, in his zeal for the University, seems to apprehend. It would simply mean that the Government, evincing a lively and practical concern in the University, took its rightful part in the government of the institution. It is gratifying to find that Professors David and Stuart favor the broadening of the Senate. A more representative Senate could not hurt the work or restrict the expansion of the University; and this view can be contended for without losing sight of the splendid service rendered by the existing Senate.

Sydney Morning Herald  
31/3/11

## CHANCELLOR'S VIEW.

### LIFE PROFESSORS AND SENATORS.

SIR N. MACLAURIN DEFENDS UNIVERSITY.

"A VERY GOOD SYSTEM."

The South Australian Royal Commission on Education sat yesterday at the Sydney University. The chairman was Mr. T. Ryan, M.L.A.

Sir Normand MacLaurin (Chancellor) was asked by the chairman if he considered the system of life selection of members to the senate good.

The Chancellor: I do; a very good system indeed.

Sir Normand, continuing, said that the most important duty the senate had to perform was the selection of professors. There had always been a considerable number of Judges of the Supreme Court on the senate. These were most valuable men. It was impossible to conceive that such men would be willing to submit themselves for election if they were to be re-elected at stated periods. He was perfectly sure Judges would never submit themselves to a contested election. The control of the affairs of the University would, with elections at short periods, eventually fall entirely into the hands of professors. Elected Fellows, on the other hand, would have perhaps only a four-years' tenure of office. There was a danger of losing the Judges with a system of contested election, and they were examples of the best types of men. Another objection was that the University would be perpetually turned upside down by such elections. It would interfere with the business of the University for possibly a month, and the

Syd. Daily Telegraph 31/3/11

## UNIVERSITY GOVERNMENT.

Sir Normand MacLaurin's advocacy of a life tenure for the Senate of the University is open to objection on several grounds, but principally because electing senators for life involves the risk of allowing the Senate to get out of touch with educational progress and the community. Higher as well as lower education is a thing of movement. Learning itself is dynamic, since every year, at least, develops new phases and applications of science, opens fresh fields of study, and demands new activities from administrators of education. A life-seated Senate may progressively adapt itself to this movement, but there can be no certainty of that. As to the Chancellor's argument that judges on the Senate should not have to submit themselves for re-election, why should they not? If they had to contest elections as judges, it would be very different, for then we should experience a pernicious association between politics and the judiciary. But their judicial positions are quite unaffected in this case. If because they are judges it is undignified for these gentlemen to go up for re-election, it would be interesting to know where dignity ends, plenty of

consequent canvassing, etc., would not suit a place like a university. It would interfere with studies.

The Chairman: In South Australia our Chancellor contests his election. No complaints have been heard.

The Chancellor said that he did not think anything was to be gained by it. If a man was always re-elected what was the use for it? If there was a bona-fide election he did not think the Judges here would submit to it.

**GOVERNMENT REPRESENTATIVE.**

A member: Are you in favour of a Government representative on the senate?

Sir Normand said he was strongly opposed to it. When the late Sir Patrick Jennings was Prime Minister he held it would not be wise for him to appear at the senate, feeling that what he said might possibly have undue influence. Other Ministers of the Crown had also refrained from coming except in a formal way to retain their seats. There is no earthly reason why the Government should interfere. If the Act was wrong, amend it. It seemed to him that the Act was a good one, and there had never been a suspicion at any time that the senate did not act in accordance with the Act.

**HONOUR, NOT CHARITY.**

The chairman said that one of the chief aims of the commission was to inquire into the best means of extending the advantages of the university to the greatest number.

Sir Normand said that there were certain bursaries placed at the disposal of the senate, carrying from £25 to £50 annually, providing exemption from fees. In addition, the senate, on its own motion, allowed a certain number of exemptions. The Chancellor had a right to administer to give exemption from fees, one condition being that a person must be poor or unable to pay for the requirements of the University. He thought personally that that was a mistake, although it was kept perfectly quiet, and no one knew who was exempt. He thought it would be better if the senate established a certain number of bursaries for public competition in the faculty of arts and the faculty of science. By this the smartest man could be found, and instead of it being something like a charity would be an honour.

A member: Do you think that in the interests of the University professors should be elected for life?

Sir Normand said he thought so. If they were limited to a number of years they would not get the best men. They would have to be content with secondary men.

Continuing, the Chancellor in answer to a question as to what system, if any, was adopted in regard to a retiring age said that after a professor had served his 20 years the University gave him the option of retiring on a pension of £400 per year. The experience was that after a man had worked at the University for 20 years he had, generally speaking, had enough.

Sir Normand held that the Government should see that the University was provided with funds sufficient for the required purposes. The senate should be perfectly free from the domination of any man. He thought the secondary schools should provide education that would fit students for admission to the University. The University would be glad to receive them, and had never turned away man or woman from the faculty of arts or the faculty of science because he or she had no money.

Reference was made to the fact that only 10 per cent. of the students of high and secondary schools passed on to the University. Sir Normand said that the Sydney Grammar School, Church of England Grammar School, Riverview College, and others sent a good number. "We should be glad to have everyone come."

A member: If a poor student showing talent out of the ordinary were to apply for the benefits of the University, is there any means for his doing anything at the University which would provide him with money during his course?

Sir Normand replied that practically all students of the University were poor. Some were so poor that they could not pay their fees.

Replying to a question as to what was being done to make the University more popular by a system of extension lectures throughout the country, the Chancellor said that wherever the public showed the slightest desire the University was prepared to supply the need.

**NOT SUFFICIENT MONEY.**

Mr. H. E. Barff (registrar and librarian) in the course of an examination dealing principally with matters of internal management said that there were many requirements which could be met if the University had sufficient money. He did not think New South Wales spent sufficient money upon the University.

The chairman asked if Mr. Barff was in favour of extending scholarships to a very great extent providing that the standard of efficiency is not lowered. Mr. Barff replied that he was; scholarships should be extended to as many people as were fit to enter the University.

Mr. Ernest R. Holme (Assistant Professor of Modern Literature) was also examined.

Professor Anderson Stuart (Professor of Physiology and Dean of the Faculty of Medicine) said he approved of the life election of the senate, otherwise they might have the spectacle of a Chief Justice being defeated by a sucking barrister.

**FREE EDUCATION.**

Professor David (in reply to a question by the chairman if he saw any objection to the abolition of fees, provided that the standard of entrance was not lowered, and the State kept up the University's efficiency) said that education at two Californian universities was absolutely free. At Stanford there was very great competition amongst intending students to enter, and vacancies could be filled twice over. The university teaching was very high indeed, and they had a fine staff of teachers. Provided there was a good standard of entrance kept up he could see no objection whatever to making it free. It seemed to him that it was their inborn right that everyone in the country, if they were worthy of the highest education, should get it free—provided that the efficiency of the University was kept up as regarded the teaching staff, accommodation, lecture halls, and laboratories, and that the standard of entrance is not lowered. If it was lowered it meant that a lot of good money in the country was really being wasted in trying to train pupils who were not worthy of the education.

Do you see any objection to the Government having a representative on the senate?—It seems to me very reasonable and proper.

He was asked whether he saw any objection to the senate being composed of, say, 25 members, five to be elected by the professorial staff, eight by the graduates, five by both Houses of Parliament (not necessarily members of Parliament), the Lord Mayor, chairman of the Chamber of Commerce, the chairman of Chamber of Manufactures, the chairman of the industrial board at the Trades Hall, three to be elected by the whole State at the time of the Federal Senate election, and the remainder to be elected by the body so constituted.

In reply, Professor David said that in the main he thought the scheme good. He would like to see the University side equally represented with the non-academic. It would be a serious departure, however, from previous practice.

In his evidence before the Adelaide Royal Commission on Education, the Chancellor of the Sydney University, Sir Normand MacLaurin made a strong defence of the system of university governance as it obtains locally. Pointed and searching questions were put to him on half a dozen phases of this important subject, and the venerable chancellor never failed to emphasise his opinion, that what is is best. No one can be surprised at Sir Normand's view. He has reiterated it on many previous occasions. A senate elected on the basis of a life tenure is his beau ideal of what a healthy senate should be. It is indeed almost may it be said that the present senate is one of the chancellor's own creation. A strong point is made as to the position of the Judges. It is pointed out that members of the Bench could not be expected to submit themselves to the indignities of a contested election, and the chancellor fears that, were such a contest a condition precedent to their occupying seats at the senatorial board, they would be conspicuously absent, and this would be a bad thing for the University. No doubt these learned legal luminaries are an acquisition. They are necessarily men of attainment and character. Their absence would thus be regrettable. Up to this point all that the chancellor has said can be wholeheartedly endorsed. But, let the investigation be carried a little further. A persusal of the list of attendances of the judicial members of the senate as disclosed by successive issues of the University Calendar shows that in some instances, at least, their membership is little more than a name. Evidently their judicial duties occupy too much of their time to admit of their effectually attending to their senatorial duties. Even the most learned Judge cannot in absentia be of much value when grave matters of public import are discussed by this body.

As to Sir Normand MacLaurin's idea, that the bursary system is preferable to the existing method of compelling poor students to plead their poverty in order to escape the payment of fees, there is a good deal to be said in its favour. After all the primary requisite in a State-aided student should be ability, not poverty. If a poor student has the capacity to force his way ahead his poverty should be no bar, but if a student is merely poor this is no particular qualification for his occupying the time of a highly-trained and expensive professorial and lecturing staff, which could be employed in moulding more plastic minds. The question is, has the University done all that its founders had expected of it? Over thirty years ago, addressing the University union, Dr. Badham said: "As a body you will not influence in any perceptible degree, the legislation of the country, you will not seek to attract the public eye as the result of your deliberations; but in after years, when men shall remark the great change that has come over our Legislative Assembly, and shall ask, 'Why is there no longer the same slipshod English, the same rapid iteration of ill-stated and confused argument? . . . Why are there such broader views, and so much more exalted a sense of the high duties of legislation?' it will be said, 'The men who produced these changes were old students of ours, who learnt these principles with us.'" Has this optimistic prediction come true? If not, may we not unreasonably hold the senate elected on pre-Benthamite principles in part at least responsible.