

science, and many of the public men and the majority of the Government officers have had the advantage of a similar course of training. Exactly the same experiences have been passed through by our universities as those in Australia are now undergoing. Ours have grown powerful and rich by meeting the people. By that I mean, having the schools quite free all the way up, and by substituting the certificates of the lower schools right along for the matriculation examinations. The universities take the men that the secondary establishments certify are sufficiently advanced and thoroughly fit to continue their studies in them. The ordinary examination is merely a discouraging institution, because many people have not the wherewithal to be coached and to prepare for it. While on the question of education South Australians may like to know that the Stanford University has established a chair—the only one in the world—which treats with Australian political history and the development of the relations of Europe to Asia. Professor Treat, who spent a considerable period in Australia some time ago, devotes his whole time to the subject.

—Timely Warning.—

"One thing which I have particularly noticed during my brief sojourn in Australia has been the lack of attention directed toward the preservation of the native animals and valuable forests. The need for that has not been impressed upon the people so forcefully as it ought. My remarks apply especially to the north. Some definite and determined policy should be pursued with the object to preserve the woods and animals. In the United States we have the Audobon Society, which has for its aim the protection of the native animals. It is performing an immense amount of exceedingly useful work, which is being appreciated in an increasing degree every day. Unless something should be done in Australia soon it will be too late.

—Cutting it Short.—

"I have been asked while in Adelaide to give an address on politics, but I have declined, as I do not wish to express any opinion upon the subject. I may mention, however, that in the United States the State Legislatures or Parliaments meet for about 10 weeks once in two years. The members are paid by the day for the session. Should their deliberations extend over the allotted period they do not receive any remuneration. Consequently they waste little time in the dispatch of business. From what I have seen of your members of Parliament they are somewhat akin to ours, except that they take longer to get through their work. Eventually I think the people of Australia will come to regard the weary and continuous sessions of the State Parliaments as almost intolerable. The Legislatures ought to be able to transact all their legitimate business in two months. We take men from their business to do our business; and that plan could be put into practice here. After the session the members of the majority of our State Parliaments are at liberty to do as they please. To the advantage of the States they do not make a living by politics, and when they are in session there is less idle talking among them, and they meddle less with matters which are outside their province. In case of emergency they may be called together at any time for special sessions of six weeks. The Federal Congress sits for about six months each year, but, of course, its work is of a much more extensive nature than that performed by the State Houses. Unfortunately in Australia the men of undoubted financial and economic ability cannot afford to devote to the State legislatures the time which they require. No; I do not think there is any tendency to rush business through in our State legislatures. Members attend the sessions with their minds made up on the subjects to be dealt with, and they vote. When a member exhibits an inclination to be more than necessarily verbose somebody moves the previous question, which closes the debate, and the proposition is generally carried.

—Mines and Labour.—

"Australia is tremendously wealthy in mines and sheep. Indeed, it is the sheep-producing country of the world. It will always produce raw material rather than manufactured goods, for the reason that it lacks water power. On the whole, I feel keenly in sympathy with the desire to keep out inferior races—the Chinese, Japanese, and Hindus—but I do not see any objection to bringing in Fijians. They do not move southward past the frost line, but remain in the tropics. White labour is highly paid here. But no other labour pays so well if strikes do not occur.

—A Word for the Press.—

"What I have seen of the Australian press has impressed me most favourably. The newspapers are more carefully edited and better than they are in any other cities of similar size that I have visited. The style of journalism is dignified and excellent in every way. I am delighted that there is an almost entire absence of what in America we term 'yellow journals.'

AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES.

THEIR METHODS AND IDEALS.

In expectation of an intellectual treat citizens who desired to hear Professor Jordan deliver his lecture on "The methods and ideals of American universities" filled the Prince of Wales Building, University of Adelaide, on Thursday evening. They were not disappointed, for at the end of two hours the large audience responded with every indication of satisfaction and whole-hearted sincerity to the invitation of His Excellency to award their entertainer with a vote of thanks. There was not a dull moment from the introduction by the Chancellor of the University (Sir Samuel War). The Professor dealt with the subject in concise, clear terms, which threw the illumination of lucidity on the system of training in vogue in the great Western world, and he lightened up the academic side with touches of dry, cynical humour for which the American is noted. Among the hearers, in addition to the distinguished gentlemen already mentioned, were the Vice-Chancellor (Dr. Barlow), members of the University Council, members of the professorial staff, the Premier (Hon. T. Price), and the Acting Director of Education (Mr. M. M. Maughan).

—Democratic Institutions.—

Professor Jordan's first point was that the keynote of the American university system was that of adaptation to the needs of a people who governed themselves. It was essentially a creation of democracy, with all the virtues a democracy had at its best, with all the mistakes and limitations ignorant people could impose on themselves. Yet in the long run wisdom always prevailed. The best safeguard against the mistakes of democracy was to let those that were responsible suffer for their own mistakes. When the people found what hurt them the remedy was in their own hands. They did not attempt to raise a few gifted men up to a high pre-arranged standard, but they aimed to take the talent existing in the community and to make the most of it along the various lines in which it might be developed. He passed on to describe the status of the schools and colleges, and pointed out that of the 507 institutions granting degrees about 250 reached the definition of college laid down by the laws of New York and by the Carnegie foundation. To meet that definition the school must require four years of secondary study for admission, four years more for graduation. It must have at least six professors engaged wholly in collegiate work, and an income from endowments of £2,000. Of the 250 there were 15 in the first rank, 60 in the second (most of which were practically equal with most of the first lot), and 150 third class, including State denominational and private colleges.

—Wealth.—

The total wealth of these institutions was now about £100,000,000, about three-fifths of this being invested endowment funds, the other two-fifths in lands and buildings. The aggregate income was about £6,500,000. Of that about 40 per cent. came from tuition fees, 25 per cent. from endowments derived from private gifts, 20 per cent. from the State, 10 per cent. from Federal aid, and the rest (about 5 per cent.) from minor sources. Generally speaking, he said, the universities were governed by a body of trustees to control the financial affairs. In some States they were elected by the people outright, in others by the Governor, and again the alumni had a voice in the selection. They had little to do with academic affairs. In choosing the professors the President took the initiative, but his recommendations were subject to the veto of the faculty. Therefore they found the President and the faculty as a rule working together. At the Leland Stanford University, of which Professor Jordan is President, there are 1,700 students with 125 regular professors, besides demonstrators and lecturers.

—Salaries and Fees.—

The President was the executive officer and representative of the institution. He might be a clergyman, a business man, or a scholar. He had known one President who was a clergyman, who wore long coats, and was always strong on funerals. (Laughter.) As a rule the successful

President came from the scholars. In America the salaries of professors ranged from £1,200 to £400; those of university Presidents from £2,400 downward; those of instructors and intermediate professors from £160 to £600. The highest salaries were paid in the schools of private foundation, and to those the Carnegie retiring fund of a little more than half-pay was granted at the age of 65. The salaries

throughout America were too low, when they considered the high pay granted to experts in all industrial matters. The fees for students in the State universities ranged from nothing up to £6 per year, and in the private institutions from nothing up to £50; the usual figure was £30.

—Developing Character.—

Dr. Jordan showed by reference to the strict rules laid down for the government of the students, not only by the officers of the institution, but by the scholars themselves in their athletics, their fraternities, and other bodies, how everything was made to tend toward development of individual character in the young men. When a man left the universities he was placed in a position at the bottom of the ladder, because they believed that as he got momentum he would rise to the top. In a word, they tried to make him effective. Speaking of the American universities, Mr. Alfred Moseley was reported as saying:—"What strikes me most is that your workshops are filled with college-bred men. At home a Varsity man is graduated into frock coat and gloves. You educate into overalls. The keynote of American education is training for efficiency." "It is the function of the university," says Emerson, "to bring every ray of varied genius to its hospitable halls by their concentrated effort to set the heart of the youth in flame."

—The Formative Period.—

The period of youth was in men the time of the formation of habits, the crystallization of character. In that period the student, if ever, must learn the value of time. It was good for him to have all the work he could do, and to be forced to do each part of it when that part was due. Hence the American university maintained high standards, and, still better, enforced them from day to day. And the student went at his task willingly, because his course of study, being fitted to his needs, appealed to him as related to his future work, and to the success he hoped to achieve. A student who was hard at work along lines in which he was personally interested was saved at once from idleness, from vice, and from conceit.

The American university maintained an open door to all who could use its advantages. Nowhere else in the world, not even in Scotland, was the path from the farmhouse to the college so well trodden. To that end the universities and the secondary schools stood in close relation—a relation which grows closer each year, and the low fees made it possible for the youth of promise to pay his own way if he cared to work hard enough. On the other hand, it was part of the American plan to treat rich and poor alike, and the general feeling was that free scholarships and special bursaries were undesirable, or, at best, a choice of evils.

—Individual Efficiency.—

The ideal of the English university system had been that of personal culture, the development of the gentleman. That of the German universities had been that of erudition, that of France and Italy largely the preparation for ready-made careers. The ideal of America was individual efficiency. If that be based on erudition and adorned by culture so much the better, but for culture which was ineffective in the conduct of life—their people had little respect. Their experience was that the best students came from the farms and the mining districts, with those from the well-educated man's family next, and that the poorest scholar was from the family of the rich, whose sons were taught to think that it was not necessary for them to earn their own living. Furthermore, they believed in the students paying their own way, and many of them had to work during their terms at the universities in order to keep themselves. Some waited at table, others were employed in various positions in the building, such as washing the bottles at the laboratories, while money was earned by writing for the newspapers and magazines, in teaching in the neighbourhood, in acting as secretaries, in farm and garden work, and in many other ways. They had done away with all scholarships except the travelling one. One young man paid all his expenses by trapping wild dogs and