

cannot see that there is any reason why the two societies should be in the slightest degree antagonistic. On the contrary, they might be mutually helpful, both having ultimately the same end in view—to teach the boys to examine, think, and act for themselves. Of course it ought to be remembered what a great innovation a society like that of Wellington College is on the traditional methods of instruction belonging to a school. The work is entirely voluntary, not clearly defined, as in the regular task-work of the school; and the only rewards held out, rewards which it is difficult to get the traditional school-boy to understand and appreciate, are, besides the direct acquisition of knowledge and the pleasure attending it, development of the power of observation, keenness of insight, and general intellectual vigour. A debating society, with all its undoubted advantages, is apt to become a nursery of boyish vanity; the reward of successful speaking is immediate and very sweet to a tyro, and can be obtained without much labour. The work of a Natural History Society involves much plodding patience, with very little glory to follow; the rewards are intangible, invisible, especially to the boys themselves, and it will take the training of a few generations to teach boyish human nature to love knowledge for its own sake. One of the most valuable means to accomplish this purpose in a school is a society like that of Wellington College, and therefore we would counsel those who are anxious for its prosperity not to be discouraged, but to work on so long as they can get any boys to work with them, using all possible means to insure success. We hope the merely local obstacles will be overcome, and that the next report will have a more lightsome beginning; also that it will contain many papers by the boys themselves, nearly the whole of the papers in the present report being by Mr. Penny and Mr. Lambert, and not one by a boy, though we are glad to see that some papers by boys were read at the meetings. The Rev. C. W. Penny, president of the Society, deserves the greatest credit for the interest he displays in the Society, and the amount of work he does to help on the objects for which it is established. A large number of the papers, full of instruction and interest even to boys, are by him; his predecessor in the presidency, Mr. Lambert, has also contributed much to make the meetings of the Society attractive and instructive. Appended to the report are pretty full botanical, zoological, and entomological lists.

Familiar History of British Fishes. By Frank Buckland, Inspector of Salmon Fisheries of England and Wales, Corresponding Member of the "Deutscher Fischerei Verein," &c. &c. (London Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.)

THIS is a new edition of the above work, Mr. Buckland having found it necessary, he says, almost to re-write the book. It may be described as a free-and-easy gossip about fishes, the book being largely made up of extracts from all quarters, *Land and Water* especially being very fruitful in material. As might be expected, Chapter xv., treating of *Salmonidae*, and occupying upwards of 100 pages, a fourth part of the volume, is the most original and valuable. The chapter will be found useful to all who take an interest in the rearing and preservation of salmon. The numerous illustrations are very fairly executed, and the general reader will find the book entertaining and informing.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

[The Editor does not hold himself responsible for opinions expressed by his correspondents. No notice is taken of anonymous communications.]

Endowment of Research

Direct and Indirect Endowment

I SHOULD like to make one or two remarks on Prof. Flower's letter in your last number.

He modestly suggests that his views respecting the endowment of research unencumbered with teaching, or as he felicitously calls it, the *direct endowment of research*, may be considered by members of the Association for the Organisation of Academical Study as "heretical." I venture to think that he is orthodox on the main theoretical position that, *in the long run*, research must be endowed directly as well as indirectly (by the subsidy of teaching professors) and with an *equally liberal hand*. He is at issue with us only, if I take him rightly, as to the *time* when it will be desirable or possible to make a claim for such direct endowment. We contend that *now is the only time* for making such a claim, and for a reason which I will give presently. Mr. Flower, on the contrary, says that while *indirect* endowment of research, by raising the salaries of teachers, may be carried out at once with less opposition from old prejudices, "the far more difficult question will follow more appropriately and [the endowment] be carried out more efficiently when the body of educated scientific men in the country is larger than it is now, and the public generally, especially those in high places, have more appreciation of the claims of Science for its own sake," *i.e.* in the more or less indefinite future.

In answer to this I would say:—

(1) The "public in high places," by which I suppose is meant Mr. Lowe, who make a conscience of Political Economy, appear to appreciate the fact that the support of an useful and necessary but essentially unremunerative employment like research, out of public money is economically a sound investment; whilst the subsidy of a remunerative employment like teaching, out of public funds, though perhaps unavoidable, is nevertheless, economically speaking, an unsound one. We have no fear of Mr. Lowe's opposition.

(2) If by "the opposition of old prejudices" is intended the attitude of the Conservative party towards the claims of knowledge, I would call Mr. Flower's attention to the fact that some of the warmest supporters of "direct" endowment are political Conservatives. It is, indeed, one of the soundest elements in the Conservative consciousness, the distrust of immature generalisations resting upon insufficient inquiry; and the suspicion that, if we insist too much upon exposition, and throw the weight of our endowments into that, and if we make it every man's duty to be continually expounding, instead of insisting upon research and throwing the weight of our endowments into study, the heads of the rising generation run the risk of being inflated with immature and windy generalisations. Depend upon it, the Conservatives are prepared for keeping the endowments of our colleges for the support of that lifelong and uninterrupted study for which the founders originally intended them.

(3) Thirdly, Mr. Flower desires to wait till the demand for these supports of knowledge is much increased, and the body of scientific men wanting them is larger than it is now. But has he ever asked himself whether it is likely, that when this millennium of expectancy arrives, there will still be any university or college endowments undistributed, out of which this increased demand is to be satisfied? If Reformers of our old Institutions content themselves with sketching merely a teaching organisation on the German model, and with asking to have that amply endowed, and take no thought for the morrow when this larger body of trained investigators shall have come miraculously into existence—and I think this would be a real miracle, the emergence of a set of phenomena for which the conditions do not previously exist—if, I say, they are afraid of asking *now* to have a large fund gradually put in reserve, to be gradually drawn upon as the occasion arises, for the support of study and of those engaged in it—does Mr. Flower imagine that the remainder of the College endowments which are not taken up by the teaching establishment upon the German model, will be allowed to lie dead? That no claim will be put in for them by the county towns for the erection of more teaching establish-