

are very visible in the British Museum specimen, are quite non-apparent in the Derby Museum specimen. These cross-bands are, in all probability, remnants of the immature plumage, the British Museum specimen being not quite adult. I was, therefore, wrong in using this character ("Cat. Bds.," xv. p. 140) to separate *Dendrexetastes temminckii* from *D. devillii*, which, however, are quite different species, easily distinguishable by other characters. But *D. capitoides* = *D. temminckii* in my decided opinion, as has been stated in the "Catalogue."

P. L. SCLATER.

"The Zoological Record."

IN reference to the note in NATURE of November 21, about the *Zoological Record* for 1894, I must ask to be allowed to say that it is stated in the preface that Prof. Hickson could not undertake a record of Cœlenterata. Consequently there has been no failure of contract on his part. Prof. Hickson has been a valued contributor to the *Record* for several years, and his work was always ready at the time agreed on.

Cambridge, November 23.

D. SHARP,
Editor of the *Zoological Record*.

THE LONDON UNIVERSITY.

FORTUNE so far has not been too kind towards the efforts made for adding teaching functions to the existing University of London. As already chronicled in NATURE, the answer of the late Government to the request of the deputation to Lord Rosebery from institutions mentioned in the Report of Lord Cowper's Commission was the introduction of Lord Playfair's "University of London Act, 1895," enacting the appointment of a Statutory Commission to give effect to the recommendations of the Royal Commission. Before it had been read a second time, the Government went out of office and the Bill was dropped. From reports which have lately appeared in the press, it would seem that on June 13 a deputation from the members of Convocation hostile to the scheme waited on the Duke of Devonshire and Lord Salisbury, then in Opposition, and were led to believe that these statesmen were not unwilling to support an amending clause to Lord Playfair's Bill, which would entail the scheme, when arranged by the Statutory Commission, being submitted to Convocation for approval in the manner prescribed for a senatorial election, *i.e.* by voting-papers. And by July 1, Sir John Lubbock, in seeking re-election for the University, had pledged himself to oppose the Statutory Commission Bill unless such a clause were inserted, and comes into line with those against whom he voted in the Senate a year previously. Following this, came the Duke of Devonshire's reference on August 15 to the "strong opposition taken by a large and not unimportant section of Convocation" to the scheme of Lord Cowper's Commission, coupled with the announcement that legislation on the subject would not be undertaken in the short session then commencing.

Judged from such incidents, the outlook could not be regarded as reassuring, and with the return of Ministers to town, steps have been taken to bring to the notice of the Government the urgent necessity of dealing with the burning question of a Teaching University for London. On November 21 the delegates represented on the deputation to Lord Rosebery, met at the University of London, and unanimously passed the following resolution:—

"That the Government be requested to introduce, at an early date, a Bill, similar to Lord Playfair's London University Commission Bill, 1895, appointing a Statutory Commission to carry out the recommendations of Lord Cowper's Commission, but with an added clause giving [in accordance with precedent Acts of similar tenor¹] to all Institutions or persons directly affected by any Statute

or Ordinance proposed by the Statutory Commission, a right of appeal to the Privy Council for the disallowance or alteration thereof, previous to such Ordinance being laid before Parliament for confirmation."

The Duke of Devonshire, on Thursday last, received a deputation in support of this resolution, the delegates present representing not only the institutions named in the Report of Lord Cowper's Commission, but also the members of that and of the earlier (Lord Selborne's) Commission on a Teaching University for London, as well as members of the recent Bryce Commission on Secondary Education. The deputation was introduced by Lord Kelvin, and its views were enforced by Prof. Rücker on behalf of the Senate of the University of London: Dr. Allchin for the Royal College of Physicians, Mr. Heath for the Royal College of Surgeons, Sir George Young (University College), Principal Wace (King's College), Dr. Frederick Taylor (Medical Schools), Principal Whitehouse (Nonconformist Theological Colleges), Sir Henry Roscoe (Association for promoting a Professorial University for London), Prof. Silvanus Thompson (Annual Committee of Convocation), and Mr. Anstie (Committee of Graduates).

In the presence of so emphatic an expression of the unanimity not only as to the need for but also the method of the reorganisation of the present University existing among the many institutions and persons interested in the settlement of this grave question, a sympathetic reply might surely have been expected from the official head of the Education Department. This, however, was not to be the case. The Duke, after conceding the representative character of the deputation, made no further reference to the manifold interests represented by the delegates; no reference to the needs of higher education in London; no reference to the widespread recognition of the necessity for a Teaching University without which, in view of the conflicting nature of the interests concerned, little approach towards a united appeal for a Commission with executive and judicial powers for their settlement could have been gained. On the contrary, his reply dwelt on the difficulty of securing the present status of the external students under the scheme of Lord Cowper's Commission, while admitting that the scheme and deputation were at one in insisting that this should be maintained unimpaired; on his desire to obtain, if possible, an expression of opinion on the subject from the external students, and on the differences in opinion which had arisen in Convocation about the scheme. In Convocation the Duke of Devonshire recognised three sections—those who accept the scheme with such modifications as may be made by the Statutory Commission, those who are irreconcilable, since they express the view that if a Teaching University for London is needed it should be founded apart from the existing University, and those who are of opinion that it would not be enough for the amendments they desired introduced in the scheme to go merely as recommendations to the Commissioners when appointed, whence their claim for a veto on the scheme when arranged, to which we may add a fourth, *viz.* the large proportion, nearly one half of the members, who, so far, have not been beguiled by the foregoing three to express any opinion at all. And recognising only these three, he dwelt on the expediency of everything possible being done to conciliate the opposition, if only on the ground that it is extremely desirable that the Bill, if it comes before Parliament, should come before it in a shape which should excite as little opposition as possible.

It is not too much to say that, in tendering this advice, the Duke showed that he had not had time to balance the relative importance of the views laid before him by the deputation from some members of Convocation in the summer, and those which had been so strongly urged by the delegates whom he was addressing. Had it been otherwise, the disparity between the interests involved is

¹ Oxford and Cambridge Act, 1877, sec. 46.
Scottish University Act, 1889, sec. 20 (a).