

building is not fireproof, the wooden cases are unsuitable and dust-collecting. Reorganization of an important collection with a view to development in an environment which presents potential danger to its very existence, ought not to be considered.

I understand from Mr. E. L. Judah that a provisional estimate for rendering the Peter Redpath building completely fireproof, has been obtained; it is \$200,000. Even if such a sum could be obtained, it would surely be better spent on a new building. Furthermore, the alterations would involve the destruction of the existing internal architectural features. This would be a pity. The Museum, an elaborately decorated late "Neo-Classical" structure, has its faults; nevertheless it stands out as the most scholarly, the most distinguished, the most beautiful building in the University, in a finely chosen position which gives an air of Athenian dignity to the Campus, hinting, most fittingly, at the ultimate dependence of the University spirit upon the Greek tradition. It is an historic document, marking a phase in cultural evolution as expressed in architecture, as well as a thing of beauty. Its isolation should be preserved (it could not be added to without ruining it), and its original character, whether inside or out should be carefully cherished.

I recommend therefore that the use of the Peter Radpath building as a Natural History Museum be given up. The future use of the building is discussed later (para. 42).

16. My view, that the best course to take would be to provide accommodation in the new Museum Building for the Zoological and Palaeontological collections raises the same problems of policy as did the collections concerned with Man. Are we to be content in the field of Natural History to perpetuate the ill-balanced character of the collections, due to chance and individual idiosyncrasy? If not, what is to be the aim? It is, I venture to think, obvious.