

I am informed, not up to date.

There are many duplicates in the Mineralogical collections, though Professor Graham assures me that there are other specimens in reserve which ought to be on view.

In the Zoological Collections there is much duplication and much material that should be eliminated. Elements of the Collection, such as those on the staircase, were, I understand, gifts to the University which it was "nobody's business to refuse". The Labelling is not adequate; there is no real guidance for visitor or student. Much of the Material is in no scientific order. The survey of this collection is a depressing experience. It is evident that no one has for years taken any interest in it, and it has never, as a whole, been subjected to scientific scrutiny with a view to the illustration of the principles or significance of Zoology, and I doubt whether at present it serves any useful purpose in the University.

Though the Museum has been in existence for fifty years, no Department in it issues any guide, catalogue, pamphlet or other aid to ^{members of the University or general} visitors.

Since the Peter Redpath Museum contains all its original case-fittings practically unaltered, and since its collections for the most part represent Museum technique as it was in the nineteenth century, it forms a remarkably complete and unusual example of conservatism and inertia in this educational field. It would be improper and unfair to blame individuals; the Museum is the victim of a vicious circle. No one is paid to manage, and practically no one is paid to work in the Museum, and it is therefore no one's business to see that its requirements in staff, material and money are met. It is starved, cannot develop, and so has passed to a large extent out of the active life of the University.

The revolution wrought by Professor Clarke in a small