TO THE EDITOR OF THE ARGUS.

Sir,—Referring to your section last week, I would like to state that the School Board of Victoria has a long tradition of integrity, and that its actions are always in the best interests of the students and the broader community. If you are not satisfied with the decisions of the Board, please direct your concerns to them directly.

Yours, &c.,

F. P. BRETT.
South Yarra, July 26.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ARGUS.

I am writing to express my disappointment with the recent actions of the School Board. I believe that the interests of the students are not being adequately represented by the Board. I would like to see more transparency and accountability in the decision-making processes of the Board.

Yours, &c.,

L. A. ADAMSON.
Wesley College, July 26.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ARGUS.

I would like to express my support for the School Board's recent decision. I believe that the Board is acting in the best interests of the students and the broader community. If you have concerns, please direct them to the Board directly.

Yours, &c.,

SPAGONI.

JULY 25, 1916.

A CANCELLED LEGACY.

£10,000 INVOLVED.

A UNIVERSITY MATTER.

At the meeting of the council of the University of Melbourne yesterday, a resolution was read, in which it was stated that a legacy of £10,000 has been cancelled. The legacy was intended to be used for the improvement of the University's facilities. However, due to unforeseen circumstances, the legacy is no longer available.

At the meeting of the council of the University of Melbourne yesterday, it was announced that a resolution to cancel a legacy of £10,000 has been passed. The legacy was intended for the improvement of the University's facilities. However, due to unforeseen circumstances, the legacy is no longer available. The resolution was supported by the majority of the council members.

JULY 25, 1916.
Mr. Brett, in reply, accused the registrar of making a misstatement, and informed him that he could furnish no satisfactory answer to the questions to which he had been submitted. He then submitted the letter to the University Council, which was referred to the sub-committee, and the last two questions in a different style, for consideration.

The whole correspondence was submitted on April 14, and the council resolved that it should be referred to the sub-committee for consideration.

The letter, which came before the council for the first time yesterday, was as follows:

"South Yarra, July 6, 1895.

Dr. Leeper:-Referring to previous correspondence, on what I have received from the University, I was asked to make a statement of the whole correspondence, and I am now prepared to do so. The entire correspondence was submitted on April 14, and the council resolved that it should be referred to the sub-committee for consideration. The letter, which came before the council for the first time yesterday, was as follows:

P. B. Brett,

Professor Sir Harry Allen said that it was a question whether it could not be possible to make the result of one examination in the way of avoiding the hardship which occurred occasionally, that candidates might be regarded as a whole. He would like to see an examination appointed, under whose supervision the whole of the subject could be examined, and that the result of one might be regarded as a whole. By that means a mark could be given if the candidate were eligible for the loss of one small point. Personally, he did not believe that Mr. Brett would do what he threatened, or that the University would allow the candidate to pass away when the opportunity for the examination passed.

Dr. Leeper said that the subject had been dealt with by correspondence, and that the University could not be expected to do it. The letter showed that Mr. Brett was willing to take the action which he threatened, and the candidate would not be eligible for the loss of one small point. Mr. Brett, and point out to him the difficulties of the case.

Mr. J. A. Adamson.—Mr. Brett's son was a member of a boat's crew which had been detained in the cold for four days in 1915. Mr. Brett wrote to the press, imputing the university's decision.

Dr. Leeper said that Bickerton had been dealt with by correspondence, and that the University could not be expected to do it. The letter showed that Mr. Brett was willing to take the action which he threatened, and the candidate would not be eligible for the loss of one small point. Mr. Brett, and point out to him the difficulties of the case.

The Registrar.—He was furnished with a copy of the report, showing the number of marks obtained by his son, and the standard for 80 marks. He stated that he was of opinion that the University had "docked" the number of marks.

Adamson.—Does Mr. Brett understand that the Register is being impeached?

Mr. Adamson.—Oh! that settles it, Mr. Morrison. Are we not making a mistake in the case of Mr. Brett? By discussing the question of the pass standard, it is clear that the boy had been the same if the boy had been examined on one mark instead of six. (Hear, hear.)

Dr. MacFarland.—I should think so. I read of Mr. Huggins. He has influenced one's business. On the motion of Mr. MacFarland, the question was put to the committee, and it was thereupon unanimously agreed to proceed with the business.
THE BOTANIC GARDEN.

To the Editor.

Sir—We regret to see that in the dis- 
connected extracts from your columns refer-
to the directorship of the Botanic Gar-
den, which appear to make the attack upon Professor Darwin, dealing to the extent of questioning his professional qualifications, I am not aware of the Botanical Department over which he is placed by the University, and seems to excuse, his colleagues on the grounds of his professional determination to the appointment of the director, does not appear to have been any other cause.

The Minister.

13 S. 16
GOVERNMENT HOUSE AND UNIVERSITY.

Removals Recommended.

The first progress report of the North Terrace Reserves and Railway Centre Royal Commission was laid before Parliament on Thursday. The question was then put to which the commission had to reply:

(a) the acquisition of the reserves on North Terrace;
(b) the railway traffic arrangements in the metropolitan area; and
(c) the need of expropriation for purposes not connected with the disposal and management of railway centres of the State.

A request from the Government that early action be taken in the matter led to the following report:

The adequacy of the area to be allotted on North Terrace for University purposes made for change, and it was decided that the area should be closer to the centre of the city. The limits of the new area were drawn to include approximately 20 acres, and the area could be increased by that means.