of opinion or of loyalty in the service of the Institute. I count that we shall in the end stand, whatever the decision in this matter, on one platform and for one cause; that is, the upbuilding of the Institute of Technology as an intellectual and spiritual power in the Commonwealth, and in the Nation. In this cause I am glad to labor just as heartily, whether our future development lies along one of these paths or another.

In behalf of the alliance, there is a financial statement by George Wigglesworth, Treasurer of the Corporation. He states that there are three courses open to the Institute:

First, To remain where it is, limiting the number of its students to its present accommodations, and striving to make the best of what it now has.

Second, It may remain in its present site, but make provisions adequate for its needs for some years to come.

Third, It may move to a wholly new site. He says that by accepting the terms of co-operation with Harvard, the Institute gets a much larger tract of land and an entirely new set of buildings, accommodating a larger number of students, and all this with less strain to the Institute's resources than by expanding where we are, and with the McKay Fund to fall back on, whereas to move to any other site would cost as much, if not more, for the land and buildings, and would leave us without any McKay Fund to look to in the future.

The pamphlets also contain a statement presenting the advantages of the proposed agreement prepared at the request of the Executive Committee of the Alumni Association, by John R. Freeman, Eben S. Draper, and A. Lawrence Lowell. There is an appended plan of the territory surrounding the proposed site.

Arguments in opposition to the proposed plan, stating the disadvantages of the proposed agreement, are given in an article by Francis H. Williams, James P. Manroe and Thomas L. Livermore. A very careful analysis of the proposed agreement is made, each section being discussed thoroughly. It states that the words "co-operation and alliance," as used in the title, are not well chosen; as an illustration of the proposed plan shows that it does not put Technology on an equal footing with Harvard. One of the objections to the plan is that it is a well recognized fact that schools of technology are hindered in their development by attaching them to universities. The wonderful success that the Institute has attained during its life of forty years, in spite of the general lack of appreciation of the kind of education it embodied when the school was just established, is a cogent reason in favor of independence. The union of the two schools would not promote economy to any degree.

The mangling of the two student bodies would seriously alter, if it did not destroy, the Technology spirit of earnestness, seriousness of purpose, and devotion to work which is distinctive and universally recognized. The proposed agreement fails to distinguish between a school of industrial science and the wider purpose embodied in the Institute of Technology. The formation of the proposed school to industrial science narrows its scope and its power of development.

Comments on Mr. Wigglesworth's figures are also made, the reasons for differing from his conclusions being based upon the figures given by him either in his address or in his report as Treasurer of the Institute for last year.

Professor Chandler has received an open letter from Mr. C. H. Blackall, Secretary for the Rotch Traveling Scholarship, announcing that hereafter a graduate of the Architectural Department of the Institute, wishing to compete, would be excused from the preliminary examinations on presentation of his degree.