

years that lay before it, than the promotion and advancement of higher education. (Cheers.)

The Cancellor then presented the degrees and diplomas.

The acting-dean of the faculty of law (his Honor Mr. Justice Poole) presented for the degree of doctor of laws:—Donald Kerr, M.M., LL.B. For the degree of bachelor of laws:—Kenneth Hainsworth Kirkman, John Tennyson Reid, Edgar Loveday Stevens (Stow scholar).

The dean of the faculty of medicine (Sir Joseph Verco) presented for the degree of master of surgery:—Juda Leon Jora, M.D., B.S., D.Sc.; Malcolm Leslie Scott, M.B., B.S. For the degrees of bachelor of medicine and bachelor of surgery:—Norman Robertson Bennett, Harold Walter Broadbent, Estelle Ruth Gault, B.Sc., Robert McMahon Glynn, Stewart Roy Hecker, Harold Keith Pavy, William Arthur Pryor, Clarence Richards, B.Sc., Clarence Oscar Ferrero Rieger, Alfred Burgess Russell, Carl Hannaford Schafer, William Bonwill Shanasy, Donald Macdonald Steele, Carl Ivo Streich, Leonard Charles Edward Lindon (Everard scholar) (in absentia). For the degree of doctor of medicine:—Ad eundem gradum, Frank Mayes Wilcox, M.D. (University of Edinburgh).

The dean of the faculty of arts (Professor Darnley Naylor) presented for the ordinary degree of master of arts:—Frances V. Ingham Berry, B.A.; Florence Mary Sherman, B.A.; Edward Mead Bagot, B.A. (in absentia). For the ordinary degree of bachelor of arts:—Florence Elizabeth Reine Bachelor, Annie Stevens Berriman, Harold Elsen Flint, James Albert Ford, Dorothy Mary Harris, Mary Veta Maczhey, Gertrude Irene Mann, James Douglas Northey, George Gilbert Wallace, Samuel Walter Coombe (in absentia), Victor Leslie Lampe (in absentia). For the degree of master of arts:—Ad eundem gradum, Mary Alice Schroder, M.A. (University of Melbourne). For the degree of bachelor of arts:—Ad eundem gradum, William Taylor McCoy, B.A. (University of Sydney).

The dean of the faculty of science (Professor Rennie) presented for the honors degree of bachelor of science:—Nancy Eleanor Winnall. For the ordinary degree of bachelor of science:—Philip Alan Berry, Wesley Hughes James, Eileen Ruth Lathlean Reed, Arnold Luens Reimann, Alfred Charles Shelley (in forestry), Russell Aubrey Fowler (in absentia). For the degree of bachelor of science:—Ad eundem gradum, John Edgar Smith, B.Sc. (Victoria University).

The dean of the faculty of applied science (Professor Chapman) presented:—For the degree of master of engineering:—Edward James Cadell Rennie, B.E. For the degree of bachelor of engineering:—George Burnett Lionel Symonds (in absentia). In lieu of surrendered degree of bachelor of science:—Robert Harold Berriman, Hugh Norman Somerville (in absentia), Donald Yates (in absentia). For the diploma in applied science:—James Cyril Stobie, George Burnett Lionel Symonds (in absentia).

The chairman of the board of commercial studies (Mr. J. R. Fowler) presented for the diploma in commerce:—John Creswell, Norman Victor Meengeren, Bruce Mitchell, Frederick James Sambell.

Ad. 18.12.19.

BRITISH DEMOCRACY.

FINE ADDRESS BY PROFESSOR HENDERSON.

PROBLEMS OF THE PRESENT DAY.

Professor G. C. Henderson, who delivered the annual address at the University commemoration yesterday, created a profound impression by a careful and searching analysis of "Democracy, Theoretical and Practical," a subject peculiarly appropriate just now and full of interest to the whole community. The audience, which included a number of learned and thoughtful men, listened with great attention to the discourse. Professor Henderson said:—One of the avowed objects of the war was to make the world safe for democracy. Before we can do that we must be clear in our minds what we mean by democracy. The war is over, and military autocracy has been overthrown; but that form of government which we have agreed to call democracy is not safe. A new foe has arisen, and it is the more dangerous, because it masquerades in various parts of the world as democracy itself. Theorists have been telling us for two centuries that democracy is government for the people by the people. In my study of history I cannot find that any such government has ever existed. That democracy has meant government for the people I have

members the condition into which England sank under the administration of the Duke of Newcastle, and how she rose again after a few years from a third-rate to a first-rate Power under the inspiring and able leadership of William Pitt. The same Constitution, the same people, but a thorough change in management. It matters not what form of government you take, success will depend very largely upon efficient management.

Constitutional Control of Leaders.

In the British Parliament it is the party leaders, and not the political associations of the electorates, that decide party policy and rule the country in fact as well as in theory. That is all to the good. Had the issue gone the other way it is difficult to see how the prestige and authority of the greatest of our institutions could have been maintained and a clash of sovereignty averted. In the seventeenth century the greatest revolution in British history arose out of a contest between Parliamentary authority and the rule of a king who claimed to derive his power from a source outside the Constitution. In our time there are organisations, unknown to the Constitution, that have essayed to challenge and even to defy the authority of Parliament; and unless we make up our minds whether we are to be ruled constitutionally by Cabinet or unconstitutionally by demagogues very serious trouble may arise. There is an old adage handed down to us from the Middle Ages, that if two men ride on horseback one must ride in front. In Great Britain and the Dominions the reins of government have for over a century been in the hands of Cabinet Ministers. They hold them now with firmer hands than ever before. On them devolve the chief responsibility for safeguarding the prestige of Parliamentary government, which has helped to make our race so powerful in the world. But while it is well to entrust our duly constituted leaders with supreme authority in the conduct of national affairs, history teaches that it is right and necessary to keep them under constitutional control; and it is clear from the extension of the franchise since 1832 that British people have made up their minds to do so. There are some people who argue that a board of experts could manage the country's affairs much more cheaply and efficiently than a Cabinet dependent upon Parliament. Perhaps they could—for a time, and then, if members of the board went the customary way of bureaucracies and oligarchies in the past they would become selfish and corrupt, and in the absence of constitutional control it would require a revolution to remove them. Revolution involving great expenditure in blood and treasure is too heavy a price to pay for increased efficiency, valuable as that is. It is not at all likely that British peoples will ever allow their executive to get out of hand again. Cabinet Ministers are responsible to a majority of the people's representatives in Parliament, and hold office only as long as they retain their confidence. That is how the harmony between the Legislature and the Executive has been secured. It seems simple, but it is a matter of far-reaching importance. It was not suggested by any theorist; it was evolved from experience, and it is the chief distinguishing characteristic of the British Constitution, and gives to it that organic character which enables it to effect changes from within. The principle of growth is in itself. The danger for us does not lie in the lack of control of Ministers. There is no possibility now of a Duke of Buckingham leading his country to failure after failure in defiance of Parliament. Our danger lies rather in the enfeeblement of the executive by excessive criticism through the press and public meetings, and interference from organised public opinion in the electorates, as well as a want of scope for the exercise of initiative and judgment inside Parliament, because of the lavish promises made in electioneering campaigns, and the pressure which is brought to bear on Parliamentary leaders by caucus and other organisations unknown to the Constitution. The further this goes the nearer we approach to Ochlocracy, and the further we wander away from the true principles of British Democratic government.

New Word Wanted.

I sometimes think it is a pity that we have not a more suitable word to describe the form of government under which we live. "Democracy" means government by the people, and there is no part of the word to suggest the importance of the aristocratic element in our working constitution. It is true in British communities that public opinion is the political sovereign; adult franchise has been conceded; but the executive, which is the most important part of government, is directed by the aristoi—not the aristoi of wealth or blood, but the best men available for carrying on the government in the interests of the people at large. There is a combination of popular and aristocratic principles in our working Constitution, and both principles have been emphasised in the political development of the last century. Adult suffrage has made popular control more effective than ever it was, but the Cabinet has never been so powerful as it is to-day. "Aristo-democracy" is an awkward compound, but at least the word expresses more accurately the go-

vernment under which we live than "democracy." But if we choose to retain the more familiar term we ought to recognize that there is a clear distinction between its derivative and its applied meaning; and that in Great Britain and the self-governing Dominions the form of government which we call democracy is not government for the people by the people, but government for the people by a few selected men, whom the people control through their representatives in Parliament.

Bolshevism a Passing Craze.

Our working Constitution is the final result of a long process of evolution, and just because of that you cannot, even if you would, break suddenly away from it without serious embarrassment, and even great peril. You may discard a theory at a moment's notice, but the British Constitution is rooted deep in the experience of our race and has broadened down from precedent to precedent. It is not a scheme upon paper, sprung from the brain of theorists. It is a growth, not a sudden acquisition, and just for that reason it is likely to be so well adjusted to the temper and capacity of the people at large that any attempt to replace it by the cut-and-dried schemes of logicians and theorists will assuredly bring on a reaction. It has always been so in the past. Great upheavals are followed by periods of unrest and change; but the continuity of history is never lost. When the wave of revolution has swept by, the habits of a nation which are called traditions have asserted their power. Reaction has followed revolution for some time, and, after that, the people have settled down to the task of making bottles for the new wine that is worth preserving. Evolution does not always proceed at the same rate in human affairs; it is sometimes rapid, sometimes slow; but there is evolution, and it is more persistent in constitutional than in any other branch of British history. Our age is in love with novelty and experiment, not only in the art of government, but in nearly all branches of art. It is likely that most of the theories in art and government will have their day and cease to be. They will not fail of some effect; the old order is bound to be modified and changed to some extent; but in matters of government tradition is so powerful that I shall be very much mistaken if Bolshevism of the twentieth century does not go the way of Communism and Anarchy of the nineteenth, and Antinomianism and Fifth Monarchism of the seventeenth century. I commend to you the working Constitution of Great Britain and the Dominions, because of its intrinsic worth. I can conceive of no better machinery by which an enlightened people may make use of the best managers in the community, and at the same time keep them true to a sense of their national responsibility. It avoids the extremes of autocracy and ochlocracy. It sweeps aside the fantastic notion that men are born with equal capacity for government; but provides all the machinery that is needed for keeping the best talent available employed in national work. I say the best available, because we must not assume that the most capable administrators in the community are willing to submit themselves for election to Parliament. Such a Constitution can fail only if the people as a whole prove themselves unequal to the task of encouraging the right men to undertake national responsibilities. Remember that it is not only by widening the franchise that you make a Constitution democratic. Germany had a liberal franchise before this war; but the executive in Germany was practically independent of the House of Representatives, and Germany was therefore an autocracy. When the Chancellor in Germany is made responsible to the Reichstag, as the Prime Minister is to the British House of Commons, then Germany will be a democracy. One of the greatest merits of our working constitution is that direct action and revolution within the state are no longer necessary for any reform whatever. If the majority of the people are determined on change, there is no reason why they should not get it in a regular constitutional way.

no doubt; but that it has meant government by the people, or means that now, I am forced to deny. That it ever will mean that, so long as men are born with unequal capacities, and are disciplined in different environments, I cannot believe. It is true that people have sometimes controlled their rulers in the past, and that in the more enlightened countries of the world they have devised political machinery for controlling them more effectively. But there is a vast difference between actual governance, and the control of those who govern. The number of men in any nation who have the capacity for the administration of great affairs is very small, the number of men and women who control them in the exercise of their powers may be reckoned by hundreds of thousands or millions, according to the size of the state. Yet so loose is the language we use in reference to government that the distinction between governing and the control of those who govern is overlooked or ignored. We live in an age of catch words and shibboleths, and one of the most misleading and powerful of those is "government for the people by the people." History is the record of human experience, and the best way to explode a shibboleth of this kind is to bring it to the test of experience. Theorists in matters of government have nearly always paid too much homage to logic and too little to the

importance of passion, prejudice, habit and tradition. Some, like the anarchists, assume that men are so good that they do not need to be governed at all, and some, like the Bolsheviks, that the poorer and more inexperienced they are the better they can manage human affairs. Nearly all of them fail to reckon with the difference between ideas that will work and theories that will merely create unrest or overturn the existing order. A course of study in the history of government would dispel many of these illusions. The nearest approach to government for the people by the people may be found at Athens in the middle of the fifth century before Christ. But two-thirds of the people were slaves; the most serious crimes—murder and arson—were dealt with by the Aeropagus, not by the Heliaea; the chief administrative officers, who had to prepare plans to meet emergencies, were chosen, not by lot, but by show of hands, and they were often re-elected. The important business of State was transacted, not by the people, but by the generals under Pericles, who was the real ruler of Athens from 445 to 430 B.C.

Nor must we forget that Athens was a city State. A flag was hoisted in the morning at the meeting place, and the citizens assembled during the day. How very different are our modern democracies, which include millions of people scattered over wide areas! Even in Athens a man who lived in the country could not be a member of the Heliaea. England has enjoyed representative government since 1295, but I know of no period in the history of that country when there was government for the people by the people. It is true that the people always exercised some control over their governors through the House of Commons, but in the fourteenth century the actual government was carried on by the king in his ordinary and perpetual council; in the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth by the king and his Privy Council; and in the eighteenth by a double Cabinet, one directed by the king, the other by the chief Minister responsible to Parliament. Since 1832 the people have had more control over Ministers than ever before; but is it not also true that Great Britain in the last century has been governed by a few selected men? The Privy Council has given way to the Cabinet, and the Cabinet must have the confidence of a majority of the people's representatives in Parliament; but it is the Cabinet that governs the country, and within that Cabinet there is an inner ring of strong and capable men, who have more to do with the actual government of Great Britain than all the millions who have voted to send them there. Great Britain has adult franchise now, but that is only the result of one important development in the last century. There is another in the consolidation of the power of the Cabinet as an instrument of government. So great has the power of the British Cabinet become in our time that exponents of our working constitution sometimes find it difficult to decide whether the Cabinet controls the House or the House the Cabinet. The majority of people in this hall have the right to vote, and therefore to exercise some control over Ministers through the Assembly on North-terrace, but how much do we who sit here have to do with the actual administration of State affairs? And this is only a small State in which nearly half the population live in one city. How much more ridiculous is this notion of popular government in a nation of millions of people. As a form of national government theoretical democracy does not exist, and never has.

Good Leaders Rare.

The history of industrial democracy confirms what I have said of political democracy. The history of trades union government in England shows how in spite of the plainest facts to the contrary the authors of paper constitutions have clung to the conviction that democracy is government by the people. Turn wheresoever you may in this world's history, you will find that in the conduct of industrial, municipal, State, national, and Imperial affairs, government for the people by the people is a delusion. It has also been, and still is, a snare. One very great mistake underlying this definition of democracy is the assumption that the qualities of management and leadership are common. They are, in fact, exceedingly rare. It is only one man in ten thousand who possesses them. The rulers of men not only make plans to prepare for future contingencies, that is comparatively easy; they must also be able to modify their plans after the emergency has arisen, and mould circumstances as they go, and that is difficult. They need insight and initiative in the hour of crisis, as well as foresight in preparing for it. When events are moving rapidly they must be able to see at a flash the right thing to do, and lose no time in doing it. They must be able to exert a power similar to that which Cromwell used at Marston Moor, Nelson at Cape St. Vincent, and Napoleon in nearly every battle he fought. And how much has been accomplished in this world under such leaders as they! How little by armies badly led! The value of management in war is generally recognised; but it holds good in statesmanship too. How much does the British Empire owe in this last great struggle to the initiative, resource, and courage of Mr. Lloyd George, who handled the finan-