students for each of the following five years, and 30 students for each of the next five years, and so on. Over a period of fifteen years, 375 such loans could be made. On the other hand, $\$ 100,000$, turned into a revolving fund, allowing $\$ 20,000$ of the principal to be loaned annually for the first five years, would be sufficient to make 1,475 such loans, which means that it would serve practically five times as many students. It would operate as follows:


The above figures should be convincing. One hundred thousand dollars administered as a revolving fund will help 1,475 students over a period of fifteen years, whereas it will help only 375 students during the same period if administered as a restricted fund. Besides helping a greater number of students, it would attract, where well administered, more money to be handled in this manner, whereas the amount forthcoming when administered under the restricted plan is far from sufficient to meet the needs. If individuals who have money to give can be shown the good that can be derived by the establishment of revolving loan funds, they will be more willing to leave money for this purpose. Speaking of administering money under the revolving method, Mr. G. C. Wintringer of Princeton University said:

A fund of this kind makes a particular appeal to me personally and I have a feeling it should find favor with others. If an institution can demonstrate to a prospective donor that any money given for student aid will be administered in a very business-like manner and can be used over and over again, perhaps adding to the principal by the collection of interest, this should make a very strong appeal. It will likewise relieve the budget of the institution of the inclusion in it of a certain sum of money each year to be used for this purpose.

Some officials and donors fear that if the principal as well as the income is loaned, the fund will eventually disappear. This fear is well founded only if we admit inefficiency in the administration of the funds.

