

in the Council there are men who opposed the change in the tenure of professorial Chairs, which is the latest point of difficulty. If we add these dissentients to the general body of dissentients in the Senate we find that there is a very large majority of persons directly concerned in the management of the University who conscientiously object to the proposed change. Is it not hard that the majority in the Council should be able to override the majority in the University in regard to a matter which is pre-eminently of University concern? The hardship is augmented when we remember that this same majority in the Council has no warranty whatever of the excellence of the principle which it favours.

And this brings us to another point. The public is unable to ascertain which of the members of the Council is for and which is against the recent change. The Council has refused to have even the official register of the attendance of its members supplied to the Senate. One would certainly hope that any amendment of the law would ensure to the elective body as much information as possible to guide it in the exercise of the suffrage conferred upon it. It is rumoured that one clause in the proposed Bill is to provide for the election of the Chancellor by the general body of the University, and not, as now, by the Council. The matter can hardly be regarded as personal to the present tenant of the office, for we suppose that if the colony had been the constituency the Chief Justice would have been elected successor to the late Bishop Short. Therefore we speak the more freely, and would strongly urge the retention of the present system, under which the highest officer of the University is chosen by a select body, rather than that he should be nominated by the Crown, as in England, or by the University, as in Scotland. For the rest we sincerely hope that the troubles which harass the University now will soon be over, and that judicious conciliation will take the place of uncompromising hostility. Both Council and Senate are, we are convinced, actuated by a regard for the best interests of the University, and it is to be regretted that the differences between them should have reached such an acute stage. Peace and unanimity would speedily be restored if on both sides due regard were had for natural diversities of conscientious opinion. This regard has not been shown by the Council, and the Senate will do no good to its own cause if it follows the bad example set by the gentlemen whom it has chosen to govern the affairs of the University.

Register July 26 1880.

THE UNIVERSITY TROUBLES.

It was proposed yesterday in the Senate that a committee, consisting of graduates of the Universities of London, Cambridge, Dublin, Melbourne, and Oxford—we place the Universities in the order of the names suggested—should draft a Bill for an Act to be substituted for the existing Adelaide University Act. The idea was to secure a committee which would be in a sense representative of different Universities, and that to this committee should be entrusted the duty of bringing their collective wisdom and experience to bear for the purpose of framing a measure which would be a happy combination of the excellences of the constitutions enjoyed by the named Universities. As distinguished from the idea, the object is stated to have been to formulate the wishes of the Senate in case Parliament desires to make any change in the present constitution. The executive powers of the Council were to be left intact, and the proposed drafting of another Bill was merely to mean the preparation of the Senate's case in the event of legislative interference. It is difficult to understand why a Bill for a new Act should be drafted by the Senate if that body is fully persuaded of the rightfulness of the Council's position. Perhaps it was because this problem was too hard for the understanding of ordinary people that Dr. Smith's motion was so signally defeated yesterday. Even if it were so, the Senate can hardly be congratulated upon its way of going to work. It would surely have been fairer and more dignified for the majority to have stated, however briefly, their view of the matter than to have voted in absolute silence. It can hardly be said that it was an act of presumption on Dr. Smith's part to introduce the matter to the notice of the Senate, seeing that a meeting had been specially called to consider it. We are quite in the dark as to whether the tactics adopted by the opponents of the motion were preconcerted or spontaneous. At first sight it looks as if they had acted with the deliberate purpose of snubbing the mover and the party led by him, which at previous meetings managed to carry all before them? If this is so, however, what has become of the party? Was a mine sprung upon it through the unexpectedly prompt action of Dr. Gardner and those acting with him? It may be that Dr. Smith has got out of touch with those who have been supporting him, and acted without their concurrence in submitting the motion; but even so, he was surely entitled to the courtesy of being told why he was not to be supported.

While saying this, we are bound to admit that the arguments advanced in favour of the motion were weak and unsatisfactory. It is not easy even to comprehend the view taken with regard to endowments by the State, and the possible claim of the State to be directly represented in their administration. It was alleged that "if this claim were ever made, it would be for the Senate to say whether they would take a single sixpence of the public money, or whether they would continue with their present magnificent endowment to do all the things which the University need do without going to the public." This means that the University would