

Advertiser July 10 1888.

THE Council and the Senate of the University of Adelaide are not dwelling together in unity, as it is desirable that they should in the interests of the institution. There is a continuance of the trouble which originated in the division of opinion on the action of the Council with regard to the five-yearly professorships. The latter body has adhered to its decision that on the expiration of the quinquennial term the appointment shall continue, subject to termination by six months' notice on either side. Against this a majority of the Senate has protested loudly. Professor Boulger, the first to be affected by the new regulation, considers himself an injured man, and his friends in the Senate have vigorously taken up the cudgels on his behalf. But, indifferent to the clamor its proceedings have aroused, the Council pursues the even tenor of its way, satisfied of the essential justice of its resolution. The Senate at a special meeting yesterday carried a series of motions in which, after reiterating the view it has previously taken, it goes a step farther, and declares itself openly on the side of Professor Boulger, dissenting in express terms from the action of the Council in offering the vacant Hughes Professorship for competition. To those not admitted into the inner circle of academical society the dispute now raging between the two bodies may seem a trivial matter. But its significance is much wider than that of the mere question of the tenure of professorships, which is the immediate cause of trouble. It is the little rift within the lute that, having already led to discord, may yet make the music altogether mute. What it really means may be inferred by those who read between the lines from some of the speeches delivered by members of the Senate. The claim is seriously put forward that the Senate has the right to enforce its views upon the Council. It is piteously declared that the Council not having succumbed to the attempted dictation the *raison d'etre* of the Senate disappears. A new definition of the relation between the two bodies is supplied by one of the speakers at yesterday's meeting. According to this, the Council is responsible to the Senate in exactly the same way as the Ministry is responsible to Parliament.

A reference to the Act of Incorporation, with which one would imagine members of the Senate ought to make themselves familiar, discloses the fallacy of this view. The entire management of the University is in the hands of the Council. The Senate, as one of its own members pointed out, has no power whatever of initiating legislation. It elects the Council, whose statutes and regulations are subject to its approval, but otherwise it is destitute of legislative functions. Into the Senate the University, at some time or other, drafts all its graduates — the *hoi polloi* as well as the distinguished scholars who take degrees with honors. The Senate transfers, or is expected to transfer, the cream of its membership to the governing body, which also includes such outsiders as from their public services or business capacity may be deemed worthy of election. The University of Adelaide is founded on a popular basis. It sprang into existence through the liberality of private citizens who, zealous as they were for the promotion of learning, made no pretensions to scholarship themselves. By men of the same class it is supported, and it is endowed by the Parliament of a democratic State with the lands and revenues of the people. In these respects it differs from most of the great schools

of learning in the old world, and the differences constitute the justification for a departure in some directions from the hard-and-fast lines on which those institutions are governed. That the objects of the founders and supporters of the University may be attained, and that the public may have a guarantee that the work of the institution will take a wide and liberal scope, it is provided that the governing body may include among its members men whose public spirit entitle them to the honor, and whose proved intelligence promises useful service, even if they be so unfortunate as not to rank with their colleagues on the purely academic plane. It is both just and expedient that the Council should include this element, and that it should not be completely eliminated. Of course we do not want a tinpot University. That goes without saying. The University ought to be so managed as to attract students, but not so that its rewards will be given for studies that show poor results. Its degrees should be the prizes of labors which will enable their recipients to claim equal rank with the graduates of the best-conducted Universities in the world. There is nothing in the past history of the University to warrant the fear that members of the Council elected from the outside will place the prestige of the institution in jeopardy by ignoring these very obvious considerations. Yet it is undoubted that a feeling is being assiduously cultivated in favor of the limitation of the Council to members elected by the Senate from its own body. There is a busy clique in the Senate ever working towards that goal.

We gain some idea of the exclusiveness, the narrow-mindedness, the mean disregard of all qualifications other than those of the academic type, under the influence of which it is sought to bring the government of the University, from the remarks of Dr. Smith at the latest meeting of the Senate. The contemptuous reference to an able and a respected member of the Council as a "respectable draper," indicates the attitude of one whose mind has not been enlarged by scholarship towards a gentleman who in Parliament, in the Government, in a variety of responsible public offices, has proved his ability to render the State good service. The bad taste of the allusions to other members of the committee appointed for the selection of the Hughes Professor of English Language and Literature need not be dilated on. But the public would view with consternation the prospect of the University falling into the hands of a clique led on by such guides. Such, however, is not likely to be the case. The Parliament will shortly put matters on a different basis. The University is not so independent of the aid of the wealthy squatters, the "respectable" tradesmen, and the many others who, from motives of the most admirable patriotism, have helped it in the past, that it can afford to turn upon its benefactors with the disdain expressed in words like those of Dr. Smith. And the unkindness and pettiness of such remarks contrast strangely with the "sweetness and light" which it is the mission of the apostles of the higher culture to confer upon a waiting world. As to the matter on which the Senate is at present at issue with the Council, we see no reason to alter the opinion we have previously expressed. So far as the question is a personal one, Professor Boulger has no legitimate ground for complaint. He can plead no