

University to every one of the other professions combined [it would be a lucky day for South Australia. It may be asked how all that I have stated may be known. Let any one at all acquainted with current events carefully read the Chancellor's address on the University Commemoration Day and the address of the Head Master of Prince Alfred College on the speech-day of that institution. He will then plainly see that what is stated above is borne out. Girls as a rule will not matriculate, hence the new curriculum seems to say, "Let there be a separate gradus of examinations for girls and boys as well which shall not contemplate matriculation." But, as Mr. Chapple stated, boys are bound not to be tied to any artificial standard created under the mistaken notion that it is in favour of the girls, but whom in reality it will doom to a position of acknowledged educational inferiority. Apart from any inferior motives, let the matriculation examination be well considered as a common gradus to be gained by all students, boys and girls alike, with a broad range of optional subjects as at present. Success in learning, and other circumstances, will often induce students when the matriculation examination is reached to go right on to gain a degree. There is thus, as far as can be fixed, a uniform standard to be aimed at and a recognised position to be gained by all contestants. The present hotch-potch competition reminds one of the garish bottles in a druggist's window labelled with symbols unknown to the public that they may not be too inquisitive as to the value of the contents. Probably the decisions of the powers at the University are Medo-Persic. But where an authority to a great extent is self-constituted and therefore beyond control, the only appeal is to public opinion, to whose consideration the subject is now remitted.

I am, Sir, &c.,

OBSERVER.

The Advertiser December 24 1886.

## AD EUNDEM DEGREES.

TO THE EDITOR.

Sir—I observe a statement on this subject in your leader of this morning about the University which is so erroneous that I think it must be a slip. The article says “The privilege of admitting graduates of other universities has only been availed of by a few universities, but, where it has obtained no distinction has ever been drawn between those who have wrought for their degrees and those who have been honored by a degree *causa honoris*.” The reverse of both these propositions is true. I know nothing of the new university at Manchester, but I am not aware of any university in Great Britain or Ireland, except London, which does not confer honorary degrees. It is the usual practice to give a few to persons of eminence every year. But in admitting graduates of other universities to the same degree there is the clearest distinction drawn between those who have obtained their degrees after examination and those who have received them out of compliment. The former are admitted as of right on paying fees; the latter have no such right. It sometimes happens that the same person has an honorary degree from both Oxford and Cambridge, as in the cases of Prince Albert and Mr. Freeman, the historian; but the one degree is not the consequence of the other. The compliment is never passed on. And what is of nearly equal importance is that the honorary graduate is always prevented from taking part by vote in the internal affairs of the university which has given him the complimentary honor. The action of the University of Adelaide in admitting an honorary M.A. of Cambridge *ad eundem gradum* (i.e. to the same position) here is unheard of, and the allowing him to be a member of the senate—which is a legal consequence—is equally so. If they had wanted to honor him as Cambridge has done they should have given him an honorary degree and bound him not to sit in the senate. At Cambridge he cannot vote as a Master of Arts in academical affairs. I am not advocating this course, but it would have been in accordance with usage. To allow him to have a vote with the other graduates as a member of the senate, a right which he now possesses, is very objectionable and is without precedent, so far as the experience goes of a graduate of over

Register January 31<sup>st</sup> 1887.

**THE GILCHRIST SCHOLARSHIP.**—The trustees of the Gilchrist Educational Fund, disappointed at the failure of their scholarship to excite competition, have asked the advice of the Education Committee of the University Council. At present a scholarship of £100 a year for three years is offered annually. Candidates must be between 16 and 22 years of age; they must either be natives of the Australian Colonies or else resident in them for five years immediately preceding the examination, and they must have presented themselves at one or other of the local examinations for the London Matriculation. The successful candidate must study either at Edinburgh or London, and must graduate in one of the faculties of the latter University. The Education Committee pointed out in its reply to the trustees the most obvious of the causes of the failure of the scholarship to attract competition. The sum of £100 a year for three years may be a very welcome addition to an income, but upon it alone no youth could go home and pass through a University course. Then, again, whilst the South Australian Scholarship was in existence the best candidates invariably went up for the more valuable prize, and the competitors for the Gilchrist would naturally be of inferior merit. Then the conditions attached are somewhat illiberal. The successful candidate under them would have no choice of a University—except the very limited choice between Edinburgh and London. Of course it may be said that with the abolition of the South Australian Scholarship there will be probably better competition for the Gilchrist. But there are two very strong objections to retaining the present conditions. The first is that where there is a University, the practice of offering scholarships to be held in other Universities is prejudicial to the best interests of education in the colony, and is calculated to depreciate the value of the local institution. And the second reason is that the money at the disposal of the Gilchrist Fund is so small that it practically closes the competition to all except those who are able to go to the home Universities without help. Now, it was no part of the design of the founders of such scholarships as the two we have mentioned to relieve the rich man from part of the cost of his luxury. When there is a well-manned University here, it is a luxury for

colonists to send their sons home—and it is a luxury for which they may well be expected to pay themselves. All things considered, the advice tendered to the trustees by the Education Committee is very wise. According to it the scholarship offered annually would be tenable for three years in the Adelaide University, and would be open to boys and girls between the ages of 16 and 20. The examinations would be conducted by the University, using the Senior Public Examination as the groundwork, and the successful candidate would become an undergraduate and be generally under the control of the University authorities. The only thing in the advice which needs explanation is the reduction of the annual value of the scholarship from £100 to £50. Why is this recommended, and what is to be done with the other £50 available? Surely it too is not to go the way of all the moneys which the Council can lay hold upon—into the pockets of the Professors and lecturers of the Medical School. A simple thing to do would be to offer two scholarships of £50—the same value as the three University scholarships now offered by the Education Department. With this change the trustees would do well to act upon the advice of the Council, and they may be sure that their fund will do much more good under the altered conditions than it has done in the past.

---