

that though the Senate is by no means a merely ornamental body, the real control of the University largely rests with the Council. It is therefore of paramount importance that the Council should be a fairly representative body, and that its members should be such as to represent more than one class and one set of opinions. Nothing can be more detrimental to the confidence the University ought to inspire in public opinion, nothing more prejudicial to the work for which it exists, than any attempt to narrow the circle from which its members are chosen. Any impression that it partakes in the slightest degree of the nature of a close corporation will be mischievous.

The Senate should remember that the University is not a body owing its endowments entirely to "pious founders." It is substantially endowed by the State—that is by the people of South Australia, and its greatest benefactors have been those who have had no university connection here or elsewhere. Sir W. W. Hughes, Sir Thomas Elder, the Hon. J. H. Angas, may be mentioned as the names of the public-spirited gentlemen to whom future generations will look back as those to whom the University owes its origin and establishment. Without the benefaction of Sir W. W. Hughes its foundation-stone would never have been laid, and the State would not have come forward with its special endowment; without the subsequent gifts of Sir Thomas Elder and Mr. Angas it would never have thriven and grown as it has. If there is anything like a disposition to regard the Council as a body which is to be recruited henceforward mainly, if not solely, from the list of those on the books of the University, the sooner this disposition is checked and curbed the better for the University and the better for the State. At the present moment the Council consists of twenty-one members. The Vice-Chancellor must be a member of the Council elected from that body. The Chancellor may or may not be. The latter takes a more active part in the direct management of the affairs of the University than the Chancellors of the two great universities of England, where the Vice-Chancellors are the real active heads. The compulsory selection of the Vice-Chancellor from the Council is probably a wise regulation. In looking over the list of the remaining members of the Council one cannot fail to notice the omission of names which might be expected to be on the council-list, not to say the presence of some whose place is due to the mere fact of an *ad eundem* degree. The Senate is, as everybody knows, a sort of paddock into which all graduates are sooner or later driven, and its meetings are probably only attended by the élite, who by a sort of natural self-selection gravitate thither. But the Council, whose quorum is fixed by the Act at six members, should be a body so well chosen that even any six of its members should command general confidence. The quorum appears to be too small, and it would not be difficult to specify the composition of one which would not consist of those to whom the public would unreservedly commit the affairs of the University. There is a sort of feeling in the political atmosphere of South Australia that membership of Parliament is a species of regeneration, and that from the time a man is able to write, in calligraphy more or less conspicuous, the mystic symbols M.P. or M.L.C. after his name, he is fit for anything from J.P. to a commission on education or fine arts.

We are not advocating the claims of members of the Legislature to seats on the Council of the University. Our idea is to warn members of the Senate from an analogous misconception of fitness, and from regarding the ability to subscribe oneself a B.A. or an M.A. as an all-sufficient justification for a seat on the Council. A mere pass degree at Oxford or Cambridge is so worthless that one of the greatest authorities has stated that if a man can take nothing higher he ought to have no degree at all.

Presumably the action of the Council with regard to the latest conditions of the tenure of a professorial chair will not pass without some comment by the Senate. We have already expressed our opinion as to the manner in which that action has been misconstrued and its meaning perverted. The Council has taken a proper stand in the interests of the University and those for whom it exists, and the charge of indignity and constructive slur is about as much warranted as it would be in the case of a man who was asked, as everyone is asked, to give a receipt for money paid. It has been attempted to set up the position that no such offensive conditions, as they have been termed, would be offered to a professor in the older universities. A recent case at Oxford supplies a commentary. Professor Lankester was dismissed by the summary jurisdiction of the Vice-Chancellor from his office as examiner in animal morphology, because in the opinion of the Vice-Chancellor he had not complied with the statutes regulating the examination for honors. Professor Lankester was appointed sole examiner in animal morphology, his knowledge being of the highest description and almost exclusive, none of his five colleagues in the schools of natural science professing the same proficiency. He chose to put his own interpretation on the statutes, and acted in accordance therewith. The Vice-Chancellor took the opposite reading, and removed the professor summarily. The Queen's Bench Division supports the Vice-Chancellor, and the judges have no doubt in the matter. The Council of the Adelaide University do not seek anything approaching summary jurisdiction with any of their professors. They offer what is in effect, after five years' probation, a life appointment, subject to termination for sufficient cause at six months' notice, the time when alone such notice may be given being specified. To argue that this is equivalent to an annual tenure, to cease at the end of each year, and to be renewed or not on expiry, with a threat of six months' notice impending all the time, can only be attributed to a clouded understanding.

---