Advertiser, July 28th, 1910.

Register. July 28th

DEMOCRACY AND EDUCATION.

ADDRESS BY REV. W. TEMPLE.

There was a large gathering at the Prince of Wales Theatre at the University on Wednesday night, when the Rev. W. Temple, M.A. (Oxford) delivered an address on "Democracy and education." His Excellency the Governor presided, and among those present were the Premier (Hon. J. Verran), the Chief Secretary (Hon. F. S. Wallis), and several members of Parliament.

The Lecturer, who had a cordial reception, remarked that the subject of his address had been assuming considerable importance in the old country of late, and, judging by a speech which he had had the privilege of hearing in the House of Assembly that afternoon, it was likely to assume considerable importance here also. Democracy was the great experiment of the modern world. There had never yet been a democracy in history. There had been things called democracy in Greece, but there the great majority of the laborers had been slaves. That was not democracy. (Hear, hear.) And because democracy was new, they had great hopes of it. In the old country democracy had confined itself to providing the machinery for registering the opinions of the people, irrespective of how those opinions were formed, with the result that the conduct of the last general election was the greatest insult ever offered to a self-governing community. For instance, huge hoardings were seen covered with hideous posters, containing, as one example, the picture of John Bull in the embrace of some ferocious monster, with under it the words, "Kill it now, John." One never knew whether it was Protection or Free-trade that John was advised to kill. (Laughter.) Democracy as at present understood, was not government of the people for the people and by the people, but government through hoodwinking the people by those who could buy the best poster artist. (Laughter.) Just as there was true and false democracy, so, too, was there true and false education. The great defect of the educational ladder was that while people were encouraged to work upward no one, except by a conspicuous lack of ability, could ever come down. (Laughter.) Its weakness, from a national standpoint, was that it encouraged the workers to discard their natural sympathies and to break away from their own people. (Hear, hear.) It was denationalising in its influence; it made the worker student self-seeking, rendered him rather objectionable to the upper classes with whom he now consorted, and wholly objectionable to the working class people from whom he sprung. The lecturer then described how the attempt at university extension had failed because, for one reason, it was unendowed, and, for another, the people at that stage did not want it. He explained how at an informal conference of sympathisers the Workers' Educational Association was voted into existence for the purpose of communicating the opinions of the working man to the University of Oxford. The aim of that association was to stimulate the demand for University education, to focus it, and to supply it. They found that as soon as they had Labor representatives upon their controlling body the movement went ahead like a fire engine. (Applause.) They began with two classes of 30 men each at Christmas; the following year they had six, then eight; then they started 31 more, and all over England the universities were at work. They adhered to the principle that education must not be "dumped" on a people, and no classes were started unless there was a demand. They also made it a rule that four-fifths of a class must be wage-earners. Their meetings were once a week, for two hours, the first being devoted to the lecture and the second to discussion. Each member pledged himself to continue in the class for three years, if circumstances permitted, and every fortnight they had to write an essay, some of which were written under the most amazing conditions. For instance, one man in Chesterfield had to write part of his essay while sitting on a sugar box, and use another box as a table, holding a candle in one hand and balancing a couple of children on his knees. (Laughter.) Yet the man's essay was pronounced equal to the production of men with first-class honors in economics. They found that when men were associated there was a keen desire for more knowledge, and naturally enough they desired introduction in economic history, because that was the subject that had all to do with their industrial conditions. Their success had demonstrated that in Great Britain a tremendous waste of intellectual capacity was going on all the time, and an educational discovery of the first importance had been made in the fact that after an interval of many years, since their schooldays, these students could successfully undertake the study of scientific subjects affecting their everyday life. Labor had entered into the government of the country, and therefore it was good for the country that labor should have what only the universities could give. (Hear, hear.) The day was far distant, however, when they could bring their best students up to Oxford, because one could not get the privileges of residence in that centre under £150 a year, and that sum was sufficient to carry on two entire classes, of 30 students each, for a whole year under the present conditions. Moreover, it was not desirable that these enthusiastic students—these working men—should go up to Oxford, because that course would lead to the divorce of the best labor people from the interests of labor, and so make increasingly difficult the attainment of an educated democracy. (Applause.)

In thanking the lecturer, his Excellency said Mr. Temple had hardly done himself justice, as he omitted to mention that the Workers' Educational Association numbered 1,000 unions and clubs in affiliation for educational purposes. (Applause.)

Professor Darnley Naylor, on behalf of the University staff, expressed deep indebtedness to the lecturer for his inspiring address.

Register, July 29th. 1910

"THE PERSON OF CHRIST."

The Rev. W. Temple, M.A., of London, lectured at the Elder Hall, Adelaide University, on Thursday evening on "The Person of Christ." There was a fair audience. Mr. Temple said some people seemed to imagine that the Higher Critics were agreed that the Gospels were a fabrication of the second or third centuries. Where that idea came from he could not conceive. With the exception of two or three Dutch critics, who had found no following, no competent critic had propounded anything of the kind. Taking the life of Christ as revealed in the Gospels, there were bound up in Him the two component strands always present in religion, and but one of which almost always predominated in the ordinary man—the spirit of quiet repose, and that of ecstatic fervour. In the drama of His life the conflict was not with sin, vice, or crime as commonly understood, but with dead religion—the hopeless state of stagnation that had lost the power of growth. Love, and growth in love, were the things demanded by Him. His teaching about prayer must have come from His own personal experience, and in it was shown the complete union between His will and that of the Father, so that His prayer was the Father's purpose. In speaking of Christ to the Gentiles as the Logos, or Word, the Apostle John had used a term made familiar by the philosophers as meaning the one principle that governed the whole creation, and claimed that that character to them unknown had been revealed in Christ. If they adopted that view, and were content to believe that the life divine had been revealed in the earthly life of Christ, the great religious problems—particularly the great problem of evil—would begin to disappear; but they would never disappear altogether until they "saw God" because they were "pure in heart."

UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE.

MEETING OF THE SENATE.

AMENDMENT OF REGULATIONS.

A meeting of the Senate was held at the University on Wednesday afternoon. The Warden (Mr. F. Chapple, B.Sc.) presided.

—Infectious Diseases.—

At present no power exists to enable professors, lecturers, or examination supervisors to deal with students believed to be suffering from contagious diseases. The council of the University recently approved of the adoption of a precautionary clause, and Senate adopted the following motion by Professor Stirling:—

If any professor, or lecturer, or examination supervisor, suspects, or is apprehensive, that any student attending or desiring to attend his classes, or any examination, is suffering from tuberculosis, or any other disease which he believes may be infectious, he may request such student to absent himself, and thereupon such student shall, without delay, leave the University premises, or any place in which any University lecture or examination is being given or held, and shall not return to the University, or such other place, until he forwards to the registrar a certificate, under the hand of the Dean of the Faculty of Medicine or of the medical officer of health in the district where he resides, or may be isolated, to the effect that there is no risk, or no longer any risk, of his conveying infection to others.

The council shall have power to close the University, or any part thereof, for such time as it shall deem desirable, in order to prevent the spread of infectious disease.

—Degrees of B.M. and B.S.—

The question of the repeal of existing regulations of the degrees of Bachelor of Medicine and Bachelor of Surgery was introduced by Professor Stirling, who moved the adoption of new regulations approved by the Council. He said the new regulations had been drafted with a view to free students from the necessity to devote so much time to scientific work, and to give them additional opportunities to study the more practical side of the medical course. The principal alterations proposed were in the following clauses:—

The ordinary examination shall be held in November of each year, and the date of the examination shall be fixed by the council:—(a) Provided that when the course of instruction in any subject has been completed before the end of the third term, the examination in that subject may be held at any convenient time to be appointed by the council between the termination of such course and the date fixed for the ordinary examination in November. (b) Students who pass in such examinations shall be deemed to have passed in that subject at the ordinary examination in the November next ensuing, and the marks obtained by them shall be taken into account in determining the results of such ordinary examination. (c) Any student who fails to pass at such interim examination, or who, by reason of illness or other sufficient cause allowed by the council, has been prevented from attending the whole or part of such examination may, with the permission of the council on the recommendation of the examiners, present himself for re-examination in the subject in which he has failed at the ordinary examination in November next ensuing, but he shall not be entitled to be classified.

In addition to the ordinary examination in November, a supplementary examination may be held in the following March, or on a date to be fixed by the council. No student shall be allowed to present himself at any such supplementary examination without the special permission of the Council.

Any student who has presented himself at an ordinary examination, but has failed to pass, or who, by reason of illness or other sufficient cause, allowed by the council, has been prevented from attending the whole or part of such examination, may, if recommended by the Board of Examiners, apply to the council for permission to present himself for examination at a supplementary examination. Such recommendation shall be made by the Board of Examiners when settling the results of the ordinary examinations, but the board shall in no case recommend for a supplementary examination any student of the fifth year who has failed to pass at the ordinary examination.

The student shall not be required to be re-examined at the supplementary examination in any subject in which he has passed at the ordinary examination in the previous year, and, on passing the supplementary examination in the subjects in which he has failed to present himself or to pass at the ordinary examination, he shall be deemed to have completed an academic year of his course, but no classification will be allowed.

The regulations were adopted.

—Degrees of B.A. and M.A.—

On the motion of Professor Darnley Naylor it was decided to repeal Regulation V. of the B.A. and M.A. degrees, allowed on August 2, 1905, and substitute the following:—

Candidates may be excused attendance at lectures on any subject in which they desire to be examined, but only upon special grounds to be allowed by the council. Exemption in more than one subject shall only be allowed under very exceptional circumstances. All candidates shall be required to do such written or practical work as may be prescribed by the professor or lecturer.

The University before Parliament
Register July 28th 1910.
Mr Thos Ryan's Speech

UNIVERSITY EDUCATION.

Mr. RYAN moved—"That a select committee be appointed to report on the best methods to be adopted to make available the facilities for higher education at the Adelaide University to deserving students." He was conscious that the House had long recognised that national development was dependent on the extension of education. Every Parliament for years has given time, attention, and money to aid its expansion. It might be said, to the credit of Parliaments, that, however great their differences had been in most proposals, there had been common agreement on the point that a most efficient system of education should be made available to all, and that the most valuable asset to a community was its educated populace. The most important duty of a Legislature was to realize that end. So far as the passing of the motion would further that, argument would not be necessary. The objections that would probably be raised might be grouped under three main headings:—(1) The right of State enquiry; (2) the need for such enquiry; and (3) would any good result from such enquiry? He accepted those as objections that demanded serious consideration. The right of enquiry, he had been informed repeatedly, was beyond the functions of the State; but he took it that it was not so, and that it would be a bad day for South Australia if ever it became so. The University was not the property of the few, but of the nation. It had been brought into existence by national law, maintained largely by national funds, and was to supply national needs. That might be seen from a study of the establishment of universities generally, including the University of Adelaide. The establishment of the University was one of those Acts in the history of the State which justified them in speaking with reverence of the men who had preceded them in those Chambers. But not only to those who entered Parliament, but to the early colonists who in the initial stages of the country's development, realized their obligations to their adopted home, to their neighbours, and to those who would take their places when the evening shadows closed around their lives. They could not speak of the University without remembering with gratitude the action of the first Patron of the University (Sir W. W. Hughes), who by his first gift of £20,000 paved the way to its establishment. Then the work and generosity of the late Sir Thomas Elder, Mr. and Mrs. R. Barr Smith, and others, would instantly come before their minds when they thought of the advantages they derived from the University. When the proposal to make available the work of a university for the people of South Australia had first been brought before Parliament, the greatest objections to its foundation came from those members of the Assembly and Legislative Council who felt that it was not a matter in which private citizens should be allowed to engage, but that it was part of their national education, and should be preserved and maintained by the State. The passage of the Bill for it had been seriously contested. The Hon. W. W. Hughes had been even asked to take back his money, on the plea that the institution was not wanted, that it was unimportant, and would be of slow growth. It had been contended at the time that the amount suggested to be set aside was altogether inadequate, and that Mr. Hughes would only succeed in establishing a rival college to those already in existence. Yet his vision has been as far-reaching as his generosity, and he realized that every help rightly given made the impulse stronger. One of the objectors to educational reform had said that it would be "Too small and too slow of growth." The generous donor and his fellow-colonists who were assisting him, knew that slowness of growth would not only be applicable to the formation of a University, but that—

> Slowly moves the march of ages,
> Slowly grows the forest king,
> Slowly to perfection cometh
> Every great and noble thing.

To the credit of the people, the majority of the House ultimately recognised that the formation of the Adelaide University would not be an exception to that time-honoured rule. In reading the history of its inauguration he had noticed the objection that the University could never do its work if it were divorced from Government control, and were not sponsored by the Parliament. He desired to call attention to a few details in connection with its history which should tend to remove any feeling that might exist against State enquiry or State intervention. On October 16, 1874, the then Minister of Justice (Hon. W. H. Bundey) moved for an Act to authorize the establishment of the University, and set out the need for such an institution and the benefits it would confer on the youth of the land. The Bill had to pass through that ordeal so common to any measure which would seem to be in advance of its time. Before the second reading it was saved from being counted out only by the narrowest of margins. However, Mr. Bundey was not a man to be defeated without a fight, and the second reading stage advanced slowly. Before it was carried many hard things were said against the University. Its opponents became very powerful, and raised many bogies to prevent the Bill passing, and contended that the measure was far ahead of its time. Reading up the debates and the proposals [illegible] the establishment of universities in [illegible]ious parts of the world, he found that [illegible] nine different cases the great argument [illegible]ainst them was that the time was not [illegible]. That empty and frequently used [illegible]rase had kept the university out of at least two of the Australian States, and only last month the Queensland Parliament, realizing that no other action would bring a university into existence there, had decided that a university should be established in Queensland. The opponents of the Bill for the Adelaide University had reminded members that it would be a choice between a grant to the Adelaide University and going without roads and bridges. Fortunately for the reputation of the State and the intellectual life of its people the proposal had been agreed to, and the Government of the day rendered itself liable to a grant not exceeding £10,000 in one year. Accordingly with 50,000 acres of Crown lands in the country and 5¼ acres in the city, under the patronage of the leading men of the day the Adelaide University had been established. It had been contended that the grant of land would secure the nucleus of funds sufficient for the work of the University, but that desire had not been realized. He could not exonerate the council of the institution from the charge of having caused them to be inadequate. That council consisted largely of business men. They had taken 50,000 acres of the State's most valuable land, and asked to be allowed to sell it for £40,000, so that the money might earn the magnificent interest of 3½ per cent. In the district represented by Mr. Campbell one-eighth of the land would easily have brought that amount. (Minister of Education—"A lot of that was useless and belonged to absentees.") They should not, however, ask the people, though they had made a mistake, to suffer through that mistake. Though it had cost the State nearly £200,000 already, and they were committed up to £10,000 per year in the future, and had before them an application for an additional £30,000, yet no voice in the expenditure of that money had been granted to the State. Remembering the great canon of all legislation, that provision of State money should go hand in hand with State regulation, was further argument necessary? One view which could weaken that contention was that the enquiry would be detrimental to the proper control of the University. He was quite satisfied, however, as precedent would show, that such would not be the case. The question of their right to enquire would, on examination, lose its terrors. As for justification or motive, he could affirm that it was not hostility to University and its functions, but a consciousness of its value. He sought not to attack, but to support, not to condemn, but to honour, not to destroy its usefulness, but to extend it. The function of a university had been stated clearly by Milton, who said that a university should provide "that education which fits a man to perform justly, skilfully, and magnanimously all the duties of all offices." or as Professor Jordan remarked—

It was [illegible]
sity was given ex[illegible] ta[illegible]
opportunity if he had [illegible] ability to

.—"The university should be a school in which every branch of higher education is taught and studied in harmonious co-operation with every other branch; that it should represent, as it were, the microcosm of the whole range of human knowledge; that it should be a place where whatever a man should know, there should be found some one able to teach him." An Oxford report on education stated:—"A modern university must be accessible to every class, not merely in the formal sense that it admits every applicant of good character who satisfies its educational requirements, but in the practical sense of making it certain that no one will be excluded on the ground of poverty. Religious tests were abolished 30 years ago by the old universities. The step is recognised as a wise one, but to the majority of the working classes a system which excludes a student because of the limited means of his parents appears indistinguishable in effect from one which excludes him because of religious beliefs." He asked the university men of the House whether they considered the University fulfilling those functions. Surely it was not unkind to say that the call for activity necessitated by many conditions of modern competitive life, had not been heard by the circle governing the university life of the State. The sentiment that should lie behind a university, if it was to be a real living force in the community, and an aid to the prosperity of the State—and unless it was it would not justify its existence—was that it should be a place where all might turn to obtain the highest knowledge available for application to practical purposes—open not to a few of fortune's favourites, who, so to speak, had the road made for them, but rather so governed that from within there should be found means to bridge the gulf between those who had and those who desired. That was the governing thought in the mind of Professor Huxley when he said in 1871—"I should like to have an arrangement by which a passage could be secured for children of superior ability to schools in which they could obtain higher instruction than in the ordinary schools. I believe no educational system in England will be worth the name of a national system or fulfil the great objects of education unless it is one which establishes a great ladder, the bottom of which will be in the gutter and the top in the university." That was the ideal of the men who have done so much for the education of South Australia, and the ideal of the Labour Party. The University was not a luxury, but a necessity. Those were the ideals which brought it into existence; and in the hope that it would fulfil them, they were justified in expending nearly £200,000. That it had not fulfilled ideals might be a fault that members of Parliament, as guardians of the State purse, must share. To the want of money rather than the desire the failing might be attributed. A fault to be found with the Adelaide University was that it not only did not do all that it could for those who were not allowed to participate in its teaching, but also not enough for the men and women who already had admittance to it. It was impossible for the University to do its work as it was situated to-day. (Premier—"How do you account for that?") In the first place, the men who controlled the destinies of the institution—he did not wish to speak unkindly—were not in touch with the everyday life of the people. They were too exclusive in every sense, and would remain so until the University Council had at its meetings representatives from every walk of life. (Premier—"You say the University authorities are too hidebound?") Yes, and if those hidebound conditions could be broken down he thought among those who would be most grateful would be the University men themselves. He spoke with confidence when he said that the conditions forced on University attendants, owing to the inadequacy of its buildings, were such that they would not be tolerated in the factory life of the community. If they visited the building they would find that its most learned men, whose every investigation was of public interest, were so environed that their best work could not be done. Many of the rooms occupied by the professors were such that no decent workman would use them for his workshop. "Buried in cells, cold stone cells," described largely the condition of its professional men. He did not think there was in the building a decent room common to all students, or that for the fagged student or teacher there was such a thing possible as a cup of tea or a decent place to take in company the midday lunch. Many of the professors were so circumscribed that their specimens, so necessary in chemistry and in other sciences, could not be unpacked. Dr. Mawson had not been able even to unpack his Antarctic specimens. The University was in danger of losing its best officers for that reason. After all, those men who had devoted many years to attain that state of proficiency, which the Adelaide professors certainly had, would have to realize that in a few years their life's work was at an end. It should be remembered how long it took to graduate, and the number of years that had to be spent before a chair could be occupied; and it should then be remembered that in the Adelaide University, in addition to all those disabilities, the professors' incomes were on the most beggarly scale. The new State University opened in Queensland last month advertised in the daily papers for professional men, and offered them to begin with nearly £300 per annum more than the Adelaide University was paying. The University might well inscribe above the doors of its professors' rooms—"Your wisdom will keep you humble, and we will keep you poor." An influential deputation had waited on the late Minister of Education and complained:—"We cannot do the work of the University, we lack money, buildings, and professors. We can find the professors, we can design the buildings, but we cannot provide the money." Was he, then, not justified in saying, "If the efficiency of the University is impaired for want of funds, and recognising that educated men and women are our most valuable asset, that money should be provided, and provided by those who will benefit most by the extension of education?" Who should find the money? This question had been answered by one of America's leading statesmen, a member of the Cabinet, on February 9 last:—"If the spending of national money in any other channel can give the return which has been received as the result of university expenditure, then it would be well for those in control of State and national finances to constantly ask themselves not how much is the least you can do with, but how much is the most you can use." That the benefit which might be derived by the State from the University had not been realized was shown by the need of further assistance in teaching history, literature, biology, astronomy, veterinary science, and solar physics, all of which could be fairly stated to depend on the greatest of its needs—a 20-acre block and an adequate building. Not only did those remarks apply to the subjects mentioned, but to other great questions. If the community was ever to be developed, would it not be through the fuller recognition of the necessity to secure agricultural, pastoral, and mineral development? The day was past when the food of the family could be sent to the farm or the pastoral run. The farmer and the pastoralist to-day, if they would do justice to their holdings, had to be men who could reason and take science by the hand. He had read with pleasure an important lecture delivered by Professor Robertson in the Adelaide University a few days ago, and for copies of which members of Parliament had cause to be thankful, not so much to the University authorities, but Mr. W. A. Magarey, who realized how desirable it was that men in Parliament should know of the great discoveries in the line of research. From that lecture and another instructive article in that month's Agricultural Review he had had a glimpse of what other nations were doing, and what might be expected in agricultural chemistry and biology in the days to come. Yet, for Professor Robertson, who was an Adelaide-taught boy, there was no room in his home Universi[illegible] room in the building, nor means to p[illegible] the starvation salary which had become almost the monopoly of the members of the University staff. (Premier—"The University seems to require to be born again.") If so, it would be through a new evangelism, rather than the old. They desired that the institution should be made available to all the people. If members were conscious of the disabilities under which the University laboured they would readily come to its help, not with a view to finding fault with what was being done or to rob it of its dignity, but to share with its staff the privilege of carrying on desirable work. There were many other branches of knowledge, without which neither individuals or communities could prosper, common to the near student in older lands, but denied in the State.

The time had come indeed when the University should be considered from the aspect of changing its quarters as well as extending its work. The little five-acre block on which it stood was probably all that had been necessary in 1874; but where to-day was there any institution in the State whose work in 1874 was commensurate with its importance to-day?. If the University was born again it would have to be—(Mr. Smeaton—"Born in bigger clothes")—in a 20 or 30 acre paddock instead of a little bit of a backyard, as at present. Let us consider now the relations of the University to the State life in other lands. The American actually looked upon his university training as a preparation for life, and who could say that that which had made so very largely for the progress of the American nation would do less for the men and women of South Australia. In Europe to-day there were 97 municipalities which provided sums sufficient to enable working boys and girls to attend university, not only by the free opening of the doors and supply of books, but also by board and lodging on the university premises to students from outside the great towns. The question of championship, which could only be obtained through living quarters, occupied a great deal of attention, but was now settled once and for all, and a university was not only a school, but a home. Speaking of one of these homes, the Chancellor of the German Exchequer in 1906 reminded his Cabinet that when the question of funds was under consideration it was to education and not to militarism that their country owes its pre-eminent position in the world. Out of 722 students who matriculated at two German universities there were 112 who wrote on their entrance paper that they were sons of working men and women, whose average earnings did not reach 6/ a day. In an American university, so its cultured professor told them in Adelaide, the intelligent young men and women had the free run of the universities; and in one State there were 17 doctors, 12 solicitors, and 61 clergymen holding the degree of M.A., who would never have entered the university but as the result of the recommendations of a joint committee—national, municipal, and educational—who found not only the money, but directions as to how that money might best be spent. Members need not be alarmed at that question of Government intervention or enquiry. What existed in America was the state of affairs in England. An important deputation had waited upon Mr. Balfour, representing the whole of the educational life of Great Britain, and at least one important point had been established at the conference. The Prime Minister of England had demanded that before the State would undertake to offer assistance there should be State control over university life. What the University was doing for the community was revealed by an examination of the history of the occupants of the 975 most eminent and useful positions in England. It was revealed that Oxford University was responsible for the training of 382 of them, Cambridge for 177, Scotland for 76, and foreign universities for 112; while the few remaining positions were occupied by men who had not been trained in the University, and who had to struggle without such an education. Then, investigation made in America and Canada revealed the fact that out of 8,144 of the most successful men, 5,775 held university degrees, 1,240 had passed the high schools, and 313 had been privately educated; while of 8,144 positions only 808 were filled by men who stopped at the primary. That recalled to his mind an important fact for those in Australian public life who know how keen was the competition between Australia and other nations, and they could not be blind to the fact that the educated man had the advantage over the uneducated man in most walks of life. Was not their struggle against every legislation increased by the fact that its legislators had had an advantage which many hon. members had not been able to enjoy? He admitted with pride that something was being done in education in South Australia.

From time to time improvements had been effected, mainly through the influence of the Labour Party in the House. Still, he would like to see more done, and more would be done in the near future. Let them compare what was being done in South Australia with that in other States. They would find that the amount spent per head of the population on education in New South Wales was 12/10, in New Zealand 18/, in Victoria 12/4, in South Australia 8/6. Had the time not arisen, he asked, when something more should be done in this State? The request embodied in his motion was not meant to be in any sense hostile to, or in any way condemnatory of the Adelaide University. The public was conscious of its usefulness, but he thought they were justified in saying to the University—"Your work is important, it belongs to the State, and your funds will be provided by the State; but before that money is forthcoming men who are responsible to the taxpayers shall see that it is wisely spent, with due regard to those persons whom the State desires shall have an opportunity to become educated and cultured men." Taking, then, into consideration what had been achieved in other lands by the university making itself part of the life of the community, which was the object of his motion, it would not be contended that they were less capable of proving worthy of its advantages. And by making those advantages available, members, though denied the honour of having brought the University into existence, would be able to lay claim to having extended its influence, and thus, by insuring a passage for deserving students from the kindergarten to the University, they would realize, as did the Athenian, that the ideal State did not consist of walls or ships, but of men—trained men, able to perform justly, skilfully, and magnanimously all the duties necessary to the service of the State.

On the motion of Mr. Coombe, the debate was adjourned until August 3.