

were moved to a site two miles from the G.P.O. He was confident that the Government's proposal would have the approval of the vast majority of the electors.

Mr. Bice—Say something to the motion before you sit down. (Hear, hear.)

The Minister was just going to. According to the Constitution, the House of Assembly would deal with the matter on the Estimates, but the Legislative Council had no right to question the action of the Government on matters where finance was concerned.

Mr. Pascoe pointed out that the Government had decided to move the Agricultural Show Grounds. If the Government wanted to extend the University grounds, why could they not make use of the old Show Grounds.

Mr. Bice—That would not give an opportunity for more buying of properties.

Mr. Pascoe—That was the whole trouble—the Government's policy of property-buying. (Hear, hear.) The Governor did not want to live all the time in the country. He had a summer residence at Marble Hill now. Perhaps the Minister of Agriculture wished to make him a market gardener. (Laughter.) If the Government wanted to shift anything, they should move the University, not the Government House. The Government were

assuming this autocratic attitude because they had an accidental majority in the other House. (Hear, hear.) They thought they could carry the Estimates through there and flout the Council with impunity, but he would commend it to them as a far wiser and far safer thing for the Government to take Parliament into their confidence. (Hear, hear.)

The Minister of Agriculture—It is not that. It is because we have a majority of twelve against us here. We would have a Buckley's chance here.

Mr. Pascoe—That did not do away with the Government's duty of consulting the people on their action. The Minister's remark that they had no constitutional right to question the action of the Government was not only unwise, but incorrect. The Council could take that last and most drastic step, and refuse to pass the Appropriation Bill, throwing South Australian affairs into chaos, and of throwing the public service out of joint and out of gear, and the Minister's challenge tempted members to take that step. (Hear, hear.) It was an unwise and uncalled-for challenge, that he was sure the Minister would regret having made. (Hear, hear.) The Council had the constitutional right and a constitutional power that would place the Government in an awkward position, and bring about chaos in the affairs of South Australia if they cared to exercise it. (Hear, hear.) Had it not been for Mr. Bice's motion the whole thing could have been, and probably would have been, pushed through without the country knowing anything about it. He hoped wiser counsels would prevail, and that Parliament would not be flouted in this matter.

On the motion of Mr. Warren the debate was adjourned till October 4.

A CHAIR OF THEOLOGY.

DR. BEVAN'S VIEWS.

PREFERS AN EXAMINING BODY.

"I am exceedingly pleased that the matter has been brought up by Professor Naylor, and that it has been brought up in so large-minded and generous a way," said Dr. L. D. Bevan (Principal of the Parkin Congregational Training College), when asked to give his views upon the question of the establishment of a theological chair and faculty at the Adelaide University. Professor Naylor addressed the Theological Students' Association on the matter last Friday evening.

"I have been disappointed by the action of the University of Melbourne," continued Dr. Bevan. "They virtually refused to consider the question and have fallen back upon the constitution of the University, which does not allow them to deal with theological questions and with questions of religion. Probably that was a necessary principle when the University was started, but as the days have gone on it is certainly not needful. There was a time when there was a danger of a University which embraced theological studies dealing with a particular view, and forcing in its instruction the peculiar tenets of one church. We have now for two or three generations got rid of that sort of idea, and, as Professor Naylor properly defined it, we have examples all over the world of Universities dealing with religion as one of their subjects, and establishing faculties and granting degrees therein. We are in danger of being as much oppressed by the narrowness of non-religious or even irreligious opinion as once the world was by the narrowness of religious opinion. I was disappointed to find that the University of Melbourne could not be moved in the large and liberal direction of including that which is, after all, the greatest of sciences, and virtually includes all the others in its outlook. I hope that Adelaide will not take the example of Melbourne as its guide, but will rather show a freedom which has marked some of the newer Universities at home and very largely has been adopted in the Universities of America and other lands.

Professor Naylor's proposed scheme involves the establishment of a chair or chairs, and also the examination of students and the granting of degrees. It is rather necessary that these objects should be pretty clearly understood. In quoting the English Universities as examples as having included theology in their faculties it must not be forgotten that some of these Universities are not teaching Universities. Their special and essential work—at least this is so in London—is that of examining and determining whether candidates are deserving of degrees. A man may get his degree in London who has not even studied at one of the colleges which by recent changes in the constitution of the University have become much more closely associated with it than they were formerly. London gives its degrees to any who come up to the standard, and they may obtain their learning anywhere. That is markedly different from the position of many other Universities, and especially ours in the colonies. They are really colleges that have the power of granting degrees, and necessarily from the smallness of our population they become little more than simple colleges. The result of this is a danger that the University should be narrowed with the limitations in each subject of its own especial professor. Virtually a University examination is controlled by a University professor. I think that there is no suspicion that this has not worked very justly and very well, but at the same time it is certain that the influence of a single professor who virtually controls the thought and opinion of an entire State, so far as that is related to the subjects with which the University deals, may lead in some cases to narrowness and want of progress. It is a dangerous possibility in all cases, but especially in the subjects which make up a theological or religious faculty. I should prefer very much to see in our Universities a theological faculty, administering examinations and the granting of degrees—as is done at the London University—for which all our colleges it is hoped

would direct their preparation. I do not doubt that men will be found who will teach in all the branches of theology intelligently and broadly, but it cannot be denied that the intense ambition of some parts in the Christian Church and the equally intense sentiments of scholars outside the Christian Church may occasion all kinds of difficulty. I think Professor Naylor hardly distinguished sufficiently between theology as it has been understood in the higher training both of colleges and Universities and religion regarded as a branch of anthropology. It is impossible in a Christian country and dealing with Christian thoughts to get rid of the unique claim which Christianity makes as contrasted with other religions. It is quite possible to treat Christianity in a course on the sciences of religion, but I gravely doubt whether such a course, except from the point of view of general culture, would be of very great advantage to students whose object in life is the Christian ministry, and it is for such of course that the proposed University scheme would be chiefly intended. It is quite certain that no University course of lectures on theology could take the place of a theological college as regards the work of the Christian ministry, to which none the less a University examination and direction of the scientific side of theology might be of the highest advantage. It must not be forgotten that so far as a University is concerned with medical study it has been found absolutely necessary to add to the University course the practical work and teaching which can only be gained in a hospital. In the same way in our community religion has a practical aspect which can be included in a ministerial college, but which it is quite impossible to bring into a University course.

"The entire question is one of so much importance that I hope it will be considered from all points of view. I can only wish the proposal every success, and express my gratitude to Professor Naylor for having introduced it. I trust it will receive the most earnest consideration. It would be pitiful to introduce into the high teaching of our community anything that would lead to an exhibition of denominational spirit, while, on the other hand, to create a narrow study of religion from a merely anthropological standpoint would be a very doubtful addition even to our merely intellectual culture."

Professor Naylor mentioned that £30,000 would be required to found the chair, said the reporter. Do you think much difficulty would be experienced in raising that sum, should the University council give its approval?

"It seems to me that the question of cost is one that might be easily met, either by individuals in our community who are making great fortunes, or even by the community itself, which is now enjoying a prolonged season of great prosperity. Thirty thousand pounds seems a large sum, but to establish a theological faculty of any real help it is by no means excessive. I only hope that the example set by some of the wealthy men of America may be followed here. Indeed, it is not necessary to go to America for examples of generosity for we have in our own land illustrations of what generous men have done. It must be remembered that the idea of a University faculty of theology is not for a single section, but for the entire community. If it is wisely founded every church, and, indeed, all the people, will benefit greatly."

Register, Sep. 29/11.

LAPSED UNIVERSITY SENATE MEETING.

A meeting of the Senate of the University lapsed on Thursday afternoon, as a quorum—20 members—was not present. "We shall have to pay the gentlemen," said one of the members in referring to the insufficient attendance. "Nowadays everybody wants payment." The agenda paper contained business from the council for the Senate's approval or rejection, as follows:—(1) New statute of the Lowrie scholarships, dealing with the anonymous donor's gift of £500 to provide scholarships for post-graduate research in agriculture; (2) new regulations of the higher public examination, by which pure mathematics are divided into two subjects, and by which the section dealing with names of distinguished candidates is rearranged.