The battle between the various colleges as to the wisdom of optional and compulsory courses—including especially the study of Greek—progresses fiercely. Interest centres, of course, on Yale and Harvard, the oldest institutions of the kind in America. Yale is the champion of conservatism, and glories in her likeness to the famous universities of England. To her elegantly useless learning is the "hall mark of a gentleman." Harvard, though yet older, is liberal even to the point of allowing an Episcopal clergyman to hold high office in her councils, after having been for many years practically exclusively Unitarian. In the matter particularly in point—whether the English or German model should prevail—Harvard has gradually broken away altogether from her old traditions. At present the two colleges stand as regards the number of hours weekly which the student can devote to the studies of his own choice as follows:

**HOURS OF ELECTIVE STUDIES (PER WEEK).**

**Yale, Harvard.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Yale</th>
<th>Harvard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The result of these differing policies has been that in the last 20 years Yale has increased from 500 to 563 or 12½ per cent, while Harvard has increased from 419 to 1,068, or 155 per cent. In other words, the mere gain at Harvard amounts to a greater number of students than Yale has ever had in its academical department. Only Yale and Princeton now "stand on the ancient paths," and they are fast being swept aside by the younger institutions which devote themselves simply to the task of making successful men. Even in the law courts an elegant quotation from the classics merely provokes a smile; no lawyer under forty can venture upon such a decidedly old-fashioned affectation.
MEETING OF THE COUNCIL.
MONDAY, MARCH 11.

Present—Dr. Brownless (the chancellor, in the chair), Professor Irving (vice-chancellor), Dr. Petherston, Mr. J. H. MacFarland, Sir Archibald Michie, Dr. Bride, Mr. R. Murray Smith, Dr. A. Morrison, Dr. Madden, Dr. Robertson, Mr. Justice A’Becketts, and Mr. H. B. Higgins.

APPOINTMENT OF A PROFESSOR OF LAW.

A letter was read from the agent-general, stating that a committee, consisting of the Right Hon. Lord Justice Cotton (chairman), the Right Hon. J. W. Mellor, Q.C., Mr. J. N. Higgins, Q.C., Mr. J. Joyce, and Mr. A. T. Lawrence, had considered 20 applications which had been received in London for the position of Professor of Law at the Melbourne University, and had presented the following report:

“We have examined the applications for the appointment, and the testimonials sent in by the several applicants, and we have selected three of the applicants whose names we give in what we consider to be their order of merit: 1. Mr. Jenkins; 2. Mr. Carter; 3. Mr. Pitt Corbett. We think that all three are good, and that Mr. Jenkins is the best qualified for the duties of the office if he were appointed to it. But we are of opinion that they stand as we have placed them in order of merit. We have had difficulty in deciding between Mr. Jenkins and Mr. Carter, of the two we should place first, and we have decided in favour of Mr. Jenkins, principally on the ground that he has had greater experience in giving lectures.”

Dr. Madden proposed that Mr. Edward Jenkins should be appointed to the professorship. The testimonials of Mr. Jenkins were of a very high character, and the fact of his name having been placed first on the list was sufficient reason for his appointment.

Dr. Robertson seconded the motion.

Professor Irving pointed out that although Mr. Jenkins was said to have had more experience in teaching than the other two candidates, since his selection the other gentlemen had furnished additional testimonials. He should be inclined to take into consideration the claims of Mr. Carter to the position.

Dr. Higginson thought that the recommendation of the committee should be given effect to.

Mr. Murray Smith pointed out that the committee had given a decided preference to Mr. Jenkins.

Mr. Higgins considered it very gratifying that the University of Melbourne should have attracted as applicants men of such high qualifications as the candidates undoubtedly possessed. A doubt had been expressed as to the possibility of getting first-class applicants, but this had been dispelled in a most unmistakable manner.

The motion was carried.

From the application and testimonials of Mr. Jenkins it appears that he is 38 years of age, a graduate in double first-class honours of the University of Cambridge, a barrister-at-law (with precedence of call), and a Fellow of the Institute of Directors in England. In 1877 he was articled to a firm of London solicitors, and on the expiry of his articles he was placed second in a list of 300 candidates for the final solicitors’ examination. After a few months’ practice as a solicitor he entered himself at King’s College, Cambridge, and at
the Middle Temple. He at this time was also
read for double honours at Cambridge, and
for honours at the bar. At the end of his first
year he obtained a Real Property Scholar-
ship at the Middle Temple, and an exhi-

bition at King's College. In January,
1888, he was proxime for the "Members'"
English Essay Prize of the University; in
January, 1889, he was awarded the First
Senior Scholarship of the Faculty of Law,
the famous "Barstow" scholarship of the
Inns of Court. In March, 1888, he was awarded
the "Le Bas" prize of the University of Cam-
bidge for an essay on "Thomas Carlyle and
John Stuart Mill." He held the post of Uni-
versity Local Examiner, and had been ap-
pointed to act as an examiner for scholar-
ships at King's College. His name had been
several times, in addition to his college lec-
tures, before London audiences.

APPOINTMENT OF A PROFESSOR OF MUSIC.
A letter was read from the agent-general
stating that, acting on the recommendation
of Sir Frederick Ouseley, Dr. McKenzie, and
Mr. Goldschmidt, he had examined the differ-
ent applications and testimonial of can-
didates for the office of Organist and Pro-
fessor of Music, and had settled upon a prelimi-
nary list of seven gentlemen consid-
ered desirable to examine personally. Mr.
Goldschmidt having in the meantime,
been employed as organist of the cata-

dral of Denver, Colorado, in the United
States, was afterwards personally ex-
amined. As a result, the committee decided to
ask that the following names should be sub-
temitted to the council, but declined to place
them in order of merit:-Dr. Gower, Mr.
Marsh Hall, Mr. Oliver, Mr. King, J.
Smith, Mr. Henry Hall, Mr. King, and Mr.
Smith were candidates last year, and
Mr. Gower's claims, though he did not actu-
ally apply, were taken into con-
sideration at the instance of his brother
supported by Sir Frederick Ouseley, so that the
new advertisement for applications did not
appear to have had any effect in bring-
ing forward candidates of mark. From
all he had heard he formed a highly favour-
able opinion of Mr. Gower's apply-

cations were sent to England.

Dr. Morrison said that as there was no
consideration the testimonials of the gentle-
men selected a committee on the ap-
pointment to consult with local musical
experts.

The Chancellor remarked that Dr. Gower
appeared to be a remarkable man, and to
have very high testimonials.
Dr. Fetherson thought it would be a reflection on the London committee to have local musicians consulted.

Sir Archibald Michie thought that the difficulties of the council would only be increased by an appeal to the judgment of local musicians.

Dr. Madden—Why did the committee in London refuse to place these candidates?

Dr. Morrison—I have no doubt that one of the reasons was that these men applied last year, and were not then considered up to the standard required by us.

Dr. Madden—Then it is not a question whether we should accept either of these gentlemen? If they were not fit for the position last year they are not fit for it this year. We have declined to accept any of them. (“No, no.”)

Professor Irving—Have not some of the conditions imposed last year been removed?

Mr. Justice A’Beckett—On the expectation that a higher class of men would be attracted a slight difference was made in the conditions.

The Chancellor—From what I can glean from reading the testimonials, they seem to be all excellent men.

Sir Archibald Michie—Is it the case that these men were reckoned ineligible last year?

Dr. Madden—I understand that the report of the committee was to the effect that they were not of a sufficiently high standard for the position.

Mr. Higgins—My resolution is that the conditions were altered so as to secure additional applicants. It was desired that the professor should have the right of private practice. I do not think there was anything in the report of the committee stating that the candidates were not good enough for the position.

The Chancellor explained that in the absence of the minutes of last year, he could not say exactly what was the report of the committee.

Dr. Morrison proposed the following motion:

“That a committee be appointed to consider the application of Dr. Gower, Mr. Marshall Hall, Mr. Oliver King, and Dr. J. Smith for the professorship of music, and report to the council after referring to the former letter from the selection committee:—1. Is the candidate recommended above in their opinion a fit candidate for the post? 2. What is the order of merit of the above four?—the committee having power, if necessary, of calling in the opinion of experts.

Professor Irving suggested the advisability of telegraphing to the Agent-General to ascertain whether the selectors could recommend any of the four selected candidates for the professorship.

Mr. Justice A’Beckett thought a satisfactory answer could scarcely be obtained by a telegram on the subject, and the cable message might give rise to a misunderstanding.

Mr. Higgins said that as the council had taken all the pains it could to get the best man for the position, he did not see what was to be gained by ascertaining again the views of the London committee. It must be assumed, as nothing was said on the point, that all the candidates mentioned were eligible.

Mr. MacFarland—Hear, hear.

Sir Archibald Michie thought the Agent-General should be communicated with by either cable or letter in three months’ time, and not run the risk of making an unsatisfactory appointment.

Dr. Bride agreed with Professor Irving’s suggestion.

It was agreed to postpone consideration of the motion.
the matter for a week to enable the correspondence which had passed between the Agent-General and the council previously to be consulted.

MATRICULATION EXAMINATION RESULTS.

Mr. Murray Smith said he desired to call attention to the letter from the registrar, which had appeared in The Argus of that morning with reference to the late matriculation examination. If the council was to maintain the control of University affairs it should take the action of the registrar in this matter into consideration. Because there was a difference of opinion between the registrar and the examiners as to how papers were to be sent to the University, the letter was unjustified in indulging in such a flood of vituperation, and he had been guilty of a very great impropriety. Nothing could excuse him for entering into a squabble through the medium of the daily press. Because the examiners had addressed a letter to the council the registrar apparently thought he was justified in making a false letter to the editor of The Argus with such phrases in it as —

“This statement is maliciously mendacious. The supreme selflessness and coolness of such a statement as this is only excelled by its mean mendacity... This protest is nothing more than a newsworthy attack on anyone who has simply done his duty: it has not one decent fact to recommend it from the beginning to the end, and it is as disgraceful to them as it is insulting to me.”

He was utterly at a loss to understand the reason for the use of such language as this, but the fact that he desired to call attention to the fact that this letter had been published without being submitted to the council, and consequently the registrar should be called upon for an explanation.

The Chancellor stated that he had received the following letters with reference to the subject under discussion:

The University of Melbourne, March 11, 1889.

"Dear Mr. Chancellor, I desire to draw your attention to the letter from The Argus of this day, and I request you to ask the council to meet to-day whether this transference of a question now under its consideration to the public press is in accordance with University discipline. I have, &c.,

Edward B. Morris."

The University, 11th March, 1889.

"My dear Mr. Chancellor, — The Argus of this morning comments unfavourably on the correspondence addressed to a recent occasion by myself and others to the council relative to alleged delays in sending the Christmas exercises to the Argus. I reply to my letter to the council, his discovery of a rule 17 in the printed instructions is plainly inadequate and an overthought, but as a fresh and awfully malevolent attack upon me, among others, his letter leaves nothing to desire; if it is not my intention to concord any reply; but I do ask you, with the utmost respect, that this new phase of official folly may be summarily disposed of, and that University business can be carried on if the publication of University papers is to be the ordinary channels of correspondence between professors and the clerical officials; while there is no desirably-organised service, public or private, in Victoria for the proper transmission of letters to one place and from another, the order of one of its officers assailing in set terms in the names of others the reputation of other members of the University to which he belongs. I am, &c.,

S. E. Raftery."

To the Chancellor and Council of the University of Melbourne, March 12, 1889.

"Gentlemen,—We are unwilling to trouble the council with further reference to the reports of the registrar on the matriculation examination, published in ‘The Argus’ of February 26th, and merely wish to state that there exists a misapprehension of the facts on the part of some members of the council. We are, &c.,

Mr. Murray Smith."
The facts are:
1. Examiners were directed to send in complete returns of the matriculation examination not later than the 1st January, 1889.
2. In every instance, with two exceptions, this order was obeyed.
3. Forty-one days after the compliance of examiners with this, the only regulation as to date known to the commissioners, to them, the registrar reported certain examiners to the council for not having sent certain complete returns not by the 1st January but by the 20th December, 1888.

The council published in the press 42 days after January 1st the report without a previous reference to the examiners issued.

We have, etc.

J. H. B. MORRISON
J. S. ELMINGTON
ALEX. FRASER MORRISON.

March 9, 1889.

It was resolved, on the motion of Mr. Higgins, seconded by Dr. Robertson:

That a draft answer be prepared to the questions contained in the joint protest of the examiners—their reasons and instructions broken to be distinctly specified.

Mr. Murray Smith then moved:

That the registrar be requested to explain his reasons for the course pursued in addressing his letter to The Argus of today.

Dr. Madden thought that the action of the registrar did not permit of his being heard. He was not a public speaker, and therefore it was very difficult for him at a meeting such as this to express exactly his feelings. If the public prints were searched it would be found that he had been subjected to as much a collection of insults as ever were levelled at any man, public or private, and he had not once made a reply. He knew that these insults were not altogether from outside people. He had been instigated and prompted by professors, lecturers, and students within the University. He had been placed in ridiculous and contemptible positions times out of number, and Professor Irving would bear him out in saying that most insulting things had been said to him. The council must allow even to a person in his position the possession of his feelings and sensitiveness, and his right to object to being continually sat upon. He had been told when changes were talked of that one of his chief defects was that he was weak, frightened, and generally feeble in his work; that he was a decent fellow in his way, but he took things easily, and had not sufficient "go" in him. Dr. Morrison had told him that he wanted more "push." When, however, he had shown some energy in endeavouring to get the examination papers in proper time, he had been thwarted by the examiners, and he had been intimidated by Professor Morris threatening to refer to his actions in the senate. He regretted that he had been induced to send a letter to The Argus, but the.
produced to send a letter to the registrar, but the council must admit that he had received strong provocation.

Mr. Murray Smith said that the registrar having expressed regret for what he had done, the council would no doubt be satisfied.

The subject was then allowed to drop, and the meeting terminated.

NOTICES TO STUDENTS.

ORDINARY EXAMINATION—February Term, 1889.

RESULTS.

The following result was posted on the University notice-board yesterday:

NATURAL PHILOSOPHY, PART I.

Certificated Teachers.—Passed, 247, 250, 251, 253, 256, 257, 258, 260, 261, 263.

FINAL HONOURS EXAMINATION.

Examinations will be continued today as follows:

School of history, political economy, and jurisprudence, 2 p.m. to 5 p.m. Paper on "Jurisprudence."

M.A. examination, 2 p.m. to 5 p.m. Paper on "Political Economy."

M.D. examination, 2 p.m. to 5 p.m. Obstetric medicine, and diseases of women and children. "Case for commentary."

THE "W. T. MOLLISON SCHOLARSHIP."

The oral examination in connection with the above scholarship will be held today at 2.30 p.m.

CORRECTION.

In the list of successful candidates for the second year arts, published in our columns yesterday, the name of Spencer Edward Holroyd (Trinity College) was omitted.