PROFESSOR BOULGER AND THE UNIVERSITY.

TO THE EDITOR.

Sir—My attention has been drawn to an advertisement in your issue of the 6th instant, inviting application for the Hughes Chair of English in the University of Adelaide. In that advertisement no reference is made to the present occupant of the chair. Such an omission will, I believe, be offensive to honest readers in a manner objectionable to me, inasmuch as terminable professorships in English are now never advertised for public competition without stating the eligibility of the existing professor, unless he be deemed ineligible. I trust, therefore, that you will permit me to state that I have offered no opposition and have declined because the council stipulated that I should accept terms as regards tenure of office and nature of duties less favorable than those which they now offer to every Australian or European candidate.

E. VAUGHAN BOULGER.

June 10, 1888.

MELBOURNE UNIVERSITY.—Table Talk of June 22 says:—Amongst the applications which have been made by the Melbourne University authorities last week for the position of Professor of Music at a salary of £70 a year were those of Professor Ives, of Adelaide; Mr. George Ball, of Sydney; Dr. W. E. Lawton, of Melbourne; Dr. Pola, of Sydney; Mr. Woolnough, of Sutton, Sarrey; and Mr. Charles Lahnmeyer, of London.

Professor Ives called upon the council last week to state that the above paragraph, so far as he is concerned, has no truth whatever. He has not applied for the position.

THE HUGHES PROFESSORSHIP OF ENGLISH.

We have received the following for publication:

"To the Council of the University of Adelaide.

"Gentlemen—In all universities where terminable chairs exist it is usual in inviting candidates for the renewed tenure to state that the actual occupant is eligible for re-election, unless fees for death have been discontinued. Will you be good enough to inform me whether it is from accident, from ignorance, or from desire to be commended, you have omitted such a statement in your advertisement."

"E. VAUGHAN BOULGER.


"The University of Adelaide, July 2, 1888.

"Dear Professor Boulger—Your letter of the 26th last was duly read at a meeting on Friday last, and I am directed to inform you that it has been received.

"Faithfully yours,

"J. WALTER TRASK, Registrar.

"Professor Boulger, M.A., D.Lit., the University, North-termace."

"To the Chancellor of the University of Adelaide.

"Dear Sir,—I am given to understand that there has been an ignorance on the part of the Council in the last letter to the Council is deemed offensive. Permit me to say that I am through you the council, that I had no desire to be discredited. My object was to make a statement and ask you to do nothing to injure me with this country. The context of my letter shows that I meant merely to imply that the announcement was possibly made in a usage observed in other universities, and I regret extremely any mean being has happened. I trust therefore that the council will state in their advertisement that I am eligible for re-election, unless they have some reason to consider me ineligible.

"I remain, Sir,

"E. VAUGHAN BOULGER."
THE UNIVERSITY.

The Senate of the University has declared open war against the Council. It is a necessity of the case that a member of the Senate shall be a graduate in arts, or laws, or medicine, before he can be considered necessary that a member of the Council shall have further experience with University management than is acquired in the work of governing. What gives importance to the character of the case is this: that the Council of the University has very large powers; one of its functions is to represent the feelings of the learned section of the community; it has to do with the appointments of professors and other dignitaries; and it has to regulate the disposition of public moneys. It has to trust to see that the cause of higher education in the colony is effectually promoted, and that the moneys which are devoted by the State to this purpose are tightly expedited. Hence the Council stands to the colony in a fiduciary relation, and its members are elected by its constituency in accordance with a known rule. The thought that an irresponsible body is a mischievous fallacy. It cannot be supported in any way or by any method of reasoning. Granted that the Council is the concrete expression of the choice of the Senate; granted, even, that the moneys which may have been made than has been made; we are irresistibly brought back to the conclusion that the Council is merely the agent by whose means and acting on whose advice the Senate promulgate its laws in the name of the University. Nor can we for a moment deny the force of the comparison which brings Council and Senate into a relative position to that occupied by Ministry and Parliament. If the Ministry does not carry out the will of the Parliament, it falls. It is not necessary to follow Mr. Hartley into his technical pleading yesterday, for the simple reason that he must know as well as everybody else that there is no mystery in the action of the law. If the Assembly decided to-morrow that the Inspector-General of Schools should no longer be an officer under the Government, all the Queen’s horses and all the Legislative Councillors would not be able to impose matters so far as he is concerned. What is true of the House of Assembly is true, mutatis mutandis, of any popular Chamber; and the Senate, which is the constituency of the Crown and the University, is bound to secure its ends in the long run.

Yesterday this ran was openly begun. Resolutions were adopted by the Senate which were plainly opposed to the expressed wishes of the Council. The popular body has in direct terms denounced the Senate, and has claimed that it exerts its power, for the Act gives the members of the Council unlimited authority to formulate what regulations they please. However, it was necessary the Senate should express its opinion on the subject, and the speeches in yesterday’s meeting, were taken with this end in view. It has been our duty to protest against the new regulations made for the governance of the universities, professorships, because they tend to lower the dignity of the chairs concerned and to deprive their value. We cannot expect good men