PROFESSOR BOULGER AND THE UNIVERSITY.

TO THE EDITOR.

Sir,—Will you allow me to wake for a few words in reply to Professor Bouglé? I quote an sentence that he has made 'straightforwardly' to make insinuations. It is not the thing I am accustomed to do, nor did I so act at the meeting of the Senate.

I stated in the broadest way the general proposition that any excessive body, whether committee, Board of Governors, Council, or what you will, must of necessity have cognizance of many matters which are not within the knowledge of outsiders. I expressly disclaimed any personal reference, and the Professor and others that he did not take me as applying to himself. Under those circumstances, I submit that I am just as much and just as little blamed as if I had quoted one of His Majesty's advisers.

I am, Sir, yours,

JOHN A. HARTLEY.

March 31.

TO THE EDITOR.

Sir,—Referring to Professor Bouglé's letter in your issue of last morning, permit me to say that inasmuch as I did not make the arguments of an expert, I desired to have my remarks in the Advertiser of the 29th. I fully concur in Professor Bouglé's remarks so far as they refer to what took place at the committee meeting to which he refers. The Professors concerned were not asked to recommend any thing, and certainly did not do so. What I did say was this, that Professor Bouglé, Professor Brown, and myself were present at that meeting, and that Professor Brown and myself consented to the proposed tenure because we believed it to be the best attainable, failing a life tenure.

I am, Sir, yours,

EDWARD M. BEANIE.

The University, Adelaide, March 31.

Yesterdays meeting of the Senate of the University was most important, whether gauged from the point of view of the number of members present or of the intrinsic interest of the measures proposed for discussion. In the books of the University there are, we believe, some 120 members of the Senate, of whom upwards of twenty have left the colony. Taking, then, in consideration the fact that many of the country members of the Senate cannot find it convenient to come into town, it shows how much interest is attached to the proceedings when thirty-nine gentlemen were present to record their votes. Readers will observe that the Graduates' Association broke down lamentably in one particular. Only one of its nominees obtained a seat; and though it must necessarily be gratifying to Dr. Smith to know that he gained 60 out of the 69 available votes, whereas the two other successful candidates had only 47 and 41 votes respectively, the Association is a body must accept yesterday's election as a decision against them. They certainly made a mistake somewhere, and whether that mistake was in the selection of candidates or in the management of the election they themselves can best decide. There is one thing, however, in this connection which, though plainly noticeable, does not receive the attention which it deserves. This is the prevalence of what may be called oligarchy. Out of these gentlemen elected yester- day two were medical men, which, since Dr. Cockburn manumissiously withdrew his candidature, means 100 per cent. of the medical men who offered themselves for election. There can be no doubt as to the high qualifications of Drs. Stirling and Thomson, but there is a danger of professional feeling counting for too much in our new University, and of the thirty odd graduates in medicine deeming it incumbent upon them to vote for their brethren irrespective of anything but the school in which they gained their degrees.
The two motions which were considered yesterday are of very great importance. We cannot but think that the first, which would open the way to the government of the University by a Board of Undergraduates of tender age, was rightly rejected. Our only regret is that the majority against it was not larger. The mover made the best of a bad case, and possibly he was weighted with the conviction that it does not become a University which has yet its way to make to introduce innovations which are foreign to the true nature of Federal government. It is an instructive circumstance that the strongest objection against his first motion was the strongest point he could urge in favour of his second, which condemned the Council's action in altering the tenure of professorships. He regretted that much of the personal element had been introduced into the discussion on this point. The case of the opponents of the new departure is strong enough without the laudation of individuals affected, and it would have been in better taste if the personality of the occupant of the Chair was not commented upon. The other case is also left out of consideration. Besides this, the mention of his name and services must be distasteful to him, whilst it cannot but have placed his friends in an unpleasant position. The strongest point against the alteration in the tenure is undoubtedly that it is not received the sanction of experienced Universities; that it will bear hardly in any particular case, however iniquitous. If the Council thinks for a moment that it is setting an example with regard to the tenure of Chairs to other Universities, it will find that it is very much mistaken. With all respect to it, its knowledge of University procedure does not qualify it to assume the character of guide to the practices of Universities in matters of vital interest. For a time at least our University, which is learning to walk, should not attempt to lead the way over fences. In another generation or two we may be able to give the cue to Oxford and Cambridge, but just now we may safely be left in matters of procedure by the precedents they have established.

The Senate understands these things better than the Council. The logic of facts was on their side as well as the logic of argument. The objections which we made to the change for the Civic elective for the Council would give a reason of any weight for the faith which is in them. Archdeacon Farr, who was the nominal author of the new tenure regulation, made a speech which carried its own refutation with it. "It was within his knowledge," he said, "that we had persons sent out from England—not necessarily the Professors—who had not come up to the mark." This is quite true, so far as it goes; but the instances are exceptions. Are we not right in saying that the rule is otherwise, and that a much bolder hand has been taken in appointing himself from England—we have an example of it? Before leaving the subject we have to protest most strongly against the unkind tactics to which one or two defenders of the Council had recourse. They mysteriously assured the Senate that if it knew a little about the characters and characters as the speakers did it would support the Council. Such a style of argument cannot be condemned.