G.P.O. He was confident that the Govern-
ment's proposal would have the approval of the House. He thought that the House of
Representatives would deal with the Bill.

Mr. Nicolson urged that the House of
Representatives should deal with the Bill.
Mr. Nicolson spoke on the question of
whether the Government would act on the
Committee's report. He said that the House of
Representatives had given the Bill its second
reading. He mentioned the importance of
the Bill to the country and the necessity for
the Government to act on the Committee's
report.

Mr. Nicolson also mentioned the need for
the Government to act on the report of the
Committee of Enquiry. He said that the
Committee had recommended that the
Government should take action to prevent
the occurrence of similar incidents in the
future.

Mr. Nicolson concluded his speech by
urging the Government to act on the
Committee's report and by reaffirming his
confidence in the Government's ability to
resolve the issue.

M.P. He was of the opinion that the
Government was not taking sufficient action
to prevent the recurrence of similar
incidents. He believed that the Government
had not given adequate consideration to
the Committee's recommendations.

M.P. He also expressed his concern about
the lack of action taken by the Government.
He mentioned that the Committee of
Enquiry had made specific recommendations
to prevent similar incidents in the future.

M.P. He concluded his speech by
urging the Government to act on the
Committee's recommendations and by
expressing his support for the Committee's
recommendations.

A CHAIR OF THEOLOGY.

DR. BEVAN'S VIEWS.

"I am exceedingly pleased that the mat-
ter has been brought up by Professor
Naylor, and that it has been brought up
in so large-minded and generous a way," said
Mr. Duckin (Darkin Congregational Training
College), when asked to give his views upon
the matter of the appointment of a
theological chair and faculty at the
Adelaide University. Professor Naylor is a
member of the Theological Association on the
matter last Friday evening.

"I have been dispointed by the action of
the University of Melbourne," continued
Dr. Bevan. "They virtually refused to
consider the possibility of accepting the
Chair 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
formed, but as the days have gone on it is certainly not necessary as a time when there was a danger of a Uni-
versity which subverted the doctrine of one
particular view, and forcing all students into one
church. We have now for three or four generations gone far that sort of idea. The New University is our University, and in it we have all the freedom that a Church of England has. We are all of one denomination, and in danger of being as much oppressed as if we were trying to introduce a presbyterian or a congregational or a orthodox religious opinion as once the world was by the narrowness of religions opinion. I am sure that we want to have the University of
Melbourne could not be moved in this direction. That is the principle that is, after all, the greatest of all in the public life of the University, and it is important that the Adelaide University should not be out of line with others in its outlook. I hope that Adela-
de will not take the example of Mel-
bourne, and its guidance will rather stay in its
theology which has marked some of the
 removed from the Establishment and largely has been adopted in the Univers-
ity. Professor Naylor's proposed scheme in-
volves the appointment of a professor of
theology, and the addition of studies in
the Church and in the study of the
Church and the granting of degrees. It is rather necessary that those who have been
preaching to the world should be pretty clearly understood. In quoting the Reformation, we are not excluding theology in its faculties but it is important that some of these Universities are not
thinking University. Their special and
essentials are the same, but the method is
the same in London—in that of examining
and determining which doctrines are
observing of degrees. A man may get his
theology anywhere in the country and be
admitted at one of the colleges which by recent
constitution of the University have become much more
associated with it than they were formerly. Lon-
don gives its degrees to everybody who
fulfils the standard, and they may obtain their
degrees without any help from us. That is very
different from the position of many other
colleges which are associated with the
colleges. They are really colleges and
the power of granting degrees, and neces-
sarily the power of assisting students, gives
them much more than simple college
powers. It is certain that the influence of a single
proponent of theological opinion and of
opinion of an entire State, so far as that is related to the subjects with which we are concerned, may create cases to narrowness and want of progress. It is possible, however, that we may be
especially in the subjects which make
theological or religious faculty. I should
remember that the minister of the Universi-
ty is a theological faculty, administering
such a scheme as is done at the London Un-
iversity, for all our colleges are in order

LAPSED UNIVERSITY SENATE MEETING.

A meeting of the Senate of the Univer-
sity was held on Thursday afternoon, as a
quorum—3 members—was not present. The
Senate's agenda included the following:

1. Omitting the remainder of the
Senate's approval or rejection, as
follows:
(a) A resolution dealing with the
anonymous donor's gift of £500 to
provide scholarships for
students;
(b) A resolution dealing with the
new constitution of the
University, which divides the
Senate into two groups, and by
which each candidate must
be distinguished from all
other candidates.

2. The Senate was adjourned until
October 4.