

Register 9 Dec 1882

ADELAIDE UNIVERSITY.—We understand that at a special meeting of the Council of the University held on Friday, the recent appointment of Mr. E. E. Morris, M.A., of the Church of England Grammar School, Melbourne, to the Chair of English Language

and Literature in the Adelaide University, was discussed. It was resolved to release Mr. Morris from his engagement in the event of his desiring to accept the Professorship of Modern Languages and Literatures in Melbourne University, to which he was elected on November 27, subsequently, that is to say, to his election to the Chair of English Literature in our own University. We believe that no further steps were taken towards filling up the vacant position, but the subject will probably be considered at the next meeting of the Council, which will be held later in the month.

Register
Dec 9 1882

THE CHANCELLORSHIP OF THE UNIVERSITY.

TO THE EDITOR.

Sir—Would it not have been possible for "Observer" to have expressed his opinion in regard to the prolonged vacancy of the Chancellorship of the University without imputations upon the Anglican Church of seeking "undue prominence" over other denominations by endeavouring to attach high secular appointments to offices held by its dignitaries? What possible proof has "Observer" got that any desire exists among Anglican churchpeople that Bishop Kennion should be Chancellor of the University? Or what attempt has been made by any member of the Anglican body to reserve this honour to the new Bishop?

Would it not have been well for "Observer" to have satisfied your readers of the truth of his statements before talking of the "impertinence and injustice" of one religious body trying to raise itself by "unfair" means above the others, or giving vent to suppositions that the Church of England is desirous of seeing the Chancellorship of a "University which owes its existence largely to the munificence of non-Episcopalians attached in perpetuity" to the Anglican Bishopric. Speaking as a clergyman of the Church of England, I may inform "Observer" that we should regard with disfavour rather than otherwise the immediate acceptance of the Chancellorship of the University by our new Bishop. There is plenty of work for him to do connected with his episcopal office without burdening himself with unnecessary responsibilities, for which, at any rate for the present, he will be ill able to afford time and attention. I quite agree with "Observer" that the University should no longer be without a Chancellor. I also think with him that there are men in Adelaide fitted for the position; but when, with what looks very much like a covert sneer at the attainments of the late Chancellor, he says "we have men in our midst who hold higher distinctions in the world of letters than ever fell to him," I am somewhat tempted to ask him to name them.

Bishop Short was a double first-classman of the University of Oxford; he had the honour of examining men like the present Prime Minister and the late Archbishop of Canterbury for their degrees. If there are men in Adelaide of higher classical distinction why on earth was Dr. Short pressed to retain the office of Chancellor when he wished to resign it more than two years ago before he had made up his mind to resign his bishopric?

I am, Sir, &c.,

M. A.

Register Dec 9 1882

TO THE EDITOR.

Sir—I am afraid the article in your issue of to-day may be taken as unreasonably severe in attributing to the Council a want of promptness and a neglect of duty in not having ere this appointed a successor to Dr. Short. The Council cannot be precipitate in the selection of such an officer as the Chancellor of the University. It should be remembered that such an officer must be one eminently gifted with the highest scholastic attainments and equal to discharge the duties of so exalted an office as that of the Chancellor of the University, and, therefore, the Council, it seems to me, have with considerable zeal for the future of our University gravely and seriously considered the great responsibility created by the retirement of Dr. Short. The Council cannot fail to see the difficulty, if not impossibility, of selecting the high-class man needed—who should prove himself possessed of the varied qualifications which such an officer requires in discharging the duties of so distinguished a post and be an honour to our University. No doubt the Council must see that such a man may not be found in our midst, so ample time should therefore be allowed, as the selection demands the gravest and most serious consideration, and the more so as it is said that an enquiry into the general management of the University is contemplated.

I am, Sir, &c.,

A MEMBER OF THE UNIVERSITY.

Adelaide, December 7.

TO THE EDITOR.

Sir—I am glad that my first communication has awakened so much interest, and I think that all well-wishers of the University must feel obliged for your excellent article upon the general bearings of this matter. My present purpose is to reply to Dr. Whittell's communication appearing in this morning's issue of the *Register*. It is a remarkably frank confession of facts, which make the delay in the appointment of a Chancellor a more serious question than ever. First, I would ask—How long is this want of unanimity in the selection of a Chancellor to continue, and who is the man—not yet evidently in the colony, but to come—who will unite the hearts of the Council in a common act of confidence and esteem? Will there ever be unanimity? Is it necessary that there should be? Is the continued condition of things to end with Dr. Short's decease, or when? Second, if the work of the Chancellor is done so satisfactorily by the Vice-Chancellor, why not give him the honours as well as the work? The idea of getting on very well without a Chancellor is unworthy of the dignity of the Imperial Corporation in the world of South Australian scholarship, and a tacit insult to the large body of accomplished men who form our colonial fellowship of letters. Though Dr. Whittell may not think so, I can assure him that the University is suffering by the present inaction of the Council. A widespread feeling of dissatisfaction is growing up, and a not ill-grounded suspicion that there is a wish to manipulate this honour for the ultimate advantage of Anglicanism; and the only way to allay this will be by proceeding, as Dr. Whittell proposes, to the immediate election of a Chancellor. I would add that it is by no means according to colonial precedent to confine this honour to graduates of Universities.

In Sydney Sir Deas Thompson was for years Chancellor, and in New Zealand Mr. Tancred held that position, and may still hold it. Sir Richard Hanson occupied a similar position in the Adelaide University, and in none of these instances, though well educated, have these gentlemen been graduates.

I am, Sir, &c.,

OBSERVER.