

From the Advertiser

6th December, 1852

TO THE EDITOR.

Sir—Candidates for the the Junior and Matriculation Examinations must have felt pleased to notice in to-day's paper, a letter signed "Justitia" relative to these examinations. The remarks made by "Justitia" can be supported fully in everything stated in regard to the arithmetic, but attention might also be called to the English paper, which was entirely too long for the time prescribed, considering the time wasted in settling down, reading, &c. Questions VIII and IX would occupy almost two-thirds of the time, thus leaving about twenty or thirty minutes to the student to finish the remaining seven questions. With reference to the readers for dictation, it is difficult, in fact next to an absolute impossibility for me to pass an opinion. It seemed as if the individuals in question were selected chiefly for the following causes:—The first, for being inaudible and inarticulate; and the second for his rapid and uninflected style of reading. It will hardly be possible for candidates in future to be induced to enter the lists in any considerable numbers, as they do in Melbourne and Sydney Universities, unless a fairer prospect of passing be presented to them.—I am, &c.,

ROYLE.

From the Register
Dec 6th 1852

CHANCELLOR FOR THE ADELAIDE
UNIVERSITY.

TO THE EDITOR.

Sir—It is now nearly twelve months since the post of Chancellor of the University became vacant through the departure from our shores of the Bishop of Adelaide, and to this time the office continues unoccupied. Is it because we are so destitute of men of scholarly attainments and social eminence that no one is found worthy of succeeding Dr. Short? This cannot be, for we have men in our midst who hold higher distinctions in the world of letters than ever fell to him.

One can hardly forbear the suspicion that the delay is caused by a wish on the part of Anglicans to reserve the honour for Dr. Short's ecclesiastical successor, making the office an attachment in perpetuity to the Bishop's chair.

If this should be the case I hope that such a vigorous protest will be raised outside the Senate against such an attempt to give an undue prominence to one religious body over others as will effectually check the impertinence and injustice. That a national institution in a country knowing no distinction between sects should be made the means of elevating one above all others will be manifestly unfair. I would not have gentlemen otherwise fitted for this honourable post disqualified simply because they are ecclesiastics, but if the Chancellorship is to be held by another cleric let him be selected from another denomination of religionists other than the Anglican body. I trust that the University powers will at once take steps to the election of a Chancellor, and allay the natural anxiety which some feel respecting this matter, and so secure the unabated confidence of the public to whom the institution belongs. Certainly it will be anomalous for a University which owes its existence largely to the munificence of non-Episcopalian donors to be in perpetuity presided over by an Anglican Bishop.

I am, Sir, &c.,

OBSERVER.

Register Dec 6 1882

✓ THE UNIVERSITY CHANCELLORSHIP.—A matter to which we have already called attention is again brought before the public by our correspondent "Observer," who thinks that it is high time some steps were taken towards filling up the vacant Chancellorship of the University. It is indeed an anomalous state of things that so important a post should be left vacant for a whole year, and the inference which outsiders will draw from the fact in regard to the fitness of South Australian public men for the occupancy of high offices cannot be in any way a favourable one. Whether the intention be as our correspondent hints—to leave the Chancellorship vacant until the new Bishop of Adelaide arrives in the colony, and so to create a precedent for regarding the office as an appendage to the Bishopric—we have no means of knowing. Certainly, if there be any idea of this sort, the Bishop, as soon as he arrives in the colony, will find himself in a very embarrassing position. The strong words applied by our correspondent to the adoption of the course which he condemns show with tolerable clearness what sort of controversy will be aroused by any attempt to attach the position of Chancellor to any ecclesiastical office. It is highly inadvisable that sectarian discussion should be allowed to gather around such a matter as an appointment to so entirely undenominational a body as the University. Such an event, indeed, would be a veritable calamity to the institution, and would prove fatal to its usefulness. The suggestion that as an Anglican Bishop has once filled the position a representative of some other denomination should be allowed to take his turn, would, if followed out, be equally injurious in its results. The constitution of the University admits of the appointment of four ministers of religion on its Council, but not more than that number. It was certainly never contemplated that the chief executive officer of the institution should be continuously the minister of some particular denomination, as is evidenced by the fact that the first Chancellor was a Judge of the Supreme Court. It would be well for the University to take its stand upon the broad principle of excluding denominationalism from its constitution entirely, and selecting the best man, altogether irrespective of his theological status. To have an Anglican Chancellor at one time followed by a Roman Catholic, or a Wesleyan, or a Presbyterian, selected in each case because of his religious creed, would be a course which would only render "confusion worse confounded." If there is to be a protest in the Senate or in the Council in reference to this matter it is to be hoped that it will not take the form of an attack by one denomination on another. From all we can hear of Bishop Kennion nothing could be more distasteful to him than to be associated with such a strife. The question raised