

Advertiser April 13th 1886
from the American Correspondent
New York March 6th 1886.

The battle between the various colleges as to the wisdom of optional and compulsory courses—including especially the study of Greek—progresses fiercely. Interest centres, of course, on Yale and Harvard, the oldest institutions of the kind in America. Yale is the champion of conservatism, and glories in her likeness to the famous universities of England. To her elegantly useless learning is the “hall mark of a gentleman.” Harvard, though yet older, is liberal even to the point of allowing an Episcopal clergyman to hold high office in her councils, after having been for many years practically exclusively Unitarian. In the matter particularly in point—whether the English or German model should prevail—Harvard has gradually broken away altogether from her old traditions. At present the two colleges stand as regards the number of hours weekly which the student can devote to the studies of his own choice as follows:—

HOURS OF ELECTIVE STUDIES (PER WEEK).

			Yale.	Harvard.
Freshman Class	None	9
Sophomore	“	...	“	All
Junior	“	...	9	“
Senior	“	...	13	“

The result of these differing policies has been that in the last 20 years Yale has increased from 500 to 563 or 12½ per cent., while Harvard has increased from 419 to 1,068, or 155 per cent. In other words, the mere gain at Harvard amounts to a greater number of students than Yale has ever had in its academical department. Only Yale and Princeton now “stand on the ancient paths,” and they are fast being swept aside by the younger institutions which devote themselves simply to the task of making successful men. Even in the law courts an elegant quotation from the classics merely provokes a smile; no lawyer under forty can venture upon such a decidedly old-fashioned affectation.

400
THE ARGUS, TUESDAY, MARCH 12, 1889.

MEETING OF THE COUNCIL.

MONDAY, MARCH 11.

Present—Dr. Brownless (the chancellor, in the chair), Professor Irving (vice-chancellor), Dr. Fetherston, Mr. J. H. MacFarland, Sir Archibald Michie, Dr. Bride, Mr. R. Murray Smith, Dr. A. Morrison, Dr. Madden, Dr. Robertson, Mr. Justice A'Beckett, and Mr. H. B. Higgins.

APPOINTMENT OF A PROFESSOR OF LAW.

A letter was read from the agent-general, stating that a committee, consisting of the Right Hon. Lord Justice Cotton (chairman), the Right Hon. J. W. Mellor, Q.C., Mr. J. N. Higgins, Q.C., Mr. J. Joyce, and Mr. A. T. Lawrence, had considered 20 applications which had been received in London for the position of Professor of Law at the Melbourne University, and had presented the following report:—

“We have examined the applications for the appointment, and the testimonials sent in by the several applicants, and we have selected three of the applicants whose names we give in what we consider to be their order of merit:—1. Mr. Jenks; 2, Mr. Carter; 3, Mr. Pitt Corbett. We think that all the three are good, and that any one of them would discharge with ability the duties of the office if he were appointed to it. But we are of opinion that they stand as we have placed them in order of merit. We have had difficulty in deciding as between Mr. Jenks and Mr. Carter, which of the two we should place first, and we have decided in favour of Mr. Jenks, principally on the ground that he has had greater experience in giving lectures.”

Dr. MADDEN proposed that Mr. Edward Jenks should be appointed to the professorship. The testimonials of Mr. Jenks were of a very high character indeed, and the fact of his name having been placed first on the list was sufficient reason for his appointment.

Dr. ROBERTSON seconded the motion.

Professor IRVING pointed out that although Mr. Jenks was said to have had more experience in teaching than the other two candidates since his selection the other gentlemen had furnished additional testimonials. He should be inclined to take into consideration the claims of Mr. Carter to the position.

Dr. MORRISON thought that the recommendation of the committee should be given effect to.

Mr. MURRAY SMITH pointed out that the committee had given a decided preference to Mr. Jenks.

Mr. HIGGINS considered it very gratifying that the University of Melbourne should have attracted as applicants men of such high qualifications as the candidates undoubtedly possessed. A doubt had been expressed as to the possibility of getting first-class applicants, but this had been dispelled in a most unmistakable manner.

The motion was carried.

From the application and testimonials of Mr. Jenks it appears that he is 28 years of age, a graduate in double first-class honours of the University of Cambridge, a barrister-at-law (with precedence of call), and a Fellow of the Royal Historical Society. In 1877 he was articled to a firm of London solicitors, and on the expiry of his articles he was placed second in a list of 300 candidates for the final solicitors' examination. After a few months' practice as a solicitor he entered himself at King's College, Cambridge, and at

the Middle Temple. He at once began to read for double honours at Cambridge, and for honours at the bar. At the end of his first year he obtained a Real Property Scholarship at the Middle Temple, and an exhibition at King's College. In January, 1885, he was *proxime* for the "Members'" English Essay Prize of the University; in January, 1886, he was awarded the First Senior Studentship of the Inns of Court for Jurisprudence, Roman Law, and International Law; in June of the same year he was placed "senior" in the Cambridge Law Tripos, was awarded the chancellor's medal for special distinction in English law and constitutional history, and was made a foundation scholar of King's College. In the March following his essay upon "The Law of Commons of England" was specially commended by the adjudicators of the Yorke prize of the University. In June of the same year he was placed second in the first class of the History Tripos at Cambridge, and obtained the "Barstow" scholarship of the Inns of Court. In March, 1888, he was awarded the "Le Bas" prize of the University of Cambridge for an essay on "Thomas Carlyle and John Stuart Mill." He held the post of University Local Lecturer, and had been appointed to act as an examiner for scholarships at King's College, Cambridge. He had lectured many times, in addition to his college lectures, before London popular audiences.

APPOINTMENT OF A PROFESSOR OF MUSIC.

A letter was read from the agent-general, stating that, acting with a committee of advice, consisting of Sir Frederick Ouseley, Dr. M'Kenzie, and Mr. Goldschmidt, he had examined the different applications and testimonials of candidates for the Ormond Professorship of Music, and had settled upon a preliminary list of seven gentlemen who were considered desirable to examine personally. Mr. Goldschmidt having in the meantime, for private reasons, resigned his position on the committee, the different candidates selected, with the exception of Dr. Gower, who was employed as organist of the cathedral of Denver, Colorado, in the United States, were afterwards personally examined. As a result, the committee decided to advise that the following names should be submitted to the council, but declined to place them in order of merit:—Dr. Gower, Mr. Marshall Hall, Mr. Oliver King, Dr. J. Smith. Mr. Marshall Hall, Mr. King, and Dr. Smith were candidates last year, and Dr. Gower's claims, though he did not actually apply, were taken into consideration at the instance of his brother, supported by Sir Frederick Ouseley, so that the renewed advertisement for applications did not appear to have had any effect in bringing forward candidates of mark. From all he had heard he formed a highly favourable opinion of Dr. Gower.

Mr. HIGGINS asked whether there were any local applications for the professorship?

The REGISTRAR stated that all applications had been sent to England.

Dr. MORRISON said that as there was no one on the council sufficiently well acquainted with musical matters to take into consideration the testimonials of the gentlemen selected a committee ought to be appointed with power to consult with local musical experts.

The CHANCELLOR remarked that Dr. Gower appeared to be a remarkable man, and to have very high testimonials.

Dr. FETHERSTON thought it would be a reflection on the London committee to have local musicians consulted.

Sir ARCHIBALD MICHIE thought that the difficulties of the council would only be increased by an appeal to the judgment of local musicians.

Dr. MADDEN.—Why did the committee in London refuse to place these candidates?

Dr. MORRISON.—I have no doubt that one of the reasons was that these men applied last year, and were not then considered up to the standard required by us.

Dr. MADDEN.—Then is it not a question whether we should accept either of these gentlemen? If they were not fit for the position last year they are not fit for it this year. We have already declined to accept any of them. ("No, no.")

Professor IRVING.—Have not some of the conditions imposed last year been removed?

Mr. Justice A'BECKETT.—On the expectation that a higher class of men would be attracted a slight difference was made in the conditions.

The CHANCELLOR.—From what I can glean from reading the testimonials, they seem to be all excellent men.

Sir ARCHIBALD MICHIE.—Is it the case that these men were reckoned ineligible last year?

Dr. MADDEN.—I understand that the report of the committee was to the effect that they were not of a sufficiently high standard for the University.

Mr. HIGGINS.—My resolution is that the conditions were altered so as to secure additional applicants. It was desired that the professor should have the right of private practice. I do not think there was anything in the report of the committee stating that the candidates were not good enough for the position.

The CHANCELLOR explained that in the absence of the minutes of last year, he could not say exactly what was the report of the committee.

Dr. MORRISON proposed the following motion:—

"That a committee be appointed to consider the applications from Dr. Gower, Mr. Marshall Hall, Mr. Oliver King, and Dr. J. Smith for the professorship of music, and report to the council after referring to the former letter from the selection committee:—1. Is any one of the above in their opinion a fit candidate for the post? 2. What is the order of merit of the above four?—the committee having power, if necessary, of calling in the opinion of experts."

Professor IRVING suggested the advisability of telegraphing to the Agent-General to ascertain whether the selectors recommend any or all of the four selected candidates for the professorship.

Mr. Justice A'BECKETT thought a satisfactory answer could scarcely be obtained to a telegram on the subject, and the cable message might give rise to a misunderstanding.

Mr. HIGGINS said that as the council had taken all the pains it could to get the best man for the position, he did not see what was to be gained by ascertaining the views of the London committee. It must be assumed, as nothing was said on the point, that all the candidates mentioned were eligible.

Mr. MACFARLAND.—Hear, hear.

Sir ARCHIBALD MICHIE thought the Agent-General should be communicated with by letter. It was better to have three months' delay than run the risk of making an unsatisfactory appointment.

Dr. BRIDE agreed with Professor Irving's suggestion.

It was agreed to postpone consideration of

the matter for a week, to enable the correspondence which had passed between the Agent-General and the council previously to be consulted.

MATRICULATION EXAMINATION RESULTS.

Mr. MURRAY SMITH said he desired to call attention to the letter from the registrar, which had appeared in *The Argus* of that morning with reference to the late matriculation examination. If the council was to maintain the control of University affairs it should take the action of the registrar in thus writing to the daily press into consideration. Because there was a difference of opinion between the registrar and the examiners as to how papers were to be sent in to the University, the latter was not justified in indulging in such a flood of vituperation, and he had been guilty of a very great impropriety. Nothing could excuse him for entering into a squabble through the medium of the daily press. Because the examiners had addressed a letter to the council the registrar apparently thought he was justified in addressing a long letter to the editor of *The Argus* with such phrases in it as—

“This statement is maliciously mendacious. . . . The supreme selfishness and coolness of such a statement as this is only exceeded by its mean mendacity. . . . This protest is nothing more than a most contemptible attack on an officer who has simply done his duty; it has not one decent fact to recommend it from the beginning to the end, and it is as disgraceful to them as it is insulting to me.”

He was utterly at a loss to understand the reason for the use of such language as this, but the fact he desired to call attention to was that this letter had been published without being submitted to the council, and consequently the registrar should be called upon for an explanation.

The CHANCELLOR stated that he had received the following letters with reference to the subject under discussion:—

“The University of Melbourne, March 11, 1889.

“Dear Mr. Chancellor,—I desire to draw your attention to a letter by the registrar in ‘*The Argus*’ this day, and I request you to ask the council at its meeting to-day whether this transference of a question now under its consideration to the public press is in accordance with University discipline.—I have, &c.,
EDWARD E. MORRIS.”

“The University, 11th March, 1889.

“My dear Mr. Chancellor,—‘*The Argus*’ of this morning contains a long commentary by the registrar upon correspondence addressed on a recent occasion by myself and others to the council relative to alleged delays in dealing with the Christmas matriculation returns. As a reply to my letter to the council, his discovery of a rule 17 in the printed instructions is plainly inadequate and an overthought, but as a fresh and avowedly malevolent attack upon me, among others, his letter leaves nothing to be desired.

“It is not my intention to condescend to any reply; but I do ask you, and with the utmost respect, that this new phase of official folly may be summarily put an end to. It is simply impossible that University business can be carried on if the public prints are to be the ordinary channels of correspondence between professors and the clerical officials; while there is no decently-organised service, public or private, in Victoria that for an instant would tolerate the insubordination of one of its officers assailing in set terms in the newspapers the reputation of other members of the institution to which he himself belongs.—I am, &c.,
J. S. ELKINGTON.”

“To the Chancellor and Council of the University of Melbourne.

“Gentlemen,—While we are unwilling to trouble the council with further correspondence relating to the report of the registrar on the matriculation examination, published in ‘*The Argus*’ of February 12, we are only too fully aware that there exists a misapprehension of the facts of the case in the minds of some members of the council.

"The facts are:—

"1. Examiners were directed to send in complete returns of the matriculation examination not later than the 1st of January, 1889.

"2. In every instance, with two exceptions, this order was obeyed.

"3. Forty-one days after the compliance of examiners with this, the only regulation as to date known or communicated to them, the registrar reported certain examiners to the council for not having sent in certain complete returns not by the 1st January but by the 20th December, 1888.

"4. This report was by order of the council published in the press 42 days after January 1.

"These are the simple, uncontroverted facts. On them the examiners submit that they are justly entitled to an unconditional withdrawal of the rebuke of the council implied in the publication of the registrar's report without a previous reference to the examiners named.

"We have, &c.,

"EDWARD E. MORRIS.

"J. S. ELKINGTON.

"ALEX. FRASER MORRISON.

"March 9, 1889."

It was resolved, on the motion of Mr. Higgins, seconded by Dr. Robertson:—

"That a draft answer be prepared to the questions contained in the joint protest of the examiners—the regulations and instructions broken to be distinctly specified."

Mr. MURRAY SMITH then moved—

"That the registrar be requested to explain his reasons for the course pursued in addressing his letter to 'The Argus' of to-day."

Dr. MADDEN thought that the action of the registrar did not permit of his being heard. He had seen fit to resort to the public prints without consulting the council, and although he had had considerable provocation, the council ought to censure him. The language he had used was to be greatly regretted, but that was a matter rather for himself than the council. What was to be reprobated was that he had ~~seen fit to attack and~~ printed.

Mr. Higgins seconded Mr. Murray Smith's motion, which was carried.

The REGISTRAR (Mr. E. F. A'Beckett) said that he was under a great disadvantage. He was not a public speaker, and therefore it was very difficult for him at a moment's notice, or perhaps at all, to explain exactly his feelings. If the public prints were searched it would be found that he had been subjected to as choice a collection of insults as ever were levelled at any man, public or private, and he had not once made a reply. He knew that these insults were not altogether from outside people. He was sorry to say that they were instigated and prompted by professors, lecturers, and students within the University. He had been placed in ridiculous and contemptible positions times out of number, and Professor Irving would bear him out in saying that most insulting things had been said to him. The council must allow even to a person in his position the possession of a little feeling and sensitiveness, and his right to object to being continually sat upon. He had been told when changes were talked of that one of his chief defects was that he was weak, frightened, and generally feeble in his work; that he was a decent fellow in his way, but he took things easily, and had not sufficient "go" in him. Dr. Morrison had told him that he wanted more "push." When, however, he had shown some energy in endeavouring to get the examination-papers in proper time, he had been thwarted by the examiners, and he had been intimidated by Professor Morris threatening to refer to his action in the senate. He regretted that he had been induced to send a letter to *The Argus*, but the council must admit that he had received

council must admit that he had received strong provocation.

Mr. MURRAY SMITH said that the registrar having expressed regret for what he had done, the council would no doubt be satisfied.

The subject was then allowed to drop, and the meeting terminated.

NOTICES TO STUDENTS.

ORDINARY EXAMINATION—FEBRUARY TERM,
1889.

RESULTS.

The following result was posted on the University notice-board yesterday :—

NATURAL PHILOSOPHY, PART I.

Certificated Teachers.—Passed, 247, 250, 251, 253, 256, 257, 258, 260, 261, 263.

FINAL HONOURS EXAMINATION.

Examinations will be continued to-day as follows :—

School of history, political economy, and jurisprudence, 2 p.m. to 5 p.m. Paper on "Jurisprudence."

M.A. examination, 2 p.m. to 5 p.m. Paper on "Political Economy."

M.D. examination, 2 p.m. to 5 p.m. Obstetric medicine, and diseases of women and children. "Case for commentary."

THE "W. T. MOLLISON SCHOLARSHIP."

The oral examination in connection with the above scholarship will be held to-day at 2.30 p.m.

CORRECTION.

In the list of successful candidates for the second year arts, published in our columns yesterday, the name of Spencer Edward Holroyd (Trinity College) was omitted.