

M

Register Dec 6th 1882

should be whether the University shall retain the character which its founders intended it should have—that of an entirely unsectarian institution, and there is little doubt that the majority both of the Council and of the Senate are desirous that it should do so. The delay in the election of a Chancellor, from whatever cause it springs, is objectionable; and if it is true that the question of appointing the new Bishop to the office has something to do with the matter, a great wrong is being done to the University and a cruel injustice to the Bishop himself, who will naturally wish to enter upon his duties at peace with all men.

From the Register
December 7th 1882

THE CHANCELLORSHIP OF THE
UNIVERSITY.

TO THE EDITOR.

Sir—In December, 1881, Dr. Short placed his resignation of the office of Chancellor in the hands of the University Council, with a request that it should take effect at whatever time should seem to the Council most convenient. From that date till this the question of accepting this resignation has not even been mooted in the Council. It follows that Dr. Short is still Chancellor, and that it is, therefore, somewhat inexact to describe the office as "vacant."

It is well known that the re-election of Dr. Short to the Chancellorship in June, 1881, was a source of peculiar gratification to him; and considering the unique position which Dr. Short occupied in the colony, and the high personal esteem in which he was held by members of all denominations, few persons will, I think, be disposed to blame the University Council if they have not been in a hurry to sever the only formal tie which still connects him with the province.

The letter of your correspondent "Observer" is, I think, to be deplored, as raising a number of very invidious questions (personal and otherwise) without any adequate provocation. I have shown that the University Council as a body cannot be charged with the design which he somewhat prematurely denounces. And, as far as an individual member can do so, I assert with considerable confidence that the question of electing a new Chancellor has been very little discussed, even in a private and informal way, by the members, and that there exists nothing of the nature of a general agreement or understanding on the subject of any kind whatever. The simple truth is that our minds are occupied, and have for a long time been occupied, with many questions of a much more urgent character.

I am, Sir, &c.,

A MEMBER OF THE COUNCIL.

December 6, 1882.

From the Register Dec 7th 1882

THE CHANCELLORSHIP OF THE
UNIVERSITY.

The Council of the University have only themselves to blame for the very natural misunderstandings which prevail as to the present position of the Chancellorship. If the facts are as represented by "A Member of the Council," whose letter appears in another column, they must be held to be not merely responsible for the unfortunate rumours which have gained currency, but they are also chargeable with having neglected their duty. If their intention is to show respect to Dr. Short they have gone to work in a very curious way to do so. Dr. Short was first appointed Chancellor in succession to the late Chief Justice Hanson in April, 1876. In April last year he ceased to hold office by effluxion of time, but it was not until nearly the end of June that he was re-elected to the position by the Council. The re-election was no doubt intended as a compliment to the venerable prelate; but, if so, it was robbed of much of its value by the delay which was allowed to take place. No one would be so churlish as to grudge Dr. Short the compliment which we assume was intended by his re-election; but, as we ventured to suggest at the time, it was doubtful whether it was an act of kindness to Dr. Short himself, and still more doubtful whether it was a wise step in the interests of the University. It was known when he was re-elected that the Bishop was about to leave the colony; it was known that he had expressed a desire not to be reappointed a member of the Council; his wish on this point was very properly acceded to; and it was known that it would be impossible for him to continue taking an active part in the work of the Council during the remainder of his residence in South Australia. The sequel has confirmed the accuracy of the views we expressed eighteen months ago. Just prior to his departure from the colony the Bishop wrote a letter to the Council "placing the office of Chancellor at the disposal of the Council, and expressing his grateful sense of the honour done him in his re-election to the office." According to the minutes of the meeting of the Council, held on December 23rd last year, supplied to us by the Registrar, "The Council placed on record its grateful sense of the great value of the services of the Chancellor to the University." The Bishop could scarcely have acted otherwise. He was re-elected to the office when it was known that he was unable to take any active part in the management of the University, and that he had made arrange-