

231
Register 3/11/13

Advertiser 3/11/13

Daily Herald
4/11/13

NOTES AND QUERIES.

PARLIAMENTARY REPRESENTATIVES ON UNIVERSITY COUNCIL.

From the Hon. F. S. Wallis, M.L.C.:—
“There could have been no ‘misunderstanding’ when the Legislative Council first selected its representatives on the council of the University. The correct position was that each side had to choose one member, and that for the two thus chosen both sides were to vote solidly on the ballot. While recognising in the first instance the right of each party to a representative, our friends on the opposite side made the mistake of selecting the two members themselves instead of confining their selection to the one for their own side alone. When they know that their choice from among the members of the Labour Party was not the member whose name we desired to submit to the ballot, they made the further mistake of declining to recognise our selection, thus placing us in the position of having to allow them to choose our man for us, or of submitting to being deprived of representation altogether. On principle we could not throw over the member of our choice in favour of the member they had chosen for us. Hence our friends of the Liberal Party, having the majority of votes, made a selection of two members outside of the Labour Party, and on the ballot they were, of course, elected. That was in 1911. At the beginning of this Parliament, in 1912, the same Party repeated its monopolistic action, again refusing to recognise our wish that Mr. Styles should be submitted, with one of their members, to the ballot. On Tuesday, when the question of filling the vacancy caused by the lamented death of the late Sir John Duncan came on, members on the other side were informed of the name of the member chosen on our side to go to the ballot, but our nomination was ignored. For the remainder of this Parliament the matter may now be regarded as settled, but on the assembling of next Parliament my party may be relied upon to again claim recognition of its right to have one of its members—and that the member of its choice—elected as a representative of the Legislative Council on the council of the Adelaide University. The position was not one to be ‘offered,’ as Mr. Lucas put it on Wednesday, by the Liberal Party to a particular member of our party—the position was never theirs to ‘offer.’ They had only to concern themselves about their own nominee.

THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL.

To the Editor.

Sir—There could have been no “misunderstanding” when the Legislative Council first selected its representatives on the council of the University. The correct position was that each side had to choose one member, and that for the two thus chosen both sides were to vote solidly on the ballot. While recognising in the first instance the right of each party to a representative, our friends on the opposite side made the mistake of selecting the two members themselves instead of confining their selection to the one for their own side alone. When they know that their choice from among the members of the Labor Party was not the member whose name we desired to submit to the ballot, they made the further mistake of declining to recognise our selection, thus placing us in the position of having to allow them to choose our man for us, or of submitting to being deprived of representation altogether. On principle we could not throw over the member of our choice, in favor of the member they had chosen for us. Hence our friends of the Liberal Party, having the majority of votes, made a selection of two members outside of the Labor Party, and on the ballot they were, of course, elected. That was in 1911. At the beginning of this Parliament, in 1912, the same party repeated its monopolistic action, again refusing to recognise our wish that Mr. Styles should be submitted, with one of their members, to the ballot. On Tuesday, when the question of filling the vacancy caused by the lamented death of the late Sir John Duncan came on, members on the other side were informed of the name of the member chosen on our side to go to the ballot, but our nomination was ignored. For the remainder of this Parliament the matter may now be regarded as settled, but on the assembling of next Parliament my party may be relied upon to again claim recognition of its right to have one of its members—and that the member of its choice—elected as a representative of the Legislative Council on the council of the Adelaide University. The position was not one to be “offered,” as Mr. Lucas put it on Wednesday, by the Liberal Party to a particular member of our party—the position was never theirs to “offer.” They had only to concern themselves about their own nominee.—I am, &c.,

F. S. WALLIS.

VARIOUS VIEWS

THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL.

The Hon. F. S. Wallis, M.L.C. writes:—
“There could have been no ‘misunderstanding’ when the Legislative Council first selected its representatives on the council of the University. The correct position was that each side had to choose one member, and that for the two thus chosen both sides were to vote solidly on the ballot. While recognising in the first instance the right of each party to a representative, our friends on the opposite side made the mistake of selecting the two members themselves instead of confining their selection to the one for their own side alone. When they know that their choice from among the members of the Labor Party was not the member whose name we desired to submit to the ballot, they made the further mistake of declining to recognise our selection, thus placing us in the position of having to allow them to choose our man for us, or of submitting to being deprived of representation altogether. On principle we could not throw over the member of our choice in favor of the member they had chosen for us. Hence our friends of the Liberal Party, having the majority of votes, made a selection of two members outside of the Labor Party, and on the ballot they were, of course, elected. That was in 1911. At the beginning of this Parliament, in 1912, the same party repeated its monopolistic action, again refusing to recognise our wish that Mr. Styles should be submitted, with one of their members, to the ballot. On Tuesday, when the question of filling the vacancy caused by the lamented death of the late Sir John Duncan came on, members on the other side were informed of the name of the member chosen on our side to go to the ballot, but our nomination was ignored. For the remainder of this Parliament, the matter may now be regarded as settled, but on the assembling of next Parliament, my party may be relied upon to again claim recognition of its right to have one of its members—and that the member of its choice—elected as a representative of the Legislative Council on the council of the Adelaide University. The position was not one to be ‘offered,’ as Mr. Lucas put it on Wednesday, by the Liberal Party to a particular member of our party—the position was never theirs to ‘offer.’ They had only to concern themselves about their own nominee.

Professors Henderson and Brown have been re-elected to represent the Council of the Adelaide University on the Public Library Board.