

scholars here to go and finish their education elsewhere the State is offering something very much like a slight to her own University. If we had no University, if boys who were specially gifted had no opportunity afforded them in the colony of entering upon higher studies, it would be our duty in the interests of education to give such scholarships as those under notice. We would go further, and say that in the infancy of the local University there was good cause for offering them. Now, however, we have not only a University here, but one which is manned by a strong body of professors of high standing and ability. It has never been said that students were allowed to graduate here unless they thoroughly earned their hall mark of distinction. A graduate in arts of Adelaide is the holder of a higher title than the man who has gone through the pass school in Oxford or who has taken a poll degree in Cambridge. Hitherto we have sent home our graduates to begin again their higher education. Seven gentlemen have gained the South Australian Scholarship since 1879, when it was established. Of these five had graduated in arts and one in both arts and law. There is only one who was not a graduate at the time of his appointment, but even he had passed his final examination for the degree. And it may be pointed out—though this cannot be regarded as an unanswerable proof—that no other colony under similar conditions gives a scholarship of this kind. Tasmania does, but then she has no University. Sydney University has the "Wentworth Travelling Fellowship," but the conditions of this prize (which, by-the-way, has not yet been awarded) are only that the holder shall visit England and the Continent, and on his return present the Senate with a narrative of his tour. He is not required to study at any University; only to make the grand tour, and say what he saw.

If the view is right that there is no excuse now for depreciating the value of the Adelaide degrees by sending their holders

to matriculate in a British University, it remains further to be seen to what use the money, supposing it to be still devoted to purposes of higher education, can be put. There are two ways open. It might be given to the school in the University which is in the most backward condition, which, of course, is the Medical School. At present students are only educated up to the end of the second year, at which point they are obliged to finish their education elsewhere. The £800 a year might be devoted to the establishment of additional chairs, or it might be given to the four best students at the end of the second year. The first course is open to decided objection on the ground that the men who would be attracted by small stipends to fill a chair in a University would not be up to the standard. The appointment would not attract men engaged in regular practice in the city, and no other good men would care to take it. Of the two ways in which it is possible to benefit the Medical School by this money the better would perhaps be the foundation of Travelling Medical Scholarships, somewhat on the principle of the Radcliffe Fellowship in Oxford and the Medical Scholarship in Dublin, only that, of course, the standard here would be necessarily lower than at the two

Universities named. Even under the existing regulations it is possible for a South Australian scholar to study medicine and not arts in Europe, and the last scholar has adopted this course. If the scholarships were made entirely medical, the Medical School here would be helped, because more students would be attracted, and the University would not be depreciated because it conferred no medical degree. But there is yet another course open to the authorities. Why should not the scholarships be cut up into exhibitions for the benefit of undergraduates in the University? These would help many parents who cannot now afford to give their sons and daughters a University education, and would thus undoubtedly have the effect of bringing in more students. On the principle that it is wiser to legislate for the community than for individuals, it would be fairer to give many the means of availing themselves of the education offered here than to give a few the means of supplementing this education in other Universities.

Advertiser June 17th 1886.

THE VIGILANCE ASSOCIATION AND PROFESSOR BOULGER.

TO THE EDITOR.

Sir—Professor Boulger in bearing his testimony to the worth of the late Dean Russell at the Shakespearian Society meeting held on Tuesday evening, is reported to have said, “No one could talk to him intimately without feeling an ever-increasing contempt for social, literary, and religious shams.” All who knew the dean “intimately” will agree that Professor Boulger spoke truly of the dean when he made the above remarks, but a decided difference of opinion will exist with reference to the rest of the professor’s remarks, which are as follows—“Or without being inspired by an earnest desire to improve others by better means than vigilance committees.” The professor after all could not have been so “intimately” acquainted with the dean as others were, for some happen to know that the “good dean” was not only a member of the Vigilance Association, but an active member of the executive committee; and I can assure the professor that I followed out the late dean’s wishes exactly in dealing with the recent case of a breach of morality now so well known. But if Professor Boulger doubts my statement if he will wait upon me I can prove by the dean’s handwriting how earnest he was as one of the most vigilant of the Vigilance Association. Professor Boulger surely can remember the dean’s earnest utterances at the Stead meeting held in the Y.M.C.A. rooms some time ago; also the speech he made in the same rooms not long since. I could also refresh the professor’s memory by calling up other public remarks made by the dean, but I have already proved that the professor did not know the dean “intimately,” and also that the dean did believe in “improving others” by being a vigilant.—I am, &c.,

A. TURNBULL.