

Req. 1st Sept.

Req. 1st Sept. 1903.

Req. 15th Sept. 1903.

RAMSAY SMITH ENQUIRY BOARD.

MR. JACOBS RESIGNS.
MR. BUCHANAN APPOINTED.

Mr. S. J. Jacobs, who was a member of the board appointed to enquire into the charges laid against Dr. Ramsay Smith, forwarded to the Government on Monday his resignation as a member of the board. He took this action in consequence of statements made in a sermon preached by the Jewish Rabbi (Rev. A. T. Boas), a report of which appeared in The Register on Monday. In the course of his remarks the Rabbi laid special stress upon the reverence which those of the Jewish faith had for the bodies of the dead. Mr. Jacobs, in communicating to the Government his decision, pointed out that he was a member of the Jewish faith, and he might be influenced by the remarks of the Rabbi. He was desirous of avoiding even the shadow of a suspicion of bias, and, therefore, he thought it was his duty to retire from the board. In order to prevent any delay, the Government accepted the resignation of Mr. Jacobs, and held a special meeting of the Executive Council on Monday afternoon, when the Master of the Supreme Court (Mr. A. Buchanan) was appointed to fill the vacancy.

Req. 1st Sept. 1903.

—Reverence for the Dead.—
"Desecrating Student." writes:—"Under this heading The Register has published some remarks of Rabbi Boas, some of which are truly remarkable. He would suggest that the practice on lifeless corpses, if necessary for promotion of scientific research, should be confined to the bodies of criminals who have paid the penalty of their crime! Now, as we have in Adelaide somewhere about 50 medical students, and as a rule about one murderer hanged in two or three years, can the learned Rabbi suggest a plan by which each of the students could avail himself of that one body so as to gain a knowledge intimate and thorough enough to enable him to perform operations in which a lack of such intimate knowledge would mean death to the patient? The bodies which are brought to the University for anatomical purposes are those of lunatics or paupers—people who during life have been kept at the expense of the state. Is it unreasonable that their bodies after death should contribute a little towards the health and safety of those who supported them during life? And, again, the criminals of whom the Rabbi speaks, have paid the price of their crime in giving life for life, and there seems to me no reason why additional ignominy should be placed on them, even though Achan furnishes a precedent in his melancholy story for such additional ignominy. Furthermore, is not Rabbi Boas betraying a courtesy on the occasion on which he peeped promiscuously into the dissecting room? Had he any right to penetrate into that 'holy of holies' to which no member of the public has access; and, having done so, should he not have said nothing about what he saw?"

Req. 4th Sept. 1903.

NAVY LEAGUE OF ENGLAND.

LECTURE BY MR. H. F. WYATT.

Mr. H. F. Wyatt, special envoy of the Navy League of England, lectured before the University students at the University of Adelaide on Monday afternoon. The Chancellor (Right Hon. Sir Samuel Way) presided over a good attendance of students. Among the others present was Lady Way.

The Chairman, in introducing the lecturer, said that it required a little courage to add another lecture to the other occupations of the day of University students. He felt that the presence of Mr. Wyatt in Adelaide was an opportunity to talk to the students on a subject that appealed to the patriotism of them all. The gathering had no political significance. The question on which Mr. Wyatt lectured was not a party question. Probably the man best acquainted in Australia with the subject upon which Mr. Wyatt was to lecture said a few weeks ago that the maintenance of the British Empire, the preservation of their territorial security and of peace, upon which the progress of the empire depended altogether, meant what Thucydides had said 2,000 years ago—the mighty dominion of the seas. Not only the men of the present day, but the coming men of the twentieth century, those who were to form public opinion and be the public men of tomorrow (and they included the students of the University of Adelaide), should be well informed on this question, that appealed to the patriotism of them all. (Applause.)

Mr. Wyatt said there was in existence between the British people of Australia and the British people of England, and of Canada, and the Cape, an identity of blood, speech, laws, literature, history, religion, ideas, mutual commerce, and the necessities for defence. But there was one condition which underlay the whole fabric of that unity. That was the retention of the command of the sea by the British people—that the commerce between the different parts of the empire should have unchecked passage across the sea, and be free for the exchange of goods. Supposing that the British Navy lost command of the sea, Australia would suffer more acutely than Canada, England would suffer more than either; and India perhaps most of all. Were this calamity to happen it would mean a dreadful state of financial distress throughout Canada, and that country would have to seek union with the United States—union at the worst moment and of the worst kind. Of course that would mean absolute ruin to the old country. Then everything that we had rescued India from in the course of a century would be undone, and the country would be overrun by bloodshed and cruelty. Australia would have to face a great danger. It was argued that if the Boers could hold out so long, how much more could this continent do so with the aid of gallant riflemen? But that argument was inconclusive, for Australia would have to face the danger which threatened her from the sea, in which case all her riflemen would be useless. It was an absurd argument to say that it would not matter to Australia if England lost command of the sea, because the shipping was not owned here. Such a thing would paralyse Australian industries, and mean loss of employment to people engaged in them, and consequent starvation. Then the isolation of Australia was another argument. That isolation did not exist. The drama of international competition was proceeding on a vaster scale than ever before. There was an amazing march of human invention, resulting in what might be termed a shrivelling up of the planet, and Australia was being thrown more and more into the circle of nations. He referred to the power of France and Germany, and the mighty onward march of Russia. If the British Navy lost command of the sea in 100 years' time it would not be a case of a white Australia, but of a yellow Australia. If there were a few white men they would be the hewers of wood and the drawers of water for the Japanese and Chinese. The object of the Navy League was to wake them up to those things. When all the side issues were put away there was only one point in difference between the Navy League which he represented and those interested in the object in Australia. That was, given an Australian Squadron, were they going to rigidly confine it to Australian waters, and refuse to allow it to leave the coast and go elsewhere when needed? The Navy League took what he considered the commonsense side of the question. The British Navy was already far too small, and they wanted every atom of its strength, and should not tie the Australian Squadron down on the local coastline irrespective of the movements of foreign fleets. That would mean that all the British dependencies would say when the mother country needed help, "No; that is your affair; we only look after our own coastal defences." He was proud to say that a branch had already been formed in Adelaide.

Professor Henderson moved—"That this meeting is of opinion that the command of the sea by the Imperial Navy is essential to the security and prosperity of Australia, and welcomes the establishment of a branch of the Navy League in Adelaide." He quite agreed with Mr. Wyatt in the paramount influence of the British Navy in the maintenance of the British Empire. What the navy had done for England it could do for Australia, because, like England, Australia was surrounded by sea.

Mr. Darling, M.P., seconded the motion, because he thought Mr. Wyatt had come at a most opportune time. There was a feeling over Australia that we should have a navy of our own, but he did not agree with that idea. We wanted an empire navy, which we should assist in every way.

The motion was carried unanimously. On the motion of Mr. Stuckey, seconded by Dr. Helen Mayo, a hearty vote of thanks was accorded to Mr. Wyatt for his lecture.

A vote of thanks to the Chancellor for presiding terminated the meeting.

LETTER FROM THE RABBI.

To the Editor.

Sir—I noticed with deep regret in this (Monday) afternoon's Evening Journal that, in consequence of a sermon which I preached on Saturday last, and which was published in The Register to-day, Mr. S. J. Jacobs felt impelled to tender his resignation as a member of the Board of Enquiry appointed to report upon certain charges against Dr. Ramsay Smith, the City Coroner. My object in writing to you is to publicly disavow any direct or indirect motive on my part that caused me to speak upon the subject of "Reverence to the Dead," beyond that of explaining to my congregants an interesting Scriptural passage bearing upon the Mosaic sanitary laws. My theme was selected as one applicable in its ethical teaching to a current event that had attracted the notice of the public during the last week or two. I usually do preach on topics of pressing moment and of practical duties of life, leaving creeds and abstracts teaching for very rare occasions. Far was it from my mind to give utterance to views on the coming enquiry, and to thereby prejudice the position of my worthy friend, Mr. Jacobs. I was under the impression that the board had simply to enquire into and report upon the facts, and never felt that Mr. Jacobs could be swayed by any matter of sentiment from the path of justice. If I have been the means of causing him to resign a position of which he and the members of my community felt justly proud let me assure him, in the words of an ancient prince—"For the integrity of my heart and the innocency of my hand have I done this."

I am, Sir, & BOAS, Rabbi.

[To prevent misapprehension, we deem it well to explain that the publication of any reference to the Rabbi's sermon was entirely unpremeditated—so far as that gentleman was concerned.—ED.]

To the Editor.

Sir—The position taken up by Mr. Jacobs over the Ramsay Smith enquiry should not be allowed to pass unnoticed. The office to which he was appointed was in its nature purely judicial, and the board should have been permitted to hear the evidence and give its decision thereon without the intervention of any outside influence. The immediate friends of Mr. Jacobs know full well that any judgment he might be a party to would be one given with the fullest thought and consideration, independently of any influence, and based upon the weight of evidence; but the public in a matter of this importance have their rights, and they demand that the judgment of this tribunal should not only be fair, but should seem to be fair—therefore Mr. Jacobs's action should receive the fullest recognition and approval. The unfortunate remarks of the Rev. A. T. Boas must have been made without a thought; and I trust that that gentleman, whose actions we have at times all admired, will in future consider before discoursing upon a subject which is occupying the serious attention of the public and is still sub judice. The Jewish community here is a small one; and although Mr. Boas's sermon, admirable though it may be, might have—and, I believe, would have—no influence on Mr. Jacobs, it might be said, after a judgment was given, that he had been influenced by it; and to avoid anything of this nature Mr. Jacobs has taken a course which every right-thinking man will admire. I am merely writing this as I feel that actions like these should be held up to others who might hereafter occupy similar positions.

I am, Sir, &c., JUSTICE.

SHAKSPEARE'S ROMANTIC PLAYS.

PLAYS.

"THE TEMPEST."

UNIVERSITY EXTENSION LECTURE.

Those who spent Thursday evening at the University Lecture Theatre were afforded an interesting and enjoyable entertainment by the Rev. John Reid, M.A., who delivered the fifth of his series of lectures on Shakspeare's romantic plays. The subject was "The Tempest."

Mr. Reid's introduction took the form of a terse comment on the alleged reasons for the production of the play. He said that Shakspeare had possibly been commanded to construct some such special amusement for the court festivities connected with a royal marriage. It was generally conceded, he said, that "The Tempest" was the last completed work of Shakspeare, and that the character of Prospero was probably the last part taken by the great dramatist before his final retirement. Therein were bound the echoes of the great man's life—the benignant benediction of one who assuredly must have been such to have portrayed the character of the studious duke, Prospero.

Next, the lecturer directed attention to the story in the play, to its form and structure. He observed that some three and a half hours devoted to the traffic of the stage sufficed to cover the actions of the dramatist's characters. Prospero, although greatly wronged, having reflected for 12 years upon the island-prison, where his right there was none dare dispute, learned that "forgiveness to the injured doth belong," and the passion of his life became the desire to accept penitence and bestow forgiveness upon his cruel enemies. To this end he made use of his magic art—that learning which gave him supreme control over the elements. The lecturer painted a skilful word-picture of the attainment of Prospero's benignant designs, in the love between his own daughter Miranda and Ferdinand, the shipwrecked son of his inveterate enemy, Alonso, King of Naples. Points of particular interest were the discussion upon the baffled treason of the ambitious scoundrels whose attempts upon the sleeping King's life had been foiled by the whispered warning of the spirit Ariel, and upon the other conspiracy of the story, in which the dramatist had drawn such a wonderful burlesque—the plot of Caliban, the man-monster; Stephano, the sodden drunkard; and Trinculo, the witless jester, to slay Prospero and capture and rule the island. The end of the tale Mr. Reid described as being the fruition of the banished duke's godly desires, imbued with the spirit of penitence and forgiveness. The words uttered at the mouth of Prospero, "Let us not burthen our remembrances with a heaviness that's gone," contained the teaching of thousands of sermons.

The third portion of the evening's study was devoted to sketching the characters of Prospero, Ariel, and Caliban, and Mr. Reid's eloquent rendering of chosen passages from the tale revealed much of the inner phases of these lives. Prospero he described as a human representation of the divine teaching, "Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good." That sentiment answered the problem of the play—how to revenge himself upon his helpless enemies. Mr. Reid propounded the question, Is "The Tempest" an allegory? and quoted from James Russell Lowell, in which he described the piece as giving ideals taken from life itself, suggesting its meaning everywhere, forcing it upon the attention nowhere, tantalizing the mind with hints that implied so much and yet told so little.

At the conclusion Mr. Reid was enthusiastically applauded. The sixth and last lecture of the series is set down for next Thursday night, when the subject will be upon the results of Shakspeare study.