

ing them up for the council's approval. He answered that that might be the case so far as the first, second, and third year examinations were concerned, but that the exercise was not an "examination," and that he should so construe regulation 9 that I need not classify. I pointed out that the precedent established in previous years confirmed my views—that both Mr. Jones and Mr. Davies had been classed, and that if he, as chancellor, insisted upon this construction of the regulations I should be obliged to bow to his decision. I refused, however, to write out a fresh pass list, and altered the pass list I had previously handed in, in accordance with the chancellor's instructions. I did this to show my disapproval of the transaction. I enclose herewith a copy of the pass list as it appears in the books of the university.

This you must please accept as a true account of the incident. Will the chancellor of the university or the registrar inform us:—1. Why the original pass list was not posted when I handed it in? 2. How the chancellor knew of its existence before it was made public? 3. Was the disfigured pass list ever seen by the council when it was approved by them? Be assured that it gives me great pain to make these revelations. Only an earnest desire to serve the best interests of the university with which I have been gladly associated for so many years, together with a pardonable regard for my own reputation, causes me to reluctantly take up my pen. I love to see in my fellow-men that which is good, and true, and honest in their purposes and work. I love not to seek for the worst side of that by which I am surrounded.

I am, Sir, &c.,
J. IVES.
The University, December 20.

To the Editor.

Sir—We, the third year Mus. Bac. students of the Adelaide University, wishing to justify the stand which we have taken in connection with the recent Mus. Bac. examination held in November last, desire to place the following facts before the public:—1. The absolute unfairness of the harmony paper. In our protest to the council we ventured to assert that there is not one musician in the whole of Australia who could complete question No. 4 alone in three hours, the time allowed for the whole paper. The expressed opinions of various authorities have since confirmed this statement. The following extract from the registrar's report, which was tabled in the House of Assembly on Wednesday, the 18th inst., sets forth very clearly the opinion of the referee, Professor Peterson:—"Professor Peterson was of opinion that question 4 was too hard, and should not have been set, and he also criticised some of the other questions." It then stated that "he plainly made every allowance for the difficulty in which they were placed, and came to the conclusion that none of them were entitled to pass." We most emphatically protest against being judged on a paper which two of the three examiners agreed was in part absurd, and on the whole most unreasonable. Is there one man on the council of the university who would submit to an examination on like conditions?

2. Owing to the length of question 4 all other questions necessarily had to suffer, and we fail to see how Professor Peterson could make proper allowances under the circumstances.

3. Reports of both examiners should have been sent to Professor Peterson instead of Mr. Wale's only. No matter where the fault lay, it was most unjust to us that the adverse report only was sent.

4. Judging by Mr. Wale's telegram, which appears in the registrar's report, and was sent to Professor Peterson, it would seem that he (Mr. Wale) was labouring under a misapprehension re the requirements of our third year Mus. Bac. exam. The telegram is as follows:—"Have no objection whatever, provided it be distinctly set forth that passing papers practically means a degree in music." This is not the case, for "after passing the third examination and before receiving his degree each candidate must send to the registrar a musical exercise, composed by himself for an occasion, of such length as to occupy not less than 20 minutes in performance, and fulfilling the following conditions:—(a) It must be a vocal composition to any words the writer may select. (b) It must contain real five-part vocal counterpoint, with specimens of imitation, canon, and fugue. (c) It must have accompaniment for a quintet string band, with or without an organ part. This exercise is sent to an English University for examination.

5. In the conclusion of the university report, attention was called to the following points:—(a) "The co-examiner, Mr. Wale, was nominated with Professor Ives's acquiescence, and has acted with him on several previous occasions." We think it would have been much more satisfactory if the co-examiner had not been a candidate for the chair of music in Adelaide. (b) "It is unfortunate that Mr. Wale should have set, and Professor Ives should have passed without objection, a question in one of the four papers set which both Professor Ives and Professor Peterson now consider too difficult. No objection to this question, however, was made until the examination was over." Professor Ives has already explained his action in this matter. We would point out that, although there are four divisions in this exam., only three papers are set, the fourth division comprising playing from a figured bass, and from vocal and orchestral scores; to these a viva voce test is added. Also, candidates must pass in all four divisions, so that question could practically fail us in the whole exam. "Professor Peterson, who was referred to for advice, agrees with Mr. Wale that none of the candidates were qualified to pass, and that even the best student needed another year's study before being fit to be examined for the degree." Surely Professor Peterson must have been influenced by Mr. Wale's telegram, which would naturally lead one to form an incorrect opinion as to the requirements for the third year exam. Mus. Bac. students almost invariably study composition for one or more years before attempting the final exercise. (d) "The charter of the university requires the maintenance of a proper standard of knowledge as a condition for obtaining its degrees." We certainly agree with the charter, as a high standard makes any degree all the more valuable; but we do object to the standard being raised without notification of such alteration being made in the university calendar at the beginning of the year. What we ask for is a fair and just examination, neither above nor below the standard prescribed by the university. "The council came to the conclusion that another year's study would prove beneficial to the students!" An extra year's study would naturally prove beneficial to any one, but the question of another year's fees is a serious matter to us all. In consequence, some of us may be compelled to abandon our academic course.

We are, Sir, &c.,
The Third Year Mus. Bac. Students.

PROFESSOR IVES AND THE CHIEF JUSTICE.

To the Editor.

Sir—Professor Ives's statement of what happened at an interview of December 7, 1897, so far as it sets up a request by me that he should place my niece's exercise in the first class, is a pure invention. The account I gave in your issue of Friday is borne out by Professor Ives's letter in today's "Register" and by the facsimile at the end of it which he calls a "pass list," but which is really the report which went on from the Board of Musical Studies to the council.

The report is signed "For the examiners, J. Ives." He now claims that he was himself one of them. In his speech at the Elder Hall the gravamen of what he alleged was that "the chancellor asked me as one of the examiners for the degree of Mus. Bac. to place a relative of his in the first-class division of the pass lists I had issued." In his letter he restates what he said in his speech as "the grave charge of seeking to tamper with an examiner." Now Professor Ives has definitely stated the occasion to which he referred, it is easy to show that on that occasion he was not an examiner at all.

In my previous letter I pointed out that this instance in 1897 was the only one in the history of the school of music at the university in which Professor Ives had assumed to himself the authority of classing a musical exercise required for the degree. In Mr. Harold Davies's case in 1896 the classing was recommended by the Board of Musical Studies, and accepted by the council, and in 1888 Mr. T. H. Jones's exercise was classed by the English examiners. In and since 1897 the mistaken practice of classing the exercises has been abandoned. In every case hitherto the musical exercise required for the degree has been sent to England to be approved of by English examiners, and Professor Ives has never been appointed a co-examiner with them.

Professor Ives writes of his "co-examiner, Dr. Bridge," as if Dr. Bridge had been the only English examiner in 1897, and as if Professor Ives had been associated with him. In fact, the examiners who were appointed in July, 1897, to deal with the exercises in question were Sir Herbert Oakley and Sir Frederick Bridge, and Professor Ives was not included in the appointment.

Sir Herbert Oakley and Sir Frederick Bridge both reported and not Sir Frederick only, as stated by Professor Ives. As to Miss Campbell's exercise, the report concluded:—"If this exercise be also corrected to the approval of the university professor at Adelaide, this candidate's work would be considered as earning the Mus. Bac. degree."

Professor Ives, therefore, had no authority from the university to act as examiner of these exercises, and the only duty with which he was entrusted by the examiners was to see that the condition that certain errors were corrected before the exercise was taken to be "approved." That condition complied with, his functions with respect to the exercises ceased.

I have shown that Professor Ives's claim to have been one of the examiners appointed to "approve" these exercises is without foundation. He had no more right to "class" them than "the man in the street." Four years have passed, and he now boldly asserts that at one and the same interview I sought to have my niece's exercise marked as of the first class, and also insisted that there was no power under the regulations to so class it! The fact is (as is confirmed by the report in facsimile at the end of his letter) Professor Ives had certified in writing before I saw his report that the exercises had been "approved." The duty with which he had been entrusted by the examiners was complete, and all I did was to point out that his affecting to class them was not warranted by the regulations.

I am, Sir, &c.,
S. J. WAY.
The University, December 21, 1901.

The University
Adelaide 17/97

December 7th 1897

The Exercise for the degree of Mus. Bac. written by William Margary Hole and Florence Way Campbell have been approved and classed as follows:— J.I.

Second class J.I.
Hole William Margary J.I.
First class J.I.
Campbell Florence Way J.I.

For the Examiners
J. Ives

Approved
C. M. vol VI page 152

Reg 21. Dec. 1901.

MUSICAL EXAMINATIONS AT THE UNIVERSITY.

Mr. DIXSON asked if the Minister of Education had received any further reports or correspondence with reference to the musical trouble at the university?

The MINISTER of EDUCATION said he had requested the registrar to forward the minutes of the educational committee. He had not yet received them. He had received a report from Professor Ives dealing with the matter, and he thought he would hand it to the press.

Mr. PRICE asked the Chief Secretary if having seen the correspondence laid on the table of the House with reference to the dispute at the university and the correspondence in the press, whether he considered it proper to demand a report from the Chief Justice?

The CHIEF SECRETARY said they had no power to demand a report, and as the correspondence was not yet finished he thought it would be better to wait.

Mr. PRICE asked whether, in view of the serious charge made against the Chief Justice, as Chancellor of the University, the Chief Secretary would ascertain the truthfulness or otherwise of the charge, and whether His Honor was fit to occupy his present high position?

The CHIEF SECRETARY said Mr. Price must know that the Chief Justice had denied the charge point blank; and until further developments occurred it was impossible for the Government to interfere. They had no control whatever over the Chancellor.

THE UNIVERSITY AND FAIRNESS.

To the Editor.

Sir—On Friday I asked the registrar to allow me to see the minute book of the board of musical studies, and to give me a copy of a certain pass list I had issued. He refused. I pointed out that as professor of music and as a member of the board of musical studies I had a right to expect compliance with my requests. The registrar replied that he was acting under instructions from the chancellor and vice-chancellor. Further comment is unnecessary.

I am, Sir, &c.,
J. IVES.
The University, December 21.