

The Crown Solicitor is against you on that matter, commented the reporter.

"Yes. It would be interesting to know, in the face of the Act of 1860, what Act or Acts in the opinion of the Crown Solicitor override that very definite statement. The question of the legality of the position which has cropped up seems to reflect want of confidence in the Attorney-General and other members of the Ministry. In all our conferences the Government have admitted the legality of the board appointing the director. The Minister's latest communication to the board agreed that the board call for applications and appoint a director."

Additional Expense, £700 a Year.

Is the board still determined to advertise for a director?

"The board will meet on Friday next, and pending that meeting I am not prepared to make any statement about what the board will do in that regard. In reference to the question of economy, the Premier stated that Professor Osborn had not sought, nor would he receive, any increase in salary. The Premier goes on to say the original scheme will be carried out, but that there will not be any additional cost. The original scheme of the Government was:—That the Professor of Botany at the University of Adelaide, be appointed director at a salary of £250 per annum (it is understood that his salary from the University is £200 per annum); that in lieu of residence he was to receive £50 per annum until an up-to-date residence was built. That seems to indicate that there is £100 extra, and if Professor Osborn is legally appointed the Government must begin forthwith to pay rent. The Government also proposed to appoint a curator at a salary of £350 per annum, with house, &c.; a keeper of the herbarium, beginning at £250 and rising to £300. On these lines alone, without taking into consideration the probability of extra cost of running the new offices, it seems to the board that at least there would be an expenditure of £700 per annum more than under the present system. The Government further proposed to erect a building for offices, and boardroom at a cost of £400; that is apart from the new residence.

Board Will Not Resign.

"The board still hold strongly that the services of a good, capable man could be secured, and he would be sole director, on the spot, at the present annual expenditure. If the Government wanted extra effort in certain directions two good working men, added to the staff, would have produced excellent results. Under the appointment announced by the Government the Professor of Botany will not live at the garden. We presume the management will be left in the hands of the curator, and it is questionable under the proposed scheme whether a first-class curator can be secured on the terms mentioned. The question of calling for applications in the Public Service is another important one. Professor Osborn, I understand, is not a Civil servant. We believe that among the applications received by the Government is one from Mr. G. Quinn (Government Horticultural Expert), who has all the knowledge and capabilities necessary to fit him for the position. The board is not clear whether Professor Osborn has the requisite qualifications in regard to the management of men."

Will the board resign if the Government appoint Professor Osborn at Thursday's Executive Council meeting?

"The members feel keenly the indignity put upon them after they have given their best services for many years, that in this scheme, which was evidently cut and dried, every other society or body has been consulted, or advice or information has been accepted, except the board that has made good. Evidently the Government must think the members are mere puppets; otherwise their advice and judgment might in all courtesy have been sought. It may be the Government are harassing them with the idea that they will resign, so that a more subservient board can be appointed. At present the members do not think of resigning."

QUESTIONS IN PARLIAMENT.

In the House of Assembly on Tuesday Mr. Ponder gave notice that he will ask to-day:—(1) In obtaining the opinion of the Crown Solicitor re the powers of the Botanic Garden Board will the Commissioner of Crown Lands state which Act, if any, overrides the powers given in Act 7, 1860 (an Act to Establish and Regulate an Institution called the Botanic Garden of Adelaide), wherein clause 5 says—'And shall also have power to appoint and remove a director, secretary, and other officers pertaining to the said Botanic Garden?' (2) Is Professor Osborn a Civil servant under the Act? (3) What position does he hold, and what is the amount of salary he receives? (4) Who pays it?"

The Commissioner of Crown Lands, in reply to Mr. Laffer, stated that in the opinion of the Crown Solicitor the Government had power to appoint a director for the Botanic Garden without first receiving a recommendation from the board of governors.

Ref. 3. 8. 16

THE BOTANIC GARDEN.

PROTEST BY THE BOARD.

The chairman of the Board of Governors of the Botanic Garden (Mr. T. H. Brooker) stated on Wednesday that the board had decided to send to the Government a formal protest against the appointment of Professor Osborn to be Director of the garden. The protest is being forwarded to the Commissioner of Crown Lands to-day.

In the House of Assembly on Wednesday Mr. Laffer gave notice that to-day he would ask:—'1. Has the Commissioner of Crown Lands received a letter from the chairman of the Botanic Garden Board, protesting against the appointment of Professor Osborn? 2. What proportion of Professor Osborn's time is devoted to vegetable pathology on behalf of the Department of Agriculture for the £600 per annum paid to the University for his services? 3. In the three or four years that Professor Osborn has been paid this sum, what important investigation has he undertaken, other than identifying ordinary types of fungus diseases? 4. During that period how many specimens of fungus diseases are recorded as being determined by him? 5. As consulting botanist, how many specimens of weed plants has Professor Osborn identified for the Department of Agriculture, and how many has he failed to identify? (a) How many has he sent to Dr. Holtze? (b) How many has he sent to Mr. Black. (c) How many has he sent to Mr. Marden—for identification by them?'

Mr. Moseley asked if the Commissioner of Crown Lands had called for applications throughout Australia for the position of Director of the Botanic Garden.

The Commissioner of Crown Lands said he had not. He had given due consideration to Civil servants whose qualifications entitled them to such consideration.

The Commissioner of Crown Lands informed Mr. Ponder that the Civil Service Act of 1874 overrode the powers given in the Botanic Garden Act of 1860. Professor Osborn was a Civil servant, but was not classified under the Act. Professor Osborn held the position of Government pathologist at a salary of £600 per annum. The Department of Agriculture paid the salary.

Ref. 3. 8. 16

THE BOTANIC GARDENS.

From H. W. Copas:—'I would like to know why the board has so strongly opposed the appointment of Professor Osborn as Director of the Gardens. It would be interesting to hear the board account for the ruination of many fine specimens of plants which were there in the time of Dr. Schomburgk. Then Adelaide could boast of the finest gardens in Australia, but to-day that certainly cannot be said. If, as Mr. Brooker says, the gardens are wanted for a public recreation reserve, it is well to note that the City Gardener has shown far more ability in that direction than many other people.'

Ref. 4. 8. 16

ADVISORY COUNCIL OF EDUCATION.

Seventeen appointments to the Advisory Council of Education were made by Executive Council on Thursday. The Act prescribes that there shall be 21 members, including the Superintendents of Primary, Secondary, Technical, and Agricultural Education; but, as those four positions have not yet been filled, the appointments to the advisory council cannot be made. The personnel will be as follows:—Appointed by the Governor:—Mr. M. M. Maughan (Director of Education), Dr. Gertrude Halley; by the Minister of Education, Messrs. W. R. Bayly (head master of Prince Alfred College), and T. A. Caterer (acting head master of St. Peter's College), Miss Caroline Jacob, the Very Rev. Prior R. F. Power, Sir Langdon Bonython, Mr. Coombe, M.P., Professor J. M. Ennis; Council of the University—Professors W. Mitchell and R. W. Chapman; by Chamber of Manufacturers—Mr. H. B. Thompson; Employers' Federation—Mr. E. H. Bakewell; Trades and Labour Council—Messrs. W. C. Melbourne and T. P. Howard; Advisory Board of Agriculture—Professor A. J. Perkins (Director of Agriculture); and Public School Teachers' Union—Mr. F. F. Wholohan. The first meeting of the council will be held on Tuesday afternoon at 3 o'clock, in the deputation room, which is situated in the north-eastern corner of Education Block, on the third floor. It is probable that the proceedings will be opened by the Premier (Hon. C. Vaughan), as Minister of Education. Under the Act, the Director of Education will be Chairman, but the council will elect a Vice-Chairman and the officers. Only preliminary business will be transacted.

Rey. 4.8.16

MORE QUESTIONS ABOUT BOTANIC GARDEN DIRECTOR.

No fewer than 20 questions are down on the Assembly agenda paper for Tuesday respecting the appointment of Professor Osborn as Director of the Botanic Garden. Mr. Hague will ask the Commissioner of Crown Lands:—1. Is it a fact that the Commissioner of Crown Lands, in his communication to the Botanic Garden Board, dated July 19, wrote—"That the board call for applications and appoint a director, as empowered under the Act?" 2. If so, did the board agree to that proposition? 3. In face of this, why was the appointment of Professor Osborn made? 4. Does the hon. Minister possess a number of applications from aspirants for the directorship? 5. Were they referred to the board of governors? 6. If not, why not? 7. The hon. Minister having stated that Professor Osborn is a civil servant but is not classified, nor does his name appear on any Government paysheet, how does he justify his contention that he is a civil servant? 8. As the hon. Minister states that Professor Osborn is not a classified civil servant, how does the Government reconcile its attitude with the Civil Service regulations, which state, "That the Director of the Botanic Garden Board shall be a first-class civil servant, receiving not less than £450 per annum?" 9. Is it a fact that when the Board of Governors of the Botanic Garden recommended Mr. R. Crawford, who had done excellent work as an ex officio member for the Royal Agricultural Society, the Government ignored the board's recommendation and appointed Professor Osborn instead? 10. If so, did the Government give the board any reasons for their action? 11. When was Professor Osborn appointed? 12. Is it a fact that the Commissioner of Crown Lands consulted with individual members of the University staff, the Royal Society, and the British Science Guild? 13. If so, is he aware that several of the same persons, including Professor Osborn, are prominent members of all these bodies? 14. Did the hon. the Minister after conferring with these learned bodies consult the board of governors on the points raised? 15. If not, why not?"

In the Assembly on Thursday, Mr. Laffer asked the Commissioner of Crown Lands (Hon. C. Goode) five questions concerning the time devoted to investigation by Professor Osborn in connection with vegetable pathology and botany, for which position he received £600. The Minister asked Mr. Laffer to repeat them on Tuesday.

Rey. 4.8.16

THE BOTANIC GARDENS.

From T. H. Brooker (Chairman Botanic Garden Board):—"I think Mr. H. W. Copas has misunderstood the position. The board has no objection to Professor Osborn. Had he been an applicant for the position of sole control and management his application would have received every consideration. The board strongly urge that, to secure the best man, applications should be called. Mr. Copas, as a successful gardener, could have had, with others, the opportunity of applying. I have never been stupid enough to say that the Gardens are wanted for a public recreation reserve only. Hence the policy of the board to have an up-to-date chess ground, which, by-the-way, is seldom visited. Regarding the state of the Gardens now and in Dr. Schomburgk's time, I will leave that with the visiting public, and have no fear of the verdict. In case others may have the same ideas as Mr. Copas, and not having too much time at my disposal, I would briefly say the board are of the opinion that, for the sake of economy and good management, one good man should be selected from the applicants; that he should give his undivided skill and energy to maintain the reputation of the Gardens; that he should be responsible to the board, and through them to the Government. Such a man will, in the opinion of the board, do better than the suggested triple appointments of the Government."

ad. in file 5.8.16

THE BOTANIC GARDENS.

From H. W. Copas, Lockleys:—"A misprint in my previous letter caused me to state that Mr. Brooker said, 'If the gardens are wanted for a recreation park, &c.' What I did say was Mr. Bowles—not Mr. Brooker. Then, again, I am of the opinion that the best man procurable for Director should be appointed, but I have been given to understand that one from the Civil Service should be chosen. So far as my knowledge enables me to speak, there is not one man capable of doing the work which is really required. Why did the board not advertise and get the best man available to have the sole management of the Garden? I hear that Mr. Bailey, of Queensland, could have been secured. If so, the Government could have had one of the best men in Australia. No doubt the directorship is one man's work. Surely, in such a small

Ref. 4. 8. 16.

HOW THE WAR WILL END.

Logical Prophecy.

To judge of the future there must be knowledge of the past. Thus one well versed in history is sometimes able to forecast the future with no small measure of accuracy. The insight gained from the book of time affords the power, so to speak, to recognise shadows that are cast before. It is not merely his familiarity with history, however, which gives Professor Henderson authority to predict the turn of events in connection with the great European crisis. There are other things which qualify him to speak with more than ordinary authority on such a subject, and among these are his acquaintance with current events, and his quick perception of the meaning of events on the great chequer board where plays destiny, with nations for pieces. He keeps pace with developments, and thus his views are abreast of the times. In an interesting chat on Thursday Professor Henderson, who is lecturer in history at the Adelaide University, concisely threw light upon the future.

—Germany's Tremendous Loss.—

"I shall refer," he said, "to the two branches of war—by sea and by land—and the outlook for the immediate future. I think there is cause for the greatest satisfaction in contemplating the achievements of the Allies at sea. Within four months of the outbreak of war the German mercantile marine had been swept from the open seas, and the trade of Germany, amounting in exports and imports to £1,300,000,000, was destroyed, with the exception of that part which she could carry on at the very great expense, and, furtively, through neutral countries and the Baltic. In seven months the surface craft of Germany's navy were also swept from the open seas, and Great Britain was left in possession of the great strategic centres of the world's commerce—Halifax, Vancouver, Sydney, Hongkong, Singapore, Colombo, Aden, and Cape Town. The latest report of the Board of Trade showed that in January, 1916, as against 1915, the imports and exports of Britain had increased by £15,000,000, and I believe that in January, 1917, as against 1916, the increase will be more satisfactory still. This is a wonderful achievement in one of the most important objects of naval warfare—namely, the protection of your own trade and the destruction of that of the enemy. Again, Germany had an Empire beyond the seas at the beginning of this war, in the Pacific, and on the Continent of Africa. She has lost all her possessions in the Pacific, and all her settlements in Africa but one. With that one it is only a matter of time and it will go the way of the others. This, again, is the result of the command of the seas. Not a surface ship of Germany's dare appear in the open; not a soldier can she send to defend her possessions in Africa or the Pacific.

—Trident of the Atlantic.—

"Great Britain still holds the North Sea, and Germany is in a state of blockade. The £300,000,000 which she had spent on her navy since 1899 has been spent almost absolutely in vain. German seamen are brave, and they understand the application of science to naval warfare, but take their achievements on the sea and consider them in the aggregate, and they are very poor indeed, and must be exceedingly humiliating to a Power that expected to grasp the trident of the Atlantic before this war began. Never has British seapower been exerted with more astounding effect than in this present war.

—"How Should We Judge?"—

"The case appears very different on land, especially to the man who is accustomed to look no deeper than the surface. Germany has overrun Belgium, and is in possession of a portion of France. She has destroyed Serbia for the time being, established communication between Berlin and Constantinople by rail, and has overrun Poland. If we are to judge results by occupation and retention of territory, Germany has proved her military power. But we have no right to judge merely by the occupation of towns and territory. There is one consideration for area, it does not even suggest enough scope for more than one good man. I don't want for one moment to hurt my friend, Mr. Brooker, but, according to my ideas, the Gardens have not been maintained professionally for many years as they should have been. The plant life is not available as it was in the time of Dr. Schomburgk. I do not know Professor Osborn,