

To the Editor.
 Sir—The recent musical embroglio at the university must cause the keenest possible regret to all who regard with interest the advancement of higher education in this state. Every one must deplore the injury done to the university by the indignity of recent proceedings, which would have reflected disgrace upon a small uncultured municipal corporation in the rural districts. Fancy an Oxford or Cambridge professor guilty of the bad taste of airing his grievances before an assemblage gathered together to participate in the annual commemoration or commencement of those universities! It is almost impossible to imagine such a thing as a disappointed professor rising up in the Sheldonian Theatre, at Oxford on commemoration day and launching forth a torrent of invective against chancellor and vice-chancellor; but one can safely say—that he would not have proceeded far in his tirade before the Beadle and Proctor's Bull Dogs would have conducted him outside the university precincts. I am not a member of the university of Adelaide, and I am not endowed with the self-assurance of certain members of the parliamentary Labour Party, who are apparently of opinion that the university only requires to be taken in hand by the Government and all things will be well with it. It is, therefore, with considerable diffidence that I ask whether it would not be a wise move on the part of the local university to follow the example of the English and Scotch universities, and make the chancellorship a more dignified office by divesting it of some of the duties now assigned to it, and handing them over to the vice-chancellor or university council. Could an Oxford man, for instance, realize the chancellor of that university popping in and out of the registrar's office and scrutinising the lists issued by the examiners! So dignified is the position of the Marquis of Salisbury in that ancient seat of learning that it would not be etiquette for him even to preside at the annual commemoration unless degrees were being conferred on royalty. Yet he is the head of the university, and as such leads its deputations to the Throne. If, in Adelaide, the chancellor was only expected to attend university convocations for the bestowal of degrees, &c., and to act as referee in matters of dispute submitted to his judgment—if, in short, he was relieved of all the administrative work of the university—there would be a great enhancement in the dignity of the office, and its occupant would not be a target for the ridicule of discontented professors, or required to defend himself in the public press from unfounded charges of nepotism. Nobody believes that Sir Samuel Way has done more than insist upon the regulations of the university in regard to the results of the musical examination of 1897 being carried out by Professor Ives; but this fact has given pretext to that gentleman for bringing a very grave charge against the chancellor, necessitating a public correspondence which has not conducted to the dignity of the university or those especially concerned. The university is fortunate in possessing a vice-chancellor who, on the authority of the professor of music, is sagacious and faithful, even if "old fashioned." If a more active share in the management of university affairs were committed into his

hands it would result in an accession of dignity to the office of chancellor.
 I am, Sir, &c.,
 P. R. PYMAR DODD, M.A., Oxon.
 Burnside, December 23.

To the Editor.
 Sir—The statement of Professor Peterson, of Melbourne, throws much light on the recent Mus. Bac. examinations, and cannot but convince the public that a great injustice has been done the third year students. Professor Peterson's comments are plain, and his decided opinion can be briefly summed up in his own words when speaking of the harmony paper as a "preposterous test." He states that in his report to the university council he entered a strong protest against three of the seven questions propounded, and he also refers to the inadequate attempts to answer the questions proposed. In the face of the harmony paper being "a preposterous test," how could the students' attempt be anything but inadequate? Although Professor Peterson distinctly states that he entered a strong protest, no such information can be gathered from the registrar's published reply to Parliament, and but one conclusion can be arrived at, namely, the council wished to keep these facts from the public. The students, in their protest to the council stated that the harmony paper was unreasonable. They have now the satisfaction of knowing that the third examiner, or referee, called in to decide the whole matter, substantiates their statements. In face of the protests entered by Professors Peterson and Ives, as well as the students, the council decide that the examination was a fair one. Is justice lost or buried? Are we not justified in asking that Professor Peterson's report to the council be published fully and openly? If the council have nothing to fear, surely they cannot object to such a request. I sincerely trust the public will not allow the matter to drop, but bear in mind that a cruel injustice has been done the third year Mus. Bac. students, who are entitled to some redress in the shape of another examination on fair and just lines.
 I am, Sir, &c.,
 MARK RIDGWAY.

THE PROFESSOR'S INTENTIONS.
 Professor Ives writes:—"The question is being continually asked when I intend to leave Adelaide. I do not intend to leave. I am making arrangements to start a Conservatorium of Music, and I purpose endeavoring to enter Parliament with a view to bringing about reforms called for by the revelations I have made as to the inner workings of the University. The University is for the people—not for a class alone."

THE CASE FOR THE STUDENTS.
 To the Editor.
 Sir—As an interested spectator of the duel between Professor Ives and the Chief Justice over the administration of University affairs, I have come to the conclusion, upon the evidence published, that the statement of Professor Ives re the classification of the degree exercise, examined in 1897, is perfectly true. The published fac-simile of the altered pass-list, to my mind, is conclusive evidence that Professor Ives was quite justified in making the charge. After carefully studying the published reports, I am of opinion that the Chancellor's action in connection with the recent examinations is deplorable, as it appears that he has used the opportunities and power that the position of Chancellor has conferred upon him, not always in the best interests of the University, but rather in a manner that would suggest that his own glorification is of more consequence than the welfare of the University. My reason for making this statement is his high-handed action in overruling the decision of the committee appointed by the council to deal with the dispute between the two examiners. According to Professor Ives the minutes of the education committee show that it was resolved to send only the students' papers to Professor Peterson. "But lo and behold, this 'great man' happened to come into the office," and ordered the registrar to send Mr. Wale's damning report and annotations also. I must respectfully ask the Chief Justice, does the office of Chancellor confer on him the right or power to over-rule the finding of a committee appointed by the council to deal with any matter brought before it? If not, then as one of the public who helps to support

the University, I will be pleased to hear his action explained. Failing such explanation, I will be forced to the conclusion that his action was not what the public expect from a gentleman holding the high office of Chief Justice of this State, and a great deal of the confidence now placed in the honor and integrity of the judges who preside over our courts of law will be shaken. According to the references to this trouble in Parliament, it appears that the public contribute £6,000 annually to the University, and yet the Government has no representation on the management. This is not as it should be, and I hope that the present Government will early next session introduce a measure with the object of altering this state of affairs, not only with the University, but with any other institution to which a subsidy is granted. No doubt had Parliament the power, members would very soon see that the injustice done to the third-year students was removed. The students in question have published in "The Advertiser" their complaints as to the treatment meted out to them at the recent examination. They draw attention to one very important particular, viz., Mr. Wale's telegram to Professor Peterson:—"Have no objection whatever, provided that it be distinctly set forth that passing papers practically means a degree in music." Probably this is the key to the stand taken by Mr. Wale and Professor Peterson. If Mr. Wale thought, as indicated in the telegram, this would account, in part, for the difficulty of the harmony paper, and also for his decision on the working of the same. There can hardly be any reasonable doubt that Professor Peterson was influenced in his decision by that telegram, and it is possible that had it been explained to him that passing the papers did not mean a degree, his award would have been entirely different. The regulations for the whole Mus. Bac. course should have been sent to Professor Peterson. Seeing that the third year examination in the Melbourne University, where he is the professor of music, is the final examination for the degree, and consequently of a higher standard than the third year examination in Adelaide, it is not unlikely that he was under the impression that the same was the case in Adelaide. In conclusion, I wish, as one of the outside public, to express the regret felt at the prospect of the departure from this State of Professor Ives, and also to express appreciation of the manly and straightforward course of action he has adopted during the time of trouble between himself and the Chancellor of the University.—I am, &c.,

JUSTICE.
 Woodville, December 23, 1901.

THE CHANCELLOR AND PROFESSOR IVES.
 Mr. PRICE asked if the Premier would demand a report from the Chancellor of the University as to the charges made against him?
 Mr. JENKINS did not think he had the power to demand a report. It would be better to wait until the present correspondence in the press is finished. (Hear, hear.)
 Mr. PRICE referred to the serious charges laid against the Chief Justice as Chancellor of the Adelaide University, and asked if the charges laid were true was he fit to be Chief Justice of South Australia? Would Mr. Jenkins investigate the matter so as to prove his worthiness to occupy the position?
 Mr. JENKINS said the Chief Justice had that morning point-blank denied the charges made. Without further developments it would be impossible for the Government to move in the matter, as they had no control.
 Mr. BROOKER, in reply to Mr. Dixon, said he had requested the Registrar of the Adelaide University to supply him with the minutes of their meeting, but he had not received them. He had received a report from Professor Ives dealing with the matter and would hand it to the press for publication.

Advertiser 25th Dec. 1901.

THE MUS. BAC. EXAMINATIONS.
 Professor Ives asks us to explain that he did not set the harmony paper which Professor Peterson of Melbourne designates "a preposterous one." For the third year examination four papers were set—two by Professor Ives and two by his co-examiner, Mr. Wale. The harmony paper complained of was one of the latter.

Register 25th Dec. 1901.

THE MUSICAL EXAMINATIONS.
ANOTHER TO BE HELD.
SPECIAL MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL.
 A special meeting of the council of the University of Adelaide was held on Tuesday, December 24, to consider additional communications from Professor Peterson and Mr. W. H. Wale regarding the examination of the third year candidates for the Mus. Bac. degree.
 The following are the letters:—
 Melbourne, December 20, 1901.
 The Registrar Adelaide University.—Dear Sir— I have yours of yesterday's date. I am very sorry indeed for the unfortunate occurrence, and wish I could be of any adequate assistance. I, of course, can raise no objection to your council making any use it thinks proper of the report I supplied. I should, however, like to see it again first, as it was written under time pressure, and some expressions should perhaps be "edited," with a view to appearance in public. I have no alteration to suggest in its meaning, but there is a difference between the freedom of a confidential report and the circumspect terms necessary for a public document. It is a pity that so much has leaked out in unauthorised form, and if the council thinks that "editing" is less important than prompt action I have no serious objection to the report being made public with all its emphatic imperfections on its head! I wonder if I may venture to suggest in the interests of all concerned that a second examination be set the four candidates at an early date—in view of the fact that Professor Ives and also the third examiner called in condemn the present paper in unmeasured terms. I make the suggestion with all respect and only with the interest of the university in view. The paper to be submitted for approval to each examiner before being adopted.
 —Yours faithfully, Franklin Peterson.
 Melbourne, December 22, 1901.—The Registrar Adelaide University.—Dear Sir—I duly received yours of 20th inst. I have only to add to my previous letter an assurance, which, I am quite sure, is not needed—that Mr. Wale's marks and annotations had not the slightest weight with me in allotting my own marks.—Yours faithfully, Franklin Peterson.
 Sydney, December 20, 1901.—To the Registrar University of Adelaide.—Dear Sir—Will you kindly forward me three copies of each of the 1901 "Third Year Mus. Bac." papers—both "Harmony" and "Form." For your information I enclose cuttings from the Sydney "Morning Herald" of the 19th inst., and the Sydney "Daily Telegraph" of to-day. It is perhaps unnecessary for me to remind you that the "Harmony" paper was forwarded by the writer to Professor Ives direct, but I think that, in justice to myself, the council should be informed that (1) the paper, as originally set, was revised and altered—presumably by Professor Ives—before appearing in print, with his endorsement on the front page; and (2) that Q. iv. (the sonata movement, and the one to which, I presume, he now takes exception) was set at his express request. In a letter which I hold, signed by Professor Ives and addressed to myself on October 14 last, he requested me to set the "Harmony" paper, and desired me to "include practical composition—as a sonata movement (sic) or vocal work, or musical, or something to show original powers"—a suggestion with which I thoroughly concurred. It is therefore altogether too late in the day for Professor Ives to object to a paper printed—after revision by himself—with his knowledge and consent, or to take exception in the public press to that portion of its contents which was inserted by his express desire. You are at liberty to make what use you please of this communication.—I am, dear sir, faithfully yours, W. H. Wale.
 The harmony paper referred to in Mr. Wale's letter was also produced. The following is a copy, omitting the music:—