

PROFESSOR PETERSON'S VIEWS.

With regard to the embroglio about the Elder chair of music in Adelaide, Professor Peterson, whose name has been mixed up in the affair, is (says the "Age") not at present inclined to be very communicative. Concerning the charges brought by Professor Ives against Sir Samuel Way he knows nothing; but in respect of the examination paper recently set for the candidates for the degree of Mus. Bac., he states that the harmony paper was a "preposterous test," and that in his report to the university council he entered a strong protest against three of the seven questions propounded. The worst of all, and the one which chiefly roused the ire of Professor Ives, consisted of a modest request that candidates should write the first movement of a sonata for clarinet and string quartet upon a given subject, the nature of which was the reverse of inspiring. They were recommended not to omit any part, and it was hinted that should they find themselves constrained to curtail their work, they would do well to indicate how the omitted part ("if any") should be treated. This was one question out of seven in a three hours' paper! Professor Peterson states further that while his Adelaide colleague's proposal to pass four students was most likely in the nature of a protest against the absurd severity of the test imposed, the fact of the paper being preposterous seemed to him not sufficient ground for accepting as correct what were only very inadequate attempts to answer the questions proposed.

THE UNIVERSITY.

PROFESSOR IVES REPLIES TO THE CHANCELLOR.

To the Editor.

Sir—I am not surprised to find that Sir Samuel Way denies the accuracy of one of my statements.

It will be patent to most observers that a gentleman holding the position of Chief Justice in this State, and that of Chancellor of this University must answer the grave charge of seeking to tamper with an examiner. That answer must either be a denial or an admission of its justification. To admit an error is manly—to seek to cloak it by a falsehood is ignoble.

The statement I made at the University on Wednesday with reference to the degree examination at which the Chancellor's relative sat is true in every detail. Even the Chancellor's letter of denial to-day confirms one portion of my statement. He admits that an interview between himself and myself (the examiner) did take place. The pass-list I had previously issued will show that it was subsequently altered. Why was it altered? Let me tell you, in the interests of truth and justice.

On receipt of the opinion of my co-examiner (Dr. Bridge) — which confirmed my own—I wrote out a pass-list and handed it to the registrar of the University to be posted. This was in the forenoon. In the afternoon the Registrar informed me that the Chancellor wished to see me. I went into the Registrar's office, and found the Chancellor waiting. He said he wished to speak to me privately, and we went to another room.

He then told me that the Registrar had shown him the pass-list I had issued, but which had not yet been posted, and, looking at me significantly, asked did I not think I should be justified in placing Miss Campbell's name in the first class. I replied I was sorry I could not, as her work did not merit it. I further added that I thought my co-examiner had taken a liberal view of the work done. He then asked to see Dr. Bridge's letter. I showed it to him.

The Chancellor then said that at each of the three previous examinations Miss Campbell had obtained a first class, and suggested that I might take that into consideration and regard the whole of the results as cumulative, and thus justify my giving her a first class. I replied that I regretted that I could not do so, that the results of each examination were dependent upon the work done at each, and pointed out that if I were to regard the question in such an illogical light a candidate who had passed three examinations could expect to pass the fourth as a matter of course, and not trouble about doing any work.

Then he hazarded the opinion that this course was done in some of the other faculties, and might be, he thought, in that of Music. The regulations were referred to, and he read through them.

Then he called attention to regulation ix., wherein it is said that—"After the exercise has been approved by the examiners the candidate must deposit a fair and complete copy of such exercise in the University library," and expressed the opinion that on that I should be justified in at least merely announcing that the exercises of the candidates had been "approved," thus avoiding any necessity to distinguish them by "class."

I pointed to regulation xi., which says:—"The names of successful candidates at each examination shall be arranged in three classes, in alphabetical order in each," and said, as the author of these regulations, I had had the idea of classification in my mind when drawing 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 ix. 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 me:—

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, &c.,

J. IVES.

The University, December 20, 1901.

Copy of original pass list, as it was when first handed to the Registrar for posting:—
The University,

Adelaide, December 7, 1897.

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

Second Class,

Hole, William Margary.

Third Class,

Campbell, Florence Way.

For the Examiners,

J. Ives.

The following is the pass-list as it now stands in the minute books of the University:—

17/97.

The University,

Adelaide,

December 7th, 1897.

The Exercises 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.

Third Class:—

J. I.

Campbell, Florence Way. J. I.

For the Examiners,

J. Ives.

At the bottom of the page has been added:—

Approved.—C.M., vol. vi., page 152.

THE MUSIC STUDENTS.

THE REGISTRAR'S REPORT.

PROFESSOR IVES' CRITICISM.

The Minister of Education (Hon. T. H. Brooker) has received the following report from Professor Ives:—

"University, December 20 — The Registrar's report evades the point at issue — Was it right to submit the candidates' papers to an arbitrator accompanied by the report and comments of one examiner and without report or com-

ments from the other examiner? The minutes of the education committee show that it was resolved to send the papers only to Professor Peterson. After their meeting the Registrar and I agreed about the details—that the pencil-marks on the papers were to be erased and that no reports from either Mr. Wale or myself should be sent, so that Professor Peterson should be able to value the papers without bias or prejudice. This, I repeat, was the decision of the education committee—the committee to which the council had referred the matter for consideration. How, then, did the Chancellor presume to dictate instructions contrary to this fair decision? He happened to come in the office (the office has a telephone—so has Montefiore) and instruct the Registrar to send Mr. Wale's adverse report, and commanded that his annotations should not be erased from the papers. I, the examiner, was not informed of this, no report from me was sent, and only when I asked about it two days later was I informed what had been done. Then I wrote as follows:—"Dear Mr. Registrar—I am astonished to hear that you have sent Mr. Wale's report along with the examination papers, and without a report from me. It was understood that the papers were to be sent for a fair, unbiassed opinion thereon, and in justice to the candidates this could be obtained in the way agreed upon between you and myself. I therefore withdraw my consent to Professor Peterson seeing the papers, and I have telegraphed to him accordingly.—Yours truly, J. Ives." Mr. Wale's telegram of December 5, which had not been shown to me, indicates that he supposed this examination to be the final one for the degree. This is not the case. After passing the third year examination, the most severe ordeal has to be gone through—that of writing an "exercise." This constitutes the final examination for the degree. It is strange that neither Mr. Wale's marks for the various questions, nor Professor Peterson's marks have been shown to me as one of the examiners, nor was I allowed to be present when the Council considered Professor Peterson's report. No doubt the Chancellor, who presides over the Council meetings, will know why the Professor of Music was not asked to be present at a meeting at which the Council virtually assumed the functions of examiners for the degree of Mus. Bac."

Advertiser 23 Dec 1901.

REFERENCES IN PARLIAMENT.

The University trouble was brought up in the House of Assembly on Saturday by Mr. Price, who drew attention to Professor Ives' reply to the Chancellor of the University. This, he stated, appeared to be a complete denial, and showed that the Chancellor had used his position to further the interests of a relative. He asked the Premier to do his best to bring about a full enquiry. Mr. Jenkins thought that the trouble had arrived at such a stage that the council of the University was bound to make an enquiry. Mr. Price contended that the council was prejudiced, and hoped that a State enquiry would be held, but Mr. Jenkins thought that at the present stage this was impossible. Mr. Giles asked the Premier to be careful in interfering with the University in view of the hospital trouble. Mr. Jenkins said an Act would be required before any alteration could be made in the charter of the University. Mr. Price asked if it was a fact that the Chief Justice appointed himself Chancellor of the University; whether that was the same gentleman who secretly jeopardised clause 74 of the Commonwealth Bill; thirdly, whether he was the same Chief Justice who made grave reflections on a brother judge in the Andersen case. "He's keeping up his record," interjected Mr. Archibald. Mr. Jenkins replied that he could not answer those questions.