

Advertiser 31<sup>st</sup> July 1901

The Chemist & Druggist of Australasia 1<sup>st</sup> August 1901.

Advertiser 3<sup>rd</sup> August 1901.

PROFESSOR IVES.

To the Editor.

Sir—The University professor of music appears to be in an unenviable position at present; his "he did" or "he did not" is still shrouded in mystery. When I wrote my previous letter I was under the impression that Mr. Ives had resigned his appointment as Elder professor of music at the Adelaide University, but from the news items in "The Advertiser" of the 29th and 30th inst. on this subject I gather that he did not resign, but that the University council intimated to him that his services are not required after a certain date, and that the council declines to give him any reasons for this action. If this reading is correct, I feel sure that the Chancellor, who is also Chief Justice and Lieutenant-Governor of this State, has not given the subject his usual careful consideration, or he would certainly make public the reasons for the council's action, which practically amounts to the dismissal of the professor. And, further, the Chancellor, who is usually very explicit in his legal decisions, will see that not only Professor Ives, but also the public, are entitled to know the reasons of the council for this step. The professor will then be able to exhibit his "discharge" with his next application for engagement, and the justice of the University council will continue on the lines so well expressed by Parker, who says—"Justice is the unchanging, everlasting will of God to give each man his right." With reference to the second part of your paragraph in "The Advertiser" of the 29th, if my memory serves me aright, Professor Ives asked to be relieved of his duties in connection with the Elder Conservatorium at the end of 1900; this was granted. I have no authority for this beyond the impression I received at the time. If such relief was not voluntarily sought by the professor, but quietly forced upon him, as it appears might probably have been the case, it must be a regret to all that the professor accepted the position without protest. This circumstance, as well as the greater one, demands the clearly-expressed reasons of the University council for its action. Nothing short of that will satisfy the public, which, after all, is the party most concerned in the issue of this unfortunate case.—I am, &c., J.R.W.

Adelaide, July 30, 1901.

Sir—I read in "The Advertiser" of the 29th inst. the short note from Professor Ives re his somewhat (to the public anyway) mysterious resignation (so called) of the position of professor of the chair of music. I contend that Professor Ives is quite within his rights when he asks for the reason of his forced resignation. Without this the public is left to imagine every evil under the sun as the cause of his not being wanted at the end of the year. If Professor Ives is not ashamed or afraid that this reason, whatever it may be, shall be made public in the press surely the council of the University need have no fear if their cause is a just one. It is an open secret that for some considerable time the sweet harmony that is given from time to time on the platforms of the Conservatorium does not exist amongst the teachers of that institution, and is this to be wondered at when the mad desire of the day is for so much of the foreign element, as teachers, amongst the powers that be? If another is eventually to take the place of Professor Ives let us hope at least he may be English, and not German, and if the council consider that degrees are of any value at all, let them show it by engaging men who possess them. Because an individual can write a song with a tune in it, it doesn't follow that his musical knowledge is such as to fit him to be the head of an important musical establishment. And is it just or right to overlook the fact that there are many competent and good musicians, local men, and Australians, who deserve some consideration at the hands of those in power, even though they cannot write "Herr" before their respective names.—I am, &c., A LOVER OF JUSTICE.

A LOVER OF JUSTICE.

SIR.—There is no necessity to have lived in the past century to know what is happening in this, neither is there any necessity to be an original member of the Pharmaceutical Society to understand the working of that organisation to-day. By the same token one has not to reside in the city to possess business capacity. A little seaside fresh air and aristocratic society is just the tonic to dissipate obsolete theories and stimulate modern ideas.

In discussing the educational problem of pharmacists in South Australia, I did not intend to deal with "the daily round, the common task." This needs no discussion as far as the higher education of our apprentices is concerned, although absolutely essential. The present mode adopted by the Pharmaceutical Council is the very best that could be provided under existing conditions, and a very excellent course at that. The lapsing of the pharmacy class was due to the death of the instructor, and that the Council have taken so long in reviving it is certainly disappointing, but the inauguration of any new system of education takes time to attain perfection. And it is distinctly unfair to abuse the other classes at the expense of this. Your correspondent regretted the fact that the education of the apprentice had been taken out of the master's hands. What was the master's instruction apparently worth in the past if, on the present testing, B secures 20 in pharmacy and nothing in dispensing? B passes in the abstruse subjects condemned by your correspondent. And now, I ask, does this reflect on the teaching imparted at the University or on the master's capability? In fact, your correspondent's idea of his duty to his apprentice seems rather incongruous.

He assails me on my singing high on the master's responsibility to his apprentice, abuses this modern system of education, and above all regrets the fact that the University does not teach business tact.

I should like to know what sort of responsibility your correspondent would take upon himself?

He, in fact, expects to obtain a premium of £25 to £100 for teaching his apprentice "what an errand boy could pick up in two or three years," or else he expects to pocket his apprentice's premium and leave the society to provide a business bureau, a school of etiquette, and a college of pharmacy combined in one. As far as I can judge from your correspondent's letter, the apprentice is, to his idea, simply a money-making machine, and as a keen business man in open competition directly he receives the money from the transaction all other interests cease. The present mode of education should intensify the master's interest in his apprentice's education, for if he fails, especially in pharmacy and dispensing (subjects to which more time is given than to any of the others), does not this to a certain degree reflect on the master's ability? I do not wish to reflect on the master's ability to teach or otherwise, but I do know who has the greater advantage, the one who has been through the University course and the one who has not, and in conclusion I may say that, although we may face a public devoid of sentiment, we also face an intelligent one who expects our mental achievements to equal our business tact, and at times it takes more tact than necessary to cover the former deficiency. And I wish to see the future chemists have advantages of which a great many of us in the past have been deprived.—Yours, &c.,

CYRIL H. STUBBS.

Semaphore, July 22, 1901.

Register 3<sup>rd</sup> August 1901.

UNIVERSITY LECTURE.

The life of Captain Charles Sturt was the subject of the second of Mr. George Sutherland's lectures at the University, given on Friday night, in connection with the extension programme. Commenting on the fact that Captain Sturt is sometimes named in historical and biographical works as Sir Charles, the lecturer remarked that his case was very nearly similar to that of the late Hon. G. C. Hawker, whose widow enjoyed the title of lady, although the actual conferring of the knighthood was delayed too long to permit of his enjoying it. The greatest of all the inland discoveries ever made in Australia, namely, the finding of the River Darling and the exploration of the River Murray right down to its mouth, were due to Sturt, who carried out a remarkable series of expeditions, starting from the Great Dividing Range in New South Wales, and going westward, during the years from 1829 to 1830. When the settlement of South Australia occurred almost the only information which the Colonisation Commissioners had to go upon was derived from the reports of Captain Barker, after whom Mount Barker is named, and who was dispatched from Sydney to traverse the country between Mount Lofty—seen by Flinders in 1802—and the newly-discovered MacFay Mouth, where, unfortunately, the gallant captain lost his life at the hands of the natives. Captain Sturt made Adelaide the starting point of his later notable expedition, extending from 1844 to 1846, and successively occupied the position of Surveyor-General, Commissioner of Crown Lands, Registrar-General, and Colonial Secretary in South Australia. Making use of the water supplies offered by the River Darling he led a party to Laidley's Ponds, on that river, and then struck away to the north and west, forming a depot among the Barrier Ranges. Two peaks of which, Mount Browne and Mount Poole, are named after members of his party. The pile of stones erected on Mount Poole was not intended as a memorial to that unfortunate officer, but was set up simply as a landmark, and to keep the men in good health during a period of enforced idleness before Mr. Poole died. The extreme hardships endured during the subsequent journeys to Strzelecki Creek, to near the centre of the continent, and finally to Cooper's Creek, were then narrated. Captain Sturt, during the return journey, was so weak as to require to be carried on a drey, and his eyesight rapidly failed until he became quite blind. He died at Cheltenham, in England, in 1857. The bust of him, which now finds a place in the National Gallery, gives an impression of the refinement and dignity of the famous explorer, but fails to convey any idea of the alertness and the practical character of the young officer who first opened up the great waterways of Australia to settlement and commerce. Mr. Donald Stuart—whose adventurous expeditions into the interior will form the topic of the last lecture of the series—expressed feelings of the highest affection and respect for his former leader, who taught him invaluable lessons in bush lore and in the management of the natives.

PROFESSOR IVES.

To the Editor.

Sir—I appear that the University Council does not intend us to retain the services of Professor Ives. Are we to be permitted to know the reason or not? If, as is rumored, Professor Ives's dismissal is due to his strict impartiality, and the fact that he is no respecter of persons, it is a most unsatisfactory condition of things. Surely for the honor of our Alma Mater, as well as Professor Ives, we should know the truth.—I am, &c., JUSTITIA.

"The Herald"

SATURDAY, August 3, 1901

THE RESIGNATION OF PROFESSOR IVES.

IS THE CHANCELLOR RESPONSIBLE?

What is the reason of Professor Ives' enforced resignation? That is the question in everybody's mouth. There is an answer to that question, and it has not yet been made public.

The Chancellor of the Adelaide University is

SIR SAMUEL WAY, BART.,

Lieutenant-Governor and Chief Justice of South Australia. We have reason to believe that the aforesaid gentleman takes an active interest in the working of that institution. In fact he is well-known to be the Pooh Bah and Grand Lama of the show. How far is the Chancellor responsible for this enforced resignation? That he is responsible in some degree is manifest in the fact that his power is so great in the institution. It depends entirely upon the

SAY OF THE CHANCELLOR

whether Professor Ives will go or stay. Professor Ives does not want to go—he is not allowed to stay—ergo, it is not the wish of the Chancellor that he should stay. Neither has the Chancellor the courtesy to inform the Professor as to the

REASON OF HIS DISMISSAL.

In support of this statement it is only necessary to quote the letter written by Professor Ives to the press:—

Sir—The council of the University have made public through your columns the fact that they do not propose renewing my appointment as Elder Professor of Music after the end of this year. Many years of earnest service—service that has resulted in placing the School of Music on a self-supporting basis—justify me in expecting to be informed of the reasons that have led to this surprising decision. I have

TWICE WRITTEN TO THE CHANCELLOR

of the University asking this favor. My request has not been complied with. I therefore think it due to myself, to my public position, and to the numerous co-workers in musical education, whose petitions have been presented to the council, to ask thus publicly for the reasons.—I am, &c.—J. IVES.

Is it possible that there is a personal reason behind this?

CONTEMPTIBLE PERSECUTION

of a gentleman whose able achievement in the musical culture of the people of this State has been long and generally recognised? Is it a fact that the honesty and integrity with which the professor discharged his judicial duties as an examiner brought upon him the

WRATH OF SOME PERSON

or persons whose interests were not served by impartial and just decisions on the merit of some student or students' work? Suggestions of this kind not only reach the ear but have found their way into print, and hereafter the following letter to the press has grave and mysterious import:—

Sir—The answer of the University respecting the Mus. Bac. examination is, in my opinion, incorrect. Rule xl. says—"The names of successful candidates at each examination shall be arranged in three classes in alphabetical order in each." You will find this rule on page 40 of the calendar for 1901, and it is in the previous calendars. Apparently, to suit some powerful interest, the word "examination" of the rule has been tortured so that it shall not include the final examination, but it is a curious fact that rule xl. is printed after the final examination of the candidates' work is described, and it is a further curious fact that in the year 1897 the only student who passed his final examination was classified.

PHARMACEUTICAL EDUCATION IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA.

SIR.—Your correspondent, C. H. Stubbs, says I should know that Materia Medica is taught at the University. If it is taught to pharmaceutical students, which I contend it is not, will he please let me know where, when, and at what time it is taught? Also, how it is the Pharmaceutical Society have arranged with the University to teach it next year? Also, if he is so satisfied with the present members and their mode of business, how is it he tried to get a seat there? I should think from the way he writes that if an apprentice followed the course being taught at the University that he would be a perfect pharmacist. He, being in a small watering place, must have very limited ideas of the chemist generally, and of competition amongst business people, to write as he does.—Yours, &c., E. S. COOPER

("One who has been through it all.")

Norwood, S.A., Jul 19, 1901.

The Chemist & Druggist of Australasia 1<sup>st</sup> August 1901.