

Advertisee
27.7.16

UNIVERSITY SENATE.

THE LOWRIE SCHOLARSHIP.

A meeting of the senate of the University of Adelaide was held in the Prince of Wales Theatre on Wednesday afternoon.

Professor Osborn moved that chapter xxxiii. of the Lawrie Scholarship be repealed, and a new chapter substituted therefor. He explained that the scholarship had been founded in 1911 by an anonymous donor of £500 for post-graduate research in agriculture. The statutes then drawn up provided for seven scholarships, each £15 in value, and as they were awarded the fund would be gradually decreased. They were open only to students with a certain specific degree, who were to undertake research work, beginning in March and ending in December of the same year. There had been no application, and it was considered desirable that the terms of the scholarship should be reconsidered to see if it were not possible that a greater field could be attracted. Revised statutes were drawn up, which provided that the University should give four scholarships each of £150, and tenable for one year. The candidates for a scholarship must have qualified for a degree at the University. It was considered advisable to give the candidate the full agricultural year for the research. In making the amount £150 the idea was to give the student sufficient to enable him to engage in a year's work. He would not be allowed to undertake outside work. Now only four scholarships were to be awarded, which at £150 would require £600. The original donation had been £500, but the additional hundred would be provided by interest that had accrued.

Professor Kettle seconded the motion, which was carried.

Amendments were made in the regulations of the degree of doctor of music to fix the date for the examination in November.

The regulations of the degree of master of arts were amended, dividing the branch subject geology and mineralogy, into two subjects, namely (1) physiography and geology, and (2) mineralogy. A similar alteration was made in regard to the regulations of the degree of bachelor of arts.

Advertisee
27.7.16

SIX MORE DOCTORS FOR THE WAR.

A special congregation was held in the Prince of Wales' Theatre, Adelaide University, on Wednesday for the purpose of conferring degrees on candidates. The Chancellor (the Hon. G. J. R. Murray) presided. The following were presented for the degrees of bachelor of medicine and bachelor of surgery:—N. B. G. Abbott, G. H. Black, C. B. Burden, G. H. Burnell, G. S. Shipway, and A. R. Southwood. For the ordinary degree of bachelor of arts Ida Marie Heyne, and for the ordinary degree of bachelor of science E. S. Burdon and J. H. Allen (in absentia). The members of the Senate and Council were present attired in the academic costume proper to their respective degrees and offices. The Chancellor, in presenting the degrees, congratulated the candidates, and particularly the medical graduates who, he stated, had all volunteered for active service. He expressed the hope that they would do good work in alleviating the condition of the wounded and sick, and said he believed their services with the army would not be required for very long.

WARR CHANGES PROPOSED

Daily Herald

25.7.16

A CANCELLED LEGACY.

£10,000 INVOLVED.

A UNIVERSITY MATTER.

At the meeting of the council of the University of Melbourne yesterday afternoon, the vice-chancellor (Dr. J. H. MacFarland) presiding, a letter was read, in which it was stated that for certain reasons a legacy to the University of £10,000, which had been provided for in a will, had been cancelled. The letter was the outcome of correspondence which, for the information of the members of the council, was summarised by the registrar (Mr. J. P. Bainbridge), as follows:—

In March last Mr. P. P. Brett, a member of a well-known firm of solicitors, wrote to Professor Laby concerning his son's failure in senior public physics, criticising the paper as most difficult, stating the possibility of his son's abandoning his University course, and asking if the examination result were final. He further expressed the view that, considering the different temperaments of boys, a candidate should not be failed on a narrow margin.

Professor Laby was not one of the examiners concerned, and handed the letter to the registrar.

The registrar forwarded a sympathetic reply, but pointed out that with the large numbers of candidates to be dealt with, and the need for prompt publication of results, it was necessary to deal with candidates on hard and fast lines, without considering the particular circumstances of individuals, but that naturally a candidate on the border line received special attention from the second examiner.

Mr. Brett, in replying, repeated his criticism of the paper as being "difficult to do" bordering on "impossibility," he rejected as unsatisfactory the explanation based on numbers and time available; he placed the following construction on the registrar's explanation—"a cast-iron numerical standard is fixed—regardless of the idiosyncrasies of examiners or examinees . . . and there is no machinery for appeal, revision, or consideration in any one case;" and added that he could "imagine nothing more calculated to discourage in an institution supposed to encourage." He added, further, that he might publish the registrar's letter, "and thus I understand your desire to sympathise, but my son fortunately is able to go elsewhere."

The registrar replied that Mr. Brett was well aware that his previous letter was not written for publication, and that if it were published he would reply by publishing Mr. Brett's letter, and would reserve his comments thereon till then.

Mr. Brett, in reply, accused the registrar of ignorance and of having forgotten himself and his position, and informed him that his comments would not be of importance. He forwarded a series of questions to which he asked for replies, and asked that these and the whole correspondence be submitted to the University Council, and reaffirmed his intention of publishing the correspondence. The first of these questions was, "Who are the examiners, and what is their age, qualification, and experience?" and the last, "If time does not permit a slow examinee to attempt all questions in a difficult scientific paper, is any consideration allowed for this?"

The whole correspondence was submitted and read to the council at its meeting on the 30th April, when the council resolved that it would not continue the correspondence.

The letter, which came before the council for the first time yesterday, was as follows:—

"South Yarra, July 6, 1916.
"The Registrar, the University of Melbourne,
Carlton.

"Dear Sir,—Referring to previous correspondence, on what it seems to show I have received authority to cancel one legacy to the University of £10,000, on account of—

- "1. The system of imposing severe examinations for entrance.
- "2. The inelastic methods of testing at these examinations.
- "3. The refusal to give information, coupled with the tone of your second letter.

"A much larger one (which I was instrumental in obtaining) may also be cancelled, as whatever may be the proper standard for obtaining degrees, the donor's intention was to encourage young students generally to acquire scientific knowledge, and not to benefit students specially adapted for examinations.

"Before taking any further steps please let me know whether the council wishes to add anything further in explanation, or to give any further information.—Yours truly,

"F. P. BRETT."

Professor Sir Harry Allen said that it was a question whether it would not be possible to do more than was done in the way of avoiding the hardship which occasionally in examinations fell upon particular candidates. He would like to see an advisory body appointed, under whose supervision the public examination might be regarded as one whole. By that means a candidate would not be rejected for the loss of one small point. Personally, he did not believe that Mr. Brett would do what he threatened to do. The feeling of anger would pass away when the opportunity for calmer reflection came.

Dr. Leeper said that hitherto the subject had been dealt with by correspondence only. Much harm might be done to the university if Mr. Brett were allowed to labour under his existing sense of injury. The letter showed that Mr. Brett was unwilling to take the action which he threatened. He was a reasonable man, and some member of the council who knew him might be asked to consult with Mr. Brett, and point out to him the difficulties involved.

Mr. L. A. Adamson.—Mr. Brett's son was a member of a boat's crew which was defeated in the "head of the river" races in 1915. Mr. Brett wrote to the press, impugning the umpire's decision.

Mr. Justice Higgins.—I may say that I know Mr. Brett, but I would not care to expostulate with him concerning the subject before us.

Mr. Adamson.—The question was referred by the University Council to the Schools' Board for its information, and when it came before the Board Mr. Brett stated emphatically that his son had failed for the want of one point only.

The Registrar.—The number of marks required to pass in the subject of physics at the examination in question was 36. Mr. Brett's son obtained 30 marks.

Mr. Adamson.—Does Mr. Brett understand that his son lost one-sixth of the marks?

The Registrar.—He was furnished with a copy of the report showing the number of marks obtained by his son, and the standard for a pass. Mr. Brett replied by declaring that the University had "doctored" the report.

Mr. Adamson.—Oh! that settles it.

Professor Harrison Moore.—Are we not making a mistake, and missing the point, by discussing the question of the pass standard and the marks obtained? The situation would have been the same if the boy had failed by one mark instead of six. (Hear, hear.) From a professional point of view the admissions implied in Mr. Brett's letter are serious.

Dr. MacFarland.—I should think so.

Mr. Justice Higgins.—He has influenced one legacy, and he knows of another.

On the motion of Dr. MacFarland, the correspondence was handed to the press.

It was thereupon unanimously agreed to proceed with the next business on the notice-paper.

Advertisements

1. 8. 16.

WELFARE WORK.

ADELAIDE LADY'S BOOK.
LONDON, July 30.

Mr. Lloyd George contributes a foreword to a book, entitled "Welfare Work," written by Miss Emily Dorothea Proud, B.A., formerly of Adelaide University, who recently came to England, and is now engaged in the welfare department of the Ministry of Munitions.

Mr. Lloyd George describes the establishment of the Welfare Department, and states that it is impossible to exaggerate its importance in safeguarding the health and well-being of the female workers. Lady supervisors are being appointed in all the national factories in which women are employed. Mr. Lloyd George says:—"I hope that all controlled establishments will follow suit, and thus help to secure a larger speed in output, while they preserve the health and happiness of the workers and relieve the harassed employer from needless strain. It is a strange irony that the making of weapons of destruction should afford occasion to humanise industry. It may well be that when the tumult of war is a distant echo, and the making of munitions a nightmare of the past, this effort to soften asperities and to secure the welfare of the workers will build a bridge of sympathy and understanding between the employer and the employed, and leave behind results of permanent and enduring value to the workers, to the nation, and to mankind at large."

Register

1. 8. 16.

MORE GOVERNMENT APPOINTMENTS.

Professor Osborn, Director of Botanic Garden.

The appointments which the Government made on Monday completed and verified the list which The Register published some months ago of changes which were pending in the service. The Premier stated that Professor Osborn had been selected to succeed Dr. Holtze as Director of the Botanic Garden. Mr. Goode mentioned in Parliament some days ago that it had been found that the Government had power to make this appointment, which, it had been understood, was vested in the functions of the board of governors. In giving the decision of Cabinet, Mr. Vaughan stated:—"Details of the selection are not yet fixed up. I desire to emphasize, however, that Professor Osborn has neither sought nor will he receive any increase in salary."

"This will mean that the Government will carry out its original scheme for the management of the garden?" suggested a representative of The Register.

"Yes," replied the Premier, "and there will not be any additional cost. Professor Osborn will not reside on the grounds at present. The curator, who is to be appointed, will occupy the house formerly used by the Director. The question of the appointment of a keeper of the herbarium and of the museum will be considered. Above all things, the Government is anxious to keep the gardens up to date. We are anxious that they shall be not only pleasure grounds for the people, but a source of instruction to those engaged in agricultural pursuits. Professor Osborn may require an assistant, and the £250 we intended to pay for the new Director's services will go towards the salary of the officer chosen to assist him at the University."



PROFESSOR OSBORN.

—Professor Osborn's Career.—

Professor Osborn is at present lecturer on economic botany, vegetable pathology, and parasitology at the University. The Government contributes annually £600 of his salary for services to the Agricultural Department in connection with pathological work. This arrangement was made some years ago. Professor Osborn was born on October 2, 1887. At the age of 21 years he graduated as a B.Sc. of the University of Manchester, and gained first-class honours in botany. After having spent a term in the laboratory of Professor V. H. Blackman at Leeds University, Mr. Osborn acted as senior lecturer in economic botany in the University of Manchester, and gave many instructional and popular lectures in both general and applied botany. He had experience at Manchester in the construction and equipment of a modern botanical school, and made investigations for private firms on the mildew of silk and diseases of the potato. Mr. Osborn was accustomed to deal with enquiries relating to economic botany. For four years he interested himself in military matters, and was connected with the Manchester University Volunteer Company and the officers' training corps.

—Board to Meet on Friday.—

The members of the Botanic Gardens Board are considering their position, and will meet on Friday.

Advertiser

2. 8. 16.

THE BOTANIC GARDEN.

BOARD VERSUS GOVERNMENT.

SITUATION DEVELOPING.

The Botanic Garden Board has taken off the gloves and is going to contest with the Government to a finish the issue in regard to the appointment of a Director to succeed Mr. Holtze. The board did not expect the Government to take the action which the Premier announced on Monday, but there will be no submissive retirement on its part. The chairman of the board (Mr. T. H. Brooker), when asked on Tuesday what he thought of the Government's decision to appoint Professor Osborn to be Director, said:—"I think the Government have not the power to do so. At most, they could only appoint him acting director, and I very much doubt if they could even do that, in view of the provisions of Act No. 8 of 1860. The Act clearly says the board shall have power to appoint and remove a director, secretary, and other officer appointed to the said Botanic Garden, and from time to time fix and determine the salary and emolument to be paid to such officers, provided that all salaries paid by the board shall be annually submitted to Parliament."