

Admission
Receipt

11. 8. 16

BOTANIC GARDEN APPOINTMENT.

MR. QUINN'S LETTER.

In the House of Assembly on Thursday Mr. Ryan asked, in the event of the Government having been prevented by the Botanic Garden Board from making the appointment of a director, would not the same power deny to the whole of the Botanic Park servants the long-service leave as part of their terms of employment.

The Commissioner of Crown Lands (Hon. C. Goode) said he believed that would be the position. The Crown Solicitor, in his report, had stated that he had no doubt that the appointment of the director came under the Civil Service Act. Several old employes of the Gardens had received long-service leave, and if they did not come under the Civil Service Act, then the question arose whether that leave had not been granted illegally.

Mr. Ryan said there was doubt in the minds of members of the Botanic Garden staff what their rights were. Was it the intention of the Government to bring in legislation to settle the rights of the Government, the board, and also the officers who might be employed?

The Commissioner of Crown Lands replied that the question involved policy, and he asked the member to give notice.

A statement made by the Government Horticultural Expert (Mr. G. Quinn) with regard to the directorship and published in the press on Saturday last, as being a communication to the board of governors was referred to by Mr. Anstey, who enquired whether the attention of the Commissioner of Crown Lands had been directed to the matter.

The Minister replied that he had been surprised to see the communication, and had asked Mr. Quinn for an explanation. Mr. Quinn had written to him as follows:—

In the first place I wish to say that I have never addressed any communication to the board of governors of the Botanic Garden, either in writing or verbally, respecting this matter. I have for obvious reasons purposely avoided doing so, much as I should have liked to have met that body to discuss their difficulties. The letter quoted in the press was written privately to a personal friend, who expressed the belief that it lay within my power to finalise this unfortunate dispute, and with that end in view I compiled the statement printed for his personal information and guidance in bringing the matter before the board. The letter was not intended by me to be given to the board, nor to be handed to the press. If its publication has in any way widened the breach between the Government and the board, I must express my regrets, as such was not its intent.

The Minister said he desired to leave the matter as it was. Possibly something might be done to clear up the relationship between Mr. Quinn and the board with regard to the publication of the letter in the press.

In reply to a question, of which Mr. Laffer had given notice, the Commissioner of Crown Lands stated that the Government had not appointed Professor Osborn to the position of Director of the Botanic Garden.

POSITION OF THE ROYAL SOCIETY.

The question whether the appointment of Professor Osborn as Director of the Botanic Garden was recommended by the Royal Society, as was recently stated by the Commissioner of Crown Lands, was referred to at a meeting of the Royal Society on Thursday night. Mr. A. M. Lea asked if the society had really made a recommendation for the appointment of Professor Osborn to the position. The president (Dr. J. C. Verco) said the council of the society had embodied the recommendation of a subcommittee, which had been appointed to deal with the question of the Botanic Garden last year in a communication to the Government. The committee had proposed that the Professor of Botany at the Adelaide University should, ex officio, be the honorary director of the Botanic Garden. The council adopted that recommendation and sent it to the Minister controlling the garden, but the Royal Society as a whole had not had the approval of the matter or otherwise under its consideration. Professor Rennie said the directorship was intended to be an honorary position. Quite apart from there being any kudos in it, if Professor Osborn obtained the position, those who were cognisant of the condition of things at the garden would realise that it would be anything but a bed of roses. There would be nothing but hard work and trouble ahead. The scheme as recommended by the council was not intended to benefit any individual, but was for the future welfare and improvement of the scientific value of the garden.

On the motion of Mr. Selway, seconded by Mr. C. Hackett, it was decided that it be placed on record that the recommendation came from the council, and not from the Royal Society, and that it referred specifically to the appointment of the Professor of Botany, and not any individual.

Advertiser 11.8.16

BIOGRAPHICAL PARTICULARS

THE LATE CAPTAIN CHARLES W. HOOPER.

Captain Charles W. Hooper, second son of Mr. John Hooper, Queen-street, Norwood, was born at Gumerical in 1884. He was educated at Prince Alfred College, and graduated at the Ade-



Captain C. W. Hooper.

elaide University, taking the degrees of B.A. and B.Sc. He recently lived at Wallaroo, where he was engaged in the assay office of the Wallaroo and Mount Mining and Smelting Company. He had been on active service since June, 1915. A widow and one son are left.

Register 11.8.16.

THE BOTANIC GARDEN.

From "A Regular Visitor to the Garden":—"I notice the letter from perhaps the best plantsman in South Australia, Mr. F. Bowels, foreman of Sewell's Nurseries; and, as it comes after the letter of Mr. Copas, some sound investigation should be made of the losses sustained in the Botanic Garden of the magnificent collection of plants that were there, and published in the catalogue of Dr. Schomburgk, in 1878. This, perhaps, would lead the public to understand the condition of the Garden botanically at present. Men of keen observation and thoroughly qualified to speak, who have had a life's experience, should be best able to judge, and to them the public ought to be thankful. My own idea is that the position ought to be advertised outside the State, and outside the Civil Service; as I am convinced that no one in our service is capable of occupying the position thoroughly."

From H. W. Copas:—"I agree with Mr. Bowels that the collection of plants at the gardens are not what they were 28 years ago—far from it. The board ought to request Dr. Holtze to issue a catalogue of all plants at the gardens at present time, the particulars to be open for inspection, and then compare it with the catalogue issued by Dr. Schomburgk in 1878. The comparison will then perhaps justify the comments made and give the Government proofs that the best practical man procurable should be appointed."

Advertiser 12.8.16

THE PAY OF TEACHERS.

In an address to school teachers in Adelaide on Friday evening, Professor Darnley Naylor referred to the standing of professional teachers in the community. He said it was regrettable that many of those engaged in two great professions which moulded the mind, the character, and the soul—the Church and teaching—received pay that very few skilled workers would accept. That was no compliment to the community, and what was the result? During his ten years' experience at the Adelaide University he had seen far too many of the best students go away to other States in order to obtain better pay and better positions. That was not right, and the people were not doing their duty to their own country. Owing to the war, he understood that the teaching staffs were numerically inadequate, and he hoped that condition of affairs would not be allowed to continue after the war. Salaries should be given that would attract to the profession the best the State could produce. The fault lay with the Government, who would not pay the extra money.

DIRECTORSHIP OF BOTANIC GARDEN.

Position of the Board.

The deadlock between the governors of the Botanic Garden and the Government was further considered by the board on Friday morning. After the meeting the Chairman (Mr. T. H. Brooker) was invited to indicate what had been done. He replied that, in view of the nature of the answers which had been made by the Government to some of the questions asked in the House of Assembly, he had not felt clear, as Chairman, what were the powers and functions of the board. Consequently he had determined to ask the board to consider the advisableness of petitioning Parliament to take action in the matter. He had noticed, however, that on the previous day the Minister, in response to an enquiry whether the Government had actually appointed Professor Osborn to be Director, had said "No." That notification had made him wonder whether the Government might not be seeking a solution of the difficulty in some other way.

—Never Used Powers Arbitrarily.—

Continuing, Mr. Brooker said:—"The document which I had framed stated, among other things:—"The members of the successive boards have been appointed to carry out the detailed workings of the garden under the provisions of the Act of 1860, which Act has only once been amended since its inception. They have given their time and services in a purely honorary manner. While, in the wisdom of the framers of the Act, wide powers were given to the board it has never used those powers in an arbitrary way, but instead has always sought the approval of the Government in power, and always recommended to the Minister any course of action needed for his approval and sanction. This policy was pursued in connection with the present trouble. When the board understood that Dr. Holtze would be retired, it straightway recommended the Government to call for applications for a suitable man, bearing in mind the custom applying in the Civil Service. The Minister then produced the scheme in regard to which the board had never been consulted. This scheme, in the opinion of the board, with its triple appointments, divided control and heavily increased expenditure compared with the board's proposal to have one good capable man similar to the previous directors, was against the best interests of the Botanic Garden.

—Still Hope.—

"The board was of the opinion that the desire of the Minister to advance the science of botany could be attained by giving the new Director some slight assistance. That course would have avoided all possibility of friction. The Minister admitted on July 19 that the board was empowered under the Act to appoint a Director, but now says that is not so, and questions even the board's right of recommendation for an appointment. The members of the board feel that if the power provided in the Act under which they were appointed, and have worked for so many years, can be whittled away or overridden by any other Act, it should be done in the way of an amending Act. They are of opinion that it will be a national loss if the democratic institutions which have stood the test of time are to be impaired by the autocracy of any Minister or Government that may be in power. They feel that what is the position of the Botanic Garden Board to-day may be the position of any other board to-morrow. They therefore court an investigation into the matter, or some amendment of the Act, to provide that citizens who give their services for their country shall be sure of their powers and functions while working under any Act or regulations." Seeing that Professor Osborn has not been appointed, the board, after deliberation, decided not to carry the matter any further at the moment.

—Mr. Quinn's Position.—

Mr. Brooker then referred to the explanation given by the Government Horticultural Expert (Mr. G. Quinn) concerning the publication of his letter dealing with the Botanic Garden situation. "The 'personal friend' alluded to in that explanation," he said, "is a member of the board, who placed the communication before the board which, after having assured itself that Mr. Quinn was agreeable to its publication, if the board so desired, handed it to the press." In conclusion Mr. Brooker emphasized the fact that the board felt that there was still hope of a reasonable solution of the problem, and said he would be perfectly willing, and, indeed, pleased, to discuss the matter further with the Minister.

EDUCATION AFTER THE
WAR.PROFESSOR DARNLEY NAYLOR'S
VIEWS.

Before a large gathering held at the Prince Hall, Adelaide High School, on Friday evening under the auspices of the Women Teachers' Progressive League, and presided over by the Director of Education (Mr. M. M. Magellan), Professor Darnley Naylor delivered an interesting address on "Education after the War." On the platform also were Miss Aletake (president of the league), Chief Inspector Charlton, Inspector Stonner, and Mr. Angus Parsons, B.A.

The professor said the answer to the question, "What will education be after the war," depended upon the manner in which the war was closed. If peace came as the result of a stalemate or armistice the prophecy would be easy. Education would be nothing better than military training—for the fitting of men to die and be killed and for the production of engines of destruction. It would be also for the upbringing of women for only one purpose. The new sense of the sanctity of life and the brotherhood of mankind would disappear, and the churches might as well close their doors. Such a possibility was too horrible to contemplate, and they all had confidence in an Allied victory. (Applause.) At the close of the war he feared mankind was likely to fall into artificial groups, closed in by bitterness and passion. That could only be prevented by the encouragement of an education that would evoke sympathy between nation and nation, and between race and race. They must fight against the building up of a Chinese wall of parochialism and prejudice. The cure was to be found in the stimulation of the teaching of all languages and of universal history. It was not enough merely to study British history or literature. As Mr. Verran was not present he could say that freedom of government, as known to the British, was not their invention, but the invention of the Greek people, which had come down through the wonderful municipal government of the Romans. One subject that it would be well to introduce some day instead of many unnecessary things was etymology, with its handmaiden philology. The ignorance of the people about other races was regrettable. Several reforms in education were necessary, and he hoped they would come with peace. He hoped the people would have the common sense to introduce the decimal system of coinage, and apply that system to the measures of length and weight. Then he hoped there would be established an academy of letters for the much-needed reform of English spelling, syntax, and grammar. If these reforms were made the English language might become world-wide. After the war literature and language—history, philosophy, poetry, and prose—should be encouraged, as opposed to a merely technical education. Otherwise they would soon become more and more a nation of shopkeepers. (Applause.)