The most important work the first Senate had to do was to secure a satisfactory teaching staff. The positions were advertised in Australia, Great Britain and America. There were only two applications from residents of Western Australia, one for the Chair of English from Mr. R.H. Robertson of Perth, and one for Mining and Engineering from H.E. Whitfield of Sandstone, Western Australia. The selections had therefore to be made from testimonials together with some reports of the impression made by applicants in Great Britain upon the Western Australian Agent General and Mr. Cyril Jackson. Mr. Jackson had been for some years the Director of Education in Western Australia and consequently was known to the members of the Senate. His report had much weight in the final selection.

The reports spoken of here were not the secret confidential report which is so favoured by University authorities and which I do not think the first Senate with its preponderance of men of affairs without University training would have tolerated. When the Agent General summoned the applicants to an interview they knew what it was for. It gave them an opportunity of doing their best to create a favourable impression and if any bias or prejudice was shown they could protest. Very different is the operation of the secret confidential report where the applicant does not know who is being asked to report upon his qualifications and so has no way of protecting himself against possible bias or mere fact.

Positions in the academic sphere are not abundant and a young man may have spent a considerable part of his life qualifying for such a post only to be damned by a secret report from some one to whom he has given offence. I have taken part in the selection of all the members of the teaching staff appointed prior to about 1940 and I was for many years a member of the Minor Appointments
Committee. The duty of this Committee was to examine the credentials and make a recommendation to the Senate as to all appointments below the rank of Professor. The personal interview was seldom possible and the secret report a diminishing factor. The only value I have ever been able to see in the personal interview is to detect the presence of physical defects such as stammering, but first impressions of personality are notoriously misleading. If secret reports are desired the only fair way is to allow the applicant to nominate a panel in addition to any the appointing authority may desire. It is argued that persons in high and important positions in the academic world will not lend themselves to any mean or prejudicial report, but this is assuming all such persons are a nearer approach to the ideal than experience warrants. On the average they of course do their honest best, but men are not aware of their prejudices or conscious of bias.

We had one very striking illustration of the injustice of the secret and confidential report. When the appointment of Professor Paterson to the Chair of Agriculture was not renewed, among the applications for the position was one from Mr. Nicholls. I was not favourable to appointing him for there was also an application from Dr. Teakle whose academic qualifications were as good, and in addition he was a West Australian graduate and Australian born. However the majority favoured Mr. Nicholls. Someone knew that about eight years previously he had been a member of a visiting English Commission or Committee of Enquiry and had been brought into contact with Sir George Julius, so a confidential report was obtained. It appears that after dining well Mr. Nicholls' conduct had given offence to Sir George Julius and his letter was in such terms that Mr. Nicholls' chances of appointment receded and it was only by the advocacy of one who was also known when young to
have taken on occasion more drink than he could control that the appointment was made. Professor Nicholls proved an acquisition. He was energetic and keen. His speciality was Animal Husbandry and he had the valuable quality of being able to enlist the interest and practical support of the Pastoral Industry and the Premier, to the advantage of the University and the creation of the Institute of Agriculture - but this is a digression.

Before calling for applications for the teaching staff it was necessary to decide the number of Chairs and Lectureships, the subjects to be taught and the terms of appointment. At the third meeting of the Senate in May 1912 the Pro-Chancellor, Mr. Andrews, moved and Mr. Grasby seconded a motion to appoint a committee of five with the Chancellor and Pro-Chancellor to report on the number of Chairs and Lectureships and the terms of appointment. This was carried. Indicative of the importance of the subject it was also decided to appoint the Committee by ballot. The ballot elected Mrs. Moss, Mr. Battye, Dr. Saw, Mr. Walker, the Minister for Education, and Mr. Grasby.

This Committee met in Cathedral Chambers. Mr. Walker was not present. The Pro-Chancellor, Mr. Andrews, moved and Dr. Saw seconded a motion that seven chairs be established. This was carried. The voting was - in favour Mr. Andrews, Dr. Saw, Mrs. Moss; against Mr. Battye and Mr. Grasby. The Chancellor, Dr. Hackett, did not record a vote.

The Committee reported to the Senate 18/6/1912 in favour of seven Chairs in the following order. There is nothing in the report to indicate that this list is in order of preference or merely in order of decision.

1. Mathematics and Physics.
2. Biology.
3. Engineering and Mining.
4. English.
5. History and Economics.
7. Philosophy (with special reference to Education).

The Committee also decided to recommend to the Senate:

"that the University shall undertake work leading up to
degree certificates or diplomas in the following faculties
or departments -

(a) Arts, including Education.
(b) Science, pure and applied, including -
   Agriculture
   Engineering
   Veterinary Science
   Dentistry
   Pharmacology
(c) Law.
(d) Music.

This seems quite an ambitious programme to finance on £13,500 and the Committee significantly add that they had not had time to go into the question of finance and they recommend it be remitted to them for further discussion. One would have thought that no decisions as to appointments should be made until the Committee was satisfied the necessary money was available.

After the whole seven members of the Committee had explained their views to the Senate the discussion was adjourned and it was ordered that the report be printed. It was also suggested that members of the Senate should submit a list of Chairs which they thought should be established on the supposition that the money available would be sufficient to provide for either five, six or seven Chairs exclusive of Agriculture, as that was to be provided by the Chancellor.

Messrs. Battye and Grasby thought so strongly on the matter that they went to the trouble of preparing and printing a minority report in favour of five Chairs. A
copy fortunately survives.

This minority report (20/6/1912) though disregarded at the time, contained much that is of great interest now after the passage of 31 years. Their forecast as to what would follow the appointment of seven Professors shows them to have been truly prophetic. The long story of financial embarrassment in which the Senate has been involved shows their foresight to have been very shrewd. They say - "We thoroughly disbelieve in the policy of deliberately going beyond our income in the expectation that the Government must come to our rescue and provide funds to make up our deficiencies." .......... the Senate must therefore maintain an independent position and be able to control its own policy. "It must show the public that it is capable of working on sound business lines, and of carrying out the broad liberal utilitarian policy which actuated Parliament in passing the Act......... We have in mind the fact that when a staff of Professors and Lecturers has been appointed the Senate must listen to their advice and must be in a position to give them in reason what they ask for to carry out their work. If five Professors are appointed others can at any time be added as funds allow; if a greater number is appointed it will not be possible at a later stage even though it be necessary to curtail our expenses."

All this thirty years experience has shown to be very sound. As a list of those things we have done which we should not have done it is remarkable. We have continued to make appointments and, to go beyond our income in the expectation that the Government would come to our rescue. The Senate has not shown the public it is capable of working on sound business lines and it has up to the present maintained its independent position only because the Government has at intervals come to our assis-
tance by increasing our annual grant, not to the extent of our real needs for equipment etc., but just sufficient to enable us to struggle along. The presence on our Finance Committee of the Under-Treasurer, at the invitation it is true of the Chancellor, but speaking and acting as a Government agent, is a present (1943) ominous sign of portending change.

The first sentence of my quotation from the minority report by Battyé and Grasby is of interest as the first emergence of a doctrine which was to have great influence on the history of the University. It can be briefly stated as follows: [The Senate has been placed by Parliament in complete control of University policy. If the existing grant is at any time not sufficient to finance what the Senate think the policy should be then it is the duty of the Government to increase the grant by whatever amount is necessary. [It is usually held that those who control the purse control policy, but this is a demand that those who control policy must be allowed to control the purse - a rather revolutionary doctrine.

The decision of the Senate at its sixth meeting to establish seven chairs in addition to Agriculture on an income of £13,500 is proof that the doctrine was supported by a majority of the Senate. It was first stated by Sir Walter James during the discussions as to the number of Chairs. When Whitfeld became Vice-Chancellor he found the doctrine fairly well established. It was one which was in complete accord with his philosophical disregard for mere filthy lucre and he never allowed the fact that there was no money available to check his efforts to establish whatever he thought was desirable, and such was his influence, backed as it invariably was by the other three Professors who were members of the Senate, that he almost always had his way. A number of cases could be quoted to show that the Senate did not regard
the entire absence of any funds as a bar to making appointments and incurring expenditure in excess of its ability to pay. The only explanation I can give of such disregard for ordinary financial soundness is that the members of the Senate had constantly at the back of their heads this doctrine that the Government were bound to finance whatever the Senate decided was desirable.

At its sixth meeting in June 1912 the Senate made its decision to establish seven chairs in addition to Agriculture. The Pro-Chancellor moved and Dr. Saw seconded the motion that there should be seven Chairs exclusive of Agriculture. Mr. T.H. Bath moved and W. Somerville seconded that seven should be struck out of the resolution and six inserted. The amendment in favour of six Chairs was defeated and the motion for seven was carried.

I supported the amendment entirely on financial grounds; on the information then before us I was convinced that six was the maximum number which could be supported on our income, and although our grant from the Government has increased from £13,500 to £38,193 in 1943 I am convinced that we to-day would be a more efficient organisation with a number of Chairs more in proportion to our income than the ten we have (1943) as well as eight Associate-Professors and numerous Lecturers etc. There is much in the records to support this view. Every year when the Senate made its annual vain effort to bring its estimates of expenditure within its income it was realised that being bound by long term contracts for salaries, by far the most important expenditure, no substantial reduction could be made, and all that could be done was to cut off £10 here and £5 there, mainly off what should be the most important items in a University budget, equipment and books. This wretched business was annual and indicated clearly the
persistent disability suffered by all the Departments due to the fact that instead of providing adequately for the number of Departments within our financial resources we were very inadequately struggling to provide for a number beyond our resources. In short the University had spread itself too thinly over too wide a field. This was the finding of our own Commissioner, Professor Wallace, Vice-Chancellor of Sydney, in an interim report of December 1939 and also in his final report of June 1940.

The most notable speech made during the Senate debate as to the number of Chairs to be established came from Mr. T. Walker, the Minister for Education. His advice was to do things on a large scale worthy of our great destiny. Six Chairs was a petty establishment—seven, eight or nine would be more in keeping with the great and glorious future assured to the West Australian University and the State when we have developed our unlimited natural resources etc. etc. Coming from a member of a Government which had proposed to charge the University interest on the cost of temporary buildings the speech was, to put it mildly, inconsistent.

It was a characteristic speech, passionate and ornate, idealistic and full of visions of the future and utterly regardless of such a mundane thing as finance. I had had many opportunities to observe the effect of Mr. Walker's oratory on crowds at election and political meetings, but its effect upon such a body as the Senate surprised me. No-one who heard Walker deliver a speech to which he attached importance could in fairness deny him the title of orator, but his matter always seemed to me to smack of fustian. The effect on Mrs. Moss was marked. She seemed to get quite worked up with it.

The Senate next decided to vote for the Chairs to be established by exhaustive ballot. In the first ballot
17 members voted for Mathematics and Physics
17 " " " Mining and Engineering
15 " " " Biology
15 " " " History and Economics
14 " " " English
10 " " " Chemistry
9 " " " Education
8 " " " Classics
6 " " " Geology

As there were 18 members the Chancellor had not apparently voted. The figures give a majority to 6 and these were taken as decided upon. The second ballot gave:

Classics 9
Geology 5
Education 4

The third ballot gave:

Geology 9
Classics 9

This required the Chancellor to give the casting vote and I well remember the pause of expectation as to how he would decide. He was well known as a supporter of classical studies and of what he frequently called the Humanities. It was consequently thought that Classics would inevitably get his support. He had already given his deliberative vote, for 9 and 9 accounted for all present and entitled to vote. After a pause the Chancellor told the Senate that owing to the great importance of the study of Geology to Western Australia, of whose industries Mining was so important, he would give his vote for Geology. Turning to Mrs. Moss who was also known to strongly support a Chair for Classics, he said "Never mind Mrs. Moss, we will see to it that we get a good Classics Lecturer."

A curious misconception as to the selection of Chairs seems to have gained currency in the Eastern States.
It was to the effect that the Scaddan Government had brought pressure to bear on the Senate to exclude Classics. Such a canard could be disregarded were it not that no less an authority than Professor Scott, Professor of History, Melbourne, sought to have it embodied in his Presidential Address to the 24th Science Congress held in Canberra January 1939. Professor Scott, as reported in the daily papers ..... "devoted the latter part of his address to the work of the Universities and the scientific staffs attached to them. He paid special attention to the somewhat defiant action of the University of Western Australia, which under the influence of the Labour Government of John Scaddan, removed the Classics from the curriculum and formed Professorships in Biology, Agriculture, Mathematics, Chemistry and Geology."

To this angelic choir, the Professor proceeded, were added a little later, with concessionary grace, Professorships in English (Walter Murdoch) and History and Economics (Edward Shann). The Scaddan Government congratulated itself on having created almost a revolution by establishing a University with so strong a scientific team and no Chair of Classics, whereas the other Australian Universities had seemed to cherish the Classics primarily and let the sciences creep in, like the laboratory cats when there happened to be mice to feed upon."

My surprise at reading this strange jumble of misrepresentation and laboured humour, can be imagined. Prompt action was necessary else the misrepresentation would appear in the published proceedings of the Science Congress and, supported by such authority, would be regarded as established historic fact. I wrote to the Sydney Morning Herald (I was in Sydney at the time of publication) stating the facts and denying, that the Scaddan Government had attempted to in any way influence the decision of the
Senate as to the number of Chairs on the subject. Although I signed my letter officially as Pro-Chancellor and also saw the Chief of Staff of the Sydney Morning Herald about the matter nothing was published. In view of the persistent policy of the large Eastern States newspapers to belittle Western Australia and all connected therewith this is not surprising. On my return home I obtained a copy of the Senate minutes which recorded what had actually happened. I sent this to Professor Scott together with a respectful request that he have his misrepresentation eliminated from his address before it was officially published. I also obtained letters from the surviving members of the first Senate supporting my protest against his misrepresentation. Professor Scott replied from "Illenden," Vermont, Victoria under date 20/3/1939 promising to make the corrections I requested and explaining that his remarks in his Presidential Address were what he recalled of what had been said by various people at various times. The war has prevented the official publication of the 1939 Science Congress so I do not know if he kept his word. He has died since.

The following is some of the correspondence relating to Professor Scott's misstatement. The first is my letter to the Professor. I received replies from all the living members of the first Senate and they all endorse as correct what I have said in refutation of Professor Scott. From these letters I have selected two as representing the lot. One is from Sir Walter James and the other from Mr. T.H. Bath. Mr. Bath's letter is of interest also because of his comment on the common assumption as to the debt we owe to the classics of Greece and Rome compared with the English classics.
Professor Ernest Scott,  
University of Melbourne,  
CARLTON, Vic.

Dear Sir,

In the report of your Presidential address to the recent Science Congress published in the Sydney Morning Herald you are reported to have "paid special attention to the somewhat defiant action of the University of Western Australia, which under the influence of the Labour Government of John Scaddan removed the classics from the curriculum and formed professorships in Biology, Agriculture, Mathematics & Physics, Mining & Engineering, Chemistry & Geology. To this angelic choir were added a little later with concessionary grace Professorships in English (Walter Murdoch) and History & Economics (Edward Shann)."

You do not give your authority for these definite statements and I assure you they are entirely wrong. You have unwittingly done a grave injustice to the memory of the Scaddan Government and cast a serious reflection on the members of the University Senate of that period. Coming from a Professor of History, speaking as President of the Science Congress, these statements will be difficult to overtake, but I respectfully suggest that you should do what you can by excising these references to the Western Australian University from any publication of your address. The action of the Scaddan Government was limited to appointing the first member of the Senate and providing the sum of £13,000 as they were required to do by the University Act. Not by any hint or suggestion did they attempt to influence the discretion of the Senate as to the nature or number of the Chairs to be established.

I was in Sydney when your address was delivered and on my return to W.A. on the 21st February, I had the minutes of the Senate meeting of June 24, 1912
examined. They confirm my recollection of what took place. The Senate first decided there should be seven chairs exclusive of Agriculture which had been endowed by the Chancellor. They next decided the subjects by exhaustive ballot. Contrary to your assertion, the Chairs of English and of History & Economics were among the first chosen. Professor Murdoch and Shann were appointed at the same time as the others, at the end of 1912. The second vote eliminated Education and a third vote resulted in a tie between Geology and Classics. The Chancellor, Sir Winthrop Hackett, was well known as a strong supporter of Classics but gave his casting vote in favour of Geology saying that as funds would not permit us to have chairs for both Geology and Classics he would vote for Geology because of its great importance to the chief industry of the State. But he added "we will make sure of a good Lecturer in Classics". Accordingly the Lectureship was established by the appointment of Associate-Professor G. Wood (then Lecturer) a month later.

These are the facts, and I think you will agree with me that they differ to such an extent from your assertions and suggestions as to justify me in asking you to be good enough to excise from your address these references to the University of Western Australia before any further publication.

Yours truly,

(W. Somerville)

Pro-Chancellor.
University of Western Australia
Crawley.
24th February, 1939.

(Sent to C. Andrews, T.H. Bath, F. Burrows,
N. Keenan, Sir J. Kirwin, Sandover, Sir
Walter James and J.S. Battye).

My dear

You may have noticed that I have taken exception to some references to the appointment of our first Professors made by Professor Scott during his Presidential address to the Canberra Science Congress. Not only are his alleged facts entirely wrong but his suggestion that the members of the Senate allowed themselves to be improperly influenced by the Government of the day should I submit be resented by all concerned.

On my own responsibility I have written to Professor Scott giving him the actual facts and respectfully asking him to have his unfortunate reference to the early history of the University of Western Australia excised from any future publication of his address.

If this is not done his distorted vision, coming from a Professor of History, will go out with such authority as to make it very difficult to overtake.

There may be further correspondence about the matter. If you feel with me it would strengthen my hand if you would permit me to use your name as that of one who supports the contention that the Senate when appointing the first Professors exercised its own discretion and that no attempt was made by the Government of the day to influence it against Classics.

In order to refresh your memory I enclose an extract from the Senate minutes. I will also venture to recall to your recollection the remark made by the Chancellor when giving his casting vote in favour of
Geology. It was to the effect that while very desirous of having a chair of Classics he gave his casting vote in favour of Geology because of its importance to the chief industry of the State.

Yours truly,

(W. Somerville)

Stone James & Co.
St. George's Terrace,
Perth.

3rd March 1939.

W. Somerville, Esq.,
Arbitration Court,
PERTH.

My dear Somerville,

I have not read a report of the Presidential address of Professor Scott and therefore did not know of his reference to the appointment of the first Professors of our University.

I am indeed surprised to hear from you that in that address the Professor suggested that members of the Senate of our University were influenced by the Government of the day in making the appointments.

Nothing is further from fact.

As a then member of the Senate I am certain that we elected the men we thought most suitable quite uninfluenced by the views of the Government or any Minister. To be quite candid, I never heard that on these matters any view was held or expressed by the Ministry or any member of it.

In the contest for the seventh Chair I spoke and voted in favour of Education.

The Chair of Agriculture was filled by our acceptance of the nominee of Hackett who endowed the Chair.
I shall be glad if you succeed in obtaining from Professor Scott a withdrawal of his statement and I should very much like to hear from the Professor, who was or were responsible for misleading him.

My absence from the State for five weeks accounts for this reply being somewhat belated.

With kind regards to you and Mrs. Somerville,

Yours sincerely,

(Walter James)

74 Farnley Street,
Mount Lawley.
March 23rd, 1939.

My dear Somerville,

I cry "peccavi" for a start. I should have answered your letter promptly; neglect put it under a pile of papers on my bedroom table until I had a clean up last night to make room for more.

Certainly, I could not have remembered the actual circumstances of the first selection by the Senate of a staff for the University until I saw a copy of the minutes. I do know that there was not the slightest attempt at dictation of the decisions of the Senate by the Government of the day, nor even a suggestion of the course it should take in deciding the Faculties to be established. The Senate was supreme in its sphere of governing the University and had a free hand in evolving its plans within the limit of the resources available to it. This was true of the work of the Senate during the whole period in which I was a member of it.

I am,

Yours sincerely,

(Thomas H. Bath)
My dear Somerville,

Taking a separate sheet of paper I agree with you that Professor Scott’s remarks made a pretty piece of misrepresentation, and I should say that he would be hard put to it to adduce any evidence in proof of his statement.

Nevertheless I think it is about time some doughty champion in the University challenged this "superiority" cult about the classics, particularly in regard to the manner of bracketing them as the mainspring of education in what is vaguely termed "the humanities."

I believe that so far as humane education is influenced by the spirit of language, we owe more to that element in our mother tongue that derives directly from the Anglo-Saxon than we do to the Latin or Greek admixture. If we wish to create a "classic" cult, I think we owe more to Tyndale’s English translation of the Bible, than we do to Aristotle or Caesar’s Commentaries; more to Shakespeare than we do to Homer or Virgil; more to Bacon than to Plato. When we want to create a new abortion of a word, the original fount of English does not serve us, as, for example, "totalitarianism"; "autarchy"; "avariciousness."

Yours sincerely,

(T.H. Bath)

Illenden, Vermont, Vic.
March 20, 1939.

The Pro-Chancellor,
The University of Western Australia,
Perth, W.A.

Dear Sir,

I thank you for your letter regarding
my presidential address at Canberra. I shall be glad of the opportunity of modifying what I said of the University of Western Australia, though what you quote me as saying is not quite correct. My allusion to Mr. Scaddan was based upon a remark which he was reported to have made at the time of the foundation of your University, a remark which provoked Professor Tucker, then Professor of Classics at the University of Melbourne, to write a very suave, gently ironical article in "The Argus." But I did not intend to convey the impression that the Scaddan Government made the appointments. I shall be very glad if you will give me permission to quote from your minutes the very interesting fact that Sir Winthrop Hackett gave his casting vote for Geology. Knowing his own classical achievements, I take that act as a noble instance of sacrifice, having regard to the circumstances of the time.

The words "a little later"—referring to the chairs of English and History-Economics—were not in my original draft. But when typing the address, I remembered a dinner given to Walter Murdoch by some of his friends in Melbourne shortly after his appointment. Winthrop Hackett was present, and there flashed into my mind as I was typing, a remark which he made, and which, apparently either I misunderstood, or did not remember correctly. My delay in answering your letter is due to the fact that I could not lay my hand upon my original draft, and only yesterday discovered it.

The point which I wished to make about the University of Western Australia remains sound, and is I think quite important in Australian University history; but I shall very gladly make the necessary corrections in the light of the information in your letter, for which, again, I thank you.

Faithfully yours,

(Ernest Scott)
UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA.

Nedlands,

Dr. W. Somerville, 2 Albert Street, Mosman Park, N.A.

Dear Dr. Somerville,

Referring to our recent conversation regarding a discussion or address at the 1939 meeting of ANZAS, I think the following extract is the one you had in mind:

"..."The treatment of the sciences in the early years of Universities of Tasmania and New Zealand was on similar lines to what has been said of Sydney, Melbourne and Adelaide — and they were, we must recognize, the lines that were most followed in these institutions in their infancy, when neither means available nor number of students made possible a high degree of specialization. The main purpose seems to have been to train students for the legal and medical professions, with a sprinkling of 'theologe' to give an early Victorian gloss to the proceedings.

But when we come to the newer Universities, Queensland (1911) and Western Australia (1913), we see the influence of a new spirit. Queensland began with professorships in Engineering (A.J. Gibson) Chemistry (Bertram Steele), and Mathematics and Physics (E.J. Priestley), though making a concession to classical scholarship by establishing a chair in that subject (J.L. Michie). But Western Australia, where the Labour administration of John Scaddan was then in office, cut out a classical chair and founded professorships in Biology (W.J. Dakin), Agriculture (K.W. Paterson), Mathematics and Physics (A.D. Ross) Mining and Engineering (H.E. Whitfeld), Chemistry (N.T.M. Wilsmore), and Geology (W.G. Woolnough). To this angelic choir were added, with concessionary grace, professorships in English (Walter Murdoch), and History and Economics (Edward Shann). Mr. Scaddan though his Government took no part in the appointments, congratulated Western Australia on having created almost a revolution by establishing a University with so strong a scientific team and no chair of classics, whereas the other Australian Universities had seemed to cherish the classics, and let the sciences creep in, like laboratory cats when there happened to be mice to feed upon.

I am informed, however, that the minute book shows that when the appointments were being made, and there was an equality of votes for a chair of Classics and one of Geology, the Chancellor, Sir Winthrop Hackett gave his casting vote for Geology, on the ground that, as funds did not permit the establishment of chairs in both subjects, Geology should be preferred because of its great importance to the chief industry of the State. In view of Sir Winthrop Hackett's classical attainments and continued interest in the study of classical literature, he probably felt that a sacrifice was being made, though he added, 'we will make sure of a good lecturer in classics'..."" (Presidential address "The History of Australian Science", by Professor Ernest Scott).

Yours sincerely, N.E. Wood. Librarian.
Dear Miss Wood,

Many thanks for the extract from Professor Scott's Presidential address to the 1939 meeting of A.N.Z.A.S.

It shows that he did what he promised me in the way of correcting a misstatement containing a serious reflection on both the Scaddan Government and the first Senate. On the former that it had brought pressure to bear on the Senate to exclude Classics and on the Senate that it permitted an interference with its selection of the first Chairs. The correction with all is a reluctant and qualified one bearing some of the original untruth.

The original statement was the "under the influence of the Scaddan Labour Government the Senate had removed Classics from the curriculum".

This he has changed to "where the Labour administration of John Scaddan was then in office". The inference he desires drawn is obvious.

He has also added to his original statement the following "Mr. Scaddan though his Government took no part in the appointments congratulated W.A. on having created almost a resolution by establishing a University with so strong scientific team and no chair of Classics". I do not believe Scaddan ever made such a remark. In his letter to me of 20/3/1939 Professor Scott admits that his only authority for his various statements were "what he recalled of what had been said by various people at various times."

This strikes me as a rather weak reason for a Professor of History to give for the inclusion of such tittle-tattle in a Presidential address. The whole episode shows what a muddle a man may get into when though possessing no gift of humour he makes a laboured attempt to be humorous.

The paragraph beginning "I am informed" is a slightly adapted extract from my letter to him.

Again thanking you for your assistance.

Yours truly,

W. Somerville.
The Senate minutes do not contain a record of what decisions were made with respect to the number and subjects for Lectureships, but a meeting of the Sub-Committee appointed to deal with the question of the teaching staff was held on 5th August, 1912 (two months after the Senate had decided on the Chairs, June 1912). It was decided to recommend to the Senate that Lectureships be established in:

1. Veterinary Science.
2. French and German.
3. Classics and Ancient History.
4. Mental and Moral Philosophy.

That the salary for the first two be £400 per annum and for the latter two £500.

It was also decided to recommend the appointment of a Lectureship in Music at a salary to be further considered.

A Lectureship in Law was favoured but recommendation was to be deferred until the question of fees was decided, though what was the connection is not disclosed.

At a further meeting on 16th August, 1912 it was decided to advertise the Lectureship in Music, and all hesitation about Law had vanished in favour of a straightforward recommendation of the appointment.

The programme now stood at 7 Professors and 6 Lecturers and the visible revenue £13,500.

The above reports were considered at a special meeting of the Senate on 26th August, 1912. Mr. Frank Wilson on behalf of the Finance Committee explained the financial position and warned the Senate that if they desired to maintain a solvent position they must proceed cautiously as the lowest estimate of the then commitments was £15,750.

Mr. Keenan and Burrows moved unsuccessfully to strike out Mental and Moral Philosophy and the whole programme was approved (26th August, 1912).
Apart from this one exception the first selection of teaching staff was remarkably successful.
in French and German. This appointment turned out to be the only mistake we made in the first list of appointments. A first glance gave me the impression of a neurotic and it was not long before whispers began to circulate that he was pawing the girl students under the pretence of seeing that they were using their vocal chords properly. At the Senate November 1915 Dr. Mead had not acted on a notice of motion (not recorded) given by her in respect to Suddard so Dr. Jull gave notice to move as to his "status." What Dr. Jull meant I do not know, so direct a motion as one to give the blackguard the sack being something really not done in University circles. Later on at the meeting Mr. Hancock moved by leave Dr. Mead's motion. This was seconded by Dr. Jull but on a vote was lost. The records make no further mention of what became of Suddard so presumably the students had to tolerate him until his first appointment for three years had terminated. He had the brass to ask for travelling expenses back to England.

To finish with this disagreeable person, the following extracts from his application is indicative of his character:

"I venture to think that 'though some men may come forward who have a greater knowledge of dead languages and archaeological curiosities than I, yet none will be found really to know the living tongues of both France and Germany as well as I do. I have myself met only one British born subject having a complete command of both languages and a really satisfactory accent in both. I believe there are not twenty such men in the Empire."

He began badly before he left England. The Senate had authorised the Agent-General to advance first class fare. Suddard booked second class and demanded the difference for his own pocket.

On November 1915 the Senate declined to renew his appointment.
be mentioned. The reasons for this remarkable decision are not given.

The Senate decisions followed without exception the recommendations of the Committee and resulted in the appointment to the Chairs of --

Biology  W. J. Dakin
Chemistry  N. T. Wilsome
English  W. Murdoch
History and Economics  E. O. G. Shann
Mathematics and Physics  A. D. Ross
Geology  W. G. Woolnough
Mining and Engineering  H. E. Whitfield

For some reason not shown in the Senate minutes the proposal to establish a Lectureship in Veterinary Science carried by the Sub-Committee to deal with the staff appointments at its meeting on 5th August, 1912 was not proceeded with. At the Senate meeting on 31st January, 1913 Dr. Smith proposed and Dr. Mead seconded that Mr. George Wood be appointed Lecturer in Classics and Ancient History. This was carried.

Mr. Walker proposed and Dr. Smith seconded Mr. P. R. Le Conteur for Mental and Moral Philosophy - carried.

Mr. Battye proposed and Dr. Smith seconded Mr. E. F. E. Suddard for French and German. There must have been present some strong feeling about this man for it was decided to make the selection by ballot. The first ballot gave Suddard 8, Pfister 4 and Perkins 0. Why Mr. Perkins was not declared out and a vote taken between the other two history saith not but another ballot with all three in gave the remarkable result of 4 votes for each. Four of Mr. Suddard's votes had transferred to Mr. Perkins. A third vote gave Mr. Perkins all of Mr. Suddard's votes and the tally was Suddard 0, Pfister 4 and Perkins 8. The Pro-Chancellor (Andrews) took the bull by the horns and declared Mr. Suddard to be Lecturer
considered equal. For English the two leading were W. Murdoch, Melbourne and A.T. Strong, also of Melbourne. Of the 21 applications for History and Economics only 3 were in the opinion of the Committee of sufficient merit to submit to the Senate. They were Mr. Bradshaw of Durham and E.O.G. Snann of Brisbane and G.S. Voitch of Liverpool. Among the applicants for Mathematics and Physics was one of three West Australian applicants thought by the Committee worthy of being selected from the 137 tendered. He was J.J. Durack who at the time held a Lectureship at Allahabad, but A.D. Ross of Glasgow was the Committee's choice. The other two West Australians were R.H. Robertson of Perth who applied for English and M. Copland of Kalgoorlie who applied for Mining and Engineering. Geology called out a strong team headed by two interesting personalities in W.G. Woolnough of Sydney and Griffiths Taylor of Melbourne.

The Committee seems to have had difficulty in making up its mind as to the best applicant for Mining and Engineering for it simply put in five names without any indication of preference of any one. Their preference had been definitely indicated in all other cases. However, H.E. Whitfield of Sandstone was first on the list.

The Senate considered this report at its special meeting on 21st December, 1912. Mr. Battye proposed and Kirwan seconded that the voting on each Chair should be by ballot. This was carried.

For Biology the ballot favoured A. Willey of Montreal, but before next meeting he had withdrawn owing to ill health and W.J. Dakin was appointed.

The figures showing the voting are recorded but as the Senate on 13th March, 1913 carried a resolution "that all particulars as to voting at the selection of Professors should be excised from the minutes" the figures cannot now
The next task was to obtain the men and in response to the advertisements there were received for the Chairs of:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Applications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History and Economics</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics and Physics</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining and Engineering</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

for the Lectureships:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Applications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mental and Moral Philosophy</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French and German</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classics and Ancient History</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Science</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On 19th December, 1912 the Education Committee presented a report in which they placed the candidates for each position in what appeared to the Committee to be their order of merit. Taking the Chairs in alphabetical order Agriculture had not been considered. The wishes of Dr. Hackett who was to endow the Chair were naturally given much weight and there were no acceptable men among the applicants. The reports on applicants in Great Britain were equally unsatisfactory and it was not until Dr. Hackett and Mr. Grasby had made special journeys to Melbourne to interview Australian applicants that Dr. Paterson was appointed on 4th June, 1913.

The next Chair in alphabetical order (Biology) had two outstanding applicants - Messrs. A. Willey of Montreal and W. J. Dakin of Liverpool. For Chemistry the most favoured applicant, W. W. Wilsome, followed by four others whose qualifications the Committee