the goal of his endeavors in these years.

Shann was not happy away from his academic work. His independence was threatened, his love of teaching unsatisfied and his capacity to take long views impaired. So he returned to the University, and in Adelaide this year he was working out in the light of his experiences a fresh approach to his teaching of Economics.

(By Professor D.B. Copland)

The matter in these letters is of great historical value.

What a revelation they and also Shann's letters to Whitfeld are of the way the peoples fate in our so-called Democracy is shaped.

While Politicians, the properly elected representatives of the people, and Journalists and all the known and accepted moulders of Public opinion argued and discussed in the open, as to what should be done to combat the nightmare of unemployment in the early nineteen-thirties (1929-35) what actually was to be done was decided after unadvertised conferences by four men (Professors Shann, Giblin, Melville and Copland) whose very names were unknown to 99% of the people whose fate they were deciding. Moreover, one of them was the agent of an organization formed for the purpose of profit making out of Finance. Moreover, the chief feature of the remedy prescribed by the four experts, the drastic deflation of wages, was felt instinctively by the mass of the people that they had no say until the necessary legislation had been passed to be wrong. They fought, through their Trade Unions, against it saying, the way out of the depression was by maintaining the purchasing power of the workers' wages. The Federal Labour Government who accepted the experts advice was driven out of office. Nevertheless, the deflation which the experts declared was the only remedy was forced on the people of the Commonwealth by Arbitration Court award (1931), and by State Legislation and now (1945)
after a further decade of economic study the present day experts seem to agree that the wage earners instinct was much nearer the truth than the experts dictum that drastic deflation was necessary because the decisions of the central banks in many cases so often unreasonably correct.

A sharp distinction must be drawn between advice by an expert in Chemistry or Geology or any of the exact sciences and that of an economist.

A razor edge is all that divides Economics and Party politics at any time and in respect to questions of wages and the social conditions of wage earners there is no division at all. Parties of the right deny this and naively claim their interests to be national, it is always those of the left who are partisans. The experience of some of the American Universities has been that some of those persons and corporations who have given great endowments is that the donors which completely indifferent to the type of Geology or Chemistry taught are acutely watchful of the Economics taught with the aid of their endowments.

The lesson from the Premiers' Plan is that while Economic Theory must be studied it cannot safely be followed until first checked and examined in open discussion by our Democratic institutions.

In support of my comment upon the fact that the fate of communities and nations is so often decided by men unknown to the people, who are not selected or elected for any representative part and carry no responsibility for their recommendations. I quote from page 450 of Brian Fitzpatrick's book "The British Empire in Australia". He is speaking of the Premiers' (Economists) Plan.

"What is of Permanent interest, with regard to these affairs is not whether Mr. Theodore or Sir Robert Gibson or Mr. Lang or Professor Copland had the economically best specific; what is of interest about the battle of the plans is that agencies which were not responsible agencies, dictated the plan which the
It is with the utmost cordiality that I extend my heartfelt congratulations to you on your birthday. May your day be filled with joy and happiness. Please accept my warmest wishes for a prosperous and fulfilling year ahead.

Yours sincerely,
[Signature]
governments, the responsible agencies, were then charged to carry out."

Fitzpatrick here selects Professor Copland as representing the Economic experts (Melville, Giblin, Copland and Shann.) He might with greater accuracy have selected Shann for he seems to have been the leader. Moreover, and most important Shann was the only one of the four who represented a profit making Corporation.

**MR. WOOLNOUGH.**

Mr. Woolnough obtained most of his early training, particularly in field work with Professor David. He assisted the Professor in the preparation of his monograph, the Coal fields of Hunter River district of N.S.W.

In 1904 he was appointed by the Sydney University as assistant to Professor David. He was then 28 years of age.

In 1897 he was a member of the expedition under Professor David to Funafuti, an Island in the Pacific, to investigate by actual boring the Darwinian theory as to the origin of coral atolls. He had also done considerable geological survey work in Fiji. His report on this work was the subject of the thesis which secured him his degree of Doctor of Science. In 1911 he accompanied as geologist the Commonwealth Government Scientific Expedition to Northern Territory under Professor Baldwin Spencer when he traversed Northern Australia from Darwin via the Roper and McArthur rivers to Camooweal in Queensland.

In March 1918 Professor Woolnough was reappointed for a second term of 7 years. On March 1919 he applied to the Senate for leave to visit England to confer with Brunner Mond and Co. as to the possibilities of the manufacture in Australia of Alkali.

The application was apparently supported by the State Minister as being in the interest of the devel-
opment of the State and lease was granted on half pay to the end of second term.

In August 1919 a cable was received from Woolnough tendering his resignation as his assistance was required for two years to investigate the possibilities of establishing the Alkali industry and that a permanent position had been offered him. The resignation was accepted, and his connection with the University terminated on October 31st, 1919. The Vice Chancellor reported that the advisability of continuing the Chair of Geology had been discussed by the Professorial Board and promptly Dr. Saw gave notice to move that the Chair be abolished and a Lecturership be established. At the next meeting in September 1919 this was accordingly done, supported by reports in favour from the Professorial Board and the General Purposes Committee. The decision to abolish was unanimous. At the next Senate meeting in October 1919, Mr. Aurousseau was appointed Lecturer in Geology.

The Chair was afterwards re-established when Professor E.de.C. Clarke was appointed.

Dr. Woolnough's job was to examine Australia in order to find in which locality there existed the most favourable conjunction of Coal, Lime and Salt. He returned to W.A. immediately after his resignation was accepted in the employ of Brunner Mend and Co. and began examining the possibilities of Lake Clifton Lime, Collie Coal and Salt from evaporation near Lake Clifton. He had as an assistant John Laird Somerville B.Sc. The investigation took Dr. Woolnough to most of the Australian States and lasted some years. Then for reasons which were not published the investigation terminated. One rumour which gained some currency was that the failure to act on the reports received engendered a suspicion that the whole investigation was a bluff on the part of Brunner Mend to stall off other possible competitors. The truth will probably never now be known.
Dr. Woolnough afterwards entered the service of the Commonwealth as Geological Adviser. In this capacity he travelled over much of Australia, particularly in the North in connection with the search for Oil. Much of this travelling was done by Plane and on one occasion a forced landing was made and he and his Pilot were lost for some days. Fortunately they were not hurt. He visited W.A. a number of times and confessed to his friends how he regretted having yielded to the temptation to resign from his comfortable job and his settled home in W.A. University.

---------

9 Lockerbie Court,
East St. Kilda S.2.
VICTORIA.
28th January, 1945.

Dr. W. Somerville L.L.D.,
2 Albert Street,
MOSMAN PARK W.A.

Dear Dr. Somerville,

It is a great pleasure to hear from you again. I have the happiest recollections of my years at the University of W.A., and have never ceased to regret my severance from the work of teaching. I was always so happy with my students, and I feel that, on the whole, any ability I had lay in the direction of teaching.

My work I have done since has involved an enormous amount of travelling, and has enabled me to obtain, probably, a much more extensive outlook of my science than I might have secured in the more limited scope of University teaching, but the contact with the young minds is something which one cannot secure so well in any other way. My last year or two of teaching, when I had to deal with such a brilliant group as Somerville, Mitchell and Worboys, to mention only the three most outstanding students, was certainly the high-water mark of my University career.
I am sending you herewith an over complimentary "obituary" published on the occasion of my election to Honorary Membership of the American Association of Petroleum Geologists a few years back. It will probably give you most of the information which you require. The later years of my connection with the Commonwealth Government as its Geological Adviser, were devoted largely to research and advice connected with the problems of the distribution of iron ores in Australia, and the advisability of permitting their working by Japanese interests for export to Japan. I was also largely engaged in reporting on the mineral resources of the Northern Territory in various directions. It may be of interest to you to know that I discovered from the air the ideal site which was later used for the Darwin Water Supply, namely, the Manton River Dam, which had not previously been considered in this connection.

Since my retirement in 1941, when I reached the retiring age of 65, I have been doing clerical work in three Commonwealth Wartime departments. Most of this has been bibliographical research, providing technical officers with information regarding published details of processes and methods, especially in cases calling for translations from other languages. This language study has always been something of a hobby. It is rather amusing that, at the present time, I am translating three papers, one from Russian, one from Swedish and one from Portuguese.

I am sorry to hear of your optical trouble, but am rejoiced to know that your operation was successful, and that you enjoy a reasonable measure of sight. I myself have practically lost the use of my left eye, after an operation for glaucoma, while the right eye is badly affected. I am living on tenterhooks, never knowing whether or when the trouble may become acute, necessitating another operation, with the inevitable loss of the good eye so far as close study is concerned.
Otherwise my wife and I both enjoy reasonably
good health, though of course, we are getting no younger
all the time.

I have not seen or heard of John for some time
now. We must really try to get him to look us up some
time when he is in Melbourne, where we are not permanent-
ly settled.

With the best of good wishes to you and yours,
Yours very sincerely,

(W.G. Wooldnough)

P.S. Please excuse typescript. I suffer a good deal
from writer's cramp at times, the aftermath of a back-
kick from a motor car some 20 years ago.

Possibly it may be of interest for your purpose
to know that, two or three years ago, I devised a method
of working out problems in Navigation and Astronomy by
graphical constructions without trigonometrical calcu-
lation, which has found some favour with individual Army
and Air Force officers and men, though it has not been
adopted officially by the Army. This was published
in book form under the name of "Direction Finding by
Sun, Moon and Stars: without mathematics" by Angus and
Robertson of Sydney.

Bulletin of the American Association of Petroleum Geolo-

THE ASSOCIATION ROUND TABLE.

WALTER GEORGE WOOLNOUGH HONORARY MEMBER¹
J.T. RICHARDS²
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

Dr. W.G. Wooldnough, of Gordon, New South Wales,
Australia, was elected to honorary membership in the
American Association of Petroleum Geologists at the meet-
ing of the executive committee on April, 21, 1941.
To write a biography of him is a difficult but interesting task. It is like writing an adventure story full of action, thrills, and inspiration. For from that hot, summer day on January 15, 1876, when he was born in the little town of Brushgrove on the Clarence River in the "Colony" of New South Wales, Australia, things commenced to happen to the future Dr. Woolnough. His Father, the Reverend James Woolnough, was born in England and his mother, Esther Phoebe (Hawke), was born in the state of Iowa, United States of America. He was their first child. Two younger brothers became physicians and one gave his life to human service during the great epidemic of bubonic plague in Sydney in 1919.

During his formative years in the elementary state schools and in the Sydney High School, scientific subjects interested him most. Astronomy and entomology were early ambitions until he entered Newington College in Sydney and came under the influence of A.H.S. Lucas, head master, himself a geologist. On entering the University of Sydney in 1895 with scholarships in physics and chemistry, he became an ardent pupil of the late Sir Edgeworth David. In 1897, young Woolnough was a member of Professor David's Coral Boring Expedition to the South Pacific island of Funafuti to test Darwin's Theory of Coral Reefs. In 1898, he graduated from the University of Sydney with honours in biology, chemistry, physics, mathematics, and geology and with the Bachelor of Science degree. Immediately, he became a "Demonstrator in Geology" under his former instructor, Professor David, and thus started a career as a teacher which was to carry him to academic heights and extend his influence around the world. In 1904, he received the degree of Doctor of Science from the University of Sydney and the same year was granted

1. Manuscript received, August 9, 1941.
2. Gulf Oil Corporation.
the identical degree by the University of Adelaide. In 1913, Dr. Woolnough established the School of Geology in the new University of Western Australia and served as its head for seven years. The honorary degree of Doctor of Science was conferred upon him by this University in 1913.

Little wonder that such a man was selected to head two expeditions (1901 and 1905) into Fiji to study the geology of these little-known islands, or that even his early writings cover most of the states of his native land, including his findings as a member of an expedition into the desert portions of Northern Territory in 1911.

Messrs. Brunner, Mond and Company, Ltd. alkali manufacturers of Norwich, England, induced Dr. Woolnough to relinquish his position as head of the School of Geology at the University of Western Australia in 1919 to join them in investigations of alkali manufacture in Australia. His long residence in Western Australia, his aptitude for chemistry, and his intimate knowledge of desert environment in the arid parts of Australia amply qualified him to conduct expeditions into the vast central desert of the continent by motor, by camel, and on foot to search out those minerals which might mean comfort and wealth for his people. Expeditions in 1922 and 1925 to study salt deposits led to his recognition of the association of oil and salt, and of the possibility of the occurrence of oil in Australia. In connection with this work, he made his first trip to the native lands of his parents.

In 1927, he was appointed Geological Adviser to the Commonwealth Government, primarily for the purpose of advising the Government in its activities for the search for oil. This position he held until his retirement, January, 1941. The first year, an expedition to New Guinea and Papua to investigate oil possibilities resulted in creating sufficient interest that detailed sur-
veys were made and some prospecting was done. Believing that his Government was unwittingly spending vast sums of money subsidizing irresponsible, unscientific, hopeless, and inadequate tests for oil, Dr. Woolnough persuaded his Government to finance another "expedition" in 1930 to the United States and Argentina that he might study the methods of petroleum prospecting and development then prevailing in those countries. His report to the Parliament of the Commonwealth shows an analytical insight into conditions, methods, and results seldom encountered, but most refreshing. Removal of prospecting for oil in Australia from a basis of unguided speculation, for the most part, to scientific exploration based on geologic principles has resulted from this report and subsequent untiring efforts of Dr. Woolnough. Although his appointment as Geological Adviser was primarily in connection with the search for oil, his activities in this capacity extended over much wider fields to include coal, gold, iron ores, water supplies, and building materials.

Aerial photography impressed Dr. Woolnough as a most likely mapping method for Australia, so, when he returned from the Americas, he "managed" for an army plane, which was equipped with the best camera available, and, with an army pilot, mapping of inaccessible regions was commenced. These regions had no markers on the ground whereby photographs might be oriented. Again his mathematical ingenuity came to his rescue and a graphical method, as yet unpublished, using the length and direction of shadows, avoided the difficulties due to otherwise non-existing ground control. As a result of these preliminary aerial surveys, a comprehensive program for the ultimate survey of the whole continent has been undertaken.

One of his last acts as Geological Adviser was the presentation of data to his Government covering the
iron-ore resources of his country. This report formed the basis for legislative action to preserve the resources from foreign domination and to conserve them for the rapidly growing steel industry of the nation.

________

MR. WHITFIELD.

In 1907 the members of the Western Australian Court of Arbitration consisting of Judge Burnside, Messrs. F.D. Good and W. Somerville were inspecting the conditions under which Gold Mines worked in the Black Range Gold Mine at Sandstone, a mining town on the Murchison Goldfield. The township has dissolved. Its site is now one of those fascinating empty areas of ground, sun baked and dust swept where the passing traveller finds it difficult not to moralise on the fleeting inconsequence of man's affairs. In 1907 it was a bright and busy place. Several mines employing some hundreds of men were in the immediate neighbourhood. A store or stores were busy and the really important building the Pub, was something exceptional. A typical genial Irish Goldfields Pub-keeper ran it quite well and the building though built of jarrah was planned on proper hot country lines. The buildings surrounding and facing inward to an oblong inclosure, and in this was a somewhat pathetic attempt at a lawn and flowers.

But the court's job was with the mine. When we travelled to such places as Sandstone we were accompanied by quite an entourage, consisting of, Agents for the parties, shorthand reporters &c. These people occasionally accompanied the Court down the mine.

Climbing about a Gold Mine is strenuous work for the novice and so all were thankful when a halt was called in a worked out stope. An empty stope, it may be explained, is the place from which the gold bearing lode or vein has been extracted. When the lode has been
wide, as it was in this case, and the height between the plate is anything up to 100 feet, an empty worked out stope can be an awesome thing. The Arbitration Court and its entourage were a motley lot. All the usual garments were covered by a mixed collection of very muddy and tattered overalls and muddy caps. Some stood, others sat on a heap of mullock. The only illumination came from a half candle which each man held. This light threw dark shadows and patches of high light. One tall thin man (Alcock - Gardeners deputy) held his candle in such a way that direct light shone on his neck. A substantial portion of his height was due to the length of his neck, which on normal occasions was covered by a ½ inch collar. Protection from the sun had made his neck very white, and with his extra large adams apple it glistened in a way which was a strange mixture of the indecent and the ludicrous.

Outside the small area illuminated by the candles was only the black vault of the stope.

When conversation stopped for a moment or two, the silence was intense. The faint drip, drip of water and the intermittent and ghastly wood-pecker sound which came from above and below only intensified the silence. This wood-pecker sound was all that reached us of the mighty roar with which the compressed air rock drills threaten the ear drums of those near them when they are drilling. It reached us from other levels reduced to this wood-pecker type after passing through many hundreds of feet of hard lode.

One of the miners had informed me that the manager was "not a bad sort of a bloke, in fact, he was rather a good sort of a bloke to work for, but rather odd, for he was reputed to carry a pocket edition of Horace about the Mine." During a pause in the conversation while seated on the mullock heap, I asked the manager some questions which I have forgotten, about stopes. In his reply he
dealt with the subject very fully, in fact a lecturette on shrinkage stopes, rill stopes and all kinds of stopes. He spoke in the measured and deliberate style of one accustomed to speaking at length.

Five years after this episode at the time the Senate were considering the application for the various chairs, I was approached by a fellow senator (E.A. Mann) with regard to the qualifications of a friend of his. I asked what Chair the friend was applying for and received the astonishing reply. He has not yet made up his mind, but it will be either Classics or that of Mining and Engineering. What! I exclaimed, do you tell me that there is one among the applicants with such a wide range of qualifications as to imagine he has a chance of selection for a Professorship in either of such widely separated subjects? I was assured it was so, that his name was H.E. Whitfeld and he had been managing a mine at Sandstone on the Murchison. My mind flashed back to the miners estimate of a Manager who "was not a bad sort of a bloke, but odd for he was reputed to carry a pocket edition of Horace about the mine"

The hesitation between the two subjects was up to his end characteristic of Whitfeld. He was saved the effort required to come to a decision by the Senate deciding that a Chair of Classics was beyond its means.

Whitfeld had a brilliant career as a student at Sydney University. He was born in Sydney in 1875, the son of a Cambridge M.A. who has master of Sydney Grammar School for nearly 20 years. Professor Edgeworth David the most esteemed of those from whom Whitfeld had obtained testimonials, says of him -

"He has been known to me for 16 years. He was educated at the Sydney Grammar School where he attained very
high distinction. Entering the Arts School at our University, his subsequent career was no less distinguished as he gained first class honours throughout the whole of his course and proved himself to be among the most brilliant classical scholars our University has produced. He graduated B.A. in 1897" Whitfeld would then be 22 years of age. Without giving all the details he seems, from the list quoted in his application, to have obtained honours and whatever special prizes were offering during the whole of his scholastic and Academic career for Latin, Greek, Mathematics and Philosophy. Notwithstanding these brilliant attainments the only work he was able to get during the next five years, was three short periods of casual teaching. The first two, April-June 1897 and January-February 1899 at his father's school, and the third from July 1897 to December 1898 in another Sydney Church of England Grammar School. In his application, Whitfeld says that in 1897-1902 he did a large amount of private coaching in mathematics, science and languages. In March 1899 he entered the Engineering School at Sydney University. This was after two years during which he was presumably trying his best to secure settled employment in some position worthy of his Scholastic attainments in Arts. This simple recital of dates provides the answer to the question I have often asked myself namely how came it that a man with Whitfeld's natural tendencies came to be an Engineer? Failure to find a job teaching arts subjects would appear to be the answer.

In the Engineering course he repeated his performance in Arts, winning honours and whatever prizes were offering throughout, except the last year when he left for Western Australia before the Honours examination were held in March 1902.

He left the Sydney University with three degrees Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Engineering (Mining and Metallurgy) and Bachelor of Engineering (Civil Engineering)
Notwithstanding this formidable list of qualifications he still does not seem to have had luck in job hunting for he, to his great credit be it said, began in a very humble position in 1902 working underground on Associated Northern Gold Mine, and Foreman on Shamrock cyanide plant at Kanowna.

In 1902 he obtained a second class Engine drivers certificate. In 1903 he was foreman on Crown Cyanide plant at Kanowna, assayer on Murchison Associated Gold Mine at Day Dawn and working on treatment plant of the Ivanhoe Gold Mine.


All these facts are boldly set forth in his application for the Professorship. For a young man with three University Degrees it is a rather pathetic record of failure to win a place worthy of his talents. Each and all of the foregoing jobs could have been held by a goldfields handy man with a modest Technical school certificate in Metallurgy. If the period had been one of depression it would be understandable, but it was one of enormous expansion, and yet for five years this highly qualified Mining Engineer dodged about the fields and did not attain even the dignity of Mine Manager until the Sandstone Gold Mine Co. was formed in 1907.

Capital of this Company was largely subscribed by Whitfeld's personal friends to work a find made during his prospecting. Its gold returns were never very satisfactory and Whitfeld is reputed to have stuck to the Mine with little or no salary for years because his friends' money was in the venture. The opening made by the establishment of the W.A. University must have been
a great thing for Whitfield. This goldfields experience reminds me of a remark he made to me on returning from a Vice Chancellors' Conference. Some question of differential treatment against W.A. interests had been discussed without Whitfield making much headway, and in explanation said to me "I am no good at these conferences, men with loud voices and aggressive manner, like Wallace (of Sydney) talk me down" and I could realise it was so. At Senate meetings and in Committee it was his habit to make his statement and if he was met by opposition he would not argue but simply go dumb.

So I can imagine that the highly qualified Mining Engineer with his three degrees, but with a soft voice and diffident manner would be just brushed aside by the hordes of pushful go-getters who swarmed on the goldfields between 1902 and 1912.

The need for a Vice Chancellor was recognised early. At its third meeting in May 1912 Sir Walter James gave notice to move "that the Senate proceed to the appointment of a Vice Chancellor who must -

(a) be personally acquainted with the State
(b) be a man of University experience and not more than 45 years of age.

There is no record as to what happened to this notice of motion, but it was probably abandoned, for the next months were occupied by the discussions as to the number of Chairs and Lecturerships, and their appointments.

When that was finished it was obvious that there was no money for a full time Vice Chancellor. In the meantime Gunn, or more correctly speaking Mr. Fletcher, was carrying on. Gunn seems to have finished his connection with the University in May 1913.

At the May meeting, Dr. Saw moved "that in view of the desire of the organiser to retire, the Professorial Board be asked to submit three names from amongst their members from whom the Senate could select one to
fill the office of Vice-Chancellor."

The Professorial Board submitted the names of Professors Whitfield, Wilmot and Woolnough. There is no record of how or for what reasons the selection was made, but in July 1913 Dr. Saw moved and Sir Walter James seconded that subject to any statute hereafter made, Professor Whitfield be appointed Vice Chancellor. This was carried. Whitfield would then be 38 years of age.

At the same meeting it was decided to appoint a Registrar and Mr. Townsend took up his duties on 1st January, 1914. In August 1914 that was almost immediately after the outbreak of war, he (Townsend) applied for leave to accept the position of Company Commander in the Second W.A. Expeditionary Force. Leave was granted.

In December 1914 Whitfield went to India.

Fletcher was to carry on while he was away. In March 1916 Whitfield asked for extended leave of absence in England and offering to surrender portion of his salary about £30 per month (£360 a year). The arrangements to carry on his Department were to give Tomlinson £150, Fraenkel £100, Student Demonstrator £25 and External Lecturers £47/5/-, this totals £322/5/-. This I suppose was near enough to £360 for Whitfield the Mathematician. The idea seems to have been that he desired to go to England to do war work and anticipated he could earn there about £30 per month, the University to make up the difference between that and his professorial salary. The matter was referred to the Finance Committee. In May 1916

---

In view of the long discussion in 1913-14 as to the salary allowances to members of the staff joining the armed forces, it is of interest to note that in giving consent to Townsend joining up, the Senate decided to make up the difference between University pay and military pay during his service. Per contra in December 1914 a letter from members of the Teaching Staff offering in view of straightened finances to return to the University 10% of salaries for two years subject to certain conditions. They were thanked and the offer refused.
Whitfeld wrote that he was desired to go to America to inspect steel for munitionals at a salary of about £300 and with a probability of expenses. Saw, Battye that he be asked for more definite particulars as to salary and expenses. This request was replied to by Whitfeld in September 1916. It had taken him 4 months to answer but there are no details in the minutes. In November 1916 Wilsome applied for leave to take service with the English Minister for Munitions, he to surrender £410 of his salary (which was half ignoring superannuation payment) and the Minister to pay to the University £300 for Wilsome's services. So £710 would come to the University leaving £110 to be paid by the University to Wilsome. How much he was to be paid by the Minister is not disclosed. Leave was apparently granted on these terms. In December a letter was received from the English Minister for Munitions asking for Whitfeld's services. (Somerville, Battye) that leave be granted provided the same terms can be arranged as in the case of Wilsome - Amendment by Jull and Mead that the terms be left to the Finance Committee, the amendment was lost. So apparently Whitfeld was granted leave on the same terms as Wilsome.

So it had taken Whitfeld from March to December of 1916 or nine months to formulate definite terms upon which he desired leave to go to England to do war work. Even then his terms were not forthcoming and he was informed he could have leave on the same terms as those granted to Wilsome. By way of contrast Wilsome's terms were those suggested in his first letter and were adopted by the Senate.

These details are inserted to illustrate Whitfeld's vacillation and ( ironic) indefiniteness.

They also show how much unrecognised work was done during these and succeeding years by Mr. Fletcher.
That the service rendered by the unpaid Vice Chancellors was conscientious there is no reason to doubt, but that it was reluctant is made clear beyond question by the Senate minutes of May 1918 when it was not until the fourth try that Professor Paterson was persuaded to act as Vice Chancellor. He was at this time receiving £200 a year less than the other Professors and I have no doubt saw the possibilities accruing from obliging the Senate. In the early part of the same meeting all the Professors had been reappointed after their first seven year term. When the appointment of a Vice Chancellor was reached, Professor Ross who had been acting during the previous twelve months was asked to continue but declined for he said he had too much work. Murdoch and Andrews then mentioned Senator Kingsmill who was at that time a member of the Senate but for some unrecorded reason the proposal lapsed. (Batty, James) then proposed Professor Shann but he would not accept unless he was provided with an assistant. Then (Somerville, James) proposed Professor Dakin but it appeared that he had research work on hand. Finally (Batty, James) proposed Professor Paterson and this was apparently carried.

I have mentioned that at the conclusion of their first term of seven years the Professors were reappointed. There was one exception: Whitfeld's reappointment was deferred for a month. This was the result of a feeling of resentment and dissatisfaction felt by some Senators at the lack of exact knowledge as to the terms of his employment by the English Minister for Munitions, to a feeling that the work he was doing in America was of minor importance and involved no war risk and that his pay with travelling allowances together with the substantial contribution to his salary from University funds was enabling him to be patriotic at a profit. This
resentment would have been allayed had Whitfield, by writing of his work and movements, shown any recognition of the inconvenience his absence was causing the Senate and the students. This feeling was accentuated by complaints received by various Senators from individual Engineering Students as to the general condition in the Engineering School. Dissatisfaction came to a head in October 1913 when a letter signed by 24 Engineering Students complaining among other things of "the feeling of unrest, dissatisfaction and instability". The Professors Board investigated the matter and in suitably vague language found that the dissatisfaction was justified but exonerated Tomlinson the acting head of the Engineering Department on the ground that the work thrown upon him as the result of Whitfield's absence was more than any man could be expected to perform. Whitfield's place had not been filled and he was, so far as was known, in America. Some of his friends on the staff received letters but his attitude to the Senate amounted almost to contempt. I do not say that Whitfield felt contempt for the Senate. He would probably have been much surprised had he been informed that his neglect to write and give particulars had created such an impression. It was just another illustration of the failure of the Academic Philosopher to see common place things as they appear to more ordinary folk. Nothing in the nature of a formal report was expected. An ordinary personal letter to the Chancellor about his work would have sufficed.

Another force working against Whitfield was a feeling voiced by Mr. Roberts himself a Mine Manager that a much better man for the Mining Chair, a Goldfields man (I think his name was Laroome) had been passed over on the first appointment because of Whitfield's brilliant string of University Degrees. I remember Roberts telling me that the Derrick (the framework for hauling from the mine) which
Whitfeld had erected over the Sandstone mine was a joke, he did not elaborate as to why.

Although Whitfeld's reappointment for a second term had come up with the other professors in May 1918 and been deferred for a month it is not again mentioned in the Minutes until October 1918 when a memo from the Professorial Board against the termination of Whitfeld's appointment was received by the Senate. In November 1918 it was moved by Battye and seconded by Kingsmill that Whitfeld be not reappointed but that Tomlinson (Senior Lecturer in Engineering) be in charge. Murdoch drew attention to the Memo. from the Professorial Board in which they say "that if financial considerations are an obstacle to Whitfeld's reappointment then economies be made by all departments. The resultant lack of efficiency in the several departments would be more than made up for by the gain to the University as a whole implied in Whitfeld's reappointment".

This argument for Whitfeld's reappointment is more casuistical than logical and its effect upon Whitfeld's fate is doubtful, for an amendment (by Kirwan, Roberts) that he be reappointed for a further seven years when put to a small meeting of the Senate, a bare quorum being present, was carried by 5 to 4. The voting was for Kirwan, Roberts, Murdoch and Mead; against Andrews, Battye, Kingsmill and Jull. I cannot recall how I would have voted had I been present. The result was a very close escape from terminating Whitfeld's University career and indicates how strong was the dissatisfaction with him. The result was also influenced by financial considerations for immediately following the decision to reappoint came a motion (by Andrews, Kingsmill) that the Professorial Board be asked to indicate economies which will enable the salaries of Whitfeld and Wilsmore to be paid. This it would appear to be a perfect sequence to the previous resolution and the arguments by the Professorial Board in support thereof but nevertheless
it was lost.

The return of Professors Wilsmore and Whitfeld (War Service) together with Lecturers Arousseau and Hill from war work at the end of 1918 back to the University pay roll created a crisis in University finances. It meant an increased pay roll of £2218 which after certain adjustments was reduced to £1645. An application to the Federal Government for a grant from the repatriation fund of £1000 for four years to meet expenditure due to the return of students (This was simply not a fact, it was due to the return of teachers), but the application was ineffective. The Finance Committee (Batty, Andrews, Somerville) were instructed to meet the Professorial Board to find out how to reduce the estimates. The meeting took place and after long discussion the Professorial Board withdrew to hold a private conclave to see if they could agree among themselves what reduction should be made. But of course they could not agree. Each member was naturally diffident at suggesting what reductions should be made in a colleague's Department and the Finance Committee had to do the job itself without any assistance from the Professorial Board. It recommended that an assistant Lecturer at £275 be dispensed with and also two at £100, that various petty and cheese paring economies in books etc. be made. By these means the estimates were reduced by £1,155 leaving a deficit on the year of £303.

These details from experience in 1918 are given as a sample of what took place every year and is still (1946) happening every year. There were also indignant letters like that from Murdoch April 1919 protesting against reduction of his Assistant Lecturer and complaining that some departments which had promised to make economies in view of the financial crisis and to avoid the termination of Whitfeld's appointment had not done so and his Department had been severely penalised.
Shortly after his return to the University Whitfeld, through the Professorial Board and Murdoch and Shann on the Senate, began to work for a change in his Department from that of a Professor and three Lecturers to what he called a School of Engineering. In June 1920 the important decision "That the Department of Mining and Engineering be converted into the School of Engineering and Mining" is recorded in the Senate Minutes without any reasons or comment. It will be noticed that the order in which the words mining and engineering were used originally is reversed when used in the Title of the School of Engineering and Mining. As a fact after Whitfeld became Vice Chancellor there was no justification for the use of the word Mining at all, for no one on the staff knew anything about Mining. When the Chair was first established the emphasis was on the Mining side. This is reflected in the very meagre equipment provided for teaching the other branches of Engineering. When the Senate established the Chair it only contemplated that branch of Engineering immediately associated with Mining and only Gold Mining at that. Otherwise it would have been absurd for a Senate which had only £13,000 per year income and no Capital Grant for Buildings and equipment to establish a Chair of Engineering in all its branches as one of five Chairs.

Among the qualifications which Whitfeld possessed that which carried most weight with the Senate was that at the time of his application for the Chair, he was a Mine Manager.

After deciding in 1920 to establish the "School of Engineering" nothing further is recorded about it until 1924 when Whitfeld, then a Senator, submitted a long document relating thereto to the Senate, it was simply received.

In December 1924 the Senate decided to appoint Whitfeld to be Vice Chancellor and in March 1925 he resigned from the Senate to take up the duties.
At the June 1924 Meeting the death of Mr. Tomlinson was reported. His widow was granted a compassionate allowance of £5 per week until £350 was absorbed. His death made a considerable change in the affairs of the School of Engineering for he was perhaps the most capable of Whitfeld's Lecturers.

In September 1925 Whitfeld persuaded the Senate to ask the General Purposes Committee to consider "how far the University had realised the hopes of its founders and on what lines it should develop in the future so as to be of the greatest value to the State, to make enquiries from such persons as it thinks fit and report at a later date on the whole matter".

It was also decided to ask the Professorial Board:

"Whether our present methods actually do tend to concentrate attention on professional instruction rather than stimulate the students own mental activities and if so whether any remedies can be suggested."

Of course neither the General Purposes Committee nor the Professorial Board could suggest any adequate answer to these philosophical speculations. A number of the members of both bodies could have written a lengthy thesis on each of the points raised, but to what end? All that the Professorial Board could suggest after three months cogitations was the establishment of Correspondence Courses and short courses of lectures on special subjects. The matter is mentioned here for it is typical of so much of the dreamy speculation on which Whitfeld spent so much of his time and upon which he caused the Senate to spend so much time to the neglect of efficient administration. It raises the question what are the proper functions of a Vice Chancellor which will be dealt with later.

After the terms of Sir Winthrop Hackett's Will became known in 1916 or 1917 a considerable amount of
scepticism existed as to the possibility of the Estate yielding sufficient to pay the family beneficiaries. The possibility of the University benefiting to any extent was discounted. I remember hearing one old employee of the West Australian Newspaper who had been mentioned to receive a small legacy being asked in satirical vein what discount he would allow for cash.

As late as November 1924, which was eight years after Hackett's death, James who should have known as much as anyone as to the possibilities of the estate, raised the question of a memorial to Hackett for his work in connection with the establishment of the University and the Senate decided to establish a memorial fund, presumably from public subscription. Then quite unexpectedly the Chancellor (Saw) reported to the March 1926 meeting that in conversation Mr. Langler informed him that the University would benefit considerably under the Will. Immediately grand schemes were visualised and the Professorial Board sought to impress the Senate with the importance of retaining Whitfeld as Vice Chancellor during building operations and "in view of extra work he be given an assistant and in view of extra expense an allowance."

Both assistant which seems reasonable as the Vice Chancellor was not paid at that time and the extra allowance which was merely a grab were deferred. A Committee consisting of the Chancellor (Saw), Pro-Chancellor (Andrews) Vice-Chancellor (Whitfeld) and Sandover were appointed to confer with Langler with power to make necessary decisions or refer matters back to the Senate. The position of the Hackett Estate as disclosed to this Committee was briefly that owing to the fall in the price of paper (the high price of paper during the war being the chief cause of the parlous condition of the Estate when Hackett died), the great increase of business after the war, the monopolistic position held by the paper, and
the price twopence per copy, had made the estate so profitable that all the legacies to the family and others had been paid out of profits leaving the Anglican Church and the University as joint residuary legatees the owners of the West Australian and Western Mail newspapers and landed estate connected therewith. This was truly an amazing and unexpected disclosure to all except Langler. The first thing to do was to ascertain what was the value of our bequest, so in April 1926 a Mr. Knight of Brisbane "Courier" was engaged to report on the value of the Newspapers apart from building and land. His report was apparently regarded as so confidential that there is no written record of it. But it was apparently so large as to fill the imagination of Whitfeld and in his Vice Chancellor's reports to the Senate he urged the collection of information as to cost of the Residential Colleges in Melbourne, Adelaide and Sydney, he proposed investing monies in building one or two model streets, that in return for relieving the Government of the cost of the main buildings we should get the freehold of the site of the temporary buildings in Irwin Street and erect City Chambers. If we could obtain suitable man to design properly the expenditure of £250,000 it might pay us to appoint him Professor of Architecture. In Sydney the Professor of Architecture is the Architect for the University Buildings and so on and on. This, it may be mentioned in passing, is the first mention of Professor Wilkinson. The Chancellor (Saw) reported to the July 1926 meeting that an expert valuation by Mr. Knight of the Newspapers and competent local valuation of land and buildings had been made. He thought the valuation fair in view of the large profits being made; there was no competition and the price of the papers was twopence a copy. Mr. Langler had been approached by a firm of the highest financial status in London and asked to give
an option, after consultation with the Senate and Anglican Joint Committee: he gave an option of purchase for £600,000. The option was to 14 August 1926, profits to that date to come to the University and Anglican Church. The buyers asked if vendors would take up debenture. Before this could be done it was necessary owing to the provisions of the Trustee Act, to secure the consent of the Treasury.

The acting Premier (Angwin) agreed if the Premier (Collier) would consent. Collier who was in Queensland was wired and consented to University taking up £150,000 debentures at 6½% with a currency of 10 years. The Anglican Church could not take up any debentures without the consent of Synod and time would not permit that to be done. The Chancellor's report continued Messrs Lionel Robinson of London have the option and they are acting in conjunction with Messrs Baillieu of Melbourne. Mr. Fink a prominent financier and Company Promoter of Victoria had been sent to Perth to examine the project. His report was believed to be favourable although details were not known. The Chancellor concluded this memorable report by expressing the opinion that if a sale was affected on these terms it would be highly satisfactory.

It is necessary here to interpolate a few observations about the peculiar form of minute adopted by Vice Chancellor Whitfeld. For some years at the beginning the Senate minutes were recorded by the first Clerk to the Senate Mr. Fletcher. The first few meetings were beautifully engrossed in the special form of lettering used in ancient legal documents, in this he was an expert. But as business increased this engrossing entailed too much labour and he wrote the minutes in his own hand writing. He recorded the names of the mover and seconder of motions and amendments and when decisions were called for,
the numbers voting and the names. This was satisfactory and, in striking contrast to what was developed by Whitfeld and Parker. Mr. Fletcher came to the University after much experience in the affairs of the Civil Service Association and in Municipal and Roads Board administration. He had been Mayor of Queens Park and Chairman of South Perth Roads Board.

From this experience of public affairs he knew what was necessary to record so that when consulted after a lapse of years the minutes would give a reasonably adequate reflex of the business transacted. My good and worthy friend Parker sported more letters after his name than any two of the most decorated men in the University. The letters all related to some accountancy or secretarial accomplishment and if he had been left to do the job himself it might have been satisfactory. But Parker had no experience in public affairs neither had Whitfeld. Moreover Whitfeld had some strange idea that to mention names was not conducive to the Senate dignity and excepting the recital of the members present and an occasional notice of motion, all names are suppressed, no amendments not carried or divisions are recorded and there is no attempt at a condensed reporting of the discussion. Minor matters are extended in great detail and matters of importance dismissed with an unintelligible line. The result is as dull as ditch water and entirely devoid of any sparkle from the personality of those transacting the business and is moreover inaccurate for with public business the amendments moved and the discussion are the only means by which the views of a minority however near to being a majority are recorded. I am aware of course that there is a danger that an unscrupulous minute recorder can if not watched fake minutes to get in some propaganda for his own view.

We had some experience of this when the vigorous Beasley was Vice-Chancellor. This danger is greatly increased
by not recording the names of the mover and recorder for in their absence there is no personal responsibility for the accuracy of any minute. Those who have had experience of societies which do record the names will agree as to how keenly the accuracy of any minute is scrutinised. After much experience of Trade Union business and of the University Senate, I have no doubt whatever that the minutes of many humble Unions give a more accurate reflex of the business transacted than does the minutes of that august body the University Senate. Moreover, during Whitfeld's time the minutes as compiled by Parker from his shorthand notes were edited first by Whitfeld and also by the Chancellor. In most organisations the accuracy of the minutes is regarded as of supreme importance and in Labour and Trade Union circles any suggestion to alter or tamper with, or any doctoring with what the minute taker said was the correct record was regarded as a very grave offence indeed. Imagine therefore, my surprise on being approached by Dr. Saw when he was Chancellor and asked if I desired any alteration in a draft set of minutes relating to something I had been interested in.

This digression has been introduced to explain repeated reference to the absence from the Senate minutes of any reference to matters I have dealt with.

Among the many things necessary for a complete history of the University of W.A. which are not mentioned in its unsatisfactory minute is an attempt made by myself during the negotiation for the sale of the West Australian newspaper to have the Senate retain its interest and run the business for its profit. My idea was that the business and policy side of Newspaper management should be handed over to a Commissioner in much the same way that the business and policy of
Railway management had been to the Commissioner of Railways. I was aware, and said so, at the time that many details as to how the political and social policy of a newspaper, owned by a University would require careful handling, but given good will they could be arranged. By a coincidence there was published in the Newspapers about this time some account of the Trust to which the Walter family transferred the control and management of the London Times. But the idea was much too advanced for the ultra conservative shop-keeping and professional audience to whom it was put. The only support I got was from Professor Murdoch, and the University finally sold the property for it was rumoured at the time the sum of four years profits.

This was the rumour current at the time, but I have recently (1944) seen two balance sheets of The Trustee of the Hackett Estate, one for 9 months of 1926, showing a profit of £70,000 for 9 months this equals approximately £93,324 for a year, and on this balance sheet £625,000 the purchase price equals something over the sum of 6½ years profits. The second balance sheet showed a profit of £50,000 for 6 months, this equals £100,000 for the year and on it we sold for the sum of 6½ years profits.

No wonder that allotment of shares in the buying Company caused quite a flutter among those in the know. It was not often that such a fat pig came on the market. If the University had retained the ownership, its share in the annual profits being earned at the time of sale would have been something in the neighbourhood of £75,000 that sum being 6½ of the approximate annual profit.

What the University would have become with such an income is hard to imagine.

But however, attractive the liquidation of the Hackett Estate was to the Company promoter the first firm handling it did not think the terms attractive enough so
the Chancellor announced in August 1926. But negotiations were proceeding. In September 1926 the Chancellor announced that an agreement had been reached with regard to the sale of the West Australian the Western Mail and the real estate attached thereto with Robertson and Baillieu for the sum of £625,000.

At the September 1926 meeting, the Senate decided to call for competitive designs for the layout of area north of Perth Fremantle road (now Stirling Highway) reserved for science buildings.

This clearly indicates that everybody, with the probable exception of Whitfeld was still thinking in terms of the Annear prize lay-out. In October 1926 the Vice Chancellor announced that Professor Wilkinson had been asked to come to Perth as soon as possible after lectures ceased in Sydney.

The Professor came, and Whitfeld ignored the accepted Annear plan with the result that the Senate got so confused between it and Wilkinson's ideas that in December 1926 to straighten things out Professor Shann and Battye moved "That all decisions adopting and modifying the Desbrow Annear plan, and specifically that of 21st August 1922, allotting to the Science Department the blocks previously set aside for Professors houses, be rescinded."

So ended the Annear plan for which the then Chancellor Hackett had provided a £100 prize. Whether it would have been better than that of Wilkinson will always be a subject of doubt. One feature of it always appealed to me, it would have placed the main Hall on the highest part of the land with elevations facing the corner of Fairway and Stirling Highway and making possible a very imposing main entrance. Its other main feature was that the Department buildings were distributed over the whole area including that north of Stirling Highway. Another feature was provision for a number of Professors' resid-
ences on the fine location now occupied by Tuart House, the Geology Department and St. George's College. The Professors on the whole were opposed to the provision of homes on the University area. In discussing the matter with Professor Wilsmore and asking the reason, he replied, "that I had no doubt read some of the books depicting married life in Continental Army quarters and the Professors did not desire a repetition of this. They would see too much of each others washing."

In July 1915 during the early negotiations with the Government regarding Crawley. I surmise in order to hasten a decision in favour of Crawley Dr. Hackett offered £125 in prizes "for designs laying out the grounds and disposition of Buildings at Crawley."

The first prize £100 was awarded to Mr. H. Desbrow Annear architect of (see page 20 of University file 5). Collins Street Melbourne. This plan was the basis of all discussions as to lay-out until Professor Whitfeld invited Professor Wilkinson to come to W.A. to advise. (see page 46 of Senate notes)

In December 1926 Whitfeld was appointed Vice Chancellor for 1927 or until such time as a permanent Vice is appointed, he was to have an allowance of £250 per annum as from the 1st January 1927.

The provision of funds in Hackett's Will for the establishment of an Anglican residential College raised the question where were the College and future Colleges to be situated. The Annear plan of lay out, which had indicated how the land north of Perth Fremantle Road was to be used, being out of the way it was open to re-allot the land, so in December 1926 the Buildings and Grounds Committee were "instructed to plan the division of the land into Residential College sites. The first denomination prepared to build to have first choice"

The decision was made on the generous, one may say the extravagant scale of five acres of this valuable land
per college. The Anglican Church having first choice naturally chose the best site, and having plenty of money for the purpose built an extravagant college at a cost by rumour £60,000 to accommodate 40 very fortunate young men. The plans prepared by Sir Talbot Hobbs were approved by the Senate in July 1902.

When the question of allotting lands for Residential College purposes, I, who have always been opposed to these institutions on grounds set out elsewhere in this thesis, thought proper to point out after examining the University act that the University had no power to set aside any of its lands for such a purpose. This though ridiculed at the time by Riley was confirmed by the University Solicitor, James. They approached the Government (Collier Angwin) and persuaded them to introduce the University Colleges Act 1926. I interviewed both Collier and Angwin and tried to get them to see that the establishment of these residential colleges in Australia was motivated by the desire, in some cases quite unconsciously, to establish in Australia the evil thing epitomized in the phrase "the old school tie".

Collier, a Roman Catholic seemed impressed by my argument, but I made a tactical blunder by saying, that the Churches might make the refusal to provide the land for their Residential Colleges an election issue. Collier, a shrewd parliamentarian saw this at once and sheared off. Poor old Angwin had before I saw him about the matter been flattered and nobbled by a visit from the archbishops and was flat out in favour of the Churches getting the land. None of the other Labour Members could be interested in the matter and so the Act was passed.

No where in the Senate minutes is there any clear and concise statement of the actual yield which the University received from the Hackett Estate. The amount has to be gleaned from various progressive state-
291.

per college. The Anglican Church having first choice

naturally chose the best site, and having plenty of

money for the purpose built an extravagant college at a

cost by rumour £60,000 to accommodate 40 very fortunate

young men. The plans prepared by Sir Talbot Hobbs were

approved by the Senate in July 1902.

When the question of allotting lands for Residen-
tental College purposes, I, who have always been opposed
to these institutions on grounds set out elsewhere in
this thesis, thought proper to point out after examining
the University act that the University had no power to
set aside any of its lands for such a purpose. This
though ridiculed at the time by Riley was confirmed by
the University Solicitor, James. They approached the
Government (Collier Angwin) and persuaded them to intro-
duce the University Colleges Act 1926. I interviewed
both Collier and Angwin and tried to get them to see that
the establishment of these residential colleges in Aus-

tralia was motivated by the desire, in some cases quite
unconsciously, to establish in Australia the evil thing
epitomized in the phrase "the old school tie".

Collier, a Roman Catholic seemed impressed by
my argument, but I made a tactical blunder by saying,
that the Churches might make the refusal to provide the

I am authoritatively informed it is not possible
to extract the figure from the current Books
Judge Wolff, the 1941 Royal Commissioner on the
administration of the Uni has this to say on page
122 of his report (Anvi) after the death of
the "Hodson" a further sum of £14,856.
This sum is not given by me as an actual figure,
"as the records of the Uni is to the sum received
an unknown." 

Again on page 133 (2nd) In order to avoid confusion
the previous figure scheme said it was the
principal sum (earns & accruing) to 1st June
1927 sum to be treated as Capital. I have no
information to tell me what the actual fund

not aside was.
ments submitted to the Senate. These are often difficult to reconcile. There is also the statement of yield in the petition prepared for submission to the Court and in the schedule to the Order itself (that of December 22, 1926)

The Will provides a legacy of £50,000 to be divided between the Anglican Church and the University in the proportion of 2/8ths to the church and 6/8ths to the University. The residuary legatee clause provides that the whole of the estate left after all prior legacies had been honoured should be divided between the church and the University in the same proportion. So with the sale of the Newspapers and associated properties for £625,000 the gross amounts due to the University were:

6/8ths of £625,000  £468,880
6/8ths of £50,000 legacy for Hall 45,000
£37,500 + interest £7,500 750

£513,880

Amount actually received by the University (see minutes of special meeting of Senate 22/11/26)

31st August, 1926 before liquidation by way of dividend

Debentures in the West Australian Newspaper Company £45,000

October, 1926 Cash from Liquidation £150,000

"There remains a sum of £111,000 or thereabouts in the hands of the Liquidator for payment as to 6/8ths thereof to the University, subject to Taxation and Liquidation charges and certain other claims."

October, 1927 letter from Morrison the liquidator forwarding fixed deposit slip from Bank of N.S.W. for £56,250 and a cheque for interest for £1,875 58,125
Amount actually received by the University £414,375

This sum £414,375 corresponds very closely with £414,856 stated by Sir W. James in his brochure of documents relative to the Hackett Estate.

In the Senate minutes for November 1927 it is stated that the Liquidator had paid £28,380 in dividend duty taxes, so it is clear that this amount which is the only known charge against the estate, apart from liquidator and Commission charges, had been paid from the estate prior to the last payment of £58,125 to the University in October 1927.

The Gross yield to the University £513,750
The sum actually received 414,375

So there was absorbed in liquidation and other commissions 99,375
A proportionate charge to the Church for the realisation of its 2/8ths would be 33,125

Total charges £132,500

This huge sum over 20% of the total receipts seems to have been absorbed by agents charges, legitimate and illegitimate. That these agents were quite generous to themselves is shown by the monstrous commission of £13,000 received by Langler which makes the beautiful memorial to him in the Winthrop Hall a lie.

Sir Alfred Langler had sufficient conscience for his monstrous commission to worry him. As soon as I heard of the payment, I protested to the Senate against it, but had to be content with a verbal statement from Sir Walter James, given I may say with some heat, that Langler was legally entitled to it all. Langler however, was not satisfied with such assurances, but pestered those whom he thought should know seeking assurances that he had done right in taking the Commission. Finally,
the worry became so acute as to upset his mental balance and he died suffering from the hallucination that the Police were coming to arrest him.

The funds for the erection of the beautiful monument were subscribed by a very limited number of those associated with Langler.

________

SIR ALFRED LANGLER.

Excerpts from Leading Article in the "West Australian" of March 28, 1928.

"After some years he became the trusted friend and adviser of Sir Winthrop Hackett and on his death succeeded Hackett in the Editorship and was co-director with G.H. Wickham who was also an executor. On the death of Wickham, a few months later, he became under the terms of Hackett's Will governing Director of W.A. Newspaper Co.,. Under his management and direction the affairs of the Company so prospered that by the middle of last year (1927) he had succeeded not only in providing for all the specific bequests under Hacketts will but in being in a position to inform the Residuary Legatees namely the University and Trustees of the Anglican Church of the fact that the residuary estate (which as events proved was worth (£625,000) would shortly be realised as it subsequently was on their accounts. Following upon the sale of the assets of the W.A. Newspaper Co., the sum mentioned was paid over in the proportions prescribed by the Testator.

The property has since been acquired by the W.A. Newspaper Ltd, of which Sir Alfred Langler occupied until stricken down by the illness which proved fatal, the office of Chairman of Directors, death came as a merciful termination to a long period of intense suffering. Stricken down twelve months ago by an illness from which there was no hope of recovery his suffering cut him off from the
companionship of all, but the closest and most intimate friends --- the shadows which enveloped the close of his career were deplored by those who knew the man and esteemed his qualities."

This eulogy from the paper he had controlled was to be expected. There are, however, many grounds for believing that the eight years boom period between the close of the War in 1918 and the sale of the paper in 1926 had much more to do with the price realised than anything done by Langler.

However, there is no desire to question his ability as a Manager, for which he doubtless received an adequate salary. But what should be questioned is the assumption that he had served the University with such distinction and devotion as to merit the beautiful memorial in the Foyer of the Winthrop Hall and placed there without any recorded consent by the Senate, which alone had the right to consent to its erection.

If the Senate had been consulted and asked for permission for its erection, opposition would have been voiced. This was avoided in a characteristic Whitfeld manner. In his report to the Senate for June 1932 there is the following -

"Mr. Napier Waller's cartoon was inspected at the West Australian Office and later for two days in the position in the Foyer. Certain minor alterations were suggested by members of the Senate and these have been communicated to Mr. H. Greig the Secretary for the Memorial Committee. I understand that Mr. Greig is sending the various data and notes to Mr. Napier Waller and asking him to proceed with the work."

Having put this before the Senate, and no one having objected, consent to erect was assumed. In striking contrast was the action taken only two months later in the matter of a memorial to one who had been a true servant of Science and the University, Dr. Hancock. Collections
for a Stained Glass window memorial had been made, and Whitfeld said in his report to the meeting in August, 1932

"They are now inviting designs for a stained glass window which the Senate has agreed to allow to be placed in the Foyer of the Winthrop Hall."

Dr. Hancock had been the earliest pioneer in W.A. in Xray work, and had paid the price in impaired health exacted from many of the earlier workers with that mysterious and powerful force. During his membership of the Senate 1915 to 1927 his right hand was always bandaged while because of Xray burns received with experimenting with than then, little known force. He was the Electrical Engineer for the Telephone and Telegraph Department. There was a man whose work entitled him to have his service commemorated.

The Langler memorial is a beautiful work of Art and might be properly housed in an Art Gallery. The only reason for any such memorial in Winthrop Hall is service to the state in general or to the University in particular. The wording on the memorial does not claim this, but its presence in a University Building indirectly claims it and Langler's service to the University was less than nil.

WHITFELD. (the Financial Agent)

Having obtained this great windfall the next thing was to decide what to do with it. The testator had provided £50,000, hoping, but apparently doubtful that the balance of his estate would yield that much, to be divided into eight equal parts, 2/8ths to go to the Church and 6/8ths to the University. Of the amount the University received ¥ was to be used in erecting "fine buildings", and ¥ for Bursaries and Scholarships. The question arose, would it be proper to divide the unexpectedly large sum of £625,000 in the same way as the testator had said he desired his expected £50,000 to be divided? The general opinion was, yes. Schemes were discussed on this basis.
That propounded by Whitfeld was that £140,000 should be set aside for scholarships, research etc. as follows.

For Bursaries £30,000, Students' Loan Fund £20,000, Fellowships £40,000, Research £30,000 and for Students' Physical Welfare Fund £20,000. For buildings he suggested £260,000. This was discussed at length. I remember objecting to such items as Fellowship £40,000 and Research £30,000, and being asked by Sandover how much I thought should be provided for scholarships, and taking my courage in both hands, I replied, that the proper recognition of Hackett's desire would only be met by providing £200,000 straight out for scholarships, and to my surprise, this met with general approval. The discussion was adjourned to a special meeting which was held October 1st, 1926.

As a member of the Court of Arbitration, I had to go to Kalgoorlie and could not attend this meeting, so I wrote a letter to the Senate, dated September 28th, 1926 in which I set out my views as to the provisions to be made for scholarships.

The scheme adopted for submission to the Supreme Court, and my letter, copies of which follow are taken from the Senate minutes of October, 1st, 1926.

I confess to have been very proud of the fact, ascertained for the first time when searching the old minute books in preparation for this writing, that the Senate ordered my letter should be entered in the minutes. It shows I think, that my basic division into two equal parts met with approval.

Albert Street,
COTTESLOE BEACH.

The Chancellor,
28th September, 1926.

Dear Sir,

I regret I will not be present at the Senate meeting on Friday as I have to go to Norseman.
I would like to submit for the consideration of the Senate, that the scheme we discussed at the last meeting be amended by deleting the whole of the second heading and inserting the following:

"(2) Money to be held by the Senate upon trust that the income shall be applied as the Senate may direct for the assistance and maintenance of deserving students of the University whose means may make it difficult for them to take up a University course. £200,000."

These words are an exact copy of the clause in the Will, and if they form portion of the Court's order, then while the amount will be fixed, the Senate will have considerable latitude to allocate what amount they from time to time think desirable to Bursaries, students' Loan Fund, Post-Graduate Work or to Research Work. Always provided that the recipient is in the terms of the will, a deserving student whose means may make it difficult for him to take up a University course.

Yours truly,

(Signed) W. SOMERVILLE.

UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA.

Extract of Senate Minutes - Friday, 1st October, 1926.

Correspondence.

A letter was received from Mr. Somerville, dated 28th September, 1926, suggesting that the scheme discussed at the last meeting be amended by deleting the whole of the second heading and inserting the following:-

"(2) Money to be held by the Senate upon trust that the income shall be applied as the Senate may direct for the assistance and maintenance of deserving students of the University whose means may make it difficult for them to take up a University course. . £200,000."
After discussion, the Scheme of Utilisation was amended to the following form for submission to the Court:

(i) That in order to arrange for the effective utilisation of the Bequest, provision should be made for an endowment to provide the salary of a permanent Vice-Chancellor.

(ii) That half the remainder of the Bequest shall be used for the "Hall" group of buildings including equipment, students' Union building, and an endowment for upkeep, the accumulated interest on these moneys to be used for the purchase of library books and for the layout of the grounds.

(iii) That the other half of the remainder of the Bequest be invested to provide for the maintenance and assistance of deserving students including bursaries, students' loan fund and research studentships: any interest that may have accrued from money unexpended under this head to be applied at the discretion of the Senate to meet the increased expenses caused by the increase in the number of students consequent upon the provision of Hackett bursaries and studentships.

The Hon. Sir Walter James stated that in order to approach the Court it would be necessary for a petition to be prepared setting out the different reasons for the proposals of the Senate and for the petition to be accompanied by an affidavit from the Chancellor. He (Sir Walter) proposed to have the documents drafted and submitted for the consideration of the Senate.
When drafted by Sir Walter the documents consisted a lengthy petition to the Supreme Court. After the Court proceedings were completed and an order secured in the terms requested in the Petition, Sir Walter prepared a brochure containing all relevant documents for the use of members of the Senate from which the following are excerpts.

"Sir Winthrop Hackett by his testamentary dispositions provided a sum of £18,000 for the endowment of a Chair of Agriculture. In addition he gave to the University six eights of his residuary estate, the principal asset of which was his interest in the West Australian and Western Mail. When his estate was realised a sum of £414,856 was paid to the University as its share of the residuary estate. The purposes for which the gift was made were set out in clause 32 of his Will. When this clause was drafted (1913-1915) the testator could not have anticipated that the residuary estate would be so large as it proved to be. It was obvious that so large an amount could not be usefully employed in the erection of a University Hall reading those words in a narrow and literal sense, and it therefore, became necessary to prepare a scheme by which the intentions of the testator could but be served."

The Court was approached on 21st October, 1926 by a petition of which the chief features were as follows:-

(1) Hackett died on the 19th February, 1916 leaving a will of three codicils.

(2) Next follow those parts of the will affecting the University being clause 32 as amended and replaced by the first and second codicils. These have been set forth above in condensed form in the quotation from Sir Walter's brochure.
(3) The trustee and executor has paid and discharged all debts and liabilities and also discharged all legacies leaving the residuary estate in trust for the residuary legatees the University and Anglican Church.

(4) When the testator died the statement of assets and liabilities filed by the executor showed an estate of the net value of £94,572 and on this sum Federal and State Tax was paid.

(5) The principal assets were the West Australian and Western Mail.

(6) By the skilful management of the estate it became of great value and has recently been sold for £625,000.

(7) From this sum certain deductions will have to be made to meet outstanding claims for taxation and otherwise but it is anticipated that a sum of £560,000 will be available for division into 8 equal parts to be shared by the University and the Church in the portion of 6/8ths and 2/8ths. The University should receive not less than £420,000.

(8) The question arises as to whether the desires Hackett expressed as to the division of £50,000, which he at the time of making his Will anticipated, should apply to the much larger sum of £420,000 actually yielded.

(9) The petitioners thought the answer to this question should be in the affirmative that the same considerations applied.

(10) The petitioners also thought that as the position of a paid and full time Vice Chancellor was contemplated by the University Act of 1911 largely through Hackett's influence in Parliament and the status and duties of a Vice Chancellor were further defined by a Statute of the University passed during his Chancellorship, it would be a proper furtherance of Hackett's wishes to set aside £25,000 the interest on which would pay a Vice Chancellors salary.
(11) After deducting £25,000 the balance should be divided into two equal parts. One part to be used for the erection of fine buildings, together with an endowment of £50,000 for their maintenance and of the grounds "and the other as an endowment to serve" deserving students of the University whose means may make it difficult for them to take up a University Course."

The Court agreed with the contention of the petitioner that the same lines of division which Hackett indicated he desired to apply to the £50,000 he thought his estate might yield should apply to the £420,000 yielded and ordered accordingly. £25,000 was to be an endowment for the salary of Vice Chancellor. After deducting this amount the remainder was to be divided into two equal parts. One part was to be invested and the income used for Bursaries Scholarships and Students' Loans. The other equal part was to be spent in the erection of University buildings after £50,000 had been deducted to form an endowment to "provide the annual cost of the maintenance and management of the Halls and Library and of the adjoining grounds."

It is not possible to ascertain from the Court's order how much actual cash was received by the University for that depends upon how much of £111,000 in the hands of the liquidator after October 1926 was absorbed in "taxation and liquidation charges and certain disputed claims". However, two definite figures are used £41,4,856 from the residuary estate and £45,000 legacy = £459,856. By a subsequent petition May 1931 also prepared by Sir Walter James the allocations to the various University funds totalled £425,000. This left £34,856 to satisfy University share of liquidation charges.

The endowment for a Vice Chancellor's salary having been obtained, the next step was to secure the man. The normal and natural way was to advertise the vacancy, but this was too democratic for University people. The
confidential report and enquiry was more in accordance with University tradition. Inquiries were made from Australian British and South African Universities. Two names were suggested by Sydney; Replies were received from nine British Universities, but only two names were submitted of men who might be suitable. Two names were also sent from South Africa.

This was a very poor response to the portentous confidential report, and yet it was taken as having exhausted the possibilities in the whole of Great Britain and Australia. An advertisement for a Vice Chancellor at a salary of £1250 in 1927 would have brought many applications from able men from whom to choose, and a wide field was obviously necessary to secure a vigorous administrator. Instead the whole and corner method of a confidential report, asked for from a small select number, was adopted and resulted in only six names from which the selection had to be made. This was an extraordinary restricted field from which to choose an important Officer whose chief duties were business manager and administrator.

It is remarkable that no vigorous protest against such a course was not made at the time, from myself amongst others.

One of the chief advocates of the confidential report and against advertising was the Chancellor, Dr. Saw. Professor Whitfield, the then unpaid Vice Chancellor, was an applicant so the restricted field from which to select may not perhaps have been fortuitous.

An extract from a letter from Sir Mungo McCallum, Vice Chancellor of Sydney University, illustrates the attitude towards the appointment adopted by one of the select few who were asked for a report. "I do not think it likely you will get any better men from Home than you will get here. For sometime I have been anxious to resign and for the last two years we have been making enquiries about my successor. Though the appointment is to be for life at a
minimum salary of £1500 and pension, no name has been submitted that seems wholly satisfactory."

Now this Sir Mungo came to Australia, an ordinary Scottish graduate and very elated I have no doubt at having achieved "Professorial Status" when 33 years of age. He remained in his Professorship for 33 years until 1920. Four years afterwards in 1924, when he was 70 years of age he was appointed Vice Chancellor. Yet he solemnly asserts that after two years enquiry, there did not appear to be a man in all the British Isles who as a successor was "wholly satisfactory".

What amazing conceit! Nor was this all, in the same letter Sir Mungo, "The only other member of the staff, whom I should consider as one suitable and likely to accept is Brigadier General F.G. Mackay C.M.G., D.S.O., B.A.,".

This man after taking his arts degree specialised in science so successfully as to be appointed Lecturer in Physics, before the War. "In the war he greatly distinguished himself and, despite his comparative youth - he is now about 42 - was promoted to his present rank."

After reciting this and much more in the same vein, Sir Mungo discounts (to University men) the whole by complacently remarking that he (Mackay) was not of Professorial Status." Can you beat it? Here was a man who had won his Brigadier General Status and D.S.O., in actual command of fighting men in the field - such a man was not of Professorial Status forsooth - and the selection committee (including myself) having the possibility of securing such a man as Vice Chancellor choose Whitfield.

At its meeting in May 1927 the Senate had appointed a committee to select a Vice Chancellor. Its members were The Chancellor (Saw) Pro. Chancellor (Andrews) Vice Chancellor (Whitfield) Professor Ross, Battye and Somerville. In recounting what took place at the meetings of this Com-
mittee and of the Senate, I quote largely from my notes made at the time.

At the meeting of this selection Committee in May the letters which had been received in response to the Confidential Enquiry were discussed at length. I said there was nothing in any of the letters which anyone might not write in support of a friend. We should if possible, get an Australian, and I asked Professor Whitfeld to retire and then move that he be offered the job. The decision was unanimous, and Dr. Saw was asked to convey the offer to Whitfeld. This response was a long and characteristic letter. He said among many other things "after giving the matter a good deal of consideration I have decided that I am, speaking generally, willing to accept the position should the Senate so desire. There are, however, a few matters to which I wish to draw the attention of the Senate." This was not a very enthusiastic acceptance. The letter proceeds: "The position is more exacting than that of a Professor who has long vacations and can use them to augment his salary - the Vice Chancellorship was a "dead-end" occupation."

This is the most remarkable use of the term dead-end I have ever heard. Most people would call it a "top of the tree occupation". He complains that he has had no long leave for a long time. In referring to the future of the Engineering School he uses the term "if I leave" several times, and concludes - "I have stated my views on these matters because my definite acceptance of the position would depend on the general attitude of the Senate towards certain of these questions."

Naturally the selection Committee were unable to decide if this letter was an acceptance or a qualified refusal, so it was decided to have Whitfeld attend a meeting of the Committee. What took place at this Committee meeting and the following Senate meeting in June
1927 is best recounted in the following notes written by me at the time. I put them on paper because I foresaw that the decision would have far-reaching effect upon the future of the University.

**SELECTED VICE CHANCELLOR.**

Copy of my notes of the discussion at the Senate Meeting.

Mr. Somerville speaking —

Mr. Chancellor. I desire to give the Senate my impressions of what took place in Committee. As you have indicated the Committee, after receiving Professor Whitfeld's letter, desired something more definite and with that object we had him in to the Committee meeting. I regret to have to say I have never in my life seen such an exhibition of indecision. He seemed to want the position and not to want it, somethings he said in one breath were vital and the next they were not necessarily vital. He seemed torn between two desires. I have been as keen as any member of the Committee to secure Professor Whitfeld, but I regret to have to say that as the result of the meeting I have come to the conclusion that he is not the man for the position. In my view, the Vice Chancellor should be one who is eager for the position, he must be satisfied with the terms we have to offer, for a dissatisfied servant is always an unsatisfactory servant (dissent from Shann). He must see in the position of Vice Chancellor a great opportunity for making a name for himself and doing important public service. It would be disastrous to appoint anyone who had a feeling that by accepting the position he was doing the University a favour and was constantly looking back on the comfortable Professors Chair he had vacated.

Watters was the only one who spoke in support definitely seizing on my word in decision as truly indicative of Whitfeld's character and a quality which was one of the worst for a Vice Chancellor to have.

Shann combatted my impressions.
Battyé said, The Committee was unanimous until it failed to get anything more definite than Whitfeld's letter. -

Andrews was silent except to say that we were unanimous that we could not alter the terms to suit Whitfeld. He had informed me at lunch that he did not think Whitfeld a suitable man. -

Saw, was noncommittal merely recounting what happened without expressing any opinion. -

Riley moved that Whitfeld be offered the job on the terms offered except that the Chancellor might indicate to him that the Senate was prepared to consider a pension fund out of the balance of the yield of the £25,000 endowment over the salary of £1250. -

Dr. Jull seconded this and she, Riley, Ross and Shann, said yes. Walters, Battyé, Somerville, Andrews and Saw were silent and it was declared, carried.

I do not know how Keil, the only other member present, voted.

-----

The Senate records of the June 1927 meeting is that the Position be offered to Whitfeld at a salary of £1250 and a scheme of superannuation to be considered later. He accepted this and his appointment was confirmed in July 1927.

In his letter of acceptance, Whitfeld wrote - "my resignation of the Chair of Mining and Engineering is an opportune time to consider the School of Engineering - the present position assumes that the holder of the Chair is competent in all branches ------- this is an anomaly in modern times ------I propose that each Department should have at its head one skilled in that Department ---- one of these heads would be appointed executive officer of the School exercising general supervision."

As Vice Chancellor it was his duty to put this scheme into practice, but nothing was ever done and today
(1946) there are still three heads "equal in all things"
The net result of the school of Engineering has been bad.
It has given rise to much rivalry and disharmony among
the heads and has detrimentally affected the status of
W.A. University Engineering.

After Whitfeld's appointment as Chief Executive
Officer he became inevitably the most prominent figure
in University life. The greater part of his time was
taken up with ordinary administrative details, Faculty
meetings, the Professorial Board and Senate Committee
etc. etc. This work was of great importance in the run-
ning of the institution but only of passing interest.
He naturally played an important part in managing the
Architectural competition for the design of and in the
erection of the Hackett Buildings, but these are dealt
with in special chapters. Whitfeld had one ambition which
was peculiarly personal and was his dominant interest,
it was the erection of Residential Colleges and Students'
Hostels, and a Womens Hall. To those who believe in the
segregation of University Youth into exclusive colonies
these were both worthy objects, but he persisted in his
efforts to secure Hackett Scholarship Trust Funds for
their erection and endowment. He persisted in turning
a deaf ear to all arguments that this was an improper and
even an illegal use of Trust Funds. When challenged, he
could not cite a single example of such an institution
which paid interest on Capital lost, much less profits.
He would not face the facts that without interest on Cap-
ital Scholarships and Bursaries would cease. However, his
efforts used up so much of the time of himself and that
of Senators as to require a special chapter.

The appointment of the first full time paid
Vice Chancellor is a fit time to consider what are the
proper functions of a Vice Chancellor and in what way they
differ from those exerived by men in other than academic spheres whose functions and duties are not hidden by such ancient and impressive names as Chancellor and Vice Chancellor. To some a Vice Chancellor should be a combination of the Prophet and the Seer. He should be able to inspire the teaching staff under him, pointing the way to higher things. In support of such a belief they point to some prominent figure in the history of some prominent figure in the history of some over sea University who is usually a Churchman or writer of distinction. Such a man will be one out of a million and I am not aware of such a one in the History of Australian Universities. We in W.A. have certainly not had part time and full time Vice Chancellors. Whitfeld could dream dreams, but to put them into effect not much more than mere money was required, for they related mainly to Buildings. There may have been much more in his mind but it remained unexpressed for he was the most ineffective of speakers, neither could he write in such a way as to put his own vision into the mind of others. This only means of expression was per medium of long typed memoranda vague to the point of exasperation in the reader and with anything approaching a concrete proposal qualified almost to extinction. These memoranda only bored those who read them and were all rapidly forgotten to be succeeded by others of the same type.

There seems to be some magic in the words Vice Chancellor which blinds most people to the fact that the term General Manager would be truly descriptive of what the vast majority of Vice Chancellors really do. The Vice Chancellors Statute is testimony to this for in all its clauses it is only necessary to replace terms such as Vice Chancellor, faculty etc. with terms suitable to other businesses such as General Manager and Department, and it would serve as a foundation for the terms of engagement for any General Manager - Managing Secretary etc. etc.
And how can it be otherwise? A University is an aggregate of a number of semi-independent Departments each presided over by an expert who would strongly resent any interference by a Vice Chancellor in his methods of conducting his Department. An interesting light is thrown on the question by an extract from Scotts History of the Melbourne University. Although proposals to amend the Victorian University Act to provide for a Vice Chancellor were made in the year 1881 and again in 1923 they were both defeated, and it was not until 1933 that an Act was passed enabling a Vice Chancellor to be appointed. The reason for opposition by some of the Professors was voiced by Professor Jenks who feared that ill feeling and friction would arise as one man might attempt to determine the character of the whole University and Professors would thereby be relegated to the position of assistant masters at a school.

If the conception of a Vice Chancellor as a general manager of the States highest Educational Institution is held not to be a fit conception then that put forth by the "Standing Advisory Committee of the Universities of Australia should be, and here is all relevant part of it".

UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA

Extract from MINUTES of STANDING ADVISORY COMMITTEE, of the UNIVERSITIES OF AUSTRALIA, 15th NOVEMBER, 1920.

CHIEF UNIVERSITY OFFICER

The Sydney Conference having resolved

(a) that it is desirable, for more effective working, and consonant with the general character of Australian Universities, that the appointment of an officer of high status, who could adequately represent both the administrative and the educational aspects of the University before other Universities and the public generally, be seriously considered,
and

(b) that the Advisory Committee should report as to the status and duties of such an officer in Australia, the following statement prepared in 1916 as representing the views of the University of Melbourne was read by the Chairman:-

"Your Committee is of opinion that the rapid growth of the University and the continuous increase in its opportunities of educational service call for the appointment as soon as possible of a chief academic officer, corresponding generally in functions with the Principal or salaried Vice-Chancellor of a modern English University. Your committee recommends that the nature of the office should correspond with these British models, and not with the more autocratic type of the President of an American University.

The proper function of the new officer is defined in several Charters as "the principal academic officer of the University." He should be the president of the Professorial Board, and ex officio a member of all Faculties and Boards. In the opinion of the Committee he ought to have a salary of £1,500 a year, with a house. The Principal would have important functions within and without the University. As administrative head of the University he must keep himself acquainted with the affairs of all the departments in the University, and assure himself of their efficiency. He must be the chief connecting link between departments with a view to promoting their co-ordination and co-operation. Where others may naturally view questions of policy from the standpoint of particular departments, the principal should be able to look at them from the standpoint of the University. And he must fulfil these functions without interfering unduly with the discretion and authority of heads of departments and of Faculties in the internal arrangements of their schools. The Principal should charge himself in particular with a consideration of the relations of the University towards other institutions with a view to their mutual understanding and co-operation. To the University he should bring a knowledge of opportunities for extension of its work and influence; he should be not merely chief executive officer, but (in the language of President Eliot) its "leader and seer". To the Government and the community he should act as chief apostle of higher education, making known its aims, its place in the educational system and in the national life, and its claims to support. Whatever the authority of a Principal, his success will be far more dependent on the influence of his character, personality and attainments. Such an office has long existed in some of the ancient Universities, and it has been instituted also in all the modern Universities in the United Kingdom. It is invariably filled by a man of the highest educational rank, distinguished by his achievements in some department of literature, or science and possessing an intimate experience of University life and work in all its phases."
The Advisory Committee thought this summary of the status and duties of a Vice Chancellor written in 1916 by Melbourne University was so good that they quote it in full. If it is examined impartially, remembering all the time that it is prepared by University men about a University Office and not forgetting that each sphere of human activity has its own problems and requires its special knowledge; if these considerations are given their proper weight, what is there in this account of the status and duties of a Vice Chancellor which might not truthfully be said of the status and duties of the Manager of a Departmental Store or of any other business which has sub branches.

As administrative head he must keep himself acquainted with the affairs of all departments and assure himself of their efficiency - he must co-ordinate their activities - each Department head naturally views questions of policy from the standpoint of his own Department and it is the duty of the Manager or Vice Chancellor to view them from the standpoint of the University or the Business as a whole. He must do all this without interfering unduly with the discretion and authority of heads of Departments in the management of their own Departments. To the Business or University he should bring a knowledge of the opportunities for extension of its work.

It is only when following President Eliot the Committee branch off from the real to the poetic and say that a Vice Chancellor should be a "leader and seer" that any quality of mind is mentioned which is not equally required for success in any other walk of life. Even with regard to leadership and seership who shall say that they are not required in every other social activity.
The truth is that when considering University Officers we are dominated by the use of ancient archaic terms which have come down to us from medieval times and in the passage of years have acquired a status in the eyes of the Public beyond the intrinsic importance of the office. No one would desire to rob them of this status but it would assist towards clear thinking on the part of the public about University problems if the terms Senate, Chancellor, Pro Chancellor, Vice Chancellor were debunked and changed to their modern equivalents such as Board of Control, Chairman, Vice Chairman and Manager.

With regard to the term Professor: the status conferred by it is very remarkable. Long may it remain so. It rests upon the average of the performance of those fortunate enough to possess it and that average is high. Long may it remain so. Between Whitfeld's appointment in July 1927 and his departure on holiday to Europe and America in 1931 his chief occupation was with the Hackett Buildings and those Buildings are dealt with in another Chapter.

My experience as acting Vice Chancellor during his absence also deserves a separate Chapter.

When Whitfeld returned from his travels in 1931 he was full of ideas as to how the students could help, on a voluntary basis, with the administrative office work, improving the grounds, giving instruction to the unemployed, making roads and footpaths between departments, etc. etc. But although they took up a great portion of his time and also that of the Senate and its Committees nothing came of them. They all lacked the essential, practicability. When I was acting in his place as Vice Chancellor and desired to find a place for some papers I found that the drawers of his big desk were choked full of typed memoranda about projects taken up with some energy pursued for a time and then
dismissed in favour of something else. There is a sample which found its way into the Senate minutes.

Extract from SENATE MINUTES of 20th DECEMBER, 1937.

Estimates for 1938.

Joint Meeting of representatives of Professorial Board, Standing Committee of Convocation and Guild Council.

The Vice-Chancellor reported that this meeting was held at "Tuart House" on 1st December, to discuss the draft estimates for 1938.

A general discussion took place for about 2½ hours on the aims of the University and on methods of its improvement, and of means of enlightening the public as to its work and usefulness to the community.

The following suggestions were put forward chiefly by the student representatives and were noted:-

(a) Every student should contribute some voluntary effort towards the University's activities, either on the Academic side or in Guild activities or both.

(b) It was thought that voluntary tutoring, or demonstrating might be increased, and the possibilities of voluntary work in the Library and in the Office should be investigated.

(c) It was thought that the first year was a difficult one for many students and guidance from senior students might be very helpful. The fresher often finds that the first lectures are covering ground which was partly covered at school. He or she thinks that it is unnecessary to work at the subject and does not learn how to work independently. This probably accounts for many first-year failures. It was thought that the freshers might be allotted in small groups to senior students for advice and a little coaching in University methods of study.

(d) It was said that in some subjects independent reading and thought were hardly necessary, as the lecturers carried the whole course and the student had only to memorise the lecture notes.

(e) It was thought that there should be less compulsory lectures, more freedom of choice and more tutorials.

(f) The Guild is considering the question of offering to take over the student accounts so as to relieve the office.

(g) It was thought that Convocation might make it its business to prepare statistics as to the occupation and residence etc., of graduates, so as to meet the popular objection that the University trains graduates who go abroad and benefit other countries.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that the proceedings were reported to the meeting of the Professorial Board held on 9th December, and the Board had decided to transmit these suggestions to the Academic Secretary and Student Adviser, Mr. T.H. Roberts when he arrives in Perth, so that he can discuss them further with the appropriate bodies.

In September 1933 Whitfeld unanimously reappointed for another 7 years.

On 27th November, 1933 at a special meeting of the
dismissed in favour of something else. There is a sample which found its way into the Senate minutes.

Extract from SENATE MINUTES of 20th DECEMBER, 1937.

Estimates for 1938.

Joint Meeting of representatives of Professorial Board, Standing Committee of Convocation and Guild Council.

The Vice-Chancellor reported that this meeting was held at "Tuart House" on 1st December, to discuss the draft estimates for 1938.

A general discussion took place for about 2½ hours on the aims of the University and on methods of its improvement, and of means of enlightening the public as to its work and usefulness to the community.

The following suggestions were put forward chiefly by the student representatives and were noted:-

(a) Every student should contribute some voluntary effort towards the University's activities, either on the Academic side or in Guild activities or both.

(b) It was thought that voluntary tutoring, or demonstrating might be increased, and the possibilities of voluntary work in the Library and in the Office should be investigated.

(c) It was thought that the first year was a difficult one for many students and guidance from senior students might be very helpful. The fresher often finds that the first lectures are covering ground which was partly covered at school. He or she thinks that it is unnecessary to work at the subject and does not learn how to work independently. This probably accounts for many first-year failures. It was thought that the fresher might be allotted in small groups to senior students for advice and a little coaching in University methods of study.

(d) It was said that in some subjects independent reading and thought were hardly necessary, as the lecturers carried the whole course and the student had only to memorise the lecture notes.

(e) It was thought that there should be less compulsory lectures, more freedom of choice and more tutorials.

(f) The Guild is considering the question of offering to take over the student accounts so as to relieve the office.

(g) It was thought that Convocation might make it its business to prepare statistics as to the occupation and residence etc., of graduates, so as to meet the popular objection that the University trains graduates who go abroad and benefit other countries.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that the proceedings were reported to the meeting of the Professorial Board held on 9th December, and the Board had decided to transmit these suggestions to the Academic Secretary and Student Advisor. Mr. T.H. Roberts when he returned from holiday.
Senate held in the R.S.L. Board room Anzac House considered a grand Building Scheme which had been elaborated by Whitfeld. £60,000 was to be used for Science Buildings. To this sum Collier (the Premier) said he would add £10,000 provided the fullest possible use was made of unemployed sustenance workers. In addition the Finance Committee had recommended that £5,000 should be taken from the Trust funds to erect a Womens Hall to cost £10,000 with interest at 3%. Another 5,000 was to be taken from the Trust funds and advanced to the Guild of Undergraduates to build a Mens Hostel to cost £10,000. The £10,000 which it was hoped to get from the Guild to be divided between the two. This would make a total of

£60,000 for Science Buildings.
10,000 for Womens Hall
10,000 for Mens Hostel

£80,000

Of this total £10,000 was to be taken from the Scholarship Trust monies and spent on enterprises which rarely if ever, pay, or are expected to pay, interest on the Capital Cost of the Buildings or even running costs. But the story of this fortunately futile project belongs to another chapter.

To build the Science quarters with Trust money the interest and repayment guaranteed by an act of Parliament was of course a perfectly sound proposition.

MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETING of the SENATE
HELD at the R.S.L. BOARD ROOM, PERTH.
MONDAY, 27th NOVEMBER, 1933, at 4.15 p.m.

PRESENT: The Chancellor (Sir Walter James) in the Chair, the Pro-Chancellor (Dr. J.S. Battye), the Vice-Chancellor (Professor Whitfeld) the Chief Justice (Sir John Northmore), Dr. J.P. Ainslie, Mr. E.W. Gillett, Dr. R.H.M. Jull Mr. H. Middleton, Professor A.D. Ross, Professor E.O.G. Shann, Mr. W. Somerville, Miss M.O. Stevens, and Mr. W.E. Thomas.

Apologies were received from Mr. W. Clubb, the Hon. J.M. Drew, and Mr. G.S.J. Norton.
The meeting was held to give further consideration to the proposed building scheme which had been adjourned from the meeting of the Senate held on 20th November, 1933.

The Chancellor said that the deputation appointed at the meeting of the Senate held on 20th November had waited upon the Hon. the Premier to ascertain what grant for saving on sustenance would be given by the Government if the money actually provided by the University were limited to the £60,000 specified in the University Buildings Act.

After hearing the views of the University's representatives the Premier agreed to provide the sum of £10,000 thus making a gross total of £70,000.

The Premier stated that he would leave it to the University to decide on which buildings the money should be spent, subject of course to the University Buildings Act. He did, however, require that unemployed labour should be used if available.

The Premier also stated that he would see the Minister for Works to ascertain whether the Government Architect could arrange to prepare the plans of the Women's Hall or Hostel if proceeded with. The Premier was anxious for the work to proceed promptly.

A letter was received from the Hon. J. N. Drew, stating that he was unable to attend owing to an important Cabinet meeting. He said that he was doubtful whether a Women's Hostel would be a financial success, but considered that a Men's Hostel is overdue. He disliked the use of Trust Funds for such enterprises, and thought it would be better to set aside the Government grant for the erection of hostels.

A confidential statement giving a tentative estimate of the cost of running the Women's Hall was submitted by Dr. Jull.

The following recommendations of the Finance Committee were then considered:

(a) That the University should advance the sum of £5000 from the Hackett Bequest Funds to the Women's College Fund Committee for the purpose of erecting a residential Hall for women, to cost £10,000, with interest at the rate of 5% per annum.

(b) That the University should advance the sum of £5000 from the Hackett Bequest Funds to the Guild of Undergraduates for the purpose of erecting a Men's Hostel to cost £10,000 with interest at the rate of 5% per annum. The men's Hostel to be a separate building, not a second storey to the present Guild building.

(c) That the grant of £10,000 to be made by the Government should be allocated as a donation, free of interest or repayment, towards the erection of the Women's Hall (£5000) and the Men's Hostel (£5000) in order to complete the erection of these buildings.

(d) That the University should proceed with the permanent Science Buildings under the University Buildings Act, which allows a maximum expendi-
of £60,000 on buildings.


The Pro-Chancellor moved that the University should limit itself to the construction of the proposed Science Buildings contemplated by the University Buildings Act, 1930, and to the erection of a Women's Residential Hall, for the present, and that the grant of £10,000 by the Government should be used for the erection of the Women's Hall.

An amendment was moved that the Science Buildings be completed before the University enters upon another building. The amendment was lost.

A further amendment was moved that the University should proceed with the erection of a Men's Hostel, as well as the Women's Hall. The amendment was lost.

After further discussion, the Pro-Chancellor amended his motion to read as follows:--

"That the grant of £10,000 to be provided by the Government be devoted to the erection and furnishing of a Women's Residential Hall."

The motion was carried.

During the discussion it was made clear that members present were of opinion that the Women's Residential Hall should provide an annual sum of £250 or thereabouts to be set aside to build up a fund to help to provide for the erection of a Men's Residential Hostel when the Senate decided that such a Hostel should be erected and/or to provide a fund to meet extensions to the Women's Hall. The Chancellor desired this expression of opinion to be noted in the minutes.

Arising out of the discussion, the Chancellor stated that as the Women's Hall would be a University building, it would be necessary for the Senate to consider the form of control under which the building would be conducted, whether by the University or by any outside body to which the Senate leased the Hall.

It was agreed that the Chancellor, Pro-Chancellor and Vice-Chancellor should bring forward recommendations to the Senate as to the method of control of the building.

The question of an architect for the Women's Hall was also considered, and the Chancellor stated that the Premier had promised to ascertain whether the Government Architect could arrange to prepare the plans, in which case it was hoped that architects' fees would not be charged. The Chancellor said that the Women's College Fund Committee proposed to submit suggestions to the next meeting of the Senate.

The question of a site for the Women's Hall was considered, and it was decided to ask the Vice-Chancellor to submit a recommendation to the next meeting of the Senate.

Other matters in connection with the proposed building scheme were then considered, and it was decided as follows:--
1. That the University should proceed with the permanent Science Buildings under the University Buildings Act, which allows a maximum expenditure of £60,000 on buildings.


3. That a Building Committee be appointed to consider matters in connection with the building scheme, and to work in consultation with Professor Ross and Professor Wilmere.

The Committee to consist of the following:-


Confirmed.

--------

In June 1928 on the motion of Murdoch, Whitfield was granted an entertainment allowance of £100 for 1928. Future years to be considered when same idea of probable cost was known. This was continued for a number of years but as he was seldom known to entertain anybody it was finally cancelled.

Neither Whitfield nor Mrs. Whitfield had any talent nor, I believe, any desire for social functions.

In May 1929 James gave notice to move that the Vice-Chancellor be granted his long leave of absence and that any previous resolution dealing with the matter be modified accordingly. When this came on for discussion it was withdrawn and the following carried -

"That the question of long service leave to Vice-Chancellor be dealt with when application is made unaffected by any previous decision of the Senate on the matter."

The significance of these moves is hidden, but I have good reason for the surmise that James and Northmore were becoming anxious about Whitfield's handling of the financing of the Hackett Buildings. James became Chancellor in March 1929. In March 1930, Northmore nominated against Battye for Pro-Chancellor, a rather unusual event, and beat him. Battye up to then had been Chairman of
Finance Committee and equally responsible with Whitfeld for the finances. The change from Contract to Cost, plus commission which Alsop and Whitfeld had supported was causing anxiety, although Brine and Son, the Contractors, had reported in June 1930 as having saved up to that time £5,590. In November 1930, it was reported to the Senate that the money to pay for the buildings was almost exhausted and before the end of the week it would be necessary to draw on permanent endowments to pay wages. This could only be done by a special Act of Parliament, and the attention of the Government be directed to the urgency for this, or alternatively the Government be asked for the £25,000 promised as a refund of part of the £26,300 paid as Hackett Estate duties. Then follows the choice bit of Whitfelding finance -

"November 1930 when money for building is exhausted then money from the permanent Trust (scholarship) should be paid into from a new special account so that it will not be necessary to draw on the permanent endowment."

As the only endowment remaining after the Building endowment was exhausted, where the allocations for Maintenance, Vice-Chancellor and Scholarships, this is a particularly immoral proposal, for when made it was absolutely illegal.

Unfortunately to get the Hackett Buildings finished we had ultimately to raid the Trust Funds and sell Commonwealth stock when, in the depth of the Depression, it was down to something about £89 per 100 stock. But this was done legally, after proper process of Law by which the Consent of the Supreme Court had been obtained. Provision was also made for repayment.

Notwithstanding these and other signs of approaching financial crises threatening to stop all building, Whitfeld went on with his arrangements for his journey to the other side of the World. His behaviour is hard to understand. The natural reaction of a conscientious man to the evident approach of an extra difficult period is
to stay to see it through, not to leave to others to deal with a muddle which has arisen after four years as chief executive Officer. But Whitfeld did, and I think he was aided and abetted by James and Northmore the two most influential Senators, and also the two most behind the scenes in Banking circles. I suspect, with good reason, that they desired to get Whitfeld out of the way so as to have someone with more directness and strength to do things when the impending financial crisis reached a head.

In 1930 two of the original members of the Senate passed away, Mr. G.M. Roberts died in August and Mr. Catton Grasby in November.

In October 1930 a suggestion was made by the Editor of the Black Swan, Mr. D.L. Serventy that an Historical Bureau be inaugurated and a full set of Photos of the Irwin Street Buildings obtained. The Senate approved of the suggestion, but unfortunately nothing was done.

During 1930 James who was Chancellor had made it known by various hints and jokes and veiled suggestions his belief, that the Chancellor should have special robes. He was not given to display, but probably the fact that he had no University Degree and consequently was not entitled to wear any gown caused him to feel rather undressed at Academic functions (He was not made an L.L.D. until after his term as Chancellor). The designing of the robes was left to Miss Stevens and Mr. Alsop. They were inspected and approved by the Senate at the March 1931 meeting and worn for the first time at the Degree Ceremony in that year.

The General Purposes Committee after considering the practice in Sydney, Melbourne and Adelaide recommended to the Senate, April 1930, that special Academic Robes should be provided for the Chancellor, Pro-Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor and Senators. At the August 1930 meeting the Senate approved of the Chancellor's Robes but refused
the others.

In December 1930 on motion by Professor Ross it was decided that future meetings of the Senate should be held at Crawley. This was done in anticipation of the completion of the Senate chamber. Accordingly the first meeting of the Senate in its permanent home took place on 16th March, 1931. It was the 202nd meeting. There is nothing in the minutes to indicate that anything was said or done to mark this Historic occasion. The fact that it was the first meeting at Crawley has to be gleaned from the heading "held at Crawley".

In December 1930, Whitfield proposed to the Senate that the Undercroft of Winthrop Hall be dedicated to Socrates and the spirit of free discussion and scientific inquiry from which Universities arose. He also offered to present a Tablet dedicating the Undercroft as above, and including a passage from Plato's Phaedries. On his return he presented a bust of Socrates.

The Senate chamber is a beautiful room but its acoustic properties are bad. Many efforts in the way of expensive carpets and curtains have been made to remedy this without appreciable improvement. In September 1931, I, as acting Vice-Chancellor, reported an offer from Messrs. Wood and Son to decorate the interior of the chamber in accordance with Alsop's design, without charge, on condition that the name of the firm was included in the list of Artists who have contributed work. Such a list Alsop had proposed to have placed on a small tablet in the Senate chamber. This was never done. The Senate approved of Messrs. Wood and Sons' offer and they carried out the work. The chief feature of Alsop's design was a painted frieze of Black Swans flying with outstretched straight necks, with wings at the extreme of the down stroke. It was in my opinion very effective, but the design and execution were the constant theme of sarcastic remarks, designed to show the acute artistic sense of the
speakers, until finally it was painted out. If the ex-
cutants had been known as an artist with a big A methinks
the design would still have been there, but the executant
was known to have worked as a house painter, hence the
sniffs from the superior persons which finally led to
the obliteration of the design.

About 1929, Professor Shann expressed dissatisfaction
with the then existing Committee system, and proposed
what he called, an Academic Board. His proposals were
reported in March 1930 and action deferred. In June the
Senate passed the Statute providing from the Constitution
and power of the Academic Board.

This body is dealt with in the Chapter on Senate
Committees.

In March 1931, Whitfeld was granted 6 months
leave of absence on full pay, and £250 expenses from the
surplus in the Vice-Chancellor's fund and wished a plea-
sant trip. He submitted a list of 11 Congresses which
were to be held, and agreed to attend as many as possible.

To one of these, the Congress of Universities of the Em-
pire, the Carnegie Corporation, had granted a free return
passage. Whitfeld proposed that during his absence, busi-
ness connected with the academic side be handled by Mr.
Preshaw and finance by Mr. Parker, both to consult with
the Acting Vice-Chancellor. He recommended that Murdoch
as Senior Professor be made acting Vice-Chancellor, but
"he be given as little work as possible". The Senate
referred the arrangements to the newly established Acad-
emic Board. The first meeting of the Board was to be
held at Irwin Street on second Tuesday in April, 1931.

Signs of approaching financial crises were the
announcement that the overdraft on current account with
commitments was £8,875 and on Building Account (Hackett
Buildings) was £3,070, the withholding of annual incre-
ments to the office staff to avoid dismissals and reduc-
ing expenditure on the Grounds from about £2000 per annum
to £1450 for a foreman and four gardeners.

Whitfeld had by this time departed on his trip to Europe. The history of University affairs during his absence belongs to the Chapter dealing with my turn as Acting Vice-Chancellor.

At the August 1931 meeting the Chancellor expressed the pleasure of the Senate at the return of Professor Whitfeld. The Chancellor also expressed the appreciation of the Senate for my services as Acting Vice-Chancellor. He also moved the resolution of appreciation recorded elsewhere.

I have no recollection of Whitfeld speaking to the motion.

The reception given to Whitfeld on his return to duty was a striking proof of the remarkable status conferred by the Academic Title, Vice-Chancellor. Here was a man whose conduct of University affairs as Chief Executive Officer was such that, immediately after his departure on a holiday trip to Europe, a financial crises developed which involved a serious loss of Scholarship Trust Capital. In any other sphere this would have earned, at the least, censure and possibly an invitation to resign. Instead he was received as if he had returned after having carried out some meritorious service when abroad. Whitfeld resumed his position without showing the slightest realisation that anything other than usual routine had happened during his absence.

One of the apparently most important things he brought back with him was a small statuette of Socrates. He made a ridiculous parade of this thing. He brought it several times to the Senate meetings and, it remained on his desk for a long time. I recall that one day shortly after his return I had to see him to square up some matter remaining over from what I had done during his absence. I had just completed five months of double duty. I was on the Arbitration Court Bench during the day. Immediately the
Court rose it was my custom to go to Crawley and work for the University for two or three hours. I was also at Crawley on Saturday mornings. So my nerves were somewhat on edge and when this morning on entering his room Whitfeld said something about Socrates, I felt an urge rise within me to seize the ridiculous doll and throw it out of the window. However, I restrained myself.

One of the most important discoveries he made when abroad was Will Rogers. After a previous European tour, he regaled convocation with an account of an ingenious clock he had seen at Nuremburg.

In December 1933, the Vice-Chancellor presented a memorandum to the Senate which was virtually a request for an Official residence, in view of the growth of the University. The site preferred was that on which Tuart House now stands. It is probably the finest site for a residence in W.A., convenient to frequent transport to the City and with an unsurpassed view over Matilda Bay, and the Swan estuary.

The Senate approved of the scheme. The house to cost £2000 and the rent to be £100 per year which was interest at 5% the then current rate. In May 1934, the plans were completed and the estimated cost had risen to £3000. This was an increase of 50% on what the Senate had agreed to find, and it apparently passed without comment. In July 1934 a tender by Brine and Son for the erection at a total cost of £3,438 was accepted. This was a second rise on the original grant of £2000. In December, the Vice-Chancellor submitted a list of extras which he desired. Then at last the Senate took a stand and agreed to them on condition that the total cost did not exceed £4000 just double what Whitfeld had first thought sufficient. Then arose the question of rent. The original proposal was to pay 5% on £2000, if the same rate of interest was to be charged on £4000 the rent of £200 it was held would be too high. So on the motion
of Judge Northmore, Chairman of the Finance Committee
the interest was reduced to 3% on the total cost, or
£120. This reduction in the rate of interest was justi-
ified by Sir John on the specious plea that on the total
investment of Hackett scholarship Trust Fund was so large
and most of it at about 5% the return on £4,000 could be
reduced to 3% without making an appreciable difference
to the total yield for scholarships.

There can be no doubt that in many Universities
an Official residence for the Vice Chancellor is regarded
as essential. Consequently if not an illegal use of
Trust money it was certainly unwise for I can foresee that
inevitably sooner or later some one who desires to secure
the favour of the Vice Chancellor or desires to show how
generous he can be (with other peoples money) will move
the Senate to relieve the Vice Chancellor of the rent
and forthwith the source of several bursaries will dis-
appear. This becomes every year the more likely, as the
general rate of interest decreases and the return on the
£25,000 endowment for the Vice Chancellor’s salary also
decreases.

I have heard resolutions carried making an
undertaking to pay the £120 rent, a condition of appoint-
ment for all succeeding Vice Chancellors. This was a
condition which the Senate attached to its consent to
find the £4,000 necessary for the Home, but this too will
be forgotten.

In May 1935, Mrs Whitfeld was thanked by the
Senate for £50 to pay for two wrought Iron gates for
Tuart House.

The Physics and Chemistry new Building was
opened on 25th October 1935. At this Ceremony Hon. J.M.
Drew represented the Premier and made a very fine speech.
It is a pity it has not been recorded. The total cost
was £60,114 with furniture £592.
In September 1935 Whitfeld conceived the idea of a special Broadcasting station at the University as a means of increasing Public interest in what the University was doing. He had a conference with Mr. Cleary the Chairman of the Federal Commission for Broadcasting who suggested experimenting with the ordinary University lectures. An ambitious scheme was drawn up. Lectures were to be broadcast every day during the first term of 1936, and tentative arrangements were to be made for second term. Murdoch was to arrange a programme of readings and other members of the staff to be approached for the third term. It was decided that the style of lectures was to be of same type as ordinary University lectures. No payment was to go to the Lecturer but if the Broadcasting Commission made any payment it was to go to the Library Fund. This experiment was not a success and soon petered out.

The response from the Public was unknown. Some amusement was caused in my own home by a member of my own family who had taken the English course, 6 years previously. After listening he declared it was the same lecture, word for word he had delivered over the with even the same joke about a chair repeated.

In July 1937, Whitfeld reported that lectures of general interest were being Broadcast and when the type of lecture had been developed they should be useful to senior forms and to the Public. Nothing more is heard about them.

When the estimates for 1936 were prepared it was actually anticipated there would be a surplus at the end of the year of £957. It is highly improbable that this was realised but the possibility immediately set Whitfeld’s craze for expansion in motion, and he urged the Senate to establish a Chair of Music. Judging by the Chair of Law the cost would probably have been in the neighbourhood of £2000 as well as considerable Capital cost for special buildings. It was deferred to enable Whitfeld to find out
if anyone would share the cost. At the next meeting he proposed that the cost should be shared by the Australian Broadcasting Commission. There could not have been any authority from the Commission for there had not been time. However the Senate rejected the idea by 6 votes to 5 on the casting vote of the Chancellor. The names of the voters are not recorded but at least 5 of the Senators supported the idea. Considering all the financial circumstances this is another striking illustration of the absence of any feeling of financial responsibility.

Another move by Whitfeld also resting upon the possibility of a surplus was the idea of securing the services of some of the German Jews who had been driven out of Germany by Nazi persecution. The Vice-Chancellor said that there was a possibility of the Carnegie Corporation helping with their salaries and added the Vice "we can not pay them this year but we will be able to in 1938 if things progressed." The Vice Chancellor was instructed to make enquiries. In his letter he gave an entirely unauthorised intimation to the Carnegie Corporation that "there is every likelihood of there being a permanent position at the end of two years." In the discussions it appeared there were two highly qualified refugees one an Economist and the other a Bio-Chemist. It was suggested the Economist might be used in Adult Education, I objected to this unless it was shown on trial that he had a sufficient command of English to be an effective speaker in English. The General Purposes Committee 20/4/36 agreed to the appointment of the Bio-Chemist subject to the proviso that the University will incur no permanent liability or obligation to find permanent employment. The discussion on this proviso led to the production of Whitfeld's letter of Dec, 1935
to the Carnegie Corporation. Much dissatisfaction was expressed at the wording, many holding that they committed the University to find permanent employment. To remedy this bungle I moved that no further action be taken. Rabbi Freedman successfully moved an amendment that the Carnegie Corporation be informed that we could accept no liability for continuous employment. This I think killed the project unless the employment of Dr. Teichert in the geology Department and Dr. Kaulla in Psychology are remnants. Teichert seems to have been a success but Kaulla has for about 9 years been a source of annoyance and dissatisfaction in Psychology. He had a capacity for getting round Fox and Murdoch which was difficult to understand for his manner was a disagreeable combination of truculence and subserviancy. He clearly regarded it the duty of the University to find him a job though all reports were to the effect that he made little or no effort to work in with others, some reports the Senate received from students were that he was a much better psychologist than Fowler the head of that department, some said that he was more of an engineer than a psychologist. The head of the department was most emphatic and condemnatory, "Dr. Kaulla was incompetent and refused to respond to many attempts to get him to work in." Notwithstanding all this Fox and Murdoch never refrained from advising the Senate against the Head of the Department on a matter which was entirely his responsibility. This line if taken by another Senator about a matter concerning their departments they would have strongly resented. Their influence with the Senate was such that Dr. Kaulla remained on our pay roll as a psychologist until he got a Federal job as examiner of patents. This last accomplishment seems to support Fowler's contention that he was more of an engineer than Psychologist.
In June 1936 Whitfeld reported the receipt of a letter from Dr. Keppel offering a grant to enable him and Mrs. Whitfeld to visit South Africa and Europe. He thought at first to leave immediately but decided to wait until the European winter was over. He did not leave for Europe until sometime in 1938. Ross acted in his absence, and Whitfeld returned Nov. 1938.

What was the date of the Foundation of the University? When did it begin? The Vice Chancellor raised this question in August 1936. He put various tentative dates to the Senate. Should it be the passage of the University Act which was assented to on 16th February 1911, should it be the appointment of the first Senate, 13th Feb, 1912, or the appointment of the Staff and beginning of teaching in 1913. It was decided that the foundation should date from the Gazettal of the first Senate on 13th February, 1912.

December 1936 Mrs. and Professor Whitfeld presented a Statue of Diotima to form a pair with that of Socrates in the Undercroft. According to a statement made to the Senate by Professor Whitfeld Diotima was a more or less imaginary woman of Mantinea by whom Socrates is said to have been taught.

Students' Adviser.

For some time prior to December 1936 Whitfeld had been working towards the appointment of one who was to be a Students' adviser. Repeated attempts to obtain from Whitfeld what he desired the Adviser to do had all failed. But notwithstanding this and the fact the University was being financed on overdraft the Finance Committee reported in December 1936 -

"His salary should not be more than £500, of this £350 might be secured from the present estimates and the balance must be found from the overdraft."

This was actually approved by the Senate and Whitfeld had authority to appoint an officer whose duties not a
member of the Senate could define. The statement in the Finance Committee report that £350 might be secured from the estimates meant that the amount might be squeezed by cutting down various departmental votes for books and equipment. In March 1937 Whitfeld advised that the position of Academic Secretary and Student Adviser be offered for one year to Howitson Roberts. To the motion that he be appointed Mr. W. E. Thomas moved as an amendment that the position be advertised, this was lost. Mr. Roberts had been a very promising graduate and Hackett Scholarship holder. He had a very attractive personality, was a good musician and debater etc. He had obtained an Oxford degree and during his sojourn in England had qualified as a Pilot in the Air Force. Afterwards and by the influence of Whitfeld with Dr. Keppell of the Carnegie Corporation he toured some of the American Universities. So provided there was work for an Academic Secretary and Students' Adviser to do and there was money to pay him, then Mr. Roberts seemed a satisfactory choice. In April 1938 twelve months after his appointment had been authorised and when his arrival was expected I again inquired what he was to do and a list of what he might be employed on was drawn up by Parker. In October 1938 the Finance Committee considered the position of Academic Secretary and Students' Adviser. Was it necessary and was he doing any work worth continuing? The decision was to terminate the position as from February 1939. This would save £417 on 1939 estimates. Murdoch attempted unsuccessfully to have the matter referred to the Professorial Board. In October 1938 the Finance Committee decided that the officer was unnecessary. This after 6 months trial. His engagement to terminate as from February, 1939.
In November 1938 Whitfeld returned to duty. He was very full of what he had seen in America of work done by the Students on a voluntary basis for the University. This was an exact and complete repetition of his views after his return in 1931. They were to clear the sports ovals, form roads, work in the gardens, wait at the Refectory, assist with Tutorials etc. etc. He bought about £20 worth of Axes, mattocks, shovels etc. The students response was to chop down some of the scrub and then like so many of Whitfeld's impracticable ideas the effort petered out. The scrub had to be cleared up by the Gardeners.

The Senate gave serious consideration to the financial position and gravely announced its opposition to any increase to the Bank overdraft and at the November and December meetings 1938 great efforts were made to reduce the estimates but nothing was accomplished beyond certain petty reductions in books and equipment. Notwithstanding this Murdoch succeeded at the December 1938 meeting in reversing the October decision to terminate the office of Student Adviser in favour of a three years' appointment at £500 per annum. This increased the annual deficit by at least that amount. At the same meeting Mr. Badger who had been Director of Adult Education resigned as he had secured a better position in Melbourne. Notwithstanding all the emphasis which had been laid on the peculiar fitness of Mr. Roberts for the position of Students' Adviser and the fact that under Whitfeld's guidance he had been by travel in America and other ways qualifying for the position, immediately Mr. Badger's resignation was announced Whitfeld secured the transference of Roberts to the position of Director of Adult Education.

(See University History 1938, p.19 26/1/39)
The Acting Vice Chancellor reported to the March 1940 meeting that he had accepted the resignation of Mr. Roberts who had obtained a position at the University of Iowa, U.S.A.

To the March meeting Whitfeld propounded a cranky scheme by which the unemployed youth were to attend certain classes at the University. Needless to say nothing came of it. To the April 1939 meeting Whitfeld presented another long memorandum about the development at Crawley of a Youth Centre. To the June meeting Whitfeld presented another long memorandum on part time work for students.

18th On July 1939 Whitfeld went into the Mount Hospital for an operation for Hernia and died on July 31st. It was indicative of his modesty and self-effacement that few of his associates in University work knew that he was suffering from such a complaint. After his death Mr. Parker told me that he had suffered for long and only consented to the operation when the affliction had grown so as to make it difficult and painful for him to drive his car. On his death Dr. Battye the Chancellor on his own authority appointed Professor Beasley the then Chairman of the Professorial Board and for that reason, to be acting Vice Chancellor. In a letter dated 24th August, 1939 addressed to Professor Nicholls, the Acting Vice Chancellor says -

"Whitfeld went into Hospital in the middle of July for an operation for Hernia and although the operation was quite successful and does not seem to have caused him unusual discomfort he had trouble with his heart a few days later. For a time things went badly with him but towards the end of July he seemed to be pulling round when on the 30th a severe heart attack occurred late in the evening. On the following day, the 31st a second heart attack occurred early in the afternoon and in his weakened state proved too much for him. He died shortly after 5 p.m."
ANNOUNCEMENTS by the CHANCELLOR.

Matters in connection with the death of the Vice-Chancellor (Professor H. E. Whitfeld)

Members of the Senate stood in silence while the Chancellor expressed the general sorrow of members of the University at the death of the Vice-Chancellor on 31st July.

The Chancellor stated that the following resolutions had been carried by the Committees:

The General Purposes Committee decided to express its very deep regret at the death of the Vice-Chancellor (Professor H.E. Whitfeld), and to record in the minutes its sense of his loss, and to convey to Mrs. Whitfeld its deepest sympathy in the loss which she has suffered as well.

The Finance Committee decided to place on record its regret at the death of the Vice-Chancellor (Professor H. E. Whitfeld) and to express to Mrs. Whitfeld its sympathy with her in the loss she has sustained.

The Chancellor then read the following statement:

"Professor H.E. Whitfeld, Vice-Chancellor, went into the Mount Hospital on the 18th July for Surgical treatment. The operation was successful, but heart trouble supervening, Professor Whitfeld died on 31st July.

On the 1st August the "West Australian" published as a sub-leader the following appreciation of Professor Whitfeld's life and good work:

"To past and present members of the University of Western Australia the news of the death of the Vice-Chancellor, Professor Whitfeld, will come with a deep sense of sorrow and personal loss. Of very few men who have faithfully occupied great positions can it be honestly said that they had not an enemy in the world. But Professor Whitfeld's unvarying charm of manner was the natural expression of an unvarying kindliness of heart which the youngest student and the most senior of his colleagues can remember with gratitude. With this personal charm the Vice-Chancellor combined great tenacity of purpose. His mind was fertile and original in ideas, and he had the power of enlisting co-operation in his schemes even from those who were uncertain of their practicability, for his plans were always generously conceived, they were ideals expressed in action, and very few people found themselves able to refuse a personal appeal to work with him. So far as any one individual could meet the varied demands of such a post, Professor Whitfeld was the ideal executive head of a new-born university. He had a noble educational gospel, which he made very persuasive with teachers and students, for first he followed it himself."
He stood for intellectual integrity and free inquiry, and it was said of him that he never closed either his mind or his door. And in a community of necessity very preoccupied with the utilitarian claims of life and before young students most of them beset very closely with material problems, he upheld most clearly and strongly and of deep personal conviction the spiritual values of life and the claims of whatsoever is lovely, honourable and of good report. Our young University is deeply impregnated with his personality. Professor Whitfield had a very keen sense of the University’s duty to the community, and never ceased to devise fresh schemes whereby this duty could be done in some new way. In this matter he was thinking as much for the growth and soundness of the University’s own tradition as of the well-being of the state. The University and the state owe the departed Vice-Chancellor a gratitude that they can best acknowledge by giving his successor, whoever he may be, all possible help in carrying forward the standards and ideals that Professor Whitfield maintained."

And now having recorded the University events during his occupancy of the position of Vice-Chancellor What of the man? I have possibly given the impression of being unduly censorious. I would desire to avoid that. I am writing a history of the University and it is no part of such a work to gloss over what the writer believes to be serious errors of judgment and mistaken policy. This is not the place for flattery or undue blame. I have given much detail. Much that is unnecessary can be eliminated. My excuse for including some of the matter is that after spending time and effort in tracking down some date or fact it is difficult to decide if it is too trivial to recount or discard. If to any reader there is too much detail for interested reading this writing may to him serve as a chronological table.

By reason of his long occupancy of the Vice-Chancellorship, Whitfield had a great influence on the History of the University. But his influence appeared to be greater than it really was. His influence was not positive or directive but rather passive. He never realised that he had a duty to watch the interests of his employer the Senate, when those interests did not coincide with the desires of the Staff as a whole or of any member of it. Each and every request for more
assistance and higher pay always had his support no matter what financial stringency might exist. A critical examination of such proposals from the Senate point of view was never supplied. The Senate carries all financial responsibility and unless its chief executive Officer gives impartial and detached advice on all proposals emanating from the Professorial Board or any member of the Staff, the Senate cannot give properly balanced and informed decisions.

During the early years when the Professors were acting as Vice Chancellors in an honorary capacity the Senators felt this want. It was recognised as expecting too much of human nature to expect Professors to adequately examine proposals put forward by a fellow Professor. Paterson did it sometimes and repelled unpopularity for his pains. So the appointment of a full time and fully paid Vice Chancellor was welcomed. Now, we said, we will get detached advice, but were doomed to disappointment.

As an administrator he was not a success. As a fact he did not administer the University affairs, in the ordinary meaning of the word administer at all, they simply drifted. He never seemed to be clear in his own mind on any financial detail and whenever in Committee or the Senate he was asked a question he invariably passed the question on to Mr. Parker who fortunately and in contrast with his chief was rarely in doubt. The result was that the finances of the University were in a constant state of muddle varied by two periods of acute crises. The first major crisis was when the Hackett buildings were in course of erection. This had to be cleaned up, at considerable Capital loss, by others during Whitfelds absence in Europe on holiday. The second financial crisis arose
immediately after his death when others again had to bring order out of muddle.

He had curious and unorthodox ideas as to what it was proper to do with funds which had been allotted to a specific purpose. All that weighed with him was, was the objective on which Whitfeld thought desirable for the University. He persistently refused to face the fact that if any of his projects he proposed to finance with Scholarship Trust money, failed to yield dividends then deserving students would be deprived of the assistance they were entitled to.

Temperamentally Whitfeld was entirely unsuited for the position of Vice Chancellor. The University role for which both by temperament and academic attainments he was peculiarly fitted was that of Lecturer in Classics. There he would have been able to sit and dream and con the wit and wisdom of the ancients to his heart's content.

Those responsible for his selection for the position of Vice Chancellor did both him and the University a disservice.

I must of course shoulder my own share in the responsibility. I can only plead that at the time of his appointment his capacity as an administrator was unknown but was assumed to be good because of his high Academic Engineering Degrees. But notwithstanding all his faults as an administrator Whitfeld the man had some quality which attracted and charmed even those who were frequently exasperated by his methods. His pleasant smile was always ready, and to opposition he was always passive but not necessarily yielding for there was a stubborn streak in his character. When men such as James and Northmore were critical and sarcastic about some one of his numerous projects I have seen the red flush of anger suffuse his face but there was no outburst in words. His anger was always suppressed and the ready smile disarmed the opponent.
I do not remember ever to have heard him laugh he
never got beyond a broad, but silent grin. This wide
knowledge of classical wisdom had begot in him a broad
tolerance. Whatever was the source of his charm the
writer was early in their association brought under it
and remained so notwithstanding I was an active critic.

After his death it was my privilege to secure for
him a memorial which will last as long as the University.
At the Senate meeting, September, 1940 I moved in per-
suance of notice,

"That the area of land bounded on the North by
Stirling Highway, on the South by Winthrop Hall,
on the East by Hackett Hall and on the West by the
Administrative building be named Whitfeld Court."

This was, of course, carried unanimously. Then Mr.
Gillett moved successfully that a suitable plaque should
be erected stating that the area has been named Whitfeld
Court and that the Grounds Committee be requested to re-
port there on.

My idea of the plaque was a natural weather worn
granite boulder from the Darling range, but as there was
no means by which this could be transported to the site
I had to be content with a granite slab weighing about
half a ton. On a smoothed panel is inscribed in 6 inch
letters the words "WHITFELD COURT" this is surrounded by
a border conventionally roughened by the Mason. Mr.
the architect who had the stone prepared by Messrs. Wilson
and Grey, Monumental Masons, got me to select the type
of lettering. My selection looked all right in print,
but on the stone it seems too light. I would have pre-
ferred the lettering to be bolder and more deeply cut.
However, as it is, it is as everlasting as the turf in
which it is bedded, and it will keep Whitfeld's memory
alive long after his faults and his virtues are forgotten.
Prior to moving the Senate in the matter I informed Mrs.
Whitfeld of what I proposed to do and she declared she
was delighted with the idea.
The stone was placed in the position in the centre of the semi circular sloping bank in what was previously known as the Court of Honour under my supervision by Mr. Dowell assisted by several men from Messrs. Wilson & Grey's yard early in December 1940. As the act of placing the stone in position was in accordance with Senate decision I did not think any further ceremony was necessary, but according to Dr. Battye, Mrs. Whitfeld desired an unveiling ceremony and accordingly he arranged one. This took place in my absence (I was in Darwin) on Monday, 21st July, 1941.

Note in 1946 The stone was placed in position by me sometime in December 1940, it was then the blue grey of the Darling Range granite. The lawn around it is watered from a well in University grounds, this water contains iron, the iron has stained the stone red in the same way that it has the lower part of all wall of limestone up as far as the sprinklers reach.

The short sub-leader published in the "West Australian" which was incorporated in the Senate Minutes of August 1939 was written by Professor Murdoch. Apart from this the only matter in the way of an estimate of eulogy of Whitfeld's character which has been published is that written by Mr. Colin Badger for the "Australian Quarterly" of December 1939. The essential portions of the article are as follows:-

HUBERT WHITFELD - 1875-1939 - By C.R. Badger.

"My own acquaintance with Hubert Whitfeld, late the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Western Australia was brief, yet his personality so impressed itself on me in the short time that I was privileged to know him, that his passing affects me as the loss of one long known and revered. It was, indeed, impossible for any young man to resist Whitfeld. He charmed, as Socrates charmed. His infectious gaiety of spirit and of mind dissolved any barrier of years between him and the youngest of his "lads" as he delighted to call them and yet his wisdom was that of the experienced, his thought impinged on the mind, left its trace, or rather, its seed, to grow and fructify.

His love of Greek culture and civilization was no affectation, for affectation of any sort was alien
The other matter is on p.337 where you refer to a short subleader on Whitfeld's death which was incorporated in the Senate Minutes and which was "written by Professor Murdoch". If we are both referring to the same sub-leader (and I think there was only one) it was written by Kenneth Henderson. I remember the circumstances well. I occasionally did Foreign Leader to help Henderson when he was very busy and I had called to see him on the day of Whitfeld's death. We discussed Whitfeld's characteristics and I recall using a phrase which Henderson worked into his leader - something to the effect that Whitfeld's greatest merit in my experience of him was that his mind was never closed to an idea nor his door to a member of his staff.

The above is an extract from a letter to me from Prof. Alexander in 1947 after he had read the first volume of my M.A.

The sub leader is referred to is given on page 333-4.
to him. And yet it was unexpected. He was trained as an engineer, and became at University administrator, but he was a philosopher by choice. His keen mind retained much of the groundwork of the sciences, but he could never view the sciences except with the eye of philosophy. It was imperative for him to view all his problems from this aspect, and the little statuette of Socrates, which stood always on his desk, stood to me for the symbol and indication of the way his mind worked. For he worked and thought Socratically, sometimes indeed, giving to those who did not follow his subtle mind, an impression of dilatoriness and even of a certain intellectual trickishness.

Whitfield had a remarkable gift in relating his beloved Greeks to the modern world. Often, when I had to consult him upon some minor administrative point, he would dispatch the business rapidly and turn with a seeming impatience to begin a discussion on Plato and the modern states system. He had, I think, been making a special study in 1936 of the Republic and the Gorgias and was quick to point out parallels and to draw Socratic conclusions. I have never met a scholar who made the Greeks live in his way, though he was no pedant and cared nothing at all for the niceties of scholarship.

His talk on America (on his return in 1931) and his experiences there was a revelation of the man. One naturally expected a good deal of semi-sociological observation and perhaps to hear something of academic life and progress. Undoubtedly he learned much there, which he meant to apply for the good of his own University but his talk and his mind ran on Will Rogers whom he had apparently discovered on this tour. It was characteristic of him. He had chosen for his study, for the type man of the American genus, this wise, witty, unaffected man of the people. For Rogers his enthusiasm was unbounded and in his lively talk about him one glimpsed what he had thought and seen of the American people at their best. Rogers would, of course, appeal to him, one saw, when he had made the point, for it was Whitfield's way to think in symbols and especially to find human personifications of the values which meant most to him.

Of his work for the University of Western Australia itself, I am not competent to speak. It expressed, however, in its external aspects, a good deal of Whitfield's taste and feeling, especially in its simplicity and ordered harmony. His was not a dominating personality, yet he leaves his mark in the spirit of the place. He was fortunate in his co-builders, and especially in Walter Murdoch and William Somerville, for to these three, with the generous benefactor Winthrop Hackett, Australia owes a very remarkable University.

Whitfield's conception of a University was generous. He had no patience with the idea that it should be a semi-cloister. He was forever urging and fostering extra-mural activities, and sought constantly to make the influence of the University felt in every part of the State. Unlike most of the State Universities, which are known by the name of their capital cities the University of Western Australia bears the name of its State, and Whitfield was deeply concerned that this should be more than a token recognition of obligation. He devoted himself to Adult Education activities and took the keenest delight in the success of the schemes he fostered, even when their success pressed heavily on the meagre budget.
It is, possibly, unfortunate that the achievement of the University of Western Australia is so little known in Australia itself. Whitfield was a very modest man, and never sought the limelight. The round of purely official calls and duties seemed to distress him, his delight was in the conversation of those who understood his rare gifts and who loved, as he did, simple things. He cut, I think, no great figure in conferences, conventions and delegations, and possibly for this reason his name was not much bruited abroad. But to those who knew him, and to those who come after him in his place, Whitfield's name must always stand as a symbol for the highest achievement in Australia's academic life. His was a rare spirit, we are poor by reason of his loss.

=====

PROFESSOR ROSS.

Professor Ross was selected for the Chair of Mathematics and Physics, largely because of the very enlogistic references from important people to his research work in both subjects, together with an impressive list of articles by him which he had published in technical journals.

In the confidential report from the English Selection Committee consisting of Cyril Jackson and Sir Newton Moore, they say -

"A.D. Ross we saw at Glasgow. He is very scotch - a nice little man - keen and pleasant, and I think with lots of go. Gregory says he is decidedly good and he goes to him for information and finds he knows his subjects. He is a physics man. He is keen on magnetism and Astronomy. He would do, as between him and Harrison, it depends on whether you want Physics or Mathematics most."

In his application Dr. Ross sets out that he was born in Glasgow in 1883. In 1899 when 16 years of age he became a pupil Teacher in the Dundas Vale Training College and after completing a two years course he underwent at the same institution the full course in the theory and practice of education prescribed for Kings scholars. In 1906 I was recognised by the Scotch education Department as a certified Teacher and I have practiced in the teaching of classes in both elementary and secondary schools I also held the Diploma in Education of the University of Glasgow with distinction in Mathematics and Science.

After completing my school education, I pro-
ceeded to the University of Glasgow where I graduated M.A. and Doctor of Science. I am also a B.Sc. and Honoursman in Physics of the University of London.

At Glasgow I was a prizeman in all my science subjects. Among the distinctions gained during my undergraduate courses was the Joseph Black medal and the Muirhead Prize in Chemistry and the Thomson experimental scholarship in Physics. In 1905 the University appointed me a research student and soon after I was awarded the Houldsworth Research fellowship of the value of £300.

After completing my course at the Glasgow University I proceeded to Gottingen University with a view to further study in Mathematics and Physics.

In 1907 I was appointed assistant to the Professor of Natural Philosophy in the University of Glasgow.

During the last eight years I have been continuously engaged in research both independently and in collaboration with others.

During the World War No. 2 Professor Ross did much valuable work for the Army, Navy and Air Forces in connection with Camouflage and Optics.

This work at the time of this writing (1946) is I believe, confidential, at least no account of it has been published, and so cannot be described here.

All the University men I have known who were entitled to use the prefix Dr. have made full use of it. Those who were Professors were addressed as often as Doctor as Professor. But not so Ross. I do not remember one occasion hearing him spoken to as Doctor. Until I re-read his application I had forgotten he was entitled the prefix. None of his associates would suspect Ross of a shrinking modesty so what is the explanation?
PROFESSOR ROSS'S WAR WORK.

In the absence of any more exact description of his efforts to help the state with its war effort the attached news cutting is of value.

It is a matter for regret that a similar account of his work in connection with Camouflage is not available.

PRECISION WORK - UNIVERSITY'S WAR JOB - "Tremendous Amount Learnt".

"Work done at the University of Western Australia during the war in manufacturing gauges used in the making of lenses for precision optical equipment was described at the weekly luncheon of the Rotary Club on Friday by Professor A.D. Ross.

Before the war, said Professor Ross, all precision optical equipment used in Australia had been imported, and in that field the Germans were regarded as pre-eminent, with the Americans in second place.

PANEL FORMED IN 1940.

In 1940, the Optical Munitions Panel was formed, and its first task was to copy faithfully the best types of instruments then in use. Fortunately, although Australia had large quantities of materials suitable for making glass, sufficient glass had been imported from overseas to meet Australia's needs. Then, as modifications became necessary, the panel had to produce prototypes to give to manufacturers.

In February of the following year, the panel asked the speaker to plan some optical work in Western Australia. Firstly, it wished to make the greatest use of all available resources and, secondly, to establish optical works here in the event of this State becoming cut off because of an extension of the war. For this latter reason, optical work had been brought to a high state of development in Hobart. Many difficulties presented themselves, and one of the chief was in regard to the transportation of glass should the threatened emergency arise. As an alternative, Professor Ross had suggested the manufacture, not of the actual lenses, but of the gauges used in their manufacture. This meant taking on a much more exacting job, as the gauges required an accuracy of three-millionths of an inch, which was much greater than that of the actual lenses. In August, a contract was given in this State for £500 worth of gauges, and in two or three years up to £3,000 worth had been produced.

Such was the accuracy required in testing curvature of lenses, that it was impossible to use a contact method, as the points of the gauge would sink into the glass. Instead, measurements had to be made by measuring the air space between the gauge and the surface of the glass, which was done by observing the colour effects produced in this space by the interference of light. The gauges were guaranteed for an accuracy of 2½ millionths of an inch, but were probably much more accurate. So accurate had processes for making lenses become that they had outstripped the precision of mechanical work.
Another type of work done in this State was the cleaning and reconditioning of binoculars impressed by the Government. The 25 girls who were engaged in this work (none of whom had had any previous experience) adapted themselves extremely well, and in 3 years 10,000 binoculars had been reconditioned at the University. In addition, checks were made of the magnification of lenses so that binoculars could be used in the field for making accurate estimates. Chemical process had been developed by chemists and botanists in the Eastern States for combating fungi, which caused great damage to lenses in the tropics. The most damaging of these fungi etched the surface of the lens and rendered it useless. These developments were applied in work done at the University of Western Australia.

JUNGLE TELESCOPIC SIGHT.

Other important optical developments in Australia during the war included a new type of jungle telescopic sight, which, besides allowing mortars to be fired through the moving branches of trees, had the advantage that it could be quickly pulled apart and rendered useless to the enemy. A graduate of the University of Western Australia working in Canberra had cut down the number of lenses necessary in a certain instrument from the 14 required in the imported article of eight.

The problem of light losses through reflection from the surface of lenses had been tackled on the basis of prior overseas research, and valuable results had been achieved, especially from a naval point of view. Vessels being paid off by the Navy at Fremantle would have their optical equipment dismantled and sent to the University for treatment. Such reflection losses were greatest submarine periscopes with their large number of glass surfaces, and formerly over 80 per cent of the light had been lost - a very important matter, since the time preferred for launching torpedoes was at dawn or twilight. Light losses in periscopes had now been cut to 19 per cent.
exercises are designed to be demonstrations of the properties and uses of these materials, but at the same time, are carefully selected and designed to allow a gradual development of the student's manual dexterity and his acquaintance with the various technical procedures. This approach allows the student to acquire the necessary techniques based on sound knowledge of the materials involved.

23rd 1920 Mr. W. K. Hancock was appointed for one year. This grant must soon become manifest in August of the same year the appointment was extended to 9 years.

During the war years 1914-18 the granting of Rhodes scholarships had been limited to that by 1920 funds had accumulated of the Trystin offered an additional 12 known as the 1921 Austrian scholarship or as the cheltenham Rhodes scholarship. This was awarded to Mr. Hancock, from Oxford he went on to further honours, Professor of Modern History cheltenham 1924-29 from professor of Economic History at Oxford.
1. That the University should proceed with the permanent Science Buildings under the University Buildings Act, which allows a maximum expenditure of £60,000 on buildings.


3. That a Building Committee be appointed to consider matters in connection with the building scheme, and to work in consultation with Professor Ross and Professor Wilsmore.

The Committee to consist of the following:
- Chancellor
- Pro-Chancellor
- Vice-Chancellor
- Sir John Northmore

Confirmed.

In June 1928 on the motion of Murdoch Whitfeld was granted an entertainment allowance of £100 for 1928. Future years to be considered when same idea of probable cost was known. This was continued for a number of years but as he was seldom known to entertain anybody it was finally cancelled.

Neither Whitfeld nor Mrs. Whitfeld had any talent nor, I believe, any desire for social functions.

In May 1929 James gave notice to move that the Vice-Chancellor be granted his long leave of absence and that any previous resolution dealing with the matter be modified accordingly. When this came on for discussion it was withdrawn and the following carried -

"That the question of long service leave to Vice-Chancellor be dealt with when application is made unaffected by any previous decision of the Senate on the matter."

The significance of these moves is hidden, but I have good reason for the surmise that James and Northmore were becoming anxious about Whitfeld's handling of the financing of the Hackett Buildings. James became Chancellor in March 1929, in March 1930 Northmore nominated to be Chancellor against Bettye for Pro-Chancellor, a rather unusual event, and beat him. Bettye up to then had been Chairman of
Finance Committee and equally responsible with Whitfeld for the finances). The change from Contract to Cost, plus commission which Alsop and Whitfeld had supported was causing anxiety, although Brine and Son, the Contractors, had reported in June 1930 as having saved up to that time £5,590. In November 1930, it was reported to the Senate that the money to pay for the buildings was almost exhausted and before the end of the week it would be necessary to draw on permanent endowments to pay wages. This could only be done by a special Act of Parliament, and the attention of the Government be directed to the urgency for this, or alternatively the Government be asked for the £25,000 promised as a refund of part of the £28,300 paid as Hackett Estate duties. Then follows the choice bit of Whitfelding finance -

"November 1930 when money for building is exhausted then money from the permanent Trust (scholarship) should be paid into a new special account so that it will not be necessary to draw on the permanent endowment."

As the only endowment remaining after the Building endowment was exhausted, where the allocations for Maintenance, Vice-Chancellor and Scholarships, this is a particularly immoral proposal, for when made it was absolutely illegal.

Unfortunately to get the Hackett Buildings finished we had ultimately to raid the Trust Funds and sell Commonwealth stock when, in the depth of the Depression, it was down to something about £89 per 100 stock. But this was done legally, after proper process of Law by which the Consent of the Supreme Court had been obtained. Provision was also made for repayment.

Notwithstanding these and other signs of approaching financial crises threatening to stop all building, Whitfeld went on with his arrangements for his journey to the other side of the World. His behaviour is hard to understand. The natural reaction of a conscientious man to the evident approach of an extra difficult period is
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1. That the University should proceed with the permanent Science Buildings under the University Buildings Act, which allows a maximum expenditure of £60,000 on buildings.


3. That a Building Committee be appointed to consider matters in connection with the building scheme, and to work in consultation with Professor Ross and Professor Wilsome.

The Committee to consist of the following:—


Confirmed.

In June 1928 on the motion of Murdoch Whitfield was granted an entertainment allowance of £100 for 1928. Future years to be considered when same idea of probable cost was known. This was continued for a number of years but as he was seldom known to entertain anybody it was finally cancelled.

Neither Whitfield nor Mrs. Whitfield had any talent nor, I believe, any desire for social functions.

In May 1929 James gave notice to more that the Vice-Chancellor be granted his long leave of absence and that any previous resolution dealing with the matter be modified accordingly. When this came on for discussion it was withdrawn and the following carried:—

"That the question of long service leave to Vice Chancellor be dealt with when application is made unaffected by any previous decision of the Senate on the matter."

The significance of these moves is hidden, but I have good reason for the surmise that James and Northmore were becoming anxious about Whitfield's handling of the financing of the Hackett Buildings. James became Chancellor in March 1929. In March 1930 Northmore became Pro Chancellor.
1. That the University should proceed with the permanent Science Buildings under the University Buildings Act, which allows a maximum expenditure of £60,000 on buildings.


3. That a Building Committee be appointed to consider matters in connection with the building scheme, and to work in consultation with Professor Ross and Professor Wilsmore.

The Committee to consist of the following:-


Confirmed.

-----

In June 1928 on the motion of Murdoch Whitfeld was granted an entertainment allowance of £100 for 1928. Future years to be considered when same idea of probable cost was known. This was continued for a number of years but as he was seldom known to entertain anybody it was finally cancelled.

Neither Whitfeld nor Mrs. Whitfeld had any talent nor, I believe, any desire for social functions.

In May 1929 James gave notice to more that the Vice-Chancellor be granted his long leave of absence and that any previous resolution dealing with the matter be modified accordingly. When this came on for discussion it was withdrawn and the following carried:-

"That the question of long service leave to Vice Chancellor be dealt with when application is made unaffected by any previous decision of the Senate on the matter."

The significance of these moves is hidden, but I have good reason for the surmise that James and Northmore were becoming anxious about Whitfeld's handling of the financing of the Hackett Buildings. James became Chancellor in March 1929. In March 1930 Northmore became Pro Chancellor.
The change from Contract to Cost, plus commission which Alsop and Whitfeld had supported was causing anxiety, although Brine and Son, the Contractors, had reported in June 1930 as having saved up to that time £5,590. In November 1930, it was reported to the Senate that the money to pay for the buildings was almost exhausted and before the end of the week it would be necessary to draw on permanent endowments to pay wages. This could only be done by a special Act of Parliament, and the attention of the Government be directed to the urgency for this, or alternatively the Government be asked for the £25,000 promised as a refund of part of the £28,300 paid as Hackett Estate duties. Then follows the choice bit of Whitfelding finance:

"November 1930 when money for building is exhausted then money from the permanent Trust (scholarship) should be paid from a new special account so that it will not be necessary to draw on the permanent endowment."

As the only endowment remaining after the Building endowment was exhausted, where the allocations for Maintenance, Vice-Chancellor and Scholarships, this is a particularly immoral proposal, for when made it was absolutely illegal.

Unfortunately to get the Hackett Buildings finished we had ultimately to raid the Trust Funds and sell Commonwealth stock when, in the depth of the Depression, it was down to something about £89 per 100 stock. But this was done legally, after proper process of Law by which the Consent of the Supreme Court had been obtained. Provision was also made for repayment.

Notwithstanding these and other signs of approaching financial crises threatening to stop all building, Whitfeld went on with his arrangements for his journey to the other side of the World. His behaviour is hard to understand. The natural reaction of a conscientious man to the evident approach of an extra difficult period is
The change from Contract to Cost, plus commission which Alcock and Whitfeld had supported was causing anxiety, although Brine and Son, the Contractors, had reported in June 1930 as having saved up to that time £5,590. In November 1930, it was reported to the Senate that the money to pay for the buildings was almost exhausted and before the end of the week it would be necessary to draw on permanent endowments to pay wages. This could only be done by a special Act of Parliament, and the attention of the Government be directed to the urgency for this, or alternatively the Government be asked for the £25,000 promised as a refund of part of the £28,300 paid as Hackett Estate duties. Then follows the choice bit of Whitfelding finance -

"November 1930 when money for building is exhausted then money from the permanent Trust (scholarship) should be paid from a new special account so that it will not be necessary to draw on the permanent endowment."

As the only endowment remaining after the Building endowment was exhausted, where the allocations for Maintenance, Vice-Chancellor and Scholarships, this is a particularly immoral proposal, for when made it was absolutely illegal.

Unfortunately to get the Hackett Buildings finished we had ultimately to raid the Trust Funds and sell Commonwealth stock when, in the depth of the Depression, it was down to something about £89 per 100 stock. But this was done legally, after proper process of Law by which the Consent of the Supreme Court had been obtained. Provision was also made for repayment.

Notwithstanding these and other signs of approaching financial crises threatening to stop all building, Whitfeld went on with his arrangements for his journey to the other side of the World. His behaviour is hard to understand. The natural reaction of a conscientious man to the evident approach of an extra difficult period is
The change from Contract to Cost, plus commission which Agrop and Whitfeld had supported was causing anxiety, although Brine and Son, the Contractors, had reported in June 1930 as having saved up to that time £5,590. In November 1930, it was reported to the Senate that the money to pay for the buildings was almost exhausted and before the end of the week it would be necessary to draw on permanent endowments to pay wages. This could only be done by a special Act of Parliament, and the attention of the Government be directed to the urgency for this, or alternatively the Government be asked for the £25,000 promised as a refund of part of the £28,300 paid as Hackett Estate duties. Then follows the choice bit of Whitfelding finance -

"November 1930 when money for building is exhausted then money from the permanent Trust (scholarship) should be paid from a new special account so that it will not be necessary to draw on the permanent endowment."

As the only endowment remaining after the Building endowment was exhausted, where the allocations for Maintenance, Vice-Chancellor and Scholarships, this is a particularly immoral proposal, for when made it was absolutely illegal.

Unfortunately to get the Hackett Buildings finished we had ultimately to raid the Trust Funds and sell Commonwealth stock when, in the depth of the Depression, it was down to something about £39 per 100 stock. But this was done legally, after proper process of Law by which the Consent of the Supreme Court had been obtained. Provision was also made for repayment.

Notwithstanding these and other signs of approaching financial crises threatening to stop all building, Whitfeld went on with his arrangements for his journey to the other side of the World. His behaviour is hard to understand. The natural reaction of a conscientious man to the evident approach of an extra difficult period is
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Dear Mr. Chandler:

I am writing to inform you of my recent movements. The Two Golden Lions, to which I am referred to for purposes of correspondence, and to which I was introduced by my friend, Mr. D., will be a continued feature in my life. I shall continue to work with them, and I shall be in touch with you personally regarding their affairs. I am glad to hear that you are well and that you are enjoying your retirement.

I hope to see you soon, and I look forward to our next meeting. Please let me know if there is anything I can do to assist you.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

P.S. I am enclosing a letter from my father, who has just arrived from the States. He would like to see you as soon as possible.

[Date: 11/12/54]
Dear Professor,

I agree that the first assignment approved in the Department of History.

Two weeks ago, you sent me a letter dated 1/9, informing me that a

same procedure reader the letter.

Since then, I have not seen you or the students. However, I have

been working on a research paper for the next semester.

I hope to see you soon.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

John Doe
In much haste,

Board of Regents

[Signature]

[Handwritten note]

Dear Dr. [Name],

Please consider the future of female education in the light of recent progress andullet and may I see you at 12? I'd also welcome the opportunity for a short conversation with you.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

[Handwritten note]

The affair...
Dear Somerville,

Though I am no longer engaged on the reading of your MS for publication purposes, I have been giving myself an odd hour with it and have much enjoyed the section of the chapter dealing with the first professors, which is contained in the volume I have. I thought you had caught Wilmore very well. Of the treatment of both Shann and Whitfeld I would make one common criticism: they appear rather too much as seen from the administration angle. In neither case have you felt it necessary to seek impressions as to their teaching ability. In Shann's case I think this was one of his strongest points. He managed to convey something of his enthusiasm to his students, particularly in his pre-Bank of New South Wales days. I came to Perth when he was still known as "Bolshie Teddy" and as I was not much older than his former students I heard a good deal of this inspirational side of his teaching and of his relations with his students outside classrooms.

Of Whitfeld I cannot speak with the same degree of knowledge of his students but I have the impression very strongly that he left them with more than an impression of his charm but gave them an approach to life which made them not only engineers but members of the community. All those weaknesses which you detected in his administration tended to enhance his value to students; he seems to have thrown things at them and forced them to work out the answers for themselves, coming along with another idea and yet another for them to chew over before they had had time to be some rigidly fixed with the first.

Two minor points. You say at page 195, 5 lines from the bottom, that "the first assistant appointed" in the department of History
From Professor Albertine

*Dear Sir,*

I have just received your letter of the 20th instant, and I trust to be able to comply with your request as soon as possible. I have been working hard on the reading of your work, and I am no longer engaged on the reading of your text.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Dear Mr. Somervell,

Your suggestion will be separately registered post. I regret that I am returning your manuscript by
publication of your work.

I am unable to recommend financial assistance for the
Commonwealth Literary Fund for the publication of your
Commonwealth Literary Fund for the publication of your
Commonwealth Literary Fund. Your application for financial assistance from the
Commonwealth Literary Fund, Prime Minister’s Department.

Commonwealth of Australia,

30 April 1929

Secretary
H. S. Temple

MOSMAN PARK, W. A.
2 Albert Street
D. M. Somervell