

Registers
7.7.16

THE UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE

EXAMINATION RESULTS

Ordinary examination for the Degrees of Bachelor of Medicine and Bachelor of Surgery, June, 1916:—Fifth Year.—Pass List (in order of merit).—First Class—None. Second Class—Burnell, Glen Howard; Southwood, Albert Ray; Black, Geoffrey Howard. Third Class—Plotz, Oscar Arnold; Abbott, Nigel Basil Grenley; Shipway, Graham Stuart; Burden, Clive Britten.

Registers 6.7.16.

THE UNIVERSITY.

A QUESTION OF SITE.

The problem of providing for the expansion of the Adelaide University was again considered by the North-terrace Reserves Commission at Parliament House on Wednesday, when Professor E. C. Stirling, Dean of the Faculty of Medicine, gave evidence. He said the present building was too good to be pulled down, not large enough to be adequate, and too big to be added to in its present grounds. At the same time he strongly favored the retention of the site on North-terrace, which, in his opinion, with the proposed additions in land, would meet all requirements for the next hundred years at least. There were present Messrs. Smeaton (chairman), Carr, Cooke, Laffer, Green, and O'Connor.

Asked what principle had guided the council in the past in its plans of extension, Professor Stirling remarked that as each department from time to time had imperatively demanded more room arrangements had been made, so far as funds would permit, to add to the buildings in the way which seemed most convenient at the period. However, he did not think such a course would be followed now. Had the originators of the University been bold enough they should have designed larger premises, which need not have been elaborate, but would have permitted of additions. At the same time attention could have been paid to a certain amount of dignity in outward appearance.

The Chairman—In this case the authorities thought they would put on a front first and add to it?

The Witness—That is where I think they made their great mistake.

Realising that you have only $\frac{1}{2}$ acres now, and that the possibilities of the case do not seem to offer more than a further 6 acres, would that area accommodate all the buildings required?—I think so, at all events, for the next 100 years ahead, provided we abandoned our previous notions of building haphazardly and began on regular lines.

In Sydney the buildings are distributed with certain spaces between them. Are the divisions too great between the various houses.—I think they could have compressed the buildings into a smaller area.

That would practically mean going away with the quadrangle. Would it be wise, from the point of view of a dignified appearance, to achieve that accommodation at the expense of spaciousness?—It is largely, I think, a question of general convenience. As a situation, I prefer our University, which is in a place where it can make its influence better felt, and I know the Melbourne and Sydney authorities envy us our position. We have the advantage of position, although we lack that of spaciousness. Where they can claim an advantage is in the luxury of having great open spaces.

In Melbourne they were offered a site equivalent to our own, but they chose another situation with about 100 acres of ground.—Of course their minds were largely influenced by the size of the University. There is certainly something in having a large area, but, personally, I am rather impressed with the centrality idea.

The Chairman pointed out that there were other institutions which would require more space, so that it would be impossible to give the University more than the 6 acres suggested. Moreover, land which was earmarked for them now would not be available with the proposed railway going through behind North-terrace, and there was no doubt that the railway would be taken along there. He thought he was right in saying that neither the University nor any other institution would get any land beyond that line.

The witness said the council had a scheme for a rather imposing quadrangle, but that would mean taking in a part of the Exhibition.

The Chairman remarked that in the event of that building being dispensed with it had been intended to hand the property to the University, but it was at present too big an asset for its destruction to be contemplated.

Professor Stirling—You say this and that institution must remain. Well, it seems that the University is the one which must shift.

The Chairman—The modern university cannot be accommodated on 10½ acres of land.

The Witness—That is all they have in New York.

The Chairman said he did not think Adelaide would like to emulate them with their big buildings. As the population grew the universities would develop separate establishments. They were up against the difficulty that the present area would not give sufficient accommodation, and he could not see how 10½ acres would suffice for the people 50 years hence. A university did not exist only to teach subjects that were taught in the past, for with modern developments in science many chairs were subdivided. He shared with the council a feeling for the old place, which already had its traditions, but for the sake of the generations to come should not they let their affections be somewhat modified? With regard to the tie to the hospital, the distance from the Melbourne University to the hospital, about a mile, was not considered a barrier.

The witness gave the view that it was essential for the medical school to be handy to the hospital. As it was, there was a long time occupied in travelling between the two places. The medical students were a very compact and important body, and there might be a tendency, if that part were cut adrift from the rest of the classes, for a certain cleavage to be caused in the university life. The council did not wish to be as a dog in the manger, but even taking the land for extending the Library and Museum, there was still a great deal that could be utilised.

The Chairman remarked that the Art Gallery would in future be as extensive as that in Sydney, and this could not be accomplished on the area that was at present available. Should they cripple other worthy institutions by giving to the University land which would not satisfy its necessities in the very near future.

The witness admitted that the idea of having a large place for a university was an attractive one. The question of a residential college, however, would not necessarily turn the scales, and although the present site was not adequate for providing quarters, that was not a great disadvantage. It would be better to have the University in a good place and the residential college separated from it than to have the seat of learning in a situation not so convenient, even though students' quarters could be located elsewhere. Another point was that the proximity of the Public Library was a great advantage. Government House property, in addition to the 600,000 square feet of land, would be considered to provide for residential colleges.

8.7.16.

FEDERAL RESEARCH.

THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN
COMMITTEE.PROFESSOR RENNIE APPOINTED
CHAIRMAN.

Professor E. H. Rennie, M.A., D.Sc., Angus Professor of Chemistry at the Adelaide University, has been elected chairman of the South Australian committee of the Federal Advisory Council of Science and Industry. When the project was launched by the Commonwealth Government the only direct representation accorded to South Australia was that the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. C. Goode) was a member ex officio. The president of the Australian Associated Chambers of Manufactures, also a member ex officio, happened to be Mr. W. W. Forwood, who is a South Australian. New South Wales and Vic-



Professor Rennie.

torian representatives preponderated in number, and as South Australia had to some extent been overlooked representations on the subject were made by the State Government to the Federal authorities. Hence the addition of Professor Rennie, Mr. W. A. Hargreaves (Director of the Department of Chemistry), and Mr. George Brookman to the council. Mr. Hargreaves is also a member of the committee appointed by the Minister of Industry (Hon. K. P. Blundell) to advise the State Government regarding the application of science to local products and industries, and his presence on both bodies will be valuable—apart from his technical knowledge—in the direction of guarding against any overlapping of effort. Broadly speaking, the Federal Advisory Council should be able to direct its attention to certain problems the solution of which will have an important bearing upon industries that are common to the whole of Australia, and the State Advisory Council is desired by Mr. Blundell to concentrate itself upon subjects that will benefit existing local industries and to indicate the possibilities of new enterprises being fostered in South Australia for the utilisation of raw material lying dormant.

Professor Rennie was born in Sydney in 1832 and began his education in that city. In 1877 he proceeded to London, where four years later he graduated as doctor of science at the London University. During his stay in London he was assistant for two years to Dr. C. R. Alder Wright in the chemical department of St. Mary's Hospital Medical School, and he taught occasionally in the Royal College of Science, South Kensington. On returning to Australia he was connected with the Government Analyst's Department in Sydney, and in 1885 he was appointed Professor of Chemistry at the Adelaide University. He has twice been president of the Royal Society of South Australia, and has for many years been a member of the council of the University.

The South Australian committee of the Federal Advisory Council held its first meeting on Wednesday. Its personnel will probably be increased by the addition of

associate members, who will not, however, be members of the Federal Council. They have to be nominated by the State Government. Professor Rennie stated on Friday that the work to be done was absolutely distinct from that undertaken by the South Australian Government's Advisory Council of Chemical Research. "We must avoid all overlapping," he remarked.

To what subjects will you direct your attention? he was asked.

"That is all in the air at present," the Professor replied. "Certain information regarding the industries has first to be compiled. There is plenty of scope for investigation without clashing, but we shall have to ascertain what they are going to do in the other States and what we can do here."

Will the Federal authorities apportion some problem or part of a problem to each State?

"Very likely that may come in the future. Questions of that kind will come more or less under the consideration of the proposed Federal Research Institute when it is established. The Prime Minister stated at the early meetings held in Melbourne that it was his intention to establish an institute of some kind, and the function of the Advisory Council at the present time is to get together all possible information to suggest the work to be done."

Register 11. 7. 17

UNIVERSITY PROBLEM

THE PROPOSED EXPANSION.

The Deputy Chairman (Hon. J. H. Cooke) presided at a meeting of the North Terrace Reserves Commission at Parliament House on Monday. There were also present the Hon. J. Carr, and Messrs. T. Green, J. Gunn, G. R. Laffer, and R. A. O'Connor.

Professor H. Daruley Naylor said he had been connected with the Adelaide University for about nine or 10 years. He had had an experience at the Melbourne University for about 11 years. In his opinion six acres added to the present four and a half acres on which the local institution stood would not be sufficient for future requirements. He realized the possibility of the advent of living colleges. They need not necessarily be in close proximity to the University. In Melbourne the residential colleges were from four to six minutes from the university. The real unity of the institution was found on the playing ground, in evening meetings, and in the college system. Part of the University for lecture purposes could exist on North terrace, but the greater part could be on a larger site affording greater possibilities of expansion. The Vice-Chancellor of the Melbourne University expressed in a letter views almost identical to those he (the witness) held. If they could not get adequate accommodation on North terrace, then they would have to go out and procure a site of between 80 or 100 acres. He was a believer in the future of Australia, and if 100 acres were secured it would be possible to provide a carefully thought-out plan for University Buildings, to be erected by their successors. If a new site were secured laboratories could be built at once. Such buildings should be made architecturally plain, so that they could be "scrapped" without scruple. The drawbacks of not concentrating the University were obvious. The institution would have to be divided so far as lectures were concerned. It seemed necessary that the medical and law schools, and the Conservatorium, should remain on North terrace. He regretted the going out of the University as a necessary, but not an ideal thing. It would be preferable to stay on North terrace if sufficient land could be obtained. It was essential to keep the School of Mines closely in touch with the University, so far as subjects common to both were concerned. If the University had to move, the greater part of the School of Mines would also have to move, to be alongside the University. The engineering work was bound to extend, and engineering and the like, if there was to be no wasteful overlapping, would have to be removed to the new University. The time had come when the higher work of the School of Mines should be combined with the University. It was a great pity that separate institutions were growing up. It would be regrettable if the University were established any considerable distance from the Public Library. The division of the University Library would not present insurmountable difficulties. He did not favour high buildings, and the people would not be thankful if the beauty of North terrace were destroyed. If the University were to be cramped into a small space there would be no recourse but to "go up." If that were decided upon the present buildings would have to be scrapped, as the foundations would not support skyscrapers. Thirty acres would be sufficient for the

buildings, if sky-rangers were not expected to, but in the end it would mean a University divided. Parkside was not too far away from the centre for University purposes. The college system would be most democratic in its influence, and the closer the colleges were to one another the better. He believed a teachers' college was proposed. They must not put their teachers in one building. They could do no greater harm to the young student than to keep him among men he would be associated with in after life in his profession. The ideal thing would be two colleges if they could get three or four instances the better—and the men studying for the different professions should be mixed, so that after they would have sympathy for the workers in all professions. The crowding at the University at present was ridiculous. He did not advocate the building of professors' houses, as in Melbourne. They were unnecessary, and did not tend towards domestic happiness.

The commission concluded the examination at 12.15 p.m.

Register 12.7.16.

THE BRITISH NAVY.

Power of the Dreadnought.

Professor G. C. Henderson, of the Chair of Modern History and English Language and Literature at the Adelaide University, gave on Tuesday evening the third of his series of three lectures on "The war at sea." The lecture was entitled "The grand fleet." The professor said that the evolution of the earlier iron warships had been such that the builders had not been able to combine strength and speed. Where the guns and armour were heavy the speed was slow, so that from 1871 onwards the shipbuilders produced two classes—one in which there was power of metal in attack and defence, but not great speed, and the other in which speed was the essential feature. The weight of armour had meant much draught. Then an Italian, Col. Cuniberti, evolved the idea that if very big ships were constructed they could combine the burden of weapons and armour with great swiftness. In other words, he planned the "dreadnought."

—Comforting Comparisons.—

To-day, ship for ship compared with the German Navy, the big British ships were the faster and carried bigger guns. The British big gun was a very important matter on sea as well as on land for three reasons, which were that it could carry further, that the shells it threw had more smashing power than those from the smaller German guns, and that its trajectory was flatter (or in other words, that the danger space was very largely increased). Britain had the big ships, then, and the guns which gave us a superiority over the big German ships. In our smaller vessels also we had carried the dreadnought principle down so as to make our light cruisers capable of putting up a good fight. On the other hand, the Germans had rather put speed than the defensive principle into their lighter vessels. We had the men, too. That the Germans were brave could not be denied, but there was evidence that they were not able to endure on the decks of their ships in action quite so much as the British seamen. That deficiency might be due to some extent to the superior smashing power of the British shells, but another reason was that the German sailors were not so adequately trained as were our bluejacket officers and men, and that lack of training implied lack of the requisite endurance necessary to win in a fight.

—What Sea Power Meant.—

The value of sea power was shown by the fact that Great Britain's contemptible little army of some 200,000 men had swelled to a British army of 4,000,000 men and an Imperial army of 5,000,000. What, he asked, had enabled Great Britain breathing time to so enormously add to the number of her armed men? The answer was—the command of the sea—that wall of steel which kept watch and ward in the North Sea so well that our troops and munitions and other things which spelled success, could be transferred to any crucial point in almost perfect security. The Germans had never had a chance of breaking through that wall, and after the battle of Jutland they had less opportunity than they had had before. Behind the men and material of the British Navy were its magnificent traditions. In 1797 Great Britain stood alone against the world, but the British ships under Nelson saved the Empire and broke the power of Napoleon and the combination of Europe. If Napoleon had got command of the English Channel for nine days he would have been master of the world. Great as had been the progress of the Germans on land in this war, they had achieved nothing like the successes of Napoleon, and yet if at the beginning of this struggle they could have accomplished what he so ardently desired we might have been under the German heel to-day. Whatever the future phases of the war, he did not believe that the Teutons would be starved into submission as some people thought. He had been to Germany and knew what intense cultivation could do there, but what would be a decisive factor in the restoration of peace would be the infliction on the Germans of a Waterloo on the sea—and the British Navy was parting to deal the blow.