

SOHC/OH 760/9

J.D. SOMERVILLE ORAL HISTORY COLLECTION, STATE
LIBRARY OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA: INTERVIEW NO. OH 760/9

DISK 1

This is an interview for the University of Adelaide Oral History Project with Sam Jacobs. The date's 23rd August 2007. The interview's being conducted at Glen Osmond.

Well, Sam, thank you very much for agreeing to be interviewed. I was wondering if you could just tell me firstly where and when were you born?

Born at Glenelg in 1920, 6th December.

And could you tell me a bit about your parents, please?

Well, my father was born in Adelaide and lived all his life in Adelaide. My mother was a Queenslander. I don't quite know how my father came to meet her, I think it was at some mutual friend's place in Victoria, but all events she came from Brisbane. They were married in 1917, in Brisbane, and then of course came to live in Adelaide where my elder sister was the firstborn in 1918, I think, and then I was born in 1920.

So what were your parents' names, Sam?

My father was Roland Jacobs, Roland Ellis Jacobs, Ellis being his mother's maiden name, and my mother's maiden name was Herzberg[?]. Her father had been an immigrant, I think, from Hamburg in the early 1880s and became quite a distinguished citizen in Brisbane, establishing a business, mainly of importers, which got into difficulties during the Depression, as I understand it, and I never knew him, he died before I was – by the first time I visited Brisbane he'd already died.

So, Sam, where was your education in Adelaide?

At Scotch College, primary of Scotch College. I was enrolled when I was eight years old and stayed there for the next ten years, leaving at the end of 1938, in which year I was head prefect, captain of the school, in 1938 and had a very interesting and rewarding year, having matriculated before that. In those days, one matriculated at what is now the Leaving standard; and then I went on and did Leaving Honours after matriculation. So I was under no great academic pressure after matriculation.

Was Mr Gratton[?] the headmaster?

SOHC/OH 760/9

Mr Gratton was the headmaster for the whole of my time there, and indeed I was President of the Old Scholars' Association in 1950 I think it was when he retired, and I was largely responsible for the ceremonial that attended to that event. He'd been the first headmaster.

Sam, what took you to the University of Adelaide in the first place as a student?

For some reason I'd made up my mind quite early at school that I wanted to be a lawyer. And I don't quite know how; the only legal background was my grandfather, my paternal grandfather, who had graduated in law in Victoria in about 1875 or thereabouts, and he did practise here in Adelaide for a short time in the early 1880s in a firm then called Stock and Jacobs, but he gave up the practice of the law when he became involved in the business community and in particular with the South Australian Brewing Company.

And your father himself had been involved with SA Brewing as well, is that correct?

Well, later.

Later, yes.

After his father died, some few years after his father died, my father was invited to become the managing director of the Brewing Company, but that was ten years or more after my grandfather's death.

So there was a slight connection to the law through your grandfather –

That's right.

– but you've got no idea what attracted it to you?

No, I don't really know what attracted it to me. But I know I was firmly entrenched, and indeed Mr Gratton insisted that I should do Mathematics in my matriculation years because it was a good training of the mind in thinking and in logic. And he was quite right; I was very glad that I'd done Mathematics even though I had no practical use for it in later life.

After your year at Scotch College, Sam, did you go immediately to university?

Yes, I went to the University in 1939 was my fresher year, and that was a relatively uneventful year – although, of course war broke out in September of that year and

SOHC/OH 760/9

our futures immediately became uncertain. But I finished the first year and I started a second year in 1940, and in fact was co-editor of *On Dit* –

Is that right?

– in 1940, but that was fairly short-lived for two reasons: one, I had a brush with the District Censor, which might have led me to resign; but I didn't have to resign because I was posted to an officer training school at Liverpool in New South Wales and at the conclusion of that school I was commissioned and posted to a unit which was designed for service in the Middle East, so that I only really did about one term of my second year at the University.

Could we go back to the beginning of your time at university, Sam? What did the place look like at that stage of its life?

Look, it was like a large school. There were only about eight hundred-odd graduates, I think, and it was almost about the same size as St Peter's College in terms of numbers, and one tended to know lots of students in other faculties. There was much more inter-faculty mingling in those early days than there was later on, and a good deal of staff mingling, too. We used to have morning tea with members of the staff in the refectory and it was a very relaxed and friendly atmosphere.

I was just thinking the Union buildings would have been quite new at that stage.

Well, yes, they were, but they had the George Murray Building and the Lady Symon Building and the refectory, and those were the three main buildings. There'd been no upper-level extensions, of course, to the Union or to the refectory at that stage.

So as far as the Law School went and lectures, where were they held in your first year?

They were held in the Mitchell Building, upstairs in the Mitchell Building was the Law School. The only full-time academic was Professor Campbell and the other lecturing was done by visiting legal practitioners, but he was the only full-time member of staff. But it was in the – can't quite describe where in the Mitchell Building, but –

Was it the Prince of Wales?

– where the I think what they call the Henry Beston[?] Room is now, in that part of the Mitchell Building.

SOHC/OH 760/9

Oh, yes.

On that eastern wing of the Mitchell Building.

So it wasn't the large Prince of Wales Theatre?

No. We had lectures in the Prince of Wales Theatre, we had Latin – I did Latin I – in the Prince of Wales Theatre; but no, there was a lecture theatre of some sort in the precincts of the Law School, in the Mitchell Building.

Who took you for Latin I, Sam?

Fitzherbert, Professor Fitzherbert. Yes. We used to rag him a bit, I'm afraid, and we used to sign – they used to pass around the roll to be signed and all sorts of strange people were doing Latin I like Sir Donald Bradman and Jack Crawford and (laughs) all the sporting heroes of the day all used to sign the roll of Latin I.

What were the other subjects you might have taken in first year?

I did my first year I did Latin I; Psychology and Logic, both with Professor McKellar Stewart[?]; and Elements of Law, which was done with Professor Campbell. That was the introduction to legal method and legal language, but there's not much substantive law in it. That was our introduction to legal studies. But the first year, if you were going to do an LLB you had to have your quota of arts units and mine was Latin and Psychology and Logic.

So what was Professor McKellar Stewart like?

A dour Scot. (laughs) But I think he was quite a good teacher. I can remember those courses were all a bit obscure for probably one or two terms but somehow he brought them all together to make sense in the third term. But he had no rapport with students at all, and indeed nor did Campbell have much rapport with students, at a social level.

So did you have tutors as well as those people?

No. No tutors.

So did you do tutorials at all?

No. No, I never had any tutorials – at any stage of my university career did I have tutorials, although when I came back from the War and went back into the Law

SOHC/OH 760/9

School the numbers were very, very small because law was not, of course, a protected occupation, and the only people doing Law were those who could not enlist, mainly. And we had some very small groups and in fact they were conducted very much as tutorials, because of the small numbers, rather than as formal lectures. I can remember Edgar Stephens[?] was one of the people and Lou Whittington[?] and they were tutorial-like sessions.

Was much of your time spent in the Barr Smith Library?

In my first year, yes, I spent a bit of time there because some of the external reading in Psychology and Logic was only available in the Barr Smith Library, it wasn't available in the Law Library; and I used to work a bit in the Barr Smith Library, sitting at one of the long tables. But after I came back from the War I hardly used the Barr Smith Library at all.

So in the first year, Sam, were you also involved with sport at all at university?

Yes, I played B-grade cricket. (laughter) And golf, I played intervarsity golf, might have been in 1940, just before war broke out, 1939 ---. I played intervarsity golf because I remember we played at the Commonwealth Course in Victoria, and I can tell you pretty well who the members of our team were: Ackland Horman[?] was our leading player and of course he was a leading Australian player; and Peter Jay[?] and Colin Gurner[?], Michael Dawson[?], John Dunstan[?], and me and Gay Thornton[?], I think that was the intervarsity golf team. Most of them were doctors.

I picked up that with Gurner. So did you find there was quite great camaraderie there?

Where?

At university proper.

No, I don't think so, perhaps because I didn't make friends all that easily. But my experience in that first year and part of the second year was really, well, very limited; and when I came back from the War I became much more involved in undergraduate affairs and student politics.

Well, we'll talk about that in a little while. But, firstly, how did you get involved with *On Dit*?

SOHC/OH 760/9

To be honest, I can't really tell you. I think I was on the staff as a reporter as a fresher, I think I was on the staff in 1939 in my first year as a fresher, and of course I'd edited the school magazine when I was at Scotch. But, yes, I was a reporter; and then I don't quite know. I was co-editor with Viner-Smith[?], we were co-editors.

Was that pretty standard, that a man and woman were the co-editors?

Oh, I think it was quite unique at that stage, I don't think it had happened before. I don't quite remember who the editors were before me: George Amos I think was one; Crisp[?], I imagine, was probably an editor of *On Dit* as well, but I'm not even sure about that.

Now, how did you come to have a brush with the local censor?

Well, the local censor happened to be Professor Campbell, my own professor, but he conducted his role as the District Censor from a little office in the Post Office Tower in King William Street. I wanted to – an article was submitted to us by Elliot Johnston, who, even at that stage, was a sort of well-known left-winger, and it was a very sensible and rational article but in which he really sought to explain the rationale of pacifism and its value as an alternative to war in solving international disputes. It was not in any way an attack upon our war effort or criticising our war effort, but putting a point of view that there was an alternative to war, the pacifist alternative. And I thought we should publish it. We were a university, we were supposed to be fighting for the preservation of free speech and I thought we should publish it. But we had to submit all our material to the District Censor and Campbell wouldn't let us publish it. I went and saw the Vice-Chancellor, who was then Sir William Mitchell and himself a really great liberal: he was very sympathetic but he wasn't prepared to intercede. And so I was very cross that we were not allowed to publish it and I may have resigned as a matter of principle – although I always have questioned the value of resignation on principle because you can't put it right if you've resigned – but I didn't have to resign because I'd joined the militia. I was in the school cadet corps at Scotch, in fact I was an under-officer in the school cadet corps, and like most of us we joined the militia after leaving school because we could see that war was imminent; and I was then selected for this officer training school, and that was the end of my university career for the time being.

SOHC/OH 760/9

So you said, Sam, that took you to Liverpool.

Yes, in New South Wales.

How long were you there for?

Couple of months. I topped the school. I was only nineteen at the time and I was commissioned and posted to a unit which was destined for service in the Middle East.

So was your commission lieutenant?

Lieutenant, yes. That was the first commission that I got, as a lieutenant.

And into which battalion, Sam?

2nd 27th. The 2nd 27th in fact had left; I was posted to the first reinforcements for the 2nd 27th, and in fact we left for overseas in February 1941.

Yes. That's my knowledge of the 2nd 27th says that should have happened.

Yes.

Were there many people in the battalion you knew?

Yes – no, I'm sorry, that's not correct. Many: no; there were some that I knew, I knew some; but I was very young and a relative stranger, it was not a very easy posting for me, but I had to manage it.

2nd 27th had a pretty hard time in the Middle East, from what I remember.

Well, we had a hard time in Syria. After I joined the unit when it was still in camp in what was then Palestine we were moved to Marsa Matruh, which was a seaport on the African coast just a bit west of Alexandria, but it had been turned into a fortress – really, I think, as a buffer for Cairo and Alexandria. We didn't really see any enemy action there. The first fighting in North Africa when the Australian 6th Division moved up to Bardia and so on, that had all happened, and Rommel hadn't started to move further east at that stage. So we didn't see the enemy, I don't think, when we were in Marsa Matruh, at all.

But then the Germans came down into Greece, and we were destined to move from Marsa Matruh to Greece but the Germans got there ahead of us, thank goodness, because otherwise we'd have all spent the rest of the war as prisoners of

SOHC/OH 760/9

war. But instead of going to Greece we were sent back into Northern Palestine, we were billeted in a kibbutz at the northern boundaries of Palestine and preparatory to fighting the Vichy French in Syria, who it was thought would capitulate but they didn't, they put up quite stiff resistance and it took us six weeks to complete that operation, although when we started the orders of the day were 'Beirut or bust.' We were supposed to get to Beirut on the first day; we got there six weeks later. And we suffered quite heavy casualties. The 2nd 27th in particular suffered quite heavy casualties. It was all the 21st Brigade, was confined to 2nd 14th Battalion from Victoria and the 2nd 16th from Western Australia, who were on our flanks. And there were various – a few hitches in that campaign. I think the intelligence wasn't very good, and particularly the people on our right flank got held up by stiff opposition and we couldn't move forward. We were stuck halfway up (laughs) because we didn't want to get outflanked from behind. But eventually there we got to was quite a heavy stoush at a place called Dayrua[?], which really sort of finished off the Syrian campaign.

I was in hospital for a little while after that because I got malaria – not a virulent type; what they call a 'benign tertiary' – but I had to go to hospital and be treated with Atebrin and the other various medicines. Then, when I recovered from that I went back to what they called the 'training battalion', which was where hospital evacuees rejoined their units *via* this training battalion, which was representative of the three battalions in the brigade.

So how long were you in active service, Sam?

In the Middle East?

Yes.

Well, we left the Middle East just after Japan came into the War in December '41, and we were hastily brought home, the 6th and 7th. The poor old 8th Division, of course, was up in Singapore –

Yes, I know.

– were stranded there; and the 9th Division, which fought later at El Alamein, and they'd been in Tobruk as well, they remained in the Middle East; but the 6th and 7th Divisions were brought home – eventually, because there was a great discussion

SOHC/OH 760/9

between Churchill and Curtin when we were halfway home at Colombo, we were all holed up in the Colombo Harbour. Churchill wanted to send us to Burma. None of us would have ever returned from there. But Curtin insisted that we all come back to Australia. And we landed back in Australia, it was after Darwin was bombed, which was on 19th February, and we arrived back, I think in either very late February or early March we arrived back, and we all came back, strangely enough, we all disembarked in Adelaide.

Did you then, after a break, go and do jungle training at all?

No. The unit were sent up to the Atherton Tableland to do jungle training, but we had to come back in the same posting as we had when we left and I was still with the training battalion after having come out of hospital, and the training battalion didn't go up to Atherton and we were in camp at Mount Barker. And there was nothing much to do, and a lot of the troops that had been disembarked in Adelaide were billeted in private homes in Adelaide and I volunteered to be a billeting officer to give me something to do, (laughter) and I had quite a large area out at Royston Park/Payneham way. And that, in some way or other, led me into the what was then a local headquarters and we had Prince Alfred College in Dequetteville Terrace and apparently somebody seemed to think that I was suitable for staff work and from then I was posted to a newly-formed unit in the Northern Territory called a movement control group, which was quite a new concept, but whose role was really to manage road and rail and ship transport in the Northern Territory.

So I was promoted to captain and sent up to the Northern Territory. Spent part of my time up there at Adelaide River, which was NorForce Headquarters. General Herring, who'd been Chief Justice of Victoria, he was the commanding officer up there. But then I spent some time in Darwin mainly looking after shipping and road transport and rail, and I was in Darwin for the wet season in that year, anyway. I experienced a Darwin wet. And there was quite a lot of Japanese air activity. There were a number of raids on Darwin after the first big raid and including one in which they did quite a lot of damage and half-destroyed a new RAF¹ squadron of Spitfires which had come up but which didn't know how to fight the Zeroes. The Zeroes

¹ RAF – Royal Air Force.

SOHC/OH 760/9

outfought the Spitfires. And prior to the Spitfires we had two squadrons of – oh, dear me, I've forgotten their name – an American fighter aircraft, anyway.

Kittyhawk?

Kittyhawks, yes, two squadrons of Kittyhawks were up there.

Then I went back to Adelaide River and I became ill and they discovered that I – I reported sick with a bit of pain in my chest and they went away and X-rayed me and put me on the next plane south because they discovered a spot on my lung which they seemed to think was tubercular. And I then spent six months in Daws Road Hospital.

Goodness. There was a good deal of TB² around, I think, in that time.

Yes. And of course they didn't have penicillin at that stage, either.

No.

So I was six months in Daws Road Hospital from July '43 until I was discharged in February '44. I was discharged as 'medically unfit' or I was put on the reserve of officers, anyway. And after a couple of months of further convalescence I went back to the University.

So was it straight back into law?

Yes, straight back into law, and I took up the subjects that I had started in my second year in 1940 but which I had to complete at that stage by private study because they were not being lectured in at that stage; but I passed those two subjects at the end of that year and then resumed for a period of full-time study.

So this is '45 you resumed, would it have been?

'45 and '46, yes.

Now, what was the structure of the course in those last two years?

I don't think it had really changed very much. But I had, very wisely, but acting on advice, I'd entered into articles of clerkship before I went away to the War and because of my war service some of my required period of services as an articled

² TB – tuberculosis.

SOHC/OH 760/9

clerk was remitted. But I had to do those two full years in '45 and '46 and I completed then what was called the final certificate, which enabled me to get admitted, and I finished my degree course after that and ultimately my degree was conferred in the ceremony in March '48.

Who were you articled to, Sam?

I was articled – that's a good question. I think I was articled to George McEwin – it was certainly Baker McEwin was the firm, and I think I was articled to old George McEwin.

That's Neil's father?

Neil's father, yes. And then when he gave up, retired, my articles were transferred to Eric Millhouse.

Oh, right.

But in fact I sat at the feet of George Ligertwood before he went onto the bench and I was his devil, and that was very interesting because I had to work on his cases and at that stage he was really the leader of the Australian bar. He'd conducted the *Uniform Tax Case* among others and was much sought-after and he had big cases, and so I had a lot of useful tuition from him before he became a judge.

So is Ligertwood at that stage working on a lot of federal law, or what?

Well, he was based here in Adelaide but he was being briefed by interstate people. He almost had the same sort of role as Barwick had later as a leader of the Australian bar, and I was his devil so that was a good experience for me.

So was he fundamentally a barrister at that stage?

Oh, yes, he did only court work at that stage. I mean I did a little bit of solicitor's work as an articled clerk, but I had to do a stint in various other parts of the firm, but I did that mainly after Ligertwood became a judge.

Had you known Ligertwood prior to that?

Well, I'd known him at school where he was on the Scotch Council and I'd been very friendly – not with his elder son, Bill, who was killed at El Alamein but his younger son, Neil, was my contemporary more or less, so I'd known the Ligertwoods

SOHC/OH 760/9

at school. And George Ligertwood really became my mentor thereafter when he became a judge and he became Chancellor of the University and so on, and it was he who encouraged me to stand for membership of the University Council saying that I had no chance on my first attempt but I should put myself forward, which I did and got in and beating Tacky Hannan³, much to Tacky Hannan's distress.

Well, he'd been on it for many years.

Yes, he had. He was Warden of the Senate and he'd made a bit of a mess of a few Senate meetings and I think that – and I was pretty active in the Senate, Roma Mitchell and I were pretty active and trying to promote the role of the Senate, and anyway I got in.

What year was that, Sam, do you remember?

1961. But prior to that I'd kept up my – going back a bit, when I came back from the War, I was very active in the student politics and the student union and I was instrumental in forming the first student representative council, which I think took office in '47. I was a representative on the National Union of Australian University Students and I was also on the advisory committee for the Commonwealth Reconstruction Training Scheme, but I was one of the early beneficiaries of that scheme and I was a sort of users' representative on that committee.

You would have had to have been one of the first.

Yes, I really was one of the early CRTS people.

Because that really didn't kick off big-time till mid-'46, did it?

Well, that's right, and that's about the time I was made the users' representative. That was really my last full year at the University was '46; in '47 I'd got married by that time and I just did the two extra subjects that I needed to complete my degree. But I was pretty active and I was the President of the Union or whatever they called it in those days and that's when I had an interesting experience. I developed a program of inviting distinguished people to come and address student meetings at lunchtime and one of them that I remember was Malcolm Sargent, who afterwards

³ Albert James Hannan.

SOHC/OH 760/9

took me back to a rehearsal of the orchestra, which was very interesting; and another visitor that I invited was Arthur Calwell, who was Minister of Immigration, and at that stage a fair flow of returned soldiers was back at the University and a lot of them were pretty right-wing.

Pretty right-wing.

Particularly the engineers and so on. And they gave Calwell a rough time, they were heckling him and throwing coins at him and so on, and I stopped the meeting. And I sat Calwell down and I said that our university was a place of freedom of speech and if people didn't like that people didn't have come and hear him if they didn't want him but at least they should behave in a civilised manner, and I invited those who we'll call the troublemakers, I said, 'You'll either keep quiet or you'll leave.' And they left, and Calwell resumed his speech; and I received a lot of approval, particularly from some of the senior academics. Gerry Portus was really pleased that I had had the strength to tackle these ruffians and shut them up.

Now, Gerry Portus would have been Professor of History at that time?

He was Professor of History at that time.

And was his son then in the Law School?

John Portus – yes, I knew John Portus, of course, because for quite a long time he was Secretary of the Law Society, before he became an industrial commissioner. But I don't know: Gerry Portus was a gregarious professor and he was fond of students and we used to have morning tea and so on, so he knew me and I knew him; but I never studied with him.

No, but he obviously approved of your actions.

Yes, he did, yes. Oh, yes, it was heavily written up in *On Dit* at the time, I remember.

So *On Dit* then was not just a once-a-year newspaper; it was a regular paper?

Oh, it was a regular paper when I was editor back beforehand. It came out – I'm not sure whether we published weekly or fortnightly. But certainly after the War it was, I think, a regular weekly publication. But I didn't have anything to do with it when I

SOHC/OH 760/9

came back from the War, I was too much involved in other aspects of student activities.

Sam, from 1946 did CRTS really change the University, do you think, in terms of student numbers?

It's hard – I think it probably did, because I think that it enabled some people to come or to resume studies who might not have otherwise been able to do so, I'd say; and certainly enabled me to get married. I really got married on (laughs) CRTS.

Did you have to promise to do certain things with CRTS?

No, no. I'm just trying to think of the professor in Sydney, the professor of economics who chaired that CRTS committee. I went up to Sydney a couple of times for meetings. The name begins with a 'B'.

Yes.

It'll come to me.

I hope it comes to me, too. (telephone rings, break in recording)

Where were we? CRTS.

Yes.

Gosh, I can't remember that professor's name in Sydney.

No, neither can I, and I do know it.

It begins with a 'B'.

Yes. It'll come.

Yes.

But for you it enabled you to get married, to get through the course and really to begin life afresh.

Yes, that's right. I mean, look, I was being supported by my parents before that, but it gave me a measure of independence that I wouldn't otherwise have had.

Did that CRTS also mean that the student group was older, in effect?

SOHC/OH 760/9

Well, it was a great mix. There was the influx of ex-servicemen – and most of us, we'd become much more worldly as a result of wartime experiences – and there were the usual school-leavers, so it was a very mixed student population at that stage.

I guess there would have been those like Harry Medlin as well, who'd been POWs.⁴

He'd been a POW, yes.

So when did you go – now, you were already at Baker McEwin as an articled clerk, weren't you –

Yes.

– so then you picked up there when you finished your degree and – – –?

Well, I became an associate then, firstly to Sir George Ligertwood – well, he wasn't 'Sir' George then – oh, he might have been. Firstly to Libertwood, and then to Napier, who was Chief Justice. And in 1948, I think it was, I was invited to join the firm which was the successor to Stock and Jacobs which was then called Stephens, Browne, Rymill and Stephens[?], and they were the successors to the old firm of Stock and Jacobs.

So what was the new firm's name, Sam?

Browne, Rymill and Stephens at that stage.

Browne, Rymill and Stephens.

Yes – Browne with an 'E' – and that was Rymill, that was, that was Arthur Rymill.

Okay. Well, Sir Arthur Rymill, or Arthur Rymill at that point, would have been pretty active on the Council, I would have thought, the City Council.

Yes, he was Lord Mayer in about 1954, he was Lord Mayor on the Queen's first visit in '54. So yes, he was.

And you were saying it was George Ligertwood who encouraged you to become involved with the university governance.

Yes.

⁴ POW – prisoner of war.

SOHC/OH 760/9

Had you any interest in that prior to his time?

Oh, yes. Look, in 1950 after Campbell – I think he must have died, I think; and after Campbell died I became President of the Union again for a couple of years and then I became President of the Graduates' Union, and so I had a continuing interest in university affairs right through the '50s, when A.P. Rowe was Vice-Chancellor.

What was Rowe like, Sam?

What was he like? He was not a very friendly man. I think he had a lot of very good qualities. He steered the University through a period of enormous post-war growth. But he was not trustworthy: he was inclined to stab people in the back. And I can remember when he was appointed George Ligertwood was ecstatic to think that they'd got this distinguished scientist to become the first paid Vice-Chancellor, and in the end George Ligertwood moved for his dismissal. (laughs)

Really? Changed that much?

Yes. He became very unpopular. But he had a lot of very marked administrative and organisational ability; but he was not really trustworthy at a personal level – at least, that was my experience. I mean I trust everybody until I find that I can't.

So I was quite active. I was President of the Graduates' Union and, as I said a little earlier, I used to go regularly to Senate meetings and was very interested in the role of the Senate which at that stage had a legislative function in respect to legislation and we set up, Roma and I, we set up – it was a nonsense to get the whole of the Senate to approve legislation which they knew nothing about and we set up a committee of the Senate to discharge its legislative function. So I was very much involved – well, not so very much; but I'd maintained an interest in the University when Ligertwood urged me to stand for the Council in 1961.

The person whom you replaced, Tacky Hannan, had you known of him previously?

Oh, yes. He was the Crown Solicitor. Oh, yes, I'd known him. I'd known him in a professional sense, that was all, not in any personal sense; but I'd come across him at Senate meetings and he'd appeared in court when I was associate and so on so I knew him as a professional man. But no, I didn't have any personal contact with him. He was very cross. He apparently, to other people, accused me of canvassing

SOHC/OH 760/9

for votes where in fact I never lifted a finger. Ligertwood said I wouldn't get in so I didn't even try. But I didn't get in because they liked me; it was because they didn't like Hannan. (laughs)

I think he came from a Catholic background, if I recall.

Yes, he did. Yes, he did. But I don't think there was any anti-Catholic sentiment in the fact that he got beaten; it was just that he was seen to be a bit of a dithery old man.

He must have served for all of thirty years, I would have thought.

It was a long time, yes.

Yes. Who were some of those others that were on Council when you first joined?

At that stage?

Yes.

Well, Frank Perry was on the Council and Ray Hone[?] was on the Council.

That's 'Pa' Hone, isn't it?

No, his son.

Oh! Pa Hone's son?

Son is Ray Hone. And I think Dryden[?], who was head of the Waterworks Department might have been on it at one stage, and I'm not sure whether Milne from the Electricity Trust wasn't on it at one stage, too. And Henry Baston was Vice-Chancellor when I joined the Council and Bob Simpson was on the Council – well, yes, he was on the Council, I think as Chairman of the Finance Committee. I don't think he'd ever been elected to the Council; he was there – – –. And then there were very few academics on the Council because the Council in those days had to fix the salaries and it was thought that the academics should not be involved in the body that fixed their own salaries, and that was largely an external membership of the Council, which changed very much as the years went by.

I think in the early days it had largely been academics, though.

SOHC/OH 760/9

Well, it might have been; I don't really know. I don't know. But Sir Ligertwood, of course, was there, and Kenneth Wills, they were – Ligertwood and Wills were both on the Council.

Did Vic Edgeloe attend?

Oh, yes. Vic Edgeloe was the Registrar; and Bampton was the university finance man in those early days. But Vic Edgeloe, I think he had become the Registrar at that stage. I don't think Eardley was on the Council when I joined it. I knew of Eardley as a young graduate when he was Registrar, but I think he'd retired when I came onto the Council.

So by the time you came in in 1961, Sam, was that at the beginning of the real growth of the University?

No, it wasn't the beginning. The growth had really occurred and a lot of the new building had occurred in the '50s when Rowe was Vice-Chancellor and there was the postwar – well, there was the postwar influx; but then, of course, also they were having to plan ahead for the Baby Boomers. The period of real growth, I really think, came a bit later when Whitlam became Prime Minister and the whole funding structure of the University was changed. I can tell you a bit about that, too.

I'd love to go into that, but I wonder if I could just first ask you about the Graduates' Union with which you were involved in the '50s.

Yes.

Could you explain what the function of the Graduates' Union was, please, Sam?

(laughs) I doubt it really had a function. It was just an old scholars' club. It used to organise a few lectures and visits and that sort of thing but it had no real role in terms of university governance. I always wanted to give it a role because I was very anxious at some stage – and it's not happened even now – that we should somehow encourage the alumni to support their alma mater and I'd always sort of hoped that we might be able to stir the graduates of the University into putting the University on their list of (laughs) charitable donations and so on, as has happened in America; but it's never really happened here. Stranks, many years later, set up a University Foundation but it never really took off.

SOHC/OH 760/9

No. That is a big difference between Australian and North American universities, certainly.

Yes.

That period of the 1960s, when you're first on Council, Sam, was Roma on at that point as well, Roma Mitchell?

Yes, she was. And Frank Hambly was on it, I think.

Yes, who would have been Master of Lincoln College.

He was Master of Lincoln College. And I think Grenfell Price was on, too.

Archie, still, was he? Yes, he would have been.

Yes, I think Archie was on it, too. Yes, and Roma was on it.

Now, was that in effect the decision-making body of the University?

Yes, it was. Yes, it was.

How quickly did you come on the Finance Committee, Sam?

I think they put me onto the Finance Committee quite soon after I was onto the Council, but I really became actively involved in I think 1965, when Bob Simpson was appointed to the Universities Commission and I can remember Ligertwood and Ken Wills – Ligertwood was then living in a little house in Fife Avenue at Mitcham and he rang me up and said he wanted to see me, could I come up? And there was Ken Wills and they said, 'We want to make you Chairman of the Finance Committee.' And I said, 'Goodness, gracious me.' And at that stage I was only forty-four or something or other and I'd been on the Council for two or three years. But anyway, they'd picked me out to become Chairman of the Finance Committee and I said – I couldn't very well say not to those two fellows, (laughs) and that's how I became Chairman of the Finance Committee.

How did the university fit into the South Australian community at that stage? This is pre-Vietnam and all that.

I don't know that I can answer that in any intelligent way. It was, of course, at that stage the only university, although it was only shortly after I became a member of the Council that the seeds of the Flinders University were sown and so it was to become 'The University of Adelaide at Bedford Park', to be another campus, and Peter

SOHC/OH 760/9

Karmel was appointed principal designate and I was on the planning committee with Peter Karmel, I was one of the Adelaide representatives on the planning committee in that would have been the first half of the '60s. But then, when Dunstan first became Premier, he immediately set up the Flinders University as a separate entity; he didn't want it to be another campus of Adelaide.

So that was a State decision.

That was a State decision, yes. It was a State decision to establish Flinders as a second university; but it was originally conceived to be a second campus for Adelaide, which caused quite a few problems, financial problems in particular, because among other things the University of Adelaide purchased additional land for the Flinders, although it had that big Bedford Park site – which I can remember walking all over with the architect planning where it was all to go and so on. But we also bought some land on the other side of South Road, which we called the 'tobacco land' – it was in fact owned by Craven A or had a big 'Craven A' – because we thought that the University might need some additional land in the future. So the University of Adelaide purchased the tobacco land. And then of course when Flinders was established they had no money to buy it back from us and eventually, when Peter Karmel became Chairman of the Universities Commission, he provided Flinders with sufficient money to repay Adelaide the money that we'd outlaid in purchasing property for Flinders.

Why was it seen as necessary to have a second campus, initially?

You see, remember, this was before the Pill and I think the demographic predictions were that we would need it. Adelaide, after all, is the smallest campus of any of the Australian universities, it couldn't grow any larger, really; and all the demographic predictions at that stage were for population explosions which would require a second university – or at least a second campus, anyway – and also, of course, the southern suburbs were starting to expand and develop.

Yes. So it was that movement. And then I suppose the coming of the Dunstan Government was a big change for South Australia, in effect – well, the Walsh then Dunstan Government – after many years of conservative government. There would have been a push down south.

SOHC/OH 760/9

Yes. Oh, yes. Playford was not personally very sympathetic about a second university. That's why he planned to have a second campus for Adelaide University.

Was the State still supporting the University at that point?

Yes, it was. The funding was split between the Commonwealth and the States at that stage. I've forgotten what the ratio [was]: I think it was one point eight Commonwealth dollars to every one State dollar, or it may have been the other way round. But I know that one thing Playford was insistent upon: that he would always give the University the maximum amount of its proportion so that he could get the maximum amount from the Commonwealth as well. But it was certainly a jointly-funded operation.

So from the years that you served on the Finance Committee – particularly in the '60s at this point, Sam – was it financially workable, or was it always tight?

I have to say it was financially workable, but I also think I helped to make it financially workable because when I became Chairman I was staggered to discover some of the financial structures. For instance, most of the University's so-called 'free' money was invested in fixed-interest government securities and debentures with no capital growth at all, and low interest rates – in Electricity Trust debentures and so on. I think the only other gilt-edged investment they had, I think they had some BHP shares. And I was instrumental in redeeming these fixed-interest debentures and so on and getting the money and establishing a proper equity portfolio, which of course turned out to be a great advantage to the University in later years with the share market boom and so on. We made a lot of money. But it was very conservatively-managed when I became Chairman of the Finance Committee.

There were other things that happened, too. I mean, for instance, the Commonwealth money was always paid to the State Treasury because they had no constitutional power to fund universities at that stage so it was all done by way of grants in aid to the States under s.96 of the Constitution, and they paid the money to the State. Apparently they paid it in two six-monthly transfers, I think they called it – it was a word something like that, anyway – and the University simply used to call on the State Treasury for money from these funds when it needed it. I thought, well, this was sort of pretty funny: it was our money; why didn't we have more control over it? So I went to see whether the then new Vice-Chancellor, which was Badger –

SOHC/OH 760/9

and I can tell you a bit about his appointment in a minute – we went to see Seaman[?], who was the State Treasurer, and he said, ‘I’ve been expecting you people for some years.’ (laughter)

This is Gilbert Seaman?

Yes, Gilbert Seaman. Because they had no right; they were using that money and investing it and so on on the short-term money market. So we got that money back under university control and played the short-term money market ourselves with it, and that helped to improve the finances as well.

Look, the government, the university management at that time – old Napier, of course, I think was on the Council – Napier and Wills and Ligertwood, they would not under any circumstances rock the government boat, you know. They were very content with the very conservative status quo. So we managed to release a bit of money for the University in that way and so we managed all right.

But then, of course, the whole scenario changed in ’72 when Whitlam was elected.

Now, Badger’s appointment was prior to Whitlam, I would have thought.

This was prior to Whitlam, yes.

Can you tell me about that, Sam, Badger’s appointment?

About Badger’s appointment? Yes, I can. Badger had been the Professor of Biochemistry or Inorganic Chemistry or something or other but then he moved to what to him was a much more attractive position with CSIRO,⁵ and then Baston retired and we had to get a new Vice-Chancellor and general discussion in the academic community said, ‘I wish we still had Badger. And I said, ‘Well, perhaps we can get him back,’ and they said, ‘Oh, I don’t think you’ll get him back because he left to improve his position and his opportunities for research and so on.’ I said, ‘Well, you never know till you try.’ So I said – I remember saying to Ken Wills – ‘I wonder what we would have to do to lure Badger back.’ At that stage I understood that the basic Vice-Chancellor’s salary was professorial plus fifty per cent and I said, ‘I don’t think that would get him back.’ I said, ‘I’d like to find out what other

⁵ CSIRO – Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation.

SOHC/OH 760/9

vice-chancellors are paid,' and I said to Wills – who was then Chancellor, I think – 'I'm going to write to my counterparts in the other states as Chairman of the Finance Committee and see whether I can get some picture of vice-chancellors' remuneration throughout Australia.' And Wills scoffed at me: he said, 'You won't get an answer, you know.' And I said, 'Well, I'll be no worse off if I don't get an answer.' In fact, I got six or seven answers.

Oh, really?

Yes, they all answered; and I can't remember the detail but it was clear to me that most universities were giving some sort of financial enticement or fringe benefits and so on to attract vice-chancellors. So, with that sort of information in front of me, we then approached Badger and worked out a deal to woo him back. I've forgotten exactly what the deal was, but it was a bit better than academic salary, professorial salary plus fifty per cent. We gave him a house and so on and things of this sort, and I think we also made some special arrangement for his superannuation at that stage as well. So we got him back and he was, of course, a very good vice-chancellor for many years.

Yes. I recall people from all faculties saying – say they were from arts or law – had been a bit concerned that he may not be what they'd hoped because he came from sciences; but in fact –

He was very good.

– he was very good.

Yes, he was very good. If he had one fault it was that he leant over backwards to be fair (laughter) when sometimes he should have been a bit more decisive. There was a famous dispute between the Botany people – what was his name? There's a gate at the Waite Institute named after one of them, and another one who was a bit of a – – –. Anyway, there was a huge academic dispute and Badger didn't handle that terribly well and it led to a bit of litigation which ultimately was solved settled. I can't tell you their names. But one of the things, Robert, of old age is you forget names so easily.

I think you're doing a great job, Sam.

SOHC/OH 760/9

Andrewartha was one of them; Andrewartha and – it began with ‘O’. He had a very aggressive wife and they used to keep geese. Andrewartha was one, Andrewartha was the innocent victim of this feud.

But Badger was very good and Badger and I worked very closely together and I became very fond of Badger. He was a good vice-chancellor.

That was an era, though, for him of student unrest at the University, wasn’t it?

Yes, it was. It was a bit of student unrest over Vietnam in particular, in the late 1960s, and I think Bray had become Chancellor by this time.

Yes, that would be correct.

And I can remember they came into the Council Room and burnt the flag in the Council Room or did something or other. And Bray was a very peaceable man and he was not strong, he couldn’t really cope with this; but Badger was very good in talking to the militant students and trying to calm the waters a bit, he was very good at that.

Sam, I’ll just set up a new recording session.

END OF DISK 1: DISK 2

This is the second session of an interview with Sam Jacobs for the University of Adelaide history on 23rd August 2007. So, Sam, you and Badger became close in that sense.

Yes, we did.

And the University began to see quite some growth in student numbers, even in the late ’60s. Would that be the result – well, the Karmel Report would have come out by then, I think, wouldn’t it?

Yes that would be the result of it. There was the earlier report in 1958 of the – what was that called? It was not the Baker Report, it was –

It was a Commonwealth report.

– a Commonwealth report in 1958 which predicted the future growth of the universities and so on. What the hell was the name of that man? I’ve forgotten his name. But anyway, so that was when Badger came.

Then there were some very interesting financial developments in the ensuing years, apart from the advent of the Whitlam Government where they took over the

SOHC/OH 760/9

whole responsibility for funding and the universities became free, and of course there was an enormous growth and expansion and we had to set up – Harry would know much more about this than I do – we had to set up various committees to work out how to share the wealth and so on. There was a thing called ‘Co-ordinating Committee’ where the faculties used to sort of sit around and find out how to share the wealth. Later on, of course, when Fraser became Prime Minister, there was a cutback (laughs) and the same sort of committee had to decide about how to wear the cuts and so on.

But we had some interesting initiatives. I can’t tell you the exact dates, but what I’m thinking about now I think was in the early ’70s, I think when one of the Engineering professors, Sam Luxton[?], came to us with a plan to completely revamp the University’s reticulated services which he said were worn out, out of date, inefficient and wasteful; and he had a plan, he’d set up the ESMG, the Engineering Services and Management Group and they wanted to restructure the whole of the reticulated services and replace some of them, and they said it would save a lot of money and increase efficiency. But he said, ‘It’s going to cost us a million dollars.’ Now, a million dollars in the early ’70s was the equivalent of somewhere between, what, five and ten million dollars now.

I think more.

More. It was a lot of money, anyway. ‘But,’ he said, ‘we will save the University a lot of money.’ Well, we didn’t have a million dollars. So I went to the top: I went to see Rymill, who was Chairman of the Bank of Adelaide.

Yes.

I didn’t go and see the general manager; I went to see the chairman of the board, because I happened to know him, anyway. And I said, ‘The University wants to borrow a million dollars.’ And I explained what it was for and I said, ‘You know there’s plenty of security. The University is solvent, we’ve got lots of assets but not realisable assets, but our credit’s good.’ And Rymill said, ‘That’s all right. I’ll approve it.’ So we got a million dollars, which we repaid [in] a matter of years out of the savings from the new [system]. We repaid the principle and the interest out of the savings from the new system which the ESMG had worked out for the University.

SOHC/OH 760/9

Now, when you say ‘services’ do you mean light and power – – –?

Light and power and water. A lot of the plant was fairly old and needed replacing, worn out. I can’t tell you the technicalities but it was inefficient and Sam Luxton, who was an engineer, said that we can do much better than this but it would cost us a lot of money. So we did it and that worked very well.

We also at round about that time, in the ’70s, we bought the CD700, which was then the biggest computer in Australia. It cost us seven hundred thousand dollars. We had no money to do that, either, but we sold its surplus capacity to commerce and business and paid for it by selling the capacity which we didn’t need. (laughs) When I see all of this now, I can remember we used to have to build a – I don’t know about a soundproof, but an airconditioned room to house this monstrous machine.

And it was humidified, too, if I remember.

That’s right, yes.

I can still recall it.

So we took the initiative to buy that big computer, which of course (laughs) became obsolete in two or three – – –. One of the great worries that we had in the Finance Committee was that our computer man – Ovenston[?] I think was his name –

Yes.

– and he wanted to get a new computer every two or three years because they were becoming obsolete, and they were obviously by the time we got them. But we managed, somehow or other.

And I suppose the other big expenditure, or out of the usual expenditure, was when the future of the Elder Hall was in issue and there was a great move – Dunstan was very instrumental, I think, in insisting on its preservation. But we had to get a new organ for it and that cost a lot of money, too. We shopped all around the world to get a new organ for the Elder Hall. Eventually got one from Canada, and again it cost a lot of money.

So those were some of the interesting financial initiatives that we had to deal with.

Sam, how did you cope with the building expansion in the late ’60s through the ’70s? Because there’s the Union’s rebuilt – – –.

Well, the Science and Maths.

SOHC/OH 760/9

Hughes Plaza. Then the Ligertwood Building's created.

That's right. Well, that was all pretty well funded by the Commonwealth, those days it was pretty well funded by the Commonwealth. And some of those buildings were pretty horrible buildings – I mean, the Napier Building's a horrible building, I think – and all the other buildings, they were all not exactly jerry-built but they were not built to last and some of them, of course, have become obsolete now. But one has to remember that some of them were built fifty years ago.

Yes, that's right. I think the Union Building's certainly standing the test of time –

Oh, yes.

– but that seems to me to be in a different form than the Wills Building and all that area, which is a bit different.

Yes.

But my memory of those years is a dramatic expansion in the form of the campus of the University.

Yes, it changed enormously. And there was some consternation because some of those buildings took up what was thought to be important vacant space, that we ought to have a bit of breathing space in the University. But we really finished up a bit like the central business district with no open space at all, much.

Did you find that those Whitlam years of expansion also caused problems? When the Fraser years came, for instance, you mentioned the cutbacks. Was that a very difficult time?

Yes, it was, it was, because we went from a period of rapid growth to a period where you had to draw in your horns and find economies and cutbacks and so on and it wasn't easy. It was quite a problem. It was largely managed – I mean, the Finance Committee would have set the financial parameters, but it was the academic community that had to work out how to operate within those parameters, and Harry could tell you much more about that than I could.

Because he was at the coal face, so to speak.

Yes.

Having to live with it.

SOHC/OH 760/9

The other interesting financial management issue that arose, of course, was the introduction of the new superannuation scheme, which was really a monumental task. Harry was much involved in that because he was President of FAUSA⁶ at that stage. Their existing scheme was all insurance-based, they all had insurance policies, and the new scheme gave them defined benefits and so on. It was a national scheme but we had to woo people away – some people wanted to remain on the old scheme, we couldn't force them to abandon it – but we had to sell the new scheme to the academic community, which took quite a bit of doing but we succeeded. Harry can tell you more about that than I can, too.

What were the relationships like generally between Council and academics, Sam?

It's hard to answer that because a lot of the academic decisions, they had to be approved by Council but they were worked out by these things like the Co-ordinating Committee and the other academic sort of sub-committees that were set up, and so that Council didn't have a great deal to do with the academic decision-making as such except to approve it. But it was really worked out by the academic community, not by the Council itself.

And of course we had good Vice-Chancellors, you see, because Stranks was a good Vice-Chancellor.

He was also a chemist, wasn't he, Don Stranks?

Yes, he was, yes. But he had to really cope with the cutbacks. But his death was a tragedy for the University because we took a long time to find a new Vice-Chancellor, a good one. I'm not even sure – I think they're all right now, but I think that – I mean, I liked Kevin Marjoribanks, he was a very nice and gentle and a scholarly man, but he was really – he didn't have the strength to guide the Council at all and he was not a great success as Vice-Chancellor.

Whereas Don Stranks had been, hadn't he?

Yes. And then of course, after Marjoribanks, I suppose, we then got a woman.

Mary O'Kane.

⁶ FAUSA – Federated Australian University Staff Association.

SOHC/OH 760/9

Mary O’Kane.

Were you still on Council then, Sam?

No, I don’t think I was. I retired from the Council in 1994.

Yes. She came a year later, if my memory’s right.

Yes. Certainly when I retired – that’s right, Marjoribanks was still Vice-Chancellor when I retired.

Sam, what are the largest changes you saw in the University over all the years that you’ve seen it. Would they have been physical, mainly, or more than that?

Certainly there were huge physical building developments. Well, in later years, some of the academic structures: they formed these sort of multidisciplinary departments and so on, which I thought was a bit of a tragedy because these multidisciplinary departments were, in their own internal management, were having to compare apples with pears all the time and the Law School particularly suffered, it lost its identity as a faculty. I think some of those academic structures left a good bit to be desired. Oh, yes, there were changes. I think the Education Committee became much more active – and, indeed, interested – in the financial management of the University, and that was a bit of a nuisance because they did not have all the necessary financial information available to them and they were sort of making decisions as to where money should be spent without really knowing where the money was coming from. They really started to intrude on the role of the Finance Committee towards the latter part of my sojourn; I think I became a bit unpopular when I protested about that.

Sam, were there ever any major clashes on Council, as such, that you can recall?

No. No, I can’t – I mean, I’m not saying that there weren’t; but I can’t really recall any major fights, that there were factions or anything of that on Council. But I’d have to probe my memory a bit more before I could answer that with any authority. And I think that there were probably clashes lower down the administrative structures and so on, but I think by the time they reached Council there was generally a resolution. So I can’t remember any significant fights on the Council itself.

SOHC/OH 760/9

So, Sam, in those years you served, you would have seen a profound alteration from a State–Commonwealth funding basis to the Whitlam Era and the Commonwealth takeover of the funding –

Yes.

– and to a very different University, in effect, I suppose.

Yes, it was. And I was always, in principle, I – while it was said to be beneficial to the University, but after all they were State universities and when I first became involved the State accepted some financial responsibility – I always sort of felt that it would have been better if the State had been ---. The State never gave the University a penny after the Whitlam Era, we got no State money at all.

Oh, yes, there were some clashes, I think – not so much on Council, but they were ---. I had a sort of ongoing clash with Quirk, the Director of the Waite Institute, because he thought that the Waite Institute was not getting a sufficient slice of the Commonwealth money. When Peter Karmel became Chairman of the Universities Commission, I [felt?] – and he quite readily agreed because he knew from his own experience – that the Waite really was in a different position, the Faculty of Agricultural Science was in a different position from other faculties because it had a very limited teaching role and a very huge research role, which was very expensive. Anyway, Peter Karmel and the Universities Commission built into Adelaide's grant – we never quite knew how, or what the basis of it was – but he did built into Adelaide's overall grant a financial recognition of the research responsibility of the Waite Institute; and Quirk always maintained that he never got as much as he was entitled to. So I had an ongoing battle with Quirk over this and that in fact got to the Council, I think, and indeed there was a Waite Advisory Committee was set up with Ken Williams as Chairman and he believed everything that Quirk told him for a long, long time, until he discovered that Quirk was misleading him, as he indeed was trying to mislead me, but I wasn't to be misled, let's say. So that really was a bit of an ongoing battle. But I'm not sure that it really was much ventilated in the Council. I think the Councillors were persuaded that the Finance Committee had got it right, and indeed I had it informally from the Universities Commission, whatever it was then called, that we'd got it right. I mean, they didn't tell us what the basis of the funding was, but they said that we had got it

SOHC/OH 760/9

about right, so I had that as my sort of fall-back position, let's say; but I could never persuade Quirk about that.

Then there was the Mitchell Committee was set up to investigate the future of the Waite Institute or something or other and it came up with recommendations, including the funding recommendations, and Quirk wouldn't accept its findings, either, he just thought he was being victimised by all. I believe he was quite a good agricultural scientist but he was not a good Director. But, fortunately, his successor – short-lived as he was –

Harold Woolhouse?

– Harold Woolhouse, he set it all to rights again. And of course at that stage the Commonwealth itself said that the Waite Institute, like any other research institute, had to earn its keep. It had to be able to attract research grants from private industry and so on, and Woolhouse was very successful in doing that.

He was indeed.

Yes, and he established a much firmer financial basis for the Institute, which was no longer dependant upon this disputed allocation from the Universities Commission. So he repaired a lot of the damage that Quirk had done.

Sam, over the years, did you take note of the role of the Law School at the University, or was your part at arm's length, pretty much?

No, I was a member of the Faculty of Law for quite a long time, but I was really – I think at one stage I was the judges' nominee on the Faculty of Law. But I became a bit disillusioned with the Faculty of Law because it refused to have anything to do or take any advice from the practising profession, and I thought that was very unwise. There were lots of people out in the profession that could have helped the Law School academically, but they did not want any pseudo-academics; they wanted only full-time academics. And it became a slightly unhappy place. It became very strongly feminist, which one can't oppose, politically correct to accept it, (laughs) but it meant that a lot of the – it lacked a leadership. People like Horst Lucke and Rogerson, they just threw their hands in the air and it no longer had the quality of academic leadership that it should have had.

Horst retired.

SOHC/OH 760/9

This was one of the things where I always disagreed with Harry a bit: it was all a part of his concept of departmental government. It was a nonsense that there be a Law Faculty and a Law Department, because there was only ---. But then it meant that every academic had to sort of take his turn as head of the department and some of them were good and some of them were very bad, and we were not getting the best academic leadership.

So, Sam, over the years, though, do you feel that the University's held its place within South Australian society and culture, if that's the way of putting it? Because I was particularly thinking of the Law School: there used to be a very strong *interrelationship* between profession and academic and it seems to me that, like you've described, those things have been strained at times and then come good, but ---.

I think they're still strained, as a matter of fact, in this State, and although I was on the Faculty I was never -- they wouldn't listen. At one stage, when Bray, who was Chief Justice, came to a faculty meeting over some issue which he thought was important -- I've forgotten what it was now -- and they just wouldn't listen to him, and he was the Chief Justice and a very distinguished scholar in his own right, and these people just wouldn't listen to him. So I think it's had a bit of a sad history in recent years, the Law School. Then, of course, it wasn't improved when it became part of PALACE,⁷ which I thought was an absolute disaster -- Performing Arts and Law and Architecture and Economics. It was really a mixed basket. However, so I think some of those changes were not for the best.

But in terms of -- I'm thinking back now to the financial structure -- there's obviously, from what you've told me, a vast improvement in the way that the finances were being handled.

Well, there was. I'm not sure what happens now. I don't know. I'm not sure about Mary, but certainly De Crespigny didn't want a Finance Committee at all; he wanted to be his *own* finance committee. And I think that there was an element within the University that thought that the Finance Committee had too much power. Well, I can't really sort of comment on that. We did what we thought we had to do, let's say. And we had some pretty astute outside help on the Finance Committee, too. We had some good people like McGregor and so on and these sort of people.

SOHC/OH 760/9

You talk about the Council, I know that Walter Crocker became very disillusioned with the Council. He was on it for a while and he thought that it was all the time discussing matters of minimal importance and not dealing with the real issues of university government and education and so on, so he didn't – and I think he became very irritated with Harry, who was a bit of a stirrer and a special pleader, and I have to say was at times a bit disruptive, let's say. Well, I mean, I get on all right with Harry now but I didn't always agree with him.

So, Sam, I'm just thinking that, in terms of your involvement, for the majority of your life you actually kept touch with the University in one way or another.

Oh, yes. Right up until the time that I retired. Indeed, I found myself in a very difficult position when I became Royal Commissioner into the State Bank because the State Bank were the University's bankers, and I really had to, well, disqualify myself from a lot of the discussions on the Finance Committee, although I did manage to somehow persuade them that they should stay with what was called 'the good bank'. That really led to my retirement: it was a bit of a conflict of interest.

Sam, is there anything else you'd like to add at this point?

I don't think, I don't think.

Well, can I just thank you very much for being interviewed today. It's been a delight to hear something of your story.

Yes. Well, it was an interesting time. I sometimes look back, I wonder how I managed to find the time to do it all, and particularly with my judicial duties; but I somehow managed to arrange it, if Council or the Finance Committee was meeting that I managed to free myself of court commitments and so on – not always, but for the most part. I didn't miss many meetings. But I had a lot of other outside interests as well as the University. But I suppose it's the old story, that responsibilities tend to gravitate to those who are best able to carry them.

Well, thanks again, Sam.

END OF INTERVIEW.

⁷ PALACE – Faculty of Performing Arts, Law, Architecture, Commerce and Economics.