

5.
THROUGH
ANXIOUS TIMES
DEPRESSION
DECADE

*For while the tired waves, vainly breaking,
Seem here no painful inch to gain,
Far back, through creeks and inlets making,
Comes silent, flooding in, the main.*

*And not by eastern windows only,
When daylight comes, comes in the light;
In front, the sun climbs slow, how slowly,
But westward look, the land is bright.¹*

IN 1928 AND EARLY 1929 the University seemed to be clear of its troubles. It was established at Point Grey; its facilities were sufficient for the student population of slightly more than 1,500 and were being improved; and, as times were good and governments and the public seemed at last to be more favourably disposed to the University, the prospect for steady expansion was bright. Discussions were held with Members of the Cabinet; plans were drawn by the University architects for two further wings to the Science Building, for the first unit of a permanent Arts Building, and for semi-permanent accommodation for Forestry and Home Economics. The Government grant for the academic year 1929-30 of \$625,000 was, in relation to the students served by it, the most generous which was made until the 1950's.

But the effect of these favorable circumstances did not last. Even before the depression came to undermine its economic prospects, the University's security and independence were threatened by interference from the new Government. The Oliver Government had gradually and grudgingly come to accept the claims

1 Arthur Hugh Clough, "Say not, The struggle naught availeth."

of the University for reasonable consideration amid the insistent demands of the constituencies for material and social development. Dr. MacLean succeeded to the leadership of the Liberal Administration on the death of the Honourable John Oliver, in August 1927. As Premier, he retained the Portfolio of Education and his policy continued to be friendly and helpful to the University during his short year of office. In the Tolmie Government, which followed, the new Minister of Education, Canon Joshua Hinchliffe, did not approve of the University as it was then being administered. His own experience with Canadian educational systems was negligible and he had little sympathy with the ideal of popular education. He was convinced that standards of the University were not high enough, and he suspected that many of the University's activities were wasteful. He especially disliked the professional and occupational courses and this dislike focussed itself on the Faculty of Agriculture. The new Minister also adopted the practice of attending Board meetings from time to time and arranging for them to be held in the Ministers' Room in the Vancouver Court House. The environment and circumstances of these meetings had a definite, and often harmful, effect upon the discussions.

A series of events in 1929 and 1930 also combined to leave the unfortunate impression on the minds of Canon Hinchliffe and his colleagues in the Government that the University was a sort of academic *Oliver Twist*, continually and unjustifiably asking for more from the overburdened resources of the Province. In 1929, in the course of investigating the University Endowment Lands, the Tolmie Government made the unpleasant discovery that the University would have to depend for much of its support on Government grants instead of income from the Endowment Lands. The Government was very conscious of its virtue in having made what it felt to be a generous grant for the year 1929-30, and was startled when the University, on the other hand, asked for an even larger operating grant for 1930-31. Moreover, the President alarmed the Minister by putting before him the provisional estimates, which included the maximum requests of the Faculties and Departments, without immediately making clear to him that this was being done, in accordance with the usual practice, for his information and for that of the new members of the Board of Governors, and that such requests were customarily reduced, if it was found possible, after discussion with the Deans and Department Heads, before estimates were officially submitted. The request for more money for buildings and landscaping, and for a grant for research in a year when there was a slight drop in registration from that of the previous year, also jarred on the financial sensibilities of the Government.

Disagreement had begun in May 1929, when the Minister told the Board that he had heard reports that the University was mishandling the money granted

by the Provincial Government, and hinted that he suspected the probity of some University personnel. The Board were justifiably indignant at the suggestion, but agreed to an investigation, which was conducted by a senior civil servant of the Government, Mr. Robert Baird, Inspector of Municipalities. The Baird Report cleared all University administrators of the charges implied in the rumours, but it also made recommendations for improvements in University financial and administrative procedures. More serious criticism soon followed. The Minister posed the question to the Board: "Is the Faculty of Agriculture worth while?" The answer of the Board was emphatically "yes." But the Faculty of Agriculture was particularly vulnerable to an attack of this sort. Its registration of regular students was low, having dropped from 85 in 1922-23, to 46 in 1929-30, at a time when the general registration was steadily increasing. In 1929-30 registration in Arts and Science was 1,434, in Applied Science, including Nursing, 298. Agriculture's research programme, for which one quarter of the University's special research grant of 1929 had been earmarked, was of a type which required many years of patient experimentation to produce results. Its main function was the application of the pure sciences to the problems of agriculture. Such an aim had very little appeal to the average farmer in the Province, who was much more anxious to have the occupational courses in agriculture developed; and it had less appeal to the members of the Legislature and their supporters who, with rare exceptions, have little interest in learning what makes the grass grow green. It must be admitted, too, that the Faculty of Agriculture was the object of a natural jealousy on the part of members of other Faculties. Like the Minister of Education, they related Agriculture's low registration to its relatively high budget and they were of the opinion that Agriculture was unduly favoured in comparison with the other two Faculties with their very much larger teaching loads.

The real situation was not nearly so simple. In their detailed defence of the Faculty of Agriculture, the President and the Board pointed out, among other things, that the Faculty, in its scientific research, served all the Faculties of the University, and that, in fact, a large proportion of the advanced research carried on in the University was conducted by the Faculty of Agriculture. The existing research programme of the Agriculture Faculty, the President maintained, should be carried on at as high a level as possible, because this work was essential to the development of agriculture, one of the largest industries of the Province. Moreover, President Klinck demonstrated conclusively that the cost of educating all students served by the Faculty was about \$500 per student, not \$2,500 as stated by the Minister.

The University's operating efficiency was now seriously threatened, but the fact was not fully appreciated by the University administration even though there

had been progressive reductions in staff since September 1930. The depression, whose effects became observable in British Columbia in the winter of 1929-30, was steadily deepening. The Minister informed the Board that the Government would probably not be able to vote an appropriation for buildings in 1930 and repeatedly urged upon the University the alternative policy of limiting the enrolment by strict selection of candidates for the First Year. At the same time he secured from the Board an admission that the University was largely dependent upon the Government grants. The Board acknowledged that the question of whether or not to introduce a policy of limitation of enrolment was a matter for the Government to decide, since it paid for the support of the institution. The Minister thereupon announced to the Senate on January 27, 1931, that a policy of limitation was to be authorized by the Government, designed to fix the enrolment at 1,500 or as much more as the University administration regarded as safe for the accommodation available: the actual administration of the limitation was to be left to the University. Ultimately an amendment was made to the University Act giving the Board the necessary power to enforce limitation. The Minister also urged an improvement of standards in both the high schools and the University, and favoured a generous system of scholarships and bursaries "to those who may reasonably be expected to profit thereby." The sum of \$25,000 was earmarked in the estimates for this purpose. After this statement the Senate was anxious to make suggestions to the Board with respect to courses and research to be offered by the University under these conditions, but action was deferred, pending the publication of the provincial budget in March.

Decisions on these matters were complicated by pressures from inside and outside the University. Senate, then as now, was a composite body. Convocation elected 15 representatives. Of these, five were U.B.C. graduates, and the remaining ten were non-U.B.C. alumni members of Convocation. Two of these latter were members of Faculty. Each Faculty also elected two of its members to Senate. Of the total of 35 Senators, 11, or less than one third, were members of the Faculty. It should be noted that, in the first instance, it was the alumni and the non-Faculty members of Senate, occupying an independent position vis-a-vis the Administration, who took the lead in the Senate in requesting the Board to make its policy clear with respect to apportioning resources among the three Faculties. Members of Faculty on the Senate were anxious, if possible, to avoid making a public issue of their differences with the Board in administrative policy. It is also noteworthy that as yet no alumni were members of the Board, and that the Board's only direct liaison with Senate was through the President. As the existence of the controversy became known, the students took a hand in it with appeals to the Government and the Opposition. Stirring denunciations were made

of the Minister and his policy, followed by the temporary suspension and eventual resignation of the editor of *The Ubyssy* for a too spirited participation in the argument. The Government and the Opposition accused each other, with considerable justice, of making the University a political football. The press, meanwhile, published rumours of impending investigations into the management of the University which were never undertaken, of meetings which never occurred, and of antagonisms which never existed.

Early in March 1931 the Minister announced that the government grant for 1931-32 would be only \$487,000, instead of \$587,000 as had been expected. It remained to apportion this much-reduced supply of operating revenue, and here the University was divided. The Minister urged the University to make severe economies in the Faculty of Agriculture. The President and the Board wanted to maintain agricultural research; the leaders of the other Faculties, as they became aware of the issue and of the fact that sacrifices were going to be demanded from all branches of the University, tended to agree with the Minister. Since the principal attack was being directed against research, and especially agricultural research, what the President apparently had in mind was a rough equalization of the sacrifices in research among the three Faculties. As early as October 1929 he had asked the Deans to submit reports on the amount of the salaries in each Faculty which should be considered as chargeable to research. The figures submitted were: Arts and Science \$32,295; Agriculture \$44,583, and Applied Science \$35,444. At that time, Dean Buchanan of the Faculty of Arts and Science had protested that the Arts figure was a mere guess, that research in his Faculty was largely carried on in the instructors' spare time, and that it was not to be inferred that the Arts Departments could carry on their teaching programmes if these sums were withdrawn. "I quite realize," wrote Dean Buchanan to the President, "that there is no intention on your part, Sir, or on the part of the Board to make any such an inference, but I am not so sure that this inference may not be made 'on the floor of the House,' for example."

Unfortunately for the harmony of the University, and in the midst of the confused battle to save agricultural research, the President did make this inference, and increased the economies to be made in the Arts budget to \$20,000. At the same time the Board approved the President's proposal that tuition fees be raised by \$25 per student, so as to bring in another \$50,000 in revenue. It should be noted that this latter decision was not at once communicated to the Deans. Their subsequent calculations of budgets for their Faculties were all made on the basis of the current student fees. The Senate, for its part, was reluctant to institute limitation, but it, too, favored curtailment of the Faculty of Agriculture and suggested that its research work be transferred to the Provincial Department

Inter-Faculty Differences

of Agriculture. It also requested the Dean of Agriculture to prepare statements showing the cost of teaching and necessary research in the Faculty, and to indicate what courses in Agriculture could be offered for a total cost of \$50,000.

On March 27, 1931 the struggle entered upon a more intense phase with a letter, addressed to the President for transmission to the Board, from Dean Buchanan and twelve Department Heads in the Faculty of Arts, protesting that the Arts Faculty was being asked to make excessive sacrifices and demanding that economies in all Faculties should be made on a uniform basis. They specifically requested that agricultural research not essential to teaching should be terminated.

After unsuccessfully endeavouring to persuade Dean Buchanan and his colleagues to withdraw the letter, the President brought the matter before a joint meeting of Board and Senate which was called on April 10 to discuss budgets and limitation. It was a particularly stormy meeting. Up to this time the Senate had not been clear as to why the Government had reduced its grant to the University. The Minister had given the impression in public that the cut was being made to enforce limitation of admissions, and the President, by his silence, had made it appear that he agreed with this interpretation. But the Board and the President also knew that the Minister wanted to reduce the Faculty of Agriculture, a fact which only now became clear to the Senate. However unwittingly, the President gave the Senate the impression that he was concealing from them the unpopularity of the Faculty of Agriculture with the Minister. He also indicated that the leaders of the Faculty of Arts, in writing their letter of March 27, had made themselves liable to dismissal for interfering with administrative matters. To make matters worse, the Dean of Agriculture made a contentious speech in which he defied the other Faculties to reduce Agriculture, criticized the Arts Faculty as unprogressive, and demanded that certain pure science Departments be transferred to the Faculty of Agriculture. It was not lost on the Senate that the Dean of Agriculture's demands were not rebuked by the President as those of the Arts Faculty had been.

Shortly afterwards, despite strong representations by farmers' organizations and against the vote of the President, the Board decided to reduce the Faculty of Agriculture to a budget of \$50,000. Later the Deans were asked to prepare minimum budgets on which their Faculties could operate. The Board had already reduced Agriculture by \$79,000, but Dean Clement agreed to a reduction of only \$30,000. Applied Science was to be reduced by \$9,000 and Arts by \$27,000. But the budget finally submitted to the Board was based on an increase of student fees from \$100 to \$125; it allowed for limitation of enrolment; and a budget deficit was covered by a supplementary grant from the Government. As a result the Arts appropriation was reduced by \$21,950 to \$275,859;

Annual Grant Cut in Half

that of Applied Science by \$11,316 to \$88,700; and that of Agriculture by \$28,948.67 to \$100,851.33. The passing of this budget involved rescinding the Board's previous resolution restricting Agriculture to a budget of \$50,000.

The leaders of the Arts Faculty felt cheated. They calculated that Arts students would contribute an additional \$40,000 in fees to the general revenue, that their Faculty budget would be reduced by more than \$20,000, and that therefore they were subsidizing the Faculty of Agriculture. From about this time each of the Faculties began to regard University financial problems almost entirely from the Faculty point of view—began to demand what they regarded as their fair share of student fees and of the Government grant. In this competition of particularities, the Arts Faculty, because it was the largest Faculty and the most nearly self-supporting, had the strongest *prima facie* case. As it turned out, the number of students in 1931-32 was less than expected, and it was not necessary to put limitation into effect by restricting the number of admissions. Economies in Agriculture were undertaken, including the sale of half the University's Ayrshire herd (made necessary in any case by the presentation of twenty-four Ayrshires to the University by Captain J. C. Dunwaters of Fintry), and of half the Rambouillet sheep flock. The suggestion that the University farm facilities be leased out was rejected for the time being. In spite of the reductions, the Faculty of Agriculture and the University as a whole were able to maintain themselves at just about the previous level of service. There was a general awareness of the threat of future restrictions, but the threat was not immediate and everyone hoped it would pass away.

But with the preparation of estimates in the autumn of 1931 the internal troubles of the University began again. On December 21, 1931, the Minister informed the President that the Government grant for 1932-33 would be only \$250,000. Now it was to become a question, not whether or not one Faculty could continue to do its full work, but whether or not the University could survive. A group in the Senate, suspicious of the intentions of the President and the Board, were particularly anxious to ensure that further economies should be made, in the first instance, at the expense of agricultural research. They asked the President for information as to costs, possible salary reductions and possible new revenues from fees, for the purpose of determining which courses throughout the University should be maintained and which should be done away with. The President replied that he had no authority to answer these questions. The questioners were referred to a special committee of the Board who likewise refused to answer until their own investigations of the same questions were completed. Later requests met with the same reply. The atmosphere was now so charged with

suspicion that the Senate began to think that they were being deliberately blocked in their efforts to get information.

The setting was being laid for a conflict between the Senate and the Board, for the former were concerning themselves with the business affairs of the University which lay within the jurisdiction of the Board. But it was difficult to draw a line between academic and business affairs. Since the beginning of the University, the Board, because of its control of money matters, had increasingly and inevitably encroached on the province of the Senate. It was understandable that, when the business and academic affairs of the University were both in crisis, members of Senate who were anxious for the welfare of the University should appear to encroach upon the prerogatives of the Board. The Board, meanwhile, had invited delegations from bodies interested in University policy to appear before it on February 5, hoping thereby to place pressure on the Government to secure an increase in the grant. The result was utterly unexpected; the University was overrun with delegates. More than 200 persons, representing more than 80 organizations, appeared before the Board on behalf of the Faculty of Arts and some Departments of the Faculty of Applied Science. In addition, letters supporting the delegations were received from 63 individuals and organizations. So large was the gathering that delegations had to wait their turn in Arts 100, the largest room in the Arts Building, before interviewing the Board, who were thus given ample opportunity to appreciate the force of opinion prepared to support the two major Faculties. At the February 8 meeting of the Board, it was decided, partly no doubt in the light of the numerous representations on behalf of the Arts Faculty, that student fees should be credited to the budget of the Faculty in which students registered, and that after deducting costs of administration, the Government grant should be divided equally between the Faculties. But Dean Buchanan complained that, by this arrangement, Arts was not paid for those very numerous students of Agriculture and Applied Science Faculties who took courses in Arts, especially in the early years. The Senate, for its part, was annoyed that the Board had ignored a resolution of the Senate, passed on February 24, that the Faculty of Agriculture should be reorganized as a Department of Applied Science. A motion of want of confidence in the President was proposed at a Senate meeting on March 16 and then tabled, until the Board had had a chance to learn of the Senate's dissatisfaction.

On March 21 the President summoned all the Faculty members of Senate to his office to express their individual views on the want of confidence motion. These members were placed in a particularly difficult position; as Faculty members, they could not oppose the policy of the President, but they felt that they had a statutory duty to perform as members of Senate. The Arts and Applied

Senate vs. President

Science representatives, without exception, declared their intention of voting against the President on the issue, and gave their reasons, most of which focussed on the President's apparent determination to preserve the Agriculture Faculty intact, or nearly so, at the expense of the other Faculties. Like other members of the Senate, they were annoyed at being denied information about the costs of courses, especially in Agriculture. The Agriculture Faculty representatives supported the President.

This interview probably made the situation worse, for it left the impression in the Senate that the President was endeavouring to apply pressure to the Faculty members of Senate to vote against the non-confidence motion. The Alumni Association, at a meeting held in King Edward High School, voted their support of the Senate motion of non-confidence. On March 31 the Board of Governors accepted the estimates for 1932-33, as prepared by the President in a last, desperate attempt to provide for the maintenance of three Faculties with operating revenue reduced by approximately \$250,000. The extreme gravity of the financial position facing the University may be seen in the following table:

	<i>Budget</i> 1931-32	<i>Estimates</i> 1932-33	<i>Reductions</i> <i>Required</i>
Arts and Science	\$275,859.00	\$198,310.00	\$ 77,549.00
Applied Science	88,700.00	76,000.00	12,700.00
Agriculture	100,851.33	36,150.00	64,701.33
Administration and Miscellaneous Services	268,833.50	190,000.00	78,833.50
Total	<u>\$734,243.83</u>	<u>\$500,460.00</u>	<u>\$233,783.83</u>

The President's estimates, shown above in the centre column, eventually formed the basis of the University budget for 1932-33. On April 5, 1932, the Senate passed by a vote of 18 to 7 the resolution stating:

That Senate regrets that it has lost confidence in the President of the University and feels that the best interests of the University cannot be served under his leadership.

They also passed a resolution assuring the Board of their wish to co-operate in arriving at a budget policy for the ensuing year. The Board on April 9 passed a resolution reasserting their confidence in President Klinck, and invited the Senate to co-operate with them in pulling the University out of its difficult position. To add to the complications, the Alma Mater Society, on March 24, passed a resolution to the effect that they disapproved "of the policy of the President of the University as expressed this winter in regard to the student body."

Lampman Enquiry

This was the situation which confronted Judge Peter Lampman, the Commissioner appointed by the Government, at the request of the Board, to enquire into the problems of the University. His investigation was conducted between May 11 and July 8, 1932. In addition to bringing out the story of the unhappy events recounted in these pages, he was able to secure a great deal of information on the individual interpretations of these events by the various participants in the drama. President Klinck's apparent refusal to pay attention to the remonstrances of the Senate stemmed from a number of sources. He felt that the Senate was concerning itself with matters which were not its concern; he regarded the proposals of the Arts and Science Faculty with respect to crediting student fees to the respective Faculties to be unworkable; he was anxious to prevent Agriculture from being reduced to the status of an Applied Science Department; he wished to preserve some part at least of the agricultural research programme. At no time was his devotion to the interests of the University questioned. Constitutionally he was not bound by the advice of the Senate on business matters, but unfortunately business and academic matters were, in this instance, inextricably intertwined. His burden of responsibility was particularly heavy because the Board appeared incapable of exercising independent action. The Senate, for their part, were most anxious that what economies were effected should be imposed in a way which combined the least degree of injustice with the greatest regard for the interests of the University as a whole. But they were in the dark about many of the arrangements with respect to the reorganization of the University to conform to the reduced budget; they were kept in the dark because, under the terms of the University Act, as interpreted by the Board, financial matters were none of their business. The root of the trouble, as Judge Lampman recognized, was the opinion of the other two Faculties that Agriculture had been carefully nourished while they had been allowed to struggle along as best they could; President Klinck did not take sufficient pains to correct this impression.

Judge Lampman's principal conclusion was that there were too many governing bodies in the University dealing with the same thing—a situation which was bound to lead to friction and meddling. The position of the President was very difficult since he was the only interpreter of Senate and Faculty to the Board, and of the Board to Senate and Faculty; though, as Judge Lampman pointed out, it was not the duty of the President to support Board or Senate or Faculty but rather to support the policy which he considered to be the right one. It was also recognized that the co-ordinating committee between Senate and the Board was not satisfactory, and it was abolished in 1935. At the same time, in order to secure a fuller liaison between the two bodies, the University Act was amended so as to provide for the election by the Senate of three of its members as members of the

Kidd Committee Report

Board for three-year terms. A complete change was also made in the personnel of the remaining six Board members, who continued to be appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. Those whose terms had not expired agreed to retire along with those who had fulfilled their terms.

The crisis and the enquiry did serve the purpose of clearing the air, but it was perhaps fortunate for the University that at this moment a further attack was launched on the University from the outside, to which the University replied with a remarkable demonstration of unity. Just as the internal crisis of the University was coming to a head, a deputation representing twenty-two leading industrial, business and financial organizations of the Province, as well as service clubs, waited on Premier Tolmie and his colleagues on April 15, 1932, and secured the appointment by the Provincial Government of an "independent non-partisan voluntary Committee" of five business men, under the chairmanship of Mr. George Kidd, "similar in scope and object to the Committee on National Expenditure" in the United Kingdom, known as the May Committee. The task of the Kidd Committee was "to investigate the finances of British Columbia with a view to recommending economies to the Government."

The Committee presented its report to the Government on July 12, 1932. Some of their recommendations were of value, some were economically unrealistic or naive. The report, as the Provincial Government pointed out in an appendix, was the work of men without "previous experience in governmental affairs," but its recommendations had a certain popular appeal for a community desperately struggling with the depression, and doubtless exercised a sobering influence upon all who were likely to be involved if its recommendations were carried out by the Government. The findings of the Committee were particularly serious for the University for the Committee predicted that the Government would not be able to continue its grant to the University in the forthcoming year. They did not profess to know what effect this would have on the ability of the University "to maintain its existence" but "should it be found that the financial resources of the University are so meagre as to impair its efficiency, the question will have to be considered whether it may not be in the best interests of higher education to close the University and rely on the proposal . . . to establish scholarships to furnish the means of attending a University elsewhere in the Dominion." The Government rejected these recommendations remarking that: "the question of closing the University should not be entertained unless the financial inability of the Province to continue its operation is clearly shown." This statement settled the matter. But meanwhile student demonstrations were held, demanding the maintenance of the University, and a campaign of public speeches and representations was undertaken, culminating in a brilliant dissection of the report by Professor H. F. Angus

Recession

in the course of a debate with Mr. Kidd at a meeting of the Vancouver Institute which filled the University Auditorium to overflowing on September 18, 1932. After this there was little more to be said on the subject. The University was to be maintained.

But it was maintained at a reduced level of operation. Limitation of enrolment was put into effect from the session 1931-32 but the drop in numbers of candidates for admission to those classes to which limitation was applicable made it unnecessary to turn away students, except in rare instances. Not until 1939-40 did combined registration of First Year Arts and Science and Agriculture exceed their permissible limit of 500. The general enrolment, however, remained surprisingly high. In 1928-29 it had been 1,730; it rose to 2,044 in 1930-31; by 1933-34 it had declined to 1,606, the lowest figure in the 1930's; it then rose to 2,049 in 1936-37, and to 2,476 in 1938-39.

In 1932-33 salaries were cut to levels of from 5-23% below the 1930-31 level. The President offered to cut his own salary by a further 13% but this offer was declined by the Board. Even with salary cuts the vacancies in departmental staffs steadily increased; replacements were not made, and temporary staff members, in most cases, were not reappointed. A considerable number of dismissals had to be made of men whom the University could ill spare. A fortunate few went to other universities; a few hung on, on the periphery of the University, as underpaid and overworked Assistants; some taught in the high schools and some left the academic profession altogether. For a few years all appointments on the University were for one year only, and tenure could not be guaranteed. The Summer Session was severely curtailed and most graduate courses were dropped.

In 1933-34 it was suggested that the University might not be able to offer scholarships and prizes because many of the bonds in which the scholarship funds were invested had been declared in default. Fire inspection contracts were not renewed in 1933, and for one year the appropriation for maintenance of the grounds was so low that a luxuriant hay field grew on the Main Mall. In fact the magnificent work of Professor Buck and his assistants in realizing the landscape and garden potentialities of the site was now partly abandoned. Buildings became dirty, plantings were choked with weeds, and the existing facilities depreciated at an accelerated rate for want of proper maintenance.

Recovery came fairly quickly after 1933, though to those who waited for it it seemed an age in coming. In its annual plea for a more generous allocation of funds, the University, from 1933-34, had to deal with one of its own staff, Dr. G. M. Weir, Provincial Secretary and Minister of Education in the new Liberal administration of the Honourable T. D. Pattullo. In 1936-37 the Government grant rose to \$350,000 and in 1937-38 to \$400,000. Now University budgets

included small grants for research and adult education, and in 1936-37 the Government made a special grant of \$30,000 for adult education to supplement the larger grant from the Carnegie Corporation to establish a Department of University Extension. By 1936 it was possible to permit smaller classes in Summer Session once more, and a number of outside lecturers were engaged. In addition, with the co-operation of the new Department of Extension, courses were instituted in drama, radio, music appreciation, and social science. In the summer of 1938, the Summer School of the Theatre, which has now attained fame throughout Canada, was conducted for the first time. In the 1937-38 session, the salary cuts were fully restored. In addition, in 1936, provision was made for including all permanent teaching staff in the annuity and insurance privileges, on a compulsory basis.

But the improvement of economic conditions also swelled registration and brought back pressure on the University's facilities. By 1935 the University was back to the situation of 1930; a University building programme was more necessary than ever. Crowded conditions, especially in laboratory courses, were presenting a fire hazard, to say nothing of reducing teaching efficiency. Further limitations of enrolment were postponed from year to year while the most forceful representations were made to the Government on the need for new buildings. The Government did, indeed, make a grant of \$5,000 at this time to make possible emergency expansion of the Applied Science accommodation, though they made it clear that this was not to be considered as a precedent for future grants. The possibility of substituting "cultural" courses for science courses as prerequisites for Forestry and Agriculture students was explored; fees for regular students were raised by \$25 and for partial, occupational and extra-session students by 20%. This change roused the students, first to vigorous protests, and later to undertake a student publicity campaign designed to educate the public in the value of the University and persuade them to endow it properly. In their campaign they envisaged a joint capital-grants programme in which the Government, private individuals, corporations and students would all take part. The Government would base its contributions in the future specifically on the number of students registered but would, in addition, contribute \$14,000 a year for ten years in order to match the \$140,000 which the students claimed to have contributed to the capital assets of the University. The Board was not at all favorable to the idea of matched grants, but was prepared to consider the possibility of borrowing for capital construction as an alternative to securing the money from the Government. Meanwhile some efforts were made to secure private benefactions and greater attention was paid to efficient utilization of existing buildings. One measure for relieving congestion, the institution of 8:30 lectures, was undertaken in 1938,

and lecture timetables were rearranged so as to make more effective use of existing classrooms and laboratories. Various organizations in the Province, including the Alumni Association, joined the students in their publicity campaign. The Government estimates in January 1939 were eagerly awaited; but though the grant for operating revenue had been raised to \$425,000, there was no appropriation for University buildings. The congestion was now becoming really alarming; but in reply to a desperate appeal to the Government for relief, the Honourable G. M. Weir, Minister of Education, on August 28, 1939 found himself unable to do more than express his appreciation of the work being done by the Board under exceptionally difficult circumstances. Two weeks later the nation was at war. The problem of University congestion at once became relatively unimportant.

Teaching and research were unduly hampered by this sequence of overcrowding, penury and more overcrowding. It was one of the ironies of the depression that just at a time when trained social workers were most needed, the University could not afford to develop this field. Instead, the flag was kept flying by Dr. C. W. Topping, who organized the Diploma Course, and by the largely voluntary endeavours of Miss Laura Holland, Miss Mary McPhedran, Miss Edna Pearce, Miss Zella Collins, and Dr. Howard T. Falk. Only after the war had brought, almost simultaneously, a realization of the great need for social workers and sufficient prosperity to the University was a Department of Social Work established. Commerce, on the other hand, required no special grants and expanded slowly in the 1930's under the Department of Economics, Political Science and Sociology until in 1939 it was given the status of a separate Department under the Headship of E. H. Morrow.

From 1931 to 1935 it was impossible to consider the introduction of new work in any field. In the latter year strong representations were made on behalf of courses in the Fine Arts. Unfortunately, the University could not support such courses, though a tentative beginning was made with the allowance of six credits in the Third and Fourth Years of Arts to those who completed certain work in Music. The University Music Committee, on the initiative of Professors Walter Gage and Ira Dilworth, arranged in 1935 an annual series of noon-hour lectures on music appreciation by Allard de Ridder, then Conductor of the Vancouver Symphony Orchestra. These were very strongly supported by the students, as were the performances on the campus of the Orchestra itself, and the series of record recitals using the record collection presented to the University by the Carnegie Corporation in 1937. By the end of the decade, in fact, with noon-hour recitals, lectures, summer music and art appreciation courses and the musical presentations of the students themselves, music and the arts had come to form an important, though as yet unofficial, part of University work.

The institution of professional courses was also discussed. After the bequest in 1933 by the late Dr. Alexander S. Munro of \$80,000 for the support of medical research the question of establishing a Faculty of Medicine was explored, but only peripheral arrangements were made. Chief among these was the co-operative development of the facilities of the Department of Bacteriology with the Connaught Laboratories, beginning in 1935. This co-operative work, with the help of National Research Council grants for medical research, led by 1939 to a plan for the establishment of a large Department of Preventive Medicine with its own building, a plan which, as we shall see, was frustrated by the outbreak of war.

How quickly research work is developed in the various Departments depends largely on the personnel of the particular Department, the degree of public support for the work, and the need for special equipment, library, or other facilities. Biology and Botany, Bacteriology and Zoology were relatively early in the field, Chemistry and Physics followed later, and the Humanities much later. Relatively few important papers were published during this period because of the lack of financial support, but the scholarly work, under difficult circumstances, of a number of members of the Arts Faculty staff deserves special mention. These included C. E. Dolman's investigations of undulant fever, botulism and staphylococcus infection; D. C. B. Duff's work on furunculosis in B.C.; A. H. Hutchinson's biohydrographical investigations which helped to lay the basis for oceanography at U.B.C.; J. A. Harris's work on rare earths; R. H. Clark's investigations of acidyl halides; W. F. Seyer's investigations of hydrocarbons; the work of G. F. Drummond and W. A. Carrothers on the economics of currency and monetary problems; C. W. Topping's pioneer studies of Canadian penology; Thorleif Larsen's scholarly studies of George Peele; Dean Buchanan's studies in astronomy; F. S. Nowlan's work on matric algebra; H. Ashton's studies on Moliere and Rostand; D. O. Evans's work on the French novel in the nineteenth century; C. McLean Fraser's work on the marine zoology of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, and G. J. Spencer's study of insect pests. In spite of the extreme difficulty of securing support for publication, a number of books were produced by the Faculty including: Joyce Hallamore's *Das Bild Laurence Sternes in Deutschland, von der Aufklärung bis zur Romantik*, C. McLean Fraser's *Hydroids of the Pacific Coast of Canada and the United States*, Mathematics texts by F. S. Nowlan, L. Richardson and W. H. Gage, H. F. Angus's *The Problem of Peaceful Change in the Pacific and Canada and Her Great Neighbour*, W. N. Sage's *Sir James Douglas and British Columbia*, F. H. Soward's *Moulders of National Destinies*, Dorothy Blakey's *The Minerva Press, 1790-1820*, and Dorothy Dallas's *Le Roman Francais, 1660-1680*. Service outside the University on the part of some members of the Faculty was also of outstanding im-

portance. The Honourable G. M. Weir, on leave of absence as Head of the Education Department, was Minister of Education and Provincial Secretary from 1933 to 1941; W. A. Carrothers was on leave of absence from 1934, as Chairman of the Provincial Economic Council; because of valuable services rendered, F. H. Soward was invited to become National Secretary of the League of Nations Society of Canada—an appointment he felt impelled to refuse; G. G. Sedgewick was the first Canadian to give the Alexander Lectures at the University of Toronto; A. H. Hutchinson was a member of the Fisheries Research Board of Canada and of the International Salmon Fisheries Commission; Dean Bollert was elected President of the Pan-Pacific Women's Association; H. F. Angus, in 1937, was appointed a member of the Royal Commission on Dominion-Provincial Relations (Rowell-Sirois Commission). It was a record of solid achievement.

Applied Science suffered seriously from the depression, not through the decline of its student enrolment, for there was a steady increase, but from the remarkable fluctuations of enrolment in particular Departments, as it became apparent that now one branch of Engineering and now another was a good field for employment of graduates. Nursing grew slowly in popularity.

Course changes in the Applied Science Faculty, except for a greater emphasis on principles and less upon detailed technical courses, were hardly significant until 1935. In that year a Curriculum Committee was appointed to consider what changes were needed to make up the deficiencies which the Faculty had suffered during the depression years. A complete expansion and reorientation of the Forestry Department was set on foot. Logging Engineering, which hitherto had been the principal preoccupation of the Department, was no longer emphasized and, with the help of Dr. P. M. Barr of the University of California, a programme of scientific Forestry was planned. Professor F. M. Knapp, meanwhile, had been very active in developing the University Forest adjoining the Point Grey site, with the help of personnel from the Provincial Young Men's Forest Training Plan. Graduate Courses in Metallurgy and Mechanical Engineering were begun, a course in General Engineering was instituted for all Second Year students; admission standards were raised, and greater emphasis was placed on theory and reading. The results of these changes were soon apparent. There was a rapid increase in the enrolment of all Departments, a large number of applications for graduate work and, in 1939, for the first time in ten years, the University could not fill the demand for graduate engineers. Research work during the period was necessarily limited in scope but of a very high order. H. Vickers' work on high-frequency circuits, F. A. Forward's experiments in the treatment of nickel ores both in B.C. and Japan, and G. A. Gillies' research in the problem of discovering new flotation reagents were particularly notable.

The Faculty of Agriculture suffered relatively more heavily than the other Faculties from the restrictions of the 1930's. By 1932 most of the research organization was being dismantled. Farm facilities were leased, livestock herds were cut back severely, prize Clydesdales were disposed of, and occupational courses were terminated. Many horticultural plantings died or were given up and the agronomy work was much reduced in scope. Research in cheese-ripening was continued on a much reduced scale with the assistance of the Federal Department of Agriculture. The fowl paralysis investigations under the direction of Jacob Biely were kept alive on a hand-to-mouth basis by generous donations of feed by four of Vancouver's feed companies and by donations from time to time from the business community of Vancouver. Professors did the work of technicians and technicians did the work of labourers.

But recovery began as early as 1933 when considerable assistance was received from the Dominion Department of Agriculture who were anxious that the results of the research programmes should not be entirely lost. Co-operative agreements were made with respect to wheat research, alfalfa experiments and, in 1937, to trials of elite vegetable seed in the Department of Horticulture. In 1935, moreover, temporary facilities were made available to the Federal authorities for blood testing for pullorum disease. The Ayrshire herd provided training for practical agriculturists, as well as experimental facilities, and continued to win most of the prizes in the Ayrshire division of the various cattle shows. In addition, cattle-judging teams, trained with the herd by H. M. King, won considerable distinction in the late 1930's. By 1939 significant support was once again being secured from private and Government sources for research, and slowly the Faculty was recovering some of its former importance and prosperity.

The work of John Ridington in maintaining and slowly building up the Library during these difficult years has not, perhaps, been fully appreciated. He showed a special skill in attracting donations of rare and expensive items from private individuals. These included a collection of rare books donated by Dr. Ralph Stedman of University College, Swansea; incunabula from Dr. H. W. V. Temperley and Sir Charles Sherrington of Cambridge. In 1937, the Library of Congress gave the University a set of Library of Congress Depository Cards, thereby vastly simplifying the cataloguing procedure of the Library. A grant of \$15,000 from the Carnegie Corporation in 1932 was, of course, a magnificent windfall, and helped to maintain the Library's purchasing in a most critical year. Other donations of a less spectacular order were extremely valuable. Among these were the regular gifts of the graduating classes and the Summer Session Students' Association to the Library book funds; of the Japanese Students' Club, and various anonymous friends of the University. The financial stringencies of the time

Faculty

were a handicap, but they accentuated that selectiveness which had hitherto characterized the acquisition policy, so that by the end of the decade the Library, though still small, was a remarkably balanced and useful collection.

The reductions in the teaching staff were perhaps the most crippling effect of the depression. New appointments made after 1935 were largely devoted to making up these deficiencies and to filling the larger establishments which were authorized in such vital Departments as Mathematics and Physics. There were a number of significant changes in the administration of Departments. Theodore Boggs accepted an appointment at Stanford University and was succeeded as Head of the Department of Economics, Political Science and Sociology by H. F. Angus. G. G. Moe succeeded P. A. Boving as Head of Agronomy in 1930. W. N. Sage succeeded D. C. Harvey as Head of the History Department in 1932. H. Ashton resigned as Head of the Department of Modern Languages in 1933, and returned to Cambridge to his old College of Gonville and Caius; he was succeeded, after an interval, by D. O. Evans. Wilfrid Sadler died suddenly on August 29, 1933, and was succeeded as Head of the Department of Dairying by B. A. Eagles. The Education Department remained without a formal head for many years after Dr. Weir went on leave of absence to enter provincial politics; in 1939, M. A. Cameron was appointed Acting-Head. C. B. Wood was appointed in 1934 to take over some of Weir's teaching duties, thus beginning his long association with the University which was to include service as Assistant Registrar from 1939 to 1941 and as Registrar from 1941 to 1957. In 1934, too, F. Dallas retired as Bursar, and was succeeded by A. MacLucas.

Dean Brock went on leave of absence late in 1934 as Chairman of the Vancouver Harbour Board. In the summer of 1935 he and Mrs. Brock were killed in an air crash. It was a tragic and an almost irreplaceable loss to the University. Dean Brock had been among the earliest of the University's administrators and his great talents had helped the University and his Faculty through many severe crises.

During the period of his Deanship, he had been responsible for one of the most extensive off-campus projects ever undertaken by the University; that is, the geological survey of the British Crown Colony of Hong Kong. This task, as planned by Brock, in a brief visit to the region in 1923, had been carried out by the members of his Department, including himself, in successive winters: S. J. Schofield, 1923-24, M. Y. Williams, 1924-25, W. L. Uglow, 1926, R. W. Brock, 1926-27 and 1932-33. The geological map of the area surveyed was published by the British Ordnance in 1935. The tragic death of Uglow in 1926 and of Brock in 1935 delayed completion of the report. The manuscript, compiled by Schofield and Williams, was sent to the Hong Kong Government in

Faculty

1939 but was lost during the savage turmoil of the war. A second manuscript of the report was prepared by Williams and transmitted in 1948, thus completing the work begun 25 years earlier by Dean Brock.

For a year after Brock's death, J. M. Turnbull was Acting-Dean until the position was filled by J. N. Finlayson. In that year, too, H. Vickers resigned as Head of the Department of Mechanical and Electrical Engineering, to be succeeded by H. J. MacLeod. In 1937 a link with the past was cut with the retirement of Mrs. Mary I. Rogers, who had been Secretary to the President since 1913. In 1938 T. C. Hebb, Head of the Department of Physics for eighteen years, died and was succeeded by G. M. Shrum. Among the more significant departmental appointments during the decade were those of W. A. Carrothers in Economics and Miss Anne Smith in the Library in 1930; A. Peebles and E. S. Pretious in Civil Engineering in 1932; I. Dilworth in English in 1934; J. Biely in Poultry Husbandry, Sylvia Thrupp in History, and F. A. Forward in Metallurgy in 1935; H. E. McIlroy and W. O. Richmond in Mechanical Engineering, A. M. Crooker in Physics, and J. A. Irving in Philosophy in 1937; R. Hull in Mathematics, E. Morrison and J. H. Creighton in English, J. A. Crumb in Economics, Political Science and Sociology in 1938; H. C. Gunning in Geology and C. E. Borden in Modern Languages in 1939.

Among the resignations during these years were those of H. R. Christie, Head of the Department of Forestry, in 1933; of H. F. G. Letson in 1936; of Robert England, Director of Extension, and E. G. Cullwick in 1937; of J. G. Davidson and H. T. Logan, both members of the original Faculty, in 1938; and of Ira Dilworth in 1939. Colonel Logan had been on leave of absence since 1936 as Principal of the Fairbridge Farm School near Duncan.

The year 1932 was notable for the first award of the title of Professor Emeritus. It was given to Professor George E. Robinson, former Dean of McGill College, first Dean of Arts of the University, and Professor of Mathematics. He was followed in 1939 by Professor James Henderson, who, at this date (1958), is the senior Professor Emeritus, and by Professor P. A. Boving in 1939. As a memorial to the service of Faculty members, the Faculty Association in 1935 presented to the University a Memorial Book and repository, containing the names of all deceased members of Faculty and those who had served the University. The book was designed and produced by Professor E. G. Cullwick. It was unveiled by the Governor-General, the Earl of Bessborough, during his visit to the University on April 9, 1935.

Faculty members earned many other honours during the decade. Among these were the election as Fellows of the Royal Society of Canada of A. H. Hutchinson, Thorleif Larsen, G. M. Shrum, W. N. Sage, H. F. Angus and C. O. Swan-

Public Relations

son. A. F. B. Clark was elected to the French Academy; Dean R. W. Brock was awarded an honorary LL.D. by the University of Hong Kong and was elected a corresponding member of the Geological Society of China; D. O. Evans was awarded the Silver Medal of the Alliance Francaise and Dorothy Dallas and Wessie Tipping were awarded gold medals by the French Academy.

In spite of the unfavourable impression created by the internal strife of the early part of the decade, the University's relations with the public steadily improved throughout most of the period. Credit for this situation should be given to the work of three organizations: the Public Relations Committee, the Alumni Association and the Extension Department, and also to the distinction of members of the University in all the academic fields. The Public Relations Committee grew out of a committee of the Arts Faculty formed in 1932 to advise Faculty members in dealing with attacks made on the University. A campaign in 1933 to publicize the scholastic achievements of University students was directed especially to the outlying areas of the Province where most of the University's critics were to be found. From time to time thereafter, the Committee was called on to deal with complaints about Faculty members (most of which were made by cranks), with unfavourable impressions created by student hazing, and with the problem of securing the greatest possible favourable publicity for the University in the newspapers. The Alumni Association, which had carried on a tenuous existence in the previous decade, began to take shape in the 1930's. A *Graduate Chronicle* was issued at infrequent intervals beginning in April 1931, and the task of gathering a record of all graduates was taken in hand. Various graduate associations of undergraduate clubs were also formed under its wing and in 1935 the constitution was amended to make possible the formation of branch associations. These sprang up in all parts of the Province, in Toronto, Montreal and Ottawa, and played an important role, together with the student publicity campaign, publicizing the University's value to the community.

Up to 1935 University Extension constituted a minor though highly important part of University activities. In the autumn of 1933 the Carnegie Corporation donated \$50,000 to each of the four Western Canadian universities "to initiate some new and significant work which would have a stimulating effect on the morale of the institution," and after careful consideration the Board decided to use \$30,000 of this grant to organize a Department of University Extension on an experimental basis. Following a survey to discover what sort of work was most wanted by the people of the Province, the University agreed to send out more lecturers as an experiment. Under the direction of O. J. Todd, the Committee provided 573 lectures which were attended by 37,870 persons. The emphasis was laid on serving the outlying districts rather than Vancouver and southwestern

British Columbia, but the strain on the resources of the University of providing lecturers for these areas was very great, and after the first year the Committee concentrated upon developing study groups in each district. In 1936 the University Extension Department was formally authorized with Robert England as Director. He was succeeded in the following year by G. M. Shrum, whose Protean talents and energy continue to amaze his colleagues. In co-operation with Farmers' Institutes, field work in agriculture was undertaken. The work of Professor P. A. Boving in the Peace River area was especially notable. The Extension Department participated in the beginning of what was to become the Radio Farm Forum; a series of extension radio talks was sponsored by the B.C. Electric Railway Company, and talks and courses on the appreciation of the Fine Arts were undertaken during the academic year and in the Summer Session. In co-operation with the Dominion-Provincial Youth Training Plan the Department also sponsored rural training schools, including a full-scale Rural Adult Education course, modelled on the work of the Scandinavian Folk Schools, and specializing in occupational and recreational training. A measure of the approval with which this work was regarded was the authorization by the two Governments of a grant of \$40,000 for the year 1939-40.

In spite of the extreme poverty of the University, what it had was fully shared with the community. Local societies were permitted to use the University classrooms for their monthly meetings, the most regular beneficiary being the Vancouver Institute. Commercial firms and research organizations, such as the Health Insurance Commission, were encouraged to conduct their experiments and enquiries in University laboratories and the Auditorium and the Gymnasium were made available at nominal fees for large meetings. Poverty prevented the University from maintaining its commitments to the national and international learned societies in the way it would have wished, though the Fifth Pacific Science Congress in 1933 and the Pan-Pacific Women's Association in 1937 held their meetings on the campus. Similarly it was usually not possible to send representatives to all the ceremonies, inaugurations and anniversaries to which the University was invited, though sometimes a graduate of the University who was near at hand was persuaded to act as representative. Such exceptions included the Tercentenary of Harvard, the Congress of Universities of the British Empire at Cambridge, and the Centenary of the University of Athens.

Honorary degrees were granted to a number of distinguished visitors, though such presentations were not, as at present, a regular feature of the Spring and Autumn Congregations. A special Congregation was held in 1935 to confer an honorary degree on the Governor-General, the Earl of Bessborough, and a similar proceeding was followed in 1939 for his successor, the Lord Tweedsmuir.

Other such special ceremonies included the celebration of the University's twenty-first anniversary in 1936, when among the recipients of honorary degrees were Sir Ernest MacMillan, the Hon. Mr. Justice Murphy and Robie L. Reid; the Autumn Congregation of 1937 when the Premier, the Honourable T. D. Pattullo, was so honoured; and the special Congregation on August 19, 1938, in honour of the meeting of the Canadian Bar Association, when honorary degrees were awarded to Sir Lyman Duff, Chief Justice of Canada, Lord Finlay of Nairn, Arthur Vanderbilt, President of the American Bar Association, and Senator J. W. deB. Farris, President of the Canadian Bar Association.

Service and honour to the community and its representatives were reciprocated by community support for the University. The incidental gifts by groups and individuals are legion, but among the more noteworthy in this decade were the ornamental Japanese garden and lantern, presented in 1934 in memory of Dr. Inazo Nitobe by the Japan Society and the Japanese Associations in Vancouver, and the gift by the Carnegie Corporation of art-teaching equipment and a classical record collection.

Scholarship awards were the most numerous of these donations. At a time when the University's own scholarship funds were strained to the uttermost, it was especially gratifying to receive such marks of respect for the status of the University as were represented by the Carnegie Corporation Fellowships in Mathematics, the Phil Wilson Scholarship in Forestry, the Ahepa Scholarship in Greek, the John and Annie Southcott Memorial Scholarship, the B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundation Scholarship, the Standard Oil Company Scholarship in Petroleum Engineering, the Britannia Mining and Smelting Company Scholarship in Mineralogy, the E. M. Kierstead Loan Fund, the David Thom Bursary in Agriculture, and the National Research Council Bursaries for research. More sweeping in scope than these were the Dominion-Provincial Youth Training Programme Bursaries, instituted in 1939, which were to play an important part in the war-time and post-war training of a great many needy and capable students.

It is probable that a large number of donors were influenced in making their gifts by the remarkable record of U.B.C. graduates in securing the great national and international scholarships. Among those whose names became associated in these ten years with scholarly attainments and promise of fruitful research were Charles Armstrong, Mildred Campbell, Roy Daniells, Malcolm MacGregor, John Liersch, Ralph Hull, Lionel Laing, Dorothy Blakey, Gweneth Humphreys, Lawrence Jack, Ralph James, Andrew McKellar, Sylvia Thrupp, Harry Katznelson, Ian McTaggart Cowan, Patrick McTaggart Cowan, Vladimir Okulitch, William Robbins, Robert J. Wilson, Michael Lerner, George Allen, Robert McKenzie, Desmond Beall, Marvin Darrach, Davie Fulton, Deborah

Universitas Columbiae Britannicae



Omnibus ad quas hae litterae pervenerint salutem:

Quoniam

Felicitas Maria Pope

disciplinam quae a Facultate Artium et Scientiae est imperata diligenter et feliciter peregit atque pensa ad hoc constituta omnia absolvit, ut titulo graduque Baccalaureatus in Artibus adornaretur cum Provinciae legibus tum statutis Universitatis ideo decreverimus ut non modo iuribus privilegiisque huius dignitatis fruere verum etiam munera omnia atque officia praestaret.

Cuius rei in fidem Cancellarius, Praeses, Facultatis Artium et Scientiae Decanus manus suas una cum communi Universitatis sigillo apponebant litteris hinc praecipimus. Datae in Comitibus sollemnibus die septimo, decimo, Mensis Maii, Anno Domini MCMLI

Geo. A. Coates
Cancellarius

Norman A. M. MacKenzie
Praeses

A. H. Chant
Decanus Facultatis

Charles B. Wood
Tabularius

Bachelor of Arts Diploma

Student Life

Aish, Leonard Grant, Malcolm Hebb, Kenneth More, George Volkoff, Kenneth MacKenzie, Gilbert Hooley and Shuichi Kusaka.

The characteristic tone of each generation of student life is hard to capture, and in a period so varied in its influences as the 1930's there is no single mode to describe student attitudes. Earnestness of purpose was characteristic of all the student generations of the 1930's but objectives changed in the course of the decade. In the early 1930's the aim was for higher standards of conduct and attainment in the University. As the depression came, the interests of the students widened and deepened with their attention focussed, first, on the serious social problems of the depression, then on the steady drift toward war. And through it all ran the constant theme of student effort—to improve the University; to develop playing fields; to build a stadium; to build the Brock; to publicize the value of the University to the community; to manage a book exchange, a vocational conference or the triennial Open House; to excel in sports, in debating, in artistic attainments, in scholarship.

Athletic facilities were still a field for student initiative. The building of the Gymnasium had been a great feat, but the playing fields were still largely undeveloped and the University needed a stadium. No permanent commitment could be assumed by the Alma Mater Society until the bonds for the Gymnasium were retired in 1935, but with the help of contributions from the Board and the Faculty, and fund-raising schemes by the students, including a student carnival in 1931, enough money was raised to drain the site of the Stadium, prepare an oval and cinder track, and set up temporary bleachers. In 1935 a bond issue was floated to pay for the erection of a permanent grandstand and this was completed, at a cost of \$40,000, in October 1937.

In 1934 the students also asked for the appointment by the University of an instructor "to give free physical training to students so desiring." The Senate and the Board favoured the suggestion and in January 1936 Maurice Van Vliet and Gertrude Moore were appointed instructors, respectively, of the Men's and the Women's Division of Physical Education. An experimental, voluntary programme was presented in the first year in which 172 men and 300 women registered, and a considerable stimulus was given to intra-mural sports. In 1936-37 the numbers rose to 232 men and 404 women; classes were held in basketball, volleyball, tumbling, corrective exercises, golf, archery, folk-dancing, and badminton. Special attention was given to the training of students for teaching Physical Education in the high schools. Such activity naturally resulted in a demand for the development of the status and facilities of Physical Education.

The students also played an important part in securing the only major addition to the University's buildings in the 1930's. Early in 1936 the Board of Gov-

Brock Hall

ernors decided that, as a permanent memorial to the twenty-first anniversary of the opening of the University, a student union building should be erected, to be called the Brock Memorial Hall in honour of the memory of Dean and Mrs. R. W. Brock. At about the same time the students, having retired the Gymnasium bonds in 1935 and being well on the way to paying for the Stadium, were turning their attention to securing a building to house the various student clubs which were then crowded into the Auditorium. A bond issue by the A.M.S. of \$10,000 was authorized and slowly other funds were secured from incidental cash contributions of the students, the Alumni Association, the Summer Session Students' Association, the Board of Governors, Convocation, the Faculty and the Women's Union Building Fund, bringing the total by April 1937 to just over \$41,000. The Board agreed in 1939 to grant the A.M.S. \$2,500 a year for ten years and donated a further \$4,000 for installing services in the building. Permission was given to the A.M.S. to increase their fees by \$3.00 in order to support a larger bond issue—of \$80,000—to complete the repayment of the Stadium bonds and help finance Brock Hall. By the summer of 1939 there was on hand \$83,801.15 in cash, and the contract for construction was let.

The Brock Memorial Building was completed and officially vacated by the contractors on January 23, 1940. It was opened by the Lieutenant-Governor, the Honourable Eric Hamber, a week later on January 31, in connection with the University's 25th Anniversary celebrations. As President Klinck said, in paying tribute to the students, the building proved "that the spirit of adventure, enterprise and creative thinking was not lacking among the undergraduate body." Brock Hall, with its Students' Council offices and committee rooms, the Mildred Brock Lounge for women students, its cafeteria and commodious hall-lounge, soon became the principal student centre on the campus.

Student government in the early 1930's was concerned with discipline of the student body. Freshman hazing was officially abolished in 1930, though the snake parades downtown continued for some years. It was only in 1938 that the Students' Council could report that for the first year in living memory there was no bill of damages at initiation time. In 1931 there was a particularly memorable Arts-Science riot, and in this respect 1934 and 1937 were also vintage years. Annually, from 1930 to 1933, the Women's Undergraduate Society forbade smoking by co-eds at University functions, and annually the regulations were disregarded until at last they were allowed to fall into innocuous desuetude.

But these manifestations of student spirit were matched by more positive activities. Athletic events, the commentaries of *The Ubyssy* to the contrary notwithstanding, were usually well supported. The basketball team—the Thunderbirds—under the leadership successively of Bob Osborne, Jimmie Bardsley and

George Pringle usually swept the boards or were at least almost always in the finals for the provincial championship. Canadian football declined in the mid-thirties, partly because of the high cost of continuing in competition in the Western Intercollegiate Conference. In 1935 the experiment was made of competing in American football with the small colleges in Washington. In the late 1930's the University returned with some success to competition for the Hardy Cup. In English rugby there was greater success in competition for the Miller, McKechnie and Tisdall Cups, the great rivalry being with Meralomas, then at the height of their powers. Perhaps the greatest triumphs came on the first occasion on which the new Stadium was used, early in October 1937, when the rugby, Canadian football and soccer teams all won their games in the same week-end. But, win or lose, they were great teams with men like Bobby Gaul, Don MacKenzie, Ken Mercer, Evan ap Roberts and coach "Doc" Burke to give them inspiration. In field sports Harold Wright, Mary Frizzell, Lillian Palmer, Bill Stott and Howie McPhee were equally distinguished. Dorothy Rennie set a world's record for the plunge at the Crystal Pool in 1933. The completion of the Stadium helped with the spirit; the student pass system, begun in 1937, helped the finances; and the team manager system, first introduced in 1934, improved the organization of athletic events. All this gave the students something to cheer for, and at games they sang Harold King's "Hail U.B.C.," were inspired to louder cheering by the Pep Club, founded in 1930, and entertained the Alumni at the Homecoming Football Rally.

It was the golden age of student clubs, a fact which was belatedly recognized by the institution of Literary and Scientific Executive Service awards in 1938. These were to be given annually to twelve students and two members of the Faculty as a means of "paying tribute to those who give generously of their time and talents to further the interests of club work at the University."² Papers of the Letters Club on Coventry Patmore, T. S. Eliot and W. H. Auden, a Classics Club discussion of Roman Roads, or a year-long series of discussions of Modern Nationalism by the Historical Society were all given maximum publicity in *The Ubyssy*. The meetings of the Vancouver Institute, too, were important events in the University life, and were attended by a great many students. The Parliamentary Forum, which owed a great deal to the enthusiasm and direction of Professor J. Friend Day, provided valuable early forensic experience to such formidable debaters as Neil Perry, Milton Owen, Nathan Nemetz, Victor Dryer, James Gibson, Davie Fulton, Jay Gould, Alex MacDonald and Darrell Braidwood. They practised formal debating in the grand manner, especially when there were visiting debaters from England, the United States or Australia,

² 1940 *Totem*, pp. 204-5.

and the Oak Room of the old Vancouver Hotel was hired for the occasion. From time to time, as during the 1933 provincial elections, the Forum's activity verged on contemporary politics; and in the late 1930's a Political Discussion Club, whose purpose was to circumvent the A.M.S. regulations against having political clubs on the campus, had a short and controversial existence.

Probably students were never more politically conscious than during these years. In the early part of the decade they were generally idealistic, in favour of the League of Nations and pacifism. It followed that they were particularly antagonistic to the C.O.T.C., which they regarded as the advance guard of militarism on the campus. The U.B.C. contingent of the C.O.T.C., under the successive command of Colonels Logan, Letson and Shrum, carried on its training in the 1930's under very difficult circumstances. It had no accommodation suitable for parades and had to beg or borrow drill-space in the Gymnasium or from the various armouries in Vancouver. Even the building of a miniature rifle-range in the basement of the Arts Building was regarded with concern by some of the authorities and with hostility by many of the students. But when the War came there was at least a small group of men on the campus with an organization ready to serve the military needs of the University.

Early in the decade the enthusiasm of the student body was directed to social reform, to aid for the destitute in the depression (a clothing and relief drive was conducted on the campus in the winter of 1932-33); and as the threat to world peace grew, this idealism became international once more. After the Italian invasion of Ethiopia less was heard of pacifism and more of supporting freedom, though as late as 1937 straw polls indicated a reluctance to actually fight. The more left-wing groups, notably the Students' League (founded in 1934), became active in support of the Spanish Government in the Civil War, and at least one student, Lionel Backler, died on the Aragon front. But though all sorts of nativist organizations professed to regard the University as a hot-bed of Communism, there was no overwhelming support for radical ideas. Tim Buck, Howard Scott and the apologists for the Italian Government were equally criticized, and the general tone of student opinion was mildly liberal. As always among students, there was a strong determination to manage their affairs in their own way, free of outside interference.

The artistic work of the societies, particularly the presentations of the Players' Club and the Musical Society, was of a very high order. Indeed such ambitious presentations as Shaw's *Caesar and Cleopatra* in 1934, *Hedda Gabler* in 1935, *The Brontes* in 1937 and *The Playboy of the Western World* in 1938 by the Players' Club, and *The Yeomen of the Guard* in 1938 and *Serenade* in 1939 by the Musical Society were of a standard which was almost professional. But, good

or bad, everyone went to the Christmas Plays and the Spring Play and the Mussoc's annual opera because they were important parts of University life. So too were a Film Society (a characteristic product of the mid-thirties) and "Varsity Time," the University's own radio programme, begun in 1937.

The essential commentator on all this was *The Ubyyssey*, growing from five to six columns, with at first four, and later, occasionally, eight pages. Here the stories of Stu Keate, Ronald Grantham, Arthur Mayse, Himie Koshevoy, Norman Hacking, and Dorwin Baird were displayed; here the features like "Muck-a-Muck," the turgid "Adventures of Chang Suey," and "The Time Has Come" found a home. *The Ubyyssey* was, too, the recorder of social change—from "My Gal's a Hullabaloo" to "Oh Ma Ma, Get That Man for Me;" from the Charleston to the Lambeth Walk; from Harold King to Ozzie Durkin, and from "no smoking for coeds" to the Bowen Island "Booze Cruise." And it left a record of all the important events of the decade: the visits of Harold Laski and the Oxford Group; the determination of the Seniors to wear gowns (they never got around to buying them); and the great snow of '35, when the Arts Building roof and Mrs. Lefevre's house nearly collapsed, the Library stacks were flooded and someone threw snowballs at a very distinguished visiting lecturer. And, as the decade drew to its close, *The Ubyyssey* noted the steady inroads which the disaster of a world in chaos was making on the idyllic peace of University life. The generation of the 1930's was indeed "armed for experience."