THE MAGNETIC SURVEY.

FILLING IN THE GAPS.

IS THERE A MAGNETIC PULL IN OIL?

Sir Douglas Mawson, Professor Kerr Grant, and the Government Astronomer (Mr. G. F. Dodwell, B.A.) waited upon the Premier (Hon. C. Vaughan) on Thursday with an interesting request. Mr. Dodwell said the Carnegie Institute at Washington had just completed a survey in Australia, and they were directly interested in it. Their stations were necessarily distributed somewhat sparsely throughout the Commonwealth. They asked South Australia to help fill in the gaps and carry on the survey, especially to produce an accurate map of the State. Professor Grant and Mr. Dodwell pointed out that while Australia was especially disturbed, and therefore recommended that it would be of interest and importance to fill in what had been done by them by means of detailed work. A valuable offer of co-operation had been made by the University of Adelaide.

Professor Kerr Grant supported the request, and handed to the Premier a treaty representing, they regarded as a fair scale and value of the work to be done.

Sir Douglas Mawson said all that the deputation asked for was not much—a grant of up to £100 for magnetic instruments that would be paid for out of State revenue. Professor Grant and Mr. Dodwell proposed in their spare time to do this work for the State, travelling from point to point and making a detailed magnetic survey. The survey was to be done on their own expense, had done a certain amount of work, and all that remained was for details to be filled in. An allowance of £250 a year should be made by the State to cover expenses out of pocket. The research would add a great deal of data, which were not only scientific, and would be referred to by the scientists of the world, and would benefit the State, as it would improve the geology and economics as well. More information was needed about the magnetic quality of the rocks often opened up in the State. The request was also important from the standpoint of the Premier, as it would help in future surveys and would be of great value in developing the State's minerals.

The Premier, after discussion, agreed to the request and promised to consider the proposal. The Premier, in reply to the request, said he would consult the department concerned, and see what the Government could do. It would be necessary for a line to be placed on the estimates.
Professor Henderson’s Lecture on the Great War.

AN APPRECIATION.

The night is fine and moonlit. The Institute Hall at Balaklava, is filled by a curiously quiet, yet an attentive audience of men being well in evidence. There is a little bussle just about eight o’clock, occasioned by the placing of a few late comers. Shortly afterwards the lecturer steps before the audience, preceded and introduced by the president of the local Belgian Committee (Dr K. Moreux), a full-blooded, athletic-looking, with, nevertheless, the slight stoop of the student. He is vested in his professional gown. His face is strong, withal kindly, and behind his glasses are dark, keen, genial eyes. His opening words are a gracious acknowledgement of the president’s welcome and his cordial relations at the University. His voice rings out at once as rich and powerful and under splendid control, rising and falling with the ascent and descent of his thoughts. He carries us at once in medias res. He contrasts the divergent temper and motive of Britain and Germany, and entering into the story of the great war. In his succinct but historical, he appeals for the main proof of his statements to official documents, in this case the respective White Books of the two Empires. Britain’s, like herself, frank and straightforward. Germany’s, just a selection of that part of the diplomatic correspondence which favours her cause and a convincing apology for her action. It is clear that she alone of the four invited Great-Powers—Germany, Italy, Russia, France—declined to send delegates to a conference in London, suggested by Sir Edward Grey, which could have confined the quarrel to Austria and Britain and bridged the breach by a similar conference actually had done in the recent Balkan war. The responsibility for war as a European conflagration is, therefore, heavily Germany’s by this refusal.

This point established, the Professor, kindling as he went, but ever judicial and passion free, laid home the moral of the war, involving as it does, violating her word, twice pledged in treaty and as late as 1913 verbally confirmed by the Kaiser himself, in the ruthless invasion of Belgium. Here was the crucial divergence ‘twixt Britain and Germany; here was the initial fault. Britain enters upon the war with a clear conscience and honour to be corrupted. Her entrance is stained by the faithlessness to her pledged word that she would respect the neutrality of Belgium. Thankful, the Professor explained he was thankful.
Every citizen of the British Empire, I believe, was the spirit of our entrance into this direful war. Our cause is just, and, therefore, must surely prevail.

But Germany’s initial fault is deeply added to by her spirit and methods of warfare. Her frightfulness in Belgium is deliberate, terrorising, atrocious and without parallel for at least a couple of centuries. It is, moreover, a predetermined plan of warfare, executed in all its brutal ruthlessness upon poor unhappy Belgium. And here, again, the Professor’s proofs were drawn from unimpeachable sources, from the testimony of the German War Book itself, and from the opinion of an expert neutral eyewitness. It was explained that the Professor’s mission in this regard, and to weigh the German warfare with absolute fairness, exaggraing nothing, Judged by this standard of strictest fairness, which could be said of the sack of Aachen, for example, save that it was a cry of lust and destruction, with German soldiers exacting on all, the civilian population had provoked it by shooting down the Chief of Staff; shooting him down, yes, but how, by the impulsive and righteous-indignant action of a boy who conceived his sister’s honor to be gravely threatened. This was only a characteristic instance of the German expectation of perfect self-control on the part of the Allies. Nevertheless, it involved all in a common degradation and a reversion to barbaric warfare. The opinion of the world, however, had steadily gone against Germany’s unfair methods, and neutral States, even America.

Despite its inexplicable official attitude, were sympathetic to the Allies. And the German frightfulness had been enjoined and its directions found inscribed in the German War Book. This was a menace to civilization, and though Germany had been recently leading the world in philosophy and technical science, she was certainly unworthy to be allowed in the frightfulness of her warfare, any rather to be justly denounced.

This brought the Professor to the middle of his lecture. His grave, measured, judicial exposition and indictment of the German atrocities deeply moved his audience, though there was little...