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-- ORIGINS --
ORIGINS

The first step towards the establishment of a University by the Parliament of Western Australia was taken when on September 10th, 1901 Mr. R.S. Haynes moved in the Legislative Council -

"That in the opinion of the House the time has arrived when a University should be established in Perth."

After some debate an amendment was carried which read -

"That this House is of opinion that the advisability of at once establishing a University or University Institute demands in the best interests of the State the immediate consideration of the Government."

The only important difference between motion and amendment is the qualifying word "Institute" which is added to University. The members of the House were apparently rather afraid of the financial responsibility of a full University and leaned towards some extension of the Adelaide University Extension Committee which had been formed in Perth in 1898. The work this Committee did was arranging for extension lectures to be delivered in Perth by men from the Adelaide University staff and conducting examinations for the Junior, Senior and Higher Public Service Certificates. These examinations were supervised by agents of the Adelaide University.

To West Australian citizens of the present day (1946) with three trains to and from the Eastern States weekly as well as a frequent service by air and sea, with a State population of half a million and a revenue of nearly £14,000,000, it is difficult to visualize the limited resources and the isolation of Western Australia before the discovery of gold on the Murchison in 1891, Coolgardie in 1892 and Kalgoorlie in 1893. The total
State revenue in 1890 was £414,314 and the population in 1891 was 49,782. Even these figures reflect the stimulus given by gold. The discovery in the Kimberleys in 1885 and at Yilgarn in 1887, even though the results were disappointing, led to an increase in the population during the period 1881-1891 of 20,000, whereas the increase during the preceding 10 years was only 5,000.

The only communication from Fremantle with the Eastern States prior to the Gold Rush was by small and poorly appointed steamers. The only regular passenger steamer on the run was the Adelaide Steamship Co. S.S. South Australian. She was in 1890 about 15 years old and her registered tonnage was 760. She probably took 8 or 9 days to reach Adelaide. The mail steamers from England passed Fremantle but did not call, so anyone who desired to travel by a larger boat than 1,700 tons had first to travel the 300 odd miles to Albany and there take such steamers as the S.S. Crusco or Lusitania of 3,825 tons, less than half the tonnage of our present Coastal Service Steamers.

The number in such a small and isolated community who desire a University education was naturally small and the number would be further reduced by parents who hesitated to send their children so far from home for the necessary years of study. During these years a visit home entailed a return journey round the notoriously stormy Cape Leeuwin and across the Great Australian Bight in a steamer as small as 760 tons.

It required some years of Gold Rush before the Adelaide University was required to give the service which has been mentioned before. Under the stimulus of the yield of gold and the borrowing policy of the Forrest Government for the construction of the Fremantle Harbour Works, the Coolgardie Water Scheme, Railway building, etc. the population and
wealth of Western Australia during the nineties continued to grow. As a consequence those interested in higher education, such as Dr. Hackett, Mr. Cecil Andrews, Bishop Riley, Sir Walter James, Mr. T.H. Bath, Mr. J.S. Battye, were led to raise the question of the desirability of a University, and so it came about that Mr. R.S. Haynes moved his motion in the Legislative Council in 1901.

Some of the remarks made by Dr. Hackett in this 1901 debate are well worth quoting today and will probably be worthy of regard for a long period yet. He was speaking about the concentration of Oxford and Cambridge and Dublin on the dead languages and Mathematics and said -- "It is partly due to this fact that so many Universities press their studies in this direction and partly through the scheme of English education whereby a man who devotes perhaps 10 or 12 years to learning Latin and Greek, which he spends the rest of his time forgetting, is deemed a far more educated being, a far more worthy citizen than a man who has worked his way up through difficulties with a fair knowledge of practical science ........... the system of Germany and America is proving to be correct in its fundamentals and I say that unless we get a University which has a thoroughly practical bearing and which puts - to mention a word considered so gross in the University I have mentioned that I almost fear to use it - the utilitarian object as the first before it, it is no use for us to create one at all ........... We have in a word to enunciate this doctrine that the pursuit of practical questions, those questions upon which the material welfare of the world depend, are at least worthy of equal position and credit to that of the dead languages and the higher mathematics and what is generally known as culture which unfortunately so often unfits a man for any practical use in life."
All this has of course been said by many, but coming from Dr. Hackett it may still with advantage be considered by the Professorial Board when making the scholarship awards which are financed from his bequest.

After the passing of the resolution in the Legislative Council in 1901 no further steps were taken until in 1903 the Government, led by Walter James, passed the University Endowment Act 1904. The greater portion of the Premier's second reading speech in the Assembly was devoted to a comparison between the population and revenue figures for the Eastern States at the time their Universities were founded. He also stressed the disability which West Australian students were under by the necessity of living away from home and travelling to the other side of Australia.

The Act of 1904 vested in the Trustees for the University Endowment 33 parcels of land of a total area of about 4146 acres. 13 of these parcels comprising 4118 acres were within 10 miles of the G.P.O., Perth and 20 lots of 28 acres were in Country Townsites. Great expectations were entertained as to the financial benefit to the University which would come from this endowment. It was described at the time, and the description has been repeated many times since, as a Statesman-like provision for the future needs of the University.

Dr. Hackett, when speaking in the Legislative Council on the 1904 Bill, anticipated that in a few years with the growth of the State a substantial portion of the running costs of the University would be paid for out of the revenue from these lands. These hopes have unfortunately not been realised. As the University has no capital with which to improve the endowment lands, and as experience proved that no one wanted them on lease or to rent, there was no way of securing income. Moreover, as
for the first 15 years sale was prohibited by the University Act of 1912; it was not possible to sell some lots to secure capital with which to improve other lots, so no progress could be made. Prior to the Amending Act of 1927 the University was prohibited from selling any endowment lands.

One very regrettable method was adopted to secure a little so-called revenue; this was by leasing quarry sites. This was first adopted by the 1904 Trustees and was continued when the land was transferred to the University Senate. From the quarries the revenue derived was in reality the capital value of the land for when the quarries were worked out the land had little or no value.

The University Endowment Bill was introduced first into the Legislative Council by Mr. Kingamill September 29th, 1903. Some remarks made by Dr. Hackett when speaking on the second reading show how extravagant were the hopes for the yield from the Endowment. They also show that the smallness of the annual grant in the University Act (1912) and the absence of any capital grant for buildings was not due to any lack of knowledge as to the amounts required but to the fear that if the real amounts were stated the Legislative Council would reject the Bill. This fear I have alluded to elsewhere.

(Dr. Hackett) "I am satisfied that a modern University to do its work should receive an endowment that would stagger the House (he had just answered a cavilling interjection by E.H. Wittenoom) if it is put into figures. I do not think a modern University will do its work effectively or thoroughly for a few years under £30,000 or £40,000 or even £50,000 a year. It seems hopeless and impossible to expect that this amount can be contributed from the funds of the State; but it is
perfectly possible and feasible that it should be the result from an income derived from the lands with which the University is to be endowed and which in a few years, owing to the development of the State, will be worth even the handsome sum I have mentioned."

Premier James spoke to the second reading of the Endowment Bill on November 17th, 1903. The Act was assented to on January 16th, 1904. James went out of Office on August 10th, 1904. Kingsmill had stated in his second reading speech that the lands to form the endowment had not yet been definitely decided upon.

According to Mr. W.A. Saw, who was at the time a surveyor in the Lands Department, the selection of the lands to form the endowment was so long delayed that when the unexpected victory of the Labour Party at the 1904 elections had shown James that his term as Premier was limited to a few days, it was decided that he would have to hurry if he were to complete his University Endowment. He and his Lands Department Officers had to work fast to get the lands safely gazetted as University Endowment. This fortunately was accomplished before James ceased to be Premier.

After the passage of the University Endowment Act of 1904 the various movements leading up to the appointment on January 6th, 1909 of the University Royal Commission are admirably set out in the Report of that body and I cannot do better than quote somewhat extensively. The Commission Report is an historical document which is becoming more scarce and difficult of access as the years go on. It is very largely the work of Mr. J.S. Pattye (as he then was).

The members of the Commission were — Dr. Hackett, LL.D., M.L.C., Chairman; the Right Rev. The Lord Bishop
of Perth, Mr. Cecil Andrews, M.A.; Sir Walter James, K.C.; Rev. Brother Homan; Hon. Henry Briggs, M.L.C.; Mr. Thomas Bath, M.L.A.; Mr. F.R. Allen, M.A., B.Sc.; Mr. W.E. Cooke, M.A.; Dr. Athelstan Saw; Dr. J.W. Smith, K.C., LL.D. The Rev. Brother Homan only attended one meeting of the Commission as he was transferred by his Church to the Eastern States. Mr. J.S. Batty, B.A., LL.B. was unanimously appointed Honorary Secretary.

After mentioning the passage of the University Endowment Act of 1904 which created a body of Trustees to administer the endowment lands pending the establishment of the University the story, as set forth in the Royal Commission's report, proceeds:

"In 1906 the University Graduates' Union was founded with the object of banding together the University men who were resident in Western Australia, and thus in some measure endeavouring to educate public opinion in favour of a University."

"In the same year advantage was taken of the presence of Dr. Hill, Master of Downing College, Cambridge, who had come out under engagement to the University Extension Committee, to hold a public meeting in Queen's Hall for the purpose of discussing the question of a University. At this meeting, held in September, 1906, at which Dr. Hackett presided, the following resolution was passed on the motion of the Bishop of Perth, seconded by Dr. Hill:

"That this meeting records its opinion that the time has come when a University should be established in Western Australia."

"The meeting further pledged itself to support the movement, and requested the Endowment Trustees and the Extension Committee to act in conjunction in the matter."

"In June, 1907, a deputation from the University Graduates' Union waited upon the Minister for Education,
and urged that a charter be granted for an examining University. The Minister expressed himself as favourable to the idea, but suggested that the Union should consult with the Endowment Trustees. The result of such consultation was that the idea of a merely examining University was abandoned, as it was felt that a teaching institution should be the goal towards which all efforts should be primarily directed.

In the following month, a sub-committee of the University Extension Committee, which had been considering the question, brought in a report advocating as a fundamental principle that the University should be a teaching as well as an examining body.

Further action was taken in the beginning of 1909, when, on February 5th, the Government appointed a Royal Commission charged to report to His Excellency the Governor "upon the question whether the time is opportune for the establishment of a University in this State," and, "if so, upon various matters in connection therewith."

The most important recommendations of the Royal Commission, with some of the reasons upon which they are founded, are as follows:—

Establishment of a University.

No. 1. That, in the best interests of education and of the State, it is advisable that a Western Australian University should be established without delay.

Your Commission is unanimous in this opinion.

Western Australia is the only considerable member of the white dominions of the Crown without a University. Indeed, every civilised State in the world save our own can now boast of having some such help for its people. In America it is said that the capitalised funds of the University endowments increase by many millions sterling annually.
In Western Australia the argument for the immediate establishment of a national University stands practically without answer. If we compare our own present position with that of the sister States of Australia at the time their Universities were founded, with one exception the advantage rests with Western Australia if we take population, revenue, and national development into account. The following are the figures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Revenue £</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>New South Wales..</td>
<td>197,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856</td>
<td>Victoria .....</td>
<td>338,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>South Australia..</td>
<td>188,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>Tasmania .....</td>
<td>145,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td>285,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second finding of the Royal Commission was --

"Constitution.

No. 2. That the constitution of the University should, as far as possible, conform to the type adopted by the Universities of the Eastern States, but with such amendments as will bring it into full accord with modern and liberal requirements.

"Equality of Sexes.

No. 3. That in all respects the members of both sexes shall enjoy equal facilities, rights, and privileges.

The Commission sees no reason for establishing any distinction whatever between the two sexes, either as regards education or the administration of the University. For this reason, not only has it interposed no obstacle to both sexes enjoying the full educational privileges of the University, but women are permitted, if occasion should call upon them, to take part in the labours of both Senate and Convocation.

"Fees.

No. 4. Your Commission favours the view that teaching
in the University should be free, and suggests
that, if fees are found to be necessary, they
should be on the lowest possible scale.
The whole question of demanding or of not demanding
fees for teaching is one of no little difficulty, and in
making this recommendation your Commission feels that the
matter is one that deals with so important a principle and
so closely affects the finances of the University and the
annual amount that would be required from the Government
for upkeep, that the settlement of it ought rather to be
left to Parliament.

"Faculties.

No. 5. That Faculties be formed in Arts, Science
(pure and applied), Law, and perhaps Music, and
at a later stage in Medicine and Surgery.
Your Commission suggests that at the establishment
of the University four Professors should be appointed, in
addition to the Chair of Agriculture which Dr. Hackett has
undertaken to endow, and recommends that these should be:-
Professor of Modern Literature and History.
Professor of Mathematics and Physics.
Professor of Chemistry.
Professor of Engineering and Mining.
In the opinion of your Commission certain Lectureships
will also be required, in addition to the Professorships
suggested. Your Commission considers that, in Classics, a
Lectureship will at the outset be sufficient for the needs
of the State. At first it may not be possible to cope
with all the subjects mentioned, but in the early stages
of the University these subjects may to a large extent be
brought together into groups, with a Lecturer for each
group.

"Buildings.

The Commission is not prepared to make a definite
"recommendation as to its housing. For the present, it is "clear, Professors, Lecturers, Examiners, and Students will "have to be content with temporary and provisional arrange- "ments, but the allocation of a site and the commencement "of permanent buildings cannot be too early arranged. A "building of the size of the Technical School, in St. "George's Terrace, or the Continuation School, in Thomas "Street, ought to be sufficient for the earlier stages. "Three sites have been suggested to the Commission - "Government House, Parliament Buildings, and a site near "the Subiaco railway station. Of these, the building "ground at Government House, even if it were procurable, "is altogether too limited in extent. A narrow strip of "clay bank is all that would be available for the University "buildings, while the site could only be extended by making "use of the swampy and unhealthy flats that extend along "the foreshore of the river. As regards the Parliament "House site, the proposal to utilise it for University "purposes only becomes practicable if it should be decided "that the cost of completing the Parliament House, and the "size of the building would be beyond the means and needs "of this State as years go on. The advantages offered by "this site are as obvious as they are numerous and im- "portant. If, indeed, within a measurable time a strong "likelihood were to arise of a smaller Parliament House "being built nearer the centre of the city, the present "building could be used with so much advantage for Uni- "versity purposes that the question of the dedication of "this fine and, from the students' point of view, most "convenient site, might well be entertained. If this be "ruled out as impracticable, the site the Commission is "disposed to recommend would be one in close proximity to "the railway station at Subiaco. One great recommendation "of this site is that the full amount of land required for
the objects of a University, say, 80 to 100 acres, could
be readily secured. The greatest objection to the
Parliament House site is that the area does not exceed
13 acres. In this case the remainder of the land required
for the University as it expands would have to be found
elsewhere. The site at Subiaco has many claims to con-
sideration. Not only is a sufficient extent of land
available in one block, but the ground is fairly level.
It is easily accessible by rail or tram, and those
student residents at Fremantle and in the suburbs lying
between Fremantle and Perth would be fully accommodated.
It is probable that arrangements could be made for
reduced fares to University students throughout the State.

Attached to the Report of the Royal Commission is an
Appendix written by Dr. Hackett. It is of value as the
work of a man who above all others knew the policy which
the founders of the Western Australian University desired
it should follow. He had attended the Press Conference
in London and had been requested to enquire into the
working of some of the most recently founded English
Universities:

I occupied myself with the great modern Universities
of England, none of them older than ten years, with the
exception of the Victoria University of Manchester, and
this although its history dates from 1880, was recon-
stituted as late as 1903. The others, Birmingham (1900),
Liverpool (1903), Leeds (1904), Sheffield (1905), and
Bristol (1909), are the gift of virtually the first ten
years of the present century. These are independent of
some half score of University Colleges in England alone,
subsidised from the Imperial Exchequer, and some of which
are clearly destined to attain full University status
before many years are over.

Modern English Universities.

These Universities have been derided as merely
"glorified technical schools. Everywhere, however, the
"service is being more fully appreciated which has been
"rendered by these bodies in providing the technical
"student with advanced courses, and in elevating the cul-
"tivation of the practical arts of life to the University
"standard. On the other hand those classical and higher
"science subjects, which till recently were inseparably
"bound up in the popular mind with the idea of what a
"University should make compulsory in its prescribed
"courses, are by no means neglected. But, it is not to
"these that the institutions mentioned owe their popularity
"and their distinctive results, though their success all-
"round has for the most part been brilliant. The note-
"worthy points are the degree in which the teaching enters
"into the everyday needs of the working life of the com-
"munity, and the provision made for instruction and
"research in those material arts which go to make a country
"progressive, existence easier, toil more honourable and
"better rewarded. It is not easy to assess at its full
"value the courage which, for instance, led Manchester
"early to embrace in her University curriculum subjects
"whose admission must have excited honest laughter in the
"soul of the typical graduate of the day. Such studies were
"for him outside the University pale, and suggested to his
"mind a complete misapprehension of the University idea.
"Other Universities need now have no fear of suffering
"either in credit or influence through following the
"example of Manchester, or of the great University of the
"midlands, in appointing professors and lecturers in such
"commonplace subjects as commerce, education, social science,
"public health, technology, dental surgery - a name of
"offence to the old medical schools - and offering special
"instruction in such arts as bleaching, dyeing, paper-
"making, accounting, brewing, textile manufacture, and the
"like.
I dwell upon this because it gives me the opportunity of striking the key-note of this report, and, once more, of insisting that whenever a University is established in Western Australia it seems clear to me that its chief solicitude must be for those primary arts of production on which the life of the State depends, and that its success should directly flow from the popular instruction it is able to provide. Instead of putting the classics, for example, in the chief rank, we must aim at teaching the living languages. In place of chiefly occupying himself with the more ancient and exalted schools of pure science the student's eye should for preference be generally directed to proficiency in such subjects as agriculture, mining, and technical work. Not that the older courses should be shut out of sight, but let the respective positions of the old and the new be revised. Let the latter be called to priority of place — priority which will bear due relation to the actual requirements of our people, and to the income of those who desire to secure for their children or for themselves that more advanced training in practical subjects, which should be offered by the University of Western Australia.

The distinction of having been the Premier to pass through Parliament the Act which at last established the Western Australian University belongs to Hon. Frank Wilson and the date of the first reading was October 13th, 1910.

In his speech introducing the Bill the Premier drew very largely on the report of the Royal Commission. He paid a tribute to the propaganda work done by Dr. Battye in the way of lecturing to inform public opinion as to the need for a University. He sketched the progress made by Education since its inception as far back as 1871 when the first elementary Education Act was passed under the old
system of Crown Government. The first Technical School was established in Perth in 1900 and the Kalgoorlie School of Mines in 1903.

The Premier guardedly expressed the hope that "the lectures I hope will always be free to all comers", but preferred to leave the question of fees to the Senate to discuss the matter "to enquire into and advise the Government as to whether the time has arrived when we should abolish all fees of every description and of every nature."

The Premier continued - "The House will agree that the University must be a people's University within the reach of all, must be of practical value in the development of the State ..... and absolutely open on an equal footing to both sexes." He expressed strong approval of the provision by which private persons or organisations by cash payments of £100 in the case of a person or £10 for two years by an organisation could secure a vote in Convocation. His hopes were doomed to fail for in 32 years there have been no offers from any organisation to come under this section. In reply to an interjection by Mr. Heitman, a goldfields member, as to capital for buildings the Premier said - "It (the University) must of course for the first year or two be housed in temporary buildings ..... I do hope that in the next financial year I shall be in a position to report to the House ..... as to the best site available and as to proposed buildings." Unfortunately, or perhaps, fortunately neither site nor permanent buildings were to be decided upon for many sessions of Parliament, and if it had not been for the great Hackett Bequest permanent buildings might still be

It may be mentioned in passing that the University Senate proved to be so dominated by the old Conservative political party outlook on education as to be incapable of definitely and finally favouring a Free University. After backing and filling for years the matter was taken out of its hands and settled in December 1921 by Parliament on the motion of the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Collier, supported by the Premier of the day, Sir James Mitchell.
only a probability.

The Royal Commission had suggested 3 possible sites - Parliament House, Government House and near Subiaco railway station. The Premier was very definite in his opposition to Parliament House -- "some wanted to earmark the building we at present occupy. I for one am not in favour of turning Parliament into the street in order to make room for a University .... further there is not sufficient space." With the promise that "I will in the meantime take steps for temporary accommodation" the Premier concluded his speech.

Not many members seemed inclined to take part in the debate which makes very flat and dull reading until Mr. Underwood rose. Mr. Rufus Underwood was a representative of one of the Northern Mining constituencies. He was a man of strong native intelligence, fortified by a good memory stored with the results of wide reading. He had spent most of his life in the backblocks and was tall and rugged looking, clean shaven face and head covered with a vigorous mop of black curls. His gift of humour was unusual and altogether he had what a lady journalist might call a colourful personality. His first speech was a long rail at Universities generally and all their human products: "Of great inventors, writers, poets, etc. only a very few had ever had any connection with a University."

When the Bill got into committee he initiated a debate which may be of some interest to students of English. He moved an amendment to line one which read "from henceforth and for ever." He contended that was absolutely and positively ungrammatical. He wanted the clause to read "There shall be established henceforth in the State of Western Australia a University."

Tautology was a thing to be avoided and "hence" meant from, and from hence meant from from which was
The word henceforth expressed all it was desired to say. No attempt was made to meet the argument as to the grammar of the clause. In committee he returned to the attack: "we could not possibly make an act for ever. It was not only ungrammatical to say henceforth for ever but we would debar providence from moving an amendment on Time from having a say."

The Premier pointed out that in the Acts establishing 6 modern English Universities the words henceforth for ever were used but Mr. Underwood's most striking contribution to the debate were his comments on Plato. He read long quotations from Plato as to what constituted honesty and justice and argued that on these matters the conclusions of the ancient sage were entirely wrong and he concluded "The man who invented the term Platonic love has my fancy. Platonic love means there is nothing in it, and how true that is of Plato.

A subject dealt with during the debate by Mr. Underwood is one which the orthodox University historian will either ignore or attempt to belittle. It is the unfortunate fact that at intervals over a long period of years the Australian Universities in imitation of the older English Universities allowed their young gentlemen students to act as Strike breakers. Allowed is too mild a term, as a fact some of the Professors, with the full knowledge of the University Governing Authorities, gave expression to their own political and class bias by encouraging and even leading their young gentlemen as strike breakers. Mr. Underwood said: "The most despicable action of the various Universities of Adelaide, Melbourne and Sydney is bringing the students out to act as blacklegs and scabs breaking strikes. The Engineering students in Sydney came out scabbing against workmen on Tramways. The Professor brought his tools (the students) out against the workmen in the Railway strike in Victoria and it was
only the other day (he was speaking on 25/1/1911) that in Adelaide Professor Nayler's students came out to defeat the striking labourers on Rundle Street, Adelaide, South Australia."

The few instances which Mr. Underwood was able to remember could be multiplied by a search of the daily press for past years. Whenever mentioned these strike breaking activities are always lauded by the daily press in extravagant terms of praise. This naturally increases the resentment of the Unions who feel they have been stabbed in the back by a body whose sympathies at least should be with those struggling for better living standards.

This partisan attitude by some University men in opposition to the wage earners' struggle for better conditions is one of the most important reasons for the regrettable attitude of aloofness and even hostility by organised labour in Australia towards the University and all connected therewith.

Another aspect of the same opinions was voiced by Mr. J. Scaddan -

"Immediately a person enters a University he is generally regarded as having removed himself from the rest of the world. He must be isolated from the people; he must have his own sports ground; he must be kept aloof from the common herd ....... The buildings must be so situated that the students can feel that everything within the four corners of the grounds is theirs ....... They must not come into contact with the people ....... that I think is the chief danger ....... The students who pass through the University should keep in close

Mr. Scaddan was the Premier of the Government which nominated the first Senate. This was the chief influence within his Government which led to the fortunate decision that Crawley should be the site for the University.
"touch with the people; they must feel with the rest of "the people the hardships they are passing through ...... "and they (the students) must feel that the advantages "they are receiving should be shared with and be used "for the benefit of the masses."

As was to be expected the contribution to the debate on the University Bill by Dr. Hackett in the Legislative Council was of a high order. He emphasised the necessity for paying adequate attention to utilitarian matters, to studies which would further the development of the State's resources. He quoted the last sentence of the Royal Commission Report - "Our children may be able to gather at will the fruits which grow on the upper branches of the tree of knowledge ...... the opportunity now at our doors which should permit us to develop by the same instrument alike the resources of the State and the faculties of its people."

Dr. Hackett proceeded - "It is a curious fact now that Queensland has taken its place in the circle of Australian Universities no self-governing country under the British Crown is without its University except Western Australia."

On the subject of the attitude of University men to Trade Unions it will be of interest to Australians to quote from OXFORD AND ITS COLLEGES by J. Wells, M.A:

"The University, then, which had gained all these "privileges, cannot be said to have been founded by any "single man, whether Alfred (see p. 49) or his successors. "It was rather, as its name, "universitas" (guild or "corporation) implied, the trade's union of the Oxford "masters or teachers, which had succeeded in securing for "itself, in a very special way, that privilege of "ecclesiastical independence, which all "clerks" claimed, "and to gain which, Becket had fought and died. The rules "of admission to this trade's union were the earliest rules "as to graduation; just as the journeyman workman was not "his own master till he had shown his competence by "producing his masterpiece, so the student was not a master "of arts till he had satisfied those who were masters "already that he was competent to teach. Hence in the "modern degree ceremony, as it is performed from term to "term, no degree can be given unless there are at least "nine masters present to "make a house."

"The character of this mediaeval union of teachers "was, on the whole, democratic. Anyone could be admitted, "even the son of a serf."
This reproach was removed for the Western Australia University Act was assented to on 16th February, 1911 and Western Australia took its place with the others.

These two quotations from speeches by Underwood and Scaddan in our Western Australian Parliament in 1911 still have their message and warning for all University well wishers. University men will probably say they are misrepresentations and as regards the views of some University men they undoubtedly are, but Messrs. Underwood and Scaddan were voicing the views held by a very great majority of those they represented. Of their capacity to do this there can be no question. Both left school at about 14 years of age and had won their way to positions of honour and responsibility and they were trusted by their fellow citizens. Under the Premiership of Mr. Scaddan much enduring work was put into the structure of Western Australian legislation. When Professors urge or tolerate the strike breaking efforts of University students, and when the daily press lauds such efforts, they are merely making clear their alignment on the side of money and power against Trade Unionists.

The exclusiveness of University people described by Mr. Scaddan is another fact which contributes towards the regrettable but very real indifference, if not hostility, felt towards Universities by the mass of the Australian people. Most University people are probably unaware of the reaction by the people to this exclusiveness and would deny the charge. But notwithstanding protestations, actions show that in many things Australian Universities are following slavishly many forms, traditions and prejudices of the older English Universities. Of this my own experience in the governance of the West Australian University furnishes
many examples from which I will quote only two:

When Professor Wilkinson (Architecture, Sydney) was here in connection with the adjudication on the prize design for University Buildings a discussion arose as to the form of gate at the main entrance to the grounds from Stirling Highway. I was strongly opposed to any form of gate and argued that as the grounds were public property they should be open without restriction to the public. Wilkinson wanted

"This considered further recommendations to the Senate included the erection of a stone wall all round the grounds such a wall would cost many thousands of pounds.

"From ancient times and the faction fights between the students and the citizens of Oxford in the fourteenth century? These faction fights were continued up to quite recent times as "town versus gown" riots of Victorian times.

(Quotation from OXFORD AND ITS COLLEGES)

"The students and the citizens were always quarrelling, "as was inevitable in the narrow space within which they both "lived. The students complained that, as always, of ex- "tortionate prices for food and lodging, and of the dirty and "unsanitary state of the town; the townsmen complained - "probably with good reason - of the lawlessness of the "students, and that they abused their privileges as clerks to "screen themselves in acts of dishonesty and violence. No "doubt both sides were to blame, but the University - thanks "to its powerful allies, the King and the Church - always "got the better in the end, and gained almost complete exemp- "tion from the ordinary courts and the right of being tried "in their own ......

".... On St Scholastica's day, February 10, 1354, the "citizens had made an attack on the students far more fierce "than any preceding one; there had been a pitched battle in "the streets, to which the bell of Carfax (the tower still "stands) had called one side, while the bell of St Mary's "had summoned the "clerks"; these at last, overborne by "superior numbers, for the citizens were reinforced by the "sturdy rustics from the country round, had fled, and many of "them had been murdered. The result of all this had been "that the city was put under interdict, and after a year's "delay Edward III. had finally decided in favour of the "students, and given them a charter of privileges which left "the citizens helpless, and made the University officials "supreme."
The second example of inherited exclusiveness by University men was a remark by Professor McFarland, then Vice-Chancellor at Melbourne. In conversation when at the Adelaide Jubilee Celebrations he said - "If I had my way I would relegate all the sciences back to the Technical Schools where they belong." Is not this opinion a remarkable example of the old monastic idea of a University as a place secluded from the world where men dwelt and spent their lives in calm and undisturbed concentration on what they were pleased to call the Humanities, a term of wide enough meaning to cover every movement for the Social and Scientific advancement of Humanity, but in their narrow view meaning little beyond the study of Greek and Roman literature? Neither should be invited here.

A third example of the tendency to exclusiveness in University people is the remarkable letter written by Sir Mungo McCallum in which he refers to Professorial status. Extracts from this letter are given in the account of the selection of Professor Whitfield as Vice-Chancellor. Their relevancy to exclusiveness is that a man who, after obtaining his B.A. and reaching a Lectureship in Physics, had on the Field of Battle and in command of men and affairs won his way to the rank of Brigadier General with many honours before he was 40, was in the view of Sir Mungo not of sufficient "status" for the position of Vice-Chancellor. Yet he (Sir Mungo) had been of sufficient "status" at the age of 70 for the Vice-Chancellorship of Sydney University, primarily because he had been a Professor.
This same Sir John McFarland, Chancellor of the University of Melbourne, said to a reporter of the Adelaide Register on 16th August, 1926 -

"Questioned as to his views on a free University, Sir John replied - I do not believe in that. I think the fees should be as low as possible and that there should be a liberal supply of scholarships and exhibitions to enable promising students to make their way through the University, but an absolutely free University would have the tendency, as it is not merely a cultural institution, to induce men who would be much more useful citizens in other walks of life, to make their way into the professions."

The logic of this is rather mixed but it appears plain that in Sir John's view, by charging University fees you restrict the number of those who can enter the professions to those whose parents can afford to pay fees - therefore to charge fees is good. Does it follow that the higher the fees the more select you make the professions? It is difficult to realise that a man who held such views could become Chancellor of a University in a democracy such as Melbourne in 1926. They are however quite consistent with his other view that if he had his way he would relegate all the sciences back to the technical schools where they belong.

If the persons who would make "useful citizens in other walks of life" are capable of passing all the examinations and prescribed tests which precede the entry into the "professions", why, in the name of Democracy, should they be discouraged?

It is germane to this matter to record that some figures published by the Department of Information show a higher grade pass by those students receiving Federal grants than by those paying their own fees.
Dr. Hackett, an enthusiast for all forms of true culture, was sarcastic about this feeling which regards "the word 'utilitarian' as so gross as hardly to be mentioned in University circles." The sciences serve the utilitarian needs of mankind and therefore should be relegated to the Technical school to form the subject matter studied by common folk. The academic mind is completely blind to the cultural effect of the practice of a skilled trade and would indeed deny that any such effect is possible. The training of the hand and of the eye, the skill, the accuracy and the wide knowledge of materials and processes necessary to craftsmanship do not, to the academic mind, indicate the possession of what they would recognise as Culture; but to fuddle young minds with the doctrines of Kant, that is another matter, that is truly Cultural.

When I had the honour of representing the University of Western Australia at the 1926 Jubilee celebrations of the Adelaide University, I was brought in contact with the University Don and mass. Most of the functions were strictly formal and everybody was on his best University behaviour, but there were banquets and excursions when these University dons metaphorically speaking discarded the mortarboard and gown and became human. They behaved
much as the ancient and honourable brotherhood of Shipwrights or Stonemasons or Blacksmiths would behave under similar circumstances, that is to say they talked "shop" at great length and in great detail, and like the shipwrights and others they hurled their trade and technical terms at each other in the form of Latin, Greek and other learned tags. They had a right royal academic "get together" and generally enjoyed themselves.

In his opening speech the Chancellor, Sir George Murray, quoted with approval from an address delivered at the first conferring of degrees by the Adelaide University by the then Chancellor, Dr. Short on May 2nd, 1877. The quotation is as follows:

"What is the part which the Universities have to "play in the Drama of modern human life? They still "find most honourable and beneficial employment in "directing the studies and forming the characters of "the governing classes of every Christian country. They "help to elevate the middle classes to higher civilization."

Now this was all very well in 1877. It was what any University Chancellor of that time might be expected to utter, but to quote it with approval in 1926 showed that the Chancellor of 1926 was not much removed from his predecessor of 1877.

The Prime Minister of Australia, Mr. S.M. Bruce, was present. Being an active and up to date politician with a Labour opposition in Parliament, Mr. Bruce when his turn came to speak felt constrained to point out that 50 years had passed since Dr. Short had spoken and that the privileged classes had no longer the monopoly of governing positions they had in 1877. Notwithstanding the Prime Minister's correction Dr. Short's sentiment so agreed with the opinions of many present that at subsequent functions it was repeated by a number of speakers
with strong approval. The audience by their applause placed it beyond doubt that a majority of them also approved of the old Bishop's aphorism. When first used I dismissed the matter as merely a sentiment which might be expected from an old man who had graduated many years previously at Oxford or Cambridge, but when it was repeated and above all applauded by the audience I was amazed. I had thought I lived in a democracy, yet there was a body of brilliant and able men, the cream of the teaching and administrative staffs of the Universities of Australasia, uttering sentiments appropriate to the England of the time when "good King George was King."

One could imagine them subscribing to the sentiments that the only occupation worthy of a gentleman is the "profession at Arms," that the eldest son of a gentleman should go into the Army, while the others took up the Church or the Law; while all those who did anything useful with their hands and tools should thank the Lord for the station in life to which they had been called and remain what Shakespeare's Faskets would describe as -

"A crew of patches, rude mechanicals
That work for bread"

They were still supporters of the bad old English class education system epitomized in the phrase "The Old School Tie." So deep were they in their own exclusive academic rut that they were unable to see that the real rulers of to-day in Australia are the common folk when they flock in their thousands to the Ballot Box.

It is perhaps only fair to add that the Professors I came in contact with in Adelaide were mostly men well on in years and some were old men, many of whom have since gone to their rest. There was probably a wide gap between what they thought and the views of the younger University teachers of that time.

The influence exercised over students by their
Professors is very great and is not confined to the subject they teach. Even if a conscientious effort is made to hide their personal political bias it is difficult to avoid by a scoff here or a sneer there, by a half truth or an untruth impressing the young minds listening to them with the teacher's personal bias. Some such explanation as this is necessary to account for the very poor showing which men with University degrees have made in the cause of Economic and Social reform. Ever since the days of Adam Smith (1776) orthodox University Economics has been the arsenal from which the opponents of reform have drawn the arguments and alleged facts necessary for their purpose. This has been true in turn of reform in the matter of Child Labour, the employment of women in mines, the Trade Union movement, reduction in hours of labour, the increase of wages, the legal fixation of wages, etc., etc. The whole of the great work accomplished by the Trade Union movement has been done in the teeth of accepted University Economic doctrine. It has required two great World wars, Karl Marx and the success of the Russian revolution to drive Economics from its individualistic outlook and even now (1945) its concession to the beneficial effect of collective effort is small indeed. Professor Mauldon (Economics, Western Australia) in reply to criticism in the same strain protested against "parading the wrong opinions of dead men as a means of belittling the honest work of the living." No-one could reasonably blame the living Professors for the mistakes of their predecessors but the so-called science they

The quotation is from the "West Australian" leading article (30/5/45) on the question of the Teachers' Union affiliation with the Labour Party. I do not endorse the view that any teacher worthy of the name would use a deliberate untruth, but I think the rest of the quotation is sound.
profess is to blame for continually blocking reform. Even its discarded theories serve for the Arbitration Courts of Australia annually spend many hours listening to evidence and addresses founded upon J.S. Mills' theory of the "wage fund." It is beyond question that the vast majority of employers who approached the Western Australian Court of Arbitration during the 33 years I was on the Bench thought of wages in terms of the "wage fund" theory propounded by Mills, even though he himself and all his successors have disowned it.

In such ways do the mistakes of the dead continue to do harm to the living generations after the author of the original mistake is dead.

So it would appear that the University leaders who shocked me by their endorsement of sentiments uttered by the Adelaide Chancellor in 1877 thereby disclosing how far they were behind current political thought and current educational needs, were unfortunately members of a large community.

Approaching the subject of academic values from an entirely different standpoint the psychologist, Professor Pear, says -

"The neglect of the intelligentsia to recognise the value of the wealth of experience which comes through a channel little used by themselves (he had been speaking of the use of tools and of making things and its effect upon mental growth) has resulted in the mutual isolation of those whose world is mainly verbal from those who think in terms of movement ...... the development of a language of Kinaesthesia would do much to break down the intolerance of each type to the other." (MS. note opl)

We all suffer from the general acceptance of many wrong values in education.

This is far too big a question to deal with adequately, but to illustrate my meaning I will give one
profess is to blame for continually blocking reform. Even its discarded theories serve for the Arbitration Courts of Australia annually spend many hours listening to evidence and addresses founded upon J.S. Mills' theory of the "wage fund." It is beyond question that the vast majority of employers who approached the Western Australian Court of Arbitration during the 33 years I was on the Bench thought of wages in terms of the "wage fund" theory propounded by Mills, even though he himself and all his successors have disowned it.

In such ways do the mistakes of the dead continue to do harm to the living generations after the author of the original mistake is dead.

So it would appear that the University leaders who shocked me by their endorsement of sentiments uttered by the Adelaide Chancellor in 1877 thereby disclosing how far they were behind current political thought and current educational needs, were unfortunately members of a large community.

Approaching the subject of academic values from an

When Professor Whitfeld attended the 1938 meeting of the British Association at Cambridge he was impressed by an address delivered by Mr. Frank Pick, General Manager of the London Passenger Transport Board and he sent me some notes thereon from which I take the following:

"University education is too narrow. It is a "literary and learned University. What the speaker sought "was a University of the hand and eye (Arts and Crafts) "to educate thro' things ....... There have been great "advances in Art and technology. Hand and eye taught the B "brain, in the master craftsman. The struggle with "materials and tools educate as well as grammar. One can "express oneself in materials as well as in letters .... "...... Take the analogy of the village carpenter's shop, "with its piles of spare timber and heaps of shavings, "litter and scrap. From time to time, at week ends or "holidays, the carpenter has a general clean up. In "university work the text may be obscured in reference and "notes. The University however does not have a clean up."
example. To be able to quote a few Latin tags, or to use a few halting sentences in a foreign language has been, for many generations, and is now, regarded as indicating a higher standard of education (culture) than is indicated by the ability to make a good wheelbarrow. I suggest that a true valuation would reverse the order and place the ability to make a good wheelbarrow higher in the scale than many scholastic attainments.

Why do we educate and for what?

Many volumes have been written in answer to this question. In my view education should aim at making men and women better men and women than they would be if not educated. If this is the proper objective sought, then the conclusion must be that education has failed. Our present system makes better Chemists, Engineers and Technicians; it teaches them to express themselves in better English; it trains those with a flair for philosophical speculation to spin endless words; but does it make better men and women? emphatically No.

To make my meaning clear I must explain what I mean by the phrase "better men and women." Men and women become better when, from some cause, they practise in greater measure what superior people call the humbler virtues. Some of these are Honesty, Truthfulness, Loyalty to a friend or a cause, Mercy, Tolerance, Willingness to give public service without fee or reward, Readiness to risk convenience and ease, even life itself for the weak or those in danger. In the manifestations of these virtues education has nothing whatever to do. The highly educated are not one iota more virtuous than the humbly educated. To those familiar with life in the factory and the mine this knowledge has always been clear,
and during the great world wars demonstrations of its truth have come in endless volume from the battle fields and the countless unknown heroes of the Mercantile Marine.

The strengthening of the virtues inherited by any individual brought about by education seems to reach its maximum early in life. When a child has been taught reading, writing and arithmetic he or she has acquired the tools for further mental advancement and can proceed by any of our education systems to the utmost of his absorbing capacity, but future progress in good citizenship depends much more upon the aptitudes and desires, the lusts and appetite he was born with more than on any present system of education.

Whether human beings can ever be made better in the sense in which I use the word by any system of education may be questioned. The biological law to the effect that -

"Acquired characteristics are not transmitted to the offspring"

seems to stand in the way. As all education is an "acquired characteristic" and is not transmitted it follows that each individual when born starts life as an original primitive savage conditioned only by his mental and physical hereditary.


"He had always been scolded as a pessimist he "said because he had denied the supremacy of culture "over the instincts, but his opinion that the barbaric, "the elemental destructive instinct in the human soul "was ineradicable has become confirmed most terribly. "Not that he got any satisfaction in being right.

"Perhaps coming centuries might find a formula to control
"those instincts, at least as regards the common con-
cerns of people; in everyday life, however, and deep
within man they survived ineradicably, perhaps useful
"energising agents."

But however slow may be man's trend upwards, we
should never give up the quest until we have found some
system of education which will help the upward trend.
Minds can be debased and virtue obscured by disease and
want and bad environment. Conversely the exercise of
virtue can be assisted by good surroundings. A
necessary foundation for any system of education is
plenty of good food, sleep and healthy environment.
These have not, up to the present, been regarded as an
essential basis for education in the sense in which that
word is commonly used. If they were enjoyed by all the
nation would reap a rich dividend in the enormous in-
crease in the mental and physical capacity of its
citizens which would follow.

During the great industrial depression in the
early nineteen thirties two members of my family were
primary school teachers. The accounts they brought home
about the effect of poor food upon the capacity to learn
in children from homes of unemployed men who were living
on the unemployed sustenance allowance, shocked me. What
the State lost and is still losing from stunted talent
and warped individuality arising from the poor food and
the sense of frustration of the depression period must be
very great.

A great deal of water has passed under the bridge
since Messrs. Underwood, Scaddan and Hackett spoke in
1910 and many class distinctions and prejudices were
driven into the background by the 1914-18 war, but they
were not eradicated. Some remarks made by Archbishop
Riley when Chancellor in August 1917 may be noted as
indicating a change in the University attitude towards
Trade Unionism and industrial disputes in general -
"By permission of the Senate I desire to bring
forward what at any time may be an urgent matter. It
is reported that the undergraduates of Melbourne have
taken sides in the present Industrial unrest. I want
to avoid anything of this kind taking place here. I
have always fought to keep Universities outside the
range of practical politics ...... We believe the
University should be a place where all sorts of
questions can be studied without the heat of politics
entering in to bias the minds of students ...... I do
hope the Senate will discountenance in every possible
way members of the University as members taking part
in political or other troubles. We do not in any way
wish to fetter the action of anyone as a private
individual, but we do want to prevent him committing
the University in any particular way."

The views of the Chancellor met with unanimous
approval of the Senate.

The Wilson Government did not remain long in
office after the University Act became law. A general
election was held which put the Labour Party in office
with John Scaddan as Premier. To this Government fell
the duty of appointing the first University Senate.