THE SITE.

To one standing in any part of the spacious and beautiful grounds and viewing the natural beauties of the site, with its wide sweep of foreshore and considering the abundance and convenience of the transport to and from the City, it is difficult to imagine that there could ever have been any so short sighted as to oppose the selection of Crawley as the University Site.

But those who took part in the battle of the Sites know how determined and prolonged the opposition was and how unscrupulous it was.

As an instance, imagine a man of the standing of Sir Talbot Hobbs, good citizen, Architect and distinguished Soldier, putting his signature to a report that:

"Considerable amounts will have to be spent on drainage, ... owing to its low level it is unsuitable for University Buildings.... on the Occasion of our (the Committee) visit, a considerable area of the ground was flooded."

The facts are, of course, that up to the present (1945) there has been no need to spend one penny on drainage, nor will there ever be, except for a small area of not more than two acres where the clay subsoil comes to the surface in what was the Orchard of the old Crawley homestead. 110 out of the 114 acres south of Stirling Highway have a soil so sandy and porous that the heaviest deluge that ever fell there is immediately absorbed.

In this report Sir Talbot was not expressing the opinion of himself only, he signed as Chairman of a Committee of six members, three of whom were selected from Perth's leading Architects, and three from leading Engineers appointed by the Faculty of Engineers.

Their exaggerated statements as to drainage etc. were made notwithstanding the existence of a report by the teaching staff of the Department of Engineering who had been working at Crawley for over six years. They reported that the water table of the land was quite satisfactory.
for Building purposes etc. etc.

Then there was the action by Perth's Medical men. No less than 46 of them signed a petition against Crawley. Anyone who had not taken the precaution to read the document carefully would naturally assume that a petition signed by 46 Doctors would relate to the health of the Site. There can be no doubt that this was the impression those who organised the petition desired to create in the Public mind. But even to oblige a colleague, 46 Doctors who would put their signatures to a declaration that Crawley was unhealthy could not be found, their only point was that it was inaccessible. But the restraint in what they signed was in sharp contrast to some of the statements made in private. I remember being very incensed at the use by Dr. Saw of the word "miasma" as descriptive of the mist which he said rose from the Crawley swamps. I said it was a gross exaggeration. He replied with some ascerbity that he was the Medical attendant on the Shenton homestead and knew what he was talking about. So I went to find the so called swamps. I found that on the South West of Pelican point between Crawley and Nedlands jetty, the strong south westerly winds (known as the Fremantle Doctor) had built up a small sand dune running parallel with the Beach. Behind this small dune in the Winter time of heavy rain, some water collected. I had worked for 10 years on the Fremantle Harbour Works and had become familiar with the great work the Dutch Sand Pumps there employed were capable of, I was consequently able to assure Dr. Saw that a few hours work with such a pump would obliterate for ever his so called swamp. As a matter of fact, in about the year 1935 this was actually done in the course of river reclamation and so the swamp bogey was laid for ever.

After the Doctors came the Professors and Lecturers with their petition against Crawley. Then up came convocation with its little lot of objections and a peti-
tion signed by 31 students.

There was also a resolution (29th Oct. 1913) in Parliament moved by Walter Dwyer, at that time Labour member for Perth (afterwards President Dwyer of the Arbitration Court) he moved -

"That the house is of opinion that the most suitable site for the University is at or near the corner of Thomas Street and Kings Park Road, being portion of Kings Park, and recommends that the necessary legislation to that effect be introduced."

In support of his motion, Mr. Dwyer said he had tabled it at the request of Convocation and it was the plea of the recent petition in favour of Kings Park. He personally favoured Kings Park and he rehearsed the same arguments about loss of time with students of limited means having to travel to such an inaccessible place. He regretted the abuse which had been heaped on Convocation for its opposition to Crawley. He then said a new thing -

"Crawley was supported by an unholy alliance between the Premier (Saadon) and the Leader of the Opposition (Wilson). The Premier, because he wanted the Subiaco lands for his Workers homes, and the Leader of the Opposition because of the exclusiveness of Crawley."

Messrs. B.J. Stubbs, Bertie Johnson, Underwood, George and Turvey all took part in the debate.

The Attorney General said among much else -

"The most active opponent of Crawley from the beginning was Dr. Saw. He had not limited his agitation to himself but had used his position and influence to enlist the services of other members of the Medical Profession."

Mr. Dwyer's motion was not voted on, but was adjourned and not again called on.

The great amount of interest taken by the Public in the University Site is shown by the number of letters and articles which appeared in the Press over a considerable period of years. The following is a sample.

In a long letter dated September 11th, 1913 Dr Saw said -

"......He (the Premier Scaddon) must have known that in the Senate the Government phalanx and the Chancellor's (Hackett) Cohorts are impervious to argument and to petitions. The phalanx faintly chants, "We want West Subiaco for Workers Homes; the Cohorts make anti-phone" Kings Park is sacro-sanct."

To this in a long leading article the editor (Hackett) replied:-

"We publish the above letter with regret. It would seem as if to Dr. Saw the W.A. University simply presented an opportunity for attacks on the Government .... and so on."

The City of Perth Council registered its opposition to any part of Kings Park being taken for University purposes on 11th November, 1913.

A side light, on the methods of one who fills a big space in W.A. annals, Sir John Forrest, is given by a resolution carried by the Kings Park Board with Sir John in the Chair favouring the granting of portion of Kings Park for University purposes. This was followed by an acrimonious Newspaper controversy to the effect that the motion had been carried by a minority, the majority being opposed to the grant. Somewhere about this date, Sir John had been dubbed by Sir. George Reid, the Emperor of the West.

When he signed his entirely erroneous report, Sir Talbot Hobbs was only joining the win tie or wangle opposition to Crawley indulged in by a large proportion of the Architects and Doctors, Professors and Students of Perth.

This opposition, if not organised by Dr. Saw and Sir Walter James at least followed the implacable opposition by these two Gentlemen. This was in turn, I am convinced, due to a large degree to political party opposition to the Labour Governments desire to secure some of the University endowment lands for Workers Homes.

But not all the opposition was Political. It is interesting now to analyse the reasons given by the opponents in their numerous petitions, and to find that the only objection of substance was that Crawley was in accessible. Even at the time it was made, this assertion did not state a fact for Crawley was served by a tram service to Nedlands Jetty.
Within three years of the completion of the Hackett Buildings, the substitution of the Trolley Bus for the Claremont Tram and the growth of the Petrol Bus made Crawley the most accessible spot in the Metropolitan area, outside Perth itself, with more frequent and rapid transport to the centre of the City.

If the opposition to Crawley had been successful there remained only two alternative sites. One of these, (in Kings Park) was hopeless, the Government had announced its determined opposition, the Kings Park Board and other Local Authorities strongly opposed the idea.

The other site and with Crawley eliminated that certain to be selected was one of 80 acres on the sea side of the Railway Station, then known as West Subiaco, and now as Shenton Park. If this had been selected, then instead of upwards of 160 acres the University would have been restricted to half that area. Immediately South is the Asylum for the Insane, on the West are the Sewerage Sludge settling Tanks, on the North the Infectious Disease Hospital and the Home for Lost Dogs. As the Land Agents would say a most select list of eligible neighbours. To crown all the Government at the time of writing have announced their intention to erect in the immediate neighbourhood an up to date and modern Jail for the Criminals.

In 1925 when the Battle of the Sites had been raging for 11 years, a movement was organised by Professors Murdoch and Wilsmore to make another attempt to finalise the matter. A conference was called consisting of three representatives, each from the Senate, Convocation and Professorial Board. The fact that the Senate, which alone of these three bodies had any actual authority to decide the issue, agreed to the same number of representatives as each of the other two is indicative of how tired the Senate was of the problem.

By six votes to three this conference emphatically condemned Crawley. Fortunately three of the members
drew up and presented a minority report. For reasons it is not necessary to state now this minority report became the accepted policy of the Senate, and Crawley was finally accepted as the University Site.

The three signatures to the minority report were W. Somerville, J.S. Battye and H.E. Whitfeld. It will I think be granted that they did a good job for the University.

But to begin at the beginning, Crawley was first developed as a farm, but for many years prior to its purchase by the Government in May 1910 for £15,500 it had been the Suburban Home of a prosperous business man who was also a Politician of note as Sir George Shenton, speaker of the Legislation Council. When the University got possession there were a considerable number of Citrus and Stone Fruit Trees, and a long and quite impressive Grape Vine Trellis. These vines according to the recollection of Mrs. Birmingham (1945) had been grown from cuttings obtained by her grandfather Sutherland from the Cape of Good Hope when on the voyage from England. The orchard was on the site of the present Oak lawn on the east side of the Engineering Department. There was an attractive flower garden and fine old trees between the homestead and the river, and at the back an old style English Brick barn which was used as a work shop by the Engineering Students. The spread of farming on the more spacious fields east of the Darling ranges combined with the growing income derived from the General store run by George Shenton on the site at present occupied by the Economic stores at the eastern corner of Hay and Williams Streets, had caused Crawley to lose its character as a farm. It had changed to a Suburban residence in spacious grounds of about 152 acres on a beautiful site a few yards from the waters of Matilda Bay.

At the time the University took possession there was still an old retainer of the Shenton family who lived
in a small Brick Hut on the edge of what is now the Great Court. The University kept him employed for some years as a Caretaker. That was before the days of Motor Cars and Commercial Trucks and a very large number of horses were stabled in Perth. The owners were very glad to be able to give them a run on grass over the weekend. Meadowcroft collected quite a surprising sum in agistment.

Knowing what I did of the harsh and unnutritious character of the coastal scrub, what the horses ate during their weekends was a puzzle. The discovery years afterwards that the Crawley paddocks carried a thick growth of the highly nutritious veldt grass supplied the answer. This grass had been introduced by accident in some straw packing used with goods imported by Shenton from South Africa. It had spread and provided good grazing on even the poor white sands in Crawley paddocks.

Meadowcroft had big ideas about the possibilities of Crawley lands and at one time had persuaded Whitfeld that if the University advanced him £200 for potato seed and manure he would guarantee a return of at least five fold. But the Finance Committee were a sceptical body.

During the costly attempt to build a Grazing Dock in Fremantle in 19 the bed of clay underlying portion of Crawley came in handy. At one stage the Engineers required a large quantity of clay with which to try to plug up the inflow of water. A Grab Dredge was sent to Matilda Bay and a large quantity of clay was dredged from below high water mark. This created a dangerous trap for the non swimmer on an otherwise perfect beach. Fortunately a use was found for the hole when the University Boat Shed was built, it gave a deep water landing stage.

The presence of this underlying clay in even a small portion made the future Crawley certain of being one of the first lots to be selected after the foundations of W.A. A similar clay subsoil, under the surface sand of the slope to the River from St. George's Terrace, had
provided the water supply from Wells and the good gardening conditions which made that area the site for their homes chosen by a number of the well to do among the earliest settlers.

Accordingly the first grant of land included in what was to become the University grounds was made by Captain James Stirling, Governor and Commander in chief to Mark John Currie Esq., on 7th August 1832 and the Bay was named Currie Bay. This was only three years and two months after the arrival of the first settlers in the Parmelia and the proclaiming of the Colony.

In 1837 Currie's Land, Swan Location 87 of 32 acres, which by the way included all the land in the neighbourhood with a clay subsoil, was conveyed to Henry James Sutherland. It remained under that title until conveyed to George Shenton in 1882.

The second grant, part of which was to be afterwards included in University grounds was Swan Location 86 granted to Edward Hamersley on 20th December 1834. It was referred to as land on Matilda Bay. This is the first recorded occasion when that name was used. It was the Christian name of one of the early Hammersleys. The Bay had previously been spoken of as Currie Bay and also as Eliza Bay. This last was the Christian name of the Wife of the Governor.

Location 87 was a large parcel of land of 320 acres. 86 acres of this came into the possession of George Shenton in 1892.

By various other dealings in land, George Shenton had by 1860 increased his holding on Matilda Bay to about 393 acres. Further transactions reduced this to 152 acres the area purchased by the Government in 1910.

FOOTNOTE: When I was inquiring into the early ownership of the University Grounds various Officials of the Lands Department were very kind and helpful. They were at considerable trouble to trace for me the ownership of the
various parcels and the change of ownership over the intervening years. They supplied me with a detailed record. Much of this is of small interest to the general reader, but some future searcher may be assisted by the details, so it is included as an Appendix.

Two very wise directions issued by Downing St., to Captain Stirling R.N. dated 30th December 1828 may be here quoted for they it would appear, had a bearing upon both the position and size of Swan Location 87, the first parcel of the future Crawley Land granted to Mark John Currie in 1832.

"...and more effectually to guard against the evils to be apprehended from an improvident disposal of the land in the immediate vicinity of the town you will take care that a square of three miles (one thousand nine hundred and twenty acres) is reserved for its future extension."

Further on the dispatch proceeds -

"I think it necessary also to caution you thus early (as land on the sea or river side will naturally be the first to be located) that you must be careful not to grant more than a due proportion of sea or river frontage to any settler. The great advantage to be derived from an easy water communication will, of course, not escape your consideration, and this advantage should be divided amongst as many settlers as can conveniently benefit by their position in the vicinity."

The application of these two passages to the future Crawley is that Currie Bay now Matilda Bay is approximately two miles from the Perth Town Hall and so would be as near as it was possible to acquire land outside the Downing Street reservation of "a square of three miles". The advantage of a sheltered boat landing in the days before roads were made would also be evident.

The early transactions in Crawley Lands were before the days of accurate survey and the boundaries were defined by "metes and bounds." That is the quaint old term to indicate that the boundaries were defined by reference to natural features. A tree or a rock on the water's edge might be taken as a starting point and the "bounds" traced by reference to other features back to
the starting point.

Notwithstanding the inherent vagueness of this method the Lands Department Officers take proper pride in the fact that records were so faithfully kept that when proper survey and transfer were established dispute over boundaries and ownership were very rare.

There is no evidence that Currie erected any substantial buildings during the five years he held the 32 acres of land on Matilda Bay. But soon after it came into the possession of Henry James Sutherland in 1837 the erection of a permanent brick home was commenced. The bricks were hand made and burnt on the location; the clay hole from which the material was taken is now used as an ornamental Lily pond. The shape and texture of these bricks, where they have not been subsequently covered with plaster, make the original portion easily identifiable. It is still (1946) in use and must be one of the oldest, if not the oldest buildings in W.A.

Henry James Sutherland was a young Engineer on Governor Stirling's staff. Sometime prior to 1855 his first wife died and he married a Miss Bussell one of the pioneers who gave their name to Busselton. In letters at present in the W.A. Archives, this Mrs. Sutherland speaks of adding a wing to the house.

After it came into the possession of Shenton in 1882 further additions and alterations were made. So the house when the Engineering Department of the University first took possession in 1914 was a comfortable home of two stories with about seven rooms, some quite large for a dwelling. It had been erected in three stages by three successive owners.

The name Crawley House was given it by the first Sutherland, Henry James, after his mother whose maiden name was Ann Crawley. The property remained in the possession of him and his children until acquired by Shenton
the starting point.

Notwithstanding the inherent vagueness of this method the Lands Department Officers take proper pride in the fact that records were so faithfully kept that when proper survey and transfer were established dispute over boundaries and ownership were very rare.

This first year I 411, when writing it I did not know the Diary of Eliza Tunno in which she records that she left the island (Enderon Island) I proceeded by boat to Eliza Bay (now Matilda Bay) at a great spot. They took up their residence in a Tent, their house was begun on 10 Jan 1881. The bricklayers finished & field & took possession of our brick cut in April.

People in those days, judging by the size of the rooms still intact were satisfied with less space than is deemed necessary now. For the records that at a Birthday party I sat down comfortably first time to dinner in our new brick house with LG (Lion Governor Stirling).

This "Brick Cut" must be the southern near Country House Still used by the Engineering House some of their equipment.

session of him and his children until acquired by Shenton
in 1882.

In 1914 when the Engineering Department moved to Crawley House and ever since there existed, a firmly established legend that the place had been named by a Captain Crawley who had named it after his English Home.

Mrs. C.E.V. Shenton (nee Lochie) when a very old woman wrote a letter to the "West Australian" on the subject "Early days in Perth" (22nd June 1935). In this she makes the erroneous statement that:

"The first owner of Crawley was Captain Crawley R.N. who named it after his home in England. The next owner was Mr. Henry Sutherland then his daughter Mrs. Edward Whitfield from whom it was rented by Sir. Edward Barlee."

The occupation by Sir Edward Barlee at that time Colonial Secretary, is authentic, but Captain Crawley was apparently a pure myth. The land Titles records show that no such person ever owned the place. He was apparently created by the Shentons to explain the name.

The reason for his creation was explained to me by Mrs. Birmingham, grand-daughter of the first Sutherland in 1946 when a very old lady. My recollection of her own words is as follows:

"We were compelled to sell Crawley when my father's health broke down owing to strain of over exertion when fighting Bush fires at Greenough. We were only paid £1,500 for our home. We deeply resented this low price, so much so that my sisters and I vowed we would never enter the place again. We were frequently questioned by the Shentons as to the origin of the name Crawley, but we refused to give family history to a Grower."

The emphasis on the word Grower is mine for it struck me that this superior family attitude towards a grower was a rather remarkable attitude, even for a very old lady in the democratic state in the democratic period of 1946. However, it had caused the "grower" afterwards, Sir George Shenton, speaker and first commoner in the State to invent Captain Crawley to explain the name of his Country Residence. He should of course, have been told the fact namely that the name was given by the second owner, Henry James Sutherland after his mother, whose maiden name was Ann Currie in 1837.
In May 1910 the Moore Government of which Mr. Frank Wilson was Minister for Works, in furtherance of its scheme for improving the River foreshores, purchased from the executors of the late Sir George Shenton 152 acres of land fronting Matilda Bay for £15,500. Mr. Learmonth, a Perth Land Agent and Valuer in a report to the Senate described the price as a fair one. The whole of the foreshore was included, but the Government reserved 48 acres of this for a Public Park. The boundary between the Park and University land followed approximately the centre of a private road leading to Crawley House from what was then the Perth Fremantle Road and is now Stirling Highway. The 48 acres reserved for a Public Park included all of the water frontage.

The resumption of the Shenton property and the excision therefrom of 48 acres of River frontage gave rise before long to a camping problem. Situated so close to Perth and served by two tram lines it was most tempting to those who did not mind roughing it, and to whom a gipsy life appeals. So tents began to appear at first owned by yachtsmen and used for the weekend, followed by more permanent camps. After some years a considerable population had squatted, they were living rent free in all kinds of structures built of all kinds of materials. Some were quite neat, others squalid and offensive. Complaints came from near neighbours in Nedlands that people were living under unhygienic conditions and children were being reared under very bad conditions. But it was not until after nine years that the Minister for Lands, Mr. Willmot began to move. The first suggestion (28/10/1919) was that the area should be placed under the control of the Tourist Department, that body to erect and control wooden camps similar to those erected by the Rottnest Island Board of Control. But the Tourist Department it would appear were not impressed with the idea.

The next suggestion was that the Municipal-
ity of Subiaco should be "sounded" to see if they would take control of the Campers on the foreshore of Matilda Bay. The "sounding" took two years before it got any response. The response, January 1920, was a request for £4,000 and an annual subsidy of £500 with which to make the place attractive. The Surveyor General and the Under Secretary for Lands then took the matter up, both urging the Government to persuade the Kings Park Board to take the responsibility for the proper conduct of the troublesome reserve.

Hitherto the campers had been squatters, erecting their shelters where they pleased and without anyone's authority. The matter was brought to a head by the receipt of an application from a Miss Hodgkiss (September 1920) for lease to camp.

Recognition of this application would have brought responsibilities to provide water supply sanitation etc. etc. So the Police were notified that no one was to be allowed to camp.

(October 1920) The Premier created the camping area a class A reserve and placed it under the State Gardens Board. The energetic administration of Mr. Shapcott soon cleaned the place up and made it a beautiful and much frequented Park and Bathing Beach.

----------

The Act to Establish, incorporate and endow the University of Western Australia (to use the full title) was assented to 16th February, 1911.

On the 16th November, 1911 a Committee consisting of -

Hon. Sir Winthrop Hackett M.A., L.L.D., M.L.C. (President)
Hon. the Speaker (M.F. Troy Esq. M.L.A.)
Hon. J.D. Connolly, M.L.C.
Hon. W. Kingsmill, B.A., M.L.C.
Hon. F. Wilson, M.L.A.
P.J. Turvey Esq., M.L.A.

was appointed by the Scaddan Government who had been in office for about five weeks was appointed to recommend a Site for the Uni-
The following sites were suggested for the consideration of the Committee:

1. Parliament House, Observatory site.
2. Ledard Gallery, Perth site, situated at the corner of Vincent and Charles Street, running along Vincent Street towards Smith’s Lake, total area 68 acres.
3. Site adjoining Subiaco Railway Station, embracing part of railway reserve in 1945 subdivided and built up, and portion of University Endowment Lands.
4. University Endowment Land adjoining West Subiaco (now Shenton Park) Railway Station.
5. Dalkeith Estate (River Frontage of Nedlands), University Endowment at Claremont adjoining Agricultural Show Grounds.
6. University Endowment on Nedlands Farm route (25 acres of this now resumed for Hollywood Hospital).
7. Portion of Melville Park Estate at Applecross.
8. Crawley Estate.

It will be noticed that an area of Kings Park, at the corner of Thomas Street and Kings Park Road, which subsequently was much canvassed is not even mentioned. The nine possible sites were reduced by the Committee by vote and without much trouble to these three:

- Parliament House plus Observatory combined.
- Shenton Park site.
- Proposed High School site.

If Parliament House plus Observatory Site had been selected it would have involved great disturbance of existing institutions. It was to include Parliament House, present Public Works Department, Observatory, proposed High School site and present High (Hale) School. It would have necessitated the resumption of part of Harvest Terrace, of George Street (now St. George’s Place) of Wilson Street and half a City Block all built on between Wilson Street and Bay Street.

Even with all this disturbance the total area...
would be only 45 acres with no possibility of extension and no playing fields, without taking part of Kings Park. Notwithstanding all the disabilities and the large sum of money involved for resumed property this site was given the first preference by two members (two M.Ps. Connolly and Kingmill) of the Committee.

West Subiaco (Shenton Park) site contained 101 acres but before the Battle for the University site was finally determined this had been reduced to 84 acres by the resumption of 17 acres for Lemnos Military Hospital.

The Committee conclude their report:

"On a straight out ballot being taken it was found that no particular site had an absolute majority of votes. Various methods of voting were tried, none of which, however, proved satisfactory. Your Committee therefore decided to report the State of the Ballot as disclosed by a preferential vote.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part House</th>
<th>Crawley</th>
<th>W. Subiaco</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sir W. Hackett</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker Troy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Riley</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Connolly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Kingmill</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Wilson</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Turvey</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus first preference votes recorded were Crawley 3 in number, Parliament House and Observatory, 2 in number, West Subiaco, 2 in number.

What the Premier (Scaddan) thought of the report was not disclosed until the Senate on May 1912 wrote asking if he had any information about the site. A prompt reply dated 28 May 1912 was received from the Premier offering portion of Crawley Park 104 acres with Locations 157 and other blocks to be resumed in exchange for

- Loc 2104 and 2120 West Subiaco of 126 acres
- 2106, Claremont 36 acres
- 29½ acres North Fremantle 29½ acres
- being part of Loc 174
- 2105 West Karrakatta 165 acres
- 356 acres

All this was endowment land set aside as such by Sir Walter James in 1904 and to him inviolable, so when it became known that the above mentioned lands were required for Workers Homes, then was the Battle of the Sites.
fairly joined.

To make clear the Premier's letter of 28 May it may be explained that Loc 157 was what was afterwards known as the Women's Hockey ground on the corner of Stirling Highway and Hampden Road.

When the Land Company subdivided Nedlands Estate they endeavoured by their ground plan to keep from the Crawley estate any benefit to be derived from their (the Company's) roads with the result that the whole of the South Western boundary of Crawley consisted of the back yard fences of the small subdivision Blocks, facing Fairway, Myers Street and Parkway. Some of these had been built on. So to give Crawley a frontage to roads on all fronts it was necessary to resume these, their total area was as R P 14, 0, 22. When this was done the total area of the University Site south of Stirling Highway was 116 acres and 22 perches.

On receipt of the letter from the Premier of 28 May 1912 the Senate on the same day appointed a deputation to discuss the matter of the Site with the Premier and obtain what information they could of the Government's intentions.

The Premier replied to the deputation by letter (20 July, 1912) and also through his Minister for Education, Mr. Walker a member of the Senate. He placed it beyond doubt that under no circumstances would the Government be prepared to ask Parliament to change the purpose of any portion of Kings Park and urging the Senate to arrive as soon as possible at a decision.

A sub-committee, which had been appointed, next reported to the Senate that they had waited on the Premier and informed him that:
"that provided the land coloured pink to the west of Crawley (this is the Nedlands subdivision Blocks) and the land coloured yellow on the plan attached (this was the Women's Hockey and all the Sirling Highway frontage from Hampden Road to Crawley Avenue) be included the Committee is prepared to strongly recommend the Senate to accept the Government's offer, as set forth in the Premier's letter dated May 28, 1912."

On 19th July 1912 a Special Meeting was held. The Chancellor stated the Senate had to decide
(1) Where the Site for the University was to be
(2) If Crawley were selected, to deal with the offer made by the Government.

After much discussion it was moved (Wilson and Andrews) "that the Senate agrees to accept the Government offer of the Crawley Site for the University Buildings, the land coloured yellow on the North Side of the Fremantle Road to be included."

With the leave of the Senate this motion was withdrawn and there was substituted for it
"That the Senate considers Crawley the best Site available for University purposes."

This was declared lost. A discussion was called for and the voting was:-

In favour: Hackett, Andrews, Keenan, Wilson, Battye, Grasby (6)

Against: James, Kirwan, Smith, Saw, Moss, Sandover (6)

Dr. Mead did not vote. I was unfortunately absent, the Court being in Kalgoorlie. Battye, Grasby then moved that the matter be deferred to the next meeting. This was also declared lost. This made the proceedings of the Special Meeting resultless and the state of confusion indicates how high feelings were mounting. The Senate had been holding two and sometimes three meetings a month. James and Saw particularly were out to damn Crawley by any means in their power. They even went so far as to question Mr. T. Walker's right to act as a member
of the Senate as the gazette notice of appointment named the Officer, The Minister for Education and not the person. On the Gazette being produced it was found that the name Hon. T. Walker was in parenthesis. So all was well. The legal quibble designed to deprive Crawley of one supporting vote was found to be a dud.

At the second Special meeting held in July 1912 The Chancellor announced that it had been called at the express wish of the Premier who wished to have a definite answer to the offer of the Government.

17 members were present, Kerwan being the only absentee.

(Walker, Burrows) "That the report of the Committee on Site be adopted!" James raised a point of order contending that the Site the Sub-committee in making the representation it had, had acted in excess of their jurisdiction.

As set out earlier the sub-committee had informed Premier Scaddan that if he would add certain lands to his offer they (the members of the sub-committee) would strongly urge the Senate to accept his offer.

The Chancellor ruled that the motion to adopt the Committee Report was in order.

(James, Sandover) That the ruling be disagreed with.

This was declared lost, division called for

In favour: 7, James, Saw, Mead, Smith, Moss, Sandover, Roberts.


Then a long amendment (Saw, Sandover) to the effect that before arriving at a final decision, reports be obtained as to valuation and healthfulness.
The amendment was lost and on division being called for:

In favour: 7, James, Saw, Smith, Mead, Moss, Roberts.


After further long and heated discussion and in an effort to meet the reasonable request of the opposition the motion (Walker, Burrows) to adopt the sub-committee report, was by leave withdrawn, and a compromise motion was moved (Bath, Burrows) "That the Report of Sub-Committee on the Site be adopted and the proposed exchange of Land agreed to subject to

A Securing an independent valuation and assurance that the proposed exchange is equitable.
B Assurances that Crawley is healthful and suitable from an Architectural standpoint."

This was declared carried but a decision was called for:


Against: 6, James, Mead, Saw, Smith, Moss and Sandover.

This last division list is interesting for several reasons. First the two women members voted against Crawley and second the fact that James and Saw continued their opposition up to the last shows that they both knew that Crawley could stand up to any test as to Health/to Architectural suitability and their opposition rested on other grounds (which I believe were largely Political.)

In accordance with the foregoing resolution a report dated the 6th August, 1912 and signed by Drs. Hope, Montgomery and Trethewan was received. It was to the effect that from a Health point of view, Crawley was quite satisfactory.
The Architects report was as follows: Mr. Herbert Eales thought Crawley satisfactory. Mr. Lancelot Oldham presented a yes no report in which he makes the remarkable assertion that the future dredging of the river will detrimentally affect the foundations of any buildings erected. On the balance his opinion is unfavourable. Mr. Hillson Beasley, Chief Architect, thought every feature of Crawley satisfactory and he was favourable, even enthusiastic.

The Valuer's each presented a long report which can be summarised as follows:

Mr. Gardiner
- A Lands required by the State from Uni. Endowment Lands £22,050
- B Lands offered by State in exchange for A £18,362
  £ 3, 688

Mr. Learmonth
- A as above £20,263
- B as above £17,840
  £ 2,443

As professional Valuers go, these two valuations are not very far apart and show that the State was then (as our experience has always been since) driving a hard bargain with the University.

All these Reports and Valuations were before the Senate meeting (19 Aug. 1912). There was also a petition signed by 46 Doctors against Crawley presented by Dr. Saw. This has been dealt with in the opening to this Chapter. Sir Walter James presented a long memo, in which he strongly attacked the valuation of Messrs. Gardiner and Learmonth. It was moved (Walker, Batthy):

"That the assurances as to the health of Crawley be accepted as satisfactory."

A decision was called for and voting was 10 to 6 in favour.

Moved (Walker, Burrows):

"That Crawley is suitable from an Architectural point of view."

Decision called for and carried 10 to 6.
Moved (Walker, Bath):

"That the exchange of Land is equitable."

On division this was carried 10 to 6.

In the three preceding divisions the voting was:


Against: James, Mead, Saw, Smith, Moss and Sandover.

Kirwan and Roberts were the only absentees. Roberts had announced his opposition to Crawley.

Kirwan's attitude I do not remember. It can be said that by their solid voting and prominence in moving and seconding motions that the 4 Labour men, Walker, Burrows, Bath and Somerville, secured Crawley. The voting of what might be called the Conservative block owing to their other affiliations in private and public life, James, Saw, Smith, Sandover and the two women, Mead and Moss was always against Crawley and the persistence in the call for Divisions shows how determined they were against it.

To conclude this memorable debate the results from which were to affect W. A. University Students for as long as W. A. exists it was moved (Walker, Bath):

"That the Committee be empowered to act on behalf of the Senate, to interview the Premier and to take all necessary steps to arrange the exchange of Crawley for the Endowment Lands set out in the letters of the Premier dated 28 May, 1912 the 19 July, 1912 and the Committees resolutions."

This was carried and no division was called for.

To the Senate meeting of 9 September 1912 the Chancellor announced that the agreement between the Senate and the Government in regard to the exchange of certain endowment Lands had been signed on 26 August, 1912.
In the memorandum written by James in criticism of the report of the Valuers there is a passage which if the memo is ever again read will be hard to understand. He speaks of what are now the College Blocks as having the disadvantage of being on the North or "dusty" side of Perth, Fremantle Road. To People of the present generation, houses on the North side, facing into the cool South West wind (The Fremantle Doctor) have an advantage over those on the South side. The universal use of rubber tyres and bitumen road surfaces has eliminated dust from our Suburban roads. But when Sir Walter wrote his memo Motor vehicles were a rarity. This particular piece of road and most of those in the Fremantle to Perth area were surfaced with white Lime Stone. Vehicles had iron tyres and were drawn by horses having iron shoes. These caused a constantly renewed quantity of fine white dust which the merry south west wind raised in clouds to the discomfort of the housewife and shopkeeper especially on the North side of the Road. As the summer advanced footpaths and roadside, grass and shrubs became coated with a thick coating of fine white limestone dust. This was before the Reservoirs in the Darling Range were constructed and the only water supply was from Bores and Wells. In the suburbs a lawn sprinker was a luxury only enjoyed by those who had Windmills.

The definite announcement that an agreement had been signed by the Government and the Senate would seem to indicate that the Battle of the Sites had been finally determined, but it was not so. There was no money available for Building and consequently no steps would be taken to implement the agreement and so long as only documents existed securing Crawley its opponents considered themselves at liberty to reopen the question.
The Battle was transferred to the political sphere. The Government introduced a bill into Parliament to give legal effect to the agreement of 26 August. This was passed by the Assembly in which the Labour Party had a majority, but was rejected by the Legislative Council the Tory stronghold by 11 votes to 9.

Sir Walter James was unable to keep his elation at this result to himself and wrote a letter to the papers expressing his pleasure that Parliament had withstood this "first attack on the Endowment Lands". Sir Walter's letter has only the month November 13, so it can be presumed that the Bill was rejected by the Council early in November, 1912. He also mentions an idea he says he had often put to the Senate, that if the Government wants land for Workers Homes they could lease endowment land, paying to the University the rent of the land unimproved.

The rejection of the Bill caused negotiations to be suspended, but not for long. The temporary accommodation in Irwin Street was inadequate and on 12 June, 1913 the Premier, in response to an application for funds with which to extend the buildings, wrote:

"The Government would be prepared to provide the additional amount required for temporary buildings free of interest subject to the University being prepared to transfer for the purpose of Workers Homes certain of the endowment lands."

This letter stirred the opponents of Crawley to renewed activities and it was moved (James, Saw):

"That the suggestion of the Hon. the Premier (Scaddan) is one which in principle the Senate cannot entertain and that two members of the Senate be appointed to convey the decision to the Premier."

This was deemed by some to be rather bellicose and an attempt was made to moderate it, (Kirwan, Burrows) by asking for further details. This was however, lost, the motion carried and the Chancellor and Frank Wilson appointed to see the Premier.
On the 19th July, the Premier

"The Government is prepared to find £9,000 free of interest until such times as the permanent home of the University is erected, provided the Senate agrees to transfer to the Government for the purposes of Workers' Homes certain endowment lands at West Subiaco and making a portion of these immediately available. It to be mutually agreed that when the permanent site has been transferred shall be considered a part of the transaction and the Government agrees not to ask for any additional area in lieu thereof."

This brought forth an attempt by Kirwan to put into practice Sir Walter's idea of leasing endowment lands for Building Workers' Homes. He gave notice to move a long resolution to this effect. But the CrownLaw advised that a ninety-nine years lease was not lawful for purposes of the Workers' Homes Act and suggesting that the necessary legislation be sought to make it lawful.

It was moved (Batty, Bath) that such amending legislation be agreed to. This was carried by ten to five, the old die hard opponents of Crawford, James, Saw, Smith, Mead and Moss voting against.

A letter was received (16th December 1913) from the Bishop of Perth (Riley) who was not then, a member of the Senate, suggesting a meeting of many Perth Bodies to try to decide upon a Site. The writer was thanked. The fact that the letter was written is indicative of the Public interest in the subject.

At a special meeting, January 7th, 1914 some of the members had some information, not disclosed in the proceedings, for as soon as the meeting opened it was moved that Standing Order No. 10 (only business on the notice paper can be transacted at a special meeting) be suspended. This was lost. Notwithstanding this, the Chairman (Andrews) then ruled that in virtue of Standing Order No. 12 (two thirds majority necessary to introduce matter not on the business paper) the following motion
might be placed before the Senate.

"That the Government be requested to grant the Crawley lands without exchange for other lands, to provide for temporary buildings (at Crawley?) required and the necessary Tramway connection or other means of access."

James asked that his protest against the Chairman's ruling be recorded.

From the standpoint of correct procedure the protest was fully justified for the Chairmans ruling was a peculiar one. But as the proposed resolution, if given effect, secured the inviolability of his endowment lands he should have supported it.

The protest being duly noted, Grasby then moved the resolution which was carried on the voices.

This resolution as quoted above is of interest for it foreshadowed what ultimately happened. Negotiations continued the Premier on his side urging the transfer of endowment lands.

In March 1914 the Engineering Department was transferred to Crawley. The Government granting £250 to adapt the old Residence. In June 1914 an application was made to the Premier for an increase in the annual grant of £9000, for equipment £10,000, and for Science buildings £12,000. Before a reply was received War Fell on the World. On 13th August 1914 the Premier wrote that under the circumstances it was impossible to think of increasing the grant and suggesting for some unspecified reason that the Constitution of Senate should be altered and the powers of Convocation curtailed.

In November 1914 the Chancellor announced his desire to give two prizes, one of £100 guineas and one of £25 guineas for a plan for the layout of Crawley for University purposes. The first prize was won by Desbrow Annear and is dealt with in the Whitfield section, pages 357, 358 and 359.

In March 1916 further efforts were made to reach finality in the negotiations for Crawley. Included was an application for 100 yards of Foreshore.
In April 1917 a letter was received from the Premier protesting against the destruction of trees at Crawley. This was doubtless prompted by Mr. Shapcott who was Chairman of the Parks and Gardens Board, and consequently in control of the Crawley Foreshores Park, and also Secretary to the Premier. The destruction of trees was by residents in the neighbourhood getting firewood. The Senate's reply (Bath, Battye) was that the Government be asked to expedite the transfer when the Senate will protect the trees. This matter is mentioned because even in such a small matter, Sir Walter James asked that his vote be recorded against any resolution which further committed the Senate to parting with endowment lands. So persistent was the opposition to Crawley five years after the signing of an agreement as to its transfer in 1912.

On 27th July 1916, The Scaddan Government went out of Office and Mr. Frank Wilson's short Premiership of eleven months began. He had only resigned from the Senate the previous year and while a member of that body had always been a strong supporter of Crawley, so hopes rose that finality would be reached with him as Premier. But his hold on to Office was so precarious that he was not inclined to do anything much beyond mark time. When the Lefroy Government came into power, 28/6/1917, another difficulty about Crawley arose out of the enthusiasm of his Minister of Industries and Forests (Mr. Robinson, I think) for the establishment of a Forests Products Laboratory. He thought portion of Crawley most suitable for a site for that activity. On application the Senate (September 1918) decided to agree to set aside twenty-five acres of the South West corner for that purpose and also decided to use the opportunity to again press for the Title to Crawley.

In October 1918, application for Land at West Subiaco (Shenton Park) was made by the Military for the purpose of a Mental Hospital for men returned from the War. This application, like other Military applications seems to have
been followed without further negotiations by compulsory resumption, for Mr. Kingsmill at the November 1918 meeting was requested to inquire of the Government if this resumption could be done without special Legislation. No reply to this question was received from the Government, but the answer to the question I have no doubt was that the land was required for a Military Hospital and under its War time powers the Federal Government could do whatever it thought necessary. The land taken was valued at the time at £6000.

With regard to the exchange of land between the State and the University involved in securing the Crawley site, the rejection by the Legislative Council of the 1912 Bill authorising the transfer, had destroyed the power of effective negotiation. On the one hand the Government had expended large sums of money in buying Crawley and its attached lands and the Endowment lands it desired by way of exchange were locked up as a Class A reserve.

The University was prohibited by the University Act from selling its endowment lands and the Government had no power to resume without special Legislation.

The state of confusion is evidenced by the Senate minutes for November 1918 which contain the items, one a letter from the Premier (Lefroy) affirming to consider a Bill to transfer Crawley without condition and secondly a notice of motion by the Pro Chancellor (Andrews) who had always been a strong supporter of Crawley to rescind the resolution of 1912 adopting Crawley.

The confusion was added to by Mr. Robinson's efforts to secure Crawley for his Forests Products Laboratory. 10/12/1918, He wrote rejecting the twenty-five acres in the South West corner, the Land had been inspected by Messrs. Colebatch (Minister in Lefroy Cabinet) Williams and Kingsmill and deemed entirely unsuitable, they requested the University to cede sufficient land facing Perth Fremantle Road. This was to be the last mention of a Forests Products Laboratory at Crawley.
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An extract from the West Australian of 9/8/1921 may here be included. It was headed, Manufacture of Paper from Australian Hardwoods, and related how the Forests Departments of N.S.W., Victoria, W.A., and Tasmania had agreed to contribute £250 each towards the cost of the investigation and the W.A. Government had set aside land valued at £20,000(?). The Australian Paper Mills Co. had contributed £100 and the W.A. Newspapers had presented their miniature Paper Machine.

The land valued at £20,000 existed, only in the imagination of the journalist for the enterprise began in an iron shed belonging to the Customs Department on the corner of William Street and the Esplanade, Perth. It was here that J.L. Somerville (my son) began the investigations which led to the great News Print industry on the bank of the Derwent River, New Norfolk, Tasmania.

This period 1916 to 1919 was one of political instability. The Labour Party was growing in power, but was not strong enough to dominate Parliament. Their opponents were rent by the personal ambitions of a number of prominent men, none of whom would be loyal to any other. When Newton Moore formed his ministry in 1906 it was said he succeeded because he was the least objectionable of the possible leaders and he lasted for four years and four months.

The second Wilson Cabinet lasted eleven months. It was followed by Lefroy one year and nine months and Colebatch one month, from the 17th April 1919 to 17th May 1919. These short lived ministries had no time to bother about the University site. The first Mitchell Government which was to last four years and ten months followed Colebatch in May 1919.

During Colebatch's very short term, he had written undertaking to carry out the Scadden undertaking of 1912. In May 1920 the Vice Chancellor, Paterson had
written asking the Premier (Mitchell) if Crawley could be used for - "University purposes generally as distinct from Site." This curious request it is to be presumed related to the establishment of sports grounds, for the Senate had decided to give the students permission to layout sports at Crawley provided the Site of the sports ground be first approved by the Senate. This is the beginning of the improvement of Crawley even though at the time the Senate had no Title to it (July 1919)

In November 1919 and again in May 1920, Deputations were appointed to explain the position to the Mitchell, the Premier since May 1919.

December 1919, Wilsmore who was then a member of the Senate moved that -

"In view of the growing needs of the University (the necessity of limited the number of students was being considered by a committee) and to prevent any more money being wasted on temporary buildings all possible steps be taken without delay to establish the University on a permanent site."

Then May 1920 (Murdoch, Shann) that a preferential vote on the various suggested sites be taken forthwith. This was deferred until James, as University Solicitor had reported as to why the Crawley agreement had not been completed.

August 1920 (Andrews, Saw) -

"That Kings Park site is the most desirable and that 100 acres of Crawley be offered to Kings Park Board in exchange,"

An amendment that a preferential vote on possible sites be taken was carried. The order of preference (no numbers are recorded) was Kings Park, Crawley, West Subiaco, Government House in that order.

September 1920 Deputation consisting of Riley (Chancellor), Andrews, Saw, James and others attended a meeting of Kings Park Board and requested the Board to let the University have 100 acres, preferably at the corner of Kings Park Road and Thomas Street for University buildings, in exchange for 10½ acres of Crawley. The Board
definitely refused to relinquish any of Kings Park, that was in December 1920.

Notwithstanding this definite refusal, it was decided in March 1921 (Hancock, Roberts) that another attempt be made to secure part of Kings Park, again without result. On 27th August 1920 on the motion of Murdoch and Wilsmore that in order to secure some progress in the selection of the site a joint committee consisting of three members, each from the Senate, Convocation and Professorial Board be appointed. This report of the committ- ee was signed by Andrews, Pro Chancellor, and it recom- mended that Kings Park was the best site, and if the con- sent of the Kings Park Board could not be obtained then West Subiaco (Shenton Park) was the next best.

There were only three dissentments, Somerville Battye and Whitfeld. They presented a minority report in which they reviewed all the arguments against Crawley. As this minority report slowly became the policy of the majority it is a notable document and is consequently re- produced in full.

---

MINORITY REPORT.

JOINT COMMITTEE of the SENATE, CONVOCATION and PROFESSORIAL BOARD.

To the Chancellor, The University.

Sir,

The important character of the Report of the joint Committee is our excuse for submitting the following by way of a minority report.

Endorsement of the majority report of the Committee will mean that the Senate has abandoned its policy to secure Crawley, and this, in our opinion, will only lead to further confusion and delay. We will have to start out afresh the dreary round of negotiations and conferences in order to arrive at the same stage with regard to Kings Park site that we have already arrived at with regard to Crawley. This may mean a lapse of a further five or six years. At the present time all that is necessary to finalise the Craw- ley site is that the Crown Law authorities shall be induced to take action; while with regard to Kings Park site we would require, first to get the consent of numerous public bodies interested, and after that special legislation, which in all probability would be bitterly opposed from one or more quarters, would be necessary.
We do not propose to enter into the respective merits of Crawley and Kings Park as sites, but as we have been recognised as supporters of Crawley in the past, we desire, in order to protect ourselves from misrepresentation, to say that as between the two we have no strong feeling. If the citizens of Perth are prepared to surrender a sufficient area of the Park, and it is regarded as in other ways the most desirable, we are content. When the question of Site is being considered, two things should, in our opinion, be insisted upon. First, the Site should be the noblest and in every way, the best W.A. can provide. Second, when the factor of convenience is being considered, too much importance should not be attached to the convenience of the present day students drawn from Mt. Lawley, West Perth or Subiaco; but, remembering that we are building for all time, an attempt should be made to choose that site which will be most convenient to the greatest number, when, as we believe, will be the case in the not distant future, Perth outnumbers Sydney and there is a greater population on the south bank of the Swan than there is at present in W.A. We would also like to point out to those who feel strongly in favour of Kings Park that, if the present policy of the Senate is brought to fruition and we secure Crawley, our powers as negotiators for a portion of Kings Park are enormously increased. At present we can only go empty handed; then we will be able to say we have in our possession 120 acres of land which will make an admirable addition to the Park and give it a water frontage, and we are prepared with the consent of Parliament to exchange.

(Signed) W. Somerville.
(Signed) J.S. Batty.
(Signed) H.E. Whitfeld. (Subject to memorandum below)


MEMORANDUM.

From experience with the Engineering Time-table, I think that a time-table could be arranged even if one or two of the Science Departments were moved to Crawley forthwith. This alternative could be adopted should the permission to use part of Government House lands be refused. The First-year courses in these departments would be held on, say, Tuesday and Thursdays, at Crawley and First-year courses in other Science Departments on Monday, Wednesday and Friday at Irwin Street. A few students taking abnormal courses might find it easier to take some First-year Science courses at the Technical School. A few would be inconvenienced, but the whole University would have more breathing space.

(Signed) H.E. Whitfeld.

But the opposition was as yet a long way from exhaustion and the agitation for and against proceeded.

May 1921, Sub Committee, Batty, Somerville, Sandover to see Premier and endeavour to expedite matters.

August 1921, Lease of Crawley for 999 years laid on Senate Table.

November 1921, Decided to ask Government to proceed with the exchange with the University of the West
Subiaco endowment Lands for the properties which had been resumed by the Government around the main Crawley Site.

December, 1921. As no reply had been received from the Premier, Committee appointed, Battye, Somerville, Sandover and the Vice Chancellor Shann to endeavour to arrange a settlement of outstanding matters.

April 1922. In view of the approaching failure of the present buildings to accommodate all the students, the Senate initiate a policy to secure the erection of Permanent Buildings on the permanent Site.

May 1922. Form of Grant for resumed Lands adjacent to main Crawley Site approved.

NOTE. These lands are the Nedlands subdivision blocks totalling 14 acres, also hockey ground 9½ acres and the land between Broadway and Crawley Avenue 41 acres, the title to which is Freehold. Crawley 104 acres being 999 years lease.

May 1922. Professorial Board is of the opinion that as many as practicable of the Science Departments should be moved to Crawley in the following order.
1. Biology, 2. Geology, 3. Chemistry, 4. Physics, 5. Agriculture, and it is desirable that not less than two be moved at one time.

May 1922. The Faculty of Engineering appointed a Committee consisting of the Dean, Sir Talbot Hobbs, Architect, Whitfeld, Hardwick; and Wright architect and the Heads of the University Departments concerned to report to Buildings required for the transfer of the Department of Biology and Geology and their adaptation to the Annear Prize design for the layout of the Permanent Site.

The report which was signed by the Vice Chancellor, Shann, approved of the transfer of Biology and Geology as the first Departments to be shifted and made other minor suggestions for altering the Annear Plan, but
no abandonment of it. One of the minor alterations suggested was to abandon the idea of erecting houses for Professors and use the ground allotted for them for the Science Buildings.

This last recommendation is interesting for it explains how Biology and Geology came to be where they are. As Hobbs was a member of the Committee his presence is probably the explanation of the similarity of the Architecture to that of St. George's College. By means of another Committee appointed by the Faculty in this important month May 1922 the opponents of Crawley got in their most weighty blow. This Committee consisted of the Dean, Sir Talbot Hobbs Architect, Messrs. Crocker, Electrical Engineer, Galbraith, City Engineer, Hancock, Telegraphs and Telephones engineer and Messrs. Lawson and Wright Architects. The report of this Committee is sweeping in its condemnation and is signed by Sir Talbot Hobbs. They say among other things –

1. The Deabrow Annear Plan is quite unsuitable.

2. Unless considerable amount is spent in drainage at least one third of the total area available is owing to bring so low lying entirely unsuitable for University Buildings. A great deal of it is unsuitable for even Playing fields, in the Winter and on the occasion of our (the Committee's) visit a considerable portion of the area of the ground south of Perth Fremantle Road was flooded.


4. Other disadvantages were the expense of bringing Building material and the provision of Gas and Fresh water.

5. But in the final paragraph the Committee recognise however, that the proximity of the Site to the river offers a great advantage to the Department of Biology.
One suspects the last to be sarcasm. Professor Whitfeld presented a minority report in which he combatted all the Committee conclusions. This minority report was based upon the experience of himself and his Lecturers who had been working in Crawley House for seven years.

March 1923. Memorial received from the Institute of Architects requesting the Senate to open to Competition, the arrangement and design of the University Buildings.

The Senate decided.

1. It was not necessary to have another competition for the University layout.

2. As the Government is providing the money and preparing the plans to 6, the University could not fall in with the Architects request.

These decisions are interesting for they show two things, first that the Annear layout was still the accepted design and secondly, that no one had any belief that the Hackett bequest would yield anything to the University.

April 1923. From the Premier forwarding plans of the Biology and Geology buildings.

May 1923. Hancock, Chancellor (Riley). That the Senate take steps to secure -


2. Buildings occupied by Repatriation Department.

3. Steps to ascertain cost of suitable building of two or three stories in Irwin Street for University purposes.

Lost.

This last is interesting as showing that even so late as 1923 the members of the Senate were in complete ignorance of the value of the Hackett Bequest. Further, in December 1924 the Senate had decided to establish a fund with which in time to erect a memorial to Hackett for what he had done as Politician Journalist and Senator to establish the University.
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Then out of the blue so to speak there came
the dramatic announcement by the Chancellor (Saw) at the
Senate meeting in March 1926 —

"The Chancellor reported that in Conversation
Mr. Langler had informed him that the University would
benefit considerably under Hackett's Will."

Up to this time the decision of the Government
to erect the Geology and Biology building, the negotiations
for Physics and Chemistry Buildings, the planting of trees
all these steps indicated that Crawley was regarded by
many as beyond doubt the Site.

But the protracted negotiations for the transfer to Endowment lands in exchange for Crawley estate and
adjoining lands had not yet been finalised and there had
been no money for the main buildings and so there was
always the possibility of the whole question being re-
opened. But the possibility of something approaching
260,000 for Buildings silenced the last opponent of Craw-
ley.

As the Universities permanent Home. The
final stages in the exchange of lands for the University
site are as follows.

In August 1921 the Lease of Crawley for 999
years was received by the Senate.

In May 1922 the Grant of the resumed lands
adjacent to Crawley was approved by the Senate.

In July 1922 the last stage is described in
the following extract from the Senate Minutes.

Extract from FINANCE COMMITTEE MINUTES of 13th July, 1922.

University Site - Resumed Lands.

The Grant for the resumed areas around the
main Crawley Site (Swan Locations, 2886, 3086, 3087 and
3088) containing 61 acres 6 roods, 10 perches, which had
been received from the land Titles Office that day was
laid on the table.

The Vice-Chancellor, reported that he had con-
sulted with the University's solicitor (the Hon. Sir Walter
James, K.C.) who had suggested —

That the Senate write to the Solicitor General
stating that the University agrees with his
view that the land resumed by the Government from the University at West Subiaco under the Public Works Act, 1902, is to be taken in satisfaction of compensation paid on acquisition of lots facing Parkway and Fairway and the value of the land to the North of the Perth Fremantle Road, as mentioned in Mr. Sayer's letter of 26th April, 1922.

The following are the University lands at West Subiaco which have been resumed by the Government:—

(a) Portion of Swan Location 2104 and Swan Location 2120, comprising in all 126 acres 3 roods 7 perches and valued at £15,215/5/-. (Resumed for the purposes of the new Hospital for the Insane).

(b) Portions of Swan Location 2104, comprising 5 acres 1 rood 29 perches and valued at £651/15/- (Resumed for the purposes of the Eastern Railway).

It was decided to recommend action on this suggestion, and also—

That the University Solicitors be instructed to advise tenants on the resumed areas at Crawley that their rents are payable to the University as from 10th July, 1922.

The Senate got—

1. Crawley Estate 104 acres
2. Nedlands Subdivision Lots facing Park way and Fairway 14 "
3. Lot 157 (Hockey Ground) 92 "
4. Land between Broadway (Hampden St) and Winthrop Avenue 16 "
5. Land between Winthrop Avenue and Crawley Avenue 25 "

168 1/2 acres

The Senate surrendered—

Endowment lands for New Hospital for Insane 126 1/2 acres £15,215. 5.0
Railway purposes 5 1/2 " 651. 15.0

132 acres £15,867. 0.0

So the Senate obtained by the exchange 36 acres more than it surrendered.

As to comparative values, experts will differ over a wide range, but it may be mentioned that in 1910 the Government purchased Crawley Estate, 152 acres, for £15,500. From this 48 acres of valuable River Frontage was taken for a Public Park. To the remaining 104 acres was subsequently added 14 acres to give the University Site street frontage on its western boundary and 50 1/4 acres
of very valuable land north of and facing Stirling Highway.

So on value also, the University gained considerably. Sir Walter James's fight for the inviolability of his beloved endowment Lands probably had good results.

It may be stated here as a matter of historical interest, the value placed upon endowment lands in 1921.

During the debate in Parliament on Mr. Collier's motion to disallow the University Statute to charge fees, Mr. McCallum (Labour, South Fremantle) asked the Premier (Mitchell) 10th November 1921 - Parliament Debates page 1613. "What is the value of University Endowment Lands?"

Answer:

1. 4,011 acres 2 roods 25 perches value in 1915 £62,185

2. 102 acres at Crawley held on 999 years lease - value is 1912 13,000

3. 61 acres to be granted in fee simple when the terms of exchange are settled - value in 1912 13,250

4,174 acres £88,435
CHAPTER 1C.

HACKETT BUILDINGS.