There is evidence that a number of the earliest pioneers, in the work of establishing a University in Western Australia envisaged a Free University.

The Royal Commission in its report says -

"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 be left to Parliament."

When the Bill for the establishment of the University was being discussed by Parliament, the Premier (Hon. Frank Wilson) said "the lectures I hope will always be free to all commers" but preferred to leave the question of fees to the Senate to discuss the matter "to inquire 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."

And there for the time being the matter rested. There is nothing in the University Act qualifying the Senate's complete discretion in the matter of charging fees. But there is no doubt that when the University was first opened there was a definite belief in Parliament and in Public opinion that Western Australia was to lead the World in the matter of a Free University. A Committee, of which I was a member enquiring in 1916 found that while there were some Universities, as for instance in California, which claimed to be free, their practice was to charge such high fees for Laboratory and other services that their claim to be free was very questionable. But Western Australia's University was to be free in the full sense and all were very proud to be associated with the first free University.

But it was not to be without challenge for long; for at the meeting held August 19, 1912 less than five months after the beginning, the Senate instructed its Ad-
ministrative and Finance Committee to collect information as to Fees.

At the next meeting in October 1912 the report of this Committee was presented and during the discussion thereon it was moved (Walker, Bath) "that no fees shall be charged to students of this University." Before this could be voted on the debate was adjourned. On resumption of debate an amendment was moved (Saw, Mead) "That a small fee be charged in all cases either for Lectures or Laboratory work, ... any qualified student satisfying the Chancellor that he cannot pay, the fees to be remitted. The amendment was declared lost and on a division being called for the voting was - for the amendment 4 Saw, Mead, Moss & Roberts against 9 Hackett, Andrews, Wilson, Bath, Keenan, Smith, Battye, Burrows, Somerville. 3 of the 4 votes for fees by University people, 5 of the 9 votes against fees, University people.

The original motion "That no fees be charged etc." was then put and the division in favour by 7 to 6. For the motion Hackett, Smith, Mead, Hirwan, Moss, Burrows, Roberts - against Andrews, Wilson, Saw, Bath, Battye, Somerville,

I find it very difficult to accept this division for by it we have Messrs. Mead, Kirwan and Roberts opposing fees and Messrs. Bath and Somerville supporting them. This was the direct reverse of their usual attitude, indeed the record must be wrong for by it Bath voted against his own motion. 3 of the 7 majority were University men. 3 of the 6 minority were University men.

But whatever the explanation the fact is that the continuance of a free University was only carried by a majority of one after the Senate had been in existence for only six months and six months before teaching began.

This Senate debate about fees had its repercussions in Parliament for on the 13th November 1912 the Legislative Assembly carried the following resolution -
"That in the opinion of this House it is desirable that all education at the University of Western Australia should be free and that the practice of charging fees at State educational establishments should be entirely abolished."

This resolution had been moved by Mr. Bertie Johnson member for Williams, Narrogin and was accepted by the Legislative Assembly without a division. This was five months before Teaching began at the University in March 1913.

And here it may be stated as a regrettable fact, as a record of proceedings yet to be presented will show, that only a small percentage of University men seem capable of rising to the fine ideal expressed in the term a Free University. If it had been left to University men it would long since have been destroyed, it has been preserved by such men as Sir J. Mitchell and Mr. Phil Collier neither of whom had enjoyed a University Education. On numerous occasions, the Senate, the Teaching Staff, Convocation and even on one occasion the Students have carried resolutions in favour of charging fees.

It is difficult to account for this. The arguments for and against will be recounted later, but opinions on such a question are influenced by other than Logic. Some think that having managed to pay fees at the University at which they were trained that W.A. students should do likewise. Another reason, hard to credit but nevertheless very real, is just snobbery. Sometime in 1917 and at a meeting of Convocation an M.D. who in mercy will be nameless delivered himself as follows:

"No one present would like to admit in after years that he had qualified at a free University."

Another who afterwards became an M.D. writing to his mother urged her not to allow a younger brother to attend the W.A. free University as it would "be a handicap in after life."

That such rank snobbery should be in the minds of some who had had the advantage of a University education
is not flattering to the contention that a University is a character training institution.

The snobs who would apparently rank a free University as a charity which they blush to have participated in are not consistent. The fees they were urging, about £12, were less than $ of the tuition fees, not to mention what the total cost would be if the rent of the beautiful buildings they occupy, municipal taxes ordinary mortals have to pay and upkeep of the beautiful grounds they enjoy etc. were all added. These charges would bring the annual cost of what the ex student had enjoyed to perhaps £50 or £60 per head. So the inconsistent snob who blushed to remember that during his student days he had accepted £12 worth and righteously desired to impose that charge upon his student successors, was not disturbed by the recollection that he had accepted about £40 worth per annum, during his student years on the sly. No one noticed he was receiving it, so it did not constitute in his view a social solecism.

At the same 1917 meeting of Convocation, Sir Walter James who was the reverse of a snob declared that "what was got for nothing was not valued."

Shann by the report of the meeting is credited with the cryptic remark - "to charge fees would increase the intellectual strength of the University."

I am afraid that the financial strength of the University, its ability to give increases in salaries was also very important in Shann's view. Indeed it is clear that a close link existed between the sum that might be got from fees and the desire by the teaching staff for increases in salary. This association can be traced right up to 1945 when a Professor delivered himself of the sage remark that while "he favoured a free University he would not have it at the expense of efficiency. The evidence of efficiency he was concerned with at the time was the ability to secure by any means, fees included, the sum necessary to pay him £1100 per annum."
Sir John McFarland, Melbourne's Chancellor told a reporter in Adelaide in 1926 that -

"...an absolutely free University would have the tendency, ....... to induce men who would be much more useful citizens in other walks of life, to make their way into professions."

He then went on to express his approval of the "Workers" educational associations, they served a very useful purpose etc.

Now these troublesome persons who would make their way into the professions would only do so after passing the necessary examinations and prescribed tests. Why then in the name of Democracy should any person desire to discourage them? The answer can have nothing to do with education, it must be sought elsewhere. It seems absurd that even a K.C.M.G. would discourage any desirous of entering a profession on the score of lowly birth. But it seems highly probable that Sir John's democracy was in the same stage as that of his contemporary Chancellor, Sir George Murray, of Adelaide, who quoted with strong approval the sentiments of the 1877 Chancellor of Adelaide, Dr. Short, that the function of a University was to direct the studies and form the character of the "governing classes."

The question of fees was next raised by a scheme drawn up by the Professorial Board and in November 1913, eight months after teaching began, it was moved (Saw, Kirwan) that this scheme of fees be adopted with the following proviso -

"In the event of any student satisfying the Chancellor that he is unable to pay such fees or deposit they may be remitted."

This was carried on the voices and no division was called for. Later the legality of this resolution was questioned for it purported to repeal the November 1912 resolution against fees. This could only be done by motion of which notice had been given. So notice to repeal the 1912 resolution was given.

When the report of this proposal became public the Metropolitan Council of the Australian Labour Party
wrote protesting against the charging of fees and asked the Senate to receive a deputation, but the Senate did not respond.

When the notice of motion by Andrews came on for discussion it was modified to read, "the resolution that no fees be charged to students of the University" be rescinded is so far as it applies to Laboratory fees and examination fees. This was lost by the following division, for, Andrews, Saw, Moss Sandover, Smith, against, Hackett, Mead, Burrows, Somerville, Grasby, Kirwan. (4 out of 5 votes for fees were University people, 2 out of 6 votes against fees were University people.)

After this second defeat of the advocates of fees the matter was in abeyance for four years until 1917. About this time the University finances first began to feel the effect of beginning with 7 chairs exclusive of Agriculture instead of the 5 chairs which in the opinion of competent critics of the time was all that the Parliamentary grant of £13,500 could finance. (see minority report on number of chairs presented by Battye and Grasby in 1912.)

As the University Act was current for about 12 months before expenditure began the University began (March 1913) teaching with a credit of £13,786. At first the salaries did not require all the annual grant so that during the years 1913-17 there was an annually decreasing amount together with the surplus over salaries from this balance with which to buy equipment and books etc.

By the end of 1917 there was no unspent balance and the salaries for 1918 would be £12,381 so that with unforeseen contingencies the Senate had to anticipate finishing 1918 with a deficit.

So again the favoured resource (with some) "fees" were urged. I took part in a students debate. I confined myself mainly to the cost to a parent of the annual upkeep of a student, the loss of earning capacity during student years, fees however small were the last straw to many parents etc.
The Guild sent a letter November 1917 to the Senate protesting against the proposal to charge fees "as not being consistent with the progress of the state" and also protesting against the proposal to reduce the number of Professors. This latter alternative way of meeting the threatened deficit had been mentioned and its possibility at the end of the first term of appointment of 5 years, explains much of the activity of a number of the Professors through Convocation Committee reports, letters in the papers etc. urging the charging of fees as a means by which to carry on the 7 chairs (exclusive of Agriculture).

The Metropolitan Council of the A.L.F. again wrote November 1917 protesting against fees and intimating "that such a course would take from the University any support or interest which the Labour organisations throughout W.A. had given to the Institution.

Convocation appointed a committee consisting of Dr. D. Clements, Professor W.J. Dakin, Mr. J. Parsons, Head master of Modern School, Mr. H.S. Thompson, Lecturer in English and W. Somerville to examine and report on the subject of Fees.

Two reports were submitted, a majority report in favour of fees was signed by Messrs. Clements, Dakin and Parsons and a minority report against the charging of fees and signed by Messrs. Thompson and Somerville. These reports are still in a measure applicable and are given in full they were presented on 12th November, 1917.

REPORT OF SUB-COMMITTEE OF CONVOCATION - appointed October 29th, to inquire into the Question of University Fees.

Although the University of Western Australia is a free University and has been so since its inception, it has not numbered among its undergraduates many students of ability and promise but of limited means. It is not the absence of fees that opens the way to the University to a student of this kind. The payment of fees alone is by no means the sole expense involved in taking a course of three to five years. During these years (when the young man is aged from seventeen to twentyone) he might well be earning a man's wage in some profitable occupation. If he wants to enter upon a University course he will need to look forward to a period of three to five years when he earns no money and remains a burden upon his parents. The only way
to reach this class of student is by means of a money grant to aid him to keep himself during his course. At present the Education Department grants ten University Exhibitions which serve to reach perhaps four or five students in poor circumstances.

At present time it is not likely that the number of exhibitions will be increased, so that the University must look to itself to devise some method of bringing in these needy students. A nominal fee of £10 per annum imposed under the conditions hereunder laid down cannot keep any worthy student out of the University and will supply some money if only a little to enable the University to grant allowances to the men and women whom it has hitherto been unable to reach. Under this scheme also there will be some money, little though it be, to make up any deficiencies in University finance or add to the equipment or to develop new departments. In this scheme too the undergraduates will feel that they also are doing something to help others less fortunately situated than themselves, and something to add to the efficiency of the institution of which they are members.

It is suggested that -

1. Unmatriculated students shall pay fees on a scale to be laid down by the University authorities.

2. An inclusive fee not to exceed £12 per annum be charged on Matriculated Students.

and that these suggestions be governed by the following conditions -

1. A rebate of fees be granted to those students who can show reason that the payment of fees would be a personal hardship, this enquiry to be conducted in such a way that none of the other undergraduates would know who are the non-paying students.

2. Fifty percent of the sum of money obtained as fees should be used for payment of allowances to enable needy students to attend the University.

(Signed) D. Clements,
William J. Dakin.
J. Parsons.

UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA - MEETING OF CONVOCATION,
12TH NOVEMBER, 1917.

MINORITY REPORT ON THE QUESTION OF CHARGING FEES AT THE UNIVERSITY.

WE OPPOSE THE CHARGING OF FEES FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:

(1) Starting from a time in Australia when fees were charged even for the infants class in the primary school, the line of progress has been from fees to no fees. Fees were abolished first for primary education, then for secondary education, then for Technical education, and finally a free University was established.

This is the line along which educational reform is everywhere moving. Western Australia is in the proud position of being first, so far as we are aware, to complete the work by establishing a free University, and it would be in the highest degree regrettable if we were to lose heart and take a retrograde step before the existing system were given a fair trial.
(2) We fear that if fees are charged at the University a precedent will be established which will be used to the detriment of the whole educational system. For a certainty, the next step will be to charge fees for the technical school. Then will come the turn of the secondary school and possible the primary school. It would be foolish to shut our eyes to the fact that the Metropolitan constituency has recently been won by a candidate who openly and without shame urged an attack upon the education vote, and we have not to go back very far to an occasion when most of the arguments used in favour of fees at the University were used in Parliament in favour of charging fees from those who could afford to pay for the primary schools.

(3) To charge fees would amount to a breach of faith with Parliament for undoubtedly the amount of £13,500 was granted on the understanding that it was to establish a free University.

(4) We believe that the principal motive actuating those who favour fees is a desire to raise a sum of money which will enable the benefits of the University to be extended to a wider circle by means of bursaries and scholarships. We understand that the utmost it is expected could be raised would be about £1,000.

The possibility of raising even this sum is questionable. The present enrolment is very satisfactory, but it can never be known until actually tried what will be the effect of even a small fee. We cannot know to how many it will be the last straw making a University career impossible. But accepting the figure, we submit as follows

(a) The sum maintained is only a portion of what is urgently needed to meet the existing liabilities of the Senate.

(b) Supposing the sum to be absolutely reserved for scholarships, it would provide say 10.

(c) Ten scholarships are absolutely inadequate to provide for the children of the city worker, the miner and farmer who annually show themselves worthy of the highest training. A mere drop in the bucket.

(d) To increase the enrolment by 10 would be a woefully inadequate return for sacrificing the great principle of free education. It is perhaps, unnecessary to say that we are as strongly in favour of increasing the number of scholarships as is the majority of your committee. We differ as to the means.

The argument has been used that the absence of fees leads to a number beginning a course, and falling out before the end, through a want of application. Fortunately the members of the staff who have had this experience are in the minority and consequently their experience though regrettable has no bearing upon the question.

It has been asserted that people do not value what they get for nothing. We would point out that if there is any truth in this ancient saw it applies to primary education as well as University education, and has on countless occasions been actually used to combat free primary education it applies to free libraries, free parks and many other facilities which all countries provide free of direct charge.

It ignores the fact that a student cannot attend even a free University without his or her parent bearing considerable charges for books, clothes, food and other requirements. We can help by not charging fees, but the
other much heavier charges remain and then there is the loss of earnings which at the least skilled form of manual labour would average over the course something in the neighbourhood of £100 per annum.

(Sgd) W. Somerville.
H.S. Thompson.

About the same time the Senate appointed a joint Committee of the Administrative and Finance Committees to report on some questions of administration and also on the question of fees. After several extensions of time had been granted the Joint Committee report was adopted by the Senate in May 1918. The report found that it was not desirable at present to charge tuition fees ... if they were charged scholarships would be required which would absorb all the yield from fees. The University has only completed five sessions and the period is not long enough to show all the relative advantages of a free University system. That after January 1919 examination and degree fees be charged.

And so was the third drive to impose fees defeated. This time the subject remained in abeyance for 3 years.

In September 1921 a long letter was received from the Primary Producers Association, the gist of which was that as a Free University benefited residents in the Metropolitan area the needs of the University should be met by charging fees.

This letter was probably prompted by Senate discussions as to the necessity for increasing the Government Grant.

The Senate at its October 1921 meeting received a letter from the Premier regretting the inability of the Government to increase the grant. It was moved (Sandover, Walter) that in view of the Governments refusal that the resolution of the Senate of November 1912 "that no fees be charged" be rescinded and the Senate approve of fees.

To this an amendment (Saw, Kirwan) to add "pro-vided the rights of present students to free tuition be maintained. This amendment was lost and Sandovers motion
was carried by 10 votes to 3. A Committee (Sandover-Walter) be appointed to draft a statute and suggest the fees to be charged and report to a special meeting within a fortnight.

The Committee were directed to consider the case of Teachers Training College students who were taking University courses. Its members were the members of the Finance Committee with the addition of James, Saw, Wilsmore and Walter.

FOOTNOTE: I was in the Chair at this meeting as both the Chancellor Riley and the Pro Chancellor Andrews were away. The majority in favour of fees was so large that I was not required to vote. The carriage of these resolutions by the Senate was the signal for a great outburst of protest and Press correspondence. Among the many who participated the following may be mentioned. Mr. Woods Lecturer in Classics Mr. Rooney, Principal of the Teachers' Training College Professors Wilsmore and Shann, Dr. Battye and W. Somerville, G. Irving Lecturer in French, T. Hartecy Chairman of Guild, H.S. Thompson, Ethel Stoneman, Psychology.

The question at issue was of course of interest to Wage earners, particularly those who had sons or daughters of University age, but I was left completely on my own to wage their fight against fees. Whether this was due to a flattering confidence in my ability to do the job or to indifference to the issue involved I do not know.

The chief points I endeavoured to make were —

(1) The amount of the fee was only a portion of the financial burden which had to be born by the parents of a University student and to some families more grievous was the loss of earnings of from £50 to £200 per annum during student years. I likened the eliminating action of every pound of increased cost to that in an athlete's high jump contest. Many could clear the bar at moderate heights just as many families could find a sum necessary for University costs but by every pound those costs were raised an increasing number could not find the sum necessary just as in the athletic jump those who could clear the bar were progressively lessened by every inch the bar was raised in height.
(2) Supporters of fees endeavoured to placate opposition by suggesting that a portion of the sum raised by fees should be used to provide Bursaries for those who could not find the fee subject to certain objectional preliminaries. One comment upon such a proposal is that the sum so raised for bursaries can never be more than a small fraction of the sum necessary to give University training to the army of talented sons and daughters of those parents on the lower wage earning standard. A second and more serious objection to this method is that it would inevitably divide the student body into two groups, the pure merinos and the goats. To submit to a means test as a preliminary to accepting a Bursary provided by an outside benefactor, such as Hackett, is one thing, to accept a Bursary provided by a levy upon those with whom you have to work and associate for 3 to 5 years is quite a different matter. In the first case only snobbish reasons can cause any difference about applying, but in the second case, in which the money from which Bursaries are to be taken is provided from fees charged to the better off students, the probable causes of friction are so obvious as not to require elaborating.

(3) One of the most important objections to the charging of fees is the effect it will have upon the participation in University work by the Primary School Teachers. These teachers are in large measure drawn from families on the lower wage earners scale and University fees would effectively block them. It is eminently desirable that School Teachers should take University courses for they, when they return to their teaching even to the most distant part of the State, will be the conduits, so to speak, through which the culture of the University can percolate down to the lowest grade in the primary school and to the Kindergarten.

Mr. Rooney, the Principal of the School Teachers Training College was very emphatic in his objection to the charging of fees.

(4) Another point I made was that the line of progress in all countries was from fees to no fees. Starting from the time when substantial fees were the rule for the lowest form of primary education and heavy fees were universal for secondary and University education, the line of progress had been away from fees. A remarkable similarity existed between the arguments used in opposition to each successive removal of fees from the Primary schools and the secondary schools to those being used today in favour of University fees.

Mr. G. Wood, Classics, opposed fees in a number of carefully prepared and vigorous letters and articles. Incidentally it should be mentioned that he and Mr. E. S. Thompson were the only members of the teaching staff who opposed fees. The other members who took part in the discussion all supported fees. On several occasions the Professorial Board have approved of fees and requested the Senate to impose them.

Mr. Wood gave details of the expanding expenditure in Great Britain on free education -

"At the moment when it seems possible that W.A. will either starve its University or strangle it with fees that cannot achieve its financial end .........
Scotland has long had free secondary education. England has it not yet. But the Scottish leaven is working southward ...... the tendency to extend rather than curtail the scope of free education."

Mr. G. Irving's, Lecturer in French and German, chief interest in the subject appeared to be in the opportunity it gave him to air a grouse about his salary -

"It is surely incumbent on the bodies protesting against fees to offer some other means of obtaining fair conditions for a staff that has neither union, appeal board, nor Arbitration Court to support it."

Mr. H.S. Thompson, Lecturer in English, concludes a long and closely reasoned letter in opposition -

"Many students now at the University find it difficult to make ends meet. Whether the additional burden of Lecture fees falls on themselves or their parents, we should hesitate to impose it on those who are striving to fit themselves to be a future asset to the State. Parents who are already to make sacrifices in order to have their children educated are "the salt of the Earth". Is it rational to discourage them?"

Professor Shann limited himself to a defence of the means test as applied to an applicant for a Bursary. It is a matter of historical interest to record that according to the Professor, the W.A. regulations were "based upon those which had operated for over half a century at Sydney University."

Professor Wilsmore wrote at length. Like all his writings it was able and had that dash of mordant humour which made everything he wrote enjoyable, but he said little about fees. His chief attention was given to a common theme with him namely "the small appreciation given to the scientific worker in comparison with the great effect of his labours upon the body politic. He once told me that many of the most important scientific discoveries had been made by Scientist "pottering about in a Laboratory."

Dr. Battye opened his letter -

"As one who had taken a somewhat prominent part in the question of the introduction of fees, I feel that it is advisable to traverse the statements of some of your correspondents more particularly Mr. Somerville."

And this is what he did, winding up with the remarkable statement - "In W.A. we can maintain existing activities reasonably well with the added income which fees would give."

This statement is remarkable for being so wide of the facts for the fees suggested at the time would yield
only a portion of the increased salaries the teaching staff were clamouring for.

The controversy was of such wide public interest that the Weekly Press took it up and the "Call" published in parallel columns statements by Somerville against and Shamn for fees.

A public meeting of those opposed to fees was also held in the University. Mr. Wood (Classics) was selected to give to the press a summary of the arguments used. His statement opens as follows -

"Fees will afford no solution of the financial difficulties."

This is a direct contradiction to Dr. Battye's complacent remark. Mr. Wood then pointed out that the State had established or was establishing district High Schools from which a crop of the University Students would come annually.

"The University cannot be ready to admit the crop of aspirants now preparing for it unless it can increase its revenue almost immediately by £6,000 to £7,000 per annum. i.e., by somewhere between two and three times the sum expected from fees."

On the 25/11/1921 the papers published a statement by Dr. Battye as Chairman of University Finance Committee -

"At the meeting of the Senate on Monday no members of the staff being present, it was resolved that the Professorial Salaries be raised to £1,000 per annum, including house allowance, and that lecturers salaries be increased in proportion ............the following are the Committee recommendations, Professors £1,000, Lecturers in Charge £550 to £650, Lecturers in departments £450 to £550, Assistant Lecturers £370 to £450 .......... The amount of additional expenditure involved next year ........ will be £1,027."

The public interested in the question were not slow to see that these increases appropriated a very great portion of the total sum which it was anticipated fees would yield and more protests were voiced and letters published. Mr. Menzies speaking as Chairman of the Parliamentary Labour Party expressed the hope that Parliament would not allow fees.
In the meantime the Senate had lost no time in implementing the report of its committee consisting of Dr. Battye and Professor Shannon in favour of fees. At the Senate meeting of 28th October 1921 the draft statute was passed. Fifteen members were present and two, Mr. W. J. Hancock and W. Somerville asked that their names be recorded as being against any proposal to charge fees. The Statute and Senate report is as follows -

UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA — STATUTE NO. 19 — FEES AND BURSARIES FOR ATTENDANCE OF STUDENTS AT THE LECTURES AND CLASSES OF THE UNIVERSITY.

(As passed by the Senate, 28th October, 1921.)

FEES: The following fees are payable for the attendance of students domiciled in Australia at the Lectures and classes of the various faculties in the University.

1) Faculty of Arts.

(a) For single courses which may be taken in the first year and which do not include laboratory work, £1/5/- per term per course.

(b) For any other single course which does not include laboratory work, £1/10/- per term per course.

(c) For single courses including laboratory work, £1/15/- per term per course.

Alternatively:

(d) Composition fee for attendance in three or more courses, not including laboratory work, £12/12/- per annum.

(e) Composition fee for attendance in three or more courses, one of which alone involves laboratory work, £14/14/- per annum.

(f) Composition fee for attendance in three or more courses two of which involve laboratory work, £16/16/- per annum.

Faculties of Science and Engineering.

(a) For single first year courses not including laboratory or field work, £1/5/- per term per course.

(b) For single first year courses including laboratory or field work, £1/15/- per term per course.

(c) For single second, third, fourth and fifth year courses not including laboratory or field work, £1/10/- per term per course.

(d) For single second, third, fourth and fifth year courses including laboratory or field work, £2/5/- per term per course.

(e) Alternatively — Composition fee for all the courses prescribed for any one year if taken in one session, £16/16/- per annum.
(iii) All Faculties.

For short courses such fees as may be determined from time to time by the Senate, on the recommendation of the Professorial Board.

BURSARIES.

The Senate shall have power in any year to award bursaries of a total value not exceeding twenty per cent of the revenue derived from fees received under this Statute during the preceding year, and for 1922 of a total value not exceeding £500.

---

UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA - STATUTE NO. 19
MEETING OF CONVOCATION, 14TH NOVEMBER, 1921 - REPORT BY STANDING COMMITTEE OF CONVOCATION ON STATUTES.

To the Warden of Convocation -

The Statutes Committee whilst regretting the refusal of the Government to increase the University grant either to improve the efficiency and usefulness of the University or even to meet current expenses, feels that it has no option but to recommend to Convocation the adoption of Statute No. 19, authorising the Senate to charge fees for attendance at lectures and classes in the University.

In the opinion of the Committee the relative scales of fees as between the different Faculties is satisfactory. They would point out that in subjects including laboratory work students are charged for breakages and in some cases for materials used. In view of this fact a composition fee of £12/12/- in Arts and of £16/16/- in Science and Engineering appears perfectly reasonable.

12th November, 1921. (Signed)
W.J. Hancock, Chairman.
F.G. Anderson.
A.D. Ross.
N.T.M. Wilsome.

EXCERPT FROM NINETEENTH MEETING OF CONVOCATION, MONDAY, 14TH NOVEMBER, 1921.

Draft Statute No. 19 Fees and Bursaries for attendance at Lectures and Classes at the University.

The report of the Standing Committee on Statutes was received. (Copy attached).

Mr. A. Sandover proposed and Mr. W.A.G. Walter seconded -

That the Statute be passed as a whole.

An amendment, Associate Professor Wood proposed, and Mr. W.J. Hancock seconded -

That the Statute be re-committed for the purpose of ascertaining the comparative cost of education in the different Faculties, and either substituting a scale of fees more in accordance with cost, and proving that the scale now proposed is not too unfair.

The amendment was lost on the voices and the motion was carried.

On the motion of the Rev. D.I. Freedman, seconded by Mr. J. Leslie, it was resolved -
That this Convocation urge the Government to increase the scholarships and exhibitions awarded to students for the purpose of attending at the University of Western Australia and to students at the Teachers Training College, Claremont, by such amounts as will cover the fees payable in their respective courses as set out in Statute No. 19.

The fees statute in due course went on to Convocation and was approved. Immediately after passing it they carried another resolution urging the Government to pay the University fees for all its scholarship and exhibition holders and for all the students at the Teachers Training College. Convocation was apparently quite unaware of the fact that if this request had been granted the whole of the poor little balance obtained from fees would have come out of the State purse as follows -

A very optimistic report had been presented to the Senate by its fees Committee (Batty & Shann) that £3,139 would be raised by their fee proposals. 20% of this was to be set aside for Bursaries (£625) leaving £2,512. The Senate's decision to raise salaries would absorb about £1,100. So the net increase to University revenue which would come from all the other about fees would be less than £1,500. Even this, if Convocation resolution about exhibition holders and teachers were given effect to would come out of the State purse.

At the Senate meeting November 1921, the Chancellor was authorised to seal the Fees Statute.

The decision again, as in 1912, had repercussions in Parliament. On 22nd November 1921, Mr. W.D. Johnson asked the Premier -

"Will he draw the attention of the University to the following resolution carried by this House 13th November 1912, "That in the opinion of the House it is desirable that all Education at the University should be free and that the practice of charging fees at all educational establishments should be abolished. Further has the Senate power to impose fees in disregard of the resolution of the House which such resolution remains un rescinded."

The Premier replied - "Yes, see sections 31 and 33 George V. No. 37. This was the University Act."

The Premier (Mitchell) in December 1921 also
wrote to the Senate drawing its attention to the Parliamentary resolution of 1912 (quoted before) and adding that the Government desired the Senate to give consideration to the 1912 resolution in relation to the fees statute now before it.

The Senate replied - "That the Senate had already dealt with the question and that Convocation had approved of Statute No. 19 imposing fees which Statute was now before both houses of Parliament."

This brusque reply was not in keeping with Chancellor Riley's usual suavity and was probably due to the almost fanatical dislike to any sign of Government interference held by Sir Walter James.

By the provisions of the University Act the Fees Statute had to lie on the table of Parliament for 30 days. Before that time had elapsed, Mr. P. Collier Labour member for Boulder and Leader of the Opposition moved 22/12/21.

"That Statute No. 19 of the University of Western Australia establishing fees and Bursaries for attendance of Students at the Lectures and classes of the University and laid upon the table of this House on Thursday 24th November in accordance with the provision of Section 33 of the University Act of 1911 ought to be annulled."

In his speech Mr. Collier quoted the third paragraph of the preamble to the University Act -

"And whereas it is desirable that special encouragement and assistance should be afforded those who may be hindered in the acquirement of sound knowledge and useful learning by lack of opportunity or means."

Mr. Collier went on quoting the expenditure on Education in 1911-12 was £238,564 and had grown in 1921 to £490,160 which estimate for current year was £529,546 an increase in 10 years of 120% and he contended the same increase should have been made to the University.

FOOTNOTE: This would have brought the University Grant to approximately £30,000 whereas it was in fact £15,000.

Mr. Underwood interjected - How did you get here?

Collier - I had to struggle through without much education.

Underwood - So had I.
Collier - And because of the difficulties I experienced in those days and the handicap I have felt throughout life, notwithstanding I am here, I want to provide better facilities and opportunities to those who come after me..... We might have been more useful members of this house..... The University Statute was objectionable because it applied a means test.

Mr. A. McCallum - .......I remind the house that only £3,000 is involved in the amount of fees proposed to be collected and the financial aid which the Senate say will be necessary to make ends meet ......... at the present time there are 105 students at the Teachers Training College who are attending the University and getting their education free. I have it on the best authority that at least half of those students will not be able to attend the University if fees are charged. Unless the standard of teaching in our primary schools is to be materially reduced the Government will be compelled to find some means of educating them to a standard equivalent to that obtained at the University. That would be costly."

When dealing with the argument that those who could afford it should be made to pay, Mr. McCallum pointed out that to be logical the argument should be carried to its logical conclusion and those who could afford it should pay the full cost of a University education and to do so would mean much heavier fees than anyone had even suggested .... .......The University should be either free and open to all without restriction or else if it is to be made a means test institution the rich man should be called upon to finance a University Education for his child to the full cost.

The Premier (Mitchell), while emphasising the need for economy he pointed out that the estimated yield from fees would be £2,740 - "It is proposed to increase salaries by £1,385 which was half the amount of the fees it is proposed to charge. It is here I think I am entitled to object whatever I may do about fees."
Mr. Collier's resolution to disallow the fees Statute was carried without a single dissentient on 22nd December 1921. So closed the fourth attempt to impose fees.

This decision was taken as conclusive evidence of Parliaments desire and no further move to impose fees was made for 10 years. Then the same old Tory party in the Senate made another attempt. Sir John Northmore moved and Mr. Sandover seconded a motion for the imposition of fees and for the appointment of a Committee to suggest a scale. This was defeated by 9 votes to 5 on September 1931.

Again the idea was for the fifth time forced into recess.

In February 1941 the fees question was again raised. This time by an official of the Senate. It was duly debated. They were not even moved by a member of the Senate.

The accumulated deficit was £3,395. To wipe this out and provide for new expenditure mentioned in the 1942 Budget, Mr. McDonald apparently recognised that as fees for tuition had been so often defeated that it was useless to suggest them, so he proposed what he called a Registration fee which was to be paid on enrollment. The ordinary matriculated student was to pay £1 each, the Teachers College students 10/ each, the Library deposits were to be taken into revenue at 20/- and the External students were to be charged 21/-. These charges would, Mr. McDonald estimated bring in £1,647 per annum.

The debate on the Finance Committee showed that the proposals were opposed by Gillett, Ellis and Somerville and supported by Batty, Barblett and Thomas. In view of this equality of voting, the matter was deferred until after a deputation had seen the Premier with a request to liquidate the deficit. The deputation reported that the Premier had given the remarkable advice "to carry on with the deficit until after the report of the Royal Commission (Wolff) had been received."
The Premier (Wilcox) also said what is most important "He was opposed to any further departure from the idea of a free University."

Thus ended the sixth effort to impose fees.

What may be termed the seventh attempt to impose fees was when Wolff reporting as a Royal Commissioner recommended a minimum basic fee of £25 per annum. But when the Government (Wilcox Premier) introduced their amending University Act 1944 they ignored the advice of their Commissioner.

UNIVERSITY - LECTURE FEES MOVE - 11/7/1944 - SENATE'S OPPOSITION.

A special meeting of the University Senate held in Perth last night rejected a recommendation of the Professorial Board that the system of charging lecture fees be instituted at the University.

The board had recommended that the Senate declare publicly for the information of the people and the Government of W.A. -

(1) That the policy of endeavouring to maintain a free University in Western Australia has failed from lack of adequate financial support;

(2) That in order to provide the University with a first instalment of the increased income which the Senate knows and the Royal Commissioner has affirmed is essential to its efficient maintenance, it is reluctantly forced to the conclusion that it now has no alternative but to impose lecture fees;

(3) That it introduce a proposed statute under Section 31 subsection 1 (p) of the University of Western Australia Act, 1911, for the purpose of imposing lecture fees to be not less than the average of the fees charged by the other Australian Universities in the various faculties schools and courses and such statute to come into operation and such lecture fees to be charged at the beginning of the academic year 1945.

Opening the meeting, the Chancellor (Professor Walter Murdoch) reported on the deputation from the Senate which waited on the Premier (Mr. Willcock) on Friday. He said that it arose through the Premier having at length replied to a letter sent to him last September. Mr. Willcock had told the deputation that the Government had agreed to include the raising of the annual grant to the University from £34,500 to £40,000 in the Bill for the University Act to be submitted to the next session of the State Parliament.

Dr. J.S. Battye: Was the question of charging lecture fees mentioned?

The Chancellor: Yes, but the Premier made it clear that public opinion would not tolerate a departure from the present system of a free University.
Dr. W. Somerville opposed consideration of the Professorial Board's recommendations on the ground that they were now out of order in the light of the Chancellor's report on the result of the deputation.

The Chancellor explained that the Senate had before it two recommendations from the board and discussion of them was in order.

To Dr. Somerville, the Vice-Chancellor explained that £242,000 was the figure considered basically necessary by the Royal Commissioner for maintenance of the University and he had recommended £14,000 additional to the annual grant of £34,500. The Senate had adopted his figures without a dissentient.

Dr. Somerville: I still maintain that the document before us is invalid in view of the first paragraph.

An amendment by Dr. Battye to item 1 of the board's recommendation - that it be referred back to the Professorial Board for reconsideration in the light of the result of the deputation was carried but was subsequently lost as a substantive motion in favour of the following moved by Professor Fox: "That the report of the Senate's deputation to the Premier on July 7th be received and that the Premier be thanked for his proposal to introduce legislation providing an increase of the statutory grant to £40,000, but that it be pointed out to him that, as this amount is not sufficient to meet the present urgent needs of the University and still less pressing developments, he be asked again to increase it to the £48,000 requested by the Senate in September and thus approximately to the amount recognised as necessary by the Royal Commissioner."

This resolution was carried by eight votes to four. The dissentients being: The Director of Education (Mr. M.G. Little), Dr. Battye, Dr. Somerville and Mr. R.J. Dumas.

Professor Fox gave notice of a further motion to be moved at the next meeting of the Senate: That if the Government cannot see its way to increase the grant to £48,000 the Senate is reluctantly compelled to institute the system of lecture fees.

Specific requests for additional staff appointments previously preferred by the Professorial Board were referred back to the finance committee.

---

UNIVERSITY BUDGETS. - DR. SOMERVILLE'S VIEWS.

Adopting an uncompromising attitude of opposition to the statement submitted by the Professorial Board to a special meeting of the University Senate on Monday - "that the policy of endeavouring to maintain a free University in W.A. has failed for lack of adequate financial support" - Dr. Somerville failed to obtain support for the following amendment of the board's recommendations: "That the Senate declare publicly for the information of the people and the Government of W.A. that the present financial position of the University is partly due to the failure of the Government to provide, during the six years prior to 1943, the increased grants necessary for legitimate expansion; but the position is due mainly to:

(1) A policy pursued over many years of establishing new departments instead of using our resources to properly equip and staff existing departments."
(2) The Senate yielding to pressure from the Professorial Board, which as a body carries no financial responsibility, to incur commitments known to be beyond the University revenue."

For many years persistent efforts were made by means of the Professorial Board to have the Lecturship in Philosophy raised to a Professorship. The first step was to have Associate Professorships established. This hybrid rank has been condemned by Dr. Wallace, Wolff J. and other authorities. Nevertheless it persisted and was extended to other Departments. Then came a series of resolutions from the Professorial Board recommending the creation of certain Chairs.

Philosophy of course, among them. These moves were brought to a successful conclusion at the last meeting of the old Senate under the Act of 1911 during its dying hours, so to speak, and before new Senate under the Act of 1944 came into office. As the Senate of the time was running a heavy deficit the Professorial Board as was to be expected urged the imposition of fees to meet the increase in salaries involved. As the chief beneficiary naively put it -

"He favoured a free University, but not at the expense of efficiency."

Efficiency, blessed word, was inextricably bound up with raising his salary to £1000.

But fees were not imposed. There ended the eighth reading. I mean to say, thus ended what may be termed the eighth attempt to impose fees.