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ABSTRACT

During the years that followed the Second World War there were important developments in the State education systems. The population grew rapidly, both through natural increase and immigration, placing a tremendous strain on the States' education facilities which had been depleted as a result of six years of war. However, it was not only the larger population that caused an increase in the demand for education. The period seems to have been marked by a growing social awareness of the value of education and with it the popular belief that all children should be given the opportunity to complete their schooling to the secondary level.

In response to this increased demand for education there were improvements in some aspects of the State education systems. These included improvements in psychological services and the treatment of individual differences, better training and employment conditions for teachers, increased emphasis on tertiary education, more efficient administrative procedures and growing Commonwealth involvement in the financing of education.
As the Second World War came to an end, the members of the House of Representatives showed considerable interest in education and many of them seemed to regard it as an integral part of the post-war reconstruction programme. The first important debate on the subject took place in July, 1945. Although this debate was initiated by the Opposition by means of an urgency motion, there was little criticism of the Labour Government's approach to education. There was a surprising amount of agreement between members of the three political parties about the importance of education and the need for the Commonwealth to give some kind of assistance to the States.

The Commonwealth Government was already assisting university students and had set up a Universities Commission during the war. In 1945 legislation was passed to make this a permanent body and the Commonwealth Office of Education was also established. The Government stressed the fact that it did not intend taking over the administration of education from the States or dictating policy to them in any way.

For many years the Commonwealth Government's assistance for education was directed at the universities and other aspects of tertiary education. Commonwealth finance for university education first took the form of direct grants to students through the Commonwealth Scholarship Scheme. In planning further assistance the Commonwealth Government called upon committees of inquiry - the Mills Committee in 1950, the
Murray Committee in 1957 and the Martin Committee from 1961 to 1964. As a result of the reports received from these committees the Commonwealth became more and more committed to the financing of university education by means of special grants made under Section 96 of the Constitution. These grants were made subject to the States maintaining a given level of expenditure. The grants were at first for recurrent expenditure only. In later years, capital expenditure and academic salaries were also subsidised in this way.

Once the Commonwealth had become involved in the financing of the universities there was a great deal of agitation for an extension of this aid to primary and secondary education. Judging by petitions presented to the House of Representatives and comments made by members, there was growing pressure from organisations outside the Parliament for the Commonwealth to become involved in all levels of public education. One important aspect of Commonwealth aid for schools was the question of State aid for the independent schools. When the Commonwealth Government did begin making grants to the States for secondary schools it was for the provision of science teaching facilities and the grants were to be divided equally between State and non-State schools.

The political parties which held such similar views on education in 1945 drew further and further apart in their thinking on this
subject as the years went by. By the late 1950's the Liberal-Country Party coalition Government was under constant attack from the Labour Opposition because of its bias in favour of the universities. The Opposition called for a national inquiry into education at all levels and for the establishment of a Commonwealth Ministry of Education.

No attempt was made to set up a separate ministry during the Prime Ministership of Sir Robert Menzies although in 1964 he did appoint Senator Gorton as Minister assisting the Prime Minister in Commonwealth activities in Education and Research. In 1967 Senator Gorton became the Commonwealth's first Minister for Education and Science in the Holt Government.

In the years preceding the establishment of the Ministry, the Commonwealth Office of Education does not seem to have undergone any significant changes. There is no evidence to suggest that it developed into some kind of "pseudo-ministry" as might have been expected. In terms of staff, the Office of Education actually employed fewer people in 1966 than in 1950. Its functions seem to have been of a routine administrative nature, gathering statistics, supplying factual information on request and administering some of the Commonwealth's assistance schemes. The important task of advising the Government on new initiatives in education was entrusted to the previously mentioned ad hoc committees.
The demand for increased Commonwealth involvement in education resulted from the combined effect of the War, a greater demand for education in general and uniform taxation. Although faced by an unprecedented demand for their inadequate educational resources, the States no longer exercised complete control over their own finances since the collection of income tax, the major source of revenue, had been taken over by the Commonwealth.

It was in this situation that the Commonwealth Government was driven into a de facto relationship with the State education systems. Both the Commonwealth and the States were reluctant to allow this relationship to develop. At first, the only forms of Commonwealth assistance were direct assistance to students and aid to the States for those types of educational activity which came within the realm of post-war reconstruction.

Once the Commonwealth had made specific grants for education, even though these could be justified as a contribution to reconstruction, these grants were taken by many as a precedent for future involvement in aspects of education that were in no way connected with areas of Commonwealth responsibility. The Liberal-Country Party Government, which was in office during most of this period, was strongly committed to the principle of federalism and it found itself slowly drawn into an uneasy compromise between this principle and the need to upgrade the State education systems as a matter of national importance.
INTRODUCTION

There can be little doubt that the role and responsibility of the Commonwealth Government in the field of education has changed dramatically since Federation and most of this change has taken place since the Second World War. The period from 1945 to 1967 has been chosen for detailed study because it is marked by two significant actions on the part of the Commonwealth Government - the establishment of the Commonwealth Office of Education in 1945 and the appointment of a Minister for Education and Science by the Holt Government in 1967.

The aims of this investigation may be summarised as follows:

(1) to describe changes which came about in the role of the Commonwealth Government in education from 1945 to 1967;

(2) to determine whether or not there was any planned growth in the responsibilities of the Commonwealth Office of Education over the years leading up to the establishment of a ministry;

(3) to examine the trends in attitude towards Commonwealth involvement;
(4) to suggest possible explanations for the change and the manner in which it took place.

The extent of the research which has been undertaken has been limited in certain ways.

Research material has been restricted, as far as possible, to the Hansard reports of Parliamentary Debates. The original intention was to examine all available documents on the subject. However, the lack of access to many classified government documents would make a thorough investigation difficult. It was felt, therefore, that it would be better to limit the study to one reliable primary source. The source chosen, moreover, is a suitable one for judging changes in attitude which took place during the period.

Only the proceedings in the House of Representatives have been referred to. In a preliminary survey of materials, some of the Senate debates on education were consulted and the decision was made to exclude such material from the study. The Senate does not carry out the role of a States' House as was intended by the framers of the Constitution. It is conducted along party lines as is the House of Representatives. As a result, the comments made in the two Houses tend to be much alike. If an examination of Senate speeches could have brought out clearly defined State attitudes on education it would have been well worthwhile but this was not the case. It should also be noted that even after a member of the Senate, Senator Gorton, had
been given some ministerial responsibility in education, announcements of policy were made simultaneously in the two Houses.

Another important limitation relates to the definition of the word "education". Prior to the period under review, the Commonwealth Government was interested in many aspects of education. It administered the schools in its own territories and it was obliged through the various Commonwealth departments to undertake a variety of activities in education. These are referred to in Chapter I and it was partly because of these existing commitments that the Commonwealth Office of Education was established. It is not the purpose of this thesis, however, to give a detailed account of those educational activities of the Commonwealth that can be legitimately explained within the terms of its own constitutional responsibilities. Our major concern is with those aspects of public education which had hitherto been recognised as State responsibilities.

Chapter I provides a survey of public education in the Australian States from 1945 to 1967. The Reviews published by the Australian Council for Educational research have been used extensively as a source of factual information. The data drawn from Hansard and presented in Chapters II to V has been organised to provide a chronological account of changing opinions and policy in the House of Representatives. The final chapter attempts to synthesise this data and arrive at some conclusions about the nature and direction of change.
For the sake of convenience, an abbreviated form is used for references to the Hansard reports of Parliamentary Debates. This is as follows:

"Hans., Vol. - , p. -"

It will be noted that the volumes referred to in the early part of the period are numbered 181 to 221. These volumes included a record of proceedings in both the House of Representatives and the Senate. From 1953 onwards separate volumes were published for the two Houses and a new number sequence was commenced. These volume numbers in the footnotes have been given the prefix "R" to denote House of Representatives.

Towards the end of the period decimal currency was introduced. No attempt has been made to convert from one currency to another. Amounts referred to are shown in either pounds or dollars depending upon the source from which they were taken. A similar situation arose with respect to the names of some members of Parliament whose titles or constituencies changed. The Leader of the Liberal Party, for example, was Mr. Menzies at the beginning of the period but later received a knighthood. Likewise, the member for Yarra, Mr. J.F. Cairns became Dr. Cairns. In such cases the different appellations are used strictly in accordance with the references cited.
During the two decades that followed World War II, there was growing pressure on the resources of the Australian economy to keep pace with a rapidly expanding education system.

It would seem fair to say that most of the changes which occurred in Australian education during that time were to do with the quantity of educational services rather than with quality. The most striking feature of the period was the unprecedented expansion of educational facilities to meet increased demand. The tremendous increase in the number of pupils placed such a strain on resources, both physical and human, that there was little opportunity for the educational authorities to make radical changes in the approach to education in terms of modern research.

The increased volume of educational activity was partly the result of the post-war population explosion the effect of which was magnified by the tendency for more children to stay longer at school (either by choice or because of an increase in the statutory leaving age) and by a general acceptance of the view that secondary education
should be available to all.

The fact that the need to cater for larger numbers assumed such importance does not mean that qualitative improvements in education did not take place. There were some quite significant developments, particularly in such areas as special education for individual differences, guidance and technical education.

The principal developments and changes in education which occurred during the period under review are dealt with on the following pages. These developments and changes may be listed, briefly, as follows:

(i) Increase in volume (growth in population);
(ii) Trend towards equality of opportunity - increased opportunity and demand for all children to complete some secondary schooling;
(iii) Growing interest in, and provision for, individual differences - handicapped, maladjusted, etc.;
(iv) Improvements in the teaching service - teacher training (pre-service and in-service) and employment conditions;
(v) Improved status of technical and technological education;
(vi) Increased pressures on universities;
(vii) Administrative developments; and
(viii) Growing public interest and Commonwealth involvement in education.

Increase in Volume

Probably the most significant change which came about in education after World War II was the rapid increase in the number of full-time students at all levels. As can be seen from Table 1, this number more than doubled over a period of twenty years (1945-1965). This increase, which naturally placed great strain on physical and human resources, can be attributed to a number of factors. One of these was the increase in the number of births from 160,600 in 1945 to 229,296 in 1967.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>GOVERNMENT</th>
<th>NON-GOVERNMENT</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>828,371</td>
<td>272,814</td>
<td>1,101,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>972,635</td>
<td>308,094</td>
<td>1,280,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>1,286,135</td>
<td>405,509</td>
<td>1,691,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>1,612,281</td>
<td>507,251</td>
<td>2,119,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>1,857,120</td>
<td>580,557</td>
<td>2,437,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>2,057,507</td>
<td>607,092</td>
<td>2,658,599</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


2. Ibid.
The Government's immigration policy in the post-war years further accounted for a large number of additional pupils in the schools. From the graph in Figure 1, it can be seen that the net increase through migration reached a peak in the early 1950's. In the five year period from 1941 to 1945 the excess of arrivals over departures (excluding movement of defence personnel) had been 7,809. Ten years later, in the five year period from 1951 to 1955, the figure was 413,824.¹

The real impact of this increase in the migrant population on the education system cannot be judged without reference to the age distribution of the new arrivals. In Table 2 the net migration figures for the period are shown according to age. It can be seen that a large proportion of the migrants were of school age or younger and would have a direct impact on the education system. Even larger was the number who could be expected to have an indirect effect on the schools since the figures do not take account of children born to migrants after their arrival in Australia.

OVERSEAS ARRIVALS AND DEPARTURES: AUSTRALIA
1946 TO 1968.

1. Ibid., p. 139
Table 2
Migrants to Australia — 1950 to 1968
Excess of Arrivals over Departures
According to Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>0-14</th>
<th>15-44</th>
<th>45-64</th>
<th>65+</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>38,664</td>
<td>101,673</td>
<td>11,681</td>
<td>1,667</td>
<td>153,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>30,628</td>
<td>70,655</td>
<td>8,118</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>110,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>23,902</td>
<td>65,729</td>
<td>7,031</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>97,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>15,441</td>
<td>23,775</td>
<td>3,077</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>42,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>25,689</td>
<td>40,107</td>
<td>2,779</td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td>68,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>28,444</td>
<td>61,635</td>
<td>4,783</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>95,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>22,518</td>
<td>58,172</td>
<td>4,930</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>86,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>23,429</td>
<td>47,779</td>
<td>5,608</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>77,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>21,750</td>
<td>38,267</td>
<td>4,252</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>64,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>22,769</td>
<td>53,229</td>
<td>6,247</td>
<td>1,333</td>
<td>83,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>23,268</td>
<td>60,255</td>
<td>5,396</td>
<td>1,216</td>
<td>90,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>19,956</td>
<td>35,777</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td>61,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>17,724</td>
<td>36,875</td>
<td>5,872</td>
<td>2,051</td>
<td>62,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>31,088</td>
<td>58,777</td>
<td>7,101</td>
<td>2,376</td>
<td>99,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>35,376</td>
<td>58,278</td>
<td>8,907</td>
<td>2,295</td>
<td>104,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>31,915</td>
<td>47,328</td>
<td>5,514</td>
<td>2,169</td>
<td>86,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>29,743</td>
<td>52,926</td>
<td>6,963</td>
<td>2,277</td>
<td>91,909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>36,030</td>
<td>66,922</td>
<td>8,064</td>
<td>2,037</td>
<td>113,053</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Commonwealth Year Books 1951-1969
Also important was the practice of allowing foreign students to study in Australia. Australia's participation in such programmes as the Colombo Plan Technical Co-operation Scheme, the United Nations Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance, the Australian International Awards Scheme, The Australian South Pacific Technical Assistance Programme, the Special Commonwealth African Assistance Plan and the Commonwealth Co-operation in Education Scheme accounted for a steadily increasing number of students.¹

The number of government sponsored overseas students grew from about 800 in 1956 to about 2,200 in 1968. In addition, however, there were numerous students from overseas (particularly Asian) who came in a private capacity and it is estimated that there were about 10,000 such students in Australia in 1968, studying at various levels.²

Alterations in the statutory school leaving age which were implemented in some States brought about an increase in enrolments by requiring many children, who would otherwise have left, to remain at school.

1. Ibid., p. 526.
2. Ibid., p. 530.
At the commencement of the period under review, the school leaving age in New South Wales was fifteen years, having been increased from fourteen by the Youth Welfare Act of 1940. In Victoria, South Australia and Western Australia, although acts of parliament had been passed in 1943, 1946 and 1943 respectively to raise the leaving age to fifteen, the effective age for leaving school was still fourteen. The school leaving age in Tasmania was increased to sixteen in 1946 although problems connected with staffing, accommodation and transport led to the granting of many exemptions. In Queensland no change from the leaving age of fourteen years was contemplated.\(^1\)

The above plans for raising the school leaving age in most States were implemented by 1968.

Compulsion alone, however, did not account for the larger number of students remaining at school. The mere fact that provisions were made to enable students to extend their studies well past the statutory leaving age acted as an inducement. In N.S.W. the restructuring of education through what is commonly referred to as the Wyndham Scheme meant that students who hoped to obtain documentary proof of having completed a basic secondary course (i.e. the School Certificate)

---

would, in most cases, need to remain at school until about 16 years of age.

Further inducement for students to stay longer at school came in the form of scholarships. The provision of more scholarships encouraged more to attempt higher education than before. There was, therefore, a general tendency for all students to stay at school longer. This tendency is indicated by the graph in Figure 2 which shows the holding power of the school relative to certain age groups.
Percentages of Certain Age Groups in the Total Populations Still at School: Australia 1956 and 1966.

The increased volume of school enrolments, however, was not matched by a comparable increase in the number of available teachers. Table 3 traces the growth in the teaching force during the period and, although the number of teachers more than doubled, reference to Table 1 will confirm that the rate of increase was not adequate.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>GOVERNMENT</th>
<th>NON-GOVERNMENT</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>30,372</td>
<td>11,799</td>
<td>42,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>34,964</td>
<td>10,985</td>
<td>45,949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>43,820</td>
<td>13,009</td>
<td>56,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>56,631</td>
<td>15,222</td>
<td>71,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>71,227</td>
<td>17,541</td>
<td>88,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>82,113</td>
<td>19,475</td>
<td>101,588</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 4, the numbers of pupils and teachers in Government Primary and secondary schools are shown. One feature of note is the impact of the teacher shortage on the Primary schools. During the period every effort was made to provide staff for the expanding secondary system and the pupil: teacher ratio actually fell from about 30:1 in 1945 to approximately 22:1 in 1960. This trend is also apparent when we consider the numbers of primary and secondary teacher trainees who attended Australian Teachers Colleges during the same period (Table 5).

1. adapted from Pratt, *op. cit.*, p. 8
TABLE 4

Pupils and Full-Time Teachers in Government Primary and Secondary Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>PRIMARY</th>
<th></th>
<th>SECONDARY</th>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>647,313</td>
<td>24,224</td>
<td>181,058</td>
<td>6,148</td>
<td>828,371</td>
<td>30,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>794,385</td>
<td>26,686</td>
<td>178,250</td>
<td>8,278</td>
<td>972,635</td>
<td>34,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>1,043,626</td>
<td>31,940</td>
<td>242,509</td>
<td>11,880</td>
<td>1,286,135</td>
<td>43,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>1,212,249</td>
<td>38,054</td>
<td>400,032</td>
<td>18,577</td>
<td>1,612,281</td>
<td>56,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>1,043,626</td>
<td>31,940</td>
<td>242,509</td>
<td>11,880</td>
<td>1,286,135</td>
<td>43,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>1,289,572</td>
<td>48,408</td>
<td>567,548</td>
<td>33,705</td>
<td>1,857,120</td>
<td>82,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>1,393,376</td>
<td>664,131</td>
<td>2,057,507</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. adapted from Ibid., pp. 6 and 8
### Table 5

**Numbers of Teacher Trainees of Australian Education Departments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>PRIMARY</th>
<th>SECONDARY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>3,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>5,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>5,104</td>
<td>3,317</td>
<td>8,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>8,202</td>
<td>6,712</td>
<td>14,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>10,109</td>
<td>13,497</td>
<td>23,606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>11,233</td>
<td>15,399</td>
<td>26,632</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Detailed statistics not available.

The fact that teachers were being recruited from a generation of low birth rate during a time of rapid population growth, would seem to be sufficient explanation in itself for a teacher shortage. As Pratt\(^2\) points out, however, there were other contributing factors such as competition from other professions and industry, failure of many potential teachers to complete secondary schooling, insufficient Teachers' College Scholarships, competition from other scholarships and awards and the poor working conditions of teachers.

---

1. Ibid., p. 8
2. Ibid., pp. 7-8
Trend Towards Equality of Opportunity

In the present generation a revolution has taken place in society's own evaluation of the social importance of education. This is particularly manifested in the stress placed on education as a factor in economic growth.

This "revolution" to which Encel refers has resulted in the widespread belief that all members of society should have equal opportunity to receive a full education. Nowhere is this attitude more apparent than in the field of secondary education.

Reference has been made, above, to the growing emphasis on secondary education during the post World War II years. This emphasis cannot be solely attributed to a growth in the size of the population. The graph in Figure 2 demonstrates that the secondary schools not only held a larger number of students but also attracted a higher proportion of the population in the fourteen to seventeen year age groups.

This increased holding power of the secondary school can only partially be attributed to an increase in the statutory leaving age in most States. It is apparent that the community attitude to secondary education was changing and that this was leading to increased demand for secondary schooling.

This changing attitude to the role of the secondary school is reflected in the Report on Secondary Education presented to the N.S.W. Government in 1957.\(^1\) That report and the changes which followed grew from the widely held belief that all children need education beyond the primary level. Such a view is peculiar to the twentieth century.

In the nineteenth century High Schools were for the social elite of the community. Towards the end of the century some provisions were made for post-primary education (e.g. in N.S.W., at the Superior Public Schools and a few highly selective High Schools) but such Government High Schools as existed tended to be based on intellectual elitism just as the private or "established" schools perpetuated a social elite.

Not until the turn of the century does there appear to have been much concern for the development of a secondary school system to cater for all. Even then there persisted the basic idea that a full secondary education system existed as a preparation for admission to the universities and other tertiary institutions. Those students not expected to reach the tertiary level did not go to full High Schools but to schools offering a shorter course (e.g. the Intermediate High Schools and Junior Technical Schools in N.S.W.).

It was during the post-war period that the concept of the comprehensive type of High School, catering for adolescents of all ability levels, became accepted. It was the growing belief among educators that it is too soon, at age 12, to decide upon the type of secondary course to be followed by any particular child.

Even in the first decade of this century Peter Board had endeavoured unsuccessfully to break the hold of the universities on the secondary school curriculum. Yet, it was not until the 1950's and 1960's that positive steps were taken in N.S.W. to develop a secondary course which had as a basic aim: "... to provide a satisfactory education for all adolescents .... to the age of about sixteen." Even so, the curriculum content was directed towards an external examination which satisfied matriculation requirements. However, a significant and progressive step in N.S.W. was the introduction of a common core curriculum in First Form, thus delaying as long as possible the grading and sorting process which determines a student's academic future.

Also important in directing attention to secondary education was the influence exercised by industry and commerce. Just as the secondary school has had thrust upon it the traditional role of a sorting and preparatory system for the universities, so has it also come to be accepted as an agency of selection for a whole variety of occupations and careers. Possession of some documentary proof of at

1. Ibid., p. 72
least a basic secondary education is now expected by most employers.

The use by employers of such public examinations as the School Certificate as a guide to potential seems seldom to be based upon a direct relationship between secondary courses studied and the nature of the work to be performed. Rather have these examinations come to be used as an arbitrary means of reducing the numbers of prospective job applicants. As a result, many children who might otherwise leave upon reaching the statutory school leaving age are persuaded to remain at school in the hope of documentary proof of a completed secondary course.

**Individual Differences**

The quest for equality of opportunity has manifested itself in other ways besides an increased demand for secondary education. As public concern for education grew there was a corresponding increase in the attention given to individual differences and special education. Modern research into psychology and learning theory had made educators aware of the fact that equal opportunity did not necessarily mean equal treatment.

Much valuable experience was gained by officers in the Psychology and Education units of the armed services during World War II. The wide range of ability and attainments which was found to exist between

1. Pratt, op. cit., p. 4.
recruits carried serious implications for post-war education. Although the most obvious problem after the war was to cope with increased numbers of students, there was considerable pressure on governments to provide improved guidance facilities and to develop new courses to cater for the needs of atypical children. As a result, the next twenty years saw a marked improvement in the fields of guidance, research and special education.

In N.S.W., both educational and vocational guidance facilities date from 1935. By 1948 there were about forty school counsellors servicing the State's schools in addition to teacher/careers advisors in all secondary schools. Following World War II, Psychology branches were set up within the Education Departments of Victoria (1947), Queensland (1948) and South Australia (1946). A Psychology officer with a small staff was also appointed in Tasmania but in Western Australia guidance was still largely confined to vocational advice for secondary pupils.

All States extended their guidance and research programmes to the extent that it became necessary in some cases to separate the guidance and research functions into two departments. In N.S.W., for

example, the Division of Research, Guidance and Adjustment was replaced in July, 1957 by two new divisions - the Division of Research and Planning and the Division of Guidance and Adjustment. By 1962, there were in N.S.W. nine District Guidance Officers with eighty-eight School Counsellors (fifty in Metropolitan areas and thirty-eight in the country).

Separate Research sections were also established in Victoria, Western Australia and Tasmania. There was a significant trend, during the 1950's and 1960's towards more research into curriculum and teaching methods besides the routine concern for such statistical analysis as enrolment trends and accommodation needs which had hitherto been the chief concern of departmental research officers. In Victoria, for instance, this type of statistical research became the responsibility of the Survey and Planning Branch, leaving the Curriculum and Research Branch to concentrate on the improvement of curriculum and teaching methods.

Associated with the improved guidance and research facilities was an expanded programme of special education to cater for atypical children. Physical handicaps were more closely studied and the number of special schools and classes increased.

2. Ibid., p. 285
3. Ibid., pp. 284-292
4. Ibid., p. 286
5. Ibid., pp. 267-284
By the end of World War II, all States had School Medical Services which were, with the exception of South Australia, administered by the State Health Departments.¹ All children were medically examined at some stage during their early schooling and efforts were made through the observations of parents, teachers and medical officers to detect physical defects.

Special schools and classes for the blind and deaf were mostly under the control of private institutions until the post-war years when the State Departments of Education began to assume more and more responsibility in this area.² Sight Saving Classes were set up in all States and by 1960 there was a balance between special schools for blind children and special classes, within normal schools, for the partially sighted, the aim being to integrate these children with normal members of their peer group where possible.³

Similar developments took place in the teaching of deaf and partially deaf children. This area of special education received a boost in all States in 1950 when the State and Commonwealth Governments sponsored a visit by Professor A.W.G. Ewing and Dr. Irene Ewing of Manchester University.⁴ As specialists in this field, they examined existing facilities and made recommendations. In subsequent years

1. Waddington, et al., op.cit., pp. 65-68
2. Ibid., pp. 62-63
a number of teachers were sent overseas for training and the number of special classes increased. In N.S.W., for example, the number of Opportunity "D" Classes grew from nine in 1949\(^1\) to twenty-four in 1962.\(^2\)

Other services offered in all States included dental examinations, with treatment if requested by parents,\(^3\) and Speech Therapy Clinics.\(^4\) Provision of schools for spastic and crippled children was still left to private organisations but the State education authorities began to supply some teaching staff.\(^5\) In addition to the growing concern for children with physical disabilities, there was a corresponding improvement in the provision of special facilities for the educationally retarded and the mentally handicapped.

All States attempted to provide some form of remedial assistance for children who, although of at least average ability, were educationally retarded. In N.S.W. special classes known as Opportunity "B" Classes\(^6\) were set up to give remedial tuition but this approach was gradually replaced by a system whereby remedial teachers took small groups of children, withdrawn from normal classes

---

1. Ibid.
3. McDonnell et al., *op.cit.*, pp. 105-107
5. Ibid.
6. McDonnell et al., *op.cit.*, p. 91
for a short period. In 1961, there were eleven such teachers, each visiting about two schools per week. Victoria and South Australia each conducted about twelve similar remedial classes whilst Queensland and Western Australia both set up centrally situated Remedial Education Centres in the Capital Cities. In Tasmania educationally retarded children attended opportunity classes along with the mildly mentally handicapped, with the chance of returning to normal classes when it was felt that they could cope.

Special Classes and some Special Schools came into operation in all States to cater for children in the I.Q. range 50-80. By far the most popular approach with these children appears to have been by means of special classes within normal schools although some States provided segregated schools as well. In 1962 there were, in N.S.W., forty-five Opportunity "A" classes and three O.A. schools. In Victoria there were about 59 opportunity grades operating in fifty-seven schools. Queensland had a total of twelve Opportunity Schools with opportunity classes also attached to five other schools. In South Australia

1. A.C.E.R., op. cit., p. 269
2. Ibid., p. 273
3. Ibid., p. 277
4. Ibid., p. 275
5. Ibid., p. 280
6. Ibid., p. 283
7. Ibid., p. 269
8. Ibid., p. 273
9. Ibid., p. 275
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and Western Australia about twenty-nine classes were operating within normal schools. Tasmania had two special schools - one in Hobart and one in Launceston - in addition to special classes at four other centres.

Responsibility for the education of children with I.Q.'s below 50 was accepted by the N.S.W. Education Department, with the provision of Opportunity "F" Classes, by the Tasmanian Education Department, which administered the Talire and St. John's Park Schools, and by the South Australian Education Department with three Occupational Centres. In the other States children of this ability level attended institutions which were privately run and supervised by other government departments (Mental Hygiene Department in Victoria, Health and Home Affairs Department in Queensland and Mental Health Department in Western Australia).

1. Ibid., p. 280
2. Ibid., p. 283
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Teachers - Training and Conditions

During the period under review, there were some important developments in teacher training and in the conditions of teacher employment generally. As with other aspects of the education system, however, the dominating force behind these developments was the rapidly expanding school population.

The stop-gap measures which had been introduced to cope with the war-time emergency were continued into peace time because of the continuing teacher shortage. Retired teachers were employed as temporary staff and in some cases the period of training for teachers was reduced.

Every effort was made to encourage school teachers to return to teaching after their war service. Their status was maintained during their absence and after their discharge they were provided with refresher courses and a period of observation in schools before re-appointment. The only State not to provide some kind of refresher course was South Australia although there, as elsewhere, returning teachers were permitted to spend a short period of observation in schools before taking over a class.

1. Waddington et al., op. cit., pp. 184-185
2. Ibid., pp. 185-186
3. Ibid., pp. 186-187
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Efforts were also made to recruit, as teachers, ex-servicemen who had not taught previously. In Western Australia, for example, a special twelve month course of training was provided\(^1\) and a one year matriculation course was available for those prospective teachers who had not reached Teachers College entrance standard.\(^2\)

During the twenty years that followed, all State education departments continued to search for solutions to the staffing problem. Their methods of dealing with the problem were of two kinds — those aimed at attracting more people into the teaching service\(^3\) and those calculated to achieve temporary relief through the optimal use of available personnel.\(^4\) In this there can be seen something of a conflict. The essentially long term process of attracting more into the teaching service implies a raising of status and standards to appeal to those who would normally be attracted by other forms of tertiary education. The expedient measures taken to alleviate the crisis by shorter training courses and lower standards of entry, however, had the opposite effect.

In New South Wales there were, in 1945, four Teachers Colleges. A Standing Committee for Teacher Education was set up in 1948\(^5\) and by 1951 two more colleges had been established, as well as an annexe to
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Sydney Teachers' College. An extensive recruitment campaign was carried out in 1950 but throughout the ensuing decade the problem of attracting sufficient students into the colleges persisted.

By 1962, however, the situation had changed to the point where teacher training was hampered not by lack of potential students but by a lack of training facilities. Although the number of colleges had increased to eight, it was not possible to accept even one-half of those seeking a Teacher Training Scholarship. Of the 7,422 students applying for scholarships in 1962, only 2,766 could be accommodated.

Three States (Queensland, South Australia and Tasmania) introduced special one year courses as an emergency measure. In Queensland, Junior Teacher Scholarships were available to certain High School students in the last two years of school to enable them to matriculate before proceeding to the Senior Teachers' College in Brisbane. A similar scheme was introduced in South Australia to enable prospective teacher trainees to complete the Leaving Honours year.

1. McDonnell et al., op.cit., p. 185
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In the meantime, there were some attempts to improve the standard of teacher education. Western Australia was the first State to introduce a Bachelor's Degree in Education, commencing in 1948. In the same year the training of teachers in Tasmania came under the direction of the University. In South Australia the need for a three-year course of training was accepted, in principle, in 1947 although circumstances prevented its full implementation.

The conditions of employment and salary of teachers made some progress during this period. One important change, which affected the status of teachers considerably, was the adoption of a single Teachers' Certificate instead of the multi-certificate systems operating previously. New South Wales was the first State to make the change in 1943. By 1955, all the other States had taken similar steps to simplify the classification of teachers. Teachers also benefited from salary increases with one State (New South Wales) introducing equal salary for male and female teachers from 1963.

1. Ibid., p.198
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In-service training gained in importance and, in most States, a senior officer of the Education Department was given responsibility for its organisation. Various types of in-service training were available - e.g. seminars, vacation schools, visits to schools by specialist teachers, the Hub School Plan in South Australia - and teachers were also encouraged to improve their qualifications through part-time University studies.

It is important to note that there was, during this period, a great deal of re-assessment and critical examination by the State departments. Research into curriculum and methods was encouraged and some consideration was given to the role and status of teachers. There was general agreement that there was need for a change in the assessment and professional growth of teachers and efforts were made to have School Inspectors take on more of an advisory role.
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Technical Education

The history of Technical education during the War and immediate post-war years offers something of a contrast to other areas of education. Primary, Secondary and University education all suffered during the war years from lack of finance. Whilst it would not be true to say that these areas of education were neglected, they were not seen as having such direct bearing on the war effort as Technical Education which was of vital importance to the production of war materials and the maintenance of equipment.

Even before the outbreak of hostilities steps had been taken to set up a Commonwealth Technical Training Scheme which had the two-fold task of training technicians in the armed forces and training additional civilian workers for employment in the wartime industries (such as munitions and aircraft production).

As the war drew to a close, the Commonwealth Government recognised the importance of technology in its plans for post-war reconstruction. For this reason Commonwealth assistance for Technical Education continued after the war through the Commonwealth Reconstruction Training Scheme. The wartime emergency and its aftermath had, in other words, provided the Commonwealth Government with a legitimate

1. Waddington et al., op.cit., pp. 131-137
2. Ibid., pp. 26-29
interest in education. Technical Education was the main beneficiary of this new interest because of its obvious connection with defence and national development. Although it might be argued that Primary and Secondary education are just as important to the building of a healthy nation, their relevance to manpower planning, industrial development and national security are not so direct and obvious.

All the Australian States expanded their Technical Education facilities. New South Wales even went so far as to set up a separate Department of Technical Education\(^1\) although, in the other States, this continued to be administered as a division of the Department of Education.

The major result of the new emphasis placed by the war (and subsequently by Soviet technological success) on technical education has been in the field of higher technical education, in this reversing the emphasis between the two wars. A notable innovation, which at one time looked as though it might make a radical new departure in the history of Australian Technical education, was the formation of an Institute of Technology in New South Wales in 1949; but this, like the technological bias that was supposed to be imparted to Monash University in Victoria, was defeated by those old bogies of technical education, status seeking and the cultural skew of the community.\(^2\)

---

1. McDonnell et al., pp.277-278

Correspondence courses supplemented the increased number of colleges in country areas to ensure that technical education was available to all. Another interesting innovation was the modification of technical courses in some States to include the study of the humanities in addition to purely technical subjects.

Advisory Councils were established in New South Wales and Victoria to make recommendations on courses. In New South Wales steps were taken to decentralize Technical education with the establishment of Regional Directorates with District Councils and Committees.

In summing up the developments in Technical Education from 1945 to 1967, it would be reasonable to state that the more significant changes occurred early in the period. After the initial burst of activity prompted by the war, and once the precedent of Commonwealth financial involvement had been established, there was a tendency to settle into a period of steady growth without any significant innovation towards the end of the period.

1. A.C.E.R., op. cit., p. 171
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Although not so directly involved in the war effort as the Technical Colleges, the Australian Universities quickly assumed importance in the government's plans for post-war reconstruction. Like the Technical Colleges, they experienced a rapid increase in enrolments through the Commonwealth Reconstruction Training Scheme (which was administered by a University Commission set up by National Security Regulations in 1943).  

University enrolments grew rapidly after the war, fell slightly in the early fifties as the CRTS came to an end, and then increased more rapidly than ever as the post-war population increase had its effect. In 1946 there were 25,585 students enrolled in universities where the full-time staff numbered 900. In 1967 there were 95,380 students and 6,000 full-time staff. Expenditure by Australian Universities increased from $3.8 million in 1946 to $181.0 million in 1967.

As the CRTS drew to a close and the number of students fell (with the consequent fall in income through fees) costs did not fall accordingly but continued to rise. This led to an inquiry by the
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Commonwealth Government in 1950 and a series of special grants.\textsuperscript{1} Even these did not prove adequate and it was obvious that more needed to be done.

The financial plight of the universities was becoming serious in 1957 when the Commonwealth Government established a committee (known as the Murray Committee) to report on the needs of universities in Australia.\textsuperscript{2} As a result of the Murray Report, the Commonwealth committed itself to assisting the universities by making grants, the size of which were determined by the amount available from student fees and State Government expenditure. This was done through a system of first level and second level grants. The basic grant was payable when expenditure from State Grants and fees reached a certain level. Once the expenditure from State Grants and fees passed this amount second level Commonwealth Grants were paid in a specified ratio up to a stated maximum.\textsuperscript{3}

The size and number of universities increased during the period. Two new universities were opened in New South Wales. The first of these, in 1948, was the N.S.W. University of Technology, the aims of this institution being to:

\textsuperscript{1} Ibid., p. 221
\textsuperscript{2} A.C.E.R., \textit{op.cit.}, 312.-319
\textsuperscript{3} Ibid., p. 319-322
(a) provide advanced training in the various branches of science and technology; and
(b) aid by research and other suitable means the development and practical application of science to industry and commerce.¹

In 1958 this university was renamed the University of New South Wales and its sphere of activities broadened.² In 1954 the University of New England was established.³ This had previously been a university college attached to the University of Sydney.

An additional university in Melbourne (Monash University) was established in 1958⁴ and University colleges were established in Newcastle (through the University of New South Wales) in 1951⁵, Townsville (as part of the University of Queensland) in 1961⁶ and Wollongong (a division of the University of New South Wales) in 1962.⁷

The Commonwealth Government took a significant step in 1946 when it passed an act of parliament to establish the Australian National University which was to be primarily a research institution.⁸

In 1960, the Canberra University College, which had been operating as
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part of the University of Melbourne since 1929, was incorporated in the Australian National University (as the School of General Studies).¹

During the period under discussion all Australian universities rapidly expanded the number of faculties and courses available and two of them (Queensland² and New England³) developed important External Studies departments, thus widening their sphere of influence considerably.

Such was the rapid growth that the Murray Committee recommended a serious re-examination of tertiary education generally. This led to the establishment of another committee presided over by Sir Leslie Martin.⁴ One of the recommendations of this committee was that new tertiary institutions, separate from universities, should be established.⁵ The government accepted this recommendation and this led to the development of Colleges of Advanced Education.⁶
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Administrative Developments

The administrative organisation in all States is fairly uniform and has remained much the same throughout the period (see Figures 3 - 8), the main exceptions being New South Wales and Queensland whose attempts at decentralization will be discussed below.

The States enjoy autonomy in education and each State is administered by a central authority. The main efforts at co-ordination and co-operation between States at the commencement of this period were made by the Australian Education Council. This body, formed in 1936, originally consisted of the State Ministers and Directors of Education. In 1944 it was reconstituted to include:

(i) a council of Ministers and their Deputies;
(ii) a Standing Committee consisting of the Directors; to meet annually or whenever required;
(iii) three Standing Sub-committees consisting of Superintendents or Chief Inspectors of primary, secondary and technical divisions, to meet whenever required by the Council or the Standing Committee.¹

It was also intended that this body should have a Secretariat to conduct research and disseminate information. This function, however, was taken over by the Commonwealth Office of Education when it was established in 1945.²

1. Waddington et al., op.cit., p. 39
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NEW SOUTH WALES—DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION—1962
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### Figure 4

**VICTORIA EDUCATION DEPARTMENT: 1961**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council of Public Education (Chairman)</th>
<th>Minister of Education</th>
<th>Schools Board¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council of Adult Education (Member)</td>
<td>Director of Education</td>
<td>Teachers' Tribunals²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recruitment Committee</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Advisory Council on Technical Education³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chief Inspector of Primary Schools</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal of Teachers' Colleges (9)²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Chief Inspectors of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Schools (3)²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chief Inspector of Secondary Schools</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal of Secondary Teachers' College and Domestic Art Teachers' College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Chief Inspectors of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Schools (3)²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Superintendent of Teacher Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chief Inspector of Technical Schools</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal of Technical Teachers' College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Chief Inspector of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Schools (3)²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Editor of Departmental Publications</th>
<th>Inspectors of Primary Schools (47)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal Curriculum and Research Officer</td>
<td>Visual Education Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment Officer</td>
<td>Organizer of Physical Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor of Music and Speech Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planning Assistant (Survey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planning Assistant (Statistics)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board of Technical Inspectors (10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board of Secondary Inspectors (22)</th>
<th>Planning Assistants (Survey)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior Guidance Officer (Primary)</td>
<td>Senior Guidance Officer (Secondary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Services Officer</td>
<td>Broadcast Liaison Officers (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' Welfare Officer</td>
<td>Planning Assistants (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Social Workers**

*¹ A non-statutory body formed in 1961 and consisting of 13 members to keep under continuous review, and to advise the Minister on the organization of technical education in Victoria.

*² The Council of Education, the University of Melbourne controls Public Examinations. Representatives of University, Education Department, Business Interests and Registered and State Secondary Schools.

*³ The Teachers' Tribunal. An independent body of three members with power to regulate salaries and conditions of teachers, etc.

*⁴ The Council of Public Education consists of 20 members, an advisory body. Representatives of Education Department, Registered Schools, University of Melbourne, Technical education, Music and Industrial interests. Responsible for advice to the Minister on Educational matters.

*⁵ The Council of Adult Education, Council of 18 members including Director (paid), Vice-Chancellor of University, Director of Education, Victorian Manager of A.B.C., and 13 other representatives.

*⁶ The Committee of Classifiers in Primary, Secondary, and Technical Division. Classify teachers, draw up promotion lists, etc., and nominate to advertised positions.

*⁷ The Recruitment Committee. The Chief Inspectors of Primary, Secondary and Technical Schools, the Survey & Planning officer, the Recruitment officer, representative of Teachers' Tribunal and representatives of the Victorian Teachers' Union.

*⁸ Each Chief Inspector is responsible for the training of teachers for his own branch of the service.

*⁹ Principals of Melbourne, Bendigo, Ballarat, Geelong, Frankston, Toorak and Barwood Teachers' Colleges & Training Centre for teachers of the Deaf.

*¹⁰ Has close association with curricula in Art in all branches.

1. *Ibid., p. 13*
Figure 5

QUEENSLAND—EDUCATION DEPARTMENT—1961

Minister for Education

Board of Adult Education
National Fitness Council
Board of Post-Primary Studies
Museum
Queensland Art Gallery
Conservatorium
Library Board of Queensland

Director-General of Education

Deputy Director-General of Education

Director of Primary Education
Director of Secondary Education
Regional Directors of Education (7)
Principals of Teachers’ Colleges

Asst. to Director of Primary Education
Asst. to Director of Secondary Education

Director of Technical Education

Asst. to Director of Technical Education

Special Education

Regional Directors of Education (7)

Principals of Teachers’ Colleges

Director of Special Education Services

Inspectors of Secondary Schools and Technical Colleges

Inspector of Manual Training Subjects

Inspector of Women’s Work

Organizer

Organizer

Organizer

Organizer

Director of Junior Farmers

Agricultural Project Clubs

1. Ibid., p. 23
SOUTH AUSTRALIA—EDUCATION DEPARTMENT: 1964

Minister of Education

Director of Education

Deputy Director of Education

Supt. of Primary Schools

Asst. Supt. of Primary Schools

Inspectors of Infant Schools (1)

Chief Inspector of Primary Schools

Senior Psychologist

District Inspectors (17)

Inspector of Elem. Agriculture

Supervisor of Music and Drama

Supervisor of Physical Education

Supervisor of Guidance Officers

Social Workers

Speech Therapists

Asst. Supt. of Rural Schools

Asst. Supt. of Rural Schools (2)

Chief Inspector of Rural Schools

Inspectors of Secondary Schools (6)

Inspectors of Technical Schools (2)

Inspectors of Technical Schools

Asst. Supt. of High School

Asst. Supt. of High Schools

Asst. Supt. of Technical Schools

Supt. of Recruiting and Training

Supt. of N.T. Schools

Secretary

Supt. of Recruiting and Training

Inspectors of Manual Training (2)

Inspectors of Manual Training (2)

Inspectors of Domestic Arts (2)

Visual Aids Committee

Supervisor of Visual Aids

Migrant Education Officer

Research Officer

Notes: 1. Class VI Primary Schools, Area Schools, Correspondence School, Schools of the Air, Subsidized Schools.
2. Teachers College Staff, not being members of the Public Service, are not shown in this table.

1. Ibid., p. 28
In 1962 there were 14 Primary Superintendents, 3 Secondary, and 16 Special

1. Ibid., p. 33
Figure 8

TASMANIA—DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION: 1961

Minister of Education

Director of Education

Deputy Director of Education

Superintendent of Primary Education
Superintendent of Technical Education
Superintendent of Secondary Education
Superintendent of Home Arts
Superintendent of Research and Special Education
Supervisor of Home Arts
Senior Superintendent Educational Administration
Senior Superintendent District Superintendents
Senior Superintendent of Special Schools
Supervisor of Special Schools
Supervisor Guidance and Welfare Officers
Research Officers
Supervisor of Curriculum Research
Supervisor of High Schools
Supervisor of High Schools and Public Relations
Supervisors of Teaching Aids
Science
Physical Education
Trade Subjects
Pre-School Speech Education
Music
Commonwealth University Scholarships
Principal
Launceston Teachers' College
Assistant to Director and Superintendent Training
Assistant to Director and Superintendent Curriculum Officers
Senior Superintendent (Admin.) and Public Service Officer
Secretary Public Service Officer

1. Ibid., p. 40
As mentioned above, two States that broke away from the pattern of highly centralized control were New South Wales and Queensland. Those two States commenced a programme of decentralization within a framework of an overall central system. In 1948 five regional areas were established in Queensland\(^1\) and one in the Riverina district of New South Wales.\(^2\) The number of Area Directorates in New South Wales then increased until by 1967 there were ten such areas, each with its own Area Director of Education.\(^3\)

In Victoria a Committee of Inquiry into primary, secondary and technical education (the Ramsay Committee) was set up in 1957.\(^4\) One of the Committee's recommendations was that some form of administrative decentralization should be attempted on an experimental basis.\(^5\) By the end of the period in question, however, no serious moves had been made to carry out the recommendation.

The only other State where any form of decentralization of administration seems to have been considered during the period is Western Australia where a District Superintendent for the north-western area was appointed in 1952.\(^6\)

The growing commitment of the State education departments to Research, Guidance and Special Education has already been discussed. Developments in these areas naturally led to changes in the administrative structure in each case. At the same time administrators were beginning to show a new willingness to critically examine policies and procedures, particularly in the field of curriculum construction.

Public Interest and Commonwealth Involvement

One of the most significant developments during this period was the shift in public attitude to education. This change is not so easily measured or illustrated as quantitative changes in, say, numbers of students or expenditure on capital equipment. Nevertheless, it became apparent that people were becoming more aware of the education system, either in their capacity as parents or as employers or students.¹

This is of some importance if we accept the premise that government action in a democratic society will eventually reflect public attitudes. The members of Parliament, whilst they do usually voice their own personal views or those of their party, may be expected to modify those views if they become aware of sufficient pressure in their electorates.

A number of reasons may be suggested for the growing public interest in education. Not the least of these would be the over-

¹ A.C.E.R., op.cit., p. XV
crowding in schools and the competition for places in tertiary institutions. The post-war technological expansion, moreover, placed greater pressure on the nation's educational facilities and this was further affected during the fifties by alarm at the tremendous scientific and technological growth overseas, especially in the U.S.S.R.

Another contributing factor to increased public interest in education may have been the move to greater educational opportunity. The changes in the structure of education, particularly at the secondary level, brought higher education within the reach of more people.

Towards the end of the period, pressure was being brought to bear on the Commonwealth Government by parents and teachers to take a more active role in the financing of education. In 1961 the Government received a petition signed by 241,000 parents and teachers, requesting a special grant and an inquiry into Primary, Secondary and Technical education.1

Quite apart from this type of pressure, the Commonwealth Government had been becoming more and more involved in education ever since the Second World War. Although it had no specific powers under the Constitution to legislate for education, the Commonwealth Government, as it developed policies in other fields, found itself becoming involved in educational matters as a result. Table 6 serves to illustrate the

1. Ibid., p. 62
extent to which Commonwealth Departments with no apparent interest in education can find themselves with responsibilities in that field.

Apart from such indirect educational commitments, however, the Commonwealth Government was accepting greater responsibility for assisting the States with public education (especially at the Tertiary level). There would appear to have been two important determining factors in bringing about this situation.

The first was the decision, during the wartime emergency, for the Commonwealth to take over from the States the collection of income taxes, the principal source of government revenue. This practice was continued after the war and the money so collected was redistributed to the States according to an agreed formula. When the States experienced difficulty in meeting the rising costs of education, the limited sources of revenue under their own control were not adequate to meet their needs and they turned to the Commonwealth for special grants.

The second factor contributing to the Commonwealth's involvement in education after the war was its assumption of responsibility for post-war reconstruction. If the Commonwealth Government accepted responsibility in this area, it was reasonable for it to take a similar interest in national development generally. The obvious link between national development and tertiary education explains why that area was the first to benefit from Commonwealth involvement in the financing of education.
## Table 61

**Educational Activities of Federal Departments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Institution, Grant or Activity</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air</td>
<td>Royal Australian Air Force School, Penang, Malaya</td>
<td>To provide education to second year secondary level for children of R.A.A.F. members</td>
<td>Staff strength (1961) 17, and students 526; activities planned by Victorian and N.S.W. Education Departments which provide staff and make inspections. Normal training for civilians in the department and specialist courses in supervisory techniques, etc.; voluntary instruction to temporary employees to assist them to qualify.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cadetships in engineering are offered. Normal in-service training for civilian staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney-General's</td>
<td>Commonwealth Police Training Depot, North Head, Manly, N.S.W.</td>
<td>To provide training for federal law enforcement officers and for officers of the Commonwealth and State police force</td>
<td>Up to 22 students in residence; opened October, 1960.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Aviation</td>
<td>Training institutions such as the Victoria-Tasmanian Regional Training School; educational institutions used include the Universities of N.S.W., Melbourne and Adelaide, Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology, Australian Institute of Management</td>
<td>Activities mainly self-contained, not being co-ordinated with other departments or state authorities</td>
<td>Cadetships in engineering (civil, electronic, mechanical) and positions of trainee engineer (civil, mechanical, electrical, and aeronautical) are offered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 (Cont'd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Institution, Grant or Activity</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The School of Public Health and Tropical Medicine</td>
<td>1. Provides teaching facilities and engages in research in these fields</td>
<td>Apart from departmental research, medical research is carried on at private research institutions. Activities at these centres are directed towards establishing patterns in pre-school training practices, etc. In-service training consists of courses in management techniques, general and financial administration; postgraduate courses; training for certain officers before taking up duty in health laboratories.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The Institute of Child Health</td>
<td>2. As for 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The Commonwealth Acoustic Laboratories</td>
<td>3. Educational facilities for deaf children are incidental to the main function of research into the problems of the deaf child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interior</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Education Section A.C.T. Services Branch</td>
<td>1. Administers public education in A.C.T. to provide: education from primary to Leaving stage; at pre-school level; courses at Canberra Technical College</td>
<td>1. With co-operation N.S.W. Government 2. Staff of 39 for 30 students. Total student attendance to December 1, 1960 was 4,125. Opened July 1956 3. Staff of 8 for about 61 students. 4. Eight lecturers for 40-80 students. The school is a co-operative venture between Commonwealth, State forest services and State universities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Australian Civil Defence Branch, Mt. Macedon, Vic.</td>
<td>2. Conducts courses and experiments in civil defence and trains instructors for Commonwealth and State Dept.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Central Training School (Meteorology)</td>
<td>3. Trains local and overseas meteorological officers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Australian Forestry School</td>
<td>4. Provides 3rd and 4th years of degree course in forestry given by Aust. universities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Labour and National Service</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Normal in-service training with some special training for office staff and (for Department of Nat. Development) cadetships in geology and geophysics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Navy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Normal in-service training with apprenticeships available and some university free places for officers and cadetships in naval armament supply.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6 (Cont'd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Institution, Grant or Activity</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Postmaster-General</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Technician Training School</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Schools maintained in all States to train staff in use of equipment providing telephone, telegraph and radio facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lineman Training School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Postal Clerk Training School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mail Officer Training School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Telephonist Training School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Phonogram Operator Training School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Accounting Machinist Training School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Schools maintained in all States to train staff to install and maintain aerial lines and underground cables for telecommunications equipment</td>
<td>2. Schools maintained in all States to train staff to install and maintain aerial lines and underground cables for telecommunications equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Schools maintained in all States to train post office staff</td>
<td>4. Schools for training mail officers in all States sometimes temporarily closed but all open in 1960</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. During 1959-60, 180 trainees passed through the schools</td>
<td>5. Six-week course. During 1959-60, 970 girls passed through training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Since 1958 schools established in N.S.W. and Victoria to instruct girls in operating accounting machines</td>
<td>6. Five-week course. During 1959-60, 121 trainees passed through the schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Phonogram Operator Training School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Accounting Machinist Training School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Industry</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal in-service training. Cadetships in veterinary and agricultural science awarded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6 (Cont'd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Institution, Grant or Activity</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prime Minister's</td>
<td>1. Commonwealth Literary Fund</td>
<td>1. Awards fellowships in creative literature</td>
<td>The Prime Minister's Department uses the Public Service Board's course on in-service training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service</td>
<td>1. Training Section</td>
<td>1. Provides central courses for dept. officers and advises depts. on internal training programmes</td>
<td>As central personnel authority for the Commonwealth Public Service Board, this board has general responsibility for training and educational matters in the Service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board</td>
<td>2. University Free Place Scheme</td>
<td>2. Permits selected Third Division officers to undertake final year university studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Postgraduate Scholarships,</td>
<td>3. Provides opportunities for postgraduate studies in Aust. and overseas up to 2 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aust. and overseas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Financial assistance for</td>
<td>4. Provides financial assistance to officers taking specialized short courses at request of their department and those doing postgraduate work under such awards as Fulbright awards, Carnegie Grants, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>short courses and study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>projects, Aust. and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>overseas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Research fellowships at</td>
<td>5. Offered to senior officers of substantial experience to provide opportunity for contribution to a field of research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aust. Nat. University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Typist-in-training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Colombo Plan and U.N.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6 (Cont'd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Institution, Grant or Activity</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Repatriation</td>
<td>Training schools at N.S.W., Victorian and Queensland repatriation general hospitals for training of student nurses and in N.S.W., Victoria and Western Australia for training of nursing aides</td>
<td>To train nurses under a 3-4 year course and aides under a 1 year course</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Supply | — | — | Normal in-service training.
| | — | — | Since 1948 a training programme has sent professional officers overseas for 1-2 years for training in universities, commercial undertakings, etc. |
| Treasury | — | — | Cadetships in statistics are offered. |
| Works | — | — | Normal in-service training. Apprenticeships are available and cadetships in architecture, engineering, etc. |
The Commonwealth Office of Education was established with post-war reconstruction as its main concern but it soon took on a co-ordinating role and provided a common meeting place for the several State education authorities. Within ten years of its inception it was possible to comment:

The Office now has a well established and firmly consolidated place in the Australian Educational structure.¹

The Commonwealth Government's migration policies after the war also served to increase its commitment to education.² Tuition in the English language was provided for migrants prior to embarkation, during the voyage and after arrival in Australia.³ Moreover, it could be argued that by bringing so many additional persons into the country and placing a strain on the existing education facilities, the Commonwealth Government was partly responsible for the crisis in education and, therefore, had an obligation to help the States to deal with it.

Through its foreign policy, the Commonwealth Government became involved in schemes to provide international aid in education (through UNESCO, the Colombo Plan, etc.).⁴ This placed added burdens on the education systems and Commonwealth assistance was necessary.

1. Ibid., p. 37
2. Vide supra, pp. 4 ff.
4. Vide supra, p. 7
As was pointed out in the section dealing with University education, the Commonwealth took the initiative in setting up the Murray Committee and took action on its findings. A further committee under the chairmanship of Sir Leslie Martin was set up in 1961 and following its recommendations, the Commonwealth Government decided to establish Colleges of Advanced Education. The planning of these colleges began in 1965 when the Advisory Committee on Advanced Education was established.
Summary

The period from 1945 to 1967 was an important one for Australian education. It was a period of re-building and re-thinking for the Australian nation. Education is always important at such a time of national development. The demands on the State education systems to prepare for the impending social and technological changes were exacerbated by a rapid population growth which strained existing physical and human resources to the limit.

The wartime emergency had served to give the Commonwealth Government more authority in a number of fields and it emerged from the war with much greater control over State finances. During the period which concerns us here, the Commonwealth Government's financial dominance and its concern for national development combined to produce a growing involvement in education. This growth was such that by 1967 the need was felt for a full-time Ministry of Education to be established in Canberra to control Commonwealth policy.

It is significant to study the exact manner in which Commonwealth involvement developed. Financial assistance was first given to individuals in the form of scholarships. Direct assistance to the States for financing specific projects was directed, first, to tertiary education and, later, to certain areas of secondary education - science laboratories and libraries. No doubt this pattern of development was determined in no small measure by constitutional considerations.
It is also important to consider the extent to which this involvement was planned. To what extent did the Commonwealth Government change its policy willingly and to what extent was it forced into action?
The year 1945 was of great significance for Australian education. Up to that time, no secure foundation had been laid for Commonwealth involvement in the nation's education. Nowhere in the Australian Constitution is the word "education" mentioned and, because the States had evolved their own systems long before federation, the Commonwealth Government had never felt obliged to formulate its own policies for the country as a whole. By 1945, however, the Commonwealth had, through its own areas of responsibility, been drawn into certain educational activities. The Commonwealth was, to begin with, responsible for education within its own territories; furthermore, a number of Commonwealth departments found it necessary to carry out functions of an educational nature. As a part of its defence programme and the war effort, the Commonwealth also found it necessary to co-operate with the State education departments and, as the war drew to a close, it was apparent that the important task of post-war reconstruction, a Commonwealth responsibility, would depend for success on an efficient education system.
The need for the Commonwealth Government to adopt a definite policy towards education in general was made all the more obvious by the experiences of the Second World War when, for the first time in the history of the Commonwealth, the country had been under threat of invasion. As the war came to an end and the nation's leaders began to plan for peace, they realised that education would play an important part in their plans. Apart from the strain that would be placed on the State education systems by returning ex-service men and women, there was also a widespread feeling in the Commonwealth Parliament that education provided the key to a better community life. By improving the quality of the population and by fostering international understanding, education could help bring security and lasting peace.

It was in this atmosphere that the parliamentary discussions on education took place in 1945. If we keep this in mind and remember, also, that education was not an important issue in the Commonwealth electorate, it is possible to understand why these discussions were conducted, for the most part, above the level of party politics. So earnest and far-sighted were many of the views expressed on both sides of the House that one member of the Government, Mr. Haylen, was prompted to remark:

...... the wide range of discussion to-day indicates that, for once, political thought is at least abreast, if not ahead, of the thoughts of the people in relation to education. The challenge often flung at the politician is that he lags behind popular thought.1

1. Hans., Vol. 184, p. 4638
In terms of policy, 1945 was an important year because of the Education Act which established the Commonwealth Office of Education and the Universities Commission and provided a starting point from which Commonwealth involvement in education might grow. An analysis of the views expressed in the House of Representatives during 1945 should provide an interesting frame of reference against which to measure the Commonwealth's achievement in education during the post-war years.

Although the important Education Bill of 1945 was not introduced until 28th September, there took place in the House of Representatives on 26th July a significant debate on Education. This debate was prompted by a motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition and Leader of the Liberal Party, Mr. R.G. Menzies (Member for Kooyong). The motion was as follows:

(1) That in the opinion of this House
(a) A revised and extended education system is of prime importance in post-war reconstruction;
(b) In particular attention needs to be directed to increased facilities for secondary, rural, technical and university training, special adult education and the problem of the qualifications status and remuneration of teachers;
(c) Effective reform may involve substantial Commonwealth financial aid and if this should prove necessary such aid should be granted;
(d) In order to provide a basis for such reform the Commonwealth should set up in co-operation with the states a qualified commission including some expert or experts
from overseas to report upon the existing educational facilities in Australia, to make recommendations for their extension and/or amendment, and to recommend how, to what extent, on what terms, and for what purposes Commonwealth aid should be given.

(2) That this House assures the Government of its support in the carrying out of the above recommendations.¹

Mr. Menzies stressed that his suggestions were not made "... in any controversial spirit" and the whole tone of the debate which followed was characterised by a remarkable consensus of opinion on most major issues. Speakers on both sides of the House expressed their concern for education and agreed that a sound education system was vital to plans for post-war reconstruction. The only really noticeable reflection of party interest was in the stress placed by Country Party speakers on Rural education. Likewise, the only parochial matters raised with respect to specific problems were in connection with country electorates.

Ten members spoke in the debate. These were: Mr. Menzies (Liberal - Kooyong), Mr. Dedman (A.L.P. - Corio, Minister for Post-war Reconstruction), Mr. Spender (Liberal - Warringah), Dr. Gaha (A.L.P. - Denison), Sir Earle Page (Country Party - Cowper), Mr. Haylen (A.L.P. - Parkes), Mr. Corser (Country Party - Wide Bay), Mr. Burke (A.L.P. - Perth), Mr. Abbott (Country Party - New England), and Mr. Lemmon (A.L.P. - Forrest)

¹ Ibid., pp. 4612-3
The aspects of education covered by these speakers may be summarised as follows:

(i) Educational Aims, Content and Method;
(ii) Teachers' Status and Remuneration;
(iii) Pre-school Education;
(iv) University Education;
(v) Technical Education;
(vi) Adult Education;
(vii) Rural Education; and
(viii) Commonwealth Responsibility for Education.

Educational Aims, Content and Method

When we consider the time at which this debate took place we might forgive the speakers if, at the end of a long war and faced by massive problems of reconstruction, they had been tempted to take a rather narrow view of education, with emphasis on technical skill and the passing on of factual knowledge. This was not the case, however, and a number of speakers spoke of the need to aim for higher ideals in the quest for a better post-war society.

It seemed to be agreed that education should be based on the development of those personal characteristics that would produce good citizens with an interest in the welfare of their fellows and the capacity to utilise their ability to the full. In the words of Menzies:
The first function of education is to produce a good man and a good citizen. Its second function is to produce a good carpenter and a good lawyer, and the good carpenter and good lawyer will be all the better at their respective crafts if they have become aware of the problems of the world, have acquired some quality of intellectual criticism, and have developed that comparative sense which produces detachment of judgment and tends always to moderate passion and prejudice.¹

Comments from Sir Earle Page, Mr. Haylen and Mr. Burke all tended to support the view that the teaching of knowledge and facts in our educational institutions was of less importance than the development of a willingness and a capacity to think and learn. The feeling expressed by these speakers was that education should inculcate in the students a thirst for knowledge so that they might develop their full mental capacity.²

In respect to the curriculum content in schools, no speakers seemed to be in disagreement with Mr. Haylen when he observed: "A recasting of the school studies is necessary, and less emphasis will have to be laid on the purely technical side of education."³

The Leader of the Opposition made a stirring call for greater emphasis on social education:

War after war is a result of the failure of the human spirit, not of some superficial elements but of the fatal inability of man to adjust himself to other men in a social world. With all our scientific development of this century, it still remains true that "the proper study of mankind is man", and that the real "peacemaker" is human understanding.⁴

1. Ibid., p. 4617
2. Ibid., pp. 4637, 4640, 4646
3. Ibid., p. 4640
4. Ibid., p. 4616
Reference was made to the value of religious education (Menzies and Spender) and to the humanities (Menzies and Gaha). Claiming that "... for years, the greatest danger to democracy has been, not so much a danger from without, as a danger from within", Menzies criticised "... the increasingly pagan and materialistic quality of our education" and also "... the unthinking contempt which has fallen upon what people are pleased to call 'useless Learning'". His plea was for a movement away from pure secularism and also for a return to the study of the humanities in order to "... develop a sense of proportion." On the latter point, Dr. Gaha agreed:

"We do not want to teach people scholasticism. I can quote for hours from the classics, and I have not read them for 30 years, but that does not prove that I am intelligent. The only kind of education we want is education in the humanities - the material problems affecting the lives and comfort and well-being of human beings."

In his contribution to the discussion, Mr. Spender called for "... greater emphasis upon the spiritual and personal values of living." He called for a decentralised system of education so that education in any area could be suited to the needs of that area.
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instead of conforming to state-wide or nation-wide standards.

Mr. Haylen, referring to the post-war training of ex-servicemen, took this argument even further by suggesting that education needs to be "planned study built around the student."\(^1\)

At some variance with this idea of decentralisation (and this was one of the few points of even slight disagreement between speakers) was the suggestion by Dr. Gaha that there should be a uniform standard of entrance to all universities in Australia with some uniformity in curriculum "... within the realms of flexibility."\(^2\)

An air of nationalism was introduced by Mr. Haylen with his call for an Australianised curriculum. Declaring that "... the dreary curriculum of Australian schools is mostly centred on an old world model",\(^3\) he decried the tendency "... to stress the brave story of 'The Charge of the Light Brigade', and to relate in a negligible and rather apologetic way the glory of Eureka."\(^4\) The suggestion was that we should be "... leaving the cold history of Europe to the Europeans."\(^5\)

Two speakers (Haylen and Spender)\(^6\) made reference to teaching method, both placing emphasis on the need for more personal contact
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between teacher and pupil. Education was seen as the development of each pupil by the encouragement of individual talents and interests.

There should be some technique whereby the instructor would be more a librarian than a teacher. Our educationists should endeavour to find out the jobs for which the students are adapted. Whether a pupil desires to be an engineer or (sic) a musician, under the present system all must go through the mill together.¹

Subscribing to the view that education should be primarily concerned with citizenship, Mr. Spender criticised the standardisation of education and the emphasis on examinations.

Having had some experience of the examination system, I know how easy it is for people with a special aptitude, such as a photographic memory, to pass examinations whilst others who have greater personal qualities are unable to make satisfactory progress. I should like to see closer personal contact between teachers and students in the primary, secondary, and tertiary stages of education. This would develop the personal qualities of the students, and would not tend so much to cast them in the one mould.²
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Teachers' Status and Remuneration

An interesting feature of the debate was the amount of attention paid to the status and remuneration of teachers. Only two of the speakers failed to refer to this subject. Although Mr. Dedman, the Government's spokesman on education, insisted that this matter should be left to the States, other members of the House (including Government members) pressed very strongly for Commonwealth intervention.

The feeling expressed by members on both sides of the House might be summed up in the words of Menzies:

.... of all the secular professions, teaching is the most profoundly important. The teacher does the work of making men. The physician and surgeon can, at best, repair them; the lawyer can, at best, adjust their differences; and the engineer can, at best provide them with the means of physical community association; yet, of all these professions, that of teaching is the worst paid, and, broadly speaking, enjoys the least recognition in a social sense.1

In drawing attention to the need to recruit more teachers, Sir Earle Page insisted that this additional staff could only be attracted by the payment of adequate salaries for, he said, "No other touch-stone will attract men."2 This view was shared by Dr. Gaha (A.L.P. - Denison):
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We cannot expect a high standard of education until we pay adequately the men and women who 'deliver the goods'. I hope that an attempt will be made in this Parliament to bring about an improvement of the remuneration of school teachers.¹

Mr. Haylen, another Government member, also deplored the low salary and status of teachers:

Many people are intelligent enough to be teachers, but they decline to adopt that profession because teachers are not adequately remunerated. The provision of adequate salaries for school teachers appears to be nobody's business, but I think that it is everybody's business. Until this omission is rectified, we shall not have real progress in education.²

Mr. Burke, also a member of the Labour Government, insisted that it was the Commonwealth Government's responsibility to assist the States in adequately training and paying teachers. He pointed out that teachers, like the members of other professions, often have such a genuine interest in their work that they are prepared to accept whatever hardships may be imposed upon them. This, however, does not give society a right to "impose unfair burdens" on such people.³

Closely connected with the salary and status problem was the matter of teacher training. In the opening speech of the debate, Mr. Menzies noted with approval the tendency to insist on higher
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qualifications for teachers. \(^1\) Mr. Spender also emphasised the need to see that teachers receive adequate preparation:

> It is idle to imagine that we shall have a satisfactory education system unless our teachers are properly trained to communicate to both children and adults the fundamental requirements of clear thinking and principles of proper conduct.\(^2\)

**Pre-School Education**

Apart from the Minister (Mr. Dedman), only two speakers made reference to pre-school education (Menzies and Haylen)\(^3\) and neither put forward any concrete suggestions. Mr. Menzies, in his reference to the subject, seemed to be mainly concerned that in the post-war period the unavailability of domestic help in the home might cause some children to be neglected. He referred also to the British Education Act which provided for a system of nursery schools, but hastened to add that he was merely endeavouring "... to assist a general consideration of the problem."\(^4\)

Mr. Haylen, in a brief reference to the subject, asserted that pre-school education was nothing new, that it was "... practised at the firesides of the people in the days of the pioneers, and it was the foundation of much solid education and the development of sound men and women."\(^5\)
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During his speech the Minister released a table showing details of Commonwealth expenditure on education during the years 1940-41 and 1943-44. In the former year no money was spent on pre-school education whilst in the latter year £9,300 was spent out of a total education expenditure of £1,415,965. Mr. Dedman linked pre-school education with physical education and national fitness as areas in which the Commonwealth had found it necessary to spend increased amounts in order to "... improve the health of the community." 2

University Education

Considerable interest was shown in the nature and extent of university education. There did not seem to be much argument about the Commonwealth's right to take an active interest in this field. As might be expected, University education was looked at mainly within the context of post-war reconstruction. Mr. Menzies 3 and the Minister for Post-War Reconstruction, Mr. Dedman, 4 were in agreement over the need to expand university facilities, it being suggested by Mr. Dedman that "... within three years after the termination of the war, approximately 10,000 persons from the services will be seeking professional training in the universities." 5
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Mr. Dedman informed the House that it was the intention of the Government to pay the fees of ex-service men and women and also to subsidise universities at the rate of £1 for every £1 raised in fees (special arrangements being made for the States of Western Australia, which didn't charge fees, and Tasmania).¹

Mr. Menzies² and Sir Earle Page³ called for the establishment of some completely new universities. Both gentlemen were quick to enlarge upon this suggestion by giving their views on the nature of these new institutions.

Lest I should be misunderstood, I say at once that I am not advocating small provincial universities that would be regarded as second-rate. They would not be a real service to education in Australia. That is not a criticism of the provincial universities. I believe in them. But it is a criticism of any idea that we should establish small universities that, in the nature of things, are regarded as second-rate. If a new university is to be created, it should be created on a first-class scale with such financial foundation as will enable it to attract the highest talent to the teaching staffs and make the degrees granted in its faculties recognized and reputable.⁴

Sir Earle Page favoured the idea of small universities with restricted enrolments to enable students to receive more "personal tuition".⁵ At the same time he urged the expenditure of large sums of money on the existing universities, whilst expressing the hope that: "These institutions should not degenerate into mass-producers of academic degrees."⁶
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One member of the Government, Mr. Haylen, expressed the fear that the universities had become "... nothing but plush-lined technical colleges."\(^1\) He recalled that the original function of the university was to teach people to think. He advocated a return to the classical concept of the university as a "studium" - a place where original and revolutionary thinking would be encouraged, while degrees in purely technical areas of knowledge might be granted by "... an intermediate form of university for technicians."\(^2\)

The Government's proposal for the establishment of the Australian National University at Canberra as a research institution was received favourably by the various speakers. Dr. Gaha even suggested that Canberra should be turned into a university city with the Commonwealth Parliament removed to one of the larger capital cities.\(^3\)

Announcing future plans for university education, Mr. Dedman stated that as well as establishing the new university the Government intended to place on a more permanent basis the Universities Commission, which had commenced operation in 1943. This Commission was set up through National Security Regulations for the purpose of war-time training. The Commission administered an aid programme for "...students who otherwise would have been prevented by limitations of finance from
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attending universities."1 Thus, after a somewhat unobtrusive entry into the field of university financing the Commonwealth Government was seeking to consolidate its influence over university education. Table 7 indicates the extent of Commonwealth aid granted through the Universities Commission in its first three years of operation. These figures were released by the Minister during his speech.

Table 7
Commonwealth aid for University Education
1943 - 1945
Expenditure on Financial Assistance 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>March-June</th>
<th>July-December</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£ s. d.</td>
<td>£ s. d.</td>
<td>£ s. d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943 -</td>
<td>81,301</td>
<td>87,048</td>
<td>168,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January-June</td>
<td>85,444</td>
<td>100,842</td>
<td>186,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July-December</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945 -</td>
<td>108,345</td>
<td>89,000</td>
<td>197,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January-June</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July-December</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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No serious objections to the Commonwealth Government's proposed involvement in university education were raised during the debate. When Mr. Dedman mentioned that he had been advised that the Commonwealth may not have any constitutional right to establish a new university, the Leader of the Opposition pledged his support in the overcoming of any such legal obstacles.¹

Technical Education

In drawing attention to the Government's successful Defence Training Scheme, Mr. Dedman commented on the excellent co-operation between the Commonwealth and State Governments which had made the Scheme possible.² In addition to assisting university education, the Commonwealth had spent large sums of money on the improvement of technical education facilities in all States. These facilities would also prove invaluable for post-war reconstruction training.

No speakers expressed the view that Commonwealth concern for technical education should diminish once the war-time emergency had ceased to exist. At least during the reconstruction period all types of tertiary education were of national importance, affecting such areas of Commonwealth concern as employment and manpower planning, domestic and overseas trade and the general state of the economy.
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Mr. Menzies pointed out that one of the lessons taught by the
pre-war depression was that the unskilled worker is always the first
to suffer during a business recession.¹ For this reason technical
training was of national importance. The development of sound
technology was also considered to be of importance to national
development (Menzies and Page).² Sir Earle Page made the following
comments:

The future economic life of Australia depends
upon our ability to preserve our place in the march of
specialization. Undoubtedly, every country must attain
a much higher technology in future in order to enable
it to survive in competition with other nations, to
raise the standard of living of its people, and to increase
the total output of goods so that the purchasing power of
wages may be maintained. Technical standards in our
secondary industries must be greatly improved, and that
will require special provision.³

Sir Earle Page not only urged the Government to assist in the
financing of technical education but also to encourage the setting
up of technical colleges in country areas so that as many men as
possible may be trained "... in schools adjacent to their homes."⁴
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Adult Education

Most references to adult education were in relation to the repatriation of ex-service men and women. The Minister reported that this subject was still being considered by the Government and that an early decision could be expected, indicating that the Government was "... determined that adult education in this country shall proceed very vigorously in the post-war years." Mr. Dedman also stated that, in his own opinion, the Training Scheme which had operated during the war years, and on which £500,000 had been spent, should form the nucleus of a post-war adult education programme. He pointed out that already 60,000 men and women had taken advantage of the scheme to engage in correspondence courses while engaged in the armed services.

Two Government members (Gaha and Haylen) strongly emphasised the fact that special methods of instruction and even special curriculums needed to be employed in the instruction of men and women who had seen war service. Dr. Gaha called for special attention to be paid to the psychological problems resulting from active service.
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Children go to schools until they reach a certain age, and leave school to take up various avocations in life. They go to work and leave their jobs at given hours. They must indulge in certain social, industrial or commercial activities in order to hold down their jobs. Life for them has a certain rhythm to which they must respond. When our sailors, soldiers and airmen ought to have been learning this social rhythm, they were uprooted from society, and they found themselves in an entirely different sphere where their life was endangered every hour and minute of the day. The longer the war lasts the greater will the psychological problem become, so I hope that the Minister in charge of the bill (Mr. Dedman) will not only pay a considerable amount of attention to the psychological improvement of persons requiring education, but also have employers educated to appreciate the peculiar changes that servicemen have undergone through the stress of war.¹

It was proposed by Mr. Haylen that the institutions responsible for the education of ex-service personnel prepare a special curriculum, the basis of which would be a study of the Pacific Region. He related the story of a young American soldier who, on returning from duty as a commando in the Solomon Islands, found himself called upon to study literature which, in the light of his experiences, appeared quite ludicrous. Mr. Haylen reached the conclusion "... that the jungle warrior was inclined to crawl back into his lair, preferring to be eaten by a Japanese rather than by a professor."²

Mr. Menzies was the only speaker who spoke at length on the nature of adult education in general, as apart from the special needs of the post-war period. He referred to the very real social
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problem which arises when young men and women leave school at the statutory school leaving age only to discover, some years later, that they have a desire to continue their education.

If a community has within its boundaries even a few thousand people burning for knowledge and deprived of the opportunity to get it because they have passed into normal unskilled ways of earning their living, that community is immeasurably the poorer. The problem of adult education is not a problem of offering people a few university extension lectures or even the Workers Educational Associations. Excellent as they are they are not a real substitute. The point is that the community has to tackle the problem of the boy of fourteen years, who left school not thinking he needed learning, growing into the young man of nineteen burning for it.

In this context, Mr. Menzies referred to the peoples' high schools in Denmark which catered for students over the age of eighteen, most of whom had received no more than an elementary education.
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The subject of Rural Education was paid considerable attention. It was pointed out by Mr. Menzies that, although Australia seemed to have a ready world market for its rural products in the short run, the post-war period was likely to bring with it a period of fierce competition.\textsuperscript{1} This would call for increased efficiency and a more scientific approach to farming. Consequently, it was of utmost importance to encourage more scientific research in the agricultural and pastoral industries and, also, to provide those engaged in these industries with more scientific training.

This call to prepare for strong competition in the export of rural products was echoed by Sir Earle Page\textsuperscript{2} who called for the establishment of a faculty of rural economy. It was, he felt, the responsibility of the Commonwealth Government to "... grant substantial financial assistance"\textsuperscript{3} to ensure that the practical experience of Australian farmers was strengthened by a scientific background.
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Mr. Corser (Country Party - Wide Bay) agreed that "... the greatest activity still remaining in connexion with rural education is along the lines of scientific development." He recommended that Australia should follow the practice in other countries of sending caravans into rural areas for the demonstration of scientific methods and the encouragement of scientific experimentation. He also called for the setting up of more research establishments with encouragement being given to scientific research into such problems as the control of pests and diseases. Reference was made to the success of scientific research in the U.S.S.R. and to the experimental farms established by the National Government of Canada to enable scientific methods to be tested in practice.

Mr. Abbott (Country Party - New England) was another speaker who compared Australian rural education unfavourably with that of other countries.

In some respects it has not even reached the standards attained by other countries 150 years ago. Anybody who studies the works of Arthur Young, dealing with his travels in France and Italy, and in England and Wales, and Cobbitt's book, Rural Rides, and other works must realize that, a century and a half ago, those nations had developed their agricultural practices to a degree which has not been reached in Australia yet.  
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One of the most serious problems in Australian rural education was seen to be that of disseminating information gained through research and putting "... information in a form which can be understood by the average person."\(^1\) The Wool Board's recent acquisition of a motor caravan to take films and lecturers to rural areas provided an excellent example of the way in which rural scientists and practising farmers could be brought closer together to the benefit of the rural industries.

**Commonwealth Responsibility for Education**

There was a general feeling that the Commonwealth had a definite responsibility in the field of education. One speaker (Page) claimed that there was a need for a Commonwealth Minister for Education who, he felt, "... would be kept fully employed."\(^2\)

Surprisingly, little argument took place regarding the constitutional difficulties which might stand in the way of greater Commonwealth involvement in education. The Leader of the Opposition did make reference to this aspect but stated that without making constitutional amendments it was quite possible for the Commonwealth to assist the States.
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There is ... no legal reason why the Commonwealth should not come to the rescue of the States on the matters that I am discussing. Either by appropriations under Section 81 of the Constitution, as to which I agree that there is some constitutional doubt, or by conditioned grants to the States under Section 96, as to which there is no constitutional doubt, the Commonwealth could make available substantial sums in aid of educational reform and development. It is inevitable, I think, that that course should be followed, and, thinking so, I have put forward the proposal mentioned at the outset of my speech. I believe that the Commonwealth will, in all probability, be a substantial contributor to educational reform, and, if so, it is in the interests of the Commonwealth to establish forthwith, in collaboration with the States, a highly competent committee or commission to investigate the problem and submit recommendations.¹

Whilst all speakers agreed that some degree of Commonwealth financial aid to Education was essential, the exact role to be played by the Commonwealth was far from clear. Mr. Spender felt that the Commonwealth should not only provide finance for education but should indicate the precise manner in which the money should be used. He was of the opinion that the Commonwealth should use its money and its influence to create equality of educational opportunity throughout the nation and to raise the status and salaries of teachers.² Sir Earle Page also called for the Commonwealth Government to ensure adequate remuneration for teachers, either by giving general financial aid to the States or by taking over from the States certain areas of educational activity.³
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Mr. Corser felt that the Commonwealth should take over the administration of education, providing that the States were prepared to reduce taxation. ¹ Mr. Burke (A.L.P. - Perth) felt, on the other hand, that although the Commonwealth had a responsibility to provide finance for education out of the money it had raised, the administration of education should be left, as much as possible, to the States. ²

One specific area in which Commonwealth involvement was recommended (by Page and Abbott)³ was the provision of libraries. Mr. Abbott (Country Party - New England) felt that the Commonwealth Government should either provide free community libraries in all districts or, at least, help stock such libraries with books, reviews and other literature. ⁴ Sir Earle Page's suggestion was that the Commonwealth should make itself responsible for the provision of school libraries and that these libraries should be open outside of school hours to cater for community needs.

During the course of the debate, the opinions expressed were mostly on the theoretical level, concerned more with planning for the future than with overcoming current problems. Sir Earle Page,
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however, did introduce a parochial issue at one stage of his speech when he referred to the shortage of teachers to staff the small country schools in his electorate.\(^1\) Citing the case of one particular district in his electorate, which had been without a teacher for nearly a year, he urged the Government to give priority to the release of teachers from the armed services for the staffing of country schools.

During the discussion, frequent use was made of the expression "co-operation with the States" but little attempt was made at definition of the term and it undoubtedly carried with it different connotations for different speakers. Also, it was apparently assumed that any attempt by the Commonwealth to "co-operate" would be welcomed by the States and not be regarded suspiciously as an attempt to usurp State authority.

The proposal by Mr. Menzies that "... the Commonwealth should set up in co-operation with the States a qualified commission..."\(^2\) was rejected by the Minister who stated that he was "... of the opinion that this matter should be dealt with in consultation with the States."\(^3\) He claimed that the Government's plans for a Commonwealth Office and for Commonwealth representation on the Australian Education Council (which hitherto consisted only of the State Ministers) would be adequate to deal with the problem of educational planning on a nationwide scale.
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Government Policy and the Education Act 1945

Under the Labour Government, in 1945, responsibility for Commonwealth educational policy was included in the portfolio of the Minister for Post-war Reconstruction and Minister in Charge of the Council for Scientific and Industrial Research, Mr. J.J. Dedman (Corio). Mr. Dedman had previously been Minister of War Organisation and Industry but in the closing stages of the war the name of his portfolio was changed to indicate the Government's intention to make the transition from a war-time to a peace-time economy as smooth and rapid as possible.

Mr. Dedman formally introduced the Education Bill of 1945 on 28th September\(^1\) although he had provided the House with a fairly lengthy account of the Government's activities and outlined its plans for the future during the July debate.\(^2\) The content of these two speeches provides us with a clear picture of the Commonwealth Government's attitude and policy with regard to education at that particular time.

On 26th July, in reply to the motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition,\(^3\) Mr. Dedman availed himself of the opportunity to review the past activities of the Government, with emphasis on those
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which had arisen directly out of the war effort, and to indicate the future direction of Government policy. To give some measure of his Government's achievements in education, the Minister issued a table of expenditure (see Table 8) in which expenditure for the year 1943-44 was compared with that of the year 1940-41 (the final year of the Menzies Government). It will be observed that the main areas of increased expenditure were either directly or indirectly related to the war effort. The figures for 1944-45 were not available but were expected to be at least ten times as great as in 1940-41.¹

Mr. Dedman pointed out that because the Commonwealth had not been granted specific powers in education by the Constitution, its activities relied on State co-operation.² This co-operation had been forthcoming and the Government had made use of some of the States' educational facilities - in some cases causing them to be expanded - by meeting any additional costs involved.

As a result of the war effort, the Government had found it necessary to become more deeply involved in tertiary education. The Defence Training Scheme, which Mr. Dedman described as "... one of the finest illustrations of co-operation between the Commonwealth and the States in the achievement of a national objective",³ involved the Commonwealth in expenditure on the expansion of existing facilities
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Table 8
Commonwealth Expenditure on Education
for years 1940-41 & 1943-44

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>1940-41 £</th>
<th>1943-44 £</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL TERRITORIES</td>
<td>75,816</td>
<td>53,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. REPATRIATION COMMISSION (Soldiers' Children's Education Scheme)</td>
<td>123,730</td>
<td>95,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. AUSTRALIAN BROADCASTING COMMISSION (189,015)</td>
<td></td>
<td>189,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. MISCELLANEOUS</td>
<td>8,100</td>
<td>7,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Includes National Library, Literary Fund Fellowships, grants to States for Dairy training, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>396,661</td>
<td>344,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ASSISTANCE TO UNIVERSITIES AND RESEARCH</td>
<td>84,540</td>
<td>353,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Not including the ordinary vote to the Council for Scientific and Industrial Research)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. PHYSICAL EDUCATION</td>
<td>23,800</td>
<td>109,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. PRE-SCHOOL EDUCATION</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>9,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. SERVICE EDUCATION</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>384,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. RECONSTRUCTION TRAINING</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>214,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of items 5-9</td>
<td>108,340</td>
<td>1,071,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of items 1-4</td>
<td>396,661</td>
<td>344,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>505,001</td>
<td>1,415,965</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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at technical colleges and other institutions, as well as the normal
tuition and administration costs. The Commonwealth also established
the Universities Commission in order to grant financial assistance
to university students "... to ensure that a sufficient number of
professional men and women will be available for the prosecution of
the war..."  

The Commonwealth had also increased expenditure on "...educational
activities calculated to improve the health of the community" 2 , such
as pre-school education, physical education and national fitness.
In addition, attention was being given to adult education through a
services correspondence scheme which was enabling men and women to
prepare for the skilled occupations that they would enter after the
war. 3 The Commonwealth Reconstruction Training Scheme, which had
already been in operation for eighteen months, would obviously involve
the Commonwealth in additional expenditure to assist the States with
the expansion of universities, technical colleges and other related
institutions. 4 The Commonwealth also acknowledged its responsibility
in the field of rural education and a Commonwealth Director of Rural
Training was to be appointed to supervise the training of ex-service
men and women for rural occupations.
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In explaining the Government's future education policy, Mr. Dedman made it clear that there was no intention of altering the Constitution or limiting the powers of the States. He pointed out that the various spheres of Commonwealth activity involved certain obligations in regard to education and that these obligations could best be met in co-operation with the States. This co-operation would be facilitated by the setting up of a Commonwealth Office of Education.\(^1\) In order to continue Commonwealth assistance to the universities during peace-time, it would be necessary to legislate for a permanent Universities Commission as the existing one was set up under security regulations as a war-time measure and would cease to exist once the state of emergency had passed.\(^2\)

Other plans announced by the Minister in July, 1945 included the establishment of the Australian National University,\(^3\) extensions to technical colleges and improvements in adult education and scientific research.\(^4\) Furthermore, it was the Government's intention to seek representation, through the new Commonwealth Office, on the Australian Education Council.\(^5\)
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The Education Bill 1945, which was introduced on 28th September provided for:

... an act to establish a Commonwealth office of education and a universities commission, to provide for the university training of discharged members of the forces, to provide for financial assistance to university students, and for other purposes.¹

This Bill was introduced on the recommendation of a committee which had been formed in 1944 by the Prime Minister (at that time Mr. John Curtin) on the suggestion of Mr. Dedman. The committee which had consisted of senior Commonwealth officers, pointed out the need for the Commonwealth to have some form of co-ordinating body to look after its educational activities.²

The functions of the proposed office of education were to be:

(a) to advise the Minister on matters relating to education;
(b) to establish and maintain a liaison, on matters relating to education, with other countries and the States;
(c) to arrange consultation between Commonwealth authorities concerned with matters relating to education;
(d) to undertake research relating to education;
(e) to provide statistics and information relating to education required by any Commonwealth authority;
(f) to advise the Minister concerning the grant of financial assistance to the States and to other authorities for educational purposes.³

1. Hans., Vol. 185, pp. 6132-3
2. Ibid., p. 6133
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Mr. Dedman claimed that the nature and functions of the office of education were consistent with the Government's desire "... to establish a body which will not conflict in any way with institutions at present established, but should provide a beginning in augmenting and supplementing the present educational resources of this nation." ¹

The first Director of the Commonwealth Office of Education was to be Professor R.C. Mills.² Tribute was paid to his reputation and experience in the field of education. His work as chairman of the Commonwealth Grants Commission and chairman of the Universities Commission made him a most suitable choice for the post. The appointment received unqualified approval from the Opposition. Mr. Menzies expressed great pleasure at the appointment and requested that Professor Mills not be given "... too much ordinary routine administration work."³

The main function of the Commonwealth Office of Education, as I understand it, will be to engage in what I may describe as "thinking on education problems", constantly to conduct research into them, and constantly to endeavour to co-ordinate the activities of the Commonwealth and the primary activities of the States in this field. Occasionally we take a man of first-class gifts for a particular kind of work and set him too many routine jobs of administration.⁴

Besides setting up the Commonwealth Office of Education, the Bill also provided for a permanent Universities Commission. The

---

¹. Hans., Vol. 185, p. 6134
². Ibid.
³. Ibid., p. 6559
⁴. Ibid.
functions of the Commission as prescribed by the Bill were as follows:

(a) to arrange for the training in Universities or other similar institutions for the purpose of facilitating their re-establishment, of persons who are discharged members of the Forces within the meaning of the Re-establishment and Employment Act 1945;

(b) in prescribed cases or classes of cases, to assist other persons to obtain training at Universities or similar institutions;

(c) to provide financial assistance to students at Universities and approved institutions; and

(d) to advise the Minister with respect to such matters relating to University training and associated matters as are referred by the Minister to the Commission for advice.¹

The Commission would be a body corporate consisting of the Director of the Office of Education, who would be chairman of the Commission, and three other members to serve for a maximum period of three years. Provision was made for the Commission to appoint advisory committees in the States of the Commonwealth. The existing Commission, which had been set up under national security regulations, had already found it necessary to set up these committees after consultation with the State Premiers.²

In addition to Mr. Dedman and Mr. Menzies, four members spoke on the Bill. These speakers were Mr. Beazley (Labour - Fremantle), Mr. Holt (Liberal - Fawkner), Sir Earle Page (Country Party - Cowper) and Mr. McEwen (Country Party - Indi). None of these speakers spoke against the Bill but all took advantage of the opportunity to express

1. Ibid., p. 6135
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some of their personal views on education and the role of the Commonwealth.

Noting that one of the functions of the Commonwealth Office of Education was "... to advise the Minister concerning the grant of financial assistance to the States...", Mr. Beazley expressed the hope that full use would be made of this provision. He pointed out the particular problems of his own State, Western Australia, where the scattered population necessitated the existence of about 700 one-teacher schools, resulting in a higher expenditure per head of population. He referred to the policy of the Union Government of South Africa where grants to the provinces were weighted according to the 'scatter' of the population. ¹

Mr. Beazley also praised the work of the Universities Commission in making scholarships available to students. He quoted from a letter which he had received from the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Western Australia, who claimed that since the scholarship scheme had come into existence there had been greater competition for the places available in the Medicine and Engineering faculties, resulting in higher standards. ²

Also of significance was Mr. Beazley's suggestion that scholarships should be given by the Commonwealth Government to secondary school pupils. ³ The university scholarship system assumed that

1. Ibid., p. 6560
2. Ibid.
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parents could afford to keep their children at school long enough for them to matriculate. Experience, however, tended to show that many promising students are forced to leave school earlier.  
Mr. Beazley claimed that in the post-war years increased commitments would place such strain on primary and secondary schools as to make a much greater contribution from the Commonwealth desirable.

Mr. Holt, without making any direct reference to the measures to be taken by the proposed legislation, put forward an argument for the immediate discharge of those members of the forces who wished to take up university studies. Another comment in relation to the university training of ex-service men and women came from Sir Earle Page. He placed great emphasis on the psychological difficulties of those who had seen war service. He recommended that these people should be enrolled in the smaller universities and quoted from a report by the Universities Commission which compared the results of first year science students at the New England University College with those at Sydney University. Although the Leaving Certificate results of the New England students were of a lower standard than those of the Sydney students, their pass rate at the University was much higher. The better progress of the New England students could be attributed, at least to some degree, to the closer personal contact
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with teaching staff at the smaller institution.

Mr. McEwen, in his speech, concentrated on the needs of agricultural education. The developments in this type of education at the university level in the U.S.A. were described as an example of what might be done. Mr. McEwen felt sure that any money spent on similar schemes in Australia would be amply repaid by a higher national income, increased efficiency and the ability for our primary industries to compete more favourably with other nations in the world market.

In his reply, Mr. Dedman promised that attention would be given to the early release from the forces of sufficient prospective students to fill available places at the universities. He pointed out that university classes would undoubtedly be large in the post-war period. At the same time he agreed with the comments of Sir Earle Page and stated that the reconstruction training authorities were planning to provide special tutors to assist students who appeared to be in need of individual tuition. In reference to agricultural education, the Minister advised that a survey had been carried out for the Government by Dr. Currie of the University of Western Australia. Recommendations had already been made and a rural training scheme was being planned.

1. Ibid., p. 6563
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Thus, with support from both sides of the House, the Education Bill 1945 was passed without amendment. Its passage through the Senate was even more rapid as the Government made use of the guillotine to rush it through in the closing hours of the session. By early October the legislation had received the Governor-General's assent and the new Commonwealth Office of Education commenced operations in November, 1945.
Summary

The education debates in the House of Representatives in 1945 indicated that many members of Parliament regarded education as a subject of great importance both as an integral part of the reconstruction programme and as a means of improving the quality of life in the community. No significant differences in party policy were evident.

The initial debate on education in July, 1945 was instigated by the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Menzies. Subjects covered during the debate included educational aims, content and method; teachers' status and remuneration; pre-school education; university education; technical education; rural education; and the general responsibility of the Commonwealth for education.

The Minister for Post-war Reconstruction, Mr. Dedman, gave a comprehensive review of his Government's achievements in education. These achievements had been mostly connected with either the war effort or plans for reconstruction. Mr. Dedman also outlined the Government's future policy in education. The keystone of that policy was an acceptance of the rights of the States in this field. It was not contemplated that the Commonwealth would attempt to dictate policy to the States or to usurp their authority in any way.
By the Education Act 1945, the Commonwealth Office of Education was established to co-ordinate the Commonwealth's activities and the Universities Commission (originally established during the war by National Security Regulations) was given permanency so that the Commonwealth Government could continue to provide financial assistance to students. Notice was also given of the Government's intention to establish the Australian National University and, through the Commonwealth Office of Education, to seek representation on the Australian Education Council.
During the period under study, there was a very clear and steady development in Commonwealth concern for and assistance to university education. Although it was some time before government leaders would accept any responsibility for the granting of scholarships to secondary students or for direct assistance to the State school systems, large sums of Commonwealth money were provided for assistance to the State universities and their students. Even so, it was frequently stressed that these grants were made through the generosity of the Commonwealth Government rather than from any sense of duty in this matter.

The initial entry of the Commonwealth into this field came during World War II with financial assistance to students. This was continued after the war as part of the Post War Reconstruction Training Scheme. In the immediate post-war years cash grants for university research were also introduced to provide added stimulus to the reconstruction programme.
It became apparent that the policies of the Commonwealth Government during the war and the reconstruction period that followed (especially the Commonwealth Reconstruction Training Scheme and the granting of assistance to students) placed a greater strain on the resources of the State universities. The problems thus created could only be solved at great expense and, since the States had lost their main source of revenue with the advent of uniform taxation, it was to be expected that the Commonwealth Government might be drawn, albeit unwillingly, into the realm of university finance and, eventually, into the financing of tertiary education in general.

The main developments in Commonwealth involvement in tertiary education can be traced through a brief discussion of four committees of inquiry which, at the request of the Government, considered various aspects of the problem and made appropriate policy recommendations.

The first of these committees was set up by the Chifley Government shortly before it was defeated in the 1949 elections. The committee originally consisted of Professor R.C. Mills, Director of the Commonwealth Office of Education, Mr. E.G. Thorpe and Mr. H.J. Goodes from the Treasury. The committee continued to meet under the new Government and the Prime Minister, Mr. Menzies, announced that the Vice-Chancellors' Committee had been asked to nominate a representative on the committee of inquiry. As a result, Professor D.B. Copland became a member of the committee in 1950.

1. Hans., Vol. 206, p. 571
The terms of reference for the committee were fairly limited and dealt with the specific matter of finance. They were as follows:

1. To examine and report upon the finances of the universities having regard to their facilities for teaching and research, including staff, buildings and equipment.

2. To examine and report upon the requirements of the universities in relation to the work at present undertaken and to the need for their future development.

3. To make recommendations as to whether any, and if so what, action should be taken by the Commonwealth to assist the universities.¹

A further direction to the committee by the new Prime Minister was that special attention should be paid to the needs of the residential colleges.²

A preliminary report was received by the Government in 1950. Following a consideration of the committee's findings, the State Governments were approached with an offer of Commonwealth assistance for the universities. The increased contributions began in the second half of 1950 although it was not until November, 1951 that the Government was able to place before the Parliament the States Grants (Universities) Bill 1951 which validated the action that had been taken and made provision for the years 1951, 1952 and 1953.³

2. Ibid.
3. Vide infra, p. 114
This policy of providing assistance on a short term basis continued for some years with States Grants acts being passed as required. The universities continued to press for even more assistance, however, and at the opening of Parliament in 1957 the Governor-General announced the appointment of a new committee of inquiry.

Parliament will be asked to give some increased financial support to universities over the next two years. In addition, recognizing that the universities are facing almost a new world in which decisions of critical importance concerning their organization, fields of teaching and finance will be required, the Government has appointed a most authoritative committee of inquiry to make recommendations for future university development.¹

The committee was presided over by Sir Keith Murray from Great Britain (where he was chairman of the University Grants Committee). Other members of the committee were Sir Ian Clunies Ross (chairman of the C.S.I.R.O.), Sir Charles Morris (Vice-Chancellor of the University of Leeds), Mr. A.J. Reid (Chancellor of the University of Western Australia and formerly head of the State Treasury) and Mr. J.C. Richards (assistant general manager of B.H.P.).²

It is perhaps a measure of the Commonwealth's growing commitment to university education that this committee had a much wider brief than the 1950 committee, which was strictly concerned with finances.

1. Hans., Vol. R 14, p. 8
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The earlier committee had obviously based its inquiries on the assumption that the existing pattern and structure of university education must be taken as given and was outside the influence of the Commonwealth. The Murray Committee, however, was asked to delve more deeply into the role of the university as an institution of national importance. In the words of the Prime Minister:

To this strong committee, we gave a wide charter which included the role of the university in the Australian community; the extension and co-ordination of university facilities; technological education at university level; the financial needs of universities and appropriate means of providing for them. In less than three months, July, August and September of this year, the committee visited every university institution in Australia, received the views of large numbers of people and bodies, including Commonwealth and State Government departments, and has prepared this extensive report.\(^1\)

The committee's report had a profound effect on Commonwealth policy and led to a further extension of the Commonwealth's involvement in university education.\(^2\) One recommendation of the Murray Report was that there should be a full inquiry into all aspects of tertiary education in Australia. In 1961, a committee was formed under the chairmanship of Sir Leslie Martin. Its terms of reference were as follows:

To consider the pattern of tertiary education in relation to the needs and resources of Australia and to make recommendations to the Australian Universities Commission on the future development of tertiary education.\(^3\)

1. Hans., Vol. 17, p. 2695
2. Vide infra, p. 116
So thorough were the committee's investigations that its report took more than three years to complete and it was not until March, 1965 that the findings of the committee could be brought before Parliament. The most significant aspect of this report was that it firmly established a new concept in Commonwealth involvement - the idea that the Commonwealth Government should assist all forms of tertiary education. Except in regard to teacher training, the Government accepted the main recommendations concerning this extension of its influence. It accepted the suggestion of the committee that a new type of tertiary institution, the College of Advanced Education, should be established and, to plan for these institutions, a new committee was formed under the chairmanship of Sir Ian Wark.

During the period 1945-1967, the principal areas of Commonwealth involvement in university education were the Commonwealth Scholarship Scheme, cash grants to State universities and the Australian National University (and the Australian University College). The Commonwealth also found itself drawn into other areas of tertiary education such as technical education, and assisted in the establishment of Colleges of Advanced Education. These areas of direct involvement through government policy accounted for a great many of the comments and discussions on tertiary education in the parliament. References were also made to subjects outside the realm of Commonwealth involvement or influence (particularly during Question Time). These references often reflected strong political interests.

1. Hans., Vol. R 45, pp. 268ff
Commonwealth Scholarships

The first significant attempt by the Commonwealth Government to assist the universities took the form of cash grants direct to students. This method of contributing to education has the advantage that it avoids the need for lengthy consultation with the State Governments. When the Commonwealth did begin to make grants to the States under Section 96 of the Constitution, the legislation needed to be rather complicated in order to ensure that the money would be used for its intended purpose.¹ Payment of Scholarships direct to students, however, is a relatively simple matter. It also has a political advantage in that, because it by-passes the State Governments, the electorate is left in no doubt as to the source of the money and the Commonwealth Government, therefore, receives all the credit. The power of the Commonwealth to make such payments was clarified and extended with an alteration to the Constitution by referendum in 1946. This alteration, which was favoured by a majority of electors in all States, empowered the Commonwealth Government to pass legislation on a wide range of social services including assistance for students.²

The granting of university scholarships to students began with the Special Assistance Scheme in 1943. By December, 1948 the Minister for Post-war Reconstruction, Mr. Dedman, was able to report that

1. Vide infra, p. 114
5,300 students had received assistance at a cost of almost £1,500,000.\(^1\) In 1948 assistance was being given to 2,000 students of whom 600 had commenced in the current year. At the university examinations held in 1947, the pass rate for students receiving assistance had been 80% compared with 65% for other students.\(^2\)

Assistance provided under the scheme was subject to a means test. It was reported in February, 1948\(^3\) that the maximum benefit was £153 a year plus fees where income from other sources was below £250. The assistance then decreased as income increased. Once income reached £600, assistance, in the form of either allowance or fees, was no longer available. Mr. Falstein (A.L.P. - Watson) pointed out the possible injustice which might arise if income were to increase as a result of cost of living adjustments.\(^4\) In reply, Mr. Dedman stated that it would be difficult to correct this without having an effect on all other social service benefits.

When the Liberal-Country Party coalition came to power in 1949 there were no dramatic changes in government policy towards assistance of students although a new Commonwealth Scholarship Scheme was introduced to replace the previous form of assistance. Students
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competed for the scholarships on the results of the final secondary school examinations. The first scholarships were awarded in 1951 on the results of examinations held in 1950. Scholarship holders had university tuition fees and other compulsory expenses paid for them, without means test. They were also eligible for living allowances, subject to means test.¹

In the early years of the scheme there was little criticism of the Government for the number of scholarships that were made available. There was, however, some concern as to whether there were sufficient students to take advantage of this type of assistance. On 28th September, 1950, Mr. Keon (A.L.P. - Yarra)² claimed that, so far, only 150 applications had been received for the 3,000 scholarships to be awarded in 1951. He referred to a recommendation of the Universities Commission that secondary school scholarships should be awarded to ensure that there would be a sufficient number of eligible students to compete for the university scholarships. Again, in February, 1952, Mr. Peters (A.L.P. - Burke)³ in a question directed to the Prime Minister, Mr. Menzies, asked how much of the allocation for scholarships had remained unspent in the previous year and suggested that any residual amount should be used to provide secondary scholarships. In reply, Mr. Menzies stated that the revised scheme of scholarship allowances had come into existence on 1st January, 1951.
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The appropriation for the period 1st January to 30th June, 1951 had been £350,000 of which £316,000 had been spent.

Secondary school courses, as an integral part of the educational system, are of undoubted importance. It is also true that some students are deterred from completing them because of the expense involved. However, the main object of the Commonwealth Scholarship scheme is to provide the opportunity for training at the tertiary level. It is not agreed by the Commonwealth Government that funds unexpended on the scheme should be devoted to secondary education. This field of education is the responsibility of the State governments.1

The matter was raised again in September, 1952 when Mr. Keon (A.L.P. - Yarra)2 claimed that the Minister for Education in Victoria had stated that of 3,000 Commonwealth Scholarships offered in his State that year only 987 had been taken up by students. After looking into the matter, Mr. Menzies was able to inform the House that 3,000 scholarships were offered annually throughout the Commonwealth. Of these, Victoria received an allocation of 805, all of which had been awarded. An additional 91 scholarships had been made available but these were deferred until 1953. Once again, Mr. Menzies pointed out that the Government's aim was to provide scholarships for tertiary education and that to provide secondary scholarships would require a major policy decision.3 This policy of providing university scholarships in isolation was frequently attacked by the Opposition. In
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August, 1958 Mr. Whitlam (A.L.P. - Werriwa) charged that "... there is an economic weeding out of children before they go on to the university."¹

By the end of the 1950's there was also growing criticism of the number of university scholarships available. The main basis of this criticism was that the number of scholarships offered remained the same for a number of years. The information contained in Table 9 was released by Mr. Menzies on 5th April, 1960 in reply to a question by Mr. Jones (A.L.P. - Newcastle).² Table 9 (a) shows the number of scholarships offered for the years 1956-60 and the allocation of those scholarships to the various States (on a population basis). It will be noted that this number remained at 3,000. Mr. Menzies pointed out that it was administratively difficult to award the exact number allocated to each State with the result that the actual number of awards granted each year tended to be slightly above or below the intended 3,000. The number of scholarships actually awarded for each year of the period can be found in Table 9 (b).

¹. Hans., Vol. R 20, p. 750
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Table 9

Commonwealth scholarships for university students 1956 - 1960

(a) Allocation of scholarships amongst States.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>New South Wales</th>
<th>Victoria</th>
<th>Queensland</th>
<th>South Australia</th>
<th>Western Australia</th>
<th>Tasmania</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>1,153</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>1,147</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>1,141</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>1,139</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>1,136</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Scholarships actually accepted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>New South Wales</th>
<th>Victoria</th>
<th>Queensland</th>
<th>South Australia</th>
<th>Western Australia</th>
<th>Tasmania</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>1,222</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>3,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>1,143</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>1,138</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>3,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>1,219</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>3,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures are not yet available
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It was the adherence to the same basic number of scholarships (3,000) that received most comment from members of the Opposition. Their criticism began in 1958 after the Government failed to implement the recommendation of the Murray Report that scholarships be increased. Several members of the Labour Party, the most vocal ones being Mr. Whitlam (Werriwa), Mr. Reynolds (Barton) and Mr. Bryant (Wills), repeatedly kept this matter before the Parliament for more than two years by means of questions, requests for statistical information and speeches. The basis of their argument was a comparison between the number of scholarships available and the number of applicants. For example, in March, 1960 Mr. Reynolds pointed out that for the years 1955 and 1959 the number of scholarships awarded had been 2,974 and 3,122 respectively - an increase of 148. For the same years the number of applicants had been 7,964 and 13,000 - an increase of 5,036. Mr. Reynolds was also able to point out that the percentage of matriculants to receive scholarships had fallen from 39.8% in 1955 to 25.2% in 1959.

In March, 1959, in reply to one of the numerous questions on this subject, Mr. Menzies stated that the Murray Committee's suggestion that scholarships be increased had not been implemented because of the limited accommodation at the universities. An increase in the number of Commonwealth Scholarships would "... place an intolerable burden on the universities." One hundred post-graduate scholarships

2. Ibid., p. 560
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were made available from the beginning of 1959\(^1\) but it was not until March, 1961 that the number of scholarships for commencing students was increased from 3,000 to 4,000.\(^2\) This number was increased to 5,000 at the end of 1963 and 6,000 at the end of 1965. Tables 10 and 11 show the numbers of Commonwealth scholars at universities for the ten-year period from 1955 to 1964.

The Martin Report on tertiary education was completed at the end of 1964, after more than three years of deliberation, and the report was presented to Parliament early in 1965. One recommendation of the report was that all university students who passed their first year examinations at the first attempt should automatically be granted later year scholarships. This was rejected by the Prime Minister as he considered it unwise to commit the Government to an "unknown charge" on its finances. At the same time, however, he promised that the number of later year scholarships would be increased from 1,280 to 1,530.\(^3\)

Some months later the rules governing the award of later year scholarships were relaxed. Students failing in first year were to be allowed to apply for a later year scholarship as soon as they passed the first year course. Later year scholarships would also

1. Hans., Vol. R 20, p. 20
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Table 10

Total number of Commonwealth scholars at Australian universities as a percentage of all students 1955 - 1964

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Commonwealth Scholars in training at Universities</th>
<th>Percentage of enrolments (both full-time and part-time) in Bachelor Degrees, Diploma and Certificate Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>8,379</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>8,641</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>9,036</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>9,513</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>10,209</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>10,860</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>11,936</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>13,044</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>13,923</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>16,044</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11

Number of full-time Commonwealth scholars at Australian universities as a percentage of full-time students 1955-1964

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Full-time Commonwealth Scholars in Training at Universities</th>
<th>Percentage of all full-time Students enrolled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>7,124</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>7,301</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>7,467</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>8,047</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>8,719</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>9,408</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>10,527</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>11,742</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>12,780</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>14,938</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Ibid., p. 1092  
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be available to all students (full-time, part-time and external) whereas, previously, preference had been given to full-time students.¹

Grants to the Universities

The granting of Commonwealth financial aid to universities was first occasioned by the Post-war Reconstruction Scheme which placed considerable strain on the universities' resources and which, since it was initiated by the Commonwealth Government, carried with it certain obligations to ensure that facilities were adequate. In April, 1947 the Minister for Post-war Reconstruction, Mr. Dedman, was able to refer to a Commonwealth grant of over £1,000,000 for additional accommodation at universities throughout Australia.² In November, 1948 another special grant of £100,000 per year for three years was made for expenditure on research.³

There was, however, a certain degree of reluctance to enter into any financial arrangement which could be described as permanent or which could, in any way, be construed as a Commonwealth "takeover" of university education. In 1948 Dr. Gaha (A.L.P. - Denison) asked the Prime Minister, Mr. Chifley, to consider appointing a royal commission to inquire into university education "... owing to the acute position of university finances in Australia, and to the

¹. Hans., Vol. R 47, p. 1036
². Hans., Vol. 191, p. 1453
³. Hans., Vol. 200, p. 3292
necessity for increased technical and university education..."¹

Mr. Chifley admitted that the Commonwealth Government was concerned
with the state of the universities, insofar as their financial
problems may have been partly the result of Commonwealth policy.
He pointed out, however, that his Government had no constitutional
power with respect to education.

I believe that it will be necessary during the
next two years for all States and the Commonwealth to
review together the whole position regarding universities.
Because of the constitutional position I am not quite
clear through what avenue the Commonwealth could assist
the States in education other than by providing direct
grants of money, even though it will have no control
over the expenditure of such money.²

Mr. Chifley's suggestion that the Commonwealth would have no control
over the expenditure of grants to the States for university education
is a little hard to understand. The right of the Commonwealth to
attach conditions to State grants, in terms of Section 96, had been
fairly well tested by this time and even the introduction of uniform
taxation had been accomplished by an adaptation of this same principle.³

In February of the following year the Prime Minister was asked
by Mr. O'Connor (A.L.P. - West Sydney) if any further consideration
had been given to the granting of financial assistance for university
education.⁴ After pointing out that a considerable amount of aid
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3. see Z. Cowan, "The Growth of Federal Participation in Australian
   Education", in W.G. Walker (ed.), School, College and University,
   St. Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1972, pp. 4-6
4. Hans., Vol. 201, p. 497
had already been given, Mr. Chifley said that, in view of the difficulties that the universities would probably experience when the Commonwealth Reconstruction Training Scheme came to an end, his Government was prepared to examine the situation if the State Governments agreed. For the time being, however, the N.S.W. Government was conducting an inquiry at Sydney University and, until that was complete, the Commonwealth Government was not prepared to conduct any investigation of its own.¹

By the end of 1949 steps were taken to inquire into the financial needs of university education. This inquiry was conducted by a committee led by Professor R.C. Mills.² A report was submitted by the end of 1950 and as a direct result of the committee's findings, the Government introduced the States Grants (Universities) Bill 1951. The Bill provided for grants to be paid to the States for university education during the next three years. The grants were contingent upon the States maintaining a certain level of expenditure and were not to be used for capital expenditure. Capital expenditure was defined as expenditure on buildings, alterations to buildings and purchase of equipment in excess of £500.

Provision was made for first level and second level grants.³ The first level grants amounted to £803,000 per year divided between the universities according to enrolment. For a university to qualify

1. Ibid.
2. Vide supra, p. 98
for the first level grant, its income from State grants and fees must be three times the amount of the Commonwealth grant plus whatever extra amount was needed to balance the budget.

If a university raised more from State grants and fees than was required to attract the full first level grant, then a second level grant, still on a £1 for £3 basis, was payable on the extra amount. A maximum of £300,000 would be paid out in second level grants.

This legislation set the pattern for Commonwealth assistance to universities for some years to come and a number of acts, similar in substance to that of 1951, were passed. The States Grants (Universities) Bill 1953 was different from its predecessor only in that it was expressed in more simple terms and doubled the amount available in second level grants. This resulted in the provision of a maximum grant of £1,500,000 per year for the years 1953 and 1954.¹

A similar Bill for the year 1955 provided for a basic grant of £877,130 plus a second level grant of £828,800.² A review of the financial position of the universities was then carried out before the introduction of another States Grants (Universities) Bill in 1956 which increased the total amount available in first and second level grants to £2,000,000.³ When presenting the States Grants (Universities) Bill 1957⁴, the Prime Minister, Mr. Menzies, announced
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the appointment of the Murray Committee to inquire into university education.¹ So that the universities would be assured of funds until the committee's report was available, the Bill of 1957 made provision for two years, 1957 and 1958. The maximum grants (first and second level) amounted to £2,300,000 for each of those years but Mr. Menzies stated that this could be regarded as the minimum amount that would be available and that additional funds would be provided if necessary.

In 1958 the Government began to implement the recommendations of the Murray Committee. One of these recommendations was that the Commonwealth should increase the size of its grant for recurrent expenses and also provide emergency grants for capital expenditure.² Consequently, the States Grants (Universities) Bill 1958, which dealt with a three-year period (1958-60), provided for:

... emergency grants totalling £4,500,000 grants for recurrent expenditure amounting to just over £9,000,000, capital grants for university buildings, and their equipment and sites, of some £7,270,000 and grants of £600,000 for residential college buildings - a total of £21,370,000.³

A further step in Commonwealth involvement was taken in 1959 when the Government placed before Parliament the Australian Universities Commission Bill 1959 and the Education Bill 1959. The former carried out the recommendation of the Murray Committee that a full-time Universities Commission be established to advise both State and

1. Vide supra, p. 100
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Commonwealth Governments on the needs of universities. The latter was an amending bill which changed the name of the existing Universities Commission to the Commonwealth Scholarship Board and amended the 1945 Act to avoid an overlapping of functions between the Australian Universities Commission and the Commonwealth Office of Education.  

Sir Leslie Martin was appointed first full-time chairman of the Australian Universities Commission which, until 1962, had four other part-time members. Under the Australian Universities Commission Act 1962 the size of the Commission was increased, by two more part-time members, to seven. One of the additional members was to be familiar with university medical schools and, in order to keep a balance between academic and non-academic members, the other would be a businessman.

In the 1960's the Commonwealth Government continued the pattern set in 1958 by making triennial grants to the universities. Capital grants were made on a £1 for £1 basis and grants for recurrent expenses on a £1 for £1.85 basis. In two acts of 1962 the Government granted aid to teaching hospitals and made supplementary grants to the States of N.S.W., Victoria and South Australia for the new University of New South Wales and Monash University and the new section of the University of Adelaide at Bedford Park.  

The Australian Universities Commission made a valuable contribution by making recommendations to both State and Commonwealth Governments on the development of university education as a whole and most recommendations were accepted and acted upon by the Commonwealth Government. As a result, in 1963, the Commonwealth offered the States more than £60,000,000 for the 1964-66 triennium, requiring that this should be matched by more than £90,000,000 in State grants and university fees.

During the 1960's the Commonwealth Government also involved itself in the matter of academic salaries. In determining the amount that it was prepared to grant for this purpose, the Government was obliged to determine what it would accept as the average salaries for academic staff. The maximum contribution was then determined according to the usual formula of £1 for £1.85. There was, of course, no compulsion for the States to pay the salaries arrived at by the Commonwealth. The approved salary was fixed at £4,000 in 1960\(^1\) and increased to £4,250 in 1962\(^2\) and £4,600 in 1963\(^3\). In 1965, Mr. Justice Eggleston was appointed by the Commonwealth Government to inquire into university salaries. He recommended salaries of £5,200 for professors, £4,300 for associate professors and readers and salaries ranging from £2,400 to £3,800 for lecturers.\(^4\) The Commonwealth Government accepted these figures and introduced the Universities (Financial Assistance)...

Bill 1964 to amend the Commonwealth contribution for the current triennium. This committed the Commonwealth to additional expenditure of £175,000 based on the assumption that additional fees and State grants would contribute a further £318,000. Although there was still no intention of enforcing the payment of the new salaries, it was a new departure for the Commonwealth Government to make its offer of assistance in this area on the basis of what it felt was desirable rather than on the basis of existing circumstances. Professor Cowan made some interesting observations about this aspect of policy, as illustrated by the salary increases of 1967.

Sometimes the situation is extraordinary. For example, a salary increase was given recently to university staff which operated retrospectively to 1 July 1967. The announcement of the increase was made by the Commonwealth Minister and the Commonwealth got the kudos. The Commonwealth said that it would pay the increase in full in universities in its own Territories, but would support them in the States on the recurrent expenditure formula, if the States agreed to come in on that basis. The States had no choice but to come in, and the tax implications were most interesting. Many university people now found themselves in a tax bracket in which the Commonwealth in respect of each £2.8 of increased salary took back at least £1 in income tax, and so (having regard to the fact that it contributed only £1 on each £2.8) got back at least as much and in some cases more than it had put in to the increased salaries.

The matching grant formula was certainly not without its critics in Parliament. In October, 1966 Mr. Bryant (A.L.P. - Wills) observed: "One of the unhappy features of the present educational activities of the Commonwealth is what we might call the coercion
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of the States by a system of matching grants." If it did not amount to coercion it might certainly be described as a very strong form of persuasion. However, it is difficult to see how some arrangement of this kind could be avoided because, if the Commonwealth was to make some real contribution, it must make its grants in the sure knowledge that State expenditure would not decrease. Otherwise, there may be a tendency for Commonwealth funds simply to replace State funds with the result that the financial position of the universities would remain unchanged.

Furthermore, the entire programme of assistance to the universities was based on the Government's commitment to a federal system with the States accepting constitutional responsibility for education.

Mr. Dean (Liberal - Robertson), speaking on the Budget in 1956, expressed the opinion that the States would not accept their full responsibility until they once more had the right to raise their own funds.

I believe that the time has come for the Commonwealth to return to the States their previously held powers in the income tax field, because until we do that the State Governments will not measure up to their true responsibilities. They will not conduct themselves in the manner in which a Government should conduct itself in financing its works and projects.

The Australian National University

Whilst there may have been some constitutional doubt about the responsibility of the Commonwealth Government with respect to education in the States of the Commonwealth, there was no doubt that it had an obligation to provide adequate educational facilities within its own territories. The first tertiary institution in the Australian Capital Territory was the Canberra University College which was established in 1929 and, until 1960, remained an extension college of the University of Melbourne.

In June, 1946, the Minister for Post-war Reconstruction, Mr. Dedman, introduced a bill for the establishment of a new university to be known as the Australian National University. Mr. Dedman expressed the hope that the new university would "... be established in such a manner that it will bring credit to Australia, advance the cause of learning and research in general and take its rightful place among the great universities of the world."\(^1\)

The new University was not intended to replace or incorporate the Canberra University College but was to be a separate university mainly concerned with post-graduate research. It was envisaged that research would be conducted in the fields of medicine, the physical sciences, the social sciences and Pacific studies.\(^2\) The establish-

2. see Hans., Vol. 187, pp. 1566-9, 2290-2310, 2313-5
ment of such an institution was important because it represented an extension of the Commonwealth's influence on tertiary education. Although it was the Commonwealth Government's prerogative to establish any type of educational institution within its own territories, the Australian National University did not cater for a specific need of the Commonwealth territory within which it was founded. Instead, it was seen as serving the interests of the nation as a whole by bringing together academics of proven ability to carry out research. In this respect it was regarded by some of the State universities as competing with their own long-established schools of research.

Although supporting the Bill, the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Menzies, questioned the wisdom of establishing a medical research school so far from the facilities of the teaching hospitals in the large capital cities. Speaking for the Government, Mr. Beazley (A.L.P. - Fremantle) claimed that there would be no serious difficulty involved if research workers needed to spend some time in a hospital in Sydney or Melbourne to follow up their research.

Apart from some minor points of criticism, most members who spoke on the Bill were in favour of the new university. The two speakers who were most critical of the proposal were Mr. Blain (Independent - Northern Territory) and Mr. Cameron (Liberal - Barker).

2. Ibid., p. 2295
Mr. Blain's main criticism was directed at the proposal for the establishment of a research school of social sciences. Mr. Blain suggested that this school was "... the result of the influence exerted on the Government by the 'rat-bags' who attend the meetings of the Summer School of Political Science" and, further, stated that "We shall be committing a great evil if we permit the Australian National University to be dominated by the pseudo-scientific 'hill-billies', of whom this Government appears to be so fond." ¹

Mr. Cameron disputed the need for a university in Canberra at all.

Once the Bill was passed and the necessary machinery set in motion for establishment of the new university, the majority of references to the Australian National University over the next few years concerned routine matters related to its physical development.

The growing cost of the university was one aspect which was occasionally subject to comment and questions. In November, 1951 the Prime Minister, Mr. Menzies, claimed that the estimates made by the previous Government had proved "grossly inaccurate", ² one example being the cost of the medical school which was now expected to cost £2,000,000 compared with the original estimate of £300,000.

1. Ibid., p. 2302
Questions asked and comments made by members covered such subjects as the letting of contracts for the university buildings, general development of the site and other matters related to physical aspects of the university. Interest was also shown in the appointments that were made to the university staff, although members were frequently advised that the employment of staff was the responsibility of the university council and something over which Parliament had no control.

Once the research programmes of the university were under way, interest in the work being done seemed to be confined to nuclear physics. In October, 1953 Mr. Bourke (A.L.P. - Fawkner) asked what efforts were being made to co-ordinate the work of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Research School of Physics. In reply, the Minister for Supply, Mr. Beale, was not able to give details but said that a long-range plan was being evolved. Mr. Wentworth (Liberal - MacKellar) took an active interest in this aspect of the university and, in 1954, he arranged for Professor Oliphant to deliver a lecture to members of Parliament so that they would be better informed on the subject. At about the same time there was considerable discussion on the desirability of providing extra funds to expedite the completion of a nuclear accelerator at the university.

1. Hans., Vol. R 1, p. 959
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Some members occasionally voiced the opinion that the money which had been spent on the Australian National University would have been better spent on the State universities. In 1953 Mr. Turner (Liberal - Bradfield), whilst not denying that the university may have some merits, complained that "... the undertaking was begun light-heartedly without any real inquiry into its value. Does the Australian National University fit into the scheme of tertiary education in Australia?"\(^1\) Mr. Bourke (A.L.P. - Fawkner) frequently criticised the expenditure of large sums on the new university and contrasted its "opulent financial position" with the "parlous plight of the State universities..."\(^2\)

Over the years there was criticism, from both sides of the House, concerning the concept of a research university which did not provide for undergraduate tuition. Mr. Bourke commented:

... that the work of teaching and research should go hand in hand, and that a university teacher, in order to do his job properly, should engage in research work so that he will be at the top of his field and have the admiration and respect of his students. A research worker should also be a teacher so that he will not have his head in the clouds, but will have his feet on the earth and will face reality.\(^3\)

In 1951, when discussing the estimates, Sir Wilfred Kent Hughes (Liberal - Chisolm) put forward a similar point of view, claiming that
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the Canberra University College and the needs for undergraduate instruction were being neglected.\(^1\) He urged that an undergraduate university be established in Canberra and that the research workers at the Australian National University be required to spend half their time teaching undergraduates. This opinion was not shared by Mr. Drummond (Country Party - New England)\(^2\) or Mr. Cairns (A.L.P. - Yarra)\(^3\) both of whom supported the original concept of the Australian National University as purely a research institution and felt that the Canberra University College should be developed into a full university in its own right.

This controversy about the future of the Australian National University and the Canberra University College continued until 1960, when Government action was precipitated by the reluctance of the council of the University of Melbourne to continue supervising the work of the Canberra University College and awarding its degrees. Finally, in March, 1960 the Prime Minister presented the Australian National University Bill 1960 which provided for the incorporation of the Canberra University College within the Australian National University.\(^4\) Mr. Menzies admitted that the proposal for association had originally met with some opposition from both institutions. However, he claimed that, once the decision had been made and
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representatives of the University and the College had been asked to co-operate in working out the details of association, "... every attitude of hostility to the change seemed to me to disappear."\textsuperscript{1}

During the debate which followed, Mr. Beazley (A.L.P. - Fremantle) voiced his opposition to the Bill on the grounds that the Councils of both the College and the University were against the amalgamation.\textsuperscript{2} Mr. Joske (Liberal - Balaclava)\textsuperscript{3} and Mr. Cairns (A.L.P. - Yarra),\textsuperscript{4} on the other hand, expressed the view that the measure should be supported. Mr. Cairns, who had consistently opposed the idea of amalgamation, stated: "Now that this step has been taken after such a long time and after such a considerable amount of delay, I feel that the right attitude to take is to accept it and to try to make it work as well as we possibly can."\textsuperscript{5}

The association of the University and the College took place at the beginning of 1961. From that time onwards the Australian National University consisted of an Institute of Advanced Studies and a School of General Studies. The post-graduate research activities were conducted by the Institute whilst the School of General Studies was responsible for undergraduate tuition.
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Other Aspects of Tertiary Education

Under the Post-war Reconstruction Scheme, the Commonwealth Government gave assistance to tertiary institutions such as technical colleges and agricultural colleges to assist them in the training of ex-servicemen for their return to civilian life. Once the scheme came to an end, however, the efforts of the Commonwealth Government were directed more and more towards assisting the universities. Nevertheless, during the 1950's, there was a growing awareness of the need to develop the technological and scientific capacity of the nation. The startling advances in this field that were apparent in the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. prompted the smaller industrial nations such as Australia to fear that they might be left behind. In 1956 Mr. Chaney (Liberal - Perth) remarked "With the development of science, and the advent of automation, skilled technicians have become so vital to the community that a country lacking sufficient numbers of them cannot hope to progress."¹ In this respect, he claimed, education was of importance to the defence of the nation. It was his contention that if Commonwealth expenditure on such public works as the building of bridges, at certain strategic locations, could be justified in terms of defence, expenditure on education could surely be justified on the same grounds.

¹ Hans., Vol. R 12, p. 282
Replying to a question from Mr. Erwin (Liberal - Ballarat), regarding the Commonwealth's role in technical education, Mr. Menzies stated:

... I must in the first place say that it is the responsibility of the States, through their technical colleges and schools, to provide the facilities for the training of skilled technicians in Australia. I have no doubt that the matter is already receiving high priority by the States. The Commonwealth Government is aware that any serious shortage of technical man-power is likely to affect national commitments. Any assistance which can be given by the Commonwealth Government to alleviate the shortage must be determined by constitutional responsibility and by the relationship which any assistance might bear to the development of Commonwealth policy.¹

Mr. Menzies then went on to point out the assistance that was being given through grants to the States for university education, claiming that "... this must be regarded as a contribution towards the provision of highly trained technical man-power."²

This policy of confining Commonwealth financial assistance, as far as possible, to university education continued for some years until the Government appointed the Martin Committee to examine the needs of tertiary education in general. Mr. Menzies tabled the "Report of the Committee on the Future of Tertiary Education in Australia" on 24th March, 1965.³ The background of this report has already been discussed.⁴ In presenting the report, Mr. Menzies referred to the
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principal recommendations of the committee and stated the Government's attitude to each. He was careful to preface his remarks with the observation that "... the aspects of education discussed in the report are ones for which the States have normal constitutional responsibility."¹

Mention has already been made of those committee recommendations concerning university scholarships.² The most radical change in policy, recommended by the committee, was the provision of Commonwealth financial assistance to tertiary institutions other than universities. The Government accepted the committee's recommendation that a new type of tertiary college should be established.

These colleges would provide for those students who, though qualified, do not wish to undertake a full university course, or whose chosen course is not considered appropriate for a university, or whose level at passing Matriculation indicated a small chance of graduation from a university in minimum time or minimum time plus one year.³

The new colleges, which were later to be known as colleges of advanced education, were not intended to be simply enlarged technical colleges. They were to provide instruction in a wide variety of subject areas, including technical ones, but, more importantly, they
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would require students to study a common core of subjects aimed at developing "breadth in education" and "critical imagination and creative abilities."¹

The Prime Minister stated that his Government was prepared to support tertiary institutions of this kind, with the proviso that entrance to the courses offered would be by matriculation or its equivalent.² Funds would be made available on the same terms as for universities - £1 (Commonwealth funds) for £1 (State funds plus fees) for capital expenditure and £1 for £1.85 for recurrent expenditure.

The committee recommended that 2,500 new scholarships be provided for students at these colleges.³ Although the Government was not prepared to commit itself to this number, it agreed to provide 1,000 scholarships with the same financial benefits as university scholarships plus £100 per year allowance, free from means test. A suggestion by the committee that these and also the university scholarships should be for full-time study only was rejected by the Government on the grounds that "... there may well be many valid personal reasons why a student chooses to do a part-time course."⁴

The committee also suggested that each State have an institute of advanced colleges to represent the colleges of that State and to make submissions to the Australian Universities Commission.⁵ The
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Government felt that the setting up of institutes was a matter best left to the States and, therefore, the granting of finances would not be made conditional upon the existence of such bodies. The idea that submissions would be handled by the existing Australian Universities Commission was also rejected as it was felt that a separate advisory committee should be formed to deal only with the advanced colleges.

One area in which the recommendations of the Martin Committee were completely rejected was that of teacher training. The committee suggested that the Commonwealth should provide an interim capital grant of £1.25 million and triennial grants, on the same terms as for other tertiary institutions, from 1967 onwards. Mr. Menzies stated that his Government was not prepared to enter the field of teacher training and that decisions about the future of the teachers colleges were best left to the States.

In April, 1966 Dr. Forbes (Liberal - Barker), Minister for Health, gave two reasons for the rejection of the committee's proposals on teacher training:
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fact that, first, in accepting the other recommendations of the Martin Committee, we would be relieving the States directly of what would have been a substantial burden on their budgets and, secondly, that the new financial arrangements made with the States for the next five years would provide large and regular subventions to their overall budgets, and therefore assist them to meet the expense of teacher training.¹

States Grants (Advanced Education) Bills were introduced in 1966 and 1967 to provide finance for the new Colleges of Advanced Education. In 1967, moreover, the Government introduced the States Grants (Teachers Colleges) Bill which provided unmatched grants for the construction and equipping of Teachers Colleges throughout Australia. This Bill made provision for grants totalling $24 million over a period of three years commencing in July, 1967. The grants were made on two conditions - firstly, that State expenditure on education should not decrease and, secondly, that at least 10% of the places available be set aside for students not under bond to the State Education Departments.²

¹ Hans., Vol. R 51, p. 1139
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Summary

Commonwealth assistance to university education began during the Second World War, first as a means of ensuring an adequate number of highly trained men and women to assist the war effort and then as a contribution to post-war reconstruction. In the post-war years it became apparent that the universities were finding it difficult to cope with the unprecedented demand on their services. The States, claiming that the financial burden was too great, welcomed a greater contribution from the Commonwealth Government to university education.

The first type of assistance to become a permanent feature of Commonwealth Government policy was the Commonwealth Scholarship Scheme which began in 1951, having grown out of the Special Assistance Scheme instituted in 1943. During the 1950's the Commonwealth Government also began to provide money for universities by means of States grants in terms of Section 96 of the Constitution. Section 96 made it possible for the Commonwealth to give grants to the States and to stipulate the purpose of the grant as well as the conditions under which it would be given. By conditional grants of this kind the Commonwealth was able to exert pressure on the State Governments to maintain a certain level of expenditure.

When first introduced, these grants were for recurrent expenditure only - the Commonwealth providing £1 for every £3 of States' expenditure plus fees. This formula was later relaxed so that only £1.85 was
needed to attract each £1 of Commonwealth money. The Commonwealth also began to provide grants for capital expenditure on a £1 for £1 basis and, in addition, began to assist the teaching hospitals and to subsidise university salaries.

In 1965, after receiving the Martin Committee's report, the Commonwealth Government widened its sphere of influence further and accepted the Committee's recommendation that colleges of advanced education be established. The Commonwealth initially refused to become involved in the field of teacher training. However, steps were taken in 1967 to provide finance for college buildings and equipment.

The Liberal member for Warringah, Mr. Bland, speaking on the States Grants (Universities) Bill 1953, described the Commonwealth's growing commitment to the financing of tertiary education in the following way:

It may be said to be the child of a marriage of convenience between post-war reconstruction and uniform taxation. It should also be remembered that this is not the last measure of this character which will arise from the alliance of post-war reconstruction and uniform taxation. We have already dealt with State grants, and this bill is another instance of the way in which uniform taxation legislation is distorting the administrative structure of the country, especially that of the federal system.1
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CHAPTER IV

THE SCHOOLS SYSTEM

In contrast with its expanding programme of assistance to the universities, the Commonwealth Government showed no inclination to provide direct financial aid to the State primary and secondary schools. This applied both to the Labour Government, up to 1949, and to the Liberal-Country Party Government which followed. As early as 1946, Mr. Duthie (A.L.P. - Wilmot) referred to a suggestion by the Tasmanian Premier, Mr. Cosgrove, that the Commonwealth should make a grant of £13,000,000 per year to the States for education.\(^1\) Although promises were made that the matter would be considered, the suggestion was never acted upon.

For reasons discussed in Chapter I\(^2\), the primary and secondary school populations began to increase rapidly after World War II and, as might have been expected, overcrowding reached serious proportions in the late 1950's when the children born immediately after the war were moving into the secondary schools. The problem of growing class sizes was mentioned frequently in the Commonwealth Parliament during
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the 1950's and efforts were made to persuade the Government to accept at least some of the responsibility.

In 1952 Mr. Galvin (A.L.P. - Kingston) commented: "All our schools are overcrowded and there is very little chance of the States improving that position unless this Government can again obtain the confidence of the people and float successful loans."\(^1\) Mr. Greenup (A.L.P. - Dalley) claimed that the Commonwealth was taking 80% of the nation's tax yield whilst the States were still expected to accept responsibility for education, water conservation and irrigation, hospitals and other expensive services.\(^2\)

Table 12 shows the result of a survey of secondary school class sizes reported to the House by Mr. Stewart (A.L.P. - Lang) in March, 1956.\(^3\) Mr. Stewart referred to comments recently made by Professor McRae of Sydney University and Dr. Turner of the Sydney Teachers' College to the effect that classes of more than thirty pupils cannot be taught properly.

Interest in education was stimulated in 1957 by the appointment of the Murray Committee to inquire into university education. Mr. Webb (A.L.P. - Stirling) claimed that if Commonwealth assistance could be given to the State universities it could also be given to
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Table 12

Class Sizes in N.S.W. Secondary Schools
1954 & 1955

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1954</th>
<th>1956</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 and over</td>
<td>11 classes or 2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 and over</td>
<td>73 classes or 17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 and over</td>
<td>179 classes or 42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 and over</td>
<td>289 classes or 66.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 and over</td>
<td>345 classes or 81.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 30</td>
<td>87 classes or 18.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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State primary and secondary schools. Mr. Stewart, referring to the extra demands placed on education by automation, pointed to President Eisenhower's recent White House Conference on Education where the remark had been passed that schools have more effect than ever on social welfare. Mention was also made of the efforts of the N.S.W. Teachers' Federation and the Federation of P. & C. Associations who were combining in a campaign for Commonwealth aid to education using the slogan: "The needs of the child cannot wait."

Referring to the 1957-58 budget, Mr. Bryant (A.L.P. - Wills) accused the Commonwealth Government of "strangling" the States by giving them insufficient money for such important works as road building and school building projects. "A democracy such as ours depends for its very continuance on an enlightened and educated community but we find nothing in the budget which admits that the States are incapable of carrying on a proper education system." Some months later, in March, 1958, Mr. Bryant again took up this theme, tendering a large collection of press cuttings which emphasised the problem of overcrowded schools.
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In 1959 Mr. Johnson (A.L.P. - Hughes) provided statistics to illustrate the great increase which had taken place in the school population.¹ In 1946 there had been 691,930 pupils in primary schools and 158,204 in secondary schools. By 1956, the numbers had grown to 1,091,431 and 263,840 respectively. Mr. Johnson also pointed out that in June, 1958 Australia had a total population of 9,846,140 of whom 2,942,810 were aged 14 years or under.

Another problem to which attention was drawn was that of wastage. In August, 1959 Mr. Reynolds (A.L.P. - Barton) referred to a recent statement by Mr. A.H. Pelham who claimed that only 8% of the students entering the first year of secondary school completed the Leaving Certificate. Further wastage occurred in the universities where only 60% to 65% of full-time undergraduates completed degrees and only 33% obtained their degrees in minimum time.²

Agitation on Behalf of Primary & Secondary Schools

Concern for education at the primary and secondary levels did not become a significant issue in the Commonwealth Parliament until the early 1950's. References to the subject became more frequent as the years passed and by the end of the decade it had assumed major importance.
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It was evident from some of the earlier references to the subject that parliamentary interest was being stimulated by growing community concern for conditions in State schools. In 1952 Mr. Opperman (Liberal - Corio) referred to the fact that many school committees, mothers' clubs and education authorities were agitating for Commonwealth assistance. Mr. Opperman made clear his own feelings on the matter when he commented: "From my personal knowledge, I can say that the Communists have now jumped onto this bandwagon." He then went on to ask the Treasurer for a clarification of the issue. In reply, the Treasurer pointed out that the State of Victoria had received £7,000,000 more than its entitlement under the statutory tax reimbursement formula. Loan moneys totalling £225,000,000 in 1951-52 and £135,000,000 in 1952-53 had also been made available. It was, he felt, the responsibility of the State Governments to allocate their funds in such a way as to meet the needs of education.

In October, 1952 Mr. Fitzgerald (A.L.P. - Phillip) referred to a recent request by the N.S.W. Teachers' Federation for a conference of Commonwealth and State Government representatives to consider the need for additional funds for school building as it had been estimated that the school population would increase by 24,000 the following year. When urged by Mr. Fuller (A.L.P. - Hume) to make more funds available Mr. Menzies asserted that "... in the history of the Commonwealth, no
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Australian Government has found so much from its own resources, for State works as this Government has done. We are not able to add to it.\(^1\)

In February of the following year Mr. Joshua (A.L.P. - Ballarat) asked the Prime Minister if the Government would contemplate providing a special allocation of funds for State schools. Mr. Menzies' reply was based on the assumption that the request was for an increase in loan funds and this, he said, was a matter to be decided by the Australian Loan Council.\(^2\) A few days later Mr. Andrews (A.L.P. - Darebin) drew attention to agitation in the metropolitan area of Victoria and asked that a special education grant (in addition to Loan Council funds) be made available to the States. Mr. Menzies replied that "... the capacity of the Commonwealth to make special grants is not inexhaustible."\(^3\) He reminded the House that, in addition to grants for university education, his Government had provided £1,000,000 in the form of scholarships and he concluded by saying:

We shall not weary of well-doing because we attach great importance to these matters. I merely say to the honourable member that to talk in large figures about general grants for educational purposes is to misunderstand the resources of the Commonwealth and the particular function that the Commonwealth has to perform.\(^4\)

In November, 1953 Mr. Clark (A.L.P. - Darling), urging that a greater interest be taken in education by the Commonwealth Government,
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suggested that immigration had been largely responsible for the overcrowding in schools. "Only if the Commonwealth enters the field and makes more money available for the building of schools and the training of teachers can we achieve the standards that we hope to attain." ¹

In the following year, during the Budget debate, Mr. Leslie (Country Party - Moore) put forward a different point of view: "It is time that the States and other bodies ceased making requests for the Commonwealth to pay the piper without being able to call the tune." ² Mr. Andrews (A.L.P. - Darebin), on the other hand, suggested that the Commonwealth should finance education by providing an educational endowment for each family, with parents able to nominate the education authority to which their endowment should be paid. ³

Agitation both inside and outside the Parliament continued and in September, 1954 Mr. Dean (Liberal - Robertson) reaffirmed the Government's contention that: "The matter of education, except in the territories of the Commonwealth, is entirely the responsibility of the State Governments." ⁴ Mr. Dean quoted from a letter sent by a P. & C. Association, as follows:

Our unanimous conclusion is that the needs of the educational system for our children are not being adequately provided for. Our school alone has the following poor conditions: large classes of pupils, inadequate classroom accommodation, insufficient storage
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space, staff rooms and office space; grounds badly
in need of further allocation of money for their
improvement.¹

This, claimed Mr. Dean, was an indictment on the actions of the
N.S.W. State Government.

By 1957 the Labour Opposition had obviously adopted education
as a major issue on which to attack Government policy. One of the
leaders in this attack was the chairman of the Opposition's education
committee, Mr. Bryant (Labour - Wills), who, in September, 1957 stated
that he would "... prefer to see in the budget some sponsorship of the
State education system, some understanding of what education means,
and some appreciation of its deficiencies in this country."²

Referring to aid for primary and secondary education, Mr. Chaney
(Liberal - Perth) commented: "This is one of the most popular themes
throughout Australia at the present time and petitions asking the
Commonwealth to grant further aid to education at the primary and
secondary levels are in process of preparation."³ Mr. Chaney, however,
expressed the opinion that the State Governments would not want
Commonwealth intervention in their affairs. At the same time he
referred to the "magnificent job" which had been done by the Common-
wealth Government in the granting of aid to tertiary education.
Mr. Chaney's remarks prompted Mr. Bryant to retort:
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The honourable member for Perth is ten years behind his own Prime Minister (Mr. Menzies), and goodness knows how far that puts him behind the rest of Australia. In 1946 the Prime Minister, who was then Leader of the Opposition, said in his policy speech that the problem of education transcended any constitutional, legal or formal matter and that his duty, once he became Prime Minister, would be to call together the Premiers of the States and the responsible education leaders and see what could be done about it. But that was more than ten years ago. The honourable member for Perth should turn back the pages of history and catch up a bit.¹

During the same debate Mr. Drummond (Country Party - New England) made the observation that "... you cannot put a coping stone, which is the university, upon a structure that has an insecure foundation or defective middle stories."² He was prepared to agree that the States should look after the "lower spheres of education" but only "with the assistance of much more finance."³

On 27th October, 1957 Mr. Turnbull (Country Party - Mallee) referred to a resolution which had been carried at a recent meeting, in Perth, of the Australian Council of Schools Organizations. The resolution called for an all-party conference representing State and Commonwealth parliaments to discuss the "education crisis".⁴ In reply, the Prime Minister stated: "I do not propose to convene such a conference. I point out to the honourable member that already I am in the middle of trying to do something about the universities of
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Australia. That is a very complex problem and at present I propose to devote my attention to it."¹

Mr. Menzies gave a similar reply, the following day, when Mr. Drummond (Country Party - New England) called for a conference on secondary schools. Mr. Drummond referred to President Eisenhower's statement, after the launching of the Sputnik satellite by the U.S.S.R., in which he called for an increased output of scientists. Mr. Drummond claimed that the output of scientists from the universities was closely linked with the output of potential scientists from the secondary schools.²

During the 1950's the Prime Minister, Mr. Menzies, was frequently reminded of statements that he had made when Leader of the Opposition. In March, 1958, for example, Mr. Cleaver (Liberal - Swan) quoted the statement by Mr. Menzies, in 1945, that "... there is no legal reason why the Commonwealth should not come to the rescue of the States in the education field" and asked the Government to provide aid for State primary and secondary schools "... which would help to overcome serious problems in relation to buildings, equipment, salaries and training of teachers."³ Mr. Menzies replied that his Government had assisted the States "in a big way" as far as university education was concerned and pointed out that supplementary finances had been given to the States to enable them to meet their commitments.⁴
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Later the same day, Mr. Bryant also attacked the Government's policy. Insisting that the Commonwealth Government must accept "... some measure of financial responsibility for the State school system in Australia", he pointed out that twelve years earlier, in the election campaign of 1946, Mr. Menzies had advocated that the Commonwealth should give the States sufficient money to finance their education systems.¹

Mr. Webb (A.L.P. - Stirling), on 1st May, 1958, referred to a number of petitions, urging the Commonwealth to assist the State education systems, which had been brought before the Parliament and he asked the Prime Minister to give them favourable consideration.² Mr. Menzies, in reply, stated that the Commonwealth already provided the States with large sums of money out of which they could finance their own education systems. However, the petitions before the House apparently supported the view that all finance for State primary and secondary schools should come direct from the Commonwealth.

In other words, honorable members are asking the Government to adopt a system under which primary and secondary education shall be within the control of the States for all purposes, but shall be financed exclusively by the Commonwealth, so that the Commonwealth will have all responsibility and no power, and the States will have all power and no responsibility. That is a practice I would not lend myself to extending.³

1. Ibid., p. 148
3. Ibid.
Shortly after he had made this statement Mr. Menzies was asked by Mr. Whitlam (Labour - Werriwa) if it would be possible for the Commonwealth Government to "... ear-mark grants to the States for co-ordinating and fostering technical and secondary and even primary education in the same way as it has, since World War II, ear-marked rapidly increasing grants to the States for universities whose principal source of revenue is now Commonwealth grants?"\(^1\)

Mr. Menzies agreed that this was possible but he rejected any implication that the Commonwealth should take over the financing of education in State schools.

The thing that the honorable member must consider as a student of the Constitution and as, I hope, a supporter of the federal system, is whether he is doing any good service to that structure by setting up another case in which all the responsibility financially is placed on one government and all authority in relation to the subject is reposed in another. That is a thoroughly unsound system.\(^2\)

This statement led to a further question from Mr. Cairns (A.L.P. - Yarra) who suggested that the Prime Minister had showed more concern for the federal system than for primary and secondary education. He asked Mr. Menzies which of the two he would choose if a choice had to be made.\(^3\) The Prime Minister, in reply, commented that question time seemed to be developing into "an argument session" and he claimed that Mr. Cairns was wrong in suggesting that the States were starved of funds for education.\(^4\)
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On 6th May, 1958 Mr. Bryant (A.L.P. - Wills) brought an urgency motion before the House calling upon members to discuss:

The urgent need for the Commonwealth to take action to ensure that sufficient funds are available to each State of the Commonwealth to provide adequate public education facilities for its people.¹

Mr. Bryant claimed that, although it was not mentioned in the Constitution, education was a Commonwealth responsibility. Pointing to the fact that the total expenditure on Australian education in 1901 was less than £2,000,000, with under £200,000 capital expenditure on educational facilities, he stated that the failure to mention education in the Constitution was understandable. He then put forward a number of reasons for increased Commonwealth involvement in education. These included reference to the Commonwealth's policy of bringing overseas students to Australia for study purposes; immigration; the change in the financial relationship between the Commonwealth and the States; the increased demand for higher education; the inadequacy of past provisions for education; and differences in expenditure between the States leading to inequality of educational opportunity from one State to another.²

Referring to the fact that approximately 1,000,000 people had come to the country as immigrants in a period of about 10 or 12 years,
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Mr. Bryant estimated that this would have been responsible for the attendance of about 125,000 additional students in the States' schools. Based on a cost of £60 per annum per child, this would have involved the States in additional expenditure of approximately £7,000,000 per year.¹

Mr. Bryant also compared State expenditure on education with Commonwealth expenditure in other fields. For example, while the States, collectively, were spending £15,000,000 annually on capital works for education, the capital expenditure of the Postmaster-General's Department was more than £30,000,000.² The Commonwealth had recently purchased a dozen Lockheed Hercules aircraft. Each of these cost £1,250,000, or the equivalent of fourteen high schools.³

In making these comparisons, Mr. Bryant claimed that he was not suggesting that the amounts spent by the Commonwealth were necessarily unwarranted. However, he questioned the priorities of the community when such a large proportion of the country's resources could be spent by the P.M.G. and Defence Departments by comparison with the expenditure on education.

Referring to the Constitution, Mr. Bryant declared that: "The dead hand of the 'nineties' should no longer be allowed to strangle

the education systems of this country."\(^1\) The Commonwealth, he claimed, could take over responsibility for the building of schools and the provision of ancillary services without robbing the States of their administrative powers.

In replying to Mr. Bryant's remarks, the Prime Minister, Mr. Menzies, attempted to refute the implication that the Commonwealth was not providing the States with sufficient funds.\(^2\) He informed the members that over a period of seven years (commencing with 1951-52, the first complete financial year of his Government) the States had received from the Commonwealth a total of £1,750,000 (excluding special grants and specific purpose grants). Added to this was a further £475,000,000 raised by loan on their behalf while they, themselves, had raised another £500,000,000 from their own sources of revenue. The States, then, had a total income of £2,725,000,000 and, out of this, their total expenditure on education was £500,000,000 or slightly less than 20%. Mr. Menzies refused to comment on the proportion which had been spent, asserting that this was "... for the States to determine."\(^3\)

Mr. Menzies compared the £1,750,000,000 which his government had given to the States over the period with the £278,000,000 provided in the preceding seven years while the Labour Party was in office. He

admitted that this may not be a fair comparison because during the first three of those years the country was at war. However, he claimed that even in 1948-49 the contribution of the Chifley Government to State finances had not been large and that, had the Labour Party continued in office, the States would not have been as well provided for as at present.¹

The next speaker in the debate was Dr. Evatt (A.L.P. - Barton), the Leader of the Opposition, who attempted to refute the constitutional objections to Commonwealth involvement in education.² He claimed that the amendment to the Constitution which had been passed by referendum in 1946 gave the Commonwealth power to provide "benefits for students". This amendment, he said, made it possible to do all that Mr. Bryant had proposed.³

Dr. Evatt also pointed out that the Murray Report had indicated that only one in four Australian children, with the capacity to graduate from university, had the opportunity to do so.⁴ This implied that there was a need for improved facilities in primary and secondary schools to ensure that students received adequate preparation. Dr. Evatt summed up his remarks by saying:

---
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I have made the point, which I think is unanswerable, that the Commonwealth can act directly, under the new constitutional power given by the Labour Government of Mr. Chifley in 1946, in the matter of education. The Commonwealth would be free of restriction. Apart from this aspect, however, the problem need not be debated on constitutional technicalities in the way that the Prime Minister would wish it to be debated. Consider the need. Is the need there? Does not the Murray report show us the necessity to ensure that not only shall the edifice be properly constructed, but also that the foundations of it shall be well and truly laid. We can only do this by providing adequate primary and secondary educational facilities throughout the States, as well as in the Commonwealth territories, and that can be done only by the provision of more Commonwealth funds.¹

Five other speakers took part in the debate. These were the Postmaster-General, Mr. Davidson (Country Party - Dawson), Mr. Barnard (A.L.P. - Bass), Mr. Turner (Liberal - Bradfield), Mr. Johnson (A.L.P. - Hughes) and Mr. Bland (Liberal - Warringah).

The Government speakers continued to argue that Commonwealth intervention in education was neither possible nor desirable. They pointed out that the State Governments would not welcome such interference in their affairs. Reference was made to the 1954 Premiers' conference where the question of Commonwealth finance for education was discussed. The Premiers were reported to have dismissed any idea of special grants, preferring that any additional funds received should be "without tags".²
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From a practical point of view, the Government speakers claimed that the Opposition's proposal for Commonwealth financing of education would lead to a highly centralised system of education which, they said, was most undesirable. Mr. Davidson (Country Party - Dawson) pointed out the differing conditions (e.g. climate, population density) which existed between States, calling for a diversity of approach which would not be possible under one central authority. Mr. Turner (Liberal - Bradfield) expressed concern that: "The Commonwealth octopus would gradually strengthen its grip on education until our education system became a truly centralized one."2

Answering Mr. Bryant's (A.L.P. - Wills) criticism of the inequality between the State education systems Mr. Bland stated:

I hope there will always be different opportunities for education and that we will not have a dull level of uniformity. Unless we have variations, there will be no progress. I welcome the different standards in the States because they provide opportunities to emulate what has been done elsewhere. One State can draw its plans from the achievements of another.4

Both Mr. Barnard (A.L.P. - Bass) and Mr. Johnson (A.L.P. - Hughes) referred to Mr. Menzies' 1945 speech in which he had expressed the
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opinion that constitutional problems should not prevent the Commonwealth from providing finance to the States for education. Mr. Barnard called for Parliament to set up a committee to inquire into the conditions in schools and into the need for Commonwealth financial assistance.

Mr. Johnson spoke of petitions, bearing 130,000 signatures, which had been received by the Parliament in the previous week. These petitions had drawn attention to the urgent need for improvements to be made in the State education systems and called on the Commonwealth to make the necessary funds available, partly because of the inability of the States to cope with the situation and partly because the migration policy, sponsored by the Commonwealth Government, was a "major factor" in the education crisis.¹

In referring to the petitions which had been received, Mr. Bland (Liberal - Warringah) suggested that the 130,000 names had been collected by "... false agitations which deliberately misled the community concerning responsibility for education generally and the amount that is actually being spent on education."² He also disagreed with the argument that the Commonwealth should provide additional funds because of its migration policies. This, he claimed, was already allowed for in tax reimbursements, which were suitably adjusted to deal with the problem.³
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During the months that followed the urgency debate, Opposition members continued to press for greater Commonwealth involvement in primary and secondary education. On 26th August, 1958, during the Estimates debate, Mr. Menzies made another statement of his Government's policy on this matter. Prompted by the remarks of Mr. Cairns and Mr. Bryant, Mr. Menzies asserted that there was no inconsistency in the fact that the Commonwealth Government gave large sums of money in special grants for university education but no similar grants for primary and secondary education.

The reasons for the Commonwealth assistance to universities were, he contended, not constitutional but historical ones. Grants such as those made for universities could be made for primary and secondary schools under Section 96 of the Constitution. "Constitutionally, of course, we can make a grant to a State in respect of practically anything, attaching such conditions as this Parliament thinks fit. So I do not put it forward as a Constitutional problem and I never have done."

Mr. Menzies gave two historical reasons for the entry of the Commonwealth into the field of university financing. The first was

2. Ibid., pp. 733-4
3. Ibid., p. 737
4. Ibid., pp. 744-5
5. Ibid.
6. Ibid., p. 745
that the Commonwealth had become committed to the financing of universities through the Commonwealth Reconstruction Training Scheme after World War II and was reluctant to withdraw its assistance when the scheme came to an end. The second historical reason was that the Commonwealth had instituted the Commonwealth Scholarship Scheme. This scheme, by enabling more students to avail themselves of a university education, placed more pressure on the universities and the Government, therefore, felt obliged to offer some financial assistance to those institutions.

The Prime Minister also referred to the conference, in August, 1953, between the State Premiers and Commonwealth representatives, where the Premiers made a request for financial assistance for their universities. This, said Mr. Menzies, was the only time that he could remember the Premiers asking the Commonwealth to pay "... for education as a specific subject." He went on to point out that the Commonwealth still only paid part of the cost of running the universities and that responsibility for them remained with the States.

Mr. Menzies maintained that although his Government did not make any specific grants to the States for primary and secondary education it did provide tax reimbursements far in excess of what was required by the formula agreed to in 1947 and, also, subsidised the loan funds which were available to the States.
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So our withers are unwrung on this matter. We have gone the second mile and the third mile and the fourth mile on this question, and in the result the States have had £2,725,000,000, of which £500,000,000 has been spent on education. I do not say good, bad or indifferent about that. All I say is that the States themselves have the right, and they jealously maintain that right, to spend their own money as they think fit, and to exercise their own judgment. In the result, some States have spent a little more on education than others have done, and, so far as I am concerned, they could not spend so much on primary and secondary education that I would be heard to complain about it, because I know of nothing more significant in this country than this kind of training, starting from the very beginning and going through to post-graduate research. But, Sir, my whole point is that this is not a matter on which we intervene.

Such explanations, however, did little to quieten the opposition. In February, 1959, Mr. Stewart (A.L.P. - Lang) claimed that the Commonwealth was responsible for the poor conditions in schools "... because it controls the purse strings" and Mr. Reynolds (A.L.P. - Barton) called for a nationwide inquiry into education. Mr. Bryant (A.L.P. - Wills) compared expenditure on education with Commonwealth subsidies paid to the airlines and Mr. Galvin (A.L.P. - Kingston) continued to press the immigration argument.

Speaking for the Government, Mr. Chaney (Liberal - Perth) expressed his regret that over the past couple of years education had become a "political football". He urged that there should be an inquiry
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into education in order to determine who was to blame for the current problems. He was confident that such an inquiry would prove that the States had been "getting away" with poor management by unfairly blaming the Commonwealth.  

In August and September, 1959, during the debates on the Budget and the Estimates, Opposition members continued to attack the Government's education policy. Mr. Whitlam (A.L.P. - Werriwa), on 20th August, criticised the Budget for not making adequate provision for education. On 2nd September, Mr. Johnson (A.L.P. - Hughes) referred to the Opposition's policy on education by quoting from Dr. Evatt's policy speech delivered on 15th October, 1958.

The Australian education systems face difficulties resulting from increased population, the migration scheme and an increased social demand for secondary education. The children entering the secondary schools in 1959 will be the age group born in 1947 when our birth rate was the highest on record. The teachers entering the profession are drawn from the age group born in the late thirties when our birth rate was at its lowest point. Therefore, a threefold crisis exists, shortage of teachers, a tidal wave of students and insatiable demands for school accommodation beyond the resources of the States.

The migration scheme alone has brought 250,035 children under 14 to Australia in the years 1950 to 1957. We are equally determined that the children shall receive full educational facilities and opportunities. The Labour Government intends to make an immediate and urgent examination of primary, secondary and technical education. The Murray Report shows clearly that there will never be full and adequate university education unless primary, secondary and technical education are also advanced.

The Labour Government will appoint a full representative committee similar to the Murray Committee to examine and report on the needs of primary, secondary and technical education.
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On 3rd May, 1960 the Opposition precipitated another urgency debate. On this occasion the attack was led by Mr. Reynolds (A.L.P. - Barton) who called on the House to discuss:

The failure of the Government (a) to institute a national inquiry to ascertain to what extent Commonwealth assistance is required to provide adequately for primary, secondary and technical education in Australia, (b) to increase the number of Commonwealth scholarships and (c) to provide scholarships for students in secondary and technical education.¹

It would seem significant that, in his opening remarks, Mr. Reynolds made reference to a conference, organised by the Australian Teachers' Federation, to be held in Sydney on 21st May. He stated, moreover, that "... resolutions are being carried by all sorts of organizations from one end of Australia to the other appealing urgently for the Commonwealth Government to make financial aid available for primary, secondary and technical education."²

Mr. Reynolds then employed the popular technique of quoting statements previously made by the Prime Minister. He drew attention to the motion moved by Mr. Menzies on 26th July, 1945, when Leader of the Opposition,³ and contrasted it with a more recent statement by the Prime Minister when, after refusing to consider further Commonwealth assistance to education, he had said: "One hundred speeches on this matter will not change my mind."⁴ During his speech, Mr. Reynolds
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referred to such problems as inequality of opportunity, overloaded classes, the teacher shortage and the need for more Commonwealth scholarships.

The following speaker, Mr. Downer (Liberal - Angas), Minister for Immigration, rejected Mr. Reynolds' inference that the Commonwealth Government was unconcerned about the problems facing the State education systems. He repeated the Government's assertion that education in the States was not the Constitutional responsibility of the Commonwealth although the Commonwealth had, in recent years made large sums of money available for the States to adequately meet their commitments in all fields including education. It was up to the States to decide what proportion of their funds should be spent on education "... and no one - let us admit quite frankly - is quicker to insist on State rights than are State Ministers, whatever their political complexion."¹ With respect to scholarships, Mr. Downer pointed out that the number of these had risen from 2,400 in 1950 to 3,100 in 1959.²

In all, twelve members spoke in the debate. In addition to those named above, they were: Mr. Barnard (A.L.P. - Bass), Mr. Forbes (Liberal - Barker), Mr. Beazley (A.L.P. - Fremantle), Mr. Banditt (Country Party - Wide Bay), Mr. Clay (A.L.P. - St. George), Mr. Bury (Liberal - Wentworth), Mr. Bryant (A.L.P. - Wills), Mr. Snedden (Liberal - Bruce), Mr. Cairns (A.L.P. - Yarra) and Mr. Allan (Country Party - Gwydir).

1. Ibid., p. 1278
2. Ibid.
The Opposition members attempted to prove that the Commonwealth had a responsibility for education other than at the university level. In this context, Mr. Barnard quoted from the Murray Report which said:

Though we made no close inquiry into the arrangements for secondary education we were sufficiently impressed by the evidence presented of wastage of talent at the secondary school level, due to early leaving, to suggest that this problem merits close attention. For example, the 1954 Commonwealth census revealed that only 45.8 per cent. of 15 year olds, 20.5 per cent. of 16 year olds and 9.4 per cent. of 17 year olds are in full-time education of any sort.

Calling for an inquiry, Mr. Barnard pointed out that there were other areas (although he did not name them) in which the States had constitutional responsibility but in which the Commonwealth had "... shown more than a passing interest." Government members, however, refused to entertain the proposal. Mr. Forbes described the idea of a Commonwealth initiated inquiry as "absurd". Mr. Bury and Mr. Snedden insisted that any decision to set up an inquiry into education must be made by the States themselves.

Any attempt by the Commonwealth to influence the State education systems would, according to Mr. Bury, "... gradually destroy the State initiative." He pointed to the fact that once the Commonwealth
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Government had taken the initiative in the granting of scholarships for universities the States had abdicated responsibility in that area. The same, he asserted, would happen with other aspects of school financing and this would eventually lead to the breakdown of federalism. "Here we see the motive of many Opposition members who see this educational issue as an ideal weapon with which to destroy the federal system with the object of centralizing everything in Canberra."¹ This suggestion was not denied by Mr. Bryant, who commented:

"Nothing could epitomize better the difference between us than this discussion does. We on this side of the House look at the schools and at the children and at the opportunities they ought to have. From the other side of the House we have nothing but funds, figures, fantasy and federalism. This, of course, is the difference between the two sides of the House, and this is why the Government finds itself in a completely indefensible position in relation to education."²

Two speakers, Mr. Beazley³ and Mr. Cairns⁴ made specific reference to taxation in their attempt to justify Commonwealth aid for education. Mr. Beazley stated:

"It is true that it is the constitutional responsibility of the States, and also that the Constitution does not envisage the Commonwealth taking charge of education. However, the framers of the Constitution, whatever their slip-shod drafting has led to in High Court decisions, did not envisage either that the Commonwealth would have exclusive taxation powers under uniform taxation, yet we

1. Ibid.
2. Ibid., p. 1289
3. Ibid., p. 1283
4. Ibid., pp. 1293-4
are hopelessly and inextricably involved in the affairs of every State because to-day we finance the vast bulk of the Budget of every State. Therefore, if education is not in an adequate position it is something for us to look at.\(^1\)

It was the view of Mr. Cairns that: "The responsibility is upon the Government either to say to the States, 'We will give you back your taxing powers and you can use them for yourselves', or to say to them, 'We will use the taxing powers adequately'."\(^2\) In response to interjections from Mr. Howson (Liberal - Fawkner), Mr. Cairns admitted that he would like to see taxation increased. Asserting that Australia was one of the lowest taxed countries in the World, he pointed out that since 1951 the total of individual incomes had increased by £1,500,000,000 whilst the taxation levied on those incomes had increased by only £20,000,000.\(^3\)

It is interesting to compare this debate with the one that took place 15 years earlier and which was dealt with in Chapter II.\(^4\) Reference has been made to the idealistic approach to that discussion, with speakers on both sides of the House outlining their own views on the nature of the education process and expressing their belief that a well-balanced education system would create a desirable post-war society.

1. Ibid., p. 1283
2. Ibid., p. 1294
3. Ibid., p. 1295
In the 1960 debate, however, Mr. Beazley was the only speaker who attempted to define education and he did so in the following terms:

> Education is that development of personality which goes on as a result of an individual's learnings, and personality is the sum total of an individual's attitudes and aptitudes. The cultural side of education is the development of attitudes, and the technical side of education is the development of aptitudes.¹

Mr. Beazley credited improved education with a decrease in juvenile delinquency² but pointed out that the task was being made more difficult by increased numbers, particularly in secondary schools because of a greater social demand for secondary education.

The general attitude of other speakers in the debate seemed to be that the effectiveness of education could be measured directly by the amount of money spent and by the number of students completing courses. Mr. Barnard referred to the expenditure per head of population which ranged from 172.5d in Queensland to 256d in Tasmania.³ He also complained that in 1954 there were only 79 science graduates per million of population compared with 336 in Russia and 281 in the United States.⁴ Mr. Bryant was another speaker who criticised the State of Queensland for spending less per head on education than any other State and he also supplied figures showing the number of students who sat for matriculation in the various States.⁵

1. Hans., Vol. R 27, p. 1283
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid., p. 1280
4. Ibid., p. 1281
5. Ibid., p. 1290
This debate, like the urgency debate of 1958, showed the extent to which clear political demarcations had emerged in the subject of education since the first education debate in 1945. Perhaps it is also relevant to note that whereas the debate initiated by Mr. Bryant in 1958 had been terminated prematurely with a Government motion that the business of the day be brought on, the debate of 1960 was permitted to run for the full time permissible under the standing orders.

About four weeks after the urgency debate, the subject of education was again referred to during the debate on the Appropriation Bill (No. 2). Mr. Calwell (A.L.P. - Melbourne), Leader of the Opposition, reminded members once more of Labour Party policy on education as explained in the 1958 policy speech of the former leader. He criticised the Government for not appointing a commission to inquire into primary, secondary and technical education. He stated that Australia's efforts in education compared unfavourably with those of the U.S.A., England and Russia.

Russia does not need to go to war to conquer the World. Russia need only concentrate on its trade possibilities and it can outsell us in all the uncommitted markets of the world and sway neutral Asian countries towards its cause. We have nothing to offer. We are not producing enough, anywhere near enough, scientists or technicians to develop this country. None of us can be smug about the matter.

1. Ibid., pp. 2072 ff.
2. Ibid., p. 2077
3. Ibid., pp. 2077-8
On 1st June, during the same debate, Mr. Reynolds (A.L.P. - Barton) reported that the convention to which he had referred during the urgency debate had been held in Sydney and was attended by 3,200 people from all over Australia pleading for something to be done about education. "But we still think that we can afford a high proportion of cars per capita of population, that we can afford to have luxurious clubs, that we can afford to have huge insurance buildings, and that we can have many other elaborate features."

This type of agitation continued and, as in recent years, was particularly strong during the budget session. Arguments for and against Commonwealth assistance for education remained unchanged. On 8th March, 1961 Mr. Courtney (A.L.P. - Darebin), speaking on the Administrator's Speech at the opening of Parliament, remarked on the fact that the Administrator had made no reference to primary and secondary education. On 14th March Mr. Reynolds (A.L.P. - Barton), speaking in support of a want of confidence motion by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Caldwell), criticised the Government for resisting pleas from "... every section of the Australian community that it should regard education, particularly technical education, as a matter of national importance which is tied to the economy and to the welfare of the Australian people."

1. Vide supra, p. 160
2. Hans., Vol. R 27, p. 2138
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Mr. Reynolds pointed out that the President of the U.S.A. had made more than £2,000,000 available in federal aid to education.

The following week, on 17th May, 1961, Mr. Aston (Liberal-Phillip) presented a petition:

......praying that the House will - (i) make immediately a substantial federal emergency grant to all State governments for education services and (ii) set up a national committee of inquiry patterned on the Murray committee to investigate and report on the needs of primary, secondary and technical education throughout Australia. ¹

During the budget and estimates debates, the Opposition again took the opportunity to attack the Government's education policy. Mr. Whitlam (A.L.P. - Werriwa) spoke of the need to "...invest in the minds and skills of our people" ² and on 6th September Mr. Johnson (A.L.P. - Hughes) moved:

That the vote be reduced by £1 -
Because the Government has failed to comply with the unanimous request of the Premiers to establish a committee to investigate and assess the needs of primary, secondary and technical education on a national basis, to suggest a long-term basis of assistance and to make some special assistance as an interim measure. ³

Mr. Forbes (Liberal - Barker) denied that the Premiers had made a unanimous request for assistance. ⁴ However, Mr. Reynolds (A.L.P. -

1. Ibid., p. 1973
3. Ibid., p. 900
4. Ibid., p. 901
Barton) read, from the official report of proceedings of the Premiers' Conference (15th June), a statement by the Premier of N.S.W., speaking on behalf of all the Premiers:

At this stage, Mr. Prime Minister, I ask the Commonwealth to accept the principle of assisting the States in these directions and to agree to establish a committee to investigate and to make an up-to-date assessment of the needs of primary, secondary and technical education on a national basis, and to suggest a long-term basis of assistance. In view of the urgency of the present situation, I also ask the Commonwealth to agree to make some special assistance as an interim measure. 1

**Aid for Non-Government Schools**

While the argument on Commonwealth assistance for State schools continued there was, in the background, the additional question of whether aid should also be extended to the independent or non-Government schools - the so-called State Aid issue. In August, 1952 Mr. Andrews (A.L.P. - Darebin) claimed that the private secondary schools were in a more desperate position than the universities. With reference to the State of Victoria he said: "Let us face the realities of the position. If the numerous non-Government schools in that State were to close, the situation would be simply chaotic."  2 Two years later, on 8th September, 1954, Mr. Andrews spoke on a similar theme, this time suggesting that parents should receive an education endowment which they could make payable to the education authority of their choice. 3

1. Ibid., p. 903
2. Hans., Vol. 218, p. 760
3. Hans., Vol. R 4, p. 1047
In February, 1956 Mr. Lindsay (Liberal - Flinders), discussing the overcrowding in schools, pointed out that many of the immigrants coming into the country were of the Catholic faith, thus placing a great strain on the Catholic school system. He proposed, therefore, that the Commonwealth should institute a scheme (similar to the Homes for the Aged Scheme) to assist in building Catholic schools.¹ Three years later Mr. Lindsay continued to show an interest in this subject and advocated the subsidising of non-Government schools.² Mr. Minogue (A.L.P.-West Sydney), on 7th May, 1959, also commented on the overcrowding of Catholic schools and criticised the fact that they received no aid from the Government although the parents of the children concerned were tax payers and might reasonably expect some assistance in the education of their children.³

Early in 1961, Mr. Minogue complained that Australia was the only British Commonwealth country where Government aid was not given to denominational schools. In England, he claimed, buildings for schools of all religious denominations were subsidised to the extent of 75% whilst in Scotland 100% of the cost of such buildings was paid by the Government.⁴

For some years, while the leading speakers on both sides of the House engaged in an increasingly bitter argument about aid to the State

1. Hans., Vol. R 9, p. 384
2. Hans., Vol. R 22, p. 401
school systems, discussion about aid to non-Government schools was limited to expressions of personal opinion (similar to those mentioned above) by back-bench members of all three parties. In fact, Mr. Whitlam was later to observe that there had been a "conspiracy of silence" amongst the party leaders on the issue of State Aid. As late as May, 1965, Mr. James (A.L.P. - Hunter) referred to State Aid as "... a very dangerous subject which most members of Parliament dodge."  

In the early 1960's there were members on both sides of the House who expressed concern at the plight of non-Government schools. They represented a sectarian interest which cut across party barriers and their views obviously did not reflect party policy on either side. The first acknowledgment by the Government parties of the need for assistance came in the form of concessions to private schools within Commonwealth territories. In 1962, in the Australian Capital Territory, the Government agreed to guarantee the interest on loans raised for urgent building projects in private schools. Meanwhile, £750,000 was provided to assist the missions in the Northern Territory.  

Mr. Drummond (Country Party - New England) called for an extension of this type of assistance to non-Government schools in the States. He observed that the principle of providing interest-free loans to independent schools and the need to recognise the value of a dual

---

system of education had been accepted at the New South Wales Country Party's annual conferences in 1961 and 1962. It was significant that Mr. Drummond felt obliged to say: "I want to make it clear that, from this stage of my speech onwards, I shall be expressing my own personal opinions as to why and how the principles I have enunciated should operate."\(^1\) His argument was that approximately 25% of Australian children were being educated in non-Government schools. "One-quarter of our school children are in independent schools but the parents of those children have to pay their share of the cost of maintaining the other three-quarters of our children..."\(^2\)

Mr. Monaghan (A.L.P. - Evans), on 21st August, 1962, applauded Mr. Drummond's speech. He pointed out that his party had promised to provide secondary school scholarships tenable at both State and non-State schools. At the same time, however, he issued a mild rebuke to the Labour Party when he said: "... I have no doubt that even my own party has further steps to take along the education path."\(^3\)

Some back-bench Liberal members also had comments to make on this issue. Mr. Chaney (Liberal - Perth) passed the remark that: "The crisis is far greater in the independent schools than any crisis that one could imagine in the State schools."\(^4\) Lest this statement,
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taken out of context, should be misunderstood it must be pointed out that Mr. Chaney was not advocating that the Commonwealth should intervene. He rather inferred that it was up to the State governments to assist independent schools especially those with large migrant populations.

It is often said that the Commonwealth must have a responsibility in this field because it has been responsible for the migrant intake which has increased tremendously the number of school children in Australia. Speaking again of my own electorate, I know that the great percentage of migrant children are not being educated at schools which are controlled by the State. About 90 per cent. of the children at one school in my electorate are migrant children. There is not one State teacher in that school nor is there one building or any facilities which have been provided by the State. The allocation of loan funds to the States takes into account our migrant intake, and that is the reason why additional funds have been made available.¹

Another Liberal member, Mr. Chipp (Liberal - Higginbotham), criticised the Labour Party for being insincere in its education policy because of its neglect of the needs of Catholic schools.

The self-appointed champions of education on the Labour side of this Parliament, including the honourable member for Barton, the honourable member for Wills (Mr. Bryant), the honourable member for Hughes (Mr. L.R. Johnson), and the honourable member for Reid (Mr. Uren), inevitably leave out of any remarks that they make about education one of the most important, fundamental and distressing aspects of this subject. They claim to be concerned because the education at the State level is breeding badly educated Australians and so on, but never do we hear from them any mention of the over 300,000 children who are in Catholic schools to-day.²

1. Ibid., p. 1037
2. Ibid., p. 1094
During Question Time on 11th October, 1962 Mr. Monaghan (A.L.P. - Evans) asked the Treasurer to amend the income tax act to allow parents of children in independent schools to deduct from their taxable income the full amount of school fees.\(^1\) The Treasurer, Mr. Holt (Liberal - Higgins), refused to commit himself to such a change of policy but reminded the House that the present Government had initiated the practice of allowing deductions for education expenses and that the position was reviewed from time to time.\(^2\)

The year 1963 was an important one with regard to policies on State Aid. It was during this year that both parties made important policy decisions on the subject. Early in the year the N.S.W. Conference of the Australian Labour Party appears to have recommended that some assistance be given to both State and non-State schools in the provision of science laboratories and equipment. At the Federal Conference of the Party, later in the year, this move was rejected\(^3\) and the official Labour Party policy on this matter was as follows:

> Citizens who do not wish to use the school facilities provided by the State, whether for conscientious or other reasons, shall have the absolute right to develop an independent system of schools of a recognised standard provided they do so at their own cost.\(^4\)

---

1. Ibid., p. 1408
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This enabled the Liberal-Country Party Government to take the initiative on the issue of State Aid. In the election campaign at the end of 1963 Mr. Menzies announced that science laboratories and equipment would be provided to State schools and independent schools alike and that secondary school scholarships would be available irrespective of school attended. Whether or not this change of policy had any great influence on the outcome of the election is difficult to determine. The Prime Minister, in announcing the early poll, made it clear that the main issue was to be foreign policy because of the position in the newly established State of Malaysia. Nevertheless, when the elections resulted in an increased majority for the Liberal-Country Party coalition, Opposition members suggested that the new provisions to give aid to independent as well as State schools had represented an attempt to buy votes. When speaking on the States Grants (Science Laboratories and Technical Training) Bill 1964, the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Calwell (A.L.P. - Melbourne) declared:

This bill was not the product of any plan or of any thinking. It was begotten because the Government was desperate and needed to buy votes. This bill was conceived in chicanery, born in duplicity and nurtured in deceit. It is obviously the second part of this bill - that dealing with non-government schools - to which the Prime Minister attaches importance. He knows that that is the reason why we have this bill before us at all, and yet he tries to pass that aspect of the question off as if it were merely incidental.

Mr. Calwell recalled that when Mr. James (A.L.P. - Hunter) had questioned the Prime Minister on the Government's policy towards independent schools, the Prime Minister had replied: "The honorable member puts to me a question that is outside the jurisdiction of this Government."¹

Mr. Freeth (Liberal - Forrest), Minister for Shipping and Transport, claimed that the members of the Labour Party were embarrassed by the Government's plans. He claimed that provision of aid to independent schools as well as State schools was: "... an attempt to achieve equality - not an attempt to divide."² With reference to the Labour Party's attitude he said that he was "... amazed that a party which professes to support equal educational opportunities for all should oppose this measure."³

Mr. Bryant (A.L.P. - Wills) described the entry of the Commonwealth Government into this field of education as "haphazard".⁴ Mr. Stewart (A.L.P. - Lang) denied allegations that the Labour Party had changed face on the subject of State aid. "We have stipulated that Labour's aid for education would take the form of a direct payment to students."⁵

1. Ibid., see also Hans., Vol. R 28, p. 514  
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The Bill which was introduced by the Prime Minister, Sir Robert Menzies, on 7th May, 1964 provided for the distribution of £4,952,900 to Government and non-Government schools in the States in terms of Section 96 of the Constitution. A further £47,100 was to be set aside in the Budget for similar purposes in the Australian Capital Territory and the Northern Territory.\(^1\) Division of the money between Government and non-Government schools would be in the same proportion as the distribution of pupils between the two types of schools. For the whole of Australia this resulted in the allocation of £3,653,300 to Government schools and £1,346,700 to non-Government schools. These amounts were to be distributed between the States in proportion to population (see Table 13).

In May, 1965 the States Grants (Science Laboratories) Bill 1965 was introduced. This provided for this type of aid to continue for a further three years.\(^2\) The amounts apportioned to Government and non-Government schools remained unchanged from that shown in the table except that the entire £47,100 provided for the territories was to be distributed to non-Government schools.\(^3\) In the second reading debate the Opposition moved an amendment which condemned the Government for not doing more.\(^4\) Opposition members still called for an inquiry into primary and secondary education.

1. Ibid., pp. 1639-40
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### Table 13

**Science Buildings and Equipment in Secondary Schools**

**Division Between States and Territories**¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Government Schools</th>
<th>Independent Schools</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New South Wales</td>
<td>1,355,000</td>
<td>377,700</td>
<td>121,700</td>
<td>499,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>1,022,600</td>
<td>237,900</td>
<td>139,100</td>
<td>377,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>524,200</td>
<td>109,900</td>
<td>83,300</td>
<td>193,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Australia</td>
<td>337,700</td>
<td>60,300</td>
<td>64,200</td>
<td>124,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td>258,500</td>
<td>58,400</td>
<td>36,900</td>
<td>95,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasmania</td>
<td>120,900</td>
<td>25,100</td>
<td>19,500</td>
<td>44,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All States:</strong></td>
<td>3,618,900</td>
<td>869,300</td>
<td>464,700</td>
<td>1,334,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Territory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; Northern Territory</td>
<td>34,400</td>
<td>9,900</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>12,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,653,300</td>
<td>879,200</td>
<td>467,500</td>
<td>1,346,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹. Ibid., p. 1640
In November, 1965 Sir Robert Menzies announced a plan to give additional aid to private schools in the Commonwealth Territories.¹ Replying to a question by Sir Wilfred Kent Hughes (Liberal - Chisholm) the Prime Minister said that additional funds would not be provided for the States to enable them to grant similar assistance.²

In December, 1965 the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Calwell, sought leave to make a personal explanation. He claimed that he had been misrepresented in the press where it was reported that he had said that State Aid had "come to stay". He claimed that he had made no such statement and had said nothing to suggest that his party's policy on State Aid had changed. He had said, however, that he proposed to examine the possibility of finding a new formula within the terms of existing policy.³

In the following year (1966) Government members continued to attack the Australian Labour Party for its neglect of the needs of independent schools. Dr. Forbes (Liberal - Barker) remarked:

... so deep are their convictions, so sincere their protestations and so pure their motives that the 20 to 25 per cent. of Australian children who attend non-Government schools can go to hell if I may employ a phrase used in a circular sent around by a man who has held high office in the Australian Labour Party.

2. Ibid., p. 2594
In August, 1966 Mr. Calwell promised that if the Labour Party were to win the forthcoming election there would be an immediate inquiry into education. Some days later Mr. Barnard (A.L.P. - Bass), speaking on the subject of State Aid, said:

I remember the last Prime Minister saying at Bathurst in a sparkling speech how he could not understand how anybody could quarrel with the irresistible logic of State Aid. He was Prime Minister for 12 years before he discovered its irresistible logic and he was assisted to discover its irresistible logic when his majority in this House was cut from 32 to 2.

Mr. Reynolds (A.L.P. - Barton), in September, claimed that State Aid policy had never been debated within the Liberal Party as it had been in the Labour Party. In October Mr. Duthie (A.L.P. - Wilmot) said of State Aid:

The policy of aid to independent schools seems to have died a very strange death in recent months but I doubt whether it will always be a dead issue. Far from it. It will be a live issue in this country for many decades to come. As both parties have now established their policy on this matter a very important decision has to be made. The independent schools need not think that they have come to the end of their journey and the end of their fight for funds to carry on their schools. I strongly suggest the setting up of an independent schools commission to handle this matter, the importance of which will not decline for many years. I suggest that an independent schools commission be established and operate on a permanent basis similar to that on which the Australian Universities Commission operates and that it be composed of top educationists, economists and researchers. In other words, the commission should be a permanent non-government body.

2. Ibid., p. 539
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The following day, on 12th October, 1966, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Whitlam, (A.L.P. - Werriwa) moved that the expenditure for the Prime Minister's Department be reduced by $10. He condemned the Government for failing "... to conduct an inquiry into all aspects of education in government and non-government schools and for its failure to make adequate provision for teacher training." Mr. Whitlam stated that in Australia's dual education system it would be wrong for the Commonwealth to help one sector only. "It must help both if it is to help either." 

Early in 1967 Parliament passed the States Grants (Science Laboratories) Bill 1967 which doubled the annual amount to be paid to State and independent schools over the next three years.
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Summary

During the period 1945-1967 the Commonwealth Government appeared reluctant to become involved in the direct financing of the State school systems. Only towards the end of the period did the Commonwealth begin to provide grants for selected aspects of secondary education (i.e. the provision of science teaching laboratories and libraries) and at no stage were special grants made for State primary schools.

It is apparent that, as time went on, there was growing public concern over the inadequacies of primary and secondary schooling throughout the Commonwealth. Members of Parliament frequently referred to public meetings and petitions, usually organised by parent or teacher organisations, calling for greater Commonwealth involvement in this aspect of education.

Interest in primary and secondary education was stimulated by the appointment of the Murray Committee to investigate university education. This set a precedent for Commonwealth activity in an aspect of education which had previously been regarded as the responsibility of State governments. The Committee's report, moreover, made a passing reference to the problem of "wastage" in education, pointing out that many potential university students failed to complete a satisfactory secondary education.
For many years the Liberal-Country Party Government consistently adopted the attitude that it was the responsibility of the States to make decisions about primary and secondary education. It was argued that the Commonwealth had greatly increased the amount of tax reimbursements and loan moneys available to the States and that it was up to the State governments to see that education was adequately provided for.

During the 1950's this developed into a political issue with the Labour Opposition calling for an inquiry into education at all levels and condemning the Commonwealth Government's apparent neglect of the nation's schools. Members of the Opposition's Education Committee kept the issue before Parliament during budget debates and by introducing urgency motions.

One aspect of the topic which seemed to be avoided by the party leaders was the so-called State Aid issue. Agitation on behalf of non-government schools came from back-bench members on both sides of the House and it was not until 1963 that the major political parties developed official policies in this area. The Australian Labour Party promised to provide secondary scholarships irrespective of school attended but rejected the idea of direct financial assistance to private schools. The Liberal and Country Parties then took the initiative in this field. In the election campaign of 1963 the Government introduced its proposals for grants to assist in the provision of science laboratories in both State and independent schools.
CHAPTER V

COMMONWEALTH EDUCATION POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION

The establishment in 1945 of the Commonwealth Office of Education represented an admission by the Commonwealth Parliament that it had some commitment to and interest in education. It had already become involved, through the Commonwealth Technical Training Scheme and the Commonwealth Reconstruction Training Scheme. The original purpose of the Commonwealth Office of Education and the Universities Commission was stated as being: "... to provide for the university training of discharged members of the forces, to provide for financial assistance to students, and for other purposes."¹

Thus, the framers of the first Education Act, whilst setting up the Office for a fairly limited purpose, wished to leave the way open, by inclusion of the words "for other purposes", for a broader commitment and responsibility if this should become desirable. Indeed

¹ Hans., Vol. 185, pp. 6132-3
the functions of the Office as outlined by Mr. Dedman indicated a desire by the Government to have a closer contact with the various education authorities. The functions of the Commonwealth Office of Education were:

(a) to advise the Minister on matters relating to education;
(b) to establish and maintain a liaison on matters relating to education, with other countries and the States;
(c) to arrange consultation between Commonwealth authorities concerned with matters relating to education;
(d) to undertake research relating to education;
(e) to provide statistics and information relating to education required by any Commonwealth authority;
(f) to advise the Minister concerning the grant of financial assistance to the States and to other authorities for educational purposes.\(^1\)

The purpose of this Chapter is to discuss the policies of the Australian Labour Party on the one hand and the Liberal-Country Party coalition on the other with respect to the role of the Commonwealth in education and to examine the development of the Commonwealth Office of Education and the eventual establishment of the Ministry of Education and Science.

\(^1\) Hans., Vol. 184, pp. 4133-4
The Development of Party Policy

It is not a simple task to determine which statements made by members in the House were expressions of party policy and which were merely indications of personal opinion. During the period of Labour Government until 1949, Mr. J.J. Dedman, Minister for Post-War Reconstruction, was responsible for handling all educational matters and for establishing the Commonwealth Office of Education. When the Labour Party was defeated in 1949 Mr. Dedman lost his seat and for some time the Labour Opposition seemed to be without any obvious leader with respect to its education policy. During the 1950's, however, the Labour Party set up its own education committee with the result that there were several opposition spokesmen on education, notably Messrs. Bryant, Johnson, Beazley and Reynolds, whose comments may generally be taken to reflect Labour policy. So, also, may the speeches of the leaders and deputy leaders of the party during that period - Dr. Evatt, Mr. Calwell and Mr. Whitlam. For the Liberal-Country Party coalition, both in opposition and in government, the undisputed authority on education policy was Mr. Menzies. This policy was strictly adhered to by senior cabinet ministers when making statements.

From the statements of policy made by these members as well as the observations of other speakers we may obtain some idea of the development of party policy during the period.
On 3rd December, 1946 Mr. Duthie (A.L.P. - Wilmot) commended the Government on its entry into the field of education.

We all agree that in these days, when there is such a clash of "isms" in the world and when we must fight to safeguard the fundamentals of democracy, education should be tackled as a national, as well as a State, problem.¹

In September, 1948 the Minister for Labour and National Service, Mr. Holloway (A.L.P. - Melbourne Ports) made the proud boast that: "Never in history were universities subsidized so that poor people and their children could obtain higher education under such favourable conditions as exist at present ... At the next election the people will recognize the value of the Government's efforts and return it to office."²

In the 1950's when the Liberal-Country Party coalition was in office discussions on Commonwealth involvement in education became more and more concerned with the question of Commonwealth-State financial relationships. In September, 1953, for example, in reply to a question from Mr. James (A.L.P. - Hunter) the Treasurer, Mr. Fadden (Country Party - McPherson) claimed that the conditions in schools were the responsibility of the States as they had loan moneys at their disposal to spend as they saw fit.³ In 1955 Mr. Bland (Liberal - Warringah)

¹. Hans., Vol. 189, p. 892
². Hans., Vol. 198, p. 372
³. Hans., Vol. 1, p. 9
complained that the system of uniform taxation was "... undermining not only the authority of the States, but also the power and independence of the Commonwealth."¹

When asked by Mr. Johnson (A.L.P. - Hughes) to establish a Commonwealth Ministry of Education and to consult more closely with the States, Mr. Fadden, who was at that time acting Prime Minister, replied:

Being an ardent advocate of the inviolability of State rights, I would not be a party to taking from the States any of their responsibilities in regard to education nor any of the benefits that have followed from the administration of educational facilities by the States.²

On 18th September, 1956 Mr. Johnson (A.L.P. - Hughes) called on the Government to set up a commission in co-operation with the State governments to consider the needs of education over the next five years. "This matter is above party politics because the future welfare of Australian children and of Australia itself is involved in the adequacy or otherwise of State educational facilities."³ In reply, Mr. Cramer (Liberal - Bennelong), Minister for the Army, pointed out that more money had been given by the Government for education than by any previous government, claiming that: "... this is the only Commonwealth Government in history that has actually taken a direct interest in and given assistance to education."⁴
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Mr. Menzies made it clear that he did not wish to undermine, in any way, the administrative authority of the States. He also dismissed the idea that the impact of the Commonwealth's immigration policy should be used as a pretext for Commonwealth intervention in education. These two points are illustrated by his reply to a question asked by Mr. Ward (A.L.P. - East Sydney) on 9th April, 1957. Mr. Ward spoke of the recent dismissal of a number of teachers in N.S.W. through lack of finance, of the increase in class sizes in schools and of his belief that the present situation was largely due to immigration. He asked if the Commonwealth would, therefore, provide additional finance to overcome the problem. Mr. Menzies refused to make any comment on the staffing and administrative decisions of the N.S.W. Education Department as such matters were outside his responsibility. With reference to immigration, he commented: "Additions to the population, whether from natural increase or from immigration, automatically result in proportionate increases in the amount of the annual reimbursement grant to the States."  

During the 1950's as has been discussed in previous chapters, the Commonwealth had assumed considerable responsibility for the financing of university education. Its entry into this field and especially the appointment of the Murray Committee and acceptance of its report prompted a call for assistance in other sections of the
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education system. It was the conviction of Government members, however, that there was a special case for assistance to universities, they being autonomous bodies and a precedent having been set for their assistance during the war.

In March, 1958, having been asked by Mr. Webb (A.L.P. - Stirling) to accede to the petitions which had been received and grant aid to State education systems, Mr. Menzies said that such a move would "break new ground" and since it involved a change of Government Policy he was not at liberty to give his view in answer to a question. Later, however, when replying to a request by Mr. Whitlam (A.L.P. - Werriwa) for earmarked grants to the States, Mr. Menzies made his feelings clear by commenting that such a plan would be unsound as it would tend to undermine the Federal system. When asked by Mr. Cairns (A.L.P. - Yarra) if he were more concerned with the Federal system than with the nation's schools, Mr. Menzies denied that the States were being starved of funds by the Commonwealth.

On 21st August, 1958 Mr. Stewart (A.L.P. - Lang) informed the House that the Labour Party had an "active education committee" which

1. *Vide supra*, p. 156 f.
2. *Vide supra*, Ch. IV above
had been preparing a policy for the forthcoming elections. ¹ This committee had already become quite vocal in the House with its chairman, Mr. Bryant (A.L.P. - Wills), leading an urgency debate in May.² Mr. Luchetti (A.L.P. - Macquarie) referred in September to the policy of his Party which, he claimed had consistently advocated a thorough inquiry into education.³

From this time on the Labour Party's policy became an integral part of the Opposition's tactics in the House. Every opportunity was taken to criticise the Government's education policy. At the end of 1961 a general election resulted in the Government being returned with a slender majority. When Parliament resumed in 1962 the Leader of the Opposition moved a Want of Confidence motion and the Government's failure to do enough for education was one of the points which he raised.⁴

In May, 1962 Mr. Reynolds (A.L.P. - Barton) brought forward a new argument in favour of Commonwealth involvement in education. He claimed that, as a direct result of restrictive economic measures taken by the Government, there were fewer job opportunities and a large number of pupils had been forced to stay at school. These pupils who were unable to find jobs were receiving education at the
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expense of the States rather than unemployment benefits at the expense of the Commonwealth.¹ Later in the year, on 15th and 23rd August, Mr. Reynolds presented two petitions seeking from the Commonwealth an immediate emergency grant for education and the setting up of a commission of inquiry.²

On 29th August, 1962, in reply to a question from Mr. Einfeld (A.L.P. - Phillip) regarding problems in teacher training, the Prime Minister remarked: "It seems a very ill thing to cast me in the role of a man who is hostile to education, when I am not. We have done a great deal about education. I have nothing to add to what I have said previously."³

In November, 1962 Mr. Menzies tabled a paper entitled "The Commonwealth and Education".⁴ The paper was debated on 6th December, the first speaker being Mr. Whitlam (A.L.P. - Werriwa), Deputy Leader of the Opposition, who attacked the Government for its failure to do more for education.

As a guide to education in the future, the Prime Minister's paper offered nothing. Those who were looking forward to a clear statement that the Commonwealth Government was preparing to meet the grave educational situation which faces Australia have been outspoken in their disappointment. There is no sign that the Government intends to stir beyond its present frontiers and its present horizons. It contemplates no more active role in education than it has played in the past.⁵
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During this debate both Mr. Forbes (Liberal - Barker)\(^1\) and Mr. Turnbull (Country Party - Mallee)\(^2\) referred to the activity of pressure groups, in particular the Teachers' Federation, and suggested that they were causing the problem to be exaggerated. Mr. Reynolds and Mr. Bryant were named as two members who, being ex-school teachers, were representing the interests of the Teachers' Federation.\(^3\)

In August of the following year Sir Robert Menzies made further reference to the activity of pressure groups when he referred to a large newspaper advertisement sponsored by the "Victorian Teachers Union of 22,000 teachers". After quoting from the advertisement, which was highly critical of him personally, Mr. Menzies commented: "The reference to 22,000 teachers has a slight suggestion of pressure about it. Speaking for myself, I can resist nothing as well as that kind of pressure."\(^4\) Sir Robert went on to say that he was speaking "... as a man who has done more for education than any other Prime Minister in the history of this country."\(^5\)

At the end of 1963 a general election was called. The Parliament had not run a full term but, with a majority of only one after election
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of a Speaker, the Government had been waiting for an opportune moment to go to the polls. As has been suggested elsewhere,¹ the main issue on which the Prime Minister justified an early election was foreign policy because of the uncertainty of the situation in South-East Asia. However, it would appear that education policy played a more prominent part than in previous elections. The Liberal-Country Party coalition was returned to Government with an increased majority. In announcing his ministerial arrangements to the new Parliament, Sir Robert Menzies informed members that in future the Minister for Works, Senator Gorton, would also be Minister assisting the Prime Minister in Commonwealth activities relating to education.²

During the election the Government had promised new education measures. As well as continuing its support of the universities the Government proposed the following measures:

It will introduce a scheme of secondary school scholarships involving 10,000 awards annually, open competitively to all secondary school students for the last two years of secondary education, and providing a maintenance grant of £100 per annum without means test and up to £100 per annum for fees and books. There will be 2,500 scholarships annually on a comparable basis for students at technical schools. An amount of £5,000,000 per annum will be made available to all secondary schools, government and independent for the provision of building and equipment facilities for science teaching. There will be an annual grant of £5,000,000 to the States towards the building and equipment costs of technical schools.
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Mr. Barnard (A.L.P. - Bass) speaking on the Governor-General's speech, said:

Although we have no quarrel broadly with the Government's education policy, as outlined in the speech, the House should be reminded that the Government is now implementing, at least partly, a policy that has been advocated by members of the Opposition over the last fourteen years.

He went on to ask why the Government had not accepted the Opposition's other recommendations - the establishment of a Ministry and the setting up of a committee of inquiry.²

As the Government put its proposals into operation there was some criticism, from Labour members, of the manner in which scholarships were to be awarded. Mr. Reynolds (A.L.P. - Barton) was highly critical of the introduction of new external examinations as a means of allocating Commonwealth secondary scholarships.³ Labour policy differed from that of the Government, he said, because it supported the granting of scholarships to all students who qualified for the final two years of secondary school. The Leader of the Opposition also condemned the introduction of scholarships on this basis.

It is a scheme which will inaugurate an era of savage competition in our schools, and this will make life miserable for parents and children alike. What will this competition strive to test? It will be a test of the pupil's ability to pass examinations and nothing more.⁴
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The respective policies of the Government and Opposition appeared to remain unchanged during the next two years. In January, 1966 Sir Robert Menzies retired and was succeeded as Prime Minister by Mr. Holt (Liberal - Higgins). In the new ministry Senator Gorton continued as Minister assisting the Prime Minister in Commonwealth activities in education and research. Mr. Griffiths, on 21st April, 1966 asked the Prime Minister whether a recent statement by Senator Gorton reflected Government policy. Mr. Holt deferred his reply until 13th May when he supplied an outline of Senator Gorton's remarks as follows:

There are a number of people who urge that the Commonwealth Government should make increased grants to the States for 'education'.

If this refers to an increase in general grants then the Commonwealth, even if it increased general grants, would have no constitutional power to direct that the increase in the general grants was spent on education. We have no constitutional power to direct States as to how their general grants should be spent or as to the priorities they decide on.

The only way that the objective advocated by these people could be attained would be by the making of special grants, under Section 96 of the Constitution, directed to a particular area of education and under laid down conditions.

Even then the objective of these advocates would not be attained unless one of the conditions laid down was that the level of State spending on education should not decrease and also that the annual level of increase in money spent on education because of an increasing State Budget should continue.
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Labour members continued to accuse the Government of using a change in education policy to buy votes in the last election. For example, Mr. Daly (A.L.P. - Grändler), on 25th August, 1966, condemned a recent statement by the Prime Minister who said that education was above party politics and that he would not use it to bargain for votes.

Did you ever hear anything so hypocritical? This Government won an election by tempting the people on this issue and now, because it has won every possible vote by bribery, it says: "We are now stepping out of this field. We are statesmen. You can be politicians and go for the votes." I am pleased the Prime Minister is in the chamber to hear what I have to say.¹

During the year 1966 a document entitled "The Commonwealth Government in Education" was printed. In tracing the historical development of Commonwealth interest in education, the document claimed that this interest had been dramatically extended "... in five new directions - aid to students; grants to educational institutions in the States; international aid; post-graduate research; and capital grants to independent schools in internal territories."² In a supplement to the booklet figures were provided to show direct Commonwealth expenditure on education since 1960 (see Table 14).
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants to States for Universities</td>
<td>22,454</td>
<td>28,322</td>
<td>31,418</td>
<td>33,860</td>
<td>41,274</td>
<td>46,778</td>
<td>54,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian National University</td>
<td>7,146</td>
<td>10,440</td>
<td>9,916</td>
<td>13,318</td>
<td>16,792</td>
<td>17,720</td>
<td>19,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance to Australian Students</td>
<td>7,288</td>
<td>8,104</td>
<td>9,494</td>
<td>10,446</td>
<td>15,474</td>
<td>21,019</td>
<td>25,939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Grants for Technical Schools</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>6,230</td>
<td>11,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants for Science Facilities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>9,878</td>
<td>10,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Projects</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,378</td>
<td>1,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges of Advanced Education</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>8,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education in Commonwealth Mainland Territories</td>
<td>6,088</td>
<td>6,026</td>
<td>5,972</td>
<td>7,034</td>
<td>7,852</td>
<td>10,681</td>
<td>12,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Aid</td>
<td>4,518</td>
<td>5,218</td>
<td>5,966</td>
<td>6,788</td>
<td>7,204</td>
<td>7,424</td>
<td>8,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Direct Expenditure</td>
<td>2,232</td>
<td>2,518</td>
<td>2,510</td>
<td>2,842</td>
<td>3,018</td>
<td>3,148</td>
<td>3,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49,726</td>
<td>60,628</td>
<td>65,276</td>
<td>74,288</td>
<td>111,614</td>
<td>125,238</td>
<td>155,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Expenditure by the Administration of Papua and New Guinea</td>
<td>5,020</td>
<td>6,546</td>
<td>8,082</td>
<td>11,910</td>
<td>11,984</td>
<td>14,120</td>
<td>not yet announced</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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At the end of 1966 an election was held and the Holt Government was returned to office. One of the Government's first acts was to establish a Ministry of Education and Science with Senator Gorton as the Minister. To do this the number of ministries was increased by one under the Ministers of State Act 1967. The Opposition opposed the increased ministry, not because they objected to a Ministry of Education but because they wanted to see a consolidation of existing ministries.

The Commonwealth Office of Education

The establishment of the Commonwealth Office of Education, its purposes and functions have been dealt with elsewhere.\(^1\) It was more than twenty years after the establishment of the Office that a full-time minister was appointed. The first member of the House to call for the establishment of a ministry appears to have been Sir Earle Page (Country Party - Cowper) speaking during the urgency debate of 1945.\(^2\) Commenting on Mr. Dedman's plan to set up a Commonwealth Office of Education, he said that he "... would prefer a Commonwealth Minister for Education who could be specifically responsible for this problem. He would be kept fully employed. Before the war there was considerable need for an extension of educational activity and Commonwealth aid. The circumstances of the war have enormously heightened that need."\(^3\)
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However, it was not until 1963, when establishment of a Ministry of Education became official Labour Party policy, that this subject assumed any importance. Until that time it had been customary, under the Liberal-Country Party administration, for education to be the sole responsibility of the Prime Minister's Department. After the 1963 general elections a minister was given the task of assisting the Prime Minister in dealing with Commonwealth activities in education. It is perhaps significant that this task was given to a member of the Senate (Senator Gorton) so that the Prime Minister, Sir Robert Menzies, continued to be the Government's spokesman on education in the House of Representatives. It was not until Sir Robert Menzies had retired and the Holt Government had won an election in its own right (in 1966) that the post of Minister for Education and Science was created.

From the comments made by members about the Commonwealth Office of Education during the first few years of its operation, it would seem that they were mainly concerned with the staffing of the Office and its publications. Liberal and Country Party members, during the period of Labour Government, were obviously concerned that the Office may be used for propaganda purposes. After the change of government in 1949 members of the Labour Opposition were critical of a tendency for expenditure on the Office to be reduced.
On 10th July, 1946, in reply to a question by Mr. Beazley (A.L.P. - Fremantle), the responsible Minister (Mr. Dedman) informed the House that staffing was not yet complete and that consideration was being given to research into the needs of the State education departments.¹ In March the following year Mr. Beazley again asked if the recruiting of staff was completed, if research was being carried out and if the Office would give advice about Commonwealth assistance to the States for education. Mr. Dedman replied that recruiting was still not complete, that a limited amount of research was being undertaken and consideration was being given to the need for aid preliminary to making recommendations to the Government.²

One of the early activities of the Commonwealth Office of Education was the publication of posters and pamphlets, such as the Current Affairs Bulletin, for use by interested groups to stimulate discussion. Some of these came in for criticism from Opposition members. On 20th October, 1948 Mr. Abbott (Country Party - New England), in a question to Mr. Dedman, drew attention to Poster No. 19 which had been described in the Sydney Daily Telegraph as being offensive to the United States of America.³ The following day Mr. Spender (Liberal - Warringah) moved the adjournment of the House in order to call attention to:
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The serious penetration, with governmental approval or permission, of subversive influences into the instruments of government and the use of government agencies, in particular the Commonwealth Office of Education for purposes subversive of the interests of Australia, and the use of public moneys to such purposes.

Mr. Spender described the poster to which Mr. Abbott had referred. On this poster was a cartoon which inferred that all aspects of political life in America were controlled by "Big Business". "The nature of the cartoon is deliberately disgraceful. The propaganda contained in it, and in the poster generally, is not merely similar, but indeed an exact parallel to what can be read in any Communist newspaper published in this country." In reply, Mr. Dedman informed the House that he had instructed the Office of Education not to issue any more copies of the poster. When asked to dismiss the officer responsible for the poster, Mr. Dedman defended the person concerned claiming that he had "... made a slight error of judgment..."

In November, 1948 Mr. Fadden (Country Party - Darling Downs) referred to Poster No. 21 which purported to show details of the Commonwealth Government's 1948-49 Budget. Mr. Fadden claimed that the poster gave a distorted view because it showed an exact balance between receipts and expenditure whereas the Government had budgeted for a deficit to be financed out of loan moneys. Mr. Chifley later advised the House
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that the figure on the poster had been simplified for the sake of clarity but that this had been fully explained in a footnote on the poster and in a discussion brief designed to be read in conjunction with the poster.¹

The charge of Communist influence in the Commonwealth Office of Education was again raised in February, 1949 by Mr. Lang (Lang Labour - Reid) who moved the adjournment of the House in order to discuss:

The urgent necessity for investigation, by a committee of this House, into the distribution of pro-Communist posters and literature by the Commonwealth Office of Education, in order to determine (a) the responsibility for such anti-Australian propaganda, (b) the channels of distribution, and (c) whether the expenditure thereon is constitutional.²

The posters referred to by Mr. Lang were No. 8, "White Australia on Trial"; No. 16, "Yugoslavia to-day"; and No. 17, "Fire over Malaya".³ Mr. Dedman replied that the discussion posters were purchased by a large number of organisations including "... commercial organizations, church bodies, adult education departments, the Workers Educational Association, and branches of the Labour and Liberal parties."⁴
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Publication of the discussion posters continued after the Liberal-Country Party coalition assumed office but ceased in 1951. In March of that year, in reply to a question by Mr. Clyde Cameron (A.L.P. - Hindmarsh), the Prime Minister (Mr. Menzies) said that publication of the posters had been discontinued partly because of cost and partly because of "... certain administrative difficulties."\(^1\)

On 12th July, 1951 the Prime Minister replied to a question upon notice from Mr. Clark (A.L.P. - Darling) who had asked for an account of the functions of the Commonwealth Office of Education and for details of the number employed by the Office in each State. He also asked about the sales of publications by the Office.\(^2\) After recounting the functions of the Office, Mr. Menzies provided information on staffing as set out in Table 15.

**Table 15**

Staff employed by the Commonwealth Office of Education in each State - July 1951.\(^3\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Staff Employed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New South Wales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Office</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Branch Office</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Australia</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasmania</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Territory</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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With regard to publications, Mr. Menzies stated that the only literature sold was adult education material (such as the Current Affairs Bulletin) and that, as some of these were sold below cost to Commonwealth Departments, State Education Departments and adult education authorities, sales did not cover the Office's expenditure "to any appreciable extent".\(^1\)

The Commonwealth Office of Education received considerable attention in November, 1951 during the debate on the Estimates. Mr. Bland (Liberal - Warringah) expressed the opinion that there was "... no room for a Commonwealth Office of Education" and suggested that the establishment of the Office represented an attempt by the previous Government to take over the functions which were already adequately performed by the States.\(^2\)

Mr. Haylen (A.L.P. - Parkes) disagreed. He applauded the involvement of the Commonwealth in education and made the comment that: "Within their limited constitutional powers both the previous Government and the present Government have done a remarkably good job in that field."\(^3\) Mr. Burke (A.L.P. - Perth)\(^4\) and Mr. Pollard (A.L.P. - Lalor)\(^5\) drew attention to the fact that in the estimates for the Prime Minister's Department the only item of expenditure which had been reduced from the previous year was that for the Office of Education.
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Mr. Menzies explained the reduction by informing the House that the Commonwealth Scholarship Scheme, although financed by the Commonwealth, would henceforth be administered by the States. Thus, the numbers of employees required in the Commonwealth Office of Education would be reduced but the Commonwealth's expenditure on education in the form of scholarships and grants to universities would be more than ever.

The whole burden of what the honourable member for Lalor had to say was that we are cutting down on the Commonwealth facilities for education. In point of fact, this Government is providing the greatest sum of money that has ever been provided for education in the history of the Commonwealth.¹

Two years later, when discussing the Estimates for 1953-54, Mr. Leslie (Country Party - Moore) referred to this again. He pointed out that, although under the estimates for the Prime Minister's Department the sum of £151,500 was set aside for education, there were other provisions elsewhere in the Estimates for expenditure of £1,033,000 for Commonwealth scholarships, for assistance to the University of Sydney and for the teaching of foreign languages and, also, £325,000 for the Australian National University. He also suggested that many people misunderstood the role of the Commonwealth in education because of the very existence of the Commonwealth Office.²
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In 1954 the argument over the Estimates arose once more with Mr. Andrews (A.L.P. - Darebin) expressing concern that the estimate for educational activities in the Prime Minister's Department had been reduced by £3,000.\(^1\) Mr. Mackinnon (Liberal - Corangamite), however, was able to show that the total expenditure on education was to increase by £300,000.\(^2\)

In 1956 Mr. Johnson (A.L.P. - Hughes)\(^3\) and Mr. Webb (A.L.P. - Stirling)\(^4\) both asked questions concerning Commonwealth involvement in education and both requested that the Acting Prime Minister, Sir Arthur Fadden, comment on the idea of a Commonwealth Ministry of Education. In both cases the Acting Prime Minister asserted his belief in the "inviolability of State rights"\(^5\) and refused to entertain the proposal for a separate Ministry.

During the Estimates debate in October, 1957 Mr. Webb (A.L.P. - Stirling)\(^6\) and Mr. Bryant (A.L.P. - Wills)\(^7\) continued to press for
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greater Commonwealth involvement in education and the establishment of a ministry. Mr. Webb referred to the "... rapid change in Commonwealth-State financial relationships over the years..."¹ and also raised again the argument that Commonwealth immigration policy provided a justification for more Commonwealth aid to education.² Mr. Bryant criticised the Prime Minister for attempting to deal with education within his own department.

I will admit that the Prime Minister accepts lots of duties that do not naturally fall under his auspices. For instance, if a defence matter is raised he becomes, to all intents and purposes, Minister for Defence. If there is a statement on foreign affairs, he becomes Minister for External Affairs. In this matter he is virtually Minister for Education, and I say that he cannot deal with education properly if he treats it as a sideline.³

In August of the following year during the Debate on the Estimates for 1958-59 there was again considerable discussion about the nature and scope of the Commonwealth's activities in education through the Commonwealth Office.⁴ Mr. Bryant (A.L.P.-Wills) quoted the functions of the Commonwealth Office of Education as defined in the Education Act, 1945⁵ and argued that the Office had not been used to perform all
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the functions for which it had been designed.\(^1\)

Mr. Reynolds (A.L.P. - Barton), in February, 1959, repeated the charge that the Government was not making adequate use of the Commonwealth Office of Education.\(^2\) In May of the same year a Government member, Mr. Bland (Liberal - Warringah) told the House: "... I am willing to bet my bottom dollar that there will be a department of education before very long, and that it will be doing much greater work than is being done now."\(^3\) He went on to make the following observation:

The Prime Minister, because of his love of education and his high regard for what is being done in the universities, hangs on to the administration of the Office of Education, and this administration perhaps entails more activities than does the administration of most of the other organizations in the department put together.\(^4\)

On 1st September, 1959 Mr. Luchetti (A.L.P. - Macquarie) drew attention to the fact that, in the year 1958-59, of the £188,660 voted for the Office of Education only £177,015 had been spent. He then proceeded to make the usual criticisms of the Commonwealth Government's record in relation to education.\(^5\) Speaking in the same debate on the

1. Ibid., p. 738
2. Hans., Vol. R 22, p. 399
4. Ibid.
5. Hans., Vol. R 24, p. 780
following day, Mr. McEwen (Country Party - Murray), Minister for Trade, complained that previous speakers in the debate, which was on the Estimates for the Prime Minister's Department (including the Commonwealth Office of Education), had tended to turn the discussion into one about education in general.

Since most of the speakers devoted themselves to the Office of Education, it may be appropriate to state once more the Commonwealth Government's attitude on this matter. We should retain our perspective as to the reason for the existence of the Commonwealth Office of Education and what it really does. The Office exists because the Commonwealth Government has certain responsibilities in education, not connected with the schooling of children, which both this Government and the previous Labour Government felt could best be handled by setting up a research and advisory body. This body - the Commonwealth Office of Education - exists first because Australia has certain international responsibilities in education, and secondly, because the Commonwealth has assumed certain functions in relation to universities and their students. It exists thirdly because we are assisting in the education of migrants. Finally, the Government has needs incidental to its other functions for advice on many aspects of education.¹

Mr. McEwen went on to discuss what he described as "the limited functions of the office." These included its concern with the Commonwealth Scholarship Scheme, the Columbo Plan and other schemes for training students from overseas as well as schemes for training of Australians abroad. Also of importance was the Office's concern with instruction in the English language and with international relations through such bodies as Unesco.²

1. Ibid., p. 805
2. Ibid., pp. 805-6
On 7th October, 1959 some significant comments about the Office of Education were made by the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, Mr. Bland (Liberal - Warringah). He was replying to remarks made by another Government member, Mr. Cleaver (Liberal - Swan) who had suggested that the Commonwealth Office of Education should take over administration of national fitness from the Health Department. Mr. Bland warned against "... a tendency for more and more things to be thrust into the lap of the Commonwealth on the ground that they are matters in which it ought to be interested."  

Using excerpts from the Public Accounts committee's recommendations to support this point of view, Mr. Bland claimed that the Commonwealth Office of Education should not be expected to expand into all areas connected with education and to usurp the powers of the States in dealing with such matters. Mr. Bland recommended that in many aspects of education the Commonwealth Office might follow the example of the Carnegie Foundation in the U.S.A. by providing an initial stimulus to educational projects (such as national fitness training) which should then become the responsibility of the States.

In 1960 the question of a Commonwealth Ministry of Education was again raised. In September, Mr. Barnard (A.L.P. - Bass) spoke of the need for a Commonwealth Minister of Education to act in conjunction

1. Hans., Vol. R 25, pp. 1863-4  
2. Ibid., p. 1856  
3. Ibid., p. 1863  
4. Ibid., p. 1864
with the State Ministers of Education. On 12th October, Mr. Bryant (A.L.P. - Wills) made reference to the Commonwealth Literary Fund which he described as "... one of the more exotic activities of the Commonwealth in Education..." and went on to discuss the question of ministerial responsibility.

The Prime Minister is the person principally responsible in these matters. I believe that the time has come for him to rationalize the educational services of the Commonwealth and bring them under one ministry so that we can pin the responsible Minister down in this chamber and so that the education services may get the advantage, if there is any, of direction from a Minister who accepts them as a principal responsibility. Whether it is time for a separate ministry of education is a moot point, but it is time that educational activities which are tremendous in their ramifications and which could have a great influence in the whole community were brought under one head.

Members of the Opposition continued to criticise the Government for its failure to create a separate ministry. Mr. Johnson (A.L.P. - Hughes), in September, 1961, complained that there had not been effective liaison between the Commonwealth and the States. In December, 1962 Mr. Reynolds (A.L.P. - Barton) saw a need for a Commonwealth ministry whose duties would be:

2. Ibid., p. 1964
3. Ibid.
... particularly to undertake research and to inquire constantly into not only the externa of education but also the content and organization of education itself.¹

Mr. Jones (A.L.P. - Newcastle) saw such a ministry as having firm control over the State education systems:

Although Australia has a large area, its population is small, and because its population is small we should seek some uniformity, even if this can be done only by the Commonwealth taking over the field of education so that the full responsibility will be accepted by one authority. Instead there has been buck-passing over the years, some saying it is the States' responsibility and others saying it is the Commonwealth's responsibility. I believe that with the establishment of a Commonwealth ministry of education we could co-ordinate education and establish a uniform level throughout the country.²

This seems to conflict with the opinion of another Opposition member, Mr. Bryant (A.L.P. - Wills) who said in September, 1963:

Our view is that there should be a Commonwealth ministry of education. That point was adopted as national Labour policy at the last federal conference in Perth. This is not an attempt to bureaucratize, regiment, centralize or create monolithic structures of which the honourable member for Wentworth (Mr. Bury) spoke. The point is co-operation. The Labour Party is not concerned with coercion, co-operation is its line of business.³

When the new Parliament opened in 1964 and Sir Robert Menzies announced the appointment of Senator Gorton to assist him with matters

¹. Hans., Vol. R 37, p. 3124
². Ibid., p. 3132
³. Hans., Vol. R 39, p. 1210
concerning education, the general opinion expressed by members of the Opposition was that this type of administrative arrangement could not substitute for a full-time ministry. Mr. Turner (Liberal - Bradfield), on the other hand, appeared to approve of the Prime Minister keeping education within his own department and commented: "I imagine that most people interested in education would be rather glad that they have an influential patron in the Government."¹

Another Government member, Mr. Kevin Cairns (Liberal - Lilley) expressed concern at the degree of centralisation which might evolve under a Commonwealth ministry of education, particularly if the Labour Party were in government.

... it has been written by one of the members on the Opposition front bench that finance for education would not be forthcoming - and these are his own words - "if what is taught is significantly inconsistent with socialism." The honourable member for Yarra (Dr. J.F. Cairns) said this.²

The duties of the Commonwealth Office of Education included research into the needs of education and the preparation of statistical data. These aspects of the Office's activities were subject to some criticism from the Opposition. In April, 1965, for example, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Whitlam, criticised the Government's use of ad hoc committees to inquire into educational needs. Speaking of the delay in the presentation of the Martin Committee's report on

1. Hans., Vol. R 41, p. 73
tertiary education, Mr. Whitlam claimed that this type of inquiry should be carried out by the Commonwealth Office of Education.

The basic reason for our having to wait so long for these reports is that in 1951 the Government halved the size of the staff of the Commonwealth Office of Education. The Office was set up under the Education Act which was passed by this Parliament 20 years ago. Under Section 5 of that Act the Office is empowered, indeed bidden, to carry out all the work that has been entrusted to these spasmodic and ad hoc committees. In 1951 the Office of Education had 375 employees. Two years later it had 158, and at the moment it still has only 184. That is why the Commonwealth has to rely upon outside experts. The experience has not been readily available on a continuous basis, as it should be. Men on ad hoc committees all are busy in their own fields and they need a long time in which to prepare their reports. In the time taken to prepare a report the position deteriorates.¹

It does seem to be true that the size and power of the Office did not grow at a pace commensurate with the Government’s growing commitment to the financing of education. Judging by the debates which accompanied the introduction of the various States Grants bills, the Commonwealth Office of Education does not seem to have played a major role in planning. Even after the various measures for assistance were adopted, much of the administrative work was done within the States or by the Australian Universities Commission.

¹ Hans., Vol. R 45, p. 1051
Summary

When the Commonwealth Office of Education was established in 1945 education was not a controversial issue. The Second World War had stimulated discussion about the role of education in national development but, at the political level, there were no significant points of disagreement.

During the 1950's, however, the Government and Opposition parties developed policies which differed appreciably in their attempts to solve the problems of education. The Government, under the leadership of Sir Robert Menzies, favoured the limitation of Commonwealth involvement to tertiary education and frequently defended this approach by insisting that nothing should be allowed to undermine the authority of the State Governments in relation to primary and secondary schools.

It was also in the 1950's that the voice of the electorate was first heard on this subject. Public meetings were called by interested groups such as the Teachers Federation and the P. & C. Associations and numerous petitions were presented to Parliament urging a greater degree of direct Commonwealth involvement in education. The Labour Opposition appeared to sense the value of education as a political issue and appointed its own committee to develop a policy directly opposed to that of the Government. This policy called for a national
inquiry into all levels of education and for the establishment of a Commonwealth Ministry of Education.

For some time, Government members denied that there was any need for a Ministry of Education. The first step in this direction was taken in 1964 when Senator Gorton became Minister assisting the Prime Minister in Commonwealth activities relating to Education. At the same time the Government began to provide finance at the secondary school level. Secondary school scholarships were provided and grants were made available for science laboratories in secondary schools and for technical schools.

In January, 1966 Sir Robert Menzies retired and was succeeded as Prime Minister by Mr. Holt. There was no immediate change in the Government's education policy. However, after the Holt Government won the election at the end of 1966 a Ministry of Education and Science was formed with Senator Gorton as the first Minister.

Comments made in the House of Representatives about the Commonwealth Office of Education do not seem to indicate any steady growth or expansion in its activities. From a purely physical point of view, the Office reached its peak in 1951. In July of that year its staff numbered 377. Soon after this number was cut by more than 50%.
One aspect of the Office's work which received considerable attention during the first five years was its publication of discussion posters and pamphlets on current affairs. Several of these were felt by some members to have a Communist bias. In later years, after the change of Government, there were complaints about the reduction in expenditure on the Office. Much of the work created by the Commonwealth's growing commitment to education was carried out by committees and other bodies. As a result the Commonwealth Office of Education did not appear to grow in size and importance to the extent which might have been expected.
The period from 1945 to 1967 was marked by some interesting changes in attitude towards the role of the Commonwealth Government in education. Quite apart from the Government's willingness to take action in this field, there was much more discussion about education in the House of Representatives than ever before. At the beginning of the period the opinions expressed by members were mostly based on personal opinion and there was general agreement between Government and Opposition members about the national importance of education and the need for some Commonwealth involvement in this field. As time went on, however, and attention was turned to defining the nature and scope of Commonwealth aid there was a tendency for discussions to become more politically oriented with the major political parties taking opposite stands on certain important issues.

This growing concern for education at the Commonwealth Government level has no simple explanation. Education had long been the responsibility of the State Governments and the change in this attitude...
seems to have been brought about by a number of factors which appeared to be in conflict with federalism and the traditional functions of the Commonwealth Government.

In this chapter a number of observations will be made about the nature and sequence of changes which took place by drawing on the data presented in Chapters II to V. These observations will be considered under the following headings: Government Action and Policy; Expressions of Opinion; and Areas of Conflict. In a final summarising section an attempt will be made to determine some kind of pattern in the changes which took place, to offer a possible explanation of this pattern and to consider its implications.

**Government Action and Policy**

Table 16 provides a chronological account of action taken by the Commonwealth Government in public education during the period under review. This summary shows the pattern of change in Commonwealth activity and gives a clear indication of those aspects of education which received greatest attention during that time.

After the establishment of the Commonwealth Office of Education the Commonwealth Government gradually committed itself more and more to the support of universities in the States. Not until 1962 do we find any new initiative in education below the tertiary level and this
Table 16

Action taken by the Commonwealth Government in regard to education 1945-1967

(Source: Hansard reports 1945-1967)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>Commonwealth Office of Education established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>Social Services Referendum - enabled the Commonwealth Government to legislate on wide range of social matters, including aid to students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Australian National University established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>Commonwealth grant of £1,000,000 to universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Special grant of £100,000 to universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Mills Committee formed to inquire into University education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Report of Mills Committee received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>States Grants (Universities) Bill 1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decision to provide Commonwealth university scholarships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff of Commonwealth Office of Education reduced by more than half</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>States Grants (Universities) Bill 1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>States Grants (Universities) Bill 1955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>States Grants (Universities) Bill 1956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>States Grants (Universities) Bill 1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Murray Committee formed to investigate the further needs of the universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Report of Murray Committee received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>Grant for recurrent expenditure of universities increased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grant for capital expenditure of universities introduced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Establishment of full-time Australian Universities Commission to advise both State and Commonwealth Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Introduction of Commonwealth grants to Universities for academic salaries on the basis of an approved salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incorporation of the Canberra University College within the Australian National University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Martin Committee formed to inquire into Tertiary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Commonwealth university scholarships increased from 3,000 to 4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Government assistance for non-government schools in Commonwealth territories (guaranteed interest on loans in the A.C.T. and grant of £750,000 for missions in the Northern Territory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Number of Commonwealth university scholarships increased from 4,000 to 5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£60,000,000 offered to the States for expenditure on universities during the 1964-66 triennium - dependent upon expenditure of further £90,000,000 by the State Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>States Grants (Science Laboratories and Technical Training) Bill 1964 to provide Commonwealth finance for both Government and independent schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senator Gorton, Minister for Works, appointed as Minister assisting the Prime Minister in matters relating to education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16 (Cont'd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Number of Commonwealth university scholarships increased from 5,000 to 6,000. Martin Committee Report received. Inquiry by Mr. Justice Eggleston into university salaries. Concept of Colleges of Advanced Education (as suggested by the Martin Committee) endorsed by Commonwealth Government with 1,000 scholarships provided for students at such institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Later year university scholarships increased from 1,280 to 1,530.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
was with respect to independent schools within Commonwealth territories.\textsuperscript{1} Only in 1964 did the State school systems begin to benefit from specific Commonwealth grants for Science laboratories.\textsuperscript{2}

The Commonwealth's preoccupation with the universities was considered by some to be a one-sided approach.\textsuperscript{3} Many felt that it neglected the fact that lack of adequate facilities in primary and secondary education may deny some worthy students the opportunity of reaching the universities. Thus it would seem that the large injection of Commonwealth funds into the universities would benefit a privileged few.\textsuperscript{4} Until 1964 the Commonwealth Government consistently rejected suggestions that Commonwealth secondary scholarships should be provided.

Several reasons were given by the Liberal-Country Party Government for favouring the universities in the matter of special grants. The universities, although State institutions, were traditionally allowed a degree of autonomy not enjoyed by the State schools. Moreover, it was argued that the State Premiers did not hesitate to ask the Commonwealth for direct financial aid to the universities whereas it was some time before any similar request was made in respect of the schools.\textsuperscript{5}

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{Vide supra}, p. 171
\item \textit{Vide supra}, p. 175
\item \textit{Vide supra}, p. 156
\item \textit{Vide supra}, p. 162
\item \textit{Vide supra}, p. 157
\end{enumerate}
It was argued by the Government that although specific grants were not made for the State primary and secondary schools, the State Governments had been allowed generous increases in tax reimbursements and loan funds which should have enabled them to meet their educational commitments.\(^1\) Another point which was raised was that, from an historical point of view, the Commonwealth was drawn into a special relationship with the universities through post-war reconstruction and that this relationship, once established, was difficult to break.\(^2\)

When the Commonwealth did begin making specific grants to the States for schools it was for the purpose of improving science and technical teaching facilities.\(^3\) This reflected the world-wide emphasis on scientific development which followed World War II.\(^4\) This was, moreover, an area in which the Commonwealth could be said to have an interest because of the importance of science and technology in national development.

It is important to note the procedures adopted by the Commonwealth Government over the years in developing and broadening its policies on education. The Commonwealth Office of Education was established in 1945 as part of the Government's plan for post-war reconstruction and it was given a sufficiently wide charter to have grown into an

1. Vide supra, p. 151
2. Vide supra, p. 156
3. Vide supra, p. 175
influential government instrumentality, charged with planning and implementing policies.¹

When the proposal for the Commonwealth Office of Education was first put forward by Mr. Dedman in 1945 he stated that one of its functions would be "... to advise the Minister concerning the grant of financial assistance to the States and to other authorities for educational purposes."² From the available evidence, however, it would seem that the Office did not play a central role in the developments that took place.

When the Commonwealth Government decided to help the States cope with the problem of education, it turned not to the Commonwealth Office of Education but to ad hoc committees.³ The Office did have a wide range of functions in connection with the administration of various government schemes, publications and research⁴ but did not seem to develop any degree of responsibility for initiating Government policy.

1. Vide supra, p. 88
2. Hans., Vol. 184, p. 4134
3. Vide supra, p. 215
Expression of Opinion

There may be truth in the well-known adage: "Actions speak louder than words" and perhaps it would be true to say that the Commonwealth's growing interest in education is best exemplified by the actions taken by the Government as set out in Table 16. However, there is also much to be learnt from what was said by the members of the national parliament even though their words were not always translated into action.

The purpose of the present study is to see the events that took place, in the form of Government action, against the background of changing public opinion and attitudes. The members of the House of Representatives, owing their position to the electors, might be expected to be sensitive to the climate of popular opinion and to express views, or at least talk on subjects which would impress their constituents. Even ignoring the upsurge in government activity in education, the mere fact that education became an important subject of discussion would infer that the electors were showing concern for education and were prepared for the Commonwealth to intervene. In some cases this intervention took the form of words rather than action.

In considering what is said by a particular member it must be kept in mind that his utterances could be of three kinds - those which are expressions of his own personal opinion, those prompted by the
special needs and attitudes of his constituents and those reflecting the policy of the party to which he belongs. It would seem that these three types of expression represented three stages through which discussion passed as education developed into a topic of national importance.

In the 1945 debates which were described in Chapter II, members appeared to be relatively free to speak their own minds. There did not seem to be any significant differences between the views of the major parties. When the Education Bill of 1945 was introduced it was not opposed by the Liberal-Country Party Opposition.

In later years, debates on education were conducted along party lines. However, there were occasions when members put forward views which appeared to go beyond their party's existing policy or even run counter to it. The State Aid issue was one aspect of education on which members retained a degree of independence for some time. Both parties had made clear what their policies were in other areas by the mid-1950's but party attitudes to State Aid did not become clearly defined until after 1960. Even so, it was from the back benches of parliament that the pros and cons of State aid were first put forward.\footnote{vide supra, pp. 169 ff.} This would seem to suggest that the party leaders were waiting until they could accurately gauge public opinion on the issue.
It might be postulated that the expression of independent views by members was restricted to those who were in safe seats or, for some other reason, had no fear of the ballot box. However, there was not sufficient evidence in Hansard to pursue this in depth. We might cite the example of Mr. Drummond (Country Party - New England) who made a speech favouring State Aid before it had been adopted as Country Party policy.¹ This was shortly before Mr. Drummond's retirement from politics. He could have felt, therefore, that he could allow himself the luxury of stating his own views on a controversial subject. On the other hand, this may not have been the only reason for his comments. It is highly likely that he was voicing the feelings of his constituents in a rural electorate with some well-established independent schools.

There were relatively few instances of members raising issues relating to their electorates or brought to them by their constituents. Some examples of these may be found in preceding chapters. Towards the end of the period this type of expression usually took the form of petitions presented by members on behalf of their constituents and these petitions did not deal with parochial issues but tended to conform with the views of pressure groups or political parties.

¹. Vide supra, p. 171
Once education became a political issue, the volume of comments increased. One interesting observation which can be made from a study of the parliamentary discussions on education is to do with the role of the Opposition. The first important debate on education in the House of Representatives took the form of an urgency motion moved by the Leader of the Liberal-Country Party Opposition, Mr. Menzies.¹ Later, when Mr. Menzies had become Prime Minister, the Labour Opposition made use of urgency motions, want of confidence motions and opposition to budget proposals in an effort to criticise the Government's policies.

It would be easier to draw some conclusions about the respective roles of Government and Opposition if there had been more changes of government during the period under review. Both the Chifley Government and the Menzies Government which followed took certain initiatives in relation to education. Because the Liberal-Country Party coalition was in power for so much longer than the Labour Party it is impossible to compare the contribution made by each. However, both parties (when in Government) were obviously cautious about the implications of the actions that were being taken. Mr. Chifley and Mr. Dedman, when in government, seemed to be just as much aware of the constitutional problems involved in Commonwealth aid to education as were Mr. Menzies and his ministers after they came to power.

¹. *Vide supra*, p. 58
Both major political groups demonstrated a different attitude to education when in opposition to that which they adopted when in government. Some of the statements made by Mr. Menzies, as Leader of the Opposition, in 1945 were turned against him by his opponents after he had become Prime Minister. This particularly applies to his assertion that there was "... no legal reason why the Commonwealth should not come to the rescue of the States...".¹

Some reference needs to be made to the tactics of the Labour Party while in Opposition. Once the political importance of education had become established, in the mid-1950's, the parliamentary Labour Party established a committee to be responsible for formulating policies and to lead the Opposition in any debates concerning education.² This method of using not one but several major spokesmen on education to criticise Government policy seems to have proved quite effective. The leading Opposition speakers on education were Mr. Bryant (Wills), Mr. Johnson (Hughes), Mr. Reynolds (St. George) and Mr. Beazley (Fremantle).

Some five years after the period with which we are concerned, the Australian Labour Party came to power and it was Mr. Beazley who became Minister for Education. Although it is not a question that can be entered into here, it is interesting to speculate on the transition

1. Hans., Vol. 184, p. 4618
2. Vide supra, p. 144
from the use of a strong committee as a vehicle of expression whilst in Opposition to the development of ministerial responsibility which comes with government.

Areas of Conflict

As was pointed out in the introduction, the period from 1945 to 1967 was chosen for study because it was marked by a tremendous change in the Commonwealth Government's attitude towards general education. The events which took place during the period were not only important for education but were of profound significance in the development of the federal system of government in Australia.

The entry of the Commonwealth into education took the form of a compromise between conflicting interests. General education had been effectively handled by the States for so long that acceptance of Commonwealth intervention in any form could only come about in special circumstances. When the Commonwealth Government did begin to play an active role in education it did so because the forces prompting such involvement became stronger than those opposing it.

The Commonwealth's growing involvement in education seems to have resulted from the interaction of four factors. These were: the Second World War; Changing attitudes towards education in the post-war years; uniform taxation; and the Constitution.
Like all other items of domestic expenditure, education suffered from lack of funds during the war years. Even without the rapid increase in enrolments during the decade following the war, considerable expenditure would have been necessary to bring the States' education facilities up to pre-war standard. Another effect of the war was to involve the Commonwealth Government in some aspects of education, firstly as part of the war effort and later for the purposes of post-war reconstruction.

The effect of the population explosion after the war was worsened by the greater importance attached to education, especially at the secondary level, and the tendency for children to stay longer at school. The Commonwealth's immigration programme also added to the strain placed on the educational resources of the States.

The problems of poor facilities and a rapidly growing school population could only be solved by the expenditure of large sums of money. This was traditionally the responsibility of the States but the situation was complicated by the fact that during the war uniform taxation had been introduced. By this measure the Commonwealth had taken over most of the taxing power of the States.

In this situation, with the deterioration of facilities during the war followed by a heavy post-war demand for those facilities and aggravated by the States' loss of financial independence, the conditions were set for the entry of the Commonwealth into the financing of
education. In fact, these conditions on their own may have been sufficient to persuade the Commonwealth Government to assume much more responsibility in this area.

The effect of these forces, however, was modified by the Federal Constitution which had left education as a function of the States. Thus, the States were expected to be responsible for provision of educational services without exercising complete control over revenue. The Commonwealth could not take over education from the States without a referendum to alter the Constitution. Failing this, the only constitutional means whereby the Commonwealth could directly assist the State education systems was by special purpose grants in terms of Section 96 of the Constitution. 1

It would appear that neither the Commonwealth nor the State governments were anxious to see a transfer of administrative responsibility in education - the Commonwealth because of the difficulty and expense of the task and the States because it would mean a lessening of their own power and prestige. The State Premiers were even reluctant to accept special grants for education, preferring to receive extra grants "without strings".

Throughout the 1950's the Government provided special States Grants for the universities, justifying this action on the grounds that the

---

1. Vide supra, p. 80
universities were, to some extent, autonomous bodies as well as being important to post-war reconstruction and national development. Grants to the other levels of education were refused, however, because education was the constitutional responsibility of the States. 1

When pressed to make specific grants available for primary and secondary education the Government pointed to the increases which had taken place in the general grants to the States in the form of tax reimbursement and loan funds. 2 It was claimed that the States were receiving a higher proportion of taxation revenue than had been originally agreed to and that it was the prerogative of the State Governments to determine how these funds were to be distributed between their various areas of responsibility.

In 1958, Prime Minister Menzies pointed out that the total income of the States from tax reimbursements, loan funds and State revenue was £2,725,000,000. Of this, £500,000,000 had been spent on education. 3 He was very careful not to criticise this proportion and emphasised the fact that the States were free to determine their own priorities and could spend as much or as little on education as they wished.

It would seem, therefore, that the introduction of uniform taxation has much to answer for. Under this system of divided

1. Vide supra, p. 158
2. Vide supra, p. 157
3. Vide supra, p. 158
responsibilities the States could blame the Commonwealth Government for not supplying them with adequate funds whilst the Commonwealth could argue that the States were devoting too small a proportion of their revenue to education.

In this situation it was preferable for the Commonwealth Government to make special grants as provided for in Section 96 of the Constitution and to ensure that this money was spent on education. By making such grants the Government was able to set conditions which forced a certain level of expenditure on the State Governments. In the matter of academic salaries, for example, the Commonwealth was able to force the States into paying what it considered to be an appropriate salary even though this was an area in which it had no constitutional responsibility. In this respect Mr. Bland (Liberal-Warringah) was probably correct when he accused uniform taxation legislation of "...distorting the administrative structure of the country, especially that of the federal system."1

1. Hans., Vol. R 2, p. 824
Summary

Public education in Australia is the responsibility of the State Governments. Their education systems were established in the 19th century and these systems were not affected by Federation in 1901. The new Commonwealth Government was given power over those matters which were thought to be of importance to the nation as a whole but these did not include education. This arrangement proved satisfactory until the Second World War broke out. During the next six years the Commonwealth Government became involved in some aspects of education as part of the war effort. Towards the end of the war there was obvious concern about the problem of post-war reconstruction and education was seen by many as being of central importance in the building of a better world.

It was against this background that the Commonwealth Government set up the Commonwealth Office of Education in 1945. This Office was expected to administer the various educational schemes which were part of the Government's reconstruction plans. It was also intended that the Office would provide information and assistance for those Departments of the Commonwealth Government that were involved in educational activities of any kind. Furthermore, it was made clear that at some later date the Office may advise the Government on the need for Commonwealth assistance to the State education systems.
From the discussions which took place in the House of Representatives in 1945, one might have expected the Commonwealth Government to quickly take over much of the responsibility for education. Members on both sides of the House agreed that education was of national importance and that the heavy demand on the States' educational facilities in the post-war years would call for additional funds.

During the important debate in July, 1945 Mr. Haylen proudly boasted that "... for once, political thought is at least abreast, if not ahead, of the thoughts of the people in relation to education." It is possible that the parliamentarians who spoke so eloquently about education in 1945 were, in fact, too far ahead of public opinion. Commonwealth involvement in education did not grow at the pace that might have been expected. It was not until the mid-1950's, when petitions and public meetings demonstrated a growing public awareness of the problems of education, that education became a major issue in Parliament.

The pattern of Commonwealth involvement in education which evolved between 1945 and 1967 was a compromise between the Constitution on the one hand and the new financial superiority of the Commonwealth (resulting from uniform taxation) on the other. When the Commonwealth

1. *Vide supra*, Ch. II
2. *Hans.*, Vol. 184, p. 4638
first began to provide finance for the universities it did so through the Commonwealth Reconstruction Training Scheme. As the Scheme was coming to an end it was felt that the universities could not survive if Commonwealth assistance was taken away and, the precedent having been set for Commonwealth aid, a number of States Grants Bills were introduced.

Precedent seems to have been important in the build-up of Commonwealth aid to education. Once the Commonwealth had begun financing the universities there was constant pressure for more to be done. Also, the fact that Commonwealth money was available to the universities naturally led to a call for similar assistance to primary and secondary schools.

Because of its constitutional implications the question of Commonwealth aid for the State education systems developed into a most controversial political issue. Behind all the discussion about national development, large classes, and shortage of teachers, the argument really resolved itself into a struggle between federalism and centralism - a struggle which had begun in the 19th century and still persists today.

The Liberal-Country Party administrations which held office between 1949 and 1967 were definitely federalist in outlook. The Labour Government in the immediate post-war years also seems to have been prepared, in the short term at least, to preserve the federal
system. In the latter part of the period, however, many of the leading members of the Labour Opposition showed a tendency to base their statements about education on a centralist point of view.

If there had been more changes in government during the period it is possible that the entry of the Commonwealth Government into education may have proceeded in a different manner. It is possible, for instance, that the Commonwealth Office of Education may have played a more decisive role in planning and that a Ministry of Education would have been established sooner. However, in view of the deep-seated nature of the constitutional argument it seems certain that whatever course of action had been taken it would have been a controversial one.

The events which took place between 1945 and 1967 represent the first difficult steps of the Commonwealth Government in trying to deal with the problem of education at a national level. By 1967 no real solution to the problem had been found but some important decisions had been made about the role of the Commonwealth Government, within the framework of the Constitution, and these decisions would undoubtedly affect the future history of Australian education.
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