

The Sir Robert Garran Oration

Some thoughts on the Australian Universities

Delivered by Professor Zelman Cowen CMG LL.M DCL LLD — Vice-Chancellor of the University of Queensland — at the 1970 National Conference of the Australian Regional Groups, Royal Institute of Public Administration held in Canberra on 23 November 1970.

Published by the Royal Institute of Public Administration (ACT Group) 1970

I am honoured by the invitation to deliver the Garran Oration. I knew Sir Robert Garran as a young man knows a monument, perhaps a little better. I knew his son, the late Andrew Garran, quite well. He, as a Rhodes selector, helped (I think) to send me on my way to Oxford and I later had association with him through the Rhodes Association and through his appointments in The Victorian Public Service. But I knew Sir Robert well through his work and above all through his writings. I think particularly of Quick and Garran's *The Annotated Constitution of the Australian Commonwealth*, to which I and indeed any Australian Constitutional lawyer, still turn notwithstanding the fact that it is now seventy years old and was written before the Constitution came into operation and before there was a single word of judicial interpretation or exegesis. In its sweep, its recital of the *travaux préparatoires* and its analysis of the comparative material and in its reading of the various clauses of the Constitution, it is a truly remarkable achievement. It used to be an expected question asked by Lord Simonds in the Privy Council when *Quick and Garran* was cited for the first time in a case "Is there no second edition of that remarkable (or excellent) book?" to which the quiet and regretful answer was "No my Lord." Garran has something to say about this in his autobiographical *Prosper the Commonwealth*. He tells that Quick imposed an enormous burden of detailed work on him as junior partner — he recounts this not, I think, by way of complaint, but by way of commentary on Quick's "excessive thoroughness". He says that he

"was also proud of the amount of pruning I had been able to effect without being caught in the act. Claude McKay observed that my 'lively mind' had been over weighted by this 'monumental tome'. Reviewers always called it that. But, at all events, it did cover the subject, became the standard work on the Constitution, and for many years was indispensable to the practising constitutional lawyer. But one result of its size was that I always shied off from the idea of a second edition to bring it up to date."

I have also turned to *Prosper the Commonwealth* for many purposes. As most of you will know, it was published posthumously. The late Andrew Garran tells in a prefatory note that his father died in the last month' of his ninetieth year, a few days after he had written the last words. It is a mixed book, and it has some excellent things in it. I recall the pen pictures of former Attorneys-General whom Garran served and particularly the perceptive sketch of Isaac Isaacs. There are some excellent stories of the federation movement and particularly the federation referendum campaign in New South Wales, and I have always gone back with enjoyment to the chapter on London in 1918 when he and John Latham, as acolytes to Hughes and Joseph Cook respectively, were duchessed in the time honoured English fashion.

Garran wrote with some pleasure of his University associations and in particular of his association with University life and planning in Canberra. I don't know what his comments would have been on the contemporary Australian and world University scene. He died before the Murray and Martin reports had made their imprint on Australian Universities, and before the rise of student discontent and public discontent still closer to our time. Student problems and public discontent have loomed large in my consciousness in the course of the last few months, and indeed have prevented me from giving the attention to the preparation of this Oration that I should have wished. I have been much impressed by a long essay on the English University scene by a member of the academic body of the University of York who, among other things, writes that —

"It should be no secret to the university profession that for at least five years the universities have had a very bad press. Academics may feel that the general public should make sharp distinctions between the majority of students and the unruly minority who sit in, or hoist Viet-Cong flags or hurl obscenities at

speakers whose views on political issues, they do not happen to share. I find no evidence that the general public makes this distinction. The tendency to generalize from a small number of cases to a condemnation of the whole class or group is something to which all of us are prone in a busy world, where events move with such rapidity and there is barely time to observe or make the fine distinctions. In the case of students, the tendency is perhaps reinforced where taxpayers are compelled by the government to subsidize every student at a university. Few newspaper editors in this country can be unaware of the widespread sentiment of ordinary people which asks, rhetorically, of demonstrating students, 'Haven't they anything better to do with their time?'"

This has been forcibly impressed on me in Queensland, since early September. I must say that I have been appalled and exhausted, as I have been ground between the two millstones of the tumultuous student caper and the vehemence of public feeling and reaction, expressed in the press, in a minor avalanche of letters, and in never ending conversation wherever I go — and I am sure in many places to which I do not go. I have been concerned to point out that the disruptive activities are the work of a comparatively small group of hugely self-delighted people to whom alone the full burden of social injustice has been revealed and who, too often, in threatening and obscene utterance proclaim it to me and to the University and to the community beyond not only by word but also by act, including, I am afraid, some ugly vandalistic acts. I have been concerned to point out that the great mass of students remains uninvolved, that while the television cameras and the press reporters may capture dismaying disorder, the fact is that the operations of classroom, library and laboratory go on unimpeded for the great majority of students and staff. Indeed, I believe that part of the cure for our present discontents is action on the part of the mass of students to stop the excesses, and I have said this on many occasions, sometimes with a glimmer of response. The truth of the matter seems to be that the democratic response comes through, sometimes pleasingly and surprisingly, in the occasional act at the ballot box, but that to ask what I call the great middle to act as a force for the maintenance of decent orderly and liberal standards is maybe, to ask too much. If it is so, I despair. I cannot believe that the answer is simply to say that we are fragile and can do nothing in face of the body force of a mass of self-proclaimed idealists who will occupy a University employment office because they disapprove of a particular employer recruiting on the campus, or who will occupy a University administration building, in support of some social view or conceived programme for the restructuring of the University and its courses. The swarming mass of body force entering premises is well known to history; it occurred in Central Europe in my youth, and it appalled me then; it appalls me now. I cannot understand the proposition stated by another English writer in a generally thoughtful article that

"If the militants want to sit in the administrative block let them sit, without issuing injunctions or sending for the police. It is only themselves they are depriving of education. The rest of us can certainly manage to teach and learn without them."

The fact is, of course, that many of the militants are not with us for our sort of education. They tell us that they don't want what we offer. At any time of the year, the day or the night, they are available for demonstration, march and embarrassment inside and outside the University, aided by helpers who have, by their non-job description, added to the vocabulary that not very happy word "non-students". These people do not see themselves as suffering from the deprivation of an education which they say is worthless and is designed only to mould them in the image of an ugly and abhorred society and they certainly disrupt the activities of and make appalling demands on the energies of an administration and an academic faculty with many important and difficult things to do. They assert the right to impose a view by force, which, on those terms, is simply unacceptable. The community asks, not without justification, why it should be compelled to foot the bill for this caper. University authority cannot by itself restore order, but this is no excuse for infirmity of purpose. To be effective, the University must be entitled to have recourse to the civil authority, not precipitately or in heat, not in a minatory way (though it will always be charged against us in that way) but as a predictable response. It is important, I think, that there should be predictable responses; while they do not always avoid tragedy, they afford a prospect that it may be avoided. I do not know, from what I read, that all my colleagues, faced with some-what comparable situations, view the matter wholly as I do. While I have so far talked in terms of response to what I regard as violent action on the part of student demonstrators, I want to make it clear that I believe it to be of critical importance to maintain communication with the student body. A University life spent in responding to sit-ins would become rapidly intolerable and, of course, that is not the situation. Some students claim that there is a failure of communication within the University. Of course many students do not ask for communication, though it

is always rewarding to see how well they respond to a talk, a meeting at which matters, general and specific, relating to their lives and work are discussed. The communication, so called, which takes place when a Vice-Chancellor faces a forum, often radical dominated, with a mass temper is without profit. It is not what a University is about; it may be what the mass political rally is about, and serious-minded University men should have none of it as a University exercise. My personal experiences of this type of meeting in the University of Queensland where its slogans, its abuse, its ugly language, its not infrequent descent into larrikinism have appalled me and I shall have no more of this form of activity. This does not mean that there are not many avenues for discourse in which I shall gladly take part. They take time and energy, which are in short supply, but they are worth it. What is disheartening too often is, that the promise of discussion comes to nothing; that the listeners don't hear or don't want to hear. After seemingly worthwhile discussion, the old accusations, the old attacks appear once again in the broadsheets, and one asks whether there is not a sort of intellectual deafness, a dialogue of the deaf, which if it spreads, bodes ill for our way of life.

I don't suppose that until comparatively recent times, I gave much thought to the problems of discipline within a University. For years I sat on the discipline committee of the University of Melbourne which then consisted of very senior members of the University whose authority was never questioned by those who appeared before it. For the most part, the issues of discipline were those involving cheating in examinations. Penalties were meted out and accepted. Nowadays the formulation of a discipline statute is a formidable business: the estates are consulted and very diverse views are expressed. We in Queensland have taken the view, in proposing revision of an old and unsatisfactory discipline statute, that procedures should be carefully spelled out, that discipline tribunals should in their membership give effect to principles of equality in membership as between staff and students, though there are serious objections, I believe, to tribunals whose members are elected by mass constituencies. That may be a prejudice, and the Jacksonian democrats would not have seen it that way, but I am not one of them. I am more concerned in what I say here to spell out the principles upon which University discipline should be based. That in turn is linked to the role of the University *in loco parentis*. Historically the University had such a role. Dr. E.J. Shoben tells us that for two centuries from the foundation of Harvard, students did not go to a University; they were sent. Comfortably placed parents paid a fee to a college for custodial care of their young and it was the College's part of the bargain to receive them, to prepare them *in loco parentis* for their places in society. The situation in Oxford and Cambridge was comparable; at their academic nadir, the Colleges were at least "boarding schools in which the elements of learned languages are taught to youths". Though Universities established later served a different purpose and provided for other and different people, their rules which included rules of an *in loco parentis* character were maintained and accepted.

In the recent pervasive questioning of the role and purpose of the University, the basis of the *in loco parentis* role of the University has been challenged. It began with challenges to the room visiting rules in men's and women's colleges and halls of residence. It has gone far beyond such modest beginnings. In the Penguin *Student Power* we are told that "the demand that students should enjoy the same legal rights as any other citizens is a preliminary and rudimentary right. No other section of the adult population is subject to an extra-legal moral code. There is no reason why students should be an exception. They should be responsible for their conduct like anyone else — before the civil courts only. The right involves the complete destruction of the *in loco parentis* system in all its aspects. It means the total abolition of special university disciplinary powers over the private lives and conduct of students".

This statement wraps up various points. For myself I agree with the conclusion of the University of *Toronto Committee on Disciplinary Procedures* which not long ago reported to the President of that University on the matter of *in loco parentis* rules. "The doctrine of *in loco parentis* would make the University responsible for the moral and social behaviour of students. We reject the application of *in loco parentis* at this University. There is an important communication problem in respect to *in loco parentis*. It is desirable that the parents and guardians of students of the University be informed that if this doctrine ever were in force, such is no longer the case. The University assumes its students are sufficiently mature that they should make their own decisions concerning moral and social behaviour".

This, in the context of discipline, carries the implication which the Toronto Committee elsewhere spells out, that University discipline applies only to acts which adversely affect the ability of the University, its teachers and officers, to carry on the operations of the University. These are the matters proper for university discipline. My

view is that the Toronto statement is plainly right; that there is no role for the University *in loco parentis*. It is not, however, right to say with the Penguin *Student Power* that there is no justification for any special disciplinary regime for the University. Many of us in professions, in clubs and associations, are rightly subject to special regulations as well as to the general law. It is an absurd proposition to state that the University cannot legitimately use disciplinary powers to assure the effective operation of the institution. The important thing is to determine what is for the general law and what is for University discipline. On my tests, in the events which occurred at and near the University of Queensland early in September and involved Queensland University students, I concluded that (1) an invasion of the Queensland University Regiment premises which are Commonwealth property off the campus was not a matter for University discipline but for action taken under the general law (2) that acts done during a meeting in the University when a South Vietnamese diplomat was detained and for some time prevented from leaving the University constituted a serious breach of University discipline (3) that a mêlée with police on the campus immediately following this incident, but after the diplomat had gone, was certainly a breach of the general law and it may also be a breach of University discipline, but on the balance should be left to the general law.

One matter which has excited a good deal of heated argument has been the miscalled issue of double jeopardy. It is said to be objectionable to punish a person under the general law and under the disciplinary code of the University for what is one act or set of acts. A great deal of nonsense is talked in such cases; the fact is that such conduct may be properly punished under the general criminal law as one offence *and* under the law of the University as another offence which goes to its relevance to the rules of the University society. Had action been taken under the criminal law in respect of the Vietnamese diplomat, as a breach of the Queensland Criminal Code, it would plainly have been proper still to proceed under University law against those responsible on the ground that their acts breached very important rules at the heart of the life of the University.

In the Australian Universities we have been caught up to some extent in the debate on the politicization of the University. This has been a very active issue elsewhere, and it seems to me that some American University administrations and faculties have gone a long way down the slippery slide. It has assumed some proportions in Queensland and elsewhere in Australia during this year, arising out of moratorium activities. I have made quite clear my position with the full support of the Senate and it seems to me simple and right. It is that on an issue like Vietnam, the University has no politics and no position, though unquestionably individual members of the University may have very strong views. The consequence is that the work of the University cannot and will not be suspended for moratorium activities; that if individual members of staff wish to absent themselves from duty to march in moratorium processions, they may do so only on terms that they consult the convenience of their classes and make appropriate arrangements for make up. That seems to me to express a proper regard for the interests of the University and for the sensibilities of individuals, though it attracts the response of insensitive and inhuman insistence on business as usual from those who practise a very different kind of business as usual.

I do not say that the University may not take a distinctively political position on issues which concern it as a University. Australian Universities took such positions on amendments to the National Service Act which would have given, as they believed, objectionable access to their records, and there are other cases that readily come to mind. There can be no doubt of the proposition that the central task of a particular academic organisation is to keep itself intellectually dispassionate, institutionally objective so that its students and staff can best make the value judgments which are part and parcel of cultural thought. I believe that McGeorge Bundy states the position well and accurately when he says that

“to the extent . . . that the university community *as such* is kept separate from political conflict, the danger of attack upon the freedom of the university from outside will be reduced. No institution which depends on society for its resources will be allowed — *as an institution* — to choose sides in the general contests of the democratic process, and violence by the privileged is an uncommonly unpopular phenomenon. If it be true, as I believe, that both politics and violence must be restrained in the academic world for reasons that are intrinsic to the nature of the university, it is also true that when violence spreads and the university is politicized, society as a whole turns hostile — and in a prolonged contest with society as a whole the university is not a likely winner”.

I cannot think of a better articulated pointer to the dangers confronting us if we take the wrong turning. There are not wanting those waiting to give -us a push down the slippery slope.

I have talked so far about one set of problems which the Australian University has had to face. Our radicals claim, as I have said, that the university serves as the trusty arm of the society to turn the student into an efficient and compliant worker operating unquestioningly within the social system. As Alexander Cockburn, the editor of the Penguin *Student Power* puts it, the University graduate "has been taught to isolate the rationality of his technique and to leave unquestioned the social purposes which that technique serves. This lobotomy is worth time and money to the system and that is why it will pay for the process (education) which performs it — a process, incidentally, diametrically opposite in result to that attributed to it by educational humanists, with their reverent observances to the 'whole man'." Or as Mr. Triesman of Essex University, with unqualified abandon puts it "Universities are linked to a set of productivity norms, which, in order to be met, need a system as authoritarian as any other factory". I regard this view as absurdly overstated. At the other end of the spectrum, the view is stated that the Universities have *failed* to provide and are not capable of providing adequately for the needs of an industrial society with a fast-developing technology. This is reflected in the recommendations which have led to the development of an alternative stream in tertiary education, the Colleges of Advanced Education in Australia, and the Colleges of Advanced Technology and the Polytechnics in the United Kingdom. Professor Niblett of the University of London Institute of Education has pointed out that discontent with the performance of Universities, reflected in doubt as to whether they are quite so much worth investing money in as used to be thought, may be perceived in the relatively greater ease with which money is now to be obtained for such Colleges and Institutes. The College design was propounded in the Martin report and was taken up with a particular emphasis and definition of role by Sir Robert Menzies on behalf of the Commonwealth Government. In these early statements there was a clear insistence on *complementary* functions in the tertiary area. As Bruce Williams rightly points out, the Martin Committee — and Sir Robert Menzies — argued that the colleges should provide for those students whose performance in matriculation examinations indicated a small chance of graduation from a University in reasonable time, for those who did not wish to undertake a full university course, or for those whose chosen course was not considered appropriate for a University.

This, however, is not the way in which the Wark Committee in its subsequent reports has seen the matter. In its 1966 report, that Committee said that the Colleges should aim to provide a range of education of a standard of excellence and a richness of content at least equal to that of any sector of education; that while university staff were expected to be custodians of excellence in academic matters and leaders in discovery, college staffs would be expected to take the initiative in the no less 'mentally exacting' task of applying knowledge. Bruce Williams says, and I think he is right, that he does not find in the Wark Committee report a viable philosophy of functional differentiation. We have, he says, binary arrangements for, rather than a binary system of tertiary education.

A ministerial attempt to define roles for Universities and Colleges by reference to the qualities of mind catered for has attracted little support. In a recent paper, Dr. Richardson, Principal of the Canberra College has spelled out the role of his institution, and has argued well that the Australian National University and the Canberra College can pursue very useful complementary activities. He also makes the point that the Colleges can provide very useful courses for graduates of Universities as well as for non-graduates.

I hope I shall not be regarded as discourteous in this place, if I say that the problem of complementarity with the Australian National University, at least at this point of time, is not too difficult. For a number of other Australian universities, of which my own is a conspicuous example with a vast range of professional and "applied" studies, the matter is more difficult. The difficulties are compounded by later specialist reports dealing with various matters relating to the Colleges and in particular with the character of their awards. Degrees are now being awarded by some Colleges in a variety of fields and this was said by the Council of the Victorian Institute of Colleges in its recent statement on *Policy on First Degree Courses and their Relation to Diploma Courses* to reflect "but one manifestation of the much more general and quite marked change in role which the Colleges are undergoing as a result of the new government policies towards the non-university tertiary educational institutions of Australia". Dr. Philip Law in a recent paper lays it on the line. He points to the fact that many Universities are up to their necks in professional and vocational courses, and that they are, in course design, recognising criticisms that their courses should be more immediately relevant to industrial and practical professional needs. At the same time, there is an awareness in the design of all such courses — wherever given — that the fast-moving pace of technology makes it necessary to emphasise principle and fundamental theory, so that capacity to adapt to rapid change may be better assured. As Robert Hutchins has put it, perhaps a little extravagantly, "the more technological the society, the less *ad hoc* education can be. The reason is that the more technological the society

is, the more rapidly it will change and the less valuable ad hoc instruction will become. It now seems safe to say that the most practical education is the most theoretical one". If these various factors are taken into account, Dr. Law says that there will be a tendency in the years ahead for vocational courses in Universities and Colleges to converge. There is no point he says, in attempting to define philosophical differences between Colleges and Universities for vocational training and unless vocational and professional training is to be removed completely from Universities, any suggestion of a binary system of tertiary education is absurd.

Entry by the Colleges into an expanded field of degree offerings does not involve an abandonment of their other activities. The Council of the Victorian Institute of Colleges in its statement of *Policy on First Degree Courses* said that entry into this field "does not mean that Colleges must abdicate their former educational values in favour of the pursuit of University type degree courses or that they must eschew their historic role in catering for industry's needs for diplomats. On the contrary, the Council believes that a distinguishing characteristic of colleges of advanced education should continue in their readiness to offer a range of studies suited to the widely heterogeneous student backgrounds with which they can, for some considerable time, expect to be confronted... on the other hand, it will be necessary for the governing authorities of these colleges which are contemplating entry into degree work to acknowledge clearly the type of intellectual and economic environment which this development requires. To establish this environment without detriment to diploma courses will provide colleges with an imposing challenge".

To this Vice-Chancellor, the respective roles of Universities and Colleges appear confused and uncertain. The early emphasis on the technical and technological role of the Colleges and the notion of a College stream producing well prepared, highly practical, adaptable and skilled men and women for a variety of demanding technical occupations at appropriate levels made good sense. In the field of continuing education, moreover, such Colleges could provide valuable courses for University graduates as well as many others in a variety of technical fields. Once the Colleges move into the degree field - not merely in *Nomenclature* of awards but in *substance* in Dr. Law's sense, the point of the exercise is not easy to see. College staffs qualified to teach such courses — which are not likely to differ significantly from University courses — will surely and rightly demand teaching and research conditions comparable with those of Universities. It may be that Universities will, for the future, look rather more carefully at proposals to establish new professional and vocational courses, but it makes little sense, particularly in view of the way in which such courses must develop and broaden in character in the undergraduate curriculum, for Universities to abandon their commitment to professional education. Dr. Law is, no doubt, an accurate prophet but as I read the situation, it has not taken very long to lose our way in the new design of tertiary education in Australia.

I want to say something about other aspects of the work and performance of Universities. Dr. Samuel Gould who recently retired as Chancellor of the State University of New York system, in a notable speech has said that "we take refuge in theoretical dissertations on the causes of campus discontent or violence, but in those areas contributing to such discontent where we have competence and jurisdiction (as in academic and administrative change) we often do as little as possible and take as long as possible to do it. Perhaps one reason for this limited action is that whatever we plan is usually kept within carefully circumscribed limits that are characteristic of our own past experience. This may be the age for bold explorations in outer space, but our educational explorations are still very much in the traditional, compartmentalized, earthbound stage. For example, teacher education has still not found the key to how learning takes place; continuing education remains no more than a step-child; international education is more talked of and written about than practised; educational technology is still feared rather than welcomed."

No doubt in the Australian context we can say — and my own University is a conspicuous example — that we have struggled so far to deal with vastly increased numbers with inadequate resource and that there has been no time, energy or resource to do much better. Others may say that they are making not unsubstantial advances in various fields. But overall, I think that Gould's criticism of University performance, and his charge of lack of imagination and innovativeness is chastening. Professor Northrop Frye has spoken of student discontent as beginning with the impatience of students with instructors who regarded their teaching as a second-rate activity and an obstacle to research. Clark Kerr has spoken insistently on this theme. In his prescriptions for the University, there is an insistence on a re-examination and an elevation of the teaching role.

"One of the major tasks", he writes, "is the improvement of undergraduate instruction in the University. It will require the solution of many sub-problems; how to give adequate recognition to the teaching skill as well as to the research performance of the faculty: how to create a curriculum that serves the need of the student as well as the research interests of the teacher; how to prepare the generalist as well as the specialist in an age of specialisation looking for better generalisation. How to treat the individual student as a unique human being in the mass student body; how to make the University seem smaller even as it grows larger; how to establish a range of contact between faculty and students broader than the one-way route across the lectern or through the television screen; how to raise educational policy again to the forefront of faculty concerns."

Many of these are familiar criticisms, but they are no less real and they go deep into any consideration of the purposes of the University. There has been a persistent downgrading of undergraduate teaching. Staff say that there is no adequate recognition of teaching performance; only research pays off. Even in comparatively small universities, we have evidence of the unsatisfactory performances of teachers standing before two, three or four hundred students or more to no purpose that seems to me really meaningful. McGeorge Bundy has said that we have made only a marginal and fractional attack on the most traditional and least rational lockstep of all; the standard lecture course. This is not satisfactorily explained by poverty and inadequate staffing. Too often senior and distinguished University teachers disengage themselves from significant undergraduate teaching duties. The reasons assigned are administrative, research and other burdens. Research, postgraduate studies, extra-university activities, involving substantial absences from the University, are seen as preferred activities.

It is not hard to see why these things have happened. Glittering prospects of involvement which are highly rewarding in kudos and stimulus draw able university people away from the task which ought to be central to the role and purpose of the University: the education in the fullest sense of the undergraduate. In the old liberal university, this was central, and distinguished scholars found it to be very satisfactory to be undergraduate teachers and while no one argues that this can be revived in Newman's conception of the University, the University must come to grips once again with the problem of undergraduate education. McGeorge Bundy has said of Pusey as President of Harvard that his notable achievement was his preservation of the standing of the College: his "firm opposition to all those forms of academic snobbery which might, without him, have made the College of the fifties and sixties a second class unit in an increasingly doctoral and even post-doctoral institution." In some parts of this country, there are encouraging signs that Universities are grappling with this hard problem; with the question of how to teach, and how to teach to teach. This must be a prime responsibility and commitment of the University. What has happened - and this is so not only in the largest of our Universities - is that in Clark Kerr's words we have suffered a loss of unity, intellectual and communal unity. "In large measure" he says, "this can be attributed to 'the overwhelming predominance of things that are new over things that are old' and to what Robert Oppenheimer calls 'a thinning of common knowledge'. Knowledge is now in so many bits and pieces and administration so distant that faculty members are increasingly figures in a 'lonely crowd', intellectually and institutionally. It is a sad commentary on the 'community of masters' when its elements come together in interchange only when they coalesce feverishly over a grievance about some episode related to a change of the calendar or a parking fee." In which of us does this not evoke a response?

There are other things that I should have wished to talk about had time allowed; among them the development of external studies in an "Open University" context. I have had association with two Universities which have performed conspicuous service in the field of - external studies and the development of the Open University idea - at due time and after due consideration, could be a useful and valuable innovation. I also referred earlier to continuing education and to Dr Gould's comment that we have done little about it. Eric Ashby has spoken of a degree or like qualification as analogous to a passport, good for a limited time and then expiring unless renewed. The difference is that the passport may be renewed automatically; the certificate or degree only on a showing of present fitness in the state of current knowledge. While programmes for continuing education will not be exclusively a University responsibility, the Universities will have a major role to play in the conduct of diverse programmes.

Professor Samuel Huntington of Harvard wrote recently of what seems to have gone from our Universities, though it was there only yesterday. "There was a shared consensus on what was important and what was not important; on what the standards of achievement were and how one ranked individuals in terms of those standards. Intellectual distinction and scholarly achievement was what counted, and with this general consensus in values

there was also a general acceptance of the system for measuring achievement of those values on the part of both students and faculty." In resource and in quality we in Australia were never Harvard, but these words have meaning for many of us who have spent our lives in Australian Universities. The way ahead is difficult and uncertain but we are well warned that Universities are not likely to solve their current problems by trying to make the clocks nm backwards. They have nothing to live for but the future.