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1990 marks the Centenary of the Law School. Technically the Centenary of the Faculty of Law occurred in 1957, 100 years after the Faculty was formally established by the new University. In that sense, Sydney joins Melbourne as the two oldest law faculties in Australia. But, even less than the law itself, a law school is not just words on paper; it is people relating to each other, students and their teachers. Effectively the Faculty began its teaching existence in 1890. In that year the first full time Professor, Pitt Cobbett was appointed. Thus, and appropriately, the Law School celebrated its centenary in 1990, 33 years after the Faculty might have done.

In addition to a formal structure, a law school needs a substantial one, stone, bricks and mortar in better architectural days, but if pressed to it, pre-stressed concrete. In its first century, as these chapters recount, the School was rather peripatetic — as if on circuit around Phillip Street. It had no fewer than six moves to different buildings, only the last of them purpose-built, in its first 80 years. And now we are planning a further move. The purpose built building turns out to be small. The teaching of combined degree students, in the first three years of their five year combined law degrees, by remote control at three kilometres distance, turns out to be an unsatisfactory procedure.

But questions of location, of the style and size of buildings, of hopes for grandeur or at least comfort, of fears — which, given the last 30 years of university building in Australia are fully justified — of architectural squalor, all of these issues depend upon prior issues of the purpose and mission of a law school.

One element of a successful institution is that it has due regard for its own history and traditions. In the case of the Law School of the University of Sydney, five features of that tradition, as described in these chapters, stand out. The first is the quality of its students overall, both as students and as shown in their subsequent careers. The second is the quality of the academic staff, measured both by the respect in which many of them are held as teachers, and by the impact of their scholarly work. The third is the substantial input made to the teaching programme over the years by dedicated part time teachers, including many judges and senior legal practitioners. The fourth is the strength of the courses in a wide range of fields, for example, contract, equity, torts, real property, constitutional and administrative law, company law, legal theory and international law. The fifth feature is a more recent one but by now well-established. The Faculty is the largest provider of postgraduate legal education, by coursework and research, in Australia.

To these traditional strengths we have been seeking to add — for example, by interdisciplinary work in particular fields. The Faculty includes staff with expertise in the economics of regulation, in criminology and criminal statistics, in the sociology of law. There are strong interests in such fields as technology and the law, international trade law, alternative dispute resolution, environmental law.
What are the alternatives for the future? One possibility would be for the Faculty to narrow its focus, to specialise more, and to concentrate more on postgraduate teaching at the expense of undergraduate teaching. In 1990 five universities offered undergraduate law degrees within New South Wales and the Australian Capital Territory. That number will probably double by the end of the decade. Despite this, and the temptation that might be felt to specialise in postgraduate at the expense of undergraduate teaching, I believe that the Law School should maintain its position as a major undergraduate teaching institution. Postgraduate teaching is important, and will become more important. But the makings of a lawyer, the beginnings of the many things that lawyers can be and do, are to be found in a broadly based undergraduate program, and that should remain our major concern. The Law School must be sufficiently large to maintain its capacity to teach and to research in all the basic areas of Australian law, and of international public and private law so far as they impact on Australia. It must be able to adapt to developing areas of the law. The combination of an understanding of basic areas of the law, and of the law in society, together with the intellectual flexibility to adapt to new roles and to new demands, must be the hallmark of our graduates. The Law School needs to be substantial enough, in the depth of its staff and resources, to educate its students accordingly.

One of the Law School’s most distinguished graduates is Sir Anthony Mason, Chief Justice of the High Court. In opening the Law School Centenary, he argued that: ... if one’s vision of the lawyer is that he or she is something more than a legal technician, then the notion of a law faculty as an integral part of the University ... seems irresistible ... Although the Law School has always striven to produce graduates with a sense of professionalism, isolation from the campus has meant that many students have not profited from the wider horizons that life at the University has to offer. Closer integration with the University should enable us to build better bridgeheads between law and other disciplines. The absence of such bridgeheads is a disturbing feature of Australian public and intellectual life. It makes lawyers vulnerable to the criticism that they are too inward-looking, that they do not understand, and are unwilling to appreciate, the benefits to be derived from other disciplines. That criticism, along with the criticism that the high cost of justice puts it beyond the reach of the ordinary citizen, is very damaging to that respect for the law which is the very foundation on which the Rule of Law rests.

But he went on to warn that ... in looking to wider horizons, the Law School must focus its primary attention on its responsibility to educate professional lawyers and in that respect it is essential that the close association between the Law School and the profession should continue unimpaired.

There is thus a dual challenge facing the School, in planning and executing a move ‘back’ to the main campus of the University. That challenge is to maintain and reinforce our traditional strengths, while at the same time developing our teaching and research in areas such as access to law, the language of the law — in general, the adjustment of the law and its institutions to meet social needs. Facing that challenge, there is much to be learned — and some things to be amused by — in the account that follows of the Law School’s first hundred years.

The Law School thanks all those who have contributed to the writing and production of this book.

JAMES CRAWFORD
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Introduction

A Century Down Town in some ways follows on from The Jubilee Book of the Law School published in 1940. We have followed our predecessor, Sir Thomas Bavin, by treating 1890 as the foundation date, although as Chapter 1 shows we could have picked on earlier dates if we had focused on the history of the Faculty, rather than the School. Likewise we have treated 1990 as our centenary rather than the apparently more correct 1989.

This book does not follow on from the Jubilee Book in a chronological sense as we have started our period back at the foundations of the University, rather than take up the story in 1941. Apart from a desire to present an account of the Law School in one volume, we felt that some of the Jubilee Book contributors were too close to the events they recorded (doubtless our successors will feel the same way about some of our contributors). In this context it should be noted that the reason for publishing the Jubilee Book was not only to give an account of the Law School’s first fifty years; it was also, as Sir Thomas Bavin states, published as a tribute to Sir John Peden.

Revisiting the earlier period enabled speculation about the delay in founding the Law School and resulted in the discovery that Professor Pitt Cobbett was not the first Dean of the Law School. Dr J. M. Bennett’s chapter on the Pitt Cobbett years discloses a far more interesting and complex character than the Jubilee Book suggests. By 1990 Peden’s 30 year term as Dean does not dominate the story of the Law School as it did in 1940.

The Jubilee Book was a series of quite short pieces — messages of congratulation from various dignitaries (politicians, judges, deans etc) from far and near; short reminiscences about the Law School and those who peopled it; chapters on the three professors who had served the School; some essays on legal subjects; and lists of graduates.

Fifty years later we have tried to be more systematic. The book is basically divided into periods of Deanships. This has been a matter of convenience rather than to suggest that a Dean makes some indelible mark on the Law School, at least since Pitt Cobbett and Peden. These two men wielded great power and so were very influential over the small School they led. We have kept the number of reminiscences down. The legal essays are to be published as a separate volume under the editorship of Professor Colin Phegan.

There are two chapters which fall outside the pattern: one on the Law School Comforts Fund, which operated during World War II for the benefit of law people in the Services, and the other on the Institute of Criminology, which has had a linked but separate existence. We have included a number of tables and lists, which are an important ingredient in institutional histories. They can be gratifying to those listed and remind them of times past, of interest to relatives, of use to historians and invaluable for settling bets.

The list of graduates has, of course, greatly expanded since 1940; we have added a list of academic staff members, both full time and part time, since our beginnings. We also sought to give recognition to the support staff (without whom no institution could survive) by listing their names since 1970. It was not an easy task to extract this list from University records and we have had to rely on the School’s corporate memory for much of this information. With all these lists we have tried to ensure that they are accurate, but give our apologies in advance for any accidental errors or omissions. Also provided are enrolment statistics which paint a picture of the growth of the School.
The publication of *A Century Down Town* has been marred by the tragic death of one of our proposed contributors. The chapter covering the 30 year deanship of Sir John Peddie was to have been written by Professor John Manning Ward AO, a graduate of the School. Challis Professor of History and former Vice-Chancellor of the University. The Law School was delighted and honoured when Professor Ward agreed to write this chapter. He was killed in a train accident before he could begin his writing for us.

Producing an account of an institution gets more difficult as one approaches the present day. It is not just a question of defamation, there is also the wish not to offend or hurt relatives and survivors. John Young and Ann Sefton, editors of the *Centenary Book of the University of Sydney Faculty of Medicine*, largely avoided this problem by completing the narrative part of their history in the 1930s. Doubtless we could have made our task much easier if we had stopped the account in 1940 and thus avoided some of the subsequent controversial events. We have tried to ensure that the later period is covered fairly, but if we have failed, the writers of later generations may be able to cure our faults.
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Early lectures were held in the Supreme Court which also housed, as evidenced in this 1873 view of the Elizabeth Street facade, various government offices. The photograph also illustrates one of the early problems of photography and live subjects. Or were the horses as restless as no doubt the students were?

JULY 6, 1887.

UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY.

FACULTY OF LAW.

The following courses of Lectures, in addition to those already notified, will be delivered in the Supreme Court during Trinity Term:

1. A second course on Personal Property and Contracts on WEDNESDAY EVENINGS, at 8 o'clock, commencing on Wednesday, the 20th of July. Lecturer, Mr. W. H. Coffey, B.A., LL.B.

2. A course of Lectures upon the Law of Evidence on FRIDAY EVENINGS, at 8 o'clock, commencing on Friday, the 22nd of July. Lecturer, Mr. Walter Edmunds, M.A., LL.B.

The fee for attendance upon each course is one guinea.

Cards of admission may be obtained from Messrs. Turner and Henderson, Hunter-street, or from Mr. C. F. Maxwell, Wentworth-court.

H. E. BARFF, Registrar.
By the Act to Incorporate and Endow the University of Sydney (assented to by the Governor on 1 October 1850) provision was made for a Faculty of Law and for the Senate to award degrees in law after examination.

Sir Charles Nicholson, Vice Provost of the University and Speaker of the Legislative Council, at the University's Inauguration Ceremony in October 1852 said:

...the time is probably not far distant when lectures in Jurisprudence ... [will] secure a sufficient number of Attendants to justify the institution of chairs... [in law]...

Whatever Sir Charles' view of how distant was 'not far distant', in fact it proved to be getting close to forty years on before the first Challis Professor of Law entered into the Sydney Law School. The key to the establishment in 1890 of the Law School was not so much Sir Charles' mid century optimism but the imminent arrival and eagerly awaited receipt of the Challis Bequest in the late 1880s.

Delays in Commencement of the Law School

The Sydney University Incorporation Act of 1850 contemplated the award of degrees in Arts, Law and Medicine and the Senate, in a by-law effective in January 1856, stated that there 'shall be' Faculties in those disciplines.

Chairs were filled in 1852 in the fields of Classics and Logic, Mathematics and Natural Philosophy, and in Chemistry and Experimental Physics. Other chairs filled before 1890 were in Geology and Mineralogy, Anatomy and Physiology, Engineering, Greek and in Modern Literature. (During this period there were some regroupings, divisions and renamings of the Chair areas.) Chairs were being established in areas which today are covered by the Faculties of Arts, Medicine, Science and Engineering. The Faculty of Science had been established and a School of Engineering had been set up within the Science Faculty.

During all this activity Law made little progress in the way of the development of institutions or the appointment of professors or full time staff. Why was Law so slow to have its Faculty fully constituted and to have its first professor? The delay can not have come from any lack of lawyers on the Senate. Of the 16 foundation Fellows of Senate, six were drawn from the legal profession although not all were in practice. The profession continued to be well represented...
during the period up to the opening of the Law School in 1890. Indeed, such were the numbers and such was the influence of the lawyers on the Senate during this period that one wonders if their hearts were really in the establishment of a Law School.

In truth there was a basic problem about what sort of law courses were appropriate for university study. Should they be more concerned with morals, philosophy and history, and thus suitable for a more general humanities based study, as part of an Arts Degree? Or should they be far more specific, detailed law courses and suitable training of students for the practice of law? (These questions still agitate the minds of lawyers interested in legal education.) This uncertainty of purpose may have helped delay the start of the Law School.

A reason given at the time related to the lack of money. It is seldom that universities are not crying poor, usually with considerable justification. Sydney is no exception — and although benefactions were starting to trickle in, it was largely dependent upon student fees (which often went to, or were shared with, the professors or lecturers) and government grants.

On reading the minutes of the Senate it is often surprising to see the Government being pressed to supplement the University's grant for what seem to be quite small amounts. It is also clear from the minutes in the 1880s that times were not always good in the colony as mortgagors who had borrowed from the University and tenants of University properties sought reductions in and postponements of their obligations.

The lack of funds, which was blamed for the delay in founding the Law School, did not prevent the establishment of courses in medical, scientific and engineering areas. These subjects demand expensive equipment and the professors of the day were adept in extracting equipment allocations from the Senate (and overspending them). Law was, and still is, a relatively low cost discipline, and one can not help feeling that if there had been strong pressure, the Senate could have found the money to develop the Law School earlier. Medicine had proved that it could be done.

The primary reason was, it is suggested, because there was no incentive to take the LLB degree other than for intellectual satisfaction or prestige. To become a member of the legal profession there was no need to obtain a law degree or, indeed, any university degree. (This is still the case in New South Wales.) The Supreme Court judges determined who should be admitted to practice as a barrister or as a solicitor. Although some concessions were made where university subjects had been passed, the fact remained that the LLB degree was neither a prerequisite nor a passport to practice.

Early practitioners came from England or Ireland and used their admission from 'Home' to be admitted in New South Wales — subject to evidence of good character. If a local resident wished to be called to the Bar he could, at considerable expenditure of time and money, go to England, qualify there and then return to practice. It was not so difficult on the solicitors' side, as articles of clerkship could be served locally from early times.

The New South Wales Supreme Court followed the English pattern by relying on types of apprenticeship and what we would now call 'in house' training, rather than more formal types of teaching and examination. Writing in the Law School Jubilee Book (1940), the Honourable Sir David Ferguson of the New South Wales Supreme Court records:

It is said that when the Charter of Justice first empowered the court to admit fit and proper persons to act as barristers, the judges did not think it essential that a candidate should have any knowledge of law. It was sufficient if he had the education of a gentleman, measured by his ability to construe an ode of Horace.

This approach did not always produce well trained barristers and lowered the reputation of the profession. Although quite detailed rules were developed for articles and admission for an 'Attorney, Solicitor and Proctor' of the Court, it was not until 1848 that the Barristers' Admission Act set up the Barristers' Admission Board, and not until 1849 that rules were made filling out the details as to admission. Educational standards were made more definite, and candidates were examined upon specified subjects. Classics were still stressed — and some legal subjects were included, but these all were English-based without any reference to Colonial Statutes, save in Constitutional Law.

On the solicitors' side the arrangements had been much clearer and were covered by rules
Before a person could enter into articles of clerkship he had to be introduced to the judges by the proposed master solicitor and there produce certificates as to his regularity and propriety while a student. The certificates also had to attest to his 'academic acquirements' in classical Greek and in Latin and his 'competent knowledge' of the first six books of Euclid. The rules also provided for examination of the candidates immediately before admission. These examinations were not a formality.

By 1850 both branches of the profession had moved towards a more organised process for admission which included at least an element of legal training and examining of a more formal kind. It might have been thought that this would have provided an opportunity for the new University to enter into a partnership with the professions and the judges for the provision of legal education for admission, but this did not happen for many years. On the contrary it is very possible that since the judges and the profession now had a more defensible training and admission system, they saw no need to press for the early development of a Law School.

It might be noted that the medical profession of that time was recruited and trained through an apprenticeship system, which had to be rounded off with a period of study followed by an examination conducted in Britain. This led to a licence granted by one of the British medical colleges. Elimination of the need to leave Australia for final qualification provided one motive for the establishment of a local Medical School in the mid 1850s, but no such motive existed in the case of the legal profession. The 1848 Act had paved the way for the admission of barristers on the basis of Australian education and training alone, while solicitors had needed only local articles for some years.

Thus, in assessing why the Law School was established so long after the founding of the University, the lack of demand from the profession must have been seen as an important element. All the legally qualified members of the original Senate had reached eminence without the benefit of a law degree; it would seem that the first LLB graduate to become a Fellow was His Honour Judge Rogers in 1889, by which time the establishment of the Law School was a fait accompli. These legal Fellows of Senate had recently seen what they regarded as satisfactory reforms to the educational admission requirements — why make further changes so soon?

As late as May 1886 the Senate received a report from a committee it had set up '...to consider the best means of establishing a Law School upon a proper footing...'. This move had been initiated by the Vice-Chancellor (Mr Justice W. C. Windeyer) and the committee consisted of the Chancellor (The Hon Sir William Manning, a Judge of the Supreme Court), the Vice-Chancellor, Sir James Martin (Chief Justice at the time of setting up the committee, but he was dead before it reported), Sir Alfred Stephen (a former Chief Justice), Mr Justice Faucett, The Hon Sir Frederick Darley (who became Chief Justice before the committee reported), the Hon Edmund Barton (later to be the first Prime Minister of Australia and a foundation Judge of the High Court) and Mr Alexander Oliver (a barrister, Parliamentary draftsman and public servant who later became President of the Land Appeal Court).

This galaxy of legal talent reported:

...they did not consider it practicable at present to establish an effective School of Law for the following reasons, first, that no such school should be attempted without a full and efficient staff of instructors, and for this the University has not at present the financial means, secondly, that to ensure the attendance of sufficient students some practical advantage must be held out in the direction of admission to Professional practice, and for this the University does not possess and cannot acquire the requisite powers without Parliamentary legislation.

Reading this report more than one hundred years later it is not easy to see what was in the minds of the committee members and the Senate, which accepted the report. At first sight the first proposition is merely the usual cry of poverty preventing progress. It is only surprising for ignoring the fact that the Challis bequest was due to be paid over in a few years. One would have thought that the report might have been laying the foundations for a strong push for a substantial claim against the bequest for a Law School. Perhaps this was what they were doing in their subtle way, for that is the way events turned out.
The second aspect of the report raises the question of how a School of Law could get sufficient students to make it viable. (It should be noted that although the University had been offering LLB since 1865, only 13 students had qualified to graduate by the time the committee reported.) As the report notes, one way of doing this would be for the admission authority to give credit for University subjects towards admission. That, of course, was true, and it was what ultimately happened. But the committee went on to say that the University did not have the power to do this without parliamentary intervention. One can be excused for thinking that the committee was raising a red herring. To suggest that the University could determine the academic requirements for admission would have raised a great conflict between the University and the profession and judges of the day. Even in 1990 the Court still has its Barristers’ and Solicitors’ Admission Boards which provide an alternative non-university method of satisfying the academic requirements for admission.

The only acceptable and realistic way to achieve the desired result would have been through the Barristers’ Admission Board. This would have been known by the Senate committee, which had sufficient judges and barristers on it to constitute a meeting of that Board. A few years later this course was followed by the Chancellor writing to the Board seeking exemption from its law examinations for holders of the University’s LLB degree. In substance this was agreed to by 1891, and did not involve Parliamentary legislation as feared by the Committee.

The Committee had also recommended:

... that lecturers should be appointed to deliver distinct and separate courses of lectures in the evening in some central place, and that there should be an examination at the end of each course. ... [and] that arrangements should be made for substituting the certificate of attendance and Examination described above for Board Examinations under the Rules for the Admission of Barristers and Solicitors.

The Senate accepted these proposals and asked the Committee to draw up details of a scheme to carry out the recommendations. These decisions were reported without comment in the Sydney Morning Herald. It was to be almost a year before the Committee reported again, and this time there was a strong reaction from the press. In brief, the proposal was that evening lectures should be given in the ‘practical’ subjects of Equity and Real Property, the Laws of Contracts, Personal Property and Torts, and in the Law of Evidence and Criminal Law. The lectures were to be given in the Supreme Court. There were to be three lecturers, each to be paid one hundred pounds per annum, plus fees from the students (one guinea per term). The Senate agreed to these proposals and in due course the positions were advertised and filled.

Some days later, 19 March 1887, the Sydney Morning Herald editorialised:

We suppose that this announcement may be considered a subject for congratulations all round; in the first place, to those members of the Bar to whom a salary of 100 pounds a year, with fees, is an object of ambition; in the second; to those young gentlemen who in Solicitors’ offices and elsewhere, are thirsting for the streams of knowledge flowing idly from the fountain-head ...; and in the third place, to the authorities of the University itself, on the ground that the establishment of these lectureships affords an index to the value which they attach to the study of law. It must be confessed, however, that, considering the relative importance of law in the practical business of life, to say nothing of its merits as a means of mental training, the position which it still occupies in the course of University studies serves little more than to provoke ridicule.

As to the University’s plea of lack of funds the Herald continued:

... available funds have been exhausted in the effort to found a School of Medicine — a plea which naturally suggests the reply that a parent is not justified in starving one child in order to fatten another.

... men who are charged with the working ... [of the] ... legal machinery should be men who have been scientifically trained in the study of their profession, instead of being left to pick up their knowledge of it like sparrows ...

At the University Commemoration Day in May 1887 the Chancellor, Sir William Manning, defending the University from the Herald’s attack, said that the Government and Parliament had made extra (but inadequate) funds available to the University for a Medical School after a
William Charles Windeyer, c.1887, oil on canvas by Arthur J. Foster.
Presented by Lady Windeyer.
University of Sydney Collection.

The Law crest on the western wall of the quadrangle.

The Arts and Law crests adorn the western tower of the quadrangle to mark the two first disciplines of the University though the Law School lagged behind the Arts Faculty.
submission from the University. Sir William went on, ‘... if a medical school exists at all it must be complete, under penalty of becoming a source of widespread danger to life and health’. This was not the case with law. He did, however, foresee the use of some of the Challis fund for law.

The contest was not an even one. Money granted for medicine could not be used for law. Clearly the Senate must have had a choice before it — which should come first, Law or Medicine. Those who wanted to do law could do so without leaving Australia and without a degree, while those wishing to enter the medical profession had to go overseas to get final registration. In the competition for money from the Government and, less directly, potential benefactors, Medicine has always been the more attractive. Birth, accidents, ill health and death are experienced by us all; the medics can promise recovery, less pain and even the delaying of death in exchange for benefactions. Law has never been a popular profession with the public. It has always been seen as too expensive; in litigation the loser has had a good case ruined by the lawyers, while the winner only got what was his obvious entitlement, and most probably he would have got it without the help of what turned out to be expensive lawyers. Financial support has never flowed to legal education easily or freely.

Until the Challis money came into the University's hands it had not done much to promote law, even as an academic discipline. Whatever the motives may have been for the years of delay, the tide was soon to turn in favour of establishing the Law School.

The Faculty of Law

During the period 1850-1890, the Faculty of Law had a somewhat shadowy existence. It was said to exist from 1856 (when the Governor approved the Senate by-law), but it had no membership or meetings. The University could award law degrees after examination, but there was no Faculty to make recommendations on curriculum, examinations, appointments or policy. Sir John Peden, writing in the Law School Jubilee Book (1940), said ‘The Faculty of Law came into existence, technically, in 1855, but not into active operation until 1859, and from then until 1890 the main work was examining, not teaching’. Peden's claim that the Faculty was in active operation by 1859 was itself an overstatement. One supposes that was chosen because that was the year the first part time member of staff, Hargrave, had been appointed, but one swallow does not make a summer . . . . It was July 1890 before the Senate passed by-laws which constituted the Faculty of Law.

The first definite (but hardly earth shattering) move the Senate made in respect of law is found in a by-law of 1853 which prescribed the ‘Academical Costume’ for holders of the degrees of Bachelor of Civil Laws and Doctor of Civil Laws. These degrees have never been awarded at Sydney and within a very short time the modern usage of LLB and LLD was adopted in the by-laws.

Having stated in 1856 that there 'shall be' a Faculty of Law (By Law 16), the Senate took little action to implement that assertion. It made provision for a Board of Examiners in Law:

The Professors and Examiners in the Faculty of Law, shall form a Board; of which the Senior Professor shall be President, with title of Dean of the Faculty of Laws. (By Law 18)

This was hard to implement since there were no professors of law. Accordingly, the Senate empowered itself to appoint the Board of Examiners (By Law 66) and, presumably, the Dean of Law. This provision was not used until 1865. During the period 1865-1884 the Dean held office as the appointee of Senate, and under a holding by-law awaiting the arrival of a Professor of Law.

By Law 65 represented similar difficulties since it stated that lectures in English Jurisprudence 'shall be' given by a professor appointed by Senate. Notwithstanding the lack of a professor to lecture, the Senate under By Law 70 required candidates for the Degree of LLB to be examined in:

Civil and International Law. (Roman Law was to be added to this group later).
A Candidate could not take out the "... LLB until after the expiration of one Academical Year from the time of his obtaining the Degree of B.A." (By Law 67).

The by-laws were amended to cover the appointment of a non-professor to give lectures. In 1858 the Senate appointed Mr John Fletcher Hargrave as Reader in General Jurisprudence. He was an English barrister who had published a *Treatise on the Thelluson Act* before he migrated to Sydney in 1857; he was soon admitted to the local Bar. He is said to have been 'appalled' at the small part that the study of law played in qualifying for admission to practice. He not only lectured for the University but gave public lectures on a wide range of legal topics both in Sydney and the country. He ceased lecturing at the University when he went to the Supreme Court. As is so often the case, the contemporary comments on his lectures and lecturing style vary considerably. He published his lecture notes which were available to his students. Although these were undoubtedly useful for the students, it has been observed that this may be '... an early precedent for that unhappy academic method called "reading the notes"'.

Hargrave had a full, if controversial, public life. He was at various times New South Wales Attorney-General and its Solicitor-General; for a short time he was a foundation District Court judge. In 1865 he was sworn in as a Supreme Court judge — in the absence of the Bar which strongly disapproved of the appointment. Hargrave's mental health had never been strong. He had a period in an asylum in England before he came to Sydney where his health improved. His retirement from the Court in 1885 followed a return of his medical problems.

Whatever his other failings may have been, it seemed that Hargrave was a prudent investor in land and his sons were well provided for. His second son, Lawrence (1850–1915), by his early 30s, derived from the leasing of a coal-mine at Coalcliff and other sources an annual income of about one thousand pounds. This enabled him to give up paid employment and become 'a gentleman-inventor'. His work as an aeronautical pioneer and inventor is remembered on today's Australian twenty dollar note.

Exactly who were lecturing up to 1890 is not always clear from the records examined, nor is it clear if the lectures were maintained continuously. Alfred McFarland (to become a District Court Judge) was appointed as Reader in General Jurisprudence, probably when Hargrave went to the Supreme Court in 1865, although it is possible he was lecturing before then. During the period 1870 to 1882 the University *Calendar* does not list any teaching staff in law, but the implications of this are not clear. The Board of Examiners in Law was listed during those years.

In March 1883 the Senate's minutes record the appointment of Mr George Knox MA as a lecturer in law (after quite a protracted period of negotiations). On 15 February 1886 the Senate received a letter of resignation from Mr Knox '... in consequence of the lack of encouragement given to his department'. At the same meeting notice was given of a motion to set up a committee to look into the establishment of a Law School.

The *Calendars* for 1886, 1888 and 1889 show a heading for law lecturers, but there are no names. The Senate minutes throw no light on this. The 1887 *Calendar* records the venture into evening lectures in the more 'practical' subjects in law. Listed as lecturers are Mr A. C. Wylie (Equity and Real Property), Mr W. H. Coffey (Contracts, Personal Property and Torts) and Mr W. Edmunds (Evidence and Criminal Law). These seem to have been taught for one year only.

During the period up to 1890 the University had been awarding the LL.D, sometimes by thesis sometimes by examination. It is hard to judge the standard of these degrees as no examples of the work submitted have been discovered. Twenty LL.Ds were awarded up to 1887 (more than the number of LLBs), then there is a gap until 1908, which suggests that Pitt Cobbett might have had some success in his efforts to raise standards. This is not to say that many of the recipients were not lawyers of great ability and did not distinguish themselves in the law.

The power to appoint the Board of Examiners in law does not appear to have been used until 1865, when the Senate appointed Professor M. B. Pell (from the Arts Faculty), The Hon Sir James Martin (a Fellow of Senate later to be Chief Justice), The Hon Sir William Manning (a barrister and Fellow of Senate who later became Chancellor of the University and a Judge of the Supreme Court) and the Reader in Jurisprudence. Thereafter Boards were regularly
maintained. They generally consisted of some of the legally qualified Fellows of Senate, the Reader in Jurisprudence and a professor from the Arts Faculty. As time went by and there were more lecturers appointed, some of them were added to the Board. Upon Professor Pell’s retirement he was replaced by Professor Badham (Classics).

The Position of Dean of Law

It would seem that Professor M. B. Pell (Professor of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy) was on the Board of Examiners at least from the mid 1860s until he retired in 1877. The Calendar in its list of members of the Board of Examiners of 1865 describes him as being ‘(Dean)’, presumably of Law under By Law 18 cited above. By the 1874–76 Calendar the Rev. Charles Badham (Professor of Classics and Logic) is shown as being a member of the Board of Examiners in Law and also as Dean, which positions he held until he died in 1884.

Both Pell and Badham had been Deans of the Arts Faculty and it might have been expected that this practice of combining the deanship of Law with Arts would be followed again. However, in 1883 the Hon Mr Justice W. C. Windeyer had been elected by Senate to the position of Vice-Chancellor. When Professor Badham ceased to be Dean of Arts and of Law, the Senate resolved at its March 1884 meeting that ‘... the Vice-Chancellor, Mr Justice Windeyer be appointed Dean of the Faculty of Law’. (He had been a member of the Board of Examiners in Law since 1881). When the Hon H. N. MacLaurin was elected as Vice-Chancellor in 1887 he did not take over the deanship of Law nor was it given to the Dean of Arts. It was retained by Mr Justice Windeyer and he was re-elected for a three year term in May 1888. He remained Dean until April 1891 when Professor Pitt Cobbett was made Dean by the Senate.

William Charles Windeyer LLD MA, Dean of Law 1883–1891; Supreme Court Judge 1881–1896; Chancellor of the University of Sydney 1895; Vice Chancellor 1883–1887; Fellow of Senate 1866–1897.
It has been customary to regard Professor Pitt Cobbett as the first Dean of Law at the University of Sydney. There is no doubt that he was the first full time teacher and first professor. However, it is also clear that he was preceded by other people carrying the title of Dean of Law. Two of those were not law graduates or teachers and their duties seem to have been nominal; each of them had served as Dean of Arts as well as professing their own disciplines. It is clear from the Senate minutes that from time to time the 'legal Fellows of Senate' were being constituted into a committee and being asked to give advice to Senate on policy matters relating to legal education. This is clear reinforcement of the contention that there was no Faculty of Law in a more modern sense and also that there was no Dean in a like sense. The Faculty and Dean, if they had existed in a real way, would have been the normal sources of such advice.

However, the position of Sir William Windeyer is seen to be very different. In the first place he was a barrister who later became a Judge of the Supreme Court and he had far more interest in and knowledge of law than did his predecessors who were Arts professors. One can speculate about whether, in taking up the posts of Vice-Chancellor (1883) and Dean of Law (1884), he was positioning himself in influential places from which he could press for the Law School. The retention of the deanship at the end of his period as Vice-Chancellor may be even more significant.

By 1887 it was known that the Challis bequest would come to the University in 1889-90 and Windeyer would have known the importance of having a lawyer as Dean during these years, rather than a Dean of Arts who might have conflicts of interest when the Challis income was being carved up. Windeyer was very active on Law's behalf and also in the establishment of the Challis Chair and Lectureships.

He retained the deanship well after the appointment and arrival in Sydney in 1890 of Pitt Cobbett as foundation professor. It was not until Windeyer's term as Dean expired in April 1891 that Pitt Cobbett was appointed by Senate as Dean.

Thus Windeyer was Dean for about the first fifteen months of the Law School's life. Furthermore he was Dean when the Senate on his motion adopted the new by-laws which were to formally constitute the Faculty of Law (21 July 1890). The work he did for the establishment of the Law School and of the Faculty, and for the foundation appointments of staff would certainly entitle him to be called the 'father of the Law School'. It is contended we can also regard him as the first Dean of the Law School. Though Professors Pell and Badham had the title of Dean of Law this was a mere convenience of administration and did not amount to deanships in the usual way.

Mr Justice Windeyer (1834–1897) was no stranger to the University. He was one of its first Matriculants and in 1856 was the senior of the first BA graduates. He took out his MA in the following year. He was a Fellow of Senate from 1866 until his death. He was Vice-Chancellor for the period 1883 to 1886 and Chancellor from 1895 to 1896. He was the foundation chairman of Women's College within the University. He was a member of the Legislative Assembly from 1859 to 1879, serving his last three years in Parliament as member for the University of Sydney. He was known for his liberal and reformist views. He sponsored the *Married Women's Property Act* in 1897. He was admitted to the Bar in 1857 and in 1879 he commenced his term of 17 years as a judge of the Supreme Court. His wife, Mary, was a pioneer of women's rights, having been president of the Womanhood Suffrage League of New South Wales.

**The Challis Bequest**

Critical for the foundation of the Law School was the Challis bequest which, when it came into the hands of the University in 1890, was a very substantial amount. Some of the assets had not been realised by the trustees and the estimates of their value when transferred to the University vary. There were still some assets in England which were not to be transferred until some annuities fell in. It does seem that the total amount of the bequest was over a quarter of a million pounds.

Mr John Henry Challis had migrated to Australia in 1829 and became a merchant dealing in wool and other merchandise. His firm did well out of the gold rushes. He invested in land in
Her Majesty's judges were always well represented on the University Senate, as were other members of the Profession. Of this group photographed on the eve of the establishment of the Law School, a number had been, were or were to be Fellows.
Sydney and in pastoral licences in southern New South Wales. In 1856 and 1859 he made substantial donations to the University for stained glass windows in the Great Hall. In 1855 he returned to England where he remained (apart from one visit to Sydney in 1859) until his death in 1880. By his will he established some annuities for friends and relations, gave a life interest to his widow, and then the estate was to go to the University of Sydney, subject to a five year period of accumulation of the income. Since his widow died in September 1884 the University was to be entitled to receive the augmented bequest in late 1889.

The making of the bequest seemed to have come as a great surprise to the University. Mr Challis had died at Mentone, France on 18 February 1880. The first the University knew about the bequest was when the Chancellor was reading his morning paper. The *Sydney Morning Herald* noted the death and reported that the late Mr Challis had left the University one hundred thousand pounds. The Chancellor reported to the Senate that he had ‘... immediately addressed a note to Mr J. R. Fairfax a proprietor of the *Sydney Morning Herald* requesting further information and assurance on the subject of this most munificent bequest ...’ Mr Fairfax responded promptly with the original telegram from London, pointing out that the amount was transmitted in words, not figures, and that there was little likelihood of a mistake. The Chancellor was assured that the *Herald*’s correspondent in London was ‘a most trustworthy man’. In the event, when the value of the colonial assets was included, the bequest was worth a lot more than the original report stated.

The Senate and the Government behaved with considerable caution in dealing with the bequest. The Senate, for the most part, forbore from spending the money in advance, while the Government said it would not reduce the annual Parliamentary grant to take advantage of the University’s windfall. The Senate decided that it would hold the corpus of the estate and only use the income.

There were protracted negotiations with the British government authorities about death duties, Mr Challis having been domiciled in England at the time of his death. Sir William Manning, the Chancellor of the University and a Judge of the Supreme Court, strongly and successfully pressed the Inland Revenue Commissioners to abandon their claim. The New South Wales government made no claim in respect of the local assets.

In the late 1880s the Senate was repeatedly reminded that the bequest was falling due to the University. For example, the trustees of the Challis Estate were consulting with the Senate about investments and the sale of land in the estate.

**Law’s Turn**

As 1890 approached, the stage was set for the establishment of the Faculty and the School. The Challis money was at hand. At the Senate meeting of 16 July the Dean of Law, Mr Justice Windeyer, gave notice that he would move for the establishment of a committee ‘to consider and report what chairs should be founded when the Challis bequest is at the disposal of the Senate’.

The committee of ten Fellows was established by November 1888 and had a strong legal membership — Manning, Windeyer, Barton, Oliver (all of whom had been members of the 1886 committee) and Mr C. B. Stephen QC.

According to the rather brief minutes of this committee almost its first act was to resolve, on the motion of Manning and Windeyer:

> That a School of Law be established with a Professor and such Lecturers and course of instruction as shall be sufficient for full preparation when required for admission to the Legal Professions, and the sum of two thousand pounds per annum be appropriated out of the Challis Fund for that object. Also that the name of Mr Challis be associated with the School of Law so established.

It was also resolved that the legal members of the committee be requested:

> ... to bring in a scheme for the establishment of a full curriculum in the Faculty of Law, which would entitle the Graduates in Law of this University to admission to the Bar and to such advantages as could be given towards admission to the roll of Solicitors.
The Down Town Law School is not denied its place on campus as shown by this unusual cherub holding aloft the scales of justice on the Nicholson gateway.

The Chancellor asked the University community for suggestions on what Chairs and other academic staff should be established under the Challis bequest. Of the seven responses listed in the committee’s and Senate’s minutes it is interesting to note that five, along with pressing their own claims, mention favourably the case for law. Their voluntary acceptance of law’s needs may have contributed to the favoured position law achieved. The Chancellor had told the committee that he estimated there would be an immediate income of a little over seven thousand pounds per annum; this would increase when certain land was sold and the annuities in England fell in.

When the committee reported to Senate on 25 March 1889 heading the list of foundations to be made from the Challis Fund is ‘A Challis School of Law, with one Professor and Lecturers, 2000 pounds [per annum].’ This was the largest allocation recommended. The report was accepted and the legal Fellows of Senate were asked to report on the distribution of the two thousand pound allocation to law. (It is interesting to note that we have now had two recommendations, both apparently accepted by the Senate, that the Law School should be called the ‘Challis Law School’. This was not done and no record has been found to explain the change.)
Once the Senate accepted the proposal about law, things moved quickly, as is recorded in the
next chapter. An English committee was set up to consider applications and make recommenda-
tions to Senate on who should hold the foundation Chair. The continuing committee of
legal Fellows of Senate went somewhat wider than its brief (which seemed only to cover cur-
riculum changes) and recommended a whole new chapter of the by-laws to cover law. The
Faculty was to be constituted and would consist of the professor or professors, the lecturers in
law and the Fellows of Senate who were members of the legal profession.

The report also prescribed the curriculum to be followed for the LLB, and which parts were
to be taught by the professor and which by the lecturers. As Dr Bennett comments in the next
chapter, it seems strange that some of these matters were not held over until the foundation
professor arrived. The committee recommended that there should be four Challis Lecturers.
These were appointed before Professor Pitt Cobbett arrived and are dealt with in the next
chapter.

The committee also raised the question of recognition of the new LLB by the court for
admission purposes:

We suggest that the Judges of the Supreme Court be invited to make rules for giving effect to
the University's Degrees in Law, by attaching to the LLB Degree the right of admission to
practice at the Bar as in Victoria (and to the Roll of Solicitors if they shall think fit), subject
only to enquiries as to personal fitness . . .

The Chancellor wrote to the court asking for recognition of the LLB, but this was not
immediately agreed to — did the judges want to size up Pitt Cobbett first?

Thus, forty years after the Incorporation Act 1850, the Sydney University Law Faculty was
constituted and the Sydney University School of Law established. This had taken longer than
expected: Melbourne and Adelaide Universities had already established themselves in law with
full time staff. At least the new Law School was comparatively well funded, thanks to the
Challis bequest. The control of the Law Faculty was in the hands of the legal profession which,
nonetheless, was not prepared to make the LLB an exclusive passport to admission as far as
academic qualifications were concerned. As might be expected, some tensions between
academics and practitioners have persisted as they so often do in professional Faculties.
However, many would argue that Sydney Law School has, in general, gained rather than lost
through the existence of these tensions.
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The Law School
Air — 'The Wearin' of the Green'

Ye students all, both great and small,
Cast off that look forlorn;
Your prayers — 'tis true — no longer do
The Conscript Fathers scorn
Now Medicine may starve and pine,
But we don't care a straw;
Hip! hip! hurrah! We shortly are
To have a school of law.

With crime and tort of every sort
We'll soon familiar be;
And learn by hear the secret art
Of wilful burglary;
We'll be acquaint with fraudulent
Device of every sort;
And reach in time the height sublime
Of gross contempt of court.

We don't know much of things that touch
Forensical transactions,
Though practised well, as you may tell,
Concerning civil actions;
Refreshers, too, we swear to you,
As taken at the Bar —
Although the word we've often heard,
We don't know what they are.

On legal feast, this year at least,
The students ought to thrive;
One professor and lecturers four,
Amount to teachers five.
Perhaps they'll teach two students each —
Perhaps a fraction over;
And you'll agree, I think with me,
They'll find themselves in clover.

Song sung by the students at the 30th University Commemoration Sydney Morning Herald 15 April 1890.
The young Pitt Cobbett, founding Professor of Law, whose appointment marked the beginning of the Law School.

Advertisements for the first Chair of Law were placed in Australia and England. It is interesting to note the higher salary offered to Professors in professional Faculties.

AUGUST 24, 1889.

UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY.

APPLICATIONS for the following CHAIRS about to be established in the University will be received up to the first day of NOVEMBER, 1889:—

1. Challis Chair of Law, salary £900
2. Challis Chair of History, salary £800
3. Challis Chair of Logic and Mental Philosophy, salary £800
4. Challis Chair of Anatomy, salary 900.

Full particulars of the duties and tenure of office, and all other matters connected with the several Chairs, may be obtained on application to the Registrar.

August 24, 1889.
In March 1889 the inaugural volume of the *Articled Clerks' Journal* reported that:

> It is proposed to establish a School of Law at the Sydney University during next year. It is to be hoped that the proposal will be carried out. In this respect we are unreasonably backward.

Impecunious Sydney had long since been left behind by others. The University of Melbourne had offered a formal course in law continuously from 1857, with a Law Faculty following in 1873; the University of Adelaide had established a School of Law in 1882; and even the University of Tasmania, founded in 1889, contemplated an operating Law Faculty.

The delay in launching a Sydney Law School had other explanations as well. In part it reflected the priorities favoured by the legal profession, which, in 1890 and for many decades afterwards, had a proprietorial role in managing legal education of whatever kind in New South Wales. A proficient enough system of legal education had operated in the Colony, as mentioned in the previous chapter, through the Admission Boards under the ultimate supervision of the Supreme Court. A degree course in law was already offered in the University of Sydney for those who felt the need for it; while more ambitious (or, perhaps, more affluent) intellects might be catered to by attending the universities 'at home' in England. But many of the then practising profession in New South Wales set little store on degrees. In their estimation, the law was to be learnt in the school of hard knocks, by practical experience in court or under the tutelage of a solicitor.

In the late 1880s the common view was personified in the Chief Justice, Sir Frederick Darley. A graduate in Arts of Trinity College, Dublin, he conquered the law by experience, moved to Sydney to escape from the overcrowded English and Irish Bars, and was an immediate success as a colonial barrister, rising to fame and fortune he could never have contemplated in the old countries. His was the pragmatic species of law that won results through mastery of practice, procedure and a few leading cases. He was thus in harmony with the then technique of the Supreme Court which, generally, disposed of issues in terse *ex cathedra* pronouncements with little regard to nice expositions of legal principle. Darley was a diligent and greatly respected judge, but his introduction here is of one symbolising an old order not much in sympathy with Schools of Law at universities.

Even his judicial colleague, Sir William Windeyer, who became first Dean of the Faculty of Law in the University of Sydney, while being obviously a supporter of the Law School, served...
two masters. Although nowhere openly expressed, his role included preserving the profession’s vested interest in the nature of the Law School — an interest revived dramatically on the appointment of R. C. Teece, KC, as ‘caretaker’ Dean in 1946, as noticed in a later chapter.

Thus Windeyer’s influence provided some guarantee that the School would keep its ‘feet on the ground’. Sydney had observed some melancholy experiences at Melbourne Law School, where the first Dean, Professor Hearn, had caused trouble because of his penchant for government politics, while his successor, Professor Jenks, had suffered from an abrasive personality and an unhappy divergence of views from those of Vice-Chancellor Dr. John Madden — soon to be Chief Justice of Victoria. Sydney had had enough, too, of the dilettantish approach to legal education espoused by the eccentric Mr. Justice Hargrave in his days as Reader in General Jurisprudence.

It was, then, an unwritten term of the contract of employment of the first Challis Professor of Law at the University of Sydney that he measure up to diverse expectations of the profession. They included his ensuring that law be taught not merely as an intellectual exercise but as a qualification to practise; that he be a man of such stature that those who sat at his feet might become better lawyers through the stimulation of his precept and example; that he, like the cobbler, should not go beyond his last, but confine himself to his academic duties; and that the seat of learning over which he would preside should be removed from the University grounds and housed next to the very precinct of the Supreme Court.

Many of these requirements contained seeds that would germinate into disagreements.

The Launching
As the figure of speech puts it, 1890 was at once the best of times and the worst of times for launching a Law School in Sydney.

Best, because the munificence of the Challis bequest enabled it; because students at law and articled clerks wanted more stimulus in their years of learning; because the ripples of the great movement to reform the laws of England between 1820 and 1870 were still lapping colonial shores; because the dream of federating the Australian colonies seemed ready to awaken into a reality; and, within the profession itself, because long-running arguments about rights of audience and fusion of the branches of barrister and solicitor were about to be resolved for good or ill.

Worst, because a financial depression of a scale not experienced for 50 years was imminent; because its effects would drive many lawyers out of practice and some of them into bankruptcy and ruin; because the launching of the Law School before Australian federation and the constitution of the High Court meant that old colonial attitudes to the study of law were predisposed to become entrenched in the curriculum; and because the law was still a gentleman’s profession permitting no entry to women, even to those who managed to qualify themselves for admission.

The legal status of women was, at the time, a pre-eminent example of social standards that had long survived but were at last under public scrutiny. Another example was the exaggerated gulf between capital and labour, that was challenged and changed in the 1890s through industrial turmoil of a degree unprecedented in Australia.

The shift in the balance between the law’s earlier preoccupation with protecting rights of property and its growing concern for personal rights and liberties was another feature of the age. But social and technological reforms tended to outrun legal reforms. In New South Wales there had been a decade of law reform beginning chiefly with Darley’s Equity Act of 1880 (which effected procedural relief while ensuring that New South Wales would long be denied the English Judicature System), embracing Sir Alfred Stephen’s Criminal Law Amendment Act 1883, and ending with the appointment of a Commission to consolidate the statute law — a task completed by Judge C. G. Heydon at the very turn of the century. Otherwise, the hard financial times were not conducive to law reform and the subject became eclipsed by the emergent Commonwealth.

The inauguration of the Commonwealth of Australia should have evoked a new era in legal education. Not only were there new constitutional relationships and new systems of law to
expound, but the High Court when it came into being in 1903 fulfilled the fears of the old legal pragmatists like Sir Frederick Darley. The new concentration on legal principle, adopted vigorously by the High Court from its inception, was due entirely to the remarkable legal genius of the first Chief Justice, Sir Samuel Griffith. His standards at once impressed the practising profession who realized that, in most cases, reliance on traditional court usage would not win appeals. More gradually the same standards influenced all Australian Law Schools. But, in Sydney, where the struggle to survive the 1890s was still being experienced, there were not yet resources enough to bring legal education fully into the twentieth century. Of that more remains to be said.

**The Return of the Native**

William Pitt Cobbett was Australian by birth. As if to compensate for the somewhat radical associations of the name Cobbett in England, his parents declared their political allegiances by naming their sons William Pitt and Wilberforce, respectively. In Australia, William signed his name, and was generally known as, Pitt Cobbett.

Being taken to England at an early age, all his mature education was English. At the University of Oxford he attained, as well as the related Bachelor’s degrees, the degrees of Master of Arts and Doctor of Civil Law, the latter being awarded in 1887 two years after publication of the first edition of his *Leading Cases and Opinions on International Law*. He had been called to the Bar at Gray’s Inn in 1875 but eschewed practice, preferring to work as a tutor in law at Oxford and as a private coach in London. His reputation as a teacher was very high. Among his Oxford pupils were at least two Australians, Bernhard Ringrose Wise and Neil Elliott Lewis, who were to become notable lawyers and public figures in New South Wales and Tasmania respectively — though Cobbett, in Australia, seems not to have maintained any association with them. At Oxford, Cobbett won other fame as an amateur boxer and as ‘an adept of the oar’.

The allocation of £2000 by the Senate of the University of Sydney in 1889 to establish its Law School represented something of a triumph for the lawyer members. With Sir William Manning as Chancellor and Sir William Windeyer as Dean, the time had come to emphasise that Medicine had received a handsome enough share of the Challis bequest and a redressing of the balance was needed. R. R. Garran (later, as Sir Robert, first Solicitor-General of the Commonwealth) admitted to turning this poetic justice into ‘poetry’ which students rendered as song on the University’s Commemoration Day in April 1890, including the lines:

> Now Medicine may starve and pine,
> But we don’t care a straw;
> Hip! Hip! Hurrah! We shortly are
> To have a School of Law.

Further, the lawyers had been given a free hand in prescribing the nature of the law course and the mandatory qualifications of the first professor. For an annual salary of £900 the Challis Professor of Law was to teach Roman Law, Jurisprudence, Constitutional Law and International Law — a prescription written almost as if Cobbett were destined to fill the Chair. But its narrowness is puzzling. One can only ponder why the University would have wished to pass over the services of a scholar with an established reputation in fields such as equity, property or torts, and possibly unwilling to profess constitutional or international law.

The arrangement of the remainder of the course was also as prescriptive as it was rudimentary. There would be four Challis Lecturers. Their several fields would be, as if continuing the style of legal education in the days of Blackstone: the law of property; the law of obligations; the ‘law of wrongs civil and criminal’; and the law of procedure. The lectureships were to be advertised on the assumption, realised in fact, that they would be taken by members of the New South Wales Bar.

While *sidere mens eadem mutato* may be the University motto, the Senate seemed disposed in 1890 to underwrite *mens eadem* by handicapping candidates from beneath southern constellations. The latter would be reviewed by the Senate itself. But applicants in England would be
required to present themselves to and be assessed by a committee of compelling eminence, whose report the Senate would entertain. That committee consisted of Lord Justice Bowen, Professors Pollock and Holland of Oxford, Professor Westlake of Cambridge, and, as colonial representatives, Sir Saul Samuel (Agent-General) and Dr. Normand MacLaurin (later, as Sir Normand, Chancellor of the University). The conclusion is inescapable that applicants interviewed by the English committee were better placed to succeed than were any others.

Whatever records may have been kept by the committee do not survive in the University Archives and, to the time of writing, no trace of them has been found. So no information can be advanced as to the applicants, their identities or qualifications; but there seem to have been 15 of them. On 3 February 1890 the Senate ‘carefully compared’ the testimonials of the committee’s nominated candidate with those of the local applicants (whoever they may have been). The result was that: ‘For the Challis Chair of Law, the choice of the Senate fell upon Mr. Pitt Cobbett, DCL (Oxford), Barrister-at-Law’. Sixteen applications for the Challis Lectureships were also entertained and four appointments were made.

Thus, at the age of 37, Cobbett severed his English connexions to return to Australia, but to a part of it with which he was unfamiliar. Further, he returned under an academic fetter. He had had no hand in designing the course over which he was to preside, just as he was taken into no-one’s confidence as to the four lecturers who were to be his coadjutants. He was unmarried. He had no established friends in Sydney. He must have had moments of doubt, during the voyage out, whether he had decided for the best.

On 19 May 1890, soon after his arrival, Pitt Cobbett was admitted reciprocally to the Bar of New South Wales on the motion of the Attorney-General, G. B. Simpson, QC. It was a mere ceremony. He did not take chambers and his name did not appear on the published annual roll. He deferred delivering his lectures until mid-year, taking time to settle in and organise the tasks ahead. Windeyer did not yet vacate the office of Dean in Cobbett’s favour, but remained on to the end of his three-year term, keeping, one supposes, a watchful eye over the performance of the new recruit.

Challis Professor of Law

No special occasion marked the translation of the first Challis Professor of Law. But he was not long delayed in making his presence felt publicly. On 27 June 1890 he read a paper ‘Democracy in America’ to a well-attended gathering of the University Literary and Debating Club. On 16 July he addressed a larger forum through a lengthy article ‘The Establishment of the Law School’ in the Sydney Morning Herald. He immediately challenged one of the criticisms of those of the old order, that creating the School ‘was not the outcome of any public need, but was due merely to a prevailing desire to add new departments to university life’. He believed that the Senate had been wiser than had its critics. Sydney Law School would follow, he was sure, not simply the precedents of Melbourne and Adelaide but would embrace the pattern of development in America — where over 50 Law Schools then existed — with beneficial results to the public at large.

Being Australian born he did not need to affect a stranger’s diffidence in pointing to the reality that Sydney would have been left behind had the Law School been much longer delayed. He wrote:

Sydney has become a great centre of commercial activity, . . . it is seemingly destined by its situation to become the commercial capital of Australia, and . . . it must necessarily, therefore, become more and more the centre of legal life and litigation.

Had the University of Sydney not acted when it did, Cobbett’s view was that it would have lost prospective law students to other Australian universities. His aim would be to provide a Law School worthy of Sydney’s place, in which students would become acquainted with the ‘science’ of law and not be turned loose upon the community to follow law ‘as a mere part of the trade of money-getting’.

As a lecturer, Cobbett had a commanding personality that verged on the magnetic. He was a master of an almost theatrical style that demanded attention. Physically described, in one
instance, as a man of 'strong bony framework [with] broad stooping shoulders', and, in another, as a 'short, frail man, . . . driving in some abstruse point . . . like a practised blacksmith pounding with a great sledgehammer on a piece of toughened steel', he was, at least at the beginning of lectures, regularly distinguished by 'a radiant smile' and 'the cheeriest manner'. Things did not always remain cheery because of his habitual heaping of humiliation upon those not measuring up to his standards. As against the view that 'with the students no one could have been more popular than Professor Cobbett', it would be more accurate to say that students respected him, they did not necessarily like him. But he was never one merely to court popularity.

In the recollection of Sir George Rich:

At lectures [Cobbett] frequently adopted a crouching attitude, with his left foot on a chair, and his head thrust forward. He would wave his spectacles to emphasize a point and would peer sideways through one glass, like a bird looking down a bottle. His delivery was rapid, his speech staccato, with abbreviations and explanations interpolated in a lower tone, but, in spite of his sudden burst of extraordinary speed, he never slurred a syllable.

Contemporary students remarked, though, that these contrivances were offset by the Professor's business-like manner, by his awesome command of the detail of his subjects (he always took notes and books to his lectures, but rarely had to refer to them), by his insistence that case references be turned up and verified by the students themselves, and by his well-meaning but measured criticism administered to his interlocutors in the Socratic exchanges he encouraged.
He adhered to a syllogistic style of presentation, inviting the students to take down headings and sub-headings as virtual premisses that would lead to necessary conclusions. Aristarchus, in a witty parody, ‘Letters to Living Professors — To Professor Pitt Cobbett’, in Hermes of May 1892, emulated the style while making a point:

Let us take this for our heading.

A. **You lecture too fast.** Your lectures are delightfully clear, and you make everything plain to the meanest comprehension; but (keeping this quite distinct) (a) is your shorthand writer? and (b) is your servant a dog?

No writer who does not come under either of these heads can possibly keep pace with an ordinary speaker, and certainly not with one who speaks as fast as you do when, a times, you get carried away by the poetic beauty of your own airy fancies. Now, I hope I have made this quite clear to you. I am willing to repeat it if you wish it.

Now, an entirely new heading please . . .

Elected Dean in 1891 and continuing so until his resignation, Cobbett soon became, as Mr. Justice Hutley put it, ‘the dominant figure in legal education in New South Wales’. He also, incidentally, commenced something of a tradition in that, to the time of writing, he and four other Deans of the Sydney Faculty have held degrees of the University of Oxford. Beyond the University of Sydney he was President of the Solicitors’ Admission Board from 1894 and an examiner for the Barristers’ Admission Board from 1891. Within the University he was the only full-time lecturer in law for many years, an *ex officio* member of the Senate from 1890, and Chairman of the Professorial Board in 1900.

Cobbett took a part, as Dean, that is difficult fully to appreciate in 1990 when the State has many Law Schools and the duties of the office of Dean are chiefly concerned with administration and ceremony. The great likelihood, in 1990, is that a student may pass through all stages of a university law course without hearing a single lecture from the Dean or Head of School.

In 1890 things were different. The Dean was at once figurehead, pilot and captain of his small ship. Those who came under his influence would learn from him such that he might ‘almost make or mar the legal standards of the State’. Not only did Cobbett fully acquit himself of that trust, he also used his influence to blend theory with practice — the science of law with the realities of its dispensation — so that it can still fairly be said that in many essential features the Law School retains the imprint of Pitt Cobbett.

**Setting Course**

Immediately after his arrival, Cobbett applied himself to a review of the University by-laws for the Faculty of Law. Although himself a product and capable exponent of the English system of legal education, his knowledge of comparable courses elsewhere acquired through his command of international law encouraged him to esteem less the English, and admire more the American, approach to Law Schools. The former lived too much in the past, directing excessive attention to history and classical literature and leaving the realities of the law to be learned by experience. The latter elevated practice subjects to intellectual disciplines in their own right, producing, in Cobbett’s estimation, lawyers of greater ability. He set out to shift the Sydney Law School’s centre of gravity away from Blackstone and Stephen, and towards a study of the law as it was then practised in Australia from day to day.

The architects of the course that had been presented to Cobbett as a *fait accompli* required considerable persuasion to agree to any change. But Cobbett won the support of Windeyer and, through him, that of the Faculty and of the Senate, to a rearrangement of the prescribed subjects and a modernisation of reference books.

The system Cobbett supplanted had made the degree of Bachelor of Laws virtually a postgraduate degree. In a five-year curriculum, Arts subjects would be taken for three years, whereupon the candidate would graduate BA. Then two years of law subjects would lead to the LLB. Cobbett, while wholly in sympathy with a balanced university education, did not like the prominence that course gave to humanities at the expense of practice subjects. Similar views would be put forward by Professor William Jethro Brown (of whom more shortly) when, at
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Cobbett’s request, he wrote a paper ‘Law Schools and the Legal Profession’ for the Commonwealth Law Review, including this assessment:

Until very recent years, at any rate in England, the law school and the profession seemed pre­destined to drift apart. The work of the teacher of law was assigned to specialists who, though often men of wide culture, learned in the law, and animated by the noblest enthusiasm for their work, were not practising lawyers. On the other hand, those who were engaged in the practice of the profession seemed well content as a body to regard the law school from that impartial and detached point of view which is the privilege of the indifferent spectator.

Brown drew upon his knowledge of American Law Schools — ‘probably the best to be found in the modern world’ — and lamented that Australia had not followed their example. Instead there had been inherited English traditions from days when ‘law schools were not schools of English law’. He instanced the English three-year curriculum that devoted the first two years to Roman Law, Public International Law, Jurisprudence, and Constitutional Law and history, while cramming into the final year Property, Equity, Contracts, Torts and Crimes. That, Brown thought, was so hopelessly unbalanced as ‘scarcely [to] pretend to embrace a study of English law’. For just those reasons, Cobbett in 1890 had the foresight to press for a better equilibrium between the theoretical and the practical.

The effect of Cobbett’s changes was that a BA was no longer a condition precedent to the LLB. But entry remained through the Faculty of Arts where two, rather than three, years had to be spent. In the third year there was an intermediate examination in Jurisprudence, Roman Law and International Law, on passing which the candidate was eligible to undertake two further years of practical subjects, leading if successful to the award of the LLB. Students having graduated in Arts could go straight into the final years of law and take as well the LLB degree.

For articled clerks, who represented an attractive force for recruitment to the Law School, even the two years of Arts under Cobbett’s revision were a deterrent. Clerking left no time to travel out of the city to the University’s expansive grounds. Many clerks voiced their disappointment and sense of frustration that they could not undertake a course in law alone at the Law School. One of them wrote in the Articled Clerks’ Journal for July 1890:

I am perfectly aware that any Articled Clerk can at present attend the lectures in connection with the degree of Bachelor of Laws . . ., but he is not eligible, minus a degree, to present himself for examination . . . No Articled Clerk possessing the least sense of manliness and dignity would attend the lectures unless he could do so on precisely the same footing as the rest of the students.

It may be mentioned that Cobbett’s revised scheme with its intermediate examination had been designed not only to effect the balancing already referred to, but also to bring the course and the examination ‘into almost complete harmony’ with the first branch of the Bar examination (of the Admission Board). Exposure of novices to ‘the theoretical subjects’ was, Cobbett believed, doubly advantageous in counteracting ‘the ill effect which might else ensue to the average student from plunging at once into the technical study of English law, with its uncouth phraseology and unsystematic arrangement’.

Pitt Cobbett’s first exam papers showed that he was not content, for example, to adopt traditional ideas about studying Roman Law as a literary exercise. Fifty years after he began, Sydney students had reverted to offering memorised translations of unexplained passages of Justinian’s Institutes. But Cobbett stimulated his students to a higher sense of comparative law as witnessed in the question:

Give a sketch of the arrangement followed by Justinian in his treatment of ‘Jus quod ad personas pertinet’. What different views have been put forward as to the meaning of this division of law?

His questions in constitutional and international law were similarly searching and, certainly without notice (possibly even with notice), would leave most modern students and practitioners floundering. Nevertheless, all five of the pioneer students passed.
During the second and third years, when the ‘professional subjects’ were undertaken, the opportunity was afforded that ‘a special subject in English law . . . be taken up by candidates desiring a place in the first or second class’. The unduly generalised subjects originally approved by the Senate were marshalled by Professor Cobbett into three themes: real and personal property; common law (including contracts, torts, criminal law, procedure and evidence); and equity. They were divided, with some overlapping, among the four lecturers. These changes again tied in with the Bar examination and, while admittedly still superficial in content, were to be ‘more in harmony with the distinctions which prevail in practice than that which was previously adopted’. There would then be a ‘final examination’ for the LLB degree, to be administered partly in writing and partly *viva voce*.

By December 1890 the Barristers’ Admission Board graciously approved the LLB degree as equivalent to a certificate by the Board’s examiners and, in the following year, a rule was made granting some exemptions to graduates from the Board’s course of study. Somewhat similar concessions were granted by the Solicitors’ Admission Board in 1894. The further relationship between the University’s degrees and the Admission Boards is beyond the scope of this work, but may be pursued in *Legal Education in N.S.W.: Report of Committee of Inquiry* (the ‘Bowen Committee’) (December 1979) and in other publications.

In 1896 the clamour of articled clerks for access to university education better suited to their circumstances could no longer be denied. They, after all, represented the Law School’s future hope, the numbers otherwise attracted to the course being disappointingly small. Pitt Cobbett revised his ideas, probably against his private judgement, and suggested that articled clerks be admitted, as students for the LLB only, on passing a preliminary examination equivalent in standard to the then Senior Public Examination.

This time, the full range of Cobbett’s proposed changes fell foul of the Professorial Board. It rejected his submission that third-year Arts students be allowed to graduate BA on taking the course prescribed for the fourth year in law without including any extra Arts subjects. A contributor to *Hermes* complained that no-one seemed properly to understand the rationale behind the Arts segment of the course and that the whole curriculum gave rise to confusion. Nevertheless, he felt that Professor Cobbett’s proposals were for the best and that the Board had acted hastily:

> The course at present is an excellent one in every way, and it might, if necessary, be supplemented by additional lectures. Many persons, even some of the Law students themselves, are inclined to think that the Fourth Year course is easier than it really is simply because of the excellence of the lectures. But it is scarcely fair to penalise the Law School because it happens to possess an exceptionally good lecturer.

Cobbett’s ideas about opening up the course to articled clerks were to have a happier conclusion. His initial notion attracted enormous interest and over 100 articled clerks attended a meeting in the Banco Court in December 1896, the Prothonotary taking the chair. It was announced that Professor Cobbett’s proposals had been examined by a committee of the Senate of the University and approved by the Senate on the understanding that the standard for the preliminary examination would be equivalent to that of the entrance examinations required in the Faculties of Medicine and Science.

At first, the articled clerks’ meeting seemed to be of one mind, that the proposals be adopted. But, in the nature of public meetings, it needed only one speaker in opposition to encourage others to join him. D’Arcy Irvine was that one, speaking at length against the whole concept of learning the law at a university:

> He deprecated it altogether as conducive to the raising up of too theoretical, too bookish, a class of Solicitors, instead of men with sound practical knowledge. Articled clerks had quite enough to do, as it was, to obtain sufficient practical knowledge to enable them to do battle with the world.

Then his supporters — ranging from the general (the matter had been ‘rushed too much’) to the more convincingly particular (the university scheme did not provide for country students) — chimed in. The opposition so gained the ascendancy that its motion to postpone
any resolution seemed inevitably passed. The Prothonotary, to 'save the day', intervened from the chair in a fashion somewhat transcending the usual duties of chairmanship but to such effect that the mood of the meeting at once turned about. The postponement was lost and the proposed new course was won.

In 1897 the Senate approved new Faculty by-laws to that general effect, the unadorned LLB course being extended over five years, the then currency of articles of clerkship. The Senate rejected a request by articled clerks that, because of their discharge of duties for their masters, they be excused from attending any lectures: but the routine of lectures in law before and after normal business hours became thoroughly entrenched by the change.

While Pitt Cobbett had been obliged in these transactions to jettison some of his most cherished ideas of allocating 'theoretical' and humanities studies to a distinct segment of the course or as part of an Arts course, the result was a successful compromise in all the circumstances. Economic conditions remained hard: the future of the Law School depended on its capacity to attract students. And, in all, there had been a very positive response from articled clerks as a body, especially when compared with their rebuffing of his attempt to interest them in lectures on law in 1895. By 1897, Cobbett openly admitted that 'the two classes the Law School was anxious to get hold of were the Civil Servants and the Articled Clerks'.

'Down Town'

Professor Cobbett was also not enthusiastic about law's severance from the University grounds, for the obvious reason that students would be denied the interdisciplinary association so essential to university life. As Hermes noted in 1895:

The Law School by its isolation in Phillip Street is practically cut off from participation in the benefits of University life . . . This isolation puts rather an unfair strain upon [law students'] loyalty, and makes it easy for them to forget that they are still members of the University, and not merely students of Law.

Similar sentiments were expressed in other issues of Hermes over several years.

The Professor's aim was to deliver lectures on the 'theoretical subjects' at the University itself 'inasmuch as most of the students attending them will be in the third year of their Course'. The venue for the professional subject lectures in 1890 was Wentworth Court, which ran between Phillip and Elizabeth streets, a little to the south of, and parallel with, what is now Martin Place. Whether in Hermes or the Articled Clerks' Journal, students managed either the heights of sarcasm in describing the accommodation, or the depths of dismay as they contemplated 'the early hours, the interminable stairs, the dust-carpeted room [and] the ironbark seats'.

After Pitt Cobbett's arrival, the Senate was prevailed upon to enter into a long association with the Parish of St. James' Church of England, King Street, and rent parochial premises in Phillip Street, near King Street — 'a respectable modest-looking building, with an elegant bull's-eye window fronting Phillip Street'. H. R. Curlewis, one of the foundation students (in due course a District Court Judge) wrote in Hermes at the time:

In place of two scanty rooms in Wentworth Court, where the dust of ages had accumulated, and where three-quarters of the lecture was inaudible for the thunder of the passing tram, the strain of the barrel-organ, and the cry of the street hawker, we now have a comfortable stone building . . . furnished with a degree of luxury . . . The building comprises a reading room, with a highly fashionable carpet, comfortable table and chairs . . . a lecture room that would make the other schools green with envy, a smoking room, and a first-rate law library.

The Senate reported that it had been prompted to change the venue by its recognition of the reality that articled clerks and students-at-law had to be provided for in the city. And, of course, the lecturers were there. The law library had been made possible by the allocation of £500 from interest on the fund from Thomas Fisher's bequest.

In 1896 the School was transferred across the street to old Selborne Chambers, 174 Phillip Street, where it remained until 1913. There were no trams in competition, but students of a nearby school of singing had a disquieting habit of articulating scales at law lecture times. The
Law School accommodation, being on the third floor — the top of the building — revived old complaints about climbing stairs, and generated new ones because the premises were very hot in the warmer months when ‘all day the sun shines full on the library wall and windows’.

The Law School’s administrative staff consisted of an attendant and, from 1891, an assistant librarian (assistant, that is, to the University Librarian). In that year, A. J. Kelynack, one of the inaugural students, became assistant librarian for the annual fee of £25. The office was not passed on when he graduated, for, in 1893, with the financial depression biting hard, the Senate reduced Law School funding and abolished the assistant librarianship. The attendant was also affected, being required henceforth to live on, and be caretaker of, the premises, his salary being reduced by £10 per year in consideration of the provision for him of such a handsome residence.

The Faculty had no hope of survival without a working library, so a full time librarian was soon appointed and, by the time of Cobbett’s resignation in 1909, the office of Law School Librarian carried an annual stipend of £130. Some students then thought it a source of grievance that no facility existed to use the library after the librarian finished his daily ration of hours and locked up. But, generally speaking, the library itself was well funded and well patronised.

Years of Tribulation

It is necessary to digress a little to say something of Professor Cobbett’s personal circumstances from the turn of the century. They greatly influenced him, as they influenced the future direction of the Law School.

In October 1900, Hermes reported that the Dean ‘seems to be recovering from the unfortunate state of ill-health in which he has been during the whole of last term’. For one who had been a fit and enthusiastic sportsman, Cobbett was doomed henceforth to a life blighted by chronic illness. He bore it with great courage, made light of it on the surface, and rarely allowed the fulfilment of his duties to be disrupted by it.

He described his affliction of 1900 as ‘an attack of myelitis, accompanied by partial paralysis’ which caused his ‘bodily and mental vigour [to be] greatly undermined’. He was thereafter assailed by a severe digestive disorder that caused acute and prolonged pain and which, with other ailments, remained with him for the rest of his life.

It is understandable, then, that Cobbett, never one to seek an outgoing or, aside from academic duties, a public life, became even more retiring than he had been. He never allowed his standards as teacher, researcher or writer to be diminished: indeed, on one occasion, when trying to write a series of learned papers during a particularly oppressive illness, he was so dissatisfied with the resulting manuscripts that he peremptorily burnt them all. The one area of professional life in which he did seek to compromise for the sake of his health was administration which, like many other scholars, he loathed heartily. Faculty meetings tended not to be held, and minutes not to be kept, or to be kept imperfectly. He continued to discharge his duties as a Fellow of the Senate, but did not take too active a part. He was unable to entertain any extension of the Chairmanship of the Professorial Board he had entered upon in 1900. He did, however, make himself available as one of many witnesses before the Interstate Royal Commission on the River Murray in 1902, giving lengthy evidence on a subject pre-eminently within his field.

Ill health made Cobbett very conscious of the climate: the summers he found very trying. He once wrote that ‘Sydney never suits me climatically... bright and sunny tho’ it is, it is, at the same time, the most enervating climate (outside the tropics) which I have experienced’. In about 1904 he removed from Milson’s Point where he had lived to a huge residence he caused to be built on some acres of land at Willoughby — then an outlying area of bucolic charm said to be elevated enough to benefit health. He called it ‘Greenacre’, demonstrating the fulfilment of a dream to become a landed gentleman. He had hoped to be original in the building’s design, but did not succeed. He wrote:
When I built at Willoughby I wished to strike out a line [of architecture] for myself; but the architect [introduced] ... so many pains and penalties in the matter of cost ... that I ultimately resigned myself to follow the conventional lines — altho' I insisted on a serviceable and easily worked arrangement of rooms.

The resulting ugly building turned out to be a folly which did not relieve Cobbett's failing health and had ultimately to be sold at a considerable loss.

During this period Cobbett continued his exertions to provide, from Sydney, something in the nature of a law journal. He had already given much time to that task as editor of the Weekly Notes Covers. In 1903 he became, nominally, Consulting Editor to, though in reality the mainspring of, the Commonwealth Law Review. Although the solicitor (sometime barrister) Everard Digby was designated editor, the range of illustrious contributors leaves no doubt that Cobbett had attracted their participation. Significantly, the Review, which was an admirable publication, expired on Cobbett's eventual resignation from the University.

His taking leave in 1905 was as much due to the need to obtain medical advice in England as it was to conduct research. The prognosis for his health would not be encouraging.

An Acting Dean and Others Pro Tempore

While Dean, Professor Cobbett twice took sabbatical leave and travelled overseas. During those absences acting Professors of Law were appointed. On each occasion the acting Dean was William Portus Cullen. His life is reviewed in the Australian Dictionary of Biography, but a sketch of it is warranted here.

Cullen was born at Jamberoo in 1855, one of many children of a farmer and his wife. His career was meant to be limited to running the family farm. Instead, at school, to and from which he walked several miles each day, he found another stimulus. He had a natural gift for mathematics and a voracious appetite for reading. He 'smuggled' books home from school to be read at intervals when his parents were not watching. They disapproved of books and of academic learning. When old enough he ran away from home, worked his passage to Sydney on a steam ship from Kiama, and took whatever menial jobs were necessary to pay his rent.

Winning a scholarship to the University, he had a career of dazzling academic brilliance, winning several more scholarships and prizes, graduating BA with first class honours in classics and second class honours in mathematics (1880) and going on to take his MA (1882), LLB (1885) and LL.D (1887). Like Pitt Cobbett, his early income after graduation was largely from tutoring and coaching, though he was also successful as a freelance journalist. He was admitted to the New South Wales Bar on 30 April 1883 and entered upon a slender private practice. He was soon torn in his allegiances.

The University of Adelaide advertised for its foundation Professor of Law in 1887. With references from Sir William Manning (Chancellor of the University of Sydney), B. R. Wise (Attorney-General), Edmund Barton, Walter Scott (Professor of Classics) and some Sydney judges, Cullen must have been a strong, if relatively young, contender. He did not succeed and he had, to Sydney University's loss, abandoned all thoughts of a full time academic career when the Challis Chair of Law was advertised in 1889.

He did, however, apply for and was appointed to one of the Challis Lectureships, being responsible for Equity and Real Property. He also delivered separate lectures to articled clerks. Although a man of some shyness and reserve, his lectures were well received. He pushed himself forward in public life by his strong support for Australian Federation which he ventilated while a Member of the Legislative Assembly representing Camden (1891-1894) and as a nominee Member of the Legislative Council (1895-1910). Because of his growing legal practice and political commitments, he decided to assist the University by resigning as Challis Lecturer at the end of 1894, his duties being taken up by Cobbett on an honorary basis, 'on the understanding', the Professor cautiously added, '[that] the fact of his doing additional work should not vitiate his contract with the University'.

Cullen was not long allowed to fade out of university life. He was elected a Fellow of the Senate in 1896 and, in 1897, he was appointed acting Dean of Law during the absence of Pitt Cobbett in Lent and Trinity Terms 1898.
That decision, incidentally, provided an entree to the Law School of the first woman student, Ada Emily Evans. Her career, recounted in the *Australian Dictionary of Biography* and elsewhere, cannot be pursued here. But the *Dictionary* correctly states that Cobbett 'would not have accepted a woman law student' and he did not on any occasion while he was Dean. Cullen, with his humble origins and his disposition to look forward rather than backwards, was readily convinced that women should be encouraged to take their place in the learned professions.

In Lent and Trinity Terms of 1905 Cobbett was again granted leave and Cullen was re-appointed acting Dean. In that year Cullen took silk, having been well received in the High Court where his 'modern' approach to the law was in keeping with that demanded by Chief Justice Griffith. Cullen's elevation as Chief Justice of New South Wales in 1910, in succession to Darley, represented the beginning of a new juridical order in the State. Knighted in 1912, Cullen went on to be Chancellor of the University of Sydney for 20 years from 1914.

Cullen was a great Australian, the State's first Australian-born Chief Justice, and a lawyer of rare eminence. His career and the achievements it represented, attained often in the face of enormous obstacles, deserve remembrance.

The acting Professors of Law during Cobbett's two sabbaticals may be mentioned here briefly. Their lives are noticed in the *Australian Dictionary of Biography*: neither had any past or future association with the University of Sydney.

William Jethro Brown was appointed to the acting Chair in 1898. He was then Professor of Law in the University of Tasmania. Cobbett and Brown became friends, but it seems most likely that this temporary appointment was the start of their friendship. Cobbett gave a written reference to Brown in 1900 that suggests no knowledge of him before 1898. It also confirms Cobbett's role in organising his *locum tenens*. 'I was fortunate enough', he wrote, 'in 1898, to secure the services of Mr. Jethro Brown as Acting Professor of Law'. He testified to Brown's discharging the duties 'with unqualified success; - an achievement not altogether of the easiest, for any one unfamiliar with the peculiarities of our local law'. The results demonstrated Brown's having 'in a marked degree' the essential qualities of a successful teacher. Brown impressed Cobbett as exhibiting a capacity 'for arousing in his students an interest in historical and philosophical aspects of their subject'.

Brown went on to be Professor of various branches of law at University College, London, The University College of Wales, Aberystwyth, and the University of Adelaide. In 1916 he was appointed President of the Industrial Court of South Australia continuing until his retirement in 1927. The Sydney law students of 1898 found Brown 'universally popular', and *Hermes* reported that:

> During his short stay amongst us he has shown a keen interest in all departments of University life, a never failing courtesy, and a deep sympathy with the interests of those under his charge. His lectures have been scholarly and interesting.

On Cobbett's taking leave in 1905 the Tasmanian precedent was followed, with Professor Dugald Gordon McDougall acting in his stead. How he could be spared, being then 'the only full-time law academic' in the University of Tasmania where he professed 'an astonishing ten subjects', can only be surmised. Cobbett was probably less than delighted, given his own inability to pursue substantial scholarly writing because of his heavy teaching duties and diminished health, to find on his return that McDougall used the Sydney interlude to see through the press his book *Self-governing Colonies*. McDougall remained as Professor of Law in the University of Tasmania until retiring in 1933.

**Challis Lecturers in Law**

Enough has been written here of Cullen's appointment. The other foundation lecturers were Rich, Leverrier and Coghlan. They were as accomplished a group of teacher-practitioners as any professor could have wished. George Edward Rich, like Cullen, was born in the country, but in a religious household where education was encouraged. After a sound career at the University (BA (1885) MA (1887)), during which he was a founder of *Hermes*, he was admitted
Law School, University government and high public office marked the career of the Hon Sir William Portus Cullen KCMG, law lecturer, acting Dean, University Chancellor, Chief Justice of New South Wales, and Lieutenant Governor of the State.

Miss Ada Emily Evans, the first woman to graduate from Sydney University Law School (1902), though denied the right to enter the profession until 1918.

to the Bar in 1887. He was a lecturer at the Law School from 1890 until taking silk in 1911. His field, at first, was to lecture on the law of obligations, personal property and contracts. Later he became responsible for Equity, Probate, Bankruptcy and Company Law. His appointment as acting Judge of the Supreme Court in 1911 led to a full commission in 1912, which he resigned in 1913 on being elevated as a Justice of the High Court. He retired in 1950 after 37 years on the High Court bench.

Francis (Frank) Hewitt Leverrier was the lecturer on Contracts, Torts and Crimes — later the law of status, civil obligations and crimes. Born and partly educated in France, Leverrier was brought to Sydney where he attended the University as an undergraduate extraordinaire. Virtually expelled from St. John's College 'because of his inability to submit to college discipline', he was at once a student of prodigious ability, graduating BA and BSc, each with first class honours, with three gold medals, including two for natural science and agricultural chemistry respectively. Turning from these improbable antecedents to the law, he became a student-at-law and was admitted to the Bar in 1888. Mr. Justice Piddington assessed Leverrier 'in all-round intellectual strength and quality [as] easily the finest man at the New South Wales Bar or, in my opinion, at the Bar of the Commonwealth'.

Piddington also remarked, drily, that it was a great loss that such a man had had to make do with practising a liberal profession when lack of opportunity in those days denied him a
scientific career. Leverrier remained a lecturer until 1907, taking silk in 1911. Surprisingly he was not elevated to the bench, but Sir John Peden considered that he would have had that preferment had he wished it.

Charles Augustus Coghlan was a lawyer of a somewhat different class from the other foundation Challis Lecturers, though no less learned, having taken the degrees of Master of Arts and Doctor of Laws in the University. Following his admission to the Bar in 1880 he built up a sound chambers practice and specialized as a pleader. He eventually took silk. It was fitting that he should lecture on pleading, evidence and procedure, even though, to rely on the memory of Mr. Justice F. S. Boyce, 'no one could rightly describe [him] as an interesting lecturer'. Coghlan shared with Cullen the capacity to push himself forward by his own intellectual vigour, being the son of working class parents of humble means. Misjudging Coghlan's retiring demeanour, H. R. Curlewis, a foundation student of the Law School, sought to lampoon him in Hermes in a piece the effect of which was that the Medical School had turned loose a lunatic from Callan Park asylum who was passing himself off as lecturer in procedure. The wrath of Coghlan descended so mightily that a craven retraction ('that which I wrote proceeded neither from malice . . . nor from personal ill-feeling') was published in the next issue, and a practical lesson in the law of defamation had been learnt.

Cullen, as already noticed, stood aside in 1894: Coghlan resigned at the end of 1900. Coghlan's place was taken by David Gilbert Ferguson who had attained his BA in the University in 1886 and worked for some years as a journalist and as a shorthand writer to a firm of solicitors. In 1890 he was admitted to the Bar and was soon recruited as a draftsman into C. G. Heydon's Statute Law Consolidation Commission. He lectured from 1900 to 1911 when he resigned to take an acting seat on the Supreme Court of New South Wales, being given a permanent appointment in 1912. He was knighted in 1934, having retired from the Bench in 1931. In contrast with Coghlan's extremely heavy lectures, it was said, perhaps tongue in cheek given the nature of the subject, that Ferguson 'could make pleading and procedure as interesting as a novel'.

Another change seems to have occurred in 1900, though there is some conflict in the sources as to the date. Cobbett, whose health was at the point of breaking down, had without complaint carried not only his own teaching load but that of one of the Challis Lecturers for several
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**FACULTY OF LAW.**

**FIRST YEAR.**

**ROMAN LAW AND INTERNATIONAL LAW.**—At times to be arranged.

* **LAW OF REAL PROPERTY AND EQUITY.**—Mond, Wednesday, Friday, 8.45 a.m. Fee, £2 2s. Mr. W. J. Cullen, M.A., LL.D.

* **LAW OF OBLIGATIONS, PERSONAL PROPERTY, AND CONTRACTS.**—Tuesday, Thursday, 8.45 a.m. Fee, £2 2s. Mr. G. E. Rich, M.A.

---

**SECOND YEAR.**

**JURISPRUDENCE AND CONSTITUTIONAL LAW.**—At times to be arranged.

* **LAW OF WROINGS (CIVIL AND CRIMINAL).**—Monday, Wednesday, Friday, 4.30 p.m. Fee, £2 2s. Mr. F. Leverrier, B.A., B.Sc.

* **LAW OF PROCEDURE, INCLUDING EVIDENCE.**—Tuesday, Thursday, 4.30 p.m. Fee, £2 2s. Mr. C. A. Coghlan, M.A., LL.D.

* Note.—These lectures will be delivered at Wentworth-court, in Elizabeth-street.
years. The University at last relented and decided to appoint, not a replacement lecturer, but a Reader in Law. The appointee was Thomas Rainsford Bavin (later Premier of the State and, as Sir Thomas, a Judge of the Supreme Court from 1935) who became Reader in Property. He had graduated in the University in Arts (1894) and in Law (1897) with first class honours in each case and the University medal in law.

When, in 1900, Jethro Brown sought the return of a favour by inviting Cobbett to Hobart to preside over the Law School of the University of Tasmania while Brown took leave, Cobbett, with typical regard for a protege, put forward Bavin as the man for the job. Bavin went south as acting Professor in Law and in History, while Cobbett was left to struggle on without a Reader, until the Senate made an interim appointment in 1901 of John Beverley Peden.

In 1902 there were some significant changes. Cobbett managed to have the curriculum revised again. But it was the last change during his term as Dean. With the exception of one final struggle mentioned later, and the intervention of a minor unsuccessful proposal in 1908 concerning deferred examinations, he had neither the strength nor the inclination to continue battles with mightier powers. The 1902 amendments brought fresh students into more immediate contact with legal subjects. The first year course retained only Roman Law and Constitutional Law (so far as the latter could fairly be called a theoretical subject) from the earlier group of humanities. With them Contracts, Mercantile Law, Torts, Crimes and Domestic Relations were to be attempted — obviously in a superficial fashion but so as to create a greater awareness in the student of the general ‘shape’ of the legal system.

In second year, as well as Property, Conveyancing, Public International Law and Jurisprudence, a group of new subjects had to be undertaken. They were Legal History, Political Science, Legal Interpretation and Private International Law.

The course was beginning to assume a ‘modern’ and balanced appearance. But delivering it to a growing body of students had become extremely burdensome, especially since Cobbett’s health had collapsed. In 1902 it was announced that Peden’s appointment as Reader in Property was to be continued. Thus commenced a long association on the permanent staff of the man who would in due time succeed Cobbett as Dean, and whose career is appropriately left for consideration in the next chapter.

Finally to be noticed here is the appointment in 1907 of Ernest Meyer Mitchell to the lectureship vacated by Leverrier. Mitchell was another outstanding scholar, having taken in the University his BA (1896) with first class honours in classics and his LLB (1900) with University Medal. He was admitted to the Bar in 1900 and built up a huge practice, taking silk in 1925, but declining offers of appointment to the Bench. He was described as ‘an unorthodox lecturer (who) walked around the room as he spoke’. Mitchell had been one of five candidates for the vacancy, an unsuccessful applicant being T. R. Bavin.

Of Smoke Concerts and Other Things

It is not practicable, in this chapter, to write much of the students at the Law School between 1890 and 1910. That is not to say that the writer subscribes to the view that histories of educational establishments may properly be written, as some now are, almost without notice of those passing through as students. But, in this case, there is another consideration. The generation of those constituting the foundation students at the Law School has passed away. What their representatives remembered of those years was set out in the Jubilee Book of the Law School in 1940. This chapter would have necessarily to rely so much on that source as to adopt and repeat many passages verbatim. It has seemed better to let the Jubilee Book speak for itself.

No records have been discovered of the enrolment of the original students. Similarly, no diaries or personal papers of those students have come to light to testify to their years of learning. There is also, after the passage of time, the inevitable temptation to assess students, not by standards contemporaneous with their studies, but with hindsight — attributing notice only to those who later became rich or famous. Every graduate will at once recognise the distortion inevitable in that approach, with its tendency to ignore the bright scholar who failed to succeed in professional life, while making much of the academic plodder who went on to command a spectacular practice in the law.
What can be recorded with certainty is who were not among the original Law School students of 1890. Sir Robert Garran recalled that:

When the Law School started . . . I and others of my year had finished with Arts, and were two years gone in study of the law. We asked to be allowed to submit ourselves, without attendance at lectures, for the LLB examination, after the manner of our fathers; but this was denied us by the hard-hearted Faculty.

Those who did start in 1890 appear to have included H. R. Curlewis, A. J. Kelynack, Sidney Mack and J. M. A. Meillon. The first three became barristers. Meillon was admitted as a solicitor, practising in partnership in a firm styled Meillon and McElhone.

In their isolation from the University grounds, these pioneers, and their slowly augmented numbers as the years went by, must have seemed more like a family than students at a Law School. Likewise the teaching responsibilities called for almost personal tutelage rather than for a detached exposition of the subjects of study.

Five students submitted themselves at the intermediate examination in 1891. By 1902 there were in all 40 students at the Law School, eight of whom sat the intermediate examination and ten the final — only one being unsuccessful. By 1908, a year before Professor Cobbett’s resignation, 155 undergraduates had been admitted to the LLB degree through the School.

The students soon organised for themselves a fair range of social and sporting activities. They formed a committee in 1891, with Thompson, Coyle, Lopez, Kelynack and Curlewis as members, serving a total complement of about two dozen students. They arranged, on the one hand, regular debates and moots, and, on the other hand, cricket matches — even in the autumn. Cobbett, still in robust health, gave his support to the cricket. Being for a time a Vice-President of the University’s Sports Union, he did not even cavil at the use of a matting wicket in a passageway of the Law School. Football, rowing and athletics were pursued outdoors.

An event of great social moment was an annual reunion, usually called a ‘smoke concert’. One of the most memorable was held at Aaron’s Exchange Hotel in May 1896. Cobbett, in an expansive mood, not only took the chair, but also delivered a good humoured speech adorned with old chestnuts about well-drawn bills of costs being the most beautiful things in the universe. The Premier (G. H. Reid) and Edmund Barton, QC, were among several guests of eminence. The latter, in proposing the toast to the Law School, remarked that:

The University had suffered from misdescription. The press had not understood its aims and objects. It had been from day to day and year to year described as for the sons of the rich, but that was a misdescription. In the days when he was an undergraduate there were not among the students who went through with him half a dozen who were the sons of rich men. They were nearly all the sons of poor men, and work which our University was doing was not really to educate the sons of the rich, but the sons of the poor in overwhelming proportion.

By 1898, the possibility of forming a law students’ society was being canvassed among the student body. The idea was pondered over for a few years, with the opinion gaining most support that a society of graduates and undergraduates would be best. In 1902 the Law School Society was founded. The moving spirit behind its foundation was probably that of Kelynack, one of the inaugural students, who had graduated in 1892 (after serving as assistant librarian), and gone on to the Bar, becoming a draftsman with the Statute Law Consolidation Commission for some years. Kelynack, the son of the Revd William Kelynack, sometime President of Newington College School, himself embarked on a course in theology, but gave it up for teaching, before taking his BA in 1889 and going on to law. He was elected as the Society’s first President. The early success of the Society was further ensured by having Cobbett as Patron, with Ferguson, Leverrier, Rich, Peden and Bavin as Vice-Presidents, and undergraduates among the lesser office-bearers and committee.

Cobbett prevailed on the Senate to release, for the Society’s own use, two of the rooms it occupied in Selborne Chambers, and at his own cost he had them fitted out as smoking and reading rooms, the latter being intended to supplement the Law School Library. Hermes reported that:
The Society has been founded in a very quiet and business-like fashion and has secured the solid support of both Undergraduates and Graduates in law. There can be no doubt that it will be a very successful institution, and that it will more than compensate the man who goes into law for the social life of the University which he loses by leaving the Main Building and coming down to Phillip Street.

The Society continued to receive Professor Cobbett's support until his resignation in 1909. He was careful, though, to ensure that his encouragement did not create any sense of competition with comparable activities at the University itself. In particular, he urged upon his students that they attend the Union debates. His counsel was said to be; 'You may cut the lectures if you like, but never neglect the Union. A lawyer must learn to express himself on his feet'. He ensured continuity of interest in the Law School Society's activities by his own energetic participation. He chaired many of its meetings, notwithstanding his troublesome health. It was a sign of the importance he attached to fostering a spirit of camaraderie among lawyers associated with the School. The Society, in his time, enjoyed a sound financial operation and became the organising body for many moots, dinners and other functions. It was a source of common regret that, at the sixth annual dinner of the Society, in the winter of 1909, Cobbett had recently announced his resignation as Challis Professor and Dean and was too ill to attend.

Of the students whom he taught in those formative years — a relatively small number when measured against enrolments in later years — Cobbett reserved a special place for those of outstanding scholarly promise. As Mr. Justice F. S. Boyce recalled of Cobbett: 'He was devoted to his Law School and did not confine his interest to our studies but had regard also to our futures'. That is where the professor's perceptions and those of some of his students tended to diverge: for Cobbett, much as he deserved credit for his efforts to produce practitioners of well-rounded ability, did not disguise his preference for those who shared his delight in academic pursuits. As Boyce put it:

His idea was, I think, that the man likely to be successful as a lawyer was the one who passed his class examinations and the like with credit. He did not realize that there were other gifts and qualities which were probably equally essential. I know of four whom he greatly discouraged with his advice but each one of those four most certainly succeeded. He meant well even if he was not always right.

Many of the students had sobering recollections of the Dean's powers of discouragement. As a contributor to the Australian Magazine remarked in 1910: 'Professor Cobbett could say discomfiting things which were none the less discomfiting because he said them in the nicest of ways'. Those in the first year had cause to fear him most. He conducted what he called a 'winter pruning' when, having assessed half a year's work and general demeanour, decanal judgement was delivered. Hermes published 'An Appreciation' of Cobbett in May 1910 which observed of the annual prunings:

It was then that the first year men who showed little promise received a polite intimation that their presence was required in the Professor's chambers. Exactly what took place there only those who have been through the ordeal really know. But this much has leaked out, that in the most paternal way it was explained to them that the legal profession was overcrowded; that there was no room in it except for men of extraordinary talent, dogged perseverance, and unlimited resource. 'It is no use your continuing the course, sir', it is said the Professor would tell them.

The same publication noted the fate of a particular student who, in Cobbett's wonted fashion, had been called upon at the start of one lecture to give an oral summary of the previous day's lecture. It was already apparent that the student's mind was blank when, deus ex machina, the Professor retired to obtain the spectacles he had left in his room. Hurried attempts by supporters to refresh the victim's 'memory' left him more confused than ever and he stood mute on the great man's return. The story concluded with the Cobbett apostrophe:

'And do you ever expect to be a lawyer, sir, when you are too slow to take such an advantage of your adversary; never, sir'. He was right. Shortly afterwards the student bade the Law School a long farewell.
Cobbett’s special attentions, then, were devoted to stimulating capable students to the attainment of university careers. They tended to be among a select inner circle whom he would occasionally entertain to dinner at ‘Greenacre’. He attempted to promote Bavin; and, no doubt, in 1902 he promoted Peden. He did the same for Teece (‘a very fine fellow; one of the most brilliant of our young Australians, and a good lawyer withal’), for Rowland (‘not so brilliant — but has excellent gifts of mind and character’), and for Dettman (‘a good scholar — a very good fellow’; who won a scholarship to Balliol College). But the finest flowering of his example in the students he befriended was surely Frederick Richard Jordan (later, as Sir Frederick, the ninth Chief Justice of New South Wales), of whom more in the next chapter. Jordan had many attributes not unlike, and perhaps modelled on, those of Cobbett. He possessed a refined intellect, and his judgements, still admired for their incisive command of legal principle, reflect a mind indubitably moulded by the influence of Cobbett.

‘Prospects Not Very Bright’

In May 1907 Cobbett wrote to Macmillan Brown commenting that, although Dr. George Rennie, his medical adviser, thought he had made ‘a wonderful recovery on the whole’, he felt so weak that he was minded to give up his work. His various afflictions had been aggravated by a gradual impairment of his hearing. Should he resign, he had resolved to settle near Launceston, Tasmania, where there was ‘some high ground close by, which looks healthy and is open and unsettled’. The previous summer he had, however, experienced a heatwave at Launceston, where he often took the long vacation, and been ‘rather seedy ever since’. He had then written of a possible move to Tasmania, but had declared his preference for Hobart. Diverted from thoughts of retirement by an invitation in 1908 to make written submissions to the Commonwealth Joint Select Committee on Privilege, he applied himself with enthusiasm to that task. But, by September, having prevaricated greatly about his future, he wrote to Jethro Brown:

I saw the Chancellor [Sir Normand MacLaurin] recently with respect to my resignation: — but at his friendly instance I postponed my formal decision for a while. I am still desirous of going: — but if there were any prospect of securing a new building for the Department of ‘Law and Economics’ I think I should be tempted to stay on until this was arranged for. But the prospects are not, so far, very bright: — and I may still carry out my original intention. I will let you know directly the matter is settled.

Those observations were made just before the publication in the Commonwealth Law Review of Brown’s ‘Law Schools and the Legal Profession’ that mirrored Cobbett’s own dissatisfaction with Australian universities’ lack of interest in so providing for legal education that it might emulate the American example. Cobbett’s remarks must also have reflected his concern that, after his 18 years at its helm, the Sydney Law School remained largely directed by the corporate influence of the practising profession which retained many reactionary views about the province of the School.

Cobbett, being the old pugilist that he was, did not yet throw in the towel, though illness must have tempted him to do so. He had been under threat of a major operation throughout 1908, but he occupied his mind by resuming his writing, advancing well with a new edition of Leading Cases. In December of that year the Law Faculty minutes recorded the receipt from R. H. Irvine, one of Cobbett’s select circle of friends and the University’s lecturer in economics and commerce, of a proposal that his subjects become the future responsibility of the Law Department. Cobbett, who had obviously engineered the submission but who, unfortunately, was not a skilful tactician — then tabled a memorandum of his own proposing the annexation of the Department of Commerce to the Faculty of Law. The weakness in his tactics lay in not preparing the ground by ‘selling’ his ideas in advance to individual members of the Senate. But Cobbett would have found such salesmanship unpalatable and beneath academic dignity.

The matter lingered into 1909 when the Senate rejected Cobbett’s proposal. In July it received and accepted with ‘great regret’ his resignation, effective from 31 December 1909 ‘in consequence, partly, of ill health’. It minuted:
an expression of regret, not only for his resignation, but still more for the circumstances which render it necessary, and also an expression of appreciation of the great services which he had rendered to the University.

Soon after the resignation took effect the Senate appointed him Professor Emeritus.

Reaction from his decision left Cobbett 'in the wars' with attacks of mumps, abscesses, further loss of hearing, 'a particularly vicious attack of pneumonia, and bronchitis', all of which rendered him 'rather decrepit'. To compensate for the absences his illness had compelled, he extended his lectures into December beyond the official close of the term. Yet, as the Sydney Morning Herald pointed out at the time, his gesture was almost unremarkable:

With him extra lectures were the rule, not the exception, and the ordinary lectures were almost invariably prolonged beyond the stipulated time... His work was everything. For it no sacrifice was too great.

There were abundant acknowledgements of his contribution to legal education. At the highest level they were epitomised in Mr. Justice O'Connor's view that it would be 'difficult to estimate what the Law and the Bench of the State owe[d]' to Cobbett. At another level, but no less eloquently, the Magistrate, in acclaiming his 20 years of 'untiring and unostentatious service', concluded that: 'Zeal, untiring industry, a kindly heart, a most scrupulous sense of honor are no bad things to be remembered by'. Cobbett felt overwhelmed. He wrote:

Everybody (the public, the press, my students and colleagues) showed me much kindness in the matter of my leaving that it almost forced me into the conviction that I was a more decent kind of body than I had been previously inclined to believe. But this faculty of generous appreciation is, I think, a faculty especially rife amongst Australians; and not unusual amongst lawyers — who altho' possessed of considerable critical power, yet judge their colleagues more broadly and liberally and with less niggardliness than other professions — such as doctors.
Before relinquishing harness, Cobbett had participated in the selection of his successor. That position, it had been resolved by the Faculty in July 1909, should be advertised in Australasia and the United Kingdom. Sir Thomas Bavin, writing in the Jubilee Book of the Law School — 30 years after the event — put it forward as 'a bit of secret history' that Peden 'could have been appointed on the recommendation of Professor Pitt Cobbett' but declined, insistent that he take his chance with other applicants after the vacancy was advertised.

That 'secret history' is suspect. Cobbett himself wrote contemporaneously that 'during the first week of December [1909] I . . . settled the matter of my successor — which gave rise to much difficulty'. It is not at all clear that Cobbett's standing with the Senate was such that any word from him would have ensured the successor of his choice. Indeed, the very element of antipathy between the Dean and the Senate had been the catalyst of his resignation. Nor is it clear that it was within Cobbett's gift to 'settle the matter' at all. It is significant that his friend Jethro Brown was an applicant for the vacant Chair. The facts that Cobbett had recently promoted Brown in the Commonwealth Law Review, had made his plans known to Brown, and had undertaken to let Brown know should he decide to resign, suggest that Cobbett's preference may well have been with Brown. But Cobbett was well satisfied with the selection of his former student and colleague Peden and spent some time helping the new Dean to settle in and cope with the transition.

There is not room here to deal more than cursorily with Cobbett's remaining few years. Immediately after leaving the Law School he had to submit to surgery which weakened him further and left him feeling worse than before. He declined invitations that he be nominated for election as a Fellow of the University Senate. Travelling overseas in 1911 — much as he hated sea voyages and hotels — he sought specialist advice in England and on the Continent. He was subjected to some evidently experimental, and very painful, treatment with electrodes and was advised that the 'colonial' operation had been performed unskilfully and was beyond repair. He had to be reconciled to a life of constant suffering, aggravated by vertigo, 'dis­turbance of vision' and a heart condition that could not be relieved by taking digitalis and like drugs because his digestive system could not tolerate them.

In moments of remission he regretted having had to give up his work so soon. But he used such energy as he could muster to work on various books, some of which were published. He decided to settle in Tasmania, living at the Tasmanian Club, Hobart, before buying 'Holebrook' in Holebrook Place, where he lived a monastic life with a butler for company. He made a few friends there, disliked the climate immensely, found it 'a very dull place . . . in the sense that the people generally have few intellectual interests', wished that he had gone to live in the Blue Mountains of New South Wales, and fretted over his loss on the sale of 'Greenacre' in 1910 by which time it was in grievous disrepair.

Apart from his writing, he derived some pleasure from speculating in share investments, in which he was coached by Professor Macmillan Brown of New Zealand who was a master of the art. By his death in 1919, Cobbett had in this way amassed a considerable estate, even after making most generous provision for his sister and her insolvent husband who travelled from England to Australia to impose upon his sense of family duty.

He took little part in public matters except for writing a few letters to the Hobart Mercury on constitutional and political issues. For a short period — virtually the only time in his life — he was offered and accepted professional briefs to advise. He did not much like the work, was 'far from eager to get it', and considered many times the possibility of involving himself instead in outdoor activities by buying an orchard or small farm.

Hundreds of pages of his distinctive handwriting, forming the manuscript of 'The Government of Australia', survive in the library of Sydney Law School as a memento of his bitter declining years. He had all but finished the proposed book at his death on 17 October 1919 from a combination of cancer of the pylorus and valvular heart disease. His death was noticed around Australia, but usually so perfunctorily as to confirm that he had been all but forgotten.

By will, made in May 1919, he constituted Jethro Brown virtually his literary executor to see 'The Government of Australia' through the press. Brown, then President of the Industrial Court of South Australia, had little spare time. There was such delay in appraising the
manuscript that the *Engineers' Case* of 1920 intervened in the High Court, overturning the previously determined legal relationships between the Commonwealth and the States. On the strength of that, two of Cobbett's three trustees decided not to publish but to present the original and typescript copies (in six volumes) to the University of Sydney.

Cobbett's brother, Wilberforce, was justifiably indignant. In fact, much of the manuscript covered the constitutional history of the old Australian colonies that had not been the subject of any earlier comprehensive scholarly work. A. C. V. Melbourne's *Early Constitutional Development in Australia* did not emerge until 1934. The constitutional writings of Quick and Garran and of Harrison Moore differed in direction and emphasis from Cobbett's work. There would still have been much worth publishing even if the portions vitiated by the *Engineers' Case* were severed. Wilberforce Cobbett wrote to the *Sydney Morning Herald* deprecating the decision of the others of his co-trustees and complaining of their failure to consult him. He expressed the hope that 'some of my late brother's pupils and graduates in Australia' might be willing to help see the work to publication. The hope was not realised.

The most personal obituary of Pitt Cobbett came from Macmillan Brown who, in a 1922 preface to the typescript copies of *The Government of Australia*, wrote:

> I never left him without having my admiration for his manly character and broad tolerant mind; and my friendship for him deepened. And I never failed to notice that he always drew to him men of the same stamp, men of manly candour and kindly tolerance . . . At his table, discussion reached a high level in outlook and philosophic breadth; nothing mean or narrow or merely personal entered into it; it was a privilege and an education to share in it.
A Man of 'Radical Views'

Looking back on Pitt Cobbett's 20 years at the Sydney Law School, a writer of 1910 summed up his contribution thus:

Out of nothing he created a Law School, and ever since has nursed his own offspring with an affection that has known no bounds. Professor Pitt Cobbett was...a great lawyer — jurist is perhaps a better word to use, for the other term seems to imply a practitioner. He was a maker of lawyers.

It is hard to improve on that assessment, except to say that the creation came not entirely 'out of nothing' but was achieved in spite of the backward and inadequate system of legal education he found on arriving in New South Wales in 1890. Almost single-handedly, though with a growing body of supporters trained by him, he transformed the teaching of law in Sydney over two decades.

As a person, Professor Cobbett was complex and enigmatic: at one and the same time bold yet cautious, shy yet demonstrative, conservative in values yet radical in thought. He would, on the one hand, be welcome as a figure of professional eminence in the Australian Club (of which he was a member), just as he would, on the other hand, take a tilt at professional custom by often wearing such unconventional attire as baggy 'Oxford' trousers and (scarcely decent though it may have seemed) coloured shirts.

He honoured his contract not to go outside his academic duties but he managed, within their confines, to show the diversity of his views. He wanted to teach, not just law, but law in extensive practical applications. His hopes, never accomplished by him, to stimulate the teaching of the interrelationship of law and economics, have already been mentioned. His lectures on politics were much admired. They 'more definitely, perhaps, than any of his other lectures, displayed great range of observation as well as reading, and unusual powers of analysis, combined with a tolerance which was particularly charming... He formulated a liberal creed which the politicians of both sides might have pondered with profit'.

His private political opinions were to some extent ambivalent. He reckoned up almost equal debits and credits on either side of party politics and deplored the 'hypocrisy' of politicians. He wrote in 1910:

I still hold to my Radical views. I believe even in graduated taxation, so long as it is intended as taxation and not for 'spoliation'; — in a living wage; — and generally in equality of opportunity. But I distrust monopoly of any kind — and fear the tyranny of monopolistic capital (which has hitherto been absent in Australia) almost less than the tyranny of monopolistic labour (which already exists in Australia, and bids fair to become even more conspicuous). Nor does socialism seem even to accord with my ideas of a true democracy; for whilst the latter makes for individual freedom — and seeks to make of every man his utmost measure, socialism seeks to extinguish the former and to make of every man a unit and a cypher.

'Radical views' were among the qualities that ensured his success as foundation Challis Professor of Law. The point need not be laboured, but his pressing for an American style of Law School, although falling short of his goal, went far towards changing the content of the law course, the approach adopted to teaching it, and the outlook of the graduates his system produced. They were better balanced lawyers, not merely in comparison with those of the old 'colonial' system of legal education, but also in comparison with many English practitioners. Even in small ways his all pervading influence necessarily shaped the attitudes of 'his' lawyers. At the colonial Bar, in Darley's time and before, 'the gift of the gab' was an almost essential prerequisite. Cobbett objected to grandiloquence as subverting the expression of reasoned ideas. One of the products of this 'radical' process asserted that:

The present generation of lawyers are not orators, largely because Professor Cobbett has discouraged them from being so. He had no time for the flowery and ornate in diction... Whenever at a 'moot' any of his students had allowed his imagination to go beyond his law, the Professor would pull him up with a sharp turn. He loved not two words where one would do.
Above all, Cobbett was the quintessential scholar, fully absorbed in the work of teaching, research and writing. He was never quite in harmony with the legal profession, the company of whose practising members, unless of wholehearted academic persuasion, he tended to shun. It is hard to imagine him in the role of counsel in court, for the very reason that he was preeminently a teacher of the principles of law, not a practitioner of the law.

His calibre as a writer should not be underestimated. His *Leading Cases* came into its own during World War I. Unlike modern case books, that serve to protect library copies of law reports from destruction at the hands of student hordes, his case book was designed to demonstrate that the perception of many English lawyers, that international law was 'fanciful and unreal', was misplaced. It was also directed to showing that there was a body of legal rules, rather than of 'amicable opinions', existing and operating within the international community. In putting together pertinent judicial and official pronouncements, that would otherwise have been difficult of access in a world then lacking prompt overseas communications, he not only provided for students but helped to establish the proper place of the subject he professed. All of his writings were supported by research of the most meticulous kind. As Sir John Peden said:

[Cobbett's] passion for thoroughness and precision made him devote, whenever he thought it necessary, a whole week to research in order that he might be able to write a single paragraph as it should in his judgement be written if it was to convey clear and accurate knowledge.

Once describing himself as 'a son of the Manse' — a simile of which his father, ordained in the Church of England, could scarcely have approved — Cobbett seemed to take little interest in religion apart from adopting a Pauline approach to marriage. He made light of his bachelor status, saying that he was too poor to marry when young, too busy when middle-aged, and, when favoured with money and leisure, 'too old for the game'. Others thought him convinced that the marriage bond operated as a strict contract to vest in 'the lady of his choice . . . the legal duty of spending his money for him'.

In truth, Cobbett, always a 'home-stayer', was a lonely man and, in his later years, alone and desperately conscious of the fact that he had no lineal inheritor of all the goods his successful speculations had accumulated. His will, made only a few months before his death, in which, among other complicated bequests, he purported to devise his real estate to his brother and his cousin in successive estates tail, tells much of his despair. Construction of the will ended up in the High Court. It is all too easy to conclude that: 'In his death he joined the large band of distinguished lawyers whose testamentary dispositions benefited his profession'. The Cobbett testament, executed as he suffered in body and mind, and pondered the consequences of heaping up riches not knowing who should gather them, was testimony to a mental anguish that no son or daughter was there to inherit.

Yet, in another way, he left more than worldly goods. The Law School he created out of nothing has gone on to take a leading place nationally and internationally. All the things he worked for so earnestly have gradually been realised — the elevation of practice subjects to independent intellectual disciplines, the maintenance of high academic standards, the attachment to the School of a functional library, publication of a *Law Review* within the School, the freedom of the School from external influences, and even (prospectively in 1990) the relocation of the School within the University grounds.

William Pitt Cobbett need not have feared. His greatest bequest — the character of the Law School of the University of Sydney — lives still. In that sense, every passing year adds to the number of his beneficiaries.

**A NOTE ON THE PRINCIPAL SOURCES**

Very few primary sources exist concerning the period of the Law School examined in this chapter. Because of Professor Cobbett's reduced health from 1900 onwards, Faculty minutes were often kept in a desultory way and are of little historical assistance. Some help in filling gaps is derived from the minutes of the University Senate and from the annual *Calendars* of the University. A little fragmentary matter survives in the minutes of the Barristers' Admission Board.
Otherwise one is driven to sources in contemporary newspapers and journals — especially the *Sydney Morning Herald*, the *Illustrated Sydney News*, the *Articled Clerks' Journal* (later the *Law Chronicle*), and *Hermes*. The *Jubilee Book of the Law School* obviously provides an invaluable record, much of it recounted from the memory of participants in the founding years. There is, however, the caveat that the book was largely of a celebratory and eulogistic kind and some of its assessments are, as evidence, open to the reservation that goes with ceremonious publications (the present, it may be hoped, not being so open).

William Pitt Cobbett himself presents a biographer's nightmare. He never married. He directed the trustees of his will, as they did, to 'go through my papers and documents and destroy all such as are of a personal nature and do not refer to property'. Mr Justice F. C. Hutley, when writing of Cobbett for the *Australian Dictionary of Biography*, sought surviving papers from collateral Cobbett descendants in England and in Canada, but none could be found.

The limited circle of Pitt Cobbett's friends presents another obstacle. Of known friends of his (O'Connor, Rich, Jordan, Liversidge, Collier, Irvine and Teceel) no collections of in-letters of substance are known to exist in public or private hands. There is, however, a valuable group of letters written by Cobbett between 1907 and 1914 to James Macmillan Brown, foundation Professor of Classics (and later of other subjects) at the then Canterbury College, Christchurch, New Zealand (G. H. Scholefield, ed., *A Dictionary of New Zealand Biography* Vol. 1, Wellington, 1940, 102). The writer is much indebted to Mr. Robert Erwin, Reference Librarian, University of Canterbury, for locating and supplying copies of those letters from the Brown Papers held in that library. There are two important Pitt Cobbett letters in papers of William Jethro Brown in the Morlock Library of South Australian, Adelaide, and two minor letters in papers of Sir William Cullen privately held in England.

No Cobbett papers have been found in any collections in the Mitchell Library of the State Library of New South Wales, the Archives Office of New South Wales, the Archives of the University of Sydney, the Archives Office of Tasmania, or the Archives of the University of Tasmania. Papers of men with whom Cobbett might have been likely to correspond have been examined in various repositories (among them papers of Bavin, Clark, Garran, Elliott Lewis, MacLaurin, Harrison Moore, Peden and Wise) but nothing has been found.

Particular thanks are due to Dr. John Ritchie, General Editor of the *Australian Dictionary of Biography*, for his kind permission to refer to the Dictionary file concerning Cobbett.

---
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Learned Practitioners

Professor John Peden 1910–1941

Judy Mackinolty

The Law School, firmly established in academic terms by the twenty year administration of Professor Pitt Cobbett, grew in size and status in the next thirty two years under its new Dean, and adopted a more public stance, Peden being much more involved with matters outside the Law School than his predecessor. Links between academe and Sydney society and centres of power were strengthened and, at least at an administrative level, even closer ties were formed between the down-town Law School and the University campus. While the student body still felt a sense of isolation, the Law School made its presence felt in University circles at Senate, of which Professor Peden was a Fellow and active on committees from 1910 to 1941, and Professorial Board, of which he was Chairman from 1925 to 1933. Naturally it also maintained its links to the legal profession through the employment of a series of part time lecturers, the further development of a Law Society, various social functions, and educational activities, for example, moot courts which members of Bench and Bar sometimes judged.

In 1910, following the retirement of Professor Pitt Cobbett, John Beverley Peden was appointed Challis Professor and Dean of the Law School. Peden had graduated BA from Sydney University with first class honours in Latin, Greek and Philosophy in 1892. He had followed this by gaining first class honours and the University medal in Law in 1898 and had been admitted to the Bar where he had a considerable practice, specialising in Equity and Probate.

As many barristers have done over the hundred years of the Law School’s existence, Peden became a part time lecturer at the Law School in 1902. He had had close contact with students as Vice Warden of St Paul’s College from 1892 to 1898, as secretary in 1891 and president in 1895 of the Undergraduates’ Association, and as President of the Sydney University Union in 1893–4 and 1910–11. He had also been editor of Hermes in 1895 and assistant lecturer in Latin in 1896. His part time appointment to the Law School was as Challis Lecturer in Property. Though he may not have been his predecessor’s first choice, as an applicant for the Chair in Law Peden had outstanding academic qualifications along with practical experience in teaching, the legal profession and administration. He also had strong connections with members of the Bar whom he would later be able to persuade to teach at the Law School on a part time basis.

The former Wigram Chambers in Phillip Street, occupied by the Law School in 1914 but now demolished. Honi Soit reported on 27 April 1939:

Law School Washed
Startling Discovery
The ‘Old’ University Chambers, containing the Phillip Street half of the Law School, have been thoroughly renovated . . . and the stone facade steam-cleaned. The cleaning has revealed a row of four learned gentlemen’s heads in stone set in the facade, hitherto obscured by dirt. Amid speculation, no one has yet discovered the identity of the Four Just Men so dramatically revealed . . .
The theory that these are the fossilised heads of the first four law students to fail (back in the pre-pedenian Pittcobbezoic era) has been definitely discarded.
In its new Dean, Professor John Peden, the Law School had gained an indefatigable worker not only in the field of teaching but also in the wider life of the University and in public life. In the period of his leadership of the Law School the population of Sydney more than doubled while that of the Law School trebled and the Faculty outgrew its accommodation. The tasks of administration and teaching, however, were not so onerous as to prevent Peden’s active participation in government and in law and education related activities.

As a member of the New South Wales Legislative Council from 1917, and President of that body from 1929 to 1946, Peden became a noted public figure and the reputation of the Law School was correspondingly enhanced. His work on Royal Commissions and in drafting legislation won him considerable acclaim, though he had also to suffer the opprobrium of some Labor members of parliament critical of his alleged earnings from law, parliament and University during the depression of the 1930s. His work as sole law reform commissioner in New South Wales set a precedent which would be followed by a number of his professorial successors in later years, though they would be seconded full time for this work and would serve as members of a team rather than as sole commissioners.

In 1910, when he was appointed to the Chair and deanship, Peden was the only full time teacher at the Law School, as Cobbett had been before him. He remained sole professor until the appointment of A. H. Charteris as Professor of International Law and Jurisprudence in 1921. Over the thirty two years of his administration, fifty staff members would teach law for shorter or longer periods, mostly on a part time basis, but in that first year he was assisted by just six. The part time teachers in 1910 were J. A. Browne (Equity, Probate, Bankruptcy and Common Law); D. Ferguson (Procedure, Evidence and Pleading); F. R. Jordan (Equity, Probate, Bankruptcy and Common Law); E. M. Mitchell (Status, Civil Obligations and Crimes); G. E. Rich (Equity, Probate, Bankruptcy and Common Law) and G. Waddell (Roman Law). Except for Ferguson and Rich, these lecturers were honours graduates from the Law School and Waddell had gained the LLD degree. Jordan was later to become Chief Justice of New South Wales, Ferguson a Supreme Court Judge, Rich a member of the High Court of Australia and Browne President of the Industrial Commission. In that first year of Peden’s administration there were 72 students enrolled in law courses.

Studying Law

It was Professor Peden’s habit to announce to his classes that he was not there ‘to create pedants, but learned practitioners’. Some would argue that ‘competent legal technicians’ would be closer to the mark, and Miss Hay, clerk to the Faculty 1919-1953, conceded that his preference for students to have taken two years Arts before entering law studies left Peden free to concentrate on turning out practitioners who were equipped ‘to earn their bread and butter’.

Throughout the period of his administration there was little change in the curriculum he had inherited from Pitt Cobbett, apart from an added emphasis on practice. In 1910 the subjects included in the law course were Jurisprudence, Legal History, Political Science, Roman Law, Constitutional Law, Public International Law, Private International Law, Contracts, Mercantile Law, Torts, Crimes and Domestic Relations, Property and Principles of Conveyancing, Procedure in Civil and Criminal cases, Law of Evidence and Pleading, Legal Interpretation, Equity and Company Law, Bankruptcy, Probate and Divorce.

From time to time, as evidenced in annual University Calendars, there were changes to the grouping of these subjects, divisions of a grouped course into separate elements, or extensions to subjects, but the changes appear to be cosmetic rather than basic reforms. For example, in 1913, practical instruction in Conveyancing extended the previously academic approach to this subject, common law subjects would henceforth include practice and pleading, and practice was added to Equity, Company Law, Bankruptcy, Probate and Divorce.

In 1925 lectures in Legal Ethics were introduced into final year. Attendance was compulsory but the subject was non-examinable. In 1933 income from the Geoffrey Hyman Memorial fund was applied to pay lecture fees for five lectures to be given in Industrial Law, again as a non-examinable subject with compulsory attendance. In 1936 the Faculty recommended and Senate approved a change to the by-law whereby fourth year students would attend the non-
examinable lectures in Legal Ethics and third year students would attend the non-examinable Industrial, Admiralty and Lunacy Law lectures.

Lectures were time-tabled for mornings and evenings as most students were attending solicitors' offices as articled clerks. Lecture notes were available after the lectures had been delivered in all but a few subjects. Term exams were held in all examinable subjects and the final exams were held in February, so that there was little free time for law students. High standards were maintained and one graduate in the nineteen thirties recalled that of the original year enrolment of 106 students plus repeating students, only 36 graduated at the end of fourth year.

Enrolments

In the thirty two years during which Peden headed the School, student numbers were to grow steadily apart from a decline during World War I as some students or potential students responded to the call for volunteers and others deferred enrolment. The total number of students enrolled in law, which had increased to 108 in 1914, dropped to a low of 73 in 1917. By 1920, however, enrolments had more than trebled those of the final year of the war and further development of the Law School seemed assured. The post war peak of 356 students in 1923 was to level out during the rest of the decade and through the thirties but would not drop below 255 (the number of students in 1928) until 1941 when 226 students were enrolled.

The Great Depression of the 1930s appears to have had less impact than war on student enrolments, though students themselves might have found it hard to make ends meet, and some were reported to be selling their text books. Apart from those on scholarships or bursaries, most law students were from the wealthier groups in society, often less affected by economic Depression. The effects of the Depression on the profession varied considerably, some going to the wall while others were busier than ever. Student comments do suggest a cut-back in social activity and a general sense of bleakness and austerity, but one could still stroll through town with a set of documents, chat with friends while waiting at the Titles Office or have a coffee at Repins in King Street or in one of the Mockbell chain of coffee houses.

In 1942, when Peden was succeeded as Dean by Professor James Williams, enrolments were down to 77, almost the same as at the beginning of Peden's administration. These figures give a vivid reflection of the impact of World War II on most aspects of life in Australia, particularly after the entry of Japan into that conflict. Law was not a 'reserved' Faculty, which classification would have exempted its students from war service, and participation in the armed services and in other activities regarded as vital to the war effort took precedence over study. For this reason enrolments remained low throughout the war.

Women Students

It has been claimed that the first woman student at Sydney Law School, Ada Emily Evans, was allowed to begin law courses only because the Dean, Pitt Cobbett, was on leave at the time. It has also been claimed that John Peden welcomed women students. It may be that because both of Peden's children were girls he was more sympathetic to women students' ambitions. In spite of this, women students were rare in his time, with only 24 graduating in the 32 years of his deanship.

Until 1918, with the passing of the Women's Legal Status Act in New South Wales, it was not possible for women to practise law in the State and this must surely have acted as a very powerful deterrent to their entry to the Faculty. The battle to remove the sex bar from the legal profession, through deputations to the State government from a variety of women's organisations, became an annual event. In 1916 the annual conference of the Labor Party gave it strong support. By 1918, with New South Wales lagging behind the other States and soon to be left behind by England as well, the Bill was presented to Parliament.

It had previously won the support of the Sydney University Senate which in August 1918 had adopted a motion proposed by Mrs Catherine Dwyer: 'That the Government be asked to pass legislation that will enable women to enter the legal profession'. Not only was Professor Peden a Fellow of Senate at this stage, but the Chancellor was none other than Sir William Portus.
Cullen who, as acting Dean while Pitt Cobbett was overseas, had allowed Ada Evans to enrol in law. The presence on the Senate of Sir Edmund Barton, Judge Backhouse, Sir Samuel Griffith, Sir David Ferguson, Sir Philip Street, Frank Leverrier KC, Albert Piddington KC and John Garland KC implies that the profession also approved of the reform. The proposed legislation had widespread acceptance in the community and had been amended to remove some of the more ‘dangerous’ or ‘impractical’ elements such as admission of women to jury service. After the 16 years’ battle that had ensued since 1902, the Bill finally passed through Parliament with little debate.

But the legislation could not be said to have ‘opened the floodgates’ for the entry of women to the legal profession, or indeed to the Law School. Peden may have welcomed women students but he evidently did not actively promote and encourage them to enrol in the Law Faculty, and numbers remained low. Two women graduated in 1924. Marie Byles was admitted as a solicitor, while Sybil Morrison went to the Bar. In a conservative legal profession many women were to face difficulty in obtaining articles and, later, in finding employment with legal firms. Marie Byles, for example, could not find employment for six months after graduation, until she was assisted by Professor Peden. She was later to establish her own law firm. Many women in this period did not seek admission to the profession but worked in other jobs, where their training and skills could be applied. Jean Malor, for example, became an editor with the Law Book Company, Olga Sangwell became librarian at the Parliamentary Library in Canberra, others entered the public service, the teaching profession or the business world.

The few women law students during Peden’s deanship do not seem to have been active in student affairs—social activities, debating, moots, or as contributors to Blackacre, which was published for the first time in 1924. Numbers of women law students were too small for there to be any team participation in inter-faculty sport but Olga Sangwell won a Blue for swimming in 1930 in her BA years on her way to LLB in 1934 and Jean Malor was awarded a Blue for swimming in 1933. She was also the first woman to graduate in law with first class honours. Women did seek better conditions for women students at the Law School and were grateful for Peden’s donation of £10 for fitting out the women’s Common Room. They showed their appreciation in practical fashion by arranging a party in the Law School Common Room early in 1939 to welcome Professor Peden back from a trip to England. It was the first social function to be held at the new Law School premises, and was well attended by staff, students and graduates.

Women law students were to make their mark in somewhat different circumstances two years later, and not, it would appear, of their own volition. Honi Soit of 18 April 1941 reported on the Sydney University Law Society’s Annual General Meeting during which there was ‘long argument over the addition of a non-voting women’s representative to the committee’. It reported that the motion, put by Hugh Gilchrist, ‘raised a storm from the conservatives’. The motion was carried by a small majority. There is no indication in the report that women played any active role in this debate or in the proposal which sparked it. The Society executive in 1941-42 included Miss Alison Christie, elected by the Committee as women’s advisory representative. Gina Christie was one of four Vice Presidents in 1945 and 1946.

Student Life

As noted earlier, Professor Peden had played an active part in student affairs while studying for his arts and law degrees. It is also of note that he later drew up the constitution for the Students Representative Council. It is not surprising then that he was concerned with the welfare and the development of the students under his control. He thought that added maturity was desirable in a student of law, and therefore favoured the traditional notion that all students should complete an Arts degree, preferably including history, classics or philosophy, before embarking on legal studies. Although he was not successful in establishing this policy, he had some impact on the issue of maturity.

At the Law Faculty meeting on 22 October 1934 Peden drew attention to the fact that four of the first year students were under 17 years of age. The meeting decided to inform the Senate that it considered that 17 should be the minimum age for students entering professional
Faculties. In April 1936 Faculty minutes reported that the University Senate had adopted this minimum entry age for law. It is possible that Peden’s attitude to student maturity could be related to his own experience. He was 21 years old when he completed his Arts degree and 27 when he graduated in law. His BA studies had given him the opportunity of a broad education as a base for law, the time to take part in campus activities, and mental and social maturity.

It is certain that Peden was well aware of the social benefits and sense of community engendered by life on campus. Peden’s undergraduate years on the main campus had been busy and varied. Furthermore, the full life of his daughter Margaret, who completed a BA and DipEd at Sydney University between 1923 and 1927, could be seen in marked contrast to his law students, since she had played such an important part in women’s sport and in the women undergraduates’ association. His other daughter, Barbara, also attended Sydney University, participating in sport and becoming an architect.

That these opportunities were lacking for the law student was made quite plain on a number of occasions. Writing in Hermes in August 1914 ‘Papirius’ was to draw the contrast quite vividly:

The fresher to law... before he has faced his first term exam... realises that the happy days of the arts’ school are gone; that the verb ‘to swat’ is the beginning and end of the curriculum in law.

While this might be seen as a comment on the demands of the discipline and on the methods of teaching and examination, it also suggests a certain narrowness of student life in law as opposed to that of the campus.
A year later another writer in *Hermes* presented the campus viewpoint:

What has happened to the law students these days? Tis seldom we see any of them at the varsity, and it seems as if 'a recruiting campaign' must be initiated to keep alive the interests of law students in the university.

This comment underlines the sense of loss felt by the University community when part of its student body does not, or is unable to, contribute to general campus society. Each learning discipline has its own particular skills to impart and these can be of tremendous value in offering a broad and balanced approach to student affairs in general. For example, the student of Constitutional Law has something different to offer student organisations than does the student of Constitutional History — in the careful construction or close analysis, and practical interpretation of clauses in constitutions, and in rules of debate and the framing of resolutions.

Not only was it difficult for students to participate in campus activities and feel part of the larger university society, but friendships at the Law School were not easily developed. Although students in a particular year of their law studies attended the same lectures, these were held before or after office hours and there was little time for socialising. Many found that
friendships developed not through attendance at the Law School but among those who trod the same paths on their way to and from the solicitors' offices in which they worked. There were, of course, times when the students' sense of fun would emerge. They delighted, according to Miss Hay, in exploiting Peden's 'Chaplin-like gesture, gripping and lifting his hat from the back of his head' and would sometimes line the approach to the Elizabeth Street entrance 'to see the familiar response which greeted each one's salutation'.

In 1919 A. H. Ferguson, Honorary Secretary of the Law Society, reported in Hermes that the law students had recently enjoyed participating in Commem Day and commented:

The Law School being removed from the University proper, these occasions afford opportunities for inter-faculty handshakes of the more congenial kind and are accordingly welcomed by the isolated brotherhood of University Chambers.

Efforts were made over the years to provide and furnish student common rooms for men and women so that some semblance of community could develop at the Law School. Law balls and dinners were organised, moots and mock trials were held, and some students participated in debating or sporting activities at Faculty or University level 'in spite of having to subpoena the members of its teams from offices'. Law students were ready contributors to Hermes, began their own magazine, Blackacre, and participated in University revues.
The sense of isolation, however, remained. A writer in *Blackacre* in August 1926 recalled with nostalgia his years in Arts with 'mornings spent on the cloisters in the sunshine in joyous conversation, sometimes frivolous, sometimes deep and serious'. In contrast, 'Law School life, apart from its lectures, seems rather flat and empty. The Arts man has a far greater knowledge of the joys of the community life than the man who has only attended his four years at the Law School.'

The students were not alone in recognising their disability. A Faculty meeting on 30 November 1927 discussed the situation whereby students...

...who take the LLB course without any preliminary work in Arts, miss many of the advantages a University education has to offer. The Law School is quite isolated, and most of its students do not go near the University, know little about it and have no share in its life... It is not even as if there was a full community life at the Law School itself, for this is made impossible by the times at which the lectures must necessarily be held, and by the occupation of the students with other affairs.

Though Faculty members present at the meeting realised that part of the problem was unavoidable, they proposed reforms which might alleviate the situation. These covered various changes to the admission of students to law. It was suggested that only those students who had completed two years in Arts or who had completed a full Arts degree should be allowed to enrol in law. Another suggestion was that there should be a special one year's course in Arts for all prospective law students. Another suggested option was the provision of some non-professional law lectures at the University.

Professor Peden had not been in attendance at the November 27 Faculty meeting as he was in Western Australia at the time on work connected with the Commonwealth Constitution Commission, of which he was chairman. Further discussion on the report on 'bringing the Law School into closer relationship with the University' took place at a Faculty meeting on 31 July 1928. Though it was agreed that the ideas for changed admission were good, they were rejected by this meeting, Peden taking a dominant role in the debate. It seems that recognition of the problem was one thing, but the difficulties of implementing change were too great, at least at this stage. It is interesting to note that 60 years were to elapse before all law students would either be undertaking combined courses (Arts/Law, Economics/Law, Science/Law) or enter law at Sydney University as graduates. It would be 46 years after this meeting before law subjects would be offered on campus.

**Getting Together**

Universities have always fostered a proliferation of clubs and societies organised around various sports, political interests, religious affiliations, cultural activities, and disciplines of learning, or broadly based on Faculties. It is thus not surprising that a Sydney University Law Society should be formed. Indeed, the Law School's location away from mainstream campus life would seem to provide both special needs for such an organisation and a favourable climate for success, with a small closely-knit Faculty, progression through the course by fixed years of study rather than a multiplicity of options, and no competing university organisations close at hand.

According to the *Jubilee Book*, the Sydney University Law Society was founded in 1902 under patronage of the then Dean, Professor Pitt Cobbett. Its first president was A. J. Kelynack who had gained his LLB in 1892. One of its vice-presidents was T. R. (later Sir Thomas) Bavin who had graduated in law in 1897 and who was to be president from 1922 to 1941. The prominence of graduates and staff members amongst the office bearers suggests that formation of what was then known as the Law School Society was not a student initiative, and this would be understandable in light of the small student numbers. The *Jubilee Book* provided an unbroken list of presidents of the Society, drawn from Bar or Bench, from 1902 to 1939 and mentioned that there had been only two patrons, Pitt Cobbett and Peden. Other evidence of the Society and its activities between Professor Cobett's resignation and 1922 is, however, fragmentary.
Occasional references in *Hermes* suggest that the Society had a somewhat uncertain existence in its early years, though the authors of the chapter in the *Jubilee Book* preferred to attribute the ‘dearth of authority concerning the social side of its activities . . . [as] the best evidence of unqualified success in this sphere’. A critical note in *Hermes* in August 1914 quoted the aims of the Society:

To unite law students and members of both branches of the legal profession in a society which will bring them together for social intercourse and discussion of subjects of professional interest.

But the writer clearly felt cheated by the lack of activity at the Law School or any obvious effort to achieve these goals.

In the following year, however, another contributor to *Hermes* wrote of the rejuvenation of the Society and commented favourably on the financial support that had been received from the University Senate, the University Union and Sydney University Law Society to refurbish and equip the Society’s room at the Law School. He optimistically remarked that ‘it really looks as if at last the society is to justify its existence’, while offering the cautionary observation that few of the current students were members of the ‘organisation to which [they] should of professional necessity belong’. He concluded by calling on ‘critics and complainers’ to ‘develop into workers and enthusiasts’. No records have been found of the office bearers who achieved these improvements or the methods they used to win financial contributions from the University, but given the allegedly small student membership and their usual impecunious state, it might be assumed that the Law Society’s contribution came largely from the profession.

Election results for the Society, published in *Hermes* in 1918, revealed a Society composition which could clearly have differing if not conflicting priorities. The president and two of the vice presidents were judges, and the other four vice presidents were law graduates; there were separate graduate and undergraduate secretaries, and the committee appeared to comprise eleven undergraduates. The main aim of the newly elected committee was to revive the Moot Court ‘which had flourished back in 1910’. The report was decidedly low key.

A very different picture emerged in the 1919 Law Society report in *Hermes* which described the atmosphere at the Law School as presenting ‘a semblance of pre-war buoyancy’. Participation in Commem Day activities, a successful series of addresses, the first annual dinner since 1915 and discussions regarding an Honour Board to record the names of those who served in the war suggest a lively and well-supported organisation which would carry through enthusiastically and confidently into 1920.

What happened in the next two years remains a mystery. A. H. Curlewis, secretary of the Law Society, wrote in *Hermes* in August 1922 that there had been considerable activity at the Law School since the beginning of term ‘with a view to reviving the activities of the dormant Law Society [which] two years ago . . . although in a flourishing condition, suddenly ceased to exist’. There seem to be no internal or external factors to explain this sudden demise and, indeed, a jump in student enrolments from 280 in 1920 to 328 in 1921 might have been thought of as conducive to heightened student activity. Curlewis’ only explanation was that there was a general University-wide apathy at the time, though there is a hint that difficulties in arranging meetings to suit both students and members of the profession may have been significant.

Whatever the reason for this collapse of the Society, by 1922 a new mood was abroad and after a general meeting in June a fresh constitution was drawn up and adopted at a further meeting in July. The major change was that, although undergraduates and graduates would still be welcomed as members, all nine office bearers would be undergraduates. The proposed programme of activities — an annual dance, annual dinner, moots and participation where possible in inter-faculty sport — were to be features of Law Society planning over the next two decades, with varying measures of success.

The first annual report of the Society ‘under the new formation’ revealed its range of activities and the mixed reception it had received. Most disappointing for a committee launched with such enthusiasm was the poor response to membership, only 43 of the 300 odd students
paying the one shilling subscription. This meant that the committee members had to outlay the cost of functions and hope for support sufficient to reimburse them. Financial difficulties in holding a dance, a smoke concert and an address by Mr Gannon KC were fortunately overcome by finding some funds from the Society's defunct predecessor. Apart from concerning itself with social and educational activities, the improvement of student accommodation and appropriate recognition of achievement — the Dean on taking silk and Mr Hanks on completing his thirtieth year as Law School librarian — the committee looked to wider issues, by an appeal to the Senate to place the Law School on a similar basis to other Faculties as regards deferred examinations.

The see-sawing fortunes of the Law Society thereafter may be gleaned from annual reports, *Blackacre*, and *Honi Soit*. Social activities figure largely along with the ups and downs of moots, debating, and participation in inter-faculty sporting contests. Of the latter, the annual report of 1941-42, echoing earlier comments, remarked that 'the difficulty is not to produce a team to win, but to produce one at all'. While this situation was understandable in war time, the same comment might have been made on a number of earlier years, the cause being put down variously to apathy, unsuitable times of contests, and other demands on law students' time.

The question of improving facilities, for students generally and in the Society's rooms in particular, emerged from time to time with some successes but some acrimonious exchanges between the Law School and campus. In 1930, for example, the Society expressed regret that it had abolished its membership fee on the clear understanding that a reasonable proportion of the five shilling levy on all students would be passed on to affiliated societies such as itself. The report added that the committee felt 'that for all its ermine robes and empty pomp the S[students] R[representative] Committee has so far proved to be not a benefit but a distraction to Faculty bodies'. In the following year the Society engaged in correspondence with the SRC 'with the object of pointing out to that body what seemed to us to be its salient weaknesses'.

Later in the thirties, however, the Society was to report with pleasure that the Union had spent £230 on furnishing and equipment for the new common room. The vexed issue of heating for the common room, the provision of lockers and the installation of a pay telephone for student use remained for some years, postponed by the coming of war.

Of special note in the twenties and thirties was the production of the first (1924) and subsequent issues of the law student publication, *Blackacre*. The student editor and his assistant aimed at producing three issues each year and for most of the period this was achieved, though not without difficulty, especially during the toughest years of the Depression. At one stage the Society made payments to the printer 'without prejudice to the Society's rights under the contract' which had provided an issue of the magazine at minimal costs to the Society in return for handing over control of and income from advertising to the printer. This sort of contract, which saved the Society considerable outlay of funds and a great deal of time and trouble, was negotiated during the thirties with only occasional recognition on the part of the Society's executive that closer attention should be given to this important element of student community life.

In 1938–39 *Blackacre* had a very 'stormy passage' with considerable loss on the first issue produced by the SRC and a major hiccup when the printer of the second issue 'went into liquidation within a few hours of the time of issue'. *Blackacre* bounced back in the following year under its editor Frank Hutley and associate editor Gough Whitlam with three issues but war, not surprisingly, reduced that publication to a single issue for two years and then to suspension.

The Law Society, over time, came to represent wider student concerns, organising interviews with the Dean to discuss assistance to students, and achieving lunch time and evening opening of the library, abolition of one and a half hour examination papers, the earlier announcement of exam results, changes in the examination timetables to spread exams over a fortnight to allow a short interval between subjects, and playing an active part in fixing the annual exam timetable in consultation with students of each year. As discussed elsewhere, the Society's executive was at odds with the student body in 1941 over the rescission motion of the
BLACKACRE

"WHEN WE WERE VERY YOUNG."

(Apologetically adapted).

Disobedience.

Prof. John Beverley Peden, K.C.; M.L.C.
Was Dean of a legal faculty
And lectured in property.
Prof. John Beverley Peden
Said to his class, said he,
"The whole of this crowd is bound to get ploughed,
unless it attends to me."
Prof. John Beverley Peden
Lectured on Mortgage and Lease;
Prof. John Beverley Peden
Expounded Morrice and Morrice.
Prof. John Beverley Peden
Said to himself, said he,
"If I were to pass more than half of this class, they'd
butcher their clients—and me."

Prof. J. Beverley Peden,
K.C., M.L.C.
Was Dean of a Legal Faculty
And lectured in ppty.
Prof. Jno. Beverley's students
Were busy as they could be
With the S.M.H. and the Daily Telg.
And solutions of cross-word P.

And that probably accounts for the débâcle in the recent
property term exam.

H. Roy Booth sketched Professor Peden for Blackacre in 1925. Penned by an unknown 'poet' in Blackacre in 1925.

University Senate, but for the most part it represented student opinion and concerns well.
The Society also involved itself in wider University activities, for example, in what was called the Carillon Movement. A gathering of students and members of the profession met in 1924 to consider the raising of funds to provide a Law School bell. The target of £390 was quickly raised, much of the success of the appeal being attributed to the efforts of W. J. Bradley and N. L. R. Cowper who approached barristers and solicitors respectively. The Society also collected subscriptions towards the University Appeal and, as mentioned elsewhere, was active in promoting the purchase of War Savings Certificates during World War II. It also participated in a faculty survey organised by the National Union of Australian University Students (NUAUS). In 1934 the Law Society's vice president was elected president of the Students Representative Council (SRC) and early in the forties the Society appointed a Faculty correspondent to the student newspaper Honi Soit.
Various changes were made to the constitution of the Sydney University Law Society after its re-formation in 1922. Some of the changes reflect the awkward nature of a society which hoped to involve undergraduates, graduates and members of the profession, yet had reconstituted itself as an undergraduate organisation. It is clear from a number of reports that the student committee needed the support of graduates. The annual dinner, for example, seemed to survive largely through the attendance of members of the Bar, comments being made on a number of occasions on the apathy of ‘the bulk of men in the Faculty’. Perhaps the dinner was too expensive for student attendance, perhaps it more closely served the interests of the barristers.

The 1926-27 report of the Society’s activities notes the appointment of Mr L. Herron as Graduate Secretary ‘to bring the Society’s activities into closer touch with the members of the Bar’. In the early thirties the constitution was altered so that five vice presidents would be elected, two of whom were to be graduates. The first of these were J. H. McClemens and A. A. Nicol. The constitution of 1941, over which a stormy meeting was held, stated that all law students and all law graduates of Sydney University were eligible to be ordinary members of the Society and all Law School teachers honorary members. Office bearers included the patron, president, four vice presidents of whom at least one should be a woman and at least one a graduate, an honorary secretary and treasurer and a committee comprising one representative from each year, one member who was male law representative to the SRC and one member to represent women members of the Society. A later development, outside the scope of this chapter, was the separate formation of the Law Graduates Association.

Although the Society was not an unqualified success, it showed the gradual development of a sense of Law School community and broadened the scope of activity for students, not merely in the availability of a number of functions but in the organisation of them. It did, of course, rely heavily on the willingness of a small number of students to take on the additional work of running the Society and its activities each year. There was also the problem of re-inventing the wheel, as new committees decided to introduce activities that earlier committees had shown to have little support and success. Through its period of constitutional change the dichotomy of the Society remained a problem — whether it was to be a professional or a student organisation, or a mix of both.

**Housing the Law School**

Growing student numbers forced the Law School to undertake a series of physical moves during Peden’s term as Dean. When he replaced Professor Pitt Cobbett in 1910, the School was housed in 174 Phillip Street in the three-storeyed predecessor of the present Selborne Chambers. In 1913 it occupied the upper part of a building at 28 Moore Street Sydney (part of present day Martin Place), referred to by a writer in *Hermes* in August 1915 as the ‘top floor, Stott & Hoare’ and also described as ‘cramped and noisy’. For the hundred or so students and eight members of the teaching staff this move was fortunately only temporary, while new accommodation was being prepared. The University had purchased Wigram Chambers at 167 Phillip Street, opposite Selborne Chambers, and Barristers Court at the rear of Wigram and fronting Elizabeth Street. These buildings were converted into premises for the Law School and for a number of tenants and renamed University Chambers. The first Faculty meeting in the new premises was held in May 1914. According to a writer in *Hermes* in August 1915 the Law School was ‘installed with full legal dignity in the University’s own building’.

The seven storey building considerably exceeded Law School needs at the time of its opening. Its size was perhaps more a sign of confidence in the future development of the School than a strategy to solve current problems of overcrowding. The acquisition of the buildings might also be seen as an example of sound economic planning for the future by the University, while bringing in a rental income in the short term. The establishment of University Chambers emphasised the fact that law was firmly seen as a down-town faculty. In part this was to appease the profession’s desire to maintain its influence over legal education in New South Wales. It may also be seen as understandable in the light of the perceived needs of the articulated
The former 'new' library in University Chambers was available to students and members of the profession though the School was to outgrow this spacious facility in the late 1940s.

In 1938 the new Elizabeth Street offices of the Law School, University Chambers, linked to the Phillip Street part, were opened.

clerk system. This always prompted the argument that the Law School should be situated in close proximity to solicitors' offices, such public offices as the Titles Office and various government departments, and the law courts. At a very practical level the building was also close to a number of barristers' chambers, from whence came the bulk of the teaching staff — the part time lecturers.

Even in the early 1930s, University Chambers was more than adequate for its less than 300 students and its thirteen staff members — two professors and eleven part time lecturers. According to the Sands Directory for New South Wales 1932–33, the first four floors provided chambers for barristers including two of the part time lecturers, Kitto and McMinn, while Professor Charteris also had his office on one of these floors. The fifth floor housed the Law Library over which Margaret Dalrymple Hay presided as librarian while also carrying out the duties of clerk to the Faculty. On the next floor were the lecture rooms and the students' common room while on the top floor the Dean had his office alongside the Senate Room and the Lecture Room of the University of Sydney. The live-in caretaker was Mr A. J. Murphy. The Law School's neighbours were the NSW Leagues Club at 165 Phillip Street and, at 169, the Australasian Pioneers' Club and then St James' Hall.
Specific inadequacies of the building as an educational establishment emerged over time, and in 1936 construction began on a new thirteen storey building to replace Barristers Court and some adjacent premises in Elizabeth Street, at that time comprising a garage and a car park. The University’s financial acumen might also be seen in the decision to build at this time. With the Depression past its worst years but certainly not over, labour was readily available and building costs still reduced. At this time, too, there was a recovery in student enrolment figures which suggested there might soon be pressure on existing facilities.

The new building, facing Elizabeth Street, was linked to the old Phillip Street structure and was used for the Law School, for accommodation of members of the legal profession, and for other tenants. A feature of the new building, which was officially opened in July 1938, was the ‘lofty modern’ library which was to be available for use by both students and the profession and the common rooms which were also to be used by the Law Society. Since this organisation encouraged professional membership along with that of students, strong links between School and profession were clearly to be maintained. The library, too, was to be a valuable adjunct to the existing court library for the use of the profession. Worthy of comment in the new building was the Browsing Room which was designed to house a collection of non-technical legal literature such as biography, history, politics, accounts of famous trials and so on. Sound-proof doors and double glazing were installed to minimise street noise. An amusing footnote to the official opening ceremony was that it was broadcast over radio station 2BL.

When plans for the construction were announced in *Honi Soit* in September 1936, special mention was made of the ‘new fast lifts’ to be installed. As student numbers grew and the Law School came to occupy more and more of University Chambers, students and staff could well be excused rueful smiles at such a description. Floors on the old, Phillip Street side and the new Elizabeth Street side did not coincide and care had to be taken in selecting a floor button depending on the lift chosen. It seems lifts have never been a strong point in Law School architecture.

Writing in 1940 for the *Jubilee Book of the Law School* the Vice-Chancellor, Dr R. S. Wallace, referred to the palatial new building and prophesied that in the future, shall we say 25 years hence, the portion of the Law School on the Phillip Street frontage will be brought into conformity with the new portion . . . [to create] a wholly beautiful and spacious block . . . worthy of the School and its achievements.

The cobbled-together buildings, gleaming brass and rich cedar on the one hand, glass, metal and tiles on the other were to house the Law School until the next move in 1969. At that stage the whimsical combination of high-ceilinged sandstone colonial and 1930s Depression modernism gave way to a Law School which some would see as architecturally acceptable but others as a building which failed to be a place for people.

War

The impact of World War I on the infant Law School can be seen in student numbers, particularly in 1917 when total enrolment was down to that of 1910. Staff numbers remained static, Professor Peden being assisted by seven part time lecturers with only one change in personnel over the period, H. R. Curlewis being replaced by J. H. Hammond in 1918. The Hon Vernon Treatt, writing in the *Jubilee Book* recorded that forty of the students at the Law School at the outbreak of the war eventually saw active service. The Law School Honour Roll printed in that publication listed 180 Law School graduates and undergraduates who served overseas, 25 of whom were killed in the conflict.

In 1915-16 Professor Peden was a member of the executive of the Universal Service League which supported conscription for overseas military service and backed Prime Minister Hughes’ conscription campaigns. It is said that he was appalled when Hughes resumed the Prime Ministership in 1917 in spite of having declared that he would not govern unless the second conscription referendum was successful. Peden showed his personal support for those serving in the armed forces by maintaining an extensive correspondence with graduates fighting overseas.
The Law School response to a Senate request in April 1917 to review and or revise activities 'in the light of the demands which the problems created by the war make upon the University' made no attempt to offer cut-backs or economies. Instead, it listed the needs of the School, including new courses, division of courses, and reduction in the number of courses for which a lecturer was responsible. It is difficult to see how the Law School could have made staffing reductions, since it still had only one full time member of the teaching staff, Professor Peden. The Faculty's response seems reasonable in light of the teaching load of the staff. Although numbers of students were low, lecture preparation and lecture hours remained heavy. At this stage Curlewis taught Procedure, Evidence and Pleading; Davidson offered Equity, Company Law, Probate and Divorce; Edwards covered Common Law Practice and Pleading; Jordan gave Equity, Probate, Bankruptcy and Common Law lectures; Mitchell was involved in Status, Civil Obligations and Crimes, Waddell in Roman Law and Legal Interpretation and Watts in Conveyancing. Peden himself lectured in Real and Personal Property, Constitutional Law, Public International Law, Jurisprudence, Political Science and Private International Law.

The Faculty's response gave further details of its needs and, rather than offer solutions to the University's wartime problems, stated that an increase in staff would be required with a second professor and additional lecturers. The estimated cost of these additions was £1500. While no immediate response was forthcoming, staff numbers grew to nine in 1919, and in 1921 A. H. Charteris was appointed as Professor of International Law and Jurisprudence.

Two changes to student life occurred during World War I. The first, which had no connection with war, was the reintroduction of typed notes of lectures, which freed lecturers from the grind of dictating and enabled students to concentrate on explanation and illustration without slavish note-taking. The second was made to assist those students who volunteered for active service. A change to the by-laws in 1916 gave these students credit for single subjects passed either in the final examinations or in earlier years, rather than requiring the student to repeat the whole year's examination in the following year.

Growing turmoil in Europe in the late 1930s impinged to some extent on the Law School. In December 1938 the Faculty responded on behalf of the University Senate to support a motion from the Faculty of Law at the University of Amsterdam. The motion noted with sorrow and dismay that in some countries innumerable people are being persecuted and tormented on account of their faith, race or political convictions and that particularly in the so-called concentration camps innocent people are without legal procedure subjected to inhuman treatment.

It went on to deplore the violation of 'basic principles of justice'. In the following year the Dean was present in the House of Commons when the British Prime Minister announced Hitler's invitation to Berchtesgaden, and he had first-hand experience of the September crisis in England.

In October 1939 the Faculty meeting discussed a new by-law, recommended by the Professorial Board and approved by the Senate, relating to students called up for military service. The Dean was thereby given power to grant exemptions from lectures for not more than three weeks, and the Professorial Board for not more than a year. At the same meeting thirteen students were granted leave to attend camp and another, called up for National Service for the duration of the war, was given credit for the first two terms of 1939.

In July 1940 the Faculty considered a request from the Vice-Chancellor to reduce expenditure as far as possible to assist the war effort. Some of the Vice-Chancellor's suggestions included reliance on full time teaching staff in an attempt to reduce part time lecturers' salaries, to curtail or cease teaching courses not absolutely essential and to reduce the number of essays required of students. The meeting decided against discontinuing lectures in the non-examinable courses of Industrial Law, Admiralty Law and Lunacy. It was clearly impossible to extend the lecturing responsibilities of the full time teaching staff since this still only comprised the two professors. It decided, however, that costs could be lowered by reducing fees to outside examiners. The Dean also announced that he would serve in an honorary capacity for most of 1941 so that there would be a saving of about £900 and that, in all, the School could save about £1000 in that year.

Judge H. R. Curlewis.
Lecturer 1912-1918.
In 1940 the Law School Comforts Fund was established to look after its graduates, under-graduates and members of the profession in the services. It aimed to supplement other funds and sought donations of five shillings a month or occasional silver coin donations, through a notice published in *Honi Soit* in June. Mention is made later in this book of the work of this Law School organisation in packing and posting parcels to its overseas servicemen. A more remarkable example of its activities was a newsletter sent out as regularly as possible to law men serving overseas or in camp, with local news and news about those law people who were in the services. It thereby aimed to keep a sense of community. Law students did their bit for the war effort by setting up a War Savings Group, based on the Law Society, with the aim of encouraging the purchase of War Savings Certificates through weekly contributions. It was their boast that in this activity they could not be matched by any other Faculty.

The Teachers

That 60 per cent of the Law School lecturers during Professor Peden's term as Dean were later to become members of the judiciary sounds, at first, an extraordinary statistic. But as New South Wales at the time had only one Law School, because most of the part time lecturers were barristers, and since the population of the State was increasing rapidly, it is less surprising. It is, however, a mark of the degree of acceptance of the Law School in the legal profession, any initial doubts as to the value of a University education in law having, it would seem, disappeared.

What attributes, apart from academic excellence, these men and those who remained barristers or solicitors or became members of parliament, brought to their teaching is difficult to assess. Students learn in different ways, some liking to be spoon-fed, others to be challenged; some preferring to move from the principle of law to individual problems and others to reach the principle via individual application of it. Thus, who are seen as the 'best' teachers depend on students' varying perceptions and needs. The later successes of the part time lecturers did not necessarily bear any relationship to their teaching ability, so that to single out the highest achievers for special mention may be invidious. Nonetheless it will provide some indication of the men who moulded a generation of New South Wales lawyers.

Recollections cannot always be trusted, obituaries are generally eulogistic, and contemporary assessments open to criticism as being fawning if too appreciative, spiteful if overly critical, or otherwise hampered by fears of laws of defamation. Student memories of a teacher in law could also be tinged by later contact in the profession as colleague, opponent or supplicant. Student comment at the time was often neutral, perhaps diplomatically.

Few general criticisms of law teaching or curriculum emerge until late in the period, apart from some wistful comparisons with experiences in Arts and complaints of the 'swatting' required of a law student. In *Honi Soit* in August 1939 early reports of the NUAUS-initiated Law Faculty survey undertaken by the Sydney University Law Society indicated some dissatisfaction with the lecturing system. Student responses indicated a preference for more variety in teaching, with attendance at courts, better practical experience, 'greater use of the tutorial system, discussion group, oral examinations, moots, and an evening course in law' being featured. The possibility of the course becoming a full time one also came under serious consideration.

In the same edition of *Honi Soit*, Labor Attorney-General for New South Wales, the Hon C. E. Martin, a 1936 graduate of the Law School, claimed that it was 'Mid-Victorian' in its methods and more concerned with training technicians than 'broad minded lawyers' capable of understanding concepts of justice. Not all would have agreed with Martin. Many, if not most, would have approved Peden's approach to law as an eminently practical discipline designed to train lawyers, and would have agreed with his caution in considering curriculum change. The perceived conservatism of the Law School arose not only from the conservatism of its Dean but through the high proportion of its teachers being drawn from what was itself a conservative profession.

Of the 50 lecturers who taught at the Law School during Peden's administration, six became High Court Judges — Sir George Rich, Herbert Vere Evatt, Sir Edward McTiernan, Sir Frank
Kitto, Sir Alan Taylor and Sir William John Victor Windeyer. The other Commonwealth appointee was T. O'Mara to the Commonwealth Court of Conciliation and Arbitration.

Of these men, perhaps H. V. Evatt had the most remarkable career. Professor Peden acknowledged him as the brightest student of the Law School and his academic record certainly bears this out. He had an outstanding academic, sporting and leadership career at Maitland High School and then at Fort Street. At Sydney University he gained first class honours in his BA degree (English, Mathematics and Philosophy) and in his MA, and first class honours and the University medal in his LLB degree. His LLD thesis earned him another University medal in 1924, while his extensive list of published works in law and history was deemed worthy of the very rare DLitt in 1944.

His career swung between law and politics. Admitted to the Bar in 1918 he took silk in 1929. From 1923 to 1927 he taught Legal Interpretation and Roman Law at the Law School and in 1925 he entered the New South Wales Parliament as the member for Balmain. He abandoned this episode in his political career in 1930 when he was appointed to the High Court. On his resignation from the Court in 1940 he entered federal politics as a member of the House of Representatives. During his time in the federal parliament he was Attorney-General, Minister for External Affairs, Deputy Prime Minister, Privy Councillor and, in 1948-49, President of the General Assembly of the United Nations Organisation.

While his contribution to law, literature, government and international affairs was outstanding, there is a suggestion that he was not the most talented of teachers. Miss Hay's account, in her reminiscences, of...
His fellow judge, Sir William John Victor Windeyer, was a Fellow of Senate from 1949 to 1959 and Deputy Chancellor of the University of Sydney in 1954.

Apart from H. V. Evatt, fourteen of the Law School teachers in the period under review were to be appointed judges of the Supreme Court of New South Wales. Again apart from Evatt, two would become Chief Justice — Sir Frederick Jordan and Sir Kenneth Street.

From 1910 to 1921 the future Chief Justice of New South Wales, Frederick Richard Jordan, was part time Challis lecturer in Equity, Probate, Bankruptcy and Company Law, also lecturing for a time in Admiralty Law. He and his family migrated to Australia when he was five years old. He attended public school in Balmain and then went on to Sydney Boy's High School. University being beyond the family's modest resources, he became a clerk, shorthand writer and typist. He saved money to complete evening studies in Arts at Sydney University and then, with a scholarship, to gain second class honours in law in 1907. In his professional life he was recognised as a brilliant lawyer but as somewhat cold and aloof. As Miss Hay recounts, the 'passionless influence' of Equity was with him in and out of court and 'on the death of a well-loved judge, one barrister returned from Court where tributes were being paid, saying "Sir Frederick said a few well-frozen words"'. It is this side of his character, rather than that of the private bon vivant who delighted in good food and wine, literature and live theatre, that he revealed to his students. No doubt, however, his facility with language and his succinct and commanding pronouncements on the law served the students well.

Sir Kenneth Whistler Street, appointed to the Supreme Court in 1931, created history by being the first to sit as a 'brother judge' with his father, Sir Philip Street. Sir Kenneth was educated at Homebush Grammar School, Sydney Grammar and the University of Sydney. He completed his arts degree in 1911 and his law degree in 1914. Admitted to the Bar in 1915, he taught at the Law School in the twenties, lecturing in Legal Interpretation, Contracts, Mercantile Law, Torts and Legal Ethics. He reached the Supreme Court via the Industrial Commission to which he was appointed in 1927. He became Chief Justice in 1950 and continued in office until his seventieth birthday in 1960.

The other Supreme Court appointees included D. G. Ferguson, who taught Procedure, Evidence and Pleading and who was also a Fellow of Senate from 1913 to 1934 and Vice-Chancellor in 1919. C. G. Davidson, who served on the University Senate from 1939 to 1941 and who resigned in protest at the filling of two Chairs in the Law Faculty, was one of the Law School's early graduates (LLB 1901) and co-author of *Law of Landlord and Tenant in New South Wales* (1906). For over a decade he lectured in Divorce, his view of teaching being that a law school 'is not a mere factory'. Sir Percival Halse Rogers also was a Fellow of Senate from 1921 to 1941 and Chancellor of the University from 1936 until he, too, resigned in protest in 1941.

B. P. MacFarlan (Probate), R. Chambers (Legal Interpretation), C. D. Monahan and J. R. Nield (Roman Law) were also appointed to the Supreme Court as were B. Sugerman, F. C. Hurley, C. McLelland and J. D. Holmes, who became Judges of the Court of Appeal, and E. D. Roper, of the Land and Valuation Court, who was also Deputy Chancellor of the University in 1946.

Part time lecturers J. A. Browne, J. A. Ferguson and W. S. Sheldon were appointed to the Industrial Commission of New South Wales. Fellow lecturers H. R. Curlewis, D. S. Edwards, B. V. Stacy, E. A. Barton and F. C. Stephen became District Court judges.

A number of the lecturers began their Law School teaching towards the end of the thirties and so made less impact during the Peden years. These included F. E. Barraclough who ran the non-examination course in Lunacy, G. R. Wright, lecturer in Admiralty Law, C. H. Currey, historian and educationalist who covered Political Science and Legal History, J. G. Starke, and R. Clive Teece KC who would be 'caretaker Dean' prior to Professor Shatwell's appointment. Others with lengthy part time teaching records are mentioned more fully in chapter 5. These include Wilfred McMinn (Procedure, Evidence and Pleading), Colonel W. K. S. Mackenzie (Divorce), P. R. Watts (Conveyancing), T. P. Flattery (Roman Law) and V. H. Treatt (Criminal Law).
Earlier lecturers of the period include E. M. Mitchell KC, a Fellow of the Senate from 1925 to 1934 who taught common law subjects before enlisting in the AIF in World War I and again briefly after the war. J. H. Hammond KC, co-author with C. G. Davidson of a book on landlord and tenant law, taught Contracts, Mercantile Law and Torts for five years after the war. J. R. Hooton (Equity and Company Law) and E. F. McDonald (Bankruptcy and Probate) both taught from 1921 to 1930. N de H. Rowland taught Procedure, Evidence and Pleading from 1924 to 1930, and Dr. G. Waddell taught Roman Law from 1910 to 1918.

The Professors

Lengthy appreciations of Professors Peden and Charteris appeared in the Jubilee Book, and both are the subjects of entries in the Australian Dictionary of Biography. Rather than repeating these, a few general comments are offered.
While few Sydney University Law School Deans could compete with Peden in breadth of activity, he could also be said to be the most parochial of them all. Born in Randwick and educated at Bega Public School and Sydney Grammar School, he was also a product of the Law School he came to lead. He practised at the New South Wales Bar (taking silk in 1922), was awarded a knighthood (KCMG) in 1930, and was a member of the New South Wales legislature, sitting in the Legislative Council. It is said that he could have had an appointment to the Bench, and it is true that in 1926 he was offered Vice-Chancellorship of the University, but neither seemed to appeal. Perhaps he preferred his own form of dominance over the legal profession and his freedom to participate in the making, analysis and reform of legislation and to contribute to University government as a member (sometimes Chairman) of the Professorial Board and as a Fellow of Senate rather than as a member of the administration. No doubt he also preferred the freedom to serve as a company director — of MLC Assurance Co. Ltd. and of the New South Wales Land and Agency Co. and associated companies — and the time to chair the trustees of Sydney Grammar School, the Sydney Round Table group, the Japan Australia Society and the Boys Brigade and to be Chancellor of the Anglican Diocese of Bathurst and later of Newcastle.

He was called 'Jacko' by his students, and that and the A. A. Milne parody included in this chapter suggest a warmth on his part and an affection on theirs. It is said, however, that he rarely laughed and could at times be very severe. Miss Hay noted that he was a 'strict disciplinarian' and 'ruled his students with an iron rod', was 'inclined to treat youthful peccadillos

'Jacko', as seen by cartoonist George Finey — a stone monolith of severe mien.
as crimes' and was 'somewhat puritanical in his outlook', apart from lacking small talk. She commented that Professor Peden practised 'the long approach'. His desk was at the far end of his office. 'Offenders summoned to the presence . . . had to walk the full length of the room with morale oozing away at every step'. She remarked that students, though they might come to like and admire Peden, 'never lost their deep awe of him'.

According to David Marr's biography, 'Barwick . . . found Peden a martinet, prone to treating his students as kindergarten children'. Against this one must place his kindness. For example, he helped both Garfield Barwick and John Kerr to find articles, as neither could afford the premiums, ranging from £100 to £600, that solicitors required to take on young students as articled clerks. He is said to have interviewed every student each year and was always available for advice. His deep conservatism, shown in his dress — wing collar and monocle — and the seriousness captured in his portrait, are said to have marked his attitude to law and its teaching — fiercely practical and devoted to black letter law.

If Sir John Peden could be categorised as parochial, the Law School had, in Professor Charteris, a complete foil. Charteris was born in Glasgow and came from an academic family. He was educated at Edinburgh, Coblenz and Glasgow. Like Peden he first graduated in Arts (MA 1894) and then in Law (LLB 1898). Indeed both men completed their studies in law in the same year. While Peden went to the Bar, Charteris worked in law offices before being appointed in 1904 as lecturer in Public International Law and International Private Law at Glasgow University. While Peden had studied Latin and Greek, Charteris spoke fluent French and German. While Peden revelled in the minutiae of law and its close analysis, Charteris was more at home in the broad sweep of comparative studies. As a council member of the International Law Association and member of the Royal Institute of International Affairs, Charteris was in touch with the leading international lawyers of the day, while Peden's legal contacts were those of the New South Wales Bench and Bar. Charteris also brought to the Sydney University Law School first-hand experience from his work for the Admiralty and for the War Trade Intelligence Department during World War I, and post war experience as legal assistant to the Berlin agent of the clearing house for enemy debts.

At this distance in time it is not easy to assess the teaching or the manner of either Peden and Charteris, or 'Jacko' and 'Archy' as they were called by students. The faces of those who recall them now invariably light up with affection and admiration at Charteris' name — that 'wonderful man'. His lectures on International Law and Political Science, including special optional Saturday morning classes, opened new worlds for his young listeners. His experience and his wide reading gave an immediacy to his teaching and, as some have remarked, he was decades ahead of his time. Humour and wit permeated his delivery and his manner was relaxed and informal.

Peden is seen as a very austere person, sometimes as a 'brooding presence' in the Law School, whose rare humour could have a sadistic turn, for example, in keeping the students on tenterhooks regarding their examination results by a series of delaying tactics. The eventual public reading of these results in class in descending order of merit could be an agony for students, especially those at the end of the list, about whom his comments could be caustic. The dreaded word 'and' preceded the last of the names of students who had passed, so the tension remained high during the whole procedure.

Writer of many authoritative articles and inveterate user, so it is said, of green ink, Charteris was also a contributor to the Manchester Guardian, the Glasgow Herald and The Times and, after his appointment to the Law School, to the Sydney Morning Herald. He also made highly regarded broadcasts in Australia to inform and entertain. In lighter vein was his book on Scottish humour, When the Scot Smiles. Wise, cultured and learned, Charteris offered shrewd comment peppered with humorous anecdote, wit and charm, and above all, with enthusiasm.

Peden, on the other hand, was according to Miss Hay, 'far more at home drafting a Bill or a clause than other types of composition'. Irish barrister J. J. Kingsley Newell, secretary to Peden while he was a Law Reform Commissioner, 'used sometimes to come from a session . . . in which little had been achieved, with impatience at boiling point'. Peden appears not to have published any scholarly work nor to have engaged in research apart from seeking helpful
answers to immediate problems, for example, the clause in the *Colonial Laws Validity Act* which provided the key by which a flexible constitution... could in effect be turned into a rigid one, through Section 7A of the *New South Wales Constitution Act*.

Just before sailing for Australia to take up his appointment at the Law School, Charteris married Margaret Rossiter. There was one son of the marriage. The family home at Turramurra was named Roseacre, maintaining the traditional legal name for property but with what might be described as an example of Charteris’ quirkish humour. Few clues as to his private life emerge, but he belonged to the Avondale Golf Club at Pymble and to an informal dining group, ‘The Happy Release Club’. He seems to have liked a glass of port, smoked Capstan or Abdullah cigarettes and the occasional cheroot. It is said that he liked to visit new restaurants when they opened, to test their fare. Above all, he liked good food, good wine, and good company.

From the date of his appointment to the Law School in 1921 until his death in 1940, Charteris appears to have made little contribution to the rather infrequent Faculty meetings, though for some of them at least he was overseas as Australian representative at international conferences where, again, the combination of intellect and informality seems to have been widely appreciated.

Man of the world if not man about town, he was a big man who dressed casually and who seems to have fitted into Australian life with ease. Dressed in slacks and short sleeved, open necked shirt he must have been a noticeable figure amongst the suited, wigged and gowned in Phillip Street. English journalist Neville Cardus, who met him towards the end of his life commented on his warmth and friendliness, his acceptance by people from all walks of life, and his gift as a raconteur which could enliven any gathering. He seems very much a twentieth century man in contrast to Peden’s nineteenth century image.

Vice-Chancellor Dr R. S. Wallace, speaking at a memorial service for Charteris on 17 October 1940, described him as one might see him at his room at the Law School —

the bulky frame; the massive head; the unconventional dress; the inevitable cigarette; the pile of books around him (his own and other people’s — for like all great bookmen, he was both a generous lender and a generous borrower); books on the desk, on the chairs, on the floor, everywhere but where they ought to be; the cheerful welcome; and the ensuing ‘crack’ about men and books, so rich and varied and delightful.

Wallace commented that ‘no one... could have been less pedantic’ and claimed that it was because he ‘laid no stress on his professorial side that he was a great teacher whose teaching will be long cherished by those who had the privilege of sitting at his feet’.

W. S. Sheldon’s comment in the *Jubilee Book* seems a fitting conclusion on the Professors:

Most good partnerships depend on contrast; and in the Law School the most potent grave and reverend seignior who rules its destinies is perfectly complemented by the incorrigible elfishness of his associate.

**The End of an Era**

Professor Peden was due to retire on 26 April 1941, on reaching his 70th birthday. In mid 1940 the University Senate discussed the advisability of taking steps to fill his Chair by March 1941, in view of the war situation. Peden offered, as his contribution to the war effort and to assist the University, to carry on until the end of 1941 in an honorary capacity after his retirement date, and his offer was accepted. In the event, Peden’s declining health forced him to cease lecturing in Trinity Term 1941, although offering to continue administrative duties as Dean. Professor Charteris had died in harness on 9 October 1940 and had not yet been replaced.

But for the war, Peden might have looked to a peaceful transition to retirement and a quiet handover to the replacement Professor and Dean. The Law School’s Jubilee celebrations in 1940 had been to a considerable degree a celebration of Peden’s own contribution to law, to its teaching and to the profession and, at the time, an only slightly premature farewell to a Dean of over 30 years’ standing. The effect of war, however, even before the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbour in December 1941, with its heightened danger to Australia, was to lead to a period of
disharmony in the Dean’s last months in office and to his abrupt departure from University government after the Senate meeting of 3 November 1941.

The disharmony arose over the question of the filling of the two Chairs in the Law School to replace Charteris and Peden. A major area of disagreement was whether, indeed, Chairs should be filled in wartime, partly on the basis of economising but also on the possible discrimination against applicants unable to be interviewed because they were serving overseas, and the ongoing disadvantage to their future careers. This became an issue, in spite of the fact that some positions at the University had been filled since the outbreak of war. Proposals to delay both appointments, or to make only one, holding over the other until after the war, were finally abandoned and the Senate meeting of 13 October accepted the Professorial Board’s recommendation of Professor James Williams for the Chair of Law and Professor Julius Stone for the Chair of Jurisprudence and International Law.

A special meeting of Senate was called on 23 October to consider Mr Richard Windeyer’s notice of motion to rescind the decision to fill the Law School Chairs. The issue of opportunity to be interviewed, denied the two unsuccessful candidates on the short list, was raised again and a suggestion made that the legal profession might be prejudiced against two appointees selected in preference to men on active service. Professor Peden himself raised a more divisive issue to which he had referred in the previous meeting — the necessity to consult with the Judges in making Law School appointments. The meeting did not debate this question but passed Windeyer’s motion with a narrow majority after considerable discussion.

The Senate’s action became a matter of public concern and debate. In the Legislative Assembly, Mr Shand, member for Ryde, asked whether ‘one of the two men selected for appointment has changed his name for racial reasons’; Mr A. Landa, member for Bondi, claimed the Senate was ‘trying to prevent the appointment of a Jew to a professorship of law’. He continued:

Perhaps his crime is that he has been associated with a Labor Government, and it may be that he belongs to the Jewish faith. . . . I will want to know the names of the members of the Senate adopting Nazi and Fascist tactics for the simple reason that this man is a Jew.

Others saw the Senate’s action as political rather than racial. Alfred Conlon, student representative on the Senate who had voted against the rescission motion, wrote to Stone the same day. He claimed that opposition to Stone’s appointment ‘represented a last desperate bid on the part of the conservatives to retain U.A.P. control of the Law School’, since both Brown and Latham had ‘very intimate relations with the U.A.P. . . . and Peden himself has been a very valuable supporter of the U.A.P.’

The rejection of the Professorial Board’s recommendation raised important principles which were aired in the press and stirred the SRC into production of a special issue of Honi Soit. It also raised other issues. The Sydney press had a field day with accusations of fascist tactics by the Senate, allegation and counter-allegation, breaches of confidentiality in revealing the names of the two unsuccessful short-listed candidates, Mr A. B. Brown and Mr R. T. Latham, and generally sensationalist comment. The Daily Telegraph appeared incapable of mentioning Professor Stone without the gratuitous rider, ‘a Jew’, while Sydney Truth seized the opportunity to beat the racist drum claiming that nowhere in the world were Jews held in the high esteem Landa claimed they were entitled to; and that . . .

In fact many people believe the refugees from foreign lands have been given too many privileges and too much latitude here. And there have been instances of gross ingratitude.

The Senate meeting of 3 November received resolutions from the SRC and a petition from 141 students in the Law Faculty expressing dismay and outrage. A resolution from the RSL supported the non-appointment to Chairs during wartime and Sydney University Law Society took a conservative line, distancing itself from the law students’ petition. Through the press, the Teachers’ Federation had criticised the Senate’s action. The University was clearly under siege.

The SRC’s protest ‘against the Senate’s refusal to accept the unanimous recommendation of the Professorial Board, the pressure brought to bear on the Senate by outside sources, and the
criticisms of one appointee on racial grounds in Parliament and sections of the Press' summed up the general areas of dispute. President of the Bar Council, R. Clive Teece, strongly denied any pressure having been brought to bear on the Senate. ‘The students know nothing about it. There is not a word of truth in the allegation, which is pure imagination’. But the SRC President’s claim that a professor had said, ‘Should this rescission stand, we will not have a decent application to this University for a decade’, was not answered, and may have had significant influence in the next round of the fight.

The SRC also raised another matter, that of the widespread employment in Australian Law Schools of part time lecturers ‘as a money-making sideline’ by members of legal firms, which had been raised by a law sub-committee of NUAUS council in 1938. In a campaign to promote the employment of full time lecturers in law and to deplore the rescission motion, the SRC quoted NUAUS proceedings which claimed that some of the part time practitioners were ‘too busy even to give, let alone prepare, lectures and whose office duties prevent any informal discussions and contact with students’.

Bringing the argument closer to home, *Honi Soit*’s lead story pointed out that since Professor Charteris’ death one Chair in law had been vacant. It claimed further that:

Sir John Peden has not been able to lecture or to fulfil his office as Dean for the last 12 months . . . [and that] administrative work of the school has been left almost entirely to Sir John Peden’s secretary, who, although she has been closely associated with Sir John for a number of years, is entirely without academic or professional qualifications . . . and the students are faced with an indefinite future of part-time lecturing and inadequate administration.

While it might be thought that the SRC was making exaggerated claims in pursuit of one of its hobby horses, it is true that no Law Faculty meeting was called between 2 July 1940 and 27 November 1941 even though this period included the death of Professor Charteris. It is true also that Miss Dalrymple Hay was awarded an honorarium of £100 by the Senate for her increased workload and responsibility over eight months as librarian, clerk to the faculty and, during Peden’s illness, carrying out almost the whole of the Dean’s administrative work.

*Honi Soit* featured photographs of A. A. Conlon, Professor Mills and the Hon C. E. Martin, three Fellows of Senate who had opposed Windeyer’s rescission motion. An article by Professor John Anderson in support of the Professorial Board’s position claimed that opposition to the Board’s recommendations ‘has been largely governed by non-academic considerations and by support for candidates judged by the Board to be inferior to the menit selected’. He further stated that ‘there were selectors at work outside the Board’s selector committee [who] have introduced all sorts of irrelevant considerations, and have succeeded for the moment in preventing justice being done’.

The storm over the rescission led Anderson to claim that the Senate should be reformed. He admitted that as long as the Senate accepted academic advice on academic matters it was ‘comparatively harmless, even though not very useful’ but ‘when they do take the bit in their teeth, they invariably bolt in a reactionary direction’. Anderson proposed the abolition of graduate representation on Senate since its effect ‘is to subject University policy to the influence of narrow-minded professionalism’. He added that ‘such bodies as the Bar Council should be directly informed that they have no right to any say whatever in University affairs’. A different sort of reform was mooted in the Sydney press, some members of the New South Wales Parliament suggesting that the government should increase its representation in this ‘citadel of conservatism’, no doubt with the aim of greater influence on University policy making and selection of staff.

Letters from law students regarding the Senate’s somersault commented on the speed of the reversal, notice of which had been given ‘hard on the heels of the original appointment’, the treatment of the Law School ‘as a poor relation of the University . . . [whose] students have been exiled well out of sight (and, apparently, out of mind) of the rest of the University’, the nationalistic point of view of some members of the Senate ‘that the professorship should be given to Australians where possible’, and the situation at the Law School with lack of coordination, the general inefficiency and the lackadaisical atmosphere, that have all reigned
throughout the year due to the absence of competent professorial supervision'.

One supposes that at the meeting of the Senate on 3 November 1941 the atmosphere must have been electric. Much of the meeting was taken up by a refutation of criticism of the Professorial Board's recommendations and its methods by its Chairman, Professor Mills. He stated that the recommendations were reached on the basis of merit alone and without consideration of availability, the committee having proceeded as they would have done in peace-time, and having reached their decision before personal interviews were held. At the Chancellor's request the selection committee had conferred with legal members of Senate who had made a series of statements, some of which tended to be vague and unsubstantiated. The selection committee rejected the Chancellor's criticisms as to its competence on the matter because it included no member trained in law. Not only had it received the recommendations and advice of legal men of high standing, but the committee itself included professors from cognate fields and three of its members held law degrees. This included the Chairman himself who held the LLM degree from Melbourne University.

Mills proceeded to address the matter of principle; that the Senate charges the Board with the duty of investigating the claims of various candidates for appointments and it is established precedent that the Senate accepts the Board's recommendations. While informal consultation with outside individuals and bodies is sound and is normal practice, such outsiders should not have a determining voice in law or any other appointments, since the University must remain the sole custodian of its academic standards.

Both Richard Windeyer KC and Peden fought a rearguard action by suggesting that the Senate had the right to determine policy in respect of the filling of Chairs, Windeyer adding that active service should constitute a claim to special consideration.

Debate on the motions to overturn the rescission motion and to appoint Stone and Williams covered much the same ground as had earlier discussions but in the end the two appointments were separately ratified. The duties and responsibilities of the Professorial Board had thus been confirmed, the students' complaints had been met and their fears allayed, and the Senate had held off any concerted move to reform. Professor Peden, however, along with the Chancellor, Sir Percival Halse Rogers, and the Hon Mr Justice Davidson felt constrained to tender their resignations as Fellows of Senate.

So the Peden era ended with something of a bang, with the profession he had served for so long under criticism. Some who either sought to reform the teaching of law at Sydney University Law School or who had other personal or ideological axes to grind had been able to seize...
on the actions of the Senate to voice their opinions in a very public forum. Even the law students had been alienated towards the end of Peden's long administration. It is ironic that, as mentioned elsewhere, student numbers in the year after Peden's departure from the Law School were as small as they had been when he took office in 1910.

It was the end of an era in other ways too, though not the end of controversy, as will be seen in the following chapter. Although the postwar deanship of Professor Shatwell would last for 27 years, part time teaching by members of the profession would continue through to the present, and the Law School, though rehoused again, would still be physically isolated the University campus, there would be marked differences from the first half century. The huge increase in student numbers and the abandonment of the articles system, freeing the timetable from its morning and evening lecture times, would bring about an increase in full time teaching staff and a shift from the 'one man band' impression of the first fifty years' administration.

As long as the 'one man band' Law School was operating it was inevitable that the nature of the School would derive to a large extent from the individual who constituted that band. A large proportion of the Bar and the Bench supported Peden and his policies. Many, of course, were products of the Law School themselves and had a concern to ensure the continuity and growth of the institution for the benefit of their profession. There can be no doubt that Peden saw his life's work in terms of creating legal practitioners, but some, such as C. E. Martin, claim that the product of his endeavours was not learned or imaginative but a narrow legal technician. Writing in the 1960s, Miss Hay noted that the School had become more academic than it was in Peden's time when, 'equipped with the fundamentals of law, students were not encouraged to wander unduly in the cloud-cuckoo land of research'.
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Who's Who in Australia
It was a particularly hot afternoon. The long narrow lecture room facing Phillip Street was furnished with connected desks and benches occupied by law students, most of whom were male articled clerks, who had spent previous hours carrying letters to solicitors or filing documents in Court offices.

The tired ones sought to occupy the benches at the back of the room, the 'bright boys' sought the front desks.

The lecturer read from his notes on the lectern in front of him and could hardly be heard by those on the back benches who were soon lulled to sleep by his droning delivery. He did not mind the sleepers and seldom raised his eyes from the notes.

We knew, however, that he took exception to being interrupted by unseemly behaviour. Thus those at the back considered it essential to wake up snorers. At one lecture the student next to me began to snore and I gave him the prescribed dig in the ribs to wake him. Still dreaming, his reaction was to give me a thump which sent me off the seat to the floor. This was the end for both of us. We were ordered out of the room with a request to see the lecturer in his study later, when we apologised and were forgiven.

In the winter when darkness came early, the top of King Street was frequented by well dressed 'Ladies of the Night'. They made propositions to the students on their way down King Street. They were wasting their time, for little did they know that these passers by were impecunious students who only had enough money to pay their fares home.

I had on one occasion to go to see the Dean of the Law Faculty Professor Sir John Peden. He was a man of intense upright character, but always could be counted on to listen to applications by the students.

I wanted to get his permission to be away from law lectures for a period of five weeks to tour with a representative Rugby team to New Zealand.

I came into his study with trepidation and put my case. I stood up all the time till he said, 'Sit down my boy', then 'Rosenblum', he continued, 'I have looked at your record and note that you have been away on numerous occasions for State and University tours. Nevertheless I notice that you have always passed your subsequent exams. I now propose to exempt you from attendance at lectures and wish you a successful tour'. He was always an upright reasonable man.
Obtaining articles was very difficult, especially if you had not the connections such as the right school, or recommendations from powerfully connected businessmen. One of my applications was successful in that I was asked to come for an interview.

After my particulars were found to be satisfactory, I was then informed that the firm was prepared to give me articles on payment of a premium of £400. I was told that the clerk in the early years would be of little use, and the premium would be required to make up the wage paid to him and the time taken for giving him instruction and allowing him time off for attendance at the University. I declined the position, explaining that I was a Scholarship University Law Student and that sort of money was not available.

However, our next door neighbour was a master plumber and he knew a solicitor who would employ me as an articled clerk without a premium at the ‘colossal’ salary of £1 per week. The solicitor’s office was at the northern end of Pitt Street. He was a pleasant man and handsome. He always treated me well. He was famous in my young eyes because he had a client who owned the current winner of the Melbourne Cup. I very seldom saw him as his office was run for many years by his managing clerk. His personal letters and other work was supplied by his private secretary, who boasted in the name of Mrs. Kiss.

My first job was to open all incoming letters and place these in a pile on the managing clerk’s table. The second assignment was to proceed round town delivering letters. In the early afternoons I made copies of typed letters by running a wet brush over the beautifully typed letter and then placing it into a press which made the copy. I then placed the original letter back into its envelope and sent it off. The process was difficult to master and most of the original letters were smudged, some impossible to read. But I was well treated and glad to be a member of the office, especially as it had one client whose name was famous round Sydney as funeral directors.

However, I realised that I had to change offices, reluctant as I was, because I was given absolutely no legal training.

The office which accepted an assignment of my articles was a larger commercial office and all the staff were pleasant and helpful. But legal training or assistance I did not get. My master solicitor, one of the partners, worked assiduously for long hours but I seldom saw him and any instruction I received came from his private secretary.

The third office I was assigned to was one of the then larger offices in town. The room I occupied was at the end of a very long passage and its only occupant was a solicitor, fully qualified, under whom I was supposed to work.

Every morning at 10.30 he would place his folded Morning Herald into an instruction cover and tell me he was going off to settle a matter and would be back at 12 noon, but I understood that he could always be found at Mockbell’s Coffee Shop between those hours.

The master solicitor could be found within a deep sanctum with his private secretary who also did all his legal typing. One day I drew his attention to the fact that all her carbon copies were smudged. He then said, ‘Rosenblum, you have been working for me for 6 months, she has been working for me for 12 years. Who do you think I should sack?’

I shut up and fled.

Summing up I can say that at all those three offices I received courtesy and help and was surrounded with good natured people but I was taught very very little.

The root of this trouble was that the master solicitors were very, very, busy, working for long hours, and no time to teach. If they could have had the time to teach, I doubt if they knew how to teach articled clerks.

It seems to me there should be a choice given to young men either to take articles with solicitors who are willing to accept them as such, or to attend the Law College after they have finished their law course.
The Law School is building up a collection of portraits of people connected with the School; examples of these appear on pp 17, 85-86 and 155-156. The University itself also has portraits of law graduates who have achieved eminence at the University — for example Professor John Ward.
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A figure depicting law appears on the string course on the north-west section of the quadrangle.
The first half century of Sydney University Law School was shared by only two Deans, Professor Pitt Cobbett and Professor John Peden. The next six years, the period of the war in the Pacific and the immediate postwar years, covered no less than three deanships. Professor James Williams served for four years, R. Clive Teece for a little over a year and Professor Kenneth Shatwell for six months, the beginning of a lengthy administration.

Professor James Williams, appointed to the Law School in 1942 as its Professor of Law and Dean, was then 34 years of age, in marked contrast to the 71 year old Dean he replaced. He had been born in Wellington, New Zealand and educated at Auckland Grammar School. At Auckland University College he had gained his LLM and then, at Clare College Cambridge, his PhD. At the time of his appointment to the Chair at Sydney University he was in his seventh year as Professor of English and New Zealand Law at the Victoria University College, Wellington. In 1932 he had published *The Statute of Frauds* and he was co-author, with Sir John Salmond, of *Principles of the Law of Contract*. He was married with three children and his hobby was mountaineering. According to the reminiscences of Miss Dalrymple Hay, law librarian and clerk to the Faculty, Williams was 'a scholarly rather gentle man who was anxious to keep the tie between the School and the profession as close as possible'.

It is hard to imagine a more difficult period in which to take over administration of the Faculty, especially for someone from outside the Law School. One of the strong supporting arguments in favour of the appointment of Williams as Professor of Law and Dean of the Faculty was that he had performed these tasks already in New Zealand, as had his co-appointee Julius Stone, Professor of Jurisprudence and International Law. The prolonged illness of Williams' predecessor during 1941 had left the burden of administration to Miss Dalrymple Hay. While Faculty meetings had tended to be infrequent and often brief during most of Peden's term of office, there had been no meeting between 2 July 1940 and 27 November 1941 at which Williams, in his absence, was elected as Dean.

Dwindling student numbers reduced some of the pressure on the new Professors, but against this was the fact that all the subjects had to be continued, regardless of the numbers. There was a need to plan for a postwar future and to do everything possible in the meantime for men.
joining up or already in the armed services. Some initiatives had already been set in train to assist men in the services and these, such as the Law School Comforts Fund, had a firm organisational basis under Miss Hay's direction and could be carried on with a minimum of trouble.

Assistance to Servicemen

Just as some flexibility had been introduced by the University in World War I to assist servicemen or those planning to enlist, World War II occasioned similar changes though on a larger scale. An early recommendation by the Professorial Board to assist men in camp to continue their legal studies brought a co-operative response from the Law School. The Faculty meeting of 23 May 1942 approved the principle whereby men in camp could be exempted from lectures, noting that this would require action by the judges, since admission to practise stipulated attendance at lectures. The meeting also agreed that law students in camp would be allowed to sit for examinations in a course or a division of a course rather than to sit the whole year's subjects at the same time. Examinations, it was decided, could be in oral or written form and could be held at times to suit the students' military duties.

In discussion, various ideas were put forward including the possibility of extending study facilities to men serving overseas, provision of tutoring in camps under the supervision of law graduates or senior undergraduates, help for students from graduates in the same unit, and the possibility of some concessions being made in the number of subjects required for completion of the LLB degree.

At a very practical level the meeting decided to assist student expenses by providing sets of lecture notes, digests of cases, some text books, visiting tutors and advisers, and the setting and marking of exercises. A survey had already revealed that 38 men wished to accept assistance and a further 94 were still considering the proposal. To assist those who had already started studying, Professor Stone, who was acting Dean pending the arrival of Professor Williams, had donated £10 — his fees for broadcasting — to the Law School Comforts Fund for the purchase of text books.

An assessment of this assistance programme at the end of 1943 indicated that it was still very active and that, for those who had had a period of study at the Law School prior to joining the services, results were good and there was no falling off in academic standards. Though the scheme had also been offered to men who were, in effect, new enrolments, it was too early to tell how they would handle such technical subjects as Contracts which bore little relationship to studies undertaken at school. It was noted that the scheme was more easily implemented in artillery, anti-aircraft defence, communications, air force and navy than in the infantry. It was noted, too, that the stage had been reached where more subjects would need to be offered since some men had already completed all the subjects for a particular year and wished to continue.

At this stage there were 185 students registered under the scheme, of whom 46 were beginners, 95 had previously attended the Sydney University Law School and 44 were taking either Barristers' or Solicitors' Admission Board courses or attending other universities.

As the war progressed requests were made each year to the National Service Committee for exemption from military service of students in second, third and fourth years. This appears to have been an attempt by the Faculty to retain the best students, from an extremely depleted enrolment, for a further years' study in view of the fact that the war might soon be over.

There was recognition that more needed to be done for men in the services than merely the provision of the means to continue their legal education. The Law School Comforts Fund filled this gap, admirably headed by Miss Hay and assisted by other women on the staff and women graduates. Recipients of its hard work and the generosity of donors from the student body and the profession were said to be envied by other servicemen in their units. One of the largest tasks was to compile and maintain a list of Law School graduates and undergraduates and other law men both in camp in Australia or serving overseas. Servicemen were encouraged to send news of themselves and others, censorship permitting, to the Law School for inclusion in the Legal Digest which covered current Law School and legal news. It was posted out every few months with the aim of keeping servicemen in touch with the profession and with each other. In addition to the Digest, the Comforts Fund sent two Penguin books to every man every month and special food parcels and cakes at Christmas time.
The Comforts Fund reported in July 1942 that since it had begun its operation, in June 1940, it had 'sent away 2799 books, hundreds of copies of The Recorder and Honi Soit and the Faculty magazine Blackacre. The cost including postage, to send a man two books a month [was] about 17/6 per annum'. At the time of this report there were 370 men on the Comforts Fund roll — 211 graduates, 116 undergraduates and 43 legal men not from the Law School. Most of the men (258) were in the army, and there were 21 in the navy, and 91 in the air force. Eight men had been recorded as killed, 11 as missing, and 43 were prisoners of war. In the 1945-46 issue of Blackacre some 600 men were listed on the Roll of Service, of which 65 were recorded as killed.

Student Activities

The Sydney University Law Society though drawing on a diminished number of students, did its best to provide activities for its members as well as supporting the war effort in general and the School's Comforts Fund in particular. In 1942, for example, it arranged moots, participated in inter-faculty debating, organised lunch hour addresses, and set up study groups to consider postwar reconstruction. It was difficult to arrange social functions under wartime conditions but some functions were held to raise money for the Comforts Fund.

The Society took a more public stance on a number of issues, in particular supporting the application of the Clerks' Union at the Arbitration Court for an award for articled clerks. It wrote to the Department of War Organisation of Industry on the question of quotas for unreserved Faculties, ie Faculties whose students were not generally exempted from war or war related service. It was then asked by the Department to report on the wartime national service which could be rendered by a law graduate, the needs of government departments and semi-government organisations for graduates with legal training during wartime, and the postwar needs of private enterprise and government. The Society thus had an opportunity to assess the role of the law graduate outside traditional legal practice.

On a number of occasions the Society unsuccessfully requested the inclusion of a student representative on the Faculty. Its last request for representation in the period under review was late in 1946, by which stage student numbers were large and many students were returned servicemen and therefore less willing to accept decision-making without their inclusion. The request this time was very moderate, seeking representation via a graduate of not more than three years' standing. After a refusal by the Faculty, a recommittal motion agreed that the students' request should be sent to the Senate. The request was rejected by the Senate.

Student 'dismay' over the results in Contracts in 1942 led to discussions with the Dean, Professor Williams, who was reported as taking a liberal attitude to posts. The Society also argued a strong case against the introduction of charges for some of the lecture notes, sending a copy of its complaint to the Vice-Chancellor and to the Students' Representative Council and urging students not to pay the fee while negotiations were under way with the authorities. This piece of student action was successful and the fees were dropped.

But they had no success in 1946 when they wrote to the Faculty suggesting that 'since Latin is no longer a matriculation pre-requisite for the Faculty of Law, it would be desirable to replace the compulsory question in Latin in the Roman Law paper by a question on the translated text'.

Faculty Matters

In August of his first year as Dean, Professor Williams brought to the Faculty a memorandum in support of full time study for the first two years of the law course. Much of his statement was an analysis of the then current practices in qualifying for admission as a barrister or solicitor, including spelling out the requirements for articles. From this he went on to consider teaching methods and the inadequacy of lecturing, whereby 'the person who learns most is the lecturer'. In his view, as long as part time instruction was the norm, and as long as students' time was limited by their forced attendance at legal offices, it was impossible to introduce such desirable teaching methods as practical exercises and small group instruction. The dilemma
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was that both law classes and office experience benefited students, but that the increase in one element automatically reduced the other.

He concluded that office experience was of greatest use in the later years of study when a firm theoretical base had been established, but that articles in the early years of study hindered this legal education. His motion, that the judges be approached to alter admission rules so that students who completed two years full time law should be required to complete only three years articles (as was the case for graduate entrants to law) full time, was also carried unanimously. By November 1943 Senate approval had been granted and the proposal had been forwarded for consideration by the judges. They agreed to the reform in November 1944 for implementation as from October 1945.

Recognition that student numbers were likely to be very high after the war led to the setting up in 1942 of a committee to consider what steps might be taken to help servicemen continue or begin law studies after discharge during or after the war, and what facilities would be required to cope with the anticipated numbers. A major problem was that of accommodation, not so much for those returned servicemen who had already completed part of the law degree, as for the predicted high enrolments in first year. The Dean announced in November 1945 that it was possible to arrange accommodation nearby if one lecture room was inadequate, that additional law reports had been bought and provisions were being made to extend the library accommodation. He suggested that some acceleration of courses could be allowed, provided there was no lowering of standards, and that arrangements could be made for returned servicemen to do up to one and a half years' study in one academic year with some study being undertaken in vacation and with the provision of tutorials if necessary.

A committee comprising two ex-service part time lecturers, B. P. MacFarlan and V. H. Treatt, along with J. D. Holmes, Stone and Williams reported back to Faculty the following month. It agreed with the acceleration proposals and recommended empowering the Dean to vary the number of courses required of an individual student, to allow not more than two courses to be taken over the vacation and to exempt students, where necessary, from attending lectures, since there were bound to be timetable clashes. Acceleration, they agreed, should not result in any lowering of standards, nor should it permit greater saving than the time lost by war service. It also recommended the appointment of two full time tutors to assist ex-service students.

Conflict

The issues of two years full time tuition in law, and the provision of facilities and general assistance for ex-servicemen, were to be central to the angry clashes of 1945. This was not because they were inherently divisive issues in themselves but as part of the criticism of Professor Williams’ handling of Faculty matters. From September 1945 the Law School was to be divided, torn by allegation and innuendo, and distressed by public airing of disputes. Professor Williams would resign and a part time Dean be appointed to replace him until Professor Shatwell took up the Chair of Law and the deanship in 1947.

Amidst the furor surrounding the appointment of Professors Williams and Stone to replace Peden and Charteris at the Law School, the Professorial Board had defended its recommendations to Senate on a number of grounds. These included the assessment that ‘together they form an admirable team because their personalities and special interests are not conflicting but complementary’. Nothing could have been wider of the mark. From later events and statements one can sense that conflict between Stone and Williams had been simmering for some time before the unprecedented events of September 1945 and thereafter.

Professor Stone brought the division between the two men into the open at a Professorial Board meeting where he announced he considered it ‘incumbent on me to inform the Board concerning the affairs of the Faculty...’. He went on to complain about Professor Williams’ failure to consult with the Faculty and to make regular reports to the Professorial Board. His written statement to that body, ‘Affairs of the Faculty of Law 1943-45’, was reproduced in full at a Law Faculty meeting on 28 September 1945. The statement covered a number of grounds of complaint. Since December 1943, it stated, the Dean had failed not only to call any Faculty
meetings but also to convene two important committees, and he had made no report to the Professorial Board for almost two years. Further, he had made policy decisions without consultation, in spite of attempts to remedy the situation. Stone claimed that continuation of such behaviour would further estrange law from the University, would reduce the Faculty to a 'virtually fictitious existence' and would establish 'by tolerated precedent' a way of conducting academic business 'unparalleled elsewhere'.

At the Board meeting Williams had read a brief statement to the effect that the Board was not a proper tribunal to judge a complaint by one professor against another and that he had no intention of entering into a controversy in that arena. He had then left the meeting.

The Board had resolved that Stone's statement be brought to the attention of the University Senate and that Senate be informed that the Board considered that regular reports from Faculties were 'desirable' and that it sought a report from the Faculty on the matter of two full time years in the law course and provisions for postwar accommodation.

At the Faculty meeting on 28 September 1945 Stone failed to have consideration of his memorandum postponed and lost a point of order which questioned the competence of the Faculty to deal with the matter. In reply to R. Clive Tice's enquiry as to why he had not used provisions in the by-laws to have a Faculty meeting convened by the Registrar, he said that 'a fair answer . . . would oblige him reluctantly to refer to matters which, for Professor Williams' sake he had not mentioned in his memorandum and to the Board'. He then referred to his memorandum, mentioning other complaints against the Dean including his 'lack of tact'. He denied that his action was 'a vicious attack' on the Dean, admitted that he had not informed the Dean of his intention to put his statement on the Professorial Board agenda, and claimed he had tried informal ways to persuade the Dean to consult with the Faculty and call meetings.

In reply Professor Williams listed the infrequent Faculty meetings over the last decade. He claimed there had been no important business to discuss in 1944 since the Faculty had given him 'a clear statement of policy and procedure until the end of the war', that the matters to be dealt with by the two committees had been resolved, that neither committee had requested the convening of a meeting, but that he would have called a meeting had he been asked to do so. Stone admitted he had made no formal request for a meeting, but said that it should have been obvious to Professor Williams that he sought a meeting.

Williams was supported by lecturers McMinn, Monahan, Holmes, Stephen and Tice and the motion of the latter, that Stone's actions had been 'unwarranted', was carried by 16 votes to 1. Stone left the meeting because, in his words, the Faculty was, in effect, 'endorsing the lack of meetings'. The Faculty then passed a motion of confidence in the Dean and agreed to disband the two committees, leaving the Dean to 'take any necessary action'.

At the meeting of 29 November 1945 it was reported that the Senate had appointed a committee 'to report on the status and duties of the Professors of Law and the organisation of the Faculty of Law'. Williams made his statement, mentioned earlier, of proposed provisions to assist ex-service students, and this was referred to a committee for consideration. Part of the business of the meeting was to elect a Dean for the next two years. Nominated by A. Landa, government nominee on the University Senate, Stone declined nomination and on the motion of Sir Henry Manning, seconded by R. Clive Tice, Williams was re-elected.

The Faculty met again on 19 December to consider the Senate report on the status and duties of the Law Professors. This came down on the side of the Dean, stating that the Law School's primary activity was law, not jurisprudence, and that the Professor of Law was therefore Head of the Law School, in charge of administration and general supervision, in addition to teaching arrangements and examinations. There was some comfort for Stone, however, since the report stated that various matters, eg curriculum changes, should come before Faculty and should then be reported to the appropriate authority. The Senate committee had also recommended and the Senate had adopted that 'the by-laws provide that each Faculty should meet at least once a term'.

The bombshell at the meeting was the Dean's announcement of his forthcoming resignation, having accepted an invitation from Victoria University College in New Zealand to return to his former Chair. He then ruled out of order a motion put by Mr Justice Roper and seconded by
Stone expressing 'deep regret at the intended resignation of the Dean'. This was hardly a gracious or a diplomatic action and is indicative of the antagonism between the two Professors.

In the brevity adopted of necessity in minutes, much of the argument seems petty but, since the affair created such a furore, there must have been more deep-seated bitterness beneath the bickering. It is hard to tell from the minutes whether Stone was moved by principle, by frustration or by desire for power. It is also hard to assess whether Williams was merely continuing the somewhat dictatorial practices of his predecessor, supported by the majority of part time lecturers. It seems they had no real desire to attend frequent meetings and felt, in McMinn's word, that 'it was satisfactory to leave the whole administration of the Law School to the Dean except for formal business requiring Faculty approval'. Busy practitioners preferred to raise any problems they might have had in informal discussions with Williams rather than attending Faculty meetings.

It is hard to explain why Stone did not use by-law provisions to correct a situation he regarded so seriously, instead of airing his complaints so publicly at Professorial Board level. He certainly does not appear to have been a numbers man, for at no time did he attract majority support for his views or his actions, some considering his memorandum to be 'a vicious attack on the Dean'. If Stone had hoped to achieve the removal of the Dean, he succeeded, but to what end it is difficult to tell. He did achieve the tightening of by-laws regarding the frequency of Faculty meetings. These had previously been loosely worded to the effect that the Professorial Board 'may consider and take actions on reports from Faculties' and that one of the functions of a Faculty was 'to report to the Professorial Board upon all matters relating to studies, lectures, examinations and degrees of the Faculty'.

Perhaps Stone's target was not only the Dean but the whole structure of the Law School, with its heavy dependence on part time lecturers drawn from the profession, and its emphasis on the practical aspects of the law. It may be that he was at odds with most of the Faculty and felt that he had been frozen out of the decision-making process.

Press reports on Williams' resignation claimed that he and Stone had previously clashed in New Zealand, where they had both held Chairs. In his article, 'The Julius Stone Affair 1940-41', M. L. Blakeney referred to correspondence between the two men at the height of the rescission controversy. In a letter to Williams, Stone had suggested that both he and Williams should withdraw their applications for the Sydney Chairs. In rejecting the proposal, Williams had implied that the rescission motion had been directed at Stone's appointment and not his. In February 1946 the Sydney Morning Herald indicated that disagreements over the general administration of the Law School had emerged shortly after their appointments. The Daily Telegraph quoted Professor Williams as saying that, 'Professor Stone had made mutual respect, confidence, and loyalty in the Law School impossible'. He felt that his 'embittered personal relationship' with Professor Stone should be terminated.

Whatever the motives of Williams and Stone might have been, the matter was unfortunately not allowed to rest. At a special meeting on 22 February 1946, called by the Registrar in response to a request by ten members of the Faculty, Teece sought an enquiry by Royal Commission or Senate into the truth of allegations made by Williams and Stone against each other, and in the meantime to try to persuade Williams to stay on. Attempts to have the motion ruled out of order were made by Mr Landa and the Hon C. E. Martin, law Fellows of Senate. They took a series of points of order which were rejected by Mr B. C. Fuller (who chaired the meeting after Williams vacated the chair and left the meeting). Thus, any attempt to put the recent dispute behind it and to make constructive moves towards co-operation at the Law School had been abandoned.

A new issue, that of the eligibility of some persons present to attend the Faculty meeting, was raised by Martin, who claimed that Senate had not approved re-appointments for 1946 for some of the teaching staff, including Teece. This was denied but both Landa and Martin left the meeting. A letter from three students seeking 'some compromise, arrangement or agreement . . . which will leave both Professor Williams and Professor Stone at the Law School', and expressing their respect and admiration for both men, was tabled and one student allowed
to address the meeting. Teece’s motion was then carried, along with a further motion that the Chancellor call a special meeting of Senate to consider the request of the Faculty.

A brief meeting on 27 February 1946 deferred election of a replacement Dean till the following month, and arranged for the confirmation of re-appointments of staff so that there could be no doubt as to their eligibility to attend meetings.

The ‘Caretaker’ Dean

On 5 March 1946 an election was held for a Dean to succeed Williams for the balance of his term, ie until 31 December 1947. Both Teece and Stone were nominated and, after a secret ballot, Teece was declared elected. A standing committee was also elected to advise and assist the Dean. It comprised Dr Currey, P. Watts, J. D. Holmes and F. C. Stephen.

Teece’s election has been seen by some as an act of revenge on the part of barristers in the Law Faculty who were still angry at the filling of the two Law School Chairs at the beginning of the war. It might also, perhaps, be seen as a blocking move to Stone who had created such dissension within the Faculty and brought the Law School unwanted publicity. Teece certainly had the qualifications for a Chair — triple first class honours and University medal in Arts in 1899 followed by MA in 1901 and LLB in 1903, with first class honours and University medal in both. For a short period he had been acting Professor at the University of Tasmania, he was a very successful barrister with strong links to the Anglican church and banking interests, he had taken silk in 1922 and had begun teaching Legal Ethics at the Law School in 1940 to ease the wartime teacher shortage. He was eminent in his profession, having been foundation president of the New South Wales Bar Association and president of the Law Council of Australia for two terms.
The election of a part time 'caretaker' Dean was a matter of some controversy, though in a strictly legal sense it could be argued that it was in keeping with the spirit of the Senate's previous ruling that the Head of the Law School was the Professor of Law, not Jurisprudence.

In spite of this unprecedented action by the Faculty, the Law School entered a calmer period. It gained increased payments for marking because of the heavier work load, appointed David Benjafield as a tutor to assist ex-service students, and agreed that in the large classes in first and second years it was too time-consuming to call rolls. Federation Hall was hired for first year classes, duplicate lectures were provided in Property and Torts in second year, two rooms in the Law School were made available to extend library accommodation, and two library attendants were appointed. It deferred the question of methods of adapting the two year, full time law study to part time students pending the appointment of a new Professor of Law. It gained additional payment for repeat lectures given by part time lecturers and planned alterations to class rooms to provide a large lecture room for the expected increase in 1947 enrolments.

The question of eligibility to attend Faculty meetings, raised in February 1946 by Martin and Landa, came to a head in a different form in October 1946, via a document referred to Faculty by the Senate, titled Constitution of the Law Faculty. It expressed concern at the high proportion of part time lecturers in the Faculty and proposed that only those who gave an equivalent number of lectures to those in other Faculties should be Faculty members in law. It detailed three proposals: that only those who gave three lectures a week should be members of the Faculty, that one representative from each of Arts and Economics should join the Faculty, but that none of the above changes should affect the position of the present Dean as long as he held office. The first proposal was rejected, Stone and Landa dissenting, and Mr Justice Roper (Deputy Chancellor) and Morison abstaining; the second and third were approved, with Stone, Morison and Roper abstaining on the second proposal, and Roper on the third.

The November meeting saw Professor Stone submitting the draft of a new by-law dealing with membership of the Faculty. Under this scheme membership would be open to the professors and full time lecturers, persons who lectured in the major law subjects (Constitutional Law, Roman Law, Contracts, Property, Torts, Political Science, Equity Principles and Practice, Public International Law, Procedure, Pleading and Evidence, and Jurisprudence), Fellows of Senate in the legal profession, the Professors of History, Public Administration, Economics, Philosophy, Anthropology and Psychology, two additional lecturers co-opted by the Faculty for one year terms, a member nominated by the Bar Association and one by the Law Institute of New South Wales. In all of the above, there should be six part time lecturers on Faculty. A motion to adopt the scheme was lost.

In January the Professorial Board entered the fray. It reported to Senate that it favoured the position where the majority of Faculty members should be full time teachers, suggested that Professors of History, Public Administration, Economics, Philosophy and Anthropology should be added to the Law Faculty and proposed that nomination for members of the Faculty should be from within the University. This report was referred to a committee of the Faculty which reported back in March.

The committee reviewed the current situation of 15 part time and six full time members of the Faculty. If it was forced to follow the Professorial Board's recommendations (ie six full time teachers and five cognate professors) the Faculty would be deprived of the counsel of many of its part time teachers. The committee saw no need to change a system which had operated satisfactorily since 1890 and was common practice in all states except Queensland. It denied any connection between the number of hours taught and the capacity to develop the traditions of the Law School through teaching and advice. It pointed to the record of its part time lecturers, 21 of whom had been appointed to the Bench, and commended the role of the part time teachers in all aspects of the Law School.

In reference to the proposal that all nominations should come from within the University, the committee stated that:

It would be difficult to propose an amendment better calculated ... to antagonise the two professional bodies with which the Law School has, to its advantage, been happily associated for so long.
Regarding the inclusions of cognate professors, the committee pointed out that this occurred in other universities only where 'the subjects so professed are prescribed as subjects forming part of the [Law] course' and that this was not the case in Sydney, where the current Law School staff were already well qualified in other humanities subjects. It added that Sydney Law School already included some outsiders, representing the legislature. The report was adopted with Stone, Hutley and Morison dissenting.

At the Faculty meeting of 27 May 1947 it was reported that the Senate had resolved that membership of the Law Faculty should remain unchanged.

In June 1947 R. Clive Teece resigned as Dean and Professor Kenneth Shatwell was elected for the remainder of the term of office, ie until the end of the year.

**Issues and Outcomes**

The period here called the Interregnum is a very curious few years in the history of the Law School. In some of the issues that emerged there are echoes of the past, foreshadowings of the future. Perhaps the heightened wartime atmosphere of tension and antagonism brought ever-present issues into sharper focus, or removed the veneer of politeness which makes outward calm possible even where conflict exists.

Looking back at the period it seems that the only victor in the whole sorry affair was the profession. Stone's taking of the quarrel between Williams and himself outside the Faculty to the Professorial Board, where he would find wider support, might have seemed justified to him, but to the Faculty it seemed to be an undermining of its independence. His unsubtle and unsuccessful attempt to weight the Faculty with humanities-based educators was another way of focusing on the issue of the appropriate method of educating future members of the legal profession. It also raised the constant question of the part time practitioner teacher as opposed to, or in addition to, the full time academic. Stone had done little to endear himself to members of the profession on the Faculty, and now it appeared that he might be about to remove its influence, and this could not be allowed.

James Williams' foray across the Tasman was brief and, it appears, unhappy. Where Peden and Charteris could agree to disagree and go their separate ways, Williams and Stone could reach no such understanding. The split that developed between them was carried over into a division between the Department of Law and that of Jurisprudence which still exists, though in modified form.

As Sir William Windeyer had maintained the dominance of the profession and its control over developments towards a School of Law in the nineteenth century, so Teece held the fort in 1946. Teece, however, saw his role clearly as 'caretaker' and stepped aside as soon as a new Professor of Law was appointed, whereas Windeyer had given the incumbent a breathing space to acclimatise to the country and the job.

Under the disguise of personal animosity, much bigger questions were being fought during this time. What should be taught, who should teach it, how it should be taught and, above all, who should determine all these matters, were the real issues at stake.

It is fortunate that student numbers were small for much of the period though students, too, were touched by the general disaffection. As their numbers grew, pragmatism was more important than philosophy or principle. Those who had lost time in the war years simply wanted to get their studies over and done with and get on with their lives.
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The Law School in World War II

John M. Ward

I entered Law in 1940, the year in which Germany conquered France; I completed Law IV in 1945, the year in which the allies were victorious. The Law School was carrying on under great difficulties which were increased when the master figure of the Faculty, Sir John Beverley Peden, retired in ill-health in 1942.

I was in the last class that Peden himself conducted in Constitutional Law, probably his favourite subject. Along with Property, Contracts and Torts, he thought it the best test of aptitude for law. Peden's Constitutional Law course was a traditional account of outlines of the British Constitution followed by a more detailed, original and authoritative study of the federal and state constitutions. The course was much more besides, because Peden treated it as an introduction to the study of all law and to legal practice.

In Contracts that year the lecturer was B. Sugerman, later Judge of the Court of Appeal, of whom it has justly been said that every lecture was an exercise in scholarship. I had the good fortune to be in a strong class in Law I that contained two future Professors of Law, W. L. Morison and R. W. Parsons, and a future Supreme Court Judge, J. A. Lee, as well as Maurice Byers, who was to become Solicitor-General. Classes were small in 1940 and became even smaller as the war continued. Most students were in employment as articled clerks or public servants. Full time students were rare.

The Peden Law School, as it may justly be called, had many virtues that earned it a great reputation in the profession throughout the country. Peden wanted every law graduate to be competent professionally, for no lawyer should 'slaughter his client'. Every graduate was also to have a broad understanding of law as a sound institution and a part of our culture. The strict professionalism of the law courses was matched by Peden's insistence that Roman Law, Legal History, Political Science, Public International Law and Jurisprudence were all compulsory subjects. The Law School then had no options.

Because most law was taught as a practice discipline, and because financially there was no alternative, the School relied heavily on part time teachers. Drawn principally from the Bar, they varied in their enthusiasm for the task and in their ability as teachers, but generally their standing was good and many of them were appointed to the Bench.

Teaching was entirely through lectures, in which the asking of questions by either teachers or taught, was not common, and through typed notes of the lectures. In the library at night the tutor, F. C. Hutley, if he were on duty, was always ready to answer questions and to guide genuine seekers after knowledge. The library was adequate for the courses taught.
One's results in law subjects were determined by performance in a single paper final examination, a procedure that Peden, with his emphasis on practice in court, did not think too exacting. The award of honours was determined by results from every part of the course on the stern principle laid down by Peden, 'You have to do well from the jump'. Students in law varied from young people who had just left school to men and women, who had graduated in other Faculties with high honours. The system emphasised rote learning and concentration on examinations, in ways more appropriate to young inexperienced students than to graduates.

Because of the war and a number of personal factors I was at the Law School for a longer time than usual, and did not finish my course until I was already a Teaching Fellow in History. In 1944 I was not at the Law School at all and in at least one other year had to withdraw unexpectedly. In that difficult time I had much sympathetic assistance first from Peden and then from Professor James Williams, who was Dean from 1942 to 1946. I knew little then of the internal troubles of the School in those years and was grateful for help I had from both Deans.

When I went back to the Law School in 1945, the return of a large number of men and women from the war had begun. They dominated student attitudes with their determination to get on with their work and to graduate quickly. I was teaching the same sorts of people in History and have never felt closer to my students or to my teachers, among whom Julius Stone, the Challis Professor of International law and Jurisprudence, was outstanding. Stone's course in Jurisprudence brought together all that I had learned in law and much of what I had learned in history.

The war years at the Law School were exceptional years, but they witnessed the survival of much of what was best in the Peden tradition and produced some distinguished practitioners and legal scholars.

MISS SIBYL GREENWELL, president of the Law School Comforts Fund, with the magnificent birthday cake which she has made for the first anniversary of the group. The cake will be cut at a meeting of the fund's women supporters at the Law School on June 3 at 3 p.m., when guests are asked to bring grocerices for an American tea. It is in the form of a law book marked 'volume 1'. Other comforts fund activities include a meeting of the women's committee on June 5, in the Law School, to make plans for the annual Law Ball, to take place at Grace Brothers on July 26 and proceeds will go to the fund.
The Australian Comforts Fund (ACF) was a national voluntary organisation with divisions in each state. Its purpose was to provide Australian servicemen and women with goods such as sporting equipment and stationery, together with food and clothing items additional to the service issue. Examples are fruit cakes and other food 'goodies' (particularly at Christmas time), tobacco, toothpaste, and handknitted garments such as warm jumpers and socks. Such items were most acceptable to service personnel stationed overseas and in remote areas of Australia. In addition there were unofficial Comfort Funds formed by bodies such as Municipal Councils and various societies and social clubs.

The Law School Fund would be described as an unofficial Comforts Fund. It was founded at a meeting held at the Law School on 10 July 1940. The first President was Mrs Sybil Greenwell, LLB. Its aim was to keep legal men and law students in the services in touch with the Law School and the profession, and with each other, and to send them articles not obtained from other sources. Benefits were not to be confined to students and graduates of the School, but were to go to all legal men and articled clerks whose names were sent in to the Fund.

The prime object of the Fund was to keep those on the roll regularly supplied with reading matter. Particulars of each man’s taste were obtained, the reading matter available being divided into six categories — fiction, biography, travel, adventure, poetry (plus plays) and digests. As long as men were outside Australia or in some remote corner of it, a monthly parcel containing two Penguin or Pelican books was sent, throughout the war. In addition the quarterly Legal Digest and, to men in Canada and Europe, a copy of a weekly newsletter produced by the Sydney Sun, were sent. Copies of the Union Recorder and the Law School students’ magazine Blackacre were also included. One recipient of these benefits, in a letter to the Fund Secretary, stated ‘... You seem to have gone to great lengths to provide not only physical but also mental comforts for us’.

The Fund was financed by seeking donations from the public, but in particular from members of the profession, plus the running of fundraising functions. The Fund also sought donations of Penguin, Pelican, Guild and Evergreen books, either new or secondhand, and donations of used foolscap envelopes with undamaged flaps.

During the period in which the Law School Comforts Fund operated, i.e. 1940-46, those who were office bearers for all or part of the time were:
Patrons: Sir Frederick Jordan, KCMB, Chief Justice of New South Wales; Sir John Peden, KCMG.
Vice-Presidents: Sir Thomas Bavin, KCMG; Hon. Mr Justice Edwards; His Honour Judge Storkey; C. E. Martin, MLA, Attorney-General; Hon. R. R. Downing, Minister of Justice; Vernon Treatt KC, MLA; David Maughan KC; R. Clive Teece KC; R. Windeyer KC; Professor J. Stone; Professor J. Williams; W. J. Baldock; J. C. Crowther.

Executive: Mesdames Blarney, Dillon, Grace, Hope, Janes, McLellan, Hilary Ford LLB, and various representatives of the SU Law Society.

Presidents: 1940-1942, Sybil Greenwell, LLB. 1942-1946, Mrs Colin Davidson.


The Wartime Experience Stories

The Legal Digest of September 1942 contained the following paragraph:

LEGAL ARCHIVES

Legal men have served and are serving in every theatre of war, and in practically every unit of all services. Their records and experiences should constitute a fairly comprehensive if miniature history of this war. It is hoped, bit by bit, to collect such experiences and records and when peace comes have them bound up, together with a complete list of those who served, with one or more letters from each man; a record of honours and distinctions and all matters relating to the profession in this war. These will constitute not only Law School archives, but as they will include the names of all on the L.S.C.F. Roll, they will be too, the archives of the profession. It is hoped that every legal man will help the Hon. Sec. of the Fund make these archives as complete and as interesting as possible, by starting now to jot down dates and facts which will enable him — when censors cease from troubling, and the M.I. is at rest — to write his experiences and details of campaigns and operations in which he has taken part. PLEASE DO BEAR THIS REQUEST IN MIND AND WRITE IF AND WHEN OPPORTUNITY MAKES IT POSSIBLE.

The University Archives has a collection of nine clothbound volumes containing a total of twenty-eight typed manuscripts of wartime experience stories written by members and students of the Sydney legal profession. I have made a short summary of the contents and propose to forward a copy of these summaries, together with the service details of each writer, to the Archivist at the Australian War Memorial, Canberra, for information.

Amongst the writers were two who were later to become Deputy Chancellors of the University, Captain R. Le Gay Brereton, later The Hon. Mr Justice Russel Le Gay Brereton, and Lieutenant D. M. Selby, later The Hon. Mr Justice David Mayer Selby.

Captain Le Gay Brereton titled his article of some fifty pages ‘Attack’ and compiled it from wartime experiences written in letters and diaries of forty-six legal ex-servicemen. These men came from all three services. The work is divided into sections: (1) The Middle East — the 9th Division garrison of Syria; (2) Kokoda and Milne Bay; (3) Navy; (4) Russia; (5) North Africa and Italy; (6) Air Force; (7) North Africa — El Alamein battle; (8) Salamaua, Loe, Finschhafen and the Ramu Valley.

Lieutenant Selby titled his narrative of 170 pages ‘Prison Without Bars’ and described it as ‘The Account of the wanderings of some Australian Servicemen down the coast of New Britain after the fall of Rabaul’. It is an epic story of courage and determination of a party of some three hundred men which included David Selby's party. This group, led by Major Owen, was ultimately rescued from Palmalmal in April 1942. One hundred and thirty-seven of the troops that had set off from Rabaul at the end of January embarked on the rescue vessel along with twenty civilians. On the trip back to Port Moresby one died on board this ship, which was the Government yacht for the Administrator of Papua.

Of some interest in David Selby’s narrative are the many references to Father E. C. Harris, a member of the Missionaries of the Sacred Heart stationed at the Mission of Malimali, Jacquinot Bay. Father Harris befriended the Australian soldiers and gave them what help he could whilst they were making their escape. In December 1942 it is reported that he was taken
prisoner by the Japanese and killed for his part in aiding our troops. It was interesting to note that Father Edward Charles Patrick Harris was a graduate of the University of Sydney Law School having obtained his LLB degree in 1932.

Another story of University interest is a short article written by Lieutenant F. L. Washington concerning a 'de facto' Law School set up in 1944 by some prisoners of the Japanese, who were members of the legal profession, held in the Australian Officers' POW Camp at Kuching, Borneo. Certificates were issued to students detailing the subject in which they attended lectures, the text used, the time occupied and the name of the tutor with his comments. The Certificate, after a report of some length on the student, finished with a statement along these lines: '...in many subjects little further study is needed to enable him to reach a standard sufficient to pass any reasonable examination in those subjects.'

Correspondence Files

The material includes, in alphabetical sequence, some hundreds of personal files of inward correspondence from servicemen on the roll of the Law School Comforts Fund. These files range from those containing one or two letters to those that contain a considerable amount of correspondence. Amongst the files are those of servicemen who later held the following distinguished positions: one Prime Minister, three Deputy Chancellors of the University, a number of judges and Ministers of the Crown, together with many others who subsequently became leaders in their professions.

The University Archives is fortunate in having a collection of seven handwritten letters, ranging in length from one to three pages, to the Hon. Secretary of the Fund by former Prime Minister and one-time University Senator, the Hon. E. G. Whitlam. The letters were written during his period of service with the Royal Australian Air Force over the years 1942 to 1944. Another perhaps minor point in respect of the collection of files is that a great number contain Christmas and Seasons Greetings cards, some with very humorous amateur art work, produced by various units of the three services for the servicemen to send home.

The Records of Service

The Records of Service were assembled in 1950 and are contained in two large bound volumes. They are not a complete record of the war service of every New South Wales lawyer or law student during the Second World War. They are, however, a fairly complete record of all those whose names were on the Law School Comforts Fund Roll.

All those on the Roll were requested to complete and return a questionnaire in order to supply details of their war service. The great majority complied with this request as can be seen by comparing these records with the 'Roll of Service' which precedes them and contains 577 names. Along with the Roll of Service is the Roll of Honour containing 67 names of those who lost their lives whilst on active service.

The two volumes of 'Records of Service' contain in alphabetical order the following information about each man (providing the information was supplied): Name: Status (i.e. graduate, undergraduate or member of the profession only): Date of Going into Service: Rank and Unit: Date of Leaving Service: Rank and Unit: Details of Service: Promotions and Schools.

The Legal Digest

The idea of the Legal Digest arose from a request from Lieutenant Jack Nagle (later Major J. F. Nagle) while in the Middle East, to Jean Malor, Hon. Treasurer of the Law School Comforts Fund, for a circular letter of legal gossip. It appears that she had written to Lieutenant Nagle and the letter had been much appreciated by legal men with whom he had shared it.

The Legal Digest commenced in March 1941 and the last issue was No. 19 of September/October 1945. It was a quarterly publication sent to all on the Law School Comforts Fund Roll. It contained some ten to twelve duplicated foolscap pages of news and gossip about the Law School and the profession. I note that sometimes it included details of new legislature

A special supplement of the Legal Digest was issued on 21 September 1945 for the benefit of the members of the 8th Division who were returning home following their release from Japanese P.O.W. Camps. The supplement was titled ‘Special Liberated Eighth Division Supplement of News’.

After the war, in response to requests from previous servicemen on the Law School Comforts Fund Roll, a reissue containing all the past Legal Digests was made and sent to those on the Roll as a memento of the war years. There are two cloth bound copies of this combined publication.

Final Comment

There is a small quantity of miscellaneous material consisting of two photograph albums containing snapshots and press cuttings, a small collection of portraits of servicemen by professional photographers and one file of general Fund correspondence.

From correspondence in Administration files held in the Archives (G3/13 File No. 3801), it appears that some time prior to 26 November 1946, The Law School Comforts Fund gave the University of Sydney a cheque for £105 (one hundred guineas) to establish a Law School Comforts Fund Memorial Prize of fifteen pounds a year for the next seven years.

The Professorial Board approved the conditions for the prize and following the next Senate meeting this announcement was sent to the press early in December 1946:

The University of Sydney — The Law School Comforts Fund Memorial Prize

A sum of money has recently been donated to the University of Sydney for the establishment of an annual prize of £15 to the most distinguished student (other than the winner of the John George Dalley Prize) graduating in the Faculty of Law, who is a Returned Serviceman. This Prize is to be known as the ‘Law School Comforts Fund Memorial Prize’ and the first award is to be made in March 1947.

It will be seen from the above that action had been taken to dispose of the residue of the Fund. It is regrettable that the Comforts Fund material delivered to the University Archives did not contain the minutes of meetings held by the Fund nor any financial records. However, despite the lack of these records the collection held in the Archives of the University gives an excellent account of the part played by members of, and those associated with, the New South Wales legal profession during World War II, both the men in the armed services and those at home who, through their efforts and financial contributions, gave them great support.

Finally, a piece of statistical information: during the years in which the Law School Comforts Fund operated there had been on its roll of servicemen 665 names.

Note: This is a shortened version of an article dealing with the Comforts Fund material held in Sydney University Archives. It was first published in Record, the newsletter of the Archives, in September 1990.
The complexities of the law and the legal system made clear by cartoonist Petty for the cover of Blackacre in 1970.
The years between the outbreak of World War II and the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbour were the last two years of near normalcy at the Law School in its previously settled style. There would be no Calvin Coolidge to preside over a 'back to normalcy' movement after the war. Enlistments for war service initially came more substantially from former rather than current students, and classes remained at somewhere near their customary size. The Law School administrative staff was involved in work for the Law School Comforts Fund for the service-men, presided over by Margaret Dalrymple Hay the chief administrative officer, then known as the clerk to the Faculty. One recalls her coming into the library in 1940 to announce the latest success in the Battle of Britain, interrupting the librarian on duty, Miss St. Clair, in her task of wrapping the comforts parcels. The trappings of war were evident from time to time. In one student debate Raymond Watson, destined to be a senior judge of the Family Court of Australia, participated resplendent in naval officer's uniform with an admiring and personable retinue of Wrans.

But by 1941 there were gathering storms, both the major gathering storm which Sir Winston Churchill made the title of one of his volumes of war history and the Law School's own lesser storm. The Sydney University Regiment normally operated with volunteer recruits but now there was preparation for students to be drafted into its ranks for what was initially intended to be a training period beginning on 5 December 1941. The preparations involved law students being interviewed by Alfred Conlon who was then the manpower officer determining their eligibility for the draft. He was later to be in charge of the Army Research Directorate in which Julius Stone, appointed to the Chair of International Law and Jurisprudence on 1 March 1942, came to serve as a part time colonel. How heavy Conlon's hands were upon the reins of the directorate may be open to question. It was during their association with it that Douglas Stewart and James McAuley composed the supposed lifetime output of the fictitious poet Ern Malley and hoaxed Max Harris into producing an issue of *Angry Penguins* devoted to it. But Stone was so impressed with Conlon that he dedicated one of his major works *The Province and Function of Law* to him jointly with Stone's own wife. It was a lifetime association for Stone was at Conlon's bedside during his last illness.

The students who had not volunteered for war service earlier were duly inducted into the regiment and after the Japanese attack on December 7 the draft became permanent for the bulk of them. Since the Sydney University Regiment was a training regiment they were
transferred in the course of a few months to other units. One of them was the 110th Lt. A.A. Regt. which was initially stationed on Kensington racecourse, part of the site of the future University of New South Wales. It is doubtful if that institution has ever given proper recognition to the fact that students from the University of Sydney spent some of their youth securing its future.

The Law School's lesser storm arose out of the vacancies in both the Challis Chair of International Law and Jurisprudence and the Challis Chair of Law after the death of A. H. Charteris and the retirement of Sir John Peden. There was a school of thought, represented as it turned out by the Chancellor Justice Halse Rogers and other law Fellows on the Senate, that replacements should not be made until after the war so that eligible candidates who were on war service should be in a position to apply. On the other hand the students were readily induced by their representatives to demand that new professors be appointed and there were allegations that the appointment of Stone, whose appointment as Challis Professor of Law eventually took effect on 1 March 1942, was being opposed on anti-semitic grounds. The Professorial Board which in those days performed the functions of the present Academic Board recommended James Williams and Julius Stone for appointment to the two Chairs. The Senate accepted the recommendations then rescinded its decision and finally confirmed the appointments in November 1941. This led to the resignation from the Senate of the Chancellor, other judges, and Sir John Peden.

Thus in 1942 the Law School was at its full customary professorial strength but with very much shrunken classes.

Teaching During the War

Nevertheless the full range of professional subjects had to be taught by part time lecturers with the exception of Contracts and Torts which were taken over by James Williams. Contracts had been taught until then by Bernard Sugerman, later Sir Bernard Sugerman, who was destined to be President of the Court of Appeal. As well as following his practice at the Bar, Sugerman wrote extensively in professional areas and was the editor of the first edition of the Australian Digest. After Peden's retirement Sugerman took over Real Property and then added Mercantile Law to his teaching responsibilities.

Sugerman's lectures were the product of extensive knowledge disclosed in a mild mannered reporting manner. The mildness of manner extended to various departments of his activities. One recalls him ringing from his chambers on one occasion to say that he would not be home until late. It was apparent that this evoked extensive comment from the other end of the telephone at the conclusion of which Sugerman mildly said that he would be home early. On another occasion during the war he was involved in one of the press of matters which occupied Friday morning in the equity jurisdiction. A woman had died intestate leaving some fifty first cousins and one husband, and the rights to succession had been determined at an inquiry before the Master. The costs of the inquiry were considerable and the Master had recommended that the husband take his share of the whole costs. Before Justice Nicholas, K. W. Asprey, later a Justice of the Court of Appeal and at that time lecturing in Private International Law at the Law School, forcefully defended the Master's recommendation with citation of authorities. Sugerman for the husband rose to his feet and mildly said in a few words that this would be unfair. The judge overruled the Master's recommendation in even less time than Sugerman's address had occupied.

Sugerman's mildness of manner at times seemed to have a defusing effect on controversy. Once a member of the Law School was moved to vulgarity by anger with the Dean of the time and said that he should shit or get off the pot. Sugerman mildly suggested that this should be rephrased to run that the Dean should defecate or abdicate. At other times Sugerman appeared to enjoy controversy among others. He once said that what he liked to do at the Law School was to listen to McMinn on Hutley and then listen to Hutley on McMinn.

Occasionally Sugerman was the centre of controversy himself. In a passage in the Federal Parliament in 1944, R. G. Menzies as leader of the opposition attacked the government for sending Mr Sugerman into court to argue a proposition which was contrary to what the government claimed was its policy. The Attorney General, Dr Evatt, interjected that Sugerman
had been instructed to argue what he did. Menzies ignored him, whereupon Evatt jumped out of his seat and shouted, ‘He had no instructions’. Menzies paused momentarily and spread his hands. ‘No instructions’, he said, ‘How did he get there?’ But Sir Bernard went far and fared well instructed or not instructed.

The Old Hands

Wilfred McMinn, whose character sketches of Hutley Sugerman enjoyed, was a barrister who undertook an increased burden of lecturing at the Law School in the war years and to a lesser extent continued as a lecturer for a number of years afterwards. He was one of a small knot of staff members who occupied a position in the Law School corresponding to the position in naval circles of those who had gone round Cape Horn under sail. They could appeal in discussion to their recollections of Pitt Cobbett, the first Professor. Even Margaret Hay, whose influence and labours for successive Deans as well as for the profession made her an institution in the Law School for many years, extending well beyond the war into Shatwell’s time, was not in that position. At her retirement Sir Norman Cowper of Allen Allen & Hemsley delivered a graceful tribute to her upon the theme of her service beyond the call of duty. In her equally gracious reply Miss Hay took occasion to remark that Pitt Cobbett was her favourite Dean because he was the only one of whom she could say, ‘He was before my time’.

Those who recalled Pitt Cobbett therefore had a special claim to venerability and familiarity with ancient authority. They also presented special individual characteristics. McMinn, while in general following closely the official Law School notes and summing up the cases referred to in them, adorned his lectures with what were often Bar stories in more senses than one. But being a stickler for propriety as he understood it, he would not recount these stories when there were women in the class. This attitude rather restricted him as it did Colonel Mackenzie who was his wartime opposite number in Divorce. Mackenzie, however, got over the problem by recounting the seamier side of life revealed in divorce cases and then apologising to the women.

The next member of the group, P. R. Watts the Reader in Conveyancing, a solicitor by profession, had less occasion to resort to accounts of sex and violence in his subject either in his lectures or in his frequent pieces on vendor and purchaser in the ALJ, but he was far from avoiding either in areas into which his academic erudition led him. He once wrote an article in the Law Quarterly Review concerning the proper interpretation of a mediaeval document in which the party of the second part, the eminent literary figure Geoffrey Chaucer, made an accommodation with the party of the first part ‘de meo raptu’. A school of literary thought had sought to save Chaucer’s reputation — in part — by interpreting raptus as abduction. But Watts would have none of this. Chaucer had raped the woman and that was that.

Watts did not bear the special title of Reader for nothing. At that time the Knocker collection of ancient documents was the centrepiece of the Law School library and the top document which could be studied in detail was changed periodically by the library staff. Watts was expert in their context and implications. His sense of the vitality of the history of conveyancing occasionally found curious expression. There was one student whose graduation was prevented for some years by difficulties with the subject. Then in 1946 he suddenly sailed through it. Watts attributed this to the fact that, knowing that the student had achieved some standing in his Arts years in the classics, he lent him a copy of Fearne on Contingent Remainders in the original Latin, the inspirational effect of which carried the student to a triumphant if belated success.

Others gave a different explanation. By the wartime years, Watts had fallen into devising a range of questions which, in his view, covered the subject, so that with the ever circling years the same questions could be expected to recur though in random order. Private enterprise among the students rendered model answers to the whole range available. In 1946 K. W. Pawley, then completing a distinguished final LLB year, and later to be the most senior judge of the Family Court of Australia appointed immediately after the first chief judge, Elizabeth Evatt, undertook a sort of goal delivery operation by instructing the student having difficulties in conveyancing in the methods which students generally used. But Watts continued to think that the explanation of the dramatic reversal of form and of 1946 was the Latin version of
Fearne on Contingent Reminders, and the truth of the matter remains a historical, if not exactly historic, mystery.

Another of the group of Law School staff who had, so to speak, gone round Cape Horn under sail, was R. Clive Teece. His teaching assignment at the School was confined to the non-examination subject of Legal Ethics, yet his name was sufficiently synonymous with the Equity Bar to give rise to a saying attributed to Justice Bonney which attained wide currency. Asked about his attitude to becoming judge in divorce after serving in the equity jurisdiction, Bonney replied that it was only the difference between Tweedledee and Tweedledee (Teece was the leading Equity barrister while Toose was a leader of the Divorce Bar). Nevertheless, as perhaps this saying implies, Teece was occasionally subject to judicial jibes, perhaps because of some prolixity. In one case which came before the Full Court during the war, a prospective student sought enrolment at the University relying on its by-laws, while the University resisted in pursuance of its obligations under the manpower provisions of the national security legislation. It immediately became obvious that the court must lose its jurisdiction as the Judiciary Act was framed at that time, because an inter se constitutional question was raised. However Teece, for the University, continued to expand on the court’s lack of jurisdiction, and the Chief Justice asked him what interest the University had in having the matter determined by the High Court rather than the one before whom Teece was appearing. Teece said he was trying to help the court, to which Frederick Jordan replied that the court was always glad to receive help but particularly from those who had some interest in the matter.

This was not an altogether isolated instance of rough handling of counsel by the Bench at that time. W. D. T. Ward graduated L.L.B at the Law School during the war and went to the Bar. He was later to be elevated to the District Court Bench. In one of his earliest cases before Justice Clyne, he happened to say that consideration was required for a simple contract. Apparently because he considered that this much should have been taken for granted, the judge demanded that counsel produce authority for that proposition.

T. P. Flattery who lectured Roman Law was another who remembered ancient traditions and continued in them. Since the ancient tradition in Roman Law included translating passages of Latin from the Institutes of Justinian in the annual examination and commenting on them, this became increasingly impracticable as student knowledge of Latin diminished. Flattery solved the problem by tipping the passages which the students could expect which in effect preserved a ritualistic shadow of the good old days without the substance.

At one of the first meetings of the Faculty I attended as a member of staff a submission from the students came before it which included a sharp attack on the conduct of Roman Law. Though I recognised the passage as one which I had composed as a member of a student committee some years earlier I did not think it appropriate to acknowledge the authorship. The applicable principle seemed to me analogous to the common law tale under which a dog got one free bite to begin with.

F. E. Barraclough, who conducted the non-examination course in Lunacy, was of a different order though he must have been the most ancient of the ancients. He once allowed himself to reminisce about how exciting it was at the age of fourteen to see the New South Wales troops depart from Sydney Harbour for the Sudan. The implication of this was that his own origins must have been virtually contemporaneous with the Franco-Prussian war. He had been the Master in the lunacy jurisdiction and he constantly kept his subject up to date year in and year out, giving lectures marked by courtesy and knowledgeability, standing out from controversy and never appearing to age. It was only when he slipped this mortal coil that we realised that he was virtually if not literally the Law School centenarian. He could have appropriately figured in The Forsyte Saga.

Younger Staff

Among the somewhat younger members of staff V. H. Treatt was also numbered among the men of stature and principle. He gave up part of his Saturday mornings to lecture in Criminal Law with understanding, wit and verve. He became leader of the opposition in the State...
When asked his view on how politicians should market themselves to the electorate he would reply that this was not the primary consideration, since the notion of political responsibility meant that one could only advocate what one believed in. Perhaps this was why he was always leader of the opposition.

C. D. Monahan undertook the formidable task of lecturing in Equity and Administration of Assets as well as Legal Interpretation with a flowing easy going style and with some tolerance of those whose attention would occasionally flag. He graced what student social occasions there were in those days with his attendance and co-operation. He was subsequently to become Chairman of the District Court Bench.

Education in the most advanced commercial subjects was undertaken with mastery by C. McLelland, later Chief Judge in Equity. He lectured in both Company Law and Bankruptcy during the war years, taking over the commercial strands in the curriculum where Sugerman left off so that students had the benefit of a distinguished team. McLelland had a quirkish wit which occasionally seemed to its recipients to go a little too far. Somewhat later than the period under immediate consideration, a student asked if he might take the judge's daughter home. McLelland replied: 'If it were anybody but you I would say — yes.' This seemed no way to talk to a future justice of the High Court of Australia, and W. P. Deane evidently thought so at the time.

F. C. Hutley was full time tutor at the Law School in Peden's last year. At the beginning of 1941 he went to Allen, Allen and Hemsley as a solicitor clerk, later enlisted and went to Japan as major in the British Commonwealth Occupation Force. He lectured in Jurisprudence after Charteris relinquished it until Julius Stone's appointment in 1942. He was briefly a full time lecturer in the Law School in 1946, went to the Bar, took silk, and was elevated to the Court of Appeals at a time when Sugerman was President. Meanwhile he continued to lecture at the Law School in Succession. When my mother thanked him for his efforts as best man at my wedding, he said it came naturally to him to be rude to people. While if that was as far as it
went, people found him entertaining, they ceased to do so when the activity seemed to them to go to lengths for which the description rudeness was much too mild a word. Justice Gaudron, a medallist of the Law School whose career at the Bar was succeeded by various distinguished appointments leading to her elevation to the High Court of Australia, said that Hutley appeared to have no idea that there was a law of defamation. T. W. Waddell’s distinguished years at the Law School were followed by advancement through customary career channels to the Supreme Court Bench. He described Hutley’s conduct in judicial circles as abandoned.

Hutley’s strictures on me were mild in comparison. I especially liked his statement that I would never amount to anything but the Methodist baker’s son. We had in common that we had both been awarded the medal in philosophy by John Anderson, though Hutley had been awarded the medal in law as well, which I had not. The philosophy/law pattern was quite common at the time because Sir John Peden recommended that students should study Arts, including philosophy, before proceeding to law. Perhaps the most distinguished of those who followed this pattern was C. A. Walsh, who had been awarded the medal by Anderson in preference to at least one person who became a distinguished Professor of Philosophy, and who pursued his brilliant law career successively to the Supreme Court Bench and then to the High Court of Australia. Other distinguished judicial examples of the genre were H. H. Glass and D. L. Mahoney, ultimately of the New South Wales Court of Appeal, and A. F. Rath, who went to the Supreme Court Bench.

Peden had also strongly recommended history as an Arts subject to prospective law students and the most distinguished example of the effects of the history-law combination was J. M. Ward. He was awarded the University Medal in history in 1939 when the professor was S. H. Roberts, and graduated in law in 1945. He followed Roberts into the post of Challis Professor of History and later into that of Vice-Chancellor of the University.

The curriculum of the Law School, as Peden left it, contained not only subjects which were considered vital for professional training but also what were conceived as academic subjects designed to carry out the idea that law was a learned profession and not merely a craft. Hence International Law, Jurisprudence, Roman Law, Legal History, and Political Science were included. The last two, immediately before and for some time after Peden’s departure, were the responsibility of C. H. Currey. Currey provided one of the few links between the Law School and the University campus because he sometimes lectured in the History department at Roberts’ invitation. Currey was a co-author with Roberts of a school history text and wrote works on his own particularly in aspects of Australian legal history. One of them was to be published by the Sydney University Press after Roberts established it. Currey was also an educationist of note as well as holding the then very rare degree of LLD of the University of Sydney, a distinction he shared with H. V. Evatt.

Since Currey had been an inspector of schools, some of us had our first introduction to law from him in our school days. In 1934 The Merchant of Venice was prescribed for the Intermediate Certificate and Currey inspected the North Sydney Boys High School English class, demolishing our support of Portia against Shylock in a way that was completely novel to us. The fact was, according to Currey, that Antonio’s bond with Shylock was simply null and void because it was contrary to public policy. The courts should simply have refused to take any notice of it for this reason, and Portia’s arguments were completely beside the point. After Currey’s departure the English master, A. D. Madew, was annoyed that we had not made the point against Currey that his argument depended on amalgamating the law of Venice centuries ago with the English common law, and there was nothing to show that the Venetian law as expounded by Portia was unsuitable to the conditions of Venice at the time. But I felt in retrospect that it was rather hard for him to expect us to graduate from our first introduction to the law of contract to propositions of sociological jurisprudence in 45 minutes.

Currey fitted easily into the traditional Law School system. In Political Science the major text was Dicey’s Law and Opinion in England which was a well devised companion work to Peden’s bible, Dicey’s Law of the Constitution. For the rest, Currey devoted himself in the course to an enthusiastic presentation of the traditional economic arguments for free trade against protection. This seemed to students a trifle dated at the time, but we might have
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Mary Gaudron, first woman to be appointed to the High Court Bench, graduated with first class honours and the University medal in Law. In a career studded with 'firsts' she was also Solicitor General for New South Wales and Deputy President of the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission.

Mr Justice F. C. Hutley, Teacher at the Law School at various levels from 1940 to 1972 until he was appointed a Judge of the Supreme Court. In 1973 he became a Judge of Appeal, an office he retained until his retirement in 1984.

reflected that with the ever circling years there is much more that comes round again beside conveyancing questions.

In Legal History Currey relied, with some background expansion, on W. J. V. Windeyer's published text for Sydney students, Legal History. As Windeyer explained in the preface, this book was intended as an efficient compendium, which it certainly was. It probably reflected Windeyer's expressed opinion that the initial instruction of law students was manageable only if it was confined to things every law student ought to know, and that it was undesirable for subjects to be 'rough about the edges' — his opinion of criminology. In the result however, the book did little justice to Windeyer's extraordinary penetration into the fundamental underlying trends of ideas in the field and the ability to bring them to bear upon current legal problems with a powerful logic. Both these qualities were to characterise his judgments in the High Court of Australia. During the war years Windeyer was on active service achieving renown as a Brigadier especially in relation to the siege of Tobruk. He was later to be Major General Sir Victor Windeyer and though he was only to lecture again at the Law School in 1949 and 1950, when he readily stepped into a breach, he continued to be active in the affairs of the University generally. Whenever the question is raised concerning who was the greatest man and lawyer the Law School ever produced, his name must come into consideration.
Mooting

The academic year 1942 was marked by Julius Stone's arrival some months in advance of the other new professor, James Williams. Stone immediately made his impact on the students generally, beyond those immediately involved in his subjects, by making moots part of the LLB course for credit, along the lines of the Harvard system. This turned out to be only a brief interlude, for Stone had made the arrangements subject to Williams' approval and Williams declined to support the scheme. But the interlude carried its share of interest, instruction and excitement.

The second year moot was the most dramatic. Immediately, Raymond Watson rose to his feet and took a preliminary objection to the jurisdiction of the court. He then proceeded to characterise the rules devised by Julius Stone as inept to constitute it. Thereupon Stone jumped to his feet in the audience, purporting to act as amicus curiae, and launched into defence of his rules. It is not clear whether the idea for precipitating this situation came from the future family court judge or the future Professor of Law and law reform commissioner D. G. Benjafield, who was sitting beside Watson as his junior counsel, wearing something approaching a smirk. But Judge McKillop of the real District Court Bench as well as the moot bench neatly nipped the developing furore in the bud by saying that it did not matter about the rules because the Act gave jurisdiction anyhow. Of course there was no Act, but if it was a real court there would have had to be. McKillop had less success with cutting short Cedric Symonds, counsel on the other side, by trying to suggest to him what he meant. Cedric who subsequently figured occasionally in the public press in what came to be the fascinating context of Eastern Suburbs waterfront properties, preferred his own more extensive formulation of his argument.

M. H. Byers a distinguished student of this time who became a leading silk and for a time Solicitor-General of the Commonwealth and, as Sir Maurice Byers, presided for a time over the Board established at the head of the New South Wales police force, was noticed to have developed one-handed adroitness in manipulating the telephone in his early years at the Bar. This may have owed something to his proceeding with his work while being briefed by Cedric at the other end of the line.

The final year moot also had its moments. The opening ones occurred when David Wells rose to his feet to address the court and Sugerman, presiding, said that the court was having difficulty in seeing him. Wells divined that this was calling his attention to his unrobed condition and made excuses after which Julius Stone, also on the moot bench, assured him that the court would do its best to see him. At a later stage Wells' junior counsel, feeling faint, slipped into the corridor of the Supreme Court for a moment. A student member of the audience followed her and kindly offered her a glass of sherry from a bottle he happened to have in his brief case. Thereupon the Sheriff of New South Wales suddenly appeared and raised the roof about orgies being conducted in a court which was his responsibility.

The third year moot, in which the participants were J. A. Lee, M. Z. Forbes, R. W. Parsons and I, was tame by comparison though C. D. Monahan, presiding, generously encouraged us by saying that the performance of all four participants was what was to be expected from experienced counsel rather than students. J. A. Lee was remarkable in his student days for the fact that long before Lionel Murphy as Attorney-General in the Whitlam government established the Trade Practices Commission to combat the evils of unrestricted competition in the commercial sphere, Lee set up a student practices commission in an endeavour to introduce some civilised behaviour into the race for the university medal in law. In the result the future Justice of the Supreme Court finished a close second to the future Challis Professor of Law. Lee had to be content with the accolade of being the fastest woodchopper that the responsible officer in the Sydney University Regiment had ever seen.

Following Williams' refusal to support Stone in the matter of moots, further difficulties developed between the two and Williams evidently enjoyed discussions with Stone so little that he preferred to dispose of matters without consultation when he felt he legitimately could. But what was legitimate and what was not became itself a matter of dispute and Stone complained
For some fifty years mooting has been an important student activity. It takes place not only within the Law School, but in competition with other Law Schools, interstate and overseas.

to the Professorial Board about Williams' alleged failure to call Faculty meetings with appropriate frequency. While the Board supported Stone on the matter, there were further disputes about the professors' spheres of authority. Though the Senate supported in part Williams' efforts to assume the mantle of Sir John Peden as head of the School, Williams was not satisfied and returned to New Zealand at the beginning of 1946.

Into the Postwar Era

D. G. Benjafield graduated with the university medal in law at the beginning of 1945. The student body was by that time very small and even before his graduation, Benjafield was involved in what had become a major activity of the School, making provision for students on active service to study law subjects and sit for Law School examinations wherever they were. This process was facilitated by the existence of the Law School notes, the system which Peden had reinstalled during the 1914-1918 war to avoid the necessity of students having to take an outline note of a lecture, and to relieve the lecturer of any necessity to dictate material to the students in the course of delivery of a lecture. H. V. Evatt was among those to praise this scheme. But its effectiveness depended upon the notes being current, and this depended upon both the lecturer and the Law School staff. Fortunately Mrs Noni Gaunson, who was to undertake the responsibilities of copying for many years, had joined the staff by this time.

The increasing replacement of part time professional teachers after the war by full time academics led to the gradual diminution of the use of the Law School notes, which caused embarrassment as long as they continued to be prescribed for the barristers' and solicitors' admission examinations. The notes varied in quality from printed books, those authored by Chief Justice Sir Frederick Jordan being the most eminent and longest respected of these, to duplicated notes which were sometimes kept current and sometimes fell short. The longest lasting of these were perhaps the Real Property Notes which Professor Benjafield amended.
Professor David Benjafield, and continued to use throughout his tenure of the subject. In a number of areas the Law School notes as supplied to the external students in the war were supplemented by notes by D. G. Benjafield himself, principally what he had prepared for his own purposes as an undergraduate. He also tutored such service students as were able to visit the Law School at times.

A further special activity required by the circumstances of the time was provision of refresher courses for returning ex-servicemen. This task was carried out by a committee established under the Commonwealth Reconstruction Training Scheme. Most of the lecturers were either lecturers at the Law School or its former students who were shortly to become lecturers. In the former category were James Williams, C. McLelland, P. R. Watts, and in the latter category A. B. Bridge, F. C. Stephen, R. M. Hope and J. D. Holmes. All those in the latter category were in the future to attain judicial office. The lectures were published in 1946 under the title of *Refresher Courses in Law* for the assistance of returning servicemen in the profession generally.

The Law School was also represented from 1946 on a committee of the Department of Post War Reconstruction to further the interests of ex-servicemen returning to law. But it soon became obvious that the main object of this exercise in the department’s eyes was to press the representatives of the then Incorporated Law Institute, representing solicitors, to pay articled clerks a living wage rather than the nominal sums which had hitherto been the rule. The department had an axe to grind because it made up the difference between an ex-service clerk’s stipend and a living wage. The solicitors’ representatives agreed to make representations along these lines to their members and this may have been a factor in the ultimate destruction of the articles system. There had been previous efforts by the clerks’ union to obtain a living wage for articled law clerks, but although proceedings were launched and heard they had somehow petered out.

Meanwhile, for a quarter of a century longer, the Law School adjusted its lecture time tables and to an extent the concept of its education to a student body consisting in a large measure of articled clerks. During 1946 the press of students during the early morning and late afternoon lecture hours and the lunch hour strained the seams of the Law School building, especially the older part of it, which threatened to become a fire hazard. For the rest of the day the corridors were largely deserted. In this funereal atmosphere some gatherings of ancients appeared from time to time giving an impression of the ghost’s high noon but this was because meetings of the University Senate were held in the Law School during this period.

The evening Faculty meetings, on the other hand, were lively enough thanks to the aftermath of the differences of opinion between the departed James Williams and Julius Stone. The Faculty elected R. Clive Teece as Dean in preference to Stone over the opposition of the newly appointed full time lecturers, Hutley and me. But this did not divide the Faculty into sides because Hutley managed to annoy Stone as much as he did Teece. Stone protected me at times from decanal arrangements which affected me adversely. The first meeting of the Australian Universities Law Schools Association later the Australasian Universities Law Schools Association and now the Australasian Law Teachers Association was held in Sydney at the end of that year by arrangement between Deans. Teece arranged with the other Deans that the academic membership should be confined to senior lecturers and above, which neatly excluded me. After Stone’s protest, Teece compromised by admitting me as secretary.

The use of teaching materials was also a source of Faculty dissension. Teece moved to prevent Stone prescribing his newly published *Province and Function of Law* on the ground that it was too difficult a book for students. But those who normally supported Teece were taken aback by this kind of interference, and Currey successfully moved that the Faculty move to the next business. Hutley sought to prevent the Real Property notes being printed on the ground that they were academically unsuitable, but Hope carried on using them and the students crowded Hope’s Real Property lectures in which they were used while substantially fewer numbers attended Hutley’s.

A student representative approached Stone and complained about the state of course materials and Stone was about to refer him to the Faculty when it turned out that his major complaint was the lack of International Law note material. At that time Stone was critically
following Lauterpacht's substantial text. It was plain that academic departures from the notes system were depriving some students of their customary security blankets and the process was painful. I was having similar problems in Private International Law. Stone, who was seeking to assert his jurisdiction on the subject, had impressed on me the academic importance of broad theoretical topics like characterisation, but most students forebore to follow me into that field of speculation.

A further problem was how to handle, in relation to honours, the fact that ex-servicemen had had broken courses. While Miss Hay was devotedly patriotic she was equally devoted to sticking to the Peden system which made Honours depend rigidly on the marks awarded. Others thought differently and examiners' meetings were lengthy and contentious. Come to think of it, it's hard to remember any time during the period covered by this chronicle when they were not so in greater or less degree.

Students

Despite the jarrings in the cogs of the examining machinery the School managed to give appropriate recognition, when they were students, to the qualities of a remarkable number of future luminaries in various fields. There were three future High Court justices in the student body in 1946. The future Sir Kenneth Jacobs shared the University medal in law at the beginning of 1947 with L. J. Downer future Reader in Medieval Studies in the Australian National University. L. K. Murphy had begun in 1945 studying, inter alia, Contracts under James Williams and generously or diplomatically told me when he fell into my hands in Torts that he remembered more of what I said. The future Sir Anthony Mason, the present Chief Justice, began in 1946 and the future Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of New South Wales, Sir Laurence Street, in 1947. Sir Laurence would be unspiring in his help to the School by way of teaching and later participating in its occasions at whatever inconvenience to himself.

The future Prime Minister E. G. Whitlam had graduated in 1946 leaving some legacy of literary output in the pages of the student journal Blackacre. Neville Wran would graduate in 1948, John Howard in 1961, and the supply of future Commonwealth and State Attorneys-General always appeared to be adequately maintained.

Future big business was represented by F. W. Millar, currently Chairman of TNT, who graduated in 1948. Miss Hay thought him very remarkable and I gained an unaccustomed accolade from her by doing the right thing by him in examining one of his external papers. Other evidences of the direction of his future were accumulating at this time. N. L. Cowper, later Sir Norman Cowper, of Allen, Allen & Hemsley had read the work of Elbert Hubbard expounding the qualities which launch people on their journey to the top under the great free enterprise system. One standard of measurement which impressed Cowper was how a beginner measured up under the 'Message to Garcia' principle. Hubbard explains this by recalling the story of a messenger being required to deliver a message to Garcia, a U.S. ally, in the Spanish-American war. Hubbard then recounts masses of questions which the messenger might have asked about his assignment but demonstrated his quality by not asking. Cowper usually had occasion to complain about the undue curiosity of Allens' clerks when asked to do anything—even about G. G. Masterman, outstanding graduate of 1956 who took silk and did so much to build the Ombudsman's office in the State. But Millar stood out. Allens' partner G. V. Davy said Millar would cut the instructions short and be off and running.

A New Style of Dean

At the time of Shatwell's appointment as the new Challis Professor of Law in 1947 the Faculty had been strengthened by appointments of a number of part time lecturers, J. D. Evans in Contracts and Mercantile Law following Sugerman's appointment to the Bench, J. D. Holmes in Constitutional Law, R. M. Hope in Real Property and Divorce, later to be replaced in that subject by D. M. Selby, B. P. MacFarlan in Bankruptcy, and F. C. Stephen in Equity. Some of these carried on until their own appointments to the Bench as C. McLelland and C. D. Monahan continued to do so also.
Shatwell’s appointment as Challis Professor of Law was not the subject of any more unanimity on the Faculty than most matters at that time were. But upon his appointment he was unanimously elected Dean, and he remained Dean until a year before his retirement at the end of 1974. Then Benjafield became Dean, as he had been for one short period previously during Shatwell’s occupation of his Chair. There were times when some might have preferred a different arrangement. Stone would have accepted the deanship at times if it had been unanimously offered to him, but he had no wish to contend for the post. Hutley, who became a part time lecturer, claimed at one stage that the University Senate should have gone out and attempted to persuade Sir Victor Windeyer to be an appointed Dean, because the only way to make the place achieve proper efficiency would have been to run it like a military unit. Although Shatwell had himself commanded small naval ships during the war, the Faculty during his period did not create the impression of a military unit and this did not always suit the former Major Hutley.

Nevertheless Shatwell did succeed in producing a distribution of authority calculated to produce greater harmony.

He abandoned any claim to be head of the School as Peden had been, and secured Stone’s independence by making an approach to the Vice-Chancellor, by this time Sir Stephen Roberts, to divide Law on the one hand and International Law and Jurisprudence on the other, into two departments. The latter was very much the smaller department since the claims that Stone had made for jurisdiction over other subjects which had been classed as academic rather than professional in Peden’s time were not carried into effect. It is doubtful if this disturbed Stone unduly for he fell into the habit of describing his later year courses as the light at the end of the tunnel. He once said that if the Law Department had not filled the students’ heads with ideas which required remedial work he would have had less material for his lectures. From this it can be inferred that there was a *modus vivendi* reached rather than a true team spirit. There was evidence elsewhere in the University during the Shatwell era that while departmentalisation might assist independence and avoid disputes about authority, a departmental division by reference to the theoretical and practical aspects of a field is not the happiest way of doing it. There was at that time a Chair of pure mathematics and one of applied mathematics. This led to regular heated jurisdictional disputes before the Professorial Board.

The effect of the departmental division on the Department of Law was to make it a pioneer in unintelligible developments which subsequently spread over the tertiary educational system of the State generally. George Bernard Shaw predicted at the beginning of this century that a feature of it would be the prominence of polytechnics specialising in the development of technical arts and crafts. But it has not worked out like that. The principle has become that no tertiary institution is to be academically or practically inferior to any other, and despite the insistence on the primacy of the duty of tertiary institutions to further practical objects, practical courses have been more and more given over to academic instructors and instruction.

Shatwell himself was not appointed as Challis Professor of Law because of his familiarity with the practical workings of the law but because of his academic strength. He had taken a first both in the BA in Law and the BCL at Oxford. Subsequently he had taught for a time at Hull in England and then practically every legal subject when he was the sole professor in Tasmania before being appointed to Sydney. He had returned to Tasmania for a short time after completing his war service. One of his earlier actions after his arrival in Sydney was to pack off his two full time lecturers in turn to Oxford to take their doctorates. I returned to Sydney after this exercise in 1951 and Benjafield, who had been appointed to the School after a period at the Bar, in 1952. We then joined D. C. Thomson in the category of senior lecturer. Thomson was a first class honours graduate of the Law School of the University of Western Australia and had carried out tertiary studies in London in the field of Industrial Law.

The extent to which subjects which had been taken over by lecturers who had been encouraged to develop their academic activities in preference to developing their experience did not pass without comment. Norman Cowper, my master solicitor, wanted to know ‘what all these academics are doing in our Law School’. The profession was coming to identify less with the School. I found during a visit to Melbourne that the then Chief Justice of the High
Court of Australia, Sir John Latham, was not in favour of the taking over of professional subjects by academic lecturers though the same process was proceeding in the Law School of the University of Melbourne.

Nevertheless the process of academisation of professional subjects proceeded unevenly and some important professional co-operation was retained throughout the period under consideration. The division of Constitutional Law into Constitutional Law I and Constitutional Law II in 1949 meant that the academic strength of C. H. Currey and the professional strength of J. D. Holmes, a future Justice of Appeal, were both retained and for a time the latter subject was taught by the future Justice Else-Mitchell. Hutley, now at the Bar, was lecturing in Probate which by 1952 had been expanded to Succession, Admiralty, and Administrative Law, the last a new addition to the curriculum. During 1950 Windeyer was conducting Private International Law. A new subject of Introductory Jurisprudence was being taught by academic members of the staff. Teaching fellowships had been instituted by 1952 and the tutorial functions these carried out attracted a crop of future judges including R. F. Cross, G. P. Donovan, D. L. Mahoney, G. D. Needham, K. W. Pawley, H. H. Glass and J. H. Wootten. Donovan soon proceeded to a lectureship in Mercantile Law. Future judges at this time were taking up lectureships in a number of other subjects — K. S. Jacobs in Equity, A. B. K. I. Bridge in Procedure, and A. F. Rath in Pleading. With MacFarlan’s appointment to the Supreme Court Bench, J. K. Manning came to lecture in Bankruptcy.

Sir Kenneth Manning was a chastening reminder to academic legal institutions that their courses have no monopoly in producing breadth of understanding of law and liberality of outlook. He had come up through the admission boards’ examinations when there were no courses of instruction. When he was in a position to do so, he saw that this was changed, and the Law Extension Committee of the University of Sydney came into existence, always under distinguished judicial chairmanship. At the time when he began to lecture at the Law School he was a solicitor but in that capacity he had as exceptional a reputation in the field of bankruptcy as MacFarlan had. Later he went to the Bar and was noted for his liberal views about reform — even when they might hurt the legal profession — before he became a judge and the first chairman of the first permanent law reform body in Australia. Then he drew on professional and academic assistance with an absence of the slightest prejudice about either. He left the Law Reform Commission to go to the Court of Appeal. Withal, Manning was a stickler for correctness and the only sadness one ever had about this was the part it played in the departure of a brilliant graduate of the Law School in 1949 from the Bar.
P. L. Clyne, apart from his academic distinction which was later to be capped by an LLM with first class honours, was a remarkable orator from his student days with a gift of humour which was compounded of iconoclasm and exuberance. One of his faults was no doubt an inability to comprehend the errors that others saw in his ways, which was stressed by courts when he unsuccessfully applied for readmission to the Bar. Once he was confined on a cruise ship with Justice Else-Mitchell and was bewildered by the fact that the judge was apparently trying to avoid him. But a less doctrinaire attitude was not without its rewards. I once had occasion to pay tribute to Clyne in the course of lectures and, a grape vine having operated, received a complimentary copy of his book How to Avoid Paying your Debts. One gathers that it might have been impractical to live with Peter, but Densey Clyne's moving tribute in the Sydney Morning Herald after his death is readily comprehensible. His classmates of the 1949 graduating class included those who pursued very different paths, including the now Chief Justice of Australia, future Deputy Chairman of the Law Reform Commission R. D. Conacher, and L. F. Sheppard. Sheppard's exceptional capacity and industry, both apparent in his student days, no doubt stood him in good stead in the diverse functions which a justice of the Federal Court of Australia is called upon to discharge.

The variety in the class of 1949 should occasion no surprise. The University song of the period, while pursuing the theme of the underlying unity of the institution, at the same time conceded that some are hung and some are married, some for years in gaol have tarried. As far as I am aware the last never happened to Peter, though one newspaper report in particular indicated that its avoidance once called for a display of physical agility remarkable in one of his avoirdupois.

Harvard Influences

Since Julius Stone was at this stage continuing his Harvard period, the beginning of the 1950s saw plans being launched for the publication of a Faculty journal along the lines of the Harvard Law Review. The Harvard Law Review is an exclusively student publication with the student editors chosen for their academic distinction, and their editorship constituting a leading part of the qualifications for their degree. However, the Sydney Law Review began in modified form with Stone as general editor, a Faculty committee including the student editor-in-chief, a board including professional and academic dignitaries, and finally the board of student editors. It was not until the close of the period covered here that it became a student publication, and even then it did not formally count towards the grading for the degree though it might be given weight informally where other things were equal.

Stone regarded the Law Review training as important both in its technical production and academic aspects. For example, he had his assistants, including the students, performing the function of pasting up the number, a function now replaced in these days of computers and photography. He was also particularly keen on developing 'rules of the house' like the major publishing firms, to establish a uniform format.

On the more substantive journalistic side, Stone proposed to launch the infant journal with a major journalistic scoop. He had had discussions with Lord Wright, who had delivered the advice of the Judicial Committee in James v Commonwealth in 1936 — the case which held that s.92 of the Australian Constitution bound the Commonwealth and gave the freedoms which the section guaranteed broad scope. Having become convinced that this was a major obstacle to economic planning in Australia, the retired and ageing Lord Wright wished to repent before he passed on. So he agreed to publish his repentance in the Sydney Law Review. But the aim of including this in the initial number of the journal which appeared at the beginning of 1953 was defeated by an act of God.

His Majesty George VI was gathered to his fathers in 1952. Thereupon Lord Wright stipulated that his article should not be published until after Queen Elizabeth's coronation — evidently feeling that the celebratory atmosphere could be marred, at least for him, by his defection from the official view of his peers. So the article did not appear until the second number of the journal in 1954. Even then its impact on the judiciary was disappointing, but it
eventually exploded gratifyingly when L. K. Murphy was elevated to the High Court Bench.

The first student editor-in-chief was A. J. Mitchell appointed, as in Harvard, on the basis of special distinction in his courses up to the final year. Alan Mitchell was one to whom fame came early. In the days before television, when radio was more a focus of public attention than now, Mitchell was for a time the youngest member of John Dease’s famous panel of quiz kids. At one time leading Melbourne law academic Geoffrey Sawer, later Professor of Law in the ANU Research School of Social Sciences, exerted himself to defeat the panel by testing their knowledge about a neighbour of the British Prime Minister. The panel turned out to be unaware that No 9 Downing Street was occupied by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The Law School was not to repeat its reflected glory from John Dease’s programme until the arrival of John Goldring, future professor at Macquarie.

Mitchell’s subsequent career was one of a number of demonstrations that academic excellence is far from being a prerogative only of those destined for the Bar or academic life. He was to become prominent in the counsels of the solicitors’ Law Society. The same point was made in the same way two years later by future solicitor David de Carvalho, student editor-in-chief of the 1955 issue, after being a student editor and contributor to the journal in the previous year. The occupation of the post in the year between the two was W. P. Deane, future High Court Justice and, in the year following these, Theo Simos, who became a leading silk.

A significant appointment during this period was that of T. R. Morling, a distinguished graduate of the 1951 class, and later well known to the general public for doing as much as was humanly possible to clear up the Lindy Chamberlain case, as part time research assistant to Professor Stone. The object was to further Stone’s plan to produce a major work on Evidence which, however, did not come to fruition during the period covered here. But Morling’s appointment released me from bondage. I had been teaching Evidence in addition to my other subjects because Stone thought he might need me for the project. This was an uncomfortable experience on a very short term basis and I was relieved when Morling stepped into the breach and the subject was returned to its professional handling by the appointment of L. C. Badharn QC. Later Gordon Samuels, who was to become a Justice of the Court of Appeal and Chancellor of the University of New South Wales, would take it over.

Stone in any case departed for a period at Harvard in 1956 and this appeared to mark the end of his Harvard period. It did not seem that the institution measured up to what he expected of it. But in the meantime Stone and others had interested Dean Erwin N. Griswold of Harvard in Australia. Stone used to send him a copy of each issue of the *Sydney Law Review* post haste — and Griswold became interested in particular in proselytising in Australia for the famous Harvard case method of teaching. In this Griswold had been somewhat anticipated by a visit of Charles O. Gregory of Chicago, and my *Cases on Torts* appeared in its first edition in 1955.

Griswold’s own nominee for the missionary function was Willard H. Pedrick, then of North Western University. Pedrick’s initial visit to the University of Western Australia was a trifle unhappy because he was nearly run down on a zebra crossing. The excursion into print in the *Australian Law Journal* which immediately followed, written in the heat of the moment, made the point that the function of zebra crossings in this country seemed to be to point out to motorists where there was the best hunting for pedestrians. Pedrick went on to sympathise with Australian courts about the problems they must have with lunacy in relation to tort. It appeared to be impossible to devise any test of lunacy which would not apply to the ordinary Australian driver.

For all this Pedrick continued to visit Australia and the chief importance to Sydney in later years of his initial visit was his encounter with R. W. Parsons, then teaching in Western Australia. Pedrick was as much a tax expert as he was a common lawyer and he influenced Parsons to shift his emphasis in the former direction. Parsons was appointed to an Associate Chair in Sydney in 1957 and to a full Chair in 1961. The results in the development of commercial law fields in conjunction with taxation at Sydney were determinative of an important direction in the future of the School.
Women Students

In 1955 the University medallist was Elizabeth Evatt who, as already mentioned, was to be the first Chief Judge of the Family Court of Australia, and the first class honours list included Jean Austin, who was to distinguish herself in the Commonwealth Public Service. From this time the medal and the highest honours would go to women with increasing frequency. Their numbers had been growing for some time. Eventually the special prize for women which had existed since the 1920s, the Rose Scott Prize for Women Students, would be extended to men so as to avoid any discrimination. But, like the male chauvinist I no doubt am, I look back to the day when it was awarded to women with affection. The fact that it was awarded in law at all was in itself a distinction for the Faculty and no doubt this distinction remains. Rose Scott is credited with the fact that votes for women came to New South Wales very early, and with other reforms of importance protecting the rights of young girls. It was when she had to relinquish her post in international women's councils through increasing illness that her friends gave her some money which she in turn gave to the University of Sydney. In the days when the prize was awarded to women for their performance over the whole course, one cannot but think that she would have felt that whenever the Rose Scott Prize went to the same person as the University medal, a point worth making was receiving emphasis.

Teaching Changes

In the mid fifties the balance of the Faculty towards full time teaching tipped further with the appointment of J. A. Iliffe as a senior lecturer. Benjafield and I became Associate Professors in that year and Thomson was appointed to that grade somewhat later so there were in the mid-fifties two professors, two associate professors, and two senior lecturers. Iliffe had been a fellow student of Benjafield's and mine in Oxford but we did not become acquainted with his unusual method of conducting his household until his arrival in Sydney from his teaching post in Tasmania, or with his unfavourable impressions of Australia. He believed in subsistence living on a small farm, and the first notice we had of his arrival was a call from the airport to
say that the goat was distressed. He was able to acquire a small farm at Cheltenham for a modest sum because it was zoned rural, but happily it was rezoned within a few years and he was able to subdivide it. This enabled him to escape from what he termed the ‘crude Australian character’ to Italy where, despite the appearance of carrying coals to Newcastle, he was able to lecture in Roman Law to students who had more concern with it than his noisy Sydney class. Nevertheless, there were those students in Sydney who admired Iliffe’s lectures in the subject, including Olive Wood who was to move from being a graduate assistant to become Pro Dean of the Faculty and senior lecturer in Succession, and to publish extensively in that area.

With Iliffe’s appointment T. P. Flattery, the long time lecturer in Roman Law, became a teaching fellow in it. But since he continued to canvass the text of the Institutes of Justinian in the manner he had always done — as schoolteachers in those days used to work through Latin authors — the tutorials became only remotely related to the examinations as Iliffe conceived them, and Flattery’s classes dwindled. On one occasion he was observed busily translating Justinian with no students in attendance at all — a man in a class by himself.

Some problematic teaching episodes of the fifties involved both departments at the Law School. J. L. Montrose, the law Dean in Belfast, was a friend of both Stone and Shatwell and his visit to the school to lecture for a time was expected to be cosy. But immediately on his arrival he launched complaints about his reception and when I apologised for the shortcomings of our arrangements he replied in his customary Johnsonian fashion: ‘Sir, to call them arrangements is to dignify them’. When invited to Stone’s home, he marched into the supper room, surveyed the substantial spread in his honour, and said only, ‘Where are the cucumber sandwiches?’, sending the catering staff back to the drawing boards. A common method of lecturing with him — I was to see it employed when he was addressing the Yale Faculty as well as Sydney students — was to begin with a series of desultory fits and starts. Then he would say: ‘Of course I haven’t prepared this lecture’. Then he would demonstrate that this did not matter
by suddenly lifting the tempo and coherence and be up and away. He saw no reason to curb the
flow of eloquence at the end of the customary academic period and students felt themselves
trapped indefinitely. Once I saw a great press of students outside St James Hall in Elizabeth
Street where some Law School lectures were given at that time. They were students waiting to
see whether Montrose would appear to give the lecture from a position whence their escape
route would not be cut off if he appeared. Montrose had mellowed when we next saw him in
Sydney en route to New Zealand at the beginning of 1966, but by that time, distressingly, he
was in the final stage of a terminal illness. He died very soon after his arrival in New Zealand,
leaving a New Zealand professor with a sense of grievance at the task of disposing of the
mortal remains imposed upon him. But one feels that Montrose for his part would have said
that to call the funeral arrangements by that name was to dignify them.

During the period of Stone's absence in Harvard in 1956-1957, arrangements had to be
made for his lectures in Jurisprudence to be delivered in his absence. On the international law
side his department was now very strong, particularly through the presence part time of J. G.
Starke QC former Vinerian Scholar of Oxford, later editor of the Australian Law Journal,
holder of a number of important academic posts including at least one Chair in Australia and
abroad, and author of standard works in International Law. The jurisprudence side was also
very strong in retrospect. The teaching fellow was Gordon Samuels about whom something
has already been said, while a research assistant was Dr Ilmar Tammelo, later to be reader in
the department, a writer of major work especially in the field of logic in relation to law, who
was ultimately to hold a Chair in Salzburg.

For all this Stone, though evidently after hesitation, called on me to undertake the same sort
of pinch-hitting lecturing task in Jurisprudence as I had at his instance in Evidence. My initial
lectures were momentarily successful with the students — mainly because of an unfortunate
tendency on my part to approach sacred subjects in a light vein. But the gilt soon wore off the
gingerbread though S. G. Hume, the Law Review student editor-in-chief, retained an amiable
attitude and the eventual outcome decided Stone that it was highly undesirable to raid the
tunnel of law and allow the mole-like creature which emerged to blink bewildered in the light
of jurisprudence — at least in my case.

What immediately precipitated this conclusion was the fact that Stone wrote to me in 1958. I
was then teaching Torts and Jurisprudence at Yale and he asked me to support him in a dis­
agreement with H. L. A. Hart, who was then the relatively newly appointed Professor of
Jurisprudence at Oxford. I replied that I had the misfortune to agree with Hart, but I would
publish a piece in the Yale Law Journal and let him have the manuscript beforehand so as to
give him an opening to define his grounds of opposition to Hart by way of reply. When I gave
him the manuscript on my return to Sydney, he decided it was not worthy of a reply. Hart, on
the other hand, whom I had never met, wrote me a congratulatory letter when the article
appeared in December 1958. The article was immediately prescribed in Professor Graham
Hughes' course at Yale.

The Lighter Side Of Law

With a still largely part time student body who were generally in articles, the Law School was
only part of the students' day to day social life. Meetings between people might take place as
much in solicitors' offices or in the public offices like the Probate Office, where the practice of
placing one's documents in the queue rather than standing in it oneself gave opportunity for
social interchanges with clerks from other solicitors' offices. So did the coffee shops like
Mockbells, or the public houses which occupied many more corners in those days than now.
The new Law School itself was built at the expense of two popular public houses and the
Pioneers' Club.

But there were Law School functions, especially those organised by the students' Law
Society, of which the events of the year were the Revue and the Law Ball. The latter had a
special flavour then because it was generally held in Sydney's huge public ballroom, the
Trocadero, which has since disappeared. For the Law Ball the Trocadero was specially decor­
ated with one huge sign over the ladies' room bearing the legend 'Court of Pretty Sessions' and

Dr Ilmar Tammelo.
another over the gentlemen's toilet bearing the sign 'Retiring Privy Council'. The president of the University Law Society was still in those days generally a judge, and one recalls Justice Manning resplendent in tails escorting the guests of honour along the great red carpet rolled out for the occasion. The ballroom dancing in those days was still of the gracious Victor Sylvester kind in which the gentleman sought to sweep the lady off her feet rather than to encourage her by example to shake herself inside out. And there were entertainments designed to concentrate the mind, either of the student revue kind or professional acts such as that of the Persian sex kitten. The latter act was completed with difficulty owing to the problem of keeping a space free from clutching hands, from which it can be seen that there was jollity to match the grace. David de Carvalho recently recalled my own extravagant behaviour when I won a case of champagne.

Further Expansion

The closing years of the fifties saw staff expansion at the Law School with increasing absorption of the lecturing by academic staff, the participation of the profession being preserved for the most part through the system of teaching fellows. R. W. Parsons was appointed as an Associate Professor in Commercial Law in 1957 though for the time being the Faculty was exceptionally fortunate in also having N. H. Bowen QC as its lecturer in Company Law and Taxation. He was a future Commonwealth Attorney-General and the first Chief Judge of the Federal Court of Australia. The 1957 medallist was P. H. Lane, a future Challis Professor of Law. He was joined in the first class Honours category by W. Howard, continuing to prove the share of future solicitors in the history of academic excellence. At the same time P. E. Nygh, future Professor of Law in Sydney, foundation Professor of Law at Macquarie and Judge of the Family Court of Australia, was contributing as a student editor to the Law Review.

The same year K. R. Handley, at the time of writing proceeding to the Supreme Court as a Justice of Appeal hard on the heels of being awarded the Order of Australia for services to law and religion, was demonstrating his qualities in the capacity of legislation editor of the Review.

1958 LAW BALL
TROCADERO
Thursday, 24 July
9 p.m. to 2 a.m.
Tickets £1/2/6 available at the Law School office, Phillip St.
Handley declined to submit his commentary on the *Trade Marks Act* 1955 in the year in which he began writing it because his work did not meet his standards of perfection. I suppose it was published in the following year as a comment rather than an article because it was a comprehensive treatment of the Act rather than the following of a theme. But it was in fact the first full length article to be contributed to the *Review* by a student, and a worthy initiator of the genre.

The 1958 issue of the *Review* also saw an array of contributions by students who would become part or full time teachers in Sydney or elsewhere: J. M. Bennett who would achieve high stature in the study of the legal history of this State leading to an LLD degree in 1990, Andrew Lang — to be a professional and academic expert on land law, A. E. Vrisakis in the same category with a future divided between work as a solicitor and a corporation executive or director, A. Hiller, medallist in 1960, with a future of teaching law in the University of Queensland, R. P. Meagher, the student editor-in-chief and medallist in 1958 with a future of lecturing and text writing in Equity and, when the subject was finally made optional in Sydney, Roman Law. Another contributor to the *Law Review* was G. G. Masterman, of whom something has already been said. The following year saw G. D. McCormack among the student editors. He was about to impress in Oxford and later to attain a Chair in Aberdeen. Among the future members of the judiciary among the top students who contributed to the *Review* at that time were W. A. Gee and B. A. Beaumont.

The teaching fellows at the close of the decade included B. S. J. O'Keefe who came to be known as the mild one to distinguish him from his famous brother, the rock star Johnny O'Keefe, the wild one. O'Keefe shows the capacity of the Law School to produce a combination of leading silk and major figure in local government. For many years he was to be and still is the Mayor of Mosman, with some intermissions, and to dwell on the heights of that salubrious.

*The Chancellor congratulates the Law School's most recent LLD, J. M. Bennett, author of chapter 2 in this publication and of numerous works of history related to the legal profession.*
area in proximity to Sir Maurice Byers. As a student he is remembered for his lively contribution to seminars in tandem with his close friend F. P. Donohoe, another highly productive student editor who subsequently went into the business world.

At the close of the decade the Department of Law was forging links with Yale following a visit to that Law School by the Dean, who was to return there a few years later. So there was a series of lecturing periods there by what were now the three professors in the Law Department, D. G. Benjafield and I having been raised to full Chairs in 1959. At the same time I was being bereaved of my subject Private International Law, which I had taught since 1946. This caused some heartburning because it meant that I never had the opportunity to tell the students about Reno, Nevada, which I had visited in an effort to enliven my lectures. Getting there had involved travelling from New Haven, Connecticut in a car I had bought for $395, negotiating the Great Lakes, climbing the Rockies and crossing the Great Salt Lake, the Sierra Nevada and the Nevada desert. The future Sir Zelman Cowen, also into Private International Law at the time, was then a legend in Salt Lake City because the entire engine of his car had fallen out on the road and he abandoned it to the locals. A frightening experience for me was when a bear succeeded in getting the door of my car open, with me inside, in the Yellowstone area. It is all very well for Willard Pedrick to complain in the *ALJ* of the lunacy of Australian drivers, but what is to be said of the lunacy of his compatriots who encouraged these dangerous animals to explore motor vehicles by feeding them biscuits from cars?

For all this it has to be conceded that there was marked progress in Private International Law, later to be renamed Conflict of Laws, from this time, thanks to its being in the hands of academics who would make it a central part of their field. The first in this category was D. J. Macdougall, a product of Melbourne who had joined the Sydney faculty on completion of studies in the United States. He moved to a Chair in Canada. Then the subject was taken over by P. E. Nygh who was to publish the Australian standard text in the field.

**It's Moments Like These . . .**

The year 1959 stands out as a year of successive painful embarrassments. In the professorial ranks of the eminent Law School of Dean W. Prosser in California there were two particular luminaries Ehrenzweig and Riesenfeld, not to be confused with Shakespeare's Rosencrantz and Guildenstern. In 1959 Stefan A. Riesenfeld came to Sydney and taught Legal History which, under our Dean's influence and teaching, had become a major subject in the first year. Riesenfeld had a particular affection for the subject of estates tail in legal history, which he could not suppress even when it was explained to him that an attempt to entail here resulted in a miraculous conversion of the estate into a fee simple. Riesenfeld's particular affections extended to humankind, and he early announced that he had fallen in love with the students in his class whose names began with H. No doubt the view that D. J. Harland, currently Challis Professor of Law in the University of Sydney, is lovable would have its adherents. But D. E. Harding! It was he who, after entering academic life in the Sydney Law School, graduated to a Chair and served as Dean in the Law School of the University of New South Wales. He was thereafter involved in the making of certain remarks about Sydney, not to mention Macquarie, in a government report. The only ready explanation of Riesenfeld's attitude, namely that he was confusing Harding with his wife, has to be rejected because Nancy would not have been around at the time.

There were some fears for Riesenfeld at the staff-student cricket match when the visitor was having his introduction to the game. The student bowler insisted on delivering high lobs which descended towards the top of the wicket, passing in close proximity to Riesenfeld's glasses. Gamesmanship was prominent in the students' intimidatory attitude to these matches. Once when I observed a student umpire examining my bowling action, I asked him what he was watching for. He replied, 'A heart attack'.

Introductory Jurisprudence had by this time also become a compulsory subject in the first year, and various of the full time staff shared responsibility for it. It could have its embarrassments too. On one occasion I was approached at the Law Ball by the class representative with
the request that I cancel the 9 am lecture the following morning out of humanity to the revellers. I agreed to this, but the class turned up for a lecture while the lecturer did not. When I asked the representative why he had not acted on my consent, he said he thought I was drunk when I gave it.

There were more embarrassments in 1959 through it being Sydney's turn to host the annual meeting of the Australasian Universities Law Schools Association. One of those who attended was A. L. Goodhart who had recently relinquished the Chair of Jurisprudence in Oxford to H. L. A. Hart. On his arrival he read me a letter he had from Hart which said, 'Say a word of encouragement to W. L. Morison. I think Stone bullies him'. One scarcely knew how to react to this since, if that was the word for it, I was scarcely the only pebble on the beach. Even W. P. Deane as student editor-in-chief of the *Law Review* had undergone some abuse in this respect on the way to his astra. Nor was he the only future High Court Justice to be impressed with Stone's sense of the duties to him of those around him. On one occasion some demolishers made a noise in proximity to the professor's room. The University proceeded for an injunction and the matter was settled at the door of the court. A. F. Mason, for the University, seemed a trifle disappointed at being deprived of the opportunity of reading to the court Stone's affidavit dealing with the effect of the operations on the advance of scholarship.

Goodhart, at any rate, thoroughly enjoyed the conference. He was greatly excited by the progress of a case in Sydney at that time, sometimes called the *Wagon Mound No 1*, which neatly raised a point in which he was at issue with Lord Sumner. Ultimately the Judicial Committee was to blast Lord Sumner's view in terms so like those Goodhart was accustomed to use that a number of people thought he must somehow have got to write it. Goodhart also had some success at a gathering of judges and professors held in association with the conference and addressed by Justice Harlan of the U.S. Supreme Court. In introducing Harlan, Goodhart said that Harlan had asked him what he should say. So he told Harlan that he should praise the professors because this would please the professors and give the judges a good laugh. This was well received by half the audience.

Our Dean had the responsibility of introducing Harlan's speech to the conference and thanking him afterwards. So he said all the right things in all the right places until the very last moment of his thanks. Harlan had concluded by apologising for any incoherence in the composition of his address. The Dean, wishing to depurate any suggestion of incoherence, had the misfortune to express himself in the terms that to call the speech incoherent was the understatement of the year. Among connoisseurs of the Dean's occasional faux pas this one was ranked second to his introduction of Dean Griswold of Harvard when he visited the School. The Dean described that eminent Bostonian as 'the Dean of perhaps the most famous Law School in the British Commonwealth'.

**Into the Sixties**

During the fifties Stone's major productions had been in the field of International Law: *Legal Controls of International Conflict* (1954), *Aggression and World Order* (1958), and the book on which he was working at the end of the decade, *Quest for Survival* (1961). In the sixties the emphasis was for some years on the production of successor books to the *Province and Function of Law* (1946) covering the different areas of jurisprudence which had formed the three parts of the earlier book: *Legal System and Lawyers' Reasonings* (1964), *Human Law and Human Justice* (1965), and *Social Dimensions of Law and Justice* (1966). The Review was meanwhile being carried on by various members of the full time staff from time to time in pairs of joint general editors until it would become an exclusively student publication in the early seventies on the American model.

The full time staff of both departments was increasing. By 1961 Stone's department had received the powerful addition of C. H. Alexandrowicz, an established scholar in the field of international law, in addition to Dr Tammelo in jurisprudence. In the Department of Law R. W. Parsons was appointed to a full Chair, Shatwell's fresh interest in criminology had been reflected in the appointment of G. J. Hawkins on his way to an Associate Chair. Dr Enid
The Law Song

(Tune: *The British Grenadiers*)

We plough our way through Halsbury,
And all the CLR’s,
We master Jurisprudence,
And Equity of Mars,
And when we are well-lectured men,
They’re going to set us free
From Law, Law, Law, Law
That Blessed * Faculty.

With academic knowledge
And useful Latin tags
We aid our Counsel gladly
By carrying his bags.
And clerks we are and clerks we stay
Until they set us free
From Law, Law, Law, Law
That Blessed * Faculty.

We'll never bribe the jury,
Or take a case on spec.,
We'll follow ethics truly,
And keep our Trusts correct.
Or else we'll have to start again
From where they set us free
In Law, Law, Law, Law,
That Blessed * Faculty.

There'll always be a Shatwell
And Roper Room TV,
A Conrick and a Gaunson,
While there's a Faculty.
But one day Ronald's lift will jamb
And NEVER set them free
From Law, Law, Law, Law
That Blessed * Faculty.

* or any appropriate Australian adjective

Blackacre 1968.
A Century Down Town

than once before his final departure. He was also incapable of being confined within the traditional boundaries of common law subjects, in respect of which, having regard to what has happened to those boundaries since, he was perhaps ahead of his time.

By this time the future Sir Anthony Mason was lecturing part time in the Department of Law, and other representatives of the part time teaching strength were R. P. Meagher, B. S. J. O'Keefe, and solicitor, conveyancing expert, and ALJ editor in his field, H. W. Tebbutt. R. D. Conacher, another of the distinguished 1949 graduates, was now Challis Lecturer in Equity Procedure. He would be later a tower of strength as Deputy Chairman of the Law Reform Commission, beginning in the years of its first chairman, Justice Manning. The future Supreme Court judiciary was further represented on the staff of this time by A. J. Rogers and G. D. Needham. The student editor-in-chief of the year and medallist of 1963 was D. J. Harland, already mentioned, and others to figure both as student editors and in the Honours list were R. Baxt, future professor at Monash and Chairman of the Trade Practices Commission, and Olive Wood, also previously mentioned.

A first class Honours LLM of that year was R. A. Woodman, who was to become a Professor in the Faculty. P. E. Nygh, already mentioned, graduated LLM in the same year as Woodman. At this time there was only a handful of LLM graduates, beginning with A. P. Renouf, future Ambassador to the United States in 1953, followed by L. F. E. Goldie on his way to posts in the field of international law in the USA in 1956, and P. H. Lane in 1960. By 1963 Lane was a member of the full time staff in Sydney on his way to a Chair there, and to publication of volumes in the field of Constitutional Law. J. M. Bennett, the historian, and Ilmar Tamnelo graduated LLM in 1964. The student editor-in-chief in 1963 and first class honours graduate in 1964 when J. R. T. Wood, now a Justice of the Supreme Court, was medallist, was D. M. J. Bennett. He called on me at Yale when he was pursuing post-graduate studies in Harvard and remarked that he had begun his studies with me by being thrown out of the first lecture for conducting a conversation. I could only say it seemed like a good idea at the time.

The LLB curriculum had by that time undergone gradual revision to the point where some impression had been made upon the traditional division of subjects into those which were compulsory examination subjects and those which were not examined though attendances at lectures in them was compulsory. Two 'optional slots' had been created and Roman Law, which ceased to be a compulsory subject, became an option. This enabled students to follow the direction of their interests to some degree and also, in some degree, enabled the deployment of the growing number of staff to the best advantage in fields of their special competence. Recent additions to the full time staff by 1964 included A. R. Blackshield in the Department of Jurisprudence and International Law, currently holding a Chair in Macquarie Law School, R. G. Nettheim currently holding a Chair at New South Wales and active in the area of Aboriginal affairs, P. E. Nygh and Dr K. C. T. Sutton, future standard text writer in Commercial Law who was to move to a Chair in the University of Queensland. Paul Ward, statistician, increased the strength in Criminology. The medallist at the beginning of the following year was M. R. Chesterman, future holder of a Chair at New South Wales.

The student editor-in-chief of the Review of that year was W. M. C. Gummow, whom I also encountered in the small class in the optional subject of Industrial and Commercial Property which I launched at that time. It also contained Jane Swanton, future member of the Faculty and writer, especially in the field of Contracts. My association with the subject was very temporary since Gummow showed such a command of it that it was shortly afterwards turned over to him — one of a number of capacities in which he was to serve the Law School. When he was appointed a Justice of the Federal Court of Australia he paid tribute to his former teachers — but the balance sheet between the Law School and himself was much in credit on his side.

The year 1965 was one in which the School was in process of losing a principal source of strength to the nascent Law Reform Commission in the State for some little time to come. D. G. Benjafield spent some time in that year travelling in the United States in preparation for his work on that body. Justice Manning had been responsible for two innovations which were starting to affect the School. One was the Law Reform Commission to which the practice came to be to second an academic for a period of two years. Benjafield was the first to be so
seconded and in fact was the only one in my recollection to serve two terms. The first centred around matters of procedure — he was described to Parliament as the architect of the *Supreme Court Act 1970* — and the second around administrative law. I was seconded in 1968–69 and others who were or had been Sydney academics included K. C. T. Sutton, Dyson Heydon, and C. S. Phegan. Manning also was responsible for the establishment of the Law Extension Committee of the University to conduct the newly introduced training courses for the Joint Examinations Board of the Supreme Court. It was always presided over by a judge but members of the Faculty served on the committee and one of the specially appointed lecturers in charge of the courses, Ross Anderson, later came to teach degree courses in the Faculty for a number of years. Dr Gordon Elkington, in the reverse process, was seconded from the Faculty to be senior lecturer and Director of the Law Extension Committee. For a number of years after its inception the Committee had the advantage of Justice Colin Begg acting as chairman.

The medallist at the beginning of 1966 was M. G. Gaudron, the fifth of those who graduated in law from the University of Sydney during the period of this chronicle to be elevated to the High Court of Australia. There is a story to the effect that on her initial appointment as a Deputy President of the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission in 1974 the Minister had occasion to refer to the modest circumstances of her early life. The Prime Minister, according to the story, considered that the picture was being painted unnecessarily graphically and complained that the next thing the Executive Council would be told was that she was born in a manger. She afterwards resigned from the Commission before being resurrected to the High Court. The student editor-in-chief of the *Review* for the 1966 issue was R. D. Giles.

At this time the Faculty was being strengthened particularly in the criminal area. New arrivals were the psychiatrist, Dr O. V. Briscoe, and Dr Duncan Chappell. The Institute of Criminology was shaping up. Outside this area there was a stream of arrivals who would advance in status as academics in Sydney or elsewhere: J. P. Ball, P. J. Hanks, D. E. Harding, D. J. Harland, G. Kenneally, and for a time G. D. MacCormack, J. R. Peden, K. C. T. Sutton and G. De Q. Walker. By 1967 the part time teachers included the future Chief Justice Gleeson and Justice Lee of the Supreme Court, and two future justices of the Federal Court of Australia, W. M. C. Gummow and I. F. Sheppard. The student editor-in-chief of the *Review* of that year was A. G. Fergus and in the following year W. J. Coleman. In that year M. D. Kirby, future President of the Court of Appeal, was graduating LLM with first class honours.
Research Assistants

By this time the University was increasingly recognising the need of the Faculty for research assistance and this became a stepping stone for some to a legal academic career. J. G. Mackinolty at first — and for some time thereafter — appears as a shadowy figure emerging from the mists of Melbourne as research assistant especially to Professor Benjafield. Thereafter he was to become lecturer, senior lecturer, Sub-Dean, Dean, and Chairman of the Academic Board. In cognate activities he was known, like that husband of the virtuous woman in the book of Proverbs, in various Councils of the elders such as the Staff Association and the University Senate. In the latter body he came to be known — somehow — as the voice of sweet reason. It was, however, in his capacity as Sub-Dean that the mysterious shadowiness which surrounded him was most acutely felt. The theory seemed to be that Mackinolty would attend to day-to-day affairs while the Deans, at first Shatwell, Benjafield for a short interregnum in 1968, and then Benjafield again after Shatwell’s relinquishment of the task, would attend to high matters of State. But the Deans did not appear to be quite certain what the day-to-day affairs involved. As in the case of the inconspicuous elephant in the *Wallet of Kai Lung*, there was a strong feeling that Mackinolty’s influence in the administration was massive if unobtrusive. Once Mackinolty disappeared altogether, only for us to receive a burst of intelligence somewhat later from Lord Scarman in England that Mackinolty had been quietly straightening out the administration of the Law Commission in that country.

Another for whom the post of senior research assistant was a springboard during this period was C. S. Phegan, future Professor of Law in the School and Dean of the Faculty. Phegan had first come sharply to the attention of Parsons and me some years earlier when, as an undergraduate, he tried out for the School’s mooting team with a number of others and impressed with his skill in oral exposition. He continued a member of the team in the following year. This was the strongest the School was to produce for many years, sweeping the opposition aside on its way to winning the Australian trophy for that year. Other team members were R. D. Giles, now of the Supreme Court, R. O. Blanch, now Director of Public Prosecutions for New South Wales, and J. R. Goldring, recently appointed Foundation Dean of the new Law School at the University of Wollongong. As a research assistant one of Phegan’s tasks was to help in the preparation of the third edition of *Cases on Torts* with me and authors in other Law Schools, and he thereupon became a co-author of later editions. In this respect the pattern was followed by Carolyn Moloney (now Sappideen) who came as senior research assistant in 1970, helped with the fourth edition of *Cases on Torts* and thereupon became a co-author of subsequent editions. She later taught and wrote in a variety of fields as well as undertaking administrative work, especially in postgraduate matters. At the time of writing it is sad to learn that Sydney has been bereaved by her departure to Monash.

Down Town or Campus?

In the closing years of the sixties the School was to become involved in a number of activities which were relevant to the shape of the School in the seventies. The first concern was the future location of the School. The Phillip Street side of it — the ‘old building’ part of the existing location — became increasingly ramshackle and the provision of a new building became requisite. The students interested themselves in the matter on behalf of those who would follow them and would sing, ‘We want a law school’ in roaring fashion on public occasions when University and professional dignitaries were present.

At first the Faculty decided that the best course would be to move the school to the University campus, and plans were developed to place the Law School on the site of the tennis courts between the Great Hall of the University and the lodge at the entrance from Parramatta Road. However, it would not be overstating it to say that Professor Parsons was dismayed by this decision. At that time, and for long afterwards, he was specially concerned with the LLM by course work, which had become important in replacing for most students the previously existing LLM by thesis. He could not conceive that, on the part time evening basis on which it had to be conducted, it would be satisfactory either for the LLM courses to be moved to the University...
or for them to be conducted in the city in circumstances in which the vast majority of the facili­ties would have disappeared to the University campus. He would paint graphic pictures in the common room of future facilities in the city resembling Neville Shute's Melbourne of *On the Beach*.

For my part, I was concerned at the difficulties for articled clerks of relocation of the school while the articles system remained in force. In fact, the solicitor's Law Society would move to abolish the articles system within a few years so that what most worried me would cease to have any force. But by the time the Law Society's attitude to articles changed, the final decision about the location of the School had had to be made. I could see one advantage in the move to the campus, in that it would facilitate the inclusion of third year Arts courses in the Arts-Law combination which up to that time enabled law students to obtain a BA degree without ever having pursued any Arts subject beyond a sequence of two. In fact Parsons and I, during the period in which the move was contemplated, made representations which were favourably received by the Arts Faculty for a change to the system to enable sequences of three courses in Arts in the BA-LLB combination.

The crunch came when Parsons was absent on leave and I was left to take the unacademic attitude of moving rescission of the decision to move to campus. At the conclusion of my address in support of this, the future Sir Kenneth Jacobs summed it up by saying that he had no doubt the same points had been made centuries before in opposition to attempts to get the surgeons out of the barbers' shops. To me this statement came to rank with his later proposition — relating to the efforts which Professor Benjafield was making at this time in the Law Reform Commission — that the *Supreme Court Act 1970* was a great leap forward in this State to 1870. However, some others were less enlightened than Jacobs. The rescission motion was carried, whereupon the Dean summed up the whole meeting by saying that it was probably the most disastrous decision ever taken in the history of the Law School.
A model of the proposed new Law School and the new courts facing the old Supreme Court and St James church in King Street.

The Four Just Men returned to grace the Phillip Street entrance to the Law School as a reminder of the old Phillip Street Law School. See also pp 56, 57.
What pushed me over the edge of the debate into possibly immortal ignominy was the collapse of the existing plans to remove the Law School to the campus. Commonwealth financial authorities on which the University was dependent had refused the tennis court site on the ground that it would spoil the sweeping grandeur of the view from the front of the Great Hall and of the front of the Great Hall. I had thought nostalgically of the move as one to the proximity of the quadrangle, that quadrangle in the centre of which classmate E. C. C. Lewis, later of the Family Law Bar, had performed his college initiation obeisances to an Allah supposedly reposing in the clock tower. The same clock tower in which, somewhat later, raiding New South Wales students armed with fireworks had accidentally set off their entire supply at once and been reduced to a desirable state of near suffocation after the doors jammed. In any case this quadrangle was now the old quadrangle, like the old market in George Orwell's *Coming Up For Air*, and there was to be no coming up for air for the Law School any more than for Orwell's corpulent hero.

The University Principal made it clear that the University was now a city, and what the Law School would have to expect was a site somewhere on the other side of City Road. Parsons, in his inspired rhetoric on this subject, had always described a move to campus as either a move to Newtown or a move to Darlington, and this now appeared as prescience. Some of the prospect of participating in a tight University community had evaporated.

The New Law School

Once the decision was made that the Law School should be built in the city, the Dean applied himself to bringing the project to fruition whatever his reservations about it. W. H. Maze, the University Deputy Principal, was fully experienced in building projects thanks to the city being built around the campus itself. The Dean of the Faculty of Architecture, R. N. Johnson, designed and supervised the building. Especially valuable in obtaining the necessary support was the assistance of Minister of Justice R. Downing and that of Sir Frederick Deer, long the chairman of the University Senate's Finance Committee. Professor Parsons was naturally prominent in advice about the academic requirements, the shape the building should serve. Professor Benjafield, in his circumstances, was alert to the need to make the building practical for the disabled which put it ahead of its time in this respect.

So a new building of fourteen storeys rose to confront St James Church and the old Supreme Court building across King Street between Elizabeth and Phillip Streets. Its towering domination of the scene was to be somewhat short-lived for the new law courts building was shortly to tower above it across Phillip Street. The lecture rooms which were of modest size in the expectation that this would facilitate communication between teacher and class, occupied
much of the three storeys below the main ground floor along with tutorial rooms. The large assembly hall occupied the main ground floor along with crowd space in front of the lifts and space for a branch of the University Co-op book shop. The lifts themselves were the invention of Leo Port who had been Lord Mayor of Sydney and had sat to assess the inventions of others on a television programme. But he did not live to hear many of the heated if not altogether glowing assessments of this invention of his own.

Above ground were student common rooms and associated union facilities, above them administrative quarters for the Law Extension Committee and an additional lecture room, above these again the library floors, then the floors for the teachers' studies, Law School administrative offices and the staff common room, squash courts and caretaker's quarters. The architecture generally was described by one reviewer as exhibiting quiet good manners.

**Divisive Issues**

But some incidents which occurred as the building was completed might be thought to have fallen short of the ideal in this last respect. It had been considered important that the lecture rooms should facilitate the Harvard case method of teaching and for this purpose it was proposed to affix numbers to the seats. But when this was done some of the numbers were torn off, and student representatives complained to the Dean in strong terms at this attempt at regimentation. This set off some lack of good manners in the staff room itself, arising out of the fact that the Dean had conceded to the students that it was unfortunate that the numbers had been affixed during the vacation. I felt called upon to express the opinion, rightly or wrongly, that this concession savoured of the abject, and the Dean later felt called upon to refer to my abrasive personality. Professor Stone sought to reason with the students and was
told by one that he had never made the acquaintance of any professor at the Law School and he intended to keep it that way. The Dean circulated a memorandum saying that he considered the student representatives were not interested in having meetings with him for liaison purposes on a friendly basis.

In his book *The Campus War*, published as a Pelican in 1972, the American philosopher John Searle regards it as characteristic of student activities of the time that they developed contentiousness which produced adversary relationships, and that older university people could not understand this because it was generally something outside their own experiences. It was certainly outside the experience of older people at the Law School, though it was characteristic also of what was occurring in other Faculties such as the conflict between adherents of philosophy factions in Arts and the conflict in the Economics Faculty about Political Economy. In some respects, however, the campus disturbances in Sydney departed from the pattern described by Searle. His account sees the student activists first searching out a sacred issue, with the conflict about it subsequently dividing the staff. The initial issue of student anonymity at the Law School was no doubt raised by the students themselves. But in Sydney students generally took up issues which were already coming to divide the staff.

A further matter which arose as the new building was being completed was curriculum revision, for which purpose a faculty committee was appointed in 1969. This led to a rift within Stone's department, for Blackshield opted for a variety of subjects in the field of jurisprudence which would be optional, while Tammelo opted for a single compulsory subject to continue.
While curriculum review was still proceeding at length in 1971, a protracted series of discussions took place at various levels about the arrangements to be made at the end of 1972 when Professor Stone was due to retire. One issue was whether departmentalisation should continue, and on this matter I supported the view of some future Deans in favour of amalgamation.

Oddly enough the ultimate result was a judgement of Solomon which nobody, as far as I am aware, then envisaged. The Department of International Law and Jurisprudence was cut in half. D. H. N. Johnson, the new Professor of International Law, preferred to be in the Law Department to emphasise the professional importance of his subject, while A. E. S. Tay, the new Professor of Jurisprudence, sustained her claim to continue a separate Department of Jurisprudence. The initial execution of the judgement of Solomon took place with such smoothness that the first I knew about it was when I objected to Professor Johnson's presence at a Law Department meeting — only to find that was where he was supposed to be.

But meanwhile the future of Stone's department was taking up the time of senior University administrators, and the Vice-Chancellor preferred not to settle the matter before advertising in general terms for three new professors, including the replacement for Professor Stone. Before the advertisements were placed, Shatwell departed for England for some months. It was agreed on all hands that Stone should be asked to accept the post of acting Dean, and Stone at first agreed. But then he declined because, he said, he would be too busy getting his papers into order to undertake the post. So I collected the task instead.

At the Faculty meeting at which I was elected there was a dispute concerning the use to which a student survey of staff was to be put. By then students were represented on Faculty and the President of the students' Law Society, Michael Joseph, sought authorisation for the general publication of the survey which had appeared in March. This was rejected on the motion of Miss Wood on the ground that it would mean unlimited publication of defamatory matter to which the persons defamed had no opportunity to reply. This was significant in that it served to give some indication to the students of where they might find alliance with members of the Faculty and where not. Olive Wood was one of three persons whose treatment by the University — in the matter of absence of promotion — was described as disgraceful in an introduction to the survey. The others said to be disgracefully treated were U. V. Baxi and G. D. Woods. Baxi expressed sympathy with the student view at the meeting. G. D. Woods had been promoted since the survey was written so that that independent and able member of Faculty, promoter of important social causes, had the momentary unusual experience of being a non-event.

The selection committee for the new chairs met at the beginning of September immediately after Shatwell's return from England. It recommended three appointments, that of Professor Clive Parry of Cambridge to a Chair of International Law, P. H. Lane of our staff, an expert on Constitutional Law and J. D. Heydon, fellow in Law at Keble College, Oxford.

Stone argued that his own choice for the Chair in Jurisprudence and International Law, Edward McWhinney, a professor at Simon Fraser University in Canada, should have been preferred to Parry. According to Stone, McWhinney had written expressing interest in the Chair, but no such letter had been received by the University. The Vice-Chancellor subsequently reported to the Academic Board that after making enquiries he had decided not to put Stone's alternative candidate to the committee. The Board resolved to adopt the committee's recommendations.

There followed a public campaign through, *inter alia*, the *Sydney Morning Herald* and an anonymous student magazine *Outlaw*, vilifying those who supported the new appointments and making exaggerated and misleading claims including the suggestion that the teaching of Jurisprudence was itself under threat. It was pointed out by more than one defender of the University that it was Stone's conduct which was open to question in his attempts to influence the choice of his successor, contrary to well established convention, and contrary to Stone's own protest at the time of his appointment.

A special meeting of Faculty was called and Stone moved that the Senate establish a Chair of Jurisprudence immediately. The motion was carried on a secret ballot by a large majority, but
The University Quad — under the clocktower. The teaching of law subjects on campus reminded some law teachers of their days as Arts students. Increased participation in campus affairs made this scene familiar to all staff.

the *Herald* report following conveyed the imputation that the Faculty had condemned the Senate. This unnecessary conclusion did not reflect the view of many who supported the motion on the understanding that it did not reflect adversely on the appointments recommended to Senate and which Senate had refused to reconsider. Stone also stated in the Professorial Board meeting following, that the Faculty had condemned the Senate for leaving Jurisprudence derelict. But the Board declined to endorse the Faculty view and simply forwarded the Faculty resolution to the Senate. The *Herald* did not report this either. Its next report was that Parry had stated in Cambridge that he declined the Chair because of literary commitments he had undertaken. The final Faculty meeting for the year took place on 20 December and Shatwell’s tribute to the departing Stone sadly had to be given in Stone’s absence.

There were hangovers of the dispute in 1973. Temporary arrangements had to be made for Jurisprudence pending the appointment of a professor necessitated by Parry’s withdrawal. The expedient adopted was to approach distinguished visitors, but Dr. Enid Campbell became indisposed soon after she had begun her segment and I had to finish it. It was a miserable experience and one over which I drew a veil.

Joseph wrote a letter published in the *ALJ*, again claiming that the issue at the Law School was whether Jurisprudence and other subjects within the Department of International Law and Jurisprudence would be taught at all. I felt bound to put in a plea in denial to the journal. So at this point this chronicle reaches its conclusion in what, as has been seen, was a shower of sparks.

**Aftermath**

Of a different order was a large gathering of judges, profession and staff to honour Shatwell on his relinquishment of his deanship. He was the last of the very long term Challis Professors of Law and long term Deans, whose tenures combined make up the largest proportion of the hundred years of the Law School’s history since lectures were begun on a comprehensive basis. He devoted himself to the major tasks of the Law School’s administration and preserved a reasonable degree of harmony until the last year or two. Despite the disharmony of those last years, the general processes of teaching went on, and the graduates continued to include persons of particular distinction in their subsequent careers. In 1969 the medallist was J. R. F. Lehane and A. R. Blackshield, P. L. Clyne, W. M. C. Gummow, and R. D. Klinger were first class honours masters graduates. In 1970 the medallist was K. Wee with R. G. Forster prox. acc. P. J. Kincaid was the first class honours LLM. J. J. Spigelman was the medallist in 1971 and in the following year R. A. Gelski. The next year the joint medallists were C. B. Penman and B. J. Ward.

John Searle points out that after the dust has settled from a crisis produced by campus warfare the formerly embattled administration is still there among the surviving filing cabinets. In the Law School’s version all the participants, in whatever interests, appeared to survive with an unimpaired future to which they could look forward. A future for Julius Stone included distinguished appointments in Australia and elsewhere and a continuing stream of accolades beginning with the decoration AO in 1973 and some years later an honorary LLD of the University of Sydney itself. As to the other members of his department at that time, a future for Ilmar Tammelo, succeeding to the Chair of Rene Marcie in Salzburg, Austria. Marcie had a happy visit with us all before the warfare developed but was tragically killed not long afterwards. A future for Upendra Baxi who was to become Dean at Delhi. A future for Tony Blackshield who had left for New South Wales in 1971, was subsequently the holder of two Chairs in succession, and was to achieve public prominence especially through championing the cause of Justice Murphy in the controversies which developed.

Among the student participants in the dispute, a future in particular for Deirdre O’Connor who was one of Joseph’s Vice Presidents of the students’ Law Society when he was President, and whom he married. She became prominent in the Law Reform Commission in New South Wales, then Head of the Australian Broadcasting Tribunal and is now a Federal Court judge.
A future for the ‘establishment’ figures. A future for the Vice-Chancellor, subsequently Sir Bruce Williams, and, when he relinquished his post in Sydney, occupying important governmental posts in the United Kingdom and Australia. A future for Kenneth Shatwell continuing as Challis Professor of Law for a year after his relinquishing of the office of Dean and retaining connections with the Institute of Criminology and government activity in the field after his retirement as Challis Professor. A future for David Benjafield as Dean and subsequently Sir Bruce Williams occupying important governmental posts in the United Kingdom and Australia. A future for Kenneth Shatwell continuing as Challis Professor of Law for a year after his relinquishing of the office of Dean and retaining connections with the Institute of Criminology and government activity in the field after his retirement as Challis Professor. A future for David Benjafield as Dean and subsequently carrying on his professorial teaching and writing under increasing difficulties until his death in harness. A future for Ross Parsons, including the writing of a comprehensive standard text in the field of taxation, and continued activity in the post-graduate work for which he had fought to retain the best possible conditions. A future, already described, for Peter Nygh who had not generally been included in the strictures levelled at other professors. A future for Pat Lane, one of the professorial appointments in the middle of the rumpus, extending the number and scope of his standard texts in Constitutional Law. A future for Dyson Heydon, the other professorial appointment at that time, as Dean of the Faculty and then in a successful career at the Bar. Some future even for me.

Some events occurred at the close of Shatwell’s period as Dean which were more or less independent of the dispute about Jurisprudence. The new system of practical training through the College of Law run by the solicitors’ Law Society was launched and I failed before the judges, arguing that the articles system should be continued as an alternative to the new system. However, some judges thought that my King Canute act trying to stem the surge of progress was well done, and I found myself on the board of governors of the College of Law along with John Peden, of the Sydney Law School staff, who had been called in at the outset. He moved to be professor at Macquarie during his period on the board until his untimely death.

In 1973 the arrangements for a radically changed Sydney law curriculum were completed to come into operation in 1974. There were far fewer compulsory subjects, with expanded opportunities for specialisation through optionals. An Arts Law, Economics Law and later a Science Law course could be completed in five years and the first three years could be completed on the University campus. This enabled at least one sequence of three Arts or Economics subjects to be completed for the non-law degree while the law subjects to be taken on campus during that period counted for the non-law degree as well.

Thanks to the teaching of law subjects on campus I found myself back in the old quadrangle for some periods each week. Once when I was waiting for the car to return to the Law School a mature aged woman student approached. ‘Fancy seeing a man in this day and age’, she said, ‘standing straight in hat and suit and lighting a pipe.’ Whereupon she squeezed my arm. A reward for retrogression.

Deirdre O'Connor, former head of The Australian Broadcasting Tribunal and now a Federal Court Judge.
The old Law School in Phillip Street was a good, but not outstanding example of down-at-heel dickensian. It had a stubbornly reluctant lift (maximum load 6 persons) and mean, narrow stairways; timber hand rails and bannisters were, like its students, slightly mobile upwards. It backed onto a more modern, but characterless construction fronting Elizabeth Street. At certain levels there was access between the two buildings, and the Law School spilled over to these accessible floors. The characterless construction had two lifts. They were under the command of Ron. It also had stairs, but they did not give ready access to the two main lecture halls, LSI and LS2, located on the fifth and sixth floors of the Phillip Street building.

We, the sixties generation, arrived in our hundreds. Entry was guaranteed by 4 Bs (one of them in English) in the old Leaving Certificate. A gentleman’s pass was 2 As and 4 Bs; anything in excess was in poor taste. We were all gentlemen, or at least we were addressed as such in lectures. And being gentlemen, we affected indifference to our rate of progress through examinations. After all, it was our right to stay at the Law School until graduation, no matter how long it took. There were stories (mostly true, we later discovered) of people who had failed Succession three and four times.

As if in concession to our numbers, expected to increase because of the postwar baby boom, there was an increase in full time academic staff. Harry Whitmore, Gordon Hawkins, Don McDougall, Enid Campbell (the only female member of academic staff) and Curt Garbesi arrived more or less at the same time as we did.

Our first task was to attend on Mrs Gaunson (and her dog, Sally) to collect the printed notes. We gave her our names, patted the dog and identified our subjects: in return she gave us the notes. Given a moderate measure of good fortune, we would soon strike up a friendship with a ‘repeat’ student whose assurances as to what would and would not be examined would facilitate a selective ignorance of their contents.

The students were classified either as full time (candidates for the four year degree course) or part time (a five year course). The difference suggested by the terminology was neither apt as a class distinction nor descriptively accurate. We were all employed or would become so well before we completed our studies. In the main we were articled to city solicitors. Our master solicitors tended to regard lectures as an unnecessary suspension of our legal education. Mutatis mutandis for the lecturers. The system survived because lectures were from 9 to 10 am, (Succession was 8.30 am to 9.30 am.), 4 to 5 pm and 5 to 6 pm.

Regularly, at 9.05 am and 4.05 pm, a chaos of students attempted to gain possession of the
lifts, despite the mandatory injunctions of Ron to take the stairs. Between 4.55 and 5.05 pm, the rule of law was suspended as hundreds of students descended via the stairs from LSI to LS2 and an equal number ascended from LS2 to LSI. We maintained a lively interest in *Indermaur v. Dames*.

Outside lectures the sexes were neatly segregated. The men's common room was in the Elizabeth Street building. Rumour had it that it contained a billiard table. The women's common room (4 chairs, 1 day'n'night lounge and 6 keyless lockers) adjoined the women's wash room where a two stand urinal stood as testimony to their equality before the law. Social contact between the sexes was had in the Catalina Coffee Lounge (housed on the ground floor of the Elizabeth Street building) under the proprietorship of a gentleman known only as Caveat Emptor. More daring mixed company was to be found in the ladies' lounges of the Phillip and the Balfour. The Phillip had an upright piano. It provided accompaniment for the Law School Song, The Ball at Shatwell's Hall. It had a rare — perhaps unique — distinction in that its chorus ('who'll sue me this time, who'll sue me now' etc.) was cleaner than that of the original.

Like the students, the lecturers were either full time or part time. In their case there was a relevant distinction. Apart from the new members of staff, the full time law lecturers were the Dean (Professor Shatwell), Professors David Benjafield, Ross Parsons and Bill Morison, and Pat Lane, Bob Roulston and Deryck Thomson. Jurisprudence maintained or was kept in its separate place adjacent to the women's common room — in deference (one supposes) to the controversy surrounding initial appointment to the Chair. It comprised Professor Stone, Professor Alexandrovitch and Ilmar Tammelo, the latter two arriving in 1961.

Most part time lecturers were from the Bar. A. F. Mason taught Equity, L. W. Street — Bankruptcy, F. C. Hutley — Succession, J. A. Lee — Procedure, G. J. Samuels — Pleading, T. J. Martin — Evidence. Aleco Vrisakis, a solicitor, taught Conveyancing.

The first thing to go was the lift in the Phillip Street Building. Stubbornness gave way to cunning: the lift developed an increasing tendency to lodge semi-permanently between floors. Our knowledge of the law extended to *Balmain New Ferry Co. Ltd. v. Robertson*. The slightly mobile upwards stairs became noticeably more mobile, including sideways and downwards.

The stairs and lifts were but a minor inconvenience to be replaced in short time by a grievance. Student photographs must be produced to the Dean's office. The printed notes would only be given to students who gave their student identity numbers and whose appearance bore some resemblance to the produced photographs. There was talk (in the Phillip and Balfour) of student protest. We produced our photos, memorised our student identity numbers and settled back to leisurely progress through the Law School; attending lectures when and if the lifts and stairs permitted.

It started as a rumour. Students who failed twice would be asked to show cause why they should not be excluded from Faculty. It became a University by-law. Some of us went to other Faculties. Most of us remained, but patronage of the Phillip and the Balfour declined.

It is not clear who started it, or why, but it became a free-for-all debate on legal education. Should there be part time students? Were articles of clerkship of any educational value? Did the Law School provide a sound legal education? We worked a little harder, hoping to graduate before the authorities found it necessary to provide answers. Patronage of the Phillip and the Balfour suffered a further decline.

Later, it was asserted that there would be a new Law School. There were those who favoured it being sited on campus, those who favoured a city location, the cynics and the sceptics. The cynics (of whom there were a few) suggested that it be an annexe to the Stock Exchange. The sceptics (female) had no reason to suppose that those responsible for their mysteriously irrelevant urinal would make good this extravagant threat.

We finished more or less at the same time as the Phillip and the Balfour. They were demolished to make way for the new Law School with preprogrammed lifts, soundly constructed stairways and a new generation of students competing for entry on a quota intake which, as if by magic, caused the part time course to disappear.
‘The Ball at Shatwell’s Hall’
Air — ‘The Ball at Kerriemuir’

Have you heard about the Law boys
And their Ball at Shatwell’s Hall?
There were four-and-twenty institutes
All dealing on the Law

Singing, who’ll sue me this time,
Who’ll sue me now.
The one that sued me last time
Has lost his action now

The Professor, he was there,
Sitting in the front,
Discussin’ on the theory
In Regina v. Hunt.

The Professor’s daughter, she was there;
She had us all in fits,
A-sliding off the mantelpiece
And serving out the writs.

The Judge is in the courtroom,
The Lawyer’s in the chair;
You couldn’t see the plaintiff
For the wigs of curly hair.
The new Law School — King Street.
The account which follows is based principally on personal recollection. It has been verified where possible by reference to such fragmentary records as are available. It is in part responsive to another account which, it will be argued, is seriously defective and misleading. But memory is always selective and frequently faulty so no claim is made to have provided a definitive, objective chronicle of what actually happened. The annals of crime are replete with examples of the unreliability of eye-witness evidence. And contemporary history writing is probably more likely to be contaminated by the author's prejudices and values than writing about periods long past.

The Institute of Criminology at the University of Sydney was the brain child of Professor Kenneth Shatwell, Dean of the Law School from 1947 to 1973. It was conceived in the early 1950s although parturition did not occur until around the end of that decade. According to one account the Institute was formally created in 1959. But it would be more accurate to say that it was informally created at that time.

When I was appointed Senior Lecturer in Criminology in 1961 no criminological teaching, research or activity of any kind was in progress although some library purchases in the field of criminology had been made. It was not until December 1966 that the Senate formally recognised the organisation and program of the Institute and granted authority to use the University crest.

The first annual report on the activities of the Institute was submitted to the Senate in 1967. By this time Mrs B. Shatwell had been appointed Honorary Secretary in addition to the appointment of three other lecturers. Mr Paul Ward was appointed to the position of lecturer in Statistics in October 1964; Dr Oliver Briscoe was appointed senior lecturer in Forensic Psychiatry in May 1965; and Dr Duncan Chappell was appointed lecturer in Criminal Law and Criminology in December 1965. In the same year, four postgraduate courses in Criminology leading to the degree of LLM and four diploma courses in Criminology were established.

In May 1965, an Advisory Committee was established under the chairmanship of Sir Leslie Herron, Chief Justice of New South Wales. Membership of the Committee was by invitation and Professor Shatwell had recruited a body of members which has been described by O'Malley and Carson, as incorporating what amounted almost to a Who's Who of the New South Wales judicial system. The Committee included three other judges in addition to the Chief Justice; the Chairman of the Metropolitan Bench of Stipendiary Magistrates and
another magistrate; the Minister of Justice, the Attorney-General and the Solicitor-General for New South Wales; the New South Wales Commissioner of Police; the Comptroller-General of Prisons, the Principal Probation Officer, and the Principal Parole Officer.

Formal recognition and approval by Senate came long after the Institute was fully operational. The fact that so much had taken place before the Institute attained formal recognition was not fortuitous. It was Professor Shatwell's view that it was always a mistake, if anything innovative or unprecedented was contemplated, to seek official approval in advance. To go through normal bureaucratic channels was to court endless prevarication and delay. On the other hand, presented with a fait accompli, the authorities would be unlikely to raise objections or make difficulties. Nor, in the event, did they.

O'Malley and Carson observed that the early advocates of criminology in Australia 'made great efforts to ally its cause with influential officials within the criminal justice and correctional systems and with the relevant state ministerial figures'. This was true both in the case of Dr Norval Morris and the establishment of the University of Melbourne's Department of Criminology in 1952, and in that of Professor Shatwell and the University of Sydney's Institute of Criminology later in the decade. In Sydney, the cultivation of this kind of extra-mural support was both politically astute and essential as there was no great interest in, nor sense of a need for criminological studies, either in the Faculty of Law or elsewhere.

It has been suggested by O'Malley and Carson that the enlistment of this kind of support and the establishment of the Institute of Criminology in the Law School had unfortunate consequences in that criminology became 'crucially tied . . . to the legal profession and to the administration of the criminal justice system'. Alliance 'with academic lawyers and state criminal justice and correctional officials' is said to have meant that the Institute's operations were 'in practice policed by state officials and members of the legal profession'. An article entitled 'The Need for Criminology in Australia' by 'two senior members of the Sydney University Institute', which appeared in The Australian Law Journal in 1967, is described as reflecting the 'subordination of criminology to the criminal justice system'.

To one who was 'present at the creation', this account seems to bear an almost inverse relation to the facts. To describe the desultory and intermittent involvement of state criminal justice and correctional officials in the affairs of the Institute as an exercise in 'Hegemonic Control' is, to say the least, whimsical. Their membership of the Advisory Committee was, in most cases, due to urgent proselytism by Professor Shatwell. Moreover, they were commonly outnumbered by others quite unconnected with the administration of criminal justice. These included: the Professor of Psychology and the Professor of Psychiatry at the University of Sydney and the Director of State Psychiatric Services; the Head of the Department of Social Work at the University of Sydney and the Head of the Department of Sociology at the University of New South Wales; and two doctors who were special advisers on alcohol and drug addiction. It may be worth mentioning also that the article which O'Malley and Carson see as subservient to the criminal justice system, was regarded by the New South Wales Commissioner of Police as highly critical.

The suggestions that the Institute of Criminology was 'squarely under the control of the law school'; that 'law [was] firmly in the driving seat'; and that the way in which the Institute was established and organised 'bonded and subordinated the discipline to the legal profession'; bear little relation to reality. By most members of the Faculty of Law the creation of the Institute was regarded as something of an aberration on the part of Professor Shatwell. If there was any interest on their part in establishing 'the hegemony of the law in the criminological field', it was very well concealed.

The statement that in Sydney 'law and lawyers clearly played a leading role in shaping early criminological development', represents an extraordinary misapprehension. The first three appointments to the staff of the Institute (Hawkins, Ward and Briscoe) were not lawyers. Indeed they had no legal qualifications whatever. Apart from Professor Shatwell (about whose role more will be said later), the only lawyers who played any part in early criminological development were the late Robert Roulston and Duncan Chappell. Roulston, as senior lecturer in Criminal Law, was certainly involved from the beginning. But so far from playing a leading role in early criminological development, his attitude in those early years, while not unfriendly,
could best be described as one of quizzical scepticism. It is hard to imagine a less likely agent of ‘domination by lawyers’. Moreover, Duncan Chappell, who had just completed his PhD at the Cambridge University Institute of Criminology, although a lawyer, was less ‘bonded and subordinated . . . to the legal profession’ than any of his colleagues. Nor were practising, as opposed to academic, lawyers any more enthusiastic. Professor Shatwell would have been happy to achieve a ‘strong alliance with the legal profession’. But for most members of the legal profession, criminology was, and continues by many, to be regarded as a dilettantish and useless pursuit, rather than a serious subject of study.

It would not be inaccurate to say that Professor Shatwell’s own approach to criminology was somewhat dilettantish. As for the first three recruits to the teaching of criminology at Sydney, their approaches to the subject were as diverse as their backgrounds. It has been rightly said by Morris that ‘contemporary criminologists have tended to emphasise approaches derived from

There’ll Always
Be a Shatwell

(Tune: There’ll Always be an England)

There’ll always be a Shatwell
While there’s an SAB
And Darcy Dugan’s tutoring
In Criminology.

There’ll always be a Shatwell
While there’s an ALJ,
And Gordon Hawkins still objects
To joining the A.A.

There’ll always be a Shatwell
And long may he be Dean,
At least until we start to think
New Law School is a dream.

There’ll always be a Shatwell
To box on manfully,
Until he takes that last K.O.
He’ll rule our faculty.

And should we lose our Shatwell
Wherever should we be,
If Shatwell means as much to you
As Shatwell means to me.

Third Term Song
their own disciplines'. In this instance, the relevant disciplines were philosophy (Hawkins), psychology (Ward), and psychiatry (Briscoe). Until 1965, the teaching of criminology was confined to undergraduates. The principal textbooks assigned to students were not written by lawyers but by sociologists: Sutherland and Cressey's *Principles of Criminology* and G. B. Vold's *Theoretical Criminology*. The only person who might have tried to ensure that law and lawyers played a leading role in shaping early criminological development was Professor Shatwell. As Professor W. L. Morison put it in the *Sydney Law Review* 1989, 'the activities of the Institute were beyond the scope of most of the Department [of Law]'. But Shatwell showed no inclination to exercise any commanding influence; indeed his abstention from interference with either the form or substance of criminology courses was almost total.

His approach to criminology was both highly idiosyncratic and eclectic. It was also somewhat amorphous so that even if he had wanted to impose his views on others it would not have been easy for him to do so. It was impossible to discern any guiding principle behind the varied array of topics which he would from time to time recommend as suitable for investigation or research. His interest in any particular matter was often evanescent. He was not committed to any substantive view about the explanation of either criminal behaviour or the incidence of crime, and never espoused or commended any particular theoretical orientation. But that is not to say that his interest in the subject was desultory and aimless.

His initial interest in criminology seems to have derived in part from what the French call *nostalgie de la boue* and, in particular, a fascination with the careers of those for whom crime is a way of life. It was also partly derived from a conviction, based on observation, that the criminal justice system in New South Wales was ineffective, corrupt and inequitable in its operation. When we first met in England in 1960, the two objects of criminological study with which he was principally concerned were those defined by Nigel Walker as ‘the “natural history” of criminal behaviour’ and ‘ways of dealing with criminal behaviour . . . sometimes called “penology”’.

His conception of the subject was strongly influenced by personal contact with Professor Leon Radzinowicz, Director of the Institute of Criminology at the University of Cambridge, and Professor Norval Morris who was the first head of the Department of Criminology at the University of Melbourne. In particular, on the issue of the relationship between the theoretical and practical aspects of criminology, he agreed with Radzinowicz that ‘to rob it of practical function is to divorce criminology from reality and render it sterile’. He also shared Norval Morris's hope that the development of knowledge in the field of crime and criminal justice should not only have practical application but lead to reform.

Shatwell also accepted Radzinowicz's contention that 'one of the best ways for criminologists to maintain an empirical and realistic attitude, is to remain in close contact with those engaged in the administration of criminal justice and the treatment of offenders'. His agreement with this was reflected in the composition of the Institute's Advisory Committee. It was also reflected in the establishment in 1965 of postgraduate courses in criminology leading to the degree of LLM and to diploma courses in criminology. The latter were, as Duncan Chappell put it, 'intended mainly for persons lacking degrees or other tertiary qualifications who were members of the police force, or other sections of the public service involved in criminal justice including officers from the departments of justice, corrective services, and child welfare'.

The first diplomas in criminology were awarded in 1967. Since then, more than 500 candidates have completed the course. Writing in 1983, Chappell noted that the largest group of candidates 'comprised officers from the New South Wales Police Force, most of them possessing no previous tertiary education qualifications and admitted under the special by-law provisions of the Faculty of Law'. He went on to say:

... of the remainder, most persons had law qualifications, many of them magistrates from throughout NSW. By 1980, following some fifteen years of teaching within the diploma program, a significant proportion of those in senior management positions within the criminal justice system in NSW had attended the diploma course and, in most instances, successfully completed it.
The diploma course covered the areas of crime causation, statistics and research methods, psychiatry and the criminal law, and the administration of justice. The completion rate for the course averaged 80 per cent. Chappell remarks that although ‘exposure to the literature and research methodologies of criminology is believed to have been beneficial . . . it is unfortunate that no external agency has conducted an evaluation of these benefits’. It may be mentioned that although some diploma graduates have subsequently been appointed to such positions as Commissioner of Police, Chief Magistrate and Law Reform Commissioner, there have been others who have since served terms of imprisonment.

A 1980 Faculty memorandum regarding the diploma claims that a major educational benefit of the course lay in the mixed nature of the groups which the classes brought together.

The course brings into one class people from both sides in the adversary system of criminal justice. Policemen especially tend to talk only to other policemen and one of the most frequent unsolicited comments received by teachers in that diploma from successful students is how much benefit they have obtained from being in a class where they can discuss their views and hear the often opposing views of other students and/or the lecturers.

Most of those with experience of the course would agree with Professor Shatwell’s claim that the course had ‘greatly benefited by the admission of suitable diploma students actively involved in various aspects of criminal law enforcement, whether as police, magistrates (present or future), prison officers or child welfare officers’.

Shatwell believed that, in addition to the teaching of criminal law at undergraduate and post-graduate levels, the Institute should fulfil a community education function and foster public interest in, and discussion of, topics of importance and concern in the criminal justice field. Accordingly in the late 1960s, he initiated a series of public seminars dealing with issues related to crime and criminal justice. Public seminars continue to be held by the Institute and are open to anyone wishing to participate. Audiences are typically made up of judges, members of the legal profession, employees of government departments and agencies, academics and researchers, students, representatives of community action groups, the media, and members of the corporate sector.

The seminar format involves the circulation of papers to participants which are then spoken to on the day by their authors and form the basis of discussion at the seminar. Seminar topics remain extremely varied, ranging from highly specific matters such as male sex offences in public places and incest, to more general subjects like white collar crime and sentencing. The object of the seminars is not to instruct nor to indoctrinate, but to provide a forum for discussion and the free expression of opinion.

The introduction of the public seminar program provided, for the first time in Australia, an active forum for meetings by academics, criminal justice practitioners and others knowledgeable in the field from all over the country. Today, the Australian Institute of Criminology in Canberra also performs this function. Until the Australian Institute got under way in the mid-1970s, Sydney alone provided what Sir John Barry called ‘a common market . . . for the formulation and presentation of ideas and hypotheses and, where it is available, verified knowledge upon criminological topics’.

The papers and discussion were recorded from each seminar and later published in the Proceedings of the Institute of Criminology. The Proceedings has now been superseded by the Institute’s journal, Current Issues in Criminal Justice. This journal continues to enjoy an even wider readership than its predecessor, both in Australia and overseas.

In addition to the Institute’s journal, members of the staff of the Institute and those associated with it, either as senior scholars or students, published a wide range of articles in criminological or legal journals and books. In the decade of the 1970s alone some of the books published include: Morris and Hawkins, The Honest Politician’s Guide to Crime Control (1970); Ward and Woods, Law and Order in Australia (1972); Woods and Stein, Harsh and Unconscionable Contracts of Work (1972); Chappell and Wilson, The Australian Criminal Justice System (1972); Hawkins and Misner, The Criminal Justice System in the Northern Territory (1973); Campbell and Whitmore, Freedom in Australia (Rev. ed. 1973); Zimring and Hawkins, Deterrence (1973); Roulston, Introduction to Criminal Law in New South Wales.
In his review of the growth of criminology in Australia, Duncan Chappell remarks that 'an indigenous brand of criminology [has not] developed in the Antipodes'. Certainly nothing comparable with what has been called 'the Chicago school of criminology' has developed in Sydney. In this connection it is notable that O'Malley and Carson are critical of the Sydney Institute for not having engaged in 'the business of theorising the Australian legal order and criminal justice system', but having adopted an approach which is 'empiricist and policy related [and] heavily invested with pragmatism'.

This is not altogether inaccurate but at the same time not entirely deplorable. The results of 'theoretically propelled research' too often tend to reflect the parti pris of the investigator and to confirm the theory that provides the propulsion. As social historian J. H. Hexter has remarked, those who 'would rather arrive at conclusions than start with them may see some virtue in a work plan that places the conclusion at the end rather than at the beginning of an investigation'. Moreover, to describe the criminology which was taught at Sydney as empiricist or pragmatist or positivist is misleading in that it implies that there was some kind of consensus among those who taught the subject which would justify the application of those, or some other, fashionable party-labels. In fact there was no uniformity of substantive interest or ideological commitment. Nor did Shatwell or any of his successors as Director of the Institute attempt to impose or encourage some specific theoretical orientation.

Thus in publications by those associated with the Institute, there is a considerable diversity in style, subject and method of treatment. The history of criminology is sometimes taught as though it were a series of conflicts between opposing 'schools' or election campaigns between rival factions. This is a perfectly legitimate teaching device. But when the history of criminology in Australia is written, it will be very hard to fit Sydney into this kind of conceptual framework unless perhaps eclecticism is regarded as a satisfactory classification for that purpose.

In an essay of this nature it is difficult to avoid a note of what has been called 'self-congratulation and institutional boosterism'. But it is surely not egregious to claim that the Institute has made a respectable contribution to the enlargement of knowledge of crime and delinquency, and of the operation of criminal justice systems in Australia. The resulting critical examination of the interrelated problems of crime, its control and the administration of criminal justice has, in some areas, led to reform. In this connection it is not irrelevant to mention that John Avery, the present New South Wales Commissioner of Police and member of the Advisory Committee of the Institute, is a graduate of the criminology diploma course.

It would be foolish to pretend that the Institute has by its efforts produced any substantial diminution in the squalor, inefficiency and inequity which continue to characterise the administration of justice in New South Wales. The most that can be said is that it has drawn attention to some of those ills, made specific suggestions for amelioration, and contributed to knowledge of the facts, which is an essential precondition of effective reformative action. That is no small claim to make on behalf of a venture which was seen by many members of the Faculty at its inception, as an ill-judged and eccentric enterprise. The Institute of Criminology, in the fourth decade of its existence and the last decade of the century, under the directorship of Mark Findlay, one of its former postgraduate students, may well develop along new and quite different lines. As Antonio says in The Tempest, 'what's past is prologue'. What's to come is in the hands of a new generation.
Research into the effects of a strike by prison officers in 1984 was undertaken by Jenny David, lecturer in Criminal Law and Criminology and Paul Ward, acting head of the Institute of Criminology. Two final year law students, Margaret Jones and Randal Odgers, seen here with Ms David, were research assistants for the project.

ENDNOTE

To a large extent, this account has been written in response to an article by Pat O'Malley and Kit Carson 'The Institutional Foundations of Contemporary Criminology' in The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology (1989), 25 (3): 333-355. A fully footnoted version has appeared in the Institute of Criminology's journal Current Issues in Criminal Justice (1990), 2 (1): 9-17. A list of seminar Proceedings produced by the Institute is available at the Sydney University Law School Library. Other works referred to are:


L. Radzinowicz, In Search of Criminology (1961)


J. H. Hexter, Reappraisals in History (1979)
Queens Square, Sydney. The new Supreme Court building, opened in 1977, and the MLC Building dwarfed the Law School and the Francis Greenway designed St James' Church. Queen Victoria has now been moved to a more central position in the Square.
The retirement of Professor K. O. Shatwell as Dean of Sydney University Law School in December 1973 brought to an end an era in the Law School's history. Although Professor Shatwell was to continue as Challis Professor of Law until his retirement on 31 December 1974, he effectively ceased to hold any administrative position in the Law School upon relinquishing the office of Dean. During his period as Dean some major changes had occurred in the direction the Law School was taking. The numbers of students increased dramatically from the immediate postwar period, when many ex-Servicemen entered the Faculty, culminating in the introduction of quotas restricting admission to the Law School. The period also marked the transformation of the Faculty from an essentially undergraduate school staffed primarily by part time teachers to one with a considerable enrolment of post-graduate students, staffed predominantly by full time academics.

Other major changes transformed the Law School from what it had been when Professor Shatwell first came to Sydney. Articles of Clerkship virtually disappeared, being replaced by a full time skills course in the College of Law to be undertaken at the conclusion of university studies. Most students now attended the Law School full time rather than as part time students who spent a great deal of their day working in legal offices as articulated clerks. This change was reflected in the Law School by the fact that no longer was it a place where young men (there were very few women) attended the Law School in their three-piece suits, with hats and furled umbrellas. The Law School became much more casual, and this was quite evident in the dress of the students. By the end of Professor Shatwell's period as Dean the number of women students had grown considerably and continues to grow to this day.

The abolition of university fees in 1974 brought about a general increase in people seeking admission to universities and it was inevitable that the demand for places in courses of legal studies would increase. In 1971 a Faculty of Law was set up at the University of New South Wales so that the Sydney University Law School ceased to be the only university Faculty in the State providing a degree in law.

The introduction of a Master of Laws degree by course work, capable of being undertaken by part time study, led to the return of many graduates of Sydney University and the enrolment of graduates of other universities in large numbers. At the same time, the undergraduate curriculum was revised, with a departure from the previous system whereby students were required to undertake a number of compulsory subjects for the degree. Optional subjects were
introduced in the fourth year of the Bachelor of Laws degree. The phasing out of part time students led to the combined Arts/Law and Economics/Law degrees being reduced in length from six years to five years.

It was against this background that Professor Shatwell retired. The office of Dean was, at that time, held for a period of two years, and as it was known that Professor Shatwell was due to retire at the end of 1974 when he would reach the compulsory retirement age of 65, the question of his successor as Dean became one of considerable interest. Although a Dean was elected every two years, there was never any question that there would be a contested election while Shatwell was Chairman. By mid-1973, Professor Julius Stone having retired, no immediate successor to Professor Shatwell was evident.

The most senior professor in the Law School was Professor D. G. Benjafield who had been Dean of the Faculty in 1968 during Professor Shatwell's absence overseas. In the period immediately prior to Professor Shatwell's impending retirement, Professor Benjafield was on secondment to the New South Wales Law Reform Commission although he regularly attended Faculty meetings during this period of special leave.

It had been a tradition within the University that the office of Dean was invariably filled by a Professor. In the early 1970s, however, there was a departure from this tradition in the Faculty of Agriculture where a non-professor had been elected as Dean. When speculation began concerning Professor Shatwell's successor in the office of Dean, John Mackinolty, a Senior Lecturer and Sub Dean of the Faculty, announced that he would stand. It was also understood that Professor Peter Nygh would be a candidate. At that time there existed no definite procedures for the nomination of persons seeking the office of Dean. The practice which was followed was simply to nominate someone from the floor of the meeting on the day of the election.

In July 1973 the Faculty had discussed a number of options relating to the selection and appointment of Dean of the Faculty. A University discussion paper had been circulated which, inter alia, raised the possibility of a full time administrative Dean and the appointment of a permanent Dean. The latter option proposed the appointment of a Dean for a fixed period of five years, subject to further re-appointment, to act as executive officer of the Faculty and to represent the Faculty in the University's central administration. The office was essentially an administrative one. These proposals met with some opposition on the ground that the loss of the Faculty's right to elect a Dean would result in some loss of independence. In the end, the Faculty resolved to continue the existing practice of electing a Dean every two years, although there was considerable support for the proposition that a person should not hold the office of Dean for more than two consecutive terms. A motion to this effect, moved by a student member of the Faculty, Mr J. J. Allen, was narrowly passed.

In October 1973 it was announced that Professor Benjafield had been appointed Head of both the Departments of Law and of International Law and Jurisprudence for a period of three years as from 1 January 1974. If, in the meantime, a Professor of International Law and Jurisprudence were to be appointed, that person would assume the position of Head of the latter department. The same Faculty meeting had on its agenda the election of Dean for the two years commencing 1 January 1974. At that stage it was known that there would be two candidates only, namely Professor Peter Nygh and Mr John Mackinolty. Rumour had it that Mackinolty had sufficient support to be elected. The election was preceded by some discussion as to the form of election, it being necessary for the first time to conduct a ballot. The Faculty resolved that the election should be by secret ballot and that if there were three or more candidates, a preferential voting system should be adopted.

Nominations were then called for the office of Dean. Professor Peter Nygh, Mr John Mackinolty and, to the surprise of many, Professor David Benjafield, were nominated. In the ensuing election Professor Benjafield was elected. His popularity with all of his colleagues ensured the result. He was to serve a second term as Dean, a term punctuated by long periods of illness which eventually culminated in his untimely death in 1980. His decision to offer himself for the office of Dean was made no more than 24 hours prior to the meeting. Of his colleagues, certainly Professor Shatwell had an influence on this decision.

Sir Laurence Whistler Street, 1984, oil on canvas on board by Reg Campbell. Presented by the University of Sydney Law Graduates Association, 1984. University of Sydney Collection.
Professor David Benjafield. The late Dr Robert Stein arranged for the collection of funds for and the commissioning of this portrait by Noel Thurgate. It now hangs in the Law School Library.

In standing for Dean, Professor Benjafield was motivated by the desire to maintain unity within the Faculty, and in this regard he was certainly successful. There is no doubt that either of the other two candidates would have been able to fill the office of Dean quite capably. Mr Mackinolty became Dean of the Faculty after the retirement of Professor Dyson Heydon and Professor Peter Nygh became the foundation Dean of the Macquarie University Law School. But Professor Benjafield was able to heal the divisions within the Faculty which had surfaced in the latter part of the Shatwell years.

David Gilbert Benjafield was educated at Sydney Grammar School where he had been a scholarship student. Like his father, David Benjafield wished to become a medical practitioner. At school he was quite capable at sport and was an extremely good marksman in the Cadet Unit. At the age of fifteen, however, he was stricken by poliomyelitis which left him confined to a wheelchair for the rest of his life. He was paralysed from the waist down and had to study for the Leaving Certificate by correspondence. His permanent incapacity also led to a change in his plans. It was not possible for him to study medicine, lack of facilities then making it impossible to attend lectures and practical classes. Accordingly, he decided to follow his elder brother into the law. But again, his incapacity limited the avenues open to him. It was impossible for him to become an Articled Clerk and consequently a solicitor as had his brother. He chose instead to become a barrister.

He entered Sydney University Law School as an undergraduate in 1941. His father, who practised as a Pathologist in Macquarie Street, would drop David off at the Law School before proceeding to his rooms. His academic record was outstanding and he regularly topped his year and won many prizes. He graduated in 1945 with First Class Honours and the University medal. He was called to the Bar in 1945 and for some two years maintained chambers of the ground floor of University Chambers in Phillip Street, the upper floors of which accommodated the Sydney University Law School. His lack of mobility limited his court appearances. However, he was, even at this early stage of his career, well-known for the high quality of his opinion writing. He was one of a number of junior counsel who appeared for the Commonwealth in the Bank Nationalisation case, in which he was led by Dr H. V. Evatt. Other counsel who had rooms in University Chambers were Mr Justice Paul Toose and Sir Maurice Byers.

Shortly after graduation, Benjafield began his long association with the Sydney University Law School. At first, he acted as a tutor for external students, especially for ex-Servicemen who had returned from World War II. Professor Shatwell, the then Dean, on many occasions urged Benjafield to become a full time teacher and eventually, in 1948, he did so. He was promoted to senior lecturer in 1952, the year in which he was awarded the degree of Doctor of Philosophy by Oxford University. The opportunity to pursue doctoral studies at Oxford had been made possible by a scholarship. In late 1950, David and his wife, Shirley, had taken up residence in Lincoln College, Oxford, a college at which his life-long colleague, Professor Bill Morison, had commenced his doctoral studies in the previous year.

Upon his return to the Sydney University Law School, Benjafield began extensive research and writing in the area of administrative law. His book, *Principles of Australian Administrative Law*, was for many years the only authoritative Australian text on the subject. The first edition was written in collaboration with Professor Wolfgang Friedmann, while later editions were co-authored by his former student, Professor Harry Whitmore. In 1955, Benjafield was promoted to Associate Professor and in December 1959 to a Chair in Law, bringing the number of professors in the Faculty to three.

Benjafield twice served as a member of the New South Wales Law Reform Commission and was on secondment to the Commission at the time of his election as Dean. He had been one of the original members of the Commission in the 1960s, working primarily on the Supreme Court Act of 1970. In his second term with the Commission in 1972 and 1973, he was mainly involved with work in the field of administrative law. One of the consequences of his work in this second period was the enactment of legislation setting up the office of Ombudsman in New South Wales.

Professor Benjafield taught a number of subjects in the Law School including Constitutional Law, Real Property and Administrative Law. He was an excellent teacher and was
extremely popular with students and staff alike. This popularity, which amounted to universal admiration, served him well in his two terms as Dean. His Deanship was a period of consolidation without any major changes or upheavals. To Faculty members he was an excellent colleague, a kind and considerate man whose door was always open to anyone who needed advice or assistance.

Benjafield had an endearing sense of humour. On one occasion, in the late 50s, he was lecturing in Real Property when a prominent student politician, immaculately dressed in dinner suit, came into the lecture room about thirty minutes late. This was at a time when University by-laws permitted lecturers to fine students who arrived late at lectures. On this occasion, Benjafield stopped, looked up and said, ‘So glad you could come’. He then proceeded with his lecture. In later years, a colleague recalls that he approached Professor Benjafield to enquire whether his Scotch, which he liked to imbibe occasionally, was diminishing without apparent cause, the colleague having experienced a similar occurrence. Benjafield replied, ‘I did until I put up a sign in Greek saying “This is poison”.’

David was always ready to tell a story against himself and, though certainly not enjoying such necessities as being hoisted aloft into aircraft by means of a fork lift, to make light of his difficulties. He would recall that his good friend Professor Rupert Cross of Oxford, who was blind, used to joke with David that there was no sense in their going out on the town lest he, Cross, became paralytic and David blind drunk. Friends also recall his special enjoyment in attending a Swann and Flanders performance in Sydney.

Benjafield would never seek aid and it became a challenge and a matter of pride for all at the Law School to anticipate his needs. One of his research assistants recalls a serious (if not morbid) discussion with David about what would be best to do if there was a fire in the old Law School. This was neither idle nor paranoid in a building whose lifts and stairs have been so graphically described by Mary Gaudron. Benjafield’s office was on the first floor facing onto Phillip Street. They concluded that in the event of fire the only sensible action was for his research assistant to throw him out the window and hope for the best. Accompanying the Benjafields to a concert in the old Sydney Stadium re-inforced this concern about fire in public places and wheelchairs.

In his four years as Dean, Professor Benjafield was supported in his administrative duties by a number of Sub-Deans including John Mackinolty, Olive Wood, Colin Phegan, Stan Hotop, Robert Austin, Bohdan Bilinsky and Greg McCarry. In 1977, while he was absent due to ill health, Professor David Johnson, Professor of International Law, acted as Dean. Also, following the retirement of Professor Shatwell, Associate Professor Bob Roulston held the office of Director of the Institute of Criminology.

The Faculty

No major changes occurred within the Faculty during the period 1974-1977. A considerable time was spent discussing procedures for election of Dean but without any changes being introduced. The period did, however, see more active participation in the Faculty by student members, and an increase in representation of students on the Faculty including the addition of a representative for post-graduate students.

One of the major problems facing the Faculty during this period, and one which was to continue for many years thereafter, was the question of quotas imposing limits upon entry into the Faculty. Of particular note was the large number of graduates in other Faculties seeking entry into the Faculty of Law. These applications greatly exceeded the number of similar applications to other Faculties and, even at this early stage, the Faculty was able to take no more than about 30 per cent of all those who had applied for entry. This gave rise to the question of how applications by graduates from different disciplines were to be assessed, and especially, whether emphasis should be placed upon results at the matriculation examination or on the quality of the first degree. Another concern was the fact that by permitting entry to too many graduates, students entering the Faculty straight from school would be disadvantaged.
Consideration was given to treating the LLB as a post-graduate degree, but that proposal was not adopted. Another issue was whether assumed knowledge in some subjects should be required as a pre-requisite to entry. Here, apart from a satisfactory knowledge of English, no conditions were imposed. The matriculation policy, however, was under constant scrutiny and suggestions were made that a 'Law School Aptitude Test' in line with the US precedent, be introduced. Again, the matter did not progress beyond the discussion stage.

In the latter part of Professor Benjafield's Deanship, the Faculty began a further review of its curriculum, and especially of the large number of compulsory subjects. This review was to develop into an on-going activity leading to changes in the curriculum from time to time.
Membership of Faculty

Between 1974 and 1977 a number of changes occurred in the membership of the Faculty, with a number of new appointments as well as some resignations and retirements.

Professor K. O. Shatwell, Challis Professor and Dean of Law from 1947, retired at the end of 1974. Mary Gaudron resigned as part time lecturer in Succession to take up an appointment as a Deputy President of the Commonwealth Conciliation & Arbitration Commission. She was later to become Solicitor-General for New South Wales and subsequently a Justice of the High Court of Australia. She was to become the first woman to be appointed to the High Court of Australia. Other resignations included Dr Peter Kutner, Dr Robert Misner, and Dr Wayne Westling, all of whom returned to the USA to take up academic appointments, Dr W. E. Lucas, Mr S. N. Verdun-Jones and Mr Peter McGonigal. In early 1974, Professor Peter Nygh resigned to take up the Foundation Chair of Law at Macquarie University. At the same time David Harland and John Peden were promoted to Associate Professor with the latter, in May 1974, taking up the second Chair of Law at Macquarie University.

In the four years from 1974 to 1977 a number of new members of staff joined the Law School. Professor Alice Tay, who had been appointed to the vacant Chair of Jurisprudence in 1974, attended her first Faculty meeting in March 1975. She served as a Fellow of Senate from October to December 1977. Other appointments included Christopher Arnold, Peter Butt, Leroy Certoma, Richard Feetham, Dr Geoffrey Flick, Andrew Koroknay, Greg McCurry, Caroline Needham, Peter Paterson, Robert Stein, Richard Vann and John Wade.

The Law School continued to be served by many eminent part time lecturers including Murray Gleeson (later Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of New South Wales), Bill Gummow (later of the Federal Court), Graham Hill (later of the Federal Court), Ted Lusher QC (later of the Supreme Court of New South Wales), Roderick Meagher QC (later of the NSW Court of Appeal), Bill Priestley (also of the NSW Court of Appeal), Paul Stein (later of the Land & Environment Court), Tom Waddell QC (later Chief Judge in Equity), Keith Mason (later Solicitor-General for New South Wales), Mr R. Giles (later of the Supreme Court of New South Wales), Mr E. Solomon, Mr N. J. Moses, Mr M. H. Tobias QC, Mr J. M. Bennett, Theo Simos QC, Bryan Beaumont (later of the Federal Court) and many others.

There were also some changes in outside representation on the Faculty of Law. Mr N. R. McDowell represented the Law Society of New South Wales and Mr Philip Powell QC, the Bar Association of New South Wales. The latter was replaced in June 1975 following his appointment as a judge of the Supreme Court of New South Wales, by Mr Peter Newman, later to become a judge of that same Court. In 1977 Mr Brian Herron QC (later Judge Herron) represented the Bar Association.

There were a number of further changes in the membership of the Faculty. The Hon Mr Justice Hope resigned to take up the appointment as Chancellor of the University of Wollongong. In 1975 Mrs Daphne Kok, later to become Deputy Chancellor of the University of Sydney, attended her first meeting of the Faculty as did Professor Harry Whitmore in his capacity as Dean of the Faculty of Law at the University of New South Wales. In 1976, Miss Mahla Pearlman became the Law Society representative. She was later to become President of both the Law Society and the Law Council of Australia.

In June 1975 Professor Clive Parry, Professor of International Law in the University of Cambridge, joined the Faculty as a visiting professor. His close association with the Law School, including a number of further visits to Sydney, lasted until his death in 1983.

One of the innovations contemplated was the appointment of a permanent Moots Director. Following his retirement from the Bench, Mr Justice McClemens, Chief Judge of the Common Law Division of the Supreme Court of New South Wales, considered accepting this appointment. He had earlier donated his personal library to the University of Sydney for use by the Institute of Criminology. Regrettably, his death in late 1975 led to the abandonment of the plan for a permanent Moots Director, although Sir Gordon Wallace, a former President of the Court of Appeal, assisted students to some extent.
Student Participation

During the 1970s, student participation in the affairs of the Faculty increased substantially. The President of the Sydney University Law Society and two other student members, one representing post-graduate students, served on the Faculty and on many committees. In 1974, Mr John Allen was President of the Society. He was followed in that position by Ken Brimaud, Colin Cook, Jim Thomson and Greg Pearce. Other active members of the Sydney University Law Society, including some who served as student members of the Faculty and of the Academic Board of the University, were Deirdre Sachs, David Brigden, Bernard Coles, Tony Cordato, Giles Tabuteau, Kim Garling, Michael Pembroke, Malcolm Turnbull, Paul Brereton, Christopher Barry and Geoffrey Standen.

On the academic side during this period medallists were Susan Charney (graduated 1975), Richard White (1976) and Margaret Allars (1977).

Sydney University Law Graduates’ Association

The Faculty maintained close links with the Sydney University Law Graduates’ Association which continued to provide support for the Faculty in many different ways. Members of the Faculty who served on the Council of the Association include Ross Parsons, Olive Wood (for many years its secretary), Bohdan Bilinsky (for many years its treasurer) and Jennifer Wily. The Law Graduates’ Association performed valuable work in maintaining a number of permanent standing committees dealing with specialised legal topics. These included the Taxation Committee under the chairmanship of Graham Hill; the Family Law Committee under Ray Watson QC (later of the Family Court); the Mining Law Committee under the chairmanship of Henric Nicholas QC, and the Criminal Law Committee.
The staff common room in the present Law School.
John Dyson Heydon was Dean of the Faculty of Law for only two years. Born in 1943, Heydon gained honours in his Sydney BA degree before proceeding, as a Rhodes scholar, to Oxford. There he completed the MA and BCL and became a tutor in law at Keble College. His appointment to a Chair at Sydney Law School in 1973 was soon followed by a four year term (1975–78) with the New South Wales Law Reform Commission. During his time as Commissioner he maintained his writing and much of his teaching load. When he ceased to be Dean he went to the Bar, but continued to do some teaching and was a part time Professor of Law until he resigned in 1981.

It is misleading in some ways to describe the years 1978–79 as 'the Heydon years'. The years of his deanship did not see any change in the direction or outlook of the School. The same eight professors remained (Roy Woodman, the most recent, having been appointed in 1977) and unless they were divided, their collective opinion held sway.

Nonetheless, the years 1978 and 1979 were significant for the Law School, because they foreshadowed the beginning of a period of transition and were the years when its objectives were determined.

The transition was the passing of central management and control of the Department of Law from an older group of teachers which included six of the seven Law Professors and John Mackinolty (whose extensive administrative contribution was increasingly important to the Law School during the 1970s) to a younger group which included Harland, Phegan and me. In terms of age, Heydon belonged to the latter group, but his abilities and force of circumstance took him into the deanship at a very young age and his views on most issues seemed to coincide with the professors of the older group. In this sense, therefore, his deanship straddled the transition, which became complete only when Morison, Parsons and Mackinolty retired in the mid-1980s.

During the brief term of the Heydon deanship, there were three broad currents of concern which gradually came to direct policies in later years. They might be identified loosely as: the demand for Faculty development; the constraints of the student-staff ratio; and the dead hand of departmental division.

This chapter is a brief attempt to identify the major issues in each of these areas during the Heydon deanship.
The Demand for Faculty Development

During 1978-79 real efforts were made within the University and within the Law School to develop a general policy on assessment of student performance in courses. The University's Academic Board produced a report on examinations and assessment late in 1977, and referred it to Faculties for comment. One of the recommendations was:

that a student's result in an undergraduate course should not be determined wholly according to any one form of assessment or examination unless in the opinion of the Faculty . . . there are special, clear and cogent reasons for doing so.

In effect the Board was proposing that 100 per cent unseen examinations were not satisfactory methods of assessment, and that unseen examinations should be combined with such other forms of assessment as essays, seminar papers, 'take-home' examinations and practical work. At least two forms of assessment should be adopted in every subject.

It was widely recognised at that time that law as a discipline lends itself well to a variety of non-examination forms of assessment, including research projects, various problem-solving exercises and activities designed to test the marshalling of arguments, such as moot court presentations. Unfortunately, most non-exam forms of assessment of legal knowledge are time-consuming and labour-intensive. In the 1978-79 period, classes in most compulsory subjects (and nearly all subjects were compulsory) numbered around 300 students. A compulsory subject taught by four or more full time academic staff, each of whom would be working at another subject as well, would have been considered very well staffed. In Administrative Law and Equity, among other subjects, there would sometimes be only one, two or three full time teachers. The Law School was barely able to staff a minimal program of straight lectures to large groups, with no tutorials in most subjects, and assessment by 100 per cent unseen examination.

In commenting on the Board's report and recommendations, the Faculty noted that there was considerable support for the view that it is beneficial to have more than one form of assessment. However, it was thought undesirable to impose more than one form of assessment if that was contrary to the judgment of the teachers concerned. Inevitably, the Faculty also noted that while different forms of assessment might be desirable in theory, they were not practicable in the Faculty of Law in view of its adverse student-staff ratio.

My recollection of the debate is still fairly vivid. A minority of Faculty members objected to any change in the pattern of total assessment by unseen examination, and would probably have objected whatever the staffing position might have been. Another minority was prepared to introduce non-examination forms of assessment at whatever personal cost for themselves and their colleagues. The middle ground was occupied by Faculty members who felt genuine anguish at their inability to respond to legitimate demands for a varied pattern of assessment. The debate made it very clear that the development of a system of assessment which the majority regarded as more effective, fair and reliable was being inhibited by lack of teachers.

The same message emerged in a discussion in 1978 on the subject of Faculty support of mooting. Debates about how to relate student participation in mooting to the formal curriculum and assessment programs are perennials of Law Faculty affairs. Each student generation raises the issue for renewed debate, not always properly researching its history. In 1978, student requests on Faculty for alterations to the system were given a sympathetic hearing. Once again, however, lack of teaching staff was a constraint upon policy formation. The member of Faculty who had assisted in organising the mooting program in 1978 expressed the opinion that mooting was sufficiently worthwhile to justify its being made compulsory. Nonetheless, and notwithstanding generous assistance from the judiciary and the legal profession, it was simply not practical to contemplate organising the number of moots which would be involved if the program were made compulsory, even for students in a single year.

The Faculty of Science's first tentative approaches for the introduction of a Science-Law combined degree program, or some other combination of Science and Legal Studies, were also greeted with some reserve because of the resources problem. Part of the Faculty's worries about practical legal training also reflected the constraints of limited staffing resources. This can be
seen in the response to the Law Society of New South Wales’ Practical Legal Training Review and Mr R. J. Ellicott QC’s proposal for a community legal aid service in the Darlinghurst area, to be staffed partly by law students.

Apart from limitations in staff, the Faculty had a very low maintenance vote, which restricted the supply of even such basics as stationery, and provided inadequate funds for conferences and travel. Perhaps most seriously of all, funds available for the library were inadequate, and the major injection of funds which should have been allocated when law subjects began to be taught on campus in the 1970s was never forthcoming. The result was that the Law library in Phillip Street was barely adequate for daily use and unable to keep up with the explosion of published legal material, while Law library facilities for Arts-Law, Economics-Law and other students of law on the main campus were so bad as to be scandalous.

When, therefore, Professor Bruce Williams, then the Vice-Chancellor, wrote to the acting Dean in November 1978 asking Faculty to review the advantages and disadvantages of locating First Year studies in law on the main campus, the outcome of the review was almost a foregone conclusion. The disadvantages of total re-location of Law I to the campus were obvious — very poor library facilities, and the subdivision of the Faculty into a group of campus-orientated teachers and a group based in Phillip Street. Had the issue arisen in later days, the Faculty might well have produced a more adventurous response than the one that it delivered in March 1979, which recommended no change to the existing arrangements. A Faculty in more strident voice might have demanded mirror facilities in Phillip Street and on campus, and might well have had a chance of obtaining them. In 1979, however, the Faculty was the campus’ ‘poor relation’ in Phillip Street and had no reason to suspect that any request whatever for additional funding would be productive.
The Constraints of the Student-Staff Ratio

It is not easy to compare figures on student-staff ratio in the Faculty of Law over the years, because the method of calculating the figure varied from time to time, and the circumstances of the Faculty underwent material changes. Nonetheless, it seems generally accepted that the University of Sydney's Faculty of Law had the worst student-staff ratio in Australia during the late 1970s and early 1980s, and a figure of 34:1 is often mentioned. Improvements in the 1980s were achieved partly by changing the basis of calculation. A different formula was adopted for counting LLM students. Additionally, changes to the LLM Degree requirements had the effect of removing a large number of LLM candidates from the University's records. Those who had completed all their course work but had not submitted their by-law papers, were allowed to graduate without the submission of the paper. Numbers in the early law subjects were dramatically reduced by an alteration to the standard for entry. This had the effect of preventing students in such Faculties as Arts and Economics from enrolling in law subjects unless they satisfied the admission standards for the combined Arts and Economics Law Degree Programs. Nonetheless the reduction of the student-staff ratio to about 22:1 by 1989 represented a real improvement in working conditions at the Law School and in the consequent effectiveness of teaching and research, even if the degree of improvement was not as great as the bare figures might imply.

The first step in any organised program to improve the student-staff ratio should obviously be to decide whether the improvement should be made by increasing academic staff numbers or by reducing student numbers. The choice is, very approximately, between a large law school servicing all areas of expertise and catering for a very large student population (roughly, the Harvard model), and a smaller and more specialised law school in which there is closer contact between students and staff but not every sub-discipline can be fully developed (equally roughly, the Stanford model). To the best of my recollection, this issue has never been debated at the Sydney Law School. Rather, it has been assumed, probably correctly, that the University would not be prepared to forego the loss of nett revenue which would be involved in substantially reducing the number of law students. They can after all, be educated very cheaply, even with an adequate student-staff ratio, compared with the cost of educating students in the sciences and some of the arts. It follows that at the University of Sydney, the objective by default is for the Law School to be a large establishment both in terms of academic staff and students (undergraduate and postgraduate), and consequently an establishment which offers expertise in all major legal subject areas.

To implement that objective, given the student-staff ratio of the 1970s, a massive recruitment drive was necessary. Obviously, additional academic positions could not be obtained while existing positions remained unfilled. During the Heydon years a concerted attempt was made to fill existing establishment positions, but staff turnover had the effect that there was virtually no nett gain in academic staff numbers. The lesson drawn by Heydon's successors was that his efforts in staff recruitment had to be duplicated, and if possible augmented, so that it would become feasible to ask the University to increase the number of academic positions on establishment.

Recruitment in 1978 began on a hopeful note. Four new members of staff arrived early in that year. Richard Feetham came to the Law School after a distinguished career at the South African Bar. He was to occupy the role of senior lecturer for two years, moving into private practice in Sydney early in 1980. Stephen Robb took up a lectureship early in 1978, and resigned to return to private practice at the end of 1979. Martin Krygier came as a lecturer in Jurisprudence at the beginning of 1978. He resigned some years later to accept the challenge of building Jurisprudence courses as a senior lecturer at the University of New South Wales. Joanne Terry remained with the Law School rather longer, teaching principally in the fields of Legal Institutions and Torts. She was one of the group who bore the brunt of enormous student numbers and particularly inadequate academic staffing in Legal Institutions during the late 1970s and early 1980s, when the Faculty had a policy of allowing any Arts or Economics student to enrol in that subject.
Ross Anderson took up his position as lecturer seconded to the Law Extension Committee in July 1978. As a committee of the University's Senate, the Law Extension Committee is formally separate from the Faculty of Law. It provides limited and supplementary instruction for the examinations administered by the Barristers' and Solicitors' Admission Boards which constitute an alternative to university law studies for admission into the legal profession. Although the Committee's role was originally intended to be temporary, it has functioned for nearly 30 years. Ross Anderson indirectly replaced Tom Cain, who had resigned to take up the position of head of the Law School at the Queensland Institute of Technology. Ross worked as principal lecturer for the Committee until 1981, when he was replaced by Dr Gordon Elkington, who had been appointed lecturer in 1979 and remains as Director of the Committee's program.

Terry Burke and Caroline Needham took up lectureships in August 1978, and remained with the Law School for the rest of Heydon's deanship. Both later resigned to enter private practice.

In addition to those of Feetham and Robb, there were four other resignations in 1979. Associate Professor Gerald Kenneally's departure in 1979 was especially sad for the Law School. Gerald had worked for many years with Ross Parsons in Company Law and Taxation. Apart from his substantial contributions to teaching and learning in those areas, Gerald was the life of the Faculty common room. His decision to retire on grounds of ill-health left a noticeable gap in the intellectual and social life of the School.

Greg Woods resigned his senior lectureship in 1979 to take up a position in the New South Wales public service. His principal academic field was criminal law, and he had worked with Professor Ken Shatwell and Associate Professor Bob Roulston for nearly a decade to build up the Institute of Criminology. Alex Koroknay, who was a lecturer teaching Commercial Law,
resigned to return to private practice. Christopher Arnold, who had arrived from England in 1975, resigned in 1979 to take up an academic position in Canada, and has subsequently settled in Nottingham. A generation of students at St Andrew’s college will remember Chris as senior tutor there.

The Faculty’s Report to the Australasian Law Schools Association in August 1979 showed a total undergraduate enrolment in law subjects of 1,633, with a further 446 postgraduates. At no time during the Heydon years did the full time academic staff at the level of lecturer or above (and there was only a handful of tutors) exceed 47. The gains made by appointments in 1977–78 were thwarted by resignations in 1979.

Resignations are both inevitable and, to a degree, healthy for a large institution like Sydney Law School. They rejuvenate the Faculty, introduce ideas and provide avenues for advancement. But this is only true provided that the level of recruitment equals or exceeds the level of resignations. In 1978–79, what was needed was a large excess of recruitment over resignation so that the Law School could persuade the University to create more establishment positions. To my knowledge, the Law School has never succeeded in filling all establishment positions before others resign. Fleetingly in the mid-1980s, all establishment positions which were not occupied were the subject of accepted offers, and at that time it was possible to obtain several new lectureship positions. But no sooner had offers been accepted than resignations were received. In the 1970s, there were always unfilled positions in respect of which offers had not been made.

Apart from the obvious need to ensure unanimity within the law contingent on appointments committees, it became clear that extra efforts would be needed to develop an interest in academic law. Methods included personal contact with promising students, enlisting the assistance of foreign academics, contacts made and developed through Faculty visitor programs and personal visits abroad, and publicising academic vacancies in recruiting visits overseas. Heydon made a significant advance for the Law School in many of these ways, and the quality of applications received during his deanship was high. The history of the Law School’s expansion during the 1980s was largely the history of development of the foundations laid by international academic contacts opened up during Heydon’s deanship.
The Dead Hand of Departmental Division

It sometimes appears to outsiders that the intensity of academic disputation varies in inverse proportion to the importance of the issue in dispute. Ever since the appointment of Julius Stone to the Challis Chair of International Law and Jurisprudence there has been a debate as to whether Jurisprudence and International Law, or Jurisprudence alone, should be the subject of a separate department within the Faculty of Law. Some aspects of the debate seem to prove the general maxim about academic disputes. The antagonists argue hotly about whether the existence of a separate department promotes scholarship in jurisprudence, whether it protects the academic independence of scholars in that area, and whether it provides a symbol of the University's commitment to the importance of that subject. It seems unlikely that the bureaucratic structure adopted for the distribution of relatively small amounts of money from the University centre would have any significant effect on these matters, and intuition seems to be reinforced by the fact that Jurisprudence thrives in some other places where it is not protected by a separate departmental structure.

However, the 'separate department' issue does have some practical consequences which even those sceptical of academic disputation would have to concede. In particular, as implemented in Sydney Law School, it has had the effect of allocating better staffing and other resources to one small group of Faculty members (those in the Department of Jurisprudence) than are available to their colleagues. Thus, the student-staff ratio in the Department of Jurisprudence has historically been substantially better than in the Department of Law. The separation has also given rise to problems in recruiting, for academic positions, applicants who are interested in jurisprudence as well as law subjects. Not surprisingly, therefore, there is a substantial body of opinion in the Department of Law that the departmental division is no longer appropriate and should be removed. Equally unsurprisingly, there is a strong body of opinion in the Department of Jurisprudence which favours the retention of the separate department. The development of this controversy over a period of more than 40 years is an unhappy feature of the Law School's history.

In November 1978 the Vice-Chancellor, Professor Bruce Williams, wrote to the acting Dean of Law, Professor David Johnson, in the following terms:

After the retirement of Professors Shatwell and Stone there were discussions as to whether there should be any Departments within the Faculty of Law or more than the two established Departments of Law and International Law and Jurisprudence. These discussions were inconclusive and it did not prove possible to get full agreement between the Professors and other senior members of staff.

The established position of the two Departments was undermined when Professor Johnson was appointed to be Professor of International Law by using a vacant Chair listed as in the Department of Law. I understand also that Professor Johnson regards International Law as a professional subject in the same sense as other subjects covered in the Department of Law. It was therefore necessary to re-consider the status of the Department of International Law and Jurisprudence and I asked the Deputy Vice-Chancellor to conduct a review.

Following the review Professor O'Neil recommended to me that the Department of International Law and Jurisprudence be changed to a Department of Jurisprudence. I have accepted that advice.

The letter went on to record that Professor Morison would be given special responsibility for the teaching of campus law subjects, and that the Faculty should conduct a review of the advantages and disadvantages of locating First Year studies in law on the main campus.

Apparently some members of the Faculty had hoped that the future of the two Departments was still under review, and there was some consequent disappointment when the terms of the letter were made available to members of Faculty. Professor Lane moved a motion on Faculty which would have noted the Vice-Chancellor's omission to seek the Faculty's formal view on the separation of the Departments. It would also have asked the Vice-Chancellor to delay the implementation of the recommendation until Faculty had the opportunity to discuss the separation fully. The motion would also have informed the Vice-Chancellor that there was considerable opposition to the separation.
Professor Lane's motion produced tense debate on Faculty. The acting Dean ruled Professor Lane's motion out of order, on the grounds that the matters in question were solely within the competence of the Vice-Chancellor, and that the Vice-Chancellor's decision was merely to change the name of the smaller department rather than to preserve the separation of departments in a broader sense. Professor Morison moved dissent from that ruling and the Chairman's ruling was defeated. Mr Bowra of the Department of Accounting took the chair and Professor Lane's motion was debated in segments. Such was the tension of the occasion that a motion merely to note that the Vice-Chancellor's decision arose out of a review of the status of the Department of International Law and Jurisprudence was carried by only 16 votes to 15. The motion that the Faculty should note the omission of the Vice-Chancellor to seek its formal view was defeated, with the vote tied 16 all. A motion asking the Vice-Chancellor to delay the implementation of his decision was carried 15 votes to 13 at an adjourned meeting, again after strenuous debate. The rest of the motion was withdrawn. The Vice-Chancellor's decision was implemented without any further debate on Faculty.

In the end, the separation of the Faculty into one very large and one tiny department was retained and continues to the present time. On a day-to-day basis the separation caused few problems during the 1980s and personal relationships between members of the Faculty in both departments were generally good. Difficulties occasionally surfaced, however, particularly in the area of recruitment. Given the discrepancy of student-staff ratios, it was difficult for the Department of Law to prefer applicants whose teaching interests included jurisprudence to applicants who would toil in the vineyards of basic common law and commercial subjects. And yet an interest in legal theory is obviously highly desirable and almost inevitable in recruits for positions in academic law.

The 'separate departments' controversy was revisited in 1989, apparently inconclusively. There is some prospect that the troublesome practical disadvantages of the separation will be reduced and may even evaporate as a by-product of financial devolution to Faculties and the increase in administrative significance of Faculties as compared to departments.

Conclusion

In 1990, the issues which were debated in the Heydon years will still seem fresh to those currently involved in Law School administration. This is not to say, however, that no progress has been made during the intervening time. Academic staff resignations remain at a high level, but real advances have been made in the process of recruitment, and in the increase of staffing establishment over the ensuing decade. Fortunately, the Law School has continued to be favoured by a high calibre student population and its academic staff continue a high level of output of published work. Heydon himself set standards for academic productiveness which very few can match, but his example of scholarship and hard work was strongly influential on the academics with whom he was associated in 1978-79.
A new decade began for the Law School with the election of John George Mackinolty as the ninth Dean of the Faculty. He took office from 1 January 1980, initially for two years, though he was to be elected for two further terms. This was only the third time that a non-professor had held this office. Sir William Windeyer of the Supreme Court was appointed Dean in 1884 and continued on in that position after the foundation of the School and the appointment of Professor Pitt Cobbett in 1890. In the period 1946–7, between the deanships of Williams and Shatwell, Mr Clive Teece KC, a part time lecturer and a leading member of the Bar, was Dean. Though Mackinolty's term was less critical than these, his time as Dean and Chairman of the Academic Board saw a changing of the guard, as six professors retired, resigned or died and six new professors were appointed.

The new Dean grew up in Melbourne, being educated at Melbourne Grammar and Melbourne University where he completed his LLM degree. After some years in private practice, he was first appointed to the Law School in 1962 as a research assistant, working with Professor Benjafield. Promoted to senior research assistant in 1963, he became a lecturer in 1965 and senior lecturer in 1970. He was Sub-Dean of the Faculty from 1968 to 1979. During his time at the Law School Mackinolty devoted his energies to teaching and making the School run efficiently in the interests of its students and staff. This was done to the neglect of academic writing and publishing, and accordingly he never sought further academic advancement.

During his long term as Sub-Dean, Mackinolty had gained a wide knowledge of how the Law School was run, as well as having a good deal of influence in the decision-making. As Professor Morison observes in an earlier chapter, much of the detailed administration had been done by Mackinolty for many years. The election of Mackinolty as Dean — and me as Pro Dean — thus made for continuity in administration. After his election he was heard to say that the main difference was that he could sign letters himself, rather than waiting for a Dean to sign them! Another aspect of continuity was the transfer of the longstanding secretary to the Sub-Deans, Mrs Ramah McDonough, to being secretary in the Dean's office. The Dean's familiarity with the operation of the Law School provided a sound base upon which he could make significant changes.

At the outset there was a significant change which was not of his doing. The Vice-Chancellor, Professor Sir Bruce Williams, decided to separate the offices of Dean and Head of
the Department of Law. In the Law Faculty and Department this had not happened before on anything but a very short term basis, and the Vice-Chancellor gave no public reasons for the change. There was a feeling amongst members of the Department that the Vice-Chancellor did not accept the decision of the Faculty to elect a non-professor as its leader and so put a professor of his choice in the position of Head of the Law Department.

Accordingly Professor David Johnson was Head until May 1982 when Professor David Harland took over. This broke with a long tradition and there was some slight difficulty in deciding who was responsible for what, but any possible demarcation disputes were easily resolved by tolerance and good humour on both sides. It became clear, especially in view of the next Vice-Chancellor’s policy to devolve more powers and duties on the Deans, that the size of both the Department and the Faculty had become too big for one person to handle both. The change would have occurred sooner or later, no matter who was Dean.

One of the Dean’s early tasks was to purchase a suit. It was generally agreed that no Dean had ever been seen presenting graduands to the Chancellor at degree conferring ceremonies in sports clothes, the Dean’s habitual attire. So the suit was bought and come income tax return time the School’s tax experts were consulted on the possibility of the cost of the suit being claimed as a business expense. Though it was conceded that the Dean should look the part on such important occasions, and it was appreciated that he was not a suit wearer or owner, the notion of a claim was laughed away. Stubbornly, the claim was made in great detail and with an offer to obtain supporting statutory declarations from the Chancellor down. The Tax Department allowed half the cost of the suit, remaining silent on the question of which half.

The Campus Connection

In the wider sphere of the campus, the new Dean had gained considerable experience through his membership of the Academic Board, which replaced the old Professorial Board in 1975. The new Board included members of the non-professorial staff elected by the academic staff on a Faculty basis. From the outset he represented the Law School and was elected as a member of the Board’s standing committee. In this capacity he made many contacts on campus which were to be very useful to the Faculty during his deanship. Professor John Ward was Chairman of the Academic Board and John Mackinolty built up a connection with him which was to stand the Faculty in good stead when Ward became Vice-Chancellor.

Firstly, and most importantly, the Dean decided that the Faculty should play a more prominent and observable part in the life of the University as a whole. The physical isolation of the School from the campus coupled with the attitude of some members of staff had led to a serious lack of contact with the University as a whole. There were, of course, exceptions to this on both institutional and individual levels. Professor Morison was an active member of the Sydney University Press Board (to be followed by David Harland) and Professor Parsons was a longstanding member of the Senate’s Patents Committee.

The process of ending, or at least minimising the effect of the Law School’s isolation, had begun with the introduction of the combined Arts/Law and Economics/Law courses and with lectures given on campus for these students. This was continued and extended in 1980 by the introduction of the combined Science/Law course. Law Faculty representatives now attended regularly at the Arts, Economics and Science Faculty meetings and at their examiners’ meetings. The Faculty was also represented by me on the Boards of Studies in Education and Music. On an individual level Professor Heydon had been Secretary to the Professors’ Association while the new Dean had had a long association with the Sydney Association of University Teachers.

Mackinolty vigorously encouraged wider participation in University affairs by nominating Faculty representatives to every University body Law was entitled to be on. To guarantee that such meetings were attended, he chose Faculty representatives widely from among all the academic ranks, thus ensuring that the burden did not fall too heavily on the same small group of professors. This had the advantage of giving many staff members valuable experience in University administration and politics, and the opportunity of getting to know academics
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from other disciplines. Similarly, a broader range of staff was nominated for selection and promotion committees; the Dean took full advantage of the change in University policy which encouraged the appointment of more female staff members to committees.

In 1980, Associate Professor Stan Hotop was appointed as adviser in relation to Senate resolutions regarding student societies; Professor Alice Tay to the core committee dealing with promotions to the rank of associate professor; Mr Bohdan Bilinsky to the committee to report on the Social Work honours course; Mr Colin Phegan to the library committee and Mr Paul Ward to the Matriculation committee. I was appointed to the examinations committee, Professor Parsons was re-appointed to the Senate's Patents committee, and Professor Bill Morison to the Sydney University Press Board. In the next few years Professor David Johnson and Mr Bilinsky were appointed to the Proctorial Board; Professor David Harland to the University research committee; Mr Richard Vann to the Appointments Board; Mr Bilinsky to the advisory committee on the Centre for Continuing Education; Messrs Vann and Ward to the combined Matriculation and Admissions Committee and Mr Bron McKillop and I to a committee of the Academic Board to set up a new Faculty of Education.
The Dean, of course, attended University meetings constantly. He was elected a non-professorial Fellow of the Senate, President of the Sydney Association of University Teachers, and Vice-President of the Federation of Australian University Staff Associations. To ensure that the Faculty was represented during any unavoidable absence of the Dean on University business which could not be delegated, for the first time use was made of the position of Pro Dean. I held this position throughout John Mackinolty’s term of office but was seldom called upon to stand in for him. The use of the position was symptomatic of his policy of devolution of power and his determination that the Law School would play a vital, visible and reliable role in University affairs.

There is no doubt that as a result of all these activities the University became aware that one of their ‘outposts of Empire’ was still alive, well and functioning in Phillip Street. Participation in campus activities was dependent to a large extent on the availability of the Law School vehicle to ferry teachers to lectures and meetings and get them back in time for Law School commitments. It was, of course, more time-consuming for Law School people to take part in University life than for those staff on campus and there was less time available to socialise with colleagues from other Faculties after meetings, but all in all it helped to break down barriers.

Previous chapters have revealed how the decision to place the Law School down town was made, and shown that the question of its isolation was often raised, particularly when the site of the present building was being debated. The controversy did not abate during the sixties and seventies, and in the eighties the Dean again mooted the possibility of a move to campus for the Faculty. By now it was not only the question of isolation, but also that the Law School building was too small to cope with the large student numbers. Another factor was the desire of the Faculty of Medicine to have a new building more suited to their needs than the nineteenth century building known as the Old Med School. This beautiful building, so convenient to the centre of campus and the Fisher Library, with careful restoration could have become a fine Law School. Time and money were spent on inspecting the site and preparing plans for restoration but, unfortunately, the scheme came to nothing. The possibility of a move, resurrected, remained to occupy the attention of the next two Deans (at least).

Law School Staff

The problem with the Law School staff was that there was not enough of them. Not that this had not been a problem for some time, but the position by 1982 was actually worsening. Because of financial pressure, University policy on staffing at this time was that no new posts could be created and casual vacancies could not be filled without a rigorous investigation and approval by a specially constituted committee. By now the Challis Professor of History, Professor John Ward was Vice-Chancellor. He was a graduate of our Law School and the father of a current student and thus had an appreciation of the difficulties facing the Law School with its bad student/staff ratio.

The Law School avoided the cuts in academic staff being inflicted elsewhere in the University and had no difficulty in convincing the committee that any appointment to its staff was an absolute necessity. By the end of 1985, the academic staff included 9 professors, 1 reader, 2 associate professors, 19 senior lecturers, 15 lecturers, 3 tutors, together with 27 part time lecturers and 6 part time tutors. An establishment of this size stretched the limited accommodation, and a grant of $80,000 was made to convert areas on level 6 into staff offices.

Although in the 1970s there had been an increase in non-professorial staff and students, this had not been matched by much change in the professoriate. The number was six in 1970, had just reached seven by 1975, and was eight by 1980. The bare figures hide an approaching crisis: four of the eight were nearing retirement (Benjafield, Morison, Parsons and Johnson), one was already a part time professor and appeared to be well on the way to full time practice at the Bar (Heydon) and one was to retire early (Woodman). The Faculty and the University were not unaware of the approaching problems, but there seemed to be a reluctance to fill advertised Chairs. The first break-through came with the appointment of Professor David Harland in 1981. In 1984 two more of our Associate Professors were appointed to Chairs — Colin Phegan and Robert Austin. Although the three appointments in the 1970s (Tay, Johnson and Heydon)
were not Sydney law graduates there was some comment that we were appointing too many of our own graduates (as these three appointees were). The selection committees were satisfied that the appointments were correct. It was not generally known that an offer had gone to a non-Sydney graduate (who seems to have thought twice about his refusal: he subsequently applied anew and accepted this time). As it happened the next acceptances came from Brent Fisse and James Crawford (both of Adelaide University Law School) neither of whom were Sydney graduates; this pattern has continued with more recent professorial appointments. All these new appointments have invigorated the School and its teaching.

In 1983, what became known as the Parsons' Scheme was introduced. Under this, visitors of high academic standing were invited to make short visits to the Department of Law, the scheme being financed by the Committee for Post-Graduate Studies in the Department of Law. This scheme is successfully being continued and has given the staff an opportunity to meet a large number of overseas visitors, some of whom have also given lectures of interest to the students.

In the first year of its operation, the Parsons' Scheme visitors were Professors D.J. MacDougall (University of British Columbia), R.M. Goode (Queen Mary College, London), W. Pedrick (Arizona State University), W. Westling (University of Oregon, and once a short term lecturer at the Law School), and Dr P. Reuter (Rand Corporation).

Coupled with this, the School in 1984 was fortunate to receive a generous benefaction from the solicitors' firm of Allen, Allen & Hemsley for an Annual Visiting Fellowship in the Department of Law for a period of three to six months. The length of the Fellowship has enabled these visitors to take a regular role in teaching and all the visitors, so far, have been welcomed by both staff and students. The first Fellow appointed in 1985 was Professor David Williams of Cambridge.

Mr Claude Schoffel of the law firm Allen, Allen and Hemsley with the Chancellor, Sir Hermann Black, after they had signed an agreement whereby the firm sponsored a program of Visiting Fellowships in Law at Sydney University. Looking on are Mr Ian Tonking of Allens and Professor David Harland.
The period from 1980 to 1985 was a comparatively peaceful one for the staff of the Law School. There was no serious student unrest and no special problem among members of the staff. All worked very hard, teaching over-large classes in Phillip Street and especially on the campus. This became harder as the move away from 100 per cent examinations and towards more continuous assessment throughout the year gathered strength, and the marking loads increased. Combined with our participation in University government, our own Faculty meetings, now held regularly at least four and sometimes five or six times a year, Departmental meetings each term, and duties on internal staff committees, it became increasingly difficult to make time for academic research other than that needed to prepare for classes. But somehow most managed to do most of what was required of us, and fairly cheerfully because of the Dean's policy of keeping the staff informed of all relevant matters, and consulting widely among staff members before making any decision that would affect them.

In our work we were ably assisted by the administrative staff. The chief administrative officer at the start of this period was Michael le Couteur but he resigned in January 1980. For a time he was replaced by Arthur Mason and Michael Bannigan until the permanent appointment of Peter Dodd in June 1980. After Peter moved back to the University Janet Dobbin was appointed, and she stayed with us until her retirement in 1984. We were lucky to have her replaced by Dr Pat Miller. Despite the shortness of some of these appointments, there was no doubt that the administration was always in capable hands, as was the running of the postgraduate studies department by Mrs Mary Taylor until her tragic death in 1985.

This period also saw the retirement of two long-standing Law School personalities, Neville Bird, who looked after staff welfare (particularly financial welfare) and always seemed to know every member of the University administrative staff personally, and Mr Matt Neal who had, from its inception, run the Law Extension Committee in a style all his own.

Last, but by no means least, we lost, through retirement, our caretaker Sid Thompson and his wife Grace. Sid was appointed when the new Law School opened, and he and his wife looked after us all with care and kindness. Their flat became a centre of hospitality, especially on Melbourne Cup Day, and Law School parties were never better organised. The vexatious question of the Law School car park was easily solved by Sid's good humour and tolerance.

The general office staff, though too many to name, also deserve praise for working under difficulties. Though the policy of staff cuts did not apply to Law School academics, it did to secretarial and support staff, who were often over-worked. The position was eased eventually by the introduction of the computer. A committee convened by Dr Lyndel Prott was set up in 1983 to consider the subject generally, and reported to Faculty at a special meeting on 7 October of that year. The Faculty endorsed the report which recommended that instruction be given to undergraduates in data retrieval, and that computers be introduced for research and word processing. Early in 1984 Dr Alan Tyree was appointed as a senior lecturer. He was a specialist in computer studies and oversaw the installation of the present Law School system.

Finally, this period saw the death, departure, or retirement of some members of the teaching staff who had served the Law School for many years. Among those who retired were Professor R.A. Woodman, Professor David Johnson, Professor Bill Morison, and Associate Professors R.P. Roulston and D. Thomson, the last two because of ill health. Professor Heydon resigned to practise at the Bar, although he continued some part time teaching. In the library Dr Budavari retired and was replaced by Margaret McAleese. Professor David Benjafield died on 24 April 1980 while still in office, and his death saddened us all. Former Law School members who died in this period included Professor Julius Stone, Professor John Peden, the Hon F.C. Hutley, and V.M. (Bill) Conrick, for many years clerk to the Faculty.

The Students

The trouble with the Law School students was that there were too many of them — 1952 were enrolled in law subjects in 1980. These numbers put a strain on both human and material resources, but the students coped well and were, on the whole, contented. One cause of complaint was the limited choice of subjects available to Arts/Law undergraduates, who could only choose two out of 16 subjects, the rest being compulsory. This problem was solved
temporarily in 1981 by shortening the subjects of Conflicts and Succession and introducing two slots for optional subjects in the course. Two new subjects, both options, were introduced to the curriculum in this period — Environmental Law in 1984 and Anti-Discrimination Law in 1985, and both proved popular with students.

In recent times there have been major curriculum reviews every decade and by the early 1980s it seemed that another was due. There was considerable pressure for change from the students and younger members of staff. This was delayed by the Dean pending the appointment of new professors and staff, as it was felt that they should have an input into the courses they would have to teach. Accordingly in 1984 a curriculum review committee was established under the chairmanship of Mr (later Professor) Richard Vann, whose task was to consider the whole curriculum and propose one more suitable to the needs of the times. The Dean, acting on the principle ‘that you should not try to rule from the grave’, left the whole question to the continuing staff. This committee worked long and hard and the fruit of its labours was seen in 1988 when the current curriculum was introduced.

Another recurring problem was the College of Law. It was too small to take everyone who applied for admission immediately following the final undergraduate year, and our students were at a disadvantage since Law School results were often too late for them to be considered for acceptance in the first intake. Professor Morison, who was a foundation governor of the College, and then Professor Austin, who took his place in 1984, both used their best endeavours to alleviate the students’ problems, even though an adequate solution has yet to be found.

There was also the worry that jobs were not readily available at this time, partly because of the economic climate, and partly because of competition from graduates of the newer Law Schools. To try to ease this situation, an extra Sub-Dean was appointed whose task, in conjunction with the careers and appointment service, was to help law graduates find jobs. This post was taken by Professor Austin. In 1984 he published a pamphlet called ‘Some Notes for Employers of Law Graduates’ to give information to solicitors of the contents of courses which over the years had changed their names or contents, leaving older graduates bewildered about what the modern student actually did. He was also instrumental in obtaining for the Law School a new position of Placements Officer, which went some way towards solving employment problems. The first appointment to this post was Mrs Jane Lennon in 1985.

As to individual student triumphs, the University medal was won in 1980 by James Alsop, and Mary Molyneux, who graduated with first class honours, received the Caltex Woman Graduate Scholarship for New South Wales in 1979. Next year, the same honour went to Margaret Cole, who also was awarded the University medal in 1981. Other medal winners in the period were Julie Ward, 1982, Mark Speakman, 1983, Justin Gleeson, 1984, and Elizabeth Grinston in 1985.
In 1980 the Australian mooting cup was won for the first time in fifteen years by our team of Michael Fabian, Joseph Jacobs and Tanya Coleman. Moots had fallen into a bit of a slump for some years, but had been revitalised by Joanne Terry and Dr G.L. Certoma and the better planning and organisation of the internal mooting program produced results. Sydney teams won the North American Debating Championships in 1982; in 1984 the World University title; and in 1985 Ashley Black was named the best speaker in the World University Debating Championships, our team coming fourth.

As usual the students were very active in University affairs. They were well represented on the Students' Representative Council, the University Union Board, the Academic Board and, during the period 1980 to 1987, there was always at least one law student on the Senate. These were Anne Britton and Tanya Coleman (1980), Alex Naple and Paul Le Gay Brereton (1981), Susan Bastick (1982), John Martin (1983) and Stephen Yen (1984-1987). It was always useful to have student support for the Faculty on Senate. In wider terms law was well represented on Senate. Apart from the Dean the following law graduates were Fellows during the period: Elizabeth Archdale, Daphne Kok, David Landa, James McClelland, David Selby, Bryan Vaughan, John Ward and Gough Whitlam.

This period saw, under Mackinolty's leadership, greater student participation in the affairs of the Faculty. This was not surprising as he had been active in student affairs in his time as a law student in Melbourne and while on the staff at Sydney he had always supported student involvement in Faculty and University activities. By this time, five students sat on the Faculty and students were represented on almost all Faculty committees. Regular meetings were held by the heads of departments with the students and matters of student concern were discussed and, if possible, solved. The students were more aware than ever of the difficulties the Faculty was facing, and accepted that it was not always possible to implement even reasonable reforms immediately.
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During his involvement with the Faculty’s administration Mackinolty was attentive to detailed and often tedious matters such as lecture and examination time tables. He saw that careful construction of these could make life and study much easier for students and also provide wider subject choices. It was also possible to arrange a lecture-free day for uninterrupted study; and to make adjustments to help those with domestic problems. These reductions in the rigidity of the system benefited the staff as well as the students. The introduction of the combined degree courses caused special difficulties with the examination time tables. The days for many Arts, Economics and Science examinations seemed to have been fixed in stone in the nineteenth century. Slotting in the law subjects tended to result in such impossibly heavy loads as Legal Institutions and English or Economics or Chemistry examinations on the one day and with another examination on the next day. Likewise the law subjects were inclined to be bunched in quite unreasonable groups. It was found that with advance planning and early pressure on the campus administration many of these problems could be avoided — especially after Mr Richard Prentice of the Registrar’s staff was placed in charge of examinations.

Another area in which there seemed to be a need for administrative change was in the course arrangements for students who failed a subject. When he first became a Sub-Dean, Mackinolty discovered that the rule was that the student must return in the following year and study and pass the failed subject and no other before going on with the degree. Seeing this as a most inefficient use of time and disheartening for the students, rules were developed to rearrange course programs, not to shorten courses but to spread the work load more rationally. Alleged time table difficulties were dealt with by firm application of Mackinolty’s maxim that time tables (like most administrative arrangements) were made to help staff and students, not rule them.

Links with the Community

As the Dean had tried to strengthen our ties with the campus, so did he try with the legal profession generally. He was a member of the New South Wales Law Society’s Education Committee, the Chief Justice’s Consultative Committee on Legal Education, the State
Supreme Court’s Legal Education Syllabus Committee, and, with Bron McKillop, the
advisory committee of the NSW Board of Senior School Studies, which was looking into the
introduction of Legal Studies into the Higher School Certificate. He was Deputy President of
the Supreme Court’s Joint Examination Board. He was also a council member of the Institute
of Technology, of the Australian Institute of Judicial Administration and of the Royal
Australian Institute of Public Administration.

Colin Phegan during this time was serving as a full time New South Wales Law Reform
Commissioner, and Associate Professor Gordon Hawkins as a part time member of the
Australian Law Reform Commission until 1982, when Professor Tay was appointed until 1987.
She was also appointed to the Technological Change Committee of the Australian Science and
Technological Council in 1985. Professor Morison, in 1984, was elected a Fellow of the
Academy of Social Sciences in Australia.

Throughout the period the Committee for Post-graduate Studies in the Department of Law
continued to give regular lectures and seminars on topics of interest to lawyers, and the
Institute of Criminology also gave regular seminars covering a wide range of interests.

The Dean also formed the practice of giving lunch to solicitors who came to the Law School
annually to address final year students about the type of work done by their firms, and to
recruit new staff. This innovation led to a closer and more personal relationship with the larger
city firms, and a better understanding of the problems faced both by them and us. It may, in
some way, have helped promote the several generous prizes donated by firms at this time, the
Fellowships funded by Allen, Allen & Hemsley, previously mentioned, and the generous
benefactions of Mr John Landerer.

The students also played their part in showing the face of the Law School to the outside
world, nowhere more particularly than in their voluntary work at the Marrickville Legal
Centre. This had been set up by the students in 1979 with help and advice from Jenny Wily,
then a lecturer, and the Dean, who was one of the three trustees of the centre. Participating
students worked hard to give free legal advice to the centre’s clients, of which about 82 per cent
were migrants, and make an important contribution to the life of the community. On a lighter
note, the Law Revue flourished during this time, and attracted a number of outsiders as well as
the basic legal audiences.

Marrickville Legal Centre.
Volunteer workers, Law School students Andrew McSpedden and Athena Touriki counsel a client – April 1980.
Conclusion

In the preceding chapter, Professor Austin has said that 1978 and 1979 marked the beginning of a period of transition which was complete only when Morison, Parsons and Mackinolty retired, but I think that any 'period of transition' was complete when John became Dean in 1980. It was he who was really responsible for taking the management and control of the Faculty of Law out of the hands of any one person or small group of professors, and involving everyone — staff and students — in policy making decisions and responsible administrative tasks. His chief gift as Dean was his capacity to delegate, and not to interfere when once he had done so, even if the result was not entirely what he might have wished.

The foundations for the Law School of the late eighties and the nineties had been firmly laid by the time John's term of office came to an end. It was a fitting conclusion to his long career of service to the University generally and the Law School in particular, that in 1985 John was elected Chairman of the Academic Board, the first non-professorial Chairman of the Board. He was also the first member of the Faculty to be elected to this position since 1925 when Sir John Peden became Chairman of the Professorial Board, as it then was.

John Mackinolty.
Coping With Change

Professor Colin Phegan 1986–1989

Richard J. Vann

Colin Stanley Phegan was born in the midst of World War II and went to Sydney Church of England Grammar School (Shore). He has been more or less continuously connected with the Law School since he commenced his law studies in 1962, taking the degrees of BA, LLB and LLM at the University. His only absences have been sabbaticals, and as a full time New South Wales Law Reform Commissioner (1984–1985). He was appointed a research assistant in 1967 and rose through the ranks to Professor of Law in 1984. His teaching and research over the years have concentrated on Torts, Conflict of Laws and International Trade Law.

Phegan had clear ideas of the changes he would like to make in many areas of the Law School's activity when he was elected Dean in October 1985. He was re-elected in 1987 and effectively ceased to be Dean on 31 December 1989, no doubt with a sigh of relief. For the degree of change that occurred during his tenure probably exceeded his expectations. In the mid 1980s there was a large turnover in senior positions at the Law School and, like every generation, the new professors had many projects for improvement. Indeed at a dinner in 1987, the previous Dean, Mr John Mackinolty, commented that he had been involved in one way or another with the appointment of every professor in attendance, which he regarded as his major legacy to the Law School. He had also set in train one of the important initiatives of the 1986–1989 period with the appointment of the Curriculum Review Committee in 1984, and revived the debate about locating the Law School on campus.

So change was inevitable. The surprise was that events outside the Law School were responsible for precipitating developments as well as internal initiatives. In 1987 Senator John Dawkins was appointed Minister for Employment, Education and Training with the task of shaking up the education establishment, which he undertook with relish. In 1988, the Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission (CTEC) Review of the Discipline of Law was published. It contained many critical comments on the Law School which CTEC required to be addressed. Partly of his own initiative and partly in response to these events, the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Sydney, Professor John Ward, engaged in his own quiet revolution in university governance including the devolution of budget and management, previously the prerogative of the central administration, to individual faculties and groups of departments.

Because of these outside pressures, neither the Dean nor the Faculty was completely in
control of events during the 1986–1989 period, and no one probably felt more frustrated by this than the Dean. The pressures did not, however, stand in the way of important achievements amidst a very lively Faculty debate that only rarely and briefly became acrimonious. It was the hallmark of the Phegan style to build debate into consensus.

Curriculum

After three years work the Curriculum Review Committee, convened by the author, produced a new undergraduate curriculum in 1987 that went into effect in 1988. The time devoted to law studies for the LLB in the usual case had been reduced from four to three years in the early 1970s mainly by cutting the optional content of the curriculum to almost nil. One of the main objectives of the 1988 changes was to make room for subject choices. The Committee considered adopting the model used overseas and in some Australian law schools of a minimal number of compulsory subjects (Contracts, Torts, Constitutional and Administrative Law, Criminal Law and Property) amounting to about one year in total, but preferred a more comprehensive compulsory curriculum to emphasise the traditional strengths of the Law School, and to give students a perspective on important issues not addressed in a minimal core curriculum.

Thus the compulsory subjects also reflect the history of development of the law (Equity), law across state and national boundaries (Public and Private International Law), law in the context of private groups (Company Law), the law in operation (Evidence) and the perspective of theory and other disciplines on law (Jurisprudence). These subjects are not found together in the compulsory core of other law schools, and give a distinctive character to the Sydney Law School curriculum. By reducing the hours for lectures or seminars in most compulsory subjects from 75 to 50 (whilst retaining and reinforcing tutorial programs), it was possible to limit the compulsory core to two thirds of the degree and to give students a wide range of optional subjects. On average each student will now take eight optional subjects spread over the last two years of law study.

The outcome involved compromises and problem areas. Many members of the Committee favoured a combined Property course incorporating elements of real and personal property and succession. Led by Associate Professor Peter Butt (who has been known to play the organ in the Concert Theatre of the Opera House in his rare time off from producing the publications that have made him the authority on conveyancing in Australia), the property lawyers resisted any combination of real property with other subjects. As a result two subjects were created, Real Property and a 25 hour course on Succession and Personal Property. Debate continues about this particular outcome. In 1990 the Faculty resolved in principle on a new compulsory 1 unit course in Personal Property. Succession would become an optional subject. Many new options were created reflecting the much enlarged choice open to students. These included offerings in new subject areas such as Alternative Dispute Resolution (the first such law course in Australia), Technology Law and Economic Regulation. The Committee nevertheless sought to avoid the smorgasbord approach often found in the area of optional subjects where very long lists are produced involving overlapping subjects, many of which are in fact not offered.

The new curriculum retains in the main the existing methods for undertaking law studies. Most students enter degree programs of five years combining law with arts, economics or science. The first three years consist of both law subjects and other subjects (amounting to about one year law and two years in the other discipline), and the last two years are entirely law but students now study six instead of four law subjects in the first three years. The alternative of a 'straight' four year all law degree was effectively dropped. The only remnant of this course under the 1988 curriculum is, in appropriate cases such as economic hardship, the possibility of dropping the other discipline after the first year of a combined degree and proceeding in a further three years to a law degree. The three year post-graduate law degree continues; indeed consideration was given to becoming a graduate only law school, as in North America, but this was not thought feasible in the dominant Australian tradition of combined degrees. In order to reinforce the full time nature of all the law degrees, minimum progress rules were introduced, in addition to the existing rule for exclusion after twice failing a subject.
Beyond these structural changes, the major change in the new curriculum was its emphasis on broader aspects of law. It was felt that students should know more than the rules that happen to constitute the law at the time they pass through Law School. They should be acquainted with the economic, political and social forces that shape the law, and the policies that may (or may not) underlie bodies of law. This will not only help students to cope with inevitable changes in the law, but allow them to participate in bringing about improvements in the law and fulfil their roles as practitioners in a socially responsible manner. While influencing particular aspects of the changes, this approach was the overarching goal of the 1988 curriculum. Such a generally expressed goal cannot be directly enforced, but the change in emphasis had very immediate effects.

During its deliberations the Committee became convinced that a shift from a 3 term to a 2 semester year was desirable so that students could concentrate at any given time on a smaller rather than larger number of subjects, and so that subjects could be sequenced in a sensible manner. Associate Professor John Wade took up the matter as a crusade with the University. After an initial setback the Law School, through the efforts of the Dean and of the former...
Dean, now Chairman of the Academic Board, was successful in having the University change over to a semester system. The change had some redoubtable opponents, particularly Dr Robert Stein, whose combined conservative and high-camp manner had delighted (and sometimes frustrated) Faculty members for 15 years. He died of cancer in 1990 and is much missed. Once the University decision was made, most compulsory and all optional law subjects were taught on a one semester basis.

The Committee also tackled postgraduate education offered by the Faculty. Because of the continuing success of the LLM by coursework program, the pressure for change was not as great. The goal of postgraduate study was identified as specialisation through structured courses or research, or both combined. A compulsory research element was re-introduced into the LLM (having been dropped in the mid 1980s) but instead of being a separate paper after the completion of courses it is directly incorporated into courses in the form of a research paper in lieu of an examination. An experimental optional program of this kind had been tried in the mid 1980s and was considered to be an outstanding success. From 1991 a paper has to be produced in at least one course and may, at the option of the student, be done in more.

Three specialist coursework postgraduate degrees were approved in 1989, the Master of Criminology, the Master of Labor Law and Relations and the Master of Taxation, to commence in 1991. In addition, to cater for students who wished to combine substantial coursework and research, the degree of Doctor of Juridical Studies (SJD) was created requiring coursework equivalent to the LLM at honours level and a thesis midway between LLM and PhD.

Teaching and Assessment

Professor Phegan founded a Committee on Teaching and Assessment with Professor Fisse as Convener. Two activists on the Committee made sure that it tackled difficult issues. One was John Wade who had taken an interest in teaching and the broader aspects of Faculty life for many years producing, for instance, a paper on 'Sabbatical blues' explaining why academics are so restless after they return from sabbatical leave. He was one of the inaugural recipients of the University Teaching Awards in 1989. The other activist was Mr Graeme Cooper who arrived at the Faculty in 1987 and made an immediate impact.

The Faculty had adopted a policy in favour of progressive assessment in the late 1970s, but a number of subjects had persisted with 100 per cent examinations, despite a requirement of annual Faculty approval of assessment regimes in all subjects. The Committee gave greater teeth to this policy by not only requiring explanations but actually recommending strong Faculty action when guide-lines were not met. As a result the spread in time and variety of assessment increased during 1986-1989, with the Dean's strong support. The Committee produced assessment guide-lines for distribution of grades, double marking of borderline cases and anonymity of students' papers and results. Anonymity of examination papers ran into problems with the University administration and is still being pursued, while the Faculty resolved to continue to publish the names of students on honours, prizes and order of merit lists on the basis that not to do so was contrary to having such awards in the first place.

The measure with the most direct impact on students was the abolition of supplementary examinations, combined with very limited rights to immediate re-examination in exceptional circumstances. The Faculty had previously maintained very generous rights to supplementary examinations, which required the setting and marking of extra examinations each January for some hundreds of students. With the introduction of the semester system featuring shorter but more frequent examining periods and the growth of progressive assessment, the Faculty felt that supplementaries had become unnecessary (there were also suspicions that students had become adept at playing the supplementary game!). The first statistics available in 1989 after semesters were in place seemed to confirm that supplementaries were no longer needed.

In 1987 at the instigation of Professor Austin, the Faculty approved compulsory assessment of teaching by students, administered by the Committee through the Faculty Office with anonymous questionnaires. The results were to be made available only to the Dean, the Head of Department, the Convener of the Committee and the staff member in question, though it
was envisaged that publication might be adopted at a later stage after some experience was gained with the system. Although the Faculty was complimented by the Academic Board of the University for this initiative, for a combination of reasons the Faculty withdrew the compulsory element from 1989, on Professor Fisse's motion. One reason related to the continued deterioration of academic employment conditions, particularly the failure of the system to reward good teaching. Another related to the failure of the students, perhaps understandably, to distinguish course content, teaching performance and physical conditions beyond the teacher's control such as class size and nature of the classroom. The results of the compulsory 1988 surveys apparently were uniformly good, which may explain why so many staff continued with them voluntarily in 1989.

Although Faculty did not adopt any particular policies on the issue, there was also debate about teaching methods. The majority favours a pluralist approach and experimentation, such as the Keller Plan of self paced instruction approved for Technology Law in 1990. So far as it is possible to generalise, it is probably the case that compulsory subjects mainly proceed by way of lecture (some Socratic, some expository) and tutorials, while the seminar style is adopted in optional subjects (for which there are no tutorials). A number of subjects have a component of class participation in their assessment plans. Whether it wanted to or not, the Faculty simply does not have sufficient resources to impose small class size limits as occurs at better resourced law schools.
The Curriculum Review Committee felt that enhanced efforts were required in teaching legal writing and research. The main burden of this teaching was assigned to the introductory subject Legal Institutions but the Committee emphasised that writing and research skills need to be reinforced throughout the LLB. The Dean convinced Faculty to introduce a system of assigning Legal Institutions students to all members of staff in very small tutorials (about six students per staff member taught in two groups of three each) to assist in the teaching of legal research and writing and also to give new students some early personal contact with the Faculty. While the program had some teething problems it was generally supported, as was the special two week legal research and writing program in the graduate law program, completed before teaching in their substantive law subjects commences. In 1989 Faculty resolved to make Legal Research and Writing a separate pass/fail subject from Legal Institutions, in part to give greater flexibility in teaching arrangements.

CTEC Review of the Discipline of Law

In the midst of all these developments the CTEC Review, containing some caustic criticisms of the Law School, was published in 1988. Most of the information on which the Report was based related to 1985 and 1986. The Report castigated the Law School for emphasising rote learning and said it was in danger of becoming 'second rate' (a phrase that captured the headlines). Although the Review Committee was not aware of the contents of the new curriculum, it was not impressed by such details as were at its disposal. Staffing was found to be inadequate in terms of numbers. The organisation of the Faculty with its lop-sided two department structure attracted comment and it was suggested the Departments should be merged. The failure to offer any part time study opportunities in the LLB was criticised. The graduate program was found to be going backwards with the abolition of the research by law paper in the LLM by coursework. And on and on.

The comment that the Review attracted from members of Faculty varied. Professor James Crawford, in his usual no-nonsense way, said that while some of the criticisms might have been valid in relation to the past, they did not apply to the present in view of all the developments outlined above. The Dean publicly defended the Faculty in various ways and also produced a lengthy official response as required by CTEC.

The author, perhaps biased because of his 15 year association with the Faculty, finds the Review a very disappointing document, an opportunity missed. It does not contain any clear vision of what legal education should be and how it should respond to the challenges of the present and the future. It emphasises diversity in legal education as a general principle but continually applies the average principle in specifics. For instance, there is no reason given why the Faculty should offer part time undergraduate education. The Review Committee itself regarded full time education as most desirable in principle, and in the Sydney region there is an ample supply of part time legal education. The only reason for suggesting that Sydney Law School should follow suit apparently was that everybody else is doing it.

The whole process of argumentation in the report seemed designed to lead to a predetermined conclusion rather than to convince. Nowhere was this clearer than in the treatment of the three university law schools in the Sydney region at the time. The criticism of Sydney Law School relating to rote learning was based on a questionnaire that the Review Committee administered to various groups. The same questionnaire produced the most favourable response for Macquarie Law School in relation to teaching, yet the Committee ignored the questionnaire in this instance and recommended that Macquarie be phased out or reconstituted.

On staffing, the Committee recommended that Sydney University provide more resources to the Law School, but that the Commonwealth Government should provide more money to the University of New South Wales to enable its law school to set up a graduate coursework program, even though UNSW Law School was already the best resourced school in the Sydney region. In the graduate area the Committee failed to acknowledge that the Sydney LLM by coursework has been the model for all such programs around the country.
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Despite these and other reservations, there was a silver lining in this cloud over the Law School. The staffing situation which was already changing when the report was produced has improved even further, partly as a result of its influence. The Law School has also become more self aware and prepared to undertake self examination. Faculty has adopted a resolution calling for a further external examination of its performance, but by a committee more independent of the current law school environment in Australia.

**Trends**

A listing of developments during the Phegan years does not give the full flavour of the change in the nature of the Law School and the central part played in that change by the Dean. The conference of the Australasian Universities Law Schools Association (AULSA) for the 1988 Bicentenary was held at the Law School. The Dean wished the Sydney conference to focus on legal theory and its impact on legal education, and an impressive array of North American scholars participated in a very successful event (including Judge Frank Easterbrook, previously of University of Chicago Law School from the Law and Economics movement, Professors Gerald Frug of Harvard and Robert Gordon of Stanford representing Critical Legal Studies and Professor Katherine Mackinnon, a feminist legal scholar from Osgoode Hall). The effort to refocus attention on legal education has been successful, as witness the name change from AULSA to the Australasian Law Teachers Association (ALTA).

The 1988 conference also provided the papers for the inaugural issue of the *Legal Education Review*, for which the Dean had been instrumental in obtaining a grant from the Law Foundation of New South Wales. The *Review* is edited by Associate Professor John Wade and Mr Graeme Cooper and has already established a wide circulation. At the same time Mr Cooper was a leading figure in setting up a Legal Education Workshop which has become an annual event sponsored by ALTA.
The Faculty staff also became more representative of a broader range of views of law during these years. While there has been some public criticism of an apparent move of the Law School to the Left, Professor Phegan would probably regard this as implicit praise for the Law School becoming a more pluralist institution. This does not imply that the Faculty was previously a collection of rigid 'black letter' lawyers. For many years the Faculty has included a number of non-lawyers, to offer perspective and interdisciplinary approaches to law, and it currently includes a criminologist, an economist, a sociologist and a statistician, not to mention a computer programmer and two lawyers who began their academic careers as professional mathematicians.

The rapidly growing number of women on the academic staff has led to an interest in feminist theories of law. The Faculty has adopted a number of resolutions disapproving of sexist language and teaching practices, and women have been responsible for development of the Alternative Dispute Resolution course which is one of the most popular options included in the 1988 curriculum. Leaders have included Dr Christine Chinkin, an international lawyer who won a prestigious American prize for her work on international 'soft' law, and Dr Hilary Astor, an authority on anti-discrimination law (and on detective novels).

While women make a very large contribution to the academic and administrative functions of the Faculty, it is still noticeable, however, that in the Department of Law, until very recently, none of the dozen or so Professors or Associate Professors were women. On the other hand the senior administrative position in the Faculty was held by women during the Phegan period, first by Dr Patricia Miller and then by Ms Catherine Cahill, both of whom were strong-minded and brought innovations in the daily operations of the Faculty, from admission procedures to timetables.

Organisation and Administration

The advent of Senator Dawkins as Minister for Employment, Education and Training has had marked effects on the tertiary education sector. It is probably in the management area that the greatest impact has been felt by the Faculty.

As mentioned earlier, under Vice-Chancellor Professor John Ward, changes in university governance had already commenced, and these were given impetus by policy changes at the government level. He introduced a five year rolling University wide plan into which each Faculty and Department had an input. As the planning process developed he began to devolve major budget and management responsibilities to Faculties.

At the same time there was a shift of power relations within the University. Previously Deans were generally elected, and were responsible for dealing with student affairs and representing Faculties on University committees, while budget and staff matters were handled by Heads of Departments appointed by the Vice-Chancellor and under fairly strong central guidance as regards budget. Under devolution Deans started to assume the budget functions and they also began to meet informally as a Committee of Deans to present a united front on various issues when dealing with the central administration. In turn the Vice-Chancellor established the Vice-Chancellor's Management Advisory Committee consisting of the Deans and University officials. This met weekly and dealt with major policy issues.

To respond to these University trends the Dean established a Faculty Planning Committee, initially to help develop the five year Faculty plan and then increasingly to advise on the many issues that were raised by the University. The plan focused primarily on measures to produce an acceptable staff student ratio and to implement the changes described above. As it turned out the plan was overtaken by events in a more rapid shift to devolution than expected and ongoing changes in government policy, but the goals in the staffing and student area were still for the most part rapidly achieved.

To deal primarily with devolution but also to consider changes in power structures that were being mooted in the Faculty, the question of organisation of the Faculty was referred to the Planning Committee. The majority, led by the Dean, favoured a management style of organisation with a small number of people deciding and implementing Faculty policy rather than the collegiate and departmental model that had prevailed. Under the latter approach, broad issues
were debated in committee and on Faculty, while staffing and teaching were dealt with by the Heads of Departments and were not subject to Faculty control. The proposal was to amalgamate these functions in a small number of committees or officials and to retain ultimate Faculty control by keeping committee positions and the Deanship elective.

The two Department structure was seen as a barrier to this proposal and the Committee favoured merging the two existing Departments. All members of the Department of Jurisprudence were opposed to this solution. Dr Alex Ziegert, the Head of the Department, whose sociological background brings a different and enlightening perspective to many issues, argued that the management approach was antithetical to academic ideals, and that the rigid nature of the departmental structure served to protect minority interests in a Faculty against the will of the majority.
As the Committee's proposals could not go forward without dealing with the departmental issue, the Dean decided to bring the matter to a head by suggesting to Faculty that it advise the Vice-Chancellor to merge the two Departments. The Faculty meeting that followed was one of the few occasions when tempers became heated during the Phegan years. The Dean as seconder of the motion vacated the chair. The motion was ultimately passed by a five to three ratio, but this was not sufficient to convince the former Vice-Chancellor to act on the Faculty's advice. No change had occurred by the end of 1990.

Although the Faculty shared in some respects the shift to managerialism that characterised University and government thinking, there was one important area where the Faculty took a different view. The University, in line with government policy, moved to make Deanships appointed rather than elected positions. If the private sector company law form of managerialism can incorporate elections, the Faculty failed to see why the same should not apply to it. In the light of the Law School's strong opposition, the University Senate allowed elective positions to continue where the Faculty so determined.

While the Faculty was successful in maintaining its principle, it did not look at the fine print of the changed rules until the time for the election of the new Dean in September 1989. To the Faculty's dismay it discovered that a slight change in wording had disenfranchised untenured lecturers, part time lecturers, students, and outside members of the Faculty. Faculty resolved to approach the University to change the electorate rules to include untenured lecturers, part time lecturers and students. James Crawford, who was elected Dean, undertook to hold a fresh election when the rules were changed.

Facilities and the Planned Move to Campus

A critical issue in the Phegan years was whether the Faculty should relocate from down town to the main campus of the University. Such an issue cannot be resolved overnight and so there was also a need for development of the facilities in the current building. The major change was the effective takeover by the Faculty of level 6 of the Law School, absorbing the Browsing Room of the Library and student recreational facilities (relocated to level 3) to provide more staff studies and a computer laboratory as well as converting a lecture room into a Moot Court.

Development of computer use in the Faculty has been extensive. The computer laboratory is an impressive facility containing about 30 personal computers connected to two mini-computers, the whole network being controlled by a full time computer programmer. The need for the laboratory arose from the increasing importance of modern technology for the law from word processing to sophisticated searches of legal databases and computer teaching aids. Development of the laboratory ran parallel to a number of important staff initiatives. The Landerer Chair in Information Technology and the Law was the first outside-funded Chair for the Faculty since the Challis bequest and the first of its kind in the world. It was filled by Professor Alan Tyree who was already on the Faculty and who has taught in tertiary institutions in both mathematics and law. He is a leading authority on applying computer logic to legal reasoning, as well as on banking law.

The Faculty also appointed a lecturer to integrate computers into the teaching of legal research and writing. This process has been assisted by the participation of the Faculty in the Datalex project jointly with the University of New South Wales and the University of Technology, Sydney. The project allows students to spend as much time as they wish developing their legal database skills without the large cost of commercial services. The driving force behind these innovations was Professor Robert Austin.

While students can be forced if necessary to confront modern technology, it is more difficult to convince academic staff to adapt to new fangled devices. Yet in a short time most of the staff have become converts and now produce most of their research on personal computers. The main person behind this conversion was Professor Brent Fisse. He has been in the forefront of developing computer uses in the Faculty, including publication by means of CD-ROMs which may well replace traditional libraries in the future (he is also an expert on white collar crime —
not how to commit it, but how to prevent it). He organised large scale purchases of personal computers so that one could be placed in each staff study. The presence of the 'machine' touched the curiosity of most staff members, and the computers were soon in constant use.

Funds for such large scale purchases do not materialise out of thin air. After much debate Faculty agreed to use the substantial balances held by the Committee for Postgraduate Studies in the Department of Law for the purpose. The Committee was set up many years before and had been a main provider of continuing legal education in Sydney until the field became very competitive in the 1980s. As a result, funds had been accumulated which were used to provide scholarships for students to undertake postgraduate studies in Sydney or overseas and to finance visits by overseas academics. The balances available were more than sufficient for these purposes and the principle at issue was whether it was proper to use the funds to provide benefits for staff members. The debate originally arose in relation to refurbishing the staff common-room and providing journals and morning tea.
Professor Ross Parsons, who had been mainly responsible for establishing the Committee in the first place, argued that it was a breach of faith to use the funds to improve staff conditions, but he was eventually persuaded that it would be appropriate to provide professional aids to staff members, such as journals and personal computers, out of the Committee's funds. This was one of the last Faculty debates in which he participated prior to his retirement at the end of 1986. As always he conducted the debate with good grace and quiet determination. The mark he has left on the Law School will be a lasting one from the LLM by coursework to the reputation of the Law School in the tax area.

One sidelight on this period was the development of the University no smoking policy, obviously designed with two storey campus buildings in mind, and not a city office block like the Law School. First, smoking was prohibited in lectures and meetings. This occurred during the tenure of the previous Dean, Mr John Mackinolty, and led to the hourly adjournment of Faculty meetings to allow the Dean and others to relieve the tension with a smoke. He could not hand the meetings over to the Pro-Dean, Miss Olive Wood, as she was also a confirmed smoker. Impressive of figure and personality, with a ready wit, a piercing laugh and a bent for writing children's television programs, Olive retired in 1988 and escaped the next phase, the complete prohibition of smoking in the building in 1989. Now there is often a collection of Law School luminaries on the steps of the Law School and they are not waiting for a bus. Among them are Professor David Harland and Ms Nicola Franklin, who are leading lights in the fields of consumer protection and environmental law.

The Dean raised the issue of a move to campus early in his tenure, following tentative steps taken by the previous Dean, and after lengthy Faculty discussion, it was overwhelmingly supported. This was a momentous decision, as the Law School has been located in the city since its inception a century ago. One argument for the move was that it would allow members of the Law School to interact more readily in research and teaching with other disciplines and
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to be integrated with the wider University community. Another was that the majority of students were on campus (in the first three years of the combined degrees) and that it was important to form closer links with this group to ensure that they do not downgrade their law studies. Yet another was the desire to escape the limitations of the current building, including its notorious lift system. Opponents of the move pointed to the advantages of close contact with judges, government and the profession, as well as the need to provide a city location for the highly successful graduate program.

Once the logistics of the move were investigated in more detail, it was apparent that a great deal of work was involved. First, it is necessary to sell the current building to finance a new building (or renovation of an existing building) on campus. Just as lawyers are the last people to have wills, the University Law School did not have a clean title to its building as the land was resumed by the State Government and then granted back to the University only for so long as it is used for University purposes (not to mention some boundary encroachments). Hence it is necessary to obtain the consent of the State Government to the sale. Secondly, an investigation of existing University buildings indicated that there was none available that could be suitably adapted for a Law School, although there was a romantic inclination towards the ivy covered sandstone of the Anderson Stuart Building. This means finding a suitable site for a new building, which is difficult except on the outskirts of the campus, whereas the Faculty wishes to be centrally located (and to retain its separate library which dictates a fairly large site). Thirdly, there is the problem of the period after sale of the existing building and before the completion of a new building; the Faculty was not enamoured of temporary accommodation, for fear both of moving twice in a short period and of the temporary becoming permanent.

The complexity of these issues was such that Professor Phegan was not able to bring to a conclusion all of the matters arising from the move and when he handed over to his successor the fate of the initiative was still not finally resolved.
Staff and Students

Staffing of the Law School was a preoccupation of the Phegan period. The student staff ratio touched 30 to 1 in the mid 1980s, two to four times that in other Faculties. Largely through the efforts of Professor Austin in his capacity of Head of the Department of Law and the receptiveness of the Vice-Chancellor, Professor Ward, (an historian who also happened to be a graduate of the Law School), significant increases in staffing were obtained so that the Faculty now numbers about 60 full time academic staff and the student staff ratio is under 20 to 1.

In the prosperity of the middle and late 1980s in the legal profession, the Faculty feared that it would not be possible to recruit staff of sufficient calibre to fill new positions and vacancies from resignations. The basis of the fear was the continuing decline in relative salary levels of academics in general, and legal academics in particular. In the distant past, professorial and judicial salaries had been tied, but by the late 1980s a law professor received about half the salary of a judge (and about a fifth to a tenth of a partner's income in a large legal firm). At the entry level of lecturer the position was even worse. A first year law graduate in a large legal firm in Sydney gets considerably more than a lecturer, with many years postgraduate study, who is not even paid enough to have a hope of entering the Sydney housing market. Benefits such as sabbatical leave and relative freedom to pursue individual interests pale in these circumstances.

The signals in the late 1980s from the important staffing factors of the resignation rate and the application rate were contradictory, with the resignation rate apparently increasing but the number and quality of applications also increasing. There has been a fairly high turnover in staff at the Law School for many years because of the ease of movement to professional practice, especially in the case of a downtown location. In 1989, however, about 15 per cent of the staff resigned or took leave without pay (often a precursor to resignation) — a very high figure. It is too early to judge whether this was an exceptional case or the reflection of an underlying trend. As long as it remains possible to replace staff with high quality applicants, there is reason to be optimistic for it is healthy to have regular infusions of fresh ideas and personalities. Still it was of concern to Faculty during these years to seek to improve salary and conditions of staff.

One method strongly supported by the Dean was a proposal to break the tie between titles and salary. In Australia, faculties have predetermined numbers of professors and non-professorial staff, and salaries are tied to rank (with some minor increments for seniority in the case of non-professorial staff). This means that once the professorial positions are all filled there is generally no opportunity for another person to achieve the rank of professor, and if, as has happened at the Law School, the professors come in generations, this position may persist for many years. Conversely non-professorial promotions tend to involve seniority, to give some recognition to faithful service. By breaking the tie between titles and salaries the proposal would do away with the fixed number of professorships — any person with the requisite qualities would achieve the rank of professor. It also would not be necessary to promote on the basis of seniority as salary increments could be used as the appropriate reward in this case. It would be possible to have a relatively young talented person with the title of professor receiving less salary than a more senior less talented person without the title. So long as some value is placed on the title, this system could provide recognition to academic merit without busting the budget.

A manifestation of the concern over salary and conditions is a degree of Faculty cynicism about the appointment and promotion process and the general handling of personnel issues by the University. Appointment and promotion are the responsibility of University committees which cannot be controlled by Faculty representatives. There is a feeling that the committees do not act in accordance with the published criteria. For example, many believe that teaching and administrative commitments are undervalued and research overvalued (especially the quantity of research). Moreover, the number of promotions seems to follow the University budget position without this always being acknowledged.

To address these concerns the Faculty appointed a Committee on Staffing convened by Dr Lyndel Prott, Reader in Jurisprudence. Together with her spouse, Associate Professor Patrick O'Keefe, she has become the international authority on the law of cultural heritage, and left in
1990 for a two year stint with the United Nations in Paris working in the area. With a twinkle in his eye, stout figure, beard and Irish background, Professor O'Keefe always brings leprechauns to my thoughts.

The Committee considered that the Faculty should have greater control over the promotion process, that more certain criteria should be adopted and applied, and that there should be more accountability for decisions, if necessary through some method of review. These issues involve the wider University and are being pursued on a University committee. It was also recommended that Faculty appoint a Staff Adviser who could provide information and advice about the processes to staff. The Faculty adopted the recommendation and Professor David Harland was appointed. In just a decade he went from being the junior professor in the Department of Law to the senior, and is looked to as a repository of Faculty experience and wisdom.
Even if all the Committee's recommendations are implemented, they do nothing to the basic financial position of academics. Short of dramatic salary increases funded by the government, the University and Faculty can only pick at the edges of the problem. The University has recently removed the monetary limit that previously applied to outside earnings of academic staff and now only a time limit applies (effectively one day per week). Members of the Faculty have considered various schemes but the main Faculty action to date has been to seek outside funding of Chairs. A few individuals are able to earn outside income consulting in the private and public sectors, but most of the Faculty have to seek modest supplements to income from book royalties and outside teaching and examining.

Despite Faculty actions to deal with staffing problems, what was viewed by some as a crisis occurred in 1989. The high rate of resignations has already been mentioned. There was also a body of thought that the emphasis of the 1988 curriculum on broader economic, political and social issues undercut the traditional Faculty strength of teaching legal doctrine in a rigorous manner. This view was intertwined with the debate concerning the merger of the two departments, the idea seeming to be that the existence of the Department of Jurisprudence and a compulsory Jurisprudence course relieved other courses of the need to address issues other than legal doctrine. Paradoxically to my mind, the Department of Jurisprudence was thus viewed by some as the defender of academic rigour and doctrinal teaching in the Faculty. Whatever the causes, there was clearly an unsettled mood among the Faculty.

The mood was particularly prevalent among younger staff and was in part directed at the perceived Faculty hierarchy, despite the Dean's earnest efforts to make it less hierarchical. For newer members of the Faculty, the mood was a first time experience and thus heightened the feeling of crisis, especially when a number of them were disenfranchised in the election of the new Dean. In my experience, however, outbreaks of staff discontent occur about once every five years (1978-79, 1984-85 and 1989 — also apparently in 1973-74). This is not to underrate the seriousness of the problem but to try to put it in perspective.

Amidst this sombre mood, some things do not change. Mr Bill Chappenden continues to solve the Times crosswords in less than half an hour, ride the ferry to his unit in Manly wearing his white hat, and entertain students of Real Property. Dr John Ball manages to link all manner of disparate arguments together in the discussion at morning tea (and proves to be an able Sub-Dean with remarkable attention to detail).

Activity in the staffing area was not matched in the student area. Students did begin to emerge from the conservatism of the mid 1970s to mid 1980s. When the CTEC review was published student leaders came out in agreement with many of the criticisms. There was also a rebellion by the first year graduate law class over the new curriculum in 1988 relating to the heavy workload that it imposed (the problem was also raised by second year students in 1988 but seems to have been solved by the semester system introduced in 1989). Apart from isolated instances of this kind and regular participation by students in Faculty decision making, there was no great surge in student activism. Indeed, formal participation by students in Faculty affairs has probably addressed many of the concerns of student activists of the past. Many of the changes discussed above were conceived with students very much in mind and strongly influenced by them.

The quiet on the student front may also partly be explained by the highly competitive nature of law schools nowadays. Entry standards have risen to the point where many graduates of the past would not now even be admitted, and the competition to get in then turns to competition to get out with the best results as a means of getting the prize jobs (generally perceived by students to be positions in the large law firms). Whether this is healthy for legal education is an issue that the Law School will soon need to address.

The high entry standards arise from the operation of quotas. One means of decreasing the student staff ratio has been to reduce student numbers. This has not, however, been achieved in a way that artificially boosts entry standards. Rather it has been a combination of measures. First, there was a hump in student numbers arising from the arbitrary increase in 1979 of the number of students in the quota by the Vice-Chancellor of the day, who apparently viewed the Law School as a money making machine for the University. It took the previous Dean five
years to get the entry numbers back to the 1979 level, and then another five years for the larger numbers to work their way through the system. Secondly, with the effective abolition of the straight law degree in the 1988, the Faculty was allowed by the Vice-Chancellor to keep the combined degree student numbers more or less at their current level, so that there was an overall reduction in intake equivalent to the straight law quota. Thirdly, the Faculty tightened up on various back door admission methods that were increasingly being used. Finally, the introduction of minimum progress rules with the new curriculum should ensure more rapid progress of students through the system and enable better prediction of future student numbers.

Visitors

There was a marked increase in the number of visitors to the Faculty, especially overseas academics during the northern summer. Most came under the auspices of the scheme, devised by Professor Parsons in the early 1980s, which pays a reasonable living allowance to a visitor for a period of one to eight weeks. Finance for the scheme is provided by the Committee for Postgraduate Studies. In addition, Allen, Allen & Hemsley funded a Fellowship to pay a professorial salary and travel allowance to a visitor for up to six months each year. The first Fellow in 1986 was Professor David Williams, Master of Wolfson College, Cambridge, an administrative lawyer and witty raconteur who is currently Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge University. He was followed by Professor Richard Buxbaum of Boalt Hall, Berkeley, University of California, a corporations, securities and comparative lawyer who has become a good friend of many Faculty members, Professor Denis Galligan, an administrative and criminal lawyer and legal theorist from the University of Southampton, who has since joined the Faculty, and Professor Misao Tatsuta, a contracts and securities lawyer from Kyoto University, Japan.

In August 1988 there was a very large influx of visitors. The AULSA conference has already been referred to. In addition the Faculty hosted, in conjunction with Monash Law School, the XIth International Congress of Comparative Law which brought many European scholars to the Law School. The invitation to host the Congress came through Professor Alice Tay who remained throughout the flurry of organisation as serene and elegant as always. In 1989 she journeyed to Edinburgh where she received an Honorary Doctorate for her contributions to Jurisprudence and Comparative Law. The whole Department of Jurisprudence was on hand for this event and the author, who was Acting Head of the Department, promised not to try to merge it into the Department of Law during their absence (despite his support for the merger). Professor Tay was in the forefront of opposition to the merger and played a prominent part in the debate over many years.

The Legal Profession

Relationships with the profession were another concern of Professor Austin. He worked very hard on employment issues and was responsible for the appointment of an administrator of the various recruitment programs run by the Law School in conjunction with the profession. He sought to lift the profile of the Law School among its graduates and the profession generally by commencing publication of the Sydney Law School Law Reports, an information newsletter about the Law School.

The continuing legal education program of the Committee for Postgraduate Studies was also reorganised under Professor Austin. The program had run into very stiff competition from other tertiary institutions and privately run seminars, and revenues began to decline. Under the new structure a member of staff was allocated responsibility for the program and a full time administrator appointed. The Committee has continued to offer high quality one-off seminars rather than programs that are recycled every year. Professor Austin was tireless in fund raising efforts and primarily responsible for a number of successes on this front. In addition to the Allen, Allen & Hemsley Fellow and the Landerer Chair, the Blake Dawson Waldron Chair of Banking Law was created (but, due to the paucity of appointable candidates was not able to be filled despite two attempts). Mr John Landerer proved a very good friend of Mahla Pearlman, first woman president of the Law Society of NSW and the Law Council of Australia.
the Law School, providing funds in addition to create a Moot Court and run exchange programs for students with American Law Schools.

Amidst the strain of his efforts Professor Austin retained his boyish looks, unlike the Dean whose beard was noticeably greyer at the end of his term (both of them acquired glasses). The partnership between them as Dean and Head of the Department of Law was a highly successful one for the Law School. Professor Austin’s resignation from the end of 1989 to go into practice was a surprise to many but he remains a Visiting Professor in Companies and Securities Law.

Law School benefactor Mr John Länderer was honoured this year by being made a Fellow of the University. His generosity has made possible the Länderer Chair of Information Technology and the Law.
The Centenary

The Law School enters its second century under closer outside scrutiny than has been the custom in the past. To the surprise of many, events in law schools are now regarded as newsworthy beyond the legal profession. There is a large legacy from the Phegan years including a new curriculum, new initiatives in teaching, new less hierarchical organisational structures, increased staffing and a likely new location, all achieved with wide Faculty consensus. Sydney Law School is now well placed to be proud of its achievements, confident of its future and welcoming of outside attention.

In the rush of events during these years especially in 1989, the fact that the Centenary was approaching faded into the background. This order of priorities, substance over form, is certainly the right one, but there is a place for the rituals and remembrance associated with centennial celebrations. The new Dean, Professor James Crawford, has started the second century auspiciously by vigorously promoting the Centenary and reaching out to the world with the good news about Sydney Law School.
Enrolments during the first hundred years of the Law School's existence have grown from the all male handful of law students in 1890 to some 1200 today, about 40 per cent of whom are women. Numbers peaked in 1973 with a total enrolment of 1478 law students.

Growth was steady but unspectacular to 1914. The period of the Great War saw a decline in student numbers followed by a substantial post war boost reaching its highest point in 1923–24.

The Great Depression of the 1930s appears to have had no very marked effect on enrolments though since the statistics cover total enrolments over the whole course rather than new entries into first year, this may have a flattening effect on the figures.

The impact of World War II on enrolments was spectacular. In 1943 only 61 students were enrolled in law compared with 330 in 1937. Of the 61 students, 23 per cent were women. This does not indicate an increase in women students but a decline in male enrolments. War service and manpower controls which directed young people into essential services were responsible for an almost 70 per cent reduction in Law School enrolments from 1941 to 1942. This reduction was more marked than for the University as a whole due to the high concentration of men enrolled in law.

It should be noted that law was not a 'reserved' faculty so that its students were not exempt from call-up for military service.

Postwar recovery was even more spectacular than had been the wartime decline. The 165 students in 1945 had grown to 599 the following year and to 856 in 1948, a massive percentage increase. Part of the increase was made up of students who had suspended their courses for war service, part was the backlog of first year students not accepted during the war, and part was caused by the introduction of special assistance to returned service people in the form of Commonwealth Reconstruction Training Scheme grants and accelerated course structures.

Periodic fluctuation in enrolment numbers may be linked to the introduction of first year quotas in 1963 and to the establishment of law courses at the University of New South Wales, Macquarie University and the New South Wales Institute of Technology (now the University of Technology, Sydney) in the 1970s. The introduction and development of the course work LLM, welcomed by the profession, played a significant part in enrolment growth.

Increased student numbers which put pressure first of all on the 'old' law school, proceeded to have a similar effect on the new building which, all too soon after its occupation, proved inadequate. The growing enrolment also resulted in a very high student/staff ratio, unequalled by any other Faculty.
An important feature to note is the increased enrolment of women students. Ada Evans, lone female student at the turn of the century and her followers who ventured into law during World War I would no doubt be startled to find women making up over 40 per cent of the current law enrolment. While this participation rate is lower than for the University as a whole,

**Student Enrolments 1890–1990**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Faculty of Law</th>
<th>No (%) Women</th>
<th>Total Uni of Sydney</th>
<th>No of Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1 (2.9)</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1 (2.5)</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1 (2.9)</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1054</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1165</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1324</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1294</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1342</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1387</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1472</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1631</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1674</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1 (1.1)</td>
<td>1798</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1 (1.1)</td>
<td>1648</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1 (1.4)</td>
<td>1736</td>
<td>559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3 (3.3)</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>4 (2.1)</td>
<td>2764</td>
<td>748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>4 (1.4)</td>
<td>3356</td>
<td>777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>8 (2.4)</td>
<td>3275</td>
<td>769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>11 (3.5)</td>
<td>2965</td>
<td>706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>12 (3.4)</td>
<td>2755</td>
<td>622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>11 (2.5)</td>
<td>2688</td>
<td>661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>9 (2.8)</td>
<td>2611</td>
<td>667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>6 (2.1)</td>
<td>2422</td>
<td>656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>7 (2.4)</td>
<td>2410</td>
<td>655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>4 (1.6)</td>
<td>2382</td>
<td>651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>6 (2.3)</td>
<td>2520</td>
<td>705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>8 (2.8)</td>
<td>2824</td>
<td>776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>7 (2.3)</td>
<td>3119</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>7 (2.5)</td>
<td>3091</td>
<td>815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>10 (3.6)</td>
<td>3062</td>
<td>757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>5 (1.9)</td>
<td>3043</td>
<td>686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>4 (1.4)</td>
<td>3029</td>
<td>654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>5 (1.6)</td>
<td>3206</td>
<td>682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>14 (4.2)</td>
<td>3378</td>
<td>761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>12 (4.2)</td>
<td>3672</td>
<td>888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>15 (5.1)</td>
<td>3839</td>
<td>974</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
it certainly indicates a marked change in the legal profession. In time this change, already
evident in the award of Honours and the University medal, might be expected to be reflected
at partnership level in legal firms, at the Bar, on the Bench and in academe.

Note: Due to various discrepancies, enrolment numbers have been used as opposed to student
numbers. The difference between the two figures is not significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Faculty of Law</th>
<th>No (%) Women</th>
<th>Total Uni of Sydney</th>
<th>No of Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>17 (6.1)</td>
<td>4079</td>
<td>1062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>12 (5.3)</td>
<td>4165</td>
<td>1177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>16 (20.8)</td>
<td>3232</td>
<td>1084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>14 (23.0)</td>
<td>3341</td>
<td>1284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>21 (22.1)</td>
<td>3859</td>
<td>1496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>19 (11.5)</td>
<td>4985</td>
<td>1713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>29 (4.8)</td>
<td>8716</td>
<td>2157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>25 (3.4)</td>
<td>10222</td>
<td>2136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>27 (3.2)</td>
<td>10779</td>
<td>2146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>34 (4.1)</td>
<td>10451</td>
<td>2145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>28 (3.7)</td>
<td>7497</td>
<td>2037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>27 (4.5)</td>
<td>8834</td>
<td>1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>37 (7.1)</td>
<td>7497</td>
<td>1817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>44 (8.6)</td>
<td>7206</td>
<td>1784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>48 (8.7)</td>
<td>7034</td>
<td>1804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>48 (7.9)</td>
<td>7405</td>
<td>1917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>51 (8.1)</td>
<td>7885</td>
<td>2074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>46 (7.3)</td>
<td>8346</td>
<td>2227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>52 (7.5)</td>
<td>9046</td>
<td>2411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>48 (6.6)</td>
<td>10316</td>
<td>2764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>64 (7.8)</td>
<td>11950</td>
<td>3341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>60 (7.6)</td>
<td>12602</td>
<td>3624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>62 (7.6)</td>
<td>14109</td>
<td>4166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>65 (7.6)</td>
<td>14719</td>
<td>4435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>68 (7.7)</td>
<td>15605</td>
<td>4917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>1063</td>
<td>86 (8.1)</td>
<td>16305</td>
<td>5213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>1171</td>
<td>93 (7.9)</td>
<td>16669</td>
<td>5461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>1233</td>
<td>109 (8.2)</td>
<td>16602</td>
<td>5160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>1284</td>
<td>103 (8.0)</td>
<td>16253</td>
<td>5340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>1365</td>
<td>117 (8.6)</td>
<td>16356</td>
<td>5408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>1302</td>
<td>124 (9.5)</td>
<td>16727</td>
<td>5627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>1332</td>
<td>167 (12.5)</td>
<td>17202</td>
<td>6184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>192 (13.7)</td>
<td>17255</td>
<td>6420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>1478</td>
<td>231 (15.6)</td>
<td>17169</td>
<td>6432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>1389</td>
<td>235 (16.9)</td>
<td>17441</td>
<td>6723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>1441</td>
<td>243 (16.9)</td>
<td>17872</td>
<td>7031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>1311</td>
<td>248 (18.9)</td>
<td>17512</td>
<td>6933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>1257</td>
<td>271 (21.6)</td>
<td>17870</td>
<td>7282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>1291</td>
<td>304 (23.5)</td>
<td>17742</td>
<td>7273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1274</td>
<td>325 (25.5)</td>
<td>17485</td>
<td>2711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1318</td>
<td>372 (28.2)</td>
<td>18094</td>
<td>7535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>1347</td>
<td>370 (27.5)</td>
<td>17917</td>
<td>7548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>1324</td>
<td>431 (32.6)</td>
<td>18206</td>
<td>7909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>1338</td>
<td>462 (34.6)</td>
<td>18569</td>
<td>8046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1379</td>
<td>518 (37.6)</td>
<td>18420</td>
<td>8155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1402</td>
<td>559 (39.9)</td>
<td>18398</td>
<td>8372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>1343</td>
<td>518 (38.5)</td>
<td>18180</td>
<td>8450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>1204</td>
<td>485 (40.3)</td>
<td>18089</td>
<td>8717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>1246</td>
<td>504 (40.4)</td>
<td>18338</td>
<td>8944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>1239</td>
<td>527 (42.5)</td>
<td>19153</td>
<td>9474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1207</td>
<td>507 (42.0)</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCES
University of Sydney, *Calendars, 1890-1971; University of Sydney Annual Reports, 1972-1988; University of Sydney, Reports of the Senate . . ., 1942-1949.

na not available
nil
Law Graduates

Bachelor’s and Master’s Degrees 1867–1990

Graduates in law from the University of Sydney have been listed below in alphabetical order by year of graduation. Every attempt has been made to ensure that the list is correct and complete, apart from those people who requested that their names be deleted. The editors apologise for any errors and omissions.

It will be noted that some law degrees were awarded before the foundation of the Law School and the appointment of the first Professor and Dean. Chapter 1 attempts to deal with this seeming anomaly.

In the following list the award of the LLM degree is indicated after the name. Otherwise the names are of those students taking out the Bachelor's degree. The letters AEG (ad eundum gradum) indicate degrees awarded on the recommendation of the faculty without examination but in recognition of degrees obtained from other universities. Names of women graduates are sometimes maiden names, sometimes married names. There may be some duplication in this regard.

It should be noted that the LLM by course work was introduced in 1964. Prior to that date, the degree was always awarded on the satisfactory submission of a thesis.

1867
ROGERS, Francis Edward

1869
PURVES, William A
THOMPSON, Joseph
TOLE, Joseph

1871
SLY, Joseph David

1873
SLY, George
SLY, Richard Meares

1876
FARRELL, Charles

1881
EDMUNDS, Walter
QUICK, John (AEG)

1882
COGHLAN, Charles Augustine

1884
MORRIS, Robert Newton

1885
CULLEN, William Portus
GREEN, Arthur Vincent

1887
MANNING, James Napoleon
YARRINGTON, William Henry Hazel

1889
JONES, Albert E (AEG)

1890
ARMSTRONG, Laurens Frederick Matthew
LEGGE, James Gordon
MARDEN, John

1891
NATHAN, Edward Alleyne

1892
CURLEWIS, Herbert Raine
KELYNACK, Arthur James
MACK, Sidney
MEILLON, John

1893
LLOYD, Frederick
TAYLOR, John Michael
UTHER, Allan Hammill
VEECH, Louis Stanislaus
WADDY, Percival Richard

1894
FLANNERY, George Ernest
GERBER, Edward William Theodore
HALLORAN, Aubrey
MEARES, Hercules
O'REILLY, Hubert De Burgh
PICKBURN, James Prosper
THOMSON, Alec
TIGHE, William
WATT, Andrew Robert James

1895
DAVIES, Wyndham John Edward
GILL, Alfred Chalmers
HIGGINS, Percy Reginald
HOLME, John Barton
KNOX, Adrian (AEG)
LEVY, Daniel
MARTIN, Lewis Ormsby
O'CONOR, Broughton B
WALDRON, Thomas Walker King

1896
BOYCE, Francis Stewart
BUTLER, Spencer Joseph St. Clair
COFFEY, Francis Louis Verhulst
DAVIES, Arthur Bernard
KERSHAW, Joseph Cuthbert
SCARVELL, Edric Sydney
WALKER, James Ernest
WOOD, Harrie Dalrymple

1897
BAVIN, Thomas Rainsford
BRIERLEY, Frank Nunan
CREAGH, William John
CULLINANE, John Aloysius
MILLS, Percy Harcourt
O'BRIEN, Patrick Daniel

1898
CLINES, Peter Joseph
ELPHINSTONE, James Cooke
HAMMOND, John Harold
MEREWETHER, Hugh Hamilton
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1921
ARNOTT, Henry Dixon
BERNE, Aubrey Percy
DARE, Lionel
GEE, Walter Samuel
GILDER, Telford Graham
HOLLINDALE, Eustace Thomas
HOOKE, Edwin James
HOWARD, Desmond Francis
LANGKER, Albert Victor
LEAVER, John
McGUIREN, Frederick
NIELD, John Roscoe
PURCELL, Basil Phillip
REIMER, Herbert Ernest Edward
SHAND, John Wentworth
SMITH, Norman Clarence
STAFFORD, George Montgomery
STORKEY, Percy Valentine
SYMONDS, Saul
TWEEDDALE, Sydney Close
YORK, Walter Robert

1922
ANDERSON, John William
ARNOTT, John Friebey
BAUM, Francis Richard
BENECKE, John Stienhouse
BLUMER, Paul Wilfrid
BOWDEN, Eric Keith Saultelle
BOYCE, Raymond Charles
Manning
BUTTERWORTH, Ronald Stanley
CARDINAL, George Vicary
CURREY, Charles Herbert
DAVIES, Alick Sidney
DINAN, Ewart John
FERGUSON, Keith Aubrey
FINCHAM, William Rollo
HUGHESDON, Victor Charles
HUNT, Hector Robert
KENCH, Albert George Thomas
LAMARO, Joseph
LANE, Frank Edwin
LUKIN, Lionel George
MANNION, Harold Joseph
McRAE, Finlay Patrick
O'BRIEN, John Joseph
RALSTON, John Malbon
ROFE, Alfred Bernard Fulton
SPENDER, Percy Claude
STURT, Rex Milford
TONKING, Kenneth John
WALKER, Geoffrey William Elford
WILLIAMS, Lewis George

1923
BALES, Joseph
BERNE, Frederick Witton
BEST, Harold Percival
BROOKS, Francis Edward Emmet
CHAPMAN, Stanley Vincent
CLANCY, Brian Patrick
COWPER, Norman Lethbridge

1924
ATKINS, Roger John
AUBREY, Russell Willis
BAKER, Harry John
BEASLY, Frank Reginald
BEVAN, Harry George
BOLAND, William John
BOYD, Victor Albert
BOYLE, Archibald Courtney
BYES, Marie Beuzeville
COHEN, Colyn Adrian Keith
CONROY, Neville Randolph
COOK, Richard Cecil
DASH, Kenneth Macdonald
FRASER, Douglas Ballantyne
GREENWELL, Sybil Enid Vera
MUNRO
HALL, Arthur John Pepperley
HART, Jack Shelton
HEAD, Roy Leverton
HERRON, Leslie James
HOLT, Henry Thomas Eulent
HOUSETON, Ralph Mervyn Mitchell
HOWARD, George Charles
HUGHES, Joseph Alfred Frederick
FOOR
JONES, David Mander
MACLEAN, William Ian
MACMAHON, Thomas Patrick
MANSFIELD, Alan James
MANT, John Francis
MARTIN, Edgar Maitland
McINtYRE, Malcolm William
DONALD
MILLER, Keith Edward
MILNE, John Wranham
MITCHELL, George

1925
ANDREW, Yerbury Ray
BEALE, Oliver Howard
BIGGS, William John
BRIERLEY, Bruce Gardiner
CARROLL, Stanislaus John
CHAMBERS, Rex
CLANCY, John Sydney James
COURTNEY, Ernest Edward
GRAIN, Walter Andrew Thomas
DICKINSON, Arnold Wallace
McKenzie
DUNLOP, Colin Hector
EDWARDS, Adrian Tollemane
FORSYTH, John Walter
GARRATT, Arthur Henry
HARDING, Alfred Norman
HARRIS, Harold Lark
HERON, Norman Grant
KINKEAD, James John Benedict
LADD, Thomas Rivers
LAW, Eleanor B B Mck.
LESLIE, Angus Neil Cameron
GRANT
LLOYD, Charles Edward Maurice
LOUAT, Frank
MARTIN, Eric Walwyn Ormsby
McINTOSH, Noel Desmond
MCLOSKY, Henry Louis
MITCHELL, John Anthony
PHILLIPS, Percy Frederick
PICKERING, Norman Samuel
PILKINGTON, Leomine James
PRATT, Eric Stanley
REED, Francis Edward
ROPER, Ernest David
ROSENBERG, Alan
ROSS, John Moore
SCOTT, Hector McDonald
SEATON, George Edward Charles
SMYTH, John William

1926
ALLEN, Herbert Daniel
AMSBERG, George Frederick
BALKIN, Harington
BARWICK, Garfield Edward John
BELL, Norman James
BOOTH, Henry Roy
BROWN, Adrian
BROWN, Thomas John
BRYANT, Frederick Charles
CRAWFORD, John Wilson
DAVISON, John Young
DENSLEY, William Pryor
DIGNAM, William John Joseph
EVATT, Clive Raleigh
EWARD, Frank Wilson
FERN, Oliver Carl
GOULD, Jack Vincent
HENERY, Thomas Taylor
IRVINE, Philip Francis
JAGELMAN, Joseph Malcolm
LAIJLOW, John Alexander Reid
LAMPORT, Alfred Maugham
LEAROYD, Harry
LETTERS, Francis Joseph Henry
MACKAY, Ronald William Gordon
McHUGH, Hugh Basil
MILLER, Eric Stanislaus
MOVERLEY, Arthur John
RUSSELL, Edward Allan Selwyn
SENDALL, Horace Richard
SHARPE, Douglas Richmond
SHEED, Francis Joseph
SHORTER, Elaine Hamilton
SNELLING, Harold Alfred Rush
STEPHEN, Frank Carter
TAYLOR, Alan Russell
TEBBUTT, Roy Elliott
WEIR, George
YELHAM, John Henry

1927
AKHURST, Philip Oscar
BENNETT, Charles Newbon
BRIDGES, Cecil Murray Edwin
BUCAN, William
CONYEARE, Alfred Theodore
CORBETT, George Harold
SEYMOUR
CUNNINGHAM, Martin Aloysius
CURRIE, William Oswald
DICKINSON, Henry Black
DONOGHUE, Margaret Kathleen
DOWE, William Arthur Edward
OSBORN, Ernest Maxwell
KERR, John Robert
TOBIAS, Raymond Henry
SPENCER, lan Gordon
NAGLE, John Hailes Flood
MOTE, Russell Livingstone
McMASTER, Patrick Eyolf
MCDONALD, Barry John
MARTIN, Clarence Edward
LAURENCE, Paul Raymond Lister
WALKER, Frank Harvey
PILE, Marcel Emile De Marsay
McKNIGHT, Allan Douglas
HENDERSON, Bruce Edmund
HUTCHINSON, Wallace Baldwin
MARTIN, Trevor James
HENDERSON, Ernest Maxwell

1937
AUSTIN, John James
BENJAFIELD, Robert Vivian
BLACK, Ivan Carlisle
BOWLER, Frank Kirkpatrick
BRERETON, Russell Le Gay
BRIDGE, Alan Bruce Keith Jan
BROADBENT, John Raymond
COWLISHAW, Thomas Abbott
DAVIS, Owen Lennox
GLASSON, Donald Edward
GOLDMAN, Philip
GREEN, Robert Noble Rex
HACKETT JONES, Frank Harold
HENDERSON, Robert Greenway
HENNESSY, Francis Peter
JACKSON, Lawrence Walter
JOHNSTONE, John Roderick
KERSHAW, Henry Burton
LANE, Ernest Olaf
LANGHAM-DALE, Norman
LANNEN, John Bede
LEE, William Jangsing
LESTRANGE, Walter Richard
MAXWELL, Ian James
McDOWELL, Norman Robert
MCKNIGHT, Allan Douglas
MOFFITT, Athol Randolph
O'NEILL, Matthew John
PAISLEY, Robert Ernest
PARKHILL, Robert John Bruce
PAYERTE, John Charles
PENNINGTON, Warick Harper
PRENTICE, Cyril Ken
RANKIN, Donald Neil Peter
ROBERTSON, Charles Anthony
ROBSON, Hugh Walker
SHATIN, Stella Rothschild
SNELSON, Thomas Morgan Lloyd
SPONG, Keith Brooks
STEED, John David
STEVENS, William Robyn Dill
TOMAS, Ernest Ormond Butler
TUCK, William Harry
WARBURTON, William Kingston
WESTON, Clive Frederick
WHITE, Clifford Henry
WILLIAMS, Kenneth Napier
1938
ARNOLD, John Clarence
ATKIN, Philip
BARTON, George
BEIT, Donald Chisholm
BENSON, Alan Philip
BRATHWAITE, Robert George
ASHLEY
CAMERON SMITH, Alistair
COLEMAN, Alan Rees
CRUTTENDEN, David Perry
DALEY, Colin William Joseph
DAVIS, Alfred Israel
DAWES, Edward Naasson
DETTMANN, Hugo Ken Conway
DIND, David Saville
DUNNE, Morgan James Paul
FERGUSON, John Bruce
GILBERT, Charles William
GORDON, Maria Ogilve
GREEN, Frederick John
HORSFIELD, Robert Scott
HUTCHISON, Robert Burns
IRVING, Gordon Maxwell
JAMES, Arthur Fitzgerald
JOHNSTONE, John Roderick
Lindsay
KERSHAW, Henry Burton
LANCE, Ernest Olaf
LANGHAM-DALE, Norman
CHARLES
LANNEN, John Bede
LEE, William Jangsing
LESTRANGE, Walter Richard
MAXWELL, Ian James
McDOWELL, Norman Robert
MCKNIGHT, Allan Douglas
MOFFITT, Athol Randolph
O'NEILL, Matthew John
PAISLEY, Robert Ernest
PARKHILL, Robert John Bruce
PAYERTE, John Charles
PENNINGTON, Warick Harper
PRENTICE, Cyril Ken
RANKIN, Donald Neil Peter
ROBERTSON, Charles Anthony
ROBSON, Hugh Walker
SHATIN, Stella Rothschild
SNELSON, Thomas Morgan Lloyd
SPONG, Keith Brooks
STEED, John David
STEVENS, William Robyn Dill
TOMAS, Ernest Ormond Butler
TUCK, William Harry
WARBURTON, William Kingston
WESTON, Clive Frederick
WHITE, Clifford Henry
WILLIAMS, Kenneth Napier
1939
BEGG, Colin Elly
BOWEN, John King
BRENNAN, Brian Larmer
BRITTN, Christopher Barton
CANTALO, Hilda Maude
CORFE, Dudley Anstruther
DICKINSON, George Arthur
DONALD, David Keith
FALLAW, Charlton
GOLD, George Richard
GRIFFIN, Charles David
GRIFFITHS, Frank Paul
HARRIS, John Cavell
HUSON, Harold Rodney
HUTCHINSON, Wallace Baldwin
HUTLEY, Francis Charles
JEFFREY, Royce Henry
JOHNSTONE, Reginald Sydney
LUSHER, Edwin Augustine
MAGNEY, Thomas Kearin
Masters, Ronald George
MEAGHER, Bryan Craven
MEILLON, John Alwyn
MELVILLE, John Alan
METCALFE, John Patrick
MOORE, Ian Scholes
O'BRIEN, John
OPIE, Clifford William
PENMAN, Eric Bruce
RITCHIE, Alan Vickery
RUNDLE, Leslie
RUSSELL, Arthur McKenzie
RYRJE, Edward John
SHAW, Harold Moffatt
SLATTERY, Kerry Michael
WEBB, Geoffrey Langley Mayo
WILD, Kenneth Edwin
WILLIAMS, John Myles
WOLFE, Samuel Eastman
WYBROW, Kenneth George
1940
ALDERDICE, Colin Boyd
ALLEN, Milton Herbert
ALLEN, Raymond Asher Milton
ASH, William Percy
BENJAMIN, David James
BONAMY, Geoffrey Dyson
BRADLEY, Houghton Burton
BROWN, Robert Mackay
CALLAS, Manoel
CARY, Ronald Arthur
COHEN, Kenneth Arthur
CONNAN, Griffith Ross
DOOLAN, Athol Sydney Daniel
DYCE, Alexander
FISHER, Peter Wallace
FLOOD, Harry Joseph
FORD, Hilary Clifton
GIBLIN, Hugh Falkiner
HAGER, John Leslie
HARDWICK, George Allan
HARKINS, Joseph Patrick
HENDERSON, Bruce Edmund
HEWITT, Joseph Martin
HUMPHREY, John Carlisle
HUTCHINSON, Wallace Baldwin
KERSHAW, Henry Burton
KNOX, Arthur Gustave
LONG, Clyde Philip John
MACHON, Francis Joseph
MC DONALD, William Graham
MCGRATH, John Bowen
MCGREGOR, Douglas Gordon
MC PHERSON, Cecil Campbell
MENZ, Gordon Kenneth
MONRO, Joseph
MOORE, Jack Cochrane
O'HALLORAN, Edmund Alfred
PARKINSON, John Richard
PERRIGNON, William Brendon
PORTER, Ormond William
REILLY, Francis William
RICHARDS, Douglas John
ROBILLIARD, Kenneth George
ROBERTSON, John Roderick
ROSS, Samuel
ROTHERY, John Montague
SALMON, Arthur Julian
SEXTON, Noel Thomas
SHARAH, Joseph Patrick
SHEPHERD, Henry Willson
SIEVEY, Richard Thomas
SOLOMON, Nicholas George
STONE, John Edward
TAYLOR, Harold Middleton
TUTHILL, Arthur Dugdale
WEDGE, Hector Mervyn
WITHALL, Ronald John
1941
ADCOCK, Albert Van Coillie
ALLARS, Kenneth Graham
ASHLEY, Arthur Ernest
BLEECHMORE, Mary Helene
BRANDT, Patricia Kathleen
BUSHELLE, John Arthur
CARMICHAEL, Gordon
CLIPSHAM, Bruce Pickering
COATES, Anthony Joseph
d'APICE, John William
DAVIES, John Rowland
DICKEN, Hugh
GLASS, Harold Hyam
GOLDSTON, John Robert
HENDERSON, Bruce Edmund
HUTCHINSON, Wallace Baldwin
KERSHAW, Henry Burton
KNOX, Arthur Gustave
LONG, Clyde Philip John
MACHON, Francis Joseph
MC DONALD, William Graham
MCGRATH, John Bowen
MCGREGOR, Douglas Gordon
MC PHERSON, Cecil Campbell
MENZ, Gordon Kenneth
MONRO, Joseph
MOORE, Jack Cochrane
O'HALLORAN, Edmund Alfred
PARKINSON, John Richard
PERRIGNON, William Brendon
PORTER, Ormond William
REILLY, Francis William
RICHARDS, Douglas John
ROBILLIARD, Kenneth George
ROSS, Samuel
ROTHERY, John Montague
SALMON, Arthur Julian
SEXTON, Noel Thomas
SHARAH, Joseph Patrick
SHEPHERD, Henry Willson
SIEVEY, Richard Thomas
SOLOMON, Nicholas George
STONE, John Edward
TAYLOR, Harold Middleton
TUTHILL, Arthur Dugdale
WEDGE, Hector Mervyn
WITHALL, Ronald John
1942
BOWEN, John King
BRENNAN, Brian Larmer
BRITTN, Christopher Barton
CANTALO, Hilda Maude
CORFE, Dudley Anstruther
DICKINSON, George Arthur
DONALD, David Keith
FALLAW, Charlton
GOLD, George Richard
GRIFFIN, Charles David
GRIFFITHS, Frank Paul
HARRIS, John Cavell
HUSON, Harold Rodney
HUTCHINSON, Wallace Baldwin
HUTLEY, Francis Charles
JEFFREY, Royce Henry
JOHNSTONE, Reginald Sydney
LUSHER, Edwin Augustine
MAGNEY, Thomas Kearin
Masters, Ronald George
MEAGHER, Bryan Craven
MEILLON, John Alwyn
MELVILLE, John Alan
METCALFE, John Patrick
MOORE, Ian Scholes
O'BRIEN, John
OPIE, Clifford William
PENMAN, Eric Bruce
RITCHIE, Alan Vickery
RUNDLE, Leslie
RUSSELL, Arthur McKenzie
RYRJE, Edward John
SHAW, Harold Moffatt
SLATTERY, Kerry Michael
WEBB, Geoffrey Langley Mayo
WILD, Kenneth Edwin
WILLIAMS, John Myles
WOLFE, Samuel Eastman
WYBROW, Kenneth George
HUMPHREY, John Carlisle
HUTCHINSON, Wallace Baldwin
KERSHAW, Henry Burton
KNOX, Arthur Gustave
LONG, Clyde Philip John
MACHON, Francis Joseph
MC DONALD, William Graham
MCGRATH, John Bowen
MCGREGOR, Douglas Gordon
MC PHERSON, Cecil Campbell
MENZ, Gordon Kenneth
MONRO, Joseph
MOORE, Jack Cochrane
O'HALLORAN, Edmund Alfred
PARKINSON, John Richard
PERRIGNON, William Brendon
PORTER, Ormond William
REILLY, Francis William
RICHARDS, Douglas John
ROBILLIARD, Kenneth George
ROSS, Samuel
ROTHERY, John Montague
SALMON, Arthur Julian
SEXTON, Noel Thomas
SHARAH, Joseph Patrick
SHEPHERD, Henry Willson
SIEVEY, Richard Thomas
SOLOMON, Nicholas George
STONE, John Edward
TAYLOR, Harold Middleton
TUTHILL, Arthur Dugdale
WEDGE, Hector Mervyn
WITHALL, Ronald John
MOYLAN, William Anthony
OLiffe, Charles Joseph
ORAM, Richard Thompson
PERRIGNON, Edmund Theodore
PRICE, John Leslie
QUILKEY, George Thomas
REIDY, John Henry
RENOUf, Alan Philip
RIMES, James Daniel
RYAN, John
SHEARER, William George
SIMON, Bruce Gordon
SOUTER, John
STAMELL, John Hector
TOOSE, Paul Burcher
TOUT, William George Campbell
TUOHY, Vincent Charles
WELLS, Gerald
WHITFIELD, John Edward
WINNING, Walter Sydney

1942
ALLEN, Maurice
ASPREY, Stanford Joseph Boyce
BATEMAN, Beatrice Mary
BOURKE, James Louis
BROWN, Keith Belfield
BURKE, James Louis
CUMMING, William Richard
d'APICE, Hugh Desmond Odillo
DAVES, Cobden Frederick
DAWES, Stanley Jack
DENTON, William Harding
GIBSON, Herbert Hammond
GRIMES, Peter James
HILL, James William
HOOKE, Richard Waldron
KENNEDY, Colin Stewart
LIDDY, Francis Joseph
LOOMES, Allan Henry
McCarthy, Olivia Beatrice Maria
McKEON, Malachi Stanislaus
MORRISON, Charles Ross
NIkolaidis, Mitrofanis
O'HANLON, Vincent Thomas
O'NEILL, John Patrick
PETHERBRIDGE, John Douglas
RATH, Arthur Francis
RICHARDS, Harry Kenneth
ROULSTON, William James
RYAN, Desmond Victor
SCHMIDT, Arthur Thomas
SETON, Brian Vernon Caristion
SIMPSON, George Vickers
SLATTERY, John Patrick
SMALL, David Kennedy
SMITH, Ewart
SMITH, Leonard Raymond
SOUTH, Walter Alexander
STEPHENS, Ronald Frederick
SUMMERHAYS, Vance Dominic
TORRINGTON, Kenneth Frederick

TUCKER, Mary Patricia
TULLY, Laurence John
WALLACE, Vincent Reinehr
WARD, William Desmond Thomas
WEBB, Richard James

1943
BOYCE, John Raymond
CUNNINGHAM, Leslie Sydney
dOWNING, Robert Reginald
GOODE, Edgar George
GRACE, Colin Henry
HILL, Jean Beverley
HUTLEY, Lelia Frances
McKAY, Raymond James
MILLAR, Horace Armitage
O'REILLY, Walter Meredith
POWER, John Michael
QUINN, Edward Thomas
REGAN, Charles Lawrence
SMITH, Frederick Henry
TUBOUTO A, Siaosi Taufa Ahau
WALTON, Jack Westlake
WELLS, David
WIRRELL, Alison Marion

1944
BEARD, Gordon Leonard
BLACKMORE, John Hugh
BOWEN THOMAS, Evan George
BOWIE, Colin Lionel James
BYERS, Maurice Hearne
FORBES, Morris Zion
HOPE, Robert Marsden
LEE, Jack Austell
LEWIS, Evan Clamp Cardiff
MANN, Joseph
McGINTY, Lawrence Frederick
MERCER, Percival George
MORISON, William Loutit
PARSONS, Ross Waite
TILBURY, Lloyd David
Wronker, Gerd Siegfried

1945
BANNERMAN, Ronald Moore
BENJAFIELD, David Gilbert
FRANKI, Robert James Anning
KIRBY, Ernest Joseph
LOWE, Vincent Burke
McGRATH, Edmund Hudson
REUSCH, Jeanette Stuart De San Fe
SHEEHY, Christopher Patrick
SPICE, Marie Keating
SUMMERVILLE, Frank Helmhich
SYMONS, Cedric Reuben

1946
ASTRIDGE, William Owen Anderson
BEACH, John Richard
BELLHOUSE, Herbert Wesley
BOWEN, Lionel Frost
BROOK, Raymond John
BROWN, Tom Austen
BUTTER, Alfred William John
CAHILL, Valma Florence Gilles
CAHILL, William Kevin
COLREAY, Maurice Francis
DAVIDSON, Harold Archdale
DAVIS, Sydney Samuel Wilton
DE GREENEWAAL, Gairne Charles
DEXTER, Georgina McIntyre
DOUGLASS, Elwin Clifford
ELLIOT, Dudley Charles Howard
ESLER, James Michael
GOODMAN, Peter Monk
KEMP, Leslie Vernon
KINGSTON, Kelvin Frank
KITCHING, Dorothy Jean
LESLIE, Peter Aytom
Muir, Alastair Gibson
O'DONNELL, Melia Helen
PARK, Keith Lemond
ROFE, Alexander John Fulton
STEEL CRAIKE, Alexander Charles
STEPHENs, Robert Aylmer
TUCKERMAN, Edward Bruce
WARD, John Manning
WHITLAM, Edward Gough
WOOSEN, John Halden

1947
ARNOLD, Montagu Guerry DeLauret
AUSTIN, Ronald Richard Austral
BADGER, Edward Joseph
BANNON, Charles Joseph
BANNON, Zdenka Vina
BIDDULPH, Edward Tregenna
BROCK, Ronald
CHALLONER, Neville Eldred
CLARKE, Malcolm Jeffery
DAVIES, Owen Mair Leaper
Davis, Jack Mervyn
DOWNER, Leslie John
DRAPER, Keith William
EDWARDS, Owen Lloyd
FENBOW, Nora
FLANNERY, Richard Gerard
GEORGE, Eric Edward
GETTENS, George Henry
HARDIMAN, Keith
HILL, Desmond George Emmett
HOLCOMBE, Bruce Andrew
JACOBS, Kenneth Sydney
KEARNEY, John Basil
KENNEDY, Peter Sutherland
KOUREBERG REIS, Karl
LAKEMAN, Allen Roger
LAKEMAN, Peggy Jean
LAMERTON, Noel Edmund Alfred
LINTON, James Morton
LOVEDAY, Ray Francis
LUCHETTI, William Henry
McALARY, Frank Stratton
MICHETMORE, Alan James
MOORE, Donald Charles
MORRISON, Donald Barry
O'BRIEN, Francis William
OLDENBURG, Margaret Eve
OLiffe, Archibald Anthony
OUSLEY, William John Ignatius
PAWLEY, Kenneth William
PENNINGTON, Clive Allenby
PETRIE, James Charles
PORTER, Chester Alexander
PRENTICE, William Thomas
RADCLIFFE, Alwyn Eric
RENOUf, Edward William
ROULSTON, Robert Parke
SAINT, John Lionel Francis
SAMBUL, Alwyn Ruta
THURLOW, David Keith
YARWOOD, William Charles

1948
ABRAM, Paul Gibson
AUSTIN, Richard Wigram Locke
BELL, Leonard Stuart
CANTOR, Henry Laurence
CODD, Frederic Harden
CREAGHE, David Barry
DARGAN, Austin Bernard
DAVIS, Victor Thomas
DETTMANN, John David
Hardine
DUGGAN, Joseph Michael
DYMOCK, John Murray
ELVIDGE, Francis Robert
ALEXander
FORD, Harvey Clifton
FRAMPTON, Phineas Edward
GIBSON, John Robert
GOLDIE, Louis Frederick Edward
GOLDSWORTHY, Arthur Clive
GREENWELL, Lloyd Pritchard
HUME, John Dudley
JELBERT, Bek
KOEeNG, Karel Joseph
LEWIS, Franklyn Netley
LOCKE, Barry John Anthony
MACKeY, Stanley
MADDISON, John Clarkson
MAHONEY, Denis Leslie
McALARY, Kenneth Stratton
McAULEY, Leonard John
McCREEIDE, Hugh George
McELHONE, Colin John
MILFORD, John David
MILLAR, Frederick William
MINTER, Robert Hugh
NORMIS, John Richard Bertram
O'CONNOR, Terence Joseph
O'LEARY, Kevin Frederick
O'LOUGHLIN, Edward Leonard
ORREILL, Edward John
PARKHAM, Robert
PEARSON, Ross Aubrey
PODGER, Margaret Lucy
A Century Down Town
O'RYAN, Edmund Ernest Jerome

SACHS, Edward Lewis

SACHS, Zena

SCOTT, Russell James

SERISIER, Leroy Dudley

SIMPSON, Edward Philip Telford

SULLIVAN, James Patrick

TATLOW, William Soryngeour

THORLEY, Barrie Ronald

UPTON, Helen

WADDELL, Thomas William

WANNAN, Charles Wilson

WARBY, Brian Gerald

WATSON, Frederick Vernon

WEIGHTMAN, Nevil

WEST, Roy Elliott

WESTALL, Harold Charles

WHITE, John Patrick

WILKINSON, Peter Marshall

WILLIAMS, Eric Arthur

WINTER, Paul Jeffery

YOUNG, David Henry

YUILL, Colin Keith

1951

ADAMS, Edward George

ALLEN, Colin Ramsay

ARINS, Geoffrey O'Connor

ARNOLD, Neville Coburn

AUSTIN, Lionel Maurice

BADHAM, Barratt Lennard

KENDA

BARBOUR, Richard Thornton

Harvey

BARCLAY, William John

BELL, Hubert Henry

BEVINS, Edward Ivason

BLACKSHAW, William Dunleath

BLUM, Alan

BOWRING, John Harold

BRABY, Alan Humphrey

BRADY, John Desmond

BRIGGS, Terence James

BROWN, Samuel Raymond

BROWNE, Philip Charles Elliot

BROWNETTE, Reginald Francis

BRUCE, Malcolm Wilkie

BRYANT, John Beresford

BUFFETT, Charles Ivans

BULLOCK, George Howard

BURGES, Kevin James

CALDWELL, William Oliver

CAMERON, Douglas Alan

CARRUTHERS, Sentel McCallum

CLAY, Peter Jeffreson

COHEN, Brian John Keith

COLEMAN, Maurice Charles

COLEMAN, Robert Fitzroy

COLLINS, Anthony David

COLLIS, Terence William

COOKE, Walter James

COX, Rosslyn William

CROPPER, Douglas Clement

CULLINAN, Clive Vincent

CUMMING THOM, Alan Ritchie

DARTON, Ronald James

DAVIS, Bruce Austin

DAVIS, David Graham

DAWSON, William Ford

DONNELLY, John Wilkinson

DUNN, Cornelius Joseph

DUNN, Edwin Charles

EDWARDS, Margaret Norman

EVATT, Philip George

FEENEY, Lawrence Bernard

FERRIS, John Chapman

FLETCHER, Robert Kennedy

FLOWANCE, James Louis

FORD, Joseph Kevin

FOX, Kevin Vincent

GALLEN, Brian Robert

GARDINER, Norbert Patrick

GOLDSBE, Leon

GRACE, Neville Holmes

GRANNALL, Brian Francis

GRESSIER, Denis

HALL, Robert Godfrey

HARGRAVES, Raymond Patrick

HARRIS, Justin Anthony

HARVEY, Charles Michael

HAWKESFORD, Reginald Geoffrey

HAYDON, Patrick Alphonsus

HAZELL, Norman James

HEALY, Patrick Michael

HELSHAM, Michael Manifold

HIBBARD, Ronald John

HICKEY, Brian John

HIGGINS, Robert Charles

HOAT, Kenneth David

HOARE, Henry Randal

HOBSON, Robert William

HOLLAND, Kevin James

HOLT, Robert Francis

HOVAN, Anthony Martin

HUGHES, John

HULLEY, Charles Edward

HUNGERFORD, Maxwell Sydney

IVES, Norman Ellis

JOHNSON, Athol Lester

JOHNSON, Boyd Stanley

JOURDAIN, Henry David

KAVANNAGH, Francis Joseph

KIRKE, Craig Peter Wharton

KNOX, Arthur Edward Rex

LATIMER, John

LAURENCCE, John Hopeoten

LAW, Arthur Graeme

LECKEY, Edmund Crawford

LENIHAN, Cornelius John

LESLIE, Edmond Colin

LEVER, Walter John

LIDDEN, Mary Helen Elizabeth

LINCOLN SMITH, Paul Aorious

LIVINGSTON, Maxwell Keith

MACARLAME, Thomas Donald

MACINNIS, Douglas Evan

MAGUIRE, Desmond Anthony

MALLON, Charles Patrick

MALONE, John Michael

MANNIX, Edward Francis

MARKHAM, Anthony Cedric

MARTIN, Antony Tummer

MASON, Noel John

MATES, Jack Royston

McCARThY, Robert John

McCLELLAN, William Rex

McKENZIE, Donal Bruce

MCKEOWN, John Vincent

McCLACHLAN, Donald Ernest

McLAREN, Kenneth Donald

MELIUSH, Arthur John

MELLETT, John Antill

MILLS, Charles Patrick

MILLS, Richard John Crawford

MILNE, Douglas Bertram

MOONEY, Peter Francis

MORROW, David Jackson

MORTON, Geoffrey Stewart

MURRAY, Geoffrey Roland

MURRAY, Kevin Douglas

MURRAY, George Francis

MYLCHREST, Alan Henry

NASH, Edward Alton Mawdsley

NOLAN, Barry John

NUTMAN, George Joseph

O'SHEA, John Wayne

PACKER, Francis Geoffrey

PATERSON, Yvonne Helene

PATTERSON, Oscar Bruce

PENKETH, Milton Richard Percy

PHILPOTT, Leslie

PRATT, Harry Lindsay

PRAY, Ronald Ernest

PRESGRAVE, Ronald Herbert

PRYCE, Athol Lester

QUINN, William Stewart

RILEY, Vincent John

RINGROSE, Roy Patrick

ROBERTS, Leslie Charles

ROSS, Peter Barclay Campbell

ROSSITER, Henry Edwin

SANDERS, Richard Edmund

SELMAN, Ross Lincoln

SHANKS, Colin Winton

SHARPE, Leonard John

SHELDON, Geoffrey Clifford

SMALLWOOD, John William

SMITH, Colin McClelland

SMITH, Ian Edward

SPICER, John Henry

ST JOHN, Robert James Baldwin

STAUNTON, James Henry

STENMARK, Antony Desmond

STEPHENS, Bryan Joseph

STYLES, Henry Charles

STREET, Laurence Whistler

THOMAS, Keith James

TUCKFIELD, John Henton

TYSON, Ivan George

WALKER, David Rowland

WALKER, Thomas Hellewell

WARD, John Francis

WEBSTER, John Pitman

WEBSTER, William John

WEIGHTMAN, Gordon Webster

WESTLAKE, William Wallace

WHITE, Colin Thomas Robert

WHITE, Rodney

WILLIAMS, Richard Evan

WILLIS, Peter Gordon Grant

WOODGATE, Richard Sydney

YOUILL, Brian Joseph

1952

ABIGAIL, Ernest Robert

ADAMS, William Monk

ANDERSON, James Outram

ASTRIDGE, Kenneth Frank

BADHAM JACKSON, Anthony

BELLEMORE, Adrian Leonard

BERRIMAN, Robert Matthew

BLUMER, Garry Munro

BLUNDEN, Alan Leslie Frazer

BORE, Richard Neil

BOWEN, Peter Michael

BRADSTREET, John Edward

BRODSKY, George

BRUNSDEN, William Pelvin

BURCHETT, James Charles

BURGES, Malcolm Eric

CAHILL, Keith Bernard

CAMERON, Peter John

CAMPBELL, Eric Charles

CANNON, Harold Oscar Frederick

CARMODY, Patrick John

CATER, Rupert Vance

CLARK, Frederick James

CLARKE, Geoffrey Spencer

CLAYTON, Lulal Brunkill

CONSTANTINE, Con

CONYNGHAM, Gregory Francis

Bede

COWIE, Brian Keith Walton

CRISP, William Robert
DASEY, Maxwell John
DE BASTO, Gerald Arthur
DOOLAN, Marcel Kingsley
DOVEY, William Griffith
DUFTY, Kevin Harold
DUNN, Harold Warwick
DYCE, Douglas Walter
EASTON, William Thomas
EDWARDS, Philip David
Sutherland
ENGLEHR, Peter Bawden
FELLOWS, James Oldbury
Campbell
FERGUSON, Clement Bruce
FETHERSTON, Kevin Roy
FIRTH, Gordon Wentworth
FITZGERALD, Arthur Cameron
FLEMING, Michael Derek
FREAME, Clive Andrew
FREESTONE, Patrick John
GALLOP, John Foster
GIRDLER, Thomas William
GRATTAN SMITH, Padraic
GRANT, Raymond Henry
GRUNDY, Hudson Parker
GUILFOYLE, Patrick James
HALL, William John
HAMILT, Stanley Albert
HARRINGTON, Brian Edward
HARRINGTON, John Bede
HARVEY, Ian James
HILL, John Hamilton
HOCHBERGER, Russell Leroy
HODGEKISS, William George
HOLT, Richard Warren
HORT, Leon David
HOUZTON, John Michael
HOWARD, Stanley Joseph
HOWITT, Adam John
HUNT, John Richard Alyoysius
HUTCHINSON, Stewart Horace
Jay
JACKSON, John Norman Stevens
JACKSON, Marquis Anthony
JOB, Richard William
JOHNSTON, John Stuart
JORGENSEN, James Murray
KERSHAW, Howard Kenneth
KNIBBS, Maxwell Charles
KNOLISCH, Howard Paul
LAWRIE, Maureen Margaret
LEAVER, Stanley Lancelot
LEFEVRE, Philip George
LYNCH, Brendon Patrick
MACKENZIE, Bob Stuart
MACRIS, John William
MAHONY, John Denis
MANION, Bruce Keith
MANNIX, John Joseph
MARSH, Cecil John Henry
MATTERS, Clarence Leslie
McCLANAHAN, Alan Lloyd
McCORMAS, William Robert
McDONALD, Donald Henry
McDONALD, William Noel
McFARLANE, Eric Norman
McGREGOR, John Kevin
McGUEN, Michael Lovell
McLEAN, Clifford George
MEAGHER, David Paul
MORRISSEY, David Michael
MUDIE, Harry
NAYLOR, Alan Ray
NEEDS, Gerald Joseph
NEILSON, Bryan Robert
NIBLETT, Kenneth Edward
O'BRIEN, Alfred Harold
O'CONNOR, Adrienne Marie
O'CONNOR, Beatrice
O'CONNOR, Desmond Patrick
O'SULLIVAN, Lawrence Gregory
O'SULLIVAN, Leslie Bruce
PAIN, Edward Oscar Guthrie
PARK, David Ian
PARKS, Michael Hall
PERRY, Anthony Wentworth
PETTIFORD, Roydon Joseph
PRITCHARD, John Adrian McNair
PURCELL, Cyril Joseph
SHARAH, Gregory Joseph
SHARPE, George Samuel
SHEPHERD, Maurice Maxwell
SILVA, Russell O'Hara
SINCLAIR, Ian McCahan
SMITH, Adrian Hildebrand
SMITH, Cyril Eric
SMITH, Frederick Chares
SMYTH, John Graham
SPIEGHT, Ann Elizabeth
SPICE, Charles Henry
STACK, Roy Solomon
TAYLOR, Brian Guy Finlayson
TAYLOR, Walter Asbrey

The Honorable Mr Justice G S Sharpe
THOMPSON, Barrie Arnold
THORNTON, Peter Barrett
TOCCCHI, Sydney Alberto
TODDHUNTER, Dorothy Jean
TURNER, Roy Frederick
VALKENBURG, Peter John
VIRTUE, Basil
WADE, Francis Joseph
WELCH, Peter James
WHITE, John Francis
WILSON, Rosemary
WISHART, Peter Henry
WOMACK, Wellesley Hugh Arthur
WORTHY, John
YOUNG, Keith
ZINES, Leslie Ronald

1953
ASHTON, Richard David Malcolm
BAIN, Robert Keith
BAKER, Eric Rainsford
BARTON, Gordon Page
BIGGERS, Geoffrey Colin
BOSCI, Stephen Alexander Peter
BRUCE, Marian Alicia
CATO, Kenneth
COLEMAN, Kevin
COOK, Adrian George Hingston
COOK, Samuel John
COOKE, Graham George
COOPER, Frederick Mervyn
COOPER, Hampton Gordon
CROUCH, Graham John
DARVALL, Cholmondeley
DONOVAN, Alexander Matthew
John
DROZCOLL, John Vincent
DUNBAR, William Daniel
EDWARDS, Richard Horace
FISHER, William Kenneth
FOSTER, Michael Leader
Fox, Edward Patrick
GIDDY, Ian Stanley
GOLDWYN, Patricia
GORDON, Vincent Francis
GOULD, Anthony Carr
HARMER, Keith Raymond
HEAD, Neville Roy
HOCKING, Bruce Percy
HOLMAN, James Charles
HOLT, Walter John
HOULIHAN, Joseph Doran
JAMIESON, Hugh Hunter
JAY, Peter Frederic William
JEFFREY, Philip John
KANDY, Robert Bartholomew
KIRBY, Geoffrey Craig
KOLTS, Geoffrey
LANGLEY, Frank Desmond
LIMBERS, Constantine George
LOVE, Vincent De Paul Anthony
MACK, Alexander
MACPHAIL, Morna Christine
MACPHILLAMY, Neil Mowbray
MACKRE, Basil John
MCKERN, Richard Antony
MIDDLETON, Robert Graeme
MILNE, James Bruce
MITCHELL, Alan John
MITCHELMORE, Clement Arthur
MOFFATT, Victor Raymond
MUNDAY, Claude Ernest
MURRAY, David Rowland
NASH, Ronald Roy
NEAL, Barry Thomas
NEWTON, Richard Stuart
NICHOL, Warren Keith
PANCKHURST, David Terence
PARNELL, John
POWELL, Owen Knapton
POWELL, Philip Ernest
PURCELL, Howard Frank
RENOUE, Alan Philip LLM
SHAND, Alexander Barclay
SHEFFIELD, Keith Hubert

SIMPSON, Daryl Telford
STAPLES, James Frederick
SWAYNE, David Vincent
TEBBUTT, Harold Wheen
TRAVERS, Joseph
WARD, Ian Beven
WEAVER, Arthur George
WRIGHT, Raymond George

1954
ADAMS, Frank
BAINTON, Russell John
BEST, Michael John Harold
BOND, Lynton Thomas
BROWN, Bruce Hartley
CAMPBELL, Michael William
CASS, Mary Josephine
CHIPPENDALL, John Kenneth
COLEMAN, Cecil Sidney
COOPER, Harvey Leslie
CRIBB, Ivan Edwin
DAVIDSON, Ronald Barnett
DEANE, William Patrick
DICK, John
DOWEY, Robert John
DOYLE, Barry Lindsay
FOORD, John Murray
GEMMELL, William Thomas
GENT, William Hedley
GOADBY, Joan
GROGAN, John Patrick
HALL, Allan Neville
HEALEY, Oliver Michael
HODGSON, Eibhin Blatna
HOGAN, Alan Eugene
HOGAN, Athol
JONES, Kenneth Raymond
JONES, Owen Michael
JONES, Paul Joseph
JONES, Warwick Alan
KIMMINS, William
KOBIN, Jack David
MACCALLUM, Ian Robert
MACKIE, Mungo Macallum
MAGNEY, Thomas Waymouth
McDARRA, John Francis
McDONALD, Anthony Francis
MCKENNA, Barry Nicholas
McMAHON, Brian John
MONAGHAN, James Edward
MURPHY, Peter Robert
NASH, Russell Bruce
NEEDHAM, Anne
NELSON, John Anthony Park
NETTHEIM, Robert Garth
NORMAN, Peter James
O'CONNOR, John Charles
PHELPS, John Rivers
PRENTICE, Reginald Colin
RATCLIFFE, Peter John
RINGWOOD, Pamela Elsie
ROBIN, Jack David
ROSENBERG, John Ralph
SHAW, Bryan George
Unnamed Law School cricketers and friends enjoy the lighter side of Law School life.

Law School Rugby Union team — Interfaculty Champions 1920
A Century Down Town
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BYRNE, Gerald Hugh
CAMERON, James Alexander
CAMERON, Neil Matheson
CARRUTHERS, Kenneth John
CASEY, Margaret Olivia
CASTLE, David Frank
COLE, Ross Alexander
COLE, Terence Rhoderick Hudson
COOLEY, Bernard Anthony
COOMBS, John Sebastian
CURLEY, Michael John
CURRAN, Margaret Maria
DAVIS, Ralph Sydney
DELANY, Patrick George
DIVER, James John
DONOVAN, Maree Ellen
DYNON, John Sydney
ERRIGAN, John Rodney
FIELD, John Francis
FLINT, David Edward
GLANVILLE, Richard Geoffrey
CURRAN, Margaret Maria
DIVER, James John
DONOVAN, Maree Ellen
DYNON, John Sydney
ERRIGAN, John Rodney
FIELD, John Francis
FLINT, David Edward
GLANVILLE, Richard Geoffrey

225

HALLGREN, John Patterson
HENCHMAN, Peter Humphry
HENTZE, Derek Raoul
HIBBERT, Margaret Anwyl
HISLOP, David John
HORNIBROOK, Michael Murray
HOWARD, John Winston
JAMES, Leslie
KENNEALLY, Gerald
KERRIGAN, John Rodney
KERRIGAN, Norman Joseph
LEYAR, Patrick Andrew
LEE, Mark Francis
LEIGHTON, Duncan John
LESLIE, John Anthony
LIN, Frederic Paul
LIND, Frederick Paul
MAINWARING, Nigel Norman
MARTINEZ, Louis Anthony
McCLUSKEY, John Warwick
McCOSKER, John William
McINTYRE, Anthony William
Donald
MCKENZIE, David Henry
MCKENZIE, James Alexander
McKIM, Graeme James
McLAUGHLIN, John Kennedy
McLELLAND, Malcolm Herbert
MINER, Graham
MOLLENBECK, Gunnar Paul
Richard
MORROW, David John
MULCAHY, Raymond Joseph
MUNRO, Paul Robert Andrew
NEAL, Raymond Eddy
NEILL, Barbara
NICHOLL, David Geoffrey

226

NIVEN, Richard John
PARKER, Roger William Rodney
PEACOCK, Marjorie Jill
POINE, John Anthony
POWLES, Ronald Adrian
PUCKERIDGE, Anthony Francis
PYNE, John Denis
RHODES, Eric Anthony
ROGERS, Leslie David
ROWELL, Robert John
RUSSELL, David Raymond
SAVAGE, Walter Ernest
SCARPAPO, Eleonora Giuliana
STANDISH, Margaret Suzanne
STEIN, Paul Leon
STRASSER, Peter Paul
TARRANT, Harley Owen
THEW, Eric Asher
TOBIAS, Murray Herbert
TUCKERMAN, David Morgan
TYLER, Garry Robert
VENESS, William Leslie
VIRTUE, Leigh Moffat
WEINGARTH, John Carmer
WINDEYER, William Victor
YOUNG, Anthony Joseph
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1962
ANDERSON, Anthony Clark
ANDERSON, James
AUSTIN, Kenneth James
AXTENS, Peter Mackay
BAKER, Jonathan Gilbert
BARTLETT, Russell James
BATES, Barry William
BEESTON, John Harrison
BORDOR, Lillian
BORLARD, Robert William
Anthony
BUCHANAN, Angus
BUCHERINE, Douglas Joseph
CAPELIN, Peter Richard
CASSIDY, John Patrick
CHAN, Cyril Joseph
CHRISTMAS, Gerald Ralph
CONOMOS, James William
CURRAN, Charles Paul
CUTLER, Christopher John
Spedley
DAQUINO, Leo
DAVIDSON, Thomas Swanson
EINFELD, Marcus Richard
ELDER, Donald John
ELRINGTONE, Gavin Graham
FRIDAY, John Rosslyn
GARRETT, Ian Balfour
GLASS, William James McFarlane
GLEESON, Anthony Murray
GOLDSTEIN, Joseph Shore
GOODE, Darryl Joseph
GRYFF, Stefan Erwin
HALLIDAY, Francis James
HAMPTON, Jill Mary
HANDLER, Thomas Joseph
HARRIS, Barry Charlton
HASTINGS, John Howard
HENDERSON, Diana Mary
HENNINGHAM, William Arthur
HEYKO POREBSKI, Louise Marie
HILL, Donald Graham
HODGSON, David Hargraves
HORVER, Lillian
HUSON, Maurice Stanley
HUTCHINSON, Ian Farley
HUTCHINSON, William Joseph
Thomas
JEFFERIS, James Burrows
JOHNSTONE, Ian McLeod
JONES, Clive Raymond
JONES, Ruth Valerie
KELLY, Victor Francis
KING, Philip John Letbridge
KIRBY, Michael Donald
KITAMURA, Torrence Edward
LEVY, Bernard Henry John
MACDONALD, Bruce Gordon
MACKEN, Anthony John
MAHONEY, Barry Edmund
MATHES, Jane Hamilton
MAY, Maurice
MCCARRY, Gregory John
MCLENNAN, Iain Alasdair
MACMAHON, Terrance John
MEERS, Nelson John
MOORE, Peter Joseph
NEVILL, Victor Ceci
PARKER, Frank Melville Grayson
PEDEN, John Ranald
RESTUCCIA, Anthony John
ROBBERDS, Lioneli Philip
ROSS, David Hugh Wallace
ROSS, Herbert David William
SARKS, Francis Michael
SCOTT, Anthony Gordon
SHAILER, John Henry
SHORT, David Dickson
SMITH, Leslie Francis
STANLEY, Francis Edward
STEPHENSON, George Murray
STEWART, Russell Andrew Forsyth
STOWE, John Milton
TAMBERLIN, Brian John Michael
THOMSON, Robert Somers
THORNTON, Brian Edmond
THRUSH, Reginald George
TRAILL, John David Edward
TRAILL, Paul Gerard
VAUGHAN, Brian Henry
WADDY, Lloyd Dangate Stacy
WALKER, Geoffrey Dennis De
Quincy
WALLACE JONES, Philip
WALSH, Paul Francis
WATFORD, Gareth Eadie
WILLIAMS, Roger Bede
WRIGHT, Kerry McGinley Joseph

1963
BARROWMAN, Harry Douglas
BAXT, Robert
BEER, Margaret Mary
BELL, Jonathan Albin
BENNETT, Kerry Vincent
BERESFORD, Geoffrey John
BILINSKY, Bohdan
BINGHAM, Carol Anne
BOLZAN, Leonard Anthony
BRAND, Robert John
BRIDGES, Bryce Dalgety
BROWN, Desmond Patrick
BRUNEN, Harry
BURGESS, Diane Margaret
BUTLER, Ormorde Roger
CARMONT, Peter Walter
CARVA, John Consantine
COLLINS, Brian Carlton
COURT, Roger Maxwell
DAKIN, Arthur Neil
DALGLEISH, Alexander Philip
Stuart
DAVIES, Alan Andrew
DICKSON, Richard Stuart
DOWD, John Robert Arthur
DOWD, Michael Antony
DUC, Brian William
ERWIN, Brian Thomas
EYRE, William Anthony
FRENCH, Hilton Leigh
FISHER, Peter John
GERAGHTY, Barry Patrick John
GIBB, James Roger
GIBSON, Norman Henry
GRAHAM, Peter Ross
HAMILTON, John Perry
HARDING, Donald Edward
HARLAND, David John
HEALEY, David Victor
HEMPHILL, Robert William
HEWITT, Anthony David Martin
HOLLI, Laurence Christopher
HORLER, Kenneth Gregory
HOUSTON, Albert John
HUNT, Ian Gilvray Melville
JAMES, Bruce Meredith
JOHNS, Malcolm Nelson
KUNER, Peter Warren
LAPaine, George
LAWSON, William Henry
LEHMANN, Geoffrey John
MACGREGOR, John Philip
Warwick
MACPHEE, Ian Malcolm
MAGUIRE, Robert John
MANT, John Hayward
MARKS, Francis
McCREDE, Donald John
McDONALD, Margaret Ann
McMAHON, Gregan John
MENCZEL, John Steven
MOSES, Neville James
NICHOLLS, Bruce Raymond
LATTIN, John Christopher
LAWLER, Peter Edward
LEWIS, Walter John LLM
LIEBERMAN, David Alexander Ross
LIMBURG, Graham Alfred
MANCHESTER, Anthony Hugh LLM
MARDEN, Ronald Garth
MATER, Roderick Colin Paul
MAZODIER, Paul Keith
MCCONNELL, Keith Stevens
McDOUGALL, Ian Lanham Ross
McINTYRE, James Alexander
McKENZIE, Bruce David
McKEOWN, Robert Edward
McLAY, Joan Beryl
MEAGHER, Thomas Francis
MILES, Robert John George
MILLS, Kerry Fraser
MITCHELL, Scott
MOORE, Ian Marshall
MOORE, Lindsay John
NEIL, Maurice James
NELD, John Roscoe
O'HARE, Colin William
PEACHEY, Noreen Veronica
PFENNIGWERTH, Ross Elvins
PHILLIPS, Lynnette Elizabeth
POULOS, James
PRESBURY, Thomas
PRIOR, Peter Carey
PULLINGER, David George
REYNOLDS, Steven Jon
RHODES, George Phillip
RICHARDSON, Peter Bruce
ROSE, Michael John
RUDDOCK, Philip Maxwell
SAUL, Phillip Howard
SAWYER, Graham Robert
SCOTTFORD, Anthony Timms
SCOTT, Dennis Neil
SCOULER, Colin Cameron
SEGGIE, Kevin Irving
SHAND, Ronald Wentworth
SIME, Murray Fraser
SOLLING, Max Charles
STERN, Terence Leland
STEVENSON, Andrew Wentworth
STEWART, Donald Gerard LLM
TAYLOR, Anne Wilson
TESORIERO, Peter
THOMSON, David Stewart
TRAILL, John David Edward LLM
TUTHILL, William Edmond Forsyth
VARDANEGA, Roger Allen
VRACHNAS, Paul Phokion
WALKER, Alexander McLeod
WALKER, Brian James
WARNER, James Dudley
WESTLAKE, John Stewart
WHEEHAAN, Dennis Anthony
WHIGHT, Margaret Agnes
WHITEMAN, Denis Dowling
WILLIAMS, Dominic John Francis
WILLIAMS, Thomas Arthur
WITHNALL, Nerolic Phyliss

1968
ANDREWS, David Ernest
APPLEGATE, Geoffrey David
BARKER, Elizabeth Angela
BATES, Graham Douglas
BAYLISS, Rex Alan
BEERWORTH, William John
BELLANTO, Anthony John
BERGER, Victor
BERNEY, Ronald Martin
BOESENBERG, Peter John
McKenzie
BOOILER, Thomas Joseph
BROWN, Geoffrey Charles
BROWN, Geoffrey Spencer
BRYDEN, Ian Edward
BUTLER, Robert Hugh
CALNAN, Bruce Victor
CARROLL, Ian Clifton
CHARLTON, Geoffrey William
CHISHOLM, Richard Colin
CHRISTIE, Terence Joseph
CLARK, Philip Marcus
COLEMAN, Peter Evan
COLMAN, Warren John
CORLETT, Robert Bruce
COWLEY, Graham John
CROMPTON, Alan Barons
CRONES, Angelo
DAVIS, Sydney Samuel Wilton LLM
DAWSON, Peter Cecil Harcourt
DEAN, John Kenneth
DEAN, Judith Margaret
DEBUS, Robert John
DELANEY, Norman Edward
DESATRICK, Ronald Jules
DUKAS, Edita Biritre
DONOHOE, Paul Michael
DUFFIELD, Anne
DUNKEL, Michael
DUNNE, Ambrose Anthony David
ELLIS, Paul Carter
FILE, Leigh Graeme
FINN, Christopher Michael
FITZGIBBON, Peter Gerald
FITZGERALD, Mark John
FITZGERALD, Michael John
FOX, David Thomas
GEDDES, David Henry LLM
GEDDES, Ronald John
GIUGNI, Peter Desmond
GOLDSWORTHY, Peter Jeffrey
GRAHAM, Geoffrey John
GRAILTON, James Edmund
GRAY, Beatrice Ann
HAINES, Trevor William
HALLETT, Brian William
HALLDAY, Hugh Edward
HAMIL, Charles Keith
HASSELDINE, Christopher John
HILL, Gerard John
HILL, Susan Louise
HISLOP, John David
HUNTINGTON, Murray John Royal
ISSAKIDIS, Michael John
JACOBSON, Peter Michael
JONES, Bernard Patrick
JONES, Ronald James
KEARNS, James Gordon
KELWAY, Jennifer Ann
KELLEHER, Kevin James
KELSO, Peter John Sidney
KEMP, Peter
KENDELL, David Ward
KENNEDY, Alan Gibson
KERNICK, John Alan
LA FONTAINE, Peter Allan
LAMPRATI, Luigi
LAWY, Ian Anthony Neil
LEACH, David George Samuel
LEVER, Frank Graham
LEYS, Roger Edward
LOVAT, Anthony John
LOVE, Colin William
MACDONALD, Alan John
MAURICE, Michael David Andrew
MCQUODA, John Colin
MCNEIL, John Bryan
MCNERNEY, Francis Gregory
MCNTYRE, Diana Ellen
MCKINNEY, Carolyn Gwenda
MACMAHON, Peter Manning
McMillan, Brian Edward
MEAGHER, Mark Philip
MELVILLE, Michael Francis
MENZIES, Paul
METLEI, Joseph
MIROW, William John
MOLLOY, Graham Brian
MORAGHAN, James Patrick
MORONEY, David Francis
MURPHY, Paul Kevin
NEGAL, John Neil
O'CONNOR, Terence Joseph LLM
ON'DONELLI, Jack
O'HALLORAN, Edmund Anthony
O'Rourke, Warwick Philip
PHOTOS, James
POLLARD, John William Faben
PURCELL, Terence Patrick
RAMSAY, Ian Wallace
RATNER, Leon Martin
RAYMENT, Brian Wade
REYMUND, Michel Bernard
ROBERTS, Gary Grant Johann
ROBERTS, Michael John Darcy
ROPER, Christopher John
ROSSITER, Christopher John
RUNDLE, Julian Francis

1969
ABADEE, Stevern Ross
ABRAHAMS, Antony Morris Frederick
ADAMS, Michael Frederick
ANDERSON, Robert Hartley
ARMITAGE, Christopher John
ASHBURNER, Alan Richard
AUSTIN, Robert Peter
AUSTIN, Terence Michael
BAILLIE, James Raymond
BARNETT, David John
BARTLEY, Anthony John
BATEMAN, Gregory John
BEER, Alice Joan
BELL, Philip Ronald
BELLANTONIO, Mario
BELLINSKY, Bohdan LLM
BIRZULIS, Ivor Andrzej
BLACKSHIELD, Anthony Roland LLM
BOONSRI, Prasert LLM
BOWLES, Lesley Roscoe
BRADLEY, Hugh Burton
BROGAN, Edward Anthony
LEIGHTON
BURKE, Ramon Francis LLM
BURKE, William Michael
REDMAYNE
CALLAGHAN, Peter Raymond LLM
CAPPE, Peter Henry
CARROLL, Bruce Michael
CLARKE, Terence Arthur
CLELAND, John Willoughby
RUSSELL, Alan Anthony
RUSSELL, Myra Winifred
RYAN, Laurence Dermot
SCHWARTZKOFF, John David
SCOBIE, Michael Boyd
SEGAL, Graham Philip
SHORT, Roger Ronald
SIMONS, Anthony Michael
SIMONS, Esther Erika
SPEED, Robin Roy LLM
STRASSER, Peter Paul LLM
STRATTON, David Erith
TADD, Richard Arvel
TAN, Michael Kun Boo
THOMAS, William Beach
TRAILL, Paul Gerard LLM
TURNER, Mark Robert
VEREKER, Anthony
WALKER, John Graham
WEINGART, John Carner LLM
WHELAN, Paul Francis Patrick
WHITE, David John
WHITE, George Peter Dukett
WHITE, Ronald John LLM
WILSON, David Padget Avonmore
WINTERS, Peter Vivian
WONG, Raymond Tung Chuen
WYNTER, Michael Rodney
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T1CEHURST, John Andrew
THOM, Wayne Frederick
TERRY, Roslyn Margaret
TERRY, Joanne Robin LLM
TAGGART, Bruce Donald
TURNBULL, Malcolm Bligh
TROUNCER, Peter Sebastian
TOLL, Margaret Estelle
TUDEHOPE, Damien Francis
WALLACH, Irving Harry
WALKER, Bret William
WILKINS, Kim Edward
WHITNEY, Robert George LLM
WHITE, Phillip James
AMES, Barbara Nance
ADRIAN, Ian Ross
WYNN, Malcolm Lewis
YANCO, Leon
YOUNG, Dianne

1979
ADAMS, Leigh William Monk
ADRIAN, Ian Ross
AMES, Barbara Nance
ANDREWS, Jennifer Elizabeth
ARDILL, Peter Jerome
ARMSTRONG, Derek Richard
ASHBY, Christine
BACK, Francis Joseph
BAXTER, Paul Charles Frederick
BAYLIS, John George
BILGRIE, David Richard
BANCROFT, Anthony Gregory
BARNES, Shenagh LLM
BARRETT, James Edward
BENTLEY, Bruce William
BERNER, Gordon Munro
BESOMO, Ian Wayne
BEST, Roderick Charles
BINNETTER, Michael Thomas
BLAXLAND, John David
BLUNDEN, Audrey Richardson
BOULTEN, Phillip Richard
BOYD, Jane Marion
BOYD, Michael Edward
BRAITHWAITE, Lynette Mabs
BROWN, Barry Allan
BROWNE, Darryl Ian
BUCHANAN, Lynn
BURGESS, John Llewellyn
BYRNE, Suzanne Maree
CALDWELL, Peter Charles
CAMERON, Don Stuart
CAMPION, Patrick Joseph
CANNON, William Daniel Michele LLM
CARA, Bruno Samuel
CARR GREGG, John Francis
CARA, Bruno Samuel
CARR, John Francis
CROMWELL
CARR, John Francis
CROMWELL
CARTER, Peter Joseph
CHIKAROVSKI, Terry Anne
CHIKAROVSKI, Kris
CHUNG, Ken Yen
CLEAVER, Peter Raymond
CLISDELL, Roger James
CLIFF, Gary Charles
COHEN, Andrew John
CONDREN, Michael James LLM
CONNOLLY, Margaret Mary
CORMACK, Harry James
CORKS, Peter LLM
COPPER, Charles Macquarie
COX, Stephen Edmund
CRAIGIE, Anne Pamela Bruce
CRANE, David John
CRAVEN, Clive Horace Cronin LLM
CRENNAN, Susan Maree
CROFTS, David Colin
CROSS, Warren Bramwell
CULEY, Derek Charles
CUMBER, Guy Masterton
CUMMING, Laelach Gordon
CURRAN, Patrick Joseph
DAVID, Jeffrey Robert
DAY, Michele Constanza
DE CARLI, Guy
DEUTSCH, Robert Leslie
DODD, John William
DUDDINGTON, Catherine Mary
EAGER, James Andrew
EARP, Martin Kenneth LLM
EDMONDS, Richard Francis LLM
EDSTEIN, John Vincent
ELKINGTON, Gordon Bradley LLM
FARRELL, Lucy Kathleen
FINDLAY, Mark James LLM
FLANAGAN, Michael James
FORESTER, Gregory Mark
FORSTER, Reginald John LLM
FOSTER, Peter Gregory
FOX, David John
FREESTONE, Julie Therese
FULLER, Gillian Mary
FURBANKS, Ian Neilist
GALITSKY, Serge LLM
GARCIA, Arthur Efren LLM
GARLING, Jane Anne
GIBBINS, Mark Christopher
GIORDANO, Francis Joseph
GIUSEPPI, Fiona Elizabeth
GLOVER, Leigh Scott
GODWIN, Prudence Marie
GOH, Alexis Lian Yin LLM
GOODALL, Brian Maxwell
GOODEN, Gerard John Michael
GOODMAN, Graham David
GOODWIN, John George
GOULD, Glenn Martin
GRAHAM, Keith James
GRAHAM, Susan Elizabeth
GRAY, Jane Ann
GREY, Anthony Leigh
GRIMSHAW, James Peter
GUEST, David John
GURNEY, T. Graeme Redington
HANRAHAN, Ross Gerard
HARRIS, Antony Alan
HARRIS, George Christopher
HARRISON, Anne Elizabeth
HARRISON, Howard Gerard
HARRISON, Maurice John Peter
HEAZLEWOOD, Ruth Alison
HEES, Josephine Mary
HERNE, Stephen Charles LLM
HERPS, Richard Allan
HILL, Jennifer Gae
HILL, Peter Thomas
HILTON, Geoffrey Allan LLM
HOPKINS, Geoffroy Ian
HORLACHER, Irene Louise
HOWARD, Stephen John
HOWN, Matthew Graeme
HUTLEY, Frances Alexandra
HUTLEY, Noel Charles
INGATE, Stephen Clyde
JANSSEN, Peter Joseph William
JEFFS, Rohan Kenneth Stretton LLM
JENKINS, Elizabeth Ann
JONES, Stephen Gregory
KACIR, Richard Paul
KELLY, Jennifer Ann LLM
KENNEDY, Desmond Thomas LLM
KENNEDY, Samuel
KILDEE, Jeffrey Francis LLM
KOEC, William John LLM
KRISTIC, Francis
LATIMER, Anthony Waddell
LAUGHLIN, Paul Grahame
LESLIE, Catherine Anne
LESTER, Jonathan Howard
LEVICK, Gregory
LUM, Jennifer Katherine
LYNCH, Rebecca Monica Grace
MACLENNAN, Malcolm John
MARIEN, Mark Curtis
MARSHALL, Narelle Kathryn
MATHEWS, Richard George
MAXTON, Ian Malcolm Graham
McCLELLAN, Geoffrey Alan
McFEE, Lorna Phoebe
McMAHON, Peter Chanel
MCMANAMEY, Bruce Gordon
MCMANUS, Karen Louise
McMINN, Anthony John
MCVEITY, Philip Bruce
McWILLIAM, Bruce Ian
MELHAM, Daryl
MELLOR, Kenneth James
MELROSE, Gregory
MENLOVE, Neville Edward LLM
MENZIES, Stephen John
MEYER, Deborah Lynne
MILES, Peter Cameron
MILES, Robert John George LLM
MILLER, Gregory Paul
MILLER, Andrew Stewart LLM
MORRISON, John Lister
MUNTON, Alexander John
MURPHY, William George
MURRAY, Michael Leslie
NEVILLE, Warwick John
NORRIE, David Gaston
NUTMAN, Victoria Anne
O'DONNELL, Maria
O'HARAE, Pamela Jennifer
O'LEY, Margaret Caroline
OLSEN, Lena Kai LLM
OMENS, Pieter Edward
PATANE, Robert Samuel
PATRICK, David Alan
PEARSELL, Peter John
PETERS, Julie Anne
PICONI, Christopher John
PIPER, Stuart William Arnold
POZNIAK, Leslie Michael Steven
PRAEGEL, Neil Stewart
PUGH, Catherine Mary
PULSFORD, Geoffrey Wills
PYKE, Geraldene Ann
RADOJEV, Alex
RATH, Philippa
REID, Paula
REID, Ronald Niall Forest
RENOUF, John Anthony
REUBEN, Samuel Yates
REWELL, Keith Phillip
RICHARDSON, James Robert
RICKARD, Timothy Justin
ROBERTS, Peter Anthony
ROSS, Robert HANDY
ROBERTSON, Bruce Ian
ROBERTSON, Gregory Keith LLM
ROBINSON, Andrew George
ROBINSON, Jane Anne
ROBSON, Colin Bruce
ROCHE, William John
ROOK, Kenneth John
ROSE, Richard Barclay
ROSENBAUM, Theadora
ROSENBERG, Martin David
BERY, Richard Douglas
BETTS, Michael Charles
BEVAN, Christopher John
BLACK, Richard Damien
BLACKAH, John David
BLANEKY, Michael Leslie LLM
BLANCH, Paul Vincent Hilton
BOLON, George Albert
BOSKOVITZ, Gabor Leslie
BROWN, Lucinda Maree
BROWN, Andrew Stuart
BRYANT, Gordon Jeffrey
BRYDEN BROWN, Jane
BUFF, Susan Jennifer
BURNS McRUVIE, Katharine Ailsa
BURNS, Susan Jane
BURTON, Gregory Keith
BUSH, Lesley Elizabeth
CALLANAN, Michael Francis
CAMBOURN, Ian Robert
CAMERON, Robert Bryan
CARDOMY, John Edward
CHENEY, Christine Helen
CLARK, Paul Antony
CLIMPSON, Stephen Wayne
CLOUGH, Michael Andrew
COLE, Stephanie Maeve
COLEMAN, Douglas Charles
COLMAN, Antony Mark
COOPER, Graeme Stuart
CORBETT, Anne Mary
CORSARO, Francis
CROSS, Graeme Bruce
COWLEY, John Dennis
CRENNAH, Paul Laurence
CROFT, Bruce
CROUCH, Ewen Graham Wolsey
CROWLEY, Michael Desmond
DEAN, Gary Richard
DENMEADE, Paul Andrew
DICCONSON, Marcellin Joseph
DIXON, Peter Graeme
DONOVAN, Brian Harrie Kevin LLM
DZIEZDZIC, Andrew Stefan
EDWARDS, Giles David Sutherland
EGRI, Peter Andrew
ELLICOTT, Michael Robert John
ENRIGH, Pamela Joy
EVERETT, Dianne Joyce LLM
FISHER, Gordon William LLM
FISHER, Matthew John
FITZGERALD, Catherine Margaret
FITZGERALD, Denis Byrne LLM
FITZPATRICK, Bruce Duncan
FLANNERY, Paul Francis LLM
FORD, Mark Antony
GALBRAITH, David Fairley LLM
GALLAGHER, Paul Francis Stephen
GALLO, Marion Jane
GARRETT, Peter James
GAUNT, Simon LLM
GELLERT, Stephen Paul
GHARTEY, Victoria Louisa LLM
GLEESON, Fabian
GRAHAM, Geoffrey John LLM
GREGG, Gary Michael
GUILD, Wayne Gregory LLM
HADDOCK, Kerry Anne
HALPIN, Gregory John
HAMER, Brian Michael LLM
HANNAM, Robert Alexander
HARKNESS, Kenneth Mark
HARRIS, Bruce Anthony LLM
HART, Stephen William
HEIDTMAN, David Sidney LLM
HEMMINGWAY, Angela Elizabeth Walsh
HENNESSEY, John Allenby
HILL, Justin Birk
HOLLINGUM, James William
HOMERSHAM, Paula Grace
HOOLAHAN, Anthony William
HOOLAHAN, Mark Bow
HOLLOWELL, Christopher Robert Kent
HOWIE, Roderick Neil LLM
INNES, Jane Gael
JACK, Pamela Margaret
JANSOHN, Frederick Peter
JESSUP, Alan LLM
JOHNSON, Tass James
KANAKIS, Lucas Jupiter
KANJIAN, Ken
KENYON, David Arthur
KERR, William
KING, Paul Julian
KINGSFORD SMITH, Dimity Anne
KNEIGHT, Waldo Bruce
KRASS, Warren Mark
LA PEYRE, Susan Joy
LAUMBERG, Anthony Steven
LAW, Alexander James LLM
LAWRENCE, Marcelle Abbey
LE PAGE, David Geoffrey
LEACH, Tanya Jane
LEHANE, John Robert Felix LLM
LEONARD, Peter Guildford
LINDSAY, Philip John
LOWE, Stephen Brian
LUCANTONIO, John Edmond
MACKERRAS, Jennifer Ann
MADDOCKS, Geoffrey John
MAIDEN, Ronald John
MANNA, Gino Luigi
MANUELL, Richard John
MARTIN, John William
MAUREL ROUSSEAU, Marie Philomena
MAXWELL, Dermot John
MAY, Susan
MCDONNELL, John Kenneth
McGUINNESS, Christine Melanie
McGUINNESS, David John
McLEAN, Ross Glen
McNALLY, Gregory Peter
McSPEDDEN, Andrew Lachlan
MEEHAN, James William
MOLYNEUX, Mary Bridget
MOORE, Geoffrey Allan LLM
MOORE, Ngaire Terese
MOORE, Peter Charles
MORATELLI, John Douglas
Muir, Thomas Robert
MURPHY, Graeme Harold
NASVELD, Karen Marie
NEWBURY, Francis Hilton
NEWBRUN, Ian Michael
NORRIS, Suzanne Winifred
O'BRIEN, Mark Leo
O'HEHIR, Christopher Michael LLM
OLLIFFE, Bronwyn Margaret
O'NEILL, Michael Francis
O'HEADES, Glenn Raymond
OUTRAM, John Thomas
OWENS, Edward Peter
PALLAVICINI, Stephen Phillip
PHILLIPS, Jeffrey Paul
PHILLIPS, Peter Lee James
PLAYER, Graeme Philip
PRAGNELL, Michael John
PULSFORD, Bruce Wills
PURDUE, Bruce Alan LLM
REGAN, Susan Margaret
RICHARDSON, David Ross
RINGER, Alison Jane LLM
ROHR, David John LLM
RUSSONIELLO, Matteo
RYAN, Judith Maureen
RYAN, Mark Anthony Patrick
RYAN, Mary Ellen
SANT, Paul Charles
SCHAFFER, Ronald William
SCOTT, Craig Francis
SCOTT, Diane Margaret
SEPTON, Grant David
SHARPE, David James
SHEEHY, John Samuel
SIDDONS, Anne Maree
SIDHU, Sushil Kaur LLM
SISINNI, Dominic Anthony
SLATER, Elisabeth Ann
SMITH, Brenda Bayley
SMITH, Frederick John
SMITH, Gregory Hilliard
SMITH, Helen Elisabeth
SMITH, Rodney Michael LLM
SNELL, Michael Leslie
SOLARI, Michael
SOMERVILLE, David Donald LLM
SPIALLANE, Michael Anthony
SPIRA, Anne Riva
STANOJEVSKI, Licijana
STARK, Suzanne Marianne
STEIN, David William
STEPEK, Peter John
SUTTON, John Ridley
TAYLOR, Michael Kevin
THIERING, Nerida Ruth
THOMAS, Kenneth Charles
TOBIN, Claire Margaret
TOOLE, Alexandra
TRAVERS, Geoffrey Clayton
TSATHAS, Peter
TZOVARAS, Ted Dorotheos
VASSILIOU, Maria
VIZZONE, Joseph
WALTERS, Robert James Michael
WARD, Philip John
WARMENHOVEN, James John
WARNER, Helen Margaret
WEBB, Jeanette Mary
WEBB, Lewis James
WEST, Philip John
WHITMONT, Deborah Anne
WHITTE, John Brian
WILLIAMS, Nanette Lee
WILSON, Ian Gibson
WILSON, John Dominic
WOODS, Elizabeth Margaret
WOODWARD, Jennifer Ann
WRIGHT, Robertson James

1981
ABBOTT, Anthony John
ALEXANDER, Penelope
ALLAN, Christine Joan
ALTOBELLI, Thomas
ANDRESAKIS, Angelo
BAILEY, Deborah Louise
BALTINS, Edgar Martin
BALTINS, Peter Ernest
BAMBER, Josephine Mary
BASAGLIA, Grazia
BATTERSBY, Michael William
BAYLISS, Russell Thomas
BECKTON, Elizabeth Anne
BENJAMIN, Timothy John
BENNETT, Anne Marilyn
BERRY, Winston Heller
BINETTER, Michael Thomas
Robert LLM
BISHOP, Daemeni
BISITS, Adam Michael Steven LLM
BOOTH, Stephen John
BRADY, Margaret Gillian
BRIDGES MAXWELL, Joanna
BROWN, Rani Beverley
BRYANT, Keith Arthur
BRYDEN, Robert Stanley
BUCHANAN, Mark Charles
BULOG, George
BURNS, Susan Lucy
BUTLER, Jennifer Mary
BYRNE, Peter Michael
CAHILL, Anthony Francis
CAMPBELL, David Robert
CAMPBELL, Ian Graeme LLM
CAMPBELL, Robert Anthony LLM
FARRAN, Ronald Alan
FEATHER, Dennis John
FENELEY, John Gerard
FENNING, Anthony Kevin
FINNEY, John Hamish Giles
FITZPATRICK, Robert Michael
FLANNERY, Leonie
FLYNN, Richard Gerard
FORD, David Clifton LLM
FOX, Elizabeth Majella
FRASER, Kim Louise
FROST, Anthony John
GALLANT, Simon John
GARDINER, Bruce Walter
GARNON, Jeffrey Stephen
GASSER, Donna Liane LLM
GEROGIANNIS, Bill
GESIERICH, Marlen Gwenedoline
GIANNONE, Richard
GIBSON, Bruce John
GILES, Jennifer Anne
GILLIS, Alwyn David
GILLS, Michael Joseph
GOLDBERG, Terence Louis
GORDON, Alison
GRAINGER, Christopher John
GRAY, Jacqueline Renata
GRECH, Lawrence Joseph Charles
GREEN, Peter Christian LLM
GREGORY, John Jude
GRIMES, Mary Josepha
GRINSTON, Elizabeth Joan
HAILS, Peter Rodney
HAINES, Michael Gerard
HALLAS, Constantina Dina
HALLEY, John Allaster
HAMID, Maimoonah
HANCOCK, Brian Patrick
HANKS, Christina Jane
HARKER, Steven John
HARKIN, Peter John
HARPER, Catherine Rosemary
HARPER, Robert Rainy Ian
HARRIES, Bruce Roderick
HARRINGTON, David Gerard
HARRISSON, Dean Raymond
HART, Meredith Louise
HASLINGDEN, Edward William
HEAGNEY, John Edward LLM
HEATH, Derek Nigel
HEATH, Hugo Reading
HEATH, Patrick John
HEMMINGS, Amanda Elizabeth
HENDERSON, Kerrie Anne
HEPWORTH, Lisa Kay
HERMAN, David Lewis
HINDE, Melissa Anne
HOWARD, Catherine Michelle
HUDSON, Campbell Robert
HUGHES, Kiera Margaret
HUGHES, Michael Richard
HUNT, Alan Peter LLM
HUNT, Lindy Jane
HUNT, Murray Hird LLM
INGUI, Samuel Anthony
INVERARITY, Fiona Jean
IRVINE, Susan Penelope Hamilton
JACKSON, Lawrence Johnson
JAMIESON, Suzanne Patricia LLM
JANU, Peter Carl
JEREMY, Lindy Jennifer
JOHNSON, David Hugh Nevil LLM (AEG)
JUMIKIS, Mark Robert
KABLE, Glenn Desmond
KEHAGIADIS, Meropi
KING, Julia Elizabeth
KINTOMINAS, Peter
KIRILLOVA, Elena
KLIMT, Steven Garry
KOH, Gary Tuck Hong LLM
KRIEWALDT, Jeremy Martin
LANG, Steven Arthur LLM
LANGLEY, Helen Christine
LEAROYD, Carolyn Mary
LEE, Cheok Fan
LEE, Kim Irene
LEWIS, Candace Gai
LIM, Hwah Beng
LIM, Kar Han
LLANES, Monique Martha
LOLLBACK, Glen Francis
LOMNY, Antonia Maria
LOUKAS, Chrissa Teresa
LOVE, Alex Edward
LOWE, Timothy Edward
LOZINA, Leonard
LUCAS, James Patrick
LUPTON, Keith Michael
LYONS, Debbord Gordon
MACDIARMID, Mark Allan
MACKIER, Catherine Jane
MANSBRIDGE, Raymon Edward
MALAMAS, Joanne Michelle
MALONE, John Bede
MANOLIOS, Cathy Anne
MANUELL, Janet Susan
MAROON, Morris
MARTIN, John Kenneth
MARTIN, Michael John
MARUCCI, Daniel John
MASON, David William
MATHIES, Richard George LLM
MATHIES, David Alan
MAXTON, Alan George Graham
MAY, Roshana
McCANN, Colin John
McCARTHY, Geoffrey
McDONALD, Patricia Emily
MCGRATH, Gai Marie
MCGRATH, John Thomas
MCHugh, Gregory John
McKERNIE, Kathleen Mary
McMAHON, Mark John
McMAHON, Maryann
McPHerson, Johanna Catharine
MEHIGAN, Terence Matthew
METCALFE, Karen Jane
MILLER, Brenden John
MORGAN, Caroline Elizabeth
MORGAN, Mark Lincoln
MORRIS, Jeffrey Michael
MORTON, Ralph Wynne
MOTTA, Lucy Grace
MURPHY, Elizabeth Eileen
MURPHY, Linda Jane
MURRAY, Richard James
MUTTON, Andrew
NAGARAJAN, Radhakrishnan LLM
NEIL, Ivan Malcolm
OAG, Andrew Stewart
O’CONNOR, Andrew James
O’DONNELL, Paul Maurice
O’DOWD, David Patrick
O’HARE, Judith Louise
ORGAN, Lynne Michelle
O’ROURKE, Kim Mare
O’SHANNESY, Leanne Gay
OSWALD, Heather June
PACEY, Christopher Laird
PAGE, Richard Bruce John
PAPANIKOLAOU, Helen
PATTERSON, Geoffrey John
PATTERSON, Peter Robert
PAYNE, Catherine Therese
PAYNE, Deborah June LLM
PEEL, Lynette Ruth
PEIRIS, Niranjan Christopher
PESCE, Giuseppe LLM
PETERS, Paul Douglas
PHANG, Oi Kwan Catherine
PHILIPS, James David Ralph
PIERCE, Mark St John
PLUSS, Nicole Annette
POLETTI, Daniela Marina
POULARD, Ruth Linda
PRICE, Elizabeth Anne
PRICE, Stephen Bruce
PRINEAS, John
PRITCHARD, David Russell
QUILTER, Chris George
RAINE, Ian Walter
RAMRAKHA, Kiran Chandra
RENKO, Mira
RENSHAW, Anthony John Joseph LLM
RENSHAW, Anthony Joseph John Joseph LLM
RENWICK, James George
RICH, Anthony Allan
RICHARDSON, Mark LLM
RITSON, Lisa Mary
RODGERS, Margaret Therese LLM
ROFF, Ashley Sherwood LLM
ROONEY, Cathryn Lee
ROUSE, John Emmanuel
ROULSTONE, Scott John
ROUSE, Anthony Christopher LLM
RUSSO, Salvatore
RYAN, Sandra Louise
SAINSBURY, Michael John
SAVILLE, Margot Louise
SCHWITTLICH, Margaret Emilie
SCOTT, Anthony Gordon LLM
SCOTT, Dennis Neil LLM
SEATON, Nicola Ann
SEKAR, Asha
SEKULICH, Nada Anne
SHANAHAN, Damian Timothy
SIDHU, Prithvi Pal Singh LLM
SIMPKINS, Jonathan Bennett LLM
SINCLAIR, Carolyn Lesley
SINDLER, Michelle Dagmar
SLOSS, Melanie LLM
SMITH, Fiona Carol
SMITH, Frances Patricia
SPANOPOULOS, Nick
SPENCE, Robert Alexander LLM
STAFF, Mary Genevieve
STEPHENS, Michael Eric
STEVENS, Glen Wayne
STOKOE, Paul Derek
STORY, Gregory Laird LLM
STREET, Nicholas Thomas
STRINGER, Ruth Lindsay
STUBBS, Leslie David
SWEENEY, Celia Lindsay
TAN, Chuen Yan Paul LLM
TAN, Michael Hock Swee
TANNA, Maria Elizabeth
TETTO, Vito Antonio
THOMPSON, Glenn Robert
TITMARSH, Shaun Michael
TOBIN, Johanne
TOOLE, David Thomas
TREBLE, Sonya Paulina
TUITE, James Patrick
TURRIN, Daniela Anna
VIRCOE, Margaret Mary
WATSON JANU, Penelope Helen
WEBBECK, Mark James LLM
WELLS, Gary Ernest
WHITE, Margaret Therese LLM
WHYTE, Roslyn Mary
WICKRAMASURIYA, Charith
Ruan
WILLOUGHBY, Amber Rose
WILLS, David Anthony
WILSON, Charles Christian
WING, Elizabeth Pamela
WITCOMBE, Gavin Maxwell
WONG, Alexandra
WONG, Helen Fung Ying
WONG, Kam Leong
WONG, Richard Ho Leng
WYNHAUSEN, Evelyn Ruth

1986

ABBOTT, Grantley Giles
ALEXANDER, Howard Lionel LLM
ALTOBELLI, Thomas LLM
THE LAW SCHOOL REVUE

Jonathon Legal Eagle

ST JAMES PLAYHOUSE

169 PHILLIP ST.

JUNE: SAT 22 • THURS 27 • SAT 29

JULY: THURS 4 • FRI 5 • SAT 6

MITCHELL’S; DJ’S; SRC

TICKETS

LAW SCHOOL LEVEL 4

$2.00

$1.50 STUDENTS

SUBJECT TO SEATING FEE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Koomen, Kaaren Lea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolupacev, Elizabeth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gondoew, Stuart Zimbambo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patson LLM</td>
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SLOWGROVE, Bradley LLM
SMARK, Kieran
SMITH, Alan Kevin
SOWDEN, Richard Randall LLM
SPEAKE, David William
SPENCE, Carl Francis
SPRING, Jane Fitzgerald
STACK, Adam William
STANDEN, Mark Lindsay LLM
STEINBECK, Mark William
STEVENs, Doreen Ramona
STOLAR, Jeremy
STRAIN, Peter Manus
STRANGE, Carolyn Jill LLM
STRAFFORD, Michael LLM
STRATTON, John Stuart LLM
STUCKEY, Michael Stephen
SWAIN, David Michael LLM
SWAN, Anthony John
TAYLOR, Christopher John LLM
TAYLOR, Michael Thornton
TAYLOR, Richard Thornton
TESORIERO, Sebastian John
THIRSK, David Malcolm
THOMAS, Brian James LLM
THORLUND, Monica LLM
TSAOUSIDIS, Paul
TSINGOS, Anna
VALOS, Anthony
VAN DER LAAN DE VRIES, Craig Andrew
VERNIER, Antonio
WALPOLA, Kamani Priyadarshini LLM
WATTUS, Louie
WEBB, Megan Naomi
WEBSTER, Carol Ann
WILDE, Michael Matthew LLM
WILLIAMS, Nevena Elizabeth
WILSON, Helen
WONG, Charles Inchun
WONG, Grace Lai Nga
WRIGHT, David Malcolm
YOUNG, Justino Joseph

1990

ABADEE, Nicole Estelle
ABDOULCADER, Leila Hanako
ANDERSON, Ian Hugh Cairns
ARDINO, Domenic Anthony
ASH, Peter Stuart LLM
ATKINSON, Alexander
AUGUSTINOS, Nicolas George
AUSTRALIAN, Kathleen Jane
AZIZ, Zarina Adbul
BAILEY, Matthew Hamilton
BALL, Andrew Brian
BARAGWANATH, Mark
BARBALICH, Helen
BARDLEY, John William
BARR-DAVID, Michael
BASTEN, Sarah Ann
BATEMAN, Brendan Anthony
BAXTER, James Victor
BEESLEY, Virginia
BELL, Andrew Scott
BELL, Kim Vanessa
BELS, Claudia Jacqueline
BENSON, John William Patrick
BENSON, Simon Andrew
BLATCHFORD, Jennifer Lynette BLUNDELL, Nicloe Louise
BOLGIU, Ileana Maria
BRANDON, Penelope Ann Joyce
BREWSTER, David Halstead
BRIAN, Gregory Peter
BRIDGES, Rhyie Ann LLM
TOOHHER, Anthony Richard LLM
TRAINOR, Christopher David LLM
TRUSWELL, Andrew McGregor
VAN EDE, Warrick John
VENTURA, Maria Amelia LLM
VIRCOE, Margaret Mary LLM
WALLACE, Timothy David
WALMSLEY, Peter David
WALSH, Louise Mary
WANSEY, Kathleen Mary
WARD, Philip John LLM
WATERS, Peter James
WATKINSON, Timothy Kenneth
WHELAN, Jennifer Louise
WHITE, Andrew Stephen
WILDISEN, Gregory Joseph
WILKINSON, Helen Louise
WILLIAMS, ALLAN Addison
WONG, Chin Chin
WONG, Erica Dawn
WONG, Jin Nee
WRIGLEY, Rebecca Jane
YORK, Susan Anna
YOUL, Felicity Ann
YOUNG, Collette Roberta
YOUNG, Gregory Thomas
YOUNG, Ian Scott LLM
ZVIRBULIS, Amanda

1990 — August
ABRAMOVICH, Mark Daniel
ANDRIEUX, Rhonda Joan
BLAIN, Georgia
BRUNEAU, Jonathan Marc
BUCKLEY, Jennifer Robyn
BURNS, Fiona Ruth LLM
CAIN, Michael Stanley Mathew Marcel
CAMERON, Ross Alexander
CHEN, Jianfu LLM
CHU, Jessica Wai Huen
CREGAN, Anne Elizabeth
DALTON, Linda Claire
De LUCA LEONARD, Moya Regina
DUNN, Andrew Sidney
FELD, Francine Louise
FRAWLEY, St John Patrick
FURLONG, Michael Patrick
GRAHAM, Ian James
JACKEL, Deanne Gaye
KONTOS, Vivian
LENTON, Peter Jonathan
LIM, Chin Soon
LLOYD, David Andrew
LONERGAN, James David LLM
LUFF, Bronwynne Margaret
McGRATH, Gavin Basil
McMAHON, Sheila Mary
PRIESTLEY, Dominic Alexander
SHARLAND, Paula Mary
SKAPINKER, Diane Joy LLM
STOCKWELL, Roxanne Tracey

SWIVEL, Mark Andrew
WATSON, Campbell Darnton
WONG, Hau Lik
ZIN, Lidia Monica
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Law Graduates — Doctorates

PhD (Law)
KRAUS, Jonathan 1974
BALL, John Preston 1979
WOODS, Gregory David 1980
STEIN, Robert Trent James 1981
MOENS, Gabriel Adelin 1982
O'KEEFE, Patrick Joseph 1985
GUNAWARDANA, Asoka de Zoysa 1986
WALLACE BRUCE, NiiLante 1986
HEMPHILL, Peter Crawford 1988
LOUGHLAN, Patricia Louise 1989
McCONNELL, Moira Lynne 1989
CHAN, Janet Bick Lai 1990
CHINKIN, Christine Mary 1990

LLD 1866-1887
In addition to the award of Bachelor of Laws degrees before the foundation of the Law School, a number of doctorates were also awarded.

PATERSON, James Stewart 1866
STANLEY, George Heap 1866
DONOVAN, John 1867
QUIRK, John Norbert 1867
GARRAN, Andrew 1870
McGIBBON, John 1870
GILCHRIST, Archibald 1873
ROKEBY, Thomas 1873
SLY, Joseph David 1873
WHITE, James Smith 1874
BEATTY, J J M 1877
SLY, Richard Meares 1877
SLY, George 1878
WHITE, William Moore (AEG) 1882
BARRY, Alfred (AEG) 1884
COGHLAN, Charles Augustine 1885
JEFFERIS, James 1885
MORRIS, Robert Newton 1886
CULLEN, William Portus 1887
GREEN, Arthur Vincent 1887

Honorary LLD 1892-1990
As a mark of recognition for services to the community, and to bestow an honour on distinguished men and women, the University of Sydney has awarded a number of honorary LLD degrees.

MANNING, James Napoleon 1892
HM EDWARD VII 1901
VARLEY, Charles Grant 1902
BIRDWOOD, William Riddell 1920
HRH EDWARD, Duke of Windsor 1920
BRUCE, Stanley Melbourne 1926
HM GEORGE VI 1927
POWELL, Baden 1931
HRH HENRY, Duke of Gloucester 1934
NUFFIELD, William Richard 1938
WALLACE, Robert Strachan 1947
RICH, George Edward 1950
GRISWOLD, Erwin Nathaniel 1951
JOWITT, William Allen 1951
CAHILL, John Joseph 1952
GARRAN, Robert Randolph 1952
HUGHES, William Morris 1952
MACKAY, Iven Giffard 1952
McLWRATH, Martin 1952
McKELL, William John 1952
MENZIES, Robert Gordon 1952
STREET, Kenneth Whistler 1952
SLIM, William Joseph 1953
MACKENZIE, Norman Archibald Macrae 1955
PATON, George Whitecross 1955
STACKPOLE, Stephen Henry 1955
MORTON, Fergus Dunlop 1957
RAHMAN PUTRA AL HAJ, Abdul 1959
WURTH, Wallace Charles 1959
HALLORAN, Aubrey 1961
DE LISLE, The Viscount 1963
SCHONELL, Fred 1965
CUTLER, Arthur Roden 1967
SELL, Walter Albert 1967
PERKINS, James Alfred 1968
COOMBS, Herbert Cole 1969
BARWICK, Garfield Edward John 1972
DOWNING, Robert Reginald 1972
SPENDER, Percy Claude 1973
WINDEYER, William John Victor 1975
DOUGHERTY, Ivan Noel 1976
SUGERMAN, Bernard 1976
STONE, Julius 1981
BEATTIE, Alexander Craig 1982
KITTO, Frank Walters 1982
STEPHEN, Ninian Martin 1984
STREET, Laurence Whistler 1984
EVATT, Elizabeth Andreas 1985
HAZARD, John Newbold 1986
MASON, Anthony Frank 1988
MCCREDIE, Hugh George 1988
MOORE, John 1989
WADDELL, Thomas William 1989
BOWEN, Nigel 1990
DEANE, William Patrick 1990
WILLIAMS, David Glyndwr Tudor 1990
LLD
The highest degree to aim for is the Doctorate of Laws. As can be seen from the list below, it is awarded very rarely. Before 1924 it was awarded by examination, after that date by thesis, and later still by an assessment of published works.

WADDELL, George Washington 1908
GELLATLY, Francis Mephan 1916
RIDDILL, William 1920
EVATT, Herbert Vere 1924
CURREY, Charles Herbert 1929
LOUAT, Frank 1933
STAMP, Josiah 1938

ALEXANDROWICZ, Charles Henry 1969
LEIGHTON, Duncan John 1969
LANE, Patrick Harding 1973
McLEAN, Gwendolyn 1974
NYGH, Peter Edward 1988
BENNETT, John Michael 1990

Professor David Williams, Vice Chancellor of Cambridge University, first Allen, Allen and Hemsley Fellow, was awarded the LLD (Hon) at the 1990 Centenary Graduation.
On 29 February 1976 a cricket match was played between students from St Andrew's College and staff from the Law School.
The following list is based on entries in annual issues of the University Calendar. Due to the nature of that publication and the necessary lead time for its production there may be some inaccuracies in the dates provided and in the listing of qualifications. For example, peoples' names may not appear until well over a year after their teaching commenced. On the other hand a person may teach for nearly a year and not be recorded at all. Qualifications listed have been given as those held at the latest date of teaching and do not include later degrees awarded.

The list covers lecturers part time, part time lecturers, tutors, lecturers, senior lecturers, associate professors, readers and professors but no attempt has been made to detail promotion path. Professor is the only title indicated.

Since its foundation the Faculty has depended to greater or lesser degree on part time teaching staff largely drawn from the active legal profession. This practice was inevitable in the early years of the Law School when our students were few. Part time teaching has also played a vital role in the LLM courses. It may well become the norm in the future as the gap between teaching salaries and the potential income to be made as barrister or solicitor widens further and it becomes more difficult to attract talented men and women to full time academic life.

The employment of practising lawyers as part time teachers has given a sense of immediacy and relevance for students and at its best has provided an automatic update and commentary on changes in the law or in its interpretation.

The system, however, has some drawbacks. The part time teacher is also a busy practitioner and often cannot afford the time for student interviews, curriculum discussion, day-to-day administration, and establishing and maintaining links with the University. There have also been some criticisms that over-close links between the profession and the teaching body tend to operate against change.

In line with changes in the composition of the student body, women are now a significant part of the teaching staff, comprising 43 per cent of full time teachers or 30 per cent of the total teaching staff in 1990. They tend, however, to be grouped in the lower staffing levels, comprising 68 per cent of full time lecturers. Only one of the 29 part time lecturers is a woman.

It is worthy of note that the present teaching staff has very varied experience, and qualifications earned from a wide range of national and international teaching institutions. This is in strong contrast to earlier years.

Ahrens, MC. LLB (Harv) 1965-1970; 1973-1979
Alexandrowicz, CH. Dr (Jagellonian) FRAS 1962-1967
Allars, MN. BA LLB DPhil (Oxf) 1985-
Allsop, JL. BA LLB 1988-
Anderson, CW. LLB (NSW) BA 1982-1986
Anderson, RL. LLB (Oxf) 1975-1976; 1978-
Armitage, JK. LLB (Qld) BA 1981-
Arnold, C. MA LLB (Lond) BPhil (Oxf) 1974-1979
Asprey, KW. BA LLB 1943-1946
Austin, HE. B Tech (Law) PhD (Brunei) 1986-
Atherton, RE. BA LLB A MusA 1990-
Austin, Prof RP. DPhil (Oxf) 1971-1986
Badham, LC. QC 1959-
Ball, JP. LLB (Oxf) 1967-
Barnes, TL. BA LLB 1985-1987
Barnes, TL. BA LLB 1985-1987

Law School Lecturers

Judge D. S. Edwards.

M. L. MacCallum.
Law School Lecturers

Barr, DG. LLB 1968
Barnaclough, FE. MA LLB 1937-1965
Barret, R. BA LLB 1976-1988
Bartoli, E. BA LLB 1929-1932
Bavin, TR. BA LLB 1902
Baxter, UV. BA (Gujarat) LLM 1969-1973

Judge E. A. Barton.

Bennett, B. M A LLM  1969; 1971-
Bilinsky, B. M A LLM  1969; 1971-
Bishop, SL. LLB (NSW) BA 1988-
Blaekshield, AR. LLM  1964-1970
Boehringer, KR. BA (Syr) LLB (NSW) 1986-1987
Bowen, NH. BA LLB 1958-1960
Bradford, MA. BEc LLB 1980-1985
Bradley, GJ. BA LLB 1973-1974
Branson, CC. LL.B 1979-1981
Brereton, VleG. BA LLB 1913
Bridge, ABRI. QC LLB 1953-1961
Briscoe, OV. MB BS (L.ond) MRCP 1965-1969
Browne, JA. BA LLB 1910
Bryson-Taylor, D. BA LLB 1975-1978
Burke, TM. BCL (Oxf) LLB (Dub) BA (Nild) 1978-1980
Burns, L. BComm LLM  (NSW') 1989-
Burn, PA. BA LLB 1975-
Byrnes, AC. BA LLB (ANU) 1985-1986
Campbell, EM. PhD (Duke) LLM (Duke) 1960-1967
Campbell, JC. BA LLB 1976-1978
Carr, JD. BA LLB 1975-1978
Carr, JW. PhD (Cant) BA LLB 1981-
Campbell, GL. DottGiur (Firenze) BA LLM 1976-1989
Campbell, R. BA LLB 1926-1935; 1939-1944
Chappel, D. PhD (Cant) BA LLB (Tas) 1966-1970
Chappenden, W'J. LLB (Nott) LLB DipCompLegStud (Cant) 1973-
Charteris, Prof AH. MA LLM (Glas) 1921-1940
Chinkin, CM. LLM  (Lond & Yale) 1982-1988
Chirn, Prof. RC. MA LLM (Melb) DPhil (Oxf) 1983-1986 (visiting)
Cobberi, Prof. Pf. MA DCL (Oxf) 1890-1909
Cobbold, CA. MA LLB 1890-1900
Cochrane, RD. BA LLB 1904-1907
Cooper, G. LLB 1988-
Cooper, GS. LLM (H & Col) BA DipJur LLM 1987-
Cornelius, PW. LLB 1966
Crawford, Prof. JR. BA LLB (Adel) DPhil (Oxf) 1986-
Cross, Prof. ARN. DCL (Oxf) 1968
Cross, RE. LLB 1957-1956
Currie, WP. MA LLB 1890-1894
Currie, CH. MA LLB 1938-1942
Cutler, B. BCom (NSW) LLB 1988-

Mr. Justice J. A. Ferguson.

David, J. LLB (ANU) LLM 1976-1988
Davidson, CG. BA LLB 1913-1922
Dean, WP. BA LLB 1958-1960
Deutsch, RL. LLM (Cant) BA LLB 1982-1983; 1985-1988
Dietz, AG. BCL (Oxf) BA LLB 1987-1989
Dixit, RK. SJD (Northwestern) LLM (Harv) BA LLB 1974
Donald, BG. BA LLB (ANU) LLM (Harv) 1976-1982
Donovan, GP. BA LLB 1952-1958
Drort, PN. Dr (Utrecht) LLB (Lond) 1968-1977
Dubler, R. BCom LLM 1988-
Dunne, BJ. BA LLB (Macq) 1986
Dwyer, RJ. MA LLM 1976
Edwards, DS. BA LLB 1913-1924
Elkington, GB. MSc PhD (Warw) BSc LLM 1980-
Evatt, HV. MA LLM 1981-
Evans, JD. BA LLB 1947-1955
Everett, DJ. LLB 1976
Evans, DG. LLB 1923-1927; 1941
Everett, DJ. LLB 1976
Farran, R. BA DipEd (NSW) LLB 1987-
Fazzone, P. BA (Conn) JD (Duke) 1989-
Fearn, MR. BS 1955
Fleiss, GL. LLB (NSW) LLM 1983-1987
Fisher, PM. BA LLM (Cant) LLM (Adel) 1985-
Flattery, TP. MA LLM 1934-1959
Flenningsen, J. MB 1955
Flick, GA. LLB (Cant) LLM 1977-1983
Foster, RK. BS 1966-67; 1969-1970
Foster, RU. MA LLM 1966-1967
Franklin, NE. BA LLM (Natal) LLM (Cant) DiplComLegStud (Cant) 1980-
Fraser, D. BCL (Laval) LLM (Dalhousie) LLM (Yale) 1989-
French, DC. LLB 1969-1970
Galligan, Prof DJ. LLB (Qld) BCL MA (Oxf) 1990-
Garbo, GC. LLM (New York) LLM (St John's) 1963-1964
Gaudron, Marj. BA LLB 1973-1974
Giles, RD. BCL (Oxf) BA LLB 1973-1976
Gleeson, AM. BA LLB 1985-1978
Gleeson, J. BA LLB 1989-
Gleeson, F. BCom LLM 1989-
Goldberger, JI. LLM (Belf) 1973; 1975-1988
Goldsworthy, PJ. LLM (Virginia) BA LLB 1972-1976
Gough, WJ. LLB (Cant) PhD (Cant) 1988-
Graham, PR. LLM (Harv) BA LLB 1967-1970
Greve, RL. LLB (Tas) DiplLegPract (Tas) BCL (Oxf) 1990-
Gunnew, The Hon Mr Justice WMC. BA LLM 1967-1986; 1988
Gyles, RV. BA LLB 1974-1976
Haig, DJ. LLB (Qld) 1979-1982; 1984-
Halse Rogers, P. BA BCL 1919-1920
Hamilton, JP. BA LLB 1976-1977
Hammond, JH. BA LLB 1918-1922; 1928
Handler, LG. BA LLB 1975-1982
Hanks, PJ. LLM (Penn) LLB 1966-1968
Harding, DE. LLM (Cant) BA LLB 1968
Harland, Pro J. BCL (Oxf) BA LLB 1966-

Mr. Justice R. Chambers.
Mackenzie, WKS. BA 1925-1943
Mackinolty, JG. LLM (Melb) LLM (AEG) 1964-1987
Magarey, D. LLM (Harv) LLB 1981-
Magen, ES. BA (Ott) BEd (Tor) LLB (ANU) LLM (NSW) 1979-
Mahoney, DL. BA LLB 1953-1961
Manning, JK. 1953-1955
Marks, F. LLM 1977-1984; 1988-
Martin, TJ. BA LLB 1965-1974
Mason, AF. BA LLB 1962-1965
Mason, K. LLM (Lond) BA LLB 1973
Masters, JH. BA PhD 1977-1986
May, HW. LLB 1937
McCarron, CD. BA LLM 1976-
McConnell, MB. BA LLB (Halifax) 1988
McDonald, B. LLM (London) BA LLB 1985-
McDonald, EE. LLB 1921-1930
McDougall, DG. MA BCL (Oxf) MA LLM (Melb) 1905
McGonigal, PG. BA LLB 1971-1974
McKillop, BA. LLM (Harv) BA LLB BSc 1982-
McKelland, C. BA LLB 1941-1952
McMahon, K. LLM (NSW) BSc 1987-
McMin, W. BA LLB 1932-1940
McFeran, EA. BA LLB 1928-1930
Merce, MJ. MSc (NZ) PhD 1975
Michels, AJ. JD MPA (SCal) BA (Loyola Marymount) 1990-
Misner, RL. BA (San Francisco) JD (Chic) 1973-1974
Mitchell, EM. BA LLB 1907-1919
Moens, G-A. DeJuris LLM (Louvain) LLM (Northwestern) PhD 1985-1987
Molyneux, MB. LLM 1980
Monahan, CD. LLB 1941-1959
Moore, DC. LLM 1952-1956
Morling, TR. BA LLB 1959-1961
Morison, Prof WJ. DPhil (Oxf) BA LLB FASSA, 1946-1985
Musgrave, T. 1990-
Nagel, T. BA DipEd LLB (Adel) LLM (Chic) 1984-1985
Needham, CA. BCL (Oxf) LLB 1973-1978; 1984
Needham, GD. BA LLB 1952-1966
Neilsen, KW. LLM (Calif) LLB 1967-1972
Nemes, I. LLM (NSW) BA 1989-
Netthor, RG. AM (Tulsa) LLM 1963-1970
Nicholls, RC. LLM 1973; 1975-
Nield, JR. BA LLB 1930-1933
Nolan, JW. BA (QLD) BEd (Macq) 1985-
Nug, Prof PB. JSL (Mich) LLM 1965-1974
O’Keefe, BSI. LLB 1959-1965
O’Keefe, PJ. BA LLB (Qld) LLM (ANU) MA (CNA) PhD 1973
O’Mara, T. LLB 1936-1938
O’Sullivan, JKP. LLM (Lond) BA LLB 1988-
Odgers, SJ. BA LLB (ANU) LLM (Coll) 1986-
Ojespekin, B. BComm LLB (NSW) BCL (Oxf) 1989-
Otterson, AK. LLB (Monash) DipCrim 1982-1985
Oxley-Oxland, J. BA LLB (Rhodes) LLM (Yale) 1971-1984
Parkinson, PN. MA (Oxf) LLM (Ill) 1986-

J. H. Hammond KC.

E. F. McDonald.

Mr Justice J. R. Nield.
Law School Lecturers

Parry, JH. BA BCL. MA (Oxf) 1975-1976
Parsons, Prof RW. BA LLB 1957-1986
Paterson, PA. LLB (ANU) 1974-1975
Pawley, KW. BA LLB 1952-1954
Peden, Prof JR. BA LLB 1901-1941
Peden, JR. LLM (Harv) BA LLB 1966-1974
Pendleton, MD. LLB 1976-1978
Phegan, Prof CS. BA LLM (Mich & Syd) 1967-
Powell, PE. LLB 1956-1963
Priestly, LJ. QC BA LLM (Mich & Syd) 1972-1973;
1975-1984
Proti, LV. DrJur (Tubingen) LicSpDrinternat (Brussels)
BA LLB 1974-
Rath, AF. QC BA LLB 1953-1963
Rawson, SL. BA LLB (Macq) 1981-
Rayment, BW. BA LLB 1975-1978
Rich, GE. MA 1890-1906
Rilev, BB. QC 1956-1963
Ritchie, JD. BA LLB 1976-1979
Robby, SD. BA LLB 1976-1979
Robertson, D. BEc LLB 1989-
Roper, ED. BA LLB 1928-1936
Rothwell, D. BA LLB (Qld) LLM (Alberta) MA
(Calgary) 1988-
Roulston, PR. LLM (Tas) LLB 1966-1983
Rowland, N de H. BA LLB 1924-1930
Rowling, GJO. BA LLB 1976-1978
Sadurska, R. LLM (Warsaw & Yale) PhD (Polish
Academy of Sciences) 1988-1989
Sadurski, W. DipJur (Warsaw) 1985-
Samuels, GI. MA (Oxf) 1955-1961; 1964-1970
Sanitow, GFK. BA LLM 1973-
Sappideen, CM. LLM (Melb) LLM 1973-1989
Schmidt, M. LLM 1987-
Selby, DM. QC BA LLB 1955-1962
Shattwell, Prof KO. MA BCL (Oxf) 1947-1974
Shea, PB. HBA GradDip (HealthAdmin) (NSW)
DipEnvStud (Macq) MBBS MPH DPM DipCrim
FRANZCP FRACMA LH A A FA IM 1982-
Sheppard, IF. QC LLB 1967-1971
Simos, T. BLitt (Oxf) LLM (Harv) BA LLB 1962-1977
Skapinker, DJ. BCom LLB (Witw) 1986-
Slater, AH. BA LLM 1979-1984; 1987-
Smith, GWJ. BEd 1976-1986; 1988
Smith, RC. QC 1956-1977
Solomon, E. LLM (Harv) LLB 1964-1974
Speed, RR. LLM 1969-1972
Spence, MJ. BA LLB 1988
St John, EH. QC BA LLB 1961-1963
Stackpoole, JE. LLM (London) BA LLB 1980
Stacy, BC. BA LLB 1924
Stapleton, BJ. BSc (NSW) LLM (ANU) PhD (Adel) 1985
Stark, JK. BA LLB (Wit) BCL (Oxf) 1941; 1952-61
Stein, RTJ. LLB (ANU) LLM (Dal) PhD AMusA
1977-1989
Stewert, AJ. BA BCL (Oxf) 1987-
Stone, Prof J. BA DCL (Oxf) LLM SJD (Harv) 1942-1973
Street, LW. BA LLB 1921-1927
Street, LW. LLB 1963-1966
Stubbs, J. BA (W'ong) 1989-
Stuckey-Clarke, JE. BA (ANU) LLM (ANU & Camb)
1982-
Sugerman, B. LLB 1926-1944
Sutton, KCT. BA LLB (New Zealand) PhD (Melb)
1963-1968
Swanton, J. LLM (London) BA LLB 1969-
Symonds, RHN. BA LLB (Melb) 1969
Tamburin, B. LLM (Harv) BA LLB 1967-1974
Tammelo, I. MA DrJur Maglur 1959-1973
Tay, Prof A-E. PhD (ANU) LLD (Edin) 1975-
Taylor, A.R. BA LLB 1936-1942
Taylor, DJ. BA LLB 1979
Taylor, LW. BA LLB 1955-1960
Tebbitt, HW. BA BA LLB 1958-1964
Teece, RC. QC MA LLB 1941-1965
Terrill, J. LLM (Auck) LLM (Harv) 1989-
Trent, VH. MA BCL. BA 1925-1961
Turner, G. LLM 1975-1976
Turess, Prof. AL. PhD (Massey) MSc (Ohio) LLB (Well)
1984-
Tzannes, R. BA LLB 1975
Vann, Prof RJ. BA LLB (Qld) BCL (Oxf) 1976-
Verdon-Jones, SN. MA (Camb) LLM SJD (Yale) 1973-
1975; 1976
Vissakiv, AE. BA LLB 1962-1968
Waddell, TW. QC LLM 1972-1974
Wade, HJ. LLM (Qld) LLM DipJur 1973-
Walker, GD de Q. SJD (Pennsylvania) LLM 1968-1974
Walker, GR. BA LLM (Otago) DipEd MLS (Adel)
1982-1984
Ward, PG. BE MA 1964-1989
Watts, PR. BA LLB 1914-1954
Weigall, CE. BA BA LLB 1920
Westling, WT. AB (Occidental College) JD (New York)
1972-1975
White, JF. LLM 1969-1972; 1979-1984
White, RW. BCL (Oxf) BA LLM 1981-1986
Whitmore, H. LLM (Yale) LLM 1961-1965
Widmer, GK. BA MSc (Kansas) LLM (La Salle)
1976-1977
Williams, Prof J. LLM PhD (Cambridge) 1942-1946
Williams, RI. BA LLB 1982-1985
Willy, JH. LLM (Cant) BCL (Oxf) 1973-1979; 1981-1982
Windeler, WV. WA BA LLB 1929-1947, 1950
Wood, JRT. BA LLB 1969-1972
Woodman, Prof RA. LLM 1963-1982
Woods, GD. LLM DipEd 1970-1979
Wotton, JH. BA LLB 1953-1954
Wright, B. MBE MA (Oxf) 1966
Wright, D. BEd BA LLB 1990-
Wright, GL. LLB 1937-1941
Wright, RJ. LLB (Cant) BA LLB 1987-
Wright, SE. BA BA LLB (Cant) LLM (London) 1988-
Wynhausen, E. MA MEd LLB 1985-1986
Yeo, SM. LLM (Sing) LLM (Well & Syd) 1986-
Ziegert, KA. DPhil (Mun) 1981; 1983
Support Staff

Compiled by Jenny Littman

It has not been possible to find the names of all those who have served at the Law School since its foundation, though some of the early support staff are mentioned in various chapters. The following lists cover the 1970s and 1980s. We apologise for any omissions and regret that our lists had to be limited to these 20 years.

Administrative Staff

AARON, Meda
ABADEE, Stevern
ALEXANDER, Marie
ARIE, Lyndon
ASHFORD, Linda
ASPREY, Jane
ATHANASSOPOULOS, Kiki
BAGNALL, Deanne
BALL, Rosemary
BANNIGAN, Michael
BARRETT, Diana
BELL, Beryl
BENNETT, Beverly
BIRD, Joy
BIRD, Neville
BLACKBURN, Judy
BODINNAR, Harold
BOHNHOFF, Ethel
BOWEN, David
BRADBURY, Julie
BRANGROVE, Jan
BROWNING, Pauline
BRUTON, Gail
BRYANT, Kathleen
BURY, Jo
BYRNE, Maria-Louisa
CAHILL, Cath
CLIPSHAM, Amanda
CONRICK, Vic
CONROY, Rhonda
CONYBARE, Leith
COOPER, Valda
COREY, Lesley
CORTISO, Pat
CURTIS, Wendy
DALTON, Janet
DAWES, Alisa
DEL ZOTTO, Virginia
DEWEZ, Jill
DIGGLE, Kathy
DOBBIN, Janet
DODD, Peter
DOWLING, June
DOWNEY, Natalie
DUCK, Julie
FARMER, Carol
FEARNLEY, Betty
FITZGERALD, Claire
FITZGERALD, Gary
FRANKS, Susan
GAULD, Sue
GAUSSON, Noni
GRAHAM, Jan
GRIESSLE, Noeline
GUNNESS, Diane
HA, Ninh Hai
HAMMOND, Joanne
HARBIDGE, Jenny
HARRIS, Julie
HART, Elizabeth
HAWKE-WEAVER, Rebecca
HEGGARTY, Terese
HENNESSY, Clare
HICKS, June
HOARE, Vida
HOLLIDAY, Judy
HOUASTON, Railea
HUNT, Lynne
HUTCHINSON, Christopher
JONES, Fay
KERR, Ruth
KUHN, Leila
LAMBERT, Michele
LANGLEY, Doreen
LE COUTEUR, Michael
LEE, Pat
LENNOH, Jane
LINKS, Moira
LINLEY, Elizabeth
LITTMAN, Jennifer
LOCKETT, Nicola
LUI, Alice
MAHER, Carmel
MANING, Pamela
MANLEY, Pat
MARTIN, Sue
MASON, Arthur
McCABE, Kylie
McCULLOCH, Sally
McCUTCHEON, Alison
McDONOUGH, Ramah
McGRATH, Orla
MEHTA, Vijaya
MILLER, Pat
MUNNICH, Lyn
NAIR, Sulachana
NG, Deborah
O’NEILL, Margaret
PAPAPETROS, Anastasia
PARKS, Heather
PARSONS, Valerie
PERRIN, Kathy
PHILP, Heather
PHILP, Muriel
PINKAS, Anita
PITT, Dinah
PLUMMER, Claude
POINTER, Moira
POYNTING, Carole
PRASAD, Nutan
PRYKE, Virginia
PURDUE, Dianne
QUINN, Betty
RAMM, Dawn
RATCLIFF, Elisabeth
RICHARDS, Robyn
RING, Erica
RITSON, Lisa
SACHS, Zena
SEIWERTH, Pat
Sid Thompson and his wife Grace are shown being farewelled after long and loyal service to the University and the Law School.
Most of the illustrations appearing in this publication were obtained from within the University. In order to avoid a lengthy list of acknowledgements, they will not be individually sourced.

Photographs already in existence were obtained from University News and Registrar’s Publications, thanks to Neville Petersen and his staff and Ann Casimir; from the Sydney University Archive with help from Tim Robinson and thanks to those who have deposited photographs there; and from Pamela Bell, curator of the University Collection. We thank these organisations for permission to reproduce photographs.

New photographs were taken for us by the Photography Department which also undertook the copying of older photographs, (particularly those from the Law School collection) and of material from *Hermes*, *Blackacre* and *Honi Soit*. Thanks are due to Bob Tully and Sharon Parsons for their help.

Other illustrations were provided by Mrs H. Davidson (p93), Judy Mackinolty (p35, top and right, p36, bottom, p86 bottom, p192 and p258), Mrs J Mullen (p61, right), Justice Deirdre O’Connor (p140), Ms M. Pearlman (p203), Ms Jane Swanton (p128), Professor Alice Tay (p161), Mr J. P. C. Watson (p76 and p235 top), Miss Olive Wood (p12 and p149).

We are grateful to Raymond de Berquelle (p137), Bill Joffe (p187), Jayne McClure (p191), John Peart (p138) and Bruce Petty (p103 and p235) for permission to reproduce their work, and to the Sydney University Law Society.

Unfortunately there are many gaps in the School’s pictorial record. It would be very much appreciated by the Law School if any photographs, drawings or other memorabilia relating to the School, its students, teachers and support staff could be sent to the Dean. These will be copied or dealt with as appropriate and having regard to the donors’ wishes.
Members of the Judiciary are, in general, only given their final Judicial office: e.g. the fact that a Judge of the Supreme Court has previously been a Judge of the District Court is not recorded. Likewise, in general, they are given their title at the time of ceasing to hold a Judicial position. The title 'The Hon' is not recorded in most cases.

The following abbreviations are used for judges: the title 'Judge' alone is a reference to a District Court Judge; (J) Supreme Court Judge; (J-lndust Comm) Judge of the NSW Industrial Commission; (JA) Judge of Appeal; (P-CA) President of the Court of Appeal; (CJ) Chief Justice of the Supreme Court; (J-FC) Justice of the Federal Court; (CJ-FC) Chief Judge of the Federal Court; (J-HC) Justice of the High Court; and (CJ-HC) Chief Justice of the High Court.

Normal academic abbreviations are used. Whether or not a person is a Challis Lecturer or a full time lecturer has not been indicated.
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