

CHAPTER THREE

CONSOLIDATION 1915-1937

Introduction

In November 1914 Central Technical College finally departed the old ex-School of Arts buildings in Ann and Turbot streets and moved onto its new site in the old Government House Domain at the end of George Street. In January, students started in this brand new College - the jewel in the Technical Education crown.¹

This chapter investigates the growth of Technical Education in Queensland from 1915 to 1937, a period during which the number of technical colleges in Queensland was again reduced. At the start of 1915 the Branch, which had existed since 1905, officially controlled only three colleges but controlled eight by the end of 1937. During this period it also opened and closed a college, and had taken-over and then closed four others. In 1915 there were sixteen State and non-State colleges offering technical classes, while only twelve centres were doing so in 1937.² Of these Gympie, Ipswich, Maryborough and Sandgate Technical Colleges were still non-State colleges, managed by local Schools of Arts, or as at Ipswich a local Committee.

High school education in Queensland became accessible for many more post-primary youth of school age. They saw education – whether technical or general – as a direct means of gaining skills for employment. They were not concerned with the relevance or appropriateness of the system – but with the functionality and worth of

1 39th RPQ for 1914, p.137.

2 one college had closed at the end of 1914.; for further details see Appendix 6 - Graph of Centres of Technical Education.

education and training offered by the system. It could have been expected therefore, that commercial courses would grow strongly. The Queensland economy was geared to primary industry but the hauling of its products throughout the world was a function of a commercial industry.

The chapter opens by noting the limited impact of World War I on Queensland and discusses economic conditions in the 1920s and 1930s and the 'drift to the cities'. It looks at educationally relevant political changes during the period, and observes technical education in other states. Trade Advisory Committees, Domestic Science education and Commercial Studies are addressed, then Day Trade Schools are investigated. Central Technical College High Schools, the *Technical Instruction Act Amendment Act 1918*, Apprenticeships, Diploma courses, Technical Correspondence, Repatriation Training, and Technical Teacher Training are then considered. The chapter closes with a summary and reiteration of critical points followed by an analysis of the development of technical education in Queensland during the period.

Background

During the first three years of World War I, Britain continued trading with other countries despite massive campaigns against its shipping by German submarines. America, aware of the importance of trade to the British war effort, finally intervened in the following year and secured the sea lanes to Britain.³ The very nature of survival graphically illustrated itself in the most potent way possible to both Britain and Australia, and the necessity to maintain supplies of products, raw materials and food was pressed home with great force. The British experience with transport difficulties had great influence on Queensland political thought.

After the cessation of war in 1918, Queensland experienced two years of unemployment, followed by nine years of relative prosperity. In the early postwar years, the economy was more in a state of recovery than of expansion although the two decades from 1910 to 1929 saw a trend towards continual growth. The State relied

3 S.H. Roberts, *History of Modern Europe*, Sydney, Angus and Robertson, 1958, pp.415-416.

heavily on primary industries for its prosperity, but these were not entirely trouble free for the wool industry experienced a downturn in the late 1920s.

The building industry displayed a good example of the rise and fall of secondary industry during this period. During the war, as labour and capital was channelled into the war effort, the industry declined. By 1918 there was a shortage of housing and as soldiers returned this shortage became acute together with a demand for factories and other industrial buildings. These pressures led to a building boom during the seven years after the war – from 1918 to 1925, the number of new factories alone rose from 15,600 to 20,800.⁴

During the 1920s, Australia's population increased by one million to 6.4 million – a rise of almost 20%. This huge increase was to have far-reaching effects on the Australian economy in the following decades. Nevertheless, in those first years after the war, the total population was still very small – too small to provide a base for economic development comparable with the more industrialised countries, such as USA and Britain. The result was that, although the population increased at a rapid rate, there was not a corresponding demand for skilled labour - and obviously little demand to train more.

The Drift to the Cities

The economy was not the only problem for the State government. The drift of population from the country – the basic source of wealth – to the more comfortable and attractive cities, had been a worrying problem for Queensland governments since Separation. A main theme of State education had always been the need to improve country education as a way of making country life more attractive. Some people publicly deplored the rural drift to the cities blaming higher wages, more attractive conditions, and the education authorities for providing education leading to 'city occupations' instead of 'rural callings'. Leonard Canton Morris⁵ took exception, however, to their allegations that technical education

4 *Year Book of the Commonwealth of Australia, 1918-1926*, passim.

5 Director of Technical Education, 1909-1938.; see also Appendix 2 - Details on Other Selected People.

. . . was training 'an army of clerks' and neglecting to prepare young people for manual work in trades and on the land [notwithstanding a] keen demand for trained clerical employees . . . parents desire to prepare their children for callings in which employment is available, and this Department is only supplying the demand which exists and is due to the operation of economic laws over which no one has any control.⁶

He said to blame, not technical education, but basic economic realities.

The new University was now pressured to include some commercial subjects in the Junior public examination. Although 'the Junior' was a university entrance examination, businesses expected youth to have a Junior educational standard, so it would not have been a radical change to include some commercial subjects.⁷ At the start of this period however, the University of Queensland had been taking students for only four years. In Queensland the public still saw university as a place for the 'elite' – certainly not for vocational purposes. For vocational education they thought of technical colleges. This was unlike New South Wales where Sydney University had been operating for sixty-two years and had implanted itself on the public mind as a place to aspire for vocational education. On the other hand, technical education in New South Wales was associated with 'trade training'.

The 1930s

The 1930s were a hard decade. The depression had arrived and developed with frightening rapidity. By 1930, unemployment was at 13%, and had almost doubled to 23% only a year later. Capital inflow ceased, banks stopped lending, and manufacturers and builders cut back drastically on investment and production. By 1931, export prices – mainly for wool and wheat – were half their 1928 prices, and Australia's income was down by 30% – but interest rates remained high. Both the marriage and birth rates dropped, and immigration virtually ceased – more people left Australia than arrived between 1930 and 1932 – and the population increased by only 500,000 in the 1930s. These figures obviously gave little encouragement to industry.⁸

6 51st RPQ for 1926, p.133

7 QPP, 1916-1917, p.17.

8 Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics, *Data in Demography Bulletin*, Canberra, Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics, N^o 67, 1949, pp.154-155.; QPD, Vol.183, 1944-1945, p.1473.

Politics

During the period discussed by this chapter, except from mid 1929 to mid 1932, Queensland was controlled by a Labor State Government. When they came to power in 1915 Labor brought with it some educational reforms. Labor's educational concern was with equality of opportunity, with practical and utilitarian general education, and with technical education. Labor, with its strong rural base, emphasised rural policies as they saw the rural sector of commerce as the backbone of Queensland.⁹

During this period, 1915-1937, Queensland had six premiers - five Labor and one Country-Progressive Nationalist. On 21 May 1929 the Labor Government was replaced by a Country-Progressive Nationalist Coalition Government which remained in power until 17 June 1932 when it was defeated in turn by another Labor Government. During this same period Queensland had seven Ministers for Education - six Labor and one Country-Progressive Nationalist.¹⁰

Technical Education in Other States

By 1915 all states had almost completed implementing new educational structures of which a dominant feature was the educational ladder. This gave access to secondary and tertiary education through new examination systems, fee structures, and scholarships. If their economic circumstances permitted, youth with academic ability could now extend their education. This 'ladder' was more strongly established in some states, notably New South Wales, than in others. The importance of this restructuring was qualified however, by a weak demand for tertiary education.

The effect of the depression on Queensland education was similar to that in other states. There was a severe cutback in expenditure. Between 1924 and 1939,

9 W.R. Johnston, *The Call of the Land. A History of Queensland to the Present Day*, Jacaranda, Brisbane, 1982, pp.165, 167.

10 see Appendix 1 - Details on Selected Politicians.; see also Appendix 3 - Incumbents of Selected Relevant Positions.

apart from two new high schools being created in 1926 out of the Brisbane Central Technical College complex and the takeover of both grammar schools in Maryborough, no new state high schools were opened.

World War I brought about some immediate and predictable changes in Australian education but with moderate consequences. As the war dragged through 1916, then 1917 and into 1918, social and economic conditions became harsher. The public started to question the duration, costs and sacrifices – the war had lost its glamour – and a growing spirit of militancy led to strikes and the anti-conscription votes in the 1916 and 1917 referenda. A more durable consequence, albeit temporary in its original form, was Commonwealth involvement in education.

A more sustained effect was that the war had encouraged industrialisation, particularly in New South Wales and Victoria. This encouraged a new interest in technical education. However as educational reconstruction had hardly been complete when the war started, there was no question of further major innovations in the near future. It was unfortunate that the war deprived the new educational systems of opportunities to take advantage of the initial years of a favourable economic climate.

The effect of the economic depression on Australian education was not uniform throughout the nation. The customary labour shortage disappeared and the greater competition for jobs increased the importance of both academic and technical qualifications. Secondary school enrolments increased, provided there were no fees, as did university enrolments. On the other hand technical college enrolments did not rise as they were typically limited to apprenticeship training. Nevertheless, interest in technical and vocational education increased.

The 1920s and 1930s were years of social division and political separatism, a period in which differences between the States increased. Technical education clearly reflected the different political, economic, geographical and social conditions in the various states. The greater strength of technical education in Victoria and to some extent in New South Wales corresponded to the industrial lead of these states. The financial difficulties in Tasmania and Western Australia stunted development of their technical education.

Trade Advisory Committees

Trade Advisory Committees were first suggested by James Blair¹¹ in 1913. Blair wanted Queensland to do more to produce skilled tradespeople, otherwise such people would soon be scarce. He said that, as Central Technical College resources had been available to both employers and employees, the department had a ‘. . . right to expect their assistance’. He believed that industry should reciprocate by advising the technical college. Through their advice, each committee would ensure college training complemented on-the-job training and that suitable trade teachers were appointed. They would also help to assess courses needing certification and ensure that Technical College instruction was recognised in apprenticeships. In addition, the committees were to encourage employers and apprentices to use college training, and to liaise between the College and industry.¹²

When the Ryan Labor Government was elected in 1915, Herbert Freemont Hardacre¹³ appointed the initial committees. Except the Trade Advisory Committee on Domestic Science, these had a good working relationship with both Technical Education and Central Technical College although some committee members believed they lacked authority.¹⁴ This complaint is difficult to accept as, according to their function as spelt out by the Minister, they had no authority. This imagined lack of authority however, was not a dilemma for the Domestic Science Advisory Committee as its members assumed authority regardless.

The Domestic Science Advisory Committee

The Domestic Science Advisory Committee (DSAC), appointed in September 1916, was not the only Committee advising Central Technical College, but it was

11 Minister for Education 1912-1915.; see also Appendix 1 - Details on Selected Politicians.

12 38th RPQ for 1913, pp.18-19.; *Brisbane Courier*, 25 August 1916, p.8.

13 Minister for Education 1915-1919.; see also Appendix 1 - Details on Selected Politicians.

14 40th RPQ for 1916, pp.162, 165-166.; 41st RPQ for 1917, p.134.; *Daily Standard*, 22 November 1918, p.6.; 26 November 1918, p.4.

unique. It was responsible, not to the College Principal nor even to the Head of the Education Department, but directly to the Minister. Presumably, this atypical leverage was due to associations of some members of the committee. The DSAC, with a formidable membership list of influential women¹⁵, dominated Domestic Science from 1916 until 1929, when Bernard McKenna¹⁶, who could no longer acquiesce to the committee's abrasive relationship with the Department, disbanded it.¹⁷

Committee advice was theoretically limited to Central Technical College. This however, was the main domestic science education centre, and therefore committee recommendations effected the whole state. Mrs Skirving¹⁸ claimed the DSAC had influenced many important developments in domestic science, and one positive achievement was forcing Technical Education to increasingly recognise Domestic Science education. In so doing however, they antagonised many senior Technical Education staff particularly Morris and Robert Riddell¹⁹ and even the Minister.²⁰

While the DSAC undoubtedly achieved much for domestic science education, its relationship with the department unfortunately, was often very strained. This is perhaps not surprising in view of it dogmatically exercising the right of direct Ministerial access, to the confusion concerning its role at Central Technical College, and to its attempts to be a social and moral watchdog. A fiery meeting between the Committee, Hardacre, Morris and Riddell in April 1917 was not atypical. The DSAC complained about a lack of free and open communication with the Department which was not treating them seriously. They assured the meeting that they '... were not a body of aggressive women [but they wanted] to learn to be useful and to offer to the Minister some thoughts'. However, in the circumstances, they felt they lacked the Department's confidence.²¹

Hardacre was now in a quandary. DSAC members were 'roses in the local social garden', but a major purpose of Trade Advisory Committees was to ensure a

15 see Appendix 7 - Members of Selected Boards and Committees.

16 Director-General of Education 1923-1936.; see also Appendix 1 - Details on Selected Politicians.

17 Minutes of the DSAC, 1917, A/15678, *QSA.*; Document 35925, 4 July 1929, A/15689, *QSA.*; DSAC, 26 April 1917, A/15678, *QSA.*

18 Secretary DSAC 1916-1929.

19 Principal, Central Technical College 1909-1919.; see also Appendix 2 - Details on Other Selected People.

20 Minutes of the DSAC, loc. cit.; Document 35925, loc. cit.; DSAC, loc. cit.

21 *ibid.*

flow of information between the Branch, the College and the public. Although fulfilment of this role was obviously vital at a time of significant public suspicion of vocational education, it would be impossible if open conflict existed. Nevertheless, though ever tactful in his comments, Hardacre stated firmly that one reason for confusion was the DSAC's belief that they should supervise Central Technical College's Domestic Science Department. Implications were that Technical Education staff would be accountable to the Minister 'through the DSAC'. Hardacre pointed out that to accept this would be to unthinkably surrender Ministerial and Departmental power. The DSAC's role he said, was only to make 'general suggestions'.²²

These abrasive relations continued until 1929, when McKenna disbanded the DSAC. His memo leading to the abolition however, has to be regarded as extremely harsh. He claimed that Branch Officers had been tactfully tolerant with the DSAC and that its interference was not appreciated. He went on to say that Domestic Science activities could have proceeded very well without the assistance of the DSAC, and that '... teaching of Domestic Science . . . should be controlled and supervised without interference . . .'.²³

The saga of the DSAC highlighted the problems for Technical Education - it was different things to different important people. If nothing else emerged from this series of altercations, it at least forced the consolidation of Technical Education - it had been forced to determine and articulate its reason for existence. Technical education management had been forced into adulthood. In general, and again except the DSAC, Trade Advisory Committees had good working relationships with Technical Education, with technical colleges, and with their trades.

Domestic Science Education

In the early decades of the 20th century, society - with the hearty support of community leaders and educators - determined that the objective of most young women studying domestic science should be one of marrying and establishing well managed households. Young women were not regarded as holding an educational position even

22 *ibid.*

23 Document 35925, *loc. cit.*

remotely equal to that of young men. Queensland was a man's world and the place of women in it was predetermined, and that position was as homemaker.²⁴

Perversely however, a growing number of these young women agreed with this goal but saw it as long-term and meanwhile wanted to work before marriage. Their demand for courses leading to paid employment was a major concern for educators in the 1910s and 1920s. Unfortunately, the field of domestic science had very few remunerative positions and, as domestic science education had not yet been adopted by either the primary schools or technical colleges, teaching was not a realistic alternative. The main alternative for domestic science graduates was to enter domestic service, for which, as newspapers complained, they ' . . . showed a general aversion . . .'²⁵

An important reason for this attitude was the rapid growth of pressure in the 1890s and 1900s for equality of educational opportunities for young women. The National Council of Women, and similar groups, adamantly opposed specialisation in vocational studies such as domestic science before the age of fourteen. They argued that dilution of academic subjects reduced post-primary educational options. Public suspicion of domestic science was also fostered by the debate among educational authorities on the proper nature and extent of vocational education. David Ewart²⁶ in particular was inclined to oppose change.

Social Attitudes

The general public was suspicious of domestic science education as they saw negligible benefits for their version of society. But on the other hand educationalists of the 1910s believed that by strengthening the moral and intellectual appeal of the roles of housewife and mother, domestic science education could play a vital role in arresting family decline. Upper echelons of society also considered that such a program might arrest some socioeconomic problems. Some believed that traditional family structures were under serious threat and believed this to be a major cause of

24 for a detailed discussion see B. Kingston, *My Wife, My Daughter and Poor Mary Ann; women and work in Australia*, Melbourne, Thomas Nelson, 1975; and R. Evans, *Loyalty and Disloyalty - Social conflict on the Queensland Homefront, 1914-18*, Sydney, Allen and Unwin, 1987.

25 *Daily Standard*, 1 August 1914, p.14.; *Queenslander*, 6 October 1923, p.6.

26 Director of Education, 1878-1904, and Director of General Education, 1904-1910.; see also Appendix 2 - Details on Other Selected People.

their difficulties in obtaining suitable domestic staff. To them, this was a serious and very real problem. As Kingston says, for the affluent

. . . housewife, the servant problem became increasingly a desperate last-ditch stand, worth fighting because without servants her freedom, and a whole way of life, were at risk.²⁷

Skirving claimed this perception was caused by the confusion of 'domestic science' with 'domestic service'. But who was being confused? The elite wanted young women to be trained for domestic service while the young women wanted training for a well paid future. Skirving's claim is quite reasonable as newspapers declaimed the lack of young women willing to apply for 'domestic service' yet funds were being spent on 'domestic economy' in the schools. As far back as 1907, 'Vesta' had strongly criticised the theoretical emphasis in the primary school syllabus. She claimed that society badly needed a supply of

. . . girls – clever girls, 'blue-stockings' for our professions; smart girls for our typewriters and shop assistants; clever handed, artistic girls for our dressmakers and milliners; conscientious, handy girls for our servants; and . . . a perfect combination of all these for our wives!²⁸

The article continued in the same vein, claiming that Queensland primary schools had failed to meet these needs. Some other newspaper columnists even used humorous embellishment to push for domestic science in schools. In one instance *Caber Feidh* declared that bad cooking instead of money was the root of all evil and that hotels were used as a consolation and an escape from bad cookery.²⁹

Truth remarked in 1915, semi-humorously, that ' . . . bad cookery and worse house-keeping were at the root of more than half the domestic differences which end in law-courts', and predicted that if domestic science education continued to develop, ' . . . in a few years' time the Divorce Courts probably will be closed.' Similarly, the *Daily Standard* lamented that it would be far better if women presided over ironing boards and practised ' . . . fitting clothes to female figures.' It saw the policy of subdividing education into specialist topics as having no benefit for society and claimed

27 Kingston, op. cit., p.22.

28 Document 35925, loc. cit.; *Queenslander*, 28 December 1907, p.6.

29 unidentifiable newspaper cutting (possibly *Truth*), attached to Document 30057, 13 November 1911, EDU/A176, QSA.

that ‘. . . the mere fact of a school being specialised must result in narrowing the outlook of the pupils [and it] tends to develop class distinction . . .’³⁰

Domestic Science in the Schools

Domestic Science for high school age students was a paradox. Although the topic was popular in technical colleges, Domestic Science Day Schools had difficulty in even maintaining student numbers. Technical college students were undertaking domestic science to enhance homemaking skills or to increase their chances of entering teaching or nursing. Almost none took domestic science in preparation for domestic service. Day School students avoided domestic science as they saw restricted employment opportunities and lower status compared with commercial studies. They saw vocations in the commercial world as offering higher wages initially and having more vacancies.

This paradoxical situation reduced the number of young women seeking domestic science training ‘. . . in domestic subjects much more specifically womanly and useful.’ To exacerbate the situation commercial courses were poaching many domestic science students, for as Elizabeth Pickard Large³¹ pointed out in 1917, young women ‘. . . are earning their own living now. They can get into a Bank or an Office and earn 30s and £2 a week’.³²

Morris tried to boost Domestic Science’s image by explaining that, in Queensland, 42% of women in paid employment were engaged in domestic duties, and women’s most important work was in the home. This only reinforced in the public mind however, the implications that Domestic Science was not only socially inferior, but academically inferior as well.³³

30 *Truth*, 5 December 1915, p.6.; *Brisbane Courier*, 4 December 1915, p.14.; *Daily Standard*, 28 August 1914, p.2.; 26 November 1918. p.4. *Age*, 26 March 1915, p.8.; 27th RPQ for 1902, p.58.

31 42nd RPQ for 1917, p.136.; 43rd RPQ for 1918, p.132.; Head Mistress, Brisbane State School for Girls.; see also Appendix 2 - Details on Other Selected People.

32 DSAC, loc. cit.; 42nd RPQ for 1917, p.131.; 43rd RPQ for 1918, p.132.

33 39th RPQ for 1914, p.133.; DSAC, loc. cit.; 46th RPQ for 1921, p.79.; 47th RPQ for 1922, p.100.; University of Queensland, *Manual of Public Examinations, 1938-1939*, p.110.

Domestic science students often found that nursing or teaching were the only professions open to them, and that even these opportunities were limited. Nevertheless, domestic science education continued to spread throughout the state but difficulties in gaining employment remained. In 1917 and again in 1918 Morris pointed out that until a full scale scheme of domestic science education started in primary schools, teaching opportunities would remain limited and the popularity of the Domestic Science Day Schools correspondingly low. As late as 1929 Morris was still complaining that young women who completed the course ‘. . . sometimes find difficulty in securing employment in which their special studies in Domestic Science may be applied.’³⁴

To provide domestic science classes for those beyond the reach of vocational centres, Technical Education established an itinerant teacher scheme in 1919. In this, domestic science teachers conducted classes in country towns, usually in tents erected in school grounds. In 1923 Technical Education upgraded this scheme by using a special domestic science railway car. This travelling temporary classroom for domestic science classes was duplicated in 1924. Except short periods during the depression and World War II, these cars operated until the 1960s.³⁵

From 1915 to 1937, Domestic Science had static growth compared to other areas such as commercial studies. Undoubtedly this lack of growth was linked to the problem of finding socially acceptable domestic science vocations.

Parental Attitudes

In general parents rated domestic science courses as having less value than academic courses. One reason was that housewifery was often regarded as mere drudgery, with no particular intelligence or training being necessary to cope with the mindless manual labour associated with the role. Another reason for this attitude was that Scholarship, Junior and Senior examinations did not include vocational subjects. These public examinations were the basis of academic, and in some cases even social

34 DSAC, loc. cit.; 42nd RPQ for 1917, p.131.; 43rd RPQ for 1918, p.132.; 53rd RPQ for 1928, p.140.

35 44th RPQ for 1919, p.127.; 47th-53rd RPQ for 1922-1928, p.100; p.100; p.110; p.122; p.126; p.130; p.130; p.142.; 58th RPQ for 1933, p.49.; 59th RPQ for 1934, p.63.; 61st RPQ for 1936, p.51.

status and the public was therefore inclined to regard vocational subjects as worthless. This, according to the popular view, was particularly true of housewives in country areas with their limited recreational facilities and opportunities for adult education and general social intercourse.

According to Morris it was commonly believed that ‘. . . only those girls incapable of taking ordinary subjects of the Junior examination entered upon the study of domestic science subjects’. This attitude had noticeably waned by the late 1930s, although Lady Cilento³⁶ claimed its influence was still significant. She believed that too often parents were the stumbling block, and were so determined that their daughters should pass their academic examinations,

. . . and be so much nearer earning a living, [that] they do not encourage them to spend time at what they consider useless subjects – that is, subjects bringing no marks in the examination.³⁷

Political Attitudes

Another reason for the interest in domestic science education was the population drift from the land. The land was seen as the basic source of wealth, and the rural drift to the more comfortable and attractive cities had been a worrying problem for Queensland governments since Separation in 1859. Indeed, one of the main themes of education in Queensland has always been the need to improve educational facilities in country areas as a way of making ‘life-on-the-land’ more attractive. As Story said

The bulk of the State’s wealth is derived from the land, and for very many years to come Queensland must be a producing rather than a manufacturing country. Her empty spaces have also to be filled. One of the problems of the present age is the rural problem - how to prevent a general exodus from the country to the towns, how to encourage a fair exodus from the towns to the country. One means towards the end is to make the country more attractive as a place to live and in which to earn a good living.³⁸

36 Newspaper columnist.

37 47th RPQ for 1922, p.100.; Newspaper cutting, 17 September 1938, *Gympie State High School, 1938-1942*, EDU/BC187, QSA.

38 38th RPQ for 1913, p.20.

Departmental Attitudes

In 1913 Blair attempted to encourage young women to accept the moral worth of their expected roles by quoting a Biblical definition of 'the proper sphere of woman'. He urged young women not to regard domestic duties as 'beneath them [or] think that helping your mother will make you less charming, less able to take your place in the world'. Similarly, John Story³⁹ told young women that, '. . . far from being second-rate, the goal of being a successful homemaker was far worthier than any scholastic goal'. He claimed the Education Department would prefer women to be successful homemakers with '. . . the best attributes of women, than have them become the most famous of scholars.'⁴⁰

Reginald Roe⁴¹ expressed concern for the maintenance of a 'sensible' balance between educational and vocational subjects. He claimed the Department was under increasing pressure to add subjects such as gardening, domestic science and hygiene to the syllabus. He remarked that there was

. . . some danger that the larger quarry (the fundamental "Three R's") may be left lurking in the thicket while we are hurrying off in pursuit of the butterflies, small birds and rabbits.⁴²

On the other hand, Story actively encouraged vocational subjects in primary schools. His influence, and the more favourable attitudes of the Labor Government elected in 1915, were largely responsible for the advances in domestic science in the 1910s. These differences of opinion among educationalists however, did nothing to enhance public confidence in vocational education.

In 1917 Hardacre was concerned with the lack of interest in Day Schools. He told the DSAC that the domestic science facilities at Central Technical College were still virtually unused for a large part of the week. He said that if domestic science courses at the Day Schools were unpopular then it was the DSAC's duty to develop courses that were. Simultaneously, attempts should be made to solve unemployment in

39 Director-General of Education 1904-1920.; see also Appendix 2 - Details on Other Selected People.

40 *Brisbane Courier*, 15 December 1913, p.6.

41 Director of General Education 1910-1916.; see also Appendix 2 - Details on Other Selected People.

42 38th RPQ for 1913, p.37.

domestic science and to counterbalance adverse public attitudes. Together he claimed, these two problems were the root cause of domestic science's unpopularity.⁴³

After 1918 Technical Education modified its attitudes towards domestic science. It accepted that preparation for the Junior examination could be an important goal itself, as could be preparation for home duties. This attitudinal change resulted in the University, in 1921, including domestic science subjects in the Junior examination. Morris claimed that until then students doing domestic science subjects were regarded in some circles as less able to do ordinary subjects.

By this time Domestic Science Day Schools were well established at Central, Ipswich, and Townsville Technical Colleges. In 1924 Richard Wearne⁴⁴ called the Junior pass 'the blue ribbon' of the Domestic Science Day School. Not all accepted this rise in domestic science's status however; in 1925, Frank Brennan⁴⁵ claimed that a Brisbane Grammar School master had recently referred to domestic science in the Junior examination as 'the potato peelers' session'. In 1926, Central Technical College Domestic Science Day School was renamed the Domestic Science High School, Central Technical College.⁴⁶

Some Wartime Influences

Wartime conditions created several pressing economic and patriotic reasons for valuing domestic science education. As the *Brisbane Courier* said a year after the outbreak of war, women had a patriotic duty to play their part in maintaining the morale and physical well-being of their families and '... to see that their menfolk are kept fit for the struggle by providing them with well-cooked, nourishing meals and a restful home atmosphere.' Good home management was not merely a patriotic duty however, as droughts, and disruptions to normal shipping and trade increased sharply

43 DSAC, loc. cit.

44 Principal, Central Technical College 1919-1932.; see also Appendix 2 - Details on Other Selected People.

45 Minister for Education 1924-1925.; see also Appendix 1 - Details on Selected Politicians.

46 44th RPQ for 1919, p.19.; 47th RPQ for 1922, p.100.; Central Technical College, Principal's Report, 1924, EDU/A363, QSA.; *Brisbane Courier*, 12 February 1925, p.16.

the cost of living during the war years. This almost made domestic science education an economic necessity. From 1914 to 1919, while food and grocery prices had risen throughout Australia, Queensland had the greatest increase. The cost of living rose 64.5% in Queensland compared with 52.4% in NSW.⁴⁷

In these conditions careful budgeting, the use of substitutes for scarce beef, and economical use of food were essential for both family and country. Interest in domestic science education correspondingly rose.

The Outcome

Despite parental scepticism and the daunting cost of providing facilities, pressure for domestic science education was very strong. At various times the government, departmental officers and media argued that domestic science was a partial solution to some of the most consistent and pressing socio-economic problems in Queensland. Additionally, many of the gentry believed that traditional family structures were threatened. The female elite saw the lack of domestic staff as a serious problem. Rising divorce and illegitimacy rates and the soaring incidence of reported venereal disease gave disturbing weight to evidence of the danger. These were real problems for prominent Queenslanders and in 1910, to combat the decline, educationalists, public servants, churchmen, politicians and other members of the elite, formed a Queensland Council of Public Morality. For many influential Queenslanders including Reginald Roe, John Shirley, and Amy Schauer⁴⁸, the attack on the family had reached crisis proportions.

The Brisbane press gave its whole-hearted support to these sentiments with the *Daily Standard* lamenting that commercial studies had replaced domestic training.⁴⁹ On the other hand, Story actively encouraged the introduction of such vocational subjects in primary schools. These differences in public opinion did nothing to

47 *Brisbane Courier*, 10 February 1915, p.9.; *Telegraph*, 23 September 1919, p.7.

48 Roe - Director of Education, 1910-1916; Shirley - Principal, Teacher's Training College.; Schauer - Officer-in-charge, Domestic Science Department, Central Technical College.; see also Appendix 2 - Details on Other Selected People.

49 G.N. Logan, *Sex Education in Queensland, A History of the Debate 1900-1980. (Historical perspectives on contemporary issues in Queensland education N° 2)*, Brisbane, Education Department, 1980, pp.6-21.; *Daily Standard*, 28 August 1914, p.2.

enhance public confidence in vocational education. Parental doubts were further strengthened by the continuing omission of domestic science and other vocational subjects from the Scholarship, Junior and Senior examinations.

In attempting to counter these attitudes educators after 1910 often publicly argued that the 'utilitarian nature' of vocational subjects did not necessarily detract from their 'educative value'. They attempted to use technical education as a tool for social re-engineering. They claimed that by strengthening the moral and intellectual appeal of the roles of housewife and mother, domestic science education could play a vital role in arresting family decline.

Under pressure from lobby groups, the media and even their own Minister, Technical Education decided to offer a complete Domestic Science course but lack of funds prevented implementation. Another idea was for a Domestic Science School. Blair even outlined the school outcomes in a diagram and saw the courses offered by the school as leading to 'Women's Pursuits'.⁵⁰

Finally in 1915, a complete Domestic Science course was introduced. In the previous September Wearne⁵¹ visited New South Wales and was particularly impressed by the continuation schools. Since at least 1911, his college had been offering Department of Home Science subjects, but left students to make up their own courses. It is not surprising therefore, that at the beginning of 1915, Ipswich Technical College established a Domestic Science School with the blessing of Technical Education. Hardacre announced this Domestic Science School as the first of its kind, '... well equipped with necessary apparatus ...'⁵²

Morris continued the social charade by telling delegates at the Annual Technical College Conference in 1917 that technical colleges could greatly assist the domestic side of rural industries. He said that conditions were not as appealing as they should be, but could be improved, if '... in the domestic department of the various colleges we [trained] our girls to be more useful and to make these homes more attractive'.⁵³

This strong and public support by influential members of the Government, Education Department and Technical Education is in variance with the growth patterns of the three High Schools of Central Technical College in later years. Despite the

50 38th RPQ for 1913, pp.20-20a.

51 Principal, Ipswich College 1901-1918.

52 Ipswich Technical College, Principal's Report, 3 April 1912.; Ipswich Technical College, Principal's Report, 14 October 1912.; 39th RPQ for 1914, p.19.; 40th RPQ for 1915, pp.161-162.; 41st RPQ for 1916, p.22.; *Daily Mail*, 23 January 1917, p.2.

53 'Conference of Technical College Delegates', 16 August 1917, p.15. A/16263, QSA.

support, the two schools with definite vocational outcomes, Commercial High and Industrial High, had the greatest growth while Domestic Science High remained comparatively small with its main vocational outcome being that of teaching in the same school. The growth of each school appears directly correlated to the employment prospects of its pupils, not to influential support.

In 1917 the primary school syllabus included domestic science; one reason articulated for this delay was the sheer expense involved. Another important factor however, was widespread parental suspicion of the subject's value. Although domestic science's popularity in the technical colleges may seem to belie this point, it should be remembered that these courses attracted only a very small proportion of the young women leaving school.

Commercial Studies

With employment prospects in the commercial world being much brighter, most post-primary young women favoured type-writing, shorthand, book-keeping and other commercial courses over domestic science. Some, realising that employment in that field was limited, abandoned the Domestic Science Day School course.⁵⁴

During the debate on the *Technical Instruction Act Amendment Act of 1918*, to allow the Education Department to take charge of committee-controlled technical colleges, Morris supported the takeover of Ipswich, Rockhampton, and Charters Towers Colleges. He claimed that such takeovers would aid commercial studies and pointed out that the colleges at Warwick and Mackay had already been taken over to inaugurate High Schools. Both institutions were being run as a joint facility, using existing buildings and equipment. He stated that this action had helped the growth of commercial studies by reducing course costs.⁵⁵

Story dissentingly raised several issues concerning the proposed takeovers advocating financial caution. He questioned the need for more combined institutions, and whether the local communities wanted them. Story went on to say that the

54 41st RPQ for 1916, p.130.; 42nd RPQ for 1917, p.131.

55 Leonard Morris, Memorandum, 16 April 1918, p.9. A/16264, QSA.; 44th RPQ for 1919, p.131.

Government may well find that it was obliged not only to fund the high school but also additional facilities for commercial subjects. This would be particularly critical if the business community insisted on Commercial Junior.⁵⁶

During the parliamentary session of 1920 several politicians criticised commercial classes for young women. James Peterson thought they should study domestic science instead to make them better qualified as housewives. Bernard Corser, William Bebbington and David Gledson had similar opinions.⁵⁷ Even the Governor of Queensland, Sir Matthew Nathan, was similarly critical in 1921. He emphasised that he and other community leaders were deeply concerned by this preference for commercial education, and that he was

. . . quite certain of the paramount importance of training that tends to heighten the home-making capacity, that teaches how to [cook]; how to make [clothing]; how to [keep house]; how to bring up [children]; I am bound to say that [compared with] domestic training I rate comparatively lowly . . . commercial training which has no domestic uses; I mean the training in typewriting and shorthand . . . generally of little or no use to the married woman, and so are not training for the state to which most girls rightly aspire. They are, at best, a 'mean-time occupation'.⁵⁸

Nevertheless, the joint facility policy continued and in 1922 Morris reported that of the seventeen colleges operating in Queensland, eight were totally controlled by the State. He also wanted the Department to take over the nearly completed Cairns Technical College and combine it with the High School creating '. . . a Secondary School in which academic, domestic, and commercial courses are available for girls, and academic, vocational, and commercial courses are available for boys.' The success of this policy was proven at Brisbane, Warwick, Toowoomba, Rockhampton, and Ipswich where commercial courses developed rapidly. Commercial Junior subjects continued to grow in popularity, and Morris reported that by 1934 approximately 70% of pupils attending Departmental high schools were studying commercial courses.⁵⁹

In the early years the emphasis of commercial education was to equip students with skills immediately useable in the workplace. Education to promote further study, or to develop a whole entity as opposed to a piecemeal arrangement of instructing for specific vocational skills, was not considered. The objective was to fill a particular

56 J.D. Story, Memorandum, 4 September 1918, A/16264, QSA.

57 QPD, Vol.34, 1919-20, p.2528.

58 *Daily Record*, 27 October 1921, p.6.

59 48th RPQ for 1923, p.96.; 50th RPQ for 1925, p.126.; 60th RPQ for 1935, p.62.; 61st RPQ for 1936, p.73.

occupational slot in society. Nevertheless, despite the conservative attitudes of some divisions of society, attitudes towards commercial education changed.

Day Trade Schools

Before 1915 technical colleges offered virtually no industry training. Nevertheless, when Central Technical College moved to its new location there were promises of new initiatives in apprentice education with direct links between technical college education for young people and trade training. Reinforcing these promises was the dissatisfaction with industry training displayed by increased political agitation. Hardacre re-emphasised Blair's vocational training objectives. He explained that vocational training should prepare trainees for apprenticeships, promote efficiency and manual dexterity, advance their general education but not to the detriment of trade training, stimulate their initiative and originality, and make them good citizens and efficient workers.⁶⁰

For some time Morris had advocated full-time training of apprentices in colleges but was unsuccessful. Finally in 1915 a committee was established to investigate trade training in the colleges. It criticised the duration of some apprenticeships and advanced a case to train apprentices in technical colleges and also recommended establishing a school to provide ' . . . systemised instruction, knowledge of, and practice in the various operations constituting craftsmanship.' The committee said that considering dentistry and surgery, crafts requiring manual skills of particular delicacy, were being taught in educational institutions, they were confident that, despite some contrary claims, trade skills could be taught in Day Trade Schools. It recommended that Day Trade Schools be established in Brisbane and Ipswich when feasible, to train scholarship holders and current apprentices. They also recommended that advanced training be made available for tradespeople, that Trade Advisory Committee duties incorporate these schools, and that industry recognise Day Trade School training.⁶¹

60 41st RPQ for 1916, p.22.

61 see Appendix 7 - Members of Selected Boards and Committees.; 40th RPQ for 1915, p.21.; Advanced Trade training was finally introduced in 1968.

Hardacre wanted to expand the scope of the technical colleges in 1916 but was restricted financially. He hoped however, to establish day trade schools at both Central and Ipswich Technical Colleges. Such schools would supply continuous trade training from primary school, through technical college and onto the workshop. Hardacre hoped not only to include training, but job placement for students including those in Government workshops.⁶²

Day Trade Schools were established in 1917 at both Central and Ipswich Technical Colleges. These provided a general education with a core curriculum in the first year suitable to all the mechanical trades. Industry leaders supported the Day Trade School concept, and favoured recruiting apprentices from these students, but had reservations about union acceptance. The first student group completed their course in 1918 and sought apprenticeships but, except for carpentry and plumbing students, had little success.⁶³

In post-War Queensland, with a rural economy instead of one based on manufacturing, Day Trade School students had intense competition for employment. There was a depressed labour market, and they were competing against returned service personnel, adults with an adult's strength, and with wages subsidised by the Commonwealth Rehabilitation Scheme. There can be little wonder therefore, that these students faced problems gaining employment.

The issue of Day Trade Schools however, appears to have been decided long before the first students completed their course in 1918. This is even more significant when Story's attitude at the 1918 Conference of Technical College Delegates is considered. His view was that students would spend two years training and then gain minimal recognition for it. He wanted the scheme stopped, claiming that Day Trade Schools were excessively resource expensive. Story doubted '... whether the Department would be warranted in expending public funds particularly in this period of financial stress . . .'⁶⁴ While he later softened his view, it came at a time of other controversial issues, and may have been an intentional distraction.

Riddell was more supportive, but he too spoke of Day Trade Schools as an experiment. He reported however, that engineering trades were enthusiastic about the

62 *Brisbane Courier*, 16 November 1916. p.6.

63 42nd-44th RPQ for 1917-1919, p.130.; pp.23, 135.; p.132.

64 *Telegraph*, 15 August 1918, p.8.; 17 August 1918, p.2.; *Brisbane Courier*, 16 August 1918, p.10.; 17 August 1918, p.12.; *Daily Mail*, 16 August 1918, p.3.; *Daily Standard*, 16 August 1918, p.6.; *Vocational Training*, pp.5-6, A/16264, QSA.

scheme after visiting Central Technical College. Riddell saw Day Trade Schools as the ‘. . . most profitable source from which to draw the future apprentice.’⁶⁵

Morris gave a warning of almost moral significance. He questioned the morality of a society that could find massive amounts of money for war, but would demur at paying for a better education system. Technical education was the way of the future he felt, as industrial methods had changed entirely, illustrated by new technologies developed during the war. He believed that although Queensland was a limited market, the high costs of transport to the state should allow manufacturers to off-set local production costs. Queensland would be compelled to train more highly skilled apprentices than those in other countries. ‘In each town the Technical College should become the centre of Culture, the working man’s University’. He concluded that if millions ‘. . . can be spent on the destruction of human life there will not be much difficulty in obtaining £1,000,000 per annum for education.’⁶⁶

But this was the end of the Day Trade Schools and Morris suggested that their trade training function be changed to one of a general nature as the trades had a high degree of commonality. Students would have a later and wider choice of trade selection, instead of being forced to specialise too early. The Central Apprenticeship Committee agreed. Central Technical College reorganised its Day Trade Schools in 1921 and Technical Day Trade School was renamed Technical High School.⁶⁷

Central Technical College High Schools

If we ignore the establishment of Domestic Science Day School in January 1910 which, as discussed previously in Chapter Two, had a technical emphasis and is not usually regarded as Queensland’s first State secondary school, the first High School to be associated with Technical Education was Central Technical College High, opened in 1912. In 1921 the Technical Day Trade School there was renamed Technical High School. In that same year, Central Technical College High moved from Central

65 *Address by the Deputy Superintendent of Technical Education*, p.2, A/16264, QSA.

66 *Technical Instruction Act*, p.7. A/16264, QSA.

67 45th RPQ for 1920, pp.65-66.

Technical College and amalgamated with the Junior High of the Normal School to form Brisbane State High School.⁶⁸

In 1926 the remaining two Day Schools at Central Technical College were renamed as High Schools. This was done as both schools now had the Junior examination as their objective. This change resulted in the Central Technical College complex now including three high schools - Commercial High School, Domestic Science High School, and in addition, the existing Technical High School was now renamed Industrial High School.

Industrial High did not separate from Central Technical College until 1947 and, as part of a secondary school decentralisation scheme, it closed at the end of 1961. When it was part of Central Technical College many of its students benefited from courses with highly utilitarian emphasis. These did not reduce apprenticeship duration but gave exemptions from some College subjects studied during an apprenticeship.

In 1928 Morris explained that Industrial High School subjects had great value, were now included in the Junior examinations, and in future would be the entrance qualifications for skilled trades. He criticised the previous High School curriculum as being too closely related to the English one, featuring subjects such as European languages which may have had ready commercial value there but were of little use in Queensland. Students were more likely to require vocational subjects, such as those taught in Industrial High School, before they could gain employment. Morris claimed that the study of vocational subjects required a level of intelligence ‘. . . quite equal to that required for any of the classical, mathematical, or science subjects.’ He felt that all modern educationalists agreed on the high educational value of manual subjects. He continued to display his enthusiasm for the Industrial Junior and Industrial High School, and in 1935 suggested that it was appropriate for careers in banking, insurance, and commerce, trade and professional engineering, and rural occupations.⁶⁹

In 1962 both Domestic Science High and Commercial High parted from Central Technical College. Domestic Science High School closed in 1963, and Commercial High School closed in 1965.

68 E. Clarke, *Technical and Further Education in Queensland: A history 1860-1990*, Brisbane, Education Department, 1992.; Letter to the Editor, *Brisbane Courier*, 12 February 1925, p.12.; Brisbane State High School is the only State High School in Queensland to ever be part of the Greater Public Schools (GPS) group.

69 54th-55th RPQ for 1929-1930, pp.139-140.; pp.136-137.; 61st-62nd RPQ for 1936-1937, p.74.; p.53.

The Technical Instruction Act Amendment Act of 1918

A big change for Technical Education occurred in 1918 when State Parliament passed the *Technical Instruction Act Amendment Act*. This Act, amending the *Technical Instruction Act of 1908*, empowered the Technical Education Branch to take over non-State controlled technical colleges. Following this however, the take-over was very gradual with the last non-State technical college, Gympie, not being absorbed until 1965.

The 1910-1912 scheme to integrate secondary high schools with technical colleges gathered further pace in 1919 and 1920. After the *Technical Instruction Act Amendment Act of 1918* nine more joint facilities came into being, but by 1934 the technical colleges in four of these had closed.

Morris claimed that this integration policy would result in increased work efficiency and would lower costs. He claimed that this would thereby reduce fees and increase enrolments. Furthermore, joining high schools with technical colleges would lead to a more efficient use of buildings, equipment and staff. Buildings could be used for secondary education during the day and technical education at night. Teachers would have greater job security as they could teach in any area of a combined high school-technical college complex.

This joint facility policy however, created a potential managerial weakness. Morris tried to ensure that each technical college and high school principal had a sound knowledge of mathematics, science and manual subjects, and at least an interest in industry. The typical principal had however, experience limited to lower secondary or primary school teaching, and sometimes little sympathy for technical classes.⁷⁰

70 44th RPQ for 1919, pp.128, 131.; 47th RPQ for 1924, p.96.; 48th RPQ for 1925, p.109.; 49th RPQ for 1926, p.121.; 53rd RPQ for 1928, p.138.

Apprenticeships

In Queensland apprentice education has always been strongly associated with technical education. Since the first technical classes in the North Brisbane School of Arts, large numbers of apprentices had always attended technical classes but, until State control of apprenticeships, they selected their own subjects with little trade guidance. Unions controlled apprenticeships and opposed employment of unskilled and child labour, but supported compulsory and systematic apprentice education.

From Separation in 1859 apprenticeships operated on the English example, remaining voluntary contracts between masters and apprentices. Apprentice education was primarily the responsibility of private bodies, sometimes subsidised by the Government. In consequence many apprentices were employed in various trades without ever signing indentures.

This was a period when politicians on both sides saw apprentice training as a means of accumulating political mileage. Each side made positive changes while in power, but always to suit their particular ideology. Arthur Edward Moore⁷¹ responded to the powerful interests of private industry while Labor politicians responded to trade union interests. It was left to Morris and other educationalists to make the legislation work. Some schemes, such as Day Trade Schools, were doomed to failure in their original form, but a modified version survived to form the basis of industrial education from which grew Manual Arts courses in secondary schools.

In 1915 Trade Advisory Committees were inaugurated to manage apprenticeships, and the *Industrial Arbitration Act of 1916* went further. It gave the Board of Trade and Arbitration authority over apprenticeships, imposed indenture registration, and determined apprentice wages.

At this stage college attendance for apprentices was still negotiable. By late 1916 some employers agreed to specialised training at college, while the Arbitration Court introduced compulsory technical college attendance in some trades. As various colleges had differing facilities however, some awards contained area-specific details. The first award to be changed compelled electrical engineering apprentices to attend technical college if they lived in certain areas.

Despite these changes there were insufficient skilled tradespeople. Hardacre saw the current short-term solution for this – importation through immigration – as

71 Leader of the Country Party, Premier 21 May 1929 to 27 June 1932.; see also Appendix 1 - Details on Selected Politicians.

‘. . . a forcible argument for extending the educational activities . . .’ Compulsory apprentice attendance at technical college led to compromises. College facilities were so inadequate initially – grossly inadequate in some cases – that they were unable to satisfy the new training needs. Regular attendance now occurred but only theory classes were offered.⁷²

By 1917 the situation with apprentice training had become acute and politicians were concerned. The persistent rural-urban conflict was epitomised by Mr Tolmie during the Supply Debates. He considered the bulk of technical education funding was devoted to Brisbane, and wanted to know what the department was doing for other youth wanting to learn a trade.⁷³

Mr Bebbington claimed that the current industrial laws and the importation of tradespeople were preventing local youth from gaining skills, forcing them to ‘. . . carry their swag through the country looking for labourer’s work.’ He supported any proposal for compulsory technical education saying that it was ‘. . . as justifiable in its own way as a system of primary education.’ Mr Stevens criticised trade unions for their conservative and restrictive regulations concerning apprenticeships, and their effect on technical education. He demanded a new system of apprentice training be created. Political anxiety over apprenticeship training suggests there was a growing conviction that the situation needed improvement.⁷⁴

Late in 1919 Trade Unions, Employers, and Technical Education had a conference with Justice McCawley⁷⁵ as Chairperson to discuss apprenticeships. Early in the following year the Government accepted recommendations from the conference and changed the apprenticeship scheme. The *Brisbane Courier* attributed these changes to Story’s influence and although supportive, suggested strongly that practical training of apprentices should be performed by employers.

A Central Apprenticeship Committee, the first in Australia, was established to broadly supervise apprenticeships. Group Apprenticeship Committees, with equal representation from employers and employees, and with Wearne as Chairman of each, were established. In an early attempt at vocational guidance, these allocated successful applicants to specific employers and supervised their training. Simultaneously the Arbitration Court removed the maximum completion age on apprenticeships. Before

72 43rd RPQ for 1918, pp.21, 24-25, p.137.

73 QPD, 1917, 3rd Session, 20th Parliament, pp.3358, 3360.

74 *ibid.* pp.3360-3362.

75 President of the Arbitration Court.

this, nobody over fifteen could enter an apprenticeship as they would exceed the maximum age before completion.⁷⁶

During the next two years, the scheme was soundly criticised. Some parents vented their anger as they were unable to directly pressure prospective employers but the major complaint concerned the lack of apprentices. The Arbitration Court applied a formula limiting the number of apprentices under each tradesperson, and some employers, well supported by the *Brisbane Courier*, attributed this restriction to union pressure. The Unions, supported by the *Daily Standard*, claimed this was necessary to stop 'slavery' of young people in the workshops. They also claimed that apprenticeship selection still depended on employer requirements as they, interested only in profits, would place only as many apprentices as their industries could profitably absorb. Archbishop Duhig of the Catholic Church stirred up the controversy by joining the *Brisbane Courier* and employers in opposing the restrictions. He alleged that Queensland was educating a nation of clerks and labourers instead of producing skilled tradespeople. Justice McCawley then entered the fray. He pointed out that employers were failing to take full advantage of the apprenticeship acts while other commentators maintained that the trade depression and competition from returned soldiers were the major reasons for the low number of apprenticeship placements.⁷⁷ With so many vocal 'experts' being egged on by the two major (and rival) newspapers, it was a wonder that any scheme for training apprentices could survive.

These were the conditions prevailing during 1920. Morris was pessimistic about the ability of industry to compete with growing manufacturing countries such as Japan and China. He believed that Australian manufacturers were not competitive on world markets, and the small domestic market was the only one left for some manufactured articles. The wool industry however, had favourable conditions – raw materials were available and there was a sizeable domestic market that should be developed. Tradespeople were needed to service and maintain products manufactured overseas and therefore needed a range of skills exceeding those of other countries.

76 45th-46th RPQ for 1920-1921, p.4.; p.64.; Leonard Morris, Statement, A/12167, QSA.; *Brisbane Courier*, 28 October 1919, p.6.; *Daily Standard*, 28 July 1921, p.4.; *Daily Mail*, 15 August 1921, p.3.

77 45th RPQ for 1920, p.64.; *Daily Standard*, 11 May 1923, p.8.; 20 August 1923, p.4.; *Daily Mail*, 1 August 1921, p.8.; 9 December 1921, p.8.; *Brisbane Courier*, 28 October 1919, p.6.; 13 July 1920, p.6.; 7 December 1920, p.6.; 28 July 1921, p.6.; 10 October 1922, p.7.; 2 April 1923, p.4.; 9 May 1923, p.7.

Tradespeople therefore needed more training than could be gained by an apprentice in one workshop. This additional training could be supplied by technical colleges.⁷⁸

The scheme continued to have problems placing apprentices. Nevertheless, in 1920 Morris felt that the results were quite acceptable, particularly as employers were unhappy with their reduced input into apprentice selection. In a thorough analysis of the situation in 1922, he explained that apprenticeship placements had increased in number as business had improved, employers had more confidence in the scheme, and appointment of full-time staff had added to the scheme's prestige. Morris pointed to a problem whereby most young people left school at fourteen and had to wait a year until they could sit for the public apprenticeship entrance examination at fifteen. Most applicants also preferred one trade over another, and in consequence some trades had eight month waiting lists, while other trades were desperate for apprentices. To aggravate this problem the Railways Department – a major employer of mechanical trade apprentices – used its own entrance examination which he thought was particularly unsuitable. Morris saw entrance examinations themselves as irrelevant and wondered why all apprenticeships had the same duration although their trade skills varied considerably. He thought a five-year apprenticeship was unnecessarily long as the education standard had risen, and saw narrow trade specialisations as limiting apprenticeship opportunities.⁷⁹

The Apprenticeship Act of 1924

Before 1924, the laws governing apprenticeships in Queensland were the *Apprenticeship Acts of 1828 and 1844*, the *Queensland Industrial Peace Act of 1912*, and the *Industrial Arbitration Act of 1916*. The first two, of course, were applicable even before Separation and were more applicable to the apprentices of England who were wards of the courts. They did however, specify who could indenture apprentices and indenture duration. The *Industrial Peace Act of 1912*, introduced to break the 'great strike', was more innocuous as only two small sections referred to apprentices. In a depression indenture time could be reduced, and employers could still employ apprentices even if employee numbers fell below the required apprentices-to-

78 43rd RPQ for 1918, p.22.; 46th RPQ for 1921, p.63.; EDU/A352, QSA.

79 47th RPQ for 1922, pp.80, 97-99.; *Brisbane Courier*, 27 September 1921, p.8.; *Daily Mail*, 29 August 1921, p.5.; *Daily Record*, 28 September 1921, p.5.

tradesperson ratio.⁸⁰ The *Industrial Arbitration Act of 1916* gave the Board of Trade and Arbitration some authority over apprenticeships, imposed indenture registration, and determined apprentice wages. It was not until 1924 that Government legislation controlled all aspects of apprenticeships.

In 1924 William Forgan Smith⁸¹ started the debate on the *Apprenticeship Act of 1924*. This formalised compulsory technical college attendance by apprentices and allowed the Group Apprenticeship Committee to co-ordinate apprenticeship training. There was to be an Apprenticeship Executive representing the Trades and Labour Council, the Employers Federation, the Group Apprenticeship Committee, and Department representatives. It introduced compulsory indentures of apprentices and a bonus scheme. Mr Dunstan supported institutionalised training saying that often ‘. . . the employer is about the worst instructor.’ He felt that some employers used apprentices merely as cheap labour while unions often controlled apprenticeship numbers to protect their trade.⁸²

The debate was on issues concerning training of rural youth, instead of trade needs. Many speakers following this line of thought were rural members, and thus once again the rural-urban conflict commandeered a debate on technical education. Bias by members is understandable however, as the union movement was the Labor Party’s power base. A major union was the Australian Workers Union (AWU), with many members being shearers and station hands and it was to be expected that the Labor Government’s main concern would be with rural issues. Rural members required sympathetic and delicate handling to ensure the party remained in Government. The Act was finally passed and the Department of Public Works, Labour Branch took control of apprenticeships. Although Technical Education did not regain control until 1932, it continued to provide technical college training.⁸³

The most significant change brought about by the *Apprenticeship Act of 1924* was the introduction of compulsory technical college attendance for all apprentices. The immediate effect of this was increased college attendance numbers, and all colleges now had to cater for a different group of students with needs more specific than previously. The Government accepted the need for college training on this scale and

80 *The Public Acts of Queensland (Reprint) 1828-1936*, Sydney, Butterworth and Co. (Aust.), pp.659-661.; Queensland Statutes, 13, 1911-1913, Government Printer, Brisbane, 1914, p.5515.

81 Minister for Public Works; see also Appendix 1 - Details on Selected Politicians.

82 QPD, Vol.143, 1924, pp.228, 236-237.

83 49th RPQ for 1924, p.122.

the implications in terms of resources required was the death knell for committee-controlled colleges. Although they could supply the resources needed for commercial and domestic science classes, the funds needed to purchase the expensive resources demanded by trade courses such as fitting and turning, and motor mechanics, were eventually beyond their capabilities.

The Apprentices and Minors Act of 1927

In 1927, the Apprenticeship Executive decided to extend the apprenticeship system throughout Queensland. Subsequently the *Apprentices and Minors Act of 1927* was passed specifically to cater for the printing trades, but was later extended to include other trades. It replaced the *Apprenticeship Act of 1924* but insofar as apprentices were concerned, was of minimal significance. The principal changes increased the Apprenticeship Executive's power. During the debate some speakers wanted a reduction of technical education as they doubted its value during high unemployment. Thomas Foley said that Central Technical College was training too many people. He believed that technical education created political agitators from students unable to find employment in the overcrowded trades and professions.⁸⁴

Morris opposed these views and said that technical education would help people to be more employable and the State to recover from the Depression. During a parliamentary session twelve years later, Henry Bruce⁸⁵ supported Morris. He claimed that unemployment was exacerbated by the existence of too many unskilled workers and the lack of skilled artisans. He asserted that the key to solving unemployment was technical education.⁸⁶

Morris believed that apprenticeship training costs should be shared equitably between the public, the apprentice and the employer. He also complained that the lack of an entrance examination led to high apprenticeship failure rates and that some apprentices even reached their final year without passing a single examination. At Central Technical College in 1925, most apprentices had failed the simple College

84 *Telegraph*, 12 December 1929.

85 Minister for Education, 1938-1941, 1947-1950; see also Appendix 1 - Details on Selected Politicians.

86 57th RPQ for 1932, pp.64-65.; 60th RPQ for 1935, p.72.; 62nd RPQ for 1937, p.48.; QPD, Vol.175, 1939, pp.1438-1439.; *Brisbane Courier*, 1 December 1931, p.10.

entrance test with 20% gaining no marks at all. Of 124 apprentices sitting for the College entrance test in 1930 only five had passed.⁸⁷

John Hill⁸⁸ claimed the new scheme allowed employers to indenture as apprentices, young people with low intelligence, low examination standards and poor physique. He said that a group psychology test one year revealed that, out of seventy-three who failed the College entrance test, only twenty-nine were mentally suited for skilled trades. Hill recommended re-implementation of an apprenticeship entrance examination. Reginald King⁸⁹ accepted this and from 1931 a minimum of a pass in Grade VI was needed to enter an apprenticeship.

Other Apprenticeship Acts

The *Apprentices and Minors Act Amendment Act of 1929* removed all references to Journeymen⁹⁰ and increased further the power of the Apprenticeship Executive. Frank Cooper defended the Amendments while Moore made the point that many union leaders were short-sighted. He doubted their 'closed shop' policy, to maintain conditions and wages, was in the best interests of the apprentice or the country.⁹¹

By 1930 the number of new apprenticeships had decreased dramatically due in particular to the Depression. Even applicants with exceptionally good results in the Industrial Junior examination were unable to gain indentures and not until 1936 did apprenticeship numbers start to approach pre-depression levels.⁹²

-
- 87 Leonard Morris, 'History of Apprenticeship', Typescript, ?1936, p.21, EHU.; 49th RPQ for 1924, p.123.; 51st RPQ for 1926, p.129.; *Apprenticeship Training*, EDU/A107, QSA.; Central Technical College, Annual Report, 1930, EDU/A363, QSA.
- 88 Inspector of Technical Colleges 1923–1937; see also Appendix 2 - Details on Other Selected People.
- 89 Minister for Education 1929–1932; see also Appendix 1 - Details on Selected Politicians.
- 90 Those who had completed apprenticeships.
- 91 Cooper - Minister for Education 1932-1938.; Moore - Leader of the Opposition.; see also Appendix 1 - Details on Selected Politicians.; QPD, 1934, p.1779.
- 92 J. Hill, Memo to L. Morris, 29 September 1930, *Apprenticeship Training*, EDU/A109, QSA.; 55th RPQ for 1930, p.76.; 61st RPQ for 1936, p.52.; Principal, Central Technical College, 15 October 1930, EDU/A366, QSA.

The 1929 amendment was followed by amendments in 1934, 1945, 1948, 1954 and 1959. Eventually, the *Apprentices and Minors Act of 1927* was replaced by the *Apprenticeship Act of 1964*.⁹³

Diploma Courses

The Technical Education Branch offered several Diploma courses for the professions. One which proved to be a source of disappointment was the Diploma in Mechanical and Electrical Engineering. Although some technical colleges had offered classes in this Diploma since 1913, the University of Queensland controlled all other aspects of the course. In 1923 Morris said that

The University Authorities have been jealous about the inauguration in country Technical Colleges of classes for the University Diploma in Engineering, and have refused to recognise work done beyond the first year's standard of the Diploma Course at such well-staffed and well-equipped institutions as Rockhampton Technical College.⁹⁴

He further complained that after ten years only fourteen out of 125 students had finished the course, and that not one of them could articulate to the university engineering degree. He felt that it would have been better for Technical Education to offer its own Diploma in Engineering and a year later Technical Education was doing just that - it was offering the Diploma in Civil Engineering.

In 1924 Technical Education raised the status of seven of its diploma courses. Holders of these 'new' diplomas could use 'letters' after their names. A Junior pass was now required, examinations were conducted externally, and all examinations had to be passed before a diploma was issued, but in 1927 Morris said that the reorganised Diplomas had resulted in a big drop-out rate.⁹⁵ Nevertheless, the Diploma in Mechanical and Electrical Engineering continued under University control.

By the 1930s the University had increased the number of its professional courses, many of which competed with technical college diploma courses.

93 J.D. Rorrison, *The Apprenticeship System. Australian Style*, Brisbane, Department of Employment, Vocational Education and Training, 1988, p.14.

94 Report by L. Morris, 24 September 1923, EDU/A 358, QSA.

95 49th RPQ for 1924, p.123.; 52nd RPQ for 1927, pp.128-129.

Furthermore, with its higher status and its full-time as well as part-time courses, it furnished more prestige and faster access to professional status compared to the long part-time grind of technical college courses. Aware of this competition, Morris in 1935 claimed that, while the University of Queensland supplied the higher levels of most disciplines, technical college diploma courses supplied most professionals required in the State.⁹⁶

Technical Correspondence Courses

The Queensland Technical Education Branch was one of the first Australian organisations to offer correspondence⁹⁷. This is understandable considering the geography of the state. The first correspondence classes were offered in 1911 for some commercial subjects but proved too expensive. By 1926 however, electrical apprentices not served by technical colleges were studying by correspondence. Central Technical College was responsible originally for managing these courses until in 1945 a separate Technical Correspondence School was established.

Trade courses by correspondence were forced onto Technical Education by the needs of the electrical trades. By law, electrical tradespeople had to hold an Electrical Workers Board license and their apprentices had to attend technical college. Unfortunately for many of these apprentices, Queensland was a particularly decentralised State and thus, unless living near a technical college, distance prevented their attendance. Nevertheless, it was essential that they have access to technical education and consequently Central Technical College offered correspondence classes. Morris however, felt that these were poor substitutes for face-to-face instruction but under the circumstances were acceptable. He said that correspondence classes were also being introduced for the printing trades, but would need complementing by on-the-job training. In 1927 correspondence classes were extended to all stages of the electrical apprenticeship.⁹⁸

96 60th RPQ for 1935, p.74.

97 Study by Correspondence was subsequently called *External Studies*, then *Distance Education*, and currently *Open Learning*.

98 51st-52nd RPQ for 1926-1927, p.125.; pp.129-130.

In 1929 the Apprenticeship Executive particularly wanted correspondence courses extended to include the mechanical trades so that fitting and turning apprentices in the sugar mills could receive correspondence education. Morris felt it would be too expensive and such classes did not start until 1937. By this time there were 164 electrical apprentices attending correspondence classes but the numbers in the printing trade course had suffered by comparison. This was due to many of the printing businesses being particularly small and therefore susceptible to economic fluctuations.⁹⁹ Nevertheless, correspondence courses continued to be developed until eventually all the important trades were included.

In the 1920s and 1930s, the value of technical correspondence classes to the sugar and mining industries and the smaller country towns far exceeded their cost. Nevertheless, without these classes country apprentices could not have learnt the theoretical component of their trades. In addition the knowledge and benefits gained from these courses were passed onto the communities and industries they served as the apprentices became tradespeople. The government may have gained politically from introducing correspondence courses but, as most secondary industries in the state, apart from those centred on Brisbane and the major mining and sugar areas, had little access to appropriately equipped technical colleges, trade standards could never have been maintained without them.

Repatriation Training

From 1916 to 1922 the rehabilitation of returned service personnel posed many problems for all Australian governments. Rehabilitation was aimed at those less than 22 years old, those whose apprenticeship or other formal training had been truncated by enlistment, and those with injuries preventing them from continuing in their former occupations. In the early stages the Commonwealth was a little tardy and the Queensland Government, through technical colleges, provided the principal source of training for some time.

By the middle of 1917, 111 returned service personnel were attending Central Technical College under the Queensland Repatriation system. As could be expected

99 54th RPQ for 1929, p.142.; 62nd RPQ for 1937, p.53.

most of the subjects studied had either a vocational outcome or a utilitarian value in the commercial world. Riddell reported that people were seeking training due to inability to continue in their former occupations, not as an attempt at occupational change. The training had to ‘. . . be given in the shortest possible time . . .’ and Central Technical College staff had worked through their holidays to ensure this.¹⁰⁰

At this time Technical Education approached the eleven non-State technical colleges requesting they provide free repatriation training, and only Rockhampton failed to accept the proposal in full. That Technical College Committee had reservations. They claimed to fully support the scheme but, in the interests of their teachers, reserved ‘. . . the right to consider each case on its merits.’ In non-State technical colleges, teachers’ wages were then determined by fees collected and, free students meant less pay.

This refusal placed the scheme in jeopardy as other non-State colleges could not be expected to supply free training if Rockhampton was being paid. This dilemma demonstrated two specific difficulties – Technical Education could not coerce Rockhampton Technical College and, if other colleges demanded equality, few returned service personnel would receive training.¹⁰¹

The Commonwealth finally decided to become involved and in January 1918 proposed that they assume direct responsibility for repatriation and would immediately arrange for technical training of discharged service personnel. Queensland would provide all facilities and staff while the Commonwealth would pay almost all costs. Morris however, was concerned with their employment prospects in some industries, and that trade unions might object to the introduction of semi-skilled people.¹⁰²

The agreement took effect from June 1918 and included more than just training implications for Technical Education which had agreed to manage all technical colleges conducting repatriation classes. The State had now effectively agreed either to control even the non-State colleges over which it had no direct control, or to provide all the services required. While it was already able to assume control of these other colleges

100 Letter, 6 July 1917, A/16516, *QSA.*; Riddell, to Story, 20 December 1917, pp.3, 5, A/16516, *QSA.*

101 *Resume of Educational Sub-committee's activities*, A/16516, *QSA.*; 41st RPQ for 1916, p.130-131.; A/16516, loc. cit.

102 Document 00851, 7 January 1918, p.2, A/16520, *QSA.*; Report, *Costs of Instructing Returned Servicemen*, 25 January 1918, p.2, A/16519, *QSA.*

by virtue of the *Technical Instruction Act Amendment Act of 1918*, this power was not exercised until much later.¹⁰³

Hardacre was dissatisfied with the result. He objected to the Commonwealth's handling of various proposals and was generally critical of their part in the repatriation scheme. By April 1919 the Commonwealth had still not paid any monies and Hardacre felt that the lack of response from, and total lack of co-operation by, the Commonwealth was so unsatisfactory that he recommended

. . . that any further dependence on the Commonwealth be entirely abandoned and the State on its own initiative do whatever is possible to further such instruction without delaying its proposals by submitting them to the Commonwealth.¹⁰⁴

The political scene at this juncture may have operated against the scheme's smooth transition from State to Commonwealth control. When Andrew Fisher retired as Labor Prime Minister in October 1915, he was succeeded by Hughes who, in contrast to Labor Party policy, staunchly supported conscription. But in 1916 the first of the two referenda on conscription failed narrowly. Because of this and continued opposition from many of his fellow Labor parliamentarians, Hughes left the party, taking twenty-three others. Eventually Hughes, with the other ex-Labor members and the Liberal Party members, formed the National Coalition in 1917. Hughes retained the Prime Ministership throughout this period and later until 1923.¹⁰⁵

Enmity against Hughes within the Labour Party was high, and it is possible that the Labor Party government in Queensland under Ryan was passively resistant to any overtures from the Commonwealth. Hughes, vituperative and petty-minded, was in return reluctant to have anything to do with Ryan. As Hughes saw it, Queensland and thus Ryan by implication and association, had lost him two referendums on conscription¹⁰⁶. Hughes therefore, would certainly not have been clambering to endow Ryan with funds for Technical Education.

103 Memo 28158, to Story, 29 May 1918, p.2, A/16519, *QSA.*; Agreement, p.2, A/16520, *QSA.*; *Brisbane Courier*, 2 March 1918. p.6.

104 Hardacre, Memo to Story, 18 December 1918, pp.3-4, A/16520, *QSA.*; Document 33906, Memo, *Present Position with Regard to Vocational Training of Returned Soldiers*, pp.2-5, 11 September 1916, A/16519, *QSA.*

105 C.E.W. Bean, *The A.I.F. in France, Vol.III*, Brisbane, U of Q Press, 1982, p.273.; A. Palmer, *The Dictionary of Modern History, 1789-1945*, 2nd Ed., London, Penguin, 1983, p.147.

106 and Ryan, therefore, must have been the basest of socialists – a condemnation used by Hughes for all who were not always in wholehearted agreement with him.; Evans, op. cit., pp.37, 59, 103.; *Daily Record*, 18 August 1921, p.5.

The Repatriation Scheme ceased in 1922 in Queensland technical colleges. Training for returned service personnel had forced State technical colleges to expand and upgrade facilities but some non-State colleges were unable to do so and Morris was eventually forced to invoke the 'take-over' clauses of the *Technical Instruction Act Amendment Act of 1918*.

Technical Teacher Training

As far back as 1888 the Commission into the Public Service was asking questions about teacher training. When Ewart¹⁰⁷ was questioned on the topic he managed to avoid a direct answer yet in his usual Machiavellian manner implied that such a thing was unnecessary. He was of the same mind in 1902 and it was not until 1914 that a Teachers' Training College was opened. This was part of the Central Technical College complex, with John Shirley¹⁰⁸ as Principal. The Queensland Teachers Union had hoped the College would be part of the new University, itself part of the Central Technical College complex, but their hopes were not met.

Morris wanted to start teacher training in 1913 when he was unable to offer Domestic Science classes due to a lack of appropriately skilled staff. Many technical teachers lacked formal teaching qualifications and were employed part-time. When the Day Trade Schools were introduced however, the problem became acute. Morris felt that part-time teachers gave their best to their full-time employers, while full-time teachers lacked instructional skills at first but as these improved with time, lost their commercial contacts. He suggested appointing selected students as part-time teachers and, after later appointing them as full-time teachers. The first group under this scheme, commercial and domestic science staff destined to teach at Central Technical College and in larger country technical colleges, started training in 1918.¹⁰⁹

107 Director of General Education 1878-1904; see also Appendix 2 - Details on Other Selected People.

108 School Inspector, 1886-1914. He was the first Inspector to have graduated from University (with a D.Sc.).

109 39th-40th RPQ for 1914-1915, p.127.; p.134.; QPP, 1971, Annual Reports, p.66.; 45th RPQ for 1920, p.66.; 48th RPQ for 1923, p.111.

In 1923 this scheme was developed further with Junior qualification being needed, and participants receiving two years training. Technical Education started selecting student art teachers on their ability in art and aptitude for teaching and by 1929 relied heavily on this source. These 'trainee art teachers' spent a period at Central Technical College assisting in art teaching while simultaneously training for teaching in country high schools and technical colleges. In other technical areas teachers, both full and part-time, were selected from the appropriate trades and professions and learnt how to teach 'on-the-job'. Morris was determined to replace part-time with full-time teachers whenever possible but during the prosperous 1920s Technical Education had difficulty attracting and even retaining trade teachers. The higher pay offered by the trades was a strong incentive to leave technical teaching.

Nevertheless, in 1929 Technical Education implemented a new scheme to train Manual Arts teachers for primary and secondary schools. Eight tradespeople were appointed as teachers and participated in a three-month course at Central Technical College to enable '. . . instruction in Metalwork and Woodwork for school pupils to the standard of the Industrial Junior Examination.' Morris felt that this method of training Manual Arts teachers was successful. He said in 1937 that after training they . . . are expected to teach apprentices in their own trades and school pupils in manual classes for Leather, Wood and Sheetmetal Working. In several cases it has been possible to utilise the services of these [people] for teaching subjects of the Diploma Course in Engineering.¹¹⁰

This training scheme for Manual Arts Teachers continued into the 1970s although other technical teachers however, continued to learn 'on-the-job'.

Summary

This chapter investigated the growth of Technical Education in Queensland from 1915 to 1937. For the full period Morris was Director of the Technical Education Branch and nurtured his charge throughout. Despite the widespread miserable economic conditions that featured twice, technical education grew into an educational

110 48th RPQ for 1923, pp.111-112.; 53rd-54th RPQ for 1928-1929, pp.142-143.; pp.142-143.; 63rd RPQ for 1938, p.50.; EDU/A366, QSA.; Document 55082, Morris, 'Minute to the Public Service Commissioner', 2 October 1928, A/16269, QSA.

system between secondary school and university. Except for a short period, the Labor Party, which wanted a practical, utilitarian and vocationally oriented educational system giving equality of opportunity, was in government. Their strategic policies helped Morris to consolidate technical education but he disliked the rural-urban political friction and warned of the consequences of promoting one economic sector over another. He staunchly believed in the concurrent development of primary and secondary industries and was particularly enthusiastic over links between technical colleges and secondary schools, and full technical college training for apprentices.

The chapter opened by noting the limited impact of World War I on Queensland and discussed economic conditions in the 1920s and 1930s and the 'drift to the cities'. It looked at educationally relevant political changes and Technical Education in other states. Trade Advisory Committees, Domestic Science education and Commercial Studies were addressed followed by an examination of Day Trade Schools. Central Technical College High Schools, the *Technical Instruction Act Amendment Act of 1918*, Apprenticeships, Diploma courses, Technical Correspondence, Repatriation Training, and Technical Teacher Training were then considered.

At the start of this period, the Queensland educational system consisted of a rigid primary school network, assorted Grammar schools, committee-controlled technical colleges conducting classes on any subject for which people were willing to pay, three State technical colleges, and a very new University. Except within the primary network, there was almost a total lack of coordination. Social changes, the war, the recession of the 1920s, the Depression of the 1930s, increasing industrialisation, an increasing population with decreasing employment, and innumerable but collectively significant factors caused a general revision of the 'reason for education'. Technical education was seen as a vehicle by which people were able to gain 'education'. By the end of the period however, technical education had become a tightly focused, cohesive, vocationally and technically oriented system of education. But what caused this change?

It was induced by a multiplicity of intermingling factors. Cohesiveness was brought about by the problems epitomised by Repatriation Training and by compulsory education for apprentices. Although parliament had passed the *Technical Instruction Act Amendment Act of 1918* allowing the State to take-over committee-controlled colleges, Morris had given this low priority until colleges such as Rockhampton, by failing to comply with repatriation training needs, had forced re-evaluation. As the State had guaranteed training through the technical colleges, technical education was forced to exercise those powers available through the Act. Economic circumstances also helped this decision with some committee-controlled colleges unable (or unwilling)

to afford resources necessary to conduct highly skilled trade training. The State was forced to take them over to ensure appropriate trade training was available state-wide.

Technical colleges traditionally supplied society with general tradespeople as distinct from the specialised tradespeople wanted by employers. While specialist knowledge may have sufficed in more populous or more industrialised States, Queensland, with its fragmented population, required more versatile tradespeople. Mandatory technical college attendance for apprentices was the result.

'Vocational' subjects were redirected so that they had a definite vocational outcome - 'The Junior'. Apprenticeship, trade and technician outcomes were added and Technical Education became an adult education system, a secondary education system, a technical training system, a technician training system and in some fields, a professional training system. The secondary system quickly grew into a State high school system while some of the professional system moved to the University. The adult education system, the technical training system, and the technician training system intermingled and grew into the technical education system of 1938.

Except for three years Queensland was controlled by Labor Governments from 1915 to well after 1937. The Labor Party emphasised rural policies, as they saw this sector of commerce as the backbone of Queensland, and because of their strong rural-union support. An important consequence of Labor's preoccupation with agrarianism was a neglect of manufacturing, urban problems and education. But Morris saw that technical education had a role to play in this agrarian focussed political world. Technical education could assist the primary industries, not only to increase production but to make rural life more attractive, and thus reduce the drift to the cities. On the other hand increased use of machinery in primary production led to higher productivity, which in turn accelerated the drift of people from the land, and changes in occupations.

Public, parental, departmental, advisory group, media, industry, economic and political pressures were always present. The effect was that Technical Education was responsive to society's needs as shown by its versatility and ability to adapt. This was illustrated by the many courses established irrespective of vocational objectives.

The introduction of Domestic Science was indicative of the strong pressures applied to technical education. This was introduced, not for vocational reasons, but for socioeconomic ones. Various people wanted Domestic Science introduced to save the 'social fabric', the 'traditional way of life', the 'family structure'. Domestic Science was not introduced as a signpost to employment. Young women saw education as needing to lead to a job although many would work for only a few years, marry and be housewives. Not until then would domestic science training benefit them, and then

only in the home. Their immediate concern with education was the degree of workplace application.

To some degree technical education in Queensland was protected from 1915 to 1937. Under the auspices of supportive governments and with continuity of Technical Education leadership, the period was used at first to reorganise and then, as funds shrunk, to consolidate what they had.

Technical Education had almost recovered from the effects of the depression when it suddenly lost its strong leadership. The long-term impact of this and the efforts made both during and post-war, and the directions taken over the next twenty-five years are discussed in the next chapter.