

Ordinary Degree of Bachelor of Science.  
Richard Baker Aldersey, Mary Campbell Dawbarn, Gordon Stuart Blyth Dick, Thomas Albert Farrent, Allen Cuthbert Harris, Harry Kingsley Lewcock, Arthur Raymond Shepley, Walter Gordon Clyde Sinclair, Frank Henry Summers, Milton Audley Bake (in absentia).  
Degree of Doctor of Science (Ad eundem gradum).—Thomas Harvey Johnston, M.A., D.Sc. (Syd.).

The Dean of the Faculty of Applied Science (Mr. E. V. Clark) will present to the Chancellor the candidates for degrees in engineering and for diplomas in applied science.

Degree of Bachelor of Engineering.—Arthur George Appleby, Norman Cecil Burgess, Reginald Theodore Kleeman, Marsden Waterhouse Padman, Alwyn Bowman Barker (in absentia), Richard Osborne Pomroy (in absentia).

Diploma of Applied Science.—Arthur George Appleby, Norman Cecil Burgess, Ralph Lindsay Jenner, Reginald Theodore Kleeman, Marsden Waterhouse Padman, Alwyn Bowman Barker, Richard Osborne Pomroy.

Diploma of Education.—Dora Bewley Featherstone, B.A., Florence Mary Sharman, B.A.

Diploma in Economics and Political Science.—Victor Eugene Cromer, William Ham, Marice Locksley, Vera Veta Macghey, B.A., Alan Rendell.

Scholars and Prizemen for 1923.

Faculty of Arts.—Roby Fletcher Prize (Logic and Psychology)—Edna Lucy Holmes, and Iris Esther Robertson (equal). John Howard Prize—Iris Esther Robertson (1922), Beatrice Mary Heywood Reynolds (1923). David-Murray Scholarship (Classics)—Lilian Kathleen Hassell. Barr Smith Prize (Greek)—Yvonne Lois Wait. Andrew Scott Prize (Latin)—Mary Gilbert Barwell. Tormore Dorothy Mead.

Faculty of Science.—The John Bagot Prize (in Essays in English Literature)—Botany Scholarship and Medal—Beatrice Mary Heywood Reynolds.

Faculty of Laws.—David Murray Scholarship (in Roman Law)—Gwendolen Helen Ure. In theory of Law and Legislation—Cecil Charles Crump. Stow Prizes—Gwendolen Helen Ure. Stow Scholar—Gwendolen Helen Ure.

Faculty of Medicine.—Elder Prize (first examination)—Edward James Hamp, Dr. Davies Thomas Prize (second examination)—James Estcourt Hughes; third examination—Raymond Jack Last. Everard Prize (fourth examination)—Herbert Champion Hosking, and Alfred Ladyman Tostevin (equal). Dr. Charles Gosse Medal for Ophthalmology—Herbert Champion Hosking, and Alfred Ladyman Tostevin (equal).

## AUSTRALIAN NOTES

### INFLATION WAS NECESSARY

(By T. S. Opie.)

Financial problems and conditions for most people become incomprehensible when they exist in the mystic sphere of international finance. Average citizens like Mr. Subbubs still obstinately maintain that there is some catch in these matters, even though economic experts declare them to be natural and simple.

Of course, to anyone who is exempt from income tax payments public and international finance is simple. All you have to do is to write down the distance of the earth from the furthest fixed star, call its marks, and then explain fluctuations by the French occupation of the Ruhr or the Japanese earthquake.

But although the reason why anyone is able to light the fire with a Russian rouble, Austrian krone, or German mark may be obscure, the part played by the Australian note during the war is fairly obvious on examination.

#### DIRECT WAR COSTS.

There are three ways by which a war can be financed: by loans, by taxation, by the issue of paper money. Unlike other belligerents, the Commonwealth Government used paper money to pay for public works and relied solely on loans to meet the direct cost of the war. But, as will be seen, this reliance on loans necessitated the expansion of the note issue without which compulsory loans or increased taxation would have been imperative.

Total Australian war loan proceeds amounted to £250,172,440, but of this about one-fifth was subscribed by the associated banks. The banks, in fact, saved the country from compulsory subscriptions, but their invaluable assistance would have been impossible if they had maintained their usual gold reserves.

#### NOTE ISSUE IMPORTANT.

The part played by the note issue was highly important. If the banks had kept nearly all their cash reserves in gold, one gold sovereign in the vaults of a bank would have provided for only £4 of bank credit. But if that sovereign had been paid into the Treasury three £1 Australian notes would have been issued, and for every one of these notes, if held in reserve by a bank, £4 in bank credit would have been created. Thus, allowing for the amount of notes held by the public, every £1 in gold held by the Treasury resulted in the formation of about £7 10/ in bank credit.

The following figures give the amount of metallic reserve kept by the banks as compared with Australian notes:—

|                   | 1914.       | 1920.       |
|-------------------|-------------|-------------|
| Metallic .. . . . | £36,092,975 | £19,641,374 |
| Notes .. . . .    | 4,977,001   | 31,464,670  |

It is certain that the large expansion of bank credit for war loan purposes would have been impossible but for the large note issue, and in this sense the expansion of the paper currency was essential to the Government in order that it could float its voluntary loans. The need for more currency occasioned by rising prices was secondary, and, in fact, itself caused by the expansion of bank credit.

#### UNFORTUNATE RESULTS.

Credit extensions of any kind always increase prices, as they add to the purchasing power of a community. But if the extension is for productive purposes the credit advance is cancelled when the goods are produced and put on the market. However, the bank credit created for war purposes was not used for production but consumption, and was consequently not cancelled.

The industrial unrest after the war occasioned by the high and fluctuating price level, must be attributed directly or indirectly to the Government's methods of war finance which involved the inflation of bank credit.

If a greater part of the war costs had been met out of taxation prices would not have risen so high as they did. Consequently the cost to the Commonwealth would have been less, for during a period of high prices higher interest rates must be fixed and more money raised.

## THE NEWS

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 8, 1923.

### IMPRISONMENT

(By Professor Coleman Phillipson.)

In previous articles I discussed briefly the attitude of society toward criminals, whether and how far crime in general is the result of disease, and the grounds and objects of punishment. I pointed out that the aim of penal treatment is, properly, social defence, which is based simply on the principle of general utility; and that for purposes of social defence and general utility punishment should combine the elements of retribution, deterrence, disabling prevention, and reformation. Furthermore, the kind of punishment adopted should be such as commends itself to the public conscience, and is in keeping with the best ideals of existing civilisation. It would follow, therefore, that capital punishment and flogging are in general undesirable penalties, so that the only available punishment is imprisonment.

#### Fair and Impersonal.

As a punishment imprisonment is of comparatively recent date. William Penn adopted it in 1685 in Pennsylvania, but it was a hundred years later that it came to be systematically used. Imprisonment in itself is fair, reasonable, and impersonal, and it hardly provokes a revengeful spirit on the part of the person imprisoned. If, however, we go beyond by adding various forms of deliberate cruelty and torture—for example, floggings, irons, prolonged solitary confinement, repellent or excessively reduced diet—we introduce the personal element of arbitrary vindictiveness, and treat prisoners as though they were wild beasts snared. And prisoners, so treated, will sooner or later respond as wild beasts. Liberty is the most valued of human possessions; to be deprived of it is in itself, in any circumstances, hard and painful enough. If you add vindictive accessories calculated or intended to crush the prisoner and break his spirit you turn the prison into a hell, and its keepers and administrators into instruments of barbarous cruelty. Neither humanity nor reason, neither the Christian spirit nor social utility can sanction such treatment and such a system.

#### Should Not be Tyranny

Punishment should never be more than just sufficient, adequate, and expedient, having regard to the particular offence committed and the individual offender. If it exceeds that measure it becomes unjustifiable repression and tyranny. If it keeps within the proper limits and pays heed to the above-mentioned objects in due proportion, the prisoner's sense of fairness and justice will, more probably, be satisfied. If it exceeds those limits, or disregards the objects, or the balance of the objects (for example, by making the retributive element unduly preponderant), then not only does punishment outrage the minds of thinking citizens, but it creates a deeper and deeper gulf between the offender and society. The attitude of a prisoner subjected to excessive hardships, which he considers undeserved and unnecessarily cruel, is well described in the words of the sorely treated Shylock, "The villainy you teach me I will execute; and it shall go hard, but I will better the instruction."

#### Prisoners are Human

A most important principle of penal administration is never to cow prisoners, never to brutalise or demoralise them, never in any circumstances to reduce them to such a condition as makes them lose their self-respect and give up hope. The great majority of prisoners are not beyond redemption. Under the

right kind of custodians—sympathetic and discerning, strong yet gentle—the better side of a prisoner's nature can be appealed to unobtrusively and cultivated gradually, so that it will sooner or later blot out the evil part. As Shakespeare says: "There is a soul of goodness in things evil, would men observingly distil it out." Let me recall a story related by a prison official in England. He received a petition signed by most of the inmates under his charge, protesting that a certain convict was behaving "in a way unbecoming to a gentleman." He put crumbs on the windowsill of his cell in order to attract the tame pigeons that were kept in the neighborhood; and when they came, he seized them and wrung their necks. He thought it was "sport," but, they complained, that was not what a gentleman calls sport, and they said it aroused "the disgust of every right-minded person in this prison." I am sure that none of my readers would say that such prisoners are beyond salvation. A wise administrator and guardian of prisoners would recognise the good elements in their character and disposition and build on them until a reliable edifice was produced, able to rest, unguarded, on its own foundation.

#### Earlier Prison Conditions

Not so long ago the conditions of imprisonment were terrible; indeed, often too ghastly to be described. Prisons in general were foul, insanitary, dark pits of horror. There was a promiscuous mingling of the inmates, regardless of age, sex, the nature of the crime and the criminal. The physical, mental, and moral evils of such indiscriminate incarceration may be left to our imagination. The aim of this treatment was revenge, deterrence and segregation of the offender. When men with hearts that were not of stone protested from time to time in the name of these unfortunate victims, the invariable answer of the controllers of public administration was: "Let them rot there."

However, terrorism and cruelty proved a failure everywhere. Hence in recent times the principle of reformation was introduced, and soon brought about great changes for the better. At first the main expedient adopted with a view to effecting reformation of prisoners was solitary confinement, not by way of exceptional or temporary treatment, but as a matter of course. The aim was to induce reflection and remorse. But it was soon discovered, through the disastrous consequences of these measures, that the social readjustment of offenders could best be brought about by promoting social life among them, and letting them engage in productive labor. Work, wholesome and useful work, and plenty of it—that is the salvation for troubled souls, for men with evil dispositions, as well as for a deteriorating community.

#### Crime and Punishment

Mr. Charles James, Port Adelaide:—Professor Coleman Phillipson possibly hails from one of those universities that polish pebbles and dim diamonds. He tells his readers that environment is a negligible quantity, and that "adverse social conditions do not necessarily force people to commit crime. The majority of people under such conditions remain honest and self-controlled"—which in proletarian English means he considers the said people are idiotic or "self-controlled" enough to prefer starving to stealing.

An overwhelming majority of Australian criminals are unskilled workers who know no other way of gaining a livelihood than by law-breaking. Certainly we have sex perverts and cranks with "kinks," but I contend the chief cause of crime to be due to economic causes. Crime even fluctuates with changing social conditions. In 1923 in the midst of the greatest stress and unemployment, Great Britain has known for a century, crimes of violence are recurring with grave frequency, and despite the dole, petty thieving is rampant.

The streets of the cities of England are haunted by scores of new recruits to the ranks of prostitution, and I was appalled by the sight of it. All these things are caused by the inexorable economic pressure of our present social system wherein the producers are divorced from the means of production. As Anatole France has it: "The law, in its majesty, forbids millionaires as well as paupers to steal purses or sleep out under bridges at night."

#### SCHOOL OF ARTS AND CRAFTS EXAMINATION.

Drawing (Metropolitan Candidates).—Diploma Course, School of Mines and Industries and University of Adelaide.—Honors—Aitchison, Gordon J.; Biskin, Sydney N.; Ellis, Ronald W.; Green, William McK.; McMahon, James P.; Saunders, Geoffrey F.; Whibley, Cyril G. Credit—Abell, Leo M.; Berry, Dean W.; Catchpole, John H. R.; Carter, George B.; Chapman, Arthur H.; Chappell, James T. Cole, Eric L.; Galbraith, Cyril; Hawke, Eric; Kernot, Gavin W.; Krichauff, George F. Laurie, Alexander J.; McEwen, Herbert; Morrison, Wyndham; Pilgrimage Ernest G.; Stephens, Thomas H.; Stierp, Allan F.; Wilington, Charles E. Pass—DeLaine, Wilfred A.; Foster, Edward H.; Graham, George E.; Kelly, George H. Lawson, Ernest; Matthew, Harold P.; Haig, Frank B.; Russell, John G.; Sles, William; Thomas, Ian D.; Yorath, Robert S.

Finer O'Neill, of Adelaide, who has been in England for over four years, returned to Australia last week. He took his M.B. and B.S. degrees at the Adelaide University in 1917, and continued his studies in the United Kingdom, and was admitted as a Fellow of the Royal College of Surgeons of Ireland. He is now in Sydney.

Among the successful students at the recent Adelaide University examinations were the three sons of the Rev. C. E. Schafer, of Glenelg. Max obtained the degree of Bachelor of Dental Surgery, while Paul and Noel, younger sons, passed the second examination (third year) of the M.B., B.S. course. The eldest son, Dr. C. H. Schafer, is in practice in Peterborough. It is interesting that four brothers should choose the medical profes-