

the maximum rate of interest shall be 6½ per cent., and also provides that the Act shall continue in force until the 31st December, 1922, and no longer. It is within the knowledge of members that the Government will be approaching the loan market in London during January, but we do not yet know on what date we may be advised to go on the market. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment and the report adopted.

Read a third time and passed.

## BILL—SUPPLY (No. 3), £1,030,000.

### All Stages.

Received from the Assembly and read a first time.

### Second Reading.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [6.13] in moving the second reading said: I have ascertained that the amount provided in this Bill is adequate for the services of the Government until the end of January. Of course it is intended that the Appropriation Bill shall be passed before that date.

Hon. A. Lovickin: We have granted Supply to the end of December. How many months' supply does this Bill represent?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Parliament has up to the present voted Supply to the end of November and this amount will enable us to carry on till the end of January. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment and the report adopted.

Read a third time and passed.

## ADJOURNMENT—CHRISTMAS HOLIDAYS.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [6.16]: In consequence of the Premiers' Conference, which is to meet on the 17th January, it is the intention of another place to adjourn until the 3rd January. Personally I should have liked

a longer adjournment than this permits. I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday, the 3rd January.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 6.17 p.m.

## Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 22nd December, 1921.

	Page
Questions: Patriotic Funds, Consolidation ...	2593
Education, Kulbin School ...	2594
Hotel License, Boyanup ...	2594
Bills: General Loan and Inscribed Stock Act Amendment, all stages ...	2594
Sale of Liquor Regulation Act Continuance, all stages ...	2594
Health Act Amendment, Council's Amendments ...	2594
Grain, Council's Amendments ...	2594
Stamp, Council's pressed request ...	2594
Constitution Act Amendment, Council's pressed Amendment ...	2596
Supply (No. 4), £1,030,000, all stages ...	2597
Supply (No. 4), returned ...	2597
General Loan and Inscribed Stock Act Amendment, returned ...	2597
Sale of Liquor Regulation Act Continuance, returned ...	2597
Industries Assistance Act Continuance, returned ...	2597
Motion: University, Fees and Bursaries, to Annual Statute 19 ...	2597
Adjournment, Christmas Holidays ...	2617

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

## QUESTION—PATRIOTIC FUNDS, CONSOLIDATION.

Colonel DENTON asked the Premier: Will he consider the advisability of appointing a Royal Commission to inquire into the amount of funds collected by various bodies and organisations during the war for the purpose of assisting soldiers and their dependants within the State, and as to the disposal of surplus funds (if any) held by the various bodies and organisations since the declaration of Peace Day, June, 1919, with the object of consolidating all the funds of the various bodies into one common fund, to be under the control of three trustees to be appointed, viz.: one from the R.S. League, one from the combined bodies or organisations, and one by the Government?

The PREMIER replied: I shall give consideration to the matter.

### QUESTION - EDUCATION, KULBIN SCHOOL.

Mr. JOHNSTON asked the Minister for Works: What is delaying the calling of tenders for the erection of the new school which was approved by the Education Department two months ago for Kulbin?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: The Department is considering a suggested design, which it is thought will be suitable and less expensive than the present standard design.

### QUESTION—HOTEL LICENSE, BOYANUP.

Mr. PICKERING asked the Premier: 1, Is he aware that plans and specifications for the erection of a hotel at Boyanup were approved in May last to replace the building destroyed by fire? 2, Is he also aware that in the meantime the travelling public have been deprived of the accommodation to which they are entitled and which is required in this centre? 3, Is he further aware that no signs of an honest endeavour to proceed with the erection of the premises is in evidence? 4, Will he have this matter inquired into with a view to enforcing immediate construction or take steps for the cancellation of the license?

The PREMIER replied: 1, No particulars are available in Perth. 2 and 3, Answered by No. 1. 4, Inquiries will be made, but when premises are destroyed by fire the license is not forfeitable until a reasonable time (in the opinion of the Licensing Bench) has elapsed for the re-erection of such premises.

### BILL - GENERAL LOAN AND INSURER STOCK ACT AMENDMENT.

#### Second Reading.

The PREMIER (Hon. Sir James Mitchell - Northam) [4.35] in moving the second reading said: The Bill is merely a small one, fixing the rate of interest which will operate through the year. Hon. members will remember that in the last Bill we fixed the rate at 6½ per cent. Unfortunately, we cannot do less than that now, because money is so dearer. I therefore ask the House to renew the authority to the Government to pay 6½ per cent. for loans floated during the ensuing 12 months. It will be noticed that the Bill does not contain any provision limiting the period during which it shall apply. In Committee, however, I will move an amendment limiting the operations of the Bill for a period of 12 months as was done last year. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### In Committee.

Mr. Stubbs in the Chair; the Premier in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1, 2—agreed to.

New clause:

The PREMIER: I move an amendment—

That a new clause to stand as Clause 3 be added as follows:—"This Act shall continue in force until the 31st day of December, 1922, and no longer."

New clause put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment and the report adopted.

Read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

### BILL—SALE OF LIQUOR REGULATION ACT CONTINUANCE.

#### Second Reading.

The PREMIER (Hon. Sir James Mitchell - Northam) [4.40] in moving the second reading said: This is simply a Bill to continue the operation of the nine to nine section of the Sale of Liquor Regulation Act, 1915. The position is clearly understood by hon. members. Unless the Bill is passed, hotels will remain open under the parent Act, in which case the hours will be from 6 a.m. to 11 p.m.

Mr. Underwood: And very good hours, too.

The PREMIER: I ask the House to continue the hours during which liquor can be sold from 9 a.m. to 9 p.m. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### In Committee, etc.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

Read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

### BILL—HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT.

Returned from the Council with amendments.

### BILL—GRAIN.

Returned from the Council with amendments.

### BILL—STAMP.

Council's Pressed Request—Money Bills Procedure.

Message from the Council notifying that it did not press its request for amendments Nos. 4, 5, and 13, but pressed its request for amendment No. 12 now considered.

Mr. SPEAKER [4.45]: Before accepting any motion with regard to this order of the

day, I must point out to the House that the message contains a pressed request, and that this House has consistently maintained that the right of the Council to request amendments in money Bills cannot include the right to repeat or press such requests. It will be well in the memory of members that this House has, by carefully worded resolutions, consented to make exceptions in the case of Bills containing financial clauses merely incidental to those measures, but the present Bill is one imposing taxation and dealing with the subject of taxation only, and there is no reason for the House to make any exception in this case.

Hon. P. Collier: Without prejudice again?

Mr. SPEAKER: Not in this case.

The PREMIER (Hon. Sir James Mitchell—Northam) [4.47]: I understand that we cannot agree to the amendment pressed by another place.

Hon. P. Collier: We can, if you so desire.

Mr. SPEAKER: Not in this Bill. This is purely a taxation Bill.

The PREMIER: There is no doubt that it is a taxation Bill. The amendment which the Council are pressing does not really mean anything, and I cannot understand why they are pressing it. However, this House has on many occasions refused to consider pressed requests in connection with Bills of this kind. I do not know that we ought to allow the Council to press amendments to purely money Bills. If we make an exception in this case—

Hon. T. Walker: The whole of our rights will be gone.

The PREMIER: Yes, the Council might in future press requests to the Appropriation Bill or any taxation measure. I move—

That a message be transmitted to the Legislative Council acquainting it that the Assembly is unable to make the amendment now requested in the Stamp Bill, and that the Assembly desires the concurrence of the Council in the Bill as amended at the request of the Council.

Mr. SPEAKER: Members are aware that an amending Constitution Bill is now before the House. If that were passed, the Council would be able to amend money Bills where money clauses only incidentally affect the Bill. That measure has not been passed but, even if it had been, it would not affect this Bill, which is purely a taxation Bill. The House can do nothing but pass the motion.

Hon. P. COLLIER (Boulder) [4.50]: I quite agree that the House, in order to protect its rights and privileges, must pass the motion moved by the Premier, but it seems that session after session we are participating in what might be described as more or less of a farce. Another place time after time presses amendments in Bills which are purely taxation or money Bills in which, under the Con-

stitution, they have no right to press amendments. The position is becoming somewhat intolerable and it is about time that the Assembly—perhaps we have not an opportunity now, being so near the end of the session—took some steps to have the position properly defined. By the amending Constitution Bill an amendment to which, made by the Council, is now before this House, the position will perhaps be somewhat advanced from the point of view of members of the Assembly, but I am quite satisfied it will be unwittingly conceded by members of the Council. I am quite unable to understand the attitude of members of another place, particularly as the President of the Council was one of the members of the committee—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member can deal with that on the next question.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Very well. Members in another place are very insistent in the attitude they adopt. Some of them seem to claim an equal right with members of this House in the matter of amending money Bills. This House cannot accept that position, and something will have to be done to compel members of another place to see the matter in its proper light. It is quite possible, if the motion is passed, that the Stamp Bill will be lost.

The Premier: I do not think so, not on such an amendment as the Council are pressing.

Hon. P. COLLIER: In the past many important money Bills have been lost because of the Council's attitude. The position is becoming intolerable from the point of view of this House and should not be permitted to continue.

Mr. TROY (Mount Magnet) [4.53]: I agree with all that has been said regarding the action of another place in pressing this amendment being contrary to the Constitution Act. I am surprised that another place has done it in a measure of this character. The Council have insisted upon the right to amend Bills which were not in reality taxation measures, and this House has given way, and wisely so, because the clauses providing for the expenditure of money were purely administrative clauses. But this is the first occasion on which another place has pressed an amendment to a Stamp Act, which has no other purpose than that of imposing taxation. Will the Premier say what he proposes to do if another place refuses to accept his suggestion.

Hon. P. Collier: Go over in a body and make an attack.

Mr. TROY: Members of another place are becoming so emboldened that the Premier will have to put up a fight.

Hon. P. Collier: If he leads, we will follow him over.

Mr. TROY: There must be an end to this passing of Bills backwards and forwards. I would not bother about fighting the Council on another Bill. I was glad that an arrangement was entered into so that we might understand our true position. On this Bill, however, we must put up a fight if we intend

to stand up for our rights under the Constitution. If another place, which is becoming increasingly arrogant, insists, what will the Premier do?

The MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. J. Scaddan—Albany) [4.57]: At the moment we need not concern ourselves with the action the Premier proposes to take in the event of the Council refusing to meet our request. The Premier is taking the responsibility of asking the House to send the message, and whatever position may arise, we shall have to meet it when it arises. We should support the Premier at this stage by passing the motion.

(Question put and passed.)

### BILL—CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT.

Council's pressed amendment.

Message from the Council notifying the Assembly that it insisted upon the amendment made by the Council, but which had been disagreed with by the Assembly, now considered.

In Committee.

Mr. Stubbs in the Chair; the Premier in charge of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: The desire of the Legislative Council is to omit paragraph 5 of Clause 2.

The PREMIER: I move—

That the Council's amendment be no longer disagreed with.

This is in no sense a surrender on the part of this House. We do not give up one single right or claim by adopting the amendment. The Bill would be better without the amendment, and it was right to disagree with it in the first place, but the Bill, even as amended, removes by far the greater part of our difficulty. It puts us in a much stronger position if the Council persists in attempting to upset the Constitution by claiming equal rights in money Bills. Under the existing law we are compelled to refuse the right of amendment in every Bill which contains a single money clause, a condition which exists nowhere else in the world, which it is impossible to justify, and which we do not want. Hon. members know that a Bill may contain only one clause dealing with the imposition of fees.

Hon. T. Walker: Or a rate.

The PREMIER: Or a rate or a license, or some small thing of that nature. There may be 50 clauses in the Bill, but only one referring to a money matter of that nature. We are not of opinion that the Council ought not to be allowed to amend a single clause in a Bill, merely because that clause happens to relate to the imposition of a fee. Freed from that incubus we can logically and successfully hold our ground on Bills

which really affect the finances of the State, such as the Stamp Bill or the Appropriation Bill, or any other Bill which is purely a money Bill. It may be contended that if we refuse the Bill we enter upon a dispute hampered by conditions which must ultimately lead to our defeat. It must be remembered that the amendment does not even claim any power on behalf of the Council, but merely leaves things, in one particular, as they were. We are not giving away anything at all. We are maintaining all the right we have to control our own affairs. It would be better to have so much of the Bill as will be left, than to have no Bill at all.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: While it is not my intention to oppose the motion I should like to point out that as the Bill was submitted to the Council from this Chamber, it is a Bill which was drawn up and drafted by the joint committee of both Houses for the purpose of removing the difficulty that had occurred in the past, and occurs up to the present—for there was a difficulty this afternoon—and placing it on the statute book so that there would be no doubt in the future as to the procedure. The member for Mt. Magnet was Chairman of the committee of this House, and the President of the Legislative Council was the Chairman of the committee of another place. These committees sat conjointly and decided upon the very Bill that is now under discussion, exactly as it is to-day before members. On 26th October, 1915, Mr. Kingsmill, then Chairman of Committees, moved the adoption of the report, the report containing the Bill that is now before us, and asked the House to accept that report, and these are the words he used—

As a disagreement has occurred, it only remains for the two committees to recommend, as they have recommended, and which recommendation I hope will be endorsed by the House.

That recommendation embodied this Bill. We now find that that hon. gentleman, on the floor of the House a week ago, opposed the Bill and supported the deletion of this very clause which the joint committee of both Houses had put into the Bill. The compromise that we made was the compromise I referred to this afternoon on the Stamp Bill. We sent very carefully worded resolutions waiving our claims to Bills that contained a money clause or two that were incidental to the working of the Bill, and had to do with fees and fines. The Committee waived that on the understanding that the Council would accept the present clause in the Bill that they now want deleted. That was to be the fixed basis in regard to money Bills. They were not to press requests for money Bills as they did in connection with the Stamp Bill, but they now want us to give way and allow them to have a free discussion and to amend Bills which contain financial clauses. They ask us to give way on that point, but are not going to give way in re-

spect to what they call their rights, of which they have none, in connection with money Bills. It we accept the Bill with the deleted clause, we shall then find ourselves in the position of having to fight them on money Bills, namely, Appropriation Taxation, and Loan. These are measures upon which this House can never give away its rights. I am more than surprised at another place adopting an attitude similar to that which they have adopted in this case. Their Committee drafted the Bill, submitted it to their House for adoption, and it was adopted. It was brought forward, not by the Government printing it or drafting it, but from the Committee's own draft for the purpose of ensuring smooth working between the two Houses. They have now gone back on the principle on which they decided as a joint House Committee. It is unpardonable, and it is the right of this House to watch the procedure of another place with very careful scrutiny. Nothing has been altered and no extenuating circumstances have been brought about. The position is exactly to-day as it was about 1907 or 1908 up to 1915, when the late Mr. Gawler moved in the Legislative Council. The Legislative Council was so concerned about the position that it appointed a select committee, and asked us to appoint another select committee, to work conjointly with them, and bring forward a measure under which we could work smoothly together. We did our part and brought the measure into existence. They adopted it, and to-day they have gone back on it. This Chamber has acted loyally, according to the conditions that were agreed to by the joint committee, but the other House has not done so. I only want to say these few words to hon. members who were not in the House at the time, and to other members who may have forgotten the position. That is the position as adopted by another place and by this House. This House is prepared to carry out its part of the agreement, but another place has gone back upon it.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment no longer disagreed with.

Resolution reported, the report adopted, and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

[Sitting suspended from 5.15 to 5.45 p.m.]

#### BILL—SUPPLY (No. 4), £1,030,000. All Stages.

Message from the Governor received and read recommending appropriation in connection with the Bill.

#### In Committee of Supply.

The House having resolved into Committee of Supply, Mr. Stubbs in the Chair,

The PREMIER AND COLONIAL TREASURER (Hon. Sir James Mitchell—Northam): I move—

That there be granted to His Majesty, on account of the service of the year 1921-22, a sum not exceeding £1,030,000.

Question put and passed.

Resolution reported; the report adopted.

#### Supply Bill introduced, etc.

Resolution in Committee of Ways and Means having been passed, a Supply Bill was brought in providing for the expenditure of £1,030,000 out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

Bill passed through its remaining stages without debate, and transmitted to the Council.

[Sitting suspended from 6 p.m. to 7.30 p.m.]

#### BILLS (4)—RETURNED.

- 1, Supply (No. 4), £1,030,000.
  - 2, General Loan and Inscribed Stock Act Amendment.
  - 3, Sale of Liquor Regulation Act Continuance.
  - 4, Industries Assistance Act Continuance.
- Without amendment.

#### MOTION—UNIVERSITY, FEES AND BURSARIES.

To annul Statute No. 19.

Hon. P. COLLIER (Boulder) [7.35]: I move—

That Statute No. 19 of the University of Western Australia establishing fees and bursaries for attendance of students at the lectures and classes of the University, and laid upon the Table of the House on Thursday, 24th November, in accordance with the provisions of Section 33 of The University of Western Australia Act, 1911, ought to be annulled.

In view of the motion which I am submitting for the approval of the House, it is interesting to recall the brief history of our little University.

Mr. Underwood: It is very small.

Hon. P. COLLIER: It is an infant to-day, but as years go on, and generations succeed generations, we hope and feel sure that it will grow to fruitful and lusty manhood.

Mr. Underwood: It will be different from other universities if it does.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I know that the hon. member is hostile to the University as an institution at all. The hon. member holds certain views regarding the facilities that should, or might be provided for the higher training of our youth. If I interpret his

views aright, he believes that the university of the world or of the bush is the best. The member for Pilbara (Mr. Underwood) is entitled to his views on that question, but I venture to say that he stands in splendid isolation.

Mr. Sampson: Why splendid?

Hon. P. COLLIER: Because anything that stands in lonely solitude has about it something splendid, that commands respect.

Mr. Underwood: Drop skite!

Hon. P. COLLIER: The hon. member will have an opportunity to express his views later on, but in the meantime I hope he will allow me to proceed with this motion.

Mr. Underwood: The member for Kanowna will tell us all about it.

Hon. P. COLLIER: After many years of consideration and discussion on the part of those interested in the establishment of a university in Western Australia, a Bill for that purpose was introduced during the session of 1910. It was brought forward by the late Mr. Frank Wilson, who was then Premier of the State. The Bill passed before the session closed and became—

Mr. Underwood: Intituled an Act.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The Act received the assent of the Governor and became law early in 1911. Whatever the views of the member for Pilbara may be, you, Mr. Speaker, and those of us who were privileged to be members of the House at the time and contributed in some small degree to the passage of the Bill, and consequently in the establishment of the University, look back with a certain amount of pleasure, if not pride, to the fact that we were able to participate in the establishment of that institution. At that time there were no Government secondary or high schools in Western Australia. Certainly, there was the Technical School in Perth and the School of Mines at Kalgoorlie.

The Premier: And the Modern School.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I am depending upon my memory, but I think that the Modern School had not been established at that time.

Mr. Underwood: It is a pity that it ever was established.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I know that the member for Pilbara would not only wipe out the University, but he would wipe out the Modern School and the primary schools as well, and—

Mr. Underwood: The two-up schools too.

Hon. P. COLLIER: He would like to see us get back to the savage days of barbarism! In any case, at the time I speak of there were no secondary schools.

Mr. Underwood: You are wrong.

Hon. P. COLLIER: There were only the two institutions to which I have already referred. It was the privilege of the Labour Government to give effect to the statute of 1911.

Mr. Underwood: I don't know so much about that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Hon. P. COLLIER: The member for Pilbara will be able to give the House some of

his weird and peculiar ideas concerning higher education later on. His views will be listened to with great interest by members of this Chamber. It was, however, the privilege of the Labour Government to breath life into the institution, and in 1912 or early in 1913, the University of Western Australia became an established fact. My colleague, the member for Kanowna (Hon. T. Walker) was a member of the first Senate of our University and it was on his motion, when the question arose as to whether fees should be charged or whether the institution should be entirely free, that the decision was in favour of the University being free. No matter what the member for Pilbara may think, I consider that by that decision the Senate of the University placed the coping stone upon the education system of this State. For the first time in the history of the world, I believe, we as a State decided that education should be entirely free right from the infant school to the highest educational sphere.

Mr. Underwood: Call it the kindergarten.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The member for Pilbara is in a facetious mood, and he will give us some entertaining views later on. The fact that for the first time in Australia at any rate, if not in the world, a university was to be free, was applauded throughout the length and breadth of the Commonwealth. It even aroused great interest in other parts of the world in scholastic and other circles interested in such a matter.

Mr. Underwood: What about that?

Hon. P. COLLIER: Our infant university was launched on its beneficent and, may I say, divine mission to add to the learning, knowledge, culture and refinement in the arts and sciences in the interests of the people of Western Australia.

Mr. Underwood: You had better let the member for Kanowna do this.

Hon. P. COLLIER: At that time, the statutory grant to the University, that is to say, the Government grant, was embodied in the Act, and represented an amount of £13,500 per annum. There were great difficulties associated with the establishment of the institution and at this juncture I would like to pay a tribute to those citizens, some of whom have passed away, who took such an active part and keen interest in the establishment of that institution. Although housed in unpretentious buildings—

Mr. Pickering: It still is.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I know we all desire that the University should be housed in buildings befitting its mission in the life of the State. That, however, is a comparatively small matter. It is not of much concern what the buildings may be like, so long as the hearts and minds of those inside are all right. But the University has encountered financial difficulties almost from its inception. It is inevitable that, year by year, the cost of maintenance should increase. Yet over a period of about 10 years, the Government grant has increased by only £1,500. In every other walk of life, in every

other department of our activities, the expenditure has increased all along the line; in all departments of State the amount of money made available for carrying on work has been largely increased. During recent years the purchasing power of the sovereign has decreased by about 50 per cent., whilst the grant to the University has increased in very small proportion indeed. The State, having decided to establish a free university, should have met the situation by increasing the funds at the disposal of that university to an extent that would have permitted of the institution fulfilling its mission. Let us turn to the expenditure on education in other directions. The total expenditure of the Education Department in 1911-12, the year in which the University was established, amounted to £238,569; for the financial year closed on the 30th June, 1921, the amount was £490,160, while the estimated expenditure for the current year is £529,546. Thus in round figures the increase in our educational vote during the last 10 years has been something like 120 per cent. And that is applied, not only to primary education, but to secondary education also. If we have been justified in thus increasing the expenditure on education generally, I see no reason why there should not have been something like a reasonable increase also in the grant to the University, accepting, as the people of this country did, the principle of a free university. Faced with this situation, and being unable to carry on, the governing authorities of the University have decided to impose fees upon the students at that institution, and consequently we have the statute which my motion deals with. The scale of fees ranges from 25s. per annum to 16 guineas for three courses for the year. I am not complaining of the action of the University authorities. Unable to carry on, and being refused further assistance from the Government, they either have to submit to a retrograde step which would curtail the usefulness of the University, or to impose fees. It is for the House to decide whether or not those fees shall be imposed. It has been contended that this is practically the only free university in the world, that fees are charged at all other universities. That, I submit, has nothing to do with the case. Other universities in Australia were established many years ago, when public opinion on the subject of free education had not reached the stage it has to-day. Once a university is established with fees, as in the Eastern States, it is very difficult to get those fees abolished later.

Mr. Johnston: Many universities in America are free to-day.

Hon. P. COLLIER: That is so. I am informed that although we claimed at the time of its establishment that ours was the only free university in the world, actually that was not so; even at that time there were in America universities at which no fees were charged. We can disregard entirely what has been done in the Eastern States; already

we in Western Australia have launched out in many directions unexplored by the people of the Eastern States. Once having adopted the principle of the free university, and having maintained it for a decade, it would be a retrograde step on our part to alter that policy now. The effect of the imposition of fees on students with limited means will be very serious indeed. The statute does not provide for those students who entered the University on the understanding that there were to be no fees. They are not to be exempt under the statute; although they may be half way through their course, they will have to pay fees in future. That in itself would compel many of those students to withdraw, and they would then be unable to complete the courses they have embarked upon. Surely that would be a distinct act of injustice to the present students! But, apart from that, it cannot be denied that the imposition of fees will have a very serious effect in respect of a considerable section of our people. In recent years and at the present time many parents have endured and are enduring privations in order to give their children a university training. We know that the cost of maintenance of a student between the ages of 17 and 21 years, particularly those whose homes are in the country, is a very heavy burden on their parents; and if, on top of that, we impose fees it will mean the proverbially last straw breaking the camel's back. As showing how our free University has been appreciated, I might point out that in 1913 there were at the University 134 students. In 1918 the number had increased to 270, and in 1921 the enrolments stand at 392. So that, from 1913 to 1921, a period of eight years, the total enrolments have more than doubled. It is informative to compare that with the position in Queensland, where in 1921 the total university enrolments are 312 students, drawn from a population of 725,000 persons. In other words, at the Queensland University there are 80 students fewer than those at the University of Western Australia, notwithstanding that Queensland has more than double our population, 725,000 as against our 330,000. That is a striking tribute to the interest taken in our University, and it shows that the absence of fees has had a material influence in the number of students ready to avail themselves of a university training. Let me quote one or two provisions of the University Act as showing what was in the mind of Parliament when the Act was passed. Here is the preamble:—

Whereas the States of the Commonwealth Western Australia alone is unprovided with a university: and whereas it is desirable that provision should be made for further instruction in those practical arts and liberal studies which are needed to advance the prosperity and welfare of the people: and whereas it is desirable that special encouragement and assistance should be afforded to those who may be hindered in the acquisition of sound know-

ledge and useful learning by lack of opportunity or means:

Mr. Teesdale: That is all right; what I object to is extending the benefit to the other crowd.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The imposition of fees will hinder and hamper the acquisition of knowledge and training by a considerable section of our people. The hon. member says he would not mind providing a free university for those who would be unable to obtain a university training if fees were imposed, but he objects to the fact that a large proportion of the students are well able to pay.

Mr. Teesdale: Yes, squatters' sons.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Well, let us see where that argument leads to. That argument applies to the whole principle of free education. There are thousands and thousands of people in this State, squatters and others, who could well afford to pay for the primary education of their children. There are thousands of pupils attending secondary schools whose parents could well afford to pay for their education, but that argument is never advanced. I do not think the hon. member himself would contend that because parents are in a position to pay for the education of their children, fees should therefore be charged. If the hon. member were consistent, he should say that those who can pay should be made to pay, irrespective of whether the children are attending the University, a secondary school or a primary school. At the Modern School I suppose a large majority of the students belong to parents who are in good positions in the city and could well afford to pay for their education, but it is not advanced by the hon. member or anyone else that, because of that fact, fees should be imposed. Why not? Because it is recognised that it is in the interests of the nation, taking things all round, that education should be free.

Mr. Underwood interjected.

Hon. P. COLLIER: It is rather a pity education was not free when the hon. member was a youth.

Mr. Underwood: How did you get on?

Hon. P. COLLIER: In the hon. member we have a living monument of the value of charging fees for education. There is no free education in the part of the State where he came from.

Mr. Underwood: How did you get here?

Hon. P. COLLIER: I had to struggle through without very much education.

Mr. Underwood: So had I.

Hon. P. COLLIER: And because of the difficulties I experienced in those days and the handicap that I have felt throughout life, notwithstanding that I am here, I want to provide better facilities and opportunities for those who come afterwards. Although I am here and the hon. member is here, both he and I, if we had had the advantage of a higher education not reaching to anything like the University, might have been more useful members of the House. It would give me a far greater sense of satisfaction in the

discharge of the duties I have to perform if I had had the advantage of a better education.

Mr. Underwood: Speaking for both of us, I do not think so.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The hon. member knows that the average child is not endowed with the extraordinary qualifications that he and I possess. We have been able to emerge from the ruck, notwithstanding our handicaps in early life, but that is not to say that the average boy will be able to reach the pinnacle of fame represented by the possession of a seat in this House.

Mr. Pickering: Even with the University thrown in.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Quite so. Had either of us had a University education—

Mr. Underwood: We would never have got here.

Hon. P. COLLIER: No, we might have been devoting our talents to even more useful purposes. We might have been engaged in one or other of the arts and sciences helping to foster, build up and develop the State rather than sitting here wearily talking night after night to very little purpose.

Mr. Angelo: You might even have been a professor criticising members of Parliament.

Hon. P. COLLIER: May be one or other of the arts and sciences has lost a professor by reason of the member for Pilbara and myself not having enjoyed the advantages of an advanced education.

Mr. Teesdale: Or even a newspaper leader writer.

Mr. Underwood: It might have been worse.

Hon. P. COLLIER: In any case, the imposition of fees is not the solution of the difficulty. It is estimated that the amount which will be received under the statute will be £2,740 for the year. That represents less than 12 per cent. of the total—a drop of water in a desert. It will merely help to tide over the financial difficulties for the year, but the same difficulties will confront the University authorities next year and the year after. Let me remark to the member for Roehourne (Mr. Teesdale) regarding his statement that the sons of wealthy people should be made to pay for their education, that even under this proposal they will be receiving free education to the extent of 88 per cent. The fees will amount, to less than 12 per cent. of the total revenue, and 88 per cent. of their schooling will be paid for by the State, and paid in many instances by the parents of boys who, because of these fees, will be excluded from the University. That will be the trouble, as I am certain a number of students will be excluded from the University. Nevertheless, their parents will have to pay their proportion of this 88 per cent. which the State will continue to contribute for the education of the sons of wealthy people. To be consistent, the member for Roehourne should require not only that these fees be imposed, but that the wealthy persons he refers to should have to



pay for the cost of the whole of the education of their children.

Mr. Teesdale: It is generally understood that sons of the better class of people predominate in the University.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Probably the sons of wealthy people are in the majority.

The Premier: I do not think so.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I am speaking without knowledge on the point.

The Minister for Mines: It is not so at present.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I was merely assuming that, in the natural order of things, the sons of wealthy people would probably predominate. I am glad to learn that such is not the case.

The Minister for Mines: Of course, any people who feel it on their consciences may make contributions or give an endowment to the University.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Quite so. If they feel it would be an indignity in after life to have it said that they were educated at the expense of the State, they could pay not only the small fees prescribed here, but the total cost of their education, and the authorities of the University would be very pleased indeed to receive it. The reference of the member for Roebourne to the sons of wealthy squatters and others—

The Premier: I do not think that is so.

Hon. P. COLLIER: To achieve the hon. member's purpose, they should pay the whole cost of their children's education, and not have the general taxpayer finding 88 per cent. of the cost while they find only about 12 per cent. There is no doubt that the imposition of fees will exclude from the University many boys and girls who have passed through our secondary schools. It may be argued that the University is not free—

Mr. Pickering: It is not free to country children.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I am coming to that point. It is not free, inasmuch as it is not available to a majority of the country children whose parents cannot afford to send them to and maintain them in Perth in order that they may attend the University. In this respect, it may be argued by some country people that the University is not free, but this condition of affairs is unavoidable. This obtains not only with regard to the University, but in almost every walk of life. Our Modern School and secondary schools are not available to a majority of the country children. In only a few of the big centres like Kalgoorlie, Northam and one or two other places, probably not more than four or five altogether, are there secondary schools, and so, not only is University education not available to a majority of the country children, but secondary education is also unavailable to them.

Mr. Teesdale: Most Ministers' electorates have secondary schools.

Hon. P. COLLIER: If this is to be used as an argument in support of fees for the

University, then necessarily it is also an argument in support of the imposition of fees at our secondary schools, because they are not available to a majority of the people. Then we might come down to the primary schools. There are some parts of the State—I hope not many—where primary education is not available to the children, and it may be said there is no free education at all, not even the most elementary primary education, available to some sections of the community. It would be a very short-sighted, one-eyed policy to lay down that, because my child or the child of my neighbour is unable to take advantage of the free education provided at secondary schools or at the University, we should therefore oppose the principle of free education and should impose fees. Even though the University may not be open to a very considerable section of the people in the country, still a number of students pass through that institution every year. We hope and believe that the knowledge and training they gain at that institution will be placed at the disposal of the State in its many and varied avocations and walks of life. If, by the existence of a free University, we provide the greatest possible scope for the education of our young people, it is not the direct advantage that presents itself to-day, but the indirect benefit which will be theirs in after life, provided the University fulfils its purpose. The generally higher training and the broader diffusion of education being available to the greatest number of people cannot result in other than benefit and advantage to the State. Free education is a national institution. An educated community is the most progressive community. Education is wealth. We turn out a number of highly trained and educated students from our higher scholastic institutions every year, and it is the equivalent of producing wheat or wool or wealth of any other description. There is no greater wealth that any nation can have than brains and knowledge to extend and expand science and learning for the benefit of mankind. It is proposed to create a fund from these fees from which bursaries will be provided. An amount not exceeding 20 per cent. of the total of the fees will be devoted to providing bursaries. An amount not exceeding £500 is to be set aside next year out of which to provide bursaries. Let us see how these bursaries are to be allocated. We find—

The Senate shall have power in any year to award bursaries of a total value not exceeding 20 per cent. of the revenue derived from fees received under this statute during the preceding year and for 1922 of a total value not exceeding £500.

The proposed regulations under this statute provide that one of the essential conditions for holding a bursary is—

that the Senate through such officers as it shall appoint shall allocate the bursaries after having obtained satisfactory assur-

ance in each instance that the candidate's own means and those of his parents or guardians are insufficient to enable him to bear the cost of attending the University without the assistance of a bursary. The information obtained and the allocation made under this section shall be strictly confidential.

That is a nice policy to introduce into our University. The officers appointed to allot the bursaries shall take into consideration the financial position of the students referred to. That would amount to nothing more nor less than pauperising the students who obtain these bursaries. No matter how confidential the information obtained may be, it would be well known to the other students that so and so had obtained a bursary, not so much because of his scholastic qualifications but because his parents or guardians were unable to provide the funds necessary for him to attend the University. He would be pointed out by the other students as one who was unable to pay the fees, and for whom therefore this bursary had been provided. It is a most iniquitous principle to introduce into that institution. I believe the people of Western Australia would not stand for that kind of distinction between students. It is placing in the hands of the officials or the board, whoever it may be who will allot the bursaries, a form of patronage, which is most objectionable, and I hope that will not be allowed to obtain in this or any other institution of learning in Western Australia. If we are going to charge fees at the University, why not charge fees at our secondary schools? There is not a member who thinks that fees ought to be charged at the University who could logically refuse to support a proposal to impose fees for our secondary and technical schools as well. The principle is the same all along the line. If we are going to introduce fees at the University the next move will be to extend the principle to our secondary schools, and from them to our primary schools. A regulation was gazetted some 12 or 14 years ago for the imposition of fees in our primary schools on the basis of 1s. a week for a child up to 14 years of age, and 2s. a week for children over that age, and those who could show that they were unable to pay were to be exempt from such fees.

Mr. Lutey: Indignation was aroused throughout the country.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Yes. It was proposed under that system that some children whose parents were unable to pay should have the finger of scorn pointed at them on the ground that they were paupers. The attempt met with such a storm of indignation that a motion was moved in this House by Mr. Bath, then Leader of the Opposition, to set aside the regulation, with the result that it was withdrawn and nothing more was heard of the fees. I know there is need for economy, but the last thing in

which we should economise is the education of the children of the State. Economy in the matter of the education of his children is the last thing that a man would think of. He may be hard pressed financially, but he will explore every avenue in which to effect an economy in his domestic expenditure before he will touch his expenditure on the education of his children. The children of this country generally should be the last that the State should turn to in order to effect an economy. It would be absurd, if we can afford to find more than half a million pounds for education—the sum of £529,000 appears on the Estimates this year—that we should haggle over a few more thousand pounds in order to permit of the University carrying on its useful career. To do that would be equivalent to spending one's energy and money in planting and growing a tree, and then to turning round and knocking off the top branches which were giving forth the fruit. It is a false policy to pursue and false economy. It should not go forth to Australia and the world that this country, after having maintained a free University for 10 years, is now going to turn right about and march back on the road of retrogression. After all, it is education that makes the civilisation of the present day, and that has wiped out the savagery and barbarianism of bygone centuries. At our universities we have imparted to our young men and young girls the cumulative knowledge of centuries. One brainy man, or one brainy woman, is worth perhaps more to a nation than millions of uneducated people. Let us glance back through history, and we will see how comparatively few brainy men have been given to the world. It is because of the development, particularly of the sciences, that the world has reached the pinnacle of knowledge and information that it has attained to-day. One man, highly trained, and having the necessary capacity to put his training to use, and turned out from our institutions of learning, and working quietly in his laboratory, may perhaps do more for mankind than hundreds of thousands of people toiling to produce material wealth. We should hesitate to take any step which means excluding from our University that boy or that girl, who, if given the necessary opportunity and facility for going right along the gamut of educational course, might do so much for his or her country and for mankind in general. I hope we shall not retrace our steps, and give it forth to the world that this Parliament at any rate endorses the abolition of our free University. Let us, for goodness sake, put our heads together and see if we cannot effect such economies in our expenditure as will enable us to give the necessary increased grant so essential to the University, so that it may carry on and perform its work. I suppose there is no member who

could not find in the Estimates innumerable items of expenditure which could be spared infinitely better than the few thousand pounds necessary to maintain our University. We are spending money in many directions not comparable with the justification we would have in spending it on this institution. There are 390 students at the University costing the State the comparatively small sum of £15,000. There is no University which costs less. Surely we can afford the necessary money with which to increase that amount. I hope the House will carry the motion, no matter what the result may be. We ought to set ourselves the task of finding ways and means of providing the funds necessary to enable the institution to carry on. I am hopeful that some of the wealthy squatters, to whom the member for Roebourne has referred, will come forward with donations, and that they will recognise the value of the University.

Mr. Underwood: You do not like charity.

Hon. P. COLLIER: It is not charity.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Hon. P. COLLIER: I hope they will come forward with grants and endowments.

Mr. Underwood: Endowments are not charity?

Hon. P. COLLIER: It is not charity when all are participating. It is not the same thing as a student being singled out as the recipient of charity, and as one who is receiving his education free of cost. Of course nothing I can say will appeal to the hon. member, but I hope in his mercy he will remember that all boys are not able to paddle their own canoes so effectively as he has done. The average boy requires to be trained in our schools to enable him to give of his best in after life. I am sure the motion will be carried, and that such a backward step as is proposed in this statute will not be permitted. I trust that not only shall we reject the proposal to impose fees, but that early in the new year we shall find some way of providing the money necessary to enable the Government and the authorities of the University to perform the work allotted to them.

Mr. UNDERWOOD (Pilbara) [8.28]: I desire to enter a slight protest against this motion. In doing so, may I say I am not opposed to education? I do not think we can spend too much money on education. I have claimed previously, and have proved previously, and I say again, that our University education is not the best of education. Our University not only fails to bring out the best that is in a man, but it prevents the best from coming out of a man. I have shown this House that there is not a single walk in life in which a University man has excelled above the non-University man.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Not one?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Not a single one.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Have you searched all history?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Pretty well all the histories.

Hon. P. COLLIER: What about Sir Henry Thompson, the electrician?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: He became a lecturer at a university, but he was not a university student.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Was not Cardinal Newman a university man, and Cardinal Manning?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: What did they do? What did they accomplish?

Hon. P. COLLIER: Read some of their writings.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Read some of the stuff?

Hon. P. COLLIER: "Stuff," do you call it?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I have previously pointed out that in literature, in prose and poetry, the university man counts for nothing. I cited the names of Shakespeare and Dickens.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Poetry and prose literature are things born in men.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I have spoken of engineers and inventors, and have given their names, and I have also spoken of explorers, including Captain Cook, and I have spoken of great scientists like Darwin, and of great statesmen like Cecil Rhodes, not one of whom was a university man.

Hon. T. Walker: There is also Underwood.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Yes, also Underwood.

Hon. P. COLLIER: And myself!

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I want to say, Mr. Speaker, and it may appeal to you, after all here in this House university men have not accomplished much, because looking round the Chamber I do not see one university man here.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Do not you think we could be improved upon?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: If university men are better men than we are, why are they not here? For myself, I do not think that I would be here if I had been at a university.

Hon. P. COLLIER: No; you would be occupying yourself more usefully.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: There is not a Prime Minister in the British Empire to-day who is a university man. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. O'Loughlin: What about Barwell of South Australia?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Is he a Prime Minister?

Mr. O'Loughlin: He is a Premier.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I spoke of Prime Ministers.

Hon. P. COLLIER: How many Prime Ministers are there?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: About seven.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I do not think so. I think, about four.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Anyway, there are very few Premiers in the British Empire who are university men.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Is that the acme and crown of knowledge and power, the Premiership of a State?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I am not putting up a Premiership as the acme and end-all of study. I am only pointing out that university men cannot get here.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Smuts is a university man, and he is something to talk about.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: He is from the same university as I come from.

Mr. Corboy: No, he is not.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: The Leader of the Opposition says I have some odd ideas about education. He says that what we want is university training. I desire to claim that in my boyhood I had in the bush such training as it is impossible to impart at a university.

Hon. P. Collier: That may be so.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: It is so. There is no "may be" about it. When the Leader of the Opposition contends that we should allow everybody to go to the university, barring nobody, all I can say is that those who have not had the opportunity of going to a university have no missed much; for there is nothing, as I have proved here before, that a man cannot accomplish without going to a university. I want to go a little further on that aspect of the question; I want to say that a university education has a cramping effect on the intellect.

Hon. T. Walker: Why did you say here, "I trust the university will be formed"?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Who said that?

Hon. T. Walker: You, in January of 1911.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I must have been trying to get the member for Kanowna on my side.

Hon. T. Walker: That is what you said then.

Hon. P. Collier: We are on your track now.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Member: At what time of night did the member for Pillbara say that?

Hon. T. Walker: It was early in the evening.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! order!

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I was not advocating this kind of university.

Hon. T. Walker: It was this very kind of university you were advocating.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: No; I was opposing this university, and I was pointing out that the way in which this University was formed was not going to prove to the advantage of the people of Western Australia. I hoped that the University would be formed on the lines upon which I desired it to be formed.

Hon. P. Collier: Would you take on the task of reforming the university?

Hon. W. C. Angwin: We must sack the University Senate first.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Yes; let us sack the senate first. The Leader of the Opposition says, "Why should not we all have the same opportunity?" To that I reply what I have said previously, that those who have not had the opportunity of going to a university have not missed much. They can win through without it. That has been demonstrated beyond doubt.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Yes; people without university training can get into Parliament.

Hon. P. Collier: We are only 50 out of three hundred odd thousand.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: That is so; we are the selected 50.

Hon. P. Collier: The cream!

Mr. UNDERWOOD: We are the selected 50, and we have not a university man among us. I am not too sure about the member for Bunbury (Mr. Money).

Mr. O'Loughlen: I think the member for Bunbury might be a university man.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Not only do one miss but very little by not going to a university, but I contend that our system of education right through fails to work to the advantage of the rising generation. Indeed, our education system operates to the detriment of the rising generation. The mental is infinitely more delicate than the physical, and we do not pay the slightest attention to the fact that we have over worked and are over working the mental capacity of our children. That is the reason why, in my opinion, we have never yet seen a brilliant Rhodes scholar. We pick Australia's best, physically and mentally best, for Rhodes scholars; and there is not a brilliant man among them. Why? Because the system we are working upon overstrains the mentality of youth.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Give us your definition of brilliancy.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: What I have said is correct. Let hon. members answer me that.

Hon. P. Collier: There are some very capable men amongst the Australian returned Rhodes scholars.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: There is not a brilliant man amongst them.

Mr. Teesdale: Never one heard of!

Mr. UNDERWOOD: That is so. This university cry is mostly put up by professors who are receiving a thousand a year for being professors.

Hon. P. Collier: There are in this city half a dozen Rhodes scholars as capable as any men in their professions.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Where are they?

Hon. P. Collier: Doctors and lawyers in this city.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Here is a point I want to stress, and as long as I can speak I intend to stress it, that the university professors and school teachers who get their living by cramming the brains of children, by getting hold of little children and forcing their mentality, are not doing the best for our rising generation.

Mr. Corboy: There are no little children at the University.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: The hon. member was there.

Hon. T. Walker: That is clever, is it not? Mr. Corboy: You would be a better man if you had been there.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I doubt it.

Mr. Corboy: I do not.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: This university of ours is a Perth university, after all. When one comes to think of it, those who are going to get the advantage of this free University tuition are the children of the wealthy people of Perth. Now, as regards a resident of my electorate who desires to send his child to a university, what difference does it make

to him whether he sends his son or daughter to Adelaide or Melbourne on the one hand, or to Perth on the other?

Mr. Corboy: I know of children of tradesmen who have got their education at this University.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: That is to say it is a Perth University.

Mr. Corboy: They are not all the children of wealthy parents.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I am speaking of what obtains mostly. The man who can keep his son until he is 21 years, earning nothing, is not a man too short of funds. The Leader of the Opposition pointed out that many parents, and good parents, have saved and scraped and stinged, have denied themselves many things, in order that they might send one child to the University. My experience is that that child always turned out an ingrate.

Mr. Corboy: You know a very poor class of people then.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I have seen a good few of those ingrates. The boy who goes navvying, the boy who works in the mines, turned out all right, but the one who became a university student showed himself an ingrate towards his parents.

Hon. P. Collier: Not always.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Not always; but it is my experience that a good few of them did. There is much sentiment, and very little logic, in regard to this question. There are the grand, fine, flowing phrases which the member for Kanowna (Hon. T. Walker) is going to spread over this Chamber directly, about education free from the kindergarten to the university—everything free.

Hon. T. Walker: You make me sick, really!

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Everything to be free!

Hon. T. Walker: Your speech reminds me of public-house slush.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. UNDERWOOD: The learned and honorable member is getting wild.

Hon. T. Walker: Not wild; absolutely sick.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: There is a great deal of false sentiment in regard to this matter, especially about this phase of it that is being put up to us now. The management of the University say that if there is a scholar who can pass the tests, and whose parents cannot afford to pay university fees, they will admit that scholar. To that the reply is, "I will not have charity." But, after all, where does charity begin? Who is paying for the University? The man who pays income tax is paying for the University. And does it make any difference how he does it? I have never heard those people who talk so loudly and loosely about not wanting charity, propose a reduction of the exemption from income tax. They are always quite prepared to avoid paying income tax. However, how it is done does not matter, but this university education has to be paid for. If one cannot pay his income tax—I cannot pay mine—

Mr. O'Loughlen: If you had been to the University you would have been able to pay it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Quite possibly, because I would have become a professor. That is what I would have become. With regard to universities generally, let me point out that during the last 100 years the world has progressed very materially thanks to inventions. In the universities one finds engineers. But have we ever known a university engineer to invent anything? Have we ever known a suggested invention to be put before a university professor without that professor telling the man, "It cannot be done."

Hon. P. Collier: Oh, that is rubbish!

Mr. UNDERWOOD: It is absolutely true.

Hon. P. Collier: It is nothing but rubbish.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Where are the university professors who have invented anything?

Mr. Heron: They are at it all the time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: When it was suggested that electricity should be generated with the aid of tides, we had one of the University professors rushing into print to say that it could not be done because it was not in the books. University men only study what others have done. A university professor's mind is absolutely full of what other people have done and there is no room in his mind for anything for him to do himself.

Mr. Lutley: Do university professors never experiment?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I said that university men never accomplished anything good. I withdraw that statement. University men have collected and collated information regarding things that other men have done. They have put that information into such a form that it can be picked up by others who desire to learn. Beyond that aspect, however, university men have accomplished nothing. Those of us who have been denied a university education have not missed much.

Mr. PICKERING (Sussex) [8.47]: It was very interesting indeed to listen to the remarks by the Leader of the Opposition in connection with his motion. I took down two or three remarks of his to which I wish to refer. During the course of his speech, he said that we should set up a university in the bush. I am in accord with the Leader of the Opposition if he desires to extend the privileges of the university to those who live in the bush.

Mr. McCallum: Have they not privileges now?

Mr. PICKERING: The Leader of the Opposition several times referred to the almost impossibility of students in the outback centres attending the University. We recognise that there is considerable truth in what he said, and I propose to move an amendment to the motion to the effect that a special allowance of £50 per annum should be paid by the Government towards the maintenance

of students whose homes are beyond a radius of 30 miles of the University.

The Minister for Mines: You cannot do that.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot increase the burden of taxation by such an amendment.

The Minister for Mines: You can say that this should be done.

Mr. PICKERING: I want to go further than that.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member can give notice of a separate motion, but he cannot amend the one before the Chair.

Mr. McCallum: We will support the hon. member if he does.

The Minister for Mines: You can say that this is desirable.

Mr. PICKERING: But I want to give effect to it. It is of no use merely saying that this should be done.

Hon. P. Collier: You can move to that effect in a separate motion.

Mr. PICKERING: Can I not move to the effect that in the opinion of this House what I intended to move is desirable?

The Minister for Mines: The motion is one to disallow a statute, and what you desire to arrive at would have to be a separate motion.

Mr. Johnston: Such an amendment has relation to the motion.

Mr. PICKERING: Do I understand, Mr. Speaker, that you rule my proposed amendment out of order?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sorry, but it is out of order.

Hon. T. Walker: We are sorry too, for we would support you.

Mr. PICKERING: I am strongly of the opinion that the University is not, as it is called, the University of Western Australia, but is in reality the University of Perth.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: It is better than the Adelaide University.

Mr. PICKERING: I am not concerned with other institutions. The Leader of the Opposition said that we should not take into consideration the universities in other States. I am not considering the other States in this matter.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I meant that the University here is better than the one in Adelaide.

The Premier: Is it!

Mr. PICKERING: It is an unfair proposition to ask members on the Government side of the House, and more particularly those who sit on the cross benches, to support a motion in favour of free education for only one section of this community.

Hon. P. Collier: Well, that is a dog-in-the-manger attitude!

Mr. PICKERING: It is unfair to ask it.

Mr. O'Loughlen: You frequently ask us to support the one section you represent.

Mr. PICKERING: Of course we do. It would not be unfair to change the name of the University to the Perth University, instead of the University of Western Australia. To make it a university for Western Australia

could only be achieved by extending the privileges of the University in the direction of making a grant of a sufficient amount to enable students from the country districts to participate in the advantages provided by the institution.

Mr. McCallum: Allowances are provided now.

Mr. PICKERING: The member for Boulder (Hon. P. Collier) said that the vote for education when the University was established, was £238,000 and that it had increased to £530,000 in ten years. That is a big increase for so short a period and for so small a population. If the result of that expenditure has been the advancement of the State, the State would surely not begrudge that expenditure. I think, however, regard should be had to the public purse, and that the education vote should be made consistent with the state of that purse. I cannot agree with the Leader of the Opposition when he says that the system of bursaries or scholarships is in the nature of charity.

Mr. McCallum: They are.

Mr. PICKERING: I cannot agree with that. Take the bursaries in connection with the High School.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Anyone can get them.

Mr. PICKERING: But only if they are proficient.

Hon. P. Collier: But in this instance, the poverty of the parents is the turning point in deciding the matter.

Hon. T. Walker: The parent has to take an oath that he cannot pay.

Mr. PICKERING: Take the Rhodes Scholarship.

Hon. P. Collier: That is a different thing altogether.

Mr. PICKERING: It was a provision that the Rhodes scholarship should be free, and—

Mr. Johnston: Open to all.

Mr. PICKERING: The guiding consideration is not the poverty of parents. I take it that in these scholarships and bursaries the guiding factor is proficiency.

Mr. McCallum: They are only given on condition that the parents are too poor to pay.

Mr. PICKERING: If people can afford to pay I agree that they should pay.

Mr. McCallum: But you surely do not agree with charity.

Mr. PICKERING: I do not look upon it as charity. The farming community have long been seeking the advantage of an extended educational system so that an agricultural college could be established outside Perth, but owing to lack of funds we have been debarred from having that advantage.

Mr. Johnston: We have a fine institution at Narrogin.

The Premier: But it is not free.

Mr. PICKERING: The charges in connection with the Narrogin State Farm School have been put up very considerably. I have been informed by the member for Williams-Narrogin (Mr. Johnston) that the charges have been increased only for board. I had to bring under the notice of the Minister for Education the fact that one student from Busselton who had been attending the State Farm School had had to leave because of the increase in the maintenance rates. I consider that is absolutely unfair, because he was admitted to the institution under what amounts to an agreement that he would be charged a certain price. If we are to have free education surely such an increase should not be foisted upon the farming community in connection with the Narrogin institution. The Leader of the Opposition said that we should not haggle over a few more thousands. I am in accord with that sentiment. If the University is to be maintained free, then a few more thousand required for the maintenance of students as I suggested in my proposed amendment, should be made available.

Hon. T. Walker: Hear, hear! I say so too.

Mr. PICKERING: The member for Boulder further said that we should not take any steps which would preclude any lad or girl from taking advantage of the University. I contend that there are a fair proportion of students outside the city area who are debarred from availing themselves of the opportunities which are open to those residing in the city.

Hon. P. Collier: I agree with you.

Mr. PICKERING: That point was emphasised by the Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. P. Collier: That is so, but the remedy is not in the direction of fees.

Mr. PICKERING: Perhaps not, but I think this House should make a recommendation to the Premier along the lines I suggest.

Hon. T. Walker: And we will help you along those lines.

The Premier: But where are we to get the money?

The Minister for Mines: That is the point. It is all very well to talk about these things, but how can we get the money?

Mr. PICKERING: On looking through the debates when the University Bill was passed I find that the member for Williams-Narrogin (Mr. Johnston) moved the following motion:—

That in the opinion of this House it is desirable that all education at the University of Western Australia should be free, and that the practice of charging fees at State educational establishments should be entirely abolished.

Hon. T. Walker: And that motion was carried by a large majority.

Mr. PICKERING: The then Attorney General when discussing the matter said—

One does not volunteer all information, to give every caller a long lecture on every step we are taking, unless a question is asked in regard to it, when we are only too happy to supply every information. There is another thing I must complain of, and that is of this House having been particularly asked to take, in a corrective sense, the Senate of the University under its wing. That body is an independent body altogether. It is a body corporate, instituted by an Act of Parliament that gives it a being, capable of looking after its own affairs. This Chamber can no more direct the details of the management of that institution than it can direct the management of the Bank of New South Wales. They both exist by virtue of the laws of the land, but they are both independent corporations, and it is left to them to decide what they shall do in regard to their business affairs. This motion presumes that the details of the management and business of the University shall be under the corrective, disciplinary forces of this Chamber, which is an absurdity.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: We have supplied them with money.

The Attorney General: Simply because we desired to see an institution of the kind. The mere supplying of the money for the purpose of helping that institution along no more enables us to take its direction in our hands than the supply of a grant to the High School enabled us to decide the details of what the gentleman who moved this resolution should learn upon its forms when attending that school.

The Attorney General decided that it was without the province of this House to say what the senate of the University should do, but it provided under the Act that the University statutes are to be laid upon the Table of this Chamber. The senate in its wisdom finds it necessary to charge fees in order that the institution may continue its existence along lines which it is claimed are essential to its maintenance. In establishing the University we desired that the University should be maintained in the best interests of the State. If the State is not able to afford a continuance of the University on lines that are essential, and the senate finds it necessary to impose fees and therefore places this statute on the Table of the House, are we conforming to the statements uttered by the then Attorney General if we rescind or annul that statute? That is the question hon. members have to take into consideration. Seeing that we have given the University powers which make it independent of the control of the House, are we right in taking away from it one of the main factors of its existence? I have been in favour of free education, but I realise there must come a

time when we shall have to limit the extent of that freedom. That time appears to be now. There can be no doubt the expense of the University has more than kept pace with our revenue, and the question is are we going to restrict it and so diminish the usefulness of the University. If the degrees and diplomas issued by the University are not to be of equal or greater value than that of the diplomas and degrees issued by other Australian Universities, the Western Australian University will cease to be of practical value.

Hon. T. WALKER (Kalgoorlie) [9.2]: I only desire to put before the House the issues we have had before us since that motion quoted by the last speaker was debated in this Chamber. We have stood out for free education. The Minister for Mines will attest that one of the fundamental principles on which we launched further afield with educational effort was that it was to be national. That is the whole point; whether we are to have a national or a sectional university, a university for the people of the State or a university for the favoured few. By our decisions up to date, we have elected to establish a national university. If it is to be national, the very moment we impose a fee of any kind, to that extent do we take from it its national character. It is no new experiment, as was pointed out by the member for Williams-Narrogin (Mr. Johnston) at the time he moved his motion. In the United States they have both State or national universities, and private universities; and the greatest good has been done, the greatest progress made where the universities have been of a national character, free from charge, free to all students—the greatest good has been done to the greatest number by that means. That is the only question we have to discuss here to-night, namely, are we going to divert from principles already established by resolution and by Act of Parliament, are we going to turn our back, to make a revision; once having set up the University, are we to hand it over to the rich, to the favoured and pampered classes of the community, and allow no chance whatever to the poor man's child? It has been argued that because not every man can afford to keep his child up to the age of 20 or 21 years studying at the University therefore it is of no benefit to the majority of the population and they can get no advantage from it. Well, wherever a free University has been tried, that argument has been belied. Of course we cannot send everybody to the University. Not every child born in the community is destined to pass through that process of education; but we must leave everyone the chance, we must give the opportunity to all; and it is that precisely which a free University does. If we look at the number of poor people who have passed through the free universities, both in America and in the experiment in this State, we shall be astonished. The sons and daughters of those

who are by no means affluent have obtained their degrees in the University, whereas they could not possibly have done so had we imposed fees. Without labouring it too much, I wish hon. members would mark that distinction: whether we are to have a national university or, a university for the class, whether we are to recognise the class. If the University is to be national, it will be used for national purposes, used to create a national spirit, and will benefit us in building up the State. If it is to be a University where fees are charged—therefore at once making a distinction between the family that can afford to have the son or daughter thus educated, and those who cannot—we have put a division in the community, we have destroyed the spirit of democracy.

The Minister for Mines: Why not make it national?

Hon. T. WALKER: I say we ought to do so.

The Minister for Mines: Then it ought to be taken over by the Federal Government. We are all one community.

Hon. T. WALKER: No, what about the State authorities?

The Minister for Mines: Why not make all universities in Australia free?

Hon. T. WALKER: I say it would be better. But we cannot legislate for the Commonwealth, whereas we can legislate for our own State. And the hon. member knows that when the University was established we intended it to be national, a State University for the good of this State, and we desired to assist it in every way. It was not I, personally, myself who moved that we charge no fees; but it was with the consent of Cabinet, the consent of the hon. member and the consent of the House. Therefore, I am pointing out, it was with that spirit to make it national, to make no breaches between one class and another in the State, but to put all on a distinct equality in respect of knowledge. Surely that is the very essence of democracy, giving to all an equal opportunity so far as we could provide it by the establishment of a university. That is really the gist of the argument. If we are to start charging fees, let us withdraw the Act—annul it. Of course, it will be difficult, because we have given the University a charter; still it can be done. We can refuse the £15,000 annual payment, and let it be the rich man's University, let him pay every penny of its maintenance, let him pay for his child's education from entry to the attainment of his degree. But do not let it be half and half, do not let us pretend that it is a State University, and then say it is a State University aided by the contributions of a select few. I think that is belittling. Let us do as they have done in some of the States of America, make it our University, the people's distinctly. I admit that we require some modification in the management, in the direction of affairs there. We ought to have more distinct control. We thought we were providing for control when we made pro-



vision for the election of some of the senators, but that has been shown to be insufficient. If it is to be a State institution in the same way as our primary schools, our secondary and technical schools and our continuation classes are State institutions, if it is to be of that character, let us foot the bill. I admit that education is costing us a lot. But can we afford to spare that cost? If we cease to spend money in the training of the minds of the growing generation we impoverish the State, we deteriorate mentally the whole State, we retard progress, we become stagnant as a nation, as a people, as those who have charge of a great heritage such as this State is.

The Minister for Mines: It depends upon how you interpret "education."

Hon. T. WALKER: I interpret "education" to mean all that which fits us for the development of all the resources of Nature, including the nature of ourselves. That is education in its broadest sense. And more, the discipline, too, if you like, the moral discipline that fits us for the real battle of life in comradeship with our fellows. That is true education. If we are to deprive ourselves of that wealth, we deprive ourselves of all wealth. The blatant champion of ignorance that we have in this Chamber, who everlastingly is talking against education, notwithstanding that he advocated the establishment of this very University of ours, approved of it, asks to-night what has ever a professor done for us, where are the professors who have ever distinguished themselves in life? It is sheer bosh. Every man who reads even the current literature, knows that some of our most up-to-date modern blessings are the products of the laboratories and the universities of the world; the very means of communicating knowledge, even through solid mountains and under the waves of the sea and certainly along the limitless air, are the products of Professor Röntgen, Professor Hertz, and Marconi, who himself was a university man. It is our university men who have given us the knowledge, which is practically being used in the development of our areas and in the prosecution of our industries. If there is one thing which has given Germany an advantage in the world, both before the war and now, it is the application of the products of her professors in the universities to the arts and industries. They have beaten the world in dyes and in synthetic chemistry, beaten the world not out of ignorance but out of knowledge, knowledge obtained in the universities. Has Lord Kelvin done nothing for us as a Britisher? Has J. J. Thomson done nothing for us as a Britisher? There is not a man walks his daily walk of life but is under a debt of gratitude to these men. Has Professor Crooks done nothing to assist and help the world along? All of us unconsciously are participating in the blessings his discoveries and knowledge have revealed to us. And if it comes to the parliamentary institutions of the country, what stupidity for the member for Pilbara to say "Where is your Prime

Minister? Where are your great statesmen? Where are they who have gone through universities?" The inference is that the member for Pilbara has beaten the lot of them. "I stand above them; I can criticise them, pull them to pieces, measure their value"—thus the member for Pilbara. The late Sir Edmund Barton cannot be despised. Would we compare him for merit and quality and utility and general world usefulness with the member for Pilbara? But he was a university man. Would we compare the member for Pilbara with the late Alfred Deakin? And yet Mr. Deakin was a university man. Would we compare Sir Samuel Griffith with the hon. member? The stupidity of it when we come to analyse it, when we come to take his speech to pieces and compare it with fact! It is an evidence of the lack of education that the man speaks so blatantly, so freely, about things of which he is so absolutely ignorant. The world everywhere benefits by our universities. American industries have been assisted inimitably by the study of organic and inorganic and by synthetic chemistry, and even invention, invention of the most subtle character—Marconi instruments for instance—has been the product of university men.

Hon. P. Collier: Marconi himself is a university man.

Hon. T. WALKER: Quite so. And to hear this kind of talk passed off as argument for diminishing our respect for free education—

Hon. P. Collier: Sneering!

Hon. T. WALKER: Why, we cannot over-value education. Where there is no education, there you see the lands, although populated, slavishly governed and managed and ruled, where every sanitary law is absent and where poverty and suffering and disease are rampant. Our universities and our knowledge relieve all these disabilities and lift us to an appreciation of the great rich treasures that Nature has in her stores for us. Education, of course, is that key which unlocks every cupboard where Nature keeps her most precious stores. And to begrudge a paltry penny or two a year in lifting all our citizens to a higher standard is to me the height of niggardly contempt for the benefit of the community. It is stupidity, because it is not the man who learns that gets the whole benefit. The glory of education is that it is diffusive. It is like a torch that is lit; it dispels the darkness, and all lives then may enjoy the pleasure of vision. In darkness we see not; one light may make clear the space our vision can cover, and so our educated people, who may never be boasting of their education and apparently never using it, are diffusing a subtle, refining, ennobling, inspiring influence on all the community, lifting everybody higher. When the highest is low, the low must be very low indeed, but if we can lift by degrees the whole community by increasing the mental activities of the general population, and we add to the mental wealth of the whole community; and after we have analysed everything, it is the mental wealth of the community that creates the material wealth of the community. Blot out our

brains; silence our thoughts, put us into a position where we can neither reason nor apply our knowledge, and our wealth is unperceived, unnoticed, unrealised. What is the difference between the nation that has a dug-out for its commerce and the nation that can employ fleets of steamers of the dimensions of the "Titanic"? The application of mentally trained forces to the material prosperity of the people—where is it to be got? In the bush? Are the brightening diamonds of thought to be found only in the wild wastes of Nature? Is it only in the back block that one can get these qualities?

Mr. Marshall: It is in Pilbara.

Hon. T. WALKER: It may be there. By it the hon. member had his intellect somewhat brightened, I admit. But have we not evidence that it is in the centres of population, where men's minds can stir up the minds of others, that we get the great products of intellectual genius and of invention? We get it in these nurseries. The university is a nursery where the start is given. It is not the full education; it is the preparation to take charge of the great forces of Nature, to harness the lightning itself; to take the power of the sunbeam and turn it to the servitude of man, to put into play and under direction those titanic forces of Niagara and make them do some work that will benefit the humblest toiler in his cottage. That is what these universities are for; that is what they are teaching us to-day. How can we deery education or bewail its cost, when we know what it has done for us, when it has built bridges of commerce between hemisphere and hemisphere, when it has put thought to travel in the solitudes of empyrean space, and made heart beat with heart and thoughts synchronise with thoughts though the producers of them have been constituents and oceans asunder. And we begrudge a penny or two for what has turned deserts into blooming paradises; for what has turned the dirty vermin-infested hovels and huts into domiciles that are past comparison; for what has taken a meagre insanitary population and made it a rich and beautiful and proud city. All material wealth primarily is created by thought, by mental powers, by educated, trained powers, by the mastery of mind over the terrific forces that lay hidden in the smallest atoms about us; it is thus that we are become civilised, powerful, and wealthy. What a change has this education made in us when we think that the kings of England and the great a'Beckett himself used rushes for carpets, and when their garments were infected with vermin and they lived and slept on rushes in caves. And now the peasant, the humblest in our midst, would scorn such comforts or such surroundings. What has wrought the change? The increase of mind over matter, the conquering of nature by intelligence; and it is the university that brings within its walls every advance of thought, classifies it, and harmonises it with all other thoughts collected from the past, and harnesses the compendium of all thought to the chariot of progress. That

is the object of the university, and we begrudge a pound or two for it. We begrudge a pound or two for it, because we cannot have a university in every electorate; because we cannot build a university at Busselton. We cannot do everything we would wish. I wish we were advanced enough to have a university at Busselton, just as there is a university in London, one in Manchester, one in Oxford, one in Birmingham, one in Cambridge, and so on all through England.

Mr. Simons: And one at Pilbara.

Hon. T. WALKER: I wish we could have one at Pilbara, that our population was so great and our progress so advanced, but we cannot. We may as well say that the parliamentary institution is bad because we can build a Parliament House only in Perth. It is the same argument. We may as well say that, because we cannot have a Parliament in Pilbara and another at Busselton, Parliaments should not be had at all and that we will not vote for Parliaments.

Mr. Money: It would be better if we could have more.

Hon. T. WALKER: Undoubtedly; I wish we could. The more we diffuse education, the more we diffuse knowledge—

The Premier: The member for Bunbury wants more Parliaments.

Mr. Money: I meant more local administration.

Hon. T. WALKER: I by no means deery local administration. It is the genius of the Anglo-Saxon race to create governments of that kind. All our local governing bodies are the products of that genius. Because we cannot have a supreme Parliament in every little township or centre it is not an argument against this Parliament. Neither is it an argument against the University of Western Australia because similar establishments are not built in some other part of the State. It has to be built where the largest population is, although it may not serve all those in the out portions of the State, and it may be an inconvenience to many to attend it and take their courses there. Nevertheless they are not altogether debarred from it. If fees were instituted, the hindrance and impediment placed upon many students would be even greater. At least we can give them free education if they can manage to get to Perth. Some allowance should be made to enable those sons of farmers who wish to attend this institution to keep them while they are going through the courses. That would be of advantage to them. In the meantime we are not asking for so much, but what we are asking for is that we shall be true to the principles upon which this University was opened, that it shall be a national and not a sectional institution, that it shall be for all and not for those who can afford to pay fees; in fine, that it shall not pass into the hands of a class but be the property, pride, and glory of every citizen of the community.

The PREMIER (Hon. Sir James Mitchell—Northam) [9.32]: I am not going to vote for the Statute, and will tell the House why. I have been asked to give the House certain information by those who are most concerned in the matter. Hon. members have spoken of expenditure in a very light manner. They say there is waste and extravagance, and that money could be saved in many directions and spent upon education. If wages and salaries could be reduced I suppose money could be saved, but we have been called upon to pay about one million per annum more in the last two years in wages and salaries than we paid before. I do not know that members ought to refer to that expenditure as waste or to object to it. The expenditure is a serious matter. I remember reading of an old philosopher who opened a school and wanted some sign to put outside his school. He put up the sign "two and two make four." He thought that common sense was of some use in the world, and so this was the sign he put up. We have to come to that when discussing the amount of money we have to spend. It is no good talking of £500,000 as being a small amount to spend on education in this State. There is a limit beyond which we cannot go. I am asked to remind the House that in 1913 we spent £276,000 on education, and this year we are spending £545,000, the amount having doubled itself in those few years. It cannot be contended that we are not doing our part by the young people of the country. The subsidy of the University up to last year was £13,500, but last year it was £15,000. I am asked to tell the House what was done last year. I am informed, and I believe it, that the expenditure has been closely watched. I believe the University authorities do make their money go as far as possible. I am told that the reserve accumulated in the first year has now become exhausted, and the authorities expect a deficiency of £3,000 at the end of the year. Seeing that this year we are spending £560,000 on education there is not a great deal of room for more expenditure. The University has very little outside the money that is voted by Parliament. It is true the institution possesses some endowment lands, and I am of opinion that they should be made use of, if possible. There is, however, very little chance of getting revenue from it unless it is sold and the money is invested. The University is not likely to be able to lease the land for building purposes for a long time. It is of no use keeping so much land idle and then asking for a vote for further income. These lands are undoubtedly of value, but no one likes to build on leasehold land.

[The Deputy Speaker took the Chair.]

Hon. P. Collier: They could give a 99 years' lease.

The PREMIER: People do not care to take land on that basis; they prefer freehold. The two systems do not work well to-

gether. The leasehold business is not popular, and so the University has not been able to lease its endowment lands. It is true we have been able to place them in the way of getting a little money by introducing a Bill this session, enabling them to lease their lands and have houses built upon them, but I do not think that will help them very materially. These lands ought to be turned to account, even if they are sold and the money invested, but they are not likely to be leased in the near future. Last year the University spent £21,246. The income was £19,945 and they took £896 from reserve, which left a deficit of £405. This year it is expected the expenditure will reach £23,040; the Government grant being £15,000, endowments £1,800, examination fees £2,200, income from various other sources £1,300, and the proposed fees £2,740. It is proposed to increase the salaries of the staff by £1,385, or nearly half the amount of the fees that it is proposed to charge. It is here I think I am entitled to object, whatever I may do about the question of fees. The deficit for last year was £405, so that without this increase there will be a shortage of £1,300. The University has done excellent work, although it is housed in buildings that are certainly not palatial and probably are hardly suitable for the work. The professors have done good work and the results have been satisfactory. I have been asked to point out what has happened in other places, and to tell hon. members what has been done for professors and lecturers in the other States. In Sydney the professors draw from £1,100 a year to £1,300 a year, and in Melbourne from £1,000 to £1,300 a year, the number of students in the former case being 2,800 and in the latter 2,600. In Adelaide the professors draw £1,100 a year, in Queensland from £700 to £1,000, in Tasmania £800, and in Western Australia £900. The lecturers in charge draw more in the bigger States than they do here. In Sydney they draw from £700 to £900, in Melbourne from £600 to £750, in Adelaide £700, in Queensland from £500 to £650, in Tasmania £500, and in Perth £454 to £604. Other lecturers draw in Sydney £350 to £700, in Melbourne £400 to £500, in Adelaide £550, in Queensland £300 to £400, in Tasmania £450, and in Western Australia £404 to £504. We have not so very much to be ashamed of in that. The total expenditure on salaries, or the average expenditure per head of students on salaries, in Western Australia is £40 as against £36 in Sydney, £27 in Melbourne, £23 in Adelaide, £57 in Queensland, and £19 in Tasmania. The revenue is very much smaller here from outside sources than it is in the other States. In Sydney the total revenue for last year was £143,000, in Melbourne £93,000, in Adelaide £46,300, in Queensland £30,110, in Tasmania £13,880, and in Western Australia £16,217. From fees we get £624 as against £3,600 in Queensland, £1,880 in Tasmania, and very much larger amounts in the other cities. The

Melbourne University collects in fees £18 10s. per head, Sydney £11 11s., Adelaide £15 3s., Queensland £12 12s., Tasmania £9 15s., and Western Australia £1 16s. There is a vast difference there. I suppose there are very few free universities in the world. Certainly the universities in the Old Country are not free, and the fees collected there are higher than those collected in Australia. The list I have here shows that they vary between £21 and £31. It has to be remembered that the University has really no revenue outside the vote given by Parliament. Some members I know are anxious that the University should remain a free institution. There will come a time when the money that is spent on education will have to be carefully scrutinised. We may be a little ambitious in our University, but I do not know that we are. If the University is to be carried on, money must be found for it. I am not going to vote for the Statute which has been submitted, one of my reasons being that half the amount collected in fees would go to increase the salaries of the staff. The staff may not be overpaid now, but I think there is very little fault to find with the salaries paid to professors and lecturers. I know that if these fees are not allowed, there will be a demand for an increased grant, but it does not follow that an increased grant can be paid.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Are you supporting the motion?

The PREMIER: I am not supporting the Statute. That is the same thing. Is that clear. I am entirely in accord with the remarks of my hon. friend when he says the University is not free to the people of the State. It is not free to people living 60 miles away. It is impossible to make it free to all the people, and its real advantage is to those who live in Perth. I do not know why the hon. member compares the fees charged at the Narrogin farm school with those proposed to be charged at the University. There can be no comparison. The fees that are charged at the Narrogin school are for the keep of the students while there. The expenditure on our University to date has not been so very great; £15,000 per annum does not represent a large proportion of our annual education vote. I had hoped that there might be some saving in connection with the main expenditure, without interfering, of course, with the education of the children. Had that been possible, an additional grant to the University would have been much easier to make. But the settlement of people here, there and everywhere about the State has necessarily increased the expenditure on education very considerably. Still, that is inevitable, because we want the people in the country, and we want those people to have children, and we must give the children education. I have no intention of supporting the statute submitted. I support the motion of the Leader of the Opposition for the reasons I have stated. All the same, it is quite evident to me that if the Univer-

sity is to exist and expand, then its grant must be increased, and revenue must be had. For the moment I prefer that those in control of the University should turn to the endowment lands and see what they can get from them. I did think we would have heard some proposal in that connection before this session closed.

Hon. P. Collier: Parliament might make such a proposal.

The PREMIER: The proposal would have to come from the University in the first place. The Chancellor spoke to me on the subject some time ago. If such a proposal comes, we shall listen to it. It is no use saying that the endowment lands are to remain unused for 20 or 30 or 50 years. They do not happen to be very favourably situated, so as to be sought eagerly by people who want to build homes; and certainly they do not attract people who want to set up in business. Therefore, I think the only thing to be done with those lands at present is what I have suggested. I hope the university authorities will turn their attention to obtaining some revenue from that source at the moment. It ought to be recognised by every member that this University is not a free university; it is free in name only. It is not free to the people of this State except so far as they live in the metropolitan area.

Mr. SIMONS (East Perth) [9.50]: I hope the House will register the opinion of members as being favourable to the retention of the free University. It would be altogether a retrograde step to depart from the institution on the lines as we have it established here to-day. I am somewhat saddened by the knowledge that a member of the professorial staff is partly responsible for originating the idea of casting aside the free university principle. I cannot understand a man of such enlightened ideas, and credited with progressive thought, advocating a going back into a period of obscurantism. If it is the increasing pressure of taxation that has brought this about, as has been suggested, there should be nothing so cheerfully yielded as a little taxation for benefiting the youth of the community. We find in families throughout Australia working people who deny themselves luxuries who stint themselves, owing to an idea, born of an ambition to give their children a better education than they themselves enjoyed. That form of self-sacrifice, simple though it may be, is an enabling one, and represents one of the highest expressions of parental solicitude. I consider that what is expressed in many Australian family homes should also be expressed in the same parental way by the Government of the country. We should readily stint and deny ourselves in the same way as parents do, so that we may maintain our free University. It is a grand ideal for any State, for any nation, to attempt to present to its young citizens a

road untrammelled, unhindered, right from the kindergarten to the highest position in university life. That is a great ideal to strive for, to be able to say that at the end of the road of learning an ivory gate of opportunity will swing back on ball-bearing hinges as soon as it is reached by the ambitious student. There is no necessity to depart from that ideal. There are many other branches of public expenditure which should be assailed long before the expenditure on our University. Now, it has been suggested that by bringing in fees we are taking from the rich students the right to have their education at the expense of the community. But we are doing nothing of the kind; we are merely taking from the rich 12 per cent. of the annual average cost of university education, and the rich will still continue to draw from the general community about 88 per cent. of the actual cost. There is nothing democratic about that. Then there is the proposal to make certain students pauperised members of the University body. I hope that no such line of demarcation will ever be introduced into our University life, a system under which one section would be dubbed the "fees" and the other section dubbed the "freest." By so doing we should be reverting to the early history of South Australia, when the community was divided into two bodies—the nobis and the snobs. When I come to picture some of the members of the University Senate I recall that the roll of the senate includes more than one name representing wealthy interests of the State, interests which, if they had any real ambition or love for helping the youth of the community, would give expression to that love and ambition by making donations to the institution instead of attacking the system of free education. Now, the revenue idea makes no provision for expansion of the University. It means that the University is to continue just as it exists today—a root-bound, pot-bound sort of institution, incapable of expansion. We should be prepared to cut down expenditure in other sections of our public life in order not to hamper the activities of our University. I was very sorry to hear the member for Pilbara (Mr. Underwood) practically proclaim that he had gone back to the cave-dwelling stage of human history. He made the statement that University men have accomplished nothing in Australia. To make such a statement is to proclaim ignorance of the growth of the Australian nation. But it is, perhaps, after all, a fitting opinion to be expressed by a member the majority of whose constituents are aborigines. If we come to survey the history of Australia from a constitutional point of view, we find that the very progenitors of the whole constitutional system of this country, from the earliest days of the last century, were university men. Any man with a knowledge of Australian his-

tory, if asked who was the father of constitutional government in this continent of ours, would have to answer William Charles Wentworth. The first born of Australia's statesmen, William Charles Wentworth, was also one of her most brilliant university sons. Tracing the course of democratic thought which expresses itself in our Constitution, we come to the father of democracy in Australia—John Dunmore Lang, a Presbyterian divine, and a brilliant university graduate. To step a little further across the stage of time, we find that when it was thought necessary to resort to arms at Ballarat, and the rising of the Eureka Stockade took place, the leader of the rising was also a university graduate, in the person of Peter Lalor. Coming to a still later stage in our history, and tracing the birth and growth of Federation, observing the creation of the Commonwealth Constitution which, when it was written, was hailed in the world as the very last word in democratic Government—

Members: Oh!

Mr. SIMONS: Members ignorant of the history of other countries may say "Oh," but if Federation has failed, it is not the fault of the brilliant men who created the Federal constitution, but our fault in sending across to the Federal Parliament a lot of bar-tenders, and individuals who could not obtain employment as yardmen in the third-class hotels of Western Australia.

Hon. P. Collier: You will have Senator Pearce down on you.

Mr. SIMONS: Senator Pearce is covering himself with glory in another part of the globe at present.

Hon. P. Collier: Wait till the cultured De Largie hears about you!

Mr. SIMONS: Yes, or the refined Henderson. However, we were tracing the growth of the Federal constitution; and, as has been pointed out by the member for Kanowna (Hon. T. Walker), we find that that instrument of democratic Government originated from the minds of Alfred Deakin and Sir Samuel Griffiths, both university graduates. There was also another great mind concerned in the creation of the Federal constitution—Charles Cameron Kingston. Let us turn to the High Court of Australia, and there we find one of the most brilliant of forensic minds, Mr. Justice Higgins, another graduate of a university. Turning to glance at the father of democracy in Victoria, one of the most cultured exponents of free government is seen there in George Higginbotham, also a brilliant university graduate. But let us enter now the realms of culture in Australia, and see how far university men have contributed in that domain. The University of Sydney was established by the Wentworth to whom I have already referred as the creator of constitutional government in Australia. Coming across to Victoria, we find that the founder of the first public library, the first museum, and the first art gallery there was Redmond

Barry, also a university man. Now take our own State, and here we find that this free University was largely the creation of John Winthrop Hackett, once more a university graduate. Of John Winthrop Hackett it may be said as of Sir Christopher Wren, "If you seek his monument, look around." During his lifetime we may not have agreed with all that Sir Winthrop Hackett wrote and said, we have to make this concession to him and to his memory, that it was largely his inspiration which gave us King's Park, and that it was largely his inspiration which gave us the Victoria Public Library, and the Museum, and the Art Gallery.

The Minister for Works: I thought they originated with the late Lord Forrest.

Mr. SIMONS: Yes, but largely thanks to inspiration derived from John Winthrop Hackett. The late Lord Forrest was a very shrewd man, who grouped around himself several university graduates of high attainments, among them notably the late John Winthrop Hackett and the late Charles Yelverton O'Connor. In our own State, it would be impossible to calculate the value of one person's effort in our single University, such as the intellectual wealth created as the result of the efforts of the late Sir John Winthrop Hackett. Who could assess his work in terms of money? Who could assess the value of his contribution to the education and the uplifting of Western Australia? I am speaking of him not as a politician, but as a contributor towards the welfare of the people of this State. Many a young man, whether Socialist or Conservative, will continually draw inspiration from the great contribution made by John Winthrop Hackett in the direction I have indicated. We are only speaking of what one man has done, and indicated what a wonderful contribution he made to the life of one State. But not alone in one section of development of the country is this evidenced. Who will deny the contribution made by Professor Gregory in the realms of exploration? Who will deny the contribution by Professor David in the world of geology or of Julian Tenison-Woods, who wrote of the existence of the artesian basins of Australia?

Mr. Latham: Not one of them got his education at a free university.

Hon. P. Collier: That is not the point. They got their training at a university.

Mr. SIMONS: These men appear before us as those who have added to the material welfare of the lives of our people. These are men who have done practical work in connection with the progress of Australia and who have added to the wealth of the world. I was referring to the wealth of contributions made by University men. The member for York (Mr. Latham) would question not only the benefits derived from a free University but from universities in general. Would he, however, deny what agricultural chemistry has meant to the lands of Western Australia? The very men sitting on the

cross benches in this Chamber would not have had sufficient men and women living in their constituencies to secure their election to Parliament had it not been for the development of agricultural chemistry.

Mr. McCallum: And agricultural science generally.

Mr. SIMONS: What has superphosphate meant to our agricultural lands? Turning to other States, we realise the great work done by the Chaffey Bros. in connection with irrigation in Victoria. Both of those men were graduates of an American University. Then there is Dr. Elwood Mead, whose great work as an irrigation expert is known throughout the Eastern States. Let us turn to the realm of war, too. It was attributed to the Duke of Wellington that he said that Waterloo was won on the football fields of England.

Hon. P. Collier: On the playing fields of Eton.

Mr. SIMONS: The last war was won in the laboratories of Europe, not on the playing fields. When the Germans were hammering at the frontier lines of the Allies, they were hammering almost successfully and approaching near to victory, as the result of the university training of the men who led their armies. When it came to the hour of deliverance, it was Foch, the university-trained military genius of France, who struck the blow. He was aided by Pershing, the American army leader, also university trained. I cannot understand how men still deny the influence of the university in our midst.

Hon. P. Collier: Who can understand it?

[The Speaker resumed the Chair.]

Mr. SIMONS: Coming to Australia, who was the great military genius whose work was recognised throughout the Allied armies and who made himself the most famous of all the generals from the Dominions? It was General Monash, also a university graduate. It is wearying to go on mentioning names. Look down the scroll of fame through Australian history, whether in our parliamentary life, in the realm of invention, or in the domain of war. We have to concede this point: The university graduate, by his work and contributions to our national life, has contributed more than enough in value many times beyond the cost of the universities maintained in different parts of Australia. I hope that the benefits of a free university will not be denied the youth of this State. I have before me the calendar of the University of Western Australia published in 1920. In black type, the following appears in the pre-amble—

Owing to the rapid increase in the number of persons attending the University, it will be necessary to restrict the enrolments of first year students.

Hon. P. Collier: What a shame!

Mr. SIMONS: That is a fearful confession for any enlightened community to make!

We have more students clamouring for admission than we can enrol! In the face of this, there are the same old Conservatives, the same old ladies and gentlemen who hate the youth of this country almost by instinct—

The Minister for Works: Rot.

Mr. SIMONS: Rot? The Minister is 'a past-master in it! Yet these people who hate the youth of our State almost by instinct, deny education on the one hand and deplore youthful depravity on the other hand. They mourn the fact that too many go to the bar and the racecourse and too few develop a studious habit. In face of all this, we make too small a provision for those who desire to benefit from the higher education! It is the most dispiriting and humiliating confession to be found in any official document in any part of the world. I hope this restriction, this tax upon ambition, will not be added to by a proposal to abolish the free University. I hope the ideals of the men who founded the University will be lived up to, and that some practical means will be found to carry on our University life without burdening our youth with the payment of fees and hampering those who desire to create a better type of womanhood and manhood in our midst.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Williams-Narrogin) [10.7]: I have been reminded during the course of the debate on the motion before the House, that I had the privilege of moving in connection with this subject on the 18th September, 1912, when the resolution I submitted read as follows—

That in the opinion of this House it is desirable that all education at the University of Western Australia should be free, and that the practice of charging fees at State educational establishments should be entirely abolished.

I may recall to memory that that resolution was moved before the opening of the University, and while the question of whether fees should be charged or not, was a burning one in the community. It was moved a few months after the militant democracy of this State had put the first Labour Government in power, with the aid of a newspaper called the "Vanguard" which, besides taking a prominent part in the election, strenuously advocated free education from the kindergarten to the University. Since then, we have had many different quick political changes. Many have progressed with the times and in political life, there is change and progress all the time, particularly during the stirring conditions obtaining during the last few years. I am pleased to recall, however, some of the remarks which I made in connection with this subject nearly 10 years ago and I have some recollection of the midnight oil I burned in preparation of my speech on that occasion. It was one of the first motions I had the privilege of moving in this Chamber.

Hon. P. Collier: You started well.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I was proud indeed of the reception that motion had, as indicated by its acceptance by the House without a division. I recall that the Leader of the Opposition at that time, the late Mr. Frank Wilson, made a lengthy speech which appears in "Hansard," in the support of the principle we are now discussing, namely, free education at the University of Western Australia.

Mr. Teesdale: If you give something for nothing, you are always pretty popular.

Mr. JOHNSTON: The brief paragraph of my speech on that occasion, which I desire to read, is as follows:—

A university has been described as a school of universal learning, and as such it should be open to all who would learn, but it is only by throwing its doors open to all that it will occupy the place it should as a popular and powerful influence for good in the national life of this country. We are told higher education is required for the development of human power and the training of human character, as well as the culture of the human mind, and I venture to assert that if there is a difference better material for this purpose will be found in the ranks of the poor than elsewhere. At any rate, if we must have a test for admission to the University we do not desire it to be a financial one, applied not to the student, but to his parents. Let merit and ability and brains be the standard on which admission to our highest educational institution shall be based, not accident of birth or temporary command over money. It is well known that in old countries the wealthy classes are apt to degenerate as time goes on. In a new country like Australia where class distinctions happily hardly exist, where the poor man of to-day is the rich man of to-morrow, we cannot yet say that this is the case.

In recalling my remarks on that occasion, I desire to state that after nearly 10 years, I stand absolutely by my utterance. I propose to support the Leader of the Opposition and to vote accordingly.

Mr. McCALLUM (South Fremantle) [10.12]: There are only two points I wish to touch upon. The first is to remind the House that only £3,000 is involved in the amount of fees proposed to be collected and the financial aid which the Senate say will be necessary to make ends meet. I desire to remind the Government that at the present time, there are 105 students at the Training College who are attending the University and getting their education free. I have it, on the most reliable authority, that at least 50 per cent. of those students will not be able to attend the University if fees are charged. Unless the standard of teaching in our primary schools is to be materially reduced, the Government will be compelled to find some means of education equivalent to the University standard for those students who are attending the Training College. It is calculated that the cost of providing that education will run into something like £250, which amount must be made a set off against the £3,000 desired by the University

authorities. As to those who argue that men who can afford to pay for their children's education at the University should be made to pay, and are using that argument as a lever to secure the fixation of fees, if that line of argument is to be followed, the grant to the University should be wiped out altogether. If there is any logic in the argument for the fixation of the fees, that argument applies to the whole question of financial assistance to the institution. If there is an objection to the rich man's son securing education alongside the working man's son, why ask the working man to pay a tax to the extent of £45 per annum per head in respect of the students attending at the University. The workers have to meet by taxation the £15,000 now being paid.

Hon. T. Walker: And that is not quite all that is paid. That is statutory.

Mr. McCALLUM: Yes. So, if there is any argument at all in favour of fees, it can be used also against the financing of the institution by the Government. If that principle is to be interfered with at all, I will take my stand against the Government's donating one penny towards the University. The University should either be free and open to all, without restriction, or else, if it is to be made a rich man's institution, the rich man should be called upon to finance it. As to the objection raised by country members, I will help them if it be possible to secure the assistance necessary to bring country children in to the University. The University will never take its proper place in the life of the community while its ramifications are restricted to the metropolitan area. Its functions should be extended throughout the State, and it should be our aim to try to apply to the students attending the University the same assistance as is afforded country children attending our secondary schools. If the Government cannot finance the University, the Senate ought to be able to find the money. They have £88,000 worth of endowment lands, from which they receive only £1,200 per annum. That is by no means a fair return from so valuable an estate, and the Senate should find some means of securing a much larger income from the University endowment properties. I hope the motion will be carried.

Mr. TEESDALE (Roebourne) [10-17]: I also have two points to which I attach importance. If only I could see my way clear to preventing the benefits of the University being accorded to people in a position to pay, I would never support the motion. But, after listening to what has been said, I admit it seems impossible to separate the two classes without reflecting on the unfortunate youth whose parents are not in a position to keep him at the University. I would not for one second debar him from getting the full benefits of that institution. But it pains me to think that men with large incomes are participating in the educational benefits provided by the State, and that at a time when we are in such extreme financial circumstances.

Hon. P. Collier: And under this scheme of fees they will still participate to the extent of 88 per cent.

Mr. TEESDALE. It is that reflection which influences me to support the motion.

Mrs. COWAN (West Perth) [10-19]: I will support the motion. Just before the member for Pilbara (Mr. Underwood) rose to speak so strongly on the subject of education, I told him I believed in having education for everybody, whereupon he remarked that I had not had a university education. In reply I said, "No, more is the pity." I think perhaps we all feel it is a pity we were not able to attend a university, that had it been free in our day it would have made a great difference to our culture generally and perhaps to the whole community. Because I always believe that what is good comes down from above to below. We do not require to take up the attitude of that hon. member, who reminds me of Oliver Wendell Holmes who in "The Professor at the Breakfast Table" says what a splendid thing it is to be a self-made man. We are all self-made in that sense of the word. He explains how interesting it is to see the Irishman's house on the marsh. He built it absolutely with his own hands. It is a little wavy here, a little out of plumb there, and a little wrong somewhere else; it certainly has not an artistic effect, but he admires it, because, as he says "Better to be made that way than not at all." When listening to the member for Pilbara I realised what a fine leader he might have been, and what things he might have done if he had had that very education we are all needing so badly. He himself is a splendid illustration of the need for that very thing which he says we should not have. I do not think we have given the system of free education a fair trial, because we have not provided the money necessary to its proper development. I do not like this pauperising idea in regard to bursaries. There is a terrible humiliation in being asked intimate and personal questions as to one's means. It hurts. When one realises, as I have done, what it means to the women who have to submit to having their personal affairs pryed into when they require help from the Charities Department, it is easy to realise what it will mean when people who desire a university education for their children are subjected to the same ordeal. I am in favour of the amendment proposed by the member for Sussex (Mr. Pickering) and I should like to see something of the sort done as soon as possible. There is another reason why we should not refuse what is needed in this way: On a practically unanimous vote it was decided to provide an additional £8,000 per annum for increases in members' salaries. If we can do that, we ought to be able to find the small amount extra required by the University. During the next few sittings of the House, when we have the Licensing Bill before us, the Leader of the Opposition will have a fine opportunity to help get in additional revenue. The revenue to be derived under that Bill should help greatly to provide these funds—

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot allow the hon. member to discuss the Licensing Bill.

Hon. P. Collier: I will consider the suggestion.

Mrs. COWAN: I will support the motion.

Mr. SAMPSON (Swan) [10-22]: I did expect—I am glad it has not eventuated—that there would be opposition to the motion. With



one exception every speaker has supported it. The member for Pilbara (Mr. Underwood) contends that a university training is not necessary. I am not of that opinion. Education does not put brains into a man's head, perhaps, but it enables him to use the intelligence he possesses, to increase it and, instead of having a mass of unassorted matter in his head, to thoroughly systematise it. It is a pity the University should confer degrees which are of no practical use in this State. A friend of mine obtained the degree of Bachelor of Science, only to find it impossible to secure a position in which his knowledge could be used. That young man, brilliantly able, was lost to the State, principally because he had won a degree for which no use could be found here. I agree that science owes much to the universities. Our own department of science and industries is very largely dependent on the work done in the University. The analyses of soils, and the treatment of different diseases of fruit and cereals are advanced, not only by practical work in the field, but also by the work of the chemist and the University. World competition has to be faced by the men and women of the State, and if those who are following on are not mentally equipped, if they have not a university training, how can they hope to compete with others more favoured? From this standpoint alone the arguments in favour of the motion are worthy of the utmost consideration and support. I should like all Western Australians to take as their creed a few words in this strain:—"I believe in Western Australia, I believe in the development of its lands and industries, and I believe that the development of those lands and industries will be brought about more quickly and more effectively by the full acknowledgment of the advantages to be secured by education in the fullest sense, from the kindergarten to the University."

Question put and passed.

#### ADJOURNMENT—CHRISTMAS HOLIDAYS.

The PREMIER (Hon. Sir James Mitchell—Northam) [10:27]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn till 4:30 p.m. on Tuesday, the 3rd January.

Question put and passed.

#### COMPLIMENTARY REMARKS.

The PREMIER (Hon. Sir James Mitchell—Northam) [10:28]: Before we adjourn I should like to wish you, Sir, and members generally a Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year. It will not be quite as happy as it might have been if to-night we were adjourning for a few months. It does not often happen that we have to come back in the early part of the year, but unfortunately on this occasion it is necessary that we should do so. The few days' rest which members will get, at all events will be something. During the last six weeks we have had a very strenuous time; indeed I do not remember ever having a more strenuous time in the House. In the hope that we should get through before Christ-

mas we have been sitting four days a week until 4 o'clock in the morning.

Mr. Teesdale: Nevertheless getting in a lot of sleep, according to the newspapers.

The PREMIER: Hon. members have been here till 4 o'clock in the morning attending to the work of the country. I do not know what the newspapers have been saying about us. We are not always as sleepy as the newspapers might think.

The Minister for Works: They will say anything.

The PREMIER: It is their privilege to say "Yes" one day and "No" the next. I wish you, Sir, and members of this House and the staff the compliments of the season.

Hon. P. COLLIER (Boulder) [10:30]: I would like to join with the Premier in wishing yourself and members of the House a very pleasant Christmas and New Year. It has been a somewhat busy session, and it is rather to be regretted that owing, I suppose, to an unavoidable little interruption, we have been unable to close the session before Christmas as has been the case for many years past.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: We will be able to do our work better when we come back.

Hon. P. COLLIER: That is so.

The Premier: I hope you will not do so much of it.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I hope members will enjoy the brief holiday and come back—I will not say renewed in strength and vigour, because that may mean a prolongation of the session into the month of February. I am sure the Premier, while wishing every member a pleasant and restful holiday, would prefer that they did not come back endowed with too much vigour and virility to carry on the work. The session has been a most interesting one to most of us, and especially to those who have been in the House for many years. To you, Mr. Speaker, I suppose it has been unique in that you have been privileged to preside over a Chamber which, for the first time in its history, has had in its midst a mother of the House. I am sure the session has been interesting to the member for West Perth (Mrs. Cowan) and I hope that, notwithstanding that she has sometimes observed what might have appeared to be unruly conduct on the part of some of us, she will not take away as a result of her first session's experience of Parliament any unkindly feelings with regard to her fellow members of the sterner sex.

The Minister for Works: Charity covers a multitude of sins.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The session has been interesting, too, in that we have had a very large proportion of new members, 15 or 16, a greater number than we have had for very many years. It has been quite interesting to many of us older members to sit back and watch the colts getting into harness. It recalled to us the days of 16 or 17 years ago when we ourselves went through similar difficult and trying times. Although it may not appear so, I always feel a very great deal of sympathy for a member who is experiencing his first session of Parliament, because I know how I felt during my early days, when I would have preferred to crawl under the bench and out of sight rather

than speak. I am sure that Parliament has been enriched in many ways by the new blood, and many of our new members give promise of occupying perhaps foremost positions in Parliamentary life in the years to come when some of the older stagers may have passed out. As the father of the House, Mr. Speaker, presiding as you do over its deliberations and being the oldest member of the Assembly, close on to the 20-year mark I believe, I wish you the compliments of the season and a very happy and enjoyable Christmas time. I hope that the clerk, the clerk assistant and the officers of the House will enjoy their brief respite from Parliamentary labours. We are all indebted to the officers of the House for the kindness, courtesy, and helpfulness they have extended to us on all occasions. I hope we shall begin the new year in a kindly spirit and will terminate the session as early as possible—

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The Premier would like that.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Consistent of course with a proper examination of the work to be laid before us and a conscientious discharge of duty. I wish members a very happy Christmas and an enjoyable new year.

Mr. PICKERING (Sussex) [10-35]: In the absence of the Leader of the Country Party and the Deputy Leader and at the request of the Leader of the Country Party, I have pleasure in joining in the felicitations so ably and fully expressed by the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition. I think members generally may congratulate themselves on the good feeling which has existed in the House during the session. With the exception of the experience of the last day or two, there has been little which has given cause for any feeling other than that which we would desire. We can congratulate the Leader of the Opposition on the generous treatment he has accorded the Government side of the House, and I think he will agree that the Country Party have conceded to the Opposition every consideration in connection with business introduced by his side of the House. On behalf of the Country Party, Mr. Speaker, I convey to your good self our sincere wishes for a pleasant Christmas and a happy new year, and thank you for the kind consideration you have extended to us at all times during the session. I would like to convey to the clerk, the clerk assistant and the officers of the House, including the "Hansard" staff, our appreciation of the consideration shown to us throughout the session, and to the whole of the members of the House our sincere wishes for Christmas and the coming year.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. W. J. George—Murray-Wellington) [10-37]: As almost the equal of you, Mr. Speaker, the father of the House, in years of membership here, may I add my quota to the good wishes which have been expressed to yourself and to all members.

Mrs. COWAN (West Perth) [10-38]: May I be allowed to thank the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition, and other members for the consideration they have extended to me during the time I have been in the House. It has been a little trying sometimes I must admit, but one

expects to get a little opposition when coming into a body such as this, and one accepts it, I hope, in the right spirit. I thank those who have been so kind and considerate to me and reciprocate the good wishes. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and all other members of the House for the spirit in which they have received the only woman member. It must be sometimes extremely trying for them to have a woman amongst them, but I have done my best to make it as little trying as possible and I think they too have done their best in the same way. I wish all a happy Christmas and a prosperous new year.

Mr. SPEAKER [10-39]: I wish to thank the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Sussex and other speakers for their kind expressions with reference to myself, the clerks, and the staff generally, in wishing us a pleasant Christmas and a prosperous new year, and on behalf of the staff and myself I reciprocate their hearty wishes. Members will be able to go to their homes earlier to-night than has been the case for some time past in order to prepare for their Christmas holidays. I hope when members return, although they appear to be in very fine temper to-night, that they will be even improved in temper to continue the arduous task still before them to complete the work of the session.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: We are always in good temper.

Mr. SPEAKER: On behalf of the staff and myself I thank you all.

*House adjourned at 10-40 p.m.*

## Legislative Council,

*Tuesday, 3rd January, 1922.*

	Page
Assent to Bills	2619
Select Committee: Land and Income Tax Assessment Amendment Bill, Extension of Time	2619
Wyndham Meat Works and State Shipping Service, to adopt Reports	2620
Bills: Architects, 2R.	2619
Workers Homes Act Amendment, Comm. report	2619
Permanent Reserves (No. 2), 2R., Com.	2622
Land Agents, 2R.	2622
Inspection of Machinery, Assembly's Message	2630
Agricultural Bank Act Amendment, 2R.	2635
Nurses Registration, 2R.	2640
Traffic Act Amendment, 2R.	2644
Motions: Education Commission Report	2626
Government's Financial Position	2628
University Fees, to disallow Senate Statute	2630

The PRESIDENT took the Chair at 3.0 p.m., and read prayers.