Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 25th January, 1911.

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

PETITION—MR. OSBORN'S LAND SELECTIONS.

Mr. JOHNSON (Guildford): I have a petition to present; it is respectfully worded and ends with a prayer. I move—

That the petition be read.

The Premier: The hon. member might tell us whom the petition is from, and what it is about.

Mr. JOHNSON: I have to take the responsibility according to the Standing Orders, of vouching for the petition being respectfully worded and ending with a prayer; further than that I am not supposed to give any information. However, I have no objection to saying that it is the prayer of a petitioner who feels that he has not received justice at the hands of the present Government. It has already been ventilated in the shape of an appeal made by Mr. Molloy, the petitioner, against the decision of the Land Board in connection with land granted to Mr. Osborn. The matter has been ventilated in Parliament, and under the Land Act Mr. Molloy took the correct course of appealing, but the Minister has ignored the appeal, and Mr. Molloy is now praying Parliament that he should be given the opportunity of having his case heard.

Question passed; petition received and read.

On motion by Mr. JOHNSON the consideration of the petition was made an Order of the Day for the next sitting.

Mr. SPEAKER: I find, according to the Standing Orders, it is necessary to move that the petition be printed.

Mr. JOHNSON: I wanted to avoid that expense, but, of course, if I am compelled to move in that direction I shall do so.

On motion by Mr. JOHNSON petition ordered to be printed.

QUESTION—RAILWAY PROJECT, NORSEMAN-ESPERANCE.

Mr. HUDSON asked the Premier: 1, Has he received the report of the Advisory Board on the Norseman-Esperance Railway? 2, Will such report be presented to Parliament during the present session?

The PREMIER replied: 1, No. 2, Mr. Paterson, Chairman of the Advisory Board, informs me that he only received Mr. Surveyor Watkins' report on the supposed wheat area lying between Esperance and Norseman on Monday last. Messrs. May and Hewby's report, dealing with the classification of the land, has also been received, so that he now only awaits the return of the Surveyor General from the Eastern States before finally considering and drawing up the board's report with regard to the suggested railway. The Surveyor General is expected to return to the State in about a month's time.

QUESTION—ELECTORAL POPULATION, AGRICULTURAL DISTRICTS.

Mr. McDOWALL asked the Attorney General: What are the details (giving the names of the electorates) of the increase of the electoral population in the agricultural districts by 11,000, as stated by the Attorney General and repeated by the Colonial Secretary in another place?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL replied: 1, When I mentioned 11,000 as the increase the reference was to the increase in the combined agricultural and pastoral electoral districts (see *Hansard*, 1910-11, page 2862). When the agricultural districts only were referred to, in moving the second reading of the Bill, the increase was given as 10,000 (see *Hansard*, 1910-11,

page 2204). 2. The details are as follows:—

AGRICULTURAL.

Electoral District.	30th June, 1910.	27th October 1905.	Increase.	Decrease.
Nelson ...	2,183	1,366	817	...
Sussex ...	1,492	967	525	...
Wellington ...	1,737	1,729	8	...
Murray ...	1,140	1,424	...	284
Swan ...	2,823	2,635	188	...
Irwin ...	1,957	1,456	501	...
Greenough ...	1,560	1,275	285	...
Toodyay ...	2,113	1,092	1,021	...
Northam ...	4,785	3,371	1,414	...
York ...	2,028	1,093	935	...
Beverley ...	2,715	1,434	1,281	...
Williams ...	4,160	2,222	1,938	...
Katanning ...	2,477	1,153	1,324	...
Total Agricultural Electoral Districts ...	31,170	21,217	10,237	284
Net Increase	...	...	9,953	..

PASTORAL.

Electoral District.	30th June, 1910.	27th October 1905.	Increase.	Decrease.
Gascoyne ...	1,407	573	834	...
Roebourne ...	520	667	...	147
Kimberley ...	1,618	1,124	494	...
Total ...	3,545	2,364	1,328	147
Net Increase...	...	...	1,181	...
Grand Total, net Increase, Agricultural and Pastoral Electoral Districts combined ...	...	...	11,134	..

QUESTION—POLICE QUARTERS, SANITARY FEES.

Mr. COLLIER asked the Premier: 1, Will he pay the sanitary fees on police quarters the same as he has promised to do for the warders occupying Government buildings? If not, why not?

The PREMIER replied: 1. No. 2, Since 1st July, 1909, all Government officials occupying Government quarters have been charged sanitary fees. The promise referred to, as will be seen from a reference to *Hansard*, was that the levy should be uniform. The following is an extract from the Treasurer's remarks in February, 1909:—

> All would be placed upon the same footing, dating as from 1st July next. If at present the warders were paying and the superintendent was not, then he must be placed on the same footing in that respect as they were. If the superintendent was getting services free so should the warders.

QUESTION—NORTH-WEST COAST NAVIGATION.

Mr. GORDON (for Mr. Murphy) asked the Premier: 1, Is it a fact that during the last three years persons without certificates have been permitted to navigate vessels from ports to ports on the North-West coast? 2, Have certificates been granted to persons for the coastal trade as masters who have never been to sea and whose experience has been gained solely on the Swan River? 3, If so, is this not contrary to our Navigation Act?

The PREMIER replied: 1, Yes, there have been several cases where men of experience, although not holding master's certificates, have been temporarily allowed to take charge of small coasting vessels until a certificated master could be obtained; these are locally owned sailing vessels carrying wool and stores from port to port. 2, No. 3, No.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Is the Premier aware that in the North-West a certificated master or captain is exempt from all blame for running on a rock which is uncharted, and that the owner of the ship knows all these rocks, and has to accompany the certificated officer to point them out?

The PREMIER: No; I am not aware of that.

QUESTION—LAND BOARD SECRETARY.

Mr. SCADDAN asked the Minister for Lands: 1, Has an appointment been made to the position of secretary to the Land Board in accordance with the regulation

gazetted during December? 2, If so, were applications called for in the usual manner in order to permit officers of the service to apply for same? 3, If no appointment has been made is it intended to fill such position in the near future, and what is the proposed salary? 4, If not already filled, has any person been recommended to the position, and by whom? 5, Is the person so recommended or appointed on the permanent or temporary staff?

Mr. MALE (Honorary Minister), for the Minister for Lands, replied: 1, Yes, temporarily. 2, Applications are not called to fill positions temporarily. 3. A Class "E" position in the Clerical Division on the permanent staff—salary £170 to £200—is being created. Applications to fill same will be called by notice in the *Government Gazette*. 4, Yes, Mr. John Lyall has been recommended by the board 5, Mr. Lyall is on the temporary staff.

BILL—ABORIGINES ACT AMENDMENT.

Report stage, etc.

On motion by the MINISTER FOR MINES report of Committee adopted.

Bill read a third time, and returned to the Legislative Council with amendments.

BILL—UNIVERSITY.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous sitting.

Mr. UNDERWOOD (Pilbara): In regard to this question we have heard a few speeches, and much has been written, but in my opinion the main consideration has never received any attention yet, and that is, in regard to the description or kind of university which we are about to establish. The Premier, in introducing the Bill, followed very closely the report which has been presented by the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the matter, and, although the *West Australian* gave him credit, and justly so, for making a clear and lucid explanation of the Bill, I would like to say that perhaps the secretary of that commission could have given an equally lucid exposition from the Speaker's gallery, or anywhere else. The member for Cue has to an extent dealt with this question, and has referred particularly to the cost of the institution, a subject worthy of consideration, and the relation of the university to our educational system, but, after all, the main question we have to consider is this: Is the university which is proposed in the Bill the one which is likely to do the most good, and to effect the most benefit to Western Australia? Is the system proposed the best possible system, and is it one that we should adopt? There has been much verbiage used to point out that Western Australia has not had a university so early in its developmental career as many of the other States of the Commonwealth, but I rather admire the system that has been adopted in Western Australia—the system of starting from the bottom and educating the masses before we start to spend thousands in educating the select few. It has been pointed out that New South Wales started 50 or 60 years ago with a university, and we must remember that that was a very long, long time before they had introduced free education for the children of the masses. Such a system was bound to be a failure, and it was a failure. I just mention this in regard to New South Wales because it comes to my mind that only recently we read in the Press that at a meeting of the Senate, or some other high and lofty party of pedants in New South Wales, it was pointed out that there were only five or six men, who had passed through the New South Wales university, in public life in Australia at that time. The fact that a university that has been established for over half a century has only half a dozen men in public life is certainly a very considerable condemnation of that institution.

Mr. Horan: On the contrary, it shows their good sense.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Possibly it does show their good sense, and it is a wonder that the hon. member does not use that sense which he possesses.

Mr. Horan: This is not the place to use it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: In considering this question it has been stated to me that we should accept this Bill almost without discussion, and that to delay it would be almost a crime. I contend that it would be far better to delay this Bill for a year or two, or even five years, so long as we get a good Bill, and a good university at the finish. The whole success and benefit of a university, in my opinion, will depend on whether we have a proper university, and if we pass this Bill handing over to a convocation and senate the whole control and management of our university, we are placing it beyond the control of Parliament; we are passing it into the control of those who have been educated in the university and all the conservatism, all the old ideas that are existing to-day will exist until these people die out. This Parliament proposes to hand over the sole and entire control of that university to outsiders, who are, it must be acknowledged, the most conservative minds in Western Australia. If we pass this Bill now it is a matter of 25 or 30 years before we are likely to get any reform or any improvement in the system. So I say again it is desirable that we should discuss and consider this matter, and if we delayed it four or five years, or even ten years, we would still be better off than if we form a university which will retard rather than accelerate the progress of this State. I just want to go shortly into the question of university teaching. It is a fact well known that an oft-repeated fallacy is generally accepted as demonstrated truth, and we have been told for such a number of years that the university educated man is entirely superior to the man who has not that university education, that we have a sort of respect for him; we have, as it were, to draw back and cringe to the university man. I remember the time when I had to take off my hat and bend my knee to any man with a degree; but being somewhat of an inquiring turn of mind I have inquired what these university men have done for the world. I ask, "Where are your university men"? Later on I will inquire why there are no university men in this Parliament. I wish to point out that there are very few, if any, great men who have had the advantage of a university education, while on the other hand all the world's greatest heroes, all those heroes we reverenced as boys and still reverence and worship, were non-university men. I have a list of some of those who succeeded in this world as soldiers without a university education. We have Cromwell, Wellington, Grant, Napoleon, Washington, and Lord Clive. When my critics are rising and are going to point out my sublime ignorance on this and other questions—which will be no argument—I would like them to show some facts. I will ask them to put up some fighters in comparison with that list of mine. I have given a list of non-university men who have fought and won.

Mr. Collier: And it does not exhaust the list.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: No. Then we came along to the sailors. We have Columbus, Cook, Nelson, Dampier, Drake and Van Tromp; and this list does not include Murphy of Fremantle. I will ask those who contend that without a university we cannot possibly progress, cannot possibly do anything, and that we are lagging behind for want of a university, to put up some sailors against that list. Then we come to a few writers. We have Shakespeare, Burns, Dickens, Scott, Carlyle, and Mark Twain. I would ask university men to put up some writers against those. It is the same in every line of life. We have the great religious reformers Luther and Knox, and among great explorers the great traveller and missionary Livingstone. We have the great anti-slavery President, the great lawyer in America, Abe Lincoln. Then when we come to the other sex we have at least Florence Nightingale and Joan of Arc. It is a fairly long list, but the names I have not read out of those who have achieved success without a university education are legion, and the names of those who have achieved success after passing through a university can be counted on the fingers of one hand. This is worthy

of the consideration of any serious man. I just want to say a few words in regard to some of the inventors. I shall not run through the list, but it is almost impossible to find an inventor who went to a university or had the advantage of a university education. With the exception of Lord Kelvin, there are practically no inventors who had a university education. I would like for one moment to dwell upon the position of James Watt. He was an instrument maker, an ordinary mechanic, who was called into the Glasgow University to repair the model of a steam engine by means of which the students were instructed in the science of steam power. Looking over that model, James Watt, the mere mechanic, was able to make improvements on it which have been to the lasting benefit of the civilisation of this world. We have this position, and one we condemn always, and one which I hope will never come into a Western Australian university—the students of the university, pampered, fed, treated on the best of this world, had to bring in an ordinary mechanic to mend their model of a steam engine, and that mechanic, James Watt, would have been, and would be now, considered unworthy to have a drink with those students—at any rate would be considered unworthy to feed at the same table with them; they might pass him a drink as mere condescension and patronage. Yet James Watt could come in and show those students how to make machines. The point I want to draw from this is that when we start in Western Australia we want our pupils to learn not only all about the steam engine from a model, but also how to repair a model, and above all things that the mechanic is as good a man as they are. There are a few men who have achieved success absolutely in spite of a university education. The first instance I will take is Macaulay. We find on reading the history of Macaulay that after two years' tuition "he had not acquired the art of classical composition as taught at public schools and heartily disliked the practice. He won, however, a prize for Latin declamation at Trinity." There we have it. Had Macaulay, in what Tate calls "those golden formative years," submitted to the pedantic ponderous system taught by our university professors we would never have had those writings of Macaulay's; they would have been mere platitudes and verbiage; but because Macaulay could not and would not learn their system we had a great writer. On the other hand we find that he took prizes for Latin declamation. Now to those who have read Macaulay, to the uneducated like myself and 98 per cent. of the rest of Australians, what is the greatest fault with Macaulay? In my opinion practically the only fault with Macaulay is his extensive use of Latin—phrase after phrase of Latin which the ordinary reader cannot understand—thereby absolutely spoiling his works, great writer and all as he was. In the first place his style was natural-born in the mind, in the second place that pedantic, contemptible method of using a language which the people do not speak was forced into him by the "dog-latin pumps" of the university. Another fairly great man whom the universities claim as having achieved success after passing through a university, is Darwin, and yet we find this written about Darwin. He went to a university, made no very great success, and before he had obtained his diploma he went to South America in a ship called the "Beagle," and this is written about him—

> It is impossible to overrate the influence of the voyage on Darwin's career. It was both his education and his opportunity. He left England untried and almost uneducated for science. He returned a successful collector, a practical and brilliant geologist, and with an idea and general knowledge of zoology gained at first hand in many parts of the world.

That is where Darwin learned—not at the university, but from nature; and I want to say right here that no man who has not had a fair study of nature, no matter what he may know of the dead past, can be very successful in the live present. But universities have a method of claiming the credit for almost every man's success. If he achieves success the whole of it is put on to the success of the

university. For instance, we have this regarding the life of Lord Kelvin—

> But Cambridge had a claim of her own upon Lord Kelvin. She possessed him during those incomparable years through which a man of genius passes as through a golden gate into the region open only to a few—the region of great achievement.

As a matter of fact universities could not possibly have stopped Lord Kelvin's scientific and inquiring mind, and therefore he got through in spite of them. There are hundreds of thousands of paragraphs of this description claiming credit for the universities. This reminds me of that couplet of Goldsmith's—

> As puffing quacks some caitiff wretch procure
> To swear the pill or draught has wrought a cure.

Speaking of Goldsmith reminds me that that gentleman himself also constituted another very prominent and able exhibition of the absolute failure of university teaching. The universities of England and of the Continent were fond of having a tilt at Goldsmith's turning out a very indifferent physician. As a matter of fact they had overlooked entirely, indeed they never knew and never would have known, that in Dr. Goldsmith Nature had provided the world with a poet, a writer, and an historian, while the pettiness of the university tried to make of him a doctor. After all we have to consider this question seriously. In theory there is no possible doubt the trained intellect is better than the untrained intellect. To judge it by the physical, the physically trained man altogether outclasses the untrained man. And it should be so. The trained intellect will surpass the untrained intellect, and, therefore, we must look to the faults in the university system of teaching and not in the teaching itself, not in the quality of the teaching. I say the training of the intellect is absolutely the best possible thing we can engage in. But we must train it in the right way. The absolute failure of the universities in the past has been owing to the fact that they have not taught in the right way. Therefore I caution Western Australia and this Parliament against following a system which has proved a failure. We are continually told, it is reiterated until almost everybody believes it, that the universities are doing great work, that the great public schools of England produce the greatest men in the world. Patterson has caricatured this fairly well in his *Overlander*, when he says—

> The new chum rode to the homestead straight,
> And he told them a story grand,
> Of the desperate fight he fought that day
> With the king of the over land.
> The tale was sent home to the public schools
> Of the pluck of the English swell,
> How the drover fought for his very life,
> But blood in the end must tell.

Where on this earth did it tell? I want those supporting this university question to tell us where blood, as represented in university education, has told. All the disasters that have befallen the British arms, all the British soldiers that have fallen, or almost all of them, have fallen when led by university men. Where else has it told? Has it ever told in any physical performance where there can be a contest? Does it tell on the cricket ground; in the football field; in the swimming bath, or the rowing boat? Cannot the ordinary, uneducated man beat them at anything from 50 yards to 26 miles? Can they ride a bicycle? Can they get in a pugilistic ring?

Mr. Seaddan: Yes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Then they will soon get knocked out if they do. "Blood in the end must tell." Can they ride a horse? As a matter of fact in every performance in this world which requires a contest, where there are only two in it the university man is second; if there are 20 in it the university man is twentieth. I want the Premier to demonstrate to me where this blood has told. The only thing it ever told was a very considerable exaggeration of its own value. Now in regard to mental, intellectual avocations; we will also inquire into these, and we will see if the university teaching has told

here. I will take the report of the Commission on this. It reads as follows:—

> Men of science, our leaders of industry, and the chiefs of our political parties all agree that our present want of higher education—in other words, properly equipped universities—is heavily handicapping us in the present race for commercial supremacy, because it provides a relatively inferior brain power, which is leading to a relatively reduced national income.

That is printed here as being from Sir Norman Lockyer. Further on we have it again stated—

> No one can fail to recognise the world's leaders of the future will come from those who stand highest in their command of the subjects in which the modern university has been established to give advanced instruction.

Now I do not know what is the opinion of the leader of this particular party, but I want to say to him that if he is of opinion that a university man could lead this party better than he can, it is up to him to resign and get work.

Mr. Scaddan: You are too candid; what about the Premier?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: And if the Premier believes, as he says he does—but I know he made the statement unthinkingly—if he thought for one moment there were better men than he to fill the position, if he thought a university man would make a better Premier than he, he would resign—if he thought a university man could run the country better than he can, he would get out.

Mr. Scaddan: Would he?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: A number of men, particularly on this side of the House, have told me it would be the greatest possible impertinence in me to speak against the University Bill. University men, they said, are better than non-university men. If that is so, those who told it to me should resign and let university men take their places. But, as a matter of fact, university men have been steadily pushed out of politics. We will have to get a new axiom to read, "It is easier for a porcupine to go backwards down a canvas hose than for a university man to get into Parliament." As a matter of fact we have two in this Chamber, and a few in another place. The last trench of the university man in politics is a Legislative Council. There are numbers of them in the fossilised Chamber in Victoria, and more in the Tasmanian House of Dodery; otherwise the university man has passed entirely out of politics. And when we are talking about spending a fair sum of money it is up to us to ask ourselves the question whether it is worth while spending it. What are we to do if we find men from the shearing shed, from the mines, from the boot factory, from the warehouse, from the counting house and from the Subiaco soap works—what are we to do if it is found that these men are the people likely to be selected by the populace of Australia for public positions? Then, possibly, it is not worth all this cost of running a University. In regard to commerce also, we are told in these same paragraphs I have read that the university does great work, and that without a university we cannot have proper commerce. One thing I have read in this report was that the great commercial industries of Western Australia were being built, and that when they were actually built up, we would require university men to carry them on. It seems that during the trials and difficulties of the pioneering days the non-university man can do it; he can build up great commercial firms and manufacturing industries, but when he has built them up it will be necessary to have a university man along to tell him how to manage them. Let us consider the great commercial men of the world; take Tyson, the late Mr. Tyson; take Mr. Angus, of South Australia; take the commercial firms; take Kidman & Copley, and the old Dalgety firm, and you will find there is not in the great industrial and commercial firms of Australia a university man amongst them. They all built up from ignorance, just as I got my position. The leader of the Opposition reminds me that the university man is useful as a clerk. If we go further we are reminded in almost every novel we read, in every musical comedy or other trashy rub-

bish we go to see at the theatre—in each of these we are presented with the ignorant, uneducated American millionaire, the Chicago pork packer. Right through the world it has come to be recognised that it is the ignorants, as the pedagogue would term them, who prove successful, and the cultured man who fails to succeed. Take Carnegie, the great American; he is no university man. I am pretty well confident that while the present system is continued we will have this continued failure on the part of the university man. The great fault, in my opinion, the main reason for this failure on the part of the university man, is that from his childhood up there is instilled into him an undue amount of arrogance and snobbery; he is taught from his childhood that he is superior to the man who has to work, to the ordinary individual about him; and when he has gone to the university and learned to do Plato, or some other flapdoodle philosopher, in the original Greek, he considers he has accomplished all that a man has to accomplish, whereas, as a matter of fact, he has not begun. After he has done that he has got to begin where I began, in the school of life. They are taught also in the dead past. The teaching in universities—I speak of English and Australian Universities—is more of the dead past, the live present and the future are neglected. Well might Lawson write—

> You seek for truth in the language dead,
> In the dust 'neath tower and steeple;
> What know you of the tracks we tread,
> What know you of our people?

There is the failing of the university man. He knows nothing of our people, that is what has to be learned. He can learn till he can absolutely hold no more of the dead past, and then he will not know how to cut down an ordinary jarrah tree. If we are going to make the University one that will be of advantage to Western Australia we must also teach our scholars something of the life of the country they are in and something of human nature. We must also teach them to respect their fellow man, whether he be the scavenger or the don who is trying to teach him. Now we come to the question of what is likely to be taught in this particular University. We find in the report—and I presume this report will be correct because the gentlemen who formed this Commission will be appointed to the Senate—and we are somewhat restricted in our selection, for there are not too many men who have these marvellous accomplishments that will enable them to act as senators to the University, therefore I take it most of the gentlemen who were on the Commision will eventually be elected to the Senate, who will control this University. We are told that faculties are to be formed in arts, in science, in law, and, perhaps, in music, and at a later date, medicine and surgery, and in another part of the report it says, "we could not possibly take medicine at the present time because it is too expensive." I just wish to say right here that, in my opinion, if there is one thing that is absolutely necessary for us to teach it is medical science, and I want to say, therefore, that until we can afford to teach medical science we can afford nothing at all. There is no science so important to the people of Western Australia as medical science and, as I said, until we can teach it and until we can afford to teach it we should teach nothing else. We should save our money until we can get the medical science fairly going, and until we teach medical science we cannot afford to teach anything else, because it is of great importance to this country.

Mr. Collier: We can afford to turn out briefless barristers.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Yes; we can afford to turn out briefless barristers, and I shall have something to say about barristers later on, as to the system in force in connection with the teaching of barristers, and I have no doubt the member for Boulder will be able to add to the remarks which I make on this question. We are to have a faculty in classics, and it behoves us to inquire what are classics. After all, the nearest definition I can get

to it is something that was written 200 years ago. The dictionary goes back further, and no doubt the university pedants could go back still further. At any rate, it is sufficient to say that what is considered as a classic is such a great philosopher as Plato, and as there are not many readers of Plato here, notwithstanding that members have a desire to impress their audiences frequently with their learning, I will read a few sentences from Plato to show some of the members what a classic is. Here he is speaking on honesty and justice, and he goes on something like this—

> When then is it, with respect to the joint application of money, that the just man is more useful than others? When it is to be deposited and be safe, Socrates! Do you not mean, when there is no need to use it, but to let it lye? Certainly. When, then, money is useless, justice is then useful with regard to it? It seems so. And when a pruning-hook is to be kept, justice is useful both for a community and for a particular person; but when it is to be used, the art of vine-dressing is useful. It apears so.

That is the style. It is on pages 8 and 9 of Spens' Translation, and that goes on for 21 pages, and at page 30 he eventually arrives triumphantly at a wrong conclusion. It goes on—

> But the intelligent is wise? I say so. And the wise is good? I say so. But the good and the wise will not want to exceed one like himself, but the unlike and contrary? It seems so, said he. But the evil and the ignorant wants to exceed both one like himself and his opposite? It appears so. Why then, Thrasymachus, said I, the unjust desires to exceed both one unlike and one like himself. Do not you say so? I do, said he. But the just man will not desire to exceed one like himself, but one unlike? Yes. The just man, then, said I, resembles the wise and the good, and the unjust resembles the evil and the ignorant. It appears so. But we acknowledge that each of them was such as that which they resembled. We acknowledge so, indeed. The just man, then, hath appeared to us to be good and wise, and the unjust to be ignorant and ill.

That is absolutely inaccurate, and to give the best possible evidence of that I would refer members to Macaulay's Essay on Bacon, where he shows that Bacon was the wisest, and the best educated man known in English history, and at the same time he was the most unjust, most treacherous and most unreliable man who ever held a position in an English Government. We are told that is a classic, and that we are to read and study it. They go so far as to say that the ordinary man cannot read it until he has a thousand-a-year man to tell him how. I am not altogether antagonistic to these people of old, for there seems to have been a humorist in the old days: the man who invented the term platonic love has my fancy, and how applicable it is. Platonic love means there is nothing in it, and how true that is of Plato. Whilst speaking of platonic love I have in my mind the definition given by Chambers in his dictionary. Chambers gives it as, "love into which sexual desire is supposed not to enter at all." When we come to think of it there is a lot of Scotch caution in that. I can imagine Chambers saying, "a man cannot be too careful in these matters." It is said that the reading of this if it does nothing else trains the mind, but it trains the mind in the wrong way. It teaches one to define undefinable things, it trains the mind to use all sorts of verbiage instead of coming exactly to the point and speaking in language that people can understand. The worst possible training any young mind could have would be to read Plato seriously, especially if it is pushed into him by a pedantic don at a university. Again, in the classics we come to the question of dead languages, of Latin and Greek. I see there has been some great commotion at one of the English universities owing to the fact that Greek has been left out of the compulsory subjects, but Latin is still retained, and in this very report I think Professor Naylor, in giving evidence, said to the Commission that he held to the doctrine that even a ploughboy should learn Latin. I want to make a few re-

marks about Latin. It has been generally understood that I do not know much about it, and my experience is that there are 99 per cent. of the members in this Chamber in exactly the same position. As a matter of fact, will the Premier when he replies tell us the use of learning Latin, tell us why we should have Latin forced on our boys at the rate of a thousand a year. If we go through the various literature that comes our way we find that almost all the great writers, as I said, have considered that Latin is necessary. For instance, we read of a man named Japhet, whose principal occupation seemed to be looking for his father, and he spoke to Malchoir and he used a Latin dictionary, and Japhet replied in medical prescriptions. We have a few remarks from Dickens that may not be out of place in an assemblage like this. Dickens was describing a meeting of the ladies' monthly linen distribution society, and they were forced to make somewhat of a sensation, and they applied for a lecturer. It goes on to say—

> The meeting was held; the orator (an Irishman) came. He talked of Green Isles—other shores—vast Atlantic—bosom of the deep—christian charity—blood and extermination—mercy in hearts—arms and hands—altars and homes—household gods. He wiped his eyes, he blew his nose, and he quoted Latin. The effect was tremendous—the Latin was a decided hit. Nobody knew exactly what it was about, but everybody knew it must be affecting, because even the orator was overcome. The popularity of the distribution society among the ladies of our parish is unprecedented; and the child's examination is going fast to decay.

That is just about the use for Latin. There is one other thing I must say before passing over this question, and that is with regard to such men as Goldsmith. There are many of us, readers of Goldsmith, who desire possibly at some future time to visit the old country, and while there to go and see the tombstone of Goldsmith. I would certainly like to go there myself as I am a great appreciator of his writings. What do we find? That every word on Goldsmith's tombstone was written in Latin by pedantic Dr. Johnson. Just think of it for one moment. The language which Goldsmith did so much to enrich, the language which did so much for Goldsmith, was not fit in the opinion of arrogant Dr. Johnson to mark the last resting place of Goldsmith. It is practices such as this which make one feel an unbounded contempt for all university men. Continuing again on this question of Latin, we inquire where this idea of quoting Latin originated. Seemingly we are to imagine that we are superior persons because we can quote Latin. I turn to Green's *Short History of the English People*, page 414, and I find this——

Mr. Horan: Is this comic history?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: No, this is serious history. That is what it is—

> In the middle of the fourteenth century the great movement towards national unity which had begun under the last of the Norman Kings seemed to have reached its end, and the perfect fusion of conquered and conquerors into an English people was marked by the disuse, even amongst the nobler classes, of the French tongue. In spite of the efforts of the grammar schools, and of the strength of fashion, English was winning its way throughout the reign of Edward the Third to its final triumph in that of his grandson. "Children in school," says a writer of the earlier reign, "against the usage and manner of all other nations, be compelled for to leave their own language, and for to construe their lessons and their things in French, and so they have since Normans first came to England. Also gentlemen's children to be taught to speak French from the time that they be rocked in their cradles, and know how to speak and play with a child's toy (and uplandish or country); men will liken themselves to gentlemen, and strive with great busyness to speak French for to be more told of."

Is that not so to-day? It certainly would encourage one's belief in the idea that our

ancestors at one time lived in trees. I will read a little further on—

> "This manner," adds a translator of Richard's time, "was much used before the first murrain (the plague of 1349), and is since somewhat changed: for John Cornwal, a master of grammar, changed the lore in grammar school and construing of French into English; and Richard Pencrych learned this manner of teaching of him, as others did of Pencrych. So that now, the year of our Lord, 1385, and of the second King Richard after the conquest nine, in all the grammar schools of England children leaveth French and construeth and learneth in English." A more formal note of the change is found when English was ordered to be used in courts of law in 1362 "because the French tongue is much unknown"; and in the following year it was employed by the Chancellor in opening Parliament.

Then we have an excellent example of what grammar shools did in connection with this glorious language of ours. I will speak later on with regard to the English language, but I want to say now what is platitude, and that it is that it is absolutely the greatest language the world has known. In Craik's *English Literature and Language*, we find on page 152 the following:—

> What was the history of the vernacular for this first century and a half after the Norman Conquest, throughout which everything native would thus seem to have been in a course of gradual re-emergence from the general foreign inundation that had overwhelmed the country. We have no historical record of statement as to this matter: the question can only be answered, in so far as it can be answered at all, from an examination of such compositions of the time in the vernacular tongue as may have come down to us. The principal literature of this period, it will have ben seen from the above notices, was in the Latin and French languages. In the former were written most works on subjects of theology, philosophy, and history; in the latter most of them intended rather to amuse than to inform, an address not to students and professional readers, but to the idlers of the court and the upper classes, by whom they were seldom actually read, or much expected to be read, but only listened to as they were recited or chanted (for most of them were in verse) by others. How far over society such a knowledge of the imported tongue came to extend as was requisite for the understanding and enjoyment of what was thus writen in it has been a matter of dispute. The Abbe de la Rue conceives that a large proportion, even of the middle classes, and of the town population generally must have been so far Frenchified; but later authorities look upon this as extravagant supposition . . . . . To whatever portion of society in England an acquaintance with this French literature was confined, it is evident that it was for some time after the Conquest the only literature of the day that, without addressing itself exclusively to the learned classes, still demanded some measure of cultivation in its readers or auditors as well as in its authors. It was the only popular literature that was not adapted to the mere populace. We might infer this even from the fact that, if any other ever existed, it has mostly perished.

I wish to impress upon the House with regard to this continual attempt to force Latin down our throats that we have here a language which has lived right through the Latin and the French. All the grammar schools, priests and philosophers have used Latin; but the mere populace, the ignorants of England, gave the world the finest language it has ever had. When we put a sign over this building after it is finished it will be in a language that not ten members of the House will be able to read.

Mr. Horan: And it will not be good Latin either; it will be a disgrace to the country.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I am certain it will not be good English. It is a contemptible practice to belittle our own language. If there was a better language than ours its use might be per-

mitted, but having a language which is admitted to be superior to all, it is contemptible and it is an outward manifestation of snobbery to use Latin, a language which is not nearly so good, not nearly so expressive as our mother tongue. I trust when this university is formed that we shall not waste any money on Latin, I trust it will teach the English language pure and undefiled, and possibly before I have finished I will attempt to teach the framers of this Bill something in the way of English language. It seems to me an absolute waste of money to force our boys and girls to learn a dead language. They are live boys and girls and we want to teach them a live language, our own language. On the other hand, if any of them desire to learn Latin, Greek, Chinese or Arabic, they can learn it. As a matter of fact, it has been proved again and again that a man possessing a thorough understanding of the English language can learn any language without the aid of a tutor; that has been demonstrated. I say it is only those who have the gift for languages who should be taught. That reminds me that a long time ago there was a certain member in this Assembly who desired to introduce a new motto for the West Australians. The West Australian motto I think is "Watchful and wakeful." This member desired to get another one which would be "Deaf and Blind." That member approached a number of his fellow members and asked them all if they knew the Latin for deaf and blind: he also came to me and I said I did not know. Eventually as no one could tell him the Latin for deaf and blind someone suggested that he might find it in the lexicon in the library. It struck me as rather curious that no one should know the Latin for deaf and blind, such simple words which were continually in use. It was strange to me that none of our Latin scholars in Parliament —we had any amount of them, and I might say here that there is only one who admits that he does not understand Latin and that is myself, while the other 49 members are all Latin scholars. As I was saying, it struck me as being peculiar that those members who had been asked by this gentleman to translate the simple words deaf and blind could not do so and he was unable to find anybody in this Chamber to do it for him. He inquired from the great men in another place, one or two of whom are university men. I might say that I have never yet come across a man who has been able to tell me the Latin for deaf and blind; there may perhaps be an exception in the hon. member for Yilgarn.

Mr. Scaddan: You would not know whether it was correct or not if he told you.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Yet all were Latin scholars. I quote this to show how absurd it is to pump a dead language into our live boys. They begin to learn it immediately they enter school and it is useless spending money to teach them something which they are almost bound to immediately forget. Teach them something that will be of use to them and something they will remember, but that which they are going to immediately forget we cannot afford to spend money in teaching. I want to say in concluding this branch of the subject—there are many other branches of it—that I have shown that the old English language was entirely submerged. French swept right over the country; French was the language of the ordinary people, and Latin was the language of the learned. But the ignorance of England was responsible for the finest language in the world. It went on in spite of university pedants, in spite of grammar schools, and in spite of teachers—it went on until it was eventually used as the language of Parliament, and a few years later it was responsible for that most extraordinary burst of splendour in the Shakesperean period. Since then it has gone on increasing the number of people who speak it, and it is increasing now more rapidly than anything on this earth. If there is anything at all that the English have to be proud of, over and above empires and everything else they have accomplished, it is the English language. Yet, we have these pedants of the university trailing along and gibbering in their dead languages, even as Carlyle's apes were gib-

bering on the shores of the Red Sea. Now we come to the question of literature. It is generally admitted that this is a subject that I know nothing at all about, and therefore I propose to make a few remarks upon it. To begin with, I wish to call attention to the idea of certain educated and highly intellectual people, that the ordinary populace, the common or garden log-chopper or bushman, cannot understand the language. For instance, to give a fair idea of what I mean, I have here an account of a meeting held at the invitation of the literary union of the Claremont Training College. The Dean of Perth, who is a very learned person, addressed a number of students and ex-students on Browning and certain of his works, and the report says—

> The procedure adopted was extremely interesting, for the speaker, readily recognising the difficulties which beset the student of verse in taking up the study of Browning for the first time, and being aware that many tasted only to cast aside, departed from the ordinary lecture style and assumed rather the role of the teacher.

Again, just one other instance of this belief on the part of highly educated people. We are told that Spens' translations of Plato is not altogether good because Spens considered only the general reader, who, by a pleasing fiction was supposed to be able to read Plato without note or comment. There is a general impression that the ordinary person cannot read these high and mighty writers, but what we want to teach our pupils in literature is that the first and indispensable principle in writing or speaking is to write or speak so that one may be understood by the masses, and the person who fails to make himself understood by the masses has failed in the main essential and is not worthy of consideration. I trust that after I have shuffled off this mortal coil no man will insult me by coming along to explain me. I do not know that any greater censure could be passed on any man than for some self-appointed pedant to come along and tell the public "you know nothing about Browning; let me explain him to you."

Mr. Horan: Will you have any Latin in your epitaph?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I am too young to worry about my epitaph. As I was just saying, what we have to teach in literature—and I take it that when we teach literature it is our desire to produce writers, for if it is only to teach a man to read he can do that himself. I repeat that when we teach literature it is with the idea of producing writers.

Mr. Jacoby: And teachers.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I have said before that the man who remains teaching is certainly no genius at writing, or he would not remain teaching. The first thing that is necessary is not the study of Browning or Plato, and these others whom it is impossible to understand without a teacher. As a matter of fact it is stated that we have to learn dead languages in order to read many of these classics. A similar statement is made in this report, which says, "But at present not only is advanced instruction in practical subjects unprovided for, but the study of ancient and modern tongues, and their matchless contribution to the learning of the world, is cut short half way." We have never yet been told that we must learn Hebrew in order to read the Bible, and surely if we can read the Bible without understanding Hebrew, we can read Plato without being able to understand Latin. Literature is something born in a man or woman, and it is impossible to be taught. The best that we can say is that Nature sowed the seeds of literary genius, and all that can be done by the teacher is in the way of fertilisation to germinate and promote growth; but literature itself must be in the man, and the first essential of literature is originality. A man cannot possibly be a successful literary man who follows somebody else's style, and ideas, but the very system of a University is to contract the mind in the golden formative years into a particular system admired by that University and used in some past time. The very essence of it is originality and, might I be allowed to digress just a moment to reply to some remarks made in this

Chamber that I myself was not original, and that I had obtained my ideas from the *Bulletin*. Now, before I read the *Bulletin* I read the *Argus* and the *Age*.

Mr. Horan: And the A.B.C.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Yes, I read the A.B.C. about the cats, before that, and it would be peculiar that I should drop on only one paper of the many I have read. If I am likely to get my views from the *Bulletin* why should I not get them from the *Daily News*? As a matter of fact there is this to be said in regard to the *Bulletin*, that many of its writers have led the same life, seen the same scenes, and been through all the things that I have been through. They know the Australian, and I know him, and naturally our expressions will be somewhat similar. It is not wonderful that our ideas should be alike, but so far from the *Bulletin* giving me my ideas I say that I first read the *Argus* and the *Age*, and later read the *South Australian Advertiser* and the *Register*, and I was just as likely to take their ideas as the *Bulletin's*. As a matter of fact it amounts to this, that some writers have written opinions that agree with our own; when they agree with our own opinions we say they are good writers, and when they disagree with our ideas we throw the books aside. I agree to a large extent with Carlyle, but in some instances I disagree with him, which only goes to show that even such a great man as Carlyle could be wrong at times. In regard to the teaching of literature, who is to be the teacher? I presume we would have a teacher such as Doctor McCallum, and if we take one or two sentences from him we will see what sort of literature he is likely to teach. He says, "I certainly think that in the faculty of arts there are two subjects that must always be represented from the very outset here in this country. One of these is classics, and the other English literature." There is an immense amount of useless verbiage in that sentence, and one of the essentials in a good writer or speaker is that he should not use unnecessary words. That sentence could easily have been written this way, "I certainly think that in the faculty of arts there are two subjects that should always be represented in this country, English literature and classics." but old Doctor McCallum has ponderous verbosity of that description; that is the style which he would teach, and it is the worst possible style that anybody can get into. If we take much of the literature produced by University men, we find that this ponderous verbosity goes all through it. Even in the writings of Morley, who is said to have produced some of the finest works in the English language, we find that his writings are merely an assemblage of platitudes in evening dress. In his *Life of Gladstone* in two huge volumes as big as the *Hansard* volumes of this session, we see all through it that the subject is so overloaded with verbiage, that the spirit of the work, the essentials of it, the life of Gladstone, is as hard to follow as the plot in a modern musical comedy. It is all filled up with turns, sandjigs, and dances, which have nothing to do with the case, and an appalling amount of useless verbiage.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I was dealing with the idea of university teachers or professors teaching literature and was pointing out that the result of university teaching on literature was an extraordinarily ponderous and verbose style of literature: and I was speaking on the excessive verbosity of Morley. I would also refer to another writer of some notoriety, if not merit, of a similar kind, that is, Justin McCarthy, who writes four huge volumes on the *History of Our Own Times* and condenses it afterwards into a shilling edition containing all that is in the four volumes. When we come to teach literature, if we attempt to teach it at all, we should have men who have different ideas from any we have known in university men previously. As I have said before we should endeavour to teach the students to express themselves in the fewest possible words. I wish to refer to a few paragraphs in the report of the Royal

Commission, and in particular to an utterance of Doctor Smith. He is a doctor of law; I think he was a government servant in this State. I intend to find fault with his literary style. I recognise it is exceedingly bad taste and unmannerly to find fault with any person's diction, pronunciation or grammar; but at the same time, if a man sets himself up as a teacher, a man like Doctor Smith who hoists himself on a self-made pedestal and looks down with pity and contempt on us, at least on those higher than I am in the educational standard, owing to the fact that they have not had the great advantages of education that he has had, then I have the right to examine his diction and his literary merit. There is one other reason. Ever since I have been in the House I have been charged by the newspapers who are opposed to my party, as being excessively ignorant. It has been laid down that this is the only fault I have. It is the only fault they charge against me as a member of Parliament. There has never been a charge as to my honesty or sincerity; there has never been an attempt to assert I have neglected the interests of my district, or been disloyal to my party, or failed in my pledges to my electorate; there has never been any charge against me except that of ignorance; and for four years they have pelted this fact at the public.

Mr. Scaddan: Fact?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: This alleged fact! But I am quite prepared to admit it is a fact. None of us are all wise; we are all ignorant on some subjects. I am prepared to admit it is a fact, but I am not prepared to admit I am the only one. I just call to memory one paragraph in this regard which said, "Underwood is a man of compound ignorance; he is ignorant of his own ignorance." After all I feel somewhat pleased to have inspired that paragraph, because it is a smart, well-written paragraph; and a smart saying or a smart paragraph in an ordinary newspaper always reminds me, as the Attorney General would say, of an oasis of onions in a desert of tripe. But I was dealing with Doctor Smith, who says in this report that "what we suffer from is that most of those who enter into articles are imperfectly educated to start with, so that they are learning nothing really in the best way; they are like donkeys turned out to grass, they do not come sufficiently equipped with a knowledge of general literature, historical knowledge, etcetera, and therefore, fail to possess the logical faculty. Having had this superior education, of course Doctor Smith has learned everything in the best way, but the ordinary lawyers, such as my friends the members for Dundas, West Perth, and Kalgoorlie, have not learned it; they are not, of course, in the same street with Doctor Smith. Now we will just examine the great literary merit of this very sentence. He says "having learned nothing really in the best way, they are like donkeys turned out to grass." When one uses a simile it should have some similitude to the subject. I would like to ask where is the similitude or where is the application. There is no better place on earth to turn out a donkey than to turn him out to grass. Further, does the worthy doctor hold that a well-fed donkey would have the logical faculty, or that it is only a matter of feeding? I presume the learned doctor would assert that if a donkey is well fed it will possess the logical faculty. I have seen donkeys eat labels, newspapers and such-like. I presume he would mean that if a donkey were fed on leading articles, or some of his own report, he would possess the logical faculty. For a man who professes to be able to teach literature that sentence is a very bad one, and I trust any men we have to teach literature will know better than to give utterance to a sentence of that description. What on earth has literature to do with law? Does the learned doctor mean to assert that the lawyer should be versed in the nefarious practices of Oily Gammon, Dodson and Fogg and Sergeant Buzfuz. As a matter of fact, when one goes to a lawyer he wants the lawyer's knowledge of law, he does not want the lawyer to quote Shakespeare any more than Henry Lawson. If it is a matter of having Banjo Paterson or Henry Lawson quoted, a person could come to me, but if a person wants advice

on a legal opinion I should certainly advise him to go to my friend the member for Dundas.

Mr. Collier: Or the Attorney General.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I certainly cannot recommend anyone to go to the Attorney General for law. I just want to make a few short remarks on that question of law. I hold that next to medical science and the production and teaching of medical men, this country requires lawyers who will be able to supply the people with law at something like a reasonable cost. We find that the system—and it will be followed in our university I expect—is that students must go through a course of arts, and must know all about Japhet in search of his father and the Mad Mullah and the mad Prince of Denmark. All these things have to be learned. They have also to learn Latin and Greek and many other things before they come to law. What we require is a Chair of Law that will teach law, and we want our law books translated into English. English is the language we speak: English is the language our people know, and English is the language our law should be written in. We want all those law books translated, and then a man studying law will be able to study it straight off without any extraneous matter. As a matter of fact, in both medicine and law the system is to learn Latin, merely to catch up a number of phrases which have been held in the various books. I believe I can say without doing anyone injury, for the sole purpose of keeping men out of the profession. A man, any ordinary man at any rate, who starts to read these law books with the Latin in them, has in his mind to translate the Latin. He is all the time, while he is reading the Latin, translating it and finding the equivalent in English. If he were studying in Latin there would be something in it, but he is studying in English and reading in Latin, and he has double the trouble of translating it and putting it into his mind in its English equivalent and not in the Latin. The sooner we knock out Latin in connection with law the better it will be. As a matter of fact, Latin was useful at one time. At the great fall-back of civilisation after the downfall of the Roman Empire all learning went back very considerably, and the only books available to anyone to gain a fair knowledge of the ancient Greeks and Egyptians and others were Latin books, so that it was necessary to have a knowledge of Latin in order to get a knowledge of the past and, to an extent, a guidance for the future. But that has passed centuries ago, and Latin is now only the hocus-pocus of the medical man or lawyer, and is used to impress his client or patient with his great importance or learning. It is of no use for anything else. I trust Doctor Smith will study this point of the case, and that he will give us, when he has a little time to spare from admiring his great abilities, some reason why a man studying law should study anything else but law. And why is it necessary that he should know all this about literature and should also possess a knowledge of Latin and the dead languages? There are two or three matters which I consider of importance in starting a University, in regard to the faculties required. The first absolute essential is the medical science. Until we can afford a chair of medicine, it is of no use establishing a University. After that there are three subjects of equal importance, namely, agriculture, veterinary science, and mining or geology. When I speak of veterinary science I mean that science which pertains to the breeding and improving of stock. This is highly important in a country like Western Australia which will have to depend to a great extent on its pastoral industry. The science of agriculture is absolutely necessary, as is also the science of mining or geology. These are the first we should attempt to teach. These are the absolutely essential things; these are sciences which will tend to the promotion of the welfare of the Stae, and, in our present condition I hold it is only necessary to attend to these sciences which will make for progress and the accumulation of wealth for the State. Later on, we can, of course, have colleges of music, and schools of art, and I would be prepared to vote liberal subsidies to colleges such as these. At the same time in regard to, say, a chair of music I do not know that anything

can be accomplished by having such a chair. It is of no use issuing diplomas in regard to art as represented in music, painting, or drawing. It is waste of ink and good paper to give, say, a singer a diploma from a University; because the only diploma that can possibly be of any use to him is that of popular approval. If he cannot win that, all the written documents he can get are of no use, while, if he can win it, it does not matter very much about the University diploma. Now, I come to the question of the drafting of the Bill. I make the same apology for finding fault with the grammar and general drafting of the measure as I have made to Dr. McCallum and Dr. Smith. Clause 3 provides an example of the most excrutiatingly bad grammer, not to mention something extraordinary in the way of arrogance. Clause 3 reads—

> There shall be from henceforth for ever in the State of Western Australia a University to be called The University of Western Australia.

Now, it seems to me the framers of the Bill do not allow that Providence has the right to move an amendment in regard to time, or the power to obliterate anything those framers might accomplish. But, passing that over, let us have a look at the grammar. Almost the first thing a grammatical student gets in the way of errors to be corrected is to be found in the first line of the clause. "From hence" is put down as an error, and a third standard boy is asked to correct "from hence" as bad grammar, as tautology. Here we have "From henceforth for ever." The sentence would read all right if it said: "There shall be henceforth in this State of Western Australia a University." That is absolutely all that is required for good grammar. When you say "hence," it means "from." You do not want "from." "Hence" is "from"; yet after "hence" we get "from." After all I would send this back to Mr. Andrews. Really it is too bad to have been passed by the cream of our educated men in Western Australia including such men as Mr. Andrews and the President of another place, and Dr. Smith and several others. Again, we find it is provided that women or females shall have the same power, privileges, and rights in all things as men; that is to say, the rights of holding office. Yet when we come to Clause 11 where the personal pronoun is used, it is in the masculine gender every time.

Mr. Collier: Does "he" mean "she" also?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I was going to suggest that we have an amendment to the interpretation clause to the effect that wherever the pronoun of masculinity is used we shall understand also the pronoun of femininity.

The Minister for Mines: That was provided for many years ago.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: The Minister for Mines must know. He always knows. Later we find in Clause 35 some more very bad grammar. It reads as follows:—

> No tax or rate shall be charged or levied upon any property vested in the University; but the benefit of such exemption shall not extend to any other person.

Now, when we mention "other person" we presuppose a person already mentioned, and therefore the university is a person. I would ask that this be sent back for re-drafting, if only for the sake of the purity of that language I love so well. I am in favour of the Bill up to Clause 3—that is after Clause 3 has been rendered in proper English. The rest of the Bill would be a disadvantage to Western Australia. I am in favour of the proposal that there shall henceforth be in this State of Western Australia a university, and I am in favour of this university being controlled directly by the Minister for Education. In going through this report of the commission, I have been criticising somewhat harshly. I myself have been harshly criticised, and I have always laid it down that I am fully as bad as I am made out to be. There is one report here which I highly appreciate, namely, that of Sir Winthrop Hackett. I appreciate the generosity of that hon. gentleman in endowing a chair of agriculture for the University, but I appreciate much more than his gift his keen foresight into what is required in regard to the

University. Speaking of modern universities, he says—

> These universities have been derided as merely glorified technical schools.

A stock phrase with the ordinary pedantic university don. The report goes on—

> Everywhere, however, the service is being more fully appreciated which has been rendered by these bodies in providing the technical student with advanced courses, and in elevating the cultivation of the practical arts of life to the University standard.

Sir Winthrop Hackett goes on in that strain for some time, and at a later stage, speaking of the American universities, he says—

> It is impossible to estimate the scores of millions sterling in lands and hard cash which have been placed at the disposal of the American universities within the last 50 years, and this applies to both private foundations and State institutions. But, of the two, the State institutions are said to be distinctly outclassing the privately endowed. Of the State university Mr. Board tells us: "Its field of investigation covers all of the practical problems of the State, agricultural, industrial, political, social, and moral. It aims to become the instrument of the State in its upbuilding." Nor is money stinted. One of the latest and best examples, the State University of Wisconsin, receives a sum annually nearly equal to one-seventh of the revenues of the State.

That is Sir Winthrop Hackett's opinion after viewing the systems in work. That is what he has found to be correct in regard to State institutions. Now, when we have an authority like this speaking of what he has seen in actual practice, I say we should certainly take some notice of it, and if it is found the State universities in America are outclassing those privately endowed, then we in Western Australia who propose to find practically all the money for the University should have it State owned and State controlled. In regard to finance, we find on going into that phase of the question that the commission consider they will require £13,450 per annum. Of this amount they ask the Government, that is Parliament, to provide £12,000. They expect to get from endowment lands—which have been also provided by the State—£450, and they expect to get from fees £1,000, and from outsiders £100. That is to start with. But there is the fact the House will have to vote practically all the money that will be required to run the University. In addition to the figures given just now the State would be asked to spend something like £50,000 in providing the site and building, and taking the interest on £50,000 it will be found that out of £16,000 the State will be asked to provide £15,000, and the pupils are asked to find £1,000. When we have to provide so much as that we certainly could provide the whole. I think it would be far better to hinge this university on to our present education system and work it hand in hand with our present education system. We would have the scholars, those who had shown some ability, some worthiness of being taught, assisted, while those who had proved in the lower schools that they had not the faculty to learn would not be persevered with and money would not be spent on them. The great drawback of the universities of the world, particularly of England, is that they are practically for the use of a lot of dunderheaded people who have a lot of money, and they practically exclude those without money but who have brains. We want to endeavour to have our universities so as to take those who have brains, and as far as can be found out we should make brains the one condition of admittance to our University. As to the system of proposed management there is no possible doubt that for concentrated conservatism you can get no better system. It is proposed that a Senate shall be appointed. To begin with we shall have what is called a Convocation, and later on that Convocation will elect a Senate. That will consist of graduates of the various universities, men who have probably passed the prime of life and whose ideas are settled, and who all learned before

our time. These are to be followed by the students of the school itself. Now, it must appeal to anyone that a student of a school will, to a very considerable extent, have it imbued in his mind right through his whole thinking system, that the school he went to was the best school, and what was good enough for him is good enough for anybody, and there will be no possible chance of reforming or improving once we pass the Bill and hand the University over to the control of students and pedantic and arrogant university graduates. I am confident it will accomplish no more than has been accomplished by any other university in Australia or anywhere else. Just one thing before I conclude. It is in regard to the most despicable actions of the various universities in Australia—Adelaide, Melbourne, and Sydney—and that is bringing the students out to act as blacklegs and scabs, breaking strikes. The engineering classes in Sydney came out scabbing against the workmen on the tramway. The professor brought his tools out against the workmen in the railway strike in Victoria, and it was only the other day in Adelaide that Professor Naylor's scholars came out to defeat the just demands of the labourers in Rundle-street, Adelaide. These brave students always come—these brave students whom the newspapers tell us have the blood, and that blood in the end will tell, always come out well guarded by a plebian policeman. If an amendment is not put into the Bill, then if any of the university students ever interfere in any labour trouble that I am connected with no policeman will stop me, and I will see if their blood will tell against mine. I trust the University will be formed, and that the Government will take the responsibility of it, the responsibility of running it, and the credit of the work done by it. I trust we shall not hand it over to a body of men who are bound to run it on the most conservative lines, and I trust above all things that in this University we shall endeavour to teach our boys not to reverence the dead past but to look at the live present and the pregnant future.

The Minister for Mines: May I by way of explanation point out what I referred to by an interjection just now. I would draw the attention of the hon. member to an amendment of the Acts Shortening Act passed in 1908, and he will find that words in the masculine gender also include the feminine.

Mr. Underwood: Does that apply to the Electoral Bill, and as to sitting in Parliament: I may also ask does it apply in the Licensing Bill?

Mr. HEITMANN (Cue): It is not very much I have to say on this Bill, and unlike my friend Mr. Underwood, I shall say what I think in connection with the measure in a very few words. In the first place it seems to me the Government, through the Premier, has been very unfair to this House and to members of another Chamber in leaving a Bill of this description until the dying hours of a session for consideration. For years past in Western Australia there has been, sometimes stronger than at other times, an agitation or request from all parts of the State and from every class of the community for an extension of our educational system in the direction of a university, and of all the Bills that have been introduced this session I am inclined to think that this at least is one of the most important, and I think that seeing that it took from eight to ten years before the request of those living spirits of education bore fruit, and seeing that it took, after the Commission was appointed, some two years for the report to be laid on the Table of the House, I am certainly of the opinion that the Government have done wrong in asking members of this Chamber to consider this Bill and pass it into law as I have stated, in the last hours of the session. There is another matter. When I refer to the Commission it draws to my mind the fact that it appears to me—while we are all deeply indebted to the Commission for the work they have taken on themselves and the report placed before us—that much more information might have been placed before the House, and particularly in regard to the various systems of management in connection with universities. It seems to me from the very start of

the report that they have come to the conclusion that we are going along on precisely the old ground that has been trodden upon for hundreds of years past. I would like to have seen more from the pen of Sir Winthrop Hackett, and some more from the universities in various parts of the world as to the extent or otherwise of this system of management. One would have expected, seeing that this Bill is of such importance, and means so much to us in the future, and to our present youth, that we should have had more information and more time for the consideration of the Bill and the information contained within the covers of the report. In introducing the measure last evening the Premier devoted a lot of time to the education of this State, tracing it from its earliest time, and there is no doubt we are all proud of the progress which has been made in this country. Seeing that we labour under difficulties which other closer settled communities do not labour under we can well be proud of our achievements and the progress made by the Education Department.

The Premier: You have had the report for over two months.

Mr. HEITMANN: I quite admit that. The Premier must admit that no matter how long we have had the report it is better for a Bill of this kind to be introduced when members are more fit to discuss it than at the present time.

The Premier: The Bill was attached to the report.

Mr. HEITMANN: I admit that. But discussion will bring out more than the reading of the Bill a hundred times.

The Premier: There is plenty of time to discuss it.

Mr. HEITMANN: I can make the same complaint as one of the newspapers did in commenting upon the disturbances which took place in this House. It is wrong for the House to be in session during the hot summer months, and generally speaking the business is dealt with in a much better manner if we conclude the business prior to Christmas. As the Premier has stated the Bill has been before the House some months.

The Premier: It is four months, I find, since I instructed it to be distributed.

Mr. HEITMANN: I did not think it was that long. I think the Premier will agree that at this stage of the session we are not likely to get proper discussion on any Bill.

The Premier: I hope not.

Mr. HEITMANN: Well, that is how it appeals to me.

Mr. Scaddan: It is to be put through Committee to-night. That is "time for discussion."

Mr. HEITMANN: I was dealing with the progress of education in the State, and with the Premier I am certainly proud of the progress made in education. When we see in the outback country after travelling forty, fifty, or one hundred miles, a settlement of ten or twelve persons with a school provided by the Government of the State, it is a matter we should well be proud of. We should take into consideration the fact that not only have we provided educational facilities for those in the large centres, but we have tried to bring out of their ignorance those who happen to be in the least thickly populated districts of the State. It is pleasing to me to note the great change that has come over the Premier during the last few years. I remember the time when the Premier stood up in this Chamber, and instead of trying to give further facilities to the people of the State and say that he desired free education from the primary schools to the university, we heard that gentleman, I regret to say, propose that we should deprive some of the poorer classes of the community of the opportunity of getting a decent education.

The Premier: That is not correct: the hon. member knows it.

Mr. HEITMANN: I will put it this way. He said we did not make it compulsory, or we did not turn away from our schools those who were unable to pay. True, he did something worse: he said at that time that fees would be asked from those able to pay. He said there were many in this State able to pay for the education of their children, who were receiving these benefits for nothing, and he added, "I desire that these

people should pay." The Minister looked upon education primarily from a commercial standpoint. I am with him as far as education being of great commercial value is concerned, but to-day we have the Premier, I am pleased to say, giving to the public of this country a statement that he wants this State, at the earliest possible moment, to establish a university, so as to give to the people those facilities which are given in other parts of the world, including all the States of Australia. While I admit we should be proud in Western Australia of our educational system, I may be allowed to say that, in my opinion, we are not getting a full return for the huge expenditure which is involved. The expenditure of the Education Department last year was £183,000, and this year we are increasing it by some £17,000. I feel sure, while I would give all credit to Mr. Andrews for what he has done, I am inclined to think that this gentleman has handed over too much of the work to those under him, and, in consequence, he has not at the present time a full grip of the situation. I have travelled a good deal in this State, and I have made it my business after hearing complaints from educational officers, to inquire not only from one but from scores, and I find that there is the greatest discontent imaginable existing. If there is one thing that we do not want, and particularly in the Education Department, it is a discontented staff. If we are to get the best from our teachers, if we expect them to do the best by our children, we should treat them fairly and see that they are contented and comfortably provided for. I have it on good authority that there is dissatisfaction in the department, that there is cliquism and favouritism in appointments, which are made irrespective of the claims of the applicants, and I am sorry to have to say even religion at times has entered into this department and interfered with the general work of promotion, etc., of the various officers. This, in my opinion, is the last thing that should be introduced, and I mention it because I think that the Minister and the official head of this department should see that justice is done to the teachers irrespective of their creed, and that no favouritism should be shown, but that promotion should be given according to merit.

Mr. Angwin: That might be mere fancy.

Mr. HEITMANN: I am inclined to think not. I have made deep inquiries into the matter, not from one, but from many, and I find that what I have stated is undoubtedly true, namely, that there is deep dissatisfaction, and that the staff are dissatisfied with the treatment they receive with their examinations, with their promotions, and with the favouritism that is shown to certain officers of the department.

The Attorney General: Will you give a definite instance?

Mr. HEITMANN: I will give a definite instance, although I admit on a Bill of this description I am hardly justified in giving details. I will mention the appointment of what is known as an advisory teacher. If the Minister can justify that I will be only too pleased to apologise to the head of the department and withdraw everything I have stated.

The Attorney General: I have already justified it.

Mr. HEITMANN: I can quite understand the dissatisfaction which exists among the teachers. Here we have an appointment made in the first place of an assistant inspector. In the last education report——

The Premier: The university will not come under the control of the Education Department.

The Attorney General: You are making a belated speech on the Estimates.

Mr. HEITMANN: I was not here when the Estimates were being discussed.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must ask the hon. member to confine his remarks to the Bill.

Mr. HEITMANN: I did not intend to go into details, but I must say that in the speech of the Premier we find that out of two and a half columns, one and a half columns are devoted towards the educational system of to-day.

The Premier: But not the Education Department.

Mr. HEITMANN: It is not possible to separate the two. However, I do not wish to go into these details, but whatever I have said I will substantiate, or I will stand the consequences, and if I find that I am wrong I shall be only too ready to withdraw. I would say to the Minister that he wants to take particular care, for at the present time in the department there are more than a dozen good officers, not those at the bottom rung of the ladder, but those who have obtained the "A" certificate, who are now seeking employment outside the department owing to the treatment they have received. It would be wise, indeed, for the gentleman in charge of the department to look into this question before it is too late. With reference to the Bill, I think I am only one of, I suppose, 99 per cent. of the people in the State who welcomes anything which will give a greater standard of education to our people, and it must be pleasing to those scholars in the community, and those who have had the advantage of a good education, and those people among us who have not had that advantage, but who know not what a good education means, to find them willing and ready to welcome the introduction of the highest standard of education possible into the State. It is, indeed, pleasing to find in all communities, and among all sections, the unanimous opinion that we in Western Australia, with all our rich resources and industries are not found wanting when it comes to a question of education. Speaking for myself, as a member of this Chamber, I would not begrudge at any time, not only £13,000, nor even the £50,000 which will be required as the initial cost for buildings, but even if it cost £200,000, or half a million, if we bring about a state of affairs which will enable us to put to the best use the brains and energies of our people, I shall be prepared to vote for it, and I think it will be money well spent indeed. As I stated, I would like to have seen more opinions expressed by the Royal Commission as to the various methods of management. I am inclined to think, although I am one who has never seen the inside of a university, or been in close touch with a university man for any length of time, or associated with a university, that in this democratic country we should endeavour to get out of the old system of management which has been in force in the old country, and in some of the American States, that is transferring the responsibility of the management of the institution to a more or less irresponsible board. It has to be remembered that the university will be paid for out of the common coffers of the people, and I am inclined to think that if we were to ask the people of this country to hand over the management of our general education, the administration of the Education Department wholly and solely to a board, they would at once say, "This is essentially a State affair, and it should be managed by the State itself." I admit at once that the Minister himself, if he were to manage this university, it would be necessary for him to have a board of some description, or at all events he would have to get a very good man as president, and I still think that under the direct control of the Minister we would have better results, and the university would be in closer touch with the people generally. As I stated, the results would be much better. I would like the Minister, in replying, to go somewhat into the question which he neglected to touch upon last evening. I notice that in the report of the Royal Commission, mention has been made of the initial cost. The matter has been dealt with by the member for Pilbara, but I certainly expected the Premier to give some good idea of his policy in connection with the

buildings and the initial expenditure with regard to the institution. As far as I could learn he remained silent upon it, and, as a matter of fact, he has remained silent upon a good many matters of more or less importance on this question. He has taken the report of the Commission, and also the draft Bill from the Commission, and it seems to me he has said, "This is my policy." At the same time I think it would be unwise to leave everything to the management of the university, which will be chiefly the Senate. When introducing the Bill the Minister should have given some information as to how he is going to finance it, and when he intends to build, and where. I admit at once that it will be a somewhat difficult matter for the Premier to say at the present moment where it is proposed to build the university, and I admit that the Commission are more competent to judge as to the claims of the various sites which have been mentioned. As I stated, as far as I am personally concerned, the Minister need not be afraid of asking this House for £50,000 or £100,000.

Mr. Angwin: We are only a small population.

Mr. HEITMANN: It is true, but if we look at the taxes we pay, I venture to say that although only a small population the people in Western Australia are in a much better condition than the people in any other part of Australia. That is my opinion. I think it would pay; indeed it is a matter of getting value for your money in this case. In a few years it would save a lot of the energy being wasted at the present time, and it will save a lot of these youths from following certain callings when they are adapted for something better, and I feel sure that the people themselves, who, after all, are those who will have to pay, will be prepared to be most liberal in connection with this matter, whether it be in connection with primary schools or the University. I understand from the Minister that it will be necessary for the present to get temporary buildings, and I would like to say that great care should be taken, by those in charge, in this matter of temporary buildings. As I pointed out in a letter to the Press recently, I think it is possible that with a little more organisation in the department, and a little closer study by the Minister and the official head of the department, the present building which is going to be utilised as a secondary school could be used for the next year or two for the purpose of a university. There is no doubt in my mind that the building is very suitable, and it possesses a fair area of ground, although I suppose for some time to come the matter of grounds will not be taken into serious consideration. Without causing any great inconvenience to the Education Department, this building could be used for the next year or two, and in some respects it would be a benefit to our present educational system. With regard to the subjects that are to be taught in our university, I must say that I agree to a great extent with the opinion expressed in the report of Sir Winthrop Hackett. Instead of going into many of those things which will not in the immediate future be of great value to the State, we should teach those things which come closely in touch with the various industries of our country. So far as permanent buildings are concerned, every precaution should be taken by the Minister, or the commission, or whoever has to decide the question of site, and instead of entertaining for one moment the idea of utilising the building which houses Parliament at the present time, or even Government House, we should look not to the present, and not to the next 20 years, but rather 100 years or more ahead, and the smallest area that this institution should be placed upon is 100 acres. That would be little enough, and I am sure that in and around Perth this 100 acres can be found. In conclusion, I would once more recommend to the Minister in charge that instead of handing over the new building on the hill in Thomas-street to the purpose of the secondary school, we should utilise it for the next year or two for the university. If we have temporary buildings we shall have to make provision for a laboratory, and that with the necessary instruments will cost a fair amount of money. We

have in Perth a laboratory well fitted up, and one that could be well used for the secondary school, which I believe should be in a central opsition in Perth. I ask the Minister for Education to bear in mind the statement I have made and endeavour to look into it, namely, that there is a vast amount of dissatisfaction in our Education Department at the present time, and that dissatisfaction is not good for the people of this State, for the teachers, or for the scholars.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. J. L. Nanson): I should not have intervened in this debate, because I think it is more important at this stage of the session to pass the Bill rather than to talk about it—I should not have intervened, I say, but for the fact that the hon. member for Cue has made a suggestion that the new Modern School, which is to be opened at the beginning of next month, should be diverted from its original purpose and used for the purposes of a university. As I understand the hon. member his suggestion is that the Modern School should be housed at James-street, and the building erected for a Modern School should go to the university. I may point out that some years ago when the building of a Modern School was under consideration by my predecessor, the present Premier, the question of having a school in James-street was very carefully gone into, and after the proposal had been considered by the present Premier, the then Minister for Works (the late Mr. Price) and the Inspector General of Schools, it was decided not to put a school in James-street for reasons, which, the more I look into the matter the more abundantly convinced I am were thoroughly sound. In the first place, a secondary school at James-street would have involved the purchase of more land at an estimated cost of something like £10,000, because it would have been absolutely necessary to put up a new building for the primary school which it was proposed to dispossess. This idea of utilising the James-street school as a secondary school is apparently based very largely on the idea that the secondary school could be run with as large classes as a primary school, for we find the hon. member for Cue, not in this Chamber, but in a communication he addressed to the Press a few days ago, suggesting that with the normal school, which is in the James-street grounds, it would be possible to accommodate in a secondary school on that site some 600 pupils. But sight is altogether lost of the fact that the classes in a secondary school, by reason of the nature of the instruction given, must be very much smaller in number than the classes in a primary school, and at the very utmost, allowing for all possible rearrangement of the existing premises at James-street, it would be impossible to make those buildings accommodate for secondary school purposes more than 300 pupils. Another difficulty, a difficulty very severely felt in regard to the existing primary school building, is that the ground space is altogether inadequate. An important feature to my mind in the Modern School is that, as in all schools of that class, some provision should be made for games. The motto of "a sound mind in a sound body" is one that there has never been less disposition to disregard than today, and one of the advantages of the site on which the modern school stands is that it is sufficiently large to allow of a sports ground and appurtenances such as gymnasia. Then, if we are to bring the Modern School down to James-street as is suggested, it would be necessary to build new rooms for the manual training and household management classes, and we should also require new rooms for the primary school; but we are faced with the difficulty that owing to the restricted area at James-street there is no room for further buildings at that site. We have to remember that this is a rapidly expanding country, and there is no reason to suppose that in Perth we shall have anything other than a great increase in regard to the attendance at our schools in a very few years. At the new Modern School, which has not

yet been opened, we have already secured more applications for admission than we can hope to accept.

Mr. Heitmann: How many?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: We have received something over 300 applications, I believe, and there can be no doubt that almost immediately a demand will spring up, if it has not already arisen, for the extension of that school. If the school is the success that I confidently anticipate it will be under its present headmaster, I believe that it will continue to appeal to the public as it is already appealing from its very inception, and we must look to a future when this school will demand increased accommodation, and to a future, moreover, when we shall have not only to supply one secondary school in Perth, but shall have to do, as is being done in New South Wales, supply these schools in other large centres of population. While I yield to no one in hearty support of this university project, I hope I shall always be prepared to oppose those who suggest that the university should be paid for, even indirectly, by sacrificing our existing educational system.

Mr. Heitmann: Nobody asks that.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I am perfectly convinced that those gentlemen who are in the main responsible for the position to which this movement for the establishment of a university has arrived, would be the last to associate themselves with any effort that would diminish the utility of our primary or secondary education. On the contrary, they regard the university, and rightly regard it, as forming the crown of our educational system, and it is *for that* reason very largely that the university movement receives the enthusiasm and cordial support of the Government, because we feel that without a university our educational system, admirable as it is in many respects, is not yet complete. We are ambitious, certainly the Government are ambitious, and I believe Parliament and the people are ambitious, to have an educational system in Western Australia, that, beginning with the primary school and going on through the secondary, technical, and continuation schools right up to the university, will be a model for a community of the size and population of ours. As regards the expense, it is well to bear in mind that although the cost of education is necessarily high in this State, and although it must grow quickly with the rapid expansion of the country, yet when we compare what we are doing so far as the money expended is concerned, with what other countries are doing, we must admit that we have some leeway to make up, looking at the matter from a financial aspect. I find that the cost of education at the present time in our State, that is national education, State education, is something like 13s. 9½d. per head. Two years ago in New South Wales they were spending 14s. 6d. per head, and I am sure that the amount has not diminished since. On the contrary, I shall not be surprised to learn that it has increased to a considerable extent. With the additions proposed to be made in New South Wales to teachers' salaries there must, of course, be some further increase. I find that New Zealand spends as much as 19s. 9d. per head. Switzerland cannot be regarded as a country nearly as rich as Australia per head of population, but I find that, taking only one of her cantons, Zurich, it spent 18s. 9d. per head, notwithstanding the fact that the purchasing power of money for teachers and all educational appliances in Switzerland is necessarily very much higher than it is in Australia. To give an example of the difference, I may mention that the average salary of the teachers in Switzerland in the canton schools is something like £45 per head, as against an average salary in our State of £141; and if we were to take the cost of erecting school buildings we would most certainly find the cost higher in this State than in an old established country like Switzerland. Notwithstanding that fact, in a relatively poor community the people are willing to spend up to nearly £1 per head of the population as against an expenditure in our own State of 13s. 9½d. per head. Therefore, although I should

be the last to urge in any way that we are not dealing liberally with education, considering the many other claims upon the national purse, yet it would be wrong to suppose that we need be afraid in regard to this university movement that it is going to place upon the taxpayer an undue burden. For my own part, I think it will be one of the best investments this country ever made; and the value of the investment will be considerably increased if we bear in mind that there must be no slackening of our efforts in regard to primary or secondary education. We are all familiar with the story of the man who, finding his blanket too short for him, cut a bit off the end and sewed it on to the top, and was somewhat astonished to find that method of dealing with the blanket resulted in no increase of warmth or covering for himself. Those who suggest that the university should be provided for to some extent by the use of some of the educational buildings over which I, as Minister for Education, have control, are really urging a course very similar to that of the man who, I say, cut off one end of his blanket and sewed it on to the other and then expected to get good results. In regard to the Normal School, the point has been made that it might be utilised in adding to the James-street school buildings in the event of the whole being used as a secondary school, but I might point out that the Normal School building is not a very large building. It consists of only two class rooms and one laboratory or science room. It is intended, on the establishment of the Modern School, to take the students away from the Normal School and place them in the Modern School; and the laboratory of the Normal School will be used as a science room for the existing James-street school, while one of the class rooms will be used as a special model school for country teachers. At present we have a model country school at Gosnells, but it is found inconvenient to bring teachers from the country to that place, and it is much more convenient to have the school in Perth. Therefore we propose to use one of the Normal School class rooms at James-street for that purpose, and I have no doubt that the remaining class room will be found convenient for the present James-street school. Indeed, I am informed by the Inspector General of Schools that at the present time the James-street school is altogether full. I may say in conclusion that one result I look for from the establishment of this university is the appointment in Western Australia of a Council of Education, composed of educational experts representing, not only the university and the State educational establishment, but also the private educational establishments. It will be able to advise the Minister for Education, the Government and Parliament in regard to educational matters. I hope on that council we shall have representatives of the Government, of the non-State schools, of the Education Department administrative staff, of the technical schools, and of the teaching staff of the department. I note in Victoria something of the same kind, after having been urged for some years by Mr. Tate, has been adopted; and by yesterday's mail I received a copy of a Bill that has just been introduced in Victoria providing for such a council. That council in Victoria is to consist of the Director of Education, Mr. Tate, as president, with three other members of his department, four representatives from outside schools, three representatives from the university, three representatives of technical education, one of education in music, and five representatives of industrial interests, two at least of whom will represent agriculture.

Mr. Scaddan: That council will only act in an advisory capacity?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Of course. We cannot hand over the absolute control; we must maintain in the Government and Parliament the responsibility for the State educational system; but even in an advisory capacity a council of this kind will be of great assistance, not only to the Minister for Education and the Government, but to Parliament and the community generally

in keeping fully abreast with modern ideas in regard to education. Apart from the value of a university in the facilities it will give to individual students to perfect themselves in the various arts and sciences in life, there is also the great value an institution of this kind will possess in quickening the enthusiasm of the community as a whole for education, in setting a high educational standard and in causing Western Australia to be regarded as being fully abreast of the educational movement which is one of the brightest ornaments of the country in which we live.

Mr. McDOWALL (Coolgardie): I rise to support the establishment of a university in this State. I think the member for Pilbara in a very critical speech has by his satire very forcibly brought home to us one or two facts that could not have been illustrated in any other manner. I allude in this matter to the importance which is given to dead languages in connection with university training. I think we must realise that, so far as this State is concerned, we need something more modern in every possible way. I do not say that the teaching of dead languages can be done away with altogether, but I maintain that too much importance is invariably given to subjects of the kind. We should establish something more on the lines of the modern university reported upon by Sir Winthrop Hackett in his report. He says inter alia—

> The noteworthy points are the degree in which the teaching enters into the everyday needs of the working life of the community, and the provision made for instruction and research in those material arts which go to make a country progressive, existence easier, toil more honourable and better rewarded. It is not easy to assess at its full value the courage which, for instance, led Manchester early to embrace in her university curriculum subjects whose admission must have excited honest laughter in the soul of the typical graduate of the day. Such studies were for him outside the university pale, through following the example of Manchester, or of the great university of the Midlands, in appointing professors and lecturers in such commonplace subjects as commerce, education, social science, public health, technology, dental surgery—a name of offence to the old medical school—and offering special instruction in such arts as bleaching, dyeing, paper-making, brewing, textile manufacture, and the like.

Now, it seems to me that this should be the key note of education in a country such as Western Australia. The member for Pilbara was at great pains to show that it was not always the man of university education that possessed the greatest brains, and I quite agree with him to a great extent in a statement of that kind, but still we cannot overlook the fact that education is necessary, and that the more education we possess the better we are able to fight the battles of life. In fact if we were to carry that argument to its logical conclusion it might be pointed out that, although in early times many men with no education performed great and heroic deeds, it does not prove that they would not have performed those deeds equally as well if not better if they had possessed some education. So I am not going to agree with the hon. member and say universities are not essential so far as a higher education is concerned. There can be no doubt we have a splendid system of education in this State, and it is pleasing indeed to hear the Premier mention its progress and what he intends to do. It is also very satisfactory to know that we are taking our children from the earliest possible period and now practically provide them with secondary schools and from these to the university. Before I proceed any further I certainly desire to impress upon the House that I hope there will be no curtailment of the expenditure on primary education; for after all is said and done, primary education is the important thing in any country. If a youth has brains and has learned the rudiments of the

English language and how to read and write and so on, he is certainly competent to advance to the highest possible positions. In these circumstances while considering a university, I sincerely trust there will be no neglect of primary education. It is pleasing to know we have splendid technical schools in this country that have done immense good during the past few years. I think they are a credit to our State, and that they have been the means of turning out splendid mechanics and useful citizens. I did not intend to speak on this measure at all, but I feel it is of such vast importance that it is advisable every hon member should express his sentiments in regard to it. With the member for Cue I regret this measure was not introduced at an ealier stage in the session in order that we might have had an opportunity of grasping its main features. I know the Premier will say there is ample time in which to discuss it, but I maintain there is not. We know the session must terminate very quickly, and that the moment the second reading of the Bill is passed we will go into Committee, after which we shall have no opportunity whatever of grasping the salient features of the measure. And, after all, to us the salient features are in connection with the management of the University. It has been suggested we should have it absolutely under State control. I somewhat favour that if it is possible to make it a State University, I would even go so far as to say that as we are providing so much money we should make it a free University. But we have no time to enter into discussions of the details of this measure, at this stage, and therefore we might commit a vital error. I am told the management is really the most liberal in the Commonwealth, that indeed it is the most liberal in the world, but I have had no opportunity of looking into the matter for myself. Anyhow, we know the Senate is to consist of 18 members, and that one-third of these are to be appointed by Parliament; that any statutes confirmed by Convocation and the Senate can be annulled by Parliament if Parliament deems fit. Consequently there is no doubt we have a controlling influence in connection with the University. And now, rather than cavil over this question, it is my intention to support the Bill and endeavour to place it on the statute-book. Of course if, in Committee, it can be shown that alterations should be made, and those alterations commend themselves to me, I shall be pleased to support them, but at this stage I have risen merely to give my opinions as briefly as possible in connection with this matter, and to say it is my intention to support the establishment of the University.

[*The Deputy Speaker took the Chair.*]

Mr. SCADDAN (Ivanhoe): My main object in addressing myself to this question to-night is to express regret that it should be necessary to pass the Bill through all its stages at this sitting in order to supply work for another place. More particularly do I regret that fact because the member for Brown Hill, who through circumstances over which he has no control is compelled to be absent this week from his Parliamentary duties, is thus unable to contribute what I think would have been a valuable address in connection with this measure. That hon. member is one of the members of the commission which inquired into and reported on this matter, and with the other members he was instrumental in presenting the Bill we have under consideration. I anticipated that hon. member would have an opportunity of expressing his views on this question, and while I believe he would have agreed with the measure practically *in toto*, yet there are one or two points on which he differs from other members of the commission—not vitally, not to the extent of preventing or even interrupting the passage of the Bill; but he would have been able to enlighten hon. members on some points in respect to which we are not fully informed. Hon. members must recognise that although the Bill was introduced something like four months ago, we have had no opportunity of giving it that consideration which its

importance warrants; not because the time has not been sufficient, but because we have had the other measures which have kept us very busy. We have been sitting four days a week giving consideration to matters of great importance. I am sure there is no member in the House, although some have criticised the details of the measure to some extent, who does not recognise the time has arrived when we should establish a university in West Australia. And while we may differ to some extent in regard to the question of control, yet rather than set back this movement for the establishment of a university there is no member who would not waive any minor objection he may have to the passage of the Bill. Of course we recognise that once the Bill is placed on the statute-book there will be great difficulty in making any amendments in regard to the control of the university; but, be that as it may, we must recognise that the control as provided in the Bill is certainly more liberal than that of any other university we know of in the English speaking world. While that is so, and while there will be very little danger regarding the control of this institution for a number of years, yet in the course of time—owing to the number of graduates who will have passed through the University becoming permanent members of convocation and thus practically controlling the institution—there is a possibility of that institution taking a conservative view of things. Because those who have passed through the University will endeavour to maintain the methods of the institution as nearly as possible in keeping with the conditions that prevailed when they were passing through, and thus bring about a conservative regime not fully tending to the benefit of the people. Dealing with the advantages of such an institution I desire to say I am afraid we are going to make the same mistake as has been made in other parts of the world in connection with universities. Immediately a person enters a university he is generally regarded as having removed himself from the rest of the world; he must be isolated from the people, he must have his own sports grounds, he must be kept aloof from the common herd. The Premier may smile, but it is a fact. I have heard it repeated over and over again by those who are authorities on the question, those who have had something to do with the bringing about of the near approach of the establishment of this particular institution. The buildings must be so situated that the students can feel that everything within the four corners of the grounds is theirs; they must be able to have their sports to themselves, they must not come into free contact with the people. And here, I think, is the great danger of this University. If education is going to have any benefit from the State point of view the people who pass through the University must keep in close contact with the rest of the people; they must feel with the rest of the people the hardships those people are going through, and that the advantages they are deriving from this institution are provided in order that those students may be the better fitted to give their assistance to the development of the State. But if they are going to be kept aloof from the rest of the people they will get into but a loose touch with the aspirations of the people. Thus we find the difficulty referred to by the member for Pilbara is brought about by that very fact. The students in the universities of the Eastern States lose touch with their comrades outside, and when an industrial dispute arises those students, not being in close touch with the industrial affairs of the State, do not recognise the seriousness of the step they take when they come out and assist one side or the other in such dispute. We deck them up in special garments that they may be recognised as something superior to the ordinary people. I claim that if the taxpayers' money is to be utilised for the purpose of educating those students—because there is not a single individual in any university who pays full value for the education he receives—the student is only a unit in the community and should not be regarded as in any way better than his fellow man. That brings me to the question of fees in connection with the institution. The opinion is held by a number of people that the students should be admitted without any fee. I do not know after all that this is the better principle;

because it must be recognised that if we are going to have free admission to the university we must have also free secondary schools. And I want to ask the Government and those people who claim that admission to the University should be free, are we in a position to provide secondary schools in all parts of the State in order to permit children to pass from the primary to the secondary school, and so on to the University, without any charge whatever? I am doubtful if we can bear such a cost. And it must be remembered that a student could not enter the University until he had advanced considerably in his teens. That being the case the poor man, the man struggling in our primary industries, the man who is to-day developing our agricultural industry, or he who is to-day developing our mining industry, could not possibly afford to keep his child at school sufficiently long to enable that child to pass from the primary to the secondary school and eventually to the University, even although no fees were demanded, for long before that time the child would be required to assist the bread winner. So, after all, it is only likely to be open to those who can pay the small fees demanded, and I do not think it will be any great hardship upon these people, for the fee will be so small that it cannot be claimed that those paying it are recompensing the State for the education received through an institution of this kind. There is a lot to be said for and against the charging of fees, and personally I am not convinced that it would be wise to ask the taxpayer, who on many occasions has to take his child from school just when the child is making some headway in the primary divisions, and when that child is, perhaps, only 14 years of age, to assist him in providing bread for the rest of the children, and possibly for the parents as well. That being the case, the University, notwithstanding free entry, will not be open to the same extent to the poor person as to the man of some wealth. Someone has said the University is, after all, only a glorified technical school. I do not know that that is any great objection. I am doubtful if there is any class of education of so much value, from the State point of view, as that furnished in the technical schools already in existence in West Australia. If the University is a glorified technical school it is evident that those people who pass through the University should lend some valuable assistance to the development of our industries. The person who passes through the University and merely becomes an M.A. very frequently turns his attention in such direction that he is of little value to the State; but the person who has passed successfully through a technical school, as it exists to-day, is of some benefit to the State as well as to himself, because he turns his attention to the development of the industries which mean so much to the well-being of the State as a whole. If the University is not going to be of lasting benefit to the whole of the community we are not warranted in passing an Act of this kind, which will mean a continual payment of at least £13,500 per annum for upkeep. If it is merely making persons who attach doctor to their name, or M.B. or M.A., and then leave the State to turn their attention to some calling in some other part of the world, then the people of this State are not receiving the benefit from that institution that they should do. The man who can really speak nice English or write a nice hand is not the individual who is going to do the most for this State. I have known many a man who knows very little about the English language, that is from the standpoint of speaking nicely, yet who has been of great advantage to the State. To-day I am doubtful if we will find many professors outback clearing our land and doing much towards the permanent welfare of the State. They turn their attention in another direction which may be necessary, in a large measure. We want men to come out of the University, men of science, who will be of the greatest benefit to us, men who can turn their attention in other directions and probably become inventors, and thus be of lasting benefit to this country. But our policy apparently is to let other States have the benefit of our educational system. Even in the civil service, for in-

stance, we are losing the best of our officers; they are leaving us year by year to join services in other States. Only two days ago I saw an advertisement in a newspaper calling for applications for a sewerage engineer for the town of Geelong in Victoria, and offering a salary of £1,000 per annum. Here I suppose a person who would be termed a sewerage expert would be paid something between £400 or £450 per annum for the purpose of attending to sewerage matters throughout the State, and yet for a town like Geelong they are prepared to pay £1,000 to a man who is properly qualified. Men who become qualified in our University may pass into other States and we shall not get the benefit which we are entitled to from our University. While we may disagree in some of the details of the measure the Premier may recognise that there is not a single man in this Chamber, at any rate there is not a single member on this side, who is opposed to the establishment of a University in Western Australia. We recognise the need of it, for our educational system is not complete until such an institution is established, and we shall render every assistance we can to the Government in providing the University in order that its doors may be opened at the earliest possible opportunity. I believe there are scores ready and anxious to enter such an institution, but unless we make better provision for secondary education in other parts of the State as well as in Perth we are not going to make this institution of advantage to the whole community. In a large measure, a University will be for the benefit of students coming out of secondary schools in the metropolitan area, but there are in industries in other parts of the State boys growing up who want further knowledge of the scientific working of those industries and who cannot receive the benefit of this within the metropolitan area, and unless secondary schools are established on the goldfields and in the agricultural centres the University will be of no benefit to them. There would be great advantage from secondary schools established in Kalgoorlie and Northam, and I hope this Bill controlling a University will, with the assistance of the Government, recognise the need for providing sufficient scholarships and bursaries which will enable poor children to enter the University without proving a hardship to their parents. How many children to-day are attending the secondary schools except they belong to the wealthy classes. Some of the brightest of our children are compelled to leave the primary schools to-day immediately they reach the age of 14 years because their parents require them to assist in keeping the home. The only thing that I regret in my life was being compelled to leave school at the age of 13 years, and I never missed half a day at the State school in my life, but the circumstances were such that I had to leave the school, and there are thousands in exactly the same position as myself to-day. We have to face the position as we find it, the social system compels it to be the case in 99 cases out of every hundred, and it is unfortunate that it is so. We want to get over the difficulties as far as possible, and it is only by providing scholarships and bursaries to enable the children to go to the secondary schools and thus to the university that this University is going to be of that advantage to the people that is claimed for it to-day. I trust that the hopes expressed by the Premier and other members will be fulfilled in connection with the establishment of this University, but I still have a doubt whether the University in a few years will not get into the same condition as the universities in the other States, unless the Government will keep a tight hand on those controlling it. The Premier might make provision in the Bill that in the event of the Senate of the Convocation doing anything that the Governor-in-Council thinks of disadvantage from a State standpoint, the Government can step in and compel the controlling body to do otherwise. Parliament can only do that by an amendment of the Bill.

The Premier: The Government will have to approve of the statutes.

Mr. SCADDAN: That is so, but it is much the same in connection with other boards. We have boards controlling other institutions, and their by-laws are laid on the Table of the House, yet I am

doubtful, owing to the pressure of work members are called upon to attend to, whether there is one in 20 that is ever looked at by members. The work is being crammed nowadays. Frequently we are told that because we are sitting here three days a week we are having a good time, but if some of those who criticise us in that fashion would recognise the amount of attention that has to be given to every Bill to obtain all the facts in connection with it, and the authorities that have to be looked up in different places, they would come to the conclusion that we have a pretty heavy task to give that attention to the Bills which they require. We are dealing with a Bill to-night without giving it that attention which is its due, because we have been cramming other work for the past few days. I question whether there are five members in this Chamber who will admit that they have read the report of the Commission, and I am sure there are not three members who have gone into the Bill clause by clause and looked up authorities and the constitution of other universities, yet we are expected to give an expression of opinion on this question, and to pass the Bill without further consideration. I regret that this is the position, but it is so, because we are cramming work through Parliament at this stage. Generally, I say, members on this side support the establishment of a university, and when the Bill is passed it is to be hoped that those responsible will not lose activeness in the future in bringing about the opening of the institution at the earliest possible date.

The PREMIER (in reply): I must say that I am gratified at the reception this measure has received by members. No matter whether they may take exception to some of the clauses of the Bill, generally speaking the principle of the measure has been supported on both sides of the House. I want briefly to point out to my friend, the leader of the Opposition, who has expressed a fear that something may be done in the way of the management of this University which may tend to make it more conservative and more on the lines of the Home universities, which are class universities, to a great extent, and perhaps give their graduates a classical education without any recognition whatever of the needs of the scientific occupations and industries of the country, that he need have no fear that the university can possibly retrogress, because the management outlined in the measure is the most liberal and up-to-date of its kind in existence to-day. The members of the Commission were all men of weight in the community, men who have had personal experience in educational institutions not only at Home but in other parts of the world, and have given some two years in going thoroughly into this matter. They have inquired into the different systems existing in other parts of the British Empire and elsewhere, and they have come to the conclusion that the modern universities that are now being established in the old country, and are established in the Eastern States of the Commonwealth, are the universities that we should base our university upon, and the management which is considered by them to be the best of all the systems they have examined into will be in force, as explained by me the other night when introducing the measure, and clearly outlined and set forth in the report. The Senate initiates the legislation which controls the whole machinery of the university. That legislation has to be endorsed by Convocation, and if it is agreed between the two bodies then that legislation is submitted to the Governor for his approval, so that members can see there is a check even there. It comes into the hands of the Government and is sent to His Excellency the Governor, and after receiving the approval of the Governor it has to be laid on the Table of the House for 60 days in order that the House may take exception to the statutes if members think advisable. I want to point out to the hon. member that notwithstanding it is absolutely true as he says that members are pressed with business during the session of Parliament, and have not even the time to peruse let alone study all the papers placed on the Table, yet if the need arises that Parliament should inter-

fere in the management of the University if something is being done which will make that institution unpopular and be in the direction of a retrogressive movement, then the hon. member may rest assured that members of Parliament will quickly learn the wishes of the people in that direction and step in and take the necessary steps to rectify the matter.

Mr. Scaddan: You can only take up a negative attitude.

The PREMIER: And disallow the objectionable statute.

Mr. Scaddan: Only disallow.

The PREMIER: That is all that is necessary.

Mr. Scaddan: Supposing it is not advancing as we desire it should.

The PREMIER: If that were so, if the University were to become so degraded——

Mr. Scaddan: Call it stagnant.

The PREMIER: That it is objectionable to this House and objectionable to the people the House could refuse to pass the constitution which they enact and send it back with a clear intimation of what their will is, and also amend the very constitution of the University itself. We have absolute power, and I maintain that we do not require any further power in this direction than that which is set forth in the Bill. Then, again, let me point out once more how liberal and how safeguarded is the constitution of the Senate itself. We have a third of the members of the Senate appointed by the Governor, and we have two-thirds to be elected by Convocation, that is two who are elected by Convocation and one appointed by the Governor coming up every year. Where can we have a greater power than the power to reject members of that Senate who are coming up for re-election because of the way they have managed the institution, and to put fresh blood there. It seems to me we are safeguarding it in every way, and with these safeguards we need not have any fear of allowing this measure to pass and so enable us to get a university established at the earliest possible date. I regret that hon. members should complain of having had no time to consider this measure. The measure in itself is not much; once the principle is approved. It is a machinery Bill from first to last. Hon. members have had the report of the Royal Commission in their hands for a considerable time. I directed from Cabinet that each member should be supplied with a copy with the Bill attached, and that was done four months ago. If members have not read either the report or the Bill up to the present time, they would not be likely to do so even inside another 12 months if that period were given to them for the purpose. I want to say with regard to the remarks of the member for Cue that notwithstanding that I am constantly twitted as being one who wished to keep the educational system of this State back, yet, if my record is inquired into it will be found that when I had the honour of presiding over the Education Department in this State for a period of three years, which was perhaps longer than the term of office of any other Minister of Education, hon. members will find that the educational system of Western Australia made greater strides in that period than it had ever made before in its history. So far from hon. members expressing surprise that I should be the Minister introducing a measure of this description, they ought to turn back to my speech made in this House in September, 1906, in which I outlined what was the wish and the policy of the Government at that time when I was Minister for Education. I said then—

> We should have a continuous system, a system which will enable us to promote the welfare of the child of merit, which will enable the child who has merit and can pass certain examinations to pass from the primary schools to the central schools, which I hope we will shortly establish with senior classes, and from the central schools to the higher grade school, when it is an accomplished fact, and some day from this higher grade school to the university. A system which is without that co-ordination of educational agency which Mr. Tate speaks so much about in his report cannot be effective, and cannot be conducive to the well-being of our educational system.

There I outlined in a few words what was passing through my mind at that time, what was the policy of the Government which I had the honour to belong to and that which the passage of this Bill accomplishes. Not only did I outline that policy but now I am in the proud position of being able to point out that these central schools with the senior classes have been established, that the secondary school has been established and will be opened next month, and from that higher grade school to the university which I mentioned at the time, I hope our boys and girls will be able to pass in the near future.

Mr. Angwin: What is going to be the cost?

The PREMIER: Thirteen thousand five hundred pounds per annum.

Mr. Angwin: What will be the capital cost to start with?

The PREMIER: I am not prepared to say; I have no estimate of the buildings which will be necessary, but I think £40,000 or £50,000 at the least will be required when we put up proper buildings and dwellings for the professors and teachers. The only other matter I wish to refer to very briefly is the speech of my friend the member for Pilbara, and I do not for one moment want to be vindictive in the slightest degree. The hon. member has naturally a great admiration for the class which he is proud to represent and belong to. I commend him for it very sincerely indeed, but I do not think that he ought to quote the fact that inventors, because in the past they have not, perhaps, in the majority of cases, been university men, are therefore a condemnation of the university system which is recognised throughout the civilised world. It is quite true that perhaps most of them have not been university men, but I should like to point out that the universities of the days of the men referred to were not of much assistance to the inventors for the reason which we recognise now that such universities would not suit our conditions to-day. The old style of university confined its attention almost exclusively to the classics and did not take any interest in the daily avocations of the people of the country.

Mr. Underwood: They had a contempt for the workers.

The PREMIER: They did not take any notice of industrial pursuits or the agricultural development of the soils of the country. These universities would have been of little use, in fact of no use to inventors, but the modern and up-to-date universities which are outlined in this report are the very foundation and the very essence of what is required to bring forth and educate our people so that they may become the inventors of the future. I venture to say, notwithstanding that the member for Pilbara's tirade against institutions of this description led him unwisely to condemn the whole educational system of this up-to-date period, that the old inventors, if they could be asked to-day whether they would like to have the advantage of our modern universities, would acclaim with one accord in the affirmative and much better results would have been obtained in times gone by.

Mr. Underwood: What university did Edison go to?

Mr. Scaddan: And what about Marconi?

The PREMIER: No doubt Marconi had a good education, but that is beside the question, and one swallow does not make a summer. I should be sorry to think that geniuses did not exist in countries even where perhaps no universities exist and even if we could find such countries to-day. The hon. member stands alone in his opposition to this movement and there cannot be the slightest ground for a condemnation of the higher educational system such as we are seeking to establish in our State. The hon. member in his remarks which I was pleased to hear, simply endorsed the action I took up during the strenuous financial period four years ago, and he pointed out the fact which is recorded in my speech that the workers were not getting the same advantages for their children from our educational system as those who were in a better position. I quite agree with the hon. member that I do not think it is advisable for us to-night to say that everything educational should be absolutely free in this university. I agree with him that there are a great many of our youth

who could not spare the time to attend the university even if they could find the fees of £5 or £6 per annum because their earnings are required by the parents in order to assist to keep the home going, but I do want also to point out that even if that be so, there is ample provision for bursaries and scholarships, and I hope at any rate the lectures which are to be delivered in this institution will be free to all comers and that all will be privileged to attend the lectures and in that way acquire knowledge.

Mr. Holman drew attention to the state of the House.

Bells rung, and a quorum formed.

The PREMIER: I merely wish to conclude by pointing out that if some of the poorer children of our community will not be able to derive any of the benefits from the university by becoming students, I hope they will always have the privilege of attending lectures and that they shall have in addition to that, the privilege of attending free continuation classes which the Minister for Education proposes to establish. The secondary school movement will go on; it has been established in Perth, and I hope it will meet with the success which is anticipated, and that eventually we will be able to provide for secondary schools in other populous centres, as was advocated by the leader of the Opposition. I regret very much that the member for Brown Hill is unavoidably absent on this occasion, because I know that if he was here, this project would receive his whole-hearted support, but the fact that his signature appears on the report of the Royal Commission goes to show that he is fully in accord with the Bill that has been submitted to the House.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I crave the right to make a personal explanation in regard to interjections. The Premier seemed upset in regard to the interjections I was making, and said that he did not interject while I was speaking. Let me say that when I came to this House under greater difficulties than any other man who ever entered the House, the members on the Ministerial side, on many occasions, sent men into the Chamber to interject in order to throw me off my argument.

Member: Never.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: The member who interjects now was one of the interjectors then, but interjections never throw me off. Members on the other side know that, and therefore they do not interject, and I object to the Premier, or anybody else claiming to show magnanimity or charity in not interjecting when I am speaking. I do not mind them interjecting, and I claim the right to interject too.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before the question is put, I would like to say that interjections are disorderly, but I think that it has been recognised for many years, not alone in this Parliament but in all Parliaments, that interjections to elicit information are necessary; and from that fact, I believe, interjections have grown to become more frequent than is necessary for the conduct of the business of the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

Clauses 1, 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—The University of Western Australia:

Mr. UNDERWOOD moved an amendment—

That in line 1 the word "from" be struck out.

The amendment was moved in the interests of the English language; the clause read, "from henceforth and for ever," and that was absolutely and positively ungrammatical. Ungrammatical language was not wanted in our Bills, especially a University Bill. He wanted the clause amended to read simply that "there shall be established henceforth in the State of Western Australia a University to be called the University of Western Australia"."

The PREMIER: The clause had been drafted and copied from similar Bills, not only in the old country but in the Eastern States of the Commonwealth. The exact phraseology of this clause had been adopted in University Bills by the House of Commons and if the member for Pil-

bara was going to set himself up as a better judge of the English language than those who had the drafting of this measure, and those who had drafted similar measures in other countries, he for one was not going to support him.

Mr. Collier: But what is your opinion of the merits of the amendment apart from what the House of Commons does?

The PREMIER: The amendment had no merits, and the Committee should reject it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: The House of Commons was not going to guide him in grammar. He had learned his grammar as a grown up man, and had remembered what he had learned, but probably the Premier who had learned his as a boy had forgotten what he had learned, and it was possible that the House of Commons had also forgotten. Tautology was a thing to be avoided, and "hence" meant "from," and "from hence" meant "from from," which was absolutely ungrammatical. "Henceforth" meant "from now forward.' The word "henceforth" expressed all it was desired to say. To use more words than were necessary was condemned by the best grammarians. "From henceforth" meant "from from now forward." The wording of this Bill above all others should be grammatical.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	.. .. ..	15
Noes	.. .. ..	17
Majority against	..	2

AYES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Johnson
Mr Bolton	Mr. McDowall
Mr. Collier	Mr. O'Loghlen
Mr. Gill	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Heitmann	Mr. Swan
Mr. Holman	Mr. A. A. Wilson
Mr. Hudson	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Jacoby	(*Teller*).

NOES.

Mr. Cowcher	Mr. Male
Mr. Daglish	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Davies	Mr. Monger
Mr. Draper	Mr. S. F. Moore
Mr. Foulkes	Mr. Nanson
Mr. Gordon	Mr. Osborn
Mr. Gregory	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Hardwick	Mr. Layman
Mr. Harper	(*Teller*).

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. UNDERWOOD moved a further amendment—

That the words "for ever" after "henceforth" be struck out.

We could not possibly make an Act for ever. It was not only ungrammatical to say "henceforth for ever," but we would debar Providence from moving an amendment or Time from having a word to say. The Premier might strike out this horribly pedantic and arrogant language, and not assume that those living at the present moment could deal with all time, that mere pimples on the belly of time should lay a thing down for ever when the very next Parliament could alter it.

The PREMIER: In the Act establishing the Manchester University in 1903, and those establishing the Universities of Birmingham in 1900, Liverpool 1903, Leeds 1904, Sheffield 1905, and Brisbane 1909, the wording was exactly the same as that employed in this clause. The words "for ever" would indicate to future generations that this Parliament at any rate meant the University should be a permanent institution. Of course Parliament was all powerful, and future Parliament could annul this Bill and abolish the University, but no Parliament of British subjects would take such a retrograde step.

Mr. COLLIER: It was a sad feature of our methods of conducting business when the Premier could not get a better argument than pointing out the existence of similar words in Acts passed by the House of Commons. What effect would these words have on future Parliaments in showing that we intended the University to exist for all time? Why should we attempt to lay the dead hand upon posterity? Why not put similar words in other Bills, such for instance as the Redistribution of Seats Bill. They would have no possible utility, because any future Parliament would have absolute power to close up the university. The clauses and amendments should be considered on their merits apart from the fact that in some other States similar words were in existence in other countries. Precedent

only meant that the dead past was governing the living present.

Mr. HOLMAN: The amendment ought to be supported. The Premier had stated that because certain things were done in the past we should continue to do them. The Minister might as well have said our farmers should continue to use the wooden plough because it was once a popular implement. We required to have things made as clear as possible.

Mr. FOULKES: The Act of Parliament passed for the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Australia had clearly conveyed the sense that the people were desirous that the Act should remain without repeal. These words "for ever" were not used in ordinary Act of Parliament, but were inserted in a Bill of this sort in order to show the desire that the University should be for ever maintained.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 4 to 8—agreed to.

Clause 9—Appointment of first members:

The PREMIER moved an amendment—

That in line two the words "six months" be struck out, and "one year" inserted in lieu.

Amendment passed; the clause as amended agreed to.

Clauses 10 to 34—agreed to.

Clause 35—Exemption of property from taxation:

Mr. ANGWIN: Some of these premises might be occupied by officials of the University, in which case the collection of rates on the premises would be perfectly justifiable. Would the Minister give the Committee some information in regard to the clause?

The PREMIER: The effect of the clause would be that the property of the University would remain exempt from taxation, just the same as church property or Government schools. However, if any of the property were to be let for private purposes it would then become taxable.

Mr. SCADDAN: Would it be regarded as used for private purposes if a professor of the University lived there?

The Premier: No, I do not think so.

Mr. ANGWIN: Certain services would have to be rendered by the municipality or roads board, and he could not see why the officials of the institution should be exempt from taxation.

The Premier: The exemption will only apply to the actual university buildings.

Mr. ANGWIN: Still the professors should pay their fair share of local taxation. This was taking away revenue from the municipality.

The Premier: As soon as the property is leased it is taxable.

Mr. ANGWIN: Officials receiving salaries and occupying the premises ought to pay local taxation just the same as anyone else. This property should be taxed.

The PREMIER: The University buildings would be classed like other Government buildings. Take the Observatory; no taxes were paid on that building, and no taxes were paid on the Public Library, Museum, and Art Gallery, on the premises of which the secretary and other officials resided. It would be an advantage to the City to have a university established within its boundaries. The buildings would be constructed in the grounds owned by the Senate, and the improvements to the grounds would enhance the surrounding properties.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 36 to 41—agreed to.

New clause:

The PREMIER moved—

That the following be inserted to stand as Clause 32:—"If the Senate passes any proposed statute which Convocation disallows or returns to the Senate with amendments to which the Senate will not agree, and if after an interval of three months the Senate again passes the proposed statute with or without any amendments which have been made by Convocation and Convocation disallows it or returns it to the Senate with amendments to which the Senate will not agree, then the Governor may convene a special meeting of the

Senate to consider the proposed statute as last proposed in the Senate, and any amendments made therein by Convocation, and any such amendments which are affirmed by two-thirds of the members of the Senate present at such meeting shall be deemed to be carried, and if the proposed statute with the amendments, if any, so carried is affirmed by two-thirds of the members of the Senate present at such meeting, it shall be taken to be duly passed and approved by the governing authority, and shall be sealed with the common seal and transmitted by the Chancellor for the approval of the Governor.

That was to avoid the deadlock that the member for North Fremantle had called attention to.

New clause put and passed.

Preamble, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

BILL—SUPPLY, £377,000.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

House adjourned at 10.35 p.m.

Legislative Council.

Thursday, 26th January, 1911.

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

QUESTIONS (2)—WATER SUPPLIES.

Ora Banda.

Hon. F. T. O. BRIMAGE asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, Is it the intention of the Government to lay water (either fresh or salt) to Ora Banda? 2, If so, when?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: A promise has been made that an adequate water supply for milling purposes will be provided for the Ora Banda district as soon as two crushing plants are in course of erection in the vicinity of the Gimlet leases, and a bond is given by the mine-owners binding themselves for a definite period to use no water for milling purposes except from the Government scheme.

Bullfinch, Cost.

Hon. T. F. O. BRIMAGE asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, What was the cost of laying water on to Bullfinch? 2, What is the average daily consumption? 3, What is the charge per 1,000 gallons at Bullfinch stand-pipe to consumers? 4, What amount of water can the Government supply per day at the Bullfinch and Corinthian stand-pipes?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: 1, Estimated cost was £7,100. Accounts have not yet been completely made up, but it is apparent that the actual cost will be somewhat less than the estimate. 2, 2,500 gallons per day at present. 3, Five shillings per 100 gallons. 4, 6,000 gallons daily at each place, or 10,000 gallons daily at Bullfinch if Corinthian is not drawing. This capacity can be increased by local pumping. Some shortage in discharge has been experienced, due to accumulation of air in main. This is now being remedied and the full capacity of main will henceforth be available.

SITTING DAYS AND HOURS, ADDITIONAL.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. D. Connolly) moved—

That for the remainder of the Session the House shall meet for the despatch of business on Tuesdays, Wednesdays,