

in the small room referred to. The child's room is used as a dining-room; food is cooked on the gas stove in passage. The enclosing of the verandah cuts off the natural light from the bedroom, while the placing of a door in the passage cuts the light off from the passage-way.

I could quote many other examples, but shall refrain from doing so. Should members require any further information I shall be pleased to furnish it to them. These reports speak for themselves, and members will agree that some legislative action is necessary to obtain more control over premises of this nature. The present housing shortage has, of course, been accentuated by existing circumstances; people are only too pleased to get shelter of any description and there are always people of a certain type who will exploit the unfortunate. However, the amendments to the definitions of "boarding house" and "lodging house," which it is proposed to effect by this Bill, will bring the proprietors of "houses let in lodgings" within the scope of the Act, thus enabling a closer supervision of such premises.

Another proposal in this Bill deals with sub-standard houses. There are in many of the older towns of the State a number of houses which continue to be occupied despite the fact that they are sub-standard. The most common amenities are frequently lacking. In some instances water is delivered to the house at one point only, sometimes at the front gate or by a verandah. Often no provision is made for the installation of cooking facilities. The Bill provides for an extension of the powers of local authorities to prevent the growth of such undesirable conditions, and, where they do exist, to remedy them.

A further proposal in the Bill relates to private hospitals. It is desired to transfer their control from the local authorities to the central authority. Experience has shown that the inspection of private hospitals under the existing legislation has not been entirely satisfactory, since the local authorities have not generally the specialised knowledge required for adequate control. It is felt, too, that the proposals for a national scheme of hospital benefits, which the Commonwealth Government now has under consideration, render it necessary to vest the control of such hospitals in one central authority. By this means uniformity will be achieved and the adminis-

tration of the national scheme will be greatly simplified.

Provision has been made in the Bill safeguarding the public against the sale of horseflesh for human consumption. The present meat rationing arrangements have resulted in the setting up in various States, including Western Australia, of the business of slaughtering horses and the selling of horseflesh for the purpose of providing food for pets. Having regard to the fact that it would be difficult and expensive to ensure a proper system of inspection, it is proposed to add a new part to the existing Act, setting out certain restrictions upon the slaughtering and sale of horseflesh. The provision thus made is based on legislation recently passed in Victoria, and should ensure, as far as is practicable, that horseflesh is not sold for human consumption.

There are other proposals in the Bill, mostly of a machinery nature, including one dealing with venereal disease, which merely amplifies some of the already-existing provisions for the control of this disease. I trust the House will, by passing this measure, endorse the Government's aim in endeavouring to ensure that more control is exercised in the matters I have mentioned. I have pleasure in moving—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. J. G. Hislop, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 6.8 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Tuesday, 31st October, 1944.

	PAGE
Assent to Bills	1415
Vermitt Act Select Committee, extension of time	1415
Bills: Rural Relief Fund Act Amendment, 1R.	1415
University of Western Australia Act Amendment, 2R.	1415
Builders' Registration Act Amendment, returned	1456

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

ASSENT TO BILLS.

Message from the Lieut.-Governor received and read notifying assent to the following Bills:—

- 1, Main Roads Act (Funds Appropriation).
- 2, Financial Emergency Act Amendment.
- 3, Industries Assistance Act Continuance.
- 4, Plant Diseases (Registration Fees) Act Amendment.
- 5, Testator's Family Maintenance Act Amendment.

VERMIN ACT SELECT COMMITTEE.*Extension of Time.*

MR. WATTS (Katanning) [4.35]: I move—

That the time for bringing up the report of the Select Committee be extended to the first day of the re-assembling of Parliament in 1945.

THE PREMIER: I would like the Leader of the Opposition to be more explicit. Does he think that the Select Committee cannot submit its report before then? Does he want it to be converted into an Honorary Royal Commission, or what is to happen between now and eight or ten months hence? Does he want the Committee to be appointed as an Honorary Royal Commission to make inquiries all over the State in the intervening period; or has the Committee already sufficient evidence and does it require the extension of time to enable it to formulate a report which it is not possible to present until the first day of the next session?

MR. WATTS (Katanning—in reply): I have already intimated to the Minister for Lands that the possibility of the Committee's completing the taking of evidence before Parliament adjourns is very unlikely. Some sittings will, therefore, be required in the new year and, following the precedent once established by the Minister for Justice in regard to the Select Committee on the Companies Act, the only remedy appears to be to move this motion. I also intimated to the hon. gentleman that, in those circumstances, and in order that the report may be tabled at the completion of the proceedings—and before it is actually signed—we shall ask for the Committee to be turned into an honorary Royal Commission. In that way we shall be able to submit the report to the Lieut.-Governor and have it tabled in the House.

It is impossible to complete the taking of evidence during this session.

Question put and passed.

BILL—RURAL RELIEF FUND ACT AMENDMENT.

Introduced by Mr. Seward and read a first time.

BILL—UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA ACT AMENDMENT.*Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 26th October.

MR. WATTS (Katanning) [4.37]: It is my intention to support the second reading, but it is not my intention to cover the ground which was so ably covered by the member for Nedlands the other night. Consequently my remarks on the subject will be of no great length, but will convey to the House such impressions as I have in regard to this measure. I feel that the financial aspect is the one that I should make reference to. Not only the policy of the Government, but my own view is that the University should be maintained without the charging of any fees. Therefore it amounts to this: That the Government of the State has to accept a very substantial amount of responsibility for the financial side of the University. Ordinarily speaking I suppose we might say it has to accept the whole of it, because the amount that can be collected by the University from other sources is comparatively small. There are, I understand, certain revenues that are derived from examination fees as distinct from tuition fees to which we are all opposed, or to which I think we are all opposed. There are also certain amounts which can be derived from endowment lands, although at present these amounts are not very great.

I have been given an estimate that the present revenue is not likely to exceed about £1,000. There are also certain other funds which are available to the University and which have been derived from certain bequests. They, however, are apparently of a minor nature and are, in fact, earmarked for specific purposes such as those which are available towards the expense of the Vice-Chancellor. Therefore, broadly speaking, finance must come from the Government if we are to retain, as I suggest we should, a university free from tuition

charges. The Premier, in the course of his speech, made reference to the inability of Parliament to grant a sum to the extent the University desired when increased expenditure was required for primary and post-primary education. At first sight it might be thought that that formed a strong argument for use with regard to the request of the University itself.

The Premier: I did not say it was self-evident because funds were needed for post-primary education.

Mr. WATTS: That was the impression I gained from the Premier's remarks, and I am entitled to state my impression. As I said, that would appear at first glance to be a very sound argument but, on more mature reflection, we must come to the conclusion that two wrongs do not make a right. Because we have insufficient funds available for primary and post-primary education it is surely wrong to say that insufficient money should be made available for the University as well. Surely it is arguable that because one section of our educational system is without the funds that it requires, we should not say that in consequence the amount available for another section should be also inadequate. On thinking it over, I am sure the impression gained from the Premier's remarks did not indicate the strong argument it might appear to be at first sight. The remedy is to find enough for both sections. The only question to be determined is: What is the minimum sum upon which the University can manage and carry on with credit to Western Australia? As the member for Nedlands said, there is no evidence that £40,000 is that sum; but there is evidence, according to the Royal Commissioner, that £2,000 greater than that amount might be sufficient.

The Premier: But the University was able to carry on for five years with less than that amount.

Mr. WATTS: The Royal Commissioner, as I understand it, said that £2,000 greater than the amount appropriated might be sufficient, but there is every reason to believe that that amount will not be sufficient for long for the purposes of the University. I am prepared to admit that the Bill contains a provision for such sums as Parliament may see fit to appropriate from time to time, but I take it those sums would be

in addition to, and not form part of, the permanent appropriation. I think it would be competent, subject to the Government's decision, to increase that amount from time to time. On the other hand, the attitude of the university authorities, as I see it, is this: They do not desire to be in a position of having to come, year after year, requesting an increase in the grant of money to make up the deficiency that may in that year exist. Possibly their objection, although I have no absolute evidence of this, is that they are required simply to approach the Treasury, either by correspondence or by way of a deputation, to establish their claim for this money.

It is clear to my mind that some provision should be made in the Bill for an inquiry at regular intervals by a Select Committee of Parliament, quite unassociated with party politics at any time, to ascertain from period to period, say for three years, exactly what the financial position of the University was, exactly what its requirements were, and to recommend an appropriation for a succeeding period of, say, three years, of an amount that should be made available. Then we would be in the position that a reasonable amount of publicity, such as is ordinarily given to papers placed on the Table of the House, would be available as to the requirements and needs of the University, and there would be some backing from members sitting on both sides of the House for the claim of the University to receive more money for that period. In those circumstances, the aspect of the university authorities having to approach the Treasury, either by correspondence or by deputation, seeking further financial assistance would be done away with, and they would for that period, as I see it, be able to lay claim to the amount which was recommended by the suggested Select Committee, after a full inquiry into all the circumstances, in a report furnished to Parliament for that purpose. I believe that would be a desirable provision to include in the Bill. Let some provision be included that will indicate there is a responsibility upon Parliament itself, not in any way associated with party politics, to meet the needs of the University and to maintain it free from tuition fees, while also avoiding the necessity of having to go cap-in-hand to secure the grant of money which, although easily justifiable,

could be justified a great deal better if it had the backing of an inquiry by responsible people. That is how the position appeals to me, and there should be some such provision in the measure.

The Premier: Who do you suggest would conduct the inquiry?

Mr. WATTS: I suggest a Select Committee of this House should be appointed, say, every three years, for the purpose of an inquiry into the position of the University, its activities, resources and requirements so that we may have a certain amount of publicity given to what is going on. A report could then be made as to the success or otherwise of the University during that period, and a recommendation could be made as to the funds to be provided for the next period of three years, based upon the information then supplied concerning the activities contemplated in that future period. I can see no harm that could be done by such a proposal while much good could arise from it. That course would remove from the minds of the University authorities the idea they may entertain that there is no responsible body in Parliament, as distinct from the Government of the day, which is taking an interest in the highest degree in the financial requirements of and facilities needed for the highest educational institution the State possesses.

If the Premier will agree to a proposal such as that, I say frankly that I have no further opposition to extend to the financial provisions in the Bill. I cannot increase the appropriation mentioned in the Bill and would not do so if I had the power, and I certainly would not seek to reduce it. I would leave that matter to a responsible body to inquire into so that the position might be clarified and everyone made more content than is evident at the present time. Turning to another phase, I may say that I am not altogether satisfied with the representation proposed in the Senate of the University. While the Premier may be justified in saying that he who pays the piper may call the tune—

The Premier: I did not say that.

Mr. WATTS: Once again, I say that is the impression I gained from the Premier's remarks.

The Premier: Someone else said that; I did not. As a matter of fact, you read that statement.

Mr. WATTS: That was the impression I gained, at any rate. There may be times when there is every justification for adopting that point of view. On the other hand, we must not lose sight of the fact that the university authorities have certain responsibilities that cannot be met in terms of money, if they carry out their duty as they should, the responsibility of educating the youth of our State in the way which would be of the greatest service to the State; if they are to regulate and guide the minds of those students who go to the University, they should influence them along lines which will be to the greatest benefit of our community in the future. Therefore I do not think there ought to be too large a measure of Government control. The measure of Government control should be minimised as far as possible. The old University Senate appears to me, so far as representation is concerned, to be quite adequate; but I have of course noticed that there were some proposals made by the Royal Commissioner who desired an alteration in the system. I have not, however, gathered from his report that he desired the alteration proposed in this measure.

The Premier: He wanted Convocation to have only three members instead of 12.

Mr. WATTS: Let the Premier say what he likes, I still believe that by the provision in this Bill the roll of Convocation can be cleared and those persons on it who take no interest removed from the roll. Then Convocation will be the very institution which should have the say. After all, members of Convocation, when they are narrowed down to those who take an active interest in the University, as they will when this Bill becomes an Act, and increasingly in the future, will include among them many of our leading citizens, many of the men best qualified to assist in carrying on the affairs of the University in which they had their student days as undergraduates.

I consider that any suggestion to restrict the membership of the Senate to these three representatives of Convocation would be completely ridiculous; nor am I content to have them holding only about 50 per cent. of the representation, because when Convocation carries out its true intent, as I believe it must, especially when the roll has been cleared up under this measure, it should find it possible to take the greatest section of responsibility for the adminis-

tration of the University. In fact, there would then be no justification at all for Government representation thereon. I do not think the fact that there are no tuition fees collected and that the only source of funds, broadly speaking, at the present time is the Consolidated Revenue, justifies such an arrangement. Were the University situated as other universities are, even in the Eastern States of the Commonwealth, there would be the strongest case for substantial reduction of Government representation. I doubt whether the Under Treasurer, or his Deputy, as a separate appointment as Government representative, is justified. Surely it would be sufficient for the Assistant Under Treasurer or his assistant to be one of the Government representatives appointed by the Governor. We have in the Bill, I think, six representatives appointed by the Governor. To that we add the Under Treasurer or his Deputy, and there is no guarantee that that Deputy would be the Assistant Under Treasurer, as in my opinion he should be. And then we have the representation of the Director of Education. It seems to me that both those gentlemen, while undoubtedly they are entitled to the consideration of the Government, should be part of the six, and not additional to the six.

To put it shortly, we do not want to make another department of the Education Department, to make the University another Government department allied to the Education Department. The University should be the Alma Mater, as it were, able to control its own affairs. It should be entitled to a great measure of autonomy, as the member for Nedlands so clearly stated; and it should not have to concern itself overmuch with Government representation as Government representation, but be entitled to conduct educational matters in the way that universities all the world over do—quite differently, as I understand from Education Departments both here and in other parts of the world. So I am going to vote very readily for the amendment that has been placed on the notice paper as to this representation by the member for Nedlands, because I think he has done justice to the administration and also has done justice, so far as he can, to the claim to be made for autonomous control of the University, without too much Government interference. He is not by any means depriving the Government of strong representation—only, as a

matter of fact, very slightly—but I think he is improving it in making sure that the Government representation will probably at all times be in the minority, even if there are one or two absentees from the other representatives who sit on the University Senate.

I do not like, either, the proposal to take away from Convocation the right of review in regard to university statutes. As far as I am concerned, I shall oppose the proposal in the Bill. I think, as I said before, that Convocation will under the other proposals in the measure soon take its place, as it should, as the representative of all those graduates of the University who continue to take an interest in it, who are probably resident in Western Australia and interested in Western Australia, and who are entitled, and will be entitled, to take their share in determining how the University shall be conducted. I do not suggest that the present system has been satisfactory. There have been a number of members of Convocation—as is quite clear from the Royal Commissioner's report—who have not taken any great interest in its activities. That, I think, is partly due to the fact that many of them, having become graduates of the University and having been trained in matters which should be serviceable to Western Australia, in which their services should be available to Western Australia, have by stress of circumstances been obliged to leave this State and go elsewhere. And that is something we should look at askance and something we should discourage to the utmost of our ability. It leads to many considerations other than the University Bill.

It leads to a question of whether employment in our Public Service, in scientific and other similar channels of our Public Service, is of such a nature as to encourage our students to remain after they have been trained at the expense of this country, in this country, for national service. In recent weeks I have had facts brought to my notice in regard to payments made to men who can be trained, and have been trained, I think, in our University here, and have had offered to them positions in other parts of the Commonwealth for similar work, held by similar men; and I find that Western Australia falls very far below the standard of remuneration. So, in consequence, after we have spent many thousands of pounds a year on educating these young men and have brought them up

to a degree of efficiency which will enable them, and has in fact enabled them, to carry out research in the best interests of the State, we have let them go away because they find that they cannot obtain sufficiently attractive occupation in this State. This is a condition of affairs which we should quickly bring to an end. It calls for a review of the many highly trained and skilled occupations available in the Public Service of Western Australia.

We have had also, I believe, research made in our University here which has resulted in remedies being found for stock and other diseases. This research work must have saved, and will save, the producers of this State and the people of this State hundreds of thousands of pounds. Yet I find that educated people who have been responsible for these investigations of a successful character cannot obtain here positions that compare favourably with what is obtainable by similar men in other States of the Commonwealth. It is no wonder, then, that we lose much of the benefit which the University ought to confer on this State, by letting, for those reasons, our men depart from Western Australia for other States of the Commonwealth and for other countries of the world. Beyond that I do not propose to keep the House. I shall support the second reading, and support many of the amendments of which notice has been given by the member for Nedlands. I shall do so in the belief that the true intent and meaning of university education and university government and management will be better carried into effect by the hon. member's amendments than by the measure at present before the House.

MR. CROSS (Canning): I do not propose to allow a Bill as important as this to pass without making some comments on it, particularly as I have received a great deal of correspondence with regard to it, including letters from University professors and graduates, one of which I consider insulting. I presume other members have received similar letters. I believe in education and I agree it is imperative that the youth of our State should be given the best possible education. Apart from the reasons advanced by the many correspondents I have mentioned, I desire to pay attention to the report of the Royal Commissioner, Mr. Justice Wolff, who spent nearly a year in

making an impartial investigation into the question of education and the conduct of our University. I propose to read some brief extracts from his conclusions and findings, because these do not agree with some of the opinions I have heard, nor with the opinions in the letters from my correspondents, most of whom reside in South Perth. Many of the latter, I believe, were asked to write to me on the subject, about which they appear to know very little. In my opinion, the findings of an impartial judge are entitled to a great deal more weight. As I said, he spent a year investigating the affairs of the University.

The Premier: He must have taken a lot of evidence.

MR. CROSS: He took an enormous volume of evidence. One of the first things to which my attention was drawn in his report deals with Convocation. It seems to me that the graduates who comprise Convocation can attend a meeting and vote notwithstanding that they have not been to a meeting for five years, and consequently would know little or nothing of what had taken place in the meantime. It must be borne in mind that some of the graduates who are actually members of Convocation have gone to the Eastern States. If these flew over to Western Australia for a Christmas trip and there was a meeting of Convocation, they could attend and vote. Mr. Justice Wolff, on page 1 of his report, has this to say about Convocation—

This body is to be reconstituted. No graduate who is not of five years' standing at least to be eligible for membership.

Nearly half of the students who attend the University never complete their course.

The Premier: In that case they do not graduate.

MR. CROSS: That is so. Mr. Justice Wolff's report continues—

To act through a standing committee to be elected as prescribed of not less than twenty-five or more than one hundred members.

No member of the teaching staff to be eligible for office of warden.

Convocation to be an advisory body only . . . Convocation no longer to have the power of revising statutes.

I find that the general allegation that this body is "run" by a very small minority is proved. It is generally difficult to get a quorum and the large majority of members are apathetic. This is due, in my opinion, to the very noisy minority which has control of the body. By enacting a qualifying period of five

years, Parliament will test the mettle of the large majority and if they fail to respond, consideration will have to be given to abolishing Convocation altogether.

Those are not my words, but the words of an impartial judge, who is not even subject to the control of Parliament. I pay attention to what he says. Speaking about buildings, Mr. Justice Wolff said, at page 4—

The system followed in the University Buildings Acts is expensive to the Government and bad in principle. It would be far better to make the University an annual grant, to be invested and held on trust for new buildings . . . In the past money has not been economically spent in some cases. In the case of the chemistry section of the science buildings at Crawley, the Government did not get full value for the liability it assumed and will have to meet. The building has many shortcomings from the technical point of view. Such errors should not be allowed to occur again. In addition, a tendency to ornament buildings unduly needs to be watched.

This happened while the wonderful Convocation was in control!

Mr. McDonald: Convocation did not control that.

Mr. CROSS: If Convocation had a majority in the Senate, it could control everything. With regard to the Hackett bursaries, the Royal Commissioner has this to say—

As regards Hackett bursaries, I have come to the conclusion that a good deal of money is being wasted, that too many bursaries are awarded and that the academic achievements of the Hackett bursars are not such as to justify the numbers granted.

It seems to me this is the same old story! From time immemorial it has been recognised that doctors and professors are exceedingly bad businessmen, and that may apply to the University. There has been much comment on the amount received per student, and the report from which I quote discloses that the amount spent per student in Western Australia is the second highest in Australia. The figures for the States are as follows:—

	Per Student. £
Sydney	69
Melbourne	43
Queensland	48
Adelaide	44
Western Australia	50
Tasmania	43

The report continues—

Thus, Western Australia has the second highest income per head of the Australian Universities, and when it is pointed out that all the other Universities (with the exception of Tasmania) have medical faculties it appears that on a comparative basis Western Australia is very well off.

The Western Australian University has no medical faculty. The report continues—

As has been pointed out elsewhere, the bulk of the revenue of the University of Western Australia comes from the Government grant.

The Commissioner sets out in a table the percentage of the total incomes of the Universities of Australia. He continues—

The fact that Western Australia is not able to conduct its University on a revenue of £50 per head while Tasmania, which in my opinion offers just as good educational fare, receives only £43 per head is a matter which will create surprise and call for explanation.

Evidently Mr. Justice Wolff had an accountant to assist him, because his report continues—

My investigating accountant made certain inquiries but beyond obtaining information with regard to a few isolated matters, which rather tended to show that the University had launched out on a great scale in 1929 when the Hackett buildings were under construction, there is no explanation given. I am told that in order to arrive at a solution of this problem, a detailed examination would have to be made of the costs of the other Australian Universities, as well as this University, so that a comparison could be made of the costs in the different departments and faculties.

I think the judge was surprised; I certainly am! He continues—

I hardly think such an inquiry is worth while. What one can say, on a view of these figures, is that there is wastage somewhere and I am inclined to think that a good deal of it is in the Faculty of Arts. In my opinion insufficient supervision has been given in the past by the Vice-Chancellors to the administration of the faculties with a view to keeping down costs and seeing that the various departments and faculties are deriving the best that can reasonably be expected from the teaching staff.

I believe in universities, Mr. Speaker, but when one reads a report such as this, one wonders how much value we are getting for the money we are spending on our University. At page 39 of the report there is a table which I do not propose to read; members can read it for themselves. It sets out the number of lectures per academic year, and these lectures comprise one hour each. The greatest number given by any professor in one year is 297, and few

professors deliver more than 100 a year. A certain amount of research work is done during that time, but what it comprises I do not know. I have yet to learn, however, that any far-reaching discoveries have been made in the University at Crawley. As a matter of fact, as I shall point out directly, very few major discoveries have been made in universities at all. The world's great discoveries have been made in research laboratories, and not at universities. There may be some reason for this, but I do not know what it is. I can assure members that Mr. Justice Wolff's report is illuminating. At page 49 he has this to say about psychology—all universities do not have a chair of psychology, but our University has—

Quite a storm was raised by the criticism which was levelled by the Chancellor of the University against this department. The Chancellor gave it as his opinion that this department had been allowed to extend itself unnecessarily and that it was quite out of proportion to the Department of Philosophy, to which it should be an adjunct rather than a separate department. The Sydney University and our University have created a sharp division between the teaching of the purely academic study of philosophy and the more technical study of psychology. Sydney University maintains separate chairs and our University has two associate professors, one of whom has charge of the teaching of mental and moral philosophy and the other of whom has charge of instruction in psychology. In all other Australian universities there is a Chair of Philosophy and under this chair psychology is taught, the psychology taught being more theoretical than practical in contradistinction to experimental psychology which is emphasised at the Universities of Sydney and Western Australia. In the University of Western Australia the Chair of Mental and Moral Philosophy is not occupied and there is no Chair of Psychology. The whole position furnishes evidence of a serious defect which is manifest in the development of the university. There is a desire to make haste without seeing that the teaching structure is built on solid foundations. In my opinion the first thing to have done, judging by other universities in Australia and also from a logical viewpoint, was to fill the Chair of Philosophy. The result is that we have two departments, neither of which is under a professor, a state of affairs which does not, I think, tend to enhance the reputation of the University in the eyes of other universities.

Later, still referring to the psychology department—and this report was compiled from an inquiry carried on while these glorious bodies, the Senate and Convocation, were in the saddle and running the

show; they cannot blame the Government or any member—the Commissioner said this—

In my opinion there is no justification for the Senate allowing this department to branch out in the way it has. Associate Professor Fowler, in reply to the criticism offered by the Chancellor, instances the position in Sydney in particular, and also pleads that in American universities great attention is paid to the study of experimental psychology. He also mentions the schools in Great Britain and New Zealand. He says that when he was travelling abroad he found it a common practice (though, I imagine, not a universal practice) to develop psychology as a separate and independent science and he says he had brought to his notice how far critics of our Australian system considered the development of psychology lagged behind in Australia.

As a matter of fact there are very few universities in the world where experimental psychology is practised. It is in the bigger ones, and it might be all right in Sydney or Philadelphia, but it is not practised in any other State of Australia except New South Wales and ours. The report continues—

Associate Professor Fowler contends that the subject was developed in the first place after due discussion by the professorial board, whose function it is to deal with the academic side of the university affairs. While admitting that that may be so, that still does not establish a case for the expenditure of large sums of money in the furtherance of this particular branch of study when one of the paramount matters to be considered in the administration of the University is the conflicting claims of the various departments for additional money to extend their teaching.

Apparently at the University, as is the case with many Government departments, when a professor gets in the saddle he starts to make his department as big as possible so as to show himself to be an important person, and quite out of proportion to the amount of money involved.

Mr. Thorn: Do you honestly think that is his reason?

Mr. CROSS: That is one.

The Premier: Each man is an enthusiast in his own branch.

Mr. CROSS: Yes, and he begins to think that his particular branch of teaching is the most important in the world.

Mr. Thorn: Why should he not?

Mr. CROSS: This matter should receive the attention of Parliament because I believe in the sincerity of members opposite. This is a non-party Bill. We are always anxious to see that the best possible facili-

ties are given, not only to those who attend the University, but to the other people in the State. I will have something to say about that in a moment. Mr. Justice Wolff said this—

Can it be said that we in Western Australia are in any way comparably with the State of New South Wales which has a population of two and a half million and a university which has an annual revenue of £300,000? The University of Sydney has substantial endowments in connection with both philosophy and psychology and the whole of the burden of running this department does not fall upon the State. Is it a fair comparison to compare Western Australia with Great Britain or the United States of America where the funds for education are immeasurably greater than in this State by reason of the greater wealth and by reason of the fact that education in those countries is financed in a different way? Comparison is also made with New Zealand. That, of course, is a smaller community than the others referred to, but here again one must bear in mind that New Zealand has a population of one and half million people with one university, having affiliated university colleges. In Australia we have six universities to cater for about seven million people. Not that I am advocating that this is too many, but it does show that a bald comparison with New Zealand is not a good comparison.

That is what the judge has to say in that regard. At page 71 of his report he gives a table of the instruments required. To my way of thinking they were very expensive, even at the time this Commission was held, and the judge thought so too. He said—

When it is borne in mind that these instruments are required for the teaching of novices or at any rate, persons who are not highly skilled in their use, I come to the conclusion on the evidence before me, that it would be very unwise to lay out such a large sum of money in so many delicate and expensive instruments.

Later in his report he said that the evidence before him was that the University could have obtained the instruments at a considerably cheaper price than was proposed. I have said about four times that I believe in a university, and I believe in a free university and in giving the best we possibly can to the university. But I also believe that it is of first importance that we should give the best primary education to the children of the State. I am not satisfied with the primary education either in the city or in the country. At this stage we cannot allow Convocation to have all that it requires because it would then have full control. The members of that body would simply get together and say that they want such and

such a thing at a cost of another £3,000 or £4,000, but they would not have to foot the bill. They take exception to the proposition put forward by the Government. Their view is that the Government will control the Senate if there are more appointees. I do not believe that. I do not know of one case on record where any Government, no matter what its political colour, instructed its appointees on the Senate to vote in any particular way.

The Bill if it is passed, means this, namely, that the University will be placed in the same position in regard to its applications to the Government for funds as is any other applicant body, in that it will be compelled to state a case before its requests are granted. Members know that if they put up to the Under Treasurer any proposition for improvements in their electorates, and it is justified, they usually get something, but if it cannot be justified no grant is obtained. If we hand over the control to the Senate it will have a free hand. It will be able to deal with expenditure, and the Government will be forced to foot the bill whether the expenditure is justified or not. If the Senate is to have this control there will be no appeal from its decisions. The State will simply be called upon to find what money the Senate requires.

The Premier: The Senate cannot spend money without first getting the authority to do so.

Mr. CROSS: No. I think that the proposal of the Government is reasonable and fair. No-one can say that this Government has not been sympathetic to the University. Since the institution started about 30 years ago the sum of £162,000 has been made available to it by various Governments for new buildings. With the higher standards now being obtained by students there are less than 1,000 attending. Many of the people who attend are classed as students—I know this because I am acquainted with some of them—but they attend only one lecture of one hour per week. This State is spending an average of £50 per student, so it means that considerably more than that is being spent on some. Instead of increasing to any extent the amount to the University we should establish a research laboratory here. I will give some illustrations to support that view. When Dunkirk was evacuated there was a group of 266 wounded men.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! What has this to do with the Bill?

Mr. CROSS: It is an illustration of how money can be better spent than on the University. I have received many letters—more than I can reply to—dealing with universities. One lady who wrote contended that the universities were the source of the great discoveries of the ages, and that wondrous discoveries have been made at Crawley University. Up till then I had not heard of anything of great import, so I had a look around. I was going to say that in one group of 266 wounded men, evacuated from Dunkirk, no infection or deaths occurred from either gangrene or tetanus. That was made possible through the research laboratories in Great Britain and France.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The Bill contains nothing about research laboratories in Great Britain and France.

Mr. CROSS: I could cite one discovery that is receiving a good deal of attention at the present time. I refer to the discovery of sulphanilamide in 1908 by a man named Gemmell in Germany. When he took it to the university at Vienna, it was turned down, and 20 years elapsed before the value of that drug was recognised. I believe members will agree that when increased expenditure at the University is warranted, the Government should have some say in the matter. I am glad the Premier has decided to place an item of £200 on the Estimates for the University in order to give members an opportunity to ventilate their views on the institution each year, just as they can do on education generally when the Education Vote is being considered. With our restricted funds, there is a definite limit to the amount of money that can be spent on higher education in this State, and it is important for the Government to ensure that the money expended on the University is not disproportionate to the sum made available for the education of poorer children and those living in the pioneering areas. I consider the Bill is much milder in effect than were the recommendations of the Royal Commissioner.

Mr. Thorn: You said you had received several letters.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. CROSS: I shall support the Bill because I think the Government has adopted a moderate attitude. Governments do not

direct their representatives on these bodies how to vote. Usually the appointees are trained civil servants. Nobody could say that the Under Treasurer has not a sound general knowledge of the money required and spent in the State. The university authorities might well be left to carry on the activities of the institution while the Government, which finds the money, calls the tune. If any unwarranted expenditure were recommended by the Senate, the Government should be in a position to check it.

MR. NORTH (Claremont): This is a measure which has aroused some interest amongst the people. During the many years that I have been a member of this Chamber, on only two occasions has any active canvassing been indulged in by post urging me to adopt a certain attitude. The first occasion was when the question of S.P. book-makers was before the House. That was a very popular topic with the people and much was said both for and against. This time I have had equally strong representations made through the post from the Claremont electorate, but all of them are in the one direction. This shows that the electors of Claremont have a very strong university conscience, a fact which is very pleasing to me, and the views therein expressed coincide largely with those given utterance to by the member for Nedlands. I do not wish to say one word in reiteration of what that hon. member said so well and so clearly.

I feel that if one advocates the provision of a larger sum of money for the University, one ought to offer suggestions as to how the money can be provided. It is very easy to ask the Government to spend money in one direction or another, but it is very hard to find the money, particularly when prospects are opening up in many directions that will demand much expenditure for achievements that we all hope to see accomplished. If it is really only for one year that extra money is required by the university authorities, I think we should try to show the Government some way in which that money might be found for this year, the assumption being that after this particular year, we shall have revenue coming in from sources that will be able to bear the strain.

If it is justifiable, as it has been in the past, to press the Commonwealth to assist our schools, which assistance is granted in the United States of America and of course

in Great Britain where education is financed by the central Government, surely it is reasonable to approach the Commonwealth for financial help for the universities throughout Australia! If this course were adopted, we would be confronted with one difficulty, namely, that our University is free. It is clear that the Prime Minister and his Cabinet would be able to say, "If you will charge fees for your students in Western Australia, then you will be on all fours with other universities throughout Australia." In those circumstances the Commonwealth might consider making a grant.

The Premier: Some grant is already made to students but we charge no fees and therefore get no money.

Mr. NORTH: The fact of our University not charging fees lays it open to that objection. On the other hand, a university that does not charge fees is something new in the world. There might be other places where fees are not charged, but they are certainly few in number. However, we would be handicapped in seeking assistance from the Commonwealth for that reason. Perhaps the Commonwealth could be induced to get the other States to imitate our excellent example by making their universities free. If that were done, the Prime Minister could, with every justification, start a Federal fund for the universities. There is a fund of this sort in Great Britain; the member of Nedlands told us that two millions pounds were allotted to universities there, although fees are also charged. I can quite appreciate the view of those who contend that fees ought not to be charged here, because our people are struggling and we have not the accumulation of funds to be found in the Eastern States. At the same time, Western Australia is the largest wealth producer per head of all the States. Yet we are in the curious position of being the weakest financially.

Mr. Cross: How much does it cost the State to pay for sabbatical leave for the University?

Mr. NORTH: It is quite natural for the Premier to seek to take control of the university finances. It is the old story of the man that pays the piper calling the tune.

The Premier: That is not so.

Mr. NORTH: Still, I do not see why we should give up the system of not charging fees, which has been a distinct move for-

ward. I understand that the Commonwealth is doing something for students in the Eastern States, and I believe that such help is vital to the future progress of Australia. I think we should pass a motion to the effect that the Commonwealth should take up the question of the universities throughout Australia with a view to getting them to forgo the charging of fees and thus come into line with us.

The Premier: The Commonwealth authorities say they are helping the students, not the universities.

Mr. NORTH: I believe that is so. Could not members, with the help of the Government find a few extra thousands of pounds this year by clipping a little off most of the items in the Estimates? We know well that the Estimates are variable and that hundreds of pounds are spent on items not provided for. We should not take the line that we cannot find more than £40,000 a year, though that is the limit under present conditions. I find that whenever I make any statement nowadays along orthodox lines, especially in relation to the system under which we are living, I receive letters asking me why I do not talk about social credit and things of that sort. That, however, is another world; we have not got there yet. Our duty is to deal with the situation that confronts us today. That is why I am making these remarks. It is difficult to make people understand that we are not living under a new order and that in all such ideas we are window-shopping, as it were. As I said, we have to deal with facts.

This House, I think, should take a different line from that of saying that more than £40,000 is not available now. Probably a good case could be made by the Premier for fixing the limit at £40,000, but surely he could do something for one year, namely, this year with a view to the Commonwealth coming into the picture! Then we would have time during the next 12 months to make further arrangements. It is worth considering whether we could not deduct a few shillings here and a few shillings there from the Estimates in order to make the extra allotment available this year.

The Minister for Mines: Have you any idea where you would start?

Mr. NORTH: I was getting down to ideas of that sort, but a deputation came along and kept me till 4.30 p.m. The Premier told us recently that, for tourist traf-

fic, he would allow £15,000 this year as compared with the previous vote of £5,000. That sounds like an extra £10,000.

The Premier: No; I said we could make it that amount after the war.

Mr. NORTH: Evidently the Premier was in a good humour that night and we have to keep him up to his undertaking. I think he said he could go up to £15,000 for tourist traffic.

The Premier: That is, when we can take up tourist traffic again.

Mr. NORTH: Evidently the deputation from the R.A.C. on the matter of tourist traffic has gone by the board. We cannot ask the Premier to act in both ways. I think if we went through the Estimates we could find £5,000 or £6,000 more for this year, and then get the Commonwealth Government to put things on a decent basis throughout Australia for ensuing years. Let us have a Federal system of free universities; that would be something to look forward to. The other point to which I would like to refer is in regard to the Senate and the Convocation. That, however, has been well covered already. I can quite see the point of view of the Treasurer in that as he finds most of the money he wants to have control over its expenditure. I can also see that it is in the interests of the University that it should be entirely free. Indeed, we want universities to be hostile sometimes to Governments, not particularly this Government, and to be on a line of their own. I admit we are in a difficult financial position at the moment, coming towards the end of the war, as we are. We might describe the body politic as being in the position of a human being fasting.

The Minister for Lands: Or hibernating.

Mr. NORTH: I would not like to think that. When the body politic fasts it is the strangest thing in nature what happens; the brain is the last part of the system to go. The body begins by eating off the fat, and then the meat is reached, and the last thing that goes is the brain.

Mr. Cross: Sometimes that goes first.

Mr. NORTH: If the hon. member does not believe me let him ask the Hon. J. G. Hislop in another place. That hon. member probably knows all about the subject. If it is true, as some say, that the university is the brain of the body politic—I do not say that it is altogether the brain though I think it has very wonderful raw material

from which perhaps brains may eventuate—it does not follow that all the brains are there, but I think the University would have a good opportunity to provide brains for the community. Let the Treasurer cast aside all his financial and Treasury precautions and come back to a state of nature and say, "We must save the brain." Then, as things build up after the war, we shall have the necessary guiding influence for Western Australia. It is worth making a supreme effort for the one year, and then let us go to the Prime Minister for future years. I support the measure with reservations as to the amendments forecast by the member for Nedlands.

MR. SMITH (Brown Hill-Ivanhoe): I feel I should have a few words to say on this Bill, in view of the fact that we have been so well circularised in connection with it, inundated as the member for Middle Swan has said. If we do not express ourselves in regard to the Bill it may be said by others who have written to us that we have just passed an ill-considered vote. I read the report of the Royal Commissioner, Mr. Justice Wolff, and in my view this measure gives effect to some of the recommendations made by him. It does not concur in all the recommendations, but in my opinion it has effected some, or will effect some, very desirable changes in the administration of the University, changes which I think are long overdue. As members know it provides for a different composition for the Senate, it reduces the representation of Convocation on the Senate, and it vests the latter with authority that cannot readily be vetoed by the Convocation. That in itself is a very important change. At the same time, the Bill increases the annual grant to £40,000 with the proviso, of course, that with the approval of the Treasurer and the consent of Parliament that amount can be further increased.

These proposed changes in the composition of the Senate I find are not unlike those that were advocated in this Chamber in 1940 by the then Leader of the Opposition. They are very similar to the position of the Senate that he advocated in the Bill that he then brought forward, and very similar to some of the changes that were then advocated by the Chancellor of the University at that time. Several members of the Opposition have said that this is an

attempt on the part of the Government to secure control of the University. Personally I think there is no substance whatever in that contention. I also think that the Bill seeks to get away from the idea expressed in 1932 by a former Attorney General when he said in this Chamber—

I do not see why the report of the University should discuss finance at great length. All that the people are entitled to know is what money is spent.

I think it was extraordinary, seeing that the people of this State are in the main contributing the great bulk of the funds of the University for its maintenance, for the Attorney General of that day to say that all that the people who were contributing that money were entitled to know was what money was spent. There can be no doubt whatever that under the existing constitution the Convocation dominates the Senate, or can dominate it, particularly when we know that there are 12 representatives of the Convocation on the Senate and six that are appointed by the Government. That it exercises this power of domination to the detriment of the Senate is quite another matter, but the fact remains that it holds a dominating authority in connection with the Senate and the University, and unquestionably I think it has too much power in its present set-up. As to the present set-up of the Senate, I point out that at a meeting at which two members of the Convocation disagreed with the decision of the Senate, although 10 members of the Convocation agreed with it—they would be representative of the Convocation on the Senate—the other two, despite the fact that their views had been defeated by a large majority of the Senate, could whip up the Convocation with the object of having their viewpoint subsequently made paramount.

Having regard to the disclosures made by the Royal Commissioner, in connection with the activities of the Convocation and the noisy minority that controls it, I think it is quite a possibility that that noisy minority might see the same way as the two discontented Convocation representatives on the Senate. Under the proposed composition of the Senate, neither the Government nor the Convocation, nor the other members of the Senate will be able to exercise the same autocratic control that can now be exercised by these representatives of the Convocation. So I think the Bill proposes to effect a very desirable

change. I listened with a great deal of interest to the speech of the member for Nedlands. No doubt he went to a great deal of trouble in preparing it, and quite possibly he was supplied with a fair amount of information that he was able to give to the House in connection with universities generally. I disagree with him entirely when he says that throughout history university life has shaped itself with wonderful results, and that it was entirely by freedom of thought that that standard had been maintained.

History itself gives the lie direct to the wonderful results, and in respect of the history of universities I point out that they had their genesis in the teaching of orthodox theology, and had their security in that orthodoxy and maintained their integrity through it. Their very existence depended upon the orthodoxy of the theology which they taught. That condition persisted down the centuries, right down to the 18th century so far as teaching and the confining of their teaching theology, languages, and theologic and kindred subjects. When Oxford and Cambridge were established in the 12th century the teaching at those universities was largely confined to languages, logic and theology. It can be left to the imagination just what measure of freedom those universities enjoyed down through the period of the Reformation, and subsequently, and all the changes that took place in respect to the views of conflicting theologies and dogmas of autocratic monarchs.

It is no use talking to me, or to other members of the House, about the freedom that universities have enjoyed down the ages. They may have enjoyed some measure of freedom so far as Governments were concerned, because Governments right down the ages, until quite recently, have been Governments of the ruling classes, and the universities have been institutions for the privileged ruling classes not enjoyed by the masses of the people, not giving opportunities for the masses of the people; so the Governments of the ruling classes would not be interested very much in the internal management of universities or in their internal affairs so long as they were privileged resorts for privileged people and representative of the ruling classes. But, since the nineteenth century, there has been a tendency to extend educational facilities. I remember having read once that industrialisation gave rise to the desire for

some measure of education for the working classes of Great Britain in order that they might be able to read the notices stuck up in the factories in which they worked. However, this tendency to extend educational facilities to people other than the privileged classes led to the establishment of many scientific and higher technical schools, not only throughout the British Empire but also throughout the world. Many of those came into existence through and owe their existence today to the giving of Government grants; and whilst Governments may not have sought complete control of universities in consequence, they certainly demanded some say in the control and character and conduct of the universities they were subsidising.

Although this proposed alteration in the Senate does not give the Government control, it will at least create a possibility by which the Government voice can be heard on the Senate—a very desirable and necessary provision, seeing that the Government represents the people who are finding the funds that are maintaining the existence of the University. If in any part of the world Governments did not seek to have their voices heard and their views expressed in connection with the control of the universities they were subsidising, they did an injustice to the taxpayers they were taxing to find the money to give subsidies to those universities. The Universities Grants Committee, of which the member for Neddlands spoke as if it were a committee vested with full authority to do this, that and the other, with over £2,000,000 per annum, was merely an advisory committee appointed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in 1919, to advise him in connection with the distribution of the grant or round sum Parliament made available for the assistance of universities throughout England. The committee had no final responsibility. It was merely a recommendatory body that relieved the Chancellor of the Exchequer of the detailed work in regard to the distribution of the funds that the Government made available for the support of universities throughout the country. The responsibility still rests with the Government with respect to the sum and also with respect to its distribution; although I have no doubt that, in many instances, having appointed the advisory committee, the Chancellor of the Ex-

chequer would act in accordance with its recommendations.

The Government of this State is asking, in this measure, only for adequate representation on the Senate and proposes that the Senate will be the master of its own decisions. That is a very desirable reform. The proposed representation of the Government is neither designed nor intended to give it predominance. Its six representatives will exercise their own discretion, as they have always done in the past. They have never been dictated to by this Government or by any former Government, but have been men in whom the Government has had confidence because of their special knowledge and ability for the tasks they have had to face as members of the Senate. The Director of Education and the Under Treasurer will also not be under the control of this Government or of any Government that succeeds it. Obviously, it is proposed that those two men should be appointed to the Senate on account of the special knowledge which they possess, and which they could bring to bear upon the problems with which the University Senate will be confronted; because the Senate is the business and administrative executive, which has to deal with the financial side and the management side generally of the institution.

In some of the speeches there was a suggestion that those six representatives of the Government and the Under Treasurer and the Director of Education and a couple of members of the teaching staffs would put their heads together in connection with the four co-opted members. That is not a very nice suggestion to make, and I do not think for one moment that anyone is justified in making it. I am of opinion that all the members of the Senate—whether Government representatives or members of the Convocation, or the Under Treasurer, or the Director of Education, or the teaching staff, or the four co-opted members—will be appointed because of their suitability for the position. I feel further that we can have confidence in each and every one that he will bend his efforts and give of his best in the interests of the advancement of the University. All being experts, they may have some difficulty in coming to agreement sometimes. I think it is Froude who says that 12 experts will take much longer to come to an agreement than 12 ordinary men. How-

ever, they will probably get over that difficulty all right.

In "The West Australian" of the 27th October, there was a letter above a number of signatures. They spoke about the fight for freedom of control and freedom of thought waged by the universities down through the centuries, according to the signatories of this letter. I would like to know something more about this fight that has been waged through the centuries. It is news to me that they had such a fight down through the centuries. The only real fight that I recollect universities having, and they ultimately lost it, was the fight to keep women out of the universities. If, down through the centuries, they had a fight for freedom of control and freedom of thought, then it conflicts with the viewpoint of the member for Nedlands who said that, down through the centuries, the last thing that Governments have sought to do has been to interfere with their freedom. Who else would seek to interfere with their freedom? The only fight that I know of was the one to keep the women out of the universities and the women defeated them ultimately—after a long fight, of course. These people go into the past and, thinking we know nothing about it and with the realisation that the history of the past is largely a fable agreed upon, make all kinds of assertions with respect to the wonderful traditions of the universities, and all that sort of thing.

Personally, I am as much justified in saying that down through the centuries the universities have been schools in which students—students who are representative of the ruling classes—have been taught the art of maintaining that supremacy. Lord Roseberry said not very long ago either; it was in this century—when speaking to the young men who had just graduated at Cambridge, "The British Empire expects you to occupy the seats of government, both State and civic, throughout the British Empire." Something similar occurred at the Church of England Grammar School, Melbourne, where the teacher told the boys that they were of the class from which the officers would be drawn. I have a great deal of suspicion about these schools and colleges associated with universities, and with universities themselves. I am not carried away with any sentimental attachment based on the history of universities, or any tradition that has been built up behind them because, although they

have always been institutions for the furtherance of the privileged classes, nevertheless they have been subjected, on many occasions, to intense criticism by the members of those classes, and not only by members of the privileged classes in the monetary sense but particularly by the classes who are privileged, by the native intelligence with which nature has endowed them, and not by the money which their parents have. Thomas Huxley said, in speaking about both Oxford and Cambridge, that what we fondly call our great seats of learning are simply boarding schools for bigger boys!

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. SMITH: I was quoting from a speech made by Thomas Huxley to the students of the South London Working Men's College. In the course of his address, he quoted the Rector of Lincoln College who said, "Colleges have become boarding schools in which the elements of the learned languages are taught to youths." Huxley also said—

England can show now, as she has always been able to show in every generation since civilisation spread over the West, individual men who hold their own against the world and keep alive the old tradition of intellectual eminence. But, in the majority of cases, these men are what they are in virtue of their native intellectual force, and of a strength of character which will not recognise impediments. They are not trained in the courts of the Temple of Science, but storm the walls of that edifice in all sorts of irregular ways, and with much loss of time and power, in order to obtain legitimate positions. Our universities do not encourage such men.

He mentions Grote, Mill, Darwin, Faraday and says—

Imagine the success of the attempt to still the intellectual hunger of any of the men I have mentioned by putting before him, as the object of existence, the successful mimicry of the measure of a Greek song or the role of Ciceronian prose.

Huxley said then as he could say now—

Imagine how much success would be likely to attend the attempt to persuade such men that the education which leads to perfection in such elegances is alone to be called culture, while the facts of history, the process of thought, the conditions of moral and social existence and the laws of physical nature are left to be dealt with as they may be by outside barbarians.

James Anthony Froude, Rector of St. Andrews, said—

A young man going to Oxford learns the same things which were taught two centuries

ago . . . If I go into modern model schools, I find first of all the three R's, about which all are agreed; I next find the old Latin and Greek which schools must keep to while universities confine their honours to these; and then, by the way of keeping up with the times, abridgements, textbooks, elements or whatever they are called of a mixed multitude of matters—history, natural history, physiology, geology, political economy and I know not what besides; general knowledge which, in my experience, means knowledge of nothing; stuff arranged admirably for one purpose and for one purpose only—to make a show in examinations. To cram a lad's mind with definite names of things which he never handled, places he never saw or will see, statements of facts which he cannot possibly understand and must remain merely words to him—this, in my opinion, is like loading his stomach with marbles. It is wonderful what a quantity of things of this kind a quick boy will commit to memory, how smartly he will answer questions, how he will show off in school inspection and delight the heart of the master. But what has the boy gained for himself? Let him carry this kind of things as far as he will; when he leaves school, he has to make his own living.

I think that statement is as true today as it was when it was uttered in 1869, notwithstanding that somebody outside told me I was speaking of the middle ages. I know that only a few years ago in Perth there was a graduate of the Western Australian University with 28 degrees who could not get a job in Perth. He could not even get a job as a clerk in the Statistician's Department, although he held a degree in statistics as well as degrees in quite a lot of other subjects. Sydney Myer, one of the benefactors of the Melbourne University—I think he made a bequest of £60,000—never saw the inside of a university except as a guest. I remember working in a draper's shop in Melbourne, the management of which were the sons of the proprietor, both of whom had had a university training, but both of them failed in the business which they were conducting and which Sydney Myer subsequently took over in Bourke-street, Melbourne, and not only made a success of it, but absorbed other businesses surrounding it, and he had not had a university education.

After the 1914-18 war, I read of a returned soldier who had qualified in certain studies in textiles. A firm sent for him and quickly gave him promotion because of his natural ability, and finally gave him a seat on the board of directors, but not until he had qualified as an accountant. He had to qualify as an accountant before he took his

seat on the board of directors so that he would be fitted to make successful contributions to the discussions of the board. I remember not more than five years ago that a Minister in a Labour Government—he is not a Minister now because he received some other appointment—went to the University and saw girls and boys lolling about beside the artificial pond in front of that wonderful building. He asked, "What are those boys and girls doing?" and one of the professors replied, "They are learning how to spend their leisure time."

Mr. Doney: It would be interesting if you gave the name of that professor.

Mr. SMITH: I could do it. Those young people were learning how to spend their leisure time against some problematical future when everybody will be working only five hours per day, and we have to find out how we are to employ the rest of our time—profitably, I presume. The former Attorney General, whom I have mentioned as having made a speech in this House in 1932 on the subject of the University, said the important part of our University education was the cultural side. Now, he was a University student, and so I presume he knew something of what he was talking about. He said the important side of a University education was the cultural side. I would like to know what the cultural side of university education is and how important it is; I would like to know what contribution it makes to our intellectual development or the progressive development of this State, which now is only in its pioneering stage. I venture to say that the School of Mines at Kalgoorlie turns out more students of a useful character than does the University down here in Perth. The students of the School of Mines are learning something useful, gaining knowledge that they can apply in a scientific way to the necessities of industry. In my opinion the cultural side of University education calls for a re-examination. The same Attorney General declared—

I do not consider it as part of the functions of an auditor to comment upon the manner in which the money is spent.

I consider that to be one of the functions of an auditor. I have known business people who expected an auditor to comment on their business activities, and who paid him for his comments and his advice. It might be all right if the University were a self-supporting institution, and if all its revenues

were coming to it as the result of fees it was charging to the sons and daughters of wealthy people able to afford to pay such fees as would keep the University on the right side of bankruptcy. They might not worry about the auditor commenting on the affairs of the University and the way in which the money is spent. But seeing that nearly all of our University's money is provided by the Government—which, after all, means that it is provided by the taxpayers—I consider it highly necessary that the auditor should make some comments on the manner in which the money is spent.

It seems to me that one of the subjects not taught at the University is the hard facts of life; but the students will learn those facts later on—those students who are making such wonderful progress in this, that and the other subject and successfully passing examinations! Why, I remember, when I was in Melbourne, seeing people there making applications for jobs, and the subjects in which they had passed would take up two or three sheets of foolscap paper! Well, the man in charge of the department was only on £600 a year, so I do not know what these students, who had passed all these examinations, would expect to receive. I have a deal of sympathy with the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition as to the salaries of these people. I do not know what salaries the district inspectors of mines get now, but they have to pass rather an extensive examination before they are appointed to their positions. I remember during the first year I was in this House raising the question of an advertisement calling for the services of a district inspector of mines at a salary of £346 per annum. I think that since then the amount has been increased to £600 per annum. But what do I find as the result of improvement? I remarked to a man on the Eastern Goldfields who was selling shirts that a certain doctor there was making £5,000 per annum, and I commented that one would expect that because the doctor was highly regarded, very skilful, and a gold medallist in surgery of the Sydney University. The man replied, "You would expect it, but I am making that amount here selling shirts." And such was the case.

I know greengrocers in Kalgoorlie with a turnover of £18,000 per year; and the big business people of Kalgoorlie, who have never seen the inside of a University, have

incomes of about as much in a week as some of the University students would receive in a year. This, I repeat, is a country in the pioneering stage; and I think that whatever education we can afford to give to our people should be devoted to subjects that can be applied to the development of Western Australia—not these fancy subjects that are described as the cultural side of the University, and after all only give polish to pupils. That polish is very nice and very desirable, but can be obtained by those who have a taste for it without going to a university at all. I do not think there is a Government in the world that gives money to universities, or gives them anything else, as the member for Nedlands suggested, without some query about how the gift is spent. If there is such a Government, I would like to know where it is to be found! I am satisfied about one thing in connection with universities, and it is this, that in every stage of its existence, from the beginning to as far in the future as we can look, the university's necessities are found to be at least equal to its resources.

I venture to say that if the Government grant to our University had been half as much again during the past ten years, the institution would have had necessities proportionate to the extent of that bigger grant. It is quite possible, though, that with a more businesslike Senate the University could have reached out in other directions; could have established, for instance, a chair of medicine in this city, if it had made better use of the resources at its disposal. But not only has it failed to make any use of those resources and of all the land with which it has been endowed, but it has not reaped such advantage as it could have reaped as the result of the realisation of some of that land in better times, thus placing some funds at its disposal; in point of fact those endowment lands have militated against the progress of many districts as the result of lying idle there for the last 30 or 40 years. But what can we expect from the business side of the University or any activity on its part in getting some funds from those lands when we read a report which was mentioned here in this House in 1939, a report made by Mr. A. J. McLaren. That gentleman is an accountant and auditor and he was appointed to make some inves-

tigation into University affairs and finance. What did he find? He said this—

The absence of a general statement of assets and liabilities in the form of a balance sheet prevents one from gaining a comprehensive view of the University's financial affairs.

Mr. North: That applies to our Estimates, too.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. McLaren continues—

The schedules appended to the Financial Statement for 1939 disclose a great deal of endowment land, a large portion of which, it is understood, is vacant.

This question of University finance has been raised in this House on several occasions since I entered Parliament in 1932. It seems to me that the University takes up the attitude that Parliament should not know how the money is spent. I think Parliament should know. In my opinion, we should have a balance sheet of the University's affairs every year. I would like to have a better knowledge, too, of the character and nature of the education given at the University, of the wastage that takes place there, and not only of the number of students but also of the number of classes. Such information is often given in the Commonwealth Year Book about other universities. As the member for Canning pointed out, some students only attend the University for about an hour a week, yet they are counted as students. We ought to know what contribution the nature of the education that is being given at the University is making in the progressive development of this State, which is an all-important thing, in my opinion, so far as education is concerned.

Mr. North: Are the students not being taught at the University how to live?

Mr. SMITH: They are taught how to spend their leisure time. That is all I know about it. I have never been there. I have no doubt that a student who attends the University and applies himself to the subjects that are taught can succeed in graduating. I am not decrying education. I am decrying certain phases of education in a State like this. If students have a taste for cultural education let them get it elsewhere. In a country such as ours, which is always crying out for money and whose educational facilities are limited in every direction, I contend that we should concentrate on those subjects which will be of value to the State; we should endeavour to turn out men who can make a contribution to

what is generally known as our intellectual development. So I think, Mr. Speaker, that the University Senate is in great need of a change, and that the injection into it of men with some talent for business will result in the resources at the disposal of the University being used to the best advantage.

MR. PERKINS (York): I regard this Bill as having very far-reaching consequences indeed if it is carried in its present form. The member for Nedlands has dealt extensively with the machinery clauses of the Bill, and the Leader of the Opposition has made a constructive speech indicating the alterations which might be made in the financial side of the University's activities. Dealing first of all with the machinery part of the Bill, which, as the Premier stated when introducing the measure, is possibly the most important part of the measure, because the financial side is altering from moment to moment, and undoubtedly the financial requirements of the University at the present time will not be the same as they will be five years hence, the appropriateness of the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition, to the effect that Parliament should be kept informed of the real financial requirements of the University, is obvious. I think the member for Nedlands has made it plain that there is a grave possibility, if the Bill is carried in its present form, of its having the effect of making the university outlook a mere reflex of the outlook of the Government of the day. Notwithstanding what has been said by members opposite tonight, I believe that universities the world over do reflect some of the most independent thought that there is in the community in which they exist. I can remember occasions when members of this House have seen fit to criticise severely some of the more radical thinkers of our own University.

The Minister for Mines: That is done in trade unions, too.

Mr. PERKINS: Every person has a right to make such criticism. I am not contending that the members of this Chamber were wrong in making criticism, because by criticism the final truth can be arrived at. It will be a sorry day indeed for Australia if ever we arrive at a stage when we do not allow a person to express his opinions, no matter what they may be, even though we do not see eye to eye with him.

The Minister for Mines: Hear, hear!

Mr. PERKINS: John Stuart Mill, in his classic essay on Liberty, says—

If all mankind except one were of one opinion, and that one were of a contrary opinion, mankind would have no more right to deprive that one man of the right of expressing his opinion than the one man would have the right of preventing a majority expressing their opinion. If the one man happened to be right, mankind would lose the opportunity of exchanging error for truth. If wrong, the truth would be brought out in greater relief by its collision with error.

The Premier: He also said that men's opinions were dependent to a great extent on their station in life.

Mr. PERKINS: That may be so.

The Premier: He said also that the reason which made him a High Churchman in London would make him a Mohammedan in Medina.

Mr. PERKINS: That makes no difference to the strength of the argument, because every individual has a right to express his opinion. Then the rest of mankind can judge of the truth or error of that opinion.

The Minister for Works: Your argument is all right, but applied to this Bill it is not.

Mr. PERKINS: As I stated in my opening remarks, it is generally accepted that the more radical thought—the independent thought—is expected to come from the university. It is nurtured to a large extent by universities, by reason of the independent outlook adopted by them; by their teaching they encourage students to adopt an independent outlook on most matters. It is conceivable that an outlook could develop at the University that would be highly objectionable to the Government of the day, no matter of what complexion that Government might be. The easy thing then to do is to bring pressure to bear on those who are expressing those opinions by means of the authority vested in the Government representatives on the University Senate. Personally, I consider that that would not be a healthy development, but it is one that could take place if this Bill were passed in its present form, as was so ably explained by the member for Nedlands.

The Premier: Tell us one University senator who has been influenced by any Government.

Mr. PERKINS: I feel highly critical of the clauses in the Bill relating to the composition of the Senate. I think, as

the Premier has indicated that this measure is not to be regarded entirely as a party Bill, the House might very well accept the amendments proposed by the member for Nedlands with a view to liberalising the appointment of members of the Senate. I cannot see why the Government should require more than a fair representation on the Senate. If the Government view can be advanced at the deliberations of the Senate, why should it be necessary to have such a large representation of the Government that the actual voting could be swayed by the Government nominees?

If the viewpoint of the Government is submitted to the Senate, surely the over-riding power that the Government holds through being asked to provide the greater portion of the finances of the Senate is quite a sufficient safeguard to ensure that the Senate will not launch out on plans that may possibly commit it to something beyond its means, and possibly could result in embarrassment at some later stage both to itself and to the Government. I have been astounded at the outlook indicated by some speeches from members opposite. I cannot see how any member can put the University into a watertight compartment of its own. Obviously, the University must be part of the life of this community. It must be a very vital part of the educational system and the greatest disservice that could be done to the educational system and to the community generally is to attempt to put the needs of primary education, in country districts, for instance, against the amount required to carry on the University. I do not think it is possible to do that.

The Premier: But they have a relationship, have they not?

Mr. PERKINS: They have this relationship: That the University must play its part in providing skilled teachers to teach other teachers, so to speak, and so keep our educational system going.

Mr. Cross: Would you give preference to primary education?

Mr. PERKINS: The right outlook is to say that in the first instance we should provide kindergartens, then primary educational facilities, then secondary educational facilities and, finally, that we should provide the University as the proper coping-stone to round off the educational system.

If we do not do that, it is obvious that we are going to develop an unbalanced educational system.

The Premier: We are doing that; what are you growling about?

Mr. PERKINS: If we do not provide proper facilities at the University, many of our more brilliant students will leave this State and be lost to us altogether. The grave danger is that if our faculties are not kept up to a proper level of efficiency, students will drift away to the other universities which have a higher standard.

The Premier: Who is criticising the University in that respect?

Mr. PERKINS: I am only just pointing out that we must try to get a proper balance in our educational system generally and not attempt to raise the argument that, if extra money is allotted for the University, some other section of education must be penalised. That is a very weak argument indeed and liable to re-act against the educational system generally. That question has been raised in the House to-night and I am endeavouring to counteract the remarks made by at least one member opposite.

Mr. Cross interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I must ask members to keep order.

Mr. PERKINS: I have been looking at the question of the University in relation to the general educational system more from the cultural angle than from the purely material angle. The cultural angle is very important. Most members will agree that one of the sharpest criticisms we have from visitors coming from overseas is in regard to the insularity in outlook of Australians generally; and I am afraid we have to admit that the criticism is just. Far too often we are so taken up with the immediate problems of our community that we fail to see the larger ones outside. I am hopeful that in the post-war period there will be some change in that direction. Unless Australia is prepared to play her part in the world as a whole and other nations are prepared to do the same, there appears to be very little hope for a better international system than we have had in the past. Many of us are hoping that we will be able to develop an international system in which the difficulties between nations will be ironed out without the necessity for a war every 20 or 25 years.

The Minister for Works: You will have to inject a lot of culture into the international bankers first.

Mr. PERKINS: I think that even the pure materialists in any nation would agree that wars are not a very profitable business. In the long run they usually injure everybody that has anything to do with them. I can only think that it is through ignorance of the undoubted consequences of war and through ignorance of the ways of bringing about a better understanding between the nations, that we have international conflicts. I do not mean conflicts such as actual war alone but in regard to trade and other things as well. I believe that the surest and most lasting way to bring about a better position in that regard is by means of improved educational facilities for the masses as a whole, and that it must be the university people who take the lead in that regard; because it is mostly people connected with universities who have the best knowledge of international problems and who can take the most disinterested view. It is very difficult for a man immersed in business to take a very disinterested view of the relations between one nation and another. Therefore, I think that members who scoff at the cultural side of a university speak without having due regard to what can be done to improve the general outlook in our community.

The Minister for Works: The view of the Opposition about university professors seems to have gone up since the Referendum.

Mr. PERKINS: Looking at the matter from a purely material angle, I think it is extremely good business to keep our University up to a high level of efficiency. The primary producers are under no illusions as to the value of scientific research in the solving of the many problems confronting the rural industry.

The Premier: We spend £100,000 a year on the Agricultural Department to do that.

Mr. PERKINS: The Agricultural Department does part of the work, but some of it must be done in conjunction with the University. Our Institute of Agriculture, in conjunction with the University, has done good work, and the right thing is for the Agricultural Department to work in conjunction with the facilities at the University and the specially trained men, not only in the departments directly connected with agricultural problems, but those in other

departments that have a more remote connection with the various pests and problems facing the rural community. I know that the Minister for Agriculture has plenty of worries on his shoulders at the moment in regard to the problems of the agricultural industry. I think he would be the first to agree that the Agricultural Department requires the assistance of the scientists of the various universities, not only of this State but those, perhaps, on the other side of the world, in order to deal with our special problems.

I do not wish to cover the ground that has been adequately covered already by the member for Nedlands and the Leader of the Opposition, but I would like to make the point that the Senate is not only responsible for the financial governance of the University, but also for the general organisation of the University work. So we must have on the Senate a large proportion of the people who are closely in touch with general university work. The question arises: How are we to obtain those people? If we could be sure of the Government, in choosing nominees, appointing people who have this expert knowledge we, perhaps, would not have so much cause to fear.

The Premier: You have nothing to fear from the Government, have you?

Mr. PERKINS: While there is another avenue through which we can get these people appointed to the Senate in a satisfactory manner it seems stupid not to use it. I refer to Convocation, which is representative of the graduates of the University. Although there is room for complaint, as the Royal Commissioner indicates, that the graduates have not taken the interest in the doing of Convocation that they should, provided there is a nucleus willing to take that active interest in the affairs of the University, then surely it is stupid not to take advantage of the enthusiasm of those people in seeing that our University is properly run.

Mr. Triat: They are not very enthusiastic.

Mr. PERKINS: But there is a proportion, and we hope that there will be a greater proportion in the future. As time goes on there must be more and more of our own University graduates living in our midst. We can only hope that, as a result of the criticism in that report, greater interest in the doings of Convocation will be

taken by the graduates, and that they will take an active interest in seeing that Convocation appoints satisfactory members to the Senate. If anyone can suggest other means by which we can secure these nominations for the Senate we will be interested to hear them, but up to date no one has made any concrete suggestions of how we can obtain representatives on the Senate except through Convocation or Government appointments. As I stated earlier in my remarks I feel that too many appointments are made direct by the Government because that Administration already exercises a strong influence through the power of the purse. To increase that pressure through more Government nominees on the Senate would, in my opinion, be doing no service to the good governance of the University. As my remarks indicate, I have every intention of supporting the second reading of this Bill, and I think I can speak for my colleagues as well as myself when I say that we shall do our best to see that the amendments foreshadowed, particularly by the member for Nedlands, are made during the Committee stage. I can see no reason why the Government should not accept them.

The Minister for Mines: That is generally the idea of any Opposition.

Mr. PERKINS: If the Government is sincere in the statement that it does not want to make this a party measure, but only to ensure the good government of the University, then it can accept the amendments. They will not add an extra penny piece to the expenditure, and if the Senate does not make a good job of governing the University then it will be the institution itself that will suffer. In these circumstances I think we have every reason to believe that the Senate will do its best to secure the good governance of our University at Crawley.

MR. McDONALD (West Perth): I confess to feeling rather depressed at the approach to this question exhibited by a number of speakers. I had always thought that we had reason to be proud of the University in our State in which we had committed ourselves to the principle of free education and which, although in its very early years and one of the youngest universities in the British Empire, already had a record of achievement of which the University and the people of the State could

well be proud. My mind goes back to 30 years ago, when this University opened its doors. I felt despondent at some of the criticism made of the past, and the attitude exhibited towards the University tonight by some speakers, when I recall very vividly those early days, as other members do, when our infant university was established in wood and iron sheds in Irwin-street, Perth, surrounded by dusty, and not very well kept gravel paths; when the students studied in extreme heat and no little discomfort in the summer and in a considerable amount of discomfort through the cold in winter, and when the professorial and teaching staffs had to carry on under conditions which, I venture to say, from a personal and teaching point of view, were very difficult when compared to similar institutions in any part of the world.

I remember, too, that there was very little money in those days. It was 15 years or more before some of the departments of the University left those wood and iron buildings. At least one professor, whom I know, spent half of those 30 years, or nearly half of them, in working in those wood and iron buildings in Irwin-street. There was very little money, and the University carried on in an atmosphere of parsimony and cheeseparing. This was accepted by the teaching staff and students because they appreciated that Western Australia was a young State without much money, that we had to make a start and that it would be unreasonable to expect in those early days conditions in the slightest degree comparable with those of longer-established universities. We in this State and in this Parliament might well pass a tribute of gratitude to those who established our University under such difficult conditions, and worked so long and so faithfully and so successfully to bring it to the stage it has reached today.

The Premier: We have progressed.

Mr. McDONALD: Yes. I read the report of Mr. Justice Wolff with very great respect, and I attach to his findings and criticism the greatest weight, but I know quite well that he would be the last man to be dogmatic in regard to many of the recommendations he made. The Government has acknowledged this by departing in some respects from his recommendations where it was thought they would not be in the best interests of the University.

The Premier: And where they proposed steps too quickly.

Mr. McDONALD: Yes, or made too violent a change. I think it was right to do so. I venture to say that, just as the Government has thought proper to depart from the findings of Mr. Justice Wolff respecting the composition of the Senate, it might equally be justified, and this House might equally be justified, in further departing from his findings regarding the constitution of the Senate, or in respect of other matters affecting the University. The representation of Convocation, which was recommended by the learned judge, I say, with great respect, is far too little. I venture the opinion that the learned judge did not give Convocation the functions its importance deserves; nor did he realise the value of the association of Convocation with the conduct of the University and the vast amount of benefit that could be obtained by utilising the interest and the experience of Convocation in relation to the government of the University. However, he has expressed his opinion and I have mine. The Government has departed from his recommendations by doubling the representation of Convocation—the figures have been increased from three to six—and while I leave the figures for Government nominees as they are, I do come to an alteration in which I would add two more to the number of the Senate for which Convocation would be responsible.

I approach the Bill from this standpoint, that our University is still in its infancy. It has passed through a period of very great difficulty; it has passed through that difficult period with commendable success, on the whole and, if it has made mistakes, they have been minor mistakes and are not to be weighed in the scale with the achievements that have been evident during the career of the University, even in the short period of 30 years in which it has been in existence. So I am not here to attempt to find a weakness in the University. It would be more than any human assembly of people if it had not made mistakes. I marvel that with the money at its disposal and with the pioneering work against so many difficulties, it has achieved so much for the State and for Australia and for the arts, sciences and professions.

The Premier: That is why the grant has been trebled in the 30 years of its existence.

Mr. McDONALD: I admit that, but our population in the same period has nearly doubled. When the University was started, it had nothing. It did not have the money, the staff or the facilities to take in more than a few students. As the numbers grew, and as its services to the State and the community expanded, obviously we had to increase the grant. While on the matter of grants, let me remind the House that the whole concept of education has been revolutionised in the last 30 years. People no longer feel that education is something to be niggardly about. They realise that expenditure on education is not lost, but that it makes for the efficiency of the whole community, and the community reaps much more than the money spent on education. That is the view which has been adopted by all countries, more than ever in the last 30 years and more so still in the last five years.

The Premier: Including Western Australia.

Mr. McDONALD: Yes, but less so here than in many other places.

The Premier: No.

Mr. McDONALD: The universities in the other States and in Great Britain and America are now enlarging their institutions. They realise that, in the post-war period, not only in the matter of efficiency and productivity in competition with other nations, but also from the broader point of view, if we are to achieve the kind of community the member for York hopes for, then we have to spend money on education to secure that standard. The member for Canning complained that our expenditure per capita was higher than that of universities in other States, with the exception of one. Who would expect it to be otherwise? As a rule, the larger the university, the less the cost per head, because the overhead charges are spread over a larger number of students. With a university of small numbers, the cost per head must inevitably be larger, and I am not prepared to attach any weight whatever to the fact that in our case we are the second highest in cost per head in the Faculty of Arts, just as we are the second smallest of all the universities in Australia. The hon. member said we could not compare our University in resources, income and endowments with the University of Sydney or the universities of Great Britain. Of course we cannot, but I

do not want to see our people condemned to an education commensurate only with the relative income of our State. It is not buildings that make education, but it is the teachers, and we can still spend money on teachers even if our buildings are small and comparatively poor as compared with those of other universities.

But it would be a dreadful assumption to adopt the basis that because we have not the material resources of a country like Great Britain, or because we have not the material resources of a State like New South Wales or Victoria, we are going to accept the position that our people and our generation are to be content with an education far inferior to that given by the universities of other States. It is all the more reason why we should spend money to ensure that our boys and girls, our young men and women, receive an education, if possible, better than that given by other States, so that they may apply their knowledge to bringing this State more to a parity with the wealthier and larger States. The hon. member says that our numbers now are not very large at the University of Western Australia. Of course they are not. He knows as well as I do, however, that people are not now allowed to go to universities unless they are licensed by the Commonwealth Government to attend university courses. We have to look at the numbers we are to prepare for in the future if our people are to get the chances of higher education.

I heard with some despondency the speech of the member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe. I listened to the hon. member with great attention and with great respect; but, as I gathered from the tenor of his speech, he considers that university education on the whole is not worthwhile. That was the whole tenor of his speech, I think. He said that the Kalgoorlie School of Mines was the kind of thing we should look to, because it would teach a man how to open up an auriferous body on our goldfields and produce wealth. He said that technical schools were far more useful to the community. He said that in a pioneering State like ours the University was having attached to it an importance in the community that it did not deserve. I quite agree that any Government must preserve a certain balance between, on the one hand, primary and secondary education and, on the other, university education; but I do not think there

is any danger in this State of our Government or our financial resources paying undue importance to the University of Western Australia. When that time comes, I shall join with great pleasure in the placing of some restriction upon lavish and excessive expenditure on higher education in this State. But I merely mention the words of the member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe to say that they are out of step, I think, with every concept of education.

The old idea that a man goes to the university purely and simply to enable him to earn a larger income than he would get if he did not go there, is gone and done for. The whole idea of a university is to teach a man highly skilled knowledge which he shall apply not only for himself but for the benefit of the whole community. Culture, as a friend of mine defined it to me, merely means a broad mind. It does not mean a narrow-minded education merely for the sake of gaining money, and nothing else except that learning which enables a man to make money at his trade, profession or business. It is the broad mind which enables the owner of it to have a knowledge of all the varied aspects of life and learning, and which fits him to take the lead in helping this country in the ideals of citizenship and general advancement of the whole of his fellow citizens.

The Premier: It helps towards snobbishness as well!

Mr. McDONALD: I will come to snobbishness in one moment. I very much regret that in discussing the University of Western Australia there should be any question of snobbishness at all. There can be snobbishness in any institution, but I believe there is less snobbishness in the University of Western Australia, as far as I know, than in any other institution of the kind known to me.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: And less in Western Australia than in any other part of the world!

Mr. McDONALD: Yes. Talk about a university being the privilege of the wealthy few! Our University is outstanding because it has had a larger proportion of students going through its doors than perhaps any other university in the world, whose means were of the slightest description. No university in Australia, and none that I know of anywhere, can be more aptly

described as a university of the people, one where the privilege of being there is less affected by amount of income or any other factor associated with the term "the privileged few."

The member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe, in his interesting speech, was good enough to challenge the suggestion that universities had been in the vanguard of progress. This may be getting some distance away from the immediate present, but we are discussing tonight a matter of very great importance, and it would be no less than a disaster if the feeling or impression went out to the people of the State that the Parliament of this State has no opinion of university education and has no opinion of the services that have been rendered, and can be rendered, in any community by a university. Universities in fact—and the hon. member must have misread his history—have been the means by which people advanced themselves in life in the past. It is true that in the past it may have been, and was, easier for those of means to join the universities than it was for those without means; but the university was, apart from commerce the only means by which a man could raise himself out of the situation into which he was born, to a wider and higher sphere of life.

Mr. Cross: The old school tie has been very valuable!

Mr. McDONALD: The old school tie is dead. When my friend mentions the old school tie at all, he dates himself as early Victorian. Thus the university, so far from being the home of the privileged few as in the old days—I speak of through the ages—has been the sole means, apart from successful commerce, by which a man in a humble station could leave the station to which he was born and emerge into a higher and more important and more valuable life. That is absolutely correct in every detail; and as regards being in the vanguard of liberty, I have collected here names of university men throughout the ages who have led liberties in England: Sir Thomas More, Oliver Cromwell, William Pitt and Shaftesbury, the last responsible for so much of the factory legislation of the last century. All those are men produced by universities and all have led in advancing the liberties of their people. When we come to the history of science, as to which the member

for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe appears to doubt the value or the efficacy of university training at all, allow me to say that I have collected these names of men, who are all university men, starting with Aquinas, Martin Luther, Calvin, Loyola, Newton, Karl Marx, Darwin, Einstein, Pasteur and Lister—all were in the vanguard of liberty or helped to break down the bonds of prejudice and orthodoxy. These are men from universities who, through the ages, have been leaders, breaking away from the fetters that had been placed on them.

The Premier: What about James Watt?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I draw the Premier's attention to the fact that he has the right of reply. I must ask him and members generally to keep order.

Mr. McDONALD: I do not detract for one moment from what the member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe refers to as the university life. Men and women from universities do not monopolise for one moment all the advances in freedom and science and philanthropy from which humanity derives benefit. There are, of course, outside of universities men of immense ability and the highest possible character. In the total they represent no doubt many more than would be passing through universities, on account of the difference in numbers. So I do not disparage for one moment all of those great men who have never been to a university, perhaps never even to a school, men like Bunyan, who was a tinker and whose "Pilgrim's Progress" we have all read, men who have laid the whole world under their debt. We pay honour to those men, but while we pay honour to those men who have not had a university education, do not let us pay dishonour to the universities which, in proportion to the numbers attending them, have produced so many men to whom mankind is so much in debt, such as men of the kind I have mentioned. Universities, by and large, have been in the vanguard of liberty through the ages. During the English revolution of the sixteenth century they were in the vanguard of liberty, as they were in the French Revolution and in other revolutions since then; and only in the last two or three years the University of Paris put up the strongest possible fight against the invaders who occupied that city.

The Minister for Works: Can you tell us where the universities stood during the Russian revolution?

Mr. McDONALD: The Russian revolution was, to a large extent, the outcome of the work and views of intellectuals; a large proportion of the men who worked for and brought about the Russian revolution were university men. Lenin himself was a university man, his associates were university men; in fact, the men of Russia who were the backbone of the revolution were to a large extent university men.

Hon. H. Millington: Stalin was the greatest of them all. You missed him.

Mr. Cross: Churchill did not go to a university.

Mr. McDONALD: I do not suggest that all leaders are necessarily university men; but I do suggest very strongly that they have—and this has been challenged here—led and played a leading part in the vanguard of liberty right throughout the ages, right down to the very revolution mentioned by the Minister for Works—the Russian revolution of 1917.

The Minister for Works: It is wonderful to think how the leaders of that revolution have so many admirers now!

Mr. Thorn: On your side of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. McDONALD: I pay full tribute to the leaders of that revolution in many respects, but I am not a believer in revolution. I believe in evolutionary progress. If we are to assess for one moment the value of universities, including our own—which has been disparaged by the member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe—allow me to mention only two or three things now. Penicillin is the product of university men; relativity is the discovery of a university man; radiolocation is the product of a British University, and without that contribution from our own Empire universities—

Mr. Cross: Grundell Matthews discovered that and he was never at a university.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The member for Canning has spoken, and I must ask him to keep order.

Mr. McDONALD: That discovery emanated from the research work in a British university. In Western Australia we have produced brilliant men even in the short career of our university, both in science and in engineering. They have occupied

prominent places in competition with the graduates of all the other universities right throughout the British Empire and America. All over the English-speaking world there will be found Western Australian graduates now occupying leading positions. Turning nearer to home, there are two things which the departments of agriculture and chemistry in our University are now doing or have done which alone would be equal to the whole, or a great part, of any endowment the University got from the State. I refer to the discovery of cobalt for the treatment of stock and the researches in connection with potash and aluminium. Do not let us disparage what has been done by our university men in general or by our young University in particular. There is a tendency in the report of Mr. Justice Wolff and in the debate on this Bill, and particularly in the speech of the Premier, to suggest that the University has been in some way blameworthy for the very limited finance it has ever had at its disposal.

The Premier: Who has attacked the University here? All we are trying to do is give it more money.

Mr. McDONALD: The whole underlying basis of remarks made is that it is not competent regarding finance; that more Government delegates are required to make certain that it does not make mistakes regarding finance.

The Premier: You were not here last week.

Mr. McDONALD: No, but I read the speech of the Premier and both his speech and the report of the Commissioner—particularly the report—conveyed the definite impression that the administration of the University with regard to finance and trust funds has not been satisfactory in certain respects.

The Premier: You will find it difficult to sustain that from my remarks.

Mr. McDONALD: There is no foundation for it whatever. While the Commissioner refers in a somewhat ambiguous way to possible administrative savings, when it comes to a specific suggestion to save expenditure at the University, the only item he mentions is the sum of £200 a year which had been paid or was being paid to a lecturer in Italian. If, after one year's research, the Commissioner could find only one specific item of £200 a year which he thought could be pruned off University ex-

penditure—and that is the only item he mentioned—all I can say is that I do not think many institutions, governmental or business, could stand such a test and emerge so well. As for the control of trust funds, nothing in any way reprehensible is suggested for one moment; and as to prudence or foresight or wisdom in the control of trust funds, there is nothing, so far as I can learn, of which any real criticism can be made and the control of the University's trust fund will bear favourable comparison with the control of the trust funds of any other comparable organisation.

The Premier: Except that the University let the trust funds lie idle.

Mr. McDONALD: I have some trust funds—not my own, or they would not be trust funds—and they are lying idle. Very often it is hard to know what to do with trust funds. They could be put out in doubtful investments and then one would have cause to regret it afterwards. In the meantime, it is wise and prudent to let things stay as they are until there is some entirely suitable investment to which they might be applied. So, from the point of view of finance, or financial control, there is very little in the report of the Commissioner or in the statements of anybody else which justifies Government intervention on any marked scale. I shall refer to some points that have been brought up in debate, because I would like to see them answered, since I have some slight knowledge of the University extending over some years. It has been said that in some way the University was wrong in having a Chair of Psychology. I do not know why. Because some universities have not a Chair of Psychology, it was thought we should not have one.

Are we never going to initiate anything of our own? A Chair of Psychology is just about to be established by the University of Melbourne. Although Mr. Justice Wolff does not appear to be satisfied about the Chair of Psychology, his views—with all respect—are at variance with the views of many educationists of high prestige; and, as I have already said, the University of Melbourne is about to establish a Chair of Psychology. Our own department of psychology has supplied the means for the tests conducted by the Education Department in connection with the aptitude of children for different vocations,

and our Chair of Psychology has been the means of supplying people who have been able to deal with industrial psychology in the various establishments in this State. The operations and existence of the Department of Psychology can be said to have been justified in no small degree. It is said there may have been long-term financial commitments by our University. Beyond the position it took up—which involved comparatively small funds—in consequence of a Carnegie appropriation being promised to it; apart from that, it has never indulged in long-term commitments that would embarrass the Government or the University itself.

Now I turn to the main part of the Bill—the Constitution of the governing body. I should very much regret to see Parliament fail to recognise the value of Convocation, not only in this University, but in all universities. It is only 27 years since the first degree was conferred on a graduate of our own University. Assuming that he was 23 years of age then, his age today would be 50. Our graduates, who compose Convocation, are young people. They have been coming out of the University over the last 27 years, and they have been occupied in establishing themselves in life. They are now just reaching the stage when, having more or less established themselves, they are able to turn their activities—and in some instances I hope, any money they many have accumulated—towards the assistance of their own University. Our Convocation is too young to be judged; it is like expecting results from boys during their first year after school. There must be time for Convocation to grow up and attain influence in the community and leisure to devote time and money to it. We have not given Convocation a trial in this State, yet we propose to condemn it.

The Premier: There are graduates of other universities on Convocation.

Mr. McDONALD: I should say there were comparatively few. Our University has 600 or 700 of its graduates and undergraduates away at this war. Those young men and women will come back and will be an addition to Convocation. I want to see them brought into the use of the University and to see them having a voice—a real voice—in the University's affairs.

Mr. Cross: Yet they can rarely get a meeting of 30.

Mr. McDONALD: As I said, Convocation is composed at present, during war-time, of men who are mostly doing a very important job in the community. They are men in the prime of their life and activities and, on the whole, are occupying important jobs in this State. We cannot expect them, in the middle of a war, to turn up at meetings; but I may tell the member for Canning that when it comes to exercising their right to vote for members of the Senate, the average vote of Convocation is 500, and that represents a very substantial percentage and shows a very substantial interest in the affairs of the University by the people who compose Convocation. Do not let us hear any more about the member for Canning's noisy majority.

Mr. Cross: I did not say that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. McDONALD: The hon. member quoted from Mr. Justice Wolff's report. The learned judge, I think—and I am not casting any reflection upon him—acted on evidence, but the evidence did not truly represent the position. I believe there has been no justification for saying that Convocation is controlled by a noisy majority. Convocation on the whole has been composed of a responsible body of men and women, and will continue to be so. The power of good it can exercise in the University will become greater and greater as time goes on, and there will be further additions to its numbers. Having disposed of these objections, I am going to say that, just as the Government refused to reduce Convocation's representation on the Senate to three, but made it six, so it should go a little further and make Convocation's representation eight, as proposed by the member for Nedlands. If the Government does not want to dominate the University, then do not let it be suspected of aiming to do so. The University, and many members of the public, see in the composition of the Senate under this Bill a desire to ensure that the Government will have the strongest say on the subject.

Mr. Triat: They are bad calculators.

Mr. McDONALD: If that is the case, nothing is easier than to allay the public mind and show the complete good faith of the Government in that respect, and that is by leaving the Government's representation, as proposed, at six nominees together with the Director of Education and the Under

Treasurer, both of whom are Government officials of high standing.

The Premier: And both are members of Convocation.

Mr. McDONALD: Yes. They are also members of the Government service. The Government should leave its representation at eight, including these two officers, and make the representation of Convocation eight. In that case, there would be a guarantee and an assurance that would allay any uneasy feeling, and would demonstrate the accuracy of the Government's statement that it has no wish to be in a position to dominate or bring undue pressure on the proceedings of the University. That is the crucial point. If the Government does not want to take charge, or be in a position to take charge, it can show its attitude in the matter by accepting the amendment of the member for Nedlands. I am not going to say anything more on that point. I have one or two other matters that I want to mention. A university is something that stands by itself. It is not a department of commerce or production in the ordinary sense, but a department of thought. There is one thing that we all agree upon, namely, that people should be allowed to think their thoughts, and no Government, or any other body should seek to control people's thoughts.

The Premier: No-one is trying to do that.

Mr. McDONALD: I await the attitude of the Premier on the amendment, and then I shall be convinced on that point. The people of this State want to be left in no doubt that it is not desired to turn this University into a Government institution.

The Minister for Works: It is remarkable how easily these cultured minds can develop all kinds of weird suspicions.

Mr. McDONALD: I have in front of me a memorandum from the Teachers' Union, a very responsible body of men and women who are all Government servants. They, in no uncertain terms, ask me to support any amendment to ensure that the University shall not be in a position where it can be dominated by the Government.

The Premier: It is a strange thing —

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I must ask the Premier to keep order. I have told him before that he has the right of reply.

Mr. McDONALD: I am not a Government servant, but when I receive a circular on behalf of several hundred Government

servants, who are in the educational service, asking me to protest against the Government proportion on the Senate, then I am prepared to pay a certain amount of deference to their views. I have not had the experience of being a Government servant, but these people have and they tell me in no uncertain terms that they want it made quite certain that the Government will not be in a position to dominate the freedom of thought and teaching at the University of Western Australia. On the governing body of that institution. I want to see appointed a representative of the University Colleges, as soon as there are more than two. The Royal Commissioner, Mr. Justice Wolff, said, and I agree with him that the University College is a fundamental part of the life of the university community. He recommended that the University Colleges should have a representative on the Senate. The Government has completely ignored that finding of the Royal Commissioner.

The Premier: You are ignoring some of his findings, too.

Mr. McDONALD: Let us both join in that. Are we not entitled to express our views? I can only express my view that we are not required to take Mr. Justice Wolff's report *holus bolus* on the assumption that he has made an investigation and that the whole of his recommendations are correct. Once we alter the recommendations, we acknowledge that in some respects his findings should not be followed by Parliament. When that is done, then equally justifiably we may alter other recommendations made by him. I want to see a representative of the University Colleges on the Senate of the University. They deal with a different aspect of life; they deal with the student outside his official study hours; they deal more with his personal life, his aspirations and his reactions, and I think a representative of those bodies would be a valuable addition to the wisdom and good government of the University.

I am prepared to accept the request of the Guild of Undergraduates that it should have a representative on the Senate, and I do not want the member for Canning to be talking to me about giving 18-year-olds a vote. The Guild of Undergraduates is an integral part of the university corporation or structure. It is provided for in the Act of Parliament, which says there shall be a Guild of Undergraduates. All it

asks is that it be permitted to elect to the Senate one representative. This representative would not be a student; he would be a graduate, which means that normally he would be over the age of 21 and have finished his academic career. On the Senate of the Melbourne University, there are two representatives elected by the Guild of Undergraduates, but I do not know of any other university in Australia in which there is representation of the Guild of Undergraduates. I suggest to the Premier that these young men—and there are many hundreds of them—might well be allowed one representative.

Mr. Cross: That is a reasonable request.

Mr. McDONALD: I thank the member for Canning.

Mr. Smith: Not under 18 years of age.

Mr. McDONALD: I will leave it to the member for Canning to support an amendment to that effect. If one representative were permitted, it would mean that the Guild of Undergraduates would not only have a means of putting its views before the Senate, but also that the Guild would accept through its representative some responsibility for the conduct and good government of the University.

I support the idea of holding a periodical survey of the University. Mr. Justice Wolff, in his report, referred to a quinquennial re-examination of the grant to the University. I am not quite sure what procedure he had in mind. I think we would we well advised to make provision for machinery by which there could be an inquiry, at least every five years, emanating from this House, into the financial position of the University.

The Premier: I have promised to put an item on the Estimates every year so that members will have an opportunity to discuss matters connected with the University.

Mr. McDONALD: I think something more than that is necessary. It is difficult for a university to budget from hand to mouth and from year to year. In a university, it is necessary to make contracts for a term of years, perhaps two, three or four years. If we had a recommendation from a committee that a grant should be not less than a certain sum for the ensuing five years and the Government, in principle, accepted the recommendation, then the University would be in a position to arrange its programme of university train-

ing or activity, whereas, if it is a matter of budgeting year by year, the university authorities might hope to get an extra £5,000 this year and it would depend upon what Parliament decided whether the item was cut out, and so the efficacy of the University would be impaired and the difficulties of administration increased. As this is something also that in part was suggested by the Royal Commissioner, I think it might well receive the consideration of the Government.

I have concluded my examination of the Bill, the second reading of which I propose to support. I hope that when the Committee stage is reached, members will not embark upon experiments with the University about which there is so much public apprehension. In the last 30 years, with a two to one representation in favour of Convocation, the University, on the balance, from every point of view, has a record deserving of the highest commendation, and, in my opinion, there has been nothing that should justify any discrediting of the association on a major scale of the convocational body with the conduct of the University. In view of the experience of other countries and other States in the constitution of their Senates and in the role to be played by Convocation, I hope that although we make an alteration, to which I am agreeable, in the proportion between Government nominees and Convocation-elected representatives, and although we reduce the proportion of Convocation representatives, we shall not do so in the drastic, revolutionary way proposed by this Bill. I hope members will accept the basis proposed by the member for Nedlands which, I think, represents a happy solution between the proposals of the Government and the old measure under which the University hitherto has operated.

I hope, too, that this Bill will emerge from Parliament on a note of optimism and appreciation of our University, our teaching staff, our graduates and our undergraduates. I think they deserve it. They should be made to feel that we are here to help them in the fullest possible way, to help them to do even better than they have done in the past under the difficult conditions that existed. After all, we cannot overestimate the value of the functions of the University. The institution is even more important in a pioneering State, if

we can make the comparison, than in an older and more highly developed State. We here have so much more to learn in almost every department. We have been so busy pioneering that there has been no opportunity to study many things that other people have been able to study. Further, from our University, we will draw our teachers who will mould the whole of the educational service of our State. On them will depend the standard and efficiency of the population of a future day.

The University has a tremendous responsibility, a responsibility that it is impossible to exaggerate. I hope we will give it all the money we possibly can, having regard always to other inescapable obligations, having regard to our most important duty to primary education and secondary education. Still I hope we will give all the encouragement we can to the University. I hope we shall not hear any more about alleged lack of administrative capacity at the University, but that we will pass a Bill which will be received by the institution and by the public with confidence and without misgivings. By that means we shall give the University a fresh start in the very great and especially important work it has to do in the years that are immediately ahead of us.

HON. H. MILLINGTON (Mt. Hawthorn): In supporting the Bill we have the advantage of the speech delivered by the Premier and that delivered by the member for Nedlands, who took an entirely different view but delivered a most informative speech, and one most helpful, especially in the contrast which he drew between our University and the universities of Eastern Australia and, for that matter, of the rest of the world. I have also to mention the speech of the member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe, who inspired the member for West Perth. I am drawn into this discussion because of the helpful advice I have received, mature and technical, from various people. In fact, we all have received such advice. It seems to me that objections have been raised in some instances quite genuinely. The objections are to the Government nominees on the Senate, that the financial grant is insufficient, that there is a suggestion of alleged interference with the control of the University. Further, there is a suggestion of interference with

free speech. It does not exist here, not being permitted. And yet people have an idea that free speech is permissible.

Those associated with the University have never in any way been hampered in respect of free speech. Here we have the President of the Teachers' Union giving his views—an employee of the teaching department, and he is perfectly entitled to state his opinions. Who is there that is circumscribed so far as free speech is concerned? Why are members so nervous about Government nominees? All those who believe in free speech and all those who desire that the Government should deal generously with the University seem nervous. I speak with knowledge when I say that if there were six nominees for the Trades Hall, hardshell trade unionists, they would be found to have most generous ideas in regard to finance, especially as applying to social services and education. Therefore those who are now nervous in that respect need have no fear of the Government nominees. As a matter of fact, I could not say which of those on the Senate are Government nominees. I doubt if many here could say. Those nominees are six in number. They are pretty good nominees, too. I think they pull their weight and are worth their positions any time; and I can assure members that they must be people of some standing before the Government would place them on the University Senate. As for interfering in any way with their judgment, it has never been done to my knowledge. I do not know whether those nominees even report regularly to the Government.

The Premier: Very irregularly, if at all!

Hon. H. MILLINGTON: They are appointed because they are men of knowledge and judgment and standing, and they are there in the same way as any board or committee, to do the job faithfully and well. Now as regards finance, does this House not insist that where the Government issues a grant of any description anywhere, it has the responsibility of seeing that the money is wisely and properly spent? To those who suggest that there is some difference between a grant made to the University and a grant employed in any other branch of education I say then, when this State declared that there should be a free University, it inevitably meant that a very large and substantial amount of the upkeep

of that University must come from Government funds. So that is when the matter was decided—not now. I think the member for York was perturbed that this should be considered as part of our system of education. Why not? It is like all the other branches of the educational system in that it depends on the Treasury for its existence. I find that other branches of the Public Service are not at all perturbed when asking the Treasury for money.

We have had primary education and technical education, and now the kindergarten has come into the picture, and the kindergarten insists that it should be supported—and with some degree of merit too! I can speak now without binding the Government in any way. Therefore when the Treasurer introduced this Bill, he expected that the mention of £40,000 would be received with applause. But it was not so. I had a letter from two people who had passed through the University—a married couple each of whom has degrees. They mentioned an amount of £48,000. I suppose they are well-meaning people. I replied that of course a greater amount than £48,000 could be expended, but I reminded them that this was only one phase of the educational system which had to be financed by the Government. Again, there is objection to the Under Treasurer being on the University Senate. I should say the Under Treasurer is a man of affairs. When we are subscribing largely to a fund—I think that principle is observed in the case of some of our trading concerns—we see that we are represented on the board of management. I should say that the University professors are seekers after truth and believers in specialists. There is no man amongst the lot that has greater knowledge of finance so far as this State is concerned, or more knowledge gained in association with some of those Treasurers and Under Treasurers in the East for whom we have very great respect. We depend on our Under Treasurer largely to put up Western Australia's case to the Commonwealth Grants Commission. Therefore he is accustomed to the examination of finances to a much greater extent than they are. I should think they would be rather delighted that such a man should be amongst them.

Mr. McDonald: We all support that.

Hon. H. MILLINGTON: I am sure the Premier will be pleased to know that they do not object to the assistance that the Under Treasurer can render because of his experience. By the way, the Under Treasurer is not from the Trades Hall, either! In order to follow this grant, for which we as a Parliament are responsible—we have heard a lot about the responsibility of this House in connection with finance—right through, an officer appointed by this House, the Auditor General, who is responsible to this House, is to audit the accounts. How can they object to that? Here is the University, the main object of which is to seek after truth.

Mr. McDonald: Pardon me, but the provision regarding the Auditor General has not been objected to.

Hon. H. MILLINGTON: Here we see objections fading as they are tackled! The Auditor General will get at the truth as far as the University accounts are concerned. The member for West Perth questioned the Royal Commission and said that the evidence received was not the right evidence. He should know something about various types of evidence. The Royal Commissioner may not have got the right evidence, but I guarantee the Auditor General will secure the right evidence when he examines the University accounts. We will then know where the money went. If it is claimed that the grant should be more than £40,000, what better evidence could be obtained in support of the claim than a report to that effect by the Auditor General? If the Auditor General reports to the Treasurer, whoever he may be, that the money has been expended economically but nevertheless the institution has not been able to get through and that the University is financially on the rocks, what better support for an increase could there be than such a report? Certainly, it would lend much greater support than someone's blind guess that the appropriation should be £48,000.

When the Treasurer, with his full responsibility and with the advantage of the best advice available plus his very considerable experience, goes the limit on this occasion in providing £40,000, one would think he would be thanked for the increase, but instead of that he is criticised. I am not in a position to say whether the University can be effectively run on £40,000 but I claim that with the set-up in the Bill this

House, as well as the Government, will have an opportunity to know whether an additional amount is warranted. I am sorry I cannot join the member for West Perth, during hostilities, in an endeavour to map out a five-year plan. That is the boldest stroke that has yet been suggested. I think we should see where we stand before we proceed along those lines.

Mr. McDonald: We are asked to pass a Bill that will provide not for five years, but possibly for 50 years.

Hon. H. MILLINGTON: The member for West Perth suggests that now is the time that we should forecast a five-year plan.

Mr. McDonald: The Royal Commissioner suggested that.

Hon. H. MILLINGTON: Apparently anyone but the Treasurer of the State can forecast a five-year plan! The Premier, as Treasurer, has to find the money, not only for education but for all the other free services. This free service idea—what an illusion it is! Free education! It is free all right. It means that the people of Western Australia pool about £800,000, spend it on themselves and then tell themselves that they enjoy free education. This idea about a free university was splendid; it was grand! But as I said earlier, when that was the declared policy of Western Australia, whenever that was—I am not sure who was responsible for it—it was quite all right, and it certainly meets with approval now. No-one is prepared to accept the Royal Commissioner's proposal that £15,000 should be raised by the imposition of fees. That proposal has gone into the discard altogether.

Hon. N. Keenan: Are you in favour of charging fees?

Hon. H. MILLINGTON: It has gone into the discard both inside and outside the House.

Hon. N. Keenan: Are you in favour of it?

Hon. H. MILLINGTON: I remind the member for Nedlands that I belong to a Party whose declared policy is in favour of free education and a free university. I would not like to take credit to my Party for having initiated the policy because it may have been initiated by others.

Mr. McDonald: I think it was.

Hon. H. MILLINGTON: Perhaps it was. But bearing in mind those who have advanced ideas in this respect, I rather suspect there was some prompting by Labour members. When I consider that, on the show-

ing of the member for Nedlands, we are ahead of the world in this respect, I appreciate that we must live up to our reputation. I agree with that hon. member that since we are deprived of the advantage of fees in this State, a greater obligation is placed upon the Government than exists in any other State. That fact was borne out by the information supplied by the member for Nedlands. I forget what the Government grant represented in South Australia.

Mr. McDonald: The grant amounted to £80,000 a year.

Hon. H. MILLINGTON: And there were not so many more students attending Adelaide University than there were in attendance at the University of Western Australia. Probably there were a hundred or so more.

The Premier: No, 300 more students.

Hon. H. MILLINGTON: The Adelaide University charges fees and, in addition, being an older institution than the University of Western Australia, it has considerable revenue from investments. Therefore the Adelaide University is in a much better financial position than is the University here and it is not so much dependent upon the Government. In this State, it seems to me, having declared for a free university we have to shoulder additional liabilities and obligations. All Treasurers will have to face that position. Therefore, leading up to what I said previously, it becomes all the more important that we should have a proper examination of the University accounts. In such a matter, I am not prepared to take evidence from anyone just now. I shall wait until there is a proper opportunity for a complete examination of the finances. We will have the Under Treasurer on the Senate—such an appointment should have been made long ago—and then the Auditor General will audit the accounts. Apparently we all agree with that. If the Bill does nothing else than establish that position, its passage will be worth while. It will have the effect of settling many arguments and will make clear a position that has been the subject of much speculation. Even the findings of the Royal Commissioner have been challenged.

Dealing now with the liability respecting educational matters in Western Australia, it is true that we have before us a circular signed by the president and secretary of the Teachers' Union. To a great extent these

people are usually putting up a case for themselves. From my experience, I know I could put up just as good a case with regard to the needs of primary, post-primary and technical education as has been submitted in favour of an increased grant for the University of Western Australia. I once had an opportunity of addressing eight out of ten district inspectors. They were all scholars and most of them held degrees. I remember saying to them on that occasion that if I could get the Treasurer—he is not an easy man to approach on such a subject, I can assure members; my experience is that all Treasurers are conservative—to make an additional amount available, I would prefer to spend it on improvements to our system of technical education. With that they all agreed. Those are men who have had teaching experience throughout the State and who have been advanced to the grade of inspectors. That must have been nearly ten years ago.

I ask any member what we were deficient in when we were attacked, when the great testing period of our history came. Certainly it was technical training. We were behind the world. Australia was well behind the world and Western Australia was behind every other State of Australia. This State was the worst off, so that, from that point of view, whatever may be the advantages of a university training, I say that what we were deficient in on that occasion, and still are deficient in, is technical training. That is how I feel about the matter. I am not one who belittles or in any way undervalues university training. We have today two departments with which I was associated, one the Agricultural Department and the other the Works Department, and I would remind members that the Agricultural Department is one of our spending departments. It spends nearly £100,000 a year.

The Premier: More!

Hon. H. MILLINGTON: It spends over £100,000 per annum. In that department we have University-trained men; these men are also men trained in just as good a university—the rude school of experience. The men who came from the University had very much to learn and the practical knowledge which they acquired is just as valuable. They become more valuable to the department as the years pass. Were it not for

the expert knowledge gathered in the various branches of the Agricultural Department, agriculture in any phase in Western Australia would be impossible, because there are so many problems requiring expert and technical knowledge in these times. I do not know what happened in the good old days; I am speaking of these times. Without that knowledge it would be impossible to carry on agriculture in Western Australia, and that is why so much money is expended on this department and why expert advisers and research officers are employed by it. When it comes to engineering, I have the greatest respect for the engineer. In fact, I must admit that it is the scientific side of the University work which I feel to be immeasurably important to this State.

The young men who go through the University and get a degree, it may be bachelor of engineering, must still acquire a vast amount of experience before they can be trusted to undertake a big job. We have to remember, however, that the University lays the groundwork of their education and usefulness. If only the two departments I have mentioned were concerned, our University would have justified its existence manyfold. I remember getting into difficulties with the late Professor Whitfield when I stressed the importance of the scientific side of the University, as against what is termed the cultural side. From the point of view of industry, we might rub along without the bachelor of arts; but we certainly cannot rub along without the scientist in the agricultural industry or in the engineering world. In our present workaday world, we can well satisfy ourselves that money expended on the University will be returned over and over again. I am not one of those who have to apologise for being half-hearted in support of the University. In suggesting that the control of the University, its educational standards and methods, is to be interfered with, I am sorry the member for West Perth mentioned the word “suspicion.” Why suspect the Government? Has the Government ever appointed anyone to the Senate who was not worthy of the appointment? Can members think of one such appointment?

The Government has never appointed a man who was not of independent thought and entirely free. Does any person imag-

ine the Government would appoint a lot of yes-men? I think those who are perturbed about the amount of money which is to be made available to the University and about its control, of which they are suspicious—they think there is going to be cheeseparing—should bear in mind that these matters require proper management. The money is still the responsibility of the Government after it has been voted and after it has been made available. That is what I feel about it. We have to reply to the objections that have been raised. I scarcely remember a time when I had so much free advice. I did not have to put in the amount of research work that the Premier, the member for Nedlands and the member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe did. My case was ready made; all I had to do was to reply to objections, and that is why I am speaking now. The University people are objecting to what is proposed by the Bill. All we are seeking to do is to introduce to the University proper recognised administrative methods. Would anyone suggest that the University people have had the same training and experience as our departmental officers have had? I think it is about time that the matter was cleared up and the University brought into line. I am not suggesting that wasteful methods have been adopted in the past; I am not making any challenges or charges, nor am I giving evidence.

Now that this matter is before Parliament, I am concerned, as I said earlier, that we shall adopt the right methods, and I contend that the methods contained in this Bill for the management of the University are defensible. As for the other very fascinating questions that have been discussed in regard to universities and their uses, the idea that universities should be untrammelled is one with which we all agree. Is there not a measure of uniformity in universities throughout the world? Are not the standards the same? Certainly the scientific standards are the same everywhere. What Government is going to interfere with the actual control of and teaching by the University? It is the management of the University, the financial part, about which the Government should take every precaution. I do not know that I have much more to say, Mr. Speaker. When people write letters, they are entitled to a reply, but I have not a large staff to

reply to all the correspondence I have received, and the only way to reply is to do so here. This Bill, instead of being something to create suspicion, is designed to be an advance on what we have now. It is a concession, and I cannot remember any concession having been received with such suspicion! Some people find no good in this Bill at all.

The Premier: They are supporting the second reading.

Hon. H. MILLINGTON: Yes, with the idea of amending the measure. I remember an occasion when a Bill was supported wholeheartedly at the second reading but subsequently amendments were made that settled it altogether.

Mr. Doney: You forget the Premier stated that this was a non-party Bill.

Hon. H. MILLINGTON: That does not mean that every Party is going to have a hand in it! Although it is a non-party Bill, it is a Government measure; it represents the Government view, and it represents my view. I do not know whether members opposite regard the suggestion that it is a non-party Bill as an invitation to them to mutilate it. It is not so at all. It stands together in one piece and should be given a trial; it should not be altered until we have had experience of it. I do not suggest that it is the last word. It is an advance—something that was needed and asked for; something that has arisen out of the report of the Royal Commission and from the urgent representations of the Senate. I do not indulge in fulsome flattery of the Government, but I consider the Bill to be one that can be recommended. We have heard talk of a new order, yet immediately a proposal like this is introduced to improve conditions it is declared revolutionary. That is what one speaker called it. But where is the revolution? Only in the imagination of people who think that the Government is going to swamp the Senate with "yes" men not worthy of the position!

It should be remembered that there is no greater test of a Government than its appointments, its picking of the right men; and there is no greater test in industry. I think we can say with confidence that those nominated by the Government will not be the tail-end of the team. I will guarantee that now, and I do not know who they will be. I can guar-

antee that much, starting with the Under-Treasurer and the Director of Education. Measure the Government nominees against others who will be selected! It is not possible to fasten responsibility on anybody in the way in which it can be fastened on to a Government. It is not a case of calling the tune. I do not know who suggested such a thing. It is a question of proper supervision and a very justifiable measure of control of public funds. That is not calling the tune; that is proper administration; and people would have a perfect right to censure the Treasurer if he did not do it. When he starts handing out £40,000 without making sure that the money will be spent effectively, that is the time to censure him. The House can rest assured that the Government's nominees will be all right. With regard to finance, I am not prepared to say that £40,000 will be sufficient. I do not think the Treasurer will be prepared to say that. I think that is what is called a target. It certainly has been a target and everybody has aimed higher than the Treasurer. What an easy thing to do! As a matter of fact, I feel a lot freer where I am now sitting than if I were sitting alongside the Treasurer. I can raise the bid, too; it is quite the popular thing. However, I think the Treasurer has done fairly well, having regard to the state of our finances and to the fact that we shall have to provide for other branches of education equally important.

When this war started, it was found possible to secure technical advisers, but not hundreds of trained technicians. That is where scarcity lay. Brains and technical knowledge are available; but, when one tries to import shiploads of men to carry out the work, difficulty is experienced in times of crisis. Actually, we were not behind in our treatment of the University. We were deficient in technical training in this State, and still are; and I say to the Treasurer, through you, Mr. Speaker, that I will not be satisfied while a case is put up for the University and the case for technical training and other branches of education in this State is neglected. Despite the fact that fees are not charged, a great many people cannot afford to go to the University. A great many in the country who would very much like to go find it altogether too expensive to do so. When I was Minister for

Education, I used to refer to primary education as the inescapable obligation of the Government; and I still consider that primary education must have prior claim. I regret the Bill has been the subject of so much criticism outside and has created undue suspicion. I do not think it is warranted.

The Premier: Interested criticism!

Hon. H. MILLINGTON: I would not say that. I am very careful to believe that those who have criticised are honest.

The Premier: Oh, yes!

Hon. H. MILLINGTON: But they have made an honest mistake. I shall support the Bill and, so far, I am not wedded to any of the amendments that have been forecast.

MR. TRIAT (Mt. Magnet): I support the Bill also. During the debate on the Education Estimates last year, I made a statement that money was cheap and could be availed of easily by the Government for the purpose of improving educational facilities in Western Australia. On that occasion, I brought a storm of abuse on my head from "The West Australian," which had a leading article headed "Cheap Money" in which it was suggested I did not know what I was talking about. I have always advocated higher education throughout Western Australia, and have also voiced the opinion that our educational standards are low in comparison with those of other countries. I know what I am speaking about, because I have seen the type of education given to children in the district I live in, and have seen the type of school erected there. When it rains, water pours into the building. The floors are not wooden but of earth. There are no decent buildings for the children to be taught in and no decent facilities. The surroundings are deplorable. There is no extra money for the education of people in the outback areas at all.

The Premier: Oh, yes!

Mr. TRIAT: It is not adequate by any means.

The Premier: This year, £20,000.

Mr. TRIAT: The Government has not gone far enough. The position is still bad. There is not one school in my electorate in which a Junior certificate can be obtained. Can the Premier tell me that that is a decent standard of education? Not a Junior certificate for any boy or girl in my electorate!

When those children leave school, are they fitted for life? No! Their education is apparently of no consequence. If it is agreed to raise the standard of education for poor people, I will agree to as much money being granted for higher education as is desired. Until those on the lower rungs are given reasonable educational facilities I am not prepared to devote the taxpayers' money to the higher classes. By the same reasoning I am of the opinion that every man and woman in Western Australia should be able to take a university course providing they have the intelligence to pass the necessary entrance examinations. They should be able to go to the University at the taxpayers' expense. But I am not prepared to advance money for this purpose until we can satisfy the needs of our primary education.

No university is of any consequence until there is proper primary education. Many of our university graduates have become highly qualified and have gone out to fill responsible positions. Unfortunately many of our highly trained men leave the State. They seek employment elsewhere. My view is that the highest technical education given in Western Australia today does not come from the University, but from the Kalgoorlie School of Mines whose diplomas are accepted in the industrial field anywhere in the world. I am told that they are accepted in any part of the civilised world as being equal to the highest qualifications. The particular technical studies carried out in that school are mostly connected with mining, metallurgy, etc. When this war broke out one of the first needs of the armed forces of Australia was in connection with airmen. Nearly everyone knows that those men had to take a course in navigation because their education was not of a sufficiently high standard to enable them to do the necessary calculating for navigation purposes. The subject of mathematics was the most deplorable one.

Very few of our young men were capable of doing mathematics, with the result that our navigators had to go through a special course. The young men in the foundries and workshops had to be trained specially. They should have assimilated all that education before leaving school, and had they taken their Junior or Leaving examinations they would have attained that standard. The pupils at many schools

in this State leave before attaining that standard and their fathers and mothers cannot afford to send them to the larger schools at Kalgoorlie or Perth where they could get a higher class of education. Before we spend money on the higher class of education we should attend to these other grades. Some correspondence has been sent to members. I must confess that I do not always read mine but I have here a fairly long printed letter from the Teachers' Union. This is addressed to Hon. J. C. Willecock, but it was in an envelope with my name on it. I presume that all members received a copy of it. A brief extract is as follows:—

We would point out that each branch of education has its own financial difficulties and that the difficulties of one branch should not be made a reason for stinting another. There can be no good reason for suggesting that the interests of any form of education are in competition with those of another when in fact they are mutually inter-dependent and must grow together.

That is the only sentence I desire to deal with. It is reasonable and sensible. They must realise that it is necessary to have proper primary education and so lead up to a higher standard for the University course. Why the teachers included the balance of their letter I do not know. They must know that the object of their particular organisation is to get proper primary education and work up gradually. If the Government has not sufficient money to give primary education it has not enough money to deal with the advanced classes of education. The other communication of consequence is headed, "University Bill. An explanation of main amendments proposed by Convocation." It is put up by a committee of Convocation, University of Western Australia. I intend to deal more fully with extracts from this particular pamphlet, which states—

Reasons for University autonomy. Autonomy is a characteristic of University constitutions throughout the Anglo-Saxon world for the following reasons:—A University must be perfectly free in the expenditure of its money, including its fees and endowments, free to follow the highest educational principles. It must also be free to appeal to the Government for the funds necessary for expansion.

That is a lot of "hooey." They tell us in one breath that they want nothing to do with the Government. They want free thought and free speech and everything else. But the thing that this world seems

to recognise as most essential is finance. All they want the Government to do is to supply the cash, and they will do the rest. If a body of highly intelligent people desires something from the Government, it should say, "You have given us something, and you shall receive consideration in return." They ask the Government to supply the money, but how it is spent is to have nothing to do with the Government and, as the Government represents the taxpayers, it therefore has nothing to do with the taxpayers. I have nothing to say about the second paragraph, but the third paragraph states—

There should be no possibility of political control over a University. This might lead to a curtailing of independence of thought and lowering of educational ideals. Freedom of thought with, of course, a consequent sense of responsibility to the community is the very essence of University education.

Who, with any sense, would suggest that the Government should endeavour to alter the educational standards of the institution? As the member for Mt. Hawthorn said, the two representatives of the Government are men with high qualifications. I refer to the Under Treasurer and the Director of Education. The University could not turn out men of higher calibre, for the particular positions, than those two men. Yet this pamphlet has the audacity to suggest that the Government intends to lower, or may lower the standard of the people attending the University. I think it is an insult that such a committee should write an article like this and send it to members and ask for their support. The next item is—

The above reasons expanded: In Western Australia Parliament has from the beginning finely insisted that the University should be free to students; in short, no lecture fees were to be charged. As a result Parliament supplies nearly all the general revenue of the University. If the Government were to obtain the measure of constitutional control contemplated in the Bill, the total effect would be disastrous. The Premier in his speech to Parliament has stated: "The Government did not find it possible to meet in full the requirements of the University." The Government, in other words, looks at the problem mainly from a financial point of view.

How else would the Government look at the matter when asked for money? When the Estimates are reviewed every member asks the Government to spend money on matters most essential to the welfare of Western

Australia. When the wheat farmer suffers from a drought he desires the Government to come to his assistance to see that his stock does not die. The pastoralist requires Government assistance to prevent the banks from seizing his property when the season is bad. The Government is always finding money, but unfortunately it cannot find enough unless it taxes the taxpayers beyond endurance, in which case the taxpayers will no longer tolerate the Government, no matter whether it be Labour, Country Party or Nationalist. Today we have not the right to tax, of course. But that is wrong. The people who wrote this pamphlet must realise that finance is all-important as far as this Government is concerned.

Mr. J. Hegney: Finance is Government.

Mr. TRIAT: Yes. This body of men says that all that seems to worry the Premier is finance. The Premier would double the University vote if the money were available, provided it was wisely spent.

Mr. North: South Australia is budgeting for a big overdraft this year.

Mr. TRIAT: I am aware of that. I suggested to the Premier that he should budget for a deficit of half a million, but he did not see eye to eye with me. We have to face the fact that we have only a certain amount of money, and that it has to be allotted to meet all the requirements of the State. There is a reference in the pamphlet about the man that pays the piper calling the tune. It says—

The old saying that he who pays the piper calls the tune is quite applicable in this case, unless it is falsely assumed that a Government knows how to play the tune, or even what tune to play.

"Or even what tune to play!" I think that is just a bit of cheap sarcasm. Of course the Government knows the tune to play. The Government is composed of hard-headed men who know what they are doing. The people of Western Australia judged well when they returned those men with sufficient strength to take office. It might be possible to fool the people once or twice, but they cannot be fooled all the time. I repeat that that reference is just nonsense. The pamphlet continues—

It cannot be sufficiently emphasised that an isolated community like Western Australia cannot afford to have an inferior university.

I do not consider that we have an inferior university. I think it is an excellent in-

stitution, and I hope that many more accomplished people will pass out of it. I do say, however, that much of the lower education is inferior. In the back country we have shocking examples of inferior education right up to the junior standard. The School of Mines at Kalgoorlie and the high schools in various towns do impart a very good class of education, and many of our colleges are second to none, even when compared with those in other parts of the Commonwealth. On the second page of the pamphlet the following appears—

Only a Senate free of Government control can do this for the university. The Senate also has trust funds to administer. This demands freedom from Government influence.

We had a highly intelligent man in the person of Mr. Justice Wolff who made an investigation of University affairs extending over 12 months. When he makes the statement I am about to quote, that reference in the pamphlet will not bear investigation. This is what the Royal Commissioner said—

Endowment Lands from Crown. I find that the best use has not been made of these endowments. A comprehensive inspection, valuation and report was made for the purpose of the Commission.

He recommended as follows:—

A standing advisory committee consisting of the Vice-Chancellor, the Surveyor General, the Chief Valuer of the Taxation Department, the Town Planning Commissioner, and an outside expert engaged in real estate business to keep the position constantly under review and advise the Investments Endowments and Building Committee.

That finding does not reflect great credit on the business acumen of the Senate at the time the recommendation was made. The Royal Commissioner further recommended—

That the endowment lands at North Fremantle be subdivided and sold as soon as possible. That the endowment lands at Bibra Lake be subdivided and sold. That a residential building scheme be instituted and carried out by the Senate in respect of certain of the endowment lands in close proximity to the University in Nedlands, Crawley and Hollywood. That besides moneys obtained from the sale of endowment land, the University be authorised by legislation to utilise and invest trust moneys in building on these lands and letting properties to tenants.

This shows that there is need to introduce some business acumen into the management of the University. These endowment lands

should not be permitted to remain idle when so many people are looking for homes. Homes are needed all over the State, but especially in the metropolitan area. If they were let at a reasonable rental, they would return a fair amount of revenue. The pamphlet, under the heading, "How is autonomy to be preserved?" says—

In his criticisms of Convocation, the Royal Commissioner did not clearly differentiate between the elective and deliberative work of that body. Nor for that matter did he face the issue of university autonomy. If the University is to have a democratic basis, Convocation is the natural and in fact the only elective body. Our Convocation, as an elective body, has done sound work. An average of 500, from a roll of 1,200, are voting by post at Senate elections.

I know nothing beyond what I have read on the subject, but when one reads the statements by the Royal Commissioner, on page 18, it is astounding how badly Convocation shows up. The Commissioner said—

A good illustration of the ineptitude of Convocation is furnished by an occurrence which took place during the hearing of my Commission. The Warden of Convocation took umbrage at certain remarks made by some of the members of the professoriate and members of the Senate who gave evidence. The tenor of those remarks was that Convocation supplied nothing useful in the life of the University, that it was dominated for the most part by the noisy element, and that it had difficulty in getting together a quorum for the consideration of business. Following these aspersions on the fair fame of Convocation, the Warden called a meeting. Notices were sent out on the 25th August, 1941, calling the meeting for the 19th September. The notice drew attention to the "disparaging remarks . . . made on the efforts of Convocation in the past to assist the University." The notice went on to say, "This is a threat to its very existence, and it is for Convocation itself to prove that the allegations are wrong. I therefore urge you to show, by attending the next meeting, that you do not agree with the adverse opinions expressed."

That was a very strong summons to address to the members of Convocation. Strong as it was, they did not come forward and attend the special meeting called for that purpose. The Royal Commissioner added—

I was sent a copy of this notice and a copy of the minutes of the meeting. Inquiry disclosed that there was a very poor attendance indeed. Only 28 members attended. Included in the 28 were seven members of the staff. Without these seven members, a quorum would not have been available.

According to the record the number of members of Convocation living near enough

to attend meetings was 745. What do members think of that? Yet we are asked to believe that Convocation is the most important part of the University. While we are asked to believe this, however, members of Convocation have not sufficient time to attend a special meeting called in defence of Convocation. There were not enough present to form a quorum save with the help of seven members of the staff! If the Royal Commissioner had not made a report and if the Government had not brought down a Bill, there would still have been no great haste on the part of members of Convocation to attend meetings, but when they find that the power is slipping away from them, they endeavour to save themselves.

Under this measure the Government is trying to do some good for the University. There is no desire on the part of the Government to swamp the Senate. Of 21 members who will constitute the new Senate, the Government will appoint eight. When the Royal Commissioner reported, he suggested that Convocation should have three representatives. The Government in effect has said, "No, we will play fair and give Convocation the same number of representatives as the Government will have, namely, six." There will also be two members from the teaching staff and four co-opted. In those circumstances, there is no chance whatever of the Government representatives voting anything down because they simply will not have a majority of the voting power. But by themselves they cannot do the whole business. Until such time as Western Australia can give education to the children of the ordinary class of people, I am not prepared to expend an extra amount of money on the University.

As soon as the Government can guarantee good primary education to the children of the mining and pastoral areas, the Government will be entitled to make additional grants to the University and the School of Mines. I hope the time is near when every girl and every boy on leaving school will be able to attend the University. I am not a Communist, but I believe in the Russian system in this respect. There is not freedom of either thought or speech in the universities of Russia. The Soviet, however, has developed every aspect of education, including the universities; and Russian

scientists are equal to any in the world. Then why should the insinuation be made that this Government intends—

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: The Russian Government pays its educationists 30 per cent. of their wages.

Mr. TRIAT: The Russian Government pays nothing, and you know that!

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mt. Magnet will address the Chair.

Mr. TRIAT: I can talk back just as loudly as the member for Subiaco. Our University is a modern University, second to none in the world. The Soviet regime did not operate in Russia 30 years ago, but it has been able to produce scientists and engineers and physicians of the first rank. I hope that people who entertain any suspicion that the Western Australian Government wishes to dominate the Western Australian University will dismiss it from their minds. I support the Bill, and I am not disposed to support any amendment on the notice paper; certainly I will support nothing that will cause complexities in this measure. On this occasion I accept the judgment of the Royal Commissioner.

MR. LESLIE (Mt. Marshall): I too want to record my support of the second reading of the Bill. Further, I shall support some of the amendments appearing on the notice paper. I do so with much the same thought in my mind as the member for Mt. Magnet, although I do not hold the same opinion as he does. That hon. member mentioned the circular letter he had received from the Teachers' Union, which letter tied up the primary schools with the University. The Premier himself did so when introducing the Bill. I would have risen in any case to speak on the Bill, because I am rather in doubt as to the Premier's sincerity.

The Premier. When you have known me longer you will know me better.

Mr. LESLIE: I consider it hardly worthy of the Premier to attempt to coerce a vote in support of the Bill by suggesting that if we do not agree to the small amount proposed—

The Premier: An increase of five or six thousand pounds! A 15 per cent. increase.

Mr. LESLIE: The 15 per cent. increase is not sufficient, according to the Royal Commissioner. Had the Premier submitted that without mentioning that in giving the University more money he is likely to be

limiting the amount for extending educational facilities in the back areas, the position would have been different. That statement was hardly worthy of the Premier. It places us, or places me, anyhow, in a position where I would have to say that I cannot afford to see the Premier paying more money to the University because by doing so he will be robbing the outback areas. On the other hand, I am desirous of giving the University any finance it really needs. What is good enough for the Premier is good enough for me in that regard. The hon. gentleman's attitude, however, is wrong. The extension of educational facilities into all parts of the State is dependent on our having university facilities for training our teachers. Tonight we have heard some eloquent speeches, going back to the Dark Ages, about universities.

In my opinion the primary object of education is to teach the children to learn. As children grow up they are taught to learn in secondary schools. In the university they are taught to apply their learning. In my opinion, the university is not a place where they actually learn. They are trained there to continue their researches further afield. The member for Mt. Hawthorn said the university professors declared themselves to be seekers after truth. I say they are seekers after the ultimate in everything. Men and women must be trained to do that, and to give that training is the purpose of the University. As regards research facilities, the biggest institution we have for that purpose is the University. I for one made many investigations to find definite and specific cases—and there are many—where the University has contributed to progress. I remember the time when Professor Whitfeld was the only man from whom the farmers could get analyses of the water samples they sent from the wheatbelt. The service was a free one at that time, I believe.

The Premier: We have had an analytical branch for 30 years.

Mr. LESLIE: But we could not get satisfaction as to analyses of the Wyalkatchem dam water until we went to the University. We have to couple primary and secondary with university education. The University we must have for the purpose of training our teachers; otherwise our standard of education will hardly improve; that is, if we rely on incompletely trained teachers.

[Mr. J. Hegney took the Chair.]

Mr. Holman: If you have not sufficient money for primary education, how can you have more money for the University?

Mr. LESLIE: I do not know to what the member for Forrest is alluding, but he mentioned the question of money. I am not at all convinced that the Premier is not able to find the money necessary for educational purposes, nor am I convinced by the suggestion that taxation is fixed and that we are bound hand and foot by the dictates of the Commonwealth Treasurer. A Budget has been placed before this House which provides for a surplus. We have had surpluses during the past three or four years. I assure the Premier that I would not indulge in any adverse criticism if he were to budget for a substantial deficit, provided he could show that the people had, in consequence, been provided with better educational facilities than they had enjoyed previously.

The Premier: The Education Vote has been increased by over £15,000.

Mr. LESLIE: I agree that the Vote has been increased, but not in the direction I desire. I shall leave my remarks on that point to a later stage, as I am afraid I would be out of order if I discussed the Education Vote when speaking to the Bill before the House. It comes as a complete surprise to me that those who are not wholly in favour of the Bill are actually placed in the position of having to defend the value of the University. That such a position should be forced upon us does not reflect any great credit upon the Chamber.

The Minister for Mines: The Labour Party has done more for the University than any previous Government.

Mr. LESLIE: I do not intend to dispute that statement.

The Minister for Mines: Then do not try to put over that sort of argument!

Mr. LESLIE: The Labour Party may have done more or may have done less than previous Parties in office.

The Minister for Mines: You are very young!

Mr. LESLIE: When we find that the value of the University is questioned, it gives us food for thought.

The Minister for Mines: You should think more and talk less.

Mr. LESLIE: It certainly makes us think.

The Minister for Mines: But you are talking all the time!

Mr. LESLIE: It will appear strange to many people that the value of the University has been questioned. To my mind the value of the institution must be accepted. Despite the assurances of the member for Mt. Hawthorn when dealing with points raised by the member for Nedlands and the member for West Perth, I still do not feel convinced regarding the position, because I believe that he who controls finance controls policy. When we find that the Government has complete control of the purse strings of any institution, whether it be a university or anything else, we must realise that it also controls policy.

The Minister for Mines: Where would the University get its funds otherwise?

Mr. LESLIE: It must get its funds from the Government, but the Government in turn has a check upon the expenditure. I agree that the Auditor General should audit the university accounts. On the other hand, we are asked to increase Government representation on the Senate, the effect of which will be to give the Government not only control over the finances but over policy as well.

The Minister for Mines: That suggestion came from your side of the House.

Mr. LESLIE: The suggestion was definitely from the Government side of the House.

The Minister for Mines: That is another of your twists.

Mr. LESLIE: That is how I understood the Premier's references.

The Minister for Mines: Your understanding is weak.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please!

Mr. LESLIE: The Premier's attitude was indicated when he referred to the Royal Commissioner's report indicating that the representation of Convocation was weak, and further that the financial management of the University was also weak, in consequence of which Government representation should be increased.

Mr. Cross: You have a vivid imagination.

Mr. LESLIE: It is better to have some than none at all. Where financial control rests, there rests the control of policy. I might be prepared to trust members of the present Government to the fullest extent.

The Minister for Mines: You have no option.

Mr. LESLIE: On the other hand, I might not be prepared to trust any other Government or the members of any other Government. There is the old injunction, watch your step. The members of the present Government may be quite honest in their intentions.

The Minister for Mines: They have never been anything else.

Mr. LESLIE: I do not doubt that, but they may not occupy their present positions for all time.

The Minister for Mines: We have just grown into it during the last 20 years.

Mr. LESLIE: I shall support the proposed amendments to the Bill seeing that they have been designed to give the University control over its own destinies.

MR. OWEN (Swan): As a graduate of the University of Western Australia, I have followed the debate on the Bill with great interest. The ground has been covered so well, particularly by speakers on the Opposition side of the House, that there is little I can add beyond alluding to some points that have been raised. We all recognise the importance of education. To my mind education will eventually solve all the problems of the world, but we must have a balanced education.

The Premier: The Germans are the best educated people in the world!

Mr. OWEN: The University must be regarded as part of our educational system. It plays a very big part even in primary education inasmuch as teachers, even if not educated up to a university standard, are guided to a great extent by the results of university research. One essential necessity in connection with education is that it must be progressive. Merely to be furnished with an education such as was enjoyed by our grandfathers and by their grandfathers would be completely useless. We must make available education that is in keeping with the times. As new ideas are evolved, they must be passed on to rising generations. From that point of view the University of Western Australia is doing sterling work which it must be allowed to continue, with the advantage of being permitted to maintain its own free school of thought.

Many statements have been made during the debate, with some of which I entirely disagree. The member for Brown Hill-

Ivanhoe rather sarcastically referred to university students learning how to spend their leisure. I see nothing wrong with that. It is a pity more of us did not learn how to spend our leisure to the best advantage. To devote our leisure to intelligent discussion or reading is much better than to spend that leisure in the manner indulged in by so many in the community today. The member for Canning mentioned that in the report by the Royal Commissioner, Mr. Justice Wolff, in connection with university matters, reference was made to the amount of money spent on expensive equipment. Without the advantage of expensive equipment students could not be trained properly.

Mr. Cross: Mr. Justice Wolff said that the same material could have been bought considerably cheaper.

Mr. OWEN: A carpenter does not learn his trade with an axe; the same thing applies to students at the University; they must have accurately made equipment if they are to receive the full benefit of the education given to them. The member for Mt. Hawthorn said that a raw university graduate is not a ball of knowledge. I quite agree with him. The graduate needs practical experience and the practical application of his theoretical knowledge before he is fully educated. I have come in contact with many undergraduates and graduates, as I was for five years—and I am proud to say it—a part-time lecturer at the University.

Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. OWEN: I hope I instilled some knowledge in my students. I point out that members of Convocation are graduates and that many of them have had years of practical experience. Many of such members are successful business men in this and other States, and I feel that they should play a big part in the conduct of the University. The Bill aims at reducing the number of members of Convocation to six. I consider that number too small. Criticism has been levelled against the members of Convocation because it is said they do not attend meetings regularly. That is easily understandable, when one realises that they are distributed over this large State, and although many reside in Perth they are not always free to attend meetings at a specified time, as they have their business to attend to. The fact that they do not attend a particular meeting, how-

ever, is not evidence that they are not interested in the University. I believe the fact that 500 recorded their votes—many of them postal votes—is an indication that members of Convocation do take an interest in university affairs. I do not propose to delay the House further. I shall vote for the second reading, but I also propose to vote for the amendment increasing the number of members of Convocation.

On motion by Mr. Doney, debate adjourned.

BILL—BUILDERS' REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Returned from the Council without amendment.

House adjourned at 10.45 p.m.

Legislative Council.

Wednesday, 1st November, 1944.

	PAGE
Question: Wool, as to railway freight paid by Commonwealth	1455
Bills: Supply (No. 2), £1,400,000, Standing Orders suspension, 2a., remaining stages	1456
Mortgages' Rights Restriction Act Amendment, 2a.	1466
Natives (Citizenship Rights), 2a.	1467
Health Act Amendment, 2a., Com.	1468
Motion: Health Act and hospital administration, as to inquiry by Royal Commission	1469

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

QUESTION—WOOL.

As to Railway Freight Paid by Commonwealth.

Hon. G. W. MILES asked the Chief Secretary:

(i) What amount was paid or payable by the Commonwealth Government to the Railway Department in respect of wool from the outer Albany Zone railed to Fremantle during the 12 months ended the 30th June, 1944?

(ii) What amount was paid or payable by the Commonwealth Government to the Railway Department in respect of wool appraised at Albany, and subsequently, under instructions from the Central Wool