

the municipality's desires may be given effect to. The Bill is therefore submitted to ratify the proposal. The Bill is on the same lines as the East Perth Cemetery Act, 1932, under which the East Perth Cemetery was placed under the control of the State Gardens Board and not the local authority. I have had a plan prepared showing the situation of the old cemetery site at Busselton, which is the subject of this Bill, and will lay it on the Table for the perusal of members. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. H. Tuckey, debate adjourned.

## BILL—STAMP ACT AMENDMENT.

### *Second Reading.*

**THE HONORARY MINISTER** [5.52] in moving the second reading said: This small Bill relates to the legislation passed last session, which made it compulsory for every owner of a motor vehicle to take out third party risk insurance. During the debate on the Bill, an undertaking was given to the effect that a person with a comprehensive policy would be exempt from the taking out of a further policy to cover third party risk. This undertaking was given in the anticipation that two policies of insurance would not be required. Unfortunately, it has been found impracticable to give effect to the promise made, and as a result many motor vehicle owners have been obliged to take out two policies, one of which, as I have already mentioned, is compulsory. This involves motor vehicle owners in the payment of double stamp duty.

Under this Bill, it is proposed that persons taking out two policies shall receive a rebate of stamp duty to the extent of 2s. 6d. That is the explanation of the Bill, and for the information of members, I would add that the question of one policy to cover all risks in respects of motor vehicles is still being actively investigated, and it is hoped that a favourable solution to the present practical difficulties can be found. This measure will be welcomed by all owners of motor vehicles.

**Hon. G. W. Miles:** Does the Government intend to refund the stamp duty that has been collected?

**The HONORARY MINISTER:** I move—  
That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. A. Thomson, debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 5.55 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly.

*Wednesday, 15th November, 1944.*

	PAGE
Questions: Railways—(a) As to Watts' "universal switch," (b) as to running cost of Gx sheep truck	1740
Murray River, as to salt content	1741
Soldier settlement, as to legislation	1741
Potato Growers Licensing Act, as to revenue and expenditure	1741
Western Australian Turf Club (Property) Private Bill	
Select Committee, report presented	1741
Bills: Trade Descriptions and False Advertisements Act Amendment, 1s.	1742
Coal Mine Workers (Pensions) Act Amendment, 1s.	1742
Workers' Compensation Act Amendment, 1s.	1742
Colliery Recreation and Park Lands Act Amendment, 3s.	1742
Lotteries (Control) Act Amendment, 3s.	1742
Legislative Council (War Time) Electoral Act Amendment, 2s., Com., report	1742
Electoral (War Time) Act Amendment, 2s., Com., report	1743
Mortgages' Rights Restriction Act Amendment, returned	1744
Shearers' Accommodation Act Amendment, Council's amendments	1744
University of Western Australia Act Amendment, 2s.	1746
Annual Estimates: Votes and Items discussed	1775

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

## QUESTIONS (5).

### RAILWAYS.

(a) *As to Watts' "Universal Switch."*

**Hon. W. D. JOHNSON** asked the Minister for Railways:

(1) Whether Watts' patented "universal switch" is in use on any part of the State railway system?

(2) If so, where?

(3) Have any derailments been recorded where such a switch is in use?

(4) Did a Select Committee favourably comment on an "improved universal switch" by the same patentee, and suggest to the Government that it be given a trial?

(5) Has this improved switch been tried out?

(6) Has any derailment occurred where it was tried?

(7) Whether the derailment of an engine and tender in the Guildford yard in April last, and the much more serious derailment at Noongaar, were attributable to the engine jumping the flange way associated with the old pattern knife point blade crossing which the department seems to adhere to?

(8) If such derailment occurs where the knife point blade is in use, is it proposed to avoid such risk by trying out something new as recommended by the Select Committee?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) No.

(2) Answered by No. (1).

(3) Answered by No. (1).

(4) No.

(5) No.

(6) Answered by No. (5).

(7) No. The derailments referred to were not caused by any defect in the permanent way equipment.

(8) No. See No. (4).

(b) *As to Running Cost of Cx Sheep Truck.*

Mr. TELFER asked the Minister for Railways:

What is the cost per mile of running a railway Cx sheep truck (a) when loaded; (b) when empty?

The MINISTER replied:

(a) and (b) Costs of running individual trucks are not recorded and it is not practicable, therefore, to supply the information asked for.

#### MURRAY RIVER.

##### *As to Salt Content.*

Mr. McLARTY asked the Minister for Works:

(1) Could he state whether the salt content of the Murray River is increasing?

(2) Is the increase such as to prevent the waters being used for irrigation purposes?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Records over the last seven years indicate a fairly material increase in the salinity of the Murray River.

(2) Yes. Records covering salinity will be continued. If, in the course of time, the salinity tends to decrease, the position will be reviewed.

#### SOLDIER SETTLEMENT.

##### *As to Legislation.*

Mr. LESLIE asked the Premier:

Is he able to inform the House whether it is likely that legislation to provide for soldier land settlement, in accord with the agreement reached between the Commonwealth and the State, will be introduced during the present session?

The PREMIER replied:

The preparation of the agreement and any necessary legislation are in the hands of the Commonwealth Government and we are awaiting its advice.

#### POTATO GROWERS LICENSING ACT.

##### *As to Revenue and Expenditure.*

Mr. HOLMAN asked the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) How much money has been collected under the Potato Growers Licensing Act?

(2) What amount of the moneys collected has been spent?

(3) What are the principal items of expenditure?

The MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST replied:

(1) £3,754 19s. 9d. has been collected up to 31st October, 1944.

(2) £837 5s. 2d. has been expended.

	£	s.	d.
(3) Office administration ..	421	16	5
Travelling expenses, i.e., car mileage and fares paid to growers' delegates attending conferences .. ..	345	6	10
Sundries .. ..	70	1	11
	837	5	2

#### WESTERN AUSTRALIAN TURF CLUB (PROPERTY) PRIVATE BILL SELECT COMMITTEE.

##### *Report Presented.*

Mr. Needham brought up the report of the Select Committee.

Ordered: That the report and evidence be printed.

**BILLS (3)—FIRST READING.**

1. Trade Descriptions and False Advertisements Act Amendment.

Introduced by the Minister for Industrial Development.

2. Coal Mine Workers (Pensions) Act Amendment.

3. Workers' Compensation Act Amendment.

Introduced by the Minister for Works.

**BILLS (2)—THIRD READING.**

1. Collie Recreation and Park Lands Act Amendment.

2. Lotteries (Control) Act Amendment.
- Transmitted to the Council.

**BILL—LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL (WAR TIME) ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT.***Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the previous day.

**MR. SEWARD** (Pingelly) [4.38]: This is a Bill to renew the Act which was passed last session whereby members of the Forces were given an opportunity to vote for the Legislative Council. Although I do not like the Bill I do not intend to oppose it. I hope, however, that the Government will make some effort to improve the methods that were adopted on the previous occasion. When introducing the Bill the Minister said that the passage of the parent Act had resulted in every member of the Western Australian Forces being given an opportunity to vote, but he did not give proof of that statement. It was absolutely untrue, not that I would for a moment insinuate that the Minister knew it to be untrue.

The Minister for Justice: That was the information which I obtained from the Electoral Department.

**MR. SEWARD**: I have talked with many soldiers who did not see a ballot paper or a polling booth, and so had no opportunity to vote. If, while this Act is in operation, another election takes place I hope that more thorough methods will be adopted to see that the men are given an opportunity to record their votes.

The Minister for Justice: The Act gives them the opportunity.

**MR. SEWARD**: Yes, but the facilities must be given for the people to exercise

their franchise. Those facilities were not given on the last occasion at many of the camps, because I have heard the soldiers say so.

The Premier: You are quite right.

**MR. SEWARD**: I know there must be a certain amount of latitude in a by-election, because it is as a rule a hurried affair.

The Minister for Justice: It rests with the military authorities to some extent.

**MR. SEWARD**: The military authorities notified us that they would not give facilities for holding any State elections in the future.

The Premier: That was only for by-elections, I understand.

**MR. SEWARD**: I hope the Premier is right. My impression was that they intended to provide facilities only for Commonwealth elections. If I am wrong then the position will not be so bad, because people accustomed to the job will take the poll. Even with experienced men many informal votes are cast. When inexperienced men act as presiding officers, because of the many duties they have to fulfil, they may deprive some electors of their franchise. That was clearly exemplified at the Avon by-election where it is recorded that the votes of 36 soldiers were invalidated because they lived at places outside the electorate. That shows how necessary it is to have in charge of these matters men who know their duties, and how essential it is to see that they have the necessary literature and plans available to enable them to determine whether a man is entitled to vote. I do not wish to speak at any length on the Bill, which is merely to continue the present Act in operation until 12 months after the war. I hope there will be no necessity to use this measure, but that the war will be over before that necessity arises. If we do have to make use of it I hope the points I have mentioned will be considered, and that no elector will be deprived of his right to vote. If one man is entitled to vote then the whole lot are.

Question put.

**MR. SPEAKER**: I have counted the House and assured myself that there is an absolute majority of members present, and there being no dissentient voice I declare the question duly passed.

Question thus passed.  
Bill read a second time.

*In Committee.*

Mr. Marshall in the Chair; the Minister for Justice in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendment of Section 23 and continuance of the principal Act:

Mr. WATTS: Will someone tell me what this phrase "for the duration of the present war" means? I do not think anyone has the faintest idea what it means. A little while ago on another measure, which made reference to this particular term, the Premier suggested that legislation would be introduced to provide exactly what the phrase meant. It is not very nice for us to be passing legislation for the duration of the present war and 12 months thereafter without knowing whether such legislation will ever be introduced and, if introduced, what it will mean. The duration of the present war according to some interpretations I have heard—I refer more particularly to legal interpretations given, if the Premier will remember, during the course of the inquiry by a Select Committee into the Commonwealth Powers Bill—might carry us on for years after the cessation of hostilities. It might easily carry us into a period when there is absolutely no-one in the Armed Forces if military strategy and necessity were of such a nature as to make it desirable that all the Forces be disbanded. It is an extremely loose phrase to use in a Bill of this kind. The support of all members of the Select Committee to which I have referred, and subsequently the support of all Parties in the House, was given to an amendment which attempted to define what "five years after the cessation of hostilities" meant. The amendment provided that it should mean a period of five years after a general armistice had been signed with Italy, Germany and Japan. We were given to understand, although I was not even then entirely satisfied, that the wording of the amendment meant that it was for a period of five years after the actual firing of cannon and hostilities had actually come to an end.

The Premier: After the armistice had been agreed to.

Mr. WATTS: Exactly! The duration of the present war is dependent upon some

subsequent Act of Parliament. This is not a desirable provision to have in legislation when there are no actual hostilities taking place and when all the members of the Forces, presumably, would be back in Western Australia even if some of them were entitled to vote under the provisions of the measure relating to the discharged members of the Forces.

The Minister for Justice: I have no objection to your moving your amendment.

Mr. WATTS: In order to move the exact words I would require to get a copy of the Commonwealth Powers Act. In the meantime perhaps the Committee will bear with me if I remain on my feet.

The Premier: It would be a new clause.

Mr. WATTS: No, it can come in here. The continual use of the phrase, which means nothing, is undesirable. On consulting the Commonwealth Powers Act, I find that an amendment cannot readily be framed, and therefore I suggest that the Minister arrange to have the amendment made in another place.

The Minister for Justice: That will be done.

Clause put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

**BILL—ELECTORAL (WAR TIME)  
ACT AMENDMENT.**

*Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the previous day.

MR. SEWARD (Pingelly) [4.53]: As the Minister pointed out when moving the second reading, this measure is simply a duplication of the Legislative Council Bill just dealt with but relating to the Assembly. Consequently the remarks I made on the other Bill apply here.

Question put.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have counted the House and assured myself that there is an absolute majority of members present, and there being no dissentient voice I declare the question duly passed.

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee.*

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

### **BILL—MORTGAGEES' RIGHTS RESTRICTION ACT AMENDMENT.**

Returned from the Council with amendments.

### **BILL—SHEARERS' ACCOMMODATION ACT AMENDMENT.**

#### *Council's Amendments.*

Schedule of 11 amendments made by the Council now considered.

#### *In Committee.*

Mr. Marshall in the Chair; the Minister for Works in charge of the Bill.

No. 1. Clause 2—Delete.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: This relates to Section 2 of the Act which sets out the conditions under which it shall not apply. It shall not apply to buildings for the accommodation of shearers where the total number of shearers employed in the shearing shed is less than eight. The Bill aimed at reducing the number to six. The opposition in the Council to the reduction was particularly strong, the contention being that it would inflict upon farmers in the agricultural areas great hardship, difficulty and expense. I have discussed the amendment with the Honorary Minister, who was in charge of the Bill in another place, and he has informed me that there is not the slightest chance of the reduction being agreed to. I think we would be wasting time and effort if we sent the amendment back for further consideration. Therefore I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 2. Clause 3:—Add at the end of clause on page 2, the words "such authority to be produced by him in pursuance of this Act."

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: This relates to a member of the police force acting as an inspector under the Act. The Council's amendment will make it necessary for a police officer to produce his authority when acting as an inspector. There is no objection to the amendment and I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 3. Clause 4, proposed new section 6, (2), paragraph (ii), page 2—Insert after

the word "passing" in line 29 the words "or erected thereafter."

No. 4. Clause 4, proposed new section 6, (2), paragraph (ii), page 2:—Delete all words from and including the word "and" in line 31 down to and including the word "compartment" in line 35.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: These two amendments are linked. They have to do with the provision of accommodation for shearers. Their effect is to ensure that the accommodation at any time shall provide for three shearers. Thus the aim of the clause in the Bill to have accommodation established for two shearers would not be achieved if Nos. 3 and 4 of the Council's amendments were accepted. The South Australian Parliament this year did pass an amending Bill absolutely in line with the proposal of our Bill in this respect. The Government feels that if South Australia is able to take that step forward and to make better accommodation available for shearers in that State, we in this State should be able to give equally good accommodation. Information is being obtained of the actual cost which would be involved in erecting new buildings divided into compartments to accommodate two shearers as against three, and also to work out the cost of altering existing accommodation into compartments to accommodate three shearers in each compartment as against the present number of four. It is considered that the difference in cost will be very small, and certainly not sufficient to cause any complaint or protest. The information is being worked out by an expert in such matters, and will be available to the Minister in the Legislative Council handling this Bill. He feels that armed with this information he will be able to convince a majority of his fellow-members that the amendments proposed by the Council should not be made. I therefore move—

That the two amendments be not agreed to.

Mr. DONEY: There is nothing particularly vital about this matter, but I call the Minister's attention to the fact that no ground whatever for the proposed alterations was given here by the Minister for Education, deputising for the Minister for Works in the Committee stage. I questioned the Minister for Education as to why these changes were being proposed, and he merely drew the Committee's attention to the fact that this was 1944 as against 1912. I asked

him whether any complaints had been received as to inadequacy of existing accommodation, and he acknowledged that he had received no complaints. Further, he said that his Party did not wait until complaints were received, but took action without waiting for them. The Minister would have been on sounder ground had he had the support of complaints from shearers. However, I raise no strong objection to the attitude of the Minister for Works.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendments not agreed to.

No. 5. Clause 4, proposed new section 6, (2), paragraph (iii), page 3:—Insert the word "stretcher" after the word "bedstead" where it appears in lines 3 and 4.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It is possible that stretchers might be required, and I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 6. Clause 6:—Delete.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Clause 6 of the Bill aims to delete from Section 8 of the Act the word "tent." Section 8 sets out the buildings which are to be used for shearers, and a tent is regarded as one structure which may be used for their accommodation. The Council is now insisting that the word "tent" be allowed to remain. There might be some argument for the Council's attitude if war conditions were to continue always, but there is not much justification for that attitude when it is understood that the Bill, when passed, will not apply until the war is over. In these circumstances I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

Mr. DONEY: Without being quite sure, I think the reason for the attempt by another place to restore the section is based on what may be termed emergency grounds. It has agreed to what is required by way of improvements in buildings; but it holds, apparently, that every now and again it may be necessary to use tents. For instance, it often becomes advisable for several farmers to shear at the one small shed, in which case the statutory accommodation almost certainly would not be available, for of course no farmer would erect buildings beyond immediate needs. I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not agreed to.

No. 7. Clause 7:—Delete the word "fourteen" in line 20 and substitute the word "thirteen."

No. 8. Clause 7:—Delete the figure "14" in line 22 and substitute the figure "13."

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: These two amendments are linked together. Their aim is to overcome a drafting error. I move—

That the two amendments be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendments agreed to.

No. 9. Clause 7:—Insert after the word "default" in line 29 the words "after such conviction."

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: As the clause is now worded, a person would be liable to a penalty not exceeding £10, and to a further penalty of £2 for every day during his default. The Council's amendment proposes that the daily penalty for default shall not commence until after the person has been actually convicted of having defaulted in the manner charged. This is a desirable amendment, and I therefore move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 10. Clause 7:—Delete the word "of" in line 29 and substitute the words "not exceeding."

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: This amendment made by the Council is also pursuant to the amendments in Clause 7 which have just been agreed to. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed: the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 11. Clause 7:—Delete the word "two" in line 30 and substitute the word "one."

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The Council's amendment seeks to make the end of Clause 7 read "to a further penalty not exceeding £1." I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

Resolutions reported and the report adopted.

A committee consisting of Mr. Rodoreda, Mr. Doney and the Minister for Works drew up reasons for not agreeing to certain of the Council's amendments.

Reasons adopted and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

## BILL—UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA ACT AMENDMENT.

### *Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 31st October.

**MR. DONEY** (Williams-Narrogin) [5.22]: There was a surprising lack of tolerance in the utterances of the member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe when speaking to this Bill something like a fortnight ago. His outlook, not merely on the institution at Crawley but on universities generally, was sour in the extreme; that is, if we can accept his uncomplimentary speech on that occasion as representing his confirmed views. He declined to accept the University at Crawley as an essential factor in the educational life of Western Australia, and therein, I think, he stands alone in this House. By strange contrast, he expressed passion for what he called a truly democratic institution, which could be relied upon to minister to the orderly and progressive development of education in this State. May I ask the hon. member: What does he want? I might go further and ask whether he knows what he wants.

In the way of democratic ideals, I cannot think of very much that the institution at Crawley lacks. Not too many of us know of too many universities but we know a little about one or two here and there, particularly in other parts of Australia. I would ask the member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe whether he knows of one university anywhere which is more democratic than the University that we have in this State, and of which we are proud. I would point out that it is a free university, and thereby it links itself up with one of the most cherished democratic ideals. It is too, I think, the only free university in Australia. I am not sure that that is so, but I seem to remember that several speakers have said it is so. I think it is the only free university in the whole world, though I am not sure of that, either.

The Premier: You are right there.

**MR. DONEY:** Having regard to what the hon. member said concerning the social standing of certain professors, I would ask him who there is among the professors or tutors at the University who is too aristo-

cratic for his taste? If there is such a one—and he would be a rarity indeed in this State—on the whole University staff, on what ground would the member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe officially demand his expulsion? If I heard the hon. member aright, he referred to the Crawley institution as the privileged resort of the privileged children of rich parents. I think that is the way he put it. Maybe—I am not sure—he made the assertion in respect of universities generally. Even so, in that case he would have included the Crawley institution. I am wondering whether today, as distinct from that day a fortnight ago, the hon. member would still assert his criticism to be fair. To me, and I think to the majority—perhaps all—of his colleagues, the criticism was altogether unfair and unjustified. As I see it, he went too far. I am glad to admit that he is usually very fair; but on that occasion he was definitely unfair. That day was undoubtedly the hon. member's off day. If I heard him aright—and, for that matter, to misunderstand the general purport of the hon. member's speech would be difficult—he was seriously annoyed that the University claimed it was entitled to freedom of thought and expression. I will grant it freedom of thought but I would not grant it freedom of expression of those thoughts. For that matter, a man's thoughts are always his own and criticism such as the hon. member may have made on that point means nothing whatever, because a man's thoughts—

**MR. CROSS:** Are you speaking of the member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe or on this Bill?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order!

**MR. DONEY:** I think the hon. member has spoken already, has he not? He need not fear that anything I may say will reflect upon him or his politics, or anything at all like that; so there is no need for any heat on his part. The member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe traced the history of universities right from medieval times, his purpose being—so I gathered, and so did everyone else—to show that universities were cradled in religious bigotry and generally were no better than they should be. That may be right, but it has no bearing on what we are now discussing. The whole thing was ridiculously out of date. Individually and nationally, there is nothing to be gained by linking us of today with the thoughts of our "rude forefathers"—for want of a better descrip-

tion. What is to be gained by all this tough talk about the Middle Ages? What possible bearing can it have? Despite the care and emphasis which the hon. member gave to his views, they could have no possible bearing upon the question of whether one of the youngest universities in the world in this year of grace 1944 should receive annually £44,000 from the Public Treasury or £45,000 or £48,000 or any other amount which might ultimately be decided upon. I think it would not be amiss if I were to deplore the fact—I do not think this point has been touched upon by any other member—that in respect of this Bill a copy was made available to the University before members of the House had had an opportunity to peruse it. That course is altogether unusual and quite out of keeping with the usage of the House since I have been a member. I believe it to be a contravention of our Standing Orders.

The Premier: No.

Mr. DONEY: Very good! Then that would seem to impose upon the Premier the onus of explaining just exactly why and in what circumstances usage has been departed from in respect of this Bill.

The Premier: I did that when I moved the second reading.

Mr. DONEY: I was not aware of the fact, and in the circumstances I apologise to the Premier for bringing up the matter again. Until the Bill was introduced I had no idea just how very ill-equipped members generally are, myself included, amply to debate it and arrive at a sound and equitable decision regarding its provisions. I believe that since its introduction we have—at any rate, I believe so—taken advantage of the opportunity more fully to inform ourselves regarding this problem. The Bill deals with two major questions. The first has reference to the amount of the grant to be made available; the other is whether the Senate is to be weighted in favour of the University or in favour of Parliament.

Unfortunately for us there is a very sharp conflict of opinion between the views indicated by the Premier in his speech in moving the second reading, and those embodied in communications which have come to us through the post and otherwise from the Senate, Convocation and the Guild of Undergraduates. Whilst I hesitate to say anything derogatory of that Guild, I may admit to some amusement when reading a

letter sent out by it. I do not know whether other members share my views regarding that matter, but that is how it appealed to me. The undergraduates referred to the sum of £40,000 as "a mere pittance" and deplored the fact that it should be necessary for such a body as the Senate to go cap in hand to the Treasurer. Apparently it is beneath the dignity of these lads—although not to truly dignified people—thus to plead! They did have one complaint to make and that referred to the present attitude of the Senate. The complaint was that the Senate was too diffident in approaching the Treasurer for more financial assistance and that on occasions—this is what hurt them most—the Senate could not see eye to eye with the students. All of this goes to confirm our opinion that boys, just as they were when we were young, are still—boys.

Mr. Cross: And still irresponsible!

Mr. DONEY: The Senate and Convocation made the point in the communications to which I have referred that they wanted to be wholly free from Government control. They wanted to be free, too, from any semblance of party political control. I gladly concede them that. They also want to be free to express, without let or hindrance, any kind of view they may hold. They want freedom from all control except, as I understand it, of themselves by themselves.

The Premier: A lot of people would be only too happy to be free from financial worry, would they not?

Mr. DONEY: Yes, I am one of them and so, I imagine, is the Premier. That is quite natural.

The Premier: Yes, of course!

Mr. DONEY: In my opinion their wishes in this respect cannot be gratified in their entirety. This is a practical world. The Government is elected to govern and it can, with its present powers, intervene in connection with any public institution, the University of Western Australia included. But it is under no compulsion to exercise that right, nor do I think it would except to assure itself that the annual grant was being wisely expended. I think the Under Treasurer, Mr. Reid, should most certainly be a member of the Senate. I cannot understand why there can be any two opinions on that point. Mr. Reid is held in very high esteem by every member of the



House and, for all I know, by the people outside. As a financier there is no clearer brain than that of Mr. Reid and I know of no-one better able to tender advice on financial matters to the University authorities. It must not be forgotten that there have been on a few occasions, not so much lately as in times gone by, instances of lax spending by the University and certain ill-considered investments, while it can be said that the Senate's control of its endowments has been somewhat on the amateurish side.

Mr. McDonald: I do not think there is any evidence of that.

Mr. DONEY: Is that so?

The Premier: Anyhow, they have done nothing about it.

Mr. DONEY: Is there no evidence of that? I admit that I have no evidence here at the moment and that might quite properly indicate that I had no right to embark upon criticism along these lines, nor would I do so were it not for the fact that there has been an admission on that point by a gentleman in a control position at the University, whose name I prefer not to disclose. The fact that we have that admission renders it possible for me to make that statement.

Mr. McDonald: I have not heard of that admission.

Mr. DONEY: That is not the point in question. The point is whether there has been lax expenditure and the hon. member said there was no evidence of that, which is an entirely different thing.

Mr. McDonald: I say there is no such admission. If there has been an admission in that respect, where did it come from?

Mr. DONEY: I have told the hon. member. The House can see the weakness I am trying to disclose. In such circumstances Mr. Reid's help and guidance would be absolutely invaluable. I cannot understand why that is not recognised by the Senate and by Convocation.

Mr. Watts: Why is his position *ex officio*?

Mr. DONEY: I do not care what the capacity may be so long as Mr. Reid's services are available to the Senate. So long as he is there at the moment when financial matters are being discussed and he is able to tender his advice when required, that is all I care about.

Hon. N. Keenan: You know he has been attending the Senate meetings for the past year.

Mr. DONEY: I do not know that that point arises. It is not a matter of his attendance at meetings of the Senate but of the opposition that is being raised to his appointment. It is on that point that some criticism is due concerning the Senate, which is in opposition to the appointment.

Mr. Watts: The objection is to Mr. Reid's being there *ex officio* and the contention is that he should be there in a more solidly established capacity.

Mr. DONEY: I have no objection to that.

The Premier: You do not care how he gets there so long as he is there.

Mr. DONEY: That is so. I do not like him to be regarded as an intruder. In all directions other than those I have specifically mentioned, the Senate may, so far as I am concerned, have autonomy in all it seeks. Its curriculum and general practices can be its own—and let the public judge by results. I say that Professor Currie and his associates have demonstrated that the University of Western Australia is quite the equivalent of universities in the Eastern States, and for that and a great number of other reasons that have been mentioned, I say that the University at Crawley is entitled to our deep respect and, on occasions like this, to all help, financial and otherwise, that we find it possible to accord it. The Senate has asked to be free from outside party political control. That is quite right, but I have, I regret to say, some small measure of criticism to impart in that respect. To the Senate's request I say, "Quite right"—but let us be quite sure that there is no suggestion of party political influences operating from within. The Senate asks to be free to interest itself in all and any questions of public consequence, including political questions and those embracing rabidly political issues. Despite that, I still say "Yes," provided the members of the Senate are wholly impartial as between the competing political parties within the State.

Mr. Rodoreda: Who would be the judge of their impartiality?

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Each political party.

Mr. DONEY: The hon. member and I have never found it possible to determine

exactly whether the other man is or is not impartial. I am in agreement with the hon. member that neither he nor I can possibly determine the matter of impartiality beyond question. There is such a thing as a general acceptance of a position. The hon. member knows, as well as I do, how that is arrived at. He knows that we would be able to agree readily that a certain institution was partial or impartial, though he and I on other political aspects might disagree in some small part here and there. My view is that in the past—the past is the only thing by which we can judge a university or anything else—the University has not in this regard been blameless. It has in one or two instances—although not recently has this been so—frequently affronted the public conscience by indiscreet utterances. Especially was that so on those occasions when those concerned linked themselves up with certain extreme political views, which are no doubt proper enough in some other countries that we know but are held, I should say, by no more people in this country than say five cent., if as many, and are anathema to the other 95 per cent. of Australians. I consider it not to be fair or proper that anyone at the University should tamper with the political beliefs held by any young person who enters that institution. That is not a part of the duty of anyone there. I do not mind their endeavouring—that is part of their duty—to change the general outlook that children have, but in respect of the party opinions that they hold in the University this should be inviolate, as I view the matter.

Hon. N. Keenan: What has that to do with the Bill?

Mr. DONEY: Let us say, in the view of the hon. member, nothing, but in my view, a great deal. If the member for Nedlands holds views that differ from mine that cannot be helped. By the indiscretions to which I have referred the University has alienated a great deal of public approval to which otherwise it was fully entitled.

Mr. Cross: I think you are right there.

Mr. DONEY: That is something I deeply deplore, particularly since I have a strong regard for Professor Currie, Professor Ross, and other professors whose names do not occur to me at the moment. I desire also to refer to Mr. Barblett and his work in the terms of the highest praise.

The Minister for Works: What about the Chancellor?

Mr. DONEY: It might be appropriate to have a word in regard to him a little later on.

Hon. H. Millington: We know to what you are referring.

Mr. DONEY: Those to whom I have referred, in my view, have earned our sincere thanks for the splendid part they have played and are still playing in the education of the youth of Western Australia under many difficult and straightened circumstances. In the interests of the State and of higher education in Western Australia I consider we should for the time being ignore the one fault—which is easily eradicated—to which I have referred, so that that may not affect our judgment as to the size of the grant deserved by the University from the public purse, and so that it shall not affect the balancing of the Senate membership in a way best suited to the needs of education. For myself I freely admit—if I have not already done so—that I cannot judge whether the grant should be £40,000 or £50,000. I ask, how many members can do so, and I maintain there are not many, if any, who can. This is a financial matter, and there must be some figure at which we should aim. There must be some set of calculations that can be utilised, but neither in the contribution from the Premier, nor in that of any other member nor in the many letters that have been sent to us from outside, has there been any attempt to show on an arithmetical basis whether the grant should be £40,000, £45,000, £50,000 or any other sum. All that we have to guide us, so far as I can see, is the competitive assertion of the Treasurer, of the Senate, of the Convocation, and of the Students' Guild which put up the highest bid of all, on the point.

The Premier: What of the Royal Commissioner's report?

Mr. DONEY: I have that report in front of me.

The Premier: That was issued only three years ago.

Mr. DONEY: Rather more than that, I think. Does the Treasurer base his claim upon that report?

The Premier: On experience.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Will the hon. member address the Chair?

Mr. DONEY: The Premier bases his calculation not on figures, but on what he calls experience. I do not know what that means as applied to the problems before us. No doubt the Premier has fixed ideas on the subject; he could have no other. He mentions the sum of £40,000, and will not budge from it. I admire fixity of purpose in the present or any other Treasurer. It is reasonable to suspect that the Premier's idea is founded not so much on what the University needs as that it is the compound of that need and what the Treasurer can afford to pay having regard to just and insistent claims elsewhere.

The Premier: Does not that apply right through life?

Mr. DONEY: Since the Premier puts it in that way, I regard it as an admission that that is exactly what determined the Premier in arriving at the figure of £40,000. I submit to the House that although we have not in front of us, or even in the report of the Commissioner, all the facts that would enable us with any degree of accuracy to assess the right sum of money, it should be possible to arrive at an amount that would be reasonably correct. It is known, for instance, that the incomes of other universities in New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, Queensland, Tasmania and Western Australia are derived from certain set sources. There are gifts from the public purse, fees, income from endowments and other avenues, but mainly from these sources. On that basis it is plain that the total of the incomes of all the universities can readily be computed. Having done that, an account would require to be taken of certain factors, not all of which are known to me, but varying as between the different institutions concerned, such as the number of students, additional or fewer Chairs, and a great number of other factors involving more or less expenditure over the years. With knowledge on these points Western Australia's one-sixth proportionate share could readily be estimated, and a figure then arrived at which would constitute a rough guide to the Treasurer as to what amount the Western Australian University was entitled to. I suggest to the Premier that before he closes down on the question of what amount should be given, he should make a calculation along these lines. It may be assumed, I think, that that was what the Premier referred to

when he spoke of his experience. But he should have said that a little earlier.

The tendency today is to regard the University as the most powerful influence in Western Australian education. Most people, I believe, will agree that that is so. Personally, I cannot accept it without reservation. I admit that there is over the University an air of distinction which is not found, of course, in the case of the humbler State schools. But it is, after all, the State schools, taken in their entirety, and not the University, that we find exercising the profoundest influence upon the present, and of course upon the future, of this State, for the reason that the State schools exercise their influence on a far greater number of people. It will be agreed that while two, or perhaps ten, may annually rise to higher levels of constructive usefulness by way of the University—possibly more than ten, because the actual number is not ascertainable—ten or twenty times that number will so rise from the State schools. I therefore maintain that the State schools—doing the greater work—are equally with the University entitled to freedom. This is as it should be. I go further, and say that the State schools are free. There is no doubt whatever on that point.

Throughout the whole length of its history the Education Department of Western Australia has been subject to rigid control as to its finances—by the Government, of course—and to a much less rigid control of its curriculum, again by the Government of the day. I ask the House, what has resulted from that situation, and what possibilities has the University to fear? There may, of course, be an odd disability here and there; but let those interested take note of the fact that political partisanship is very certainly not among such features. All here, I think, will agree as to that. I would like to say that during my years in this House—some 16 now, I think—I would acquit every Minister for Education, every Director of Education, every Chief Inspector of Education, and every Secretary for Education of the sin of party pressure in the matter of education. I consider that such deflection from the straight and narrow path of political neutrality as may be noticed in an occasional school teacher has arisen not from the plotting of the Labour Party or the National Party or the newly-created Democratic League—not from those sources at all, but

from the misguided persuasion, shall I say, of a few professors over the years, which professors, I hope, are no longer upon the University staff. It will have been noticed that in the view of the University spokesmen, it is not competent for this Chamber to determine, without outside aid, the fate of this Bill—that outside aid meaning, in this case, the University itself. Members of the University show by the persistence with which they have bombarded us with advice and instruction as to our attitude, and even by constructing amendments for our guidance—

Mr. McDonald: The University has not done that.

Mr. DONEY: I say that because such communications have come to me over the University signature. I know of course that my learned friend on my left does not need, whatever may be said of us, any legal guidance from any outside source. I am not pretending, either, that any member of the University has a desire to guide the member for West Perth; but members of the University have thought that members of this Party were in need of guidance. I am quite ready to admit that their attitude in this regard has been useful to me certainly, and probably, by the same token, to many others, including even my learned friends on my left and on my right.

The Minister for Works was shrewd enough, or he may have considered that he was helpful, in mentioning the name of the Chancellor of the University; that is to say, Professor Murdoch. Professor Murdoch has written much, and I have been willing on occasion to be guided by him. In a recent article published in "The West Australian" he tells us graciously but superiorly how we must treat this University Bill if we are to earn his approval. He was good enough to point out—I think my memory is clear on this aspect of his article—that this Bill afforded members an excellent opportunity to demonstrate to themselves and to the world at large whether they were statesmen or mere politicians; the plain indication being—as I am sure every member will agree and anyone else from the University who may happen to be listening—that if we meet his (the Professor's) views, we will be statesmen, but if we ignore them, of course we will be nothing but mere politicians.

Mr. North: He is on a good bet.

Mr. DONEY: I am not necessarily agreeing with the member for Claremont. I have heard it said that the angler who thinks his cunning to be superior to that of the fish makes very few catches indeed. I would, with respect, point out to the professor, and to my other university friends, that as we are elected to legislate, so our friends at the University are elected to teach. Each to his own job! They at the University work hard to achieve the best; so do we, with all our faults.

The Premier: We have no faults.

Mr. DONEY: They are noticeable, on occasions. Our friends at the University say, in effect, that our help—interference is a better interpretation of their attitude, but let us say our help—is not necessary to their progress. What ought we to say in reply? There is, of course, an obvious answer; but, as it is obvious, I will not voice it. It is sufficient for us to realise that the University is here, and that it is our University. That it will rise in power and usefulness I have no doubt; in fact, I am confident of it. At the moment it represents the highest attainable in State education. By its labours it is accomplishing much for the State. It is therefore our plain duty to do all in our power to further its progress. In the meantime, give it our trust and our help, financial and otherwise. That is essential. I hope the Treasurer agrees. Give it our trust, despite whatever past weaknesses there may have been and despite the want of perfection to which I drew attention a little while ago. So far as I am concerned, the University may have the Senate which Convocation asks for; but I say, too, that if the University does not welcome, to a far greater degree than it appears to do now, the assistance of Mr. Reid and two or three more of his kind, its finances are not likely to be as stable as they could be. Convocation would therefore sadly disappoint its friends, with the result that the law might then be invoked and the Senate find itself in trouble from that source. I draw the attention of members to the fact that this State spends on general education the sum of £850,000 per annum. By comparison, the sum of £40,000 seems small. I hope that by bringing the two sums together in this way, the smaller amount will look even less than the Premier previously considered it to be.

The Premier: Do not forget that there are a great many schools over which the Education Vote has to be spread.

Mr. DONEY: I know that that is so; but we have to rely upon the University to a very large degree—almost wholly—for our commercial, scientific and general cultural advancement. I suggest to the Treasurer that he have a talk with those gentlemen who, in a senior way, control the University, with the object of ascertaining whether there are not some grounds for increasing the sum. I know that is a difficult matter for the Treasurer, particularly in times like the present, but I consider there are ample grounds for the Treasurer to give this matter greater consideration than he has given to it in the past.

The Premier: I thought you were going to move for a reduction.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DONEY: Of course I know the Premier is not sincere in making that interjection. However, the matter is now left to the House.

MR. W. HEGNEY (Pilbara): Since the Premier recently indicated that the Government intended to bring down certain amendments to the parent Act, much interest has been displayed by interested organisations, some of which are rather perturbed. They have the idea that if the amendments are implemented it will be to the detriment of the administration of the University and its management generally. In common with other members, I have received a number of communications dealing with the Bill. I freely admit that the closest study has been given to all the correspondence received, including the correspondence from Convocation, the State School Teachers' Union and the Guild of Undergraduates. I have also studied the parent Act and the proposed amendments. In addition, I closely scrutinised the recommendations of Mr. Justice Wolff, who conducted an inquiry into the University some 3½ years ago. Incidentally, I listened carefully to the thoughtful contribution to this debate by the member for Nedlands. Taking all the circumstances into account, I have come to the definite conclusion that the proposed amendments are quite justified, and I have no hesitation in saying that Convocation should be eliminated altogether. That is my sincere and candid opinion. Much has been said

with respect to the University about autonomy and democracy. The main provisions of the Bill, as I see them, are that Convocation is to be eliminated as part of the governing body of the institution, and that the number of the Senate is to be increased from 18 to 21.

*Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.*

Mr. W. HEGNEY: Before tea, I was outlining the main features of the Bill. In addition to the provisions mentioned, the Bill provides for the appointment of the Under Treasurer and the Director of Education as ex officio members of the Senate, bringing the number of Government nominees from six to eight. It provides further for a guaranteed minimum of £40,000 per annum to be paid to the University from Consolidated Revenue, for the imposition of certain obligations on and the granting of certain powers to the Senate in connection with the investment of its trust funds, and for the appointment of an auditor under the jurisdiction of the Auditor General. The main objection to the Bill emanates—naturally, I should say—from Convocation itself. Summarised, the objection is that if the Bill is implemented it will have a very strong tendency to undermine the autonomy and independence of criticism of the University; and Convocation naturally desires the power it now has to remain part of the governing body of the institution. It wants the number of Government nominees on the Senate reduced from eight to six and the number of co-opted members reduced from four to two.

Hon. N. Keenan: It does not ask for any reduction.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: Convocation consists in the main of graduates and ex-members of the Senate and donors of £10 upwards. I have tried to ascertain just what functions Convocation carries out. From the communications received from interested parties and from the speech delivered by the member for Nedlands, one would be led to believe that Convocation was the very soul of the University; that it plays a most notable part in the administration and government of the University. So far as I can see, however, the only function that Convocation performs, apart from electing two-thirds of the members of the Senate, is to obstruct or delay for the time being any statutes or regulations that the Senate may, from time to time, adopt. I

looked for some cogent and positive reason to justify the continued existence of Convocation. The only reason advanced—and it was the keynote of the speech by the member for Nedlands—was that Convocation should retain its power and authority because of tradition.

On an occasion like this I do not think we should be dominated by tradition. Another place is steeped in tradition, but who would suggest that we should leave that Chamber sacrosanct? Who would suggest that, because it has a tradition, it should always remain a privileged Chamber? I submit that there are other ways in which the will of the people would be more truly reflected in the Senate than by the present method of appointment of its members. I said I could find no sound reason except tradition for the continuance of Convocation as such. On the contrary, I find that one of the members of the Senate who has been closely associated with the University for 30 years—I refer to Dr. Somerville—very definitely declares that Convocation performs no useful function; that while it elects two-thirds of the membership of the Senate, which has the power to spend £35,000 of the Government's money, it does not—apart from agreeing to statutes—perform any real service to the University. When I speak thus, I am not speaking in any personal sense, but of Convocation as a body.

Dr. Somerville definitely indicated that Convocation had outlived its usefulness long ago, and at the time of Judge Wolff's inquiry it was pointed out that Convocation, while admitting that it had performed no useful function till then, promised to do so in future. One can allow a certain margin in regard to the opinions of Dr. Somerville. He was a member of the Senate for very many years and, during that time, I suppose a certain amount of bitterness and warm feeling would be engendered between him and those with different opinions. But let us look at the views of Mr. Justice Wolff. He indicated that while his inquiry was being held, Convocation had occasion to call a special meeting. Notices were sent out to all members—there were 745 altogether—inviting them and urging them to attend that special meeting. The notice indicated that the very existence of Convocation was at stake.

The report mentions that a total of 28 attended the meeting. It is necessary to have 25 to form a quorum. Of the 28 who attended, seven were members of the staff. As a layman, I look upon that as an indication that the great bulk of those entitled to take an active and enthusiastic part in the functions of Convocation are apathetic, and do not care how Convocation works. We must take the position as we find it.

We have heard references to outside interference and freedom from dictatorship. It is evident to me that the elements are available so that a few people could, by being enthusiastic in the use of the machinery of Convocation, ensure that a dozen of their nominees could dominate the Senate. I am not suggesting that that has been done, but the facilities are there for it to be done. Against that, I would like to say that, as the Government has seen fit to arrange for six representatives from Convocation to act on the Senate, it has been very liberal. The proposal is to increase the membership of the Senate from 18 to 21. That will make the number of members to be elected by Convocation six, and the number to be elected by the Government six. In addition there are to be three ex officio members and two members of the teaching staff, making a total of 17. They will be able to co-opt another four. The member for Nedlands, when dealing with what the Senate might do, definitely left the impression with me that he wanted Convocation to elect the major portion of the Senate, and he indicated that if a certain thing happened, that is, if one of the two members of the teaching staff, or the Vice-Chancellor, could not see eye to eye with Convocation, the Government would dominate the whole position and policy of the University. That is an unintentional insult directed not only at the three nominees I have mentioned but at the other members of the Senate. Members would not be so obtuse in their outlook, or so supine, as to allow a thing like that to happen.

Even going on the figures embodied in the Bill now before us, the Government representatives, if they acted collectively, would not be in a majority. The Government is not going to instruct the Under Treasurer and the Director of Education and its other representatives. Those men will not meet beforehand and receive their instructions

from the Premier. Even if they did, they would still be only eight out of 21 and, if the remainder of the Senate acted against the Government's nominees, the Government would still be in a minority of five. I do not think the member for Nedlands, or any other member of this Chamber, or any member of the Senate or the staff of professors of the University, believes that the Government intends to undermine the freedom of criticism and policy that all universities should enjoy. If I thought that this measure was a move to make the University more or less a Government institution, I would resolutely and vehemently oppose it. No one, by the wildest stretch of imagination, can successfully show that this Bill is a measure designed to undermine the authority, or the autonomy of our University. I believe that if Convocation were granted two representatives on the Senate, it would be ample. I am of opinion that in the early future a different method of appointing members to the Senate might be considered. Convocation was formed some hundreds of years ago and the custom has been handed down from generation to generation. At the time it was originally formed no semi-public organisations, such as we have today, existed. There were no professional or industrial organisations.

I strongly favour the appointment of men apart from representatives of the staff and the Vice-Chancellor and men like the Under Treasurer and the Director of Education. Instead of having members appointed directly from Convocation, I would urge that the Government draw the balance of the Senate from organisations like the British Medical Association, the Law Institute, the Institute of Civil Engineers and Surveyors, the accountancy institutes, the Chamber of Commerce and the huge industrial organisations of employers and employees. By so doing, we would get a very representative cross-section of the community. I would say further that these organisations would be responsible for recommending appointees to the Government, and the Government would automatically make those appointments to the Senate. If that were done, no one could successfully say that the Government was endeavouring to undermine the autonomy of the University. When we look at this matter in a rational and fair-minded way, we must agree that this measure

in no way seeks to minimise the independent or liberal thought that permeates and should continue to permeate the University. After all is said and done, Convocation in the main consists of graduates. We must look at things from a practical point of view and, in the final analysis, the Government finds the major portion of the finance to carry on the University.

There is no doubt that while members of Convocation are entitled to have their organisation, it should not have the authority that it has had since it was first instituted, in regard to this University, and up till now. What are the functions of the Senate? The Senate is the governing body of the University and deals with the management, finance and general administration of the University on the business side. As far as I am aware, no one has ever charged the Senate with endeavouring to tell the professors what they should teach and how they should teach, or with dealing with the courses or the length of study, or the matter of teaching policy generally. Those matters have been left, and rightly so, to the teaching staff. I have no doubt that the same position would arise in the future, and I have no doubt also, from my limited knowledge of the professors of this University, that they are not of the type that would lightly bow the knee and submit to any number of senators, if they thought that they themselves were in the right. I think they have more backbone. On the contrary, I know of professors who have been able to influence Governments by their policy and by their views—and they have not been State Governments either! The charge that the Government is taking a step that will undermine the autonomy of the University and unduly interfere with it has, I consider, been a little stretched.

Regarding the financial side, the Act provides for an annual grant of £13,500, which was stipulated at the time the University was established, but progressive increases were made until 1936 when the sum was £34,500. While some people contend that the judge was of opinion that, with the Government grant and provided fees were charged, a sum of approximately £52,000 or £54,000 should be made available to the University, the Government has seen fit to increase the grant by £4,500.

The Premier: No, £5,500.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: That is so. The member for West Perth deplored the approach some members had made to the Bill. I am sorry that we have to make the approach in this way, and would respectfully suggest that those who make that point should offer some concrete proposal. I would like to see the sum of £100,000 placed at the disposal of the University annually. I hope the day is not far distant when we shall not have to cheese-pare and look twice at every penny made available to the University. Such a seat of learning and honoured institution should be absolutely free of financial worries. But if the Government voted twice the amount of money now proposed, it would most likely mean that other branches of education, primary and secondary, would suffer. Every member who speaks on education refers to the lack of equipment and the drabness of schools. Throughout the length and breadth of the State there is a crying need for alterations and improvements to buildings, for greater facilities for training teachers and for better accommodation generally. If the Government indiscriminately raised the grant to the University there must be a shortage of funds for other requirements, and this would be the means of creating strong objection from various sections of the community. Consequently, while I deplore the approach that we have to make, we must view the position from a practical point of view.

Previous speakers have quoted figures and practices relating to universities in England, on the Continent and in the Eastern States. Again I refer to the member for Nedlands, who was in the forefront in indicating what happens in the Eastern States and in advocating that we should follow their example. I wish to direct attention to the difference in his attitude in that respect to this Bill and to the Companies Bill. I recollect clearly that the hon. member, in speaking on the Companies Bill, castigated the Minister for Justice roundly on various occasions when he advocated the adoption of certain provisions in order to achieve uniformity with the law in the Eastern States. The member for Nedlands strongly contended that we should take no notice of what happened in the Eastern States, that we should act on our own initiative and regard the question from a Western Australian point of

view. I am trying to view this Bill in the broadest possible way and not take any parochial attitude. On this occasion, however, it no doubt suited the hon. member—although I give him credit for sincerity—to advance an entirely different argument.

Those are the remarks I have to offer on the Bill. I should not have liked to cast a silent vote on the second reading. I sincerely hope that the second reading will be passed, and that the Government will not agree to increase the number of representatives of Convocation on the Senate. Although the member for Williams-Narrogin made facetious reference to the correspondence received from the Guild of Undergraduates, I would say that if any alteration is to be made in the constitution of the Senate as set out in the Bill, I would be inclined to reduce the number elected by Convocation and grant the Guild of Undergraduates one delegate. The undergraduates are obliged, under the University Act, to be members of the Guild, and if a gesture of this sort were made either now or later on, I think it would encourage members of the Guild to take part in the administration of the University.

Undoubtedly the University will continue to be a training ground for technicians and professional men. There will be a big demand for men of such training not only in this State but also throughout Australia in the early post-war years. Although the Government must hesitate before increasing the amount of the grant made available to the University, I hope that when the Act is again brought up for amendment, serious consideration will be given to granting a substantial increase for carrying on the University. Labour conferences for years have endeavoured to further the interests of education in this State, and a free University has been a plank of the Labour platform for many years. We have a free University and can boast of it, and while the Government cannot see its way clear to concede the full measure of the financial requests made by the Senate, I sincerely hope that before long the grant will be substantially increased so that the University might be made what it ought to be—an institution for the highest training of the young people of this State.



**MR. RODOREDA** (Roebourne): We should all be grateful to the member for Pilbara for the very lucid exposition he has given of the position that will prevail at the University when this Bill becomes law and for the constructive criticism he has offered. I regret that there was not a larger attendance of those people interested in the measure to hear his speech. There is one aspect of the measure that mainly interests me, and it is a point that has been referred to only casually during the course of the debate. I do not claim to have studied the Bill as the member for Pilbara has done. I do not know enough about the set-up and the internal organisation of the University to be able successfully to debate the question whether there should be two members of this body or four members of that body on the University Senate. I am prepared to accept the decision of the Government in the matter. The Premier has gone into the question thoroughly, and has a full knowledge of the facts—a better knowledge than private members can possibly have—and I am quite satisfied to leave the decision to him.

The aspect that interests me as a supporter of the Labour Party is the aspect of the so-called free university; and here I find myself expressing views divergent from those expressed by the member for Pilbara and the Premier and many other members who have taken part in the debate. The Premier says we are proud of our free university. The member for Pilbara echoes that sentiment, and so do other members. Well, I am not proud of it from the aspect of its being free. If ever the term "free" was a misnomer, it is in this instance. I am frankly disappointed with the Bill because no progress whatever has been made towards the ideal of a free university in the 30-odd years that the institution has been established. We of the Labour Party—and I do not suppose we have a monopoly of this ideal—are always giving lip service to "a free university," but have not progressed one iota in that direction during the last 35 years. Let us examine this free university of ours! In the matter of primary education, parents have to feed, clothe and house a child whether the child goes to school or not. In the case of the University it is a totally different matter.

Our University is free to students only as regards the least part of the expense involved in attending it. I doubt whether the cost of fees, if charged, would be any more than the annual cost of the necessary books. I cannot express a definite opinion, but I think that probably the cost of books would be greater to the parents who send a child to the University than the cost of fees if charged. The great expense is housing, food and clothing. And young people have to attend the University for three, four or five years or more! Our ideal of a free university that the child of workers can attend in common with all other children whose desires run in that direction—

The Premier: There are a number of bursaries, you know!

Mr. RODOREDA: Very few indeed.

The Premier: I know two daughters of a man on sustenance who went through the University.

Mr. RODOREDA: I know of 10,000 daughters of 10,000 families who wanted to go to the University but could not. The right for them to go is what I want. It is ridiculous if the Premier wishes to suggest to me that any basic wage earner can send his child to the University. Under present conditions that is absurdly impossible.

The Premier: No; it is true.

Mr. RODOREDA: On the whole, it is ridiculous to assert that.

The Premier: It is true.

Hon. N. Keenan: Could you suggest how a child in Kalgoorlie could come to the University?

Mr. RODOREDA: No; not only the children of the basic wage earners in the metropolitan area are debarred from attending the University, but practically all the children of the country areas are debarred. The expense of attending the University would be not less than £3 or £4 per week, and what basic wage earner could afford that amount? In addition, he has to do without the earnings of the child if it were sent to work. Therefore to my mind it is ridiculous for us to speak of our free University, and I do not see that we are endeavouring to make any progress towards that ideal. We as a Labour Party should delete the free University plank from our platform or else take some steps to put it into practical effect. I would far sooner have fees charged at the University, and the amount thus paid in given

by the Government in bursaries or scholarships of an amount at least sufficient to keep the student for the years he may spend at the University. A large number of bursaries should be given. The present system merely makes it easier for parents who could otherwise afford to send their children to the University.

The cost to the University for every student attending the institution is £14 or £15 per annum. The Supreme Court Judge who was appointed a Royal Commissioner to go into the question of the University suggested that from £15 to £20 would be chargeable for fees. Of course the amount could be £100, as the Premier just interjects, or whatever the Senate of the University liked to determine; and of course the Senate would not to any absurd length. The basic wage earner can find from £25 to £30 for one year's attendance of his child at a commercial college. Why should not the Government subsidise that tuition? To my way of thinking, it is just as important as university training. The Labour Party, however, takes no steps towards making business colleges free. In normal times it is practically impossible to get a commercial position for a child unless he or she has been through a commercial college, and it costs the parents £30 or £40 to put a child through the curriculum of such a college for a year or 18 months.

The Premier: There are technical schools.

Mr. RODOREDA: I admit that, but in many instances children attend a technical school for six or eight or twelve months and then finish up at a business college. I repeat that we have not a great deal to be proud of as regards our free University! I urge the Government to do whatever is practicable towards making the institution a really free university, something that we could be proud of. That brings another reflection, that this University is really a luxury which we really could not afford at the time of its establishment, and can scarcely now afford. That is the crux of the problem. I have never been one to say or do the conventional thing just because it was conventional. I want a better reason than that. The burden of this debate has been that everyone wishes more money to be given to the University, but "we cannot afford it." Everyone knows that the University has always been more or less stinted for money.

It has never been a really effective University since its inauguration. So we are much in the same position as frequently obtained in New South Wales families, where the head of the family bought rump steak to give to the greyhound and the kiddies lived on bread and dripping! That is the case here. We are buying the rump steak to hand to the University; and all we can afford for our primary education, in a manner of speaking, is bread and dripping.

As regards the necessity for the University, my contention is that there are first-class universities in Australia as near to our metropolitan area as our own University is to many potential students in outback areas of this State. We are within seven or eight hours of the Adelaide University by air, and only a day or a day and a half by train. There are hundreds of potential students of our own University who are as far away from it as are potential students in the metropolitan district from the University of Adelaide. It is a wonderful ideal to have a university of our own and we talk about the cultural aspect of it, but it is an expensive luxury in our present pioneering stage. There are many more important matters upon which our education vote could be expended. Unless we can devise some other means of increasing the money available in order to make our University a real university, instead of what I might term a glorified high school, which it is at present, we would be better without one. In that respect I am somewhat inclined to agree with the views expressed by the member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe, who was so roundly castigated—in a very pleasant manner, I admit—by the member for Williams-Narrogin this evening. He is a reasonable person, and I can see him smiling now.

There is always much talk, whenever universities are mentioned, about the cultural aspect. Culture is very nice in its way, but it is a somewhat nebulous term. It is like defining the term "gentleman." It is difficult to describe what culture is. It has a different meaning for different people. It is difficult to tell whether a man is cultured or not. One cannot tell whether a man is cultured by the way he walks or by the way he dresses. Culture is nebulous and intangible.

Member: You can tell by his tie.

Mr. RODOREDA: As I say, one person would say that a man was cultured and the

next person would deny it. Whether universities really inculcate culture into their undergraduates or graduates is a moot point. Throughout the centuries Germany was considered to be the home of culture; but lately we have taken to spelling culture with a K, and it makes all the difference. Are we to adopt the German brand of culture and say that it is good, or are we to adopt our own British form of culture which, so far as I can ascertain, largely comprises the ability to quote the iambic pentameters of Virgil or of Horace or of some Greek tragic poet? That is what seems to have permeated all our English public school life and English university life, and now we have the tradition in Australia. It was a mere circumstance that Latin and Greek culture was adopted by Europe. We might have adopted the Chinese form of culture; the Chinese were a civilised and cultured nation thousands of years before Europe was thought of in an historical sense. When one comes to analyse culture, one finds it to be intangible. It is not much good to a man on the dole.

If that is the extent of the effect which the University is going to have upon the life of this State, I say we can well wait until we are past the pioneering stage, until we have a reserve of wealth here similar to that which has been accumulated in the Eastern States. There the universities are enjoying revenue from large benefactions of men who have endowed the universities with bequests. So it is possible to build up a decent university in the Eastern States. Here, our University turns out large numbers of law students. We could well afford to do without them, and the State would be no worse off. But we want hundreds of doctors, and of what use is our University in that respect? Not a bit. The University turns out numbers of students with M.A. and B.A. after their names. Culture again! But these do not add to the scientific or technical requirements of the State. We want agricultural scientists, veterinary scientists, scientists who can classify our lands and our soils, and we want geologists; but definitely, we can quite well do without the M.A., the B.A., and the legal practitioners. I am not now speaking of the member for Nedlands.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. RODOREDA: From the aspect of culture alone, our University is a very ex-

pensive luxury. With regard to the universities of America, some of them are not what we would term universities; they are glorified high schools and are scattered in great numbers over the various States. They are really not much better than our own University, but they get on very well without the study of Latin and Greek—the classics, as we term them. If a student in an American university has an urgent desire to know how many parasangs Hannibal marched his army on the twenty-first day, or what Charon said to Virgil when he crossed the Styx, he can get a book and obtain the information for himself, or he can go to England and learn about it. The American university trains students in practical subjects, and that is what we should do at our University. What we need to establish here is a Faculty of Medicine, and then we would have the Premier really worrying about finding the money for it. But that is an urgent need for the State, as the Minister for Health will agree. We are neglecting the essentials while chasing some phantom that we call culture.

Various references have been made to the flood of circulars which have been sent to members in regard to this Bill. Some have caused amusement; others resentment. However, I do not feel any resentment. I consider that people who have thus sent us their views—it may be propaganda—are entitled to do so. Of course, we are not compelled to read the correspondence; but, if we do, we get the other person's viewpoint. Frankly, I must plead abysmal ignorance on subjects such as this, as, of course, the member for Nedlands will have gathered from my speech. However, I rather welcome an expression of opinion from anybody at all interested in legislation brought forward in this Chamber. I therefore cannot see that any wrong has been done in that way, and I do not see why members should express resentment on that score. As far as the Guild of Undergraduates is concerned, this caused much amusement to the member for Williams-Narrogin, but I consider the guild has a perfect right to ask for representation upon the Senate.

Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. RODOREDA: I would give the Guild three members, or at least two, because the members of the Guild are attending the University, from some motive best known to themselves, and are in the best position to

know what they want. They are certainly not attending it from the cultural aspect. They are attending it with the idea that, once they get through their selected course, they are going to have a better and easier way of life than has the man who did not go to the University. That is the outlook of the majority; I do not think anyone can successfully contradict that expression of opinion. That is the real reason people go to universities. Those people are seeking knowledge of some sort; and they are the ones to know whether they are assimilating it or not, and whether the right method of imparting the knowledge is being followed, or whether some improvement could be made which might possibly not strike a body of professors or the middle-aged and elderly gentlemen comprising the Senate of the University. In my opinion, that is the greatest fault in the world today: that we of a generation that is done with do not let go of control. We let youth have no say whatever. We have made an awful mess of things up to date, but we will not let any of the rising generation have a say, if we can avoid it. The voice of the undergraduates should be heard in the deliberations of the Senate. After all, they are the people concerned—not the professors, not the Senate. The object of the University is to impart knowledge, inaugurate discussion, seek after facts and conduct investigations; and if students are dissatisfied with the courses being adopted and with the way they are being taught, they should have some means of expressing their opinions at meetings of the Senate.

**MR. GRAHAM** (East Perth): In common with, I suppose, all members, I have been practically inundated during recent weeks with the written word in connection with this matter—the printing press having apparently worked overtime. It might be considered that a sense of fear has been generated thereby in the minds of those in favour of the proposals set out in the Bill in connection with the Senate, unless they give voice to the point of view they are supporting. For that reason, I desire very briefly to submit my views on this question. Earlier it appeared that there was to be an intensive barrage so far as the amount of money to be devoted to the University was concerned; but somehow that appeared to lift and we have been experiencing a broad-

side so far as Convocation is concerned. I was particularly interested in the remarks of the member for Nedlands wherein he gave much play to the word "precedent." Because, in other parts of Australia and other parts of the world, Convocation had been elected or chosen upon a certain basis, that in itself appeared to him to be sufficient justification for a similar course to be adopted in Western Australia. I very heartily disagree with that viewpoint and suggest that, if we were to be guided in all respects by precedent, we would now be passing up and down Hay-street in bullock wagons rather than in modern means of transport.

Notwithstanding the remarks of the member for Roebourne, I contend that we have in Western Australia a free university; because, in a general sense, the word "free" is intended to convey that no fees are charged. Admittedly, the fact of having a member of the family attending any educational institution imposes a financial burden on the parents. Fortunately, so far as university education is concerned, considerable assistance is at present being granted by the Commonwealth Government, so that children of those less fortunately circumstanced can, if they have the desire and the ability, receive a higher and better education than was previously possible in the history of Australia. Because the University in this State is free in the sense that no fees are charged, that University is in a totally different category from any other university of which I am aware. Our University is the property of the people; the people in the main pay for the University. I suggest that it is not the property, nor is its management the exclusive right or prerogative of the students or graduates of that institution. It is the concern of every one of us.

I can agree that those who attend the University do so for the purpose of establishing for themselves certain claims, so that their progress in after life may be benefited to some extent and that they may be better qualified to proceed to business ventures, scientific undertakings, and the rest of it. That is the angle of the student at the University. From the point of view of the State, however, it is not with the idea of any individual gain that the University is maintained and supported; but rather with the idea that, as a consequence of the training and knowledge

gained by those who pass through the institution, the State as a whole will derive considerable benefit. I repeat that, because a person has passed through a university, he does not thereby establish a claim to play any part in the administration or control of that institution. It might just as well be suggested that, because a person travels on trams, that qualifies him to participate in the management of the tramway system, which it certainly does not.

Mr. Perkins: The tramways might be a bit more efficient if it did!

Mr. GRAHAM: They might or might not! I submit that travelling on the trams does not qualify patrons of the system to manage it. Other factors must be taken into consideration. With regard to a reduction of the representation of Convocation, the justification is the report of the Royal Commissioner who spoke in regard to this matter in no uncertain manner. He was an impartial person who himself had passed through a university, and he has stated for our guidance that, in his considered opinion, a far lesser representation of Convocation should be imposed upon the University Senate. It has been suggested that the autonomy of the University would be undermined if the proposals embodied in this Bill were given effect, and that all sorts of terrible things might befall the University if Convocation should lose some of the control it is able to exercise at present.

So far as I am concerned, the appointments that this Government and previous Governments have made to public positions bear examination by anybody. The people selected have been fully competent and have served in their respective positions with credit to themselves and the Governments that appointed them. Why it should be suggested that there will immediately be a political bias creeping into the University if the Government makes appointments is entirely beyond me. I believe it is impossible to establish on a sound basis that such would be the case. It has been argued, I submit, from the premises that the only persons who have political bias are either members of the Government, members of Parliament, or the persons that may be appointed to responsible public positions. Of course such is anything but the truth. After all, I dare say every member of Convocation at present has de-

finite political views. I suggest, in addition, that it is not beyond the wit of those who comprise Convocation to do a little organising, whether it be with regard to religious or political bias, in order to secure representation on the Senate under the old order of things so that the majority shall be of their particular persuasion. But the Government in the first place is responsible, as announced in the Bill, for finance to the tune of £40,000 towards the upkeep of this institution. The Government, moreover, is responsible to the people in every sense. It can be called to order at three-yearly intervals and dealt with if the people so desire, that is if the Government has breached the confidence of the people generally. But such is not the case with regard to Convocation.

I echo the sentiments of previous speakers that if there is any error in the composition of the Senate, so far as Convocation is concerned, it is in the fact that its representation is too liberal rather than too little. No matter from where the members of the Senate are drawn, I feel that any charges of political bias made against the Senate in regard to its administration and conduct of the affairs of the University would be found to be entirely groundless. In any event, if by some mischance, the dismal critics of this particular provision are found to be correct in their surmises, then it is not beyond the ability of this Parliament, or a succeeding one, to make amendments to the composition of the Senate in order to rectify the position. I lay emphasis on the fact that if there is any likelihood of political bias dominating the University, it will not be overcome by allowing Convocation to elect a greater representation than is provided by the present measure. Broadly, those are the main comments I have to make on the Bill. Because it is a free University and because it is financed by the Government the people of the State have a right, as expressed through the Government, to determine who shall be the persons responsible for the control and administration of that institution.

I agree, too, that whilst there are sections represented on the University Senate some consideration might be given to a limited representation for those who are at the present moment attending the University, namely, the graduates receiving

their training at that institution. If those who have already graduated and passed through the institution are to be given a representation of six, then surely those who are gaining by or suffering from the present administration are entitled to some consideration. If when we reach a later stage an amendment is submitted along those lines I shall be prepared to support it. I hope the Bill will be passed substantially in its present form. In any case, I reiterate that no increase should be allowed to Convocation which, as has been pointed out, is so wide, and so open, being composed of persons who are responsible to nobody, that it is dangerous for any great control of the University to be vested in it.

**MR. BERRY** (Irwin-Moore): I was not in this State when this University was launched, but from what I have heard in this Chamber and from inquiries that I have made it strikes me that in this launching we launched a vessel of great beauty in which we apparently have great pride, without paying sufficient regard to the fact that the engining of that vessel was going to cost a lot of money. I really believe that the initial mistake was made when it was decided that the University of Western Australia should be free. That mistake is due to the fact that we are not in a position to make the University free. It is claimed, I believe correctly, that a population of 1,000,000 people is required to support a university. I think that even that population would not be sufficient to uphold a university which carried an expensive medical school. I agree with the remarks of the member for Roebourne. I think that if we want to make a free university we should make it free. I did not want to say so, but I happen to be a man who went through a university, and I assure members that the fees were the least of my expenses. They were, oddly enough to my mind, infinitesimal by comparison with the other costs that I had to face. Nor would I miss this opportunity of assuring you, Mr. Speaker, that by virtue of having been to a university I do not belong to the governing class as was intimated in this Chamber.

If we want to make a university free it is incumbent upon us to see that the democratic principle which guided the original decision is sufficiently elastic to allow it to be free. Otherwise we have the position

arising whereby the man on the basic wage, referred to by the member for Roebourne, cannot possibly take advantage of the free tuition because the rest of the business is not free. The member for East Perth told us that it is free because there are no fees to pay. But I understand there are microscope fees. There are entrance examination fees as well. These things do not show that the University is free. The motive that prompted the collection of these fees exemplifies the point that I am trying to express, that we have not enough money in Western Australia to provide a free university. I held these views before I read the somewhat voluminous report of the Royal Commissioner, and I find that he recommends the charging of fees. In a small community like this, where we are endeavouring to do a great service to the community, the question of whether students should contribute towards something which is of immense value to them is important.

Because this free tuition does not include free board and residence, and the payment of other contingencies, it looks to the man on the basic wage like a case of endeavouring to burnish democracy with dull meanness. I suggest that in all cases in this State where, among the poorer classes, a child shows intelligence, it is incumbent on any Government, of any political colour, to take that child and educate him in the fullest measure. That, I think, would be better democracy than scratching the surface and saying in a grandiloquent manner, "We have a free university at which you pay your various living costs and fees for microscopes and entrance examination fees." The member for Nedlands told us that the University of Western Australia enjoyed the distinction of being the only free university in the world or in the British Empire. We are very proud of that. As I have been saying, however, pride in itself is inadequate. We must substantiate that pride with sufficient money to allow the University to function as other universities do. I am satisfied from what I have heard here that there is need for reform, that there is need for the Premier to introduce legislation and that there is need for the discussion that has taken place.

But I would be horrified, and so would many other members of the community, if we found that the University passed into the hands of the Government and became no

more than a glorified technical college. That should not be tolerated. I do not think there is any member of this Chamber, even including the member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe, who would not, if it were in his power to do so, send his boy to the University in order to give him the very advantages that we have heard criticised during the course of the debate. That deals with one point on which I disagree with the remarks of the member for Roebourne. I refer to the question of culture and refinement. The member for Roebourne asked: What is this culture? He said it was nebulous, something we could not touch, something that was not tangible, not practical, something that could not be hit with a hammer. He concluded therefore that it was no good.

In my opinion, culture is the refinement in human beings the possession of which results in young people refraining from jostling older people and women out of their way in order that they may get the best seats in a bus. That is what culture and refinement represent. As to what culture or refinement may be, no-one needs more than one moment to recognise it. It is inherent in some. It may be born in some. It can be taught to others. It is the University that can teach it to the individual. The member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe also queried: What is culture? He spoke scathingly. He said that a Minister of the Crown had paid a visit to the University and had seen some young people lolling about the pool. He had asked what they were doing, and the professor or whoever it was to whom the question was addressed replied that they were learning to take their leisure. That was not a bad reply. Personally, I would prefer to see young people taking their leisure by reclining on a green lawn surrounding a beautiful pool than to see them spending it at an S.P. betting shop round the corner, or in the local pub of which we have heard so much recently, or in the demoralising two-up school in the lane. I know which of these particular refinements I would prefer for my son.

I do not think anything could be gained by the utterance of the scathing criticism of the member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe who told us there was a fellow in Kalgoorlie who had grown cabbages from which he secured a turnover of £18,000 a year. The hon. member lauded that cabbage grower

and gave us the impression that the man had done much more than had these university people. I deny that. I would hate to compare the efforts of Sir Douglas Mawson or Professor David with those of the cabbage grower at Kalgoorlie. I think it will be found that the University people have fallowed the land so that others can sow the seed. I know Michael Faraday was not a university man but was one of very lowly beginnings. Yet he became a great man, and so did Edison; but so did the Australian I mentioned who located the magnetic pole in the Antarctic. Such men as those rendered great service to humanity.

University trained men have rendered great service to commerce and trade generally. Yet the member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe could refer to them in contemptuous tones and could compare their efforts with cabbages! It was all very disappointing coming from the one member of the House who, in my opinion, has made greater efforts than any other of us not only to improve his knowledge but to make himself one of the most interesting members of the House. For the first time since I have been here, I discovered that my idol had feet of clay. He told us of a man named Myers in Melbourne who had amassed a fortune without going to a university, but who had donated £60,000 to the Melbourne University. Why in the name of thunder did he do that? I suggest he did it because he realised there was something lacking in his own life, something that might be obtained from a university; and with that end in view and for the benefit of others, he endowed the Melbourne University with the sum of £60,000. Perhaps, too, it was to encourage culture and refinement in Australia.

I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that Australia is not distinguished throughout the world for its culture or refinement. It can only be through the universities of Australia that a change in that respect can be brought about, and I trust that it will be achieved. Then again the member for Nedlands told us that other universities in the world were not interfered with by Governments, that they were provided with Government subsidies but that the universities carried on themselves. That is so, but there is a difference between the problem the Premier has brought to us and that obtaining elsewhere.

The universities that have been referred to are, almost without exception, fee-collecting institutions. The student pays to go there, and in respect of those institutions the subsidies received from the Government are rather in reverse compared with the position confronting the University of Western Australia. Here the Premier, through Parliament, is asked to provide the entire funds required for the University. The Premier is, quite rightly, restive about the expenditure of that money. In that connection he has my sympathy. Nevertheless I would hate to see Government control over the University, be it a Labour Government or a Government of any other political colour.

I would hate to see the University come down to the level of having to study its p's and q's because it had become, practically speaking, a Government department. I certainly would not like to see that. We have only one instance on record of a Government very definitely taking over the mental activities of a university in its country. I refer to Germany, a nation whose education was practically dictated by one man and certainly by one Party, to such an extent that we see the result today in the whole world being devastated and shocked. I think Hitler showed us that the most powerful weapon in the world is education. It is the most powerful when we consider the effect of taking a little tot, bringing it up and teaching it the doctrines that he taught. And yet there is nothing simpler. Unless the problem is taken in hand by the universities, we can expect nothing but a repetition of what is happening in Europe, and God forbid that some of us should have to stand up to a third war because of our futility and a desire to make everything work our own way! The member for Roebourne struck a happy note when he said, "Give the kids a chance." We have given the young fellow much lip service, but little of practical use. Let us give the young fellow at the University an opportunity. We have said in effect, "Look at the great and wonderful world we have built for you, but for God's sake keep out of it." Let us not do that. Do not let us interfere in any way with the freedom of the University in which we might take more pride than we are taking in a university that we can ill-afford to maintain. We have a pride in what we have done, and my worry is how

to finance that pride so that it will become something of democratic lustrousness.

I suggest with all earnestness that the whole problem of the Bill is money and that the only way to solve the problem is to say to the student, "When you come of people who can afford to pay for your university training, you will pay," and to those people who are not in a position to pay, "We shall see that the brains with which God has endowed you shall receive every possible opportunity of development at the hands of some of the most skilled teachers—our University professors." These are men who give their lives to the business, men who are so imbued with the principles of teaching that it seems almost irreligious to come into this Chamber and discuss them in association with the subject of finance. Western Australia is a young, pioneering, progressive State. We know the problems of agriculture that have already been solved, thanks in a great part to the universities. We know of the problems that still lie ahead, and we as a people will turn to our universities for the necessary guidance in solving them, even as the Public Service of Australia is today looking to the universities to supply the most technical and highly-trained men for Government positions.

I must support the Bill. I trust the University will not become a State instrumentality, and that it will never lose the prestige that the people of the State believe the University has. Let us hope that it does not degenerate into the technical college of which I spoke. Let us see light and reason and find the money. It is the same old problem wherever we look—in the realm of education, railways or anywhere else. Everything we have is tumbling to pieces because we have not sufficient money to maintain it. I believe that the problem of the University and the very criticism of the people associated with it have arisen from the fact that their minds are distraught because of the lack of money. Let us find the money! If people can afford to pay for the University instruction of their children let them do so, while those who cannot afford to pay may receive free education in what we hope will become one of the finest institutions in the State.

**MR. SEWARD (Pingelly):** I desire to say only a few words on the Bill because its scope is very limited, and members who



have already spoken have dealt fairly exhaustively with it. The measure contains two features—one that of finance and the other that of the composition of the governing authority. In common with other members I have received quite a number of communications—I do not know how many—but unlike other members, I have not read any of them. I am afraid, however, that not too many members have read the report of the Royal Commissioner or, if they have read it, have not given much consideration to it. The report deals very exhaustively with all phases of University activity and I consider that, when Parliament appoints a man of the calibre of Mr. Justice Wolff to inquire into the University, we ought to give due consideration to his findings. That is the reason why he was appointed to make the inquiry. One should be guided by his findings, and Parliament should be guided by his findings. If members read the report carefully they will certainly find that the whole of the trouble is not due to an insufficiency of money. At any rate that is how I read the report.

Most members have stated that they favour a free University. The Party to which I belong includes that policy as a plank of its platform. I certainly do not advocate a policy that everyone in the State should attend the University free of charge. I strongly advocate making it possible for anyone to attend the University provided he has application and ability to assimilate a university education and has earned the right to go there. But to send a young man to the University simply because someone says that he ought to go there would be ridiculous. Everybody is not suited for a university education. Our economic life is not suited to a condition where everyone is university trained. There are many jobs in the State in which there is no need for university education to qualify people to do them; and to send such people to a university would be to waste their time and the money of the country. If anyone has the application and ability and has earned the right to study at the university, by all means give him all possible monetary assistance so that he may reach the highest rung in the professional life of our State. I say this for a particular reason.

I remember instances that happened years ago in universities, not in Western Australia, of young fellows, the sons of people

who could well afford to keep them at the university, attending at the expense of the taxpayers, and they did not take a five, six or seven years' course; they took a course of 11, 12 or 13 years simply because they were enjoying the life. If they did not pass their examination in the first year, they continued to study for it in the second or third year, and only if they failed in the second or third year did they have to leave. The result was that they took two or three years to pass each examination and had an enjoyable time. If such people wish to attend the University, they should pay for it; they should not go there at the expense of the taxpayers. So far as I am aware, that is not happening here, though I am not sufficiently well versed in university affairs to say definitely that it is not. Certainly we have only one residential college, and I hope that there the course is not extended over as long a period as possible simply in order that those taking it might have an enjoyable time. Having read the report of the Royal Commissioner carefully, I propose to quote some of his remarks as follows:—

The University is dissipating a great deal of energy in accepting many students who are not fitted for a university education. Only one out of every two students who enter for full degree courses completes the course. A dissipation of energy is also apparent in the case of sub-graduate courses and courses taught at elementary standard . . .

The only persons who should be assisted in their academic careers are those who are intellectually worthy and would otherwise be unable to obtain a university education.

With that opinion of the Royal Commissioner, I heartily agree.

One must face the fact that there is a large student wastage in the University, and that in my opinion seems clear proof that the University is accepting students who are not fitted for a university education.

The student wastage at the University is appalling. A study of the 1930, 1931 and 1932 figures shows that for the whole of the faculties only 50 per cent. of the full-time students entering completed their degrees within eight years.

Inquiry is needed to prevent that wastage; in other words, to see that we receive the full value of the money spent on the University. Obviously it is our duty to do that.

The Premier: Many of the students take eight years instead of five!

Mr. SEWARD: It is our duty to give attention to that very strong statement of the Royal Commissioner. As the member for

Roebourne pointed out, we are not in a position to waste money. We seem to have, in the University, an expensive luxury, with a small population and limited resources. The strain is too severe. Again, the Royal Commissioner, turning to the Hackett bursaries, has this to say—

The Hackett Bursary Fund has been distributed over too wide a body. I estimate on statistics that only about one-third of the number held are justified on results. Awards to the remaining deserving students could be increased according to needs, and the available revenue used to pay their lecture and other fees.

In other words, by giving the bursaries to only a third of the number of students now receiving them, the amount of each bursary would be doubled or more. Thus the expenses of the worthy students could be met. Therefore, when we have that evidence of want of adequate care to see to the proper spending of the money, and in view of the need for great expense on our primary education, it is obvious that we should exercise that care. I as a country member could not possibly see my way clear to support the Bill if it contained a provision for a greater financial grant to the University than is now being made. The need for further money to be spent on our primary schools is far too urgent to permit of any extra money being spent on the higher grades. It has been pointed out that we could more easily send the students to Eastern Australian universities if the financial strain of our University became too great, or if we were faced with inability to maintain the University at the expense of our primary and secondary education. However, we may be able to do both.

Another highly interesting part of the Royal Commissioner's report is where he points out the revenues per student received by various universities during 1939: New South Wales, £69; Western Australia, £50; Queensland, £48; South Australia, £44; Victoria and Tasmania, £43. Therefore Western Australia is the second highest of the whole lot. The other universities, excepting Tasmania, have medical faculties; and so, as the Royal Commissioner says, the University of Western Australia is well off in point of money available per student.

The Premier: Money nearly all of which is granted by the State.

Mr. SEWARD: Yes. Our University has substantial revenue per head, and it ought

to produce results. The Royal Commissioner also points out—

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

"I have tried to get that explanation from the University," said the Royal Commissioner, "but I have not succeeded." So I cannot agree with the member for Williams-Narrogin when he states that education is being carried out at our University in straitened circumstances. The money is there, and it behoves us to see that the money is properly spent. The Bill provides for a vote of £40,000. In view of the criticisms of the Royal Commissioner, I consider that amount adequate at the present time. I would go even further and say that the University should be made acquainted with the position, for the Royal Commissioner also recommends that the grant should be cut down after five years, a period which he considers would afford the University opportunity to put its house in order. If it could then be proved that the grant of £40,000 was needed, the position could be reviewed. The Royal Commissioner, however, has pointed out that the University went into faculties which were beyond its present needs. A medical school, the Commissioner points out, should not be established for ten years. I do not believe that as soon as the war ends we shall get money from everywhere, and also a new era. My belief is that there will be a time of financial stringency consequent upon the huge waste of money that has been going on for five years. If we cannot make a bigger grant to the University, if even the medical school will have to be put back, we may be able to finance students desiring to take the medical course to take it at an eastern Australian university. The annual grant of £40,000 I consider reasonable, and therefore I intend to support the second reading of the Bill.

I turn now to the other feature of the Bill, the appointment of the Senate. I regret having to uphold the Royal Commissioner's findings, because I would like to see Convocation taking a more active part than it has apparently done in the past. It gives me no pleasure to see the Royal Commissioner, I will not say castigating, but exhibiting little sympathy for Convocation

in the position in which it finds itself. It seems to have brought that position on itself by not taking a more active part in the University in the past. I hope Convocation will rectify that by showing increasing activities in university affairs in the future, so that it can assume greater responsibility in matters relating to the institution. I see no reason why Convocation should not have large representation on the Senate. Convocation consists of graduates who have gone through the University, and therefore are people who, in my opinion, should be qualified for the position. I certainly was amused with the speech of the member for Pilbara, who seemed to advocate that everybody should go to the University and graduate, and when they got through he had nothing but scorn to pour on them for having graduated. I could not see any sense in that at all. Rather do I think that the graduates should be encouraged to continue their association with the University and take a large share in its government.

One feature of the Bill does not appeal to me; it is the power to be given to the Senate to co-opt members, without in any way indicating who the members should be. The Royal Commissioner commented upon the fact that, in respect of the Melbourne University, provision is made for the representation of certain interests. Probably loose financial management in the past is one of the disabilities of the University. The Royal Commissioner pointed out the need for a finance committee consisting of practical men. Provision is made in respect of the Melbourne University for the appointment of a leading banker, a member of the commercial community, an accountant and a lawyer to assist in the government of the University. I would much prefer to see a similar provision in the Bill before us. We should not be left merely to hope that suitable persons will be appointed whose advice would be of advantage to the University. I intend to support the second reading, which I hope will be carried. I also hope that the proposed amount will not be increased, because in the present state of our finances we cannot afford to give the University a larger amount.

Mr. Watts: It will not be increased.

Mr. SEWARD: I hope it will not be.

Mr. Watts: You know that private members cannot increase it.

Mr. SEWARD: The Bill might be defeated, but I hope it will pass both Houses. I also hope the University will take steps to put its house in order in the next few years so that, should it be necessary to make a larger amount available then, we shall at all events have good reasons for making an increase.

MR. SHEARN (Maylands): There has been a general agreement among members as to the desirability of the objects of this Bill, but a great deal of difference as to the method by which those objects shall be achieved. Personally, I am a little saddened by the way in which some members have addressed themselves to the measure. I am not representing any particular section of the community in this matter, although, like most members, I have received a number of letters and much literature from people associated in various ways with the University. I am in agreement with a previous speaker who said he took no exception to such correspondence and literature. Indeed, I sincerely welcome it. One of the difficulties which members of Parliament are faced with is that the people are too silent on matters of great public interest. After all, we are the representatives of the people and the instruments by which their wishes are to be given effect. I take no exception to the receipt of such correspondence. On the contrary, I commend the persons concerned for making their views known now rather than at a later stage. In my opinion, there has been much ill-informed and ill-digested criticism of the activities of the University.

Some members have suggested that the University is a kind of close preserve, but I can quote an example in my own electorate. A blind man—whose economic position will be obvious to members—was able to matriculate and he is now taking a course at the University and doing very well. I can assure members that he does not come within the leisured class. The students of our University are drawn from all grades of the community; and I think it deplorable that some members have implied that the status of the University is only that of a technical school. Surely we can think better of the University than to give expression to such a view! A moment's consideration should make it obvious that, were it not for the University, our primary and post-primary schools would not have enough efficient

teachers. The Minister for Industrial Development knows better than I that at least two important researches have been made during recent years by our University graduates. One could quote other instances, and so I deplore the comparison of the University with a technical school when it has done such wonderful work.

The Bill proposes to make available to the University the sum of £40,000, with the proviso that a further sum of £2,000 can be had on application at a later date. I thoroughly realise the difficulty in which the Treasurer is placed; but, nevertheless, I would point out that for several years past the Government has had a surplus and that education is the very basis of our State. Surely the Premier will admit, as he did when moving the second reading, that there is need for a bigger grant to the University! Let us face up to the position and make the money available now, and not place the University authorities in the humiliating position of having to approach the Government, as some member aptly put it, cap in hand, for further assistance.

The Premier: We are increasing the grant by £5,000.

Mr. SHEARN: But the Premier mentioned in moving the second reading—and this has been referred to by members on the Government side of the House—the urgent and imperative necessity of making a greater amount available to the University.

The Premier: No!

Mr. SHEARN: I am unable to agree with the observation of some members that Mr. Justice Wolff indicated that £40,000 would be sufficient.

Hon. N. Keenan: He said £42,000 as a minimum.

Mr. SHEARN: Yes!

Mr. McDonald: Plus £12,000 in fees.

The Premier: No!

Mr. SHEARN: The Royal Commissioner suggested in his report that if fees were charged, approximately £12,000 would be earned from them. But we have a so-called free University, notwithstanding what has been said by some members, and it is up to Parliament to see that the institution is not unduly impoverished. I suggest, in the light of what the Premier has told us—and what he said is supported by the evidence of those in a position to

judge—that £40,000 falls far short of what is required. We are therefore faced with the position that we give the University £40,000, or a larger amount so as to make the University a practical project. The Premier does not need to be reminded by members how important it will be in the post-war period for us to have skilled scientists in all walks of life, to enable us to exist in competition with the other States of Australia, indeed, with the world generally. Education will be the basis of rehabilitation after the war and, if we fail in that respect, then in my humble opinion only one thing can happen to us. It will not be a question of standing still; we will retrogress. That is a position which we cannot allow to arise.

This State must go forward. It is the one State in Australia which is backward and which has the greatest need of the most highly skilled men and women in various scientific and other walks of life that can be procured. We have a University with a highly skilled staff, intent on doing what is in the best interests of the students who pass through the various courses; and it is the duty of the Government, representing the people, to give that institution every assistance. The University is a democratic institution, because it is open to and is being utilised by people from all strata of society and cannot be said to represent any particular class. As I have said, it is the duty of the Government to make available to the University sufficient funds to allow it to function adequately in the interests of the community, and it is the duty of this House to support the Government in that direction. With regard to the proposal for the re-allocation of representation on the Senate I, like the member for Williams-Narrogin, have no objection whatever. It is very wise to provide that the Under Treasurer shall play his part in relation to matters dealing with finance and the assets possessed by the University. Equally, I appreciate the necessity for expert opinion being available for the University. At the same time, I object to a situation that postulates political control.

I am not suggesting for one moment that it is the deliberate intention of the Premier to make this a politically controlled institution; but we have to remember that this measure will be perpetuated and the

fact must be taken into account that Governments come and go. Knowing that he has a deep interest in the University and a sincerity of purpose in relation to it, I would be prepared to trust the Premier but I am not prepared to give an open cheque. If there are any who know the requirements of the institution intimately, surely it is those who are inside the institution and not those who are outside. I find myself in entire agreement with the sentiments expressed in relation to this aspect by the member for Nedlands; and I propose to support the amendments he has placed on the notice paper and also the amendment of the member for West Perth, which seeks to give representation to those young men and women whose destiny is wrapped up in the success or failure of this important institution.

**THE PREMIER** (in reply): Members will recollect what occurred about three or four years ago when an amendment to the University Act was introduced in this Chamber by the Leader of the Opposition. I said at that time—and it has been borne out by this debate—that members generally were very much uninformed with regard to the activities of the University; and that, in order that they might be informed in regard to its activities, its financial position, its staff and its constitution, I would be pleased to appoint a Royal Commission to go into those matters and furnish the House with a report containing a lot of data on which to base an intelligent opinion on proposed amendments to the Act. Mr. Justice Wolff submitted his report, which has been available to members for a couple of years. Generally speaking, as I indicated when the member for Pingelly made his speech, when a Royal Commission is appointed confidence is shown in the judgment of the Commissioner. He is considered to be an authority and is given sufficient time to make a thorough and capable investigation into the matters requiring his advice. Having confidence in the judgment of the Royal Commissioner who inquired into the University we should accept the recommendations of so high an authority with such an excellent judicial mind. As a matter of fact, to a great extent, the Government has followed the recommendations of Mr. Justice Wolff.

I do not intend to reply to all the speeches made both in support and in criticism of this Bill. Every member has indicated his

support of the second reading, so I suppose the majority of the matters contained in the Bill will be discussed again in Committee. Consequently, I do not want at this stage to devote too much time to the points raised. There are, however, one or two matters with which I would like to deal. First of all, I will touch on the criticism of the member for Nedlands. It is quite obvious that he was putting up a special plea for the right of Convocation to have greater representation on the Senate. The Royal Commissioner gave particular attention to that matter. He was very scathing in his criticism with regard to the management of the University, which he said was dominated by people elected by Convocation. He went so far as to say that Convocation was entitled to only three out of the 18 members on the University Senate. The Government has compromised in this connection. Instead of adopting the very drastic recommendation of the Royal Commissioner, it has agreed to double the number of representatives of Convocation suggested by Mr. Justice Wolff. I have been informed—and running through the report of the Royal Commissioner it seems to be implied, if not stated directly—that Convocation is run by a comparatively small number of people who get together for the purpose of protecting their own interests by putting on the Senate people whom they desire to be there.

Hon. N. Keenan: You know the average poll?

The PREMIER: About 600!

Hon. N. Keenan: Is not that sufficiently wide?

The PREMIER: I remind the hon. member that there are 470,000 people in this State who have only six representatives, and that 500 or 600 members of Convocation are in the privileged position of having double the number of representatives under the Act and an equal number under the Bill.

Hon. N. Keenan: You appreciate that Convocation will continue to grow each year?

The PREMIER: I appreciate all that but I appreciate also—and the member for Pingelly made pointed reference to it—that the Royal Commissioner was scathing in his remarks about the administration of the University being dominated by the election of members from Convocation to the Senate. He recommended a drastic change.

Mr. McDonald: I do not think he was scathing.

The PREMIER: Oh, wasn't he! This University has a greater revenue per student than has any other university in Australia; and nearly all the money is found by the Government. The only university which has a greater income per student than ours is that in New South Wales, which is very richly endowed by a number of wealthy people.

Mr. Berry: If the Government continues to pay out money, there will not be much incentive to people here to endow the University.

The PREMIER: The testing point of the administration of any concern is what it does with the moneys it receives. This University gets more money, per student, to run the University than does any other university in Australia with the exception of the highly endowed University of New South Wales. The word "autonomy" was mentioned many times during the course of the debate. It would appear that the member for Nedlands has been so long in politics that he instinctively looks for opposition parties in the Senate as he would in this House; for one side to be composed of members nominated by the Government and the other by members elected by Convocation. Nothing could be further from the truth. I would challenge the member for Nedlands to go to the University and listen to a debate for two or three nights and then to inform me, without having made inquiries, who are the Government representatives and who are the Convocation representatives.

Hon. N. Keenan: Do you know that I was on the Senate for six years?

The PREMIER: Yes, and I know that the hon. member cannot say that the Government nominees invariably, or even usually, adopt one outlook in connection with the government of the University and the Convocation members another. Any uninformed spectator who listened carefully to the University Senate debates would not, unless he knew the different persons, be able to tell from their attitude whether they were Government representatives or Convocation representatives. I have been Treasurer for about eight years, and during that time not one of the Government representatives has been to my office to consult me with regard to the Government's

attitude. I have not discussed with any member what attitude he should take in the matter of the government of the Senate. The only time that members of the Senate have been to my office was when they made application for money which they succeeded in getting. It is ridiculous to assert that the Government is, by some devious means, trying to get control of the University. If the Government wanted to gain that control it would get in touch with its nominees and attempt to cajole or convince them to adopt a certain attitude. No Government member has been to the Treasurer or to any other representative of the Government to receive instructions as to the attitude he should take.

Mr. Perkins: The Bill deals with the future, not the past.

The PREMIER: We take the experience of the past to guide us as to what is likely to happen in the future. In any case, the Government is not seeking by this Bill to get a majority on the Senate. Therefore the charge, the implication or the innuendo that has been voiced here that the Government wants to undermine the present University Senate by getting control is ridiculous in the extreme!

Mr. Doney: Did some member actually say that?

The PREMIER: Did not the hon. member hear the member for Nedlands talk about the autonomy of the University which would be undermined? He mentioned the word "autonomy" about 15 times, and other members have also mentioned it. The bulk of the criticism has been in connection with the alteration of the Senate.

Hon. N. Keenan: It is an expression used by every educationist. I am not the inventor of it.

The PREMIER: I do not accuse the hon. member of having invented it. He gave expression to criticisms which, in the light of my experience, are naturally baseless. The Government has not sought to impose its views on its appointees to the Senate of the University. We have heard a lot about the correspondence in connection with the University propaganda. One of the most solid attacks made against the Government's proposal to alter the Constitution of the Senate was made by a Government representative in the person of Mr. Thomas, the Secretary of the

Teachers' Union. He is a Government nominee, but yet so independent that he can come out in the open—I do not accuse him of sneaking—and publish a circular signed by himself and Mr. Huck, the President of the Teachers' Union.

Hon. N. Keenan: He used the word "autonomy" too.

The PREMIER: Yes. It shows how ridiculous it is for a Government nominee, whom the Government has never attempted to influence, to use a word like that.

Mr. McDonald: I do not know. I would be very much disposed to listen to his views as Government nominee or appointee.

The PREMIER: I challenge Mr. Thomas to say what experience he has had to indicate that there is any desire on the part of the Government to undermine the autonomy of the Senate of the University. The very fact that he considers it his duty to give free expression to his views by addressing a circular to all members of Parliament indicates that he has the utmost freedom to exert any influence in any way he likes as a member of the Senate of the University.

Hon. N. Keenan: On this occasion he is in opposition to the Government's proposals.

The PREMIER: That is so. I hope that we have heard the last of this talk about autonomy.

Hon. N. Keenan: Since he represents you on the Senate, will you take some action?

The PREMIER: I did not say he represented me, but that he was the appointee of the Government. Therefore this talk of autonomy is based on the belief that the Government seeks to appoint to the Senate people whom it can influence and who will in turn influence the Senate.

Hon. N. Keenan: It means that if the Government had a majority this might happen, not that it happens today.

The PREMIER: The Bill does not seek to give the Government a majority of nominees.

Mr. Marshall: So the amendments of the member for Nedlands go overboard.

The PREMIER: In any case the public servants of this State are members of a non-political body. The member for Nedlands has had experience of them. He had loyal support from the public servants. The two nominees are *ex officio* members and are not Government nominees. Those who talk about autonomy include the two Government

*ex officio* members as being on the side of the Government. One of these members is the Director of Education, and when the member for Nedlands was Minister for Education he had something to do with him. Mr. Little was at that time an inspector in the department. He has independent views. I do not know whether he holds Labour views or not. My experience of him is that he is very honest, straightforward and candid in regard to any proposal on which the Government desires his advice. So far as Mr. Reid, the Under Treasurer, is concerned, I do not know whether he has any politics. He does not show them to me, but he gives loyal service. He has never given expression to his private political views, and I have never asked him to. These two gentlemen are said to constitute the spearhead of the attacking force which is going to undermine the autonomy of the University. Of course, it is ridiculous!

Mr. McDonald: I do not think so.

The PREMIER: That is the charge. The Government is to have only the same number on the Senate as previously, namely, six, with the exception of the two gentlemen I have mentioned. In addition to that, the Government has doubled the number of members of Convocation making six, whereas the Royal Commissioner recommended that there should be only three. That was recommended because of the manner in which they had accepted their responsibilities and carried out their duties, on account of which he recommended a reduction of 75 per cent. The Government did not desire to make such a drastic change, and therefore effected a compromise to the extent I have indicated. With regard to the finances, the Royal Commissioner recommended a grant of from £35,500 to £42,000. The Government went nearly all the way with him and provided a grant of £40,000. At this stage of our development, we cannot afford to hand out to governmental, and semi-governmental authorities and boards of other descriptions more money than they require, because we have too little money with which to provide for other necessities. It can be proved conclusively that where the absolute necessities of the University require more money to carry on its existing activities it will be forthcoming, as it has been during the past five or six years.

Members know that the University finances drifted to the extent of between £8,000 and £9,000. When it was shown that the money had been utilised in a proper manner, the Government provided the £9,000 necessary to wipe off the deficit. It should be recognised that the University has the second highest revenue per student of any university in Australia. The member for Pingelly said the Royal Commissioner's criticism of the institution was that it had launched out in too many directions. As soon as it received a few pounds in trust funds, some fresh activity would be started and would be financed satisfactorily for two or three years. Then the University authorities would go to the Treasurer and say that they had entered into some long-term commitments for the payment of a professor or a tutor, whose engagement had another seven or ten years to run, and they had reached the stage where they had not the money with which to make the required payments. In those circumstances they would ask the Government to increase the grant.

The Government's attitude has been that the University authorities should show more foresight with regard to commencing new activities. At this stage of the development of Western Australia we cannot afford to be too lavish in the expenditure of funds on the academic education of the people. The Government is anxious to do the best possible in that direction, but it cannot do three times as well as any other Government with regard to assistance to universities.

The member for Pingelly quoted some particulars with regard to the Tasmanian University, which institution provides as good an education as is obtainable at the University of Western Australia and, in some respects, a better one. The point is that that university receives £5 or £6 per student per year less than does the University of Western Australia. I do not quarrel with the academic qualifications of the professional staff but, from the economic standpoint, the Government claims there is room for more effective and more economical management. If men of sound common-sense, men who are anxious to do the best for the University, can be procured to assist in the work, the Government has endeavoured to appoint them as its nominees. All the Government asks is that the best results shall be obtained. Only men of standing in

the community, of irreproachable character and progressive outlook are chosen as its nominees. The Government has never appointed anyone with a view to curtailing the activities of the University.

Mr. McDonald: I think Government nominees have been in a majority on the finance committee for many years past.

The PREMIER: I do not know anything about the position regarding the finance committee, but I know that the Royal Commissioner was not very satisfied with the financial management as exercised by the Senate and its finance committee. The Under Treasurer represents the people of the State, not the Government, and, as a member of the Senate, he sees that ordinary business acumen is displayed in the administration of the institution. He has been engaged in the work for the past two or three years and has done well in the interests of the University. I have heard no word of criticism with regard to the attitude he has taken up in connection with that work.

Mr. McDonald: All of us have great confidence in him.

The PREMIER: With regard to the financial position of the University, it has been said that the Government should pay more because the State has deliberately adopted the policy of a free university, and therefore no Government should oppose that ideal but should lend increased financial support. In that regard it must be remembered that Western Australia is dependent upon the Commonwealth Government, through the Grants Commission, for the necessary funds with which to maintain social services. The comparison upon which the grant is determined is with what are known as the standard States—Queensland, Victoria and New South Wales. On a population basis, the per capita expenditure in New South Wales works out at 11d., which is paid to the Sydney University. In Victoria the Government's payment works out at 1s. 2d. per head, which is paid to the Melbourne University, while in Queensland a payment of 1s. 1d. per head is made available by the Government to the Brisbane University. In Western Australia, on the population basis, the Government's contribution to the University works out at 2s. 2d. per head. That is our contribution compared with an average in the three standard States of about 1s. 1d. per head.



Hon. N. Keenan: But in the other States fees are charged.

The PREMIER: I am speaking of what the people pay directly through taxation. That shows the contribution made by the people of this State to the University compared with what obtains elsewhere. Notwithstanding that fact, we hear it said that the Government takes credit for having a free university, and yet it is not prepared to pay for it. The Government is paying for it, to an extent practically double that applicable to Queensland, Victoria and New South Wales.

Hon. N. Keenan: Did you hear the figures I quoted for New South Wales.

The PREMIER: Yes, and this State's contribution is more than double that of the Government of New South Wales. Is that not a striking comparison? The Government has nothing to be ashamed of in this State, for it freely accepts its obligations. We can take pride in the fact that the people of Western Australia pay almost two and a half times as much as do the people of New South Wales towards the provision made for university education. I do not think it has been suggested that we can afford to lower our standard of primary, secondary and technical education in order to provide more money for the University. The few people who receive University education—the number at present is 600 or 700—get about one-twentieth of the money we spend on education generally. There are 60,000 children who are dependent on the Government for their education, and we spend £800,000 or £900,000 on them. Thus the students at the University have about six or seven times as much spent on them.

Then the Royal Commissioner pointed out that the University, instead of taking students who, with application and ability, could get through their course in five years, has an average of about eight years, and about half of the young people do not get through at all. That is not much encouragement for the Government to spend a lot of money on the University. I have no desire to criticise the professional staff or the students on their application to the studies, but we are not doing so wonderfully well. We could educate half as many students again if the students got through their courses in the five years, because they are taking half as long again as they should do.

Hence there is something to be said against this propaganda regarding the lack of cultural capacity arising from the fact that not enough have been able to attend the University.

The member for Roebourne said that nothing is being done to make free University education available. The Government gives ten exhibitions ranging from £32 to £48 a year, and would give more but for the fact that the extremely generous endowment made by the late Sir Winthrop Hackett enables about 90 students to get from £10 to £75 a year. The Royal Commissioner says that as far as those are concerned the wrong attitude has been adopted, and that it would be better to select a fewer number and do what the member for Roebourne considers is a fair thing, namely, take the responsibility entirely for their subsistence instead of subsidising them to the extent of only 60 or 70 per cent. of it.

Mr. Rodoreda: Do not you agree with that?

The PREMIER: Yes, but the Royal Commissioner said that the results do not show that the right people have been given the exhibitions.

Mr. Rodoreda: There are not nearly enough.

The PREMIER: I agree with that, too. I agree with the remarks in relation to domestic economy. I point out, however, that very few people can afford to buy a wireless, player piano and refrigerator for the home at the one time. Most people have to acquire such things gradually. The hon. member would agree that every home ought to have a refrigerator, an electric washing machine and a wireless. Equally it might be said that everyone ought to have a motor-car. The point is that everybody cannot afford to have those things in the state of development we have so far reached. Neither can all these luxuries be afforded for the University. The University has to take its respective place amongst the many social services to which we have to contribute from revenue.

The Grants Commission tells us that we spend more money on social services than does any other State. Therefore, I cannot see where we can get the money to constitute ourselves a Father Christmas to the University, to the detriment of other requirements. Everything has to take its relative place. It is my responsibility as Treasurer

to allocate the available money fairly. I might have sympathies in the direction of giving orphan children a little more than they receive. We have assisted widows and orphans.

Mr. Doney: Did not you say that this State contributes more from revenue to our University than does any other State to its University?

The PREMIER: I said that the people of Western Australia contribute 2s. 2d. to the University whereas the average for the other States is about 1s. 2d. per head.

Mr. Doney: That is not the construction I put on your remarks.

The PREMIER: That will be found in the report of the Grants Commission. We contribute to the University double as much per head as do the people of the other States.

Mr. Doney: You could not determine their needs on that basis.

The PREMIER: Though our needs may be a little greater, we must have some regard to the amount we can find for the University. If I asked the hon. member to do without a school or two in his district because I wanted more money for the University, I know what he would say.

Mr. Doney: So do I.

The PREMIER: Most of the remarks I have made were inspired by the interesting and informative speech given by the member for Nedlands. While we might not agree with all that he has said, we are certainly indebted to him, because he enabled us to acquire a lot of information, which will enable us to give a more intelligent vote when we come to discuss details in Committee.

Now I come to the Leader of the Opposition, who proposes that a Select Committee should inquire into the finances of the University every three years. I do not agree with that suggestion because he gets down to the basis of the responsibility of the Executive. If we adopted that attitude to the University, we would have to do the same thing in regard to the Museum, Art Gallery, Public Library, Zoological Gardens, and many other organisations to which contributions are made annually from revenue. The biggest job I have as Treasurer is to allocate fairly and without prejudice the money available to the various institutions dependent to a greater or less extent upon the Government for their financial support. Sometimes I find myself desirous of doing

more for one or the other but, when representations are made regarding the needs in various directions, I find that I have to restrain my enthusiasm because to carry out my first intention would be unjust to other people. I think the proportion of public money that is available for this aspect of our public finance has been very well divided, and I cannot believe that the Government is entitled to execrations and condemnations from the University for increasing the grant to the extent of only £5,500 a year.

I fail to see how we have earned the indignation which has been expressed by some people on the score of the "niggardly" amount the Government is finding. I do not regard the amount as niggardly. The population has doubled since the inception of the University, and the Government contribution to the University has more than trebled. And there is this particular aspect, that if we increased Government contributions to other social services and other items of expenditure by the percentage to which we have increased the University grant this year, namely, 15 per cent., the State's expenditure would have risen by £2,000,000 a year. Members of course know that that is utterly impossible. I do not want to be charged with being unduly favourable to the University.

Mr. Doney: I do not think you are likely to be!

The PREMIER: I hope that I am not to be charged with being unduly favourable to anybody. I desire a reputation for having evenly held the scales of justice from the standpoint of social security. The Leader of the Opposition disagreed with the Royal Commissioner, but I have only to reiterate that Mr. Justice Wolff spent a year in examining the whole business, and even the member for Pilbara said that he had made an intensive study of all the correspondence and evidence as well as the report, and admitted that the task had occupied him for two or three weeks. We cannot lightly disregard what the Royal Commissioner has reported. While the Government has in effect said to the Judge, "We think your recommendations are too drastic in some respects; we consider that as regards the cash payment which you recommended should be given to the University you went a little too far; and we have compromised to proposals for all of these things, and consider

we are holding the scales of justice evenly."

Mr. McDonald: Not much remains of the report after that!

The PREMIER: The report comprises about 150 pages, and it includes a lot of sound sense. Some of the Judge's recommendations have been given effect to long ago, and to the advantage of the University. Particularly I consider that more attention could be given to University finance by business men on the Senate, for instance as regards the endowment lands, the value of which is estimated at £120,000 and which are returning an income of only a couple of hundred pounds a year. Those lands should be put to some use. Then there are the proposals put up for the investment of trust funds. It has been suggested that we need to spend more money on research, and that the University people are the only people who can carry out research work. But the University's function is to teach people to think, so that they can undertake research. We are spending £130,000 on the Department of Agriculture on this year's Estimates, and nearly all of that amount will be spent on research work. The Minister for Mines has two geologists spending all their time on research work. I admit that the University has done good work in regard to several matters which the Minister for Industrial Development has asked it to undertake on behalf of the people of Western Australia. The University has also given great assistance in regard to pilot plants and other things of the kind.

The Government spent for years £30,000 in endeavours through geophysical work to find oil in this country. Unfortunately we were not successful, but we were keen to do it, and if we had found oil the discovery would have been of immense value to the people of Western Australia. So we did not shirk our responsibilities in that regard. I turn now to the Leader of the National Party, who has constituted himself a defender against what he considers to be an attack. I think that if I were a private individual and somebody attacked me to the extent of sending me a cheque for £5,500 as additional income per year, I would not feel injured. I quite agree with the Leader of the Opposition that the University's professorial staff and other people who have to do with administration of the institution have done excel-

lent work under very grave and even extreme difficulties, particularly during the time they spent in the tin sheds in Irwin-street. There they undertook with great enthusiasm the educational work and the academic functions of the University.

Mr. McDonald: That is not what other people say!

The PREMIER: I can be responsible only for what I say on my behalf or on behalf of the Government. My Ministers declare themselves highly pleased with the work done by the university professors during troublous times. My Ministers and I are very pleased to endeavour to assist them. But this £40,000 is not the only money granted to the University. We are paying up to £6,000 per annum in respect of the university buildings, and £600 or £700 in respect of sinking fund on the Agricultural Institute which is erected on university grounds. The liability for expenses and sinking fund on places we have erected costs the State very nearly £50,000 a year. Had it not been for the munificence and generosity of Sir Winthrop Hackett and Mr. Gledden, and other people who have been so anxious to assist the University, its establishment would have cost the State very considerably more. I consider that at this stage we should pay a tribute to what those people have done for the University. But for that aid I do not think we could have established the University at all. I have no inclination at this stage to discuss the Bill any longer. Every member who has spoken has said that he will support the second reading of the Bill. I suppose we shall have some differences of opinion in the Committee stage.

I agree in principle with the amendment which the member for Nedlands has put on the notice paper regarding investment of trust funds. It is awkward to endeavour to amend an existing clause, and I have accordingly had the clause re-drafted and put on the notice paper. I commend it to the attention of members, so that it may be discussed when we reach the Committee stage. Generally speaking, I have no cause for complaint about the attitude of the House to the Bill. Members desired to give vent to their enthusiasm and altruistic ideas about providing more money for the University. I would be only too glad to accede to their wishes, but, unfor-

tunately, the Government cannot do so. I think it can be said that if the Government has not treated the University overgenerously, at least it has done the University justice.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

### ANNUAL ESTIMATES, 1944-45.

#### *In Committee of Supply.*

Resumed from the previous day; Mr. Marshall in the Chair.

*Vote—Public Works and Buildings, £201,730:*

### THE MINISTER FOR WORKS [10.12]:

I am sure we all very much regret the fact that the member for Mt. Hawthorn is not available this year, as he has been during each of the last eight years, to introduce these Estimates to the Committee. We regret it the more for the reason which caused him to resign his position as a Minister some nine or ten months ago. It is quite clear to all members that the rest which he has had since then has been beneficial to him, and we are delighted to find him restored to health and so bright in every way. His work over many years as a Minister, particularly as Minister for Works, will, I am sure, continue to earn for him in the years ahead much respect and gratitude from the people of the State.

Mr. Doney: Hear, hear!

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The revenue collections of the department for the year 1943-44 amounted to £481,000, and the expenditure from revenue to £449,000. Under broad headings, the expenditure from revenue was for—

	£
Public Works and Buildings ..	233,000
Goldfields Water Supply Undertaking ..	141,000
Other hydraulic undertakings controlled by the department ..	74,000

In addition, the sum of £1,100,000 was expended by the department on works not provided for in the Estimates of the Public Works Department. Members will realise that the department carries out a great deal of work for other departments of the State, for the Commonwealth and for organisations not directly departments

of either the State or the Commonwealth. The works so carried out are as follows:—

	£
Commonwealth, including Defence works for the Commonwealth ..	788,000
Erection of new Perth Hospital ..	43,000
Hospital Fund buildings, and buildings for other departments	75,000
Construction of wooden ships for the Commonwealth ..	193,000
Construction of shipbuilding yards, or the portion of the expenditure for that purpose incurred during the last financial year ..	11,000

Taking the total amount of expenditure covered by the ordinary revenue coming to the department, and the total amount expended for other State department and the Commonwealth, the main items are—

	£
Harbours and rivers, not including Defence works ..	59,000
Construction of wooden ships and the shipbuilding yards ..	204,000
Water supplies, drainage and irrigation ..	229,000
Public buildings, including the erection of abattoirs ..	256,000
Commonwealth works and Defence works ..	782,000
Miscellaneous works ..	25,000

Approximately, 300 men were employed by the Harbours and Rivers Branch throughout the year, mainly on urgent Defence and Commonwealth works, which embraced very important dredging undertakings, the construction of jetties, launching ways, slipways, the fitting out of barges and the building of ways for an 80-ton floating crane. The total expenditure by this particular branch during the 12 months on behalf of the Commonwealth amounted to £294,000. This branch also operated two slipways within the State and dealt with 112,000 tons of shipping on one of such slipways. It will be apparent to members that a great deal of the work done by the Harbours and Rivers branch during the year was in connection with the war effort. The work was carried out not only for the Commonwealth Government, but also for Allied Governments, including the American and the Dutch Governments, as well as, in later months during the past financial year, for the British Government. Designs for the construction of a conveyor system for the loading of bulk wheat into ships at North Fremantle have also been undertaken by the department. This proposal will no doubt be more

fully explained to the Committee by the Minister for Lands and Agriculture.

The general maintenance of harbours, jetties and wharves has been carried out. An average of approximately 200 men were employed on various Defence works, such as the installation of oil and water tanks in various parts of the State and the installation of gun emplacements in various parts of the State. In the North-West, jetty and harbour facilities have been maintained. Although the State motor vessel "Koolama" has not yet been removed from alongside a certain wharf in the State, the Commonwealth Government has indicated that as the military situation improves attention will be given to the removal of this obstruction. This matter is extremely important, not merely for the purpose of removing this sunken vessel but for other vital purposes which cannot be achieved until this obstruction is removed from the jetty concerned. We have continued to press the Commonwealth to have action taken for the removal of this vessel in order that the jetty may be available for other vital purposes for which it will be required early next year.

Mr. Doney: Are they responding to your request?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The indications are that the necessary action will be taken in time to achieve the purposes we have in mind. The stock routes have been maintained, but roads generally have been considerably cut up and river crossings have been damaged by Army transport. A very considerable sum will be required to bring roads and river crossings back to their original state. Practically the whole of the manpower available to the department in the North-West was devoted to carrying out defence works. In connection with the damage done by Army transport to roads and river crossings in the North-West, the department has communicated with the road boards concerned and suggested to them that they should without delay prepare a case for submission to the Commonwealth for the purpose of trying to obtain monetary compensation for the great amount of damage done in that part of the State. It is true that Army transport has done damage of a smaller character in other parts of the State, particularly in certain districts; but the greatest damage has certainly been done in the North-West and I

am hopeful that the road boards in that area will prepare a case for submission to the Commonwealth.

The officers of the Public Works Department, and particularly those of the Main Roads Department, are available to assist the road boards to prepare the best case possible; and I am sure that, if they act upon the suggestion made to them by the department, they will have a very good chance of receiving reasonable monetary compensation from the Commonwealth for the damage done to roads and river crossings and also to bridges. Defence works in hand in the North-West at present cover the establishment of aerodrome beacons, the carrying out of drainage at aerodromes, the erection of necessary buildings at aerodromes already established, the construction of fuel tanks and the necessary pipe-lines to those tanks, the construction of water supplies to serve various aerodromes, the putting in of bomb shelters, the construction of bomb stores, the erection of buildings for civil aviation purposes, repairs to aerodromes where necessary, and the erection of shelter sheds where required by the Air Force. The work carried out by our Public Works Department and by the Main Roads Department in the North-West for defence purposes has been considerable and has involved the expenditure of a very great sum of money, the whole of which has been recouped by the Commonwealth to the departments concerned. The Commonwealth departments in question—namely, the Army and the Air Force—have expressed themselves as well satisfied with the class of work done and also with the cost at which the work has been carried out.

During the year, the Principal Architect's Branch was mainly engaged on defence works of varying magnitude, the principal being the establishment of a large ordnance depot at an estimated cost of £320,000, the establishment of a large aircraft depot at a cost of £175,000, and the provision of hospital extensions at a large military hospital within the State at an estimated cost of £107,000. The actual expenditure by the Principal Architect's Branch on defence works during the year approximated £298,000. Owing to shortage of manpower and materials, work on the Perth Hospital during the year was restricted, only £42,000 being expended. The Minister for Health will make available to members, when intro-

ducing his Estimates, much more information in connection with this matter. The State Shipyards, established during 1942-43, have continued to function in a satisfactory manner. A number of hulls has been launched and the engines, which caused the hold-up in delivery of the completed craft, began to come to hand in June of this year.

Mr. Seward: How many have been constructed?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I am not permitted to give the number publicly, but I shall be glad to tell the hon. member privately. An interesting feature concerning the construction of these craft is that, with the exception of the engines and navigation and electrical gear, the whole of the equipment, including winches, has been manufactured in this State, mostly at the State Engineering Works. During the year an order for the manufacture of 100 Bren-gun carriers was completed at the State Engineering Works, and the management was congratulated by the Commonwealth authorities on the quality of the workmanship. These works have been mainly employed on shipping repairs, and at times the urgency of the situation has required the working of a great deal of overtime. The work done in connection with shipping, particularly on repairs, has been done not only for the Commonwealth Government but also for a number of Allied Governments. The works have also completed an order for 50 large steam winches, as part of the equipment required by the Australian Shipbuilding Board for the 6,000-ton steamers being built in the Eastern States. During the financial year under review, a great deal of re-organisation was carried out at the State Engineering Works, including the provision of overhead electric cranes and the installation of a number of heavy and modern machine tools. These works are rapidly developing to a stage where they will be able to carry out almost any class of shipping repair work which may be required in this State.

The departmental technical and designing staff were engaged on the necessary designs for the various post-war works under consideration by the Government. These included the comprehensive agricultural areas water supply scheme, which will involve the raising of Wellington and Mundaring dams and the reticulation of approximately

12,000,000 acres of land. At the request of the Government, the Electricity Advisory Committee during the year commenced investigations into a proposal for the provision of a power station or power stations in the South-West and the distribution of electricity throughout that region. It is anticipated that the Committee's report will be completed by the end of the year and will be available for consideration by the Government early in the New Year. Members are well aware of the decisions already made by the Government in connection with the extension of the power scheme in the metropolitan area. The Government has decided to establish a new power station at South Fremantle and steps in that direction are now being taken. However, I do not want to go deeply into that matter, as no doubt the Minister for Railways will tell the Committee a good deal about it.

The point I want to emphasise in connection with both these proposals is that the proposed establishment of the power station at South Fremantle in no way prejudices the proposal for a power scheme in the South-West. I know it has been spread through the South-West that the Government's decision to establish a new power station at Fremantle killed, or was likely to kill for many years to come, any proposal to establish a power scheme in the South-West. That is not so.

Mr. Willmott: The people there will be very pleased to hear that.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: They have been told that many times before, and I am surprised to know that there is still an idea prevalent in the South-West that the establishment of a new power station at South Fremantle will postpone for many years to come the possibility of a power scheme being established in the South-West.

Mr. McLarty: Can you get the money for both?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: As a matter of fact the establishment of a power station at South Fremantle is essential to meet the urgent needs of the metropolitan area. The proposal to establish a power scheme in the South-West is to meet the reasonable needs for electric power in the South-West portion of the State that would be served by the scheme which the committee will probably recommend should be established. The proposals are entirely separate; there is no relationship whatever between

them. The proposed new power station at South Fremantle does not prejudice the other in even one small degree.

Mr. Doney: Not even to the extent of delaying it?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Not to the extent of delaying it for one second.

Mr. Perkins: If you cannot bring the power here by power line from Collie many people seem to doubt whether it can be taken from Collie over the rest of the South-West.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The point about establishing a power scheme in the South-West is that it will be established on the basis of serving the best area in the South-West, that is the most thickly populated area and where there is likely to be the greatest demand for power. On that basis an economical unit would be established to distribute power over a certain area. I do not suggest it would be established profitably. It is possible that in the first two or three years the Government would have to face the prospect of making good any losses on the scheme, but as the electric power was made available within this certain area so I have no doubt that production would increase, population would increase, the demand for electric current would increase, and the community within that area would in the passing of time—and I should say within a reasonably short period—increase so that additional units would be established around the original unit to extend the power scheme which would thus ultimately serve a greater area of country through the South-West.

Mr. Holman: Have you any idea when the report will be forthcoming?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I mentioned a few moments ago that the committee hoped to present its report to the Government towards the end of this year, and the Government anticipates being able to give consideration to that report.

The total expenditure on defence works, including wooden ships, by the various branches of the department, not including work carried out at the State Engineering Works, amounted to £987,000, or just a few pounds short of a million pounds for the year. During the year 1,899,000,000 gallons were pumped from the Mundaring Reservoir, being only 100,000,000 gallons less than in the record year of 1940-41, despite the

fact that the goldmines have been operating to a limited extent only during 1943-44. The maintenance cost of the main conduit was £23,685 compared with £21,365 in the previous year. Special maintenance work was found necessary in connection with the wooden pipe section. Leakage from the branch mains running into the agricultural areas has become excessive, but owing to shortage of manpower and the inability to obtain the necessary pipes, the position cannot be alleviated at present. During the year special water supply systems and extensions were provided for the following defence establishments:—

No. 4 Aircraft Depot.  
Large Ordnance Depot.  
No. 10 R.A.A.F. Stores Depot.  
Reserve Ration Stores.  
R.A.A.F. Explosives Depot.  
Reserve Ration Stores.

In addition, skilled operators and welding plant were made available for urgent defence work in other portions of the State. During the year 90 chains of new 12-inch diameter concrete-lined steel mains were laid in the Geraldton Water Supply rising main. In connection with the Bridgetown water supply, investigations are being made into alternative sites for a new dam. Members may be aware that the reservoir at Bridgetown does not hold very well with the result that only a small amount of the water caught each year is retained. That means, of course, that as soon as the summer commences, and even before in some years, there is trouble about the supply there, and restrictions have to be imposed. It is a great pity where we have reservoirs that they fail to fill because of lack of rain, but it is an even greater pity where we have reservoirs that fill because there is plenty of rain, but because their holding capacity is not good they are, perhaps, a half or only a quarter full by the beginning of summer, with the result that restrictions have to be imposed on the people in the use of water in the locality concerned. During the year the Boyup Brook dam was completed and reticulation of the town site commenced. Owing to the shortage of pipes it is probable that some holdup will occur in completing the reticulation.

I do not want to weary or worry members by telling them of all the difficulties we have had in connection with water supplies gener-

ally, or the old story of difficulties in connection with manpower and the inability to obtain pipes. That story has been told to members so often that they get worried about it just as I do myself. Nevertheless, it is a fact. It seems that in these days, no matter where we turn, we always come face to face with the problems of the shortage of labour and the shortage of material. We seem to be in reverse compared with the position that existed before the war when many of us, including you, Mr. Chairman, advocated a policy to the effect that what was physically possible ought to be made financially possible. Now we seem to be in reverse in that we find today that what is financially possible is not physically possible. In other words we have the money to do a great deal of work in connection with water supplies and a hundred and one other things, but we have not the physical ability to do it, and so it remains undone.

We are awaiting the availability of manpower and materials to carry out urgently required undertakings. Maintenance of irrigation and drainage channels was carried out so far as available manpower would permit. When manpower becomes available, a considerable amount of belated maintenance will have to be done. In the three irrigation areas, the acre-waterings increased by 18,646 to a total of 60,170. I want to quote a table to the Committee showing the class of public buildings and the amounts expended in connection with repairs and maintenance during the year. The table shows the following details:—

Buildings.	Expenditure. £
Schools and quarters .. ..	19,891
Hospitals and institutions ..	8,321
Police stations and quarters ..	4,225
Gaols and quarters .. ..	994
Court houses and residences ..	1,106
Mines Department (including Kalgoorlie School of Mines	282
Harbour and Lights Department .. ..	513
Lands and Agricultural Departments .. ..	575
Miscellaneous buildings .. ..	3,625
Miscellaneous services .. ..	1,219
Total .. ..	40,751

The following table shows the expenditure in connection with water supplies generally:—

Service or Undertaking. Water supplies, etc.—	Expenditure. £
Towns .. ..	35,174
Stock routes .. ..	1,251
Special country tanks .. ..	16,648
Drainage and irrigation .. ..	20,474
Murchison, Eastern and other goldfields supplies .. ..	10,008
Goldfields Water Supply .. ..	145,478
Total .. ..	229,033

As members are aware, the department has been carrying out investigations in connection with the possible establishment of an irrigation scheme in the Ord River district of the North-West. I have some information to present in that connection. Surveys have been completed to a stage that will enable the dam to be designed and the lay-out of the construction plant to be planned. The rock floor has been located and defined across the stream bed, and the site has been examined by the Government Geologist. Before any finality as to the site can be reached it will be necessary to ascertain, by means of diamond drilling, what is the condition of the quartzite rock formation at depth below the surface. It is proposed to carry out this testing during the next dry season, which will be from May to October, 1945. If the results are satisfactory, it will be possible to build a dam approximately 130 feet high from pool water level, which will have a capacity of approximately 2,000,000 acre feet. This compares with the present storage capacity of the Hume Reservoir of approximately 1,250,000 acre feet.

Approximately 150,000 acres of plain country have been located below the dam, but soil and other surveys have not been carried out over the whole of this area. Preliminary engineering surveys are progressing on an area of approximately 80,000 acres, which would include the first areas to be irrigated. When completed the work done this season will enable the preliminary lay-out of this area to be planned. The engineering surveys will have to be con-



tinued during next season after which, providing that the diamond drilling proves the foundations to be satisfactory, designs and estimates of the dam, the power house, No. 1 pumping station, channels, roads, etc., for the first area can be prepared.

Mr. McDonald: What would be the nature of the production of the irrigation areas, so far as you have been able to gather?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I am not in a position to deal with that aspect at this stage. That is a phase of the proposals which comes directly under the control of the Agricultural and Lands Departments. A rough estimate of the cost of the scheme is £3,000,000. It is the intention of the Government to have a case prepared for submission to the Commonwealth Government for the purpose of obtaining from its financial assistance in connection with the proposals, if finally they are found to be practicable. In that regard the Government intends to prepare a comprehensive plan for the development of the North-West, in connection with which we shall seek Commonwealth financial assistance. As a matter of fact, it is probable that the Governments of Queensland and Western Australia will, together with the Commonwealth Government, formulate a comprehensive plan of development for the whole of the north of Australia which, of course, will include the North-West of this State, the North and North-East of Queensland and the northern portion of the Northern Territory, which is Commonwealth territory.

Mr. Perkins: Did not the Commonwealth provide one-third of the cost of the Murray Valley irrigation scheme?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes, the Commonwealth did provide a large proportion of the finance necessary. At this stage, Mr. Chairman, I seek your guidance as to how I can be permitted to continue my remarks at a later sitting.

The CHAIRMAN: If a member of the Committee is prepared to move that the Minister be given leave to continue his remarks at a later sitting, he will be permitted to do so.

*As to Leave to Continue.*

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I move—  
That the Minister for Works be granted leave to continue his speech at the next sitting.

Motion put and passed.

Progress reported.

*House adjourned at 10.47 p.m.*

## Legislative Council.

*Thursday, 16th November, 1944.*

	PAGE
Question: Agricultural Bank, as to capital, advances and repayments	1780
Leave of absence	1781
Bills: Friendly Societies Act Amendment, 1A.	1781
Health Act Amendment, 3A.	1781
Perth Diocesan Trustees (Special Fund), 3A.	1781
Natives (Citizenship Rights), recom., report	1781
Legislative Council (War Time) Electoral Act Amendment, 1A.	1783
Electoral (War Time) Act Amendment, 1A.	1783
Bussellton Cemetery, 2A., Com., report	1783
Stamp Act Amendment, 2A., Com., report	1783
Members of Parliament Fund Act Amendment, 2A.	1784
Mortgages' Rights Restriction Act Continuance, 2A.	1785
Colliery Recreation and Park Lands Act Amendment, 2A.	1787
Lotteries (Control) Act Amendment, 2A.	1787

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

### QUESTION—AGRICULTURAL BANK.

*As to Capital, Advances and Repayments.*

Hon. C. F. BAXTER (for Hon. H. Seddon) asked the Chief Secretary:

(i) What has been the total capital provided since the inception of the Agricultural Bank in 1894 up to the 30th June, 1944, for the following activities now administered by the Agricultural Bank:—

- (a) Agricultural Bank;
- (b) Group Settlement;
- (c) Soldier Settlement;
- (d) Industries Assistance Board?

(ii) The total amount repaid in (a), (b), (c) and (d) to the same date?

(iii) What is the total amount outstanding in (a), (b), (c) and (d) to the same date?

(iv) What is the total loss of capital and interest respectively in (a), (b), (c) and (d) to the same date?