

# Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 10th September, 1912.

	PAGE
Papers presented .. .. .	1527
Questions: Powellising sleepers .. .. .	1527
Crawley foreshore .. .. .	1527
Wickepin-Merredin Railway Select Committee, Extension of time .. .. .	1527
Bills: Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, 3a. .. .. .	1527
Tramways Purchase, Com. .. .. .	1527
Fremantle-Kalgoorlie (Merredin-Coolgardie Section) Railway, Com. .. .. .	1528
Industrial Arbitration, 1a. .. .. .	1529
Pearling, 1a. .. .. .	1529
Unclaimed Moneys, 1a. .. .. .	1529
High School Act Amendment, 1a. .. .. .	1529
Election of Senators Amendment, Returned Proportional Representation, 2a. .. .. .	1529
Motion: University Site .. .. .	1535

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

## PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Colonial Secretary: 1, Return showing total expenditure and total cash value of earnings from fees, produce, etc., in connection with State farms for each of the past five years to 30th June, 1912 (ordered on motion by Mr. Cullen). 2, Perth Municipal Council, amendment of by-laws. 3, Collie Municipal Council, by-laws. 4, Preston Roads Board, special by-law.

## QUESTION—POWELLISING SLEEPERS.

Hon. F. CONNOR asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, Whether it is a fact that under the agreement with the Powellising company the State Government have rights which only cover sleepers used within the State? 2, If so, what amount of royalty is suggested to be paid to the Powellising company for any sleepers which may be exported by the State saw-mills for the Transcontinental railway or other uses?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: 1, The agreement with the Powell Process Company covers rights both for the State consumption and export. 2, There is no question of suggested royalty, as the rates are already fixed under agreement.

[55]

## QUESTION—CRAWLEY FORESHORE.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, Have the Government retained the foreshore of Crawley for the purpose for which it was purchased, viz., a recreation ground for the people? 2, Is it the intention to proclaim this land a Class A reserve?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: 1, Yes. 2, Yes.

## WICKEPIN-MERREDIN RAILWAY SELECT COMMITTEE.

### Extension of Time.

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH (East) moved—

*That the time for bringing up the report of the Wickepin-Merredin Railway Deviation Select Committee be extended for one week.*

The committee had completed taking evidence, and the number of witnesses had been unexpectedly large, totalling nearly 200; naturally there had been some delay in the printing of the evidence. On that account he desired to ask the indulgence of the House in the direction the motion indicated.

Question put and passed.

## BILL—PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS.

Read a third time and returned to the Assembly with amendments.

## BILL—TRAMWAYS PURCHASE.

### In Committee.

Resumed from the 4th September; Hon. W. Kingsmill in the Chair, the Colonial Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clause 3—Ratification of purchase:

The CHAIRMAN: An amendment had been moved that at the end of the clause the words "may and shall be carried into effect" be added.

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH: Would the Chairman give his ruling as to whether

the amendment was in order. Was it not tantamount to an appropriation of money? As the Bill stood it seemed to be a harmless machinery measure, but if the words were added the Government would be compelled to pay the money and execute the agreement.

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment was quite in order. The measure was already a money Bill.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: The point the hon. member had raised was whether we could make any amendment to a money Bill. The Committee might do it by way of suggestion.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee would be allowed to make a suggestion. The amendment was quite in order.

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH moved—

*That the further consideration of the clause be postponed.*

It would be advisable to adopt this course until the Committee had considered the agreement itself.

Motion passed; the clause postponed.

Clauses 4 to 7—agreed to.

Clause 8—Privileges conceded to local authorities:

Hon. A. G. JENKINS moved an amendment—

*That after the word "purchase" in the first line the words "until the year 1939 and thereafter" be added.*

Later on it would be necessary to strike out the word "and" which immediately followed. The amendment was moved in accordance with the report of the select committee which inquired into the measure, and the object was to provide that the city council should have three per cent. of the gross earnings until 1939.

Hon. C. SOMMERS: Members had had no time to consider the report of the committee, together with the evidence, and it would be advisable to postpone the consideration of the measure. He therefore moved—

*That progress be reported.*

Motion passed.

Progress reported.

## BILL — FREMANTLE-KALGOORLIE (MERREDIN-COOLGARDIE SECTION) RAILWAY.

*In Committee.*

Hon. W. Kingsmill in the Chair, the Colonial Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Authority to construct:

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH: This clause gave power to construct and maintain a railway with a gauge of 4ft. 8½in. It was understood from the statement which had been made by the Colonial Secretary and in another place that the immediate intention was to construct a line of a gauge of 3ft. 6in. Would the Colonial Secretary explain the matter?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It was the intention in the first place to lay the rails on the 3ft. 6in. gauge and afterwards extend it to 4ft. 8½in.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: The intention of the Government had already been explained, but it was to be feared that the Government had not covered in this Bill what they intended to do. It would be open to any contentious person to dispute their action, and for any amount of litigation and claims for damages by employees and others to arise, if the Government did not cover their actual intentions in the powers of the Bill. He urged on the Colonial Secretary the wisdom of either postponing the clause and getting the framer of the Bill to consent to cover in this clause what the Government really intended to do, or alternatively the clause might be passed with a view to recommending it later. Governments could not proceed in this haphazard way. It would be necessary for the Government to take power not only to ultimately lay a 4ft. 8½in. line, but to temporarily lay down a 3ft. 6in. line.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: All railways when once constructed came under the powers in the Railway Act of 1904, and it was provided in that measure that before railways could be run they must be inspected by a person appointed by the Minister and then declared by the Minister to be safe for traffic. Until a railway was inspected the Government enjoyed certain immunities under the Railways Act. For

instance, the Government were entitled to use coal as a means of generating steam, and if they used Collie coal and the sparks from that fuel caused accidents they would be exempt from responsibility. If this Bill was really to construct and maintain a railway on the 4ft. 8½in. gauge, when the officer of the department was called upon to make his inspection with a view to the Minister declaring that the railway was fit for traffic, he never could say, if the gauge was only 3ft. 6in., that the line had been constructed in accordance with Parliamentary authority. Railways were different from other public works inasmuch as there must be a separate Act in respect of each line authorised. It would be impossible to put half a dozen lines in one Bill, and, therefore, the authority for constructing this particular line applied only to a line on the 4ft. 8½in. gauge. The officer when sent to inspect the line could never say that the authority of Parliament had been carried out, because at the time of the inspection the line would be only a 3ft. 6in. one. Therefore, something should be put in the Bill authorising the laying down of a railway on the 3ft. 6in. gauge with power to the Government to extend it to 4ft. 8½in. later on. The Government would then have proper statutory authority for running the line on the 3ft. 6in. gauge.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: There seemed to be considerable force in the remarks of hon. members, and he therefore moved—

*That progress be reported.*

Motion passed.

Progress reported.

#### BILLS (4)—FIRST READING.

1. Industrial Arbitration.
2. Pearling.
3. Unclaimed Moneys.
4. High School Act Amendment.

Received from the Legislative Assembly.

#### BILL—ELECTION OF SENATORS AMENDMENT.

Returned from the Legislative Assembly without amendment.

#### BILL — PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION.

##### *Second Reading.*

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister), in moving the second reading, said: In bringing forward this Bill I would like to dissociate myself from any party feeling whatever. Further than that, I wish to say that I am satisfied with the justice of the proportional representational system, but have some doubts as to its applicability, taking the State as a whole. There is no doubt that in addressing the House on this measure one is addressing a sympathetic audience, because recently we have carried a resolution approving of the system of proportional representation, and I think that all members are satisfied that there is a certain amount of injustice in connection with the present electoral laws inasmuch as they do not act fairly at times to any party. Sometimes they act very detrimentally on one party and at other times they act with equal detriment on another party. The figures given by Mr. Gawler and Mr. Davis have shown conclusively that each of the parties which represent political opinion in the Commonwealth has suffered very considerably through the present electoral system. In the Senate, particularly, it is more manifest than in any other House of Parliament in Australia, for it is possible there that a party with a majority of 100 or 1,000 votes out of 30,000 or 40,000 may secure all the seats and the other party get none. Recognising that, the Government have introduced this Bill in order to provide the machinery for proportional representation, provided, however, that the Acts necessary to be altered before proportional representation can be introduced are so altered.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: Ought not that to have come first?

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): If the machinery is provided, there is no doubt the alteration of the other Acts will be greatly simplified. Although I have some doubt as to the applicability of a system of proportional voting, taking Western Australia as a whole, there is no doubt if this Bill is adopted it will be a great advance on our present laws. It will ensure majority rule and minority representation. We cannot say that we get either under the present electoral law; sometimes we do not get majority rule, and very often we do not get minority representation; but if the Bill is carried, so far as the distribution of seats itself is concerned, it ensures majority rule and minority representation. Any section sufficiently strong enough to secure a quota will be represented. All the talk we hear about every section of the community being represented under proportional representation is altogether wrong. As I said when speaking to the motion Mr. Gawler moved, it is only those sections that are organised sufficiently to secure a quota who will be represented. The Bill is only a machinery one. If it is passed it may be used in the event of the Constitution Act and the electoral law being altered. Of course it will also be necessary to have a redistribution of seats, or at least to lump together a number of the seats as they are constituted at present. We must have multiple electorates, and they may be in any number from three upwards. The State may be cut up into one electorate, but I do not think any member would advocate that.

Hon. J. D. Connolly: It would be rather a big ballot paper.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): Yes, but it could be done. Under the system of proportional representation the State could be put into one electorate, but that would only increase the objection I have to the Bill. The Upper House, to preserve its continuity, would probably retire half its members every three years; possibly some other method of retiring members might be brought about, but to my mind that would be the simplest way in which to preserve the continuity of the Upper House while re-

turning members under the proportional representation system. The electorates could still be cut up to allow community of interest. It does not follow that proportional representation means representation entirely on a population basis; that could hardly take place in a State like Western Australia with its large area and with its sparse population in some places as compared with the towns. The Electoral Act would not need a great deal of amendment to adopt this system. The method of voting under proportional representation as followed by the Bill is just the same as it is at present; the elector will vote in a similar manner, and one part of the system is really in operation now. The Bill provides three rules under which an election can take place, any one of which may be adopted by an adopting Bill. There are Rules 2 (a), 2 (b) and 2 (c). Rule 2 (a) provides for compulsory preference to be given to all candidates, as is the case now. Rule 2 (b) provides for optional preference for one candidate or two candidates or the whole of the candidates, as the case may be. That provides for plumping. Rule 2 (c) provides for compulsory preference being exercised for the number of candidates to be elected. If there are six candidates and there are three to be elected, the voter must show at least three preferences. These are the three rules provided under the Bill, and the adopting Act must set out which rule is to be provided for. We are now working under the first rule, that is, it is compulsory for the voter to record his preference for the whole of the candidates standing. The second and third schedules to the Bill seem to be very complicated, and indeed they are, and I shall not attempt to explain them in detail. I think they can only be thoroughly grasped by seeing the system in working, that is by seeing the votes counted. Until one does see an election counted under these schedules I am positive they will never be thoroughly grasped. The second schedule provides for what are termed popular elections, that is where the number of electors exceeds 300. The third schedule provides for elections which take place in municipi-

pal councils or for an election of Senators or a public works committee by Parliament, or something of that kind. The method of counting is slightly different in the two cases. Every vote that is counted under the third schedule counts 100. This is done in order to guard against the fractions. If an election under the third schedule was counted as is provided under the second schedule the fractions would have too much weight, and consequently there would not be that fairness in counting the election as there would be in counting the results of an election under the second schedule. The method of counting under the second schedule, which deals with parliamentary elections, is something like this: the first preferences are counted first; the total number of votes is thus ascertained, and the quota is obtained by dividing the total number of votes by a number which exceeds the number of vacancies to be filled by one and then increasing the result by one; all the candidates securing the quota or over are elected; if a surplus is obtained by any candidate the whole of his votes are again submitted to a scrutiny to ascertain how the preferences are distributed. It seems to be a difficulty in many of the Bills relating to this system that have been introduced from time to time to know what votes are to be counted in the event of a surplus. In some schemes they are simply bunched together and the bare surplus taken from them, but under this scheme the whole of the surplus has to be counted and the value of the votes is obtained by multiplying the votes transferred by the surplus of the candidate and then dividing by the number of votes obtained by the candidate. As I have said before, I do not think any member can demonstrate whether that is an absolutely correct method of counting, but we are told it is mathematically correct, and that it is not possible for the wrong man to be elected under this system of counting. When the surplus votes have been dealt with, the returning officer proceeds to eliminate the candidate with the lowest number of votes, as is done at present. This system provides for counting the

surplus number of votes as well as for counting the votes of the candidates who are lowest on the list. I do not know that it is any use my attempting to explain these schedules any further, because I am sure that if members devote a week to them in trying to ascertain simply from reading them what is required they will not be able to do so; and if I might make a suggestion, which perhaps Sir Winthrop Hackett might take up, it would be that the daily papers should demonstrate to the public what this system really means. Then if there are any objectors, those that have objections will be able to voice them, and if there is the good in it which we claim there is, we can show the public where it is; and I have no doubt the Electoral Department will be quite willing to allow their officers to count any ballot that is taken. That was done in England. A vote was taken under the proportional representation system, and the public were shown how it would act.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: Is the hon. member supporting the Bill?

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): I am supporting it, but I want to be absolutely fair; I want to show where there are a few disadvantages in connection with it. I would like to show what Mr. Stenberg has to say about it. He is undoubtedly one of the best experts we have in electoral matters, and I do not think anyone questions his fairness, at the same time I cannot quite follow him.

Hon. M. L. Moss: The best expert is the man who has had one or two elections and has had to pay for them.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): I shall read what Mr. Stenberg calls the advantages of the system, and what he refers to as the alleged disadvantages. Mr. Stenberg is an enthusiast upon this, but we, who are supposed to take every precaution, must not allow enthusiasm to influence us in dealing with a matter of this kind. Now Mr. Stenberg sums up very briefly the advantages of this system as follows—

It will give the Legislature a fully representative character. It will provide for direct representation in the Legislature, not only of the majority in

the electorate, but also of all substantial minorities. It will be the means of giving to each party a share of representation in strict proportion to the number of votes recorded in favour of each party. It will secure an increased number of desirable candidates for Parliamentary honours.

A very hard thing to think it will do.

It will almost to a certainty result in the retention continuously in the service of the people of the most prominent and able public men, irrespective of parties. It will enable political questions to be approached upon a broader basis. It will enable candidates to widen their platforms. It will revive interest in political matters and elections. It will give more independence to individual members of the Legislature. It will prevent the minority in the electorate securing a majority of representation.

This is one of the very best things offered by the system.

It will greatly simplify the problems of redistribution of seats or the adjustment of electoral boundaries.

It will certainly do that, because there will not be so many seats, and consequently not so much heartburning and gerrymandering—if I may so term it—in connection with those seats.

It will, by the creation of large electorates, mitigate the evil influences of geographical boundaries which are so prominent under a system of small single-member electorates. It will make an effective "gerrymandering" of electorates practically impossible. It will to a large extent obliterate the personal element at elections, and simultaneously increase the importance of the main political issues. It will enable both electors and members to adapt themselves more freely to new political problems through the elasticity of the system. It will abolish the main reason for "constituency nursing." It will secure for each party the absolute right to choose and return its own leaders. It will infuse more sincerity into the electoral platforms. It will widen the choice of the electors, as the approval

of party organisations for candidature would become unnecessary. It will strengthen the personnel of Parliament by ensuring the election of the ablest men of all parties.

Mr. Stenberg sums up the advantages in that way. Under the heading of "alleged disadvantages" he refers to the creation of "groups" and election of "cranks" and "faddists," and the increased cost of elections to candidates. Here I might say that proportional representation will, to a certain extent, work out somewhat badly. There is no doubt in the world that if the whole of the seats in Western Australia were to be contested under this system the election expenses of the candidates would be increased; and, further than that, their expenses after election would continue to increase. But in spite of that I think that what is to be gained under this system far outweighs any disadvantages which may be apparent. In moving the second reading, I may express the hope that it will be carried. Then when the Convention Bill comes before us, despite what Mr. Cullen has had to say, it may so happen that this scheme for electing our members will be adopted. I think it will be very much better for the country; that it will lessen the intense party feeling we have at present. I do not believe that it will do away with the party system, nor do I think it is desirable that the party system should be done away with, but I think that much of the intense party feeling that exists, not only in this State, but in all States, could be lessened to the advantage of the country at large. I have pleasure in moving—

*That the Bill be now read a second time.*

Hon. D. G. GAWLER (Metropolitan-Suburban): I would like to express my gratitude to the Government for having brought forward the Bill so immediately following my motion as passed in the House. I do not say that the Bill carries out the idea of that motion; because the motion affirmed that this system should be applied to Parliamentary elections, whereas the Bill only gives us the machinery for so applying it. However, I recognise that it is an instalment, and

I feel, too, that the Bill is a recognition of the excellence of that system, and I hope the rest will very shortly follow. I do not propose to roam over any but very little of the ground I have previously traversed, but there are some points to which, perhaps, I did not refer when moving my motion, and which I would like to put before members prior to discussing the Bill in particular. The Honorary Minister has raised one or two points well worthy of consideration in discussing this subject. One is the abolition of the existing electorates for the purposes of the Bill. There he sees a difficulty. I admit the matter does present some difficulty at first glance, but I think it is one that can easily be got over. I believe that with a capable Chief Electoral Officer, such as Mr. Stenberg, we shall be justified in leaving the fixing of the electorates in his hands. I also believe that the main basis on which electorates will have to be framed will be that of population. The hon. member says he thinks community of interests should be taken into account in such a consideration. I do not altogether see eye to eye with him there, because however arbitrarily the electorates were fixed, so long as a fair choice be given to the electors by providing them with sufficient candidates, proportional representation of minorities would be attained. It may mean that if you take the more densely populated parts of a district into consideration and give them members on a population basis you will require to add one or two members to the present number, and instead of having, say, 50 members for the Lower House, you may require 52 or 53. But it seems to me, whichever way you cut up electorates, the minority will still be able to get representation, and the same result will obtain if you divide those electorates and give them five members each as if you adopted the whole State as one electorate. But, as I say, if there is to be a difficulty, we might apply the system to one portion of the State only for the time being, say to the towns, and not to the agricultural districts, although I see no objection to applying it to the whole

of the State; or we might make exceptional provision for certain portions of the State. Another point the Minister has raised is the question of the continuity of the Upper House. That was very ably dealt with by Mr. Kingsmill. But, as the Minister suggests, we can retain the continuity of the Upper House by aggregating two electorates, and providing that three members should retire every three years.

Hon. J. D. Connolly: We could only do that with five.

Hon. D. G. GAWLER: It is obvious that to retain the present mode of continuity, namely, one member retiring every two years, would be to caricature the system, because that one member would have to be returned by a majority of voters every time, which would destroy the principle of representation of minorities. I do not altogether believe in the system of supplementary candidates, as proposed in certain other parts of the world. In Belgium they have a system of supplementary candidates ready to fill up vacancies.

Hon. W. Patrick: Does it apply to the Senate in Belgium?

Hon. D. G. GAWLER: I cannot say to which House, but it certainly applies there, and the supplementary candidates are held ready to fill the places of those who die or resign. This is unsatisfactory, because public opinion may change with time, and the candidate himself may change his opinions. It means putting in a man appointed two or three years before. But I do not think the objections to the application of the system to this Upper House are by any means fatal. The advantages which the Honorary Minister has quoted, as laid down by Mr. Stenberg, are, I think, well worthy of the attention of hon. members, and more particularly the ground raised by him that the system will widen the choice of candidates, and increase the interest taken in elections. Now, as against those, the disadvantages raised, such as the increased cost of election, also require consideration. Hon. members will remember, however, that where there is a large number of candidates going up together, the cost of elections would be con-

siderably less than if individual candidates were going up. For instance, where several candidates of the one platform are contesting the election organisation will come in, and the cost will be considerably decreased. To my mind one of the chief advantages of the system is that it will destroy the roads-and-bridges idea, the parochialist, while the man who represents district rather than party will not be so liable to have pressure brought to bear upon him, and the average member will be much more likely to take an interest in the State generally rather than in his own particular district. Then, assuming there are disadvantages, those disadvantages will certainly be outweighed by the fact that under the system we will have minorities represented, whereas at the present time they are unrepresented. Under our present system we could have almost half the State unrepresented. As I have said before, we must get the majority rule, but the minority should be there to criticise, and under the present system they have no chance of doing that. With regard to the Bill as introduced, the main part is comprised in the schedules. I agree that it would be idle to attempt to go through the schedules and explain them in detail, and I suggest to the Honorary Minister that, in addition to the methods he suggested of acquainting the public with these methods, a view should be given to members of Parliament of an election conducted at some time to be arranged, so that members can see how the system works. I think we have men in the electoral office capable of doing it, and it would be more satisfactory to members to see it worked out. The Minister has explained that this is merely a machinery Bill. It gives us three methods for voting; one is the system, as at present, where it is compulsory to vote for all candidates on the paper, another where it is compulsory to vote for the number of members to be elected, and the other where it is optional how electors express their preferences. The form of ballot paper is also given and there are provisions in the schedule for what shall invalidate a ballot paper. I should like attention to be paid to these provisions because, it seems to me, that

a very small slip on the part of the elector would make his vote invalid. In some countries which adopt this system, I believe the only condition on which a paper is invalidated is where the elector places the figure one opposite to the name of more than one candidate, but under this Bill a number of things have been laid down which render the paper invalid, and some of those things should be cut out. I do not see why discretion should not be allowed the returning officer to say whether a paper should be invalid. Experience under the present system shows that there has been a very small percentage of informal votes, and I do not see why the ballot paper should not be made as free as possible. It is to the credit of the people of this State that informal votes have been so few. The Minister has touched shortly on the two schedules, one providing for popular elections and the other for the non-popular elections. It must be obvious to members that it is necessary, under the third schedule dealing with the non-popular elections, to make the number of votes to the value of 100. If they turn to page 15 of the Bill they will see that this is an illustration where only 84 votes were given. There were eight members to be elected and 16 candidates. If it were not for the increased value of the votes by making them each of the value of 100, it would mean that the quota of nine, obtained by adding one to the number of candidates, divided into the number of votes (84) would leave a number of votes which could not be distributed among the other candidates. If B has 13 votes and the quota is 10, that would leave a surplus of three, and unless the increased value is provided, it is impossible to distribute the three votes among the other candidates. That is the reason why provision is made in regard to the increased value of votes. On page 16 there is a rather intricate way of arriving at the number of surplus votes to be distributed amongst the different candidates. I shall not attempt to explain that, but members should look further down at the table where they will see a significant item, "Loss of value owing to neglect of



fractions," which is 12. Owing to that way of deciding the number of votes to be distributed there is a loss of 12 votes. I have worked this out and I find it can be worked out so that no votes at all should be lost. At the top of page 16 members will see that in the various sub-parcels, that is parcels made up after ascertaining the candidates to whom the surplus votes are to go, G, H and L have 1,000, 500 and 300 respectively. If a simple proportion sum were indulged in members will find that instead of leaving 12, owing to loss of fractions, they can allot these seats without losing one. The proportion sum would be—as 1,800 (which represents the total number of second preferences in the elected candidate's parcel) bears to 100, so is 966 (that is the surplus) to the answer. Members will find that they can get the answer without fractions. However, that is a detail of the schedule which I shall not pursue at present because it will hardly interest members. In conclusion, I wish to recommend this Bill to the favourable consideration of members, and I feel sure that if the machinery there is adopted, it will answer all purposes which we require, and if we go a little further and get the Government to make an alteration in the electoral laws, so as to apply this straight away to Parliamentary elections, not only will the resolution, which I moved and had carried in this House, be brought into effect, but I feel certain a benefit will be conferred upon the whole of the State. Members in speaking to the Bill will, no doubt, address themselves not altogether to the details but to proportional representation, and I hope they will be with me in doing all they can to see that the Government apply this system as soon as possible to Parliamentary elections.

On motion by Hon. J. F. Cullen, debate adjourned.

#### MOTION—UNIVERSITY SITE.

Debate resumed from the 4th September on the motion of the Hon. J. F. Cullen: "That in the opinion of this House, the University Senate, having accepted the Government offer of the

Crawley estate in exchange for endowment lands of corresponding value, should now, with the consent of the Government, negotiate with the trustees of King's Park for an exchange of the Crawley estate for land of corresponding value on the highest available part of King's Park, as the most suitable site for the University of Western Australia."

Hon. R. G. ARDAGH (North-East): I desire to say a few words only in connection with what I consider is a very important question. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the debate so far as it has gone and I have formed the opinion, after hearing the remarks of Mr. Kingsmill in particular with regard to the medical profession's opinion, that the site at Crawley is not a suitable one for an institution such as the University. There are many reasons which may be advanced against it, and the one which appeals to me most is the fact that a great many of the people who will no doubt take an opportunity of attending the University will be those who are engaged every day in various walks of life, and who will necessarily be obliged to attend such an institution during the evening. I think a more central position might be selected, so that these people who are engaged during the daytime, following their various occupations, can attend in the evening without losing such a great deal of time, as they would necessarily have to lose in going to Crawley, if the University is established in that district. Further, I believe the site is not altogether suitable for medical students, who would have to attend the hospitals. These institutions would be so far away and it would be inconvenient for them. Personally I think the site mentioned by Mr. Kingsmill, that is a few acres of land opposite to Parliament House, might be given some consideration. I would like to see the University located in some portion of King's Park. I believe it would materially assist to beautify King's Park, and would not in any way be a menace to it. There is a large area of land in King's Park and I think a small portion for this particular purpose could easily be set aside.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: What do you call a small portion?

Hon. R. G. ARDAGH: I think 50 acres would be suitable, and King's Park, I believe, has an area of 1,018 acres. Out of that I think 50 would be suitable for a site for the University. Mr. Kingsmill referred to the personnel of the Senate and the inclusion of the two gentlemen connected with the Trades Hall, Messrs. Somerville and Burrowes. I do not think when the selection of the Senate was taken into consideration the Trades Hall was in any way considered in connection with it. This is the first I have heard of the personnel of the Senate being selected on political grounds and the first I have heard of it being a party question. I do not think it was made a party question at all. These two gentlemen are men who in my opinion are filling their positions on the Senate with credit. One is a high classed engineer, a man who has held a public position for many years, and the other gentleman, Mr. Burrowes, is a highly educated man in the accountancy line, and I think the inclusion of these gentlemen is in no way detrimental to the personnel of the Senate. That is all I have to say on the matter. I believe that the debate, so far as it has gone, especially the opinions expressed from the medical profession, is that the most suitable site has not been selected for the University.

Hon. M. L. MOSS (West): I find myself in a difficulty with regard to this question because I cannot vote for the motion of Mr. Cullen although I feel the University is to be put in the wrong place. I would not have troubled the House with any speech if I could have given a vote for or against the motion and my vote could have been thoroughly understood by the people I represent, but I am afraid I could not give that vote without expressing the views I entertain. So far as the King's Park is concerned it is a class A reserve and it is dedicated to the recreation of the public and on broad principles I object to a class A reserve being interfered with at all. There are too few reserves around the City, and a magnificent asset such as the

King's Park is will not be thoroughly appreciated until the population of Western Australia is ten times what it is today.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: Would you object to enlarging it?

Hon. M. L. MOSS: I object to encroaching on any portion of the King's Park. You are going to exchange 150 acres at Crawley for 150 acres, perhaps a portion of the park.

Hon. J. D. Connolly: But Crawley was bought for a park.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: I do not object to Crawley being thrown into the park. I object to the King's Park being encroached upon for a university or for any purpose. Apart from that, the King's Park is unsuitable in my opinion. I am expressing my opinion without passing any censure on the University Senate at all. They have no doubt voted in the best interests of the University. They have been put there to guard and protect the University and to give their votes in the interests of that institution. I believe that the exchange of the valuable endowment at West Subiaco for land at Crawley is a change in which the Government came off first best.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: Part of the land at Crawley.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: The site of the land at Subiaco is very suitable for the erection of a university, and for this reason, bearing in mind that the lectures at the Australian universities are generally held late in the afternoon and in the evening, and in view—

Hon. J. F. Cullen: That is not so.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: It is so, especially in the summer.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: More are held in the morning.

The PRESIDENT: Order, the hon. Mr. Moss has the audience.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: I do not mind, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT: But it is irregular.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: But it is useful to me, because I get the value of what is passing through the hon. member's mind.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: And it sets the hon. member right.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: The hon. member is quite right; I speak as far as the University of New Zealand is concerned where the university lectures are held at four o'clock in the afternoon, but I will give the hon. member the benefit of the lectures being held in the morning and not at night time. A large proportion of the residential population of Western Australia is residing outside the city of Perth, that is to say at Midland Junction and Guildford and along the railway line right to Perth and then in another direction at Leederville, Subiaco, and so on to Fremantle: the bulk of the people would have to make a railway journey. If the University were erected at Subiaco people would have to remain in the train for a longer or a lesser time, but they would not have to take a train journey and then a tram journey as well and for a long time the tram service to Crawley will be a bad one, indeed it certainly will remain a very bad service until such time as there is considerable settlement between Crawley and Claremont. Until there is a fair population the Government or private enterprise will not supply a tramway service to any considerable extent. I have expressed my opinion briefly as to the locality which I think is most suitable for the erection of buildings in connection with the University. They ought to be somewhere on high land alongside the railway line near to the city of Perth, and I think West Subiaco an ideal site, but the University was obliged to be sacrificed in order that the Government could carry out one of their pet schemes, that of the erection of workers' homes on the site at West Subiaco. I cannot vote for the King's Park site because it is a large area of land dedicated for the purpose of the recreation of the general public, and no vote of mine now or at any time will be directed to encroaching on that area. I am going to vote against Mr. Cullen's motion, and although I do so I object to the buildings in connection with the University being put up at Crawley. I hope there is still time to repair the damage which has been done by the vote given in the University Senate. These buildings cannot be provided for a considerable time to come. It will re-

quire a large sum of money to be voted, and while I have the greatest confidence in the University Senate as at present constituted, and I believe they are doing the best for the institution, as soon as Convocation is established there will be close on five or six years and the Senate will be differently constituted from what it is to-day, and there will be time to revise what has been done in the past. There is this additional safeguard, we shall have an election of members to this House and to another place before any considerable amount of money has been voted for the erection of these buildings; therefore the whole of the community through their representatives will have an opportunity of expressing their opinion on this important question. There must be other land available alongside the railway somewhere where we can get 100 or 200 acres for the purpose of establishing the University. I do not complain; I suppose if another differently constituted Senate of the University were to come along and pick another site, there would be persons who would say it was not the best, therefore the Senate need not resent the action which is being taken because people will complain, as there are people who differ from others in the selection of the site at Crawley. My experience is this: whether it is the members of a senate or of a municipal council or the members in this House or another place they must be subjected to criticism. They cannot expect to be placed on a pedestal and to think that when they are placed in charge of the expenditure of public money or the exchange of lands they must not be subjected to criticism. I think the Senate erred very badly in this matter. I cannot vote for Mr. Cullen's motion, but I want to put my protest on record because I think Crawley is not the proper site on which to build the University.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM (North): I do not propose to take up very much time on this question. I regret I cannot vote for the motion before the House. Although I do not take an active part in connection with the King's Park I happen to be one of those responsible for the resumption of that land. I was a member of the Government at the time

the land was resumed and considerable trouble was taken to get some of the purchased land that commanded some of the best frontages, and having done so we achieved at that time the fact of being able to secure a good piece of land for the people of Perth. That park has been referred to not only by people who live here but by visitors who come here, as a magnificent asset to the City. I know every part of it and I have so much interest in it that I oppose taking a single foot from it, I do not care what the reason may be, whether for a university or anything else, I shall object and oppose to the full power I am able, the taking away of any portion of that park. I am not in the least exercised as to where the University is to be put.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: Not in the least?

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: Not in the least. I know nothing about universities; I never went to one; I do not know how they are conducted. I have a good deal of knowledge of primary education, I have taken a great interest in secondary education, and I may take credit for having introduced the technical schools; beyond that I know nothing, but I think as we have a Senate constituted of people who have been carefully selected, it is quite sufficient for them to be able to say where the University should be. I am not exercised myself as to where it should be. Superficially I thought Crawley eminently well adapted for the purpose. It seemed to have all the advantages, but of course there will be objections to any site. I should object entirely to the University, or anything else, being placed in the King's Park. If that is done it may create a precedent and by and by we might have application for another institution to take another portion from the King's Park. Even admitting the exchange—I think Mr. Cullen suggested 200 acres being taken—was compensated for by the land at Crawley—that will not affect the purpose. It would split up the park and change the place entirely. Crawley would be no exchange at all. I take the strongest exception to the proposal to use any portion of the park, not only for the Uni-

versity but for any other purpose. Therefore I am afraid I shall have to oppose the motion of the hon. member.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN (South): There is a great deal that I could say upon this question, as I have given it much thought, but what I intend to put forward will be fairly brief. I purpose supporting the motion moved by Mr. Cullen, and although prior to his giving notice of it I had no conversation whatever with that hon. member on the subject, the ideas he expressed in his speech, as well as the motion in itself express my views. I am very glad that the hon. member has brought the proposal before this Chamber. I think it is desirable that public opinion should occasionally be expressed regarding matters of importance to the University. It is desirable that the University should be a popular institution. It is essential that it should be popular in order that it should be successful. It was established as the outcome of the wishes of the people; it belongs to the people, and it is extremely desirable that the people should be encouraged to take an interest in what is being done in connection with it, and that on questions such as this or on other matters of vital importance, the members of the Senate should have some idea of public opinion. The Senate as has been announced in the Press is divided on the question of the Crawley site. Ten members of the Senate are in favour of the Crawley site, and it has also been shown by the Press that there are eight members who are opposed to the selection of Crawley. For that reason and also because it is a matter that affects public property, Mr. Cullen is to be complimented on bringing the question forward so that the opinion of this Chamber might be ascertained. I am opposed to the selection of Crawley, and I oppose it on three grounds. The first is because Crawley is so inaccessible: the second is that strong objections have been raised to the site by the powerful petition signed by so many well-known medical men, and the third objection is that at least one better site is available. The question of the inaccessibility

of the Crawley site is, to my mind, a question of extreme importance. I think the university ought to be not only for the rich but also for the poor, and it should be of such a character that if possible no young man should be debarred from the advantages of a university education because of his own poverty or the poverty of his parents. It would be impossible to fully realise that ideal, but I think that we ought to do everything we can to approach towards it. It would be a magnificent achievement for Western Australia if we could start with a free university, so that this State would have the advantage of free education from the kindergarten to the university. The matter of the inaccessibility of the site is therefore of great importance and should receive considerable attention. Take the question of evening lectures. There is no class of university student that is more worthy of encouragement than the student who attends the evening classes. He is a young man who is engaged in work during the greater part of the day, and he is desirous of advancing himself by means of a higher education. He is most careful to derive all the benefit he possibly can from the university, and every effort ought to be made to give every reasonable attention to him. The case for that class of student has been very well set out in a petition that was prepared by intending law students, and which has been published in the Press. The case for the evening student is clearly made out in that petition. It is signed by 31 intending students, men who are representative of a very large section of the future students of the university, and it is so very clear that a few paragraphs from it are worthy of being read to the House. The petition says—

That the proposed Crawley site for the university is unsuitable owing to its being inaccessible. We would point out—

1. That a large proportion of the students will always be drawn from persons engaged in earning their livelihood during the day time.

2. That it is a matter of extreme difficulty to arrange lectures at suitable times for evening students (other than at 5 p.m. and 7 p.m.) in order to allow sufficient time for laboratory work and private study (laboratory work occupying three or four evenings per week.)

3. That it would probably take at least 25 minutes to travel from the Town Hall to Crawley by tram. This would be valuable time lost.

4. That under the present conditions at the Perth Technical School lectures are held at 5.10 p.m. and 7.10 p.m. in order to leave the evening free for other work. At the Crawley site these times would be impracticable, and lectures would probably finish at 6.30 and 8.30 p.m. Thus the students attending the 6.30 lectures must go to the expense of purchasing a meal in order to continue their work at night. The students attending at 8.30 lecture have only one hour for laboratory work, which is useless. Owing to the time taken in getting back to Perth it would not be possible to remain at the university later than 9.30 to catch the 10 o'clock train from town.

5. That all time a student absents himself from his occupation must in most case be made up.

6. That it is very probable that it will be many years before a frequent tram service is available via Mounts Bay-road, since population would not warrant it.

7. Students may be expected from Perth, Fremantle, Midland Junction, and intermediate places. Students from outlying places would need to travel per train to Perth and then per tram to Crawley. A student missing a connecting car would be unable to attend his lecture.

8. That the tram journey will increase the cost of a university course, apart from the increased necessity for purchasing meals.

These are the objections against the Crawley site, held by the class of student that I trust will be numerously represented when the University is in going

order. I therefore claim that if the University is to be at Crawley that position will be a severe handicap to the poor student, especially to the student attending evening classes. Whatever site be selected, we ought to endeavour to make that site accessible to the great bulk of the students. The second objection I have, was set out in the petition that was read by Mr. Kingsmill when that member spoke on this proposal. It is a petition that ought not to be lightly set aside. The petition was signed by no fewer than 46 of the medical practitioners in the metropolitan area. Dr. Saw, in a letter dealing with this petition, states—

There were only five practitioners in Perth and suburbs at the present time who had not signed the petition. Of these, four had expressed their concurrence, but of these two had not wished to sign for entirely private and personal reasons; the two others had neglected to sign it. So far as I knew there was only one practitioner who was in favour of Crawley—Dr. Nyulasy.

Surely we cannot ignore petitions signed by no fewer than 46 medical practitioners.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: And university men.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: And only one of them in the metropolitan area is known to be in favour of Crawley site, and that one is Dr. Nyulasy. I say that in itself is a very weighty argument indeed; it is a practically unanswerable argument.

Hon. Sir J. W. Hackett: Only it is inaccurate.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: I am very much surprised to hear that such a petition is inaccurate.

Hon. Sir J. W. Hackett: I mean to say that it is inaccurate so far as the statement that there is only one practitioner in favour of Crawley is concerned.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: Dr. Saw goes into particulars, and if the statement be inaccurate it ought to be contradicted. I certainly have not seen it contradicted. The letter from which I quoted appeared in the *West Australian* of the 22nd

August, and in that letter Dr. Saw states definitely "so far as I know there was only one practitioner in favour of Crawley—Dr. Nyulasy."—One practitioner within the area wherein reside the doctors who were asked to sign this petition, and that statement has not been contradicted until to-day.

Hon. Sir J. W. Hackett: I contradict it now.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: Perhaps the hon. member might be able to mention the names of some of the doctors who are so keenly in favour of the Crawley site?

Hon. J. F. Cullen: Dr. Hackett.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: I would like to draw attention to the reports of the architects regarding the Crawley site. Mr. Cullen quoted at length from these reports.

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

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: Before tea I was referring to Crawley site from an architectural point of view. I would like in this connection to call the attention of members to the report of the parliamentary committee regarding the site for the university. That committee was appointed on the 16th November last, and it included a number of members of both branches of the legislature. The members were the Hon. Sir J. W. Hackett, the Speaker (Mr. Troy, M.L.A.), the Right Rev. Dr. Riley, the Hon. J. D. Connolly, and the Hon. W. Kingsmill, the Hon. Frank Wilson, M.L.A., and Mr. Turvey, M.L.A. That committee submitted a report in favour of Crawley, but there were only three members of the committee who gave their first preference votes to Crawley. Three sites were voted on, namely, the Parliament House-Observatory site, Crawley, and West Subiaco, and I find that Sir Winthrop Hackett, Dr. Riley, and the Hon. Frank Wilson were the only three members who gave their first preference votes for the Crawley site. Crawley received three first preferences, the Observatory two, and West Subiaco two.

Hon. J. D. Connolly: And if there had been a straight-out vote between West

Subiaco and Crawley, the majority would have been for West Subiaco.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: That is very interesting. The important matter I wish to call attention to is that only three votes were given for Crawley, and the hon. member who interjected now offers the information that a vote between Crawley and West Subiaco would have resulted in favour of the latter.

Hon. J. D. Connolly: I made the interjection because the Premier stated that the members of the committee were overwhelmingly in favour of Crawley.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: The first vote shows what the feeling was, and the hon. member now gives us additional information. In connection with the choice of a site, a statement was made by the committee which was responsible for reports being subsequently obtained regarding the suitability of the site from an architectural point of view. In referring to Crawley, the report stated—

Underlying water rests about five feet above water mark. This, according to Mr. Lawson, presents no difficulty in way of foundations for heavy buildings, especially if reinforced concrete be used. A clay bank runs across the property, but does not bank the water back, as it is of no great thickness, and water runs underneath.

A statement of that kind contained in the report of the committee called for additional investigation. The result of that additional investigation was contained in three reports, which were published in the Press as supplied to the University Senate; and these reports were quoted from by Mr. Cullen. Two of the reports are in favour of Crawley from an architectural standpoint, but there was a very strong difference of opinion amongst the architects who reported. One of these gentlemen was so pronounced in his opposition to Crawley that his report is worthy of the closest attention, and justifies further inquiry as to the value of Crawley from this point of view. Mr. Oldham was the gentleman who gave the minority report, and he severely condemned the site. His report is the most lengthy of the three, but I need only

quote from a couple of paragraphs to show its nature:—

My experience, extending over 18 years, of the Swan River from Perth to Fremantle and the low-lying foreshores is that such localities are unavoidably damp, owing to proximity of water level and evaporation from the river, and when shut in from prevailing winds, as Crawley undoubtedly is, apt to be stagnant as regards air, and the subsoil, which has to carry foundations for the structures comprising University buildings, would require most searching testing and consideration. It also occurred to me that the possibility of the river being dredged in the future must be faced, as the possible removal of the banks now branching out under water would undoubtedly affect the strata and consequently the foundations of the proposed buildings. Another point is that some three miles of cartage must be faced. The buildings, if erected, could never be seen to advantage, as even from the river at any distance they would appear low-lying and on the land side from the main road below the ordinary sight line.

The reports on the site from an architectural point of view are as satisfactory as they might be. It is extremely desirable to see if we cannot obtain a site more suitable from a health point of view, more suitable as regards accessibility, and more suitable from an architectural aspect. From the references made during this debate to the proposal to build the university in the King's Park, one would imagine that it was a direct attack upon King's Park. Sir Winthrop Hackett referred to it as a scandalous proposal, and other language used concerning that suggestion was also of a wildly exaggerated nature. I believe that King's Park should be kept for the use of the people, and I would be strongly opposed to doing anything that would injure the Park as a public resort. The proposal put forward by Mr. Cullen, as I understand it, would not in any way detract from the park. It is not suggested that the building should be placed on the high ground overlooking the river, but that 100 acres

be obtained in King's Park that would be eminently suited for a university site. If Crawley be made an extension of the King's Park, the grounds at Crawley will be far more useful for park purposes than those upon which it is suggested the university should be built. I see no reason why 100 acres cannot be obtained in King's Park, say, facing King's Park-road, where we would have a university site that would be in a suitable position: there would be no doubt whatever as to its healthfulness, or its fitness from an architectural standpoint. It seemed to me that the language used by Sir Winthrop Hackett on this question went altogether beyond bounds. He referred to the King's Park as being a treasure house of the enchanting flora of Western Australia. We all admire the flora of Western Australia, and would like to see it preserved, but I claim that a park of 1,000 acres, such as the King's Park, is not a place in which to preserve the flora of a country. It is too limited in area, and the most beautiful portion of the park is that from which the flora of the country has been removed, and imported trees and grasses have been grown. Parks the world over are not the treasure houses of the natural flora. On the contrary, parks are everywhere improved by imported trees and shrubs. In England, and in other places; we do not always see only the flora of the country in the parks. We go to the parks to see something different from what comes under our notice on a visit to the country. We go to see imported flora, things we are not accustomed to see in our daily walks. Therefore, while I am thoroughly in sympathy with the idea of preserving the flora of Western Australia, I claim that the best mode of doing that would be by establishing a national reserve of vastly greater area than King's Park. We want a national reserve where the flora would be preserved, and which would be also a sanctuary for birds and other wild life of the country. In saying that King's Park should be kept intact in order to preserve the flora of the country, it almost seems as if the hon. gentleman forgot the time when the

park will be far more used than at present. As the population becomes greater, the park will be used by an infinitely larger number of people than at present go there, and the flora does not become more beautiful when it has been trampled down by children and by picnicing parties. There would be ample room left in the park if we were to take 100 acres for university purposes. There would be, in addition to the present park, the Crawley estate, and I contend that the drive through the park, which is so much admired by every visitor, would be improved by its extension through Crawley. The present drive is on the high ground overlooking the Swan River, and there is an almost unsurpassed view from that site, but the drive might be extended so that it would run along the water's edge right round the peninsula of Crawley. This extension would add beauty, variety and interest to the drive. The utilisation of the site, which those who favour this motion think should be set apart for the University, would not in any way detract from the value of the park. In addition to that, as Mr. Cullen points out, the grounds of the universities in the other States are always open to the public. In Sydney and Melbourne the grounds of the universities are used as parks.

Hon. Sir J. W. Hackett: You are altogether mistaken.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: I have just recently returned from a trip to the Eastern States, and when I was in the Eastern States I made a point of visiting all the universities there. The University grounds at Sydney are crowded with people using them in the same way as parks. The grounds have ornamental water, flowers, trees and grasses, and so on, and the people in the vicinity use them very extensively. I was there several days, and on every day I was there the grounds were crowded with men, and women and children. In the same way the grounds of the Melbourne University are open to everybody. There is also ornamental water there, and although the grounds are not quite so beautiful as the Sydney University grounds, I



noticed a number of people enjoying them the same way as they would a park. The Adelaide University has less than five acres, so there is really very little in the way of garden, and consequently the people have not the opportunity of using the University grounds there as they have in Melbourne and Sydney. I take it that a university such as is proposed to be established here would not for a moment think of shutting up the grounds to prevent the free access of the people. The point comes up to those who do not approve of Crawley, and who do not wish that King's Park should be encroached on in any way, as to what other site is available. Mr. Kingsmill and some other hon. members have favoured the Parliament House and Observatory site, but I find from a report that I have with me that that site has a very limited area. According to this report, the inclusion of Parliament House, the present Public Works buildings, the Observatory, the proposed High School site, the present High School site, and a resumption of Wilson-street and the block to the north of it towards Hay-street would only provide for 45 acres. Every authority who has expressed any opinion for the purpose of guiding the University Senate in the matter of a site agrees that the site should not be less than 100 acres in extent. We know that in Adelaide the University is so crowded that the authorities do not know where to look for elbow room, and the Queensland University, it is understood, has made the mistake of starting with too small a site. The Sydney University has a vast area, considerably over 100 acres, and the grounds include various affiliated colleges of which there are four now. The authorities at the Sydney University, however, tell me that they do not consider they have by any means too much room, and that if a request be made for further colleges within the University grounds they will be rather troubled to know where to place them. In the case of Melbourne, I had a conversation to-day with Dr. Bride, a gentleman who has been for thirty years a member of the University Council of Melbourne, and he told me that they felt

the grounds at present, comprising 50 acres, were not sufficiently large, and that they are anxious to secure further land, and are going to apply to the Government for 200 acres for an agricultural college and farm. Whatever should be done in the matter of a site, all authorities are agreed that we should not have less than 100 acres.

Hon. V. Hamersley : What do they want such an area for?

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN : To provide for the growth of the future. They have to provide, not merely for to-day, but for to-morrow, and for the day after to-morrow. A university such as is about to be established is not for one generation but is for many generations for hundreds of years to come, and the time will arrive when there will be several colleges associated with the University, and we do not know how many of these colleges there may be. Also a large area of ground will be necessary for the purpose of sport, residences of professors and so on. Throughout the whole world, so far as modern universities are concerned, there is universal recognition that there must be ample ground around a university. I would like to refer to a memorandum prepared by Sir Winthrop Hackett and supplied to the parliamentary committee concerning the site for a university. That memorandum, which was no doubt very useful to the committee, and which has been of immense value to those who are interested in the starting of a university in Western Australia, contained a number of recommendations with which everyone in the Chamber must agree; but some of these recommendations however are not quite in accord with the position that the hon. member has taken up concerning the Crawley site. He says in the memorandum for the parliamentary committee—

I venture to suggest to the committee that the five conditions to which peculiar attention should be paid in the matter of a university site are: 1, healthfulness; 2, sufficient area; 3, facilities for access; 4, position and appearance; 5, character, contour, and material.

In the matter of healthfulness, which is, we must all admit, of primary importance in connection with a university, the hon. member says—

The main requirement in this regard appears to be that it should not be in the vicinity of undrained or marshy land.

I think the hon. member would find it difficult to reconcile that statement, say, with the report of Mr. Oldham. Then there is another point in the memorandum which is also worth quoting. It is a point we all agree with, I think, and it has a bearing on the Crawley site. It deals with the question of facilities of access. The hon. member says—

It has to be remembered, of course, that we propose to give instruction to evening or night classes, as well as by day, and further, that means of travelling, which must be made absolutely safe, shall be provided for the numbers of young girls on their way to and from the University, and whom it is our hope will share to the full in the benefits of the University.

I am afraid that the young girls that Sir Winthrop Hackett would like to see attending the University; and whom every one else would like to see attending there, would find a great deal of difficulty in getting to and from Crawley and the city of Perth during the evening.

Hon. Sir J. W. Hackett: Special provision will be made for them; that was quite considered.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: No matter what provision may be made, they would still have to travel that distance at night. I hope the hon. member has some way of overcoming the difficulty, but it seems somewhat difficult at present. I am sorry to find myself in opposition to the hon. member on this question. We all admire the earnestness with which he has taken up the matter of the University, and even those of us who are opposed to him must admire the determination with which he is adhering to the Crawley site. I believe he is mistaken in that matter, and I trust that even now at the eleventh hour possibly he may come round and agree to

some other site which would be more suitable.

Hon. Sir J. W. Hackett: Hear, hear; if you propose it.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: We have already proposed a more suitable site in King's Park.

Hon. Sir J. W. Hackett: The impossible site.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: Why not have 100 acres facing King's Park road? I have been told, though I do not know that it is correct, that the trustees of King's Park, some of them at any rate, are of opinion that Crawley is more useful for park purposes than the 100 acres I have referred to. It would be a valuable addition to King's Park, which would more than compensate for the area required for the University.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: Hear, hear; the majority of the board think it.

Hon. Sir J. W. Hackett: Who says so?

Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom: The motion asks for the "highest possible" part.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: Perhaps in that respect the motion does not exactly correspond with my idea, which is that 100 acres of the high ground of King's Park should be utilised for this purpose, especially as that 100 acres is now practically lying idle. With the addition of Crawley I fail to see how King's Park is in any way lessened in value as a popular resort, and it would be a tremendous advantage to the University, which is as much the property of the people as is King's Park, and will serve certainly a not less useful purpose. In the course of my remarks I have said that I trusted that the University will be popular, that the people will take an interest in it, that they will realise that it is their own institution, and that in the University equal opportunities will be provided for all. Although the University may be free, still the ideal of providing free opportunities to all seems at present almost impossible of realisation. The boy or girl whose parents live at the gates of the University will be at a considerable advantage; the boy or girl who lives in the metropolis will have a considerable advantage as

compared with the boy or girl who lives at Geraldton, Albany, or Kalgoorlie. The expenses of the student who can remain at home will be comparatively trifling, but a free university to the youth who lives in the country will not be a free university unless some special consideration is paid to providing for that youth's maintenance. I think it is a duty to do all we possibly can to provide equal opportunities in the matter of education for all. At present the State provides free primary education and it is about to provide free secondary education. Not only is primary education free, but it is also compulsory. Now it is an old saying that a little learning is a dangerous thing. If the State compels the child to acquire a little learning it is surely the duty of the State to see that that child shall have an opportunity of completing its education. On that point I would remind the House that with the increased political power of the people the necessity for higher education is all the greater. In view of the growing political power of the masses safety lies in making higher education more general if not universal. Therefore, in considering this question of the site of the University every effort should be made to supply the fullest opportunities to as many people as possible to get the advantage of the higher education to be provided at the new University.

Hon. D. G. GAWLER (Metropolitan-Suburban): This question is to be commended to members for their earnest consideration. Perhaps the most important point to be remembered is that the Crawley site has been condemned by a very large number of the medical profession. How many are in opposition to that petition I cannot say, but according to Dr. Saw there is only one. At any rate we cannot get away from the fact that a large number of the medical profession is opposed to the site, nor can we forget that the students, those who propose to attend the University, are also opposed to it for the good reasons they have given. A further fact is that although this site has been chosen by the Senate of the University

there is a large minority in that Senate opposed to it. It will be seen, therefore, that the question is well worthy of the consideration of hon. members. I am opposed to the Crawley site, although at the same time I am not in favour of the site proposed in King's Park. I am opposed to Crawley on the grounds of inaccessibility, health, obscurity of site, and lack of suitability in respect to position and appearance. During the 26 years I have lived in the State I have had a good deal of experience of Crawley. I may say I have never been there, either in the daytime or at night, without experiencing inconvenience; at night from the mosquitoes and miasma, and in the daytime from the heat and a feeling of suffocation. The site is very much shut in. It is shut in all round from the cool southerly, south-westerly and westerly breezes. The only open portion is towards the east; and in the morning of a hot day the easterly sun reflected off the water inflicts considerable inconvenience and discomfort upon those living at or near Crawley. Another matter worthy of consideration is the plague of mosquitoes to be found in the locality at night time. Hon. members may laugh at the suggestion, but it is a matter of some moment to those living there. We have had in the daily Press an expression of opinion from a well known authority who has given his views with regard to Crawley. Though I am not at liberty to mention names, I have had another opinion from an equally good authority.

Hon. Sir. J. W. Hackett: Who is the one you refer to?

Hon. D. G. GAWLER: I do not propose to mention names.

Hon. Sir J. W. Hackett: I mean the first one you referred to.

Hon. D. G. GAWLER: Sir Edward Stone. But I have had an opinion from one who is even perhaps a higher authority than is Sir Edward Stone, and that authority tells me than in the morning Crawley is a sea of fog; that if you look out of the windows at Crawley you can see nothing but the fog and miasma, while in the evening the mosquitoes are a perfect pest. This winter has been a

comparatively dry one; had it been a normal or, as might at any time happen, an abnormal one, the ground down there would be one extensive swamp.

Hon. Sir. J. W. Hackett: That never happens.

Hon. D. G. GAWLER: I venture to differ from the hon. member. I object to the site for another reason, namely, its unsuitability. It is a long distance from town. Until that district is settled the tramway must run to a dead end; because when the tramway system is continued to Cottesloe or Claremont it is not likely to go round that way, but will pass the other side of Subiaco; so that for many years to come the Crawley district must represent a dead end to the tramway, which means it will be a big undertaking on the part of the tramway authorities to run a convenient service solely for the purposes of the University.

Hon. J. D. Connolly: How many students will be there?

Hon. D. G. GAWLER: It is a matter for conjecture. Another objection is the obscurity of the position; the position is absolutely obscured from view.

Hon. J. D. Connolly: But they are going to build it up some twelve feet in the air.

Hon. D. G. GAWLER: Even then it will only be seen by those passing by water. The appearance of the University will be absolutely lost. Mr. Cullen suggests as a site the highest available spot in King's Park. To be suitable it must be a high spot, but I am afraid Mr. Cullen will not get a high available spot in King's Park without taking away that portion which, to my mind, should be sacred to the people. If Mr. Cullen goes further and says "never mind about the highest available spot, let us have it in King's Park-road," there comes up again the difficulty of inaccessibility to a large extent, and unsuitableness in point of position and appearance. If you are going to put it in a lower position than the highest available in King's Park you might just as well have it at Crawley at once. You cannot take a good site in King's Park

without invading the rights of the people. If we are to have it far away we must have it in King's Park-road where we can run trams to it.

Hon. J. D. Connolly: Nothing would destroy the park more quickly.

Hon. D. G. GAWLER: Then the objection raised by Sir Wintthrop Hackett as to the unsuitability of such a position for young people going down there at night is at once emphasised if you have it anywhere off the road. Therefore we do not accept that situation. The question is, where should we choose one? Mr. Moss has suggested West Subiaco. With the exception, perhaps, of position and appearance, I think almost the same objections may be raised to West Subiaco as apply to Crawley. Where then are we to go? I agreed with Mr. Kingsmill when he suggested the Observatory site. I am quite aware that I have many eminent authorities against me with regard to that.

Hon. Sir J. W. Hackett: Everybody.

Hon. D. G. GAWLER: Still I maintain my opinion. The objection is to the limited area. I may be wrong, but to my mind the consideration of a University should be confined largely to its educational purposes, and to facilities in respect to building. I do not think we should look so much towards its recreative requirements. If we have 17 acres up there then to my mind that would, to a very large extent, fill the bill in respect to the buildings for many years to come. For that purpose it is a large area, and it would not only provide sufficient accommodation for building but there would be a few acres over for tennis courts, gymnasium, and things like that. As to other outside recreations, such as cricket, rowing or football, I see no difficulty in getting suitable grounds outside the University. For rowing purposes the site is sufficiently near to the river. Clerks in the City who indulge in rowing travel a greater distance than that, so why should not the students do the same? As for cricket and football, there are other grounds available, while tennis courts are already provided in King's

Park. The Adelaide University stands on five acres, and recreation grounds are provided outside.

Hon. F. Connor: Why not resume Parliament House?

Hon. D. G. GAWLER: If the 17 acres are not sufficient, it would be possible to resume a further area of land down to Hay-street, the cost of which would not be so very great. The cost of Crawley, I believe, amounts to £46,000.

Hon. J. D. Connolly: It costs more than that, and they are going to include other land.

Hon. D. G. GAWLER: I venture to say the money they are expending on the exchange of the properties would be very much better expended on the Observatory site which, as far as appearance and position are concerned, would be an ideal spot. I think one important consideration in connection with a University should be the architectural beauty of its buildings. It will last for many generations and will be added to considerably, and for a long time to come should be a noble pile of buildings; but it will be thrown away on any but a commanding site. It is not necessary to touch upon the question of free education, but I would like to say that I do not go to the extent that some members do in regard to free education. I think it is liable to be more a burden to the State than an advantage. If we over-educate the people, we make education cheap and nasty, and there is no value in it. However, I will not touch on that question further, but with regard to the question before the House I hope I have made it clear that I personally cannot support Crawley, and for the reasons I have explained, I cannot support the motion.

On motion by Hon. J. D. Connolly, debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 8.16 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly,

*Tuesday, 10th September, 1912.*

	PAGE
Questions: Meat Supply, State retail shop, Kalgoorlie	1547
Public Service Appeal Board	1547
Papers presented	1548
Government Business, Precedence	1548
Bills: Unclaimed Moneys, 3R.	1548
Election of Senators Amendment, 3R.	1548
High School Act Amendment, 3R.	1548
State Hotels, 2R.	1548
Game, 1R.	1591
Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, Returned	1591

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

### QUESTION—MEAT SUPPLY, STATE RETAIL SHOP, KALGOORLIE.

Mr. MUNSIE (for Mr. Green) asked the Honorary Minister (Hon. W. C. Angwin): 1, Is the Minister aware that the sales of Government cattle in the open market at Kalgoorlie have not reduced the price of meat to the public? 2, In view of the foregoing will the Minister take into consideration the establishment of a Government retail shop at Kalgoorlie, so as to have the same satisfactory effect as has been achieved in Perth?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister) replied: 1, The prices have been reduced. 2, In view of the foregoing it is not considered necessary at present.

### QUESTION — PUBLIC SERVICE APPEAL BOARD.

Mr. GILL asked the Premier: 1, Will he give all officers of the clerical division who are now on the permanent staff under "The Public Service Act, 1904," an opportunity of voting at the forthcoming election, if any, of a representative and a deputy representative of their division on the Public Service Appeal Board? 2, Will a list of those who have been placed on the permanent staff since June, 1911, be supplied to the returning officer? If not, why not?

The PREMIER replied: 1, The regulations provide for this being done. 2, Yes.