

MR. BATH: What the hon. member wanted to-day was what they did in the old days.

MR. JACOBY: The hon. member for Hannans could not really lay claim to be more humane or generous than any other member in the House. We had to see that proper power was given to those administering the Act to maintain discipline, the only possible way in which a very serious outbreak might be prevented. The safeguards in the Bill were quite sufficient. The hon. member would not trust the officers of the prison nor the visiting justices.

MR. BATH denied having said that.

On motion by the **MINISTER FOR WORKS**, progress reported and leave given to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 10.25 o'clock, until the next Tuesday.

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 6th October, 1903.

	PAGE
Royal Portraits	1386
Questions: Postcards Illustrated	1388
Sewerage Scheme, Perth and Suburbs	1389
Return ordered: Royal Commissions, particulars	1389
Bills: Merchant Shipping Act Application, third reading	1389
University Endowment, second reading concluded, in Committee, reported	1389
Assent to Bills (2)	1402

THE PRESIDENT took the Chair at 4.30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

ROYAL PORTRAITS.

THE PRESIDENT: Members would bear in mind that on the 23rd January last year he reported to the House that he had received a letter from the Secretary of State for the Colonies to the

then Governor, Sir Arthur Lawley, informing us that portraits of their Majesties the King and Queen had been presented to the Legislative Council. The portrait of His Majesty the King had now arrived, and was on the wall of the Chamber; but in regard to recording our thanks, it would be better to wait until we received also the portrait of Her Majesty the Queen, and then we could pass a vote of thanks from this House to their Majesties for the portraits. As he had mentioned, the portrait of the Queen would follow shortly. In the meantime the portrait of the King could remain on the wall of the Chamber, and he was sure all hoped that His Majesty would long live to reign over this Empire.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the **COLONIAL SECRETARY:** 1, Plans of proposed Hospital for the Insane at Claremont. 2, Western Australian Government Railways—Alterations to classification and Rate Book. 3, Roads Act, 1902—By-laws of the Nelson Roads Board. 4, Public Works Department—(a) Reports on the Water Supply of Perth, including the townships between Midland Junction and Fremantle. (b) Reports on the Sewerage of Perth and its environs. 5, The Life Assurance Companies Act, 1899—Returns under Section 60.

Ordered, to lie on the table.

QUESTION—POSTCARDS (ILLUSTRATED).

HON. S. J. HAYNES, for Mr. Piesse, asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, If the Government is aware that it is the intention of the Deputy Postmaster General to shortly issue illustrated postcards for this State. 2, If so, will the Government take steps to have agricultural views prominently represented in connection with such issue?

THE PRESIDENT: This question seemed to deal with a matter over which the State had no control, being a federal matter.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY said he had no objection to furnish replies. Replying to 1 and 2, the question had been referred to the Federal Government, and on receipt of a reply the information would be transmitted to the hon. member.

QUESTION—SEWERAGE SCHEME,
PERTH AND SUBURBS.

HON. G. BELLINGHAM asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, If the Government has considered the question of a deep drainage or other suitable scheme for the disposal of sewage of Perth and suburbs. 2, If so, what is the scheme.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: 1 and 2, Parliamentary Papers on the subject have already been distributed, and it is the intention of the Government to introduce legislation this session.

RETURN—ROYAL COMMISSIONS, PARTICULARS.

HON. G. BELLINGHAM moved that a return be laid on the table of the House, showing—1, The number and names of the Royal Commissions held during the present Parliament. 2, The *personnel* of same. 3, The attendance and fees received by each individual member.

THE PRESIDENT: I drew attention the other day to the fact that members moving for returns of this kind should give some reason, and not move purely formally. I should require this to be done because these returns require a great deal of labour in preparation, and because I think members of the House have a right to some explanation why the returns are asked for.

HON. G. BELLINGHAM: I moved this motion for the purpose of seeing the number of Royal Commissions that have sat during the present Parliament, because to my idea there has been a very great amount of money spent, and to a great extent uselessly, in these Royal Commissions. The appointments of those members who have to sit on commissions are made by the Government, and I should very much sooner see these appointments made by Parliament.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: That is the most republican proposition ever made in this Chamber.

HON. G. BELLINGHAM: It may be, but we are in a rather democratic time.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: You will have to alter the Constitution.

HON. G. BELLINGHAM: The attendances and fees received by each individual member of these commissions is a matter which will be rather an eye-

opener to a great many of us, and it is for that purpose, and for the purpose of a motion which I will bring forward later on, that I wish this return laid on the table of the House.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I was quite prepared to meet this purely formal motion, but as the hon. member has given his reasons, I will defer any remarks I have to make on the subject until the motion he has announced makes its appearance before the Chamber. I shall have very much pleasure in giving him the information he asks for in the shape of this return, in order that he may be fully armed for the criticism of these Royal Commissions. I have no objection whatever to the passage of the motion.

Question passed, and the return ordered.

MERCHANT SHIPPING ACT APPLICATION BILL.

Read a third time, and transmitted to the Legislative Assembly.

UNIVERSITY ENDOWMENT BILL.

SECOND READING.

Debate resumed from 29th September.

HON. J. W. HACKETT (South-West): I have to thank the House for giving me the opportunity of addressing myself to this most interesting and most important Bill. I have nothing but congratulations to offer the Colonial Secretary on being the first to introduce a measure of this kind into the Parliament of Western Australia; and I can assure him it is my belief that, if the Government press on with the matter, if it is not merely a shadow of a great name, and if they are resolved to carry out the conception of a university which I trust and believe is the right conception of a university for this State, if the James Government did nothing else they would be deserving of the gratitude of their country and to their place in the history of its people for their action in this respect. The Bill is a very simple one, and requires really no comment at all. I have only one to offer—that the Bill will not be left a dead letter, and by "dead letter" I mean that there will not be merely a university endowed with a few hundred acres, such as I know it is the intention of the Government to

endow it with, but that there will be ample funds at its disposal to carry out to the fullest extent the ideal of a modern university suited to the requirements of the day. This will be a very much more expensive thing than a university founded on the lines of Oxford and Cambridge, attended by the children of the well-to-do whose fees go to a considerable extent towards supporting such institutions, and which source of supply will be cut off from a university such as I trust will be established in Western Australia. I hope, therefore, there will be no niggard hand on the part of the Governor-in-Council in giving such lands to this body which in years to come—and I trust it will be a very few years—will be able to do justice to a modern university; in which case I can assure the hon. gentleman the university which I suppose will be in Perth, the centre, or wherever it will be, will in my firm conviction take the lead of any other university within the Commonwealth.

HON. E. H. WITTEOOM: And take the Minister's name.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: No; I think it would be a more suitable thing if my friend would become a convert, which I think he will. I know his career. He has always opposed these proposals, but in the end he always proposes them. I am satisfied he will yet rise in his place and congratulate the Government on their foresight and wisdom in introducing this Bill. A university such as we desire this university to be—and I am speaking now as one who feels most absolutely identified with this movement—should, to my mind, conform to three main requirements. In the first place it should be a practical university. In the second place it should be within the reach of all, which means the rich and poor. I for my part do not contemplate to any degree the sons of the well-to-do taking advantage of this university. If it is to be founded on lines likely to prove successful, it will be a university for the poor man, the working man and the working woman. Thirdly I beg to impress on the attention of the Government this requirement, that the university should be largely endowed. We can make provision for primary education on modern lines, and I observe the Government intend to do something with regard

to secondary education, and it will not cost very much; but I am satisfied that a modern university to do its work should receive an endowment that would stagger the House, if it were to be put into figures. I do not think a university will do its work effectually or thoroughly for a few years under £30,000, £40,000, or £50,000 a year. It seems to be hopeless and impossible to expect that this amount will be contributed from the funds of the State; but it is perfectly possible and feasible that it should be the result of an income derived from the lands with which the university is endowed, and which in a very short time, owing to the development of the State, will be worth even the handsome figure I have already mentioned. The Cornell University, the leading practical university of the United States, or what was the leading practical university, for I believe Chicago in desiring to be first in all modern ideas has outstripped the Cornell University, had an endowment of between nine hundred thousand and a million acres placed at its disposal in the State of New York. I know there are objections raised to this proposed university. I have taken down some of them. We have been told that the teaching will be useless for the majority of the population, and on this I shall have something to say in a moment or two. We are told that the teaching is to strictly conform to the English idea of a university. I would like to lay great stress on the words "English idea." We are also told that there will be no demand for the teaching, and that there will be no prospect of sufficient means. Happily that, after all, is no stumbling block. The action of the Government purposes to remove it. We are told that it will be a university only for the rich; but I entirely agree with my friend on the left: the rich are not likely to attend it. The sons of the well-to-do, who do not go to the sister universities in the Eastern States, which are supposed to be more genteel—and I use the word in its vulgar sense—than universities for working men, will go to the old country and will surely not put up with the teaching which I think this university is intended to supply. All these matters will answer themselves shortly. What I wish to point out is how entirely—from the few remarks

dropped even by so enlightened and practical a gentleman as my friend the Hon. B. C. O'Brien, due I think to his not having fully studied the question, and other members of this House—it is necessary to go back a little and discover what the true idea of a university is, and how far an English university is applicable or not applicable to the State of Western Australia in its present conditions. It is a most extraordinary thing that any person in an English-speaking country—well, it is not extraordinary, but it is remarkable that any person in an English-speaking country who uses the word “university” makes two mistakes. One is the idea that a university, according to the derivation of the word, means a seminary or institution which teaches everything within the universe. The second mistake is the supposition that a university, unless it follows more or less on the lines of the two great honoured universities, Oxford and Cambridge, is not a university at all. We all know what, till a few years ago, were the subjects to which Oxford and Cambridge were confined, and I will go so far as to say that if those subjects, which mainly embrace the classics and the higher mathematics, were excluded from the curriculum of this new university, it would be much to be regretted. It certainly would not add to its credit in the eyes of the world. It would expose it to derision in various directions; but to my mind it would not interfere to any serious extent with the efficiency of the university and the beneficial character of the education which it should be intended to give. Till a few years ago those who founded English universities founded them upon the model of those two great institutions. They were persuaded that the main things to be lived for were the graces of culture, that polish which the race received from the study of the great masterpieces of literary art, or from examinations in the lunar theories, or the differential calculus. These were the aims of those universities, and these were considered the *summum bonum* of human attainment as far as universities could help them to that end. They all sought to make pale, ineffectual imitations to a large extent of Oxford and Cambridge. A few were successful, but the larger part naturally suffered the fate of all

plagiarisms—they became ridiculous, they became useless. I may say here that during the speech on the Address-in-reply I perhaps interrupted my hon. friend (Sir E. H. Wittenoom) a little too sharply, but I was displeased at his laying the axe to the root of a tree which I hope before my days are ended to see a flourishing monarch of the forest in Western Australia. He stated that he had been informed that it was only the sons of the rich who went to the American universities. I can very well believe my hon. friend receiving the information, but from whom did he receive it, and what colleges did his informant refer to? I think that is easily answered. When the English migration to America took place they endeavoured to transplant, as they put it literally, a New England to the new continent, and amongst other things naturally they must introduce something which reminded them of Oxford and Cambridge; the consequence being that such great universities sprang up as Harvard, Yale, and Princeton, and these are almost altogether given over to the dominion of rich men. On the subject of American universities there is a most interesting chapter in Bryce's Commentary, the writer following very much the lines I am following now. These universities now contain a smattering of poor men's sons, but it was not Harvard or Yale or Princeton which could make America, though they are those of which America is most proud, but those newer classes, especially those in the Western States such as the great university I have mentioned, Cornell. Harvard, Yale, Princeton, and their sister universities are all founded on one eternal model. The result is that to a large extent their studies are restricted in the same degree, and with very few exceptions—those only introduced in the last few years—they content themselves with acquiring the literary and scientific research which has been a marked recommendation of the Oxford and Cambridge universities. But all that is now changed. I took down a few figures in regard to America, which are 20 years old. I went back a considerable time so that it might not be said this is a new idea, and at all events I tried to get back as nearly as possible to a state of things which might bear better comparison with ourselves.

At that time there were 370 colleges, and nearly all, if not all, comparatively new ; but I for my part believe that to a great extent America is rushing to the other extreme and is creating a number of degree-making factories—it really amounts to nothing more—which are an object of scorn and contempt among Americans as with us. The great bulk of those 370 deal with the practical work of life, and simply set themselves out to prepare the sons and daughters of the people for battling with the conditions of existence and enable them to rise. The income from funds belonging to the 370 colleges—"college" means university to a large extent in the United States—amounted to £700,000, and the students numbered 33,000 ; the value of the buildings was £9,000,000 sterling, and the books on the shelves even 20 years ago numbered 2,500,000. Those figures I think in nearly all cases may be doubled with regard to these same institutions at the present time, with the exception of the number of colleges, for there is a feeling that they have enough if not too many of these institutions in many of the States of the Union. It is not the American university which I desire to see embodied here, but rather the German ; and I will not inflict myself at any length on the House with regard to this matter, only to record my conviction that I at least have been converted by those who urge that the great progress of Germany has been due in the largest degree to its system of higher education. We are all familiar with the life-and-death struggle now going on in the old country. We are aware that Mr. Chamberlain says that England's sun is set unless she can take steps to reassert her old commercial supremacy in the world, or at all events make herself the paramount and dominant manufacturer and commercial partner in the British Empire. The columns of newspapers have been full, and very full indeed, of his views, and Mr. Balfour's views are no doubt present in the memory of members of the Council. But it is worth recording that a large number of Englishmen long ago pointed out that the commercial supremacy of England was threatened and would probably be found to be on the wane, and the explanation they gave was the same as I invite members to receive now, that

sufficient attention was not being paid to practical education, that this was almost altogether neglected. The Governments of other countries were devoting themselves heart and soul to the question, lavishing their funds in order to create a superior technical system of instruction ; and when that was created it was an easy matter to grapple the palm of the commercial battle from countries which were lagging behind in these important matters. A little periodical called *Nature* is I suppose familiar to most of the members of this House. There is in it an article on higher education in Great Britain and Germany, a contrast between the two being given, and it is largely based on a report made by the British Consul at Stuttgart, Dr. F. Rose. This is an English journal, and I have an American paper almost on the same lines, but I forbore to bring it down, believing that "made in America" might create a prejudice. This is made in England. It says that in the Berlin Technical High School alone—one technical school in one town—there were more third and fourth year students of engineering than in all the universities and colleges of the United Kingdom put together. These technical high schools are of the very same standing as the universities. Their curriculum is of course different from that of our universities, but the amount of knowledge for the curriculum, the standard of attainment, is, *ceteris paribus*, equal to that required for our national universities. Farther, it goes on to say that none of those German students were under 20, whilst the English figures could only be obtained by counting every student of this standing over 17. The writer proceeds:—

To what must we attribute our great inferiority in this respect ? In the first place to the condition of secondary education in this country ; secondly to the fact that German and American manufacturers believe in technical education, while many of their competitors in this country are still blind to its advantages ; and thirdly to the fact that while our Government contributes with liberality to elementary education, it is exceedingly parsimonious in its dealings with higher education.

It goes on to say :—

As to Germany, Dr. Rose's report mentions the following facts. The Prussian State gave to the Berlin Technical High School alone in 1871 an annual subvention of £8,511. This grant has

been gradually increased until in 1899 it amounted to £33,675: while in the same year the total grant to the three Prussian technical high schools reached the sum of £65,350, being more than half the total revenues of these institutions.

I may say that this great advance in technical education and higher education in Germany has only taken place since the Franco-Prussian war, since so recent a date as that, and that it is coincident with the period in which the English decline has set in. Then as to attendance it says:—

The attendance at German universities, technical, agricultural—

and it is a shame that at Cambridge such a course has not been made a university one—

veterinary high schools, etc., has increased from 17,761 in 1870 to 46,520 in 1900; or to state the matter in another way, there were in such institutions in 1870 about nine students for every 10,000 male inhabitants of Germany, while in 1900 there were nearly seventeen students for every 10,000 male inhabitants. The rate of increase has been much more rapid in the technical high schools, though the universities also have made progress; the actual figures given by Dr. Rose are for the universities 13,674 students in 1870, and 32,834 in 1900.

and so on. Then he concludes, and the final sentences are worth remembering. He summarises the result of his extensive inquiries:—

The technical high schools cannot boast of the proud traditions of the old universities, nor are their buildings and institutions regarded with those feelings of gratitude and reverence which a long and honourable career in the service of humanity naturally inspires; but in default of this they can point to an almost perfect organisation and equipment for modern requirements, and to a development within the last 40 years almost unparalleled in the annals of educational history.

It is a subject of almost continual regret to me that when Australia set out to create her universities she did not look a little farther afield, to Germany or America for a model, instead of keeping her eyes always backward on the universities of the motherland. Had she done so the universities of Sydney and Adelaide would be better than they are. It is only England that houses the idea that the Oxford and Cambridge system is the ideal; but even in England I hope to see that it is no longer regarded as the ideal. The Victoria University was the first to

work out of the old rule, and it was followed afterwards by Birmingham. It is a curious thing that Mr. Chamberlain, who I believe is chancellor of that university and delivers an address every year, when he delivered his last address, which I have read with the greatest interest, seemed absolutely unconscious of the great work that Birmingham was performing, and of the work proposed to be done by that university. His address might well have been delivered at Oxford or Cambridge, Dublin or Edinburgh—at least the Edinburgh of the past. As to Birmingham, they have just made an appeal for a million sterling to carry forward their work, the money to be contributed from private funds. The Birmingham University advertises, and sends advertisements to the advertising sheets of the weekly or daily Press setting forth its advantages and its need of students. To show what they teach in Birmingham I will read you what one school does. The whole of the faculty, of course, gives the degrees, but this is what one school in the faculty advertises, and I take the advertisement from the columns of a weekly periodical. It says:—

The School of Mining meets the requirements of those who intend to become practising and consultative mining engineers, colliery managers, managers of metal mines, teachers of mining, mine surveyors, land and estate owners, land owners, owners of collieries, and those generally interested in mines and quarries.

A course could not be imagined more out of accord with the old university conception. These are subjects to which a modern university should give its main attention. In a place like Western Australia, where our first and principal industry is mining, such a course should have a dominant position. In addition to this, at Birmingham they would be instructed in practical electricity—a very different thing from theoretical electricity; and in the schools they propose to teach public health, commerce, agricultural education, and even such things as dentistry and brewing. I venture to say that if this movement initiated in Birmingham is taken up with enthusiasm in England, the cry of England's decadence need no longer be raised, but she will be able to hold her own in the markets of the world. I trust that I have said sufficient, and I will not delay

the House much longer, to justify the existence of what I call a modern university in Western Australia, and to justify the Government in providing ample means for its necessities, both by grants of money and by this admirable method they have brought down of providing an endowment of the land of the State. For my own part, even if the university were established in a year, it seems to me we have sufficient to work upon. We should take those with any ambition and with higher desire for the advancement of their country from the primary schools, the secondary schools, the technical schools, the schools of mining, the training college, the agricultural schools, and so on. We could very easily sweep in a sufficient number to make a respectable start at the very outset. The only question to be answered is, Why provide a university? Why not leave the students to the present means and the present appliances for pursuing their studies? The answer to that is very clear. In the first place these institutions and these academies to which I refer do not carry their course far enough. They get as a rule no farther advanced than the sixth form in an English school, in a proportionate degree. But there is a stronger reason. It is due to what may be called the prejudice or predilection of the Englishman for a degree. Unless you establish a system of degrees, for even diplomas would not do because they take second place, people will not believe in the first place that it is a university at all, or in the second place that they will have any reward for their ambition. We should need a most valuable stamp on the knowledge and experience students are supposed to gain, and need the protection and prestige of a degree. We also should know that it is only through a university that a perfectly adequate amount of instruction and appliances for giving it can be provided. We know it is a university that sets the standard in the examinations which regulate all the schools and seminaries of a State. As it were, it makes the furrows that every aspiring boy and girl will be ambitious of ploughing. It is this which the Bill will establish or bring into existence. These are a few of the reasons why we should give a university to those higher branches

of studies which would be included in the higher system of instruction a university would give. I have already delayed the House too long. I may express once more my emphatic approval of the step the Government have taken, and can fully reiterate my belief that it will be long remembered of the James Government as a wreath of laurel would be by one of the contestants at one of the olden games. I have great pleasure in supporting the second reading.

SIR E. H. WITTENOOM (North): As I made a few remarks in connection with this subject in the debate on the Address-in-reply, I think it will not be out of place if I address myself to it again for a few moments. I feel certain that in doing so it will hardly be necessary for me to say, if I perhaps take a different view from other people in connection with the establishment of a university, that it is not to be taken as opposed to progressive education. On the contrary no one who has at all followed my career in the past would say that I have not done a good deal for the development of education in Western Australia. We have listened with a great deal of pleasure to the admirable speech of the Hon. Dr. Hackett, and I do not think anyone in the House will quarrel with a word he has said. The advantages of a university are obvious; but my view of the matter is that it is quite premature to take any step in this direction at the present time. However I do not propose to oppose this Bill in any way, for the reason that the Government have not asked that any grant should be made. Had they asked for the expenditure of any money, I should have opposed the Bill. In saying that a university is premature I mean to say that expenditure of money in other directions would do a great deal more good to the State. It is not that we are deficient in an educational system here. I think all must admit that we have one of the best elementary systems we could possibly have. Our secondary education is fairly good. I am not going to say it is first class, but it is fairly good. We are also, I believe, making strides in the proper direction of technical education. These are the three things we want in a State like Western Australia: first an elementary system, then a secondary system, and thirdly a first-class technical

system. The Hon. Dr. Hackett says first of all that we should have a university, and then he speaks for some considerable time and endeavours to prove to us that what we really want is a first-class technical school. He states he does not want a university on the lines of Oxford and Cambridge, but on more modern lines, and he instances the subjects he prefers or wishes or thinks it necessary to teach in those schools; but they all point clearly to the fact that they are either advanced technical schools or advanced secondary schools.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Why are they taught in every modern university?

SIR E. H. WITTENOOM: They are not taught in Oxford or Cambridge.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: I say every modern university.

SIR E. H. WITTENOOM: They are technical schools. I pointed out when speaking about America that the universities or higher classes of schools there were put at the disposal of the labouring classes for a mere song; that they had nothing to pay for it; and yet there was evidence that they hardly availed themselves of it, not because those institutions were on the system of Oxford and Cambridge, but because the principal inhabitants of America are hard-working people, and as soon as they have a fair education they go to work. It is not the cost which puts education outside them. It is because, having got a good, fair, practical education they immediately go to work, and the argument there is that there are not sufficient people of leisure to take advantage of it. Therefore those expensive universities are kept up principally for the wealthy. Taking our own case here, I am of opinion that very few people would be able to avail themselves of a university, not because it would be too expensive—you may put a university at their disposal for nothing—but simply because they have not the time to give up years of their life, from 16 to 20 or something of that kind, to learning. If I were assured that the institution would be well attended, I would be one of the first to support it, and I recognise the advantages of the extra teaching which we would get should the people avail themselves of it; but I am quite certain they would not. The majority of people get a good elementary edu-

cation, and a good many get a good secondary education. A few of those who could not avail themselves perhaps of the day schools or night schools and who wanted university education could go to Adelaide, Melbourne, or Sydney.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: That is the view that is ruining England.

SIR E. H. WITTENOOM: I do not agree with you. I took the trouble to find out what the technical school in Sydney was doing, and they assured me its existence was hardly justified. I went through it, and found that one could learn almost everything, from painting from nature down to sorting wool.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: That was some time ago.

SIR E. H. WITTENOOM: Five or six years ago. I was informed that they were not well supported.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: They are very well supported now.

SIR E. H. WITTENOOM: If a population of half a million could not support a technical institution, how are we, with a population of 200,000, going to support a university? However, we are not going to have a university just at present. I am making these remarks in justification of what I said the other day, and to record my own opinion that the present time would be premature for a university. I do not find fault with what the Government are doing now. I think perhaps they are to be praised for it. They are making provision for the future; and as they are not making demands upon the revenue, no practical need can be found; but were they doing so, there are, I think, many ways in which money could be spent for the State which would have far better results than any which we should get from the amount of attendance that there would be at a university. I shall support the Bill on the grounds I have stated.

HON. J. M. DREW (Central): I do not intend to oppose this measure, because I find it does not provide for the immediate establishment of a university, but enables endowments or grants of lands, and gifts and bequests to be made on behalf of a future university. Trustees will be appointed, and these trustees will be enabled to receive

grants of lands and get bequests from the Government and others; but I consider the time is not yet ripe for founding a university in this State, and I hope that no university will be founded until the population of Western Australia is at least double what it is at present. The population of Queensland is about 490,000 and they have no university there. It is true that when Sydney university was established the population was only 187,243.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: And Adelaide?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: About 300,000.

HON. J. M. DREW: The Adelaide university was established in 1874. At the time Sydney University was established there were no other universities in Australia, and until then people who wished their children to receive the highest education had to send them to Oxford or Cambridge. No such necessity exists with regard to Western Australia. We are within a convenient distance of Adelaide, Melbourne, and Sydney at the present time, and when we get the Trans-Australian Railway it will place us in still closer connection with them. I find that when Sydney University was first founded the income was something like £5,000 a year, and during five or six years the cost of the buildings amounted to £60,000; but from what Dr. Hackett has stated, something larger is proposed for Western Australia, an expenditure of something like £60,000 a year.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: From land.

HON. J. M. DREW: If certain expenditure is required, it must come from the State. I fail to see why the State as a whole should bear such a burden on behalf of one section of the community. Only one section of the community can get the benefits to be obtained from it. How can poor people send their children to a university? In the first place there is the expense, and then, as Sir Edward Wittenoom pointed out, there is the loss of time, a boy being away from the age of perhaps 16 to 21. How are his parents to get along without his assistance? Can they afford to keep him at school and clothe him? I am sure they cannot.

HON. G. RANDELL: What about President Garfield?

HON. J. M. DREW: If we spend money to provide educational facilities, those educational facilities should be provided for the mining communities in the back blocks and people in the country.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: That is already being done.

HON. J. M. DREW: There are many places where no schools are established.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Very few.

HON. J. M. DREW: If we have money, I think that before we involve ourselves in expenditure which we are informed will eventually amount to about £60,000 a year—

HON. J. W. HACKETT: I hope it will.

HON. J. M. DREW: We should provide education for children in the back blocks of the State.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: What children?

MEMBER: We have done very well in that direction.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Perhaps some member from two centuries ago will address the House.

HON. S. J. HAYNES (South-East): I listened with very much pleasure indeed to the very able address which Dr. Hackett gave us, but I have come to the conclusion that the establishment of a university at the present time would be somewhat premature. I am entirely in sympathy with the views advocated by the doctor, but I do not think that, having regard to its population, this State at the present time is in a position to warrant the expenditure on a university upon lines laid down by the hon. member. However, that matter at the present time is hardly before the House; but with respect to the Bill before us, I am in entire sympathy with it, because the measure is at any rate one making preparation for what we ultimately hope to have, a university as portrayed by Dr. Hackett, in which the curriculum will not only include the technical subjects referred to, but also the classics and higher mathematics. A university of that class would be an exceedingly expensive institution to carry on. Reference has been made to universities established elsewhere. I think we all know that those universities have had a pretty hard time of it to make headway.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Which do you mean?

HON. S. J. HAYNES: I refer particularly to the one in South Australia.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: It deserved it; but it is now getting on to modern lines.

HON. S. J. HAYNES: It has had a very big struggle indeed, and it is well known that gifts expected did not come in, although one or two persons have made every large donations.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: £120,000 from one man.

HON. S. J. HAYNES: Even with these gifts it has taken it all its time to struggle along. However, I shall support the second reading of the Bill. As I say, I think that at the present moment our State is such that it would be premature to establish a university now, but at the same time I quite agree with the words which have fallen from previous speakers with respect to the absolute necessity of improving our education in technical and practical matters, and I hope the Government will improve those as speedily as possible. With respect to the Bill before the House it has, I say, my entire sympathy. It is preparing for what I think we all hope will be established some day, a university which will be rich in practical and technical subjects, and also give the classics and higher mathematics a show; so that whatever degrees may emanate from that university, they will be respected in all parts of the world, and that the majority of those who obtain them will at any rate receive the hall-mark of being thoroughly competent and thoroughly well educated in certain things which it is best to know. This Endowment Bill will no doubt lead to that object ultimately, but there is one clause to which I desire to draw the attention of members. There is only one clause that I intend to refer to, and that is perhaps the most important one in the Bill. I mean Clause 4, which seems to me to give a very wide hand indeed. I would rather see it laid down what the Government propose to do. The clause says, "By way of permanent endowment, the Governor may grant or demise to the trustees such lands of the Crown as he may think fit."

HON. J. D. CONNOLLY: Let them put it in the Bill.

HON. S. J. HAYNES: I would rather see what the Government propose to do in the Bill than give them such a big margin as that. Supposing there were an excessive grant?

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Then it could be taken away.

HON. S. J. HAYNES: That clause seems to give a very free hand. As has been remarked, that might be repealed, but at the same time I would rather see practically what the Government propose to have done at the present time, and I am sure that whatever is brought forward will be dealt with in an exceedingly liberal spirit, because the object is undoubtedly good, and would tend to increase and promote the welfare of this State.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: The trustees can do nothing until another Bill is brought in.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The land could not possibly be specified at present.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Another Bill would have to be brought in to explain what had been done with the land.

HON. S. J. HAYNES: That may be explained in Committee, but I just drew attention to the clause as it appeared to me. If Clause 4, having regard to other clauses, means that the lands which the Government are proposing to endow the university with will have to pass this House, I shall agree with the Bill in its entirety.

HON. J. D. CONNOLLY (North): Although this Bill has not my entire sympathy, I do not intend to oppose the second reading. I am quite alive to the great benefits of a university, but at the same time I quite agree with hon. members that this thing is premature in a little State like ours with less than a quarter of a million inhabitants. I think it can well be said that the establishment of a university is altogether premature. To my mind it would be better to have one Australian university of some standing, instead of each State having its own university.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: You could never get over the jealousy.

HON. J. D. CONNOLLY: If I had any guarantee that a university would be established on the modern lines that Dr. Hackett speaks of, it would have my

entire sympathy; but, as far as I can gather from the remarks of that hon. member, his university would be simply the same as the schools of mines which we have already established, and technical schools which we are now establishing. Although in favour of the principle of the establishment of a university, I certainly do not agree with the scheme laid down by this Bill for an endowment. I am quite at one with the Hon. S. J. Haynes, who takes exception to Clause 4. It is quite evident the Government intend to endow this university with some lands, or they would not introduce the Bill. Why should they not state it in the Bill? Parliament, as representative of the people, should say what the endowment should be. Why should we give away the right of the people to endow the university with any amount of Crown lands? In Committee I hope the Bill will be amended to read "with the consent of Parliament," and then the Government can at the present time state what they wish to endow the board with, and in the future it could be done with the consent of Parliament. I certainly object to Clause 4 as it stands now, and also to Clause 7. I feel that it gives the trustees, with the consent of the Governor, too much power altogether to allow them to transfer and exchange lands. I also object to Clause 9, which says that no taxes shall be charged or levied on this property. That is extremely unfair. We can imagine that the endowment of Crown lands would be in South Perth. In 10 or 20 years' time it would be built on and would become surrounded by the city. The municipality would have to make roads for the board, without receiving one penny in rates.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: That is wrong. They have to pay rates. Read the latter part of the clause.

HON. J. D. CONNOLLY: It provides for it in some respects, but why should they not pay rates on all their lands?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Not on unimproved lands.

HON. J. D. CONNOLLY: Why should they not pay rates like everyone else? As I have already remarked, this Bill has my approval with the alterations I have just mentioned.

HON. W. MALEY (South-East): It is my intention to support this Bill on this

occasion. I look upon it merely as a skeleton or framework of what will be effected later on. I agree with most of the hon. members who have spoken, that it is an early date to establish a university in our midst. I would like to know something about the site of this university, whether it is to be in Subiaco or Perth.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: So should I.

HON. W. MALEY: I would like to call attention to the beautiful arrangement existing in Adelaide, to which reference has been made. With regard to its public institutions I think that the few natural advantages in Adelaide have been made most use of on that North Terrace. The stranger who visits Adelaide can at once, within a short distance of the railway station, become acquainted with all those beautiful edifices which are monuments of their public men of the past.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: It is a very bad place for the Adelaide university. You know it is very cramped.

HON. W. MALEY: Their public buildings, for their size and for the time they have been built, are models which we could very well follow. A few shafts have been cast at South Australia as regards its educational policy. I may say that I had the honour of attending school with a lad who paid his entrance to school life by a bursary, and received two years' free education. That lad has been most successful in his career, and is at present Professor of Engineering in the Edinburgh University. At the present time our Government have so far done well in giving scholarships to the High School, and I think scholarships should be given at the present time to colleges to induce them to farther their establishments. It would be a good thing for the State. I still hold the opinion I have expressed before that the primary schools are capable of extension, although well equipped in most parts of the State. Extension is urgently demanded in the back blocks at the present time. Very few hon. members of this House have the facilities I have of getting about the country and seeing how settlement is progressing in the agricultural portions, and I hold the opinion that the increase of population in this State is not so much on the goldfields to-day as it is in the

agricultural settlements. Every place of accommodation on the Great Southern Railway is at the present time taxed to its utmost with settlers looking for land. These settlers will bring their children with them, and these children require education. As a means of farther settlement, and as a means of encouraging people to take up land and increase the revenue of the State, it is urgently necessary that these primary schools should be farther established and fully equipped in all parts of the State. I do not mean in any degree to reflect on anything that has been done by any Government. The undertaking is almost too enormous at the present time to meet the requirements of a very sparsely populated and very large State. These are the difficulties that present themselves, and until we have thoroughly established our primary and secondary schools, and until scholarships have been given and won, no particular step should be taken to give effect to this Bill, which I hope to see passed through this House. I am very glad to see that the hon. member (Dr. Hackett) has given up the idea of the English form of university, and has come down to a lower grade, one of a practical, common-sense, technical university to meet the requirements of the State. I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

IN COMMITTEE.

Clauses 1, 2, 3—agreed to.

Clause 4—Endowment:

HON. J. D. CONNOLLY moved that the words "with the consent of Parliament" be added after the word "Governor," in line 1. Parliament had a perfect right to know what lands were to be endowed, and to express an opinion on it. He referred not only to the lands to be given now, but to the lands that might be given from time to time. Parliament should at all times know what was to be given, and whether it should be given or not.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The Committee should not accept the amendment. It practically struck at the constitution of responsible government. If Parliament had any objection to make, there was a proper constitutional way in which to make it; but if the Govern-

ment were forced to come to Parliament for every little question such as this, and consult Parliament first, it would absolutely do away with that responsibility of the Government which was in the first place accountable to Parliament. Some correspondence had appeared in the Press with regard to the land proposed to be endowed. The land would not be portion of the Perth Commonage between Mueller and Subiaco roads. That was the only land he knew there had been any public agitation about. It certainly had been discussed, and it might probably eventuate that the Government would, if this power were given to them, donate some part of the Perth Commonage as an endowment to the university, but not that part about which a considerable amount of popular feeling had arisen. He still maintained that in this connection—and strange to say in this connection alone—it was wished to limit the power which a responsible Government always possessed. Daily, reserves were declared all over the State, not by the consent of Parliament. If any objection were raised, it would be easy enough for a private member to introduce a Bill which should annul a reserve, or which in this case should annul an endowment, and the consent of Parliament might be obtained. To pass this amendment would be to limit the power of the Government which, whilst it was a responsible Government, it should possess.

SIR E. H. WITTENOOM: As a rule he quite agreed with the remarks which had fallen from the leader of the House, that the Government should take the responsibility of matters of this kind. But this was not like a grant of money. A grant of money had to come before the House and to be passed. In cases like this there might be a grant of very valuable land. Supposing the Premier of the day were imbued with enthusiasm for a university; supposing Dr. Hackett to be Premier of the day; in his enthusiasm in connection with a university he might give up 500 or 600 acres of most expensive town land, most valuable land.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: One could be turned out for it.

HON. G. RANDELL: Where could he give 500 or 600 acres?

SIR E. H. WITTENOOM: That was only an instance. The amendment rather appealed to him in this case, because he did not think the Government should have the power to give away valuable grants of land, if they felt disposed to do so, without Parliament having a say in the matter.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: The amendment really meant embodying the preamble of the Bill again in the 4th Clause. There seemed to him to be no reason for any alarm whatever. Perhaps coming events cast their shadows before. If it would be of any use he would inform his friend that if he (Dr. Hackett) were the Premier of the State he would never be a party to vesting an acre of land in these trustees. Nothing could be done farther with the university until a Bill was introduced into Parliament, and it would have to pass both Houses. This Bill merely allowed an endowment to grow. He himself would have liked to have gone a little farther, but the Government were cautious. With regard to the £50,000, the hon. member had misquoted him. What he said was that if a university was to do full justice to the State, by and by on modern lines it would require any sum from, he thought he said, £20,000 to £30,000, or £40,000, or even £50,000. One of these universities in America spent several hundreds of thousands.

HON. J. D. CONNOLLY said he was not objecting to the amount at all.

HON. G. RANDELL: If the proposal were carried, it would affect the Bill very lightly. He was not disposed to give with one hand and take away with another. He was inclined to trust the Government in a matter of this kind, in which they could have no personal interest or interest on behalf of their friends, but in which the discretion given them by Parliament must be exercised in the general interests of the whole State. He was patriotic enough with Dr. Hackett to desire that at the earliest possible moment a university might be established in this State. One man of genius passing through the university might be worth more to this State than all the money which the State would expend upon it. Such a man might have the opportunity given him to develop his genius and the powers

he possessed for the benefit of the State at large. The amendment was a most extraordinary one, which introduced a very difficult thing into the Bill, and would in his opinion make the measure practically unworkable. If it said "subject to the approval of the Legislature," there might be more reason for agreeing to the amendment, which was highly objectionable in its present form. He was not inclined to agree that the establishment of a single university in the Commonwealth was sufficient, for it would not meet the needs of the different States of which the Commonwealth was composed. Those States would not be satisfied unless in each one of them there was a university which could afford the instruction Dr. Hackett had so clearly and forcibly alluded to. One could value the culture such as was given at Oxford, Cambridge, London, and Dublin, and he valued even much more than that practical and technical education. He asked members not to throw the slightest impediment in the way.

HON. S. J. HAYNES said he did not care to have the amendment in its present form. He would like the Government to be prepared to come down and state clearly the lands they proposed to endow this university with. If this Bill were once passed, the Executive could grant such lands practically as they thought fit, and we knew that although Parliament was all-powerful, in the face of a grant of that nature there would have to be a very extreme case to undo the wrong that was done.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: It could be done by trustees.

HON. S. J. HAYNES: What he was alluding to was a public grant.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: There would be no trouble.

HON. S. J. HAYNES: There might be trouble. He could not see what objection the Government should have to scheduling what they proposed to endow this university with at the present time. He felt satisfied the Government would make a thoroughly honourable and good appointment so far as their views were concerned; but, however honourable their views, they might make a grant of a piece of land to the granting of which strong objections might be made, and

the grant having been effected it would be a very difficult matter to undo it, although Parliament was all-powerful.

HON. J. D. CONNOLLY: It was the future more than the present.

HON. S. J. HAYNES: It would be better if the lands were specified in a schedule, because there might be some strong objection to the granting of a certain piece of ground, without any reflection at all being cast upon the Government.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: It was a pity no hon. member had touched upon the point that, to insert the amendment, was striking a blow at the responsibility of the Government. There could be no answer to the question that the Government, which had power to give away land in all directions for all purposes, should have its responsibility barricaded in this particular Bill. That was absolutely unreasonable.

HON. S. J. HAYNES: The Government could not grant the land.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The Government could make special reserves, which could only be destroyed by Act of Parliament. He was taking a wider view of the matter. The amendment absolutely struck at the system of responsible government. There was no reason to do in this Bill what was left undone in the general practice of the government of the State. It was absolutely out of place to put such a provision in the Bill while there was responsible government.

HON. W. MALEY: The Ministry should seek no farther responsibility than what Parliament was prepared to give. If the Ministry were responsible they were responsible to Parliament; and if Parliament was responsible to the people, then it was urgent that Parliament should protect the people with respect to the people's estate. If the Government were to grant certain lands in Perth, and these lands were at once sublet on long leases to speculative builders, it would be a great scandal and a great discredit to the Ministry. There was evidence in all parts of the world that notwithstanding scandal and notwithstanding impropriety these things did sometimes happen. Thus it became the duty of Parliament to take preventive measures to see that they should not happen. He did not for a moment wish to impute anything to any

Government. He had great doubts as to whether this grant of land would be satisfactory. It was the granting of an enormous area of such present value as would be required to bring in sufficient revenue to endow a university, and Parliament should have some idea at the earliest possible moment as to what that land would be. If land were granted it represented a certain value to the people of the State, for if the Government reduced the available amount of land for settlement, or the land available for building purposes, the general asset of the community was being reduced. While power was given to the Government, Parliament should first of all know what the Bill would cost.

HON. J. D. CONNOLLY: Some hon. members supposed that he was opposed to a grant to a university; but he was not opposed to a grant either in land or money, and there was no difference between them. He simply maintained that Parliament, as representative of the people, should have the right to say what land should be granted. If it was to be a grant of money, the consent of Parliament would have to be obtained. Why should that consent not be obtained when land was to be granted? Too much land was given away on the eve of a general election, and it would be done again in the future. His amendment was dealing more with the future than with the present. A piece of land representing £30,000 in value—the site of the Police Courts—had been granted to the City Council. A sum of £30,000 might just as well have been taken out of the Treasury. It had been done without the consent of Parliament.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: That gift was not quite complete yet.

HON. J. D. CONNOLLY: It was not the fault of the Government that it was not complete.

HON. S. J. HAYNES: The amendment should be slightly altered, so that the Government could bring in the description of the land in a schedule. However, he would support the amendment.

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

Ayes	8
Noes	10
				—
Majority against	2

AYES.
 Hon. J. D. Connolly
 Hon. S. J. Haynes
 Hon. W. Maley
 Hon. B. C. O'Brien
 Hon. J. A. Thomson
 Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom
 Hon. J. W. Wright
 Hon. J. M. Drew
 (Teller).

NOES.
 Hon. T. F. O. Brimage
 Hon. E. M. Clarke
 Hon. J. W. Hackatt
 Hon. W. Kingmill
 Hon. R. Laurie
 Hon. W. T. Loton
 Hon. E. McLarty
 Hon. G. Randell
 Hon. Sir G. Shenton
 Hon. C. Sommers
 (Teller).

Amendment thus negatived, and the clause passed,

Clauses 5 to end—agreed to.

Preamble, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

ASSENT TO BILLS.

Messages from His Excellency the Governor received and read, assenting to the Co-operative and Provident Societies Bill and the Trans-Australian Railway Enabling Bill.

ADJOURNMENT.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: As I promised hon. members that I did not wish to go on with the consideration of the two Bills affecting the Constitution until the third Bill, the Redistribution of Seats Bill, came up to the House, and taking into consideration also the fact that an important speech is to be delivered in another place, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Question passed.

The House adjourned accordingly at 6:30 o'clock, until the next day.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 6th October, 1903.

	PAGE
Trans-Australian Railway, Remarks in South Australia (urgency motion) ...	1402
Questions: Education Scheme, Advance Copy ...	1413
Railway Through Rates, Murchison ...	1418
Bills: Factories, Select Committee's Report ...	1414
Mining, second reading resumed ...	1414
Assent to Bills (2) ...	1417
Financial Statement, the Annual Estimates ...	1417

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at 4:30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the **PREMIER**: Report of the Perth Local Board of Health on the sanitary condition of Factories and Workrooms in Perth and Fremantle.

By the **MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS**: Return showing railway revenue from passengers, goods, firewood, etc., between Coolgardie, Kurrawang, and Kalgoorlie; moved for by Mr. F. Reid. Alterations in Railway Classification and Rate Book.

By the **MINISTER FOR MINES**: Eighth Progress Report of Public Service Commission.

Ordered, to lie on the table.

TRANS-AUSTRALIAN RAILWAY, REMARKS IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA.

URGENCY MOTION.

THE SPEAKER: The member for Kanowna (Mr. Hastie) has given me notice of his desire to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of calling attention to the remarks of the Premier of South Australia, who is reported to have said last week that the goldfields people in Western Australia were against the early construction of the Transcontinental Railway. The question is, That the hon. member be permitted to make his motion.

Question passed.

MR. R. HASTIE (Kanowna): I wish to call the attention of the House to this matter, and I will conclude with a formal motion. The importance of the question largely arises from the fact that a few days ago this House agreed to an Enabling Bill, to give authority to the Federal Parliament to construct this railway, and to authorise our State Government to