The Bill proposes to hand over entire institution to the Education Department, regardless of the wide differences between the two divisions of its work and the utter unsuitability of the proposed authority for the management of the higher or scientific branches. With a view to the transfer of the industrial classes to the Education Department and to merge them into a system of technical schools to be connected with the present arrangements for primary and secondary education, there is need for dealing similarly with the diploma courses in mining, metallurgy, and engineering. From the standpoint of a theorist anxious to reorganize technical education on the basis of abstract fitness it would certainly appear to him to those portions of the school which are concerned with the professions of scientific branches of technical instruction. The Education Department has no better claim to take over the associate, fellowship, and other courses of the School than to annex the B.S. or the B.E. of the University. As a matter of fact, the two institutions already work out the scientific courses in close cooperation, thus avoiding duplication of teaching and appliances, and in a single controlling authority if necessary, it would naturally and normally pass to the University rather than to the manager of primary schools who have neither the educational status nor the required skill for the advantageous completion of its duties. Transfer of the scientific branches to the University would be in perfect harmony with the extension of academic work on the technical side which is to be seen in Universities, both in the old and the new world, which have endeavored to meet the educational requirements. It is to the credit of the School of Mines and Industries that it established its higher technical branches not in competition with similar teaching by its neighbor, but to fill an obvious gap in the system. When it made a success of them, and the University, fired by a spirit of emulation, launched out in a similar direction, the need of co-ordinating the activities of the two institutions became necessary, it would, at once cease, and satisfactory arrangements were made to avoid overlapping and duplication. These have met every objection on practical grounds to the co-existence of two authorities granting degrees in the field of professional scientific training, while a wholesome rivalry has been kept alive. Undoubtedly, however, if changes are to be made in obedience to the demand for systematization, the University, not the Education Department, should assume the responsibility for the higher and professional branches of technical education.
Sir I have read Mr. Laybourne Smith's statement in regard to the School of Mines and Industries appearing in today's leader with the greatest interest and with an uninterested spirit. I should not have it appear in any other way than I have noticed it in the spirit which Mr. Smith wrote in his leader. I regarded an author, and should be heard with profound respect. His long and unbroken service to the Mines and Industries has given him the right to hold views with firmness and determination, and I speak with confidence of that institution, and although I differ from him, I do not in any way denigrate the work of the School of Mines and Industries. I have a full appreciation of the value of these institutions, and I am assured that the value of mines and industries should not be lessened in any way. It was not easy for me to adopt the views of Mr. Laybourne Smith, if it did not condemn the previous machines. Their work is of the greatest importance, especially in the case of Adelaide. Mr. Laybourne Smith has brought it world-wide name for the value of its diploma, was sufficient to ensure the maintenance of educational institution under a departmental head as having a substantial argument to me for the change in the closer association of the branches of our educational system, which have hitherto been maintained at least, if not in fact, that Mr. Laybourne Smith and others believe that a higher and academic side is the more important and valid today.
must be apart from the Educational system—the side which, as I have more linked with the primary schools. My difficulty is this. If we develop the trade and industrial school in connection with our secondary school system without trenching on main functions of the School of Mines. As I am not one who would admit that institution's work, necessarily admit that it is itself, without straining any principle, with the University together, which finalizes in this country and stands to the graduates who secure them. There are other methods by which this difficulty may be surmounted; one is that to which I have alluded before; the other is by continuing the School of Mines and Industries under its present control as a sort of technical university, involving mining and industrial schools, and granting high degrees in technical and industrial arts. I do not regard it as settlement which will be ultimately satisfactory. For although it would be impossible to imagine that the members of the council of the School of Mines would not seek to disagree with the methods devised by the Education Department for the adequate administration of the mines and trade schools; yet the very fact of independence would create such a break that many possibilities of misunderstanding and friction would be disregarded. I am perfectly sure that no desire for personal advancement for himself or the members of the council of the School of Mines, would induce Mr. Smith in the view which he has so strongly expressed, and it is the more difficult, therefore, to disagree with him in his view, but, looking ahead, say that strenuous efforts must be made to carry out the work of the School of Mines and Industries closely co-ordinated with the educational system of the State under the control of the University. Who would supervise the whole of the technical school activities of the State, will be equally successful in achieving the best results. I would even say that, even though we disagree in the method devised for their attainment, to my mind the weak point is touched by Mr. Laybourne Smith and Mr. Langdon Bonython in the columns of The Advertiser this morning. Where it shows that close association between the University and the academic side of the School of Mines, is not desirable to give a high objective to the efforts of the students, and an ultimate reward to those who shall be successful. I wish to see the foundation of competition with similar institutions in other States and countries. I do not see the way to overcome this difficulty. I would suggest that Mr. Laybourne Smith and Mr. Langdon Bonython, with their unbounded knowledge of the conditions of our mines, and their long and honorably associated, linked to a desire for the benefit of the students, who will use that institution in days to come. I wish to see some method by which the association of the University may be secured for the advantage of those who will graduate from it, and be placed from some method which is imparted under the aegis of the University. I am, &c.,

[Signature]

Parliament House, November 9, 1915.

[Our correspondent evidently does not realize that Mr. Laybourne Smith resigned the position of registrar of the School of Mines two years ago. —Ed.]