

99  
Gold

Mail 15.9.23

Register

needs of the country could hardly be imagined. A concise summary of the representations of the experts reveals these businesslike propositions:—

The fact that South Australia alone utilizes each year three-quarters of a million pounds worth of timber in various directions surely proves that this State should develop its own timber resources. At present it has about 200,000 acres under forest, in addition to 25,000 acres devoted to silvicultural experiments and extensions. Three-quarters of a million trees are planted yearly on about 850 acres. Kuitpo Forest, which is under the special direction of Mr. Corbin on behalf of the University as well as the Government, contains a million pine trees, and several million eucalyptus besides in the natural forests and large numbers of merchantable wattles; and experiments are proceeding constantly upon its area of 25 square miles. In the State forest at Wirrabara, controlled by Mr. Gill, the veteran Conservator, £50,000 has been obtained for fruit cases made during the last 20 years. The department gives away nearly a quarter of a million young plants every year, and altogether 11 millions have been distributed in this way. In New Zealand a charge is made for the plants, and the fee is based upon the cost of production, plus 10 per cent. as a fair margin. The Dominion authorities argue that people do not take the same care of what is given to them as they would take of what they have to buy. They say the free-gift system is attended by a manifest waste, due to the fact that when a man is staving his requirements in connection with the free distribution he is naturally disposed to exaggerate the need, because he knows that it will be better to have too many trees than too few. In the 46 years during which our State forests have been established the £530,221 which has been spent, and the £304,000 disbursed, do not tell all the story. An immense capital stock of potential



DR. H HEATON.

Foreign economists, he says, regard Australia as a huge social laboratory.

*Register*  
also Herald  
19 SEP 23

### ASSISTING HIGHER EDUCATION.

### Proposed Increase of University Grant.

"This measure represents a further effort on the part of the Government to assist the cause of higher education in South Australia," said the Premier (Sir Henry Barwell) in the Assembly on Tuesday, when moving the second reading of the Adelaide University Bill. He added that it proposed to increase the annual grant payable to the University, and also to exempt that institution from payment of land tax. The circumstances which had influenced the Government in making that decision were of considerable public importance. In 1914 the late Mr. Peter Waite made over to the University (subject to life interest to Mr. and Mrs. Waite) his estate, Urrbrae, to advance the cause of education generally, and specially to promote the teaching and study of agriculture, forestry, and allied subjects. A condition of the gift was that half of Urrbrae should be retained by the University as a public park. In 1915 Mr. Waite made a further gift, consisting of areas of Claremont and Netherby Estates, and three years later he gave the University 5,888 shares in Elder, Smith, & Co. The life interests in Urrbrae had ceased, and the property given by Mr. Waite had become vested in the University, and was available for utilization in the terms specified. The committee appointed to devise a means of putting the scheme into operation had recommended that the estates should be constituted an institution for agricultural research, known as the Waite Agricultural Research Institute. It was to be under the control of a director. He would also be the Professor of Agriculture at the Adelaide University, and would be paid a salary equal to that of other University professors. The committee further recommended that the sum of £1,000 a year should be spent on the maintenance of the estate generally, and the upkeep of that part of Urrbrae to be set apart as a public park. It had been decided that the park should be planted with trees, thus affording an opportunity for experimental work in afforestation.

#### Why Assistance Should Be Given.

The only funds available to the University for the maintenance of the proposed institute consisted of the income from the proceeds of the sale of the shares, and certain revenue derived from the Claremont and Netherby Estates. That income amounted to £3,280 a year. After defray-

ing the cost of the upkeep of the Estates there would be only £500 a year left to provide and maintain suitable buildings and equipment, and to pay the salary of the necessary persons engaged in research. That sum was inadequate, and the University had requested the Government to assist them to proceed with the work. The Government had, therefore, decided to relieve the University from paying land tax, and also to increase the annual grant from £10,000 to £20,000. The immediate effect of the proposal to raise the limit from £10,000 to £20,000 would be to give the University on the endowment they had at present the sum of £17,500. The Universities of the other States were not subject to the payment of land tax, and he did not think they should be here. The debate was adjourned until the following day.

*Advertiser*

### AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH.

### ASSISTANCE FROM THE GOVERNMENT.

### A BILL IN THE ASSEMBLY.

The effect of a Bill now before the Assembly is to increase the Government grant to the University of Adelaide from £10,000 to £17,500, and to exempt that institution from the payment of land tax in order to assist in the extension of agricultural science.

The Premier (Sir Henry Barwell), in moving the second reading of a Bill to amend the Adelaide University Act in the Assembly on Tuesday, said the measure represented a further effort on the part of the Government to assist the cause of higher education in the State. It was proposed to increase the annual grant payable by the Government to the University and to exempt that institution from the payment of land tax. The circumstances which had influenced the Government were of considerable public importance. In 1914 the late Mr. Peter Waite made over to the University, subject to a life interest reserved to himself and Mrs. Waite, that fine property at Glen Osmond, known as Urrbrae, in order to advance the cause of education generally and specially to promote the teaching, the study of agriculture and afforestation and allied subjects. It was a condition of the gift that half of Urrbrae should be retained by the University as a public park. Subsequently Mr. Waite made gifts of the adjoining lands, known as Claremont and Netherby, and in 1918 he made a further gift by transferring to the University 5,888 shares in Elder, Smith & Co. The latter gifts were intended to provide funds to enable the University to utilize Urrbrae. Now the life interests in Urrbrae had ceased, and all the property given by Mr. Waite was vested absolutely in the University and was available for the purpose specified by the donor. A committee appointed by the University to devise a scheme whereby the benefaction could best be put into operation had recommended that the estates be constituted a Waite Agricultural Research Institute, under the control of a director who should also be a Professor of Agriculture at the University of Adelaide. That committee had recommended that £1,000 be spent on the maintenance of the estates and the upkeep of Urrbrae required to be set apart as a public park. That park would be planted with trees to afford an opportunity for the study of afforestation. The difficulty was that the total income from the estates was £3,280 annually, and that after making provision for providing equipment and paying the salaries of officials engaged in research work. Clearly that sum was inadequate, and the University had requested the Government to grant assistance. The Government had decided that this assistance could best be afforded by relieving the University from the obligation to pay land tax and by increasing the limit of the annual grant from £10,000 to £20,000. The grant was based on the endowments made to the University, and those were now sufficient for the institution to claim the full grant of £10,000 a year. The percentage grant on the donations of Mr. Waite would increase that grant to £17,500, and as was the case in other States, the University would pay no land tax. The debate was adjourned.

### DISCRIMINATING IMPRISONMENT.

### Professor Phillipson's Views.

Professor Coleman Phillipson delivered the last of his series of three lectures on "Crime and Punishment" in the Prince of Wales Theatre, University of Adelaide, on Tuesday night. There was a large audience. Professor Phillipson suggested certain improvements that might be made in gaol and prison life, for example, in regard to enforced silence. He considered that organized games, freer access of visitors, and privileges for good conduct might also be introduced with advantage. The employment of the various forms of deliberate and excruciating torture, such as flogging, irons, solitary confinement, or excessively rigorous diet, the personal element of arbitrary punishment was introduced, and by it we tended to regard the prisoner as a wild beast ensnared, and the prisoner would sooner or later respond as a wild beast. The prison was in no circumstances to be turned into a hell. Did humanity, or reason, or utility sanction unnecessarily ferocious treatment?

#### Not Without Hope.

Imprisonment, he added, ought never to be more than just sufficient or expedient. If it was kept within the proper limits justice would be more likely to be satisfied; if it exceeded these limits, it created a deeper gulf between the victim and society. The attitude of the prisoner subjected to excessive hardships which he considered unjustified might be rehabilitation in a worse degree. It was most important never to break the spirit of a prisoner or to brutalize him or to reduce him to such a condition as would make him lose his self-respect. The great majority of prisoners were, certainly, not beyond redemption. In the hands of the right kind of custodian—sympathetic, discerning, and strong—the better side of a prisoner's nature could be brought out.

#### Prisons Should Be Reformative.

Earlier conditions, continued the speaker, had been terrible. They were filthy, insanitary, dark pits of horror, and the prisoners were mixed up promiscuously, regardless of age or sex, and the nature of their crime and the criminal. Now the principle of reformation was uppermost, and great headway towards bettering the conditions was being made. Various devices had appeared from time to time for encouraging reformation, such as rewards for good behaviour, discharges for good conduct, religious instruction, training (physical and industrial), and also the so-called "honour system," all tending to give the accused person a certain amount of self-government. The great object was to try to inculcate the sense of responsibility, trustfulness, and loyalty in the inmate. But that method could not be used for prisoners indiscriminately, as they differed enormously. The teachings of psychology and sociology showed an urgent need for modifying the old treatment of offenders. It was necessary to have healthy conditions in prisons, to discriminate between offenders, so as to prevent the mixing of the worst types with those who were not so bad. To determine the exact treatment the ordinary authorities were not sufficient. There must be the assistance of the psychiatrist, who understood abnormal behaviour. He would be able to diagnose each case, and to apply the proper treatment. It was, obviously, absurd to treat an epileptic or "hardened" criminal in the same way as the accidental criminal, or to treat the alcoholic or drug victim, or nervous wreck, in the same way as the sexual pervert. It followed that individualization was absolutely essential, and the term of imprisonment must be adapted, not to the crime, but to the criminal, having regard to his nature as well as to his former environment. It also followed that the indeterminate detention provided for by the Act of 1907 for habitual criminals should be applied to others, too. They should be released on the advice of a board of experts, and not at the discretion of the State authorities. The released men should have to apply, not to the Commissioner of Police, but to unofficial persons of experience and sympathy, and after release they should not be described as habitual criminals. "Long sentences of imprisonment cause despair," the professor concluded. "An indeterminate sentence is a ground for hope, because a prisoner knows that his release is in his own hands, and so it does not crush his self-respect. All criminals possess a spark of divine fire. Let us search it out, and by treating them as human beings capable of improvement, they will respond as such, and so will we fan the spark into a strong flame."