

information and publicity to businesses in all parts of each State the people concerned could be better informed as to the pitfalls which may occur.

Mr Skidmore: There are three very good booklets issued by the Commonwealth public relations office. I do not know whether you are aware of those?

Mr McPHARLIN: I know, but I think there ought to be more of this sort of thing.

Mr Skidmore: I could not agree more.

Mr McPHARLIN: There does not appear to be a financial institution which can assist these people. Of course they want what the farming community would like, which is long-term low-interest finance. There has been some talk lately about reducing interest rates and I think we should be looking not at short-term interest, which is now indulged in by many people in rural communities, but at long-term finance on which the interest rates should be kept low.

The SPEAKER: The member has five minutes.

Mr McPHARLIN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Thirty years would not be an excessive time over which to lend money to those engaged in rural pursuits because of the fluctuating markets that affect primary industry; and of course those same fluctuating markets affect people in country areas who are engaged in businesses. In other countries a considerable amount of advice is given. I believe in the United States approximately 4 500 of these information centres are spread around the country to assist small business operators with advice.

I wish to make reference in the few minutes remaining to me to the consumer affairs inquiry which was conducted last year. Members will recall that the member for Geraldton moved for a Royal Commission. It was decided by the Government not to have a Royal Commission for several reasons: Several other Royal Commissions were being conducted, the cost factor had to be considered, and a Royal Commission would probably not reveal any more than an inquiry would reveal. So the bureau, in association with members of Parliament, conducted these inquiries. If I remember correctly, only one Opposition member arranged a meeting of the people in his electorate. In all 46 meetings were held and I held eight of these in my electorate.

Mr Davies: You are not patting yourself on the back, are you?

Mr McPHARLIN: I am just telling the House the facts. The average attendance at all these meetings was approximately 40 people. They represented community business interests, which

comes back to my point about small businesses. These people were given the opportunity to present their arguments, their points of view, and their dissatisfaction. All the information which was collated has been submitted to the bureau, and I was pleased to hear the Minister indicate in answer to a question that the report I have in my hand is but an interim report and a more comprehensive report will be submitted in due course.

Mr Bryce: How many of your colleagues did likewise?

Mr McPHARLIN: Quite a number of members on this side of the House. I am not sure of the number, but I can assure the honourable member the number would be greater than the number of Opposition members who did so. The point is that these people were given the opportunity to raise points of concern, which they did. Many submissions were made. I think it is a credit to the Government that the opportunity was provided to the people about whom we are concerned and about whom the Opposition says it is concerned.

Mr Carr: And we are.

Mr McPHARLIN: The Opposition had the opportunity to call these people and advantage was not taken of that opportunity. Yet Opposition members criticise this side of the House when we did everything possible in this regard. When the people whom the Opposition claim to support were given the opportunity to present their case the Opposition did not take advantage of that opportunity.

Mr Jamieson: They told you to go ahead and increase charges.

Mr McPHARLIN: I would have imagined Opposition members would be very reluctant to make that criticism, although I know they will make it. I think they should have second thoughts about doing so because they did not accept the opportunity that was given to them.

*Sitting suspended from 3.46 to 4.04 p.m.*

MR PEARCE (Gosnells) [4.04 p.m.]: I do not suppose any honourable member has ever spent more time or been more nervous than I in preparing his maiden speech to present to this House. I hope to do my best today. I have polished my shoes and put on my best tie, and come down to present myself as the first member for Gosnells. I might say I purchased my tie last week at a local establishment—it was the ordinary type of family establishment from which one would purchase a tie—but it turned out to have a rather startling feature. I am not prepared to demonstrate the feature to members in this

House at the moment, because it is a feature to which I feel sure the member for Moore would take exception and may well lead you, Mr Speaker, to ban the wearing of ties in the Chamber.

I might also take this opportunity to congratulate you, Mr Speaker, on your election to the high and honourable office of Speaker in this House. I also congratulate the member for Cottesloe who moved the adoption of the Address-in-Reply. His maiden speech was a fine effort. We have been sparring partners since our university days and I am sure we will continue to exchange points of view. I would like to extend my gratitude to the members of the staff of the House for the patience they have shown me during the first three months I have been a member before the sitting began.

I have been told it is traditional for a new member to give some eulogy of his predecessor. I noticed that the member for Cottesloe followed that tradition, and I listened to his maiden speech with some interest. In this regard I will listen to the maiden speeches of the member for Mundaring, and the member for Clontarf. However, I came into this House unprecedented and, therefore, I can offer no eulogy. Members opposite may like to draw conclusions from my lack of antecedents, but all I can say is that, "It takes one to know one".

I want to say that probably no member has had an easier ride into Parliament than mine. I am reliably informed my seat was the first to be officially declared after the last election. I feel somewhat embarrassed when my seat is compared with the seat of Nedlands or the seat of Floreat.

The members representing those seats must have had some worries while they had to sit out and wait for some weeks before they knew the final and official result of the election!

Had Parliament met at 9.30 a.m. on the 28th February, I would have been a one-man Parliament, and literally holding the position now virtually held by the member for Nedlands! I also felt that I had just the right majority—not too large to lead to over-confidence, nor too small as to lead to legal action. Members will be aware that since I won the seat there has been a considerable amount of hostility towards me in that the Liberal Party was denied the opportunity to govern in its own right. There was much speculation leading up to the declaration of the poll that the Liberal Party would go it alone without the National Country Party. When the result of the election was finalised, that was found not to be possible. Being quite innocent in these matters, for some time I was hoping for some sign of gratitude from the National Country Party for my efforts on their behalf. Some of the more

cynical members might not be surprised to know that no token was forthcoming. Possibly, a large sum of money will be placed into my coffers prior to the next election! As the member for Ascot has reminded me, I did not even receive a Queen's silver jubilee medal.

On the question of the National Country Party, I noticed with some little cynicism that prior to the election of the leader of the Country Party the Premier let it be known he hoped certain gentlemen would be elected and, lo and behold, a day later I was surprised to see those certain persons elected. I do not know whether that can be quoted as an example of a "Court controlled ballot"

My electorate is one of the expanding outer suburban electorates which I feel sure will come to play a greater part in the affairs of this country than those in some of the more rapidly growing cities in the Eastern States. As the population is increasing the problems seem to gather at a faster rate than elsewhere. Very often, the problems are associated with the growth which occurs. Over the last six years the old electorate of Canning has been broken up into three separate electorates. Since the election, some three months ago, this area has expanded rapidly, with nearly 3 000 new electors going on the roll.

I hope that my area will not get much larger because it will mean my voters will get only one-third of the value of their vote instead of the effective one-half they get now compared with some neighbouring electorates.

Transport is another problem in my area. The centre of my electorate would be some 15 miles from the centre of the city. Far-flung suburbs develop naturally as a result of corridor development. New areas have to be provided with the necessary transport, and I think there should be some form of financial relationship between State Government authorities and local shire authorities to assess future needs. Shires such as the Armadale-Kelmscott Shire and the City of Gosnells are forced to provide a larger number of facilities than are required in the older-established shires. It will be necessary for the State or the Federal authorities to provide much more assistance to local authorities in this country.

I will mention, particularly, the lack of shopping centre facilities in my area. Langford comes to mind. The situation at Langford demonstrates one of the failures of private enterprise in that the site allocated for a shopping centre has been up for tender on a number of occasions, but no private authorities are prepared to put up the money. Perhaps they consider that

the provision of shopping facilities for the people in Langford is simply not profitable. In those circumstances it is clearly incumbent upon the Government to provide such facilities.

In seeking election to this House obviously I had some area of interest to myself which caused me to feel that if I were able to gain a seat I would be able to contribute to the deliberations of this House. At the beginning, because of my association with education, I was moved to seek election to this House. I observed some unfortunate and dangerous trends developing within the Government and within society. I am sure that in the months leading up to the election, and certainly during the month or two after the election, we saw increasing attacks on educators and the education process that was to soften up the community for cuts in educational allocations, both in Federal and State terms. What I said before the election, and certainly after the election, turned out to be true so far as the Federal Budget is concerned.

I notice that the Federal Government claimed that the rate of expenditure on education would be maintained. That may be true in strictly cash terms, but the growth allowed for, for educational needs, does not match the growth in the population. It is of no use claiming that to maintain funds at a certain level is to provide the same amount of money in real terms, if the school population is rising. The school population is rising at more than 2 per cent allowed for in the education Budget. We have yet to see what the State Government will provide in the forthcoming Budget, but I will be very surprised indeed if there are any significant increases in real spending.

Both the Minister for Education and the Premier have made statements during the last few months, and an article appeared only last week, to the effect that a cut in funds did not necessarily mean a cut in the quality of education. There has been a tendency to say that the expenditure of more money does not necessarily improve the quality of education, and I have to agree with that. On the other hand, the corollary that seems to be drawn is that the Government cut-back of funds will mean the quality of education will be improved. Patently and clearly a cut-back in the quantity of funds available for education does not guarantee a cut-back in quality, but is it not more likely that if more money and facilities are available the quality is likely to improve?

These generalised statements are only of value if it is true, as the Premier and the Minister have claimed, that there has been a waste in education funding. I think they should go out to my

electorate and point to the areas in which this waste is taking place.

Indeed, I issued a Press statement asking either of those gentlemen to do just that and it was not even acknowledged. No-one has pointed to waste in any of the schools in my electorate or any in which I have been involved. In a statement which *The West Australian* did not publish I asked, "If there is a waste in education who is to blame for it?" Who is in charge of education in this State? The Minister for Education, and he is talking about waste in the system for which he is responsible.

It is all very well to say these things but those on the opposite bench have an opportunity which is not available to us on this side—that is, they can do something about it—and we must question the sincerity of statements made by the Government when it takes no direct action on the matters about which it is complaining.

The laugh I got out of the whole question of the waste in education was that the Liberal Party was elected in 1974 on a promise of massive expansion in the funds for education. When the Liberal Party turned up for the 1974 election it contested the election on a fairly comprehensive policy, as the member for Karrinyup should remember, which would have meant expenditure of something just under \$20 million a year, on 1974 figures, in increased educational funding on a recurrent basis, and something like \$156 million on capital expenditure necessary to set up the scheme.

The scheme to which I am referring is the compulsory extension of primary education to five-year-olds, which would have added a vast number of children to the school system; the arbitrary transfer of year-seven students from primary to high school; and the split-up of high schools into two sections, which would have necessitated the construction of a large number of additional high schools. The free textbook scheme was to be extended at a cost of over \$3 million and there was to be increased aid to independent schools. That was the 1974 policy on which the Liberal Party ran and won the election.

Of course, none of those proposals was put into effect, and I think educators around the State were probably in large measure grateful for that. But the same Government turns up in 1977 and runs on a policy of quality of education without spending very much money on it at all, when it had proposed in 1974 to improve the quality of education by massive expenditure. The Government learnt its lesson over the three years but I

feel it was inconsistent thinking aimed at gaining votes at both elections.

I am choosing the example of education but what I have said applies in other fields when one compares the 1974 and 1977 policies. The Government promised to beat inflation State by State and in six months. An editorial in *The West Australian* stated the Labor Party was irresponsible if it said it could make some improvement in inflation or unemployment levels, that it could not be done, and that no-one should elect a Labor Government on promises like that. The editor could have drawn from that a conclusion that the 1974 promises were unreliable and that those making them must have known they could not be put into effect; but that was beyond the ken of the editor of *The West Australian* in 1974 and 1977, I take it.

In my opinion education is an area which requires a fair amount of specialised knowledge. I do not argue that education must be left to teachers and educators, and that the community does not have a real interest or the right to participate in educational decisions. However, I think the person appointed to the office of Minister for Education should understand something about the job involved. I do not reflect directly on the Minister for Education personally, because he did not put himself into the job; but it seems people are appointed to jobs on the front bench about which they know nothing and one has to rely on them to assimilate a vast area very quickly or rely on the department. My advice to Liberal back-benchers is if they want to gain a portfolio in any area the thing to do is know nothing about it because studied ignorance seems to be required, and I suppose the obvious corollary to that is if one wants to be Premier one should extend one's study of ignorance to all possible areas.

In the functioning and operation of the Education Department there is a good deal of ill-feeling and unnecessary confrontation. Several members on this side of the House have talked about unnecessary confrontation in industrial matters, but it seems to me the confrontation which now exists between the Teachers' Union and the Education Department is not only unnecessary but also highly unfortunate, and there are lessons to be learnt from it in industrial areas.

During the reign of the Tonkin Government from 1971 to 1974 a very good working relationship was built up between the Teachers' Union, the Education Department, and the Minister for Education, and there was a great deal of consultation and co-operation. I was a

member of the union at the time and one who was dissatisfied with the degree of co-operation which existed previously, to the detriment of some educational objectives, and campaigned against too much co-operation and consultation when it meant giving up what I thought were desirable objectives.

Nevertheless, a union such as the Teachers' Union, which is a conservative, right-wing union and has not been on strike since the 1920s or 1930s, suddenly found with the loss of the Tonkin Government and the accession of the Court Government that getting co-operation and consultation out of a Government which said it valued those objectives was very difficult. I sat through several executive meetings of the council at which the Minister guaranteed consultation, and we had to call him back to repeat that guarantee. He then sent us copies of his Press releases at the same time as he sent them to the Press, which meant if we had a meeting on the night he sent out a Press release we would learn from him what we could read in the newspaper the next morning.

The Teachers' Union feels quite strongly it has not received the promised degree of consultation and co-operation, not only from the Minister but also, probably more seriously, from the departmental head who appears to be effectively running the whole of the educational system in the State; so much so that the issue before last of *The Western Teacher* carried as its headline an instruction to members not to apply for certain positions as principals of experimental high schools which were currently being advertised.

I was involved in setting up the experimental high schools scheme in the days of the previous Director-General of Education, and through the union which had a very strong commitment to hierarchical procedures of promotion. The union decided to put aside hierarchical procedures of promotion in order to promote teachers more rapidly to special innovative schools. That was a very important step.

In the new Director-General of Education we have a man who understands the field of innovative education and is an expert in it; yet within a few months he had brought the union to the point where it wanted to scrap the whole scheme and was prepared to direct its members not to participate because they were not being consulted. Consultative processes had been written into the agreement reached between the department and the union but they were not being put into practice by the director-general who simply advertised vacancies without consulting the union about which schools were to be declared

special schools. The union was prepared to stick with its position and it was the Minister who had to back down.

Where ill-feeling is built up between a union such as the Teachers' Union, the department, and the Government, unfortunate consequences can follow. There is a message to other unions in what has happened to the Teachers' Union. The Government says it wants responsible, nonmilitant unions, which will not go on strike and are committed to the objectives of co-operation and consultation. The Government has such a union in the Teachers' Union, yet it walks all over that union. Unions which value consultation and co-operation do not get it. The only unions which do get it are those which are more militant, and one cannot blame the more militant unions when they see what happened to the Teachers' Union.

If the Government values consultation and co-operation, let it consult and co-operate and it will find rank and file unionists much more prepared to go along with the agreements worked out between the leaders on both sides, even if they are not completely what the rank and file members want.

There are many needs in education at the present time, and I am prepared to agree with the Minister that there is a great necessity for investigation, research, and remedial programmes to cure the problems of literacy, numeracy, and specific learning difficulties. Many of the experts do not understand the nature of the problem and how it is to be diagnosed and cured.

The Minister has made a brief statement on the matter but one had the impression from the National Country Party's policy speech that an attempt was being made to establish a mythology of fear about what was going on in schools—that dastardly things were being done in schools and there had to be a return to the "three Rs", back to the 1920s or 1930s or even the 1890s. It was a vote-catching move.

Nevertheless, the National Country Party is right in saying there is an unacceptable degree of functional illiteracy in the community. There is much less than existed in years gone by when fewer people went to school. However, there is a problem to be dealt with. I was interested in a question asked today by the member for Cockburn in relation to what was being done to cure these problems. The reply revealed that very small things were being done, no substantial research or diagnostic programme was being put up, and no substantial effort was being made to educate teachers widely in diagnosing and treating these problems, particularly at the

primary level. In fact, very little is being done. Much noise is being made and many votes are being won but not much actual effort has gone into it since the Government was returned.

Many members will have received a series of letters from a private group which one would have thought would appeal to the Government. The Dyslexia Research Foundation cannot even squeeze a miserable \$7 000 out of the Government to promote a campaign to tackle what the Minister acknowledges is a great problem in education. I know cut-backs are being made but if the Government cannot find \$7 000 for research by a private enterprise group I will be very surprised.

One other matter relating to education which has come up since I was elected and to which I have turned my attention is the Government's proposed interference with the student guilds in the tertiary institutions. If ever I saw a politically motivated move, this is it. I imagine the process began before the election and the Government thought it could buy some cheap popularity with the public by buying into the debate about what was happening in regard to the Australian Union of Students. The national Press has carried articles about the problems that organisation is experiencing.

In order to prevent these independently-constituted student guilds from sending money to the Eastern States the Government proposes to make their membership voluntary, conveniently and neatly overlooking the fact that on every university student guild statute there is an opt-out clause which has been used in the past to allow people to not be members of the organisation. Ignoring that, the Government announced it was going to legislate by amending the University Acts and Statutes to make the opt-out provisions stronger and to make membership even more non-compulsory than it presently is.

The Minister for Education (Mr P. V. Jones) has said a number of times that there is no intention to interfere with the structure of the guilds. That was the essence of the answer he furnished to a question I placed on notice yesterday. If anything shows the ineptness of the Government's approach to problems, it is this example of mismanagement.

However, having said it would legislate to make membership non-compulsory, the Government discovered that the guilds in themselves are very large financial organisations; in fact, they are not only large financial organisations, but also are largely indebted financial organisations. I am speaking specifically now of the University of

Western Australia, where the guild owns two of the university buildings; namely, a building which houses the refectory and many other services and the university sports centre. Large loans over a very long period have been taken out on both buildings. If the membership were to become non-compulsory and a large number of students opted out of paying their \$72 fees, the loans on these buildings could not be financed by the students, and somebody else would have to take up the responsibility.

So, having removed any suggestion of compulsory membership of the guilds, the Government will turn around and permit the tertiary administration itself to collect a compulsory fee. In other words, students will be able to opt out of guild membership so that they will not have to pay a fee to sit for their examinations, but they are going to be charged a fee by the university administration to sit for those examinations. This is a typical example of the Government's duplicity in this area.

Then the Government discovered it had no-one to administer the fee; either the student organisation administers it, or the administration does. Apparently, the Government was not prepared to take the complete step and leave everything in the hands of the university administration. One must realise that a tremendous amount of this work is done in an honorary capacity; students carry out a great deal of this work without pay, and in fact it can be considered as part of their education. It would cost a fortune to pay for the work now being done voluntarily.

Therefore, I envisage that the following situation may develop: A compulsory fee amounting to some 95 per cent of the present student fees will be handed over to the student organisation to administer. However, that organisation may well be a non compulsory organisation, which could mean that the Government will be handing over this money to a very small proportion of the total student population at the university. In trying to beat the leftists in the AUS, and stop the students' money going out of the State, the Government effectively may be handing over control to the very student activists it is trying to defeat. This Government may be responsible for the most significant move towards leftism in universities ever seen in Western Australia.

Another thing which really bugs me is that the system of the Guild of Undergraduates came into being when the university itself was established by the late Sir Winthrop Hackett, who was the proprietor of *The West Australian* and not a

radical by any stretch of the imagination. I am not one who continually screams that we should save our heritage, but the Student Guild is an integral part of the history of the University of Western Australia and is almost unique to Western Australia in that it has been copied by only the Queensland University. The other States still operate on more traditional, overseas lines, which I believe to be more costly and less effective than the system which operates here.

The Minister is not even a Western Australian, but should he examine the situation in the University of Tasmania, he would find that system certainly does not operate on the same lines as the guild in Western Australia.

I feel the Government has given insufficient attention to detail in this whole matter before coming in feet first and putting both feet in its mouth with all the facility of a double-jointed hippopotamus. It has discovered the implications of its proposed actions too late, after it has committed itself.

In this whole matter, one is reminded of the 1974 election campaign, when exactly the same thing happened. The Government raised many vote-catching issues and proposed streamlining education and giving it a new look—the words flow to mind only too readily. Yet after the election the Government's proposals turned out to be impractical and had to be discarded. In this case, because there is not so much money involved and only a small number of people, the Government may foolishly go ahead with its current proposals.

The Minister for Education has complained that the Government's intentions are being misinterpreted. If they are, it is only because the Government has not made clear its intentions in respect of this matter. It has not announced the details of how it intends to implement its proposal. In fact, I invited the Minister for Education to appear with me at the university—I even arranged a venue—to discuss the matter with the thousands of interested students. However, the Minister replied that if I had an interest in the matter, I could raise it in Parliament, as if it were only the member for Gosnells who was affected by the proposals. The Minister was not snubbing me by refusing to appear at the university; he was snubbing the many interested students.

This leads me to another area of considerable concern. I refer to the whole problem of authoritarianism both in education and the community at large. Throughout my career in education I have, been very much opposed to

authoritarianism, which I suppose was why I took so much exception to the policy speech of the Leader of the National Country Party, when he spoke of returning to those concepts if his party were ever returned to power. I certainly hope that does not eventuate. In fact, I spoke strongly on authoritarianism at the pre-selection interviews. Authoritarianism in education is only the beginning; it leads the community to accept the concept of authoritarianism. This Government is one which practices authoritarianism quite deliberately as part of its political strategy.

In the short time I have been here I have been amused at the words which have been thrown across the Chamber, words such as "facism" and "totalitarianism". However, we should try to remove the emotive elements from these words. I believe the word "authoritarianism" adequately sums up the situation in this State under the present Liberal Government, where the Liberal Party says, "We know what is best for the students. We cannot put them in positions of authority because they cannot be trusted to make decisions affecting hundreds of other students." What was actually the problem was that the guilds were not running the operations as the Government would like them run, and these proposals are designed to make sure the Government's wishes are carried out.

For a Government which pretends to be a free-enterprise Government, I find that policy to be quite remarkable. Of course, the Government often tends to justify its authoritarian policies by referring to the great silent majority. In fact, only this morning there appeared in *The West Australian* a letter using this very phrase.

I am always astonished by the number of individuals who pretend to speak for the great silent majority, without any backing for that statement. I listened to a recent talk-back programme on radio station 6PR where a gentleman who was organising a walk through the streets of Perth to Trades Hall, was inveighing against people who were doing things they were not elected to do. I felt like telephoning the radio station and saying, "At least I was elected, and at least union leaders were elected. Who elected you to speak on behalf of the great silent majority?" Something like 2 000 people turned up to support him and, by the way, they were not very silent. I wonder what terminology will be used to describe the great number who stayed away; I suppose they will be called "the missing majority".

Authoritarianism has its base in seeking confrontation as a policy. How often have we heard it said that the Government was elected to govern? I would not agree with that statement in

its entirety. Simply because a Government was elected to occupy the benches of Parliament, does not mean it can govern without reference to the people. It is all very well for the Premier to say, as he did last night, that he was elected to govern for three years. Certainly his party was elected to hold those benches, but that does not mean open slather on all sections of the community—not even on all those areas of policy which were presented to the people before the last election.

It would not have been very proper had the Government tried in 1974 to implement its astounding education policy, against the wishes of all the State educators and education departments, and against the declared wishes of the people, revealed through Gallup polls and the like. In other words, the Government is not the repository of absolute power in the State. Certainly, morally, the Government is not justified in doing anything it wants to do. Rather, a Government should govern well instead of just governing or not being able to govern at all, simply because it was prepared to antagonise a certain section of the community, especially people in positions of power. It is my belief that Governments should govern by consultation; certainly, that is the principle espoused by the Opposition.

Any discussion of authoritarianism inevitably leads to the politics of fear. The "we know what is best for you" approach generally spills over into "we know what is going on behind the scenes on the other side". The communist can have been pulled out from time to time ever since before the Second World War in order to strike fear into the hearts of the community and shift electoral confidence away from the Labor Party.

I thought the communist can had been laid to rest in the early 1970s. However, I was astounded to hear the Premier in his policy speech say something like, "Socialism is the bridge over which communism crosses". Yet the Premier had the gall last night to say that people misrepresent positions for purposes of attracting votes. I am not even sure that I could argue cogently what his expression means, but I assume he means that if the people had elected Colin Jamieson at the last election, the next day Ho Chi Minh would have led the yellow hordes across the Narrows Bridge.

I suppose such a statement would have some influence on people in the electorate who are not all that interested, concerned or informed about politics, political processes, or even political parties. That is the sort of emotionalism Governments can well do without. This Government has an adequate majority and is in a strong position to govern, and it should adopt a

more responsible attitude to government. It needs to adopt two responsible policies, the first of which is to stop that type of emotionalism, which is inherent in its policy of union bashing and teacher bashing, in its confrontation policies with the unions and in its attitude towards minority groups within our community.

The second thing the Government should do is to endeavour to put some rationality into the debate which comes from its side of the House, and into the political debate in the community generally. The first method by which this aim can be achieved is for the Government and its supporters to stop kicking the communist can and the union can.

If the Government has a conscientious belief in the merits of the political philosophies it is espousing, it should be able to get along on that belief. If the Government cannot command a majority from the community on the basis of those political philosophies it should accept that fact and not endeavour to promote the politics of fear as a means of gaining or holding office.

Perhaps it is clear from what I have said tonight that I see my role in this House as a double one, representing some bodies of opinion in this House as well as the people purely within my electorate. It is a problem with the type of electoral representation we have that people can come here in a sense representing only a narrow territorial interest, and many of the larger interests can be left by the way. I feel the role of any member of Parliament is to represent these larger interests as he sees and interprets them, as well as representing the people within his electorate.

I certainly have every intention of working as hard as I can for the people of Gosnells and I hope that in my efforts on their behalf and in the things I shall say on the larger issues before the Parliament they will find me a worthy representative.

**MR MacKINNON (Murdoch) [4.45 p.m.]:** Mr Speaker, I rise to support the motion moved so ably by the member for Cottesloe. In doing so I wish to congratulate you, Mr Speaker, on your election to the high office you now occupy. I am sure you will carry out your duties in this position in a fitting and honourable manner, bringing credit to both yourself and this House.

I should also like to congratulate all other members elected to high office and all new members. My sincere thanks are extended also to all members of the staff and all members of this House and the other place who have assisted me in my early days in this Parliament.

As a new member representing a new electorate I am naturally greatly honoured to have been elected to this Parliament. I am also fully aware that I have much to learn and much to do in my electorate to justify the confidence which the electors of Murdoch have placed in me. For the information of the member for Gosnells, this will not include the study of ignorance.

I also wish to place on record my sincere thanks not only to the electors of Murdoch but also to all those people who assisted in my election campaign. I would especially like to thank all the campaign helpers, in whatever manner they assisted; our various committees; my parents, who gave me outstanding support; my wife; and the honourable Clive Griffiths, the President of the upper House, for his valued advice, assistance, and guidance.

It is very tempting at this stage to depart from my prepared speech to answer some of the criticisms raised by the previous speaker. However, I am sure that in time to come in this House there will be ample opportunity to debate those issues quite adequately. Suffice it to say that the people of Western Australia made their decision on the 19th February on most of the matters raised by the previous speaker.

As the first member for the new electorate of Murdoch I feel it is my responsibility to inform members about my electorate. I shall start with the great person after whom my electorate was named. This man was Professor and later Sir Walter Murdoch. He has been described as an essayist, a biographer, an anthologist, and an occasional poet. Of these activities he was noted mostly for his essays and his articles in local newspapers which naturally extended his influence within the Western Australian community.

Sir Walter Murdoch was born in 1874 in Scotland and was the last of 14 children. When he reached the age of 10 he moved with his family to Melbourne and was educated at Scotch College and then at the University of Melbourne, graduating with honours in logic and philosophy. He then began as a tutor, at that stage for the princely sum of £40 per annum which is roughly equivalent to a current member of Parliament's salary.

In 1903 he took up a position as a lecturer in English at the University of Melbourne. Walter Murdoch filled this position for eight years and at the same time was a large contributor to the *Argus* newspaper in Melbourne. However, in 1911 the University of Melbourne professorship of English became vacant. Walter Murdoch was