

the Premier, and that it is quite undemocratic. The same man, through the Minister who controls the Industrial Arbitration Act, has been talking about changing the electoral system for unions which are already operating under a democratic system. I am trying to point out that there is an inconsistency on the part of the Government in regard to the two issues.

I also suggest that the Premier has embarked on union bashing without any regard for electoral democracy at all. He has taken this course simply to find himself a replacement excuse since he has lost the excuse of the Whitlam Government. He has to find another issue and has embarked on union bashing.

Sir Charles Court: Why do you have to catch onto phrases which are purely claptrap?

Mr CARR: The Premier seems to be intent on forcing an election.

Sir Charles Court: You are dead scared we might have one at any time. Only 80 per cent of the people are in favour of us!

Mr CARR: If an election were held next year when due the Premier would be judged on his actions without an excuse. Hence, the Premier realises he would have no excuse for his non-performance and incompetence. He is anxious to build up to an election right now so that he will not have to wait until after the Federal Budget and, with that in mind, he has started union bashing in order to create an atmosphere for an election now. Obviously the Premier has no real concern for union democracy—only expediency to serve a political purpose which has nothing to do with electoral democracy at all.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes—16

Mr Bateman	Mr Hartrey
Mr Bertram	Mr Jamieson
Mr Bryce	Mr T. H. Jones
Mr Carr	Mr May
Mr Davies	Mr Skidmore
Mr H. D. Evans	Mr Taylor
Mr T. D. Evans	Mr A. R. Tonkin
Mr Fletcher	Mr McIver

(Teller)

Noes—22

Sir Charles Court	Mr Old
Mr Cowan	Mr O'Neill
Mr Coyne	Mr Ridge
Dr Dadour	Mr Rushton
Mr Grayden	Mr Shadders
Mr Grewar	Mr Stephens
Mr P. V. Jones	Mr Thompson
Mr Laurance	Mr Tubby
Mr McPharlin	Mr Watt
Mr Mensarow	Mr Young
Mr Nanovich	Mr Clarke

(Teller)

Fairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr J. T. Tonkin	Mr Sodeman
Mr B. T. Burke	Mrs Craig
Mr Harman	Mr Crane
Mr Barnett	Mr Blakie
Mr Moller	Mr O'Connor
Mr T. J. Burke	Mr Sibson

Amendment thus negatived.

Debate (on motion) Resumed

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Young.

House adjourned at 10.57 p.m.

Legislative Council

Wednesday, the 7th April, 1976

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. A. F. Griffith) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS (14): ON NOTICE

1. ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES

Carnarvon Small Boat Harbour

The Hon. G. W. BERRY, to the Minister for Justice representing the Minister for Works:

When is it anticipated power will be available at the small boat harbour in Carnarvon?

The Hon. N. McNEILL replied:
Progressively from July 1976.

2. MARINE SERVICES ASSOCIATION

Tenders

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON, to the Minister for Justice representing the Premier:

(1) Is the article which appeared in *The Sunday Times* on the 4th April, 1976, under the heading "Ship Builders bid to get Contracts" an accurate report of the Premier's statement on this subject?

(2) Will the Minister advise the House in what way the Premier envisages the proposed Marine Services Association may transgress the Trade Practices legislation if, in fact, it is tendering with interstate competitors?

(3) How does the Government intend to avoid collusive tendering by members of the Association for State Government projects?

(4) What does "full support to the industries objectives" promised by the Premier mean in terms of tangible action that will be taken by the State Government?

(5) Would the Minister explain the apparent contradiction between the following two statements which appear in the article and attributed to Sir Charles Court—

"The organization would be a completely private enterprise project", and

"The involvement of the State Government to protect the public interests should suffice"?

The Hon. N. McNEILL replied:

- (1) Basically correct.
- (2) The Marine Services Association will not be tendering, but assisting the establishment of the consortium who will tender and contract. Some recent experience in such matters indicates that the Trade Practices legislation could be seen by some parties to restrict such co-operative effort.
- (3) The Association should facilitate collaborative pooling of resources and skills where necessary to undertake major projects. It will not be a vehicle for collusive tendering for projects which are quite capable of being undertaken independently as now by its members. In fact, its members will be most anxious in such instances to maintain their independence in both tendering and contracting.
- (4) The State Government sees the industry, on its own initiatives, providing an integrated approach which can demonstrate a collective ability, to bid for work which they have not previously been able to participate in.

The inaugural meeting of the Association this morning endorsed this objective as a primary requisite for the marine industry. The Government will give support to the Association in its endeavours to win contracts for its members in Western Australia, whether those efforts are in Australia or overseas. Government representations can be made on behalf of the Association and the consortium it brings together.

- (5) I do not see any contradiction. The Association is formed of member companies with direct involvement in the industry.

The Hon. Premier said the State Government was closely identified with the steps being taken to establish the Association, its objectives, its functions, and its role and in his view this involvement should be accepted as an action in the public interest.

As such the Association should not be seen or inferred as an area of inquiry into Trade Practices.

3. ALBANY TECHNICAL SCHOOL *Hostel*

The Hon. T. KNIGHT, to the Minister for Education:

As the Albany Technical Annexe is unable to cope satisfactorily with country students due to lack of

residential facilities at the Annexe, is it the Government's intention to—

- (a) establish a residential hostel at the Albany Technical Annexe; and
- (b) if so, when?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

- (a) and (b) The Education Department has, under the recommendations of the Second Report on Needs in Technical Education, T.A.F.E. in Australia, May 1975, used available Commonwealth finance to establish a hostel at Bunbury.

No T.A.F.E. funds have been made available for a hostel in Albany.

There is no indication as to the financial provisions for hostels in future Commonwealth legislation.

4.

ABORIGINES

Needs and Opportunities: Report

The Hon. J. C. TOZER, to the Minister for Community Welfare:

- (1) When was the report, prepared by business consultants W. D. Scott and Associates and titled "Assessment of the Needs and Opportunities for Aborigines in the Kimberley" or some comparable name, submitted to the Government?
- (2) Has the report been tabled in Parliament or released for public scrutiny?
- (3) If not, why not?
- (4) Will the Minister now—
 - (a) table the report;
 - (b) provide copies for the guidance of such responsible bodies as the Kimberley Regional Development Committee; and
 - (c) make it available for public scrutiny?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER replied:

- (1) It was submitted to the then Hon. Minister for Community Welfare on 4th November, 1971.
- (2) No.
- (3) The report contains information of a confidential nature.
- (4) (a) to (c) No, for the reasons stated in (3), but I am prepared to show it to the hon. member by arrangement with me.

5. TRADE UNIONS

Ballots: ILO Conventions

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY, to the Minister for Education representing the Minister for Labour and Industry:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that Article 3 of the International Labour Organisation Convention concerning Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise (I.L.O. Convention No. 87) which came into force for Australia the 28th February, 1974, provides that—

Workers' and Employers' Organisations shall—

- (a) have the right to draw up their Constitutions and Rules;
- (b) elect their representatives in full freedom;
- (c) organise their administration and activities; and
- (d) formulate their programmes and, that—
- (e) the public authorities shall refrain from any interference which would restrict these rights or impede the lawful exercise thereof?

- (2) Was the Minister correctly reported in reference to the proposed Government control of union ballots in *The West Australian* newspaper of the 3rd April, 1976, when he said "the changes would allow Western Australia to conform more effectively to the International Labour Organisation Convention on the Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise"?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

- (1) Yes.

- (2) Yes. The transfer of control of a union election to the Chief Electoral Officer alone is consistent with the protection of community interests particularly as large numbers of persons, as members of unions, are affected and will ensure that they can exercise a vote democratically and in fuller freedom.

It must be remembered that the principle purpose of registration as a union under the Industrial Arbitration Act, whereby laws have to be conformed to in order to obtain registration, is to gain the benefits of the arbitration system.

Article 8 of Convention No. 87 specifically states "In exercising the rights provided for in this

Convention workers and employers and their respective organisations, like other persons or organised collectivities, shall respect the law of the land."

6.

BEEF

Prices: USA and Britain

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH, to the Minister for Justice representing the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) What has been the quarterly price movement in United States cents per pound, and Australian cents per pound, of Australian Loreless cow beef delivered to the United States West Coast since 1973?
- (2) What has been the quarterly price movement in British new pence per pound, and Australian cents per pound, of Australian hinds at Smithfield since 1973?

The Hon. N. McNEILL replied:

- (1) The following material has been extracted from the Australian Meat Board's "Statistical Review of Livestock and Meat Industries" and "The Meat Producer and Exporter":

COW BEEF (a)

Year	Quarter	U.S. cents per kg (b)	Aust. cents per kg (c)
1973	1	174.8	116.3
	2	173.3	108.6
	3	207.3	130.6
	4	201.5	120.7
1974	1	178.5	102.2
	2	139.2	75.2
	3	137.3	73.6
	4	118.6	68.9
1975	1	102.5	52.8
	2	120.6	65.8
	3	121.9	70.3
	4	135.8	82.6
1976	Jan.	137.3	83.0
	Feb.	150.9	93.1

(a) Average prices of Australian manufacturing boneless cow beef.

(b) C.I.f. United States.

(c) Approximate values, f.a.s., Australia—based on offers to Australian exporters.

NOTE: Prices are in cents per kilogram.

- (2) This information is not available to my Department. It is understood that only 68 tonnes of beef were exported from Western Australia to the United Kingdom in the eight months ending February, 1976.

7. DUNCAN HIGHWAY *Reopening*

The Hon. J. C. TOZER, to the Minister for Health representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that the killing season at the Wyndham Meatworks will commence within three or four weeks?
- (2) Is he aware that the Negri River crossing on the Duncan Highway has been impassable to all traffic other than some four-wheel drive vehicles with skilful and lucky drivers since November?
- (3) Is he aware that a number of cattle, variously estimated as being between 10 000 and 14 000, are due for transportation over this road this killing season?
- (4) What are the immediate plans for re-opening the Duncan Highway?
- (5) Have the long term plans for the Negri Crossing been crystallized any more than when I asked an almost identical question on the 22nd April, 1975?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) No. I have been unable to confirm the numbers given by the hon. member.
- (4) Work commenced on April 5 to open Duncan Highway following the "Wet" Season. It is expected that Negri Crossing will be trafficable again within two weeks.
- (5) Survey of an alternate site for a river crossing has been completed and detailed design will be commenced shortly. Subject to the availability of funds it is expected that a new crossing will be constructed during the 1976-77 financial year.

8. HOUSING

Teachers: Rents

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON, to the Minister for Justice representing the Treasurer:

- (1) Is it the intention of the Minister for Housing to amend the Government Employees' Housing Authority regulation 5, or any other relevant regulation, to provide that—
 - (a) the advice of the chief valuer of the Australian Taxation Department in this State will not be taken into

account in determining a fair rent for teacher housing, and neither will the Authority be required to fix a rent on a fair basis;

- (b) teacher housing rents will be linked with those charged by the State Housing Commission for a comparable house?
- (2) Is the Minister for Housing aware of correspondence from the State School Teachers' Union of Western Australia which draws attention to the above proposals and opposes them on the following grounds—
 - (a) Government Employees' Housing Authority does not have State Housing Commission overheads;
 - (b) teachers are a captive market with rents deducted at source by the employer;
 - (c) Government Employees' Housing Authority houses range from modern to ancient of over 70 years old;
 - (d) Education Department advice to the Government Employees' Housing Authority which in part states "... it will be impossible to fill some country positions because teachers will refuse to take up the opportunities. The Department fears that if the subsidy is phased out serious industrial repercussions will follow."
- (3) Is it the intention of the Government to introduce legislation to remove the rights of appeal of teachers in respect of homes built prior to 1946?

The Hon. N. McNEILL replied:

- (1) (a) and (b) The advice of the Chief Valuer of the Taxation Department will not be taken into account in determining the rent for teacher housing. "Fair" rent is synonymous with "market" rent, and the Authority does not determine its rents on this basis. Rents are determined on the basis of the accommodation and facilities that the houses will provide, and the quality thereof, as compared with houses outside the metropolitan region let by the State Housing Commission.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) This has not yet been considered by the Government.

9. **FUEL TAX**

Exemption: Road Construction Vehicles

The Hon. G. W. BERRY, to the Minister for Education representing the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

Further to my question 6 on Thursday, the 1st April, 1976—

- (a) have any representations ever been made to the Commonwealth for Fuel Tax exemption to be given to registered trucks when engaged solely on road-making; and
- (b) if not, would the Government consider making such representation?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon replied:

- (a) No. Registered trucks engaged on road making themselves use existing roads and therefore it is considered that they should be liable for fuel tax. The Department of Customs and Excise will not exempt registered trucks used solely on road making if they are used for transporting goods over existing roads. The fuel tax paid by the Main Roads Department is currently only about \$30 000, which is less than 4 per cent of their annual fuel bill.
- (b) In view of the above the Government does not consider that representations to the Commonwealth for exemption are warranted.

10. **KING EDWARD MEMORIAL HOSPITAL**

Day Care Centre

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN, to the Minister for Community Welfare:

Would the Minister advise—

- (a) whether the day care centre/creche at King Edward Memorial Hospital is to close on the 23rd April, 1976, because of financial loss and poor patronage;
- (b) what steps the hospital authorities have taken to enable the continuance of the centre—
 - (i) by obtaining a grant under the Federal Government Child Care Act, 1972;
 - (ii) by advertising the facilities available and widening the area of recruitment to include children of staff of other hospitals and local residents; and

- (c) whether the Minister will take steps to encourage the hospital to retain this important facility which has been an example it was hoped other employers would emulate?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER replied:

- (a) Yes. The Board of the Hospital at its meeting in March 1976 received a report from a special committee of the Board and decided with regret to close the creche on 23rd April, 1976 because the continuing lack of use by children of staff over the past six months made the cost of continuing the creche out of proportion to the number of staff being assisted.
- (b) (i) None.
- (ii) None. The Board has not sought to widen the use of the creche by children other than those of its own staff. The Board has regarded the continuance of the creche in a residential locality as a privilege extended to it initially to offset the then problem of recruitment of essential nursing staff at a time when there were no other privately conducted child care facilities available in the area.
- (c) No.

11.

JURY SERVICE

Wyndham and Kununurra

The Hon. J. C. TOZER, to the Minister for Justice:

(1) Is the Minister aware that—

- (a) 100 residents from Wyndham and Kununurra were called for jury service in District Court hearings listed for Monday, the 5th April, 1976;
- (b) the jurors (excepting two or three excused for medical reasons) waited without seating and without drinking water on the verandah of Wyndham's corrugated iron court house from 9.00 a.m. to noon (except for a short time when they stood inside and watched the court served with chilled water) in temperatures which passed the Fahrenheit century, before being told that they were not required;
- (c) to take 50 (more or less) listed jurors from small communities like Wyndham and

Kununurra almost brings the business of the towns to a halt?

- (2) Was it necessary to call 100 people for jury service with half of them having to travel 100 km each way to attend?
- (3) Was it necessary to call any people without a reasonable certainty that any cases would, in fact, be heard?
- (4) How many people are listed for jury service in—
 - (a) Wyndham; and
 - (b) Kununurra?
- (5) Would it not be reasonable to hire suitable nearby premises, such as the air-conditioned lounge or dining room of the hotel across the road, so that the jurors could wait, under suitable supervision, in reasonable comfort for the Court to sort out its legal hassles?
- (6) What is the estimated cost—including fees—to bring the Judge and his entourage, the witnesses, and the 100 potential jurors, to Wyndham for the District Court?

The Hon. N. McNEILL replied:

- (1) (a) No. However, I am informed that 31 persons were summoned from Kununurra and 39 from Wyndham to serve as jurors at Wyndham for criminal trials commencing 5th April, 1976.
- (b) Jurors did have to wait outside the Court while legal argument ensued. Seating is not provided on the verandah, as it is only in unusual circumstances that jurors would be required to wait outside. They were not permitted to leave the precincts of the Court until they were discharged at about noon. Drinking water is available on the verandah.
- (c) Assuming that all jurors were associated with the business of the towns it is agreed that their absence would affect the communities.

However the occupations of only 10 jurors summoned from Kununurra and Wyndham indicate such an association.

Included in the panel were 31 Government employees and 9 persons described as homes duties. The balance were of miscellaneous occupations.

- (2) No. Only 70 jurors attended. This number is required to allow for challenges and the flexibility to

empanel a second jury while the other is in retirement considering its verdict. Such an event would result in the earlier discharge of the panel.

- (3) Yes. It was not known until the cases were called that one accused would not appear and that another would change his plea to guilty, nor that a legal argument which in any event could not be resolved until the case was called on, would influence the continuation of the hearing of the third case that was listed.
- (4) (a) 263.
- (b) 268.
- (5) No. The delay in this instance was unusual.
- (6) \$3 500.

12. METROPOLITAN LOCAL AUTHORITIES

Pig Swill Collection: Ban

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON, to the Minister for Justice representing the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Will the Minister advise whether the proposed ban on the collection of pig swill will apply to all metropolitan local authorities from July this year?
- (2) If not, will he advise what arrangements have been made with each of the local authorities for the introduction of the ban?

The Hon. N. McNEILL replied:

- (1) and (2) The matter is under consideration.

13. PARLIAMENT HOUSE

Fire Alarm System

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH, to the Minister for Justice representing the Minister for Works:

Is the Western Australian Parliamentary building fitted with a fire alarm system?

The Hon. N. McNEILL replied:

There is no fire alarm installed in the building. The nearest alarm is on the corner of Harvest Terrace and Parliament Place.

The Public Works Department is at present preparing an estimate of the cost of providing Parliament House with automatic fire and smoke detection equipment, sprinkler installation and fire barriers in roof space, together with evacuation alarm bells.

14. LAND

Rates and Taxes: Recommendations

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON, to the Attorney-General representing the Minister for Local Government:

Further to the reply to my question 8 on the 6th April, 1976, concerning rates and taxes, will the Minister advise on which of the Committee's recommendations a decision has already been made, and what action is being taken to implement the decision?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF replied:

A final decision has not yet been made to implement any of the Committee's recommendations. As stated in my reply to Question No. 8 on the 6th April, 1976, the opinions of those affected by the proposals will be considered before action is taken by the Government.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: SIXTH DAY*Motion*

Debate resumed from the 6th April, on the following motion by the Hon. M. McAleer—

That the following address be presented to His Excellency—

May it please Your Excellency:

We, the Members of the Legislative Council of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament assembled, beg to express our loyalty to our Most Gracious Sovereign and to thank Your Excellency for the Speech you have been pleased to deliver to Parliament.

THE HON. GRACE VAUGHAN (South-East Metropolitan) [4.54 p.m.]: Firstly, I should like to speak to the contribution made by the Hon. M. McAleer in moving that an address be forwarded to the Governor. To my mind, the most important part of her speech was her courageous but probably futile attempt to convince the Government that it should establish more committees involving more of the expertise which is available both inside and outside the House. I wish her well in her efforts and hope that, rather than a ritual reply being forwarded to the Governor, her efforts will result in something real and exciting in this House in the future.

As several people have mentioned, this is the first occasion on which a woman has moved the motion for the Address-in-Reply; in this, the Hon. M. McAleer joins the member for Wellington (Mrs Craig), who accomplished this feat in the lower House last year. This is a very encouraging trend, because while I believe women should attempt to achieve by their own merits, there are many barriers for

them to overcome because of the entrenched idea that a woman's place is in the bedroom and the kitchen.

In this vein, I should like to read to the House an extract from what I suspect is a women's magazine—I am not quite sure where I got it—for which I make no apologies. It states as follows—

The French government has recently increased the number of women in Cabinet to five and now claim the largest number of women officials of any government in the world.

This doesn't alter the basic character of capitalism in France nor the economic and political exploitation of women (including their under-representation in parliament).

It must have been a very radical magazine! The article continues—

Yet it is a pointer to the resilience of capitalism in being able to absorb radical movements. Especially those which demand equality, rather than liberation.

It also poses a challenge to those countries in Eastern Europe who continue to claim that they have solved the problem of "equality between the sexes".

In the light of the recent Federal election campaign in Australia we turned up the following statistics on women and the electoral processes in this country.

Since federation in 1901, to May 1975 there have been a total of 365 women candidates in federal elections. The Australia Party tops the list with 45 women and the Communist Party runs second with 38.

Up to the present elections, which didn't reverse the trend, only 4 women had been elected to the House of Representatives and 10 to the Senate. Victoria provided the largest number with 2 reps and 4 senators.

I hope that illustration of the ability of women to speak on such important matters as the Address-in-Reply will fire some enthusiasm in other women in the community, and persuade the political parties to consider seriously the applications of women on their merits, but without prejudice.

Apart from the point Miss McAleer made about establishing Joint House committees and Select Committees to make use of the particular expertise of people within the community, the part of her speech which most struck a chord in me was that part in which, while talking about the Government's aims, she said—

... to involve people more than has been done previously. In this way we will be better able to reflect their aspirations, and be able to continue our development as people no less than the development of our resources.

In the time at my disposal, and before I weary the House—some members would say I have started to do that already—I will attempt to show that, on the contrary, most of the trends in the actions of the Government seen by many people, although not necessarily Labor supporters, have been towards the noninvolvement of people and the interference of Government in their lives. One matter which is very close to my heart and into which I have put a tremendous amount of work is the Australian Assistance Plan.

I know there was a tremendous amount of opposition from the Liberal Party and National Country Party in this State, but not so much in the Federal sphere, to the Australian Assistance Plan of grass roots involvement of people, their theory being that all this should be left to local government.

I notice in *The West Australian* of the 6th April a report indicating that the State Government wants to end the Australian Assistance Plan in its present form. With the way the Federal Government is going about its irrational cutting of expenditure, I do not think the State Government will have to worry about the form of the Australian Assistance Plan, because there will be no money for it. However, I think that the plan, the principles it contains, and the spirit behind it will remain.

It was started with the provision of funds as the main object, and it started off with some rather traumatic birth pangs and damage, but nevertheless the spirit was to involve the people in decision-making at the grass roots, irrespective of any level of government involved, and that includes local government. I would be the first to say that local government is closest to the people, and should be used to achieve the objectives in certain ways. Certainly I do not believe it should make all the decisions for all the people all the time.

This is one way in which the present State Government seems to be determined to keep the people out of decision making. Another area in which we see some interference with involvement of people is conservation issues, in respect of which the Premier has indicated that he will be much more ready to take advice from statutory bodies and Government departments than he would from the proliferating conservation groups in the community. There has been proliferation, because there are so many dangers inherent in our physical and social environment through the untrammelled, uncontrolled, and almost pathological pursuit of any action that is likely to make money for some people, irrespective of what the result will be to the community.

I notice in this morning's newspaper that a visitor from the United Kingdom, Mrs Ann MacEwen, made some comments about the use of motorcars in the city. She says that if we do not reduce the

number of cars coming into the city we will not only create pollution to the air and to the physical environment by the increased number of car parks and roads, but we may even change our climatic conditions.

Our climatic conditions form one of our most delightful and enchanting attractions to visitors. The air we breathe and the climate we enjoy are so conducive to good health that Perth has become very attractive to visitors from overseas and the other States. We may, in fact, be ridding ourselves of one of our best tourist attractions, and dissuading people from coming to this city to enrich our society.

The comparison with other States and other countries of the world is something which I consider to be a ritual of the conservatives who constantly mention what other people have done, instead of forming their own ideas in regard to conservation.

The second matter I want to refer to concerns a current and very topical subject; and that is interference with the people who are involved in providing labour to our society, and their right to conduct their own affairs. I know that other speakers, such as Mr Cooley, will have more to say about this subject, as they have more knowledge of the actual functioning of trade unions and ballots.

What frightens me is the analogy one can see between such interference and the actions of the Nazi Party of Germany. We have heard the Premier of this State alleging that trade unionists are fascists, and he has drawn an analogy between the unionists and the nazis. However, I see the boot on the other foot.

In fact, one of the first things which Hitler did on assuming power—this is an historical and not a political philosophic view—was to rid Germany of its trade unions. He interfered with them to the point that not only was the Nazi Party regimenting the way in which the unions should operate under the decisions of his elitist Government, but through programmes such as the iniquitous "strength through joy" programme with its physical exercises, the Nazi Party regimented their recreation as well.

I think this is undue and unwarranted interference with the way in which groups that provide labour to society organise themselves. Surely in this place people should not have to be reminded that under the Industrial Arbitration Act adequate safeguards are provided to ensure honesty in and integrity of trade unions.

The Hon. R. J. L. Williams: That was not what Hitler did first when he assumed power. His first step was to burn the Upper House in Germany.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: That might not have been a bad step either, and perhaps we should burn down the Upper House here, as the honourable mem-

ber has indicated! That is his contribution, but my contribution is that the action of the Nazi Party was analogous to this Government's move. I have looked at some of the facts that are associated with the rise of the Nazi Party in Germany, and in this respect I consulted a very conservative American book, the *Columbia Encyclopaedia*. I was also interested in, and can draw an analogy between, the Governor-General of Australia and Field Marshal Paul Von Hindenburg, a former President of Germany.

In this morning's *The West Australian* a correspondent naively said that if there had been a Governor-General like Sir John Kerr in Germany, perhaps the things that happened there might not have happened. I find a very clear analogy between the actions of our Governor-General and Field Marshal Von Hindenburg who was elected as President of Germany with the aid of the Socialist Party. That is an interesting point to be borne in mind.

A former Prime Minister regretted the fact that he had recommended to Her Majesty the Queen that Sir John Kerr be appointed Governor-General. To return to the position in Germany, Field Marshal Von Hindenburg actually defeated Hitler in the elections to appoint a president in 1932. Because he was afraid of the possible revelation of some of the questionable actions of the Prussian Junkers, the army officer corp, in relation to the disappearance of some State relief funds, and because of a little blackmail, he appointed Hitler as chancellor. History tells us what happened after that. Field Marshal Von Hindenburg then remained a figurehead till his death a year later.

While we are not wishing anything like that on our Governor-General perhaps he also may soon vacate the position he holds for some reason or other according to rumours circulating around Canberra.

The Hon. N. McNeill: You are making an analogy, but your comments need clarification.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: The National Socialist Party of Germany was originally called the German Workers' Party. The party which started in Australia under that name contains some of the philosophies behind the German Workers' Party. It places a tremendous emphasis on rabid nationalism, and is opposed to democracy. Like the German Workers' Party which later became the Nazi Party, it is also a blatantly elitist party. It appeals to the psychologically insecure and power-hungry elements of society.

Another analogy we might draw, when we are talking about the actions of the parliamentary members of the conservative parties both here and in the Federal scene, is based on the similarity of philosophies of the Workers' Party or the Nazi Party and the trends that have occurred under

this State Government and the Federal Government. This is an emphasis on the strong, and a disdain for the weak, the mediocre, and those who fall behind in our capitalist society.

The Federal Minister for Defence (Mr Killen) has talked about our soft society and about the sort of compassion that is motivating groups like the Australian Council of Social Services to ask the Federal Government to consider its cuts in social welfare expenditure. He has talked about the engendering of dependence in our society. The word "dependence" is a terrible word.

The value of people who perform the lesser jobs in our society, or who fall behind because of invalidism, temporary sickness or because of other forces which are endemic to the capitalist system and cause unemployment, is not only recognised, but brings about a general hatred among some sectors of our society because of the fact that those people have to be maintained at the expense of the taxpayer. The unreasonable hounding of such people is typical of the kind of philosophy that comes from an elitist party which regards weakness, mediocrity, and any handicap to the progress of a capitalist society as being the traits of pariahs to be sneered at, and generally to be made to feel more miserable in their existing misery.

The Hon. N. McNeill: I would like you to qualify the comments you have made about Mr Killen.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: What I have said is justified, and the newspapers are full of reports about such people. I regret very much that they use the word "dependence". In fact there are many reports appearing in the newspapers about the dole and dole cheats. The word "dole" has connotations of misery, inadequacy, and of pulling society back, etc.

Unfortunately, the specific stimulus that is applied in attempting to root out, as it were, the people who might be exploiting the system has had a generalised response which has spread to everyone who is unemployed.

What is reported in the newspapers is most unfair. Unfortunately we find not only the newspapers and the conservative parties in Australia, but also the church joining in this general denial of the right of people to be supported during periods of unemployment, and they have supported the restrictions which are applied to the payment of unemployment benefits. There seems to be some kind of false moral rectitude around in our society which is quite frightening in its intensity and ubiquity.

As legislators we ought to be attempting to do something to stop all the unwarranted, unreasonable, and cruel spread of sneering, disdain and general treatment of people as pariahs.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: You know as well as anyone that people who are entitled to it can get it and those who are not—the dole cheats—do not get it.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: I have just explained my views to the House and I was hoping some members might have absorbed a little of what I have said. I may seem to be over-reacting, but in view of my personal knowledge of the numbers of people who are the victims of this general persecution, I think I am understating the matter.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: This is absolute rubbish.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: The Hon. Gordon Masters has in the past made a feature of talking about "dole bludging", and I took him to task about it during the last session of Parliament. I shall do so again, both inside and outside the House.

To bring perhaps some light relief to what I have said about the restrictions placed on unemployment benefits, I will read a little poem—

Crawling out of the woodwork—

The PRESIDENT: Order! Would the honourable member quote the document in which the poem appears?

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: The poetess is myself. I am not submitting it for literary criticism but simply to try to express succinctly what I feel about this persecution. The poem reads—

Crawling out of the woodwork
From the pulpit, the school, and the
lodge,

We march in a mighty army
To ensure that work you won't dodge.
Faster on that machine there,
Make sure that your tie is on
straight,

Or transfer to some far off salt mine
May tomorrow be your fate.
Don't put your toe in the water
Or glance at the beauty or shout,
Or we'll class you as not unemployed
But a touristy gadabout.

We have a short back and sides cut,
An indication of work attitude.
If you don't cut your locks short
We predict to the boss you'll be rude.
From Canberra up to Marble Bar,
Recruiting all the way,
Blessed at Ballarat and Bunbury,
We march to victory day.

I think too many people want to join this army and go along with the rest of the persecutors, hounding the people who are unemployed to the very end, so that some of them are even afraid to get help from unemployment benefits until they are down to their last penny. I have plenty of documented evidence of such people, if any members are interested to see it.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: I have plenty of documentary evidence to prove that those who are being charged definitely deserve it.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: I am sure smug self-satisfaction will come first and compassion last with Mr Withers.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: Has he ever been unemployed?

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Yes.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: I would like to enlarge on the attitude that society is becoming soft. We ignore what we start off with. For instance, the Hon. Bill Withers ignores the fact that he is a finely set up young man with a lot of drive and creative talent. He certainly has plenty of endurance when it comes to standing on his feet in the House and he has certainly given plenty of attention to his electorate and spent a lot of time working for the people in it. But he was born with those attributes. He did not acquire them through his own moral rectitude. That is his makeup; that is the way he is. He has been able to use those resources to advantage, combined with chance, the way in which nature endowed him, and the environment in which he was reared. He may have had parents who were very careful to look after him. On the other hand, he may have had to battle very early in life, which gave him some resilience and ability to succeed. I do not know.

As a student of human behaviour, all I can say is that in the main our lives are left very much to chance. The attitude of many of our elitists is that it is bad luck if one happens to be born into a poor family; and unless one can grow up to be another Einstein, society will have to do without one. They see that as one of the misfortunes of life. The headmaster of one of the leading schools in Perth said he regretted this had to happen but that was one of life's chances. Because of this attitude, perhaps we are losing the Einsteins and even the religious saviours and moral rearmers who are left by the wayside because their talent has never had a chance to develop.

I move on to other people in the community who are being neglected in this trend towards not involving people in their own decision-making and not using the community organisations we have at our disposal to discover the plight of people, what they need, and—more positively—what they can contribute.

In the matter of children—our little people—we find the Government supports a party which in the Federal sphere has cut \$9 million away from a programme to help pre-school children or children who need to be cared for outside school hours. In answer to a question I asked of the Minister for Community Welfare, we heard today about the closing of a day centre at King Edward Memorial Hospital. That centre could well have been kept open. It is already functioning very satisfactorily and is a going concern.

We cannot cope with the number of children who need this type of care in Perth; there are too many children for the number of places in the day care centres. This situation has arisen mainly because committees are not being encouraged to start up day care centres and become eligible for the grants which are available through the Federal Government. Even though the Federal Government has cut the funds for this purpose by \$9 million, the Federal Minister for Social Security (Senator Guilfoyle) has said that the grants will be slowed down but they will still be available under the same conditions.

It is very sad indeed that we have not made some effort, and the Minister simply gives me a peremptory, "No, we will not encourage the maintenance of this particular day care centre." So we have another facility closing up which could well have shown other employers the value of accommodating the children of working mothers.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: You know very well this had nothing to do with an ordinary centre.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: At the King Edward Memorial Hospital there are four or five single or unmarried mothers who are sole supporting parents and the closure of the day centre will cause them great problems. It seems to be a very short-sighted policy. Once upon a time we had to attract employees to our hospitals, so we offered them these carrots in the way of child care. We should be saying, "Here is a hospital which is concerned with the health of mothers and babies, and we want the children who are brought into the world to be well cared for; so we are giving the rest of Perth an example of the way to look after children while the mothers are working." It is a great tragedy that this centre is closing down while there are people who need this kind of facility—mothers who cannot afford the excellent day care which is offered by many private day care centres.

I also hope the responsible Minister will consider the possibility of making a recommendation to the Federal Government that subsidies be extended to private day care centres if they will take a proportion of children of mothers in need. I am speaking about the private enterprise centres which care for the majority of the children whose mothers go to work; I am not speaking about the arrangements mothers make for the care of their children in private homes. At the moment, subsidies are available only for nonprofit-making, committee-run day care centres.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: You know very well the department does not run day care centres.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: I am not saying it does.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: You intimated that it should.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: I did not. The Minister seems to be antagonistic towards the suggestion before he understands it. I did not spell it out but I thought he would have understood. I suggested that the department concerned with the licensing of day care centres might ask the Minister to make a recommendation to the Federal Government that subsidies under the Federal Child Care Act of 1972 be extended to private enterprise centres. This, coming from a socialist, might shock the Minister, but I see it as a way of involving people at the grass roots. If there are not enough committees set up to attract funds, surely we can do something to attract funds to the private enterprise committees which already exist.

The little people do not have an opportunity to register their protests through the ballot box, and the mothers of the children who need day care are usually not very active politically. We hope for an increase in the involvement of women in politics, when perhaps these very important matters will move a little higher up the priority list in regard to expenditure.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Are you suggesting that the "little people" to whom you referred—the babies—should have a vote?

The Hon. Grace VAUGHAN: I also want to talk about the old people. The procrastination in relation to the care of old people is becoming almost scandalous.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Procrastination by whom?

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: The Government set up a committee to which many people who are caring for and concerned about old people gave evidence. The Minister set up this excellent committee to look into the matter of bringing about some parity with other States in the matter of concessions and fringe benefits for pensioners. The matter took a long time to be dealt with, and it now seems the only recommendation that has been made is that other States should do as well as we are doing in certain areas. Other suggestions that we should give more concessions and fringe benefits to pensioners seem to have been forgotten. Of course, that would be tantamount to telling the old people they were living in a soft society, and we must not do that.

We have to make them tough; they have to be tough in this world or they will fall behind; we cannot have these sorts of people in our society because they are too much of a stone around our neck. That seems to be the attitude.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Has any other State come up with such a comprehensive report and tried to do something about this?

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: The Government of this State should be showing the way if the other States are not doing

well enough. We should be setting an example and showing just what good we can do for the old people.

One of the most depressing cost cuts of the Federal Government, which espouses the philosophy of the Government in this State, was in regard to funeral benefits. Has there ever been anything so miserly? Anybody who has had anything to do with old people would know this is a matter of great importance to them. Many of these people have battled all their lives and have had little money at their disposal. They have lived through times of depression. Most of the old people now approaching death have lived through the depression times when it was very difficult to save money. In fact, many got into debt and never quite recovered from it, either in terms of ability to save or of enthusiasm to pursue money-making avenues.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Who did you say cut the funeral benefits?

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: Many of these people had the stuffing knocked right out of them. This ought to be understood by those who are fortunate to have the attributes that enable them to be successful and well adjusted in our society.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Who did you say cut the funeral benefits?

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: It seems that the defensiveness of some members on the Government side indicates their consciences are perhaps a little touched.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: The consciences of some other people want looking into in respect of this matter; don't worry about that.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: It is very easy to worry about everyone else's consciences. To worry about other people's consciences is to be without a conscience.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: You will not say who cut the funeral benefits.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: Mr President, this was one of the most miserly actions that could have been taken, because people who are approaching the time of death feel very strongly that they do not want to be buried by the State. Although the amount of money involved in the funeral benefit is not very great, it is usually sufficient when added to some money provided by, perhaps, a funeral benefit fund or relatives. The amount of the benefit is sufficient, even in these days of very expensive funerals to remove the worry from these old people. At least they know it is something the Government will give them as a right and not as a handout, and they know they will not be buried as charity cases.

This is typical of the principle lying behind the cost cutting of the State Government, which has the same political philosophy as the Federal Government. The

whole principle is one of, "We must show people that they cannot expect something for nothing". This is Mr Killen's attitude.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: You are telling a false story about funeral benefits, and you know it. Why don't you tell the truth?

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: You tell us.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: I will, don't worry about that. I will not put up with stories like this.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: Let me now move onto overseas aid. Again, this subject is an indication of the trend of the party which espouses this philosophy which is elitist and nationalistic—

The Hon. G. E. Masters: The popular party.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN:—and lacking in compassion. I refer to the very savage cut in aid to overseas countries. The poverty in the world surely does not need to be emphasised to members here. They may see the situation just as a set of figures; and that is where my concern lies. I am concerned that the people involvement or people component in the policies of this Government is something which is reprehensible, because the Government sees figures but not suffering, humiliation and misery.

Where is the pity and where is the compassion? We see plenty of industrial resource development, but what about people development, and what about the care and concern that should be increasing as our country becomes more affluent? Instead we find an inverse relationship between our own affluence and our compassion. I regret this very much, and I feel that almost all of the actions of this Government have tended towards development of the individual as an economic animal rather than as a social animal. As long as a man is able to make money he receives respect from the conservative parties. If he speaks up for the people who are unemployed or for the elderly, he is considered to be a "softy" and a person not to be considered as part of the development of this country, which has to be resource oriented and money oriented. Individualism in this country is seen only in terms of the economic component and not in terms of the arts, of social welfare, or of families.

The Hon. N. McNeill: That is absolute tripe!

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: There has been a cut-back in spending on the arts; and not only a cut-back, but also a general sneering by conservative people at the allocation of arts grants and the buying of works of art such as Blue Poles etc. Blue Poles has become the butt of a great joke. When Michelangelo painted the Sistine Chapel, probably there were plenty of people who said that the money

could be better spent on developing markets for marble. However, the Sistine Chapel is considered to be of inestimable value to the whole world.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: Do you think Blue Poles is the same?

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: We find, of course, the Government takes a tremendous amount of exception to people involvement. The Federal Government has set up committees that are looking for ways of denying people health and welfare benefits, and it is closing down the committees that are looking into matters of human relationships and the sorts of areas that are not to do with money.

We are again looking at the whole business of what occurred in the Australian Assistance Plan where money was to be allocated with the relativity in mind of one area to another throughout Australia; and in this way, of course, we find we are becoming not only nationalistic but are becoming "State's righters", almost to the point of not caring what happens to the rest of the country.

I feel the same principle applies to Medibank and to the low prescription fees and free prescriptions for people under certain incomes. The real pain and lack of prevention of ill health that will occur as a result of this prescription fee scheme is inestimable.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: That is a lot of claptrap.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: Consider for example the mother who visits the doctor and tells him she does not feel well. He gives her a prescription. Then she says, "Little Johnny has a bit of asthma at the moment, can you give me something for him?" The doctor gives her a prescription for Johnny. Then she says, "Mary has dermatitis", and she ends up coming out with three prescriptions. She looks in her purse to see what she can afford, and if she has little money members can guess which prescriptions are filled and which one is not. Certainly it isn't Mum's prescription that is filled.

The idea of a health service is that everybody can be sure of receiving reasonable health care. Under the prescription fee scheme and also a suggested alteration to the Medibank scheme, one must pay a certain cash fee. Whether one is the richest person in the land or the poorest person around, one still must pay \$2. The philosophy behind this seems to be that there will be overuse of medical facilities. It is all right for the rich man to overuse these facilities, because \$2 means nothing to him. So the principle of "You must not overuse this" is applied only to poor people. However, all the surveys and studies that have been made into health in the community show that the people who are likely to become sick more often and who are less likely to go to the doctor

early under any health scheme are the poor. So in the end, of course, once again this cost cutting will cost us a lot more than the short-term saving.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: I hope you have facts to prove this.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: I would like to move on to a part of the Governor's Speech which I think needs to be aired in this Parliament; that is, the matter of electoral districts. We said a great deal last year and filled many pages of *Hansard* with our opinion of the malapportionment and the gerrymandering of the electoral districts.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Don't bring that up again.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: Although the Minister for Education still is not convinced, it is only because he does not want to be convinced. However, it was indeed a gerrymander.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Of course it was not.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: The Minister still does not quite grasp the situation. I do not know whether it is because some of his neurons are dying or whether they are prevented from functioning by his prejudice. However, if he cares to have a little look at *Hansard* and read slowly several times the argument I presented, perhaps it might sink in.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Aren't we being patronising?

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: I can nearly equal the Minister.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You could teach a lesson to everyone in this place.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: The amendments introduced last year to the Electoral Districts Act in fact worsened the situation for the lower House. At least before then we had a ratio upon which the electoral commissioners were able to work; that is, every two votes in the city were counted as one in assessing the size of electorates.

At least they had that to guide them, but now it has been taken away from them so that the Parliament will determine how many seats are in the metropolitan area and how many are in the country. Based on the redistribution which has not yet been finalised, the suggested changes by the Electoral Commissioners, given their restrictions under the Electoral Districts Act, show that there are now 2.3 metropolitan voters to every one voter in the agricultural, mining and pastoral areas; and that figure is probably on the increase.

Furthermore, it is a potentially disastrous situation if we have a Council which is constituted as it is now of 20 country representatives and 10 metropolitan representatives; and that figure of 10 will

become 12 in the future. It is very unlikely that those country representatives will say, "Let us give the metropolitan voters a few more seats." Furthermore, the Parliament being able to set up the boundaries of the metropolitan area and therefore being able to set up another potential gerrymander is a very real threat. I am not accusing members of this House of being likely to be terribly unfair to the metropolitan voter. I would not dream of saying that they were unfair to the metropolitan voter. They are all fair men, but, Mr President, we might all be blown up in a holocaust tomorrow, particularly if the Government goes on with its idea of putting an Omega base in Western Australia, and a different set of people might not be so nice or so understanding of the voter as the ladies and gentlemen at present seated in this House. It is not a question of condemning people who have perused this Bill, but rather it is a matter of saying, "We are laying something down in a law which can be used in a way that will be quite catastrophic for any democratic society to have on its Statute book". We warned of these things at the time. The Government did not see fit to amend the legislation.

The West Australian, that great protector of public and democratic rights, did not have the intestinal fortitude at the time to say that the amendment was not good enough and that there ought to be other provisions in it. On the 29th March, when it knew the time was safe to say so, that newspaper published an editorial which called on the Government to reform the composition of the House through an Electoral Districts Act amendment. I think that is a very cowardly thing for *The West Australian* to do. In any other western society we would have a newspaper which would crusade for fairness and for some reduction in the malapportionment, but *The West Australian* has hidden behind the skirts of time, as it were, and has said, "We can now say it without the fear of anything happening. We would not say it at the time but we will say it now so that nobody can say to us 'What did you do about getting rid of the malapportionment in the Western Australian Government?'" It will say, "Look at our issue of the 29th March, 1976. We said it was an inequitable situation and the Government should do something about it." This cowardly newspaper, which is doing very little to preserve the democratic rights of people and to present objective reporting of events both in the Parliament and the society generally, once again is showing how it escapes from what should be its duty, which is to help to protect the democratic rights of Western Australians.

To show something of the inequities which are contained in the malapportioned system which we have and to attempt to bring some logical contemplation to how we could amend the Act, I should like to

point out that I represent a province which contains the largest number of electors at the moment. I wish to cite the 1974 election figures for my province which are very much less than obtain now. The argument that I hear presented is that we metropolitan representatives have an advantage in that we can walk or, if necessary, ride our bicycle from house to house whereas the country representative—

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: I wonder whether that would make you mentally fit as well as physically fit.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: I can ride a bicycle. The honourable member will be pleased to witness that sometime. It is one of the things I learned in my adult education. It is very useful to be able to ride a bicycle. We may have to do it soon if our friends the Arabs keep on becoming as economically oriented as we are. I wish to emphasise that although the Labor Party feels that the chance of its dominating this Council in numbers is pretty unlikely, I suppose we ought to be excused for saying so. We have never had a majority in this House. Of course that has been the situation for only 100 years; but perhaps we are a little impatient and we should be prepared to wait a little longer!

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: It depends on the type of member you are putting up.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: That is a point which worries us because we believe that if a two-party parliamentary system in the democratic, western mode is to flourish there must be a strong Opposition. Unfortunately although we have plenty of quality we do not have the quantity at the moment; and the way that things are weighted we think it is unlikely that we ever will have the quantity. The attention which it is necessary for a member of Parliament to give to all duties as a member of Parliament; responsibility for whatever passes in the way of legislation; the need to improve knowledge in the special areas for which the member is seen to be an expert, and the need to study legislation to ensure that the particular interests which the member represents, either through the party or through the area, are served, are all time consuming.

We must assume that the actual work of parliamentarians within the House and within their own special spheres of interest is common to all members. Let us be realistic about this matter. If one represents a seat which is very difficult to hold for one's party it is necessary to spend a tremendous amount of time in the electorate. So assuming that all the seats are equal in marginality, which they are not of course, if the Hon. Clive Griffiths and myself between us were to have some sort of communication with all our electors and we spread the interviews

over six years we would have to do 58 interviews a day. This is not taking into calculation Sundays and sitting days; the calculation is based on approximately 250 days a year. On each of those days for six years we would have to do 58 interviews.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Do not tell me that you are not taking your 58 a day.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: I try, but I just cannot keep up my quota. Perhaps I need some monkey glands or some winding up to race out of one interview and into another and then to another. I am afraid it is beyond my capability. The Hon. Clive Griffiths might boast that he is able to do that but I think he speaks in jest. If he does conduct his 58 interviews a day he probably does half of them in his sleep. I am not suggesting that he would do anything unbecoming in a constituent's bedroom or anything like that. But the probability is that one would have to disturb one's constituents at three o'clock in the morning and say "I am awfully sorry but you are my forty-seventh for the day."

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Interview, of course!

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: One would have to say, "I am sorry but that is the way it is; and if I hope to do my job as a parliamentarian I have to complete my quota tonight."

At the other end of the scale we can cite the Lower North Province. I hope that the Hon. George Berry and the Hon. Stan Dellar will not mind my mentioning this matter because 377 000 square miles is a very large area in anybody's book. My sympathies are with them. I believe very firmly that the time is coming when we will have to say that anybody who represents an area of more than 250 000 square miles shall have a helicopter and that anybody who represents an area of between 100 000 and 250 000 square miles shall have a proven racing car. I am being facetious of course but I believe that some facilities should be available to members who have this very real problem of getting to see their constituents. They should have transport help, electoral assistants, extra allowances and other help so that they can give their electors more value for their votes. This problem will take a lot of working out and it may take some money, but it is a very important aspect of our democratic system which we simply must pursue and resolve. If we do not do so we shall be held up in a ridiculous light when we maintain that we have a democratic Parliament.

In this 377 000 square miles reside some 6 000 electors and if the members for that Lower North Province were to carry out their duties as I have described them—that is, scanning of legislation, preparation of speeches, discussions, and the pursuit of their special interests in the political

field—and wished to make a point of seeing each of their electors over the six-year period, they would have to see four per day. This anomaly is surely glaring to anyone in this House.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Plus travel time.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: If it is necessary for Mr Clive Griffiths and me to see all our electors in the six years, we must do 58 interviews each day while the members in the Lower North Province must see only four people.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: You should take the variation in areas in both electorates into consideration and compare them because travel time will also be involved.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: It would not be an insuperable task even for Mr Lewis, who may not be as bright at arithmetic as I am—which is not very bright—to work out a formula to overcome the problem associated with vast distances.

One may even take other matters into consideration and study the number of welfare recipients in the area, the number of rivers to cross, the number of mountains to climb, and so on. We may have to introduce several variables before coming to a decision as to how much help ought to be given to each particular member.

In between these polarised examples I have given—that is, four and 58 per day—there are varying numbers of interviews which must be made per day by other members. Members might be interested to know the quota of interviews they must make. Mr Withers and Mr Tozer would have to make nine interviews on each of the 250 days of the year they were not sitting in the House or observing the Sabbath.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: You forgot the 100 000 miles—

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: No; I have already mentioned that it is not as much as Mr Berry or Mr Dellar must do; but we could devise some help for Mr Withers. I think a helicopter would do. He would look fine in one of those; in fact I can see him as the Red Baron, although Mr Lewis would make a better one. On the other hand I do not think Mr Lewis would quite have the qualifications for a helicopter. He could perhaps have a fast racing car. I cannot see Mr Tozer as a Red Baron, but I could see Mr Withers in such a role.

We move to the slightly busier areas and the slightly busier members. Mr Gayfer and Mr Baxter would have to make 14 interviews a day and so would Messrs Perry, Lewis, Leeson, Stubbs, and Heitman, and the Hon. Margaret McAleer. Obviously they are doing over their quota. I do not know about Mr Lewis, but Mr Heitman and the Hon. Margaret McAleer would be.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: If they run through them all before their six years, are they allowed to start again?

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: Yes, because that is all political mileage. I do not know that we need to devise a list of honours for those who go over the quota per day, but perhaps it is something to which some thought could be given.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Do you think we could get the Australian honours for it?

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: Possibly.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Or the English honours?

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: I would say the Australian honours because very few countries have the vast transport problems which face us.

Mr Knight and Mr Wordsworth would have 15 interviews to do a day. It is possible that those members would be saying that they do not believe Mr Lewis has any further to travel than they have. Mr Knight has told us about the Lake Grace and Lake Varley areas to which he goes. Great distances are involved, I know, because I have been there in the middle of summer. It is a problem.

Sitting suspended from 6.05 to 7.30 p.m.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: Before the tea suspension I was speaking of the need to acquaint the Governor, in our Address-in-Reply, with some information in regard to the malapportionment and the undemocratic nature of the electoral system in Western Australia. I particularly mentioned the Legislative Council and the inequities which are revealed by some analysis of the work of the representatives of particular provinces with regard to the number of electors within their regions. I also took cognizance of the travail of travelling, isolation, and the shortage of facilities, and in doing so I pointed out the differences which appear when one considers the desirable goal of at least seeing each of one's electors once during a six-year term.

I also pointed out that given 250 non-sitting days in a year, over a period of six years, the range is between four visits in the less populated areas and 58 in the more populated areas. I did name some of the members concerned and the number of interviews one would see them as having.

The Hon. R. J. L. Williams: You are implying that your Assembly colleagues do nothing.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: That Mr Williams should accuse me of thinking that the Assembly members do nothing is quite an insult to the lower House members.

The Hon. R. J. L. Williams: It is based on your statistics.

The Hon. J. Heitman: Perhaps the Assembly members do not know that the Hon. Grace Vaughan is here.

The Hon. R. J. L. Williams: You cannot twist statistics.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: I am illustrating, for the exercise, what is required for each member to be able to see each one of his electors during his term of office. The Hon. John Williams has misinterpreted my remarks by saying that we should divide the electorate up amongst all the representatives of the area. I did that, and the figures are quite startling.

It could be that the Hon. John Williams does not particularly want to see all his electors, but if that were his desire he would have to interview 45 people every day in order to meet all his electors personally. I am not presuming that each of the 45 electors would want to see Mr Williams; in fact, many of them might shut the door in his face. This is purely an exercise to present to the members of the Legislative Council the anomalies which exist. A representative of the Lower North Province has to interview only four electors, while I need to see 58 people a day.

Under the hypothetical situation which I have outlined, and given that we have the constant variable of each of the members having an equal chance of winning his seat for his particular party in the next election—I can see that the Hon. Charles Griffiths is getting edgey.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Charles Griffiths! That certainly has a nice ring to it.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: I want to make a point before I listen to his interjection.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: I could have saved you about seven minutes because you said all this before the tea suspension. Actually, you had gone past this stage of your speech.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: To finish what I was saying: all members having in common the desire to pursue their course in a given area which they might want to refine and improve, in the time left the number of personal interviews would vary from four people in the Lower North Province to 58 people in the metropolitan provinces.

I will now demonstrate what can be done about this situation. I believe the Governor ought to be acquainted with what is happening. The average number of interviews given by each member—if all members had an equal number of electors in their electorates—would be reduced to 25. Of course, that is a figure which most members would find difficult to handle whether in very high density areas or not because of the other work which is required of a member. They would find it difficult to carry out that number of interviews and also do the follow-up work because of the time factor.

Given that there is the possibility of interviewing 25 electors a day during each six-year period—if each electorate had an equal number of electors—it would be necessary of course for those people who live in the sparsely populated areas to have modern facilities to help them, and

extra allowances to enable them to afford the cost of keeping in touch with their electors. I emphasise that point, and I want to pursue it. The Labor Party sees itself as being in an invidious position in not having been able to achieve a majority in the Legislative Council for some 100 years. At the same time, I want to emphasise how important it is to see this as a principle of fairness to democratic representation, and not simply as a party matter.

I know that some people will say that certain efforts in certain areas could have brought about more equitable distribution of representation of political parties in this House. However, I am pursuing the point that it is a matter of a House of Review looking at the situation which even *The West Australian* considers is in need of reform.

Looking at this matter as a House of Review we should be very much aware of the odium into which this House has fallen because of the malapportionment which exists. Because I see this as an urgent matter, and one which was not met but rather exacerbated by the amendment to the Electoral Districts Act last year—

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: What are you leading up to?

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Have a guess.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: Be patient.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: —It is my intention to move to amend the motion moved by the Hon. M. McAleer.

Amendment to Motion

I move an amendment—

That the following words be added to the motion—

However Members of this House express their concern that the Legislative Council has been brought into public odium and disrepute because of the Government's failure to initiate and implement those constitutional and electoral laws that will create a Parliament based on truly democratic principles, and in these circumstances it is regretted—

1. That the principle of one vote one value whilst obtaining in the House of Representatives and within the States so far as the Senate of the Australian Parliament is concerned and in comparable countries including the United States of America does not apply in Western Australia.
2. That in Legislative Assembly elections the value of one vote varies by as much as 8 times!
3. That in Legislative Council elections the value of one vote varies by as much as 14 times!

4. That in Local Government elections many people who are entitled to vote in Australian and State elections have no right at all to vote whilst others have the right to plural votes.
5. That the Australian Labor Party's attempts to rectify these gross anomalies have been frustrated by the conservative forces of the Liberal and National Country Party.
6. That whilst the Australian Labor Party has often held a majority in the Legislative Assembly it has never held a majority of the seats in the Legislative Council and in consequence has always been denied the right to govern with the same power as that enjoyed by the Liberal and National Country Party when it is in Government.
7. That the Australian Labor Party the senior political party in this State should continue to be permanently disadvantaged by the existing malapportionment and gerrymandering of boundaries within this State—

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member is moving an amendment and I think it is common courtesy to listen to the amendment without interrupting.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: Thank you, Mr President. To continue—

—it being our belief that any election should be conducted on an equitable and fair basis and not in such a way as to be manifestly unfair and unjust, and in a manner which will as nearly as practical ensure that the result will reflect the opinion of the majority.

8. That you and the State of Western Australia should be embarrassed by the circumstances as they now exist in respect to the electoral laws of this State, particularly since there is still no intention on the part of the Liberal and National Country Party Government to remedy the electoral laws but on the contrary the Government has tampered with the electoral laws without seeking or having any mandate from the people to do so and without attempting to achieve a one vote one value result.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It is not so much an amendment, as an alternative Address-in-Reply.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Will you run through that again?

THE HON. N. McNEILL (Lower West—Minister for Justice) [7.48 p.m.]: Of course I oppose the amendment proposed by the Hon. Grace Vaughan. Perhaps before examining in any detail the very lengthy amendment which has been placed before the House, I should comment about the considerable preamble which she delivered as a prelude to moving the amendment, and I refer to the speech itself.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan has been in the House for a considerable period, and we have had the opportunity to hear her speak on subjects such as this on prior occasions. One thing is certainly very evident: in the speech she gave to the House this afternoon and this evening, we heard many expressions which I can only describe as being rather mean; mean in that they are expressive of class distinction. She continues to use the words we have often heard from her, words such as "elitist", which I have interpreted as a derogatory expression when used in connection with the conservative parties. The Hon. Grace Vaughan has harped on such expressions, and in my opinion they are intended clearly to create an atmosphere of division in the community, and this is illustrated by the substance and content of the actual amendment. By way of comparison, the drawing of analogies, and the making of innuendoes, the honourable member used such words as "sneering disdain" and "pariahs"—

Point of Order

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I rise on a point of order, Mr President, and I would like to quote Standing Order 191 which reads as follows—

Any amendment proposed but not seconded shall not be entertained by the Council, nor recorded in the Minutes.

I believe the amendment was not seconded, and therefore it is out of order.

The PRESIDENT: The fact that no seconder was called for was probably my error. I propose to put the motion again and ask whether there is a seconder. The question is that the words to be added be added. Is there a seconder?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I rise to second the motion, and speak—

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Minister for Justice has the floor.

The Hon. J. Heitman: You can only second it.

The PRESIDENT: The Minister for Justice had the call and he was interrupted on a point of order. Is the honourable member assuming the right to speak before the Minister for Justice? In the circumstances, I think it would be reasonable to allow the Minister for Justice to continue his remarks.

Debate (on amendment to motion) Resumed

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I will continue, but I will certainly not repeat the comments I have made already. However, I would emphasise that in my view the expressions used by the Hon. Grace Vaughan can be interpreted as intending to be divisive, as is the amendment itself, by drawing attention once again to this theoretical approach of one-vote-one-value. Even the Press, to which the Hon. Grace Vaughan herself referred, regarded this system as being—to use my words—"not on" in this State.

There is in fact a need for a weighted vote in the electorates of Western Australia, and therefore the principle of one-vote-one-value has no real application. However, if it did, as was pointed out in the editorial which appeared in *The West Australian* of the 29th March to which the honourable member referred, there would be a complete domination of the Parliament by metropolitan representation. While metropolitan domination in itself may not necessarily be a bad thing, I am sure none of us in this House, and certainly none of us on this side of the House, is deluded into thinking that the Hon. Grace Vaughan has moved such an amendment altruistically simply to provide for a better balance of metropolitan against country representation! We know that any move of that nature is—irrespective of the feelings, aspirations, and the voting allegiance of the people—simply to provide for nothing more than a continuing Labor Party Administration and Government in this State.

The Labor Party is not concerned about whether or not the people have a fair and equal opportunity in the Parliament. Labor Party members are not concerned about the wishes of individuals, and let us face it, they would be completely unrealistic if they did not agree that their purpose is to achieve a better, or in fact, an almost complete and total opportunity for the Labor Party to gain complete domination of the Parliament. That is their purpose.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: You have always had it, and you will not let it go.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Let us look at the words of the amendment moved by the honourable member. In paragraph 1. of the typed copy I have we see that the word "principle" is incorrectly spelt. The paragraph reads as follows—

That the principal of one vote one value whilst obtaining in the House of Representatives and within the States so far as the Senate of the Australian Parliament is concerned and in comparable countries including the United States of America does not apply in Western Australia.

I agree that the system applying in Senate elections does not apply in Western Australia, but it certainly does apply for our Senate representation from Western Australia. Also, since when are we obliged to regard the system adopted in the United States as the criterion for electoral representation? Perhaps some succeeding Labor members will tell us that, and I am sure they will tell us the words of an eminent Chief Justice in a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States about this matter. It ought to be said in anticipation of such a quotation, that even in the United States it has been recognised from experience that the system has many shortcomings and, indeed, it does not work as idealistically as it was thought it would.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Who said it does not work?

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I said it is being discovered that the system does not work the way it was intended to work. There are shortcomings in the system.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: You are saying it?

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Yes, I am saying it—I am not putting the words into anyone's mouth. The second paragraph reads as follows—

That in Legislative Assembly elections the value of one vote varies by as much as 8 times!

So what! Apparently the Hon. Grace Vaughan has gone to a great deal of trouble with her little calculating machine—

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: It may be a big calculating machine.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: She has spent a great deal of time on these calculations—

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: A great deal of money too—calculators are expensive.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: —to illustrate the number of interviews that members in certain electorates would have to hold each day in order to speak with all their constituents. She told us that in certain electorates it would involve four interviews a day and at the other extreme, it would involve 58 interviews a day. What does that really mean? I consider it means that the honourable member regards her function and role as a member of Parliament to be that of interviewing electors. I would have thought the role of a member of Parliament is the purpose for which he or she is elected; that is, to legislate, and not to be a glorified social worker.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: The Minister was not listening.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Oh, the Minister was listening very intently.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: Well he blacked out somewhere, apparently.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: The honourable member used that example to illustrate one of the so-called inequities in the system. However, by her interjection she has conveyed that perhaps she was not meant to be taken seriously in that context. That is very much in keeping with the rest of her speech, which I thought was light-hearted in the extreme. The Labor Party apparently regards this as a very serious subject, and such a light-hearted speech certainly conveyed something less than sincerity in the proposal subsequently put to the House by the honourable member. I come back to the point that we should put ourselves into the position of being an ordinary member of the public, an elector in the State of Western Australia.

What is the real concern of such an elector? He is concerned to see that he is adequately represented and that he has adequate access to his member of Parliament. Not every elector requires the opportunity to be interviewed, nor does he require to interview every member of Parliament.

The Hon. R. Thompson: That must destroy the remote areas garbage you go on with from time to time.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Not at all. What I said was that in my view provided an elector has adequate representation and access to his member and to all members legislating in the Parliament, he is not concerned at the varying numbers of voters enrolled in provinces or electorates.

Let us consider two metropolitan Assembly electorates. Even in the most ideal circumstances, the number of registered voters could not be identical. Even if we adopted totally the principle of one-vote-one-value, at any given time there would be differing numbers of electors in those two electorates. Therefore, the principle is destroyed immediately; it cannot be achieved.

Nevertheless, let us suppose there is a difference in the number of registered voters of, say, 5 000. On the argument put forward by the Hon. Grace Vaughan the people in the larger districts are disadvantaged. But do the people in the electorate with the larger number of voters regard themselves as disadvantaged? Certainly they do not if they are represented adequately and if they have adequate access to their member. They do not go around complaining that their member represents 5 000, 10 000, or even 70 000 people, and this is why I believe the Labor Party is barking up the wrong tree. Its argument is completely unconvincing to the electorate at large.

During the course of her address, the Hon. Grace Vaughan drew attention to section 5 of the Electoral Districts Act which related to the statutory provision of a 2:1 voting ratio. In the past we have listened to Labor Party spokesmen criticising the loading provisions contained in the Act.

It was suggested that if section 5 were amended, it would meet with the approval of the Labor Party. But there is no longer a statutory provision for such loading.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: Not in law, but it is still there in fact.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: No such opposition was expressed tonight, because the Hon. Grace Vaughan said it would be better to have that provision back in the Act.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: I did not say that; I said that at least it would provide a nexus. That is quite a different thing.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Now we are splitting straws; I suppose there is a difference.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: Splitting straws! You are splitting votes!

The Hon. N. McNEILL: The honourable member said it would be preferable to have it in the Act.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: I said that at least it would provide a safeguard against it getting worse.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: As members opposite know very well, the number of seats represented in the Parliament is determined by the Government, through the Parliament, and it remains for the Government or the Parliament at any time to make provision for the number of seats in the Parliament.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: I was talking of the ratio between metropolitan and rural seats, as you well know.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: The honourable member has made her speech.

The Hon. R. Thompson: What does the Liberal Party policy say?

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Because you have moved from the front bench to where you now sit, does it mean you are no longer allowed to speak?

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I am sure the Hon. R. Thompson has read the Liberal Party policy speech a far greater number of times than even I, so I will leave it to him to answer the question.

It always has been the function of Governments and Parliaments to determine the number of electorates in a Parliament, and that continues to be so. It is interesting to see what action the Labor Party has taken in recent times in regard to the 2:1 provision contained in section 5. Only a short while ago they found it quite obnoxious.

However, on the last occasion the Labor Party had the opportunity to amend the Electoral Districts Act, it failed to achieve a constitutional majority and the second reading was not passed. That was in 1973, and in that Bill the Labor Government

made no provision to amend section 5 to alter the weighting provision. That was a matter of only 2½ years ago; members opposite had the opportunity to do something about the section, but they did not take advantage of it.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Do not confuse the issue. They brought in a completely new concept, and you know it.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: That is a most interesting observation, because from what was said at the time by the Minister introducing the Bill, that was not the case.

The Hon. R. Thompson: You would do better to have a look at the Bill, rather than quote what the Minister said.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: In other words, the Minister was trying to get it through and was not telling the truth, was he?

The Hon. R. Thompson: I would say it was more like the Minister was used to the lies told by members opposite.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: I am not sure whether I heard the interjection correctly, but I understood the Hon. R. Thompson to be referring to members on this side telling lies. If that is the case, all I can say is that we are not unaccustomed to hearing that kind of expression from the honourable member and on previous occasions I am sure that points of order have been taken.

I quote now the words of the then Attorney-General, the member for Kalgoorlie (Mr T. D. Evans) when introducing the Electoral Districts Act Amendment Bill on Tuesday, the 8th May, 1973. The second reading of this Bill appears at page 1457 of *Hansard*, and the member for Kalgoorlie is reported as saying—

Clause 4 amends section 4 to draw attention to an alteration to section 5, and clause 5 amends section 5 of the principal Act by providing that the number of electors in relation to any area shall be calculated as on the date of the publication in the *Government Gazette* of the latest proclamation made pursuant to section 12 of the Act. This puts into the Act a practice which has been followed by electoral commissioners.

Those are the comments of the then Minister in relation to the amendment of section 5. So, the Labor Party had an opportunity to amend this section, but it failed to take advantage of that opportunity.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Your interpretation of that is that the Labor Party allowed the commissioners to determine the matter; but that is not what you people did.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: That comment is a red herring, as the honourable member knows full well.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: The comment of an old man.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Considerable reference has been made to the word "gerrymander"; it was used many times last year, and again tonight, and has been directed particularly at boundaries.

Let me discuss the specific issue of the drawing of electoral boundaries. The Hon. Grace Vaughan knows as well as anyone else that there is no gerrymander of the district boundaries of Western Australia, because they are drawn up by the Electoral Commissioners who, within the flexibility and discretion allowed them under the Act, draw those boundaries in the metropolitan area and the country districts, including the north-west and Murchison-Eyre, where they see fit.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: I have never heard you talk about who draws the metropolitan boundaries before.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Mr President, I am sure that you well recall the various amendments to the Electoral Districts Act affecting the metropolitan area boundary. It would be interesting for members, particularly members opposite, to read some of the debates of past years relating to that subject.

For instance, Mr President, you will remember very clearly that in 1965 certain provisions were introduced in relation to the boundary of the metropolitan area. As you know, those provisions were statutorily fixed, and the Commissioners had no power to alter them.

That Bill of 1965 was supported by the Labor Party, although in fact there was a division in the House because it was necessary for the purposes of gaining a constitutional majority. It is interesting that *Hansard* records only two members of the Opposition as having voted against the Bill, the Hon. Eric Heenan, and the Hon. Ruby Hutchison. All other members voted with the Government in support of that Bill which established the boundary of the metropolitan area.

That was not so long ago; it was in 1965, and most members in the House tonight were here in those days.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: Most? You should have another look around.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Well, a sufficient proportion of members were present when that Bill went through the House. As I say, it was only 10 or 11 years ago, which in parliamentary history is not very long.

The fact is that apparently there has been a remarkable change in the policy and attitude of the Labor Party. Members opposite might also like to refer to what the Tonkin Labor Government wished to do in relation to the metropolitan boundary when it introduced its Bill in 1973. Again, it might be said that the Tonkin Government had the opportunity to do something about the boundary. It did try to do something about it, but in

actual fact what it wished to do was to provide for only minor variations of the metropolitan boundary to bring it into line with new street alignments.

As many members will recall, Beach Road was specifically mentioned by the Minister when introducing the Bill. Obviously, in 1973 the Labor Party was not greatly concerned at the alignment of the metropolitan area boundary because it made no effort to change it. As the Minister said, the Bill provided for only minor variations of the boundary in order to meet new street alignments, divisions of roads, and so on, to make it more convenient for the Electoral Commissioners in the course of a redistribution.

We have heard a great deal of rubbish in this House about the boundary of the metropolitan area; quite obviously we can say only that there has been a remarkable change of attitude on the part of Labor members. Now they want to see a complete change in the system.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: That is a typically conservative concern.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: The honourable member has used the expression "a typical conservative concern" obviously intending it to be derogatory, but I do not mind being referred to as a conservative. I prefer that to being referred to as a radical. I do not find the expression in any way to my disadvantage or to the disadvantage of the electorate at large. The people do not regard the description "conservative" as undesirable.

In recent election campaigns there was a great desire on the part of the Australian electorate to return to conservatism. That was what the people wanted. In the words of Mrs Vaughan, she acknowledges the speech of the Hon. Margaret McAleer which placed the accent on people. So it is the people, what the people require, and what they desire, which is of the greatest importance. It is not what the Labor Party or the Liberal Party wants that is of the greatest importance. We should remember that.

Let me refer to the metropolitan electoral boundaries. The last few lines of paragraph 8 of the amendment states—

... the Government has tampered with the electoral laws without seeking or having any mandate from the people to do so and without attempting to achieve a one vote one value result.

I emphasise the words "without seeking or having any mandate from the people to do so".

You, Mr President, will know better than I or any other member of this House that there is always a mandate given to the Government, and particularly to the Minister in charge of electoral matters to keep the electoral laws, the electoral boundaries, and the redistributions well and truly up

to date. Not only do you know that well, but in the past we have been reminded of that many times.

I well recall in 1974 when some word got around the countryside and was fed back to the then Leader of the Opposition that the Government was contemplating a redistribution. I suppose it can be said a Government can be contemplating a redistribution at any time. That little bit of publicity was a sprat to catch a mackerel. In part it was directed at the situation existing in the metropolitan area, in the northern, north-eastern, and south-eastern suburbs.

Because of the growth in the population in those suburbs we found in 1975 that in the Toodyay electorate there were enough electors to fill more than two quotas, and that seven seats were out of balance. Although Mrs Vaughan was extremely critical and used some intemperate language in discussing the editorial in *The West Australian* of the 29th March, she did not refer to an article by a columnist which appeared in that same newspaper last year.

I do not have the cutting with me, but it will be recalled that this was a half-page article by Don Smith. He included in that article a photograph of an area in Balga. The article directed attention to the inequities then existing and pointed to the need for a change in the boundaries and an adjustment to bring those districts into the metropolitan area.

At the time there were seven seats out of balance, and particularly they were disproportionately out of balance. I as the Minister would have been totally irresponsible had I ignored the situation, bearing in mind if a redistribution had not been introduced at that time there would be no redistribution prior to the next election. Following the next election there would be without question eight seats out of balance, and as a consequence there would be an automatic redistribution effected by the Electoral Commissioners without any change to the metropolitan boundaries. What would be the result? Anything could have come out of such a redistribution, because there were so many urban electors outside the then metropolitan boundaries.

I return to the words which I used on this question: the Government clearly has a mandate. I say it has more than a mandate; it has an absolute responsibility to bring about the necessary changes. Did the Tonkin Government in 1973 have a mandate for what it tried to do in its electoral legislation? Of course it had. It might not have included that matter in its policy speech but it had a mandate, as does every Government.

The words in the amendment have no significance at all. I want to repeat that the Government and I make no apology for fixing the number of seats in the agricultural, mining, and pastoral areas at 24.

We make no apology for attempting to provide a greater balance in the representation by increasing the number of seats in the metropolitan area. We should bear in mind that through its decisions the Government has provided six more seats in the metropolitan area—four in the Assembly and two in the Council.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: And increased the number of electors in the metropolitan area.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: Certainly, but not in proportion to the six extra seats. I do not have the figures at my fingertips, but the increase in the number of metropolitan electors is between 20 000 and 25 000. That was the number of electors transferred to the metropolitan area as a consequence of the change in boundary.

There are four new electoral districts, and two new provinces. That is not a bad achievement, bearing in mind that the country representation has been maintained at 24 seats. It still is open to any succeeding Government or Parliament to make a change in the number of seats if it so wishes, subject to the Government being able to obtain a constitutional majority in Parliament.

Let me return to a point which has been referred to many times. There seems to be a change in the attitude of the Labor Party because of its past performances. It has expressed great concern for the interests of the people, when in fact it is only concerned with its prospects of gaining control of the Parliament. No doubt, every political party would wish to be in control of a Parliament, but that should be achieved through the votes of the people and not brought about by a system which automatically ensures such a result.

As I said in the remarks I have made at other times, the Labor Party had a greater representation in the Legislative Council previously than it now has. I suppose it thought that under the 1965 legislation and the Bill that you, Mr President, were responsible for introducing to provide adult franchise for Legislative Council elections, it could view its prospects with considerable glee. Surely the passing of that legislation would have given it a greater chance to obtain a majority in the Legislative Council. However, the result it expected did not come about. The result of the election came about through one reason, and the Labor Party should be reminded of it. The result came about because the people in the electorate did not want majority Labor Party representation. These things have been said often, but I make no apology for repeating them.

Let us look at the situation in the North Province when Mr Withers was elected, and subsequently when Mr Tozer was elected. We all know what happened on the day that Mr Withers was elected. At

the election held on the same day under the same conditions with the same people voting, a member of the Labor Party was also elected. At the subsequent election Mr Tozer was successful in defeating the Labor candidate. We should bear in mind that the Labor Party had been represented by two of its most eminent members in the North Province; I refer to the Hon. Frank Wise and the Hon. Harry Strickland.

The Hon. J. Heitman: Do not forget that Mr Willesee also represented the same area.

The Hon. N. McNEILL: That is right. I am now talking about the North Province which was represented by Mr Wise and Mr Strickland. That representation by members of the Labour Party dwindled and dwindled. It would not matter at all whether or not the votes in the Gascoyne electorate, the Lower North Province, or the Murchison-Eyre electorate were of equal value to the votes of the electors in Ascot or Cottesloe. The fact is that in the electoral districts and provinces in the north the votes of the people were of equal value. It transpired that the Liberal Party increased its representation at the expense of the Labor Party.

No great concern was expressed by the Labor Party when it had representation of most of the seats in the north and the goldfields area. Recently I made a Press comment that there had been no clamour by the Labor Party in the past when it had nine members representing less than 25 000 people in the pastoral and mining areas. In those days there was no clamour by the Labor Party; let us be completely realistic about this.

I fail to see any great purpose being served by spending more time in debating this amendment. I reject completely the arguments put forward by Mrs Vaughan. Without hearing other members of the Opposition, I expect there will be a repetition of many things which they have said before on this subject. By repeating these things they hope they can keep the subject alive and make it an issue at the next election.

I say it is an issue that will not be a winner for the Labor Party. Provided the people have good representation they are not concerned whether they are in an electorate the member of which represents 10 000 electors or 50 000 electors. If members of the Labor Party believe that members of Parliament are held in such great esteem in Western Australia or in Australia then they are deluding themselves.

I reject the amendment. There is no real substance in it. I will on a later occasion when we continue with the debate on the motion refer to the remarks made by Mrs Vaughan. For the present I confine myself to some remarks she made in putting forward the amendment. Many

other things can be said about her speech, but I think they can be dealt with more properly in the debate on the Address-in-Reply than in the debate on the amendment. I oppose the amendment.

Point of Order

The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS: Mr President, I ask for your ruling on the preamble to this document which has been presented as an amendment. I believe it contravenes Standing Order 85 as to paragraph 7, and that paragraph 8 contravenes Standing Order 84 in its latter meaning.

The PRESIDENT: Would you repeat your last words?

The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS: Paragraph 8 contravenes Standing Order 84 after the passage "in debate,".

The PRESIDENT: I am afraid I must rule that in my opinion there is no question of either Standing Order 84 or Standing Order 85 being contravened.

The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS: Mr President, do you regard the word "gerrymander"—

The PRESIDENT: Is this a point of order the honourable member is raising?

The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS: Yes, Sir. Do you consider the word "gerrymander" to be an orderly word?

The PRESIDENT: The word "gerrymander" has been used quite frequently in the Chamber and presiding officers in the past have accepted it as not being unparliamentary. Other words such as "lies" are very unparliamentary. If in the honourable member's opinion the word "gerrymander" is unparliamentary, he could have asked for the withdrawal of the word when it was first used. In the present context I cannot sustain the point of order.

Debate (on amendment to motion) Resumed

THE HON. LYLA ELLIOTT (North-East Metropolitan) [8.32 p.m.]: It is obvious that members opposite do not want to hear what we have to say. That is the third point of order we have had so far.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: We hear it every year.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Sit down and we will make your speech for you.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Will honourable members please keep order. The Hon. Lyla Elliott.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I wish to support the amendment moved by the Hon. Grace Vaughan. I will commence my remarks by reading the preamble to which Mr Williams takes exception—

However Members of this House express their concern that the Legislative Council has been brought into

public odium and disrepute because of the Government's failure to initiate and implement those constitutional and electoral laws that will create a Parliament based on truly democratic principles . . .

This is the point which I believe we should be debating. Is this House elected on truly democratic principles?

I asked the library staff to look up some definitions of the word "democracy". I would like to quote three of them which I think support our case.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Would you read the ones which support ours as well?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I do not think any such definitions could be found. The first definition comes from Webster's dictionary and it reads—

democracy—Government by the people; rule of the majority.

Please note the word "majority".

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: The majority in this place.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That is democracy.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: The majority in this Parliament.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: The second definition comes from a publication entitled "Our Sham Democracy", by A. E. Mander.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Is he related to Gerry?

The Hon. D. K. Dans: A very appropriate name.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: He is not related to Gerry. He gives a number of ingredients essential to democracy. The first one is—

A society in which the governing body (parliament) is freely chosen by majority-vote in secret ballot, and is subject to re-election at intervals of not more than two or three years.

That is the second reference to majority vote or majority rule.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: We are clear about that up to date.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: The third definition comes from the *Encyclopedia Britannica* and it reads—

democracy, term literally meaning rule by the people (from the Greek *demos*, "the people" and *kratos*, "rule") . . . (1) a form of government in which the right to make political decisions is exercised directly by the whole body of citizens, acting under procedures of majority rule, usually known as direct democracy; (2) a form of government in which the citizens exercise the same right not in person but through representatives chosen by and responsible to them, known as representative democracy;

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Why did you choose American publications instead of the Oxford dictionary, which is the acceptable one?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Perhaps there is not an Oxford dictionary in the library.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: What rot! It is the only one which is acceptable in Parliament. American publications are not acceptable.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Does the Minister not accept the *Encyclopedia Britannica*?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: No. It is an American publication. It is laid down somewhere that the Oxford dictionary is the one to be used.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: The *Encyclopedia Britannica* and Webster's dictionary are authoritative sources and I am happy to accept their definitions.

I have given three definitions of democracy—the kind of thing we have been talking about for years in this Chamber, and the kind of definition we use. "Democracy" means majority rule, government through representatives of the people elected by a majority of the people.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Can you tell me one member of this Parliament who was not elected by a majority of the people?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order, please! When the Chair calls for order, honourable members will please maintain order and not continue to interject. The Hon. Lyla Elliott.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Thank you, Mr President. Someone was talking about red herrings. That is a red herring. It has nothing to do with rule by a majority of the people of Western Australia.

I have given three definitions of democracy, and I am sure members opposite would be horrified if someone suggested to them that we did not have democratic government in this State. We cannot say that the situation which exists is as defined in those three definitions I gave, which I consider to be authoritative. We do not have majority rule in this State; therefore we do not have a democratically elected Parliament.

The Hon. T. Knight: You have your views and we have ours.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I will quote some figures to demonstrate what I mean.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: I think you believe that yourself.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Of the electors of Western Australia, 66½ per cent live in the metropolitan area, yet those people are entitled under our existing legislation to elect only 49 per cent of the

seats in the Legislative Assembly and 37½ per cent of the seats in this Chamber. However, the position is reversed in the rural areas, where we find that 33½ per cent of the total population are represented by 51 per cent of the seats in the Legislative Assembly and 62½ per cent of the seats in the Legislative Council.

The Hon. N. McNeill: Why do you not win more of the seats in the country?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: We are not talking about who wins the seats; we are talking about electoral justice for the whole of this State.

The Hon. N. McNeill: I thought it was rather important who won the seats.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Those figures show that two-thirds of the electors, who live in the metropolitan area, cannot elect a majority in either House of this Parliament. I think that is an unjust and undemocratic situation. If we accept the fact that all men—and all women—are equal before the law, we must accept that the way to achieve that equality is through the parliamentary system. When we talk about the parliamentary system we must also talk about the electoral system.

To summarise what I have been saying, the three main ingredients in a democratic electoral system are—

- (1) Universal suffrage.
- (2) One person one vote.
- (3) One-vote-one-value.

Those three principles are not established under our legislation in respect of the electoral system in this State. Only two of the three principles have been established. Western Australia has the worst imbalance in Australia in the value of votes. Is this not a wonderful achievement? Are members opposite proud of this record? We can have electorates in the Federal Parliament which are just about equal. A wide application of the principle of one-vote-one-value exists in a country like the United States. Despite what the Minister said, there is already application of this principle in the United States; yet we cannot have it in the State of Western Australia.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Would you want the same system of representation as they have in the United States?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Would you like presidential elections to be held in the same way as in the United States?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: The Minister for Justice said he was going to have quoted to him a statement made in the Supreme Court of the United States. I did not intend to repeat a statement which I have quoted on two previous occasions in this Chamber, but in view of the fact that the Minister wants to be reminded of it I will quote it again. In a case

in the Supreme Court of the United States in 1964 dealing with this precise question of the imbalance between rural and city votes, Chief Justice Earl Warren said—

Legislatures represent people, not trees or acres . . . To the extent that a citizen's right to vote is debased he is that much less a citizen.

The court ruled on that occasion that as nearly as practicable one man's vote is to be worth as much as another's. What is wrong with that? It is a perfectly sound principle for which we should be aiming with every amendment to our electoral legislation, instead of making the situation worse.

The Hon. T. Knight: I thought your party disagreed with American principles. Everything we do here you criticise.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: That is not true.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Of course it is true.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: The Labor Party formed the American alliance.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: From the beginning of the parliamentary system we have always had in our midst those conservatives who try to exclude some group or class of people from electing governments. In the first place it was considered only people with property should have the right to vote. Then it was thought only men had the necessary wisdom and that women should not exercise the right to vote. Then women were given the vote and it was thought Aborigines should not be entitled to vote. The people who deny electoral justice today are the same kind of people as those who in the past have denied the vote to women, Aborigines, and people who did not have property.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Who brought in the legislation to give adult franchise to this place?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: The only reason the Government concerned brought it in was that it was nagged at for so long by the Hon. Ruby Hutchison.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: The answer is the Liberal-Country Party.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: The same kind of people—the conservatives who are afraid of progress and real democracy—do not want to contest elections on the same basis as the Labor Party. They are very conveniently forgetting the unanimous decision of the all-party committee which was set up by Sir Robert Menzies back in 1956 to review the Australian Constitution.

This all-party committee unanimously recommended that the Australian Constitution should be amended to provide that

the variation between electorates should be not more than one-tenth of the figure established as the quota. There were Country Party and Liberal Party representatives on that committee, and for some reason or other they have all conveniently forgotten that recommendation.

What did this Government do last year when it amended the Electoral Districts Act? Instead of introducing electoral reform that would provide the basis for real democracy in the State, this Government made the situation worse. It adjusted the metropolitan boundary in such a way that some seats were made safe for the Liberal Party.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Just offhand, how many of those seats do you reckon we will win?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Not many, I hope.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Just a minute ago you said they were safe for the Liberal Party.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: We now have the absurd situation that places like Wanneroo, Gooseberry Hill, Kalamunda, Lesmurdie, and half of Armadale are in what are considered to be the rural areas in which people have a weighted vote, so the votes of people in those areas are worth twice the value of a metropolitan vote.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: What is the point of that?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: What is the justification for it? We are told about the problems of distance that face Mr Withers and others in the north-west; but how can members opposite justify a person living on one side of the railway line in Armadale being entitled to a vote which has twice the value of the vote of a person living on the other side of the line, or in any of the other suburbs I have mentioned? The people who live in the areas I have mentioned cannot be classed as disadvantaged because of the fact that they live in those areas. They have the same radio and television services as people on the other side of the boundary; they have the same telephone rates and can ring up with the same convenience; they have the same newspaper delivered each morning; and they can get into their cars and drive into the city in about 30 minutes. What justification is there for those people to have a weighted vote?

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: Wherever you put the boundary there will still be a weighted vote.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: That is the point; it is an artificial boundary. It should be removed and the State should be divided into electorates of equal numbers. Only in that way will we get some sort of electoral justice.

I do not intend to go into all the details of the services now available to people in the outback and the north-west in respect of transport, postage, and communication facilities, because I went into this in detail in my speech last year on the Bill to amend the Electoral Districts Act.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Did you support that Bill?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: However, I want to reiterate that we are no longer living in the horse and buggy days when people were isolated for weeks, perhaps months, as a result of poor communications.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: In the north you can be as isolated today as people were 100 years ago.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Modern means of transport and communication have removed any justification, if ever it existed, for a person at one end of the State to have a vote with 14 times more value than the vote of a person at the other end of the State.

The amendment moved by the Hon. Grace Vaughan refers also to local government elections. Paragraph 4 states—

That in Local Government elections many people who are entitled to vote in Australian and State elections have no right at all to vote whilst others have the right to plural votes.

This is another area in which I believe we are living in the 19th century. The time is long overdue to abolish property franchise. I believe adult franchise should be introduced for local government elections on the same basis as for parliamentary elections.

The Hon. N. McNeill: And the endorsement of political candidates?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: If it is right that universal franchise should be used for the election of representatives in Parliament, why is it so wrong for local government? I think the philosophy that a man's right to vote should be tied to property is archaic; and it is time we adjusted our thinking and recognised that people are more important than property, trees, acres, or sheep.

THE HON. A. A. LEWIS (Lower Central) [8.51 p.m.]: I do not wish to delay the House for very long, but when someone from the other side moves an amendment discussing democracy I think it should be opposed automatically, because we have seen the democracy of members opposite and of their Federal leaders. We have seen their sense of democracy in respect of the Governor-General; so I believe it is farcical for them to come to this place and put the matter of democracy before us.

Let me deal with this quietly and quickly.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Quietly—impossible!

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: If Mr Cooley would like to commence his boycott now I am sure Mr Dans would join him, and I will excuse them. If Mr Cooley puts up his hand a little further, I will excuse him.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member will please address the Chair.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I am sorry, Sir.

The South-East Metropolitan Province has been mentioned in the debate on this amendment. The Hon. Grace Vaughan said that northern provinces have 14 times the voting value of the South-East Metropolitan Province. It is very ironical, as my leader has said, that before 1965 the Labor Party had nothing at all to say about weighted electorates. I can find nothing said by any Labor member before 1965 regarding weighted electorates in the north.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: We are not like conservative Governments; we make progress.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Members opposite have not made progress in this place, because in 1965 they had 13 members but now they have nine. If they call that progress that is their business. The Hon. Grace Vaughan brought out her little calculator and told us the number of people in a quota. I will not accuse the honourable member of misleading the House; I just say I think she has not yet worked out how to use her new toy—the calculator—and how to get a quota.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: You go to the Wheat Board.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Your neurons are running wild again.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Well, she said she had 58 quotas; but she is not getting her quota now with her little gadget.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: The Hon. Grace Vaughan has told us that the South Province, represented by Mr Knight and Mr Wordsworth, has a quota of 15, and the Lower Central Province has a quota of 14. She was working this out on six years at 250 days a year. The fact is that in the figures I worked out there was only a total difference of about 100. Of course, I am very jealous of the fact that Mr Tom Perry and I should have a cut in our quotas because we have only 100 less than Mr Wordsworth and Mr Knight. I do not believe that 100 makes 1 500, even on the Hon. Grace Vaughan's calculator.

Let us refer to the way she overcame the distance problem. She was going to give me a racing car, and give Bill Withers a helicopter.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: The Red Baron!

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I think her argument is the only barren thing we have had tonight. We had the argument put up that one vote had a value 14 times greater than another vote. Perhaps the Hon. Grace

Vaughan would like to note these figures. The numbers in the South-East Metropolitan Province—if we are going to take it vote for vote—are near enough to equal to the numbers in the North Province, the Lower North Province, the Upper West Province, the South-East Province, and the Central Province. That takes in virtually everything north of Perth and across to the South Australian border.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan wants this vast area to be represented by two members. She would need to have a helicopter much faster than has yet been invented to cover that area. She said that members of Parliament should receive assistance. By that I presume she means research officers, secretaries, and community welfare officers who will look after her electorate for her. How crazy that is!

Under the present system we have members who are responsible to their electors. Under the Grace Vaughan system members would be responsible to their officers. I can imagine the eyebrows of the Clerks would lift if we asked them for more staff; and your eyebrows, Sir, would go straight through the ceiling. More officers attached to members would require more telephones. I believe a member of Parliament can serve an electorate far better than a paid employee.

We have only to look at the job that members of Parliament do compared with, say, the Australian Assistance Plan. We cost far less, but are far more effective. Unfortunately some people come to this House with the idea that one can pay people to do whatever one likes.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: How many acres of wheat have you harvested to date?

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: As an employee and a member of the Australian Workers Union, some years ago I took off some 20 000 or 30 000 acres, and I was very satisfied with my boss. I will not deal with Mr Cooley because his interjections are fairly puerile at the best of times.

Let us go back to the Hon. Grace Vaughan and her problems of distance, and the matter of giving members more help. We would have the area from just north of Perth to the South Australian border and north to Wyndham covered by two members in this House: that is the sort of proposition being put forward by the Opposition. As I said, such a proposition was not presented prior to 1965; it was not put forward in the days when property gave one a vote for this House. The Labor Party then had 13 members in this place, now it has nine, and after next year it will have eight or probably seven.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: How do you work that out?

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Well, Mr Dellar's seat will go, and the only person who could hold Mr Stubbs' seat is Mr Stubbs himself; and as he is retiring

that will bring it down to seven. So this is an arithmetical progression, and it is caused as a result of the type of argument put forward by members on the other side of the House. It is becoming progressively worse. Members opposite move progressively from there to there and their interjections become more inane as they do so.

The Hon. R. Thompson interjected.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Your seat was the first one written in to ensure that the Labor Party had some membership in this House, and it has hardly been altered since. That is why you will win your seat and you have no chance of losing it.

The Hon. R. Thompson: You said that before when you were sitting down.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: We are democratic. We are understanding. We are fair. You could not win a seat so we gave you one.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Say it was written in 1893.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: The Hon. R. Thompson goes on as if he were here since it was written in.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott talked about artificial boundaries. Which boundary would not be artificial? Would she say that the line from Perth to the South Australian border due east is not an artificial boundary? I do not believe the Hon. Lyla Elliott is that silly. It is interesting that the Labor Party put up its big guns, the people who know its dogma best, to propose and second this amendment. I am very glad to see that, because it shows some female superiority on the Labor side. Being a male it hurts me a little to think that there is such female superiority on the other side and I hope that after the next election—if some people are retiring from the other side—the Labor Party can gain one or two strong men.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: They have superiority only in numbers.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: The ladies on the other side of the House have superiority of intellect as well, and the inane comments coming from the cross bench will guarantee that that is a certainty.

The Hon. R. Thompson: The Liberal Party has never let you do it on behalf of your party.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: The Hon. Ron Thompson wants to look at the *Hansard* reports from another place. He makes statements all the time which are half-truths. I do not believe the public ought to be fooled by them.

The other matter which the Labor Party put up in support of its amendment was a pathetic adherence to United States electoral policies. Opposition speakers damn multi-national companies and anything in the United States day after day.

I remember somebody in this debate virtually damning the Omega station. I hope it comes to Western Australia. We can do with that sort of money being spent in Western Australia.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: Money is the important thing, is it not?

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: No, the jobs for people are important. That is the problem with Opposition members; they never think about people. They think about dogma, dogma, and only dogma. As long as their dogma is written into *Hansard*, that is all right. But there is no way that they would think of people. They are not oriented to think about people. It is obvious from the election results since the franchise has been changed in this House that Opposition members have no appeal to people because they wanted—

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: What am I doing here?

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I wonder at times.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: That is your opinion.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: It is the opinion of everybody else but they are too polite to tell the honourable member.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: You cannot remember back that far through your bushy skull.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: We stand here and look at all nine of the Opposition, if they are not boycotting the place, and we listen to their dogma. Is there any real heartfelt cry for people? There never is.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: That is not true.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Opposition members have been trained by the party and I believe they have been stood in line and been made to say the same thing.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: I wonder what will happen to the Liquor Bill in this session? The same as last year?

The PRESIDENT: I must ask the honourable member to connect his remarks to the matter before the chair.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I shall, Sir. The Labor Party document says that the Labor Party wishes to create a Parliament based on truly democratic principles. I do not believe that being taught dogma is a democratic principle. I hope that explains how I am tying my remarks to the amendment.

I have little more to say except that the Opposition will never become the Government until it begins to realise that people in far-flung areas want actual parliamentary representatives. They do not want some minion to go and visit them; for community welfare people go and visit them. They believe they need a member of Parliament to go and visit

them, just as any person in Perth can visit a member of Parliament with a two-penny tram fare or bus fare. I shall defer to the Hon. Ron Thompson before he says that it is now 10c or 15c.

The Hon. R. Thompson: The minimum fare is now 30c. Your Government put that up.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: The second matter is the fact that the only example of so-called democracy that the Opposition can give us is the United States which on the other hand it damns. Thirdly, members of the Opposition talk about artificial boundaries—boundaries which are just drawn in. It was amazing that in the discussion on the artificial boundary from Perth west to the South Australian border—

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: You would have to go east to go to the South Australian border or you will end up in Madagascar!

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: So one goes east to the South Australian border, but members opposite agree with me that that would be an artificial boundary.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: We do not know what you are talking about.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: Which line?

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I understand now that if one talks of matters outside that dogma the Hon. Lyla Elliott cannot understand any sort of logical argument.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: You do not even know what dogma is.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Towards the end of her speech the Hon. Lyla Elliott touched on the subject of property and local government. I assume that the Hon. Lyla Elliott wants Government to pay all the rates. She does not want land owners to pay rates to the shires or municipalities.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: I did not say that.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I know the member did not say that, but she wants everyone to have a fair share when the money is split up. The home owner, the person who puts money into the area and employs the people in the area should not have any more say than the—

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: What about the taxpayers' money that goes into local government these days, millions of dollars from the taxpayers, not drawn from direct local sources?

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: It is fascinating to listen again to this sort of thing. Mr President, through you I said to the Hon. Lyla Elliott that it appeared to me that she wanted Government to pay this money and she said, "I did not say that".

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: They are getting this money already.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: The honourable member says that we are getting that money. Obviously she does not understand

local government. She does not understand the Council, the Assembly, or electoral boundaries and now she has proved that she does not even understand local government.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I thought you were going to make a brief reply.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I am. It shall be very brief. After all, the Leader of the Opposition created the situation whereby this amendment has been moved. I thank him very much because it gives me twice the opportunity to speak in the Address-in-Reply debate.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: Two times nothing is nothing.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: The Hon. Grace Vaughan has got that calculator working at last.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: It has come up with the right answer.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: It is the only right answer she has ever come up with. It is obvious that the Hon. Lyla Elliott does not want somebody who contributes to building his own home to have more say than anybody else in any shire. She wants an equal share for everybody.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: What is wrong with that?

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: That is no good in your elitist theory of course.

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I believe people who contribute ought to get something back. I do not believe in the soft society in which the Hon. Grace Vaughan and the Hon. Lyla Elliott believe. But that is not what we are discussing at the moment. If members opposite wish to hear me on that subject they can ask me the same questions during the Address-in-Reply debate and I shall tell them just how the Whitlam Government ruined this country.

The Hon. S. J. Dellar: What has that to do with this amendment?

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I said that I was not going to talk about it but if members opposite wish to ask questions during the Address-in-Reply debate I shall give them the answers. I oppose this amendment. I have given reasons for opposing it which are far more logical than any reason which has been given in support of it. I hope that there are some males in the Opposition who will try to get the Labor Party out of the intricate mess in which it is at present, having left their intellectual colleagues to propose and second the amendment.

THE HON. D. W. COOLEY (North-East Metropolitan) [9.12 p.m.]: I support the amendment that has been moved and supported by my two charming colleagues on this back bench. I did not really think that the days of chivalry had passed, but we have seen a rather pathetic effort tonight

by a senior Minister in the Government and one of his colleagues in trying to denigrate the ladies of this Chamber—

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: You do not believe in equality.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: —in respect of the presentation of their argument. I think if the ignorant were blessed Mr Lewis would be a saint. He said that the speeches of Mrs Vaughan and Miss Elliott will go down in *Hansard* as very unworthy efforts. I think the amendment that has been moved by Mrs Vaughan is very timely because it seeks to reform the Electoral Act. In view of the pressure that is applying in the community at present I expected to see in the Governor's Speech some reference to such reform. It is not only the Labor Party which is advocating reform of electoral matters in Western Australia. There are people in high places who consider it very undesirable that there should be a malapportionment in the electorate to the extent of eight to one in one House and 14 to one in another. While the average person in Western Australia has not yet come to grips completely with the principle of one-vote-one-value, I think the people in our community who make a study of politics see that the malapportionment is a very unfair situation which should not be perpetuated for much longer.

I believe that deep in their hearts some of those on the other side of the Chamber also feel that a great number of injustices are associated with the present system. The Government should be planning now to provide some way by which the position can be rectified. Mention has been made of the United States and that we do not like America for some reason; but that is not completely true in every respect.

The Hon. N. McNeill: Not in every respect.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: In some.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I have said here before that the true friends of people are those who genuinely criticise them. A person is not a friend if he continues to go along with everything a person does even when something he is doing is obviously wrong. If a person behaves in that way, that person is doing the friend a bad turn. We are trying to genuinely criticise America; but that is off the track and has nothing to do with this amendment.

The Hon. N. McNeill: You criticise the Americans because you like them so much.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I do not think the President will allow me to continue, but in respect of the relationship between the ALP and the American nation I repeat what I said by way of interjection; that it was the ALP which established the American alliance during the last war. Of course that has nothing to do with the amendment. We refer to the United States in the document because

they do have a system of one-vote-one-value and they are often referred to as the bastion of democracy.

Returning to the amendment, it is true that the conservatives did, in 1965, introduce adult franchise for the Upper House and it was quite a laudible effort on their part.

There is no guarantee that if the one-vote-one-value system applied, the ALP would be elected to office. All the ALP seeks is a more democratic system than that which applies at present. If we cannot get the one-vote-one-value system I appeal to the Government to try to correct some of the anomalies apparent at present.

I am not absolutely certain of the figures, but I believe that at the last election for this Chamber we received 50 per cent of the votes in the metropolitan area but gained only one seat.

The Hon. J. Heitman: That is very easily explained.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: That does not seem to be a very democratic situation.

There might be some justification for saying that vast areas should be treated differently from the metropolitan area. However, let us consider the position. The seat of Gascoyne has 3 588 electors on the roll, and I presume that Gascoyne is in the Lower North and is nearer to Perth than is the Pilbara where there are 11 430 people on the roll. I do not claim to know a great deal about the north-west, but I assume the Pilbara is more isolated than the Gascoyne. Yet the present situation obtains. These anomalies and malapportionments are unjust. I assume that members on the other side of the House believe in democracy. My understanding of parliamentary democracy is the Westminster system. The Liberal Party believes in a two-party system because it is forever trying to get rid of the Country Party.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: With some success, I might say.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I do not believe the present situation is democratic in any way at all. It is certainly not democratic when one of the parties cannot govern in its own right; and that has been the position in this State for 90 years.

The Hon. N. McNeill: Does the Westminster system have one-vote-one-value?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I think the Minister has lost track of my argument.

The Hon. N. McNeill: No I have not.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I am supporting a proposition of one-vote-one-value, but until that goal is attained I believe that certain anomalies should be rectified. I thought that in this last year of office the Court Government might do something about the situation.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: May I make a correction? It is not its last year, but its third year.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: There is no way in the world by which it could be returned again.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I think Mr Cooley used the right term. You might have a different Premier.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It is its third year.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Would the honourable member return to the question before the Chair?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The point I am making is that the document states that we have always been denied the right to govern with the same power as that enjoyed by the Liberal and Country Parties. The present Government has been in office for two years and I do not know how many Bills have passed through this Chamber in that time. However, I do know that only one has been defeated and that was one I introduced to amend some minor provisions to the long service leave legislation in order to confer some benefits on working people. Every other Bill has been passed.

The Hon. N. McNeill: Including one introduced by a Labor member in another place.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: And it was passed in this Chamber?

The Hon. N. McNeill: Yes.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: That may be right, but no Government Bill has been rejected in this Chamber since the Court Government came into office.

In the preceding three years something like 23 Bills sent to this Chamber by the Tonkin Government were rejected. The Tonkin Government certainly had a mandate to introduce those 23 Bills which were rejected by this House.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: And we had a clear mandate to reject them.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The Opposition did not.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: My very word we did.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The Opposition did not, and this is the point I make.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: We did have a mandate because I was elected on the same day as the Tonkin Government.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The Opposition did not have a mandate—

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: My very word it did.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: —because in 1973 when some of the industrial legislation was defeated here there were in this Chamber members elected in 1968. So those people did not have any mandate at all to defeat the legislation.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: There were 15 of them elected in 1971.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: They did not have the right at all to reject that legislation—

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: You will put yourself up again next year?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: —because in respect of a number of the Bills submitted to this Chamber the Tonkin Government did indicate prior to the 1971 election that it intended to introduce them. The people returned the Tonkin Government in the Lower House for that purpose.

The Hon. J. Heitman: No. I have listened to what people say in the country. Every time I went through the country I used to be told, "Thank God we have an Upper House."

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: That has been said for a long time, but we must move with modern thinking. In 1965 the Liberal-Country Party Government did a very commendable thing. It introduced adult franchise.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: What about—

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Despite the fact that Mr Lewis gabbles on and roars like a bull he will not put me off my speech as he does others.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: No-one has to put you off; you are off.

The Hon. N. McNeill: Did the Legislative Council defeat any of the Brand Government's legislation?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: My research has not gone that far, but if the Legislative Council did so—

The Hon. N. McNeill: At least six were thrown out.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: —I do not imagine that 23 Bills would have been defeated. However, that is not the point.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: That was a completely different situation there, and thank you for reminding me of it.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I think we have a right—and the Hon. Margaret McAleer made this point on opening night in her speech which she presented very well without any insinuations being made about her; she was not insulted, and far be it from us to do that to her because she is too nice a person for such treatment. It would be the last thing we would do; that is, to be discourteous to a lady. I think it only right that the same treatment should be afforded the lady members on this side of the House.

The PRESIDENT: May I ask once again that the honourable member address his remarks to the question before the Chair?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I was talking to the motion.

The PRESIDENT: That is not the question. The question before the Chair is the amendment.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: We are trying to amend the motion—

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Chair is the amendment. I make that perfectly clear.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Yes. The amendment simply states that the ALP has always been denied the right to govern with the same power as that enjoyed by the Liberal and National Country Party Government.

Let me come back to the question of democracy. I would not support any undemocratic policy in my own party. Honestly, if I knew there was a situation under which I thought the Labor Party could never be removed from office, I would not support it. The situation here is that the Liberal-Country Party Government can never be removed from office while the present law exists in respect of the electoral boundaries which do not give the Labor Party any chance to govern in this House. That is the position. We have had the same situation here for 90 years. In other words, we have not had one win. As a track record that would not be acceptable. If a horse on a racetrack made 38 starts and had 38 wins everybody would assume the races were rigged because such a performance would not be possible.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Or it would be a very good horse.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: It would not be possible for such an undemocratic situation to exist anywhere else in the free world and I am sure that no-one could quote any place where in a two-party system one of the parties has no possibility of gaining control.

All this amendment seeks to do is to go some of the way towards solving the problem. We believe in the one-vote-one-value system, but I appeal to members opposite to study the situation and consider whether they are doing the right thing.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: From what document were you quoting?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: It is all very well for Mr Pratt to win his seat in 1974 and sit there with a bland smile on his face for another five years doing nothing, knowing full well that he cannot be removed from his seat.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Why not?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: There is no power under the present legislation which could allow his defeat.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Come off it.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: No matter what Mr Pratt does in this Chamber in respect of political matters he cannot be removed from his seat. He can reject every Bill presented from the lower House, but he cannot be defeated. The law does not permit him to go to the people to enable the people to state whether he is doing the right thing; yet that is democracy.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: I want to know the name of the pamphlet from which you are quoting.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: The honourable member cannot be removed from his seat.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member's remarks are not connected to the question before the Chair.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I do not know why you say that, Mr President.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I have indicated to the honourable member that in my opinion his remarks about whether a member can be removed during the currency of his term of office in this Chamber is not pertinent to the question before the Chair. If the honourable member wishes to disagree with that ruling, he may do so.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I do not wish to disagree, but I do not think that by casting aspersions on the ladies on this side of the Chamber members were speaking to the amendment before the Chair, yet certain people in this Chamber are allowed to do that without any—

Point of Order

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I wish to raise a point of order. I do not ask very often for remarks to be withdrawn. Only two members from this side have spoken to the debate.

The PRESIDENT: What is the point of order?

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I maintain that no aspersions were cast on the individual persons of Miss Elliott or Mrs Vaughan. The subject matter of their speeches came under criticism; and therefore I would like Mr Cooley's remarks on the matter withdrawn.

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member will please withdraw the words.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: In deference to you, Mr President, I will withdraw the words and without qualification—

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: I'll say you will.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: —because you require that.

Debate (on amendment to motion) Resumed

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: Now that you have calmed down, can you tell us from which pamphlet you were quoting about five minutes ago? You picked it up and waved it around.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: In the two years I have been here I have not heard anything constructive from Mr Pratt and I do not intend to respond to his interjection.

The amendment goes on to say that the Australian Labor Party is the senior political party in this State. I do not

think an election has ever been held in Western Australia in which the Labor Party did not poll more than any other single party but we have never been able to govern in our own right. Surely to goodness there should be some area in which the Government, having regard for the amendment, can do something to rectify the position.

The amendment goes on to tell the Governor that the State of Western Australia is embarrassed by the situation which now exists in respect of the electoral laws. There is evidence of a popular opinion within the community that the electoral laws should be amended. Since the Government moved to redistribute the boundaries three leading articles have appeared in *The West Australian*. The articles have referred to voting equity and Council weighting. A feature article appeared in *The West Australian* as recently as Monday, the 29th March, and the article commences—

There is growing evidence of disquiet among Australians at the way the institution of Parliament is functioning as an arm of democracy.

The article goes on to say that one of the reasons for the public losing confidence in the system is the nature of representation in Western Australia. It states that the present system of weighting votes might have been appropriate many years ago.

Those are not the words of the Labor Party, they are the words of the leader writer in *The West Australian*. Referring to the system of weighting votes the article goes on to state—

Today it is loaded with anomalies and inequities. It badly needs to be corrected—and not by the device of increasing the size of Parliament, which is the way the Court government has gone about boundary changing.

A little further the article states—

There is no convincing case for a two-to-one loading in Assembly electorates which are virtually part of the metropolitan area or which enjoy comparable amenities and services.

The article also states—

The worst aspect of the present system is its application to Legislative Council provinces in which non-metropolitan electors exercise about three times the voting power of their city cousins.

Surely that shows there is something wrong, having regard to what I said with respect to democracy. The article goes on—

The Council is one of the most strongly entrenched Upper Houses of any Parliament. It has the same power as the Australian Senate, but not the same obligations.

Council members could refuse to grant Supply to a government, yet be immune from the consequences of such a step.

I know I am getting away from the amendment so I will not continue to quote. However, I believe the present situation is a result of not having a fair and equitable system of electing members to this Chamber.

I do not cast aspersions on the Legislative Council Chamber in making those comments; I cast aspersions on the method by which we are elected. It really is not fair and I do not think anyone on this side would agree it is fair. Members opposite, as reasonable men, could not agree that the situation is fair where there are so many inequalities.

We ought to give some consideration to the amendment. It does not commit the Legislative Council at all to a policy of one-vote-one-value. It simply states that we should look at the situation to see whether we can reach that desirable objective ultimately.

Point of Order

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: I rise on a point of order, Mr President, under Standing Order 150. The Hon. D. W. Cooley did quote from a document and I asked him to identify it. He would not identify it and I ask that it be tabled.

The PRESIDENT: Would the honourable member please table the document?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Can the honourable member tell me which document it was? I could not understand his interjection because three or four other members were interjecting. If he can quote to me the document . . .

The PRESIDENT: Order please; I have got the message. What is the document which the honourable member wishes to have tabled?

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: That is what I am trying to find out.

The PRESIDENT: Then the honourable member had better let me know when he does find out.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: It is the document which Mr Cooley held in his hand and waved to the Chamber.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: You can have them all, if you want them. I quoted from a document published by Mr Graham Hawks.

The Hon. J. Heitman: That is the one.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: I also quoted the amendment, and I have some leading articles.

The PRESIDENT: Do I take it the honourable member is prepared to table all the documents?

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: That is so. I am prepared to table all of my notes.

The PRESIDENT: Just say "Yes". The documents will be laid on the Table of the House.

The documents were tabled (see paper No. 153).

*Debate (on amendment to motion)
Resumed*

THE HON. I. G. PRATT (Lower West) [9.36 p.m.]: In opposing this rather unfortunately-worded amendment I firstly want to assure Mr Don Cooley that I will not take the advice he tendered to members on this side of the House. If he wants the lady members on his side to enter into debate they will be treated as Legislative Councillors, and not as ladies. They will not receive any chivalry from me, and they should expect to get in return exactly what they give.

One part of a sentence from this unfortunate document which particularly concerns me is in the preamble and it states—

... the Legislative Council has been brought into public odium and disrepute ...

If ever I have seen a contribution which has done just that I have seen it tonight. It is very difficult to believe that the Hon. Grace Vaughan was really genuine in the way she presented her amendment tonight. She showed a callous disregard for the people living in remote areas and, to be honest, I am incensed.

I hold this Chamber and this Parliament in the highest regard and I do not like to hear such ridiculous statements—in what is supposed to be meaningful debate in this House—that members in outback areas can use helicopters and racing cars to get around their electorates. After hearing statements such as that one has to doubt really the reasons for the amendment now before us.

A number of members from the other side of the Chamber have said that we on this side should give serious thought to the problems facing us. I think the Hon. Grace Vaughan should give serious thought to her amendment and her motives in bringing such an amendment to this House and expecting it to be given serious consideration. If Phyllis Diller were here tonight she would cry tears of blood.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Who is Phyllis Diller?

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: He has time to watch funny movies.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: The Hon. Grace Vaughan has watched those funny movies too because she knows the lady.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I am sure I do not.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: Perhaps one day Mr Dans might know her. Perhaps tonight he will have an opportunity to examine the type of performance that lady gives after listening to the first part of

the speech made by the Hon. Grace Vaughan and her reference to helicopters and racing cars to be used by members so that they could service their electorates. That is sheer nonsense.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: I was quite serious.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: I take it the honourable member is quite serious. At the moment everyone is worried about our road toll and yet she has suggested that members should use racing cars in order to reach their electors. If that is a serious suggestion then perhaps I am expecting too much from the Hon. Grace Vaughan.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: I would not expect members to exceed the speed limits.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: Then I presume she wants some special prestige for members by identifying themselves with racing cars. Perhaps she would want to number them. If the honourable member is sincere, I shall accept that explanation, which she made by interjection, with deep regret for the logic which she put into the preparation of her speech for this debate.

I want to mention the metropolitan boundaries, which have been brought up frequently. Forrest Road in Armadale has been mentioned very frequently, and that is an area where we have been told the people who live on one side of the road are privileged whereas those on the other side are under-privileged. If those members who spoke in that vein knew the area as I do, they would know that the main interest of the people is good representation. They have got good representation, not only in the Lower House from the member for Dale, but also in the Upper House, and they will continue to receive that good representation. They will also receive it in the seat of Gosnells because they will have a Liberal representative there. Those people will be represented in the Upper House by the Hon. Clive Griffiths and will receive the same standard of representation which they have been receiving and they will be satisfied.

I have very many friends in the area on both sides of Forrest Road because it is very close to the school of which I was the headmaster. The sporting grounds on which my children now play were used by myself, and I got to know the people in that vicinity very well.

The people in that area are well known to me and they are my friends. They also include people who are members of major political parties with a different philosophy from mine, and not one of those people has complained to me. Not one person in my circle of friends has raised the matter of the electoral boundaries.

My electorate office is in Armadale and people visit it daily with all sorts of problems. Many of those people are from the

area on each side of Forrest Road where State Housing Commission homes are constructed. All members are aware that people who have problems make use of their elected representatives. None of these people have complained about the change of boundaries. No-one has come to my electoral office specifically to complain about the boundaries and the weighting of votes.

A certain gentleman in the area has been trying to stir up some trouble and almost every edition of the local paper carries an article from him. This week, the Press went out to talk to some of the disadvantaged—so called disadvantaged—people and found that those people were not interested in the trouble which the person to whom I have referred had been trying to stir up.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: They did not understand it.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: The Press received the same reaction as I received; that the people were interested in the standard of representation they received.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Why is the member opposite so rude to Mr Pratt's electors?

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: I am not being rude.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Of course you are, in saying that they do not understand.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: I am sure they do understand that they get good service, and that they will continue to get good service from the Hon. Clive Griffiths.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: My word, they will.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: They will continue to receive good service whichever Liberal Party member represents them in the Legislative Assembly.

It has been said that the Liberal Party members do not want to go into an election on the same basis as Labor Party members, and I said I would have something to say on that point. Most definitely, we do not want to go into an election on the same basis as the Labor Party. In the area under discussion we have people presenting themselves as alternative representatives for the area. They are offering themselves as representatives for Dale and as representatives for the Lower West Province. During the last election we actually had one candidate, from the same political party, passing himself off as the MLC for the province. I raised the issue in this House. Certainly, we do not want to go to an election on that basis.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That is right.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: We will present the facts which show that every person in the electorate has an equal vote. We will provide the electors with good representation, as we have done in the past.

I do not think the amendment, or the speech of the honourable member, is worthy of a very long reply, but I want to say that on examining my figures for the last election I found that in most boxes I out-voted the Legislative Assembly candidate of my party. I like to think I held some magic power and that the electors thought I was that much better than the other candidates. However, fortunately, I am human enough to be honest and know that is not so.

We had very good candidates for the Legislative Assembly—candidates who were probably far better known than I was in the area, and probably they would have received more support than I would, but the fact is that while people were prepared to give Labor Party candidates a go in one House of this Parliament, they just did not trust them. A significant number of people who voted for a Labor candidate in the Legislative Assembly, voted for the party I represent in the Legislative Council.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Very sensible.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: The fact is that the people did not trust the Labor Party with complete power. As Mr Heitman said by way of interjection, the people said, "Thank God for the Legislative Council", in the same way that last year they said, "Thank God for the Senate." Many of the people voicing this expression were Labor Party supporters; they just do not trust the Australian Labor Party—that is what it is all about.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: That is not true.

THE HON. W. R. WITHERS (North) [9.46 p.m.]: I may surprise some members of the Opposition when I say that I cannot argue against the democratic theory of one-vote-one-value. Unfortunately, however, to make that theory work in practice, another factor must be considered; that is, the theory must be applied to a homogenous group of people who are distributed equally right throughout a governed area. Now Australia, and particularly the State of Western Australia, does not have this factor. We do not have equal distribution of people throughout the State. Western Australia covers approximately 996 000 square miles, but 75 per cent of our population lives around the metropolitan area.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan made several comments—during her preamble leading up to the amendment—with which I agree, but they do not relate to this amendment. In fact, I am rather surprised that such a gracious and intelligent person—

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You'll get on!

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Flattery will get you everywhere.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: —as Miss Vaughan, should produce a theory that would not allow democracy to operate in practice. In any practical democracy, every person must have the right to present his or her views, regardless of his or her circumstances, and wherever he or she may be in the governed area, and for the purpose of this debate that is the State of Western Australia. Every person has the right to have his or her voice heard, and in a parliamentary system this can be achieved in two ways. Firstly, by placing a vote in the ballot box, a person has a say in the election of a parliamentary representative; and secondly, he should be able to speak to his parliamentary representative without fear of expensive telephone costs and without the trauma of having to write long and involved letters. As members know, many people in the community, unlike members of Parliament, are not used to corresponding by letter, so it is most important that they should be able to express their views in person to their parliamentary representative. It is the importance of this fact that gives the lie to the theories put up by the Opposition, because the needs of the people cannot be ignored. It surprises me to hear the Opposition speak in a way that does not help the needs of the people.

The Opposition has accused us of playing the numbers game, but in fact, it is Opposition members who are suggesting we should play the numbers game. The Opposition would not allow people to express their views to their members of Parliament. Some members in remote areas have developed ways to permit their constituents to express their views. Each one of us has devised a different system, as we are all separate individuals, and I would like to describe the system I use in 31 centres of my electorate. I do not express my party's views, but I advertise the fact that people should use their member of Parliament, regardless of his or her political philosophy.

The system I use is to advertise the fact that I will be coming to a particular town to consult with the people. I have here a document which I use for this purpose, and I will describe it for the benefit of *Hansard*. It has the Legislative Council crest at the top and it then says, "Bill Withers M.L.C. Member for North Province", and beside that is a photograph so that people who see me in the street may stop me to ask any questions. The pamphlet goes on to say that I will be in town for consultation on a certain day at a certain time, in the shire office, community hall, or even under a boab tree.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Or under a banyan!

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: We have even held meetings under banyans, as Mr Tozer said. The notice goes on to say—

If you or your community has a problem, complaint or idea for better government, consider its presentation to one of your parliamentary representatives for assistance, comment or action.

After my description of that system, I ask Opposition members to reconsider the amendment put before this House, and to encompass those thoughts with my last debate in this House when I mentioned that city thinking has strangled the development of our nation through legislation. I consider that the Opposition's amendment would increase that strangulation rate in the remote areas of our State.

On behalf of the hard-working people in my province who provide 55 per cent of the State's export income, I wish to say that I cannot, and never would, accept the proposals put by the Opposition in this amendment until—and this is a reservation here—the day that we have an equal distribution of people throughout the State, so that they may be truly represented.

I would like to make passing reference to some of the statements made by members. The Hon. Grace Vaughan said that she would like to see me representing my huge province of 378 000 square miles in a helicopter. I must agree with her; I would like to see it too, but unfortunately a helicopter has not yet been developed in our technology that would allow a member to travel economically over such vast distances. It would need a large maintenance and air crew. When we consider the requirements of the DCA it would be totally impractical for me to use a helicopter, much as I would dearly like to.

I would like to quote also from the *Concise Oxford Dictionary*. We know that the Hon. Lyla Elliott quoted from American documents and she gave her views and the American views about democracy. I must agree with my colleague (Mr MacKinnon) when he said that American documents are not acceptable as references in this House. The honourable member should have used the *Concise Oxford Dictionary* which gives the definition of the word "democracy" as "Government by the people, direct or representative." Of course, that definition does not cover the principle presented in the amendment.

I would like to say through you, Mr President, to Mr Cooley, that I truly believe he was sincere when he said he could never allow his party to set up any system which would give total control to any House of Parliament. However, I would like to add that regardless of his sincerity, he could not do what he said unless his

party agreed in Caucus that he could oppose the decisions of Caucus. I refer him to page 24 of the Australian Labor Party Constitution and Rules where the ALP pledge is set out. This pledge must be signed by every Labor member of Parliament, and it prevents such a member voting against a Caucus decision, unless Caucus decrees that he may do so.

I think I have presented the case as concisely as possible, and I cannot agree with the amendment.

THE HON. D. K. DANS (South Metropolitan—Leader of the Opposition) [9.56 p.m.]: I support the amendment. I must confess that I have heard some rather amazing speeches tonight, and I have heard a great deal of talk from members that had nothing to do with the amendment. I believe the most amazing contribution was part of the speech made by the Hon. A. A. Lewis. He rather staggered me at the commencement of his remarks when he rather truculently said, "Democracy—as soon as the Labor Party mentions democracy, we should be opposed to it immediately." These may not be his exact words, but they are very close to it.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Not within a bull's roar—or even your roar of it.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That is a bit of an understatement.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: He said, "We should be opposed to it immediately."

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Obviously the Leader of the Opposition did not understand what I said.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I will have a look at Mr Lewis' uncorrected *Hansard* duplicate because I am sure his words were something like that. I did say at the time that I was amazed. There are a few people whose brains cannot keep up with their tongues—in other words, their tongues race ahead of their brains.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: That would not be hard for you!

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I hope Mr Lewis was not expressing the view of the Liberal Party.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: I do not come here to express the view of my party. I come here to express my own view—which would be a change.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I am intending to try to speak to the amendment. I am not going to be chivalrous, and neither am I going to be unchivalrous. We have heard a number of definitions of the word "democracy", but I do not think it really matters whether the definition is from the *Concise Oxford Dictionary* or from a tiny tot's comic paper. Basically, when it is boiled down, all the definitions mean the same thing.

In support of this amendment, I would like to give the House two viewpoints and one quote. I have this quote in my possession because of a chance remark Mr Withers made to me some time ago when I was intending to purchase the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* for my children. He said to me, "Do not get that one, buy the *World Book Encyclopedia* as it is easier to follow."

Mr Withers told me that if I read how to make a laser beam in the *World Book Encyclopedia*, he was sure I could make one myself. I did not want to make a laser beam, but I did find this quote in the encyclopaedia, and I think it fits the situation. In the *World Book Encyclopedia* volume 5, at page 104, E. B. White had this to say—

Democracy is the recurrent suspicion that more than half of the people are right more than half of the time.

That is what we are saying in our amendment. One could discuss this principle for hours and hours, but we are asking for some democratic application. I am inclined to agree with Mr Cooley that the amendment does not refer to the principle of one-vote-one-value only. The composition and function of this Council could well be looked at and upgraded.

There has never been a time in the western democracies, and more importantly in this country, particularly over the last 18 months when the parliamentary system has been under closer scrutiny and greater challenge. I do not want to recount what happened in the Australian Parliament but there are people now of all political persuasions saying, "What about Parliament? It is no good any more". I think that is a very dangerous situation.

A recent programme of, I think, "This Day Tonight" referred to the opening of State Parliament. From the TDT team's inquiries it was revealed it was almost a nonevent. People did not know Parliament was opening and, in fact, some people did not even know where Parliament was! That is a very bad situation.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Particularly for the nine members of the Australian Labor Party.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: It does not matter if there is only one member of the ALP in this Chamber and only one member in the other place; I would expect the same of any party which had only one member. I will continue to express the viewpoint of the minority. We must remember that we are talking about democracy and about this amendment. That is our role in the parliamentary system.

The Hon. N. McNeill: That is the role of an Opposition.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: And I will continue to follow it.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: You will not be boycotting Parliament?

The Hon. D. K. DAns: I think Mr Pratt should read the newspapers more closely. I did not see any word relating to "boycott" in this amendment. In my opening remarks I said I would try to confine my remarks to the amendment. At some later stage we may have the chance to talk about a boycott at which time we will put our views very effectively, and will try to explain some of the wording which appeared in the newspapers so that Mr Pratt may understand it.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: You might even demonstrate it.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: All you had to do was say "Yes" or "No".

The Hon. D. K. DAns: I have a reputation for never making propaganda statements in the Press. I established this long before I came to this House during my time as a trade union official. I have never been a propagandist, as anyone in this House would know.

The question has been asked tonight about what the ALP really means when it talks of democracy. With your permission, Mr President, I have noted some of these points, and I may have to refer to them from time to time in order to be concise. I rarely read when I am on my feet; at least members opposite should give me some credit for that.

Our party supports and believes democratic government to mean representative responsible Government, elected on a universal and equal adult franchise.

Mr McNeill referred to a Bill which went through in 1965. I would have been very disappointed if we had not supported it; in fact, I was a little surprised to hear that two members did not support it. Regardless of what the outcome was going to be, the Liberal Party to its credit took a very significant step; in my book, it is to be congratulated.

It is not possible to have a direct democracy. Citizens elect persons to represent them in the Assembly or the Council; we call this "representation". I believe this was the point Mr Withers was making. Of course, someone already has told us that "demos" is the Greek word for populace and "Kratos" means rule or authority, and that is what democracy is all about. That does not come from the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, *The World Book Encyclopedia*, or anything else. This is what my party believes in, and this is why it has brought this amendment forward.

I took exception to the harsh words spoken about my party in relation to our amendment. It is our duty and our right—and we claim it—to move motions and amendments. This is the right of any member in this Chamber or in the other place, and having moved a motion or an

amendment, he should stand and support it to the best of his ability. I firmly believe in this amendment.

In the western democratic tradition, the Government is formed from members of the popular Lower House and is responsible and accountable to them. It remains the Government so long as it enjoys the support of the majority of that House. That is what we call responsible government.

I do not wish to get into mathematical calculations of who represents whom; it has been fully stated that malapportionment exists. When the Hon. N. McNeill was speaking he said that when the principle of reapportionment, as they call it in the United States, was invoked by the United States Supreme Court, it was found not to work. But from discussions with American consular officials and others living in this State I have never gained the impression that it does not work.

Members all know that the American system of government varies from State to State. When reapportionment was ordered by the Supreme Court, in the case of some States it had to be ordered three or four times because the people were still up to the old trick of trying to get two for one. The system that operated in America lasted for 200 years. I hope we do not have to wait that long! This is the bicentennial year of US independence, and they have had Legislative Councils a lot longer than 200 years. It has worked admirably.

I concede that total equalisation is not possible; one would need a ready reckoner in one's pocket and would need to say, "We will switch him from here to there."

But one of the amazing things is that even though the votes have been equalised as far as is humanly possible there have not been a great many changes in representation in the various States.

In other words, in some States where they have had Democrats in power for years, we have not seen a sudden flow to Republicans, and vice versa. In some States where they have had a change of Government almost every two or three years, we have not seen that situation change. It is amazing when one reads the history of the United States to find there are a couple of States which actually had socialist governors and State legislators, and they actually won elections; this was not so many years ago.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: They did not last too long.

The Hon. D. K. DAns: Strange as it may seem, I was once told by an American that not very long ago the State legislature of Colorado would make Bob Hawke and his left-wingers look like a bunch of right-wingers, they were so much further

to the left. Whether or not this is true, it serves to demonstrate my point that it has worked in America.

The Hon. N. McNeill: The word I used was "shortcomings".

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I apologise if I have misquoted the Leader of the House. The only country in the western democracy where government is still operating effectively, and actually making decisions is the United States. Members should check this for themselves. More decisions are made elsewhere—outside this Parliament—than ever before.

The Hon. R. J. L. Williams: How do you account for the fact that with all this equal distribution there are still only two senators in each State sent to the Federal Parliament of the US?

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I believe this is a matter to be discussed at another time. Mr Williams with his wide variety of knowledge would be as well informed on that matter as I.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You do not ask questions if you do not know the answers.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: From time to time, one may ask questions in this House when one is sure the other fellow does not know the answer.

One must concede that throughout the electorate there is a growing feeling that the many thousands of people who support the Australian Labor Party are being diddled and that the malapportionment which has been described by my colleagues is denying them the kind of representation to which they are entitled.

As Mr Cooley has said, the Legislative Council has the power to send the Assembly to an election, and not go itself. Surely even in our wildest dreams, this would never happen but if it did, could we then rightly claim this was a democratic House? At least when the Senate forced the House of Representatives to the people, it went itself.

The Hon. J. Heitman: You are quite safe in that direction, as long as you have a Liberal Party in control.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I am not so sure of that; that did not seem to be the case in the Federal sphere. After all, I was a member of this Chamber at a time when many rumours were floating about to this effect. I do not believe in Dame Rumour, but there were some very strong people in this Chamber on the Liberal side who felt this way.

If the rumour were correct, those people were disposed to turning out the Tonkin Government. To their credit, they did not take this action, and I salute them for their restraint. However, it is possible that could happen.

As Mr McNeill pointed out, Bills which were sent to us by the Brand Government have been rejected in this Chamber. I

remember during the last Parliament that some Bills were carried for the same reason that similar Bills were rejected during the days of the Brand Government. At that time, of course, the Liberal Party did not have complete control of this Chamber because on occasions the Country Party voted with the Labor Party.

The Hon. N. McNeill: That was not what I was referring to.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I thought the Minister was referring to that point. He well recalls a milk Bill—

The Hon. R. Thompson: The Dairy Industry Authority Bill.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: —and another Bill to do with death duties.

The Hon. N. McNeill: One of them was a small seeds Bill.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I will accept what the Minister says. I could go back even further to a Fremantle union which somehow—miraculously—got through this Chamber with the magnificent assistance of the Country Party, provision for appearance money!

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That was not with the assistance of the Country Party. Gilbert Fraser paired two Country Party members with two Liberal Party members, and one of them currently is occupying a very dignified position in this Chamber.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I have heard that story many times from union officials, and at last I have heard the true version.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: And it was without the permission of the four people involved.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: That is very interesting; I would like to hear more.

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member can consult with me privately.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: It can be said that in those days things were taken on their merit. I do not suppose there is anything wrong with having a House of Review, but nobody can rightly and truthfully say that ours is a House of Review. I could concede that when the third party was present, under some given circumstances legislation could have been reviewed on a number of occasions. I may concede, but I shall not, that there is a case for the imbalance in the country electorates. However, I have not conceded the point and hence our amendment and our opposition when, in this Chamber, legislation comes forward which seeks to bestow some benefit on the people of the city, and the members representing rural electorates are used to defeat the legislation.

That is one of the bases of our opposition. I refer in particular to long service leave benefits. We have a situation here

which leads to frustration and the moving of amendments such as the one before us. Government employees have enjoyed long service leave conditions for 50 years, and the benefit was introduced by the Collier Government; yet 50 years later, although some progress has been made in respect of employees in private enterprise it is nowhere at the point of equality with Government employees. From that it is easy to understand the frustration of the Labor Party and the reason for such amendments, when we take into account the fact that the Public Service employees have enjoyed long service leave after 10 years' service.

Let me refer to some wages employees in the Fremantle area who receive long service leave after seven years' service, and the second spell of leave after a further five years of service. That provision is as old as Methuselah. Is it any wonder that frustration has eventuated?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I understand the frustration of the Democratic Labour Party, but I am not silly enough to think you will help it.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I have not said that I will help the DLP.

The PRESIDENT: I cannot find anything about that in the amendment before the Chair.

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I did not raise this point. If one looks at the Press cuttings one finds many reports referring to the breakdown of democratic processes. A report appeared in *The West Australian* of the 29th March to this effect under the heading of, "Council Weighting". Also in the 29th March issue appeared another report under the heading, "Electoral Inequality". There are many others.

I am afraid we will not be fighting an election on this issue, as we have been challenged to do, but our campaign will be continued. For the first time since we have been looking for some form of democracy in this Chamber we find numbers of people—not all of our political persuasion—are now ready to render assistance in one way or another at least to start the first faltering steps to get some democratic representation in this Chamber.

That forward step might not be on the basis of one-vote-one-value. It could be a step forward on the basis of proportional representation. Whatever method presents itself and whatever opportunities arise to further our claim that this is not a democratic House—I did not say "democratically elected" because many connotations can be placed on that term—we will use the processes that are available and move amendments such as this one within the framework of the parliamentary system. I do not think anyone should criticise us for doing that.

The amendment sets out reasonably clearly what we have in our minds. I would not expect members opposite to agree, but I recall that when an Act was being amended—Mr Thompson may have something to say about this matter—a member of the then Opposition said—

No political party is going to agree to a suggestion that will make it easier for its opponents to gain votes or gain Government.

I presume that was a fairly accurate statement of fact. The processes of reform have gone on all over the world, except in this country, and more particularly in this State. I am one of those who do not agree, and I am quite sincere in saying this, that because we alter an electoral system we will not keep any political party in power forever, unless we weight it the other way.

I just do not think this is the case. I believe in equal opportunity and I am very sure a system could be devised to provide that because, after all, to have a system which went on for ever would, in the final analysis, result in some kind of tyrannical system, no matter how good those in office thought they were.

I am always reminded that the Whigs were in power for 40 years straight in the United Kingdom. That is a long time, but since then they have never been back.

I am asking the members of this Chamber to give serious consideration to the amendment. I do not want them to view it as being some Labor Party trick. I as an individual do not engage in tricks. I have never known them to bring any success whether here or in any other form of endeavour. It might be possible to be successful in a trick once, but the next time the only person who is tricked drastically is oneself.

Unless we are prepared to seriously consider the proposals in the amendment, there may be people within the community who do not believe in our parliamentary system and who at a certain given time in our history may start engaging in more dangerous acts.

The Hon. J. Heitman: What are you threatening now?

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I am not threatening anything. I do not do that. I think I have mentioned that before. I do not think the honourable member could have been listening carefully, because I said there may be some people in the community who do not believe in our parliamentary system—I did not say "yours", but "ours"—who may start engaging in acts which are not the kind we would expect; and I think that is reasonable enough.

After all, we are tonight debating this amendment within the framework of our parliamentary system and we will continue to do that and sooner or later someone must take some notice. It would be

foolish to think that everything in Australia today is rosy. Things are changing. Unemployment is still with us and inflation is continuing to rise. At the week-end I was reading some economic indicators which revealed that the consumer demand is lagging still further.

Even if members do not believe in the one-vote-one-value principle, they should be trying to implement at least some of the suggestions of *The West Australian*.

I support the amendment. I hope that members of the coalition Government accept it in the spirit in which it has been moved. It is no trick, but is an expression of the opinion of my party and those who support it. I therefore commend the amendment to the House.

THE HON. G. W. BERRY (Lower North) [10.25 p.m.]: I rise to oppose the amendment and in particular I wish to refer to the first paragraph which states—

That the principal of one-vote-one-value whilst obtaining in the House of Representatives and within the States so far as the Senate of the Australian Parliament is concerned and in comparable countries including the United States of America does not apply in Western Australia.

I refer to a debate to be found in *Hansard*, volume 203. The year was 1974 and I was speaking to the Address-in-Reply debate. I brought to the notice of the House the fact that electoral matters were being discussed in Federal Parliament. Because part of what I said then is relevant to the first paragraph of the motion I just read, I would like to quote from page 482 of *Hansard* of 1974 as follows—

While I am still on the question of the imbalance of electoral representation I wish to refer to a speech made by Mr Anthony, the Leader of the Country Party in the Federal Parliament, on the 6th August, 1974, at the joint sitting of the two Houses of Parliament. This is recorded on page 14 of the proceedings of the joint sitting of the Senate and House of Representatives, and is as follows—

Let us have a quick look at what happens in some of the other countries with no less an attachment to democracy than we have. In New Zealand enrolments range from 16 000 to 21 000, a difference of about 35 per cent. In Britain, the mother of modern democracies, at the recent election, which was immediately after a redistribution, numbers ranged from 22 000 to 96 000, a difference of 400 per cent to 500 per cent. Britain could fit into any one of a number of our large country electorates. In Canada, where there has only recently been an election, the number of electors

in electorates varies from 7 500 to 80 000. The Minister for Services and Property returned from Canada only recently, but we did not hear a word about this variation.

The amendment refers to comparable countries. I take it that the countries to which I referred in the speech I just quoted are comparable countries and they have just as great an imbalance as we have in this Parliament.

THE HON. R. THOMPSON (South Metropolitan) [10.28 p.m.]: I rise to support the amendment, and I do so for a reason. In Western Australia we recently welcomed a new Governor (Sir Wallace Kyle) and we wish him well in his office. However, I believe that at the outset he should be well acquainted with the political conditions applicable in Western Australia. Therefore we draw attention to the malapportionment of electorates and provinces throughout Western Australia. This, to my way of thinking, is the main reason for the amendment. No-one can say that we have an equality of voting opportunities in Western Australia.

It has been surprising tonight to hear members of the Liberal Party contradicting themselves. Several members said that Liberal Party members are elected because—

The Hon. G. E. Masters: As candidates.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: It is the same thing. They must be candidates to be elected. I should have thought Mr Masters would know that. As I was saying, it has been said that Liberal Party members are elected not because of what they do in their electorates, but because of the representation they gave in Parliament. The Leader of the House said that, Mr Lewis said it, and it was contradicted by Mr Withers. So, we now see that there is some contradiction, particularly with regard to the debates which took place during discussion on the electoral Bill introduced into Parliament last year.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Would you describe the contradiction?

The PRESIDENT: Order! The member must not interject when not sitting in his own seat.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Much of the debate which took place on that occasion centred around the remoteness of people in Western Australia. However, remoteness has now been forgotten by members of the Government parties. Therefore, it is hardly a valid argument when it was argued strongly seven months ago that remoteness was the principal reason for the Bill which was presented to us. The purpose of the Bill was to give people in remote areas equal representation.

That was not the case, which I will go on to prove at a later stage. The Leader of the House also tried to confuse members by saying that the Labor Government, in its 1973 legislation, did not attempt to amend section 5 of the Electoral Districts Act.

The Hon. N. McNeill: I did not say that at all.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Yes, the Leader of the House did. He should check what he said, for the simple reason that he laid emphasis on Beach Road frequently during the discussions.

As the Minister in charge of the department concerned he would know the reason for the introduction of the amendment. It was quite simple. It was introduced because of development. The Electoral Commissioners, at that time, drew the attention of the Government to the fact that if the boundaries were not moved they would run right through the middle of some houses. The boundaries were probably taken from datum posts some time previously.

The Hon. N. McNeill: Obviously, you were not listening to what I said.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: That was the reason for the very simple amendment introduced in 1973. During the previous year we introduced a Bill which was mentioned by the Minister, but on which he did not elaborate. That Bill would have given to Western Australia a unicameral system of Parliament. I do not have to repeat everything which was included in the Bill, but its main purpose was to introduce a one-House system of Parliament. The Bill was defeated because, as the Leader of the House has said, we did not have a constitutional majority. We had a majority of one, and that happened to be the Speaker. However, we did attempt to do something. The Leader of the House went further and said that any Government has the right to introduce electoral laws if it has a mandate. Well, I consider we had a mandate.

The Hon. N. McNeill: You are twisting completely everything I said.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: No, I am not.

The Hon. N. McNeill: I said any Government has a mandate to introduce laws relating to the electoral system.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I am not twisting any words at all.

Our policy and our platform have been stated tonight. If members opposite studied our platform at the time we were elected to Government, they would have seen that part of our policy was to introduce a unicameral system of Parliament. We attempted to do that but the Bill was rejected, and not given a second reading in the Legislative Assembly because we did not have the required numbers. That is a factual summation of what happened.

Let us turn now to some other points which have been mentioned. I was responsible for introducing the word "gerrymander" into the amendment because I consider that the Governor should be made aware of the fact that the electorates were gerrymandered last year as a result of the Bill introduced by the Government.

When I introduced my amendment to the Bill which was ultimately passed, I drew attention to the number of electors in the Gascoyne electorate. They numbered 3 588. There were 4 101 electors in the Kimberley, and 2 101 in Murchison-Eyre. And yet alongside those electorates was the Pilbara electorate with 11 430 electors. When I questioned those figures the Leader of the House eventually conceded that a future Government would have to do something about the seat of Pilbara.

If that is not a gerrymander I would like to know what is. Three seats encircling the Pilbara contained, in total, fewer voters than did the seat of Pilbara. I consider that to be a gerrymander.

I now come to the question of the rights of people. The people elect members to come to Parliament so that they can make laws, and those laws are enforceable and can be used against every citizen in Western Australia if the occasion arises. Those laws are applicable to all the people and, therefore, the same voting laws should be applicable to all the people. If people have to pay the same taxes, and pay the same prices for goods and services, they should have the same voting powers.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: That does not happen, of course.

The Hon. J. Heitman: Of course it does not.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: It does happen. If people are governed by laws decided upon by this Parliament, they should have equal rights to elect members to this Chamber. They should have equal representation. It is a lot of hogwash to get up and defend, weighted voting. Last year we tried to amend the Bill that was introduced to amend the Electoral Districts Act. Perhaps it might be as well to refresh the memory of members with regard to what the amendments contained, because I do not think members opposite took any notice of them at the time. They were told by their parties to vote against the amendment.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: That does not happen on this side.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I believed that until the discussion on the liquor Bill.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: We can have some fun discussing the liquor Bill, but we had better not introduce that discussion now.

I attempted to amend clause 2 of the electoral Bill so that the commissioners could make inquiries into and recommendations in respect of dividing the State into 51 electoral districts and for the election for each district of one member of the Legislative Assembly.

The amendment proposed to clause 3 was—

3. Section 4 of the principal Act is repealed and re-enacted as follows—

4. For the purpose of carrying out the duties referred to in the next preceding section, the Commissioners shall regard the State as one homogeneous area.

Mr Withers mentioned that tonight.

The Hon. J. Heitman: In other words, you wanted all the seats to be in the metropolitan area.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: The honourable member did not listen previously. If he is patient he will understand it, although eight months too late.

The amendment proposed to clause 5 was that the following be substituted for section 6 of the Act—

6. The Commissioners shall divide the State into fifty-one electoral districts and shall fix a quota of electors for each electoral district by dividing the total number of enrolled electors within the State by fifty-one and the quotient shall be the quota of electors for each electoral district.

The amendment proposed to clause 6 was that section 7 of the principal Act be repealed and re-enacted as follows—

7. In dividing the State into electoral districts the quota of electors shall be taken as the basis for such division.

Provided that the Commissioners may adopt a margin of allowance to be used whenever necessary, but not in any case to a greater extent than fifteen per centum more or less.

The Federal electoral laws allow for 10 per cent, which is to be increased to 15 per cent; so it cannot be said we were not being reasonable. To continue—

Provided also that the Commissioners shall give due consideration to—

- (a) community of interest;
- (b) means of communication and distance from the capital;
- (c) physical features; and
- (d) the existing boundaries of Districts.

The proposed amendment to clause 7 was that the following be substituted for section 9 of the Act—

9. As from the date of the coming into operation of the Electoral Districts Act Amendment Act, 1975, the Commissioners shall adjust the boundaries of the fifteen electoral provinces as existing at that date so that each of the electoral provinces shall—

- (a) consist of three or four complete and contiguous electoral districts;
- (b) be, as far as possible, of the same size; and
- (c) contain, to the extent considered practicable by the Commissioners, approximately the same area as it contained immediately prior to that date.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: That is impracticable. You have just contradicted yourself.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: It was also proposed that section 8 of the principal Act be repealed and re-enacted as follows—

8. In the exercise of the powers conferred on the Commissioners by this Act, the boundaries of any electoral district may be modified by the Commissioners by excising portions therefrom or by adding other portions thereto and the electoral districts may be designated and redesignated.

Of course it was not a gerrymander.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: What you have suggested is totally impracticable.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: A gerrymander was brought about by the boundaries which appeared on the map. Even the Minister could not tell us who drew up the boundaries.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: And they were marked in red pencil.

The Hon. N. McNeill: I told you who was responsible.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: We now come to the basis of the argument. We were not attempting to draw a map or a line anywhere. It would be the responsibility of the electoral commissioners to divide the State into 51 electorates. It would not be the responsibility of a political party.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: They could not do it on your guidelines. It would be impossible.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: The guidelines we suggested were that the State be divided into 51 electorates by the commissioners, not by a political party.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Of approximately equal size, with equal numbers of electors. You cannot do it.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: With a margin of 15 per cent either way.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: You cannot do it.

The PRESIDENT: Order, please.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: If it cannot be done, how does the Federal body do it?

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Have a look at the size of Kalgoorlie, which is the largest electorate in the world. It cannot be done.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Have a look at the size of Murchison-Eyre. I knew members did not know what was in the previous amendment. The commissioners would take into consideration community of interest, means of communication, distance from the capital, physical features, and the existing boundaries. They had an open cheque to draw up and introduce electoral democracy into Western Australia for the first time.

There is no need to have such a weighting of votes in country areas, which was acknowledged by Mr Lewis when he said to Mrs Grace Vaughan that knocking on doors and doing the mundane electoral work was not a necessary part of a politician's work but representation in Parliament was.

I come back to the point that people can be protected or prosecuted by the laws of the State. If they are to elect members of Parliament, they should do so within a framework of justice. If justice is meted out to them in the courts, they should have justice in their representation by having a system as close to one-vote-one-value as is possible. I accept the fact that it is not always possible.

Mention has been made of the article which appeared in *The West Australian* newspaper on the 29th March. I have no criticism to make of the article or even of its timing. I would have liked to see it in August of last year, but in fairness to the newspaper Mr F. A. Barker, the political writer, wrote a very good summary of what will happen in relation to the electoral Bill which was introduced into Parliament. From memory, he gave a very good, fair, and honest summary of the situation which could develop from the electoral Bill and the map we saw.

I recommend that *The West Australian* continue with this type of editorial to educate the public and not brainwash them into believing that a person who lives on one side of a railway line should have a vote of twice the value of the vote of a person who lives on the other side of the railway line. I guarantee Mr Pratt did not acquaint the people who came into his electoral office of that situation.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: I did not need to. The person who is masquerading as their representative would have told them every week, with no effect at all.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I think it is worth quoting the editorial in *The West Australian* because it has not been quoted in full. I will do this to remind members of this Chamber and the Government in particular that even *The West Australian*, which has a great responsibility because it is virtually our mass media in Western Australia—

The Hon. D. K. Dans: It is the only one!

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: And very unbiased at that.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I wish the honourable member had taken note of me when he voted against my amendments last year.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: They were crazy!

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I have just pointed out to Mr Clive Griffiths it is easy to see by his stupid interjections that he did not understand me last year. This is the first time that he has really had explained to him what the amendments meant. All he had last year was the word "dogma" mentioned by Mr Lewis, and the regimentation to come into this Chamber and to vote as his party directed him.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: I told you a moment ago you are mixing it up; it is you people who are regimented and not us.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: If I may just have a minute, I will read the editorial which is dated Monday, the 29th March, 1976. It commences—

ELECTORATES AND EQUITY

There is growing evidence of disquiet among Australians at the way the institution of Parliament is functioning as an arm of democracy. More and more the parliamentary system is coming under scrutiny and suspicion.

The behaviour of politicians (of all persuasions) is one reason why the public is losing confidence in the system. But there are others—and in WA one of them is the nature of representation.

The present system of weighting votes might have been appropriate many years ago. Today it is loaded with anomalies and inequities. It badly needs to be corrected—and not by the device of increasing the size of the Parliament—

Of course, that is what the Government did last year. To continue—

—which is the way the Court government has gone about boundary changing.

That does not mean apply the principle of one vote-one value, which would lead to absolute domination of the State by the metropolitan area.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Would you agree with that?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: To continue—

But the present grotesque loadings should be broken down.

And the honourable member does not agree with that.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Who said?

The Hon. G. E. Masters: You are putting the words into his mouth now—pure guess work. Let him make up his own mind.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: He does not agree with it, because if he did agree with it he would stand up and say so. He has followed rigidly the Liberal Party dictates which have created these inequities—even *The West Australian* acknowledges that. The editorial continues—

There is a case—indeed a need—for weighting votes in some electorates to safeguard the interests of electors spread over a big area. The seat of Murchison-Eyre, with 2000 electors in 1,032,000 square kilometres, illustrates that argument.

There is no convincing case for a two-to-one loading in Assembly electorates which are virtually part of the metropolitan area or which enjoy comparable amenities and services. It is easier to argue that there should be a differential between Bunbury and Merredin than it is to defend a weighting between Perth and Bunbury. The editorial goes on under the heading "Council weighting"—

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Yes, we are waiting.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: —as follows—

The worst aspect of the present system is its application to Legislative Council provinces in which non-metropolitan electors exercise about three times the voting power of their city cousins.

Council weighting should be no greater than exists for Assembly seats—and both should be broken down.

There is much to be said for the bi-cameral system. If the non-Labor parties are inhibited by fears that Labor would one day do away with the Upper House if it gained control of the Parliament, they have a safeguard available—legislation to prevent abolition of the House without a referendum.

Legislation involving the Legislative Council should not stop there.

The Council is one of the most strongly entrenched Upper Houses of any Parliament. It has the same power as the Australian Senate, but not the same obligations.

That point is vital to our argument. The editorial concludes—

Council members could refuse to grant Supply to a government, yet be immune from the consequences of such a step. At the least the State Parliament needs double-dissolution machinery that could be invoked if that course were ever taken.

These are all matters to which the Court government should be giving attention.

The longer inequities and anomalies persist the more the confidence of the people in the parliamentary system will diminish.

I agree with that editorial 100 per cent, although it could be said it is not completely in line with the amendments I moved last year. If the Court Government paid heed to the intention behind the editorial, it could bring some equity into parliamentary representation in Western Australia.

The Hon. N. McNeill: In other words, if that sort of thing were introduced, you would support it all?

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Why don't you try us?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I would say that any reform—and we are a party of reform—

The Hon. N. McNeill: You said you were behind it 100 per cent; I am asking you—

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Any reform in this Chamber must be good. I have criticised the Chamber outside Parliament on dozens of occasions.

The Hon. N. McNeill: Would you support all the propositions in that editorial?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: The basis of the arguments put forward is very good, and I would say it would be a reform—

The Hon. N. McNeill: You are not answering my question.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: —it would be progress—

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Answer the question!

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: If that were the best we could get, I would support it.

The Hon. N. McNeill: I think we could best call that a qualified reply, don't you?

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: There is one way to test it.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: At least I gave a reply, the Minister for Justice never does.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: That is unfair.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: The Minister talks around a question for ten minutes, until we have forgotten what it is about. He loses us in a maze of words. At least I did give a reply.

When I was speaking to the amendments I moved last year, everyone said my idea was not possible. The platform of my party has been mentioned here tonight, but let us look at what the glorious Federal Leader of the Liberal Party said on the 16th May, 1974, as reported in *The West Australian*. I think all members would have seen this article, setting out the case for a "Yes" vote and the case for a "No" vote. The article has Mr Whitlam on one side and Mr Snedden on the other. I do not propose to read the whole article.

The PRESIDENT: Has this quote which the honourable member proposes to read anything to do with the amendment?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I think it has a lot to do with it, Sir. Our policy has been quoted to us tonight, and I wish to quote the policy of the then Leader of the Liberal Party as I think it is germane to the argument.

The PRESIDENT: Is it to do with the referendum held last year?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Yes.

The PRESIDENT: Then I do not think it has anything to do with the amendment before the Chair.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: If you say that I cannot quote that Mr Snedden said every person's vote in Australia should be of equal value, then I cannot quote it. However, I think it has something to do with the amendment.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: You are challenging the Chair.

The PRESIDENT: If the honourable member is not reading when he makes the quotation, that is perfectly all right.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I was intending to read eight or 10 lines of this article, Mr President, and that is the matter it deals with. Am I permitted to do so?

The PRESIDENT: If you want to, and if it is pertinent to the amendment.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Well, Sir, I consider it is, because we are drawing to the attention of the Governor the anomalies and inequities contained within the Western Australian parliamentary system. This is what Mr Snedden had to say—

Every person's vote should be of equal value. It is the number of votes that counts. Distribution of an electorate according to population denies the fundamental principle of enabling any voter to have equal say compared with his fellow voter.

So, Sir, you can see that is the policy of the Federal Liberal Party, and it has not changed. Members of the Liberal Party

believe in a 15 per cent loading, although they would agree with a 10 per cent loading. Yet in Western Australia the same coalition parties, probably with the same platform, have views totally different from that because in this State they want a loading of two to one in rural Assembly seats, and they are prepared to go along with loadings of three to one, four to one, and as great as 14 to one in some other defined areas. Of course, one just cannot have it both ways; one has to be honest. I say that the Liberal Party is not even honest with itself when it introduces a Bill to amend the Electoral Districts Act which provides for rigged boundaries. This is what the Governor should be made aware of.

The Hon. N. McNeill: You are a fine one to talk about honesty in that case.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: The boundaries are rigged. The line has been set, and the electoral commissioners must divide the area into metropolitan seats; and in the country area the commissioners have some means of balance because of the distance factor in some pockets and remote areas.

I trust this is only the start of a campaign to see electoral justice brought to Western Australia. I hope the media will play a great part in this campaign, because without that a great deal of argument and time will be wasted and the Government will in any case eventually have to bow to the dictates of the people.

After all, I agree with Mr Snedden that it is the voters that count and not a philosophy of a political party that is prepared to rig boundaries in order to stay in office.

I support the amendment.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes—8

Hon. D. W. Cooley	Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs
Hon. D. K. Dans	Hon. R. Thompson
Hon. S. J. Dellar	Hon. Grace Vaughan
Hon. R. T. Leeson	Hon. Lyla Elliott

(Teller,

Noes—15

Hon. G. W. Berry	Hon. M. McAleer
Hon. H. W. Gayfer	Hon. N. McNeill
Hon. Clive Griffiths	Hon. I. G. Pratt
Hon. J. Heitman	Hon. J. C. Tozer
Hon. T. Knight	Hon. R. J. L. Williams
Hon. A. A. Lewis	Hon. D. J. Wordsworth
Hon. G. C. MacKinnon	Hon. W. R. Withers
Hon. G. E. Masters	(Teller)

Amendment thus negatived.

Debate (on motion) Resumed

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. G. W. Berry.

ANZAC DAY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Receipt and First Reading

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by the Hon. N. McNeill (Minister for Justice), read a first time.

House adjourned at 11.09 p.m.