

Hon Norman Moore; Hon Nick Griffiths; Deputy President; Hon Bruce Donaldson; Hon Derrick Tomlinson;  
Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Peter Foss; Hon Dr Chrissy Sharp; Hon John Fischer; Hon Jon Ford

---

## VOTE WEIGHTING

### *Motion*

**HON NORMAN MOORE** (Mining and Pastoral - Leader of the Opposition) [2.00 pm]: I move without notice -

That this House calls on the Gallop Labor Government to remove from its election platform the policy that provides for the abolition of vote weighting in country Western Australia, which would result in a reduction in country representation in the Legislative Assembly by 35 per cent through the transfer of eight country seats to the Perth metropolitan area, because the implementation of such a policy would be seriously detrimental to the economic and social wellbeing of non-metropolitan Western Australia.

In 2001 the Gallop Labor Government introduced legislation into the Parliament to abolish country vote weighting. The legislation provided for a number of concessions to the Greens (WA) to enable them to support that legislation, which was fundamentally a concession for dummy votes in remote regions. The Labor Party wholeheartedly supported those votes because it meant it would keep one extra seat in the remote areas. The other proposal for the Legislative Council was for representation from six regions with six members rather than the Labor Party's proposition of one statewide electorate. I do not know the ALP's current position on the Legislative Council representation but that was its position at that time. As members know, the legislation was passed in the lower House. However, the Legislative Council passed it with a simple majority, not the absolute majority most of us thought the legislation required. History tells us that the Bill was sent to the Supreme Court for a determination of its validity, and the court ruled that the Bill needed an absolute majority. At great expense to the state taxpayers the Government appealed to the High Court and the result was the same. The legislation was therefore ruled invalid because it had not been passed legitimately through the Parliament.

Many people in Western Australia think that that court decision was the end of the war, and that the war had been won. I regret to tell them that it is a battle in an ongoing war. The battle continues because the war continues as a result of the Labor Party's policy, to which I referred in the motion, to reduce country weighting in the Western Australian electoral system. Until the Labor Party eliminates that country vote weighting argument from its platform, the battle will go on and on. We have been able to resist the Labor Party's intentions until now, most recently because of the courts' intervention. I say to the Western Australian people, particularly those living in the country who are concerned about this, that if they want to retain their current level of parliamentary representation, they must tell the Labor Party to abandon its policy; and, if it will not, they should vote it out. It is a very simple situation. They need to get the Labor Party to abandon its policy or vote against it.

As we know, Labor's policy will reduce country representation by eight seats in the Legislative Assembly; that is, from 23 seats to 15, which is a very significant reduction of 35 per cent. Where will the eight seats go? They will go not to another part of country WA, but to the city - the Perth metropolitan area - which now has 34 of the 57 Assembly seats. Not one person in the city has ever said to me that he or she wants more members of Parliament, particularly if they will not be from country Western Australia. In addition to that, and presuming that the Legislative Council policy - as I thought it was - is that we have one state electorate, under the current arrangements of most political parties, virtually every Legislative Council member will be elected by interests that represent the majority of people; that is, interests in the city. If the Labor Party had its way totally in both Houses, eight Legislative Assembly seats would be taken from the country and virtually the entire Legislative Council would be a representative body of the city, because that is where the numbers lie in the political parties that will endorse candidates for Legislative Council elections.

The Labor Party policy ignores a very simple reality in politics not only in Western Australia but also in Australia and the world. If people have no representation or their representation is diminished, their influence over the decision-making processes in the State's affairs and over the laws they are bound by will be diminished. By losing representation they lose influence over the decisions that affect their lives. Under the Labor Party's plans, country WA will be seriously under-represented and the city will dominate, even though people say that that is the case already, but it will be even more so in the future. The country will be but a tiny minority rump in the Parliament of Western Australia. In fact, even under the existing rules, which provide for weighted voting in country Western Australia, there has been a reduction of one Assembly seat in my electoral province, the Mining and Pastoral Region. Under the existing laws, the number of seats has been reduced from six to five, and why? The number of seats has been reduced because the population in the remote parts of Western Australia is not increasing at the same rate as the population in the metropolitan area. We have lost a seat. Under the Labor Party's proposals for one vote, one value we will lose another seat, and if it gets rid of the dummy voting proposal put forward by the Greens (WA), we will lose two more seats. The prospects for the Mining and

Hon Norman Moore; Hon Nick Griffiths; Deputy President; Hon Bruce Donaldson; Hon Derrick Tomlinson;  
Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Peter Foss; Hon Dr Chrissy Sharp; Hon John Fischer; Hon Jon Ford

---

Pastoral Region, which at the moment has six lower House seats, is for five seats under the current legislation, four seats if Labor goes along with the Greens and gets rid of the dummy voting system, or three seats if the Labor Party gets its way. Presuming that the Labor Party goes along with the last lot of legislation and the dummy votes of the Greens are in place, we will lose one more seat, but which will it be? I can tell the people of Kalgoorlie-Boulder that it will be one of theirs. The way the numbers are located in regional Western Australia means that the state seat of Eyre will be virtually amalgamated with the current state seat of Kalgoorlie. That will mean that the state seat of Kalgoorlie will stretch from about Newman in the north to Gascoyne Junction in the west to the South Australian border in the east to south of Norseman in the south. One member for the seat of Kalgoorlie will represent the interests of that vast part of Western Australia. That will mean that, for the first time in history, a member of Parliament will not represent the city of Kalgoorlie-Boulder as an entity. Under the Labor Party's proposals for electoral change, the people of Kalgoorlie-Boulder will lose one of their two members.

Before the last election the ALP candidate for the seat of Eyre, Mr Bowler, said that he opposed one vote, one value and would vote against it in the event he was elected to Parliament. That is what he said. History shows us that he was elected. History also shows us that he did not vote against it. In fact, he even said after the election that he would oppose Labor's principle of one vote, one value. When it came to voting, he stood alongside his colleagues from the Labor Party voting against the interests of his own constituents. I have a lot of respect for the member for Eyre; I like him as an individual. Like the member for Kalgoorlie, he works for his electorate; he is a good advocate for the goldfields. There are two good advocates for the goldfields at the present time; thank goodness one of them is from the Labor Party, but the member for Eyre wants to get rid of one of them - I suspect we all know which one he wants to get rid of - but when the people of Kalgoorlie-Boulder recognise that it is because of the efforts of Mr Bowler and his colleagues in the Labor Party that they will lose one seat in Kalgoorlie, he will carry the can for that. They will not say, "You are a good guy, John, so we will vote for you." They will say, "John, you have taken away one of our members and you and your colleagues have disadvantaged Kalgoorlie-Boulder in a way that it has never been disadvantaged before." This is coming from one of their own members! As you know, Madam Deputy President (Hon Adele Farina), no matter what he says before or even after the election, if a member from Kalgoorlie-Boulder walks into the Parliament and does not vote the party line he will be pushed out of the Labor Party door. It does not matter what he says before the next election. What he has done and will continue to do if re-elected is continue to vote against the interests of his own electorate's parliamentary representation. What is more important than that? Nothing that I can think of, when it comes to the fundamental economic and social wellbeing of the regions of Western Australia.

Mr John Bowler would do his electorate a very big favour if he were to urge the Labor Party to accept the thrust of this motion today. It has been moved in his own electorate and it gives him an opportunity, right up front, right in front of all his constituents, to say that he still agrees with what he said before the last election and he will fight the Labor Party tooth and nail to make sure that it does not take a seat away from his region. I am asking Mr Bowler to support the continuation of vote weighting, because he knows it is vital to the future of this electorate. I am asking him to support the continuation of two members representing the broader goldfields region. I am asking him not to support an extra member going into the metropolitan area at the expense of Kalgoorlie-Boulder. That is where the seat will go - into the city, into the Perth metropolitan area! It will not go to some other part of deserving regional Western Australia; it will not go to some other part of the State that needs assistance. No, it will go to the metropolitan area of Perth, which does not need any more members anyway. I ask Mr Bowler not to support another member for the metropolitan area at the expense of his own constituents. Mr Bowler should tell his party that equality of representation is as important as the motion of one vote, one value. He should do as the goldfields-Esperance country zone of the Western Australian Local Government Association did last week, and that was to oppose one vote, one value in Western Australia. As recently as last Friday, this regional body of local government again voted to support the notion of vote weighting in the country. As far as I am concerned, provided the electoral system we have ensures that the party that gets the most votes becomes the Government, it does not matter much where the voters are located. In Western Australia there has been one occasion only in recent history under our system of weighted voting when the party that got the most votes did not win the election, and that was in 1989 when the Labor Party won. At every other election there has been a correlation between the number of votes won by a party in total and who wins or loses government. That gives us the best of both worlds, because it provides reasonable representation for country electorates and the party that wins the most votes becomes the Government. That is a fair and reasonable outcome. The Labor Party's ideological, hell-bent endeavour to destroy the electoral system of Western Australia, to lay bare country representation, is just based upon its hell-bent determination to make sure that, under any circumstances, it wins every election.

Hon Norman Moore; Hon Nick Griffiths; Deputy President; Hon Bruce Donaldson; Hon Derrick Tomlinson;  
Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Peter Foss; Hon Dr Chrissy Sharp; Hon John Fischer; Hon Jon Ford

---

The Government could not care less about country Western Australia. Government members are in Kalgoorlie this week. A cabinet meeting has been held, and the members have wandered the streets of Kalgoorlie promising vast quantities of money, but the Government wants to take away the thing that is most important to Kalgoorlie-Boulder - one of its members of Parliament. If the Government gets half a chance, it will take away Legislative Council members at the same time. The Government cannot be trusted, because it is all about taking away Kalgoorlie-Boulder's representation, which is absolutely vital for the future economic and social wellbeing of the region. It is hard enough to live in country Western Australia as it is now. Taking away any chance of people having an influence over their own lives would add another burden to people wanting to come here.

A wonderful outcome of this parliamentary sitting in Kalgoorlie-Boulder would be for the Labor Party to take notice of what the people here actually want, and come out of the sitting having changed its mind on vote weighting in country Western Australia. It would be for the ALP to resolve not to disadvantage the people of the goldfields by taking away one of their members, but to stick with the existing system. How wonderful it would be for the people of Kalgoorlie-Boulder if the Leader of the House were to announce that today. That would be something meaningful. The Government has given the people a bus from the metropolitan bus system, and has put \$50 000 here and \$100 000 over there; it is like an auction. That does not count for a row of beans when the people of Kalgoorlie-Boulder are always subject to the whim of city-based politicians who wander up here when they feel the need to, hand out a few beads and baubles, and then wander back to the city saying that they have looked after the people way out there who have no representation in Parliament, so the Government need not worry about them anyway. Let us see something meaningful come out of this visit to Kalgoorlie-Boulder by the Legislative Council. Let us see the Labor Party announce once and for all that it will jettison its policy of one vote, one value and replace it with a policy that provides for proper regional representation of country electors in Western Australia in the Legislative Assembly.

**HON NICK GRIFFITHS** (East Metropolitan - Minister for Housing and Works) [2.18 pm]: What an interesting speech we have just heard from a city-based politician.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! Before the minister continues, I remind members that the Leader of the Opposition was shown the courtesy of being heard in silence, and I expect the same courtesy to be shown to the minister.

Hon NICK GRIFFITHS: Thank you, Madam Deputy President. I am very conscious that I am speaking in the city of Kalgoorlie-Boulder, and that the city needs very strong representation in the Parliament of Western Australia, particularly the Legislative Assembly. The city of Kalgoorlie-Boulder does not need as its Legislative Assembly member someone who was described as an MIA - missing in action; it needs someone who will do the job. I am very confident that Mr James Donnelly will do the job. In making reference to Mr Birney, as the Leader of the Opposition made reference to Mr Bowler on a number of occasions, I could not help but notice the current, albeit short-lived, member for Kalgoorlie - I do not mean short-lived in terms of mortality but of him being a member of the Legislative Assembly - sitting down yesterday in the President's Gallery next to the current - again, I suspect, short-lived - Leader of the Opposition. I say short-lived, because he will be replaced by his party when he loses the next election, as sure as night follows day, to quote another failed Leader of the Opposition, albeit a very interesting character. Yesterday, when Hon Colin Barnett was seated next to the current member for Kalgoorlie, the body language of the member for Kalgoorlie evidenced that he was in great discomfort. The member for Kalgoorlie had actually twisted his body away from Hon Colin Barnett because he felt so uncomfortable about being near him. There is a very good reason for that. I compliment the current short-lived member for Kalgoorlie for having the honesty to be -

Hon Norman Moore: What you are doing is character assassination.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! The Leader of the Opposition will come to order.

*Points of Order*

Hon BRUCE DONALDSON: I suggest, Madam Deputy President, that the minister talk about the motion. He is making an assassination attempt on a number of members. He has drifted so far away from what this motion is all about that he is a disgrace.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I do not believe there is a point of order. Perhaps if there were fewer interjections the minister would be able to get to the point that he is trying to make.

Hon DERRICK TOMLINSON: Madam Deputy President, I draw your attention to the fact that the convention of this Parliament is that when members refer to members of the other place they refer to them by the name of

Hon Norman Moore; Hon Nick Griffiths; Deputy President; Hon Bruce Donaldson; Hon Derrick Tomlinson;  
Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Peter Foss; Hon Dr Chrissy Sharp; Hon John Fischer; Hon Jon Ford

---

their seat. Members of the other place do not, either within that place or this place, have a name. They represent a seat.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! That is not a point of order. The minister is referring to those members in their capacity as candidates. I am sure members will have noted that the Leader of the Opposition referred to those members by name also.

*Debate Resumed*

Hon NICK GRIFFITHS: Thank you, Madam Deputy President. I was referring to the very honest behaviour of the member for Kalgoorlie when he was seated next to the Leader of the Opposition, Hon Colin Barnett. It was very honest behaviour because, to paraphrase the motion, the Leader of the Opposition poses a serious threat to the economic and social wellbeing of non-metropolitan Western Australia.

Hon Norman Moore interjected.

Hon NICK GRIFFITHS: The Leader of the Opposition seems to be discomforted by that -

Hon Norman Moore: The former minister for Kalgoorlie is talking now!

Hon NICK GRIFFITHS: I was very pleased to be the Minister for Goldfields-Esperance, and on another occasion I will talk about a number of matters that relate to that. The reason for the member for Kalgoorlie's discomfort is clear. Hon Colin Barnett is now in a coalition with Hon Max Trenorden, the member for Avon and Leader of the Parliamentary National Party. The member for Avon has made a number of interesting observations about his coalition partner - this person who poses a real threat to the economic and social wellbeing of country Western Australia. In an article in *The West Australian* in November 2001, Hon Max Trenorden made a number of observations. I think the House should be reminded of them.

Several members interjected.

Hon NICK GRIFFITHS: I know members opposite do not like to hear it, but this is the view of the would-be Deputy Premier in the unfortunate event that the coalition did happen to fall across the line at the next election. The article reports the member for Avon as saying -

... Mr Barnett had never shown any interest in rural issues when he was a Court government minister nor had he shown any interest as Liberal Leader.

I suggest that nothing has changed. It continues -

Mr Trenorden said Mr Barnett had consistently opposed uniform electricity charges for country businesses and spending money on electricity infrastructure.

Is that not an interesting observation to make about Hon Murray Criddle's coalition partners?

Hon Murray Criddle interjected.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order, members! I remind members that the Leader of the Opposition was heard in silence. I ask that members extend the same courtesy to the minister. If members are struggling to deliver that silence, they should perhaps leave the Chamber until the conclusion of this debate.

Hon NICK GRIFFITHS: Thank you, Madam Deputy President. Mr Trenorden said that Mr Barnett had -

... publicly opposed country road building programs, including the \$100 million southern transport corridor which would open links to the Geraldton port.

He went on to say -

The Liberal Party did not have a policy on drought relief for farmers and small businesses.

*Point of Order*

Hon NORMAN MOORE: The motion refers to the state electoral system. It has absolutely nothing to do with the Geraldton transport system. I ask you, Madam Deputy President, to ask the minister to be relevant to the debate, because we really want to know what the Labor Party will do about one vote, one value.

*Debate Resumed*

Hon NICK GRIFFITHS: I have just about finished quoting from the wise words of the would-be Deputy Premier of Western Australia. He said this of Hon Colin Barnett, the member for Cottesloe -

“In his days as a Cabinet minister he hardly ever went near the country areas even though he was minister for energy, a vital portfolio for country WA.”

Hon Norman Moore: That is just not correct and you know it.

Hon Norman Moore; Hon Nick Griffiths; Deputy President; Hon Bruce Donaldson; Hon Derrick Tomlinson;  
Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Peter Foss; Hon Dr Chrissy Sharp; Hon John Fischer; Hon Jon Ford

---

Hon Simon O'Brien: Tell us what you're going to do about one vote, one value and taking a member out of Kalgoorlie. That is what the debate is about.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order, members!

Hon NICK GRIFFITHS: I have already dealt with the issue of taking a member out of Kalgoorlie and inserting another member in another place.

Hon Simon O'Brien: Good. Tell us about it then.

Hon NICK GRIFFITHS: The House would do better to consider another form of words for the motion, so that it would read: "That this House calls on the Gallop Labor Government to ensure that our electoral system enshrines democratic principles and provides for the economic and social wellbeing of all Western Australians."

Hon Norman Moore: I have already described what your system would be; you know it and I know it.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order, members!

Hon NICK GRIFFITHS: This is something that the Gallop Government is pursuing with great vigour. We are concerned about the social and economic wellbeing of all Western Australians, particularly those who reside and work in this great part of Western Australia, the goldfields-Esperance region. We recognise the fantastic contribution they make to the wellbeing of all Western Australians. There is no way in the world that we will let them down. We have so far done more for this region than members opposite ever dreamt of, and we have not yet completed our first term.

Hon Norman Moore: That is rubbish.

Hon Simon O'Brien: Rubbish! What have you done?

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order, members!

Hon NICK GRIFFITHS: Madam Deputy President, I have just referred to the attitude -

Hon Simon O'Brien: You should see the body language of your own people behind you.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order, members!

Hon Simon O'Brien: You should take notice of their body language. They are either absent or they are swerving to avoid being associated with what you are saying.

*Withdrawal of Remarks*

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon Adele Farina): Order, members! I name Hon Simon O'Brien.

Hon NICK GRIFFITHS: Madam Deputy President, I did not want to interrupt the unruly interjection of Hon Simon O'Brien.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The minister will come to order! I give Hon Simon O'Brien the opportunity to withdraw his interjections and to apologise to the House for continuing to interject when I had issued an order that there be no interjections.

Hon SIMON O'BRIEN: Madam Deputy President, I do withdraw, and I apologise to the Chair for ignoring the order. In the hurly-burly, I must admit that I did not hear you raise it again. However, you did mention it before. I unreservedly withdraw, and I apologise.

*Point of Order*

Hon NORMAN MOORE: I ask the Deputy President to explain to the House why on this occasion she has determined that no interjections at all will be tolerated, when that has not in fact been the case for the duration of the sitting in Kalgoorlie. I did not request it during my speech; in fact, I anticipated it. If the Deputy President explains to the House the reasons she is taking such a firm view of the standing orders on this occasion, it might make it easier for us to understand the processes we are going through.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order, members! As the Chair, I am not required to give justification for making those rulings. Having said that, I have already explained that this is a matter of great interest to the community, and I am sure it wants to hear the speakers without interjections. That courtesy was extended to the Leader of the Opposition, and I ask that the same courtesy be extended to all speakers in this debate.

*Debate Resumed*

Hon NICK GRIFFITHS: I was just going to remind the House of some of the achievements of the Gallop Labor Government so far in the goldfields-Esperance region and some of the programs that we are in the course of putting in place, so that the people of the region will understand that we appreciate the great job they do for the

Hon Norman Moore; Hon Nick Griffiths; Deputy President; Hon Bruce Donaldson; Hon Derrick Tomlinson;  
Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Peter Foss; Hon Dr Chrissy Sharp; Hon John Fischer; Hon Jon Ford

---

people of Western Australia as a whole. I make the point again that there is no way in the world that this Government will let down the people of non-metropolitan Western Australia, and in particular the people of the goldfields-Esperance region.

We have invested, and are in the course of investing, in massive water supply resources, and are upgrading water treatment facilities in many parts of the goldfields-Esperance region. I believe Hon Ken Travers yesterday mentioned the very important Ravensthorpe nickel project. That is a project for which the Howard Government has given a belated degree of support but to which the Gallop Labor Government has committed \$24.1 million. We are determined that that very worthwhile project will get off the ground. It is an important project because it attacks head on the issue of fly in, fly out. If members opposite had bothered to listen to anybody in the city of Kalgoorlie-Boulder over the past couple of days, and if they had bothered to talk to anybody in the towns outside the city of Kalgoorlie-Boulder, such as Coolgardie, Menzies, Leonora or Laverton, they would be aware of the fact that those people are very concerned about the fly in, fly out issue. This Government is doing something about it. We have committed \$24.1 million to that project, and we certainly want to get it off the ground. We committed money early, even though the Howard Government just sat on its hands and was not concerned at all. We pushed for it, and it will get off the ground. This project will meet the needs of the region. It will generate about 1 000 construction jobs and 300 new permanent jobs. Importantly, those 300 permanent jobs will not be fly in, fly out jobs. I hope that the mining industry as a whole will learn from this and that this will be a great encouragement to overcome what has become a cancer to our communities, particularly in the goldfields-Esperance region.

The Government has expended and is expending on behalf of the people of Western Australia significant resources in the region. I will mention a few in passing. In education, we are upgrading the Esperance Senior High School, and a new \$4 million primary school in Hopetoun is proposed. I will tell members about that part of the State. It does not vote Labor. We do not cause money to be expended because of the way people vote. We are not cynical like the Opposition. We spend money for the public good. Unlike the Opposition, we govern for all Western Australians, and that is why the Opposition will not occupy the Treasury bench for a long time.

*Amendment to Motion*

Hon NICK GRIFFITHS: I move -

That all words after "to" in line one of the motion be deleted and the following words be inserted -

ensure that our electoral system enshrines democratic principles and provides for the economic and social wellbeing of all Western Australians.

*Point of Order*

Hon PETER FOSS: I think that in this House that change is out of order.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon Adele Farina): The amendment is not a direct negative of the motion that is being considered. It is relevant. It still refers to the electoral system and it deals directly with the second part of the motion, which refers to social and economic impacts. There is no point of order.

*Debate Resumed*

**HON PETER FOSS** (East Metropolitan) [2.37 pm]: I was reminded of Basil Fawltly when the minister spoke because Basil Fawltly was told "Don't mention the war!" The minister carefully avoided dealing with the issue that concerns the people of the goldfields; namely, the Government's idea of abolishing country vote weighting. I am not surprised about that given the record of government members when it comes to country vote weighting. In particular, members will recall that the member for Eyre told the people of the goldfields that he was against the Labor Party's proposition and promised to oppose it. However, we all know what happens to Labor members when an issue becomes part of the Labor Party's platform - they cease to be representatives of their electorate and become ciphers for the Labor Party, which is controlled from the outside. We all know how Labor members got their nominations this year - it was done by the federal executive. What a wonderful representation for Western Australia that was! We also know that even within Western Australia the Labor Party is controlled by factions. It is quite possible that even with one vote, one value a majority of Western Australians would not vote. A clever little factional system would decide who should run on behalf of a little group of unions. Those decisions are not even made within the party because the unions control the Labor Party. The Labor Party's legislation would not have given the people of Western Australia representation, it would have given the unions representation - not the unions as a whole membership, but the people who are happy to control the unions. The legislation would have provided us with the same stinking process that the Labor Party uses. I am not surprised that the minister did not want to talk to the people of Kalgoorlie about one vote, one value. That subject does not stand up too well here. The Government has a poor record in Kalgoorlie. When

Hon Norman Moore; Hon Nick Griffiths; Deputy President; Hon Bruce Donaldson; Hon Derrick Tomlinson;  
Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Peter Foss; Hon Dr Chrissy Sharp; Hon John Fischer; Hon Jon Ford

---

Mr Bowler became the member for Eyre, he had to do as he was told. As was quite well stated in the headline of the *Kalgoorlie Miner* on 4 August 2001, "Country electors sold out by Labor". The article states -

Country WA and, in particular, Goldfields voters are being sold out by the Labor Government.

If all goes according to the ALP's grand plan, by the next State election the seats of Kalgoorlie and Eyre are likely to be merged and the Goldfields will have just one voice, instead of two in the lower house of State Parliament.

That is exactly what the Labor Government intends for not only the goldfields, but everywhere in the State. A classic example is the seat of Ningaloo. What does the Government intend to do with the seat of Ningaloo? It intends to cut a swathe through a great chunk of coast across Western Australia to the South Australian border and have one member represent all the people in that electorate. How would that member physically get from one end of the seat to the other, in between spending time at Parliament in Perth? The member could get to most places in the electorate only via Perth. The member could not represent all the interests in that electorate, as they would be diverse and in many ways against each other. That is what representative government is all about. No member has the right to be heard on every issue. This place is not Switzerland and it is not ancient Greece; it is a place that has a system of representative government. The key word in our type of democracy is "representative". There are all sorts of ways in which we could fiddle things, and a classic example is rotten boroughs, which is why we talked about equality of numbers, although that is not the only reason. We could have equality of numbers and have a gerrymander. A classic gerrymander involves equality of numbers but arranging the seats in such a way that gives the Government a disproportionate number of seats.

The United States has an institutionalised gerrymander. The electoral system works in such a way that longstanding members from both sides set up most of the seats, so that longstanding members are returned. Under that system between one and three seats are made up on balance, which is where non-longstanding members go. The election is determined in that system through a deal done between the parties. As a result, the United States has very strangely shaped electorates that ensure the election of all longstanding members. It is similar to the system used by the Labor Party for pre-selecting candidates at the last election. All longstanding members were reinstalled by the Labor Party's federal executive, which is dominated by the eastern States which, in turn, are all dominated by the unions. It is lovely to know that every government member of this place will owe his or her position in the next Parliament to an eastern States' group dominated by eastern States' unions that decided whether he or she would get back in again. Congratulations though are due to some, as I know that threats were made to their positions. It is nice to know that they have the comfort of support from their eastern States' mates to make sure they get back in again. The Labor Government will put that sort of candidate before the people of Western Australia and say that is democracy. Representative democracy has a little more going for it than that, provisions for which are in our Electoral Act. For members who have not read the Act, I suggest that one of the best things they could do is read a little-known volume that was published by the Standing Committee on Legislation and presented by Hon Jon Ford titled "Report of the Standing Committee on Legislation in Relation to the Electoral Distribution Repeal Bill 2001 and the Electoral Amendment Bill 2001". I suggest chapter 6 as recommended reading for anybody, especially those living in the countryside, who wants to find out what that legislation is all about, what the Labor Government intends to do to people in the country and the little chance they have of ever being heard again in the metropolitan Parliament.

Why are we in Kalgoorlie today? Has anybody read the paper? Do members know that one way in which the Gallop Government hopes to hold on to government is that it believes it might win back the seat of Kalgoorlie? Why are we here? Because members opposite have suddenly realised that they have alienated the people of Kalgoorlie. That was well covered in the newspapers of this area at the time the member for Eyre voted in favour of the legislation. Members opposite have worked out that they should perhaps come here. This is the only time people will see them - when they think they might get some electoral advantage. Where did the Assembly go? Albany. That is another seat that changed at the last election, which the Government has to hold on to if it does not want to lose government. In addition, it is in the country. The Government might lose some of its representation. Where have we been? Albany and Kalgoorlie.

I will make for the people of Kalgoorlie a little correction to what the minister said about all the wonderful things which have been done by this Government and which he said were better than anything we did. Anyone who knows anything in the goldfields will say that what has made the biggest single difference to the goldfields, what has made everything possible, is the fact that the previous Government deregulated gas and made possible the goldfields gas pipeline. I have always said that of all the measures introduced not one was more important than the deregulation of gas.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: Who was the minister?

Hon Norman Moore; Hon Nick Griffiths; Deputy President; Hon Bruce Donaldson; Hon Derrick Tomlinson;  
Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Peter Foss; Hon Dr Chrissy Sharp; Hon John Fischer; Hon Jon Ford

---

Hon PETER FOSS: The minister was Hon Colin Barnett. In the time before the election he had a vision for the State and the goldfields. He talked of the pipeline that came from the north and went across the goldfields. He knew it was the one thing needed for the nickel project. In fact, none of the projects work, nothing works, but for the cheap energy that is provided by deregulated gas and the gas pipeline. If members do not know that, it shows a very poor knowledge of the goldfields. I know that people will have got a briefing note on this telling them all the wonderful things that Labor has done. However, Labor does not understand the industry and it does not understand economics. It does not understand what happens to places like this if they do not have essential things such as gas. Although he was not a Liberal in those days, but was seen as being on our side of politics, Sir John Forrest got a pipeline up here. It is funny that the two pipelines should be provided by the conservative side of politics. The pipelines have been the lifeblood of the goldfields.

I will deal with another thing that came up; the Premier mentioned it on Monday night. He stopped telling the story of Federation. Five years after the point at which he finished the story, the federal Government took the taxes that came from the import revenues, which up to that time had gone back to the places at which they were gathered. The revenues enabled this State to build and flourish; in fact, it enabled people to build the first part of Parliament House. As the President mentioned, the building suddenly stopped after that. Why? Because all the money went. The more populous States decided that, instead of money being distributed on the basis of where it came from - where it was being earned and where there was a possibility of economic development - it should be distributed on a per capita basis. That had the effect of reducing the state budget by £500 000. That does not sound like a lot of money; it sounds like \$1 million. In those days the total state budget was £2 million. It took away one-quarter of the state budget. It crippled Western Australia economically for decades. We became the Cinderella State because we were made the Cinderella State by the federal Government taking away money and handing it out on a per capita basis. "Per capita" sounds fair but the decision crippled this State economically.

What did the federal Government do during the war? During the war the price of gold on the international market skyrocketed. It would have been a time for Kalgoorlie to make a killing. It was decided that all gold would have to be sold to the Government at a fixed price. That was a war measure, which might have been acceptable, but that continued in place for a long time. Who got the profit from the increased price of gold? It was the federal Government. It took the money that I think rightfully belonged to Kalgoorlie.

What did that do to Kalgoorlie during the war? Let us have a look at what happened during that time. It was a time when Kalgoorlie should have been able to develop and flourish, but it was crippled. Which party was in government? It was the Labor Party. The fact is that the Labor Party has always seemed to resent the goldfields, because the goldfields workers have done well for themselves. They have earned well and have managed to make something of their lives. They have a tremendous spirit of "we can do for ourselves". Practically every person in the goldfields is a prospector on the weekend and on their days off. They always want to find gold for themselves. They want to be their own masters. That spirit of the goldfields makes them less docile and less amenable to Labor Governments, because they do not do as they are told.

The Government wants to take one of their representatives away from those people, one of the people who can speak for them. It wants to give them electorates in which everybody will have a different interest. The Government can give that to the city where it will have pockets of members all preaching and singing the same song and the same interest will be echoed over and over again. We will see repeated once more the sorts of imperfections that occur when Governments are not prepared to give people a fair voice or to recognise that members for regional areas must travel huge distances. Regional members spend most of their time out of their electorate and they spend the rest of their time travelling huge distances trying to get from one person to another to hear different views. As they move around they find there are many highly different views. How members of this House from the Mining and Pastoral Region manage to represent every view in the vast electorate that they have, I do not know. How they get around the region at all at times leaves me completely perplexed. If lower House electorates are equally large, people will not be heard where the money is spent. The reason that money was spent here was not because upper House members came here but because the Cabinet, lower House members and the Government came here. If we were to come here on our own without all the people with the money from the lower House, we would not be able to do anything. What do members think people would get in those circumstances?

**HON CHRISTINE SHARP** (South West) [2.52 pm]: The Greens (WA) are very pleased to hear about the amendment to the motion, and we will be supporting the amendment. I will go through the reasons for that, but I also want to thank the Opposition for putting forward this motion today in Kalgoorlie. It has succeeded in putting on to the agenda something that is obviously very much of interest to Kalgoorlie and to the region. It is good that we have the opportunity to deal with a motion that we can debate robustly.

I want to make some observations on the approach of the Greens to this issue. Electoral reform has, without doubt, been the most difficult issue that the Greens (WA) have had to face in this term of Parliament and



Hon Norman Moore; Hon Nick Griffiths; Deputy President; Hon Bruce Donaldson; Hon Derrick Tomlinson;  
Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Peter Foss; Hon Dr Chrissy Sharp; Hon John Fischer; Hon Jon Ford

---

probably in our short life in Parliament. We have found this a very difficult issue to grapple with. The solutions to this are not easy. From our point of view, two very disparate principles are at stake that we, and I am sure everybody here, find very difficult to bring together and to build a bridge between. It is very difficult to disagree with the basic tenet that all votes should be equal. The Opposition is raising a very difficult argument in the House this afternoon. Clearly we are in a very special location at the moment but we are speaking as though we could be anywhere in this State. In determining government, it is very difficult to argue that a vote anywhere in Western Australia should be worth more than the weight of a vote elsewhere. That is something very fundamental to equality. On the other hand, this State comprises extraordinary geography. Despite the State's vastness - one-third of the continent - three-quarters of the population live in the metropolitan area. That makes it very difficult to simply apply a purist model of one vote, one value thinking. This is probably the most difficult place in the world to apply a simple, purist model of counting heads without doing some injustice by not recognising the extremes of our geography. So there we have it. What a conundrum!

What is a fair way to resolve the issue of fair and equal representation in Western Australia? That is what the Greens have had to tackle because, as everybody here in this room will be aware, that was on the Labor Government's agenda when it was elected. Very soon after that, it approached our party seeking our assistance and wanting to know our position. We thought, "Crikey, that's a really difficult issue to start with." It took us some time to consider. We were involved in a lot of consultation and did a lot of research into electoral systems in the rest of Australia and all over the world to find a position that we thought would not provide any particular electoral advantage for any minority in Western Australia or provide us with an electoral advantage. We simply hoped we could determine a fair system for the people of this State that would last. We found ourselves previously, and here we are again today, providing a bridge between two opposing arguments. We think that in building a bridge between the two older parties, we have come up with a position that manages to balance those opposing positions; those two important principles of providing vote equality and of preventing the domination of parliamentary representation in WA by the Perth metropolitan region.

I refer to some really basic background points. It is a fact that under the current system voters in regional WA have two, three or, in the case of the electorate of Eyre, even four times the weight of voters in some metropolitan seats such as Wanneroo. It is also the case that, given our unique geography that I was just talking about, some seats, such as the seat of Maylands, are as small as 20 square kilometres and the seat of Pilbara is more than 800 000 square kilometres - extreme differences in size. With the introduction of one vote, one value, those extremes would be even greater. We are also the only State in the Commonwealth that chooses its Government on the basis of vote weighting. It is the only State with malapportionment. As the elected representatives of the people of Western Australia, it is time for us to address that and to accept that we must rectify it. We also accept and we all know - we have been talking about it today - that the natural resources of the regions of Western Australia are what run the economy. In fact mining produces one-quarter of Western Australia's gross state product and agriculture earns, I think, nearly 20 per cent of our export revenue. These earnings all come from the regions. These are all the sorts of things we have tried to weigh up in working out how we go forward on this matter.

There is also the practical difficulty of how members of Parliament represent some of the largest electorates in the world. That is why we have always made it very clear that any changes to remove malapportionment in our electoral system must be done in conjunction with members of Parliament having far better resources, and in particular regional members of Parliament, so that at the very least regional MPs will have every possible resource assistance as is practicable, such as adequate numbers of staff and so on, to assist them in the task of covering such large geographical areas. However, when I make that argument one of my metropolitan colleagues in the Greens (WA) always reminds me, "I know that country members have to travel vast distances, but you should look at the number of people in my region. I am supposed to represent three times the number of people you represent in the south west. Not only that, but also people in the metropolitan region come from very diverse backgrounds so I am representing more community groups, more diverse cultures and so on." In general, it is true to say that communities, certainly in the north metropolitan region, are not as homogeneous as they tend to be in the country. Faced with all those factors, and with the fact that there was no running away from the issue, it would have been very nice to say, "Why us? Why do we have to be involved somehow in resolving this difficult issue?" Indeed, even the five representatives of the Greens have argued. We had different views, let alone all the members of the two older parties. We came up with a solution of which members of this place are very aware. It is a very simple solution. It is based on what is done in Parliaments elsewhere. It recognises that we have a bicameral system - that is, we have two Houses - so why not use that to our advantage in this issue? In other words, we propose that vote weighting remain for Legislative Council elections and that this House formally be given the role of the regional House of Western Australia. Funnily enough, although we have two Houses, the respective roles of the Houses have never been formally defined. Both Houses have plugged away, but without any formal constitutional role. This is our solution. We believe it

Hon Norman Moore; Hon Nick Griffiths; Deputy President; Hon Bruce Donaldson; Hon Derrick Tomlinson;  
Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Peter Foss; Hon Dr Chrissy Sharp; Hon John Fischer; Hon Jon Ford

---

is only fair to all Western Australians that all votes in the Assembly, which is the House in which the Government is determined, be equal and that we remove the situation in which the 26 per cent of our population that lives in the regions has 40 per cent of the representation. Indeed, if we give that minority vote weighting, why do we not give extra votes to all minorities? Why do we not give special seats to Aboriginal people? Why do we not have special vote weighting in other ways too? We think that a case of one vote, one value for one person is the way the Government should be determined in this State in line with what is done elsewhere. As an aside, if people think that sounds absolutely shocking, I can tell them that that is how the current election for the federal seat of Kalgoorlie is being conducted. It is conducted without malapportionment. It is conducted on a one vote, one value system. There is nothing with which the residents of this region are not already familiar.

Hon Norman Moore: Do you know how big the seat of Kalgoorlie is?

Hon CHRISTINE SHARP: In the same way, when people vote for the Senate they will be voting for a lot more senators from Western Australia per head of population in this State compared with the rest of the Commonwealth. We have also advocated that there are some practical difficulties with large electorates. We recommend the same system that applies in Queensland, in which there are six electorates covering more than 100 000 square kilometres. Some 0.5 per cent of the land area should be taken into account, in addition to the actual number of people. Therefore, an area of 200 000 square kilometres will count as an additional 1 000 votes. In the Legislative Council, the Greens (WA) take a very different position from that of the Government, because the Government is very keen to introduce one vote, one value in both Houses. We said no to that; we think it is fair that the Government in the Legislative Assembly be organised in that way, but we are very aware of the extreme geography of Western Australia and we want to ensure that the regions have a strong voice in the House of Review. The Legislative Council should become the regional House, similar to the Senate. We are advocating equal regions and equal numbers for each region, no matter what the population.

I can assure people in the gallery that this motion was not set up as some way of attracting their vote, but it brings into play a system whereby this region, with its five representatives here today, would have an extra member. There would be six members representing the Mining and Pastoral Region.

Finally, the reason that this appeals to our green thinking, apart from its being consistent with voting arrangements in Parliaments throughout the world, is that we are very aware of the enormous environment of this State and the importance of its natural resources. We believe that natural resources cannot be managed through satellite imagery; local knowledge is needed and that is why it is critical to have a strong regional voice.

**HON JOHN FISCHER** (Mining and Pastoral) [3.08 pm]: When I first became aware of the motion put forward by Hon Norman Moore I referred to a Westpoll survey in *The West Australian* on 17 June 2001, which indicated that only 33 per cent of the people surveyed supported the concept of one vote, one value. That meant that 67 per cent of the people were against the proposal. The Westpoll also indicated that only 42 per cent of Labor supporters supported the change to one vote, one value. That surely indicates that the Government does not have a mandate to continue with this proposal, particularly in view of the fact that Labor got only 37 per cent of the primary votes at the last election.

The Labor Government established the current system of representation in 1987. It was good enough then, but it is obviously not good enough now. New metropolitan seats that would have been created by Labor's one vote, one value election platform represent 0.2 per cent of the land area of Western Australia. In the south west the number of seats would have been reduced by three. Labor currently holds only seven rural seats in the Legislative Assembly, and the imposition of one vote, one value would undoubtedly increase its level of representation in the lower House in this State. The one vote, one value concept is, without a doubt, an attempt to put in place a system in which the vote of each person in this State would have an equal impact on the election of members of Parliament. However, we must consider the implications of that for the economics of this State.

The Mining and Pastoral Region covers about 90 per cent of this State. In fact, the federal seat of Kalgoorlie is virtually identical in area; it is slightly bigger because it includes Merredin and Esperance. As the Leader of the Opposition has noted, we have already lost the seat of Burrup in the redistribution. Under the one vote, one value system we would lose one member from Kalgoorlie and Eyre. However, that area produces twice the export income of the entire State of Queensland. Unfortunately, the redistribution of that income is another problem that can be spoken about on many occasions at another time. However, what it means is that, in the Pilbara, only one dollar of every \$800 in revenue returns to that area. With the lack of state representation, I doubt very much that it would stay at one dollar in 800. There is every chance that the regional areas of Western Australia would be even more disadvantaged than they are at present. It is fine for someone in Tasmania, for example, to sit under a tree and contemplate the meaning of life, when the actual engine room of this country is

Hon Norman Moore; Hon Nick Griffiths; Deputy President; Hon Bruce Donaldson; Hon Derrick Tomlinson;  
Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Peter Foss; Hon Dr Chrissy Sharp; Hon John Fischer; Hon Jon Ford

---

in the Mining and Pastoral Region of Western Australia. To contemplate in any way a lack of political representation is extremely unfair on the people who live in these areas.

The legislation that the Gallop Government tried to ram through would not have achieved fair representation. In essence, the proposed legislation had three principles. The first was that each legislative electoral district would have an equal enrolment, subject to a tolerance of up to 10 per cent of average district enrolment. The second point was that the 10 per cent variance would be increased to 20 per cent where the size of the electorate was greater than 100 000 square kilometres. We have already heard discussion on the difficulty of being able to service these electorates, because it is generally necessary to pass through Perth in moving from one major town to another. However, the deemed number of electors was based on a formula of one notional elector for every 200 square kilometres. The third point was that the State would be divided into six electoral regions, each returning six members to the Legislative Council, with equal representation in the city and country regions. The Legislative Council would therefore have been increased in size by two members. In the lead-up to the last election, as I have mentioned, the people of Kalgoorlie were told they would get two members under the one vote, one value concept, but in fact there would have been only one representative from the city of Kalgoorlie-Boulder.

The Government's equal voting formula would in essence do two things - increase numbers in the Legislative Council instead of reduce them, and make concessions on the size of those rural electorates, with the 20 per cent tolerance. In effect, we would not have equal representation at all. As there was supposed to have been equal numbers of city and country members in the Legislative Council, one vote, one value would not have been achieved. So why introduce a new system that would bring about only another system of unequal representation?

Often when I listen to the news I get rather disturbed about the growing dichotomy between urban and country Australia. It seems that in our society our major culture is being divided into two on a city and a country basis. This is a very dangerous principle. Some people and groups cynically pursue this agenda, often for paltry short-term gains. I put the Labor Party squarely in that category. In my view there is not a genuine anti-country hostility in our cities. There is probably just massive ignorance about the amount of economic value that is driven by the country. That reminds me strongly of the comment of a former American President, Abraham Lincoln, when he said that if all the cities in America were destroyed, the country would rebuild them; however, if the country were destroyed, it would merely be covered in grass. That statement is extremely true today. It is also extremely relevant to the attempt to inflict one vote, one value on the State of Western Australia. It is demonstrated in countless ways that the amenities and facilities in the country are not equal to the amenities and facilities in the city. However, it is not all one-sided because tangible benefits can be gained from living in the country. However, they generally tend to be social benefits and not a cost on the public purse.

It is an indisputable fact that the wealth of this State is generated in the hinterland, not the cities. If we inhibit the wealth-creating capacity of the hinterland, then sooner or later the city will suffer as well. By and large, I believe that country people are well informed about the city as they generally need to go there on a regular basis. One example of how the bias against the country has worked in the past is that in 1978 the Bureau of Transport Economics recognised that the bitumenising of the road from Kalgoorlie to the Pilbara would be one of the most economically useful roadworks to construct. In 1978 the sealing of that road was an election priority of the then Labor Opposition. However, when the Labor Party won that election it took it only a very short time to abandon that policy. The reason for this act of fervidness was the belief by the massively urban-based Caucus that if Kalgoorlie were allowed to develop into a natural transport hub, it would lead to the demise of Kewdale. That was, of course, a nonsense. The development of Kalgoorlie might have slowed the growth of Kewdale, but that would have been very good for Kalgoorlie. At the same time it would have reduced transport costs and provided a quicker and safer route to the Pilbara. I could give many examples like that.

I could go on, but other members wish to speak, and unfortunately we have limited time. It is essential that we maintain representation for rural areas. It is apparent that one vote, one value is a dead duck. It will discriminate against country voters. The High Court agrees with that view. Accordingly, I support the motion and call on the Labor Government to remove one vote, one value from its election platform.

**HON JON FORD** (Mining and Pastoral) [3.20 pm]: I support the amendment. The current corrupt electoral system has not delivered better outcomes for regional and country communities. Kalgoorlie-Boulder was the birthplace of the Western Australian branch of the Labor Party, the first platform of which was produced in 1899 and included the principles of majority rule and a fair electoral system. In 1905, five of Labor's six seats were from the goldfields, and four of Labor's first five Premiers came from the goldfields. All were committed to a fair electoral system. Both now and throughout our proud history in Western Australia the Labor Party has been insistent on seeking fairness and equality in not only voting but also all matters.

Hon Norman Moore; Hon Nick Griffiths; Deputy President; Hon Bruce Donaldson; Hon Derrick Tomlinson;  
Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Peter Foss; Hon Dr Chrissy Sharp; Hon John Fischer; Hon Jon Ford

---

We have heard a lot of arguments on one vote, one value, many of which were dishonest and misrepresented the position of the ALP. It has been a longstanding and consistent Labor policy that everybody should be valued equally in a democratic society and that the Government should be elected by a true majority of electors. Who else believes this? In less than two weeks the people of Kalgoorlie will elect whom they want to represent them in the federal Parliament. Guess what? The electoral system to effect this election is based on the principle of one vote, one value.

Hon Simon O'Brien: Not in certain territories and Tasmania, of course.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon Adele Farina): Order, members! Hon Jon Ford has the call.

Hon JON FORD: Thank you, Madam Deputy President. The Prime Minister, Mr Howard, supports this system. He is the federal leader of the Liberal Party. It is a matter of public record that the current state leader of the Liberal Party, Mr Barnett, supports one vote, one value.

Hon Norman Moore: That is not true, and you know it.

Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich: Yes, it is.

Hon Barry House: It is not! Look at the way he voted.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order, members! I ask that Hon Jon Ford be heard in silence, as other members have been.

Hon JON FORD: In the Commission on Government hearings, Mr Jeremy Buxton, on behalf of the Liberal Party, argued that the party with the majority of votes should win government. In 1996 the Court Government responded to Commission on Government recommendations 250, 255 and 256 on electoral reform, stating that the Legislative Assembly could not continue with the current arbitrary boundary line between metropolitan and non-metropolitan seats, with the present fixed allocation of seats. The Court Government considered that the Legislative Assembly should move far closer to a basic equity of enrolments, and that it would address reform in the next Parliament. The Court Government's commitment received extensive publicity in the election campaign at that time. A headline to an article in *The West Australian* of 1 November 1996 read "Court backs call for voting reform". A commitment to a common quota for Legislative Assembly seats with a 15 per cent tolerance was widely reported. On 3 November 1996 *The West Australian* editorialised on the issue, stating that although the Court Government had ducked some issues raised by the Commission on Government, its commitment to an electoral system approaching one vote, one value was an encouraging sign that Western Australia was headed for some meaningful electoral reform.

Labor has consistently argued that every person in Western Australia should be equally franchised to vote. Nobody should be valued more than any other person. We heard the money argument from Hon John Fischer that because some areas of this great Mining and Pastoral Region produce an extraordinary amount of revenue for the State and Commonwealth, electors from this region should be given a weighted vote, which would give them an advantage over other Western Australians. What about people in Nullagine? I have some sympathy for the argument raised by Hon Christine Sharp. I was at the Ngaanyatjarra community the other day. What about those people? They are probably the most under-represented people in Western Australia. Should we add weight to their vote? Nobody argues that. Then we heard the irrelevant argument that the honourable Leader of the Opposition raised about a comparison with the alternative system of the Labor Party. I could talk about our system compared with the Liberal Party system. I believe our system is more representative. It is up there; everybody knows our system.

Hon Norman Moore: That's democracy.

Hon JON FORD: Is it relevant to this debate? No, it is not relevant to the debate, so why is the Opposition putting all these red herrings into the debate?

Hon Norman Moore: It just shows your hypocrisy.

Hon JON FORD: We can talk about hypocrisy. There is the argument about the ideological position of the Labor Party. If giving everybody equal power in electing a Government is a position of principle, I am happy to take it.

Hon Barry House: Your constituents didn't have much of a say in your preselection. It was decided by a central body somewhere in the eastern States.

Hon JON FORD: The Opposition's arguments are dishonest, because this is about protecting its electoral schemes. The National Party has failed its constituency and desperately needs vote weighting to survive. That is what this is about. If the Opposition's arguments were honest, and if it really believed in delivering better

Hon Norman Moore; Hon Nick Griffiths; Deputy President; Hon Bruce Donaldson; Hon Derrick Tomlinson;  
Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Peter Foss; Hon Dr Chrissy Sharp; Hon John Fischer; Hon Jon Ford

---

services and justice to country citizens, which is what we should be debating, it would argue for more members across the board - that could be one of its arguments - supported by better resources. The only thing that can effectively deliver services and community infrastructure is good government. When I was the chair of the inquiry that looked into one vote, one value - we heard evidence from witnesses in the room next to this place - people consistently told us that they were not happy with the delivery of services to country and regional areas. Their arguments were not about one vote, one value; they were about the delivery of services.

The Gallop Labor Government is delivering the goods. I will give an example. People want performance and a commitment to all Western Australians. A Latham Labor Government, for instance, will deliver the goods. Mr Latham has shown his commitment to this electorate and all other Western Australian country electorates through the Gorgon project royalty payback, to the tune of \$75 million every year for the life of the project. That is a real commitment to infrastructure for all of Western Australia - not for just Karratha or Onslow, but for all the region.

Hon Norman Moore: For which region?

Hon JON FORD: The Mining and Pastoral Region. The Gallop Labor Government is already committed to good government. It is delivering to country and regional Western Australia. For example, \$1.75 million has been allocated to expand the New Living program in south Kalgoorlie, and \$1.2 million has been committed this year for a country housing project. In addition, there is a \$1 million allocation from the regional investment fund - the regional investment fund has been extended for the next four years to the tune of \$80 million - and this includes a \$50 000 subsidy for local government and eligible community organisations to establish new dwellings for key employees. There is a grant of more than \$0.5 million for services for people with disabilities and their families in the goldfields. These are practical commitments to people in this electorate. That is the type of commitment that country people want. They do not want to listen to us talk about the same old and tired argument. The Labor Party is committed to one vote, one value; however, it is also committed to the regions. When one considers how many members have been returned to both Houses of Parliament, the Labor Party is very well represented. In fact, I think we represent more country seats in the Legislative Assembly than any other single party. Country people want us to be committed to country people. They also want a commitment to equity and services. They do not want tired and dishonest arguments. They want and need a Government that performs, and that is what our Government is doing.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result -

Ayes (16)

Hon Kim Chance	Hon Adele Farina	Hon Dee Margetts	Hon Christine Sharp
Hon Robin Chapple	Hon Jon Ford	Hon Louise Pratt	Hon Ken Travers
Hon Kate Doust	Hon Graham Giffard	Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich	Hon Giz Watson
Hon Sue Ellery	Hon Nick Griffiths	Hon Jim Scott	Hon Ed Dermer ( <i>Teller</i> )

Noes (15)

Hon Alan Cadby	Hon John Fischer	Hon Robyn McSweeney	Hon Bill Stretch
Hon George Cash	Hon Peter Foss	Hon Norman Moore	Hon Derrick Tomlinson
Hon Murray Criddle	Hon Ray Halligan	Hon Simon O'Brien	Hon Bruce Donaldson ( <i>Teller</i> )
Hon Paddy Embry	Hon Barry House	Hon Barbara Scott	

---

Pair

Hon Kevin Leahy

Hon Frank Hough

Amendment thus passed.

*Motion, As Amended*

Question put and passed.