

to be some prospect of justice being done and some good reason for Parliament to call a citizen to the Bar of the House. There would need to be evidence that a reasonable conclusion, and not more confusion, would be reached.

I think anyone who was called before this Parliament would be expected to give evidence, and the Parliament would be treated more or less as a court of justice. However, this Parliament is different from the Federal Parliament, and it would be difficult for us to arrive at a sound decision.

The other move, as I have already mentioned, was for a Royal Commission. During my parliamentary life, when I have been in authority I have resisted calls for Royal Commissions not because I believed they were not warranted, but because I believe Royal Commissions do not achieve a great deal except in very special circumstances. They cost a lot of money and tend to prolong the confusion and doubts; and so many of them never arrive at a worth-while conclusion.

However, so far as this issue is concerned, I am convinced that this is one instance which calls for some sort of inquiry. I realise that the remaining planned sitting time of Parliament is quite short, and any moves for the appointment of a Select Committee or some other inquiry would simply take up the time of Parliament and take us further towards Christmas. I do not think a good decision would result. Therefore, in view of the significance of this matter and its seriousness to the community, and the operation of the parliamentary system, we are of the opinion that it is desirable that an inquiry should be held by an appropriate authority, especially in respect of the unauthorised psychiatric report which is not only unethical and unfair, but also casts a shadow over all reputable practitioners.

I would like to emphasise this point. I believe the Australian Medical Association should take a very serious view—and no doubt it does—of the fact that any practitioner should become involved in providing such a report. Statements of the opinions of a number of practitioners have appeared in the Press, and they have certainly deplored the action as being unethical. Some have claimed that no worth-while report could be made from a distance.

Therefore, I would ask the Premier to give very serious consideration to the points that have been made in respect of this issue—and no-one can deny the seriousness of the situation—and seriously to consider setting up some form of inquiry in order that at least one section of this controversy may be cleared up. I refer particularly to the psychiatric report; even if the inquiry was limited to that report I am sure the public and the Parliament would be relieved to know that these

tactics will not become something we can expect in future in relation to the Houses of Parliament of Western Australia.

Mr. Graham: Would you agree to the widening of the investigation to cover the question as to whether a Minister threatened overseas investors if they so much as talked to Hancock and Wright?

MR. BRYCE (Ascot) [5.34 p.m.]: I believe the topic which has been emphasised by the Leader of the Opposition is the most relevant topic for me to discuss in my initial remarks. I am particularly pleased that he referred to the need for this Parliament to have a close look at the Constitution because I believe that certain other aspects—not exactly the same aspects—should also be reviewed.

My entry into this Parliament as the member for Ascot was the consequence of the sudden and untimely death of one of the Parliament's most respected and popular members. Since my arrival I have discovered that it will be as difficult to follow a man of the political stature of Merv Toms in the parliamentary context as it is proving to be in the constituency aspect of a member's work. Particularly in the Bayswater section of the Ascot electorate in which Merv Toms had a most distinguished and long career in local government, mention of his name is always associated with automatic expressions of sincerity, integrity, and great loyalty.

Merv Toms' concern for people and his wonderful humanitarian instincts in my opinion made it inevitable that he would be attracted to the Australian Labor Party which he served as unselfishly as he served the interests of the people he represented at both local government and State Government levels. The hallmark of his sincerity was the unannounced manner in which he achieved the alleviation of so many of the problems of his constituents. It is always difficult to succeed a man of his quality and personality; but I have made the point to many of my colleagues on this side of the House that because of the efficiency with which Merv Toms approached his electoral affairs and constituency matters he made it easier than I would have believed possible for me to assume the responsibilities of member for Ascot in his stead.

Following the change of Government earlier this year, the election of Merv Toms to the position of Speaker of this House was a very popular move. From the sentiments already expressed by the leaders of the three political parties in this Chamber, it is obvious that he fulfilled this difficult role with remarkable fairness and impartiality.

The sudden death of the Speaker of this House on the 8th October, only halfway through the first session of this the twenty-seventh Parliament, precipitated a political

crisis to which the Leader of the Opposition has already referred; a crisis of proportions not readily known in Western Australia. The general election earlier this year produced a change of Government after 12 years. After the election of the Speaker from the Government side, the numbers in this Chamber were as finely balanced as they can possibly be. Consequently, a single death on the Government side produced a perilous situation.

The Governor's decision to prorogue the Parliament to permit a by-election to be held in Ascot became the subject of a rather acrimonious debate. Naturally, members opposite were eager to have a second general election within nine months; and, just as naturally I think, the Government was not. Irrespective of attitudes coloured by vested interests, I believe the Governor's decision was fair and correct.

The by-election campaign which ensued was, according to most pundits, perhaps the most keenly fought by-election for some time. I think this was to be expected because the stakes were particularly high. Without delivering a rehash of the issues which dominated the campaign, I would say the people of Ascot found it hard to accept that the eight-month-old Labor Government, after only 2½ months in Parliament, could be legitimately held responsible for the economic and social weaknesses which were attributed to the Government at that point of time. A considerable majority of the electors in the Ascot district ultimately agreed that the Tonkin Labor Government deserved the opportunity to prove itself.

Partly because it was a key issue at the time of the by-election, but essentially because it is probably the greatest issue of concern facing the entire nation at present, I believe it is relevant for me to give some brief consideration to the man-made economic recession which at present confronts all seven Australian Governments. To be appreciated in its true perspective, I believe the economic downturn must be considered in the light of developments at the international, the national, and the State levels.

At the international level the entire western free enterprise world is currently experiencing a serious economic shake-down associated with what is probably the most important adjustment of the international monetary system experienced since the second World War.

The other major economic ill at present sweeping the western world is the relatively new problem of "stagflation"—which combines a rapidly rising level of inflation with an uncanny rise at the same time in the level of unemployment. Both of these phenomena create instability and a loss of confidence in the international capital markets throughout the world, and have led to a compounding of economic problems in Australia.

I have with me some figures from the *International Labour Office Bulletin of Labour Statistics*. I believe they serve as a partial illustration of the point I made with regard to the unemployment question at the time of the by-election. That is the reason I choose to illustrate this point at this stage. From 1969 to the end of the March quarter in 1971, unemployment levels in the following western free enterprise countries increased as follows: In Canada, the level of unemployment grew from 6.6 per cent. to 8 per cent. of the work force during that period. In Britain, the level jumped from 2.5 per cent. to 3.3 per cent. of the work force. In Japan, the level is considerably lower, although there is a discernible increase from 1.1 per cent. to 1.5 per cent.

I refer now to the United States of America where the level of unemployment has jumped from 3.5 per cent. to 5.7 per cent. of the work force. In West Germany, obviously the most fortunate of the nations I have chosen to exemplify the position, the level increased from .8 per cent. to 1.4 per cent. During the same period the level of unemployment in Australia increased from 1.14 per cent. to 1.26 per cent. Members of the Western Australian Parliament will appreciate that the figures for Western Australia indicate that the level of unemployment has jumped from 1.1 per cent. to 1.46 per cent. of the work force.

My sole purpose in quoting those figures is to illustrate firstly that our predicament is part of a world-wide predicament; and, secondly, that our situation is nowhere near as bad as that which is facing a number of other free enterprise economies throughout the world.

At the national level the essential economic problems are those associated with inflation, unemployment, and a decline in certain rural industries. The rate of inflation currently exceeding 5 per cent. per annum can no longer be regarded as incipient. The level of unemployment—at 1.26 per cent. of the work force—although well within the theorists' margin of up to 2.5 or 3 per cent. for full employment—is a departure from the condition of total employment to which Australians have grown accustomed in recent years.

A gradual deterioration of the terms of trade, together with a rising domestic cost structure, has produced the well-known cost-price squeeze on the incomes of many farmers, not only farmers in Western Australia but in other parts of the country. In some instances this has forced farmers from their land, and in other instances it has forced farmers to diversify.

At the State level, the end of Western Australia's economic honeymoon of recent times began with the collapse of the land and building boom in 1969. Since then there has been a continued deterioration

in the level of activity in the building industry. Of course, for generations this industry has been used as the economic barometer for the economy as a whole.

The year 1970 saw a sharp decline in speculative activity in the mining field, and for almost a decade the rural producers in this State in a gradually worsening state of affairs have been experiencing declining incomes.

This brings me to the point of finding solutions. As a single economic unit, Australia is quite powerless in many respects to effect a complete solution. I am sure there is not a member in this House who is not fully aware that for generations our destiny has been determined by economic trends in other parts of the world. Australian State Governments, acting individually, are just as powerless to effect a remedy to the basic economic problems associated with inflation, unemployment, and rural depression.

The responsibility for finding solutions to these problems lies squarely at the feet of the Commonwealth Government, at least for basic initiatives to act in concert with the States.

This brings me to what I believe to be the total inappropriateness of the most recent Commonwealth Government Budget. It is in the context of the inappropriateness of the 1971-72 Commonwealth Budget that I ask members to consider a number of points. State Governments, Liberal and Labor alike, have assailed this Budget; so have employers' organisations, trade unions, and academics.

The Commonwealth Budget was deliberately contractionary at a time when certain basic sectors of the economy required stimulation. As a consequence, at this point of time the business community faces a crisis of confidence; and there is an ever-increasing number of unemployed members of the work force.

The declared intention of the Commonwealth Budget was to reduce the rate of inflation; to this end it has failed completely. Orthodox Keynesian fiscal policy was used to cope with a situation which lay quite outside the scope of such policies. Already the Governments of the United Kingdom and the U.S.A. have realised that new and different economic policies are necessary to cope with the concept of cost-push inflation.

Whether the current recession is actually a phase of the regular cyclical fluctuations which have plagued free enterprise economics for generations, or whether it is typical of the recessions which have been created—particularly in the years since the last World War—by deliberate Government economic action, it is certain that remedial action is necessary.

For the benefit of those people who do believe that State Governments have the financial power to effect a solution to

these problems, I would draw the attention of members to a comparison between recent Budget estimates at the Commonwealth and the State level.

In Western Australia it is estimated that the Government's entire revenue for the 1971-72 financial year will amount to \$515,000,000. The Federal Budget brought down in August anticipated the gross revenue for the 1971-72 financial year to be \$8,900,000,000; and it budgeted for a domestic surplus of \$630,000,000. This suggests that the Commonwealth Government intends to sit on a planned domestic surplus which is far in excess of Western Australia's entire Budget.

Although new economic policies are essential to cope with the difficulties highlighted by the shift in the "Phillips Curve" in Australia, because the present economic malaise in this country, at both the Federal and the State level, was substantially created by orthodox economic measures, certain orthodox remedies should be employed immediately to restore confidence and a higher level of demand; so as to get us back, at least, to square one.

Interest rates on loans for home construction should be reduced to stimulate an ailing construction industry. Capital expenditure on national development projects should be increased. Special loans and/or grants should be made to the States for works programmes. Considerable attention has been given to other orthodox remedies which I do not intend to elaborate upon at great length.

I did suggest that the current economic downturn was the issue of greatest concern facing the community at present. This is the issue of concern about which the people are aware. An issue of greater long-term significance about which the vast majority of Western Australians are not aware is the incredibly undemocratic system of parliamentary representation in this State Parliament. I wish to make the point that I refer particularly to the system of representation for the Legislative Council. I refer specifically to the fact that the principle of one-man one-vote one-value, which is a keystone of parliamentary democracy, has been deliberately disregarded in Western Australia.

It is time that Western Australia was brought screaming into the twentieth century. It occurs to me that many people who have sat in this Parliament have only paid lip service to the concept of democracy. I am not suggesting that some Governments should be whitewashed and others be smeared, purely on political lines. I am suggesting a fault exists, and I am hoping that Parliament will give some attention to it before the life of the present Parliament expires.

I am positive that the large mass of people in the metropolitan area are completely unaware that every time they cast

their votes in a State election they are being belittled, insulted, and scorned by those of us here who help to perpetuate the system of electoral malapportionment which operates throughout the electoral districts of this State.

It is implied by the present electoral system in Western Australia that the people I represent in Ascot, and for that matter all the electors resident in the metropolitan area, are in many cases less than second-class citizens.

The practice of creating and maintaining a system of pocket boroughs had its origin in the eighteenth century in England for the express purpose of providing protection for the landed gentry. The problem to which I now refer stems from similar attitudes which were implanted when Western Australia was granted independence as a self-governing British Colony in 1890. In this State alone there have been some amazing examples of the extent to which malapportionment has been unjustly maintained. I will reiterate that I am not attempting to deny the fact all major political parties in this Parliament have probably benefited in the past from a system of malapportionment.

I would like to quote one particular example which highlights the point I am making. It relates to the very early period of this State's history. I suggest this problem has its roots at the origin of self-government in Western Australia, and the example to which I draw the attention of members is the situation which prevailed at the turn of the century.

The supporters of Lord Forrest at that time included nine members of the Legislative Assembly who together represented a grand total of 1,280 people. This figure included the seat of Ashburton, with an enrolment of 42 electors, of whom I believe only 11 were resident while the rest voted by proxy.

At the same time the seats of Kalgoorlie and Boulder with 17,000 electors on the roll were represented by two members in the Parliament. The district of Kanowna, containing 13,000 people, was entitled to only one representative; whilst a little elementary arithmetic indicates that 19 of the members who supported Lord Forrest represented the same number of people.

Lord Forrest rationalised this situation. Here I quote from an extract appearing in *Hansard* in which Lord Forrest said that the goldfields were "plains fertile in radicalism." I could not for one minute believe this to be the reason why Governments in this State, subsequent to the time of Lord Forrest, have discriminated against the people in the metropolitan area.

The word "democracy" is derived from the Greek words "demos" meaning the people and "kratia" meaning control by. To me this suggests that, at least, in a parliamentary democracy the Parliament and its members should represent the people; and not acres of land, ears of wheat, or fields of various minerals.

It has been suggested that a proposal to legislate for an end to this malapportionment is too radical, or even borders on the controversial. I should make the point that at least two of the world's greatest democracies have already taken steps in this direction. In the British House of Commons the problem has been largely overcome; although I fully appreciate that this is not a very good geographical comparison to make with Western Australia. Significantly, however, the injustices associated with electoral malapportionment have been recognised and steps have been taken for the rectification of this problem in the United States of America. In 1962 the U.S. Supreme Court made the famous decision in the *Baker versus Carr* case. The Supreme Court ruled that electoral malapportionment was unconstitutional and illegal.

Such a ruling applies to the State as well as Federal Legislatures. The outcome of this decision is that the U.S. Supreme Court can order a situation constituting malapportionment to be rectified. I am not suggesting for one minute that the example is exactly transferable, because obviously Australia has a different Constitution but I am suggesting that the basic principle of one-man one-vote one-value has been recognised and accepted. If a form of precedent is needed other democratic countries have adopted it.

I do not believe that in Western Australia in 1971 there is any excuse to perpetuate a system which I regard as phoney democracy, based on a tremendous variation in the size of electoral districts. At this stage I would indicate that this applies particularly to the Legislative Council.

At the time of the last election the smallest electoral district in this State involved 1,840 electors, and the largest contained 21,346. In the Legislative Council the smallest province enrolment was 5,125, while the largest contained 79,883 people. There is no need for me to suggest which of those districts were urban and which were rural.

In the past the problems of communication and great distance have been used to justify small numbers of people in certain seats. In an age of sophisticated technology the argument of "horse-and-buggy" travel does not apply, but boundary concepts for electoral districts which were drawn up in the age of the horse and buggy still do.

I believe facilities for communication and travel to country members should be greatly increased, even at the cost which would be involved. Parliament should be prepared to legislate in that direction.

In anticipation that some of the remarks I have made on this subject will be misunderstood, I would like to emphasise, firstly, it is not my purpose to denigrate the people who live in rural areas. They are probably as unaware of this situation as most of the people in my own electorate of Ascot. I am not suggesting that people in rural areas should be discriminated against as their counterparts in the city have been for 81 years. I am simply suggesting that people in urban and rural areas should have votes of equal value.

Secondly, I was born and spent most of my life in rural areas. My own family—on both the paternal side and the maternal side—have lived in the south-west for four generations. I am fully aware that the people in the districts where I lived are not aware of this particular situation.

Thirdly, I believe the issue is not simply party political, because the solution to the problem concerns members from both sides of the House. I believe the present system of electoral distribution is a serious reflection on members of this Parliament and I repeat what I said at the outset: I sincerely hope the issue will receive the attention of the Government and the attention of members of this Parliament before the life of the Parliament expires.

Finally, I would like to indicate to the members of the staff at Parliament House that I am fully appreciative of the generous and patient manner in which they have handled my questions, as a new member. I would also like to thank the people of Ascot and the members of the Australian Labor Party who have placed their trust in me as the member for Ascot.

Mr. Speaker, and members on both sides of the Chamber, I would like to express my thanks for your patience and co-operation during the ordeal of yet another maiden speech.

DR. DADOUR (Subiaco) [6.05 p.m.]: Firstly, Mr. Speaker, I wish to comment on some remarks concerning the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, and I want to indicate that I support what the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has had to say. I could not believe my ears when I heard the Deputy Leader of the Opposition telling members in this House about a long-distance psychiatric report. I have heard about this sort of thing and I have thought it could happen in some parts of the world, but I did not believe it could happen in Australia, or in Western Australia.

We are Australians living in Australia and what has occurred is contrary to the Australian way of life. I venture to say that no decent, self-respecting medical

doctor—I stress “medical doctor” because there may be doctors of science fooling around with psychology—would make a report such as the one referred to. If one stops to think of the ethics involved in the work of a doctor then one will realise that it is not possible to make any form of accurate psychoanalysis of anybody from a distance. It is true that a doctor can ascertain what is wrong with some people from a distance, and I think I can pick what is wrong with a couple of members in this House in some psychiatric way, but I would not claim to be accurate in my analysis. I may be fairly accurate in a couple of cases, but in most cases I would be inaccurate. I would not relate my remarks to any person because that would be libellous!

An individual should never be psychoanalysed unless he has given his permission and he knows that he is being analysed. That is the right of every individual. Under no circumstances would a doctor—if he is a medical man—ever be a party to this kind of action. If a doctor was of sound mind he would not do anything of this nature, and I mention “sound mind” because I believe it is possible for some psychiatrists to become affected by what rubs off.

Mr. T. D. Evans: Would the honourable member say that such an exercise or study could strictly be called a psychoanalysis?

Dr. DADOUR: No. It could not be called psychoanalysis; that is the wrong term. It could be some sort of psychiatric report.

Mr. T. D. Evans: A guess?

Dr. DADOUR: It would be a terrible feeling to know that such a document had been made up against one. Every time one made a speech one would be wondering whether someone in the audience was attempting to make out a better report.

Mr. T. D. Evans: It is not strictly a psychoanalysis report at all?

Dr. DADOUR: No, I think it would be devastating to a person to know that somebody in an audience was trying to carry out a psychoanalysis.

Mr. Hartrey: It is only a form of blackmail.

Dr. DADOUR: That is the point I was about to make. If it is possible to find the writer of the document, and if the document has been signed by a medical man, that man must be brought before the Medical Board. I do not doubt that he would be struck off the medical register and he probably would not be allowed to practise again. Also, I imagine there would be some gaol term attached to such an act because it would be an intimidatory action.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition showed a great deal of courage—probably more courage than most of us have—by getting up and bringing to the notice of the House exactly what had been said. The