

From: [cockmanbetty](#)
To: [WA Electoral Reform Submissions](#)
Subject: VALID RURAL PRIORITIES AT RISK IN ONE-VOTE-ONE-VALUE.
Date: Tuesday, 8 June 2021 2:46:52 PM

This change to fundamental, long-standing electoral procedures which gave rural voters a voice in this vast land, is to be halted.

I appeal to members of the Expert Panel to use both your expertise and your principles of democratic morality, to find better ways to address electoral anomalies such as unrepresentative parliamentarians being elected on a bizarre low number of votes.

Do not use the sledge hammer of eliminating the voice of rural voters, to crack this nut.

City centric voters' interests and preoccupations will swamp those of rural citizens. At this moment in history the city votes also represent the worst extremes of the leftist, progressive dogma of critical race theory, identity politics, cancel culture and climate alarmism.

These fads have swamped tertiary education in the USA and Aussie universities are keen to emulate the trend.

Clusters of city voters represent more of these contaminated university graduates and their bureaucrat careerists. I believe this voting schism is strongly evident in US election outcomes and the eastern states here.

As a previous city slicker and senior bureaucrat, and now in a family, Midwest farming and fishing business, I can attest that these rural occupations involve the hardest dawn-to-dark hard yakka known to modern man, and that the work would wipe the smile off many city employee faces.

We drive daily on long gravel roads to and from work and at work, and we drive to hilltops to get telecom services, if we're lucky.

We rural voters have many unique needs that deserve equal representation in our democracy.

One vote one value sounds like a laudable democratic appeal, but it is not. It inevitably devalues the rural vote, rendering it mute and inconsequential.

I am concerned about the influence of the very dominant union background of many of the current WA state government MPs. The premier is an exception and I hope his perspective will overcome any implicit electoral advantage for Labor in the proposed electoral change.

Is this the motivation for this electoral change?

Unionists, as well as the more extreme Left, are evaluated reliably as less aware and hence less sympathetic about the risks of private enterprise.

Are they equally unaware of our many rural voters' special needs and above average productivity contributing to the economy?

I strongly oppose this proposed change to one value one vote.

Betty Cockman