

From: [Peter Hulme](#)
To: [WA Electoral Reform Submissions](#)
Cc: phulme53@bigpond.com
Subject: Electoral Reform _ Comment Tuesday, 8 June
Date: 2021 2:56:13 PM

Thank you for the opportunity to comment, I will keep it short,
As a child I remember going on a school tour into parliament house back in the 1950's and being told then that the upper house was rigged to over represent agricultural interests as opposed to being representative of our state population.

Considering that the lower house is the one that in reality determines policy and direction and that the upper house is supposed to be a house of review designed to provide balance for the interests of the state it is suggested that for the Upper house to better represent West Australians it is suggested that the upper house electoral seats be determined by a simple first past the post process regardless of second choices/preferential determinations.

Theoretically preferential systems don't deliver and when applied result in the current warped consequences as cited. Preferential systems mean that the individual that achieves the highest acceptance can be denied selection due to manipulation of preferences, sweetheart deals which may act to the detriment of legislation and to the parliament.

The Upper House and the Federal Senate are supposed to be houses of review and it would be nice if they could actually do that job, however whilst members of these houses can become Ministers it is an obvious conflict of interest in contested situations. Members of these institutions I believe should be precluded from becoming ministers, as ministers are required to present their departments/portfolios and therefore have a conflicted priority in their determinations.

One other point, greater governance seems to be required how about the speaker of the house requiring ministers to respond directly to questions raised and reduce the Dorothy Dixers and facilitate more in depth challenges where and when required. In the case where members fail to respond clearly and concisely, empower the speaker to be able to force a response or where failure to achieve same can result in the member forfeiting the days pay for failing to perform their duties?

Thank you for the opportunity,

Regards

Peter Hulme
