



**AUSCRIPT AUSTRALASIA PTY LIMITED**

ACN 110 028 825

**T:** 1800 AUSCRIPT (1800 287 274)

**E:** [clientservices@auscript.com.au](mailto:clientservices@auscript.com.au)

**W:** [www.auscript.com.au](http://www.auscript.com.au)

**TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS**

**TRANSCRIPT-IN-CONFIDENCE**

O/N H-751337

**LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES  
REDISTRIBUTION TRIBUNAL**

**CHAIRPERSON M. BLAKE, Presiding**

**TRIBUNAL HEARING**

**HENTY HOUSE AUDITORIUM  
91-97 CHARLES ST, LAUNCESTON, TASMANIA**

**9.21 AM, FRIDAY, 3 MARCH 2017**

MR BLAKE: I formally open this hearing in the north of the state and thank you for joining us. I will make a brief statement, if I may. So please allow me to make an initial statement of welcome. Welcome to this hearing of the Redistribution Tribunal regarding the Legislative Council boundary redistribution, and thank you  
5 for making a submission based on the initial redistribution proposal. My name is Mike Blake and I chair the redistribution tribunal. I will not introduce you to my colleagues because their names and roles are clear from their name tags. The initial redistribution proposal was prepared by the Legislative Council Electoral Boundaries Redistribution Committee, who are with us today, in accordance with the Legislative  
10 Council Electoral Boundaries Act 1995. And I would like to place on record my thanks to them and the Electoral Commission staff and others who supported them.

The initial proposal was advertised and comments, suggestions or objections for the proposal were sought. Twenty-nine submissions were received by the due date of 27  
15 February 2017. This tribunal has an obligation to bring an independent and unbiased perspective to its consideration of the committee's proposal and to do so in a timely manner. The tribunal is also obliged to apply the same priorities as the Distribution Committee. The first priority is to ensure as far as practical that the number of electors in each council division would not in four and a half years time vary more  
20 than plus or minus 10 per cent of the average council division enrolment. The second priority is to take into account the community interest within each council division. After taking into account the priorities noted, the tribunal must consider the following matter in the case of each electoral division: the means of communication and travel within the division; the physical features and area of the division;  
25 existing electoral boundaries and distinct natural boundaries.

For this redistribution the average division enrolment or quota is 24,998, which was determined at 30 September 2016 and in no case is any variation from the council division quoted to exceed 10 per cent. I also note that this figure is based on actual  
30 enrolment data at 30 September 2016, and waiting or delay will not result in any more accurate information. So the information used by the committee is the most up-to-date official population estimate. Every objector has a right to be heard at this inquiry. So far as the procedure today is concerned, it is not a court of law and for the most part the tribunal can determine its own procedures. We will deal with these  
35 matters as informally as possible noting only that this is required to be a public inquiry and the tribunal has the power to, if it thinks it's in the public interest to do so, to hold parts of the inquiry in private.

You are invited to indicate whether there is any part of the material or information  
40 you want to provide to us you believe should be held in private. We will consider such an application if it is made. Although the tribunal has the power to do so, we will not be swearing people in to give evidence because we are dealing, essentially, with matters of opinion rather than contested fact. But we do reserve the right to require you to give sworn evidence, if necessary. Also, the Act requires that any  
45 evidence which is given by way of written statement must be tendered and verified

by oath. So if you will be tendering any written statement, we will need to administer an oath to them for the purposes of verifying your statement.

5 Subject to these matters, the intention is that you are invited to outline the nature of your objection to, or indeed support for, the proposal uninterrupted. We will provide an opportunity for discussion and comment and questioning from members of the tribunal and then an opportunity for a closing statement from you. As you can tell, today's proceedings are being recorded. Following today's inquiry and those in  
10 Launceston today, Friday, the tribunal is going to deliberate, which we will do on 14 March. We will not make any immediate response to anything that is put to us today. Do you have any questions about the process?

15 MS RATTRAY: No. It just feels a little bit unusual being on the other side of the table.

MR BLAKE: If there are no questions, please proceed.

MS RATTRAY: Thank you, Chair. And thank you very much for allowing me to just come and speak to my submission, and, really, my intention is just to reinforce a couple of the points that I think are very important around this but also have me as  
20 the Member for Apsley, and have been for over a decade now. That seems like a long time, but 13 years, and I feel like I have some knowledge and understanding of the communities that I represent and how this boundary redistribution will affect them as well. And I know that some people have taken the opportunity to make  
25 submissions around that. Quite a few have wanted me to write them for them, and so I said, "No. Look, it needs to be your words and how you feel about the redistribution, not mine." So that's one aspect of it. But that might be a pretty good lead-in to where I might start, Chair, if I can, because there is quite a lot of concern in the community but also not a high level of understanding of the implications of the  
30 redistribution.

And so actually trying to explain that to people has been quite – quite onerous, but also without my papers and my maps I think it is quite difficult for people to actually get a grasp of what's being proposed. And I know when I first saw the redistribution  
35 map myself, and I know that Andrew will probably verify this, that I was quite stunned. It took me quite a while to understand the implications of what might unfold. So that's one aspect, that I really believe that with such wide – you know, sweeping changes and massive repercussions for particularly the north-east and the east coast that there's not that high level of understanding, albeit that I know that two  
40 local government areas that I do represent – or three actually, Northern Midlands as well, I've got just a little part of that – have also come out and made representations.

So they've been engaging with their community as best they can as well. But is the timeframe long enough? In my view, no, it isn't. And I know, absolutely  
45 acknowledge that there is a legislative timeframe around this, and I've spoken, again, to Andrew in regard to this. But I also understand that, you know, legislative requirements can be adjusted as well. So that's something that I've got in my mind,

that I feel – I know that there is an attempt to perhaps push out the timeframe. But you will hear more about that from another presenter. So, again, they're significant changes, and I feel somewhat compromised here because I represent both the north, north-east – when you think about the Furneaux Group, right through to Sorell and across to Mangalore, I have, effectively, one-third of the state. So I don't have the north/south divide in my mind. I don't. And I want to make that very clear at this presentation: that it has never been for me about the north and the south because I've had that big area right from 2004 and it hasn't been an issue.

10 It just means that I turn over my car very quickly and I do a lot of kilometres and at times my family are a bit cross that I'm not available to them. But I took on this job with 100 per cent commitment, and that's exactly where I believe that I can remain today. So, as I said, that's not as big an issue for me – is actually dividing that now from north/south to east/west. And that's where I feel that the community of interest that has been built up since the division of Apsley has been in place will be completely lost. It will be completely lost. And there is – I mean, the Great Eastern Drive, for instance, is a magnificent initiative and been very well received right through Tasmania, I believe, but particularly the east coast. That, effectively, will be cut in half.

20 And I also am aware that local government, the Break O'Day Council, the Sorell Council and the Glamorgan Spring Bay Council are, as we speak, having a report commissioned by KPMG to look at possible amalgamation re distribution of boundaries, which will then lead to the Bicheno Coles Bay area going into the north electorate, and then from there down going into a more southern electorate. So, effectively, what's being proposed somewhat goes against what the community are looking at themselves in that regard. And I know that, and fully aware, that the panel has numbers firmly in their mind. But I would like to, I guess, express upon the panel that the community of interest is so very important in Tasmania, and that's one issue that I think needs further consideration around there. And I know that the KPMG report – or I believe – won't be available until a couple of months time. And then there will need to be, obviously, more community discussions around that.

35 But that would, effectively, dissect again this proposal that has been put forward. So that will be something that the Break O'Day Council – and I'm not sure whether the Glamorgan Spring Bay had made representation around that. But they are working towards that as well. Another issue that has been put forward to me is around the timeframe. I mean, I've just been elected in 2016. So, effectively, I have a five-year term remaining. People feel disenfranchised by that, that they might not necessarily have the member that they chose in 2016 for that period. Obviously, you know, that's – I don't know if that's part of the consideration of this panel at this point in time or not, but it has certainly been raised with me. And I know that possibly it has been raised in submissions as well.

45 I've talked about that. There has been quite a bit of discussion around the census information, and I understand that the panel has looked at the electoral roll and, obviously, the up-to-date census information hasn't been available yet. My question

would be would it be wise to wait until the new census information is available, and I say that because the seat of Rumney, which has caused a lot of grief, but, obviously, that's the growing part, and that has caused the balance as well as the timeframe, I acknowledge that. That will be run and won, if you like. So the people who are  
5 electing their member – while the election campaigns are on now, they will have a new member on 6 May, or 7 May, or whenever it is. And so all this is going on around it and, effectively, there could be quite a lot of people that are voting for someone that they think they will have as their member for six years, and I'm not sure how you campaign in that space, really.

10 But that's what's happening and I would – I think that's something that people need to have – need to understand that they could, effectively, not have that member. And then how does that work in the future? So it is a significant issue, I feel, with the Rumney election being run and won, and they really – that extra small number now,  
15 that might change in the future. And I say that there potentially is some growth in the north, and we know that the dairy industry is growing in the north, and already I know of a couple of dairies that are conversions that are taking place in the north-east, which means that we will, hopefully, have more people, more job opportunities, which is something that has been lacking. But also the university relocation.

20 There's quite a bit of Hansard from a recent ABC interview around the expansion of the university and brought into the CBD is going to attract a larger number of people into the north of the State. So I think that even though we've got these numbers projected for the future, they might not necessarily be as firm as what has been, you  
25 know, has been modelled, if you like. And I think that that's something that we need to be mindful of as well, is that northern expansion, and I would hope that the panel would take that into consideration. Chair, I would be interested if there is any questions. I mean, obviously, all of these points, I believe, have been made in my submission. I would like to ask is there anything that needs some clarification and  
30 give the panel some opportunity. Thank you.

MR BLAKE: Thank you very much. So I will open it up to the panel, but I might just start with, you haven't talked about Jordan. Did you want to just - - -

35 MS RATTRAY: I did, yes. Obviously, I'm looking at all scenarios and Prosser – the Member for Prosser, I kept on thinking about how would I – I mean, obviously, I will be the member for whatever electorate I'm allocated, and that will be the fact. But I just felt that Prosser – here again we have a geographical feature that doesn't resonate so much with all parts of it. Whereas Jordan, I felt, had some history  
40 associated with it, and hence I touched on it being a previous electorate. It has the two Bisdee – members of the Bisdee family and the Bisdee family is a very well recognised and respected family in the southern part of the State.

45 So I felt that the Jordan name would be a much more palatable name. And I know it's difficult to find names. I've often considered that when people talk about being the Member for Apsley and they look quite blankly at me because it doesn't necessarily resonate very much with the Furneaux Group and, for that matter, the far

north-east of Tasmania. But when you get around to Swansea area, of course, Apsley is quite prominent at Bicheno, Swansea area. So I was looking for a name that I thought might be looked upon as, you know, at least having some merit. And I know that the river runs north. So it gets up to about Campbelltown. So I thought, well, that's encompassing that part of it as well. So that was my thoughts around that. But I also spent quite a bit of time researching and it is not that easy.

MR BLAKE: No. It's good that you suggested an alternative which we will look at.

10 MR GIUDICI: What are your views about the name, McIntyre?

MS RATTRAY: McIntyre. I felt actually quite comfortable about the McIntyre, albeit that the member didn't actually serve in any part of this electorate that's proposed as McIntyre. But I – you know, the fact that she was the first female. But also she only served, I think, six days in the parliament and then, unfortunately, lost her life in an aviation accident.

MR GIUDICI: Tragically, yes.

20 MS RATTRAY: So she had a very short career. But, you know, I certainly didn't have an alternative for the McIntyre for most – yes.

MR BLAKE: Any other questions?

25 MR GIUDICI: Yes, if I may. In your submission – and you referred to it a bit in your statement – you make some comments about the disruptive nature of a large change all at once like this, which is the proposal. Is it your view that an incremental change over time would be less disruptive if people potentially are moving from division to division over a number of redistributions?

30 MS RATTRAY: I'm not quite sure how – how that would take place.

MR GIUDICI: So – I mean, one of the – in the current proposal, the change is quite significant, as you're aware, but it may last for a long time which would allow communities of interest to build up again. If it wasn't proposed as it was and it was more of an incremental change, it may be that subsequent changes would have to occur in subsequent restrictions as well. Is it your view or your constituency's view that that would be preferable to a more stable long-term change?

40 MS RATTRAY: Absolutely, that would be my preference that, you know, if the Seat of Apsley needs to pick up some more of the southern part of the electorate in the short term, well, that wouldn't be any problem. I mean, as I said, I already go down to that area. I mean, it's always difficult to get a boundary that suits everyone, that people feel comfortable in. I mean, when you – you know, I have some people who live at Dromedary who live 10 minutes out of New Norfolk and probably would feel much better served by the Member for Derwent. But that's, you know, I didn't set the boundary and so – you know, I make myself available. Technology is a

wonderful thing. You know, emails are a very common occurrence now to have a communication with people.

5 But people, particularly small rural communities, I feel, still appreciate their member  
being able to attend functions. I mean, I spend most of my weekends attending  
functions. I do because that's what happens in small communities. Not very much  
happens during the week because people are fairly busy and so I do a lot of weekend  
work. I mean, a couple of weeks ago on a Sunday, I opened the extensions of the  
10 Lebrina hall on a Sunday at 12 noon. And we had about 45 people there. That's a  
fairly big turn-out for a small community. And that's what they like. And I think  
losing the member that they've come to know and have re-elected so recently is a  
major change.

15 So if we could do it in a more slow approach, if you like, and do just the short term,  
the four and a half years, rather than the nine-year projection, I think would be much  
more palatable and much easier. And I'm sure it would be less expensive. I expect  
that this change will be a very expensive exercise all up. You know, moving offices,  
relocating and not to mention what happens to our staff because I have a staffer that  
20 has been with me for 13 years and I have no idea what – I can't tell her anything. I  
don't know what the future holds.

MR GIUDICI: Thank you.

25 MR BLAKE: Thanks.

MR HAWKEY: Can I ask you a question. You were talking about the local  
municipal areas of Northern Midlands and Break O'Day and Dorset. Did you get  
any feedback from Southern Midlands about the new proposal?

30 MS RATTRAY: Yes. They want to keep me.

MR HAWKEY: But – so that's about you as a representative. What about as the  
boundaries?

35 MS RATTRAY: Not particularly, Andrew, no. No. I did have some contact from  
one constituent who 10 minutes out of New Norfolk felt that the boundary  
readjustment would probably be more suitable for them. And I will make some  
contact with them and, you know, always available. But it's, you know – it's having  
people on the ground. And because we're single member electorates we don't have a  
40 team that we can ask to go and represent us. So if we can't make it ourselves, then,  
you know, it's not always appropriate to have – you know, staff can sometimes turn  
up to something if they feel comfortable or even are available. If not – and certainly  
not on weekends – but, you know, during the day they might be able to do something  
weekdays. But not – I've never asked my staff to attend anything on a weekend that  
45 I haven't been able to manage. I've just had to try and allocate my day, and that's  
just something about time management that you just have to learn.

MR BLAKE: Karen, anything from you?

MS FROST: No.

5 MR BLAKE: No. Lisa? So last one from me. You've mentioned in your written document and a number of times today that there are a number of people who you spoke to who are concerned. Can you give me a feel for just how many those numbers of people are? We've had 29 submissions. I haven't got a feel for the scale of people that you're talking about.

10 MS RATTRAY: Everywhere I go, people want to sign a petition, Mike, and I keep on saying to them, "A petition won't suffice in this case. You actually have to provide some written input by submission." But people generally don't do that and I'm – you know, I'm not sure if you're aware. They're usually very busy, and, like I  
15 said, people have contacted the office and wanted me to write their submission. That hasn't been appropriate, and I've given them contact details and copies of the map and the like. But it's not appropriate. So – but, generally, you know, look, dozens of people. I won't say hundreds because that's not the case because I don't think a lot of people understand the real ramifications of this. As I came down to here today,  
20 one of the people who work upstairs had no idea that there would be any serious ramifications because it didn't affect their member. So – and they work in the political sphere, if you like. And so that tells me – and even the journalist who rang from time to time had no concept of what was being proposed. Couldn't get their head around it at all. So I think there's that lack of understanding, and not because  
25 they're not interested. It's just a bit out of leftfield, it doesn't happen very often, and we've had minor adjustments, but nothing as significant as this since the reduction of numbers from 19 to 15. It's a major change.

30 MR BLAKE: All right. Thank you. No more questions from us. Any closing statements from you?

MS RATTRAY: No, just – no. But, please, I think something as significant as this proposal needs more time. I really do. I think there needs to be more time to thoroughly explore what might happen. So a small boundary adjustment for the  
35 short term, for the four and a half years, which was muted, I think would be much more – much more palatable to the community and certainly allow people more time. And we really don't know what – you know, nine years time in Tasmania – who knows what nine years time in Tasmania is going to look like. I mean, according to the premier, when he came in to government, we were going to have a million people  
40 by 2020 or 2050, something. So, you know, it's – but we're a long way off that. So I think we've got some – certainly got some growth to happen. Don't necessarily think it will all be in the south because I think there's some exciting things what happening in the north, but I would like you to really consider that community of interest. And the strong community of interest that already exists, I think, is really  
45 important. So thank you.

MR BLAKE: All right. Thank you for your time. Thanks for your input.



MS FROST: Thank you.

MR BLAKE: Greg, if you're ready, we can make a start a few minutes early.

5 MR HALL: Do you want me there now, Mr Blake?

MR BLAKE: Yes. Let's go.

MR HALL: Thank you.

10

MS .....: And I apologise, Greg, I got the number ..... wrong.

MR HALL: Hi. Good to see you.

15 MR BLAKE: Thanks, Greg. I might make an initial statement of welcome.

MR HALL: Thank you.

20 MR BLAKE: So, for those in the audience, you're going to hear this lots of times today. Welcome to this hearing of the Redistribution Tribunal regarding the Legislative Council boundary redistribution and thank you for making a submission based on the initial redistribution proposal. My name is Mike Blake and I chair the Redistribution Tribunal. I will not introduce you to my colleagues because their name tags are clear from what's in front of you. The initial redistribution proposal  
25 was prepared by the Legislative Council Electoral Boundaries Redistribution Committee in accordance with the Legislative Council Electoral Boundaries Act 1995. And I would like to place on record my thanks to them and the Electoral Commission staff and others who supported them.

30 The initial proposal was advertised and comments, suggestions or objections for the proposal were sought. Twenty-nine submissions were received by the due date of 27 February 2017. This tribunal has an obligation to bring an independent and unbiased perspective to its consideration of the committee's proposal and to do so in a timely manner. The tribunal is also obliged to apply the same priorities as did the  
35 Distribution Committee. The first priority is to ensure, as far as practical, that the number of electors in each council division would not, in four and a half years time, vary more than plus or minus 10 per cent of the average council division enrolment. The second priority is to take into account the community of interest within each council division. After taking into account the priorities noted, the tribunal must  
40 consider the following matter in the case of each electoral division: the means of communication and travel within the division; the physical boundaries and area of the division; existing electoral boundaries and distinct natural boundaries.

45 For this redistribution the average division enrolment or quota is 24,998 which was determined at 30 September 2016, and in no case is any variation from the council division quota to exceed 10 per cent. I also note that this figure is based on actual enrolment data at 30 September 2016 and waiting or delay will not result in any more

accurate information. So the information used by the committee is the most up-to-date official population estimate. Every objector has a right to be heard at this inquiry. So far as the procedure today is concerned, it is not a court of law, and for the most part the tribunal can determine its own procedures. We will deal with these matters as informally as possible, noting only that this is required to be a public inquiry, and the tribunal has the power, if it thinks it's in the public interest to do so, to hold parts of the inquiry in private.

You are invited to indicate whether there's any part of the material or information you wish to provide to us you believe should be heard in private. We will consider such an application if and when it's made. Although the tribunal has the power to do so, we will not be swearing people in to give evidence because we are dealing, essentially, with matters of opinion rather than contested fact. But we do reserve the right to require you to give sworn evidence, if necessary. Also, the Act requires that any evidence which is given by way of written statement must be tendered and verified by oath. So if you will be tendering any written statement, we will need to administer and oath on them for the purposes of verifying your statement.

Subject to these matters, the intention is that you are invited to outline the nature of your objection or, indeed, your support for, the proposal uninterrupted. We will provide an opportunity for discussion and comment and questioning from members of the tribunal and then an opportunity for a closing statement from you. As you can tell, today's proceedings are being recorded. Following today's inquiry, the tribunal is going to deliberate, which we will do on 14 March. We will not make any immediate response to anything that is put to us today. Do you have any questions regarding the process?

MR HALL: No.

MR BLAKE: No. Proceed.

MR HALL: Thank you, Mr Chair, and members of the panel, and I appreciate the opportunity to be able to come along and speak to you. I do apologise, I've got a bit of a summer cold but I think the incubation period is well over. So I've shaken hands with you all now. You won't get it, I can assure you. It's just one of those things that came up, but it has made my hearing a little bit more impaired. So, anyway, that's the way it is. So, Mr Chair, with your indulgence, I would just like to make an opening statement. Yesterday afternoon I sort of read back through my submission, and I got more and more thoughts in my head, and I ended up, sort of – I didn't want to miss anything out. So, basically, I went through and typed it out and went through in that respect so that I didn't miss anything that I wanted to present to the tribunal.

So just a small bit of a history. As we know, the central principle in deciding electoral boundaries is one vote, one value. And when the Parliamentary Reform Act of '98 that reduced a number of members in the House from 15 to 19. One vote, one value was the guiding principle. Then in '98 the Redistribution Tribunal, as we

know, determined the boundaries and the division names for the new electorates and how the transition would take place. It was a great change, as we know, at that time for the Tasmanian Parliament, but after 20 years or so now we can safely reflect on that process that took part at that time. And whether it's still the proper model, of course, is up for debate. But I'm not going to – obviously not going to address that today.

I think it's fair to say that the transition from 19 to 15 worked pretty well and it was fair and equitable. And in 2008, in fact, the Redistribution Committee commented on how well the boundaries established in '98 had stood the test of time. But my question is: is that still the case? So the criteria for the redistribution of '98 and the subsequent reviews are set out, as we know, in section 13 of the Legislative Council Electoral Boundaries Act of '95 and requires to take into account the two priorities. And, as you know, and I think, Mr Chair, you talked about that – that the number of electors in each division would not in four and a half years time vary more than plus or minus 10 per cent and to take into account the community of interest in each council electorate or division.

In addition, you had, as you also mentioned, it talked about the matters of communication and travel within the electorate, the physical features and areas of each electorate, the existing electoral boundaries and the distinct natural boundaries. And these, of course, as you've mentioned, the criteria used by this Redistribution Committee to produce this initial proposal. However, I've got to say, with respect, I think the Redistribution Committee has given far too much weight on the first priority, and that is the number of electors in each council division must not vary more than plus or minus 10 per cent of the average council division enrolment. I think that, with respect, that they are trying very hard to keep the variation in average council division enrolment numbers to a minimum percentage, and maybe even see zero as a perfect result in the pursuit of the one vote, one value principle.

To me, that's not a requirement of the legislation, as I read it, but I can understand some of the influences that might take it academically desirable, if I might put it that way. And I just, as a matter of interest, Mr Chair, I note the comment from the Constitutional Centre of Western Australia, the notion of one vote, one value is that each member of parliament represents, and is elected by, a comparable number of electors. This means the boundaries are distributed on the basis that every district would have an equal number of electors plus or minus 10 per cent.

Then it goes on to say:

*In some cases legislation can provide for exceptions to give separate consideration to remote and regional areas.*

And so perhaps a 10 per cent variation should be used to help equalise the access of voters in large divisions to their member of Parliament and have regard to one member's ability to satisfactorily service a large electorate. I would contend that if the larger rural divisions were permitted to have few – fewer projected electors than the average but still within the 10 per cent variation, and so the Redistribution

Committee might not have felt the need to propose such drastic changes. With regard to the data on attachment C of my submission, existing divisions and enrolment trends of the initial proposal booklet 2017, only the division of Rumney is projected to exceed the 10 per cent variation in the legislation, and that's plus 13.54 per cent over the next four and a half years. And perhaps – it has been suggested a simple exchange of electors with Apsley or a seating of minus 6.31 could resolve the imbalance.

Mr Chair, the Redistribution Committee's proposed major restructure of the two divisions in the northern half of the state – and they're the ones that I want to focus – in Western Tiers, naturally, also has other serious implications. It would, by the creation of the new divisions of McIntyre and Prosser, move a Legislative Council seat to the south of the state; more likely – most likely to be based at Sorell. The current projected division populations do not support a change of this magnitude. It would also shatter established communities of interest. The proposed new division of McIntyre stretches from Railton in the west – just near where I live, for example, I'm on the cusp of the north-west coast – right around to Flinders Island and St Helen's in the east and along the way grabs voters from Evandale and the Fingal Valley, for example.

It would be, one could contend, an unwieldy electorate of some 15,208 square kilometres with no clear town of focus. But, currently, the elected members in the towns of Deloraine, Westbury, Longford, Evandale, Scottsdale, Bridport, St Helen's, Scamander are all approximately between one and 2000 electors, making adequate representation almost impossible on the proposed redistribution for a single Legislative Council member. Further, it would lump five very different communities there: the north-west, Meander Valley, Northern Midlands, north-east and the east coast into a large electorate that I would contend will be very little in the way of common interests. And I would also note, Mr Chair, there's not one person who I've spoken to or contacted me are of the opinion that the proposed McIntyre electorate makes any sense. The overwhelming comment has been disparaging, to say the least.

So the current electorate of Western Tiers is currently centred on Deloraine, which although on the north of the division, is seen as an appropriate and acceptable focal point for the electorate and its communities of interest. It is likely that the division base or the electorate base for the proposed electorate of McIntyre would be Launceston which would deprive two large existing divisions of a direct access to their member, to a large degree. I would then pose this question: why are the voters of Western Tiers being asked to accept such a major change? Since the last redistribution in 2008, the number of enrolled electors in Western Tiers has gradually increased according to the enrolment figures published in accordance with the Legislative Council Electoral Boundaries Act of 1995.

In 2008 the number of enrolled electors in Western Tiers had a variation from the division average of minus 4.29 per cent, or minus 1000-odd – minus 1011 enrolled electors. And yet in 2016 the variation from the division average was minus 0.51 per

cent, or minus 128 electors. The projected variation from the division average in 2021 will be minus 1.12 per cent, minus 280 elected – enrolled electors. So it's pretty well right on the money. So, to me, there would appear to be no reason for any change to the division of Western Tiers based on population numbers alone.

5 And there is doubt – there is no doubt that more change leads to more voter confusion. Mr Chair and members, I must say since 1989 enrolled electors in in the Meander Valley stretching right through from Mole Creek to Carrick, for example, have had four electorate name changes to deal with – Tamer, Roland – although no election was held under this name – Rowallan and Western Tiers and now, under the

10 currently proposal, we're adding another one, McIntyre.

People just don't know where – what are we up to, they ask. Anyway. It can also be argued that members of Parliament in the Lower House and Federal members of Parliament are able to service electorates larger and more decentralised than the

15 proposed division of McIntyre. But that doesn't take into account the fact that the Legislative Council seats, as we all know, are single member electorates and do not have the staff or resources and multiple electorate officers available to members of other Houses of Parliament. You know, I think around a large electorate, even the state, you know, there's probably six or seven electorate officers, for example. And

20 they're able to share themselves around and physically on the ground and with their electorate officers and EAs. We can't – we simply cannot do that. We have basically – the average EA is about 0.7 0.6 or 0.7 for one member in the Legislative Council.

It also doesn't – following on from that – it also doesn't take into account the fact that independent members of the Legislative Council do not have access to party resources, staff or support. The one vote, one value principle can only work if voters have reasonable access to their members of Parliament. And that would not be the

25 case in the proposed division of McIntyre. I think, Mr Chair and members, there's also no practical comparison between large rural electorates and the kick-overs, if I might use that, kick-over electorates; high population densities of some electorates. So examples, so in some, like the Mersey, Pembroke, Elwick, some of those others, Hobart, you can virtually drive from one side of an electorate to the other in 10

30 minutes.

They usually just have one community of interest. We have many communities of interest. We have many regional newspapers to deal with. We have myriads of sporting and service clubs and it goes on and on. You know, we've got – I'm not complaining about this, it's a fact of life, but it is a fact of life, we have got six hours

35 return drive to Hobart for Parliament, all those sorts of things, whereas other members are – it's very easy to do that. And I think, you know, that as I travel, and as I travel to Hobart and I come from, as I say, on the cusp of the north-west coast and out of probably a private sector environment, you know, I do see that two speed economy that's happening in Tasmania at the moment.

40

45 Whether we like it or not, that's good luck for Hobart. But I do see that two speed economy. And I do see – and what does concern me – I see the amount of

deprivation which is in the rural electorates. And if those rural regional electorates aren't getting proper – this is just another blow to them, I feel. So, in short, the importance of keeping the enrolled elector numbers within 10 per cent has to be balanced by the accessibilities of the elected members to the elected members in their  
5 division. And I think that the current divisions of Western Tiers and Apsley work because they provide a communication corridor from the north to the south. And the proposed redistribution and dramatic changes to the northern divisions is, according to the initial proposal based on the needs to adopt – to address a population shift in Tasmania and makes the following statement:

10  
*The general eastward and southward movement trend of elected members over the past 18 years continues across this redistributions four and a half year enrolment projections. The initial proposal also states that population projections for each of the 15 divisions are based on ABS data produced in*  
15 *2015.*

However, the ABS population projections are themselves based on data from the 2011 Australian Census. And that is what the – this is what the ABS says about their population projection data:

20  
*The ABS recognises the increasing interest in stochastic methods among demographers. While such methods were not specifically used to comply in these projections, some limited applications of the methods were used in assessing some of the assumptions. The ABS welcomes further feedback in*  
25 *these emerging methodologies ahead of the next set of projections.*

Now ..... I suppose, Mr Chair ..... what does stochastic mean. I had to look that up. I had to Google it. It's a word I was unfamiliar with, and it turns out to be an adjective which just describes something randomly determined, a probability/possibility. And  
30 you will note the ABS warning on the emerging methodologies it uses in its population projections. The fact is the data used to make such drastic changes to Legislative Council divisions is now at least six years old and is being used to predict electorate numbers for the next four and a half years. It would seem there is room for some doubt in this process. And a lot can happen in 10 years. And I think in  
35 Tasmania we're seeing a whole range of different population growth drivers, particularly in the north-west, north-north-east and Midlands in regard to irrigation schemes, vineyard expansions. I know around my area, massive horticultural expansions by Driscoll's and the Costas and all that sort of thing. Mining is always cyclical like as with a lot of other primary industries.

40  
Forestry has now started to pick up again and, you know, we've got the adventure tourism, eco-tourism, matters of mountain bike riding and golf, angling, etcetera. So I'm concerned that the current review published its proposed – sorry, I will start again. I will finish that little bit there. Mr Chairman, I'm also a bit concerned that  
45 the current review published its proposed changes at the end of January, a peak holiday time for many Tasmanians. And it was put in the three day list on that Australia Day weekend, but just that single assertion. I understand the Electoral

Commission have done their undertaking, their responsibilities in doing that in accordance with the legislation. But I might just say, as we all know, how few people – or many less people now read daily newspapers. And those that did said, “I can’t understand this. It’s all a bit too much. It does your head in when you start to look at it along the lines.” I know it’s very difficult for the Redistribution Tribunal to probably get anything different from that, but I just wanted to make that point.

So I have no doubt that the legislation enacted to create the divisions back in ’98 served the Parliament and the people of Tasmania well at that time. I don’t think that’s the case now. And so, Mr Chair, I would like, with respect, to advise the tribunal that upon return to Parliament, I intend to move a Private Member’s Bill. And the purpose of my bill would be to amend the Legislative Council Electoral Boundaries Act 1995 in two ways. One is to delay the determination of the 2016/2017 Legislative Council Electoral Boundaries Redistribution Committee until population projections based on the most recent census data, August 2016, are available from the ABS. This would allow the Redistribution Committee to make its population projections on the latest available data and ensure a sounder basis for boundary changes.

It will also allow the committee to consider any changes to federal electorates in Tasmania as a result of the current review which is due to be completed by the end of this year. It would also synchronise future Legislative Council electoral boundary reviews with the availability of population projections based on the most recent Australian census data by doing a 10-year review cycle from 2018 instead of the current nine-year review. The Australian census is held every five years in the month of August and I’m assured that this will continue. And ABS population projection data is updated every three months. And so – and whilst there is probably a good reason for the nine year and four and a half year review cycles in place in the current legislation, it is clearly out of kilter with the regular release of reliable ABS and census data.

So, Mr Chair, I just mention that. It’s not – I’m not criticising the committee at all with what they’ve done. You’ve acted entirely within the Redistribution Committee, entirely within the legislation. That is a political matter and that’s a matter that I just, as a matter of courtesy, I thought I would just mention to you, that’s what I intend to do. So, just in conclusion, I’ve been a member of the Legislative Council for nearly 16 years. I’ve tried to always shy away from the politics of parochialism despite what I’ve said about the two speed economy before. But I just see that – I see that as – those of us with long service in our chamber know a good deal about our electorates and our State and the issues that affect our constituents.

It’s very hard-earned knowledge, I might say, and understanding we use to represent the interests of our constituents and help with their problems and issues. As an aside, I was somewhat bemused when my attention was drawn to comments from the Member of Rumney, Mr Chairman. He indicated that I was of retirement age. Well, I’m 68 and still going strong. And further I had indicated retirement in 2018. In casual conversation, I might have indicated, as you always do, you know,

considering all options. And I certainly haven't ruled out not standing again in 2018. Look, I'm younger than Mr Trump. So there you go.

MR BLAKE: And I suspect much more reliable.

5

MR HALL: Thank you, Mr Chair. Anyway, my Private Member's Bill was not about – as I said before, it's not about saving my seat of Western Tiers or my future. It's just about ensuring that the process that decides who we represent and those who follow us is democratic and fair and equitable to all. And just a final bit of  
10 conclusion, I would respectfully request that if changes of a minor nature cannot be achieved, then at least the tribunal seriously consider my Hall 3 proposal, which was the eastern and the central matter. And I do think Mr Page, therefore, his patience and going right through that almost figures ..... so. Thank you, Mr Chair, that completes my rather long-winded dissertation.

15

MR BLAKE: Thanks. Thank you Greg. So I will open it up to the panel.

MS FROST: I have a question.

20

MR BLAKE: Go ahead.

MS FROST: Mr Hall, thank you very much for your Hall 3 proposal and for coming up with an alternative because that is very helpful.

25

MR HALL: Yes, yes.

MS FROST: To us to consider. And you've mentioned about the distances involved, but under your proposal the Apsley region goes from Flinders Island right down to Tasman Peninsula.

30

MR HALL: Yes.

MS FROST: And you mentioned about distances and I'm thinking how do you think – do you think that that distance is reasonable for the Apsley representative?

35

MR HALL: Yes. I suppose if you look at Apsley at the moment – Tania Rattray – Tania comes down to Buckland, as it is at the moment. So, you know, she has – that's quite a distance south. And I recognise that it's also a – but I see that connect of the east coast, as I always go down there, and I know that, yes, the Tasmanian  
40 Peninsula protrudes down further. But I would have thought that still it was an achievable matter for a member to service. I really do because I think that if you go between Buckland and the Tasman Peninsula, there's a gap there where there's not too many people through Nugent and those areas there. But then you just get into the Tasman Peninsula, not a particularly high population, but certainly, of course, Sorell  
45 has.



And, conversely, the proposal put me down into Brighton. Well, I now – I can't really come down just south of Bothwell. So, you know, 95 per cent of my people live in that northern part of the electorate. But in servicing Bothwell, and going to Hobart or a member of the current Western Tiers at central electorate, it is not all that  
5 difficult. It is pretty small population down there. There are large rural holdings. Probably only about 300 people live in Bothwell. There's shacks and everything else. So it simply means instead of coming down the Midlands Highway, you just go down the – come across the Lake Highway, the lake secondary road. And any issues that I have to deal with can be done there, in that respect, yes.

10

MS FROST: Thank you.

MR HALL: So I just sort of saw that as a – yes, rather than, yes, the east-west, cut off the north-south one, it appeared to me – and I think and other people too – it  
15 would be an option which I think has merit, has quite a bit of merit. Yes.

MS WARDLAW-KELLY: Did you consult your constituents in areas like Bothwell in particular and did you get any feedback on the proposed changes?

MR HALL: Yes. As I said before, some people came into the office and others came in and they were quite unhappy with that initial proposal. It's pretty difficult to – even to explain what goes on, you know. I mean, people get local government areas mixed up with us. You know, even if you go out and door-knock and you've been a member for a while, "You're standing for Northern Midlands Council", you  
20 know. And so you do get quite a bit of that. The word "council" tends to get mixed up.

25

MS WARDLAW-KELLY: Sure.

MR HALL: In the whole shooting match. So it's a bit difficult. So, yes. But the people that I have spoken to, to answer your question, said, "Look, you know, we can see the merit in what you're" – I just told a few people. I didn't tell all that many people about what I proposed here as an alternative 3, and they said "Yes, we can see that as something which is quite feasible and it doesn't upset the apple cart to any  
30 great degree." And, I mean, as far as I was concerned, if that proposal came into being, then yes, I'm in Hobart, I'm going backwards and forwards. I'm going through Brighton anyway. And I'm going through Campbelltown and I'm going through those others areas. Yes, I do take, you know, it into account, as you say.

35

I'm from Flinders and I know that the member for Apsley has also serviced, you know, the Flinders Island, you know – there is that real community of interest right down that east coast and the east coast drive and the fishing and the tourism which is totally – which is divorced from that central area which I probably represent, which is mainly, you know, rural based. It has a – and so, like the moment, if I look at  
40 where I am at the moment, if I go through even from Port Sorell through to where I live, it's only probably about 30, 35 minutes. 30 minutes, 35 minutes. But it's a continuation of very strong rural communities of interest through Kentish. And I can  
45

drive from my place, then through to Perth or Longford in another 35 minutes or so. So that's – you know, in that respect because it's – it's central – Deloraine is a central town in that context, I suppose, yes. That's just the way it has been. It's the way we've had to service it, yes. Michael.

5

MR GIUDICI: Yes. Thank you, Greg, for your statements. In your submission and also in your statement you very much favour an incremental approach or a minimalist approach to the changes. But you also mention that many constituents have seen a number of changes over the last times with - - -

10

MR HALL: Sorry.

MR GIUDICI: A number of your constituents are perhaps sick and tired of change in terms of the nametags that have happened over time.

15

MR HALL: Yes. Yes.

MR GIUDICI: You mentioned that.

20

MR HALL: Yes.

MR GIUDICI: The current proposal suggests a fairly radical change.

MR HALL: Yes.

25

MR GIUDICI: Which may stand the test of time in terms of subsequent changes not being required. So, you know, what are your views around what's better: an incremental change which may have the effect of affecting people several times or something that lasts?

30

MR HALL: Yes. Look, I understand what you're saying, Michael. Excuse me. I will have a sip of water. Too much talking. Yes, I understand that an incremental change may provide some issues down the track for, you know – if it's only small incremental change, it might provide some issues. But then, again, you know, the world changes, as we know, and you know some of those population projections may change. And that's why I'm talking about, you know, waiting until the latest ABS data is available there. Yes. I really just have to say, Michael, I really don't like – and people don't like – that proposal as it is. At the moment it will be a very difficult electorate to service, I think, the McIntyre one as it is. And that's why – and I realise that, you know, I think, that the – if the incremental – if the smaller incremental change is not acceptable, then the other one certainly has – the scenario 3, I think, has real merit to do that without – and still fit a lot of the guidelines which we have to fit with, yes.

35

45

MR GIUDICI: Thank you.

MR BLAKE: Nothing else. No. So you've answered our questions. Thanks, Greg. And any closing remarks before we finish up?

5 MR HALL: No, I don't think so. Look, I would just like to – I think I went on long enough with what I said, but I just wanted to make sure that I covered off on all those salient points, Mr Chair, and I thank you very much for your indulgence and allowing me to appear today. Thank you so much.

10 MR BLAKE: Thank you.

MS WARDLAW-KELLY: Thank you.

MR HALL: Thank you.

15 MR BLAKE: So, tribunal, we might break for 45 minutes, is that okay.

MR GIUDICI: Yes.

20 MR BLAKE: And back here at 11.30. 11.25.

MR GIUDICI: Yes. Okay.

25 **ADJOURNED** **[10.23 am]**

**RESUMED** **[11.19 am]**

30 MR BLAKE: So we have reconvened after our tea break this morning, the tribunal, and welcome Rosemary Armitage. I won't read through my statement again. You've heard it a couple of times.

35 MS ARMITAGE: I have, yes.

MR BLAKE: But I might just re-emphasise because this is causing some confusion, I believe, the bit about the quota. So for this redistribution, the average division enrolment or quota is 24,998 which was determined at 30 September 2016. And in no case is any variation from the council division quota to exceed 10 per cent. I also  
40 note that this figure is based on actual enrolment data at 30 September '16 and waiting or delaying will not result in any more accurate information. So the information used by the committee is the most up-to-date official population estimate. You understand the process?

45 MS ARMITAGE: Absolutely.

MR BLAKE: You're welcome to proceed.

MS ARMITAGE: Thank you. No, I do. I totally understand the process. And probably the submission that I would have is purely that I would have hoped that there could have been a less disruptive way of achieving the outcome that we need to. I understand that some of the electorates, of course – the numbers are down and  
5 others are up a little bit and it needed to be changed. But I just see that what we've come up with or what the committee has come up with seems to be quite disruptive to at least two of the electorates, being the current Apsley, of course, and Western Tiers. And I would consider that a lot of those electors will be disenfranchised quite considerably, particularly as the Member for Apsley said previously when she was  
10 speaking that she has just gone to an election last year in 2016. You've got basically half the electorate then with a different member, obviously, whether it's going to be her or whether it's a southern part. But someone is going to have – half that electorate is going to have a different member that they voted in last year.

15 The other issue, of course, is Rumney, which I would see that as being quite difficult for the current member. I'm up for election now. I know how hard it is, and I simply have one small area that will be different. But to have a huge part of the electorate change is certainly a hard thing to cope with. But where I'm looking at it primarily is the fact that I see that we need to have equal representation around the  
20 state. And if we look at numbers, with 15 members of the Upper House, I would consider that we would be losing a northern voice. At the moment, of course, you can have a northern or southern voice when you go from, basically, Bridport right down to – where is it, down to Sorell where it goes. So you could have someone that perhaps is from the south and lives there. But you have the opportunity of having a  
25 northern voice which we've had for a great number of years with the current member and I think her father previously to that.

So it has been a long time that we've had that northern voice. But with these proposed changes there's no possibility. So what primarily at the moment is two  
30 northern voices or can be and usually is two northern voices becomes only one northern voice. And all of a sudden we get another southern voice. And, to me, it's all to do with representation across the state. There needs to be equal representation. And, of course, not being parochial, but we do see ourselves often as a bit of the poor relations in the north. And I make no apology for that, you know. While we're  
35 elected by the state. We're also elected to look after our regions. And I see that as a bit of an issue that now with these changes, if they go through, there is no possibility for the north to have that extra voice.

And probably that's one of the main things that I would say, just looking at – the  
40 other area that I would mention, and I think it was mentioned by the other members, is the size of their electorate. I'm very lucky in Launceston. As has been mentioned, I can cover my electorate, even if it's changed to Perth, 20 minutes I could be anywhere within my electorate. And it's quite correct, as the Member for Apsley said, one of our main tasks or functions is to attend events put on by our community,  
45 that they do like to think that people turn up and go to them. So I am lucky that I can actually do that. But for these two members to have an electorate that, you know – where it's proposed – where McIntyre particularly is proposed and all the way up the

east coast, I would see it very hard for someone to actually cover an electorate that size.

5 And when you look at the Lower House, while they may have electorates  
geographically similar, they've got five members. And they can have – well, they  
would have at least five offices. Most members have two offices. You know, some  
of them will have an office either end, particularly if they're in government and even  
opposition because they are party members, whereas we have one staff member and  
one office. And I would see it very difficult for my fellow members, whether it be  
10 Prosser or whether it be McIntyre, to actually be able to cover that whole area and to  
cover it well. And I think that's the thing. To geographically be actually able to go  
to all areas and to be able to look after those constituents would be difficult. I know  
in Launceston it's not always easy, even though geographically I can – as you say, I  
can be there 20 minutes anywhere. It's still not always easy to be everywhere that  
15 you need to be. But to have an electorate that size they would spend the largest part  
of their time in their car travelling.

I also see that as a danger because you can go to a function and the member would  
tell you, you know, "Triabunna or Swansea, you can go home." You've got to look  
20 at is it safe working hours because of the amount of time you are spending in the car.  
The longer you're in the car, the more unsafe it is. And I see that as a real issue too  
because by making their electorate so large, you're actually putting them in the  
vehicle that much longer. If they've got something up here at Bridport and then  
they've got something over at Deloraine or somewhere similar, and they feel,  
25 "We've got to go. These are compulsory things that we really need to do to look  
after our constituents and so they don't feel disenfranchised or disengaged", then the  
travelling they can do – and I'm sure the members will tell you – there's nothing for  
them to spend six hours in a car of a day. You know, three hours to get somewhere,  
you're spending somewhere for an hour or an hour or two, and then you're heading  
30 home that night. I don't see that as safe. And I see that as a real issue.

We don't allow doctors and nurses and other people to have unsafe working hours.  
So why should we let our politicians have unsafe working hours? I think that's – it's  
quite critical that – you know, accidents can occur and, while they haven't, we've  
35 been fortunate they haven't yet. It certainly is a danger, the larger your electorate  
and one person having to cover it. And they're probably my main concerns. As I  
said, the fact that currently, yes, there are large electorates with the Lower House.  
They do have multi-member to cover it. And if it's a party, obviously, they would  
assign different people to different events, which they can do. But when you're a  
40 single person, you feel you need to be there for your whole electorate as best you  
can. Unlike the member for Apsley, I would have one car for three years quite easily  
and probably still doesn't need changing because of the short distances I'm  
travelling. But I'm mainly speaking on their behalf.

45 It doesn't concern me. And I felt I could come and speak to you because I don't  
have any self-interest this. I'm not speaking about my electorate. I'm quite happy  
with whatever happens in that electorate. So I'm really looking at my fellow

5 members and supporting them in that I think unsafe working hours for the travelling they would have to do to actually cater for an electorate that size. And also for the constituents who will be disenfranchised and disadvantaged at having lost a member that they've just recently elected, or in the case of Rumney they will lose a member that they will have just instantly elected. So that's pretty much my feeling.

MR BLAKE: Yes. Thank you. Any questions from the tribunal?

10 MR GIUDICI: Just exploring the size of the electorate argument a bit more.

MS ARMITAGE: Yes.

15 MR GIUDICI: The proposal reduces the size of existing Apsley significantly, and Murchison is already very large.

MS ARMITAGE: Murchison is very large, but the greater part of Murchison doesn't have anyone in it.

20 MR GIUDICI: It doesn't have anybody in it, no. So – that's right.

MS ARMITAGE: No.

25 MR GIUDICI: One of the proposals from your colleague, Greg Hall, was that Apsley would go from Flinders Island to Nubeena. So would you have potential issues with that?

30 MS ARMITAGE: I haven't really – well, I haven't looked at Greg's people so I couldn't really comment on it. But I simply see when you look at the size, geographically where it is, you can look at it, and you can say how big it is geographically, but if you look from where you have to travel and where the roads are to take you where you need to go – and I think in the case of Apsley it's very difficult for Tania Rattray in that she has an office at Scottsdale and she has a staff member at Scottsdale, and it's quite obvious that she would have to take over Prosser. You couldn't expect Western Tiers to become Prosser because there's 35 basically none of Western Tiers in it. So I can see that. So there are other problems too, when you consider your electors and your constituents.

40 All the constituents from, basically, Bridport right down to – is it Campbelltown or Canara where it changes, they will no longer belong to someone they elected last year. But geographically even when you're down here, it's a long way right down to the bottom end, you know, of where the proposed changes are. So it's still a great deal of travelling. And I see that as unsafe working hours, I really do. I know how many hours the Member for Apsley does because I see she will have a new car every so often and you think, "Gosh." She said, "Well, I've done so many thousand 45 miles", and I think – or kilometres – that cannot be safe to be travelling that much. So I do see that as an issue for her, and I guess I'm one of the lucky ones in that I

don't have that. But that doesn't mean I can't see the problems for my fellow members.

MR GIUDICI: Thank you.

5

MR BLAKE: So can I explore with you, and this is because, as you say, you're not here with any particular view - - -

MS ARMITAGE: No. No. I have – no. I - - -

10

MR BLAKE: And I think the problem we – I'm sort of looking at, having also looked at this proposal that my colleagues have come up with, is because of the way we elect our Upper House members whatever we do it's going to affect a member, whether it's now or nine years time. So there's going to be some member who will be in ..... subject to the transition arrangements. I don't know how we can avoid always - - -

15

MS ARMITAGE: These seem such major changes, though. And I know they're only small numbers – or small numbers compared to the overall number in each electorate.

20

MR BLAKE: Yes.

MS ARMITAGE: But the geographic changes to the map are quite major. So they're not small changes.

25

MR BLAKE: So the question Michael has asked a few members is if we don't make this change today, we're going to have to – likely, if the population trends continue, make a much bigger change in nine years time, and that's my, sort of, looking at the numbers. So when does a panel like ours make that call? A few times morning Greg mentioned 1998 was a great outcome, that significant changes were made and stood the test of time. Should I make a similar view we should develop something that's going to stand the test of time?

30

MS ARMITAGE: Look, I agree - - -

35

MR BLAKE: And that's – I'm trying to toy in my own mind with that.

MS ARMITAGE: I do agree with you that you do have to make decisions, and, at the end of the day, you have to make decisions. You can't take everything into account because you would never make a decision because everyone will have differing opinions. But looking at the map, particularly looking at Western Tiers or what was Western Tiers becoming McIntyre, to me that – and I appreciate we've got Murchison, but this bottom end of Murchison, basically, has no people in it.

40

45

MR GIUDICI: No.

MS ARMITAGE: And to go from here up to here, you know, it's not just a matter of just climbing around a map. You've got to have roads that go – it just – it looks a very strange delineation to me, and I just see it as quite difficult for any member to cover an area like that. And my main reason for coming down, and as I said, the fact that the north loses a voice. And that's very important to me, that, you know, when we're in the Legislative Council most of us are independents, which is very important. And we certainly vote many times on issues that could be called parochial, whether it be hospitals or whether it be football or whatever, that are north/south. And I accept that we're there for the whole state, but I also am very conscious of the fact that I have to look after the north because if I don't support the north of the state, then no one else will. We, as elected members for the north, yes, we look at overall the state, but we also look after our regions. And I am considering that it will be losing a northern voice. There is one northern voice gone. So there's one vote done in our House that won't be supporting something or may not be supporting something that happens in the north.

And, to me, that's important as well because there are many issues that do come down to parochialism, whether we like it or whether we don't. It does happen. And it's important that all regions are equally represented. And so I would like to see a – I don't see – there's probably quite a fair balance. I haven't seen the Member for Western Tiers' proposal. And I think the Member for Apsley may have had a proposal as well. But I thought, "Well, no, that's their proposals". I'm only interested in looking at your proposal.

MR BLAKE: No. You're right, yes.

MR GIUDICI: For sure.

MR BLAKE: All right. I think we've - - -

MS ARMITAGE: So I - - -

MR BLAKE: - - - exhausted our questions. Thank you again for coming in. Thank you.

MS ARMITAGE: That's all right. I just thought I would offer you just a quick submission.

MR GIUDICI: Yes. Thank you.

MR BLAKE: Thank you.

MS ARMITAGE: Thank you very much.

MR BLAKE: What's the size of the proposed McIntyre compared to the original Apsley? I would have thought Apsley was bigger.



**ADJOURNED**

**[11.32 am]**

**RESUMED**

**[11.51 am]**

5

MR BLAKE: So after a short break we reconvene the tribunal. Mr Nott, may I just make an introductory few comments. So welcome to this hearing of the Redistribution Tribunal regarding the Legislative Council boundary redistribution and thank you for making a submission based on the initial redistribution proposal. My name is Mike Blake and I chair the Redistribution Tribunal. I will not introduce you to my colleagues because their names and roles are clear from their name tags. The initial redistribution proposal was prepared by the Legislative Council Electoral Boundaries Redistribution Committee in accordance with the Legislative Council Electoral Boundaries Act 1995. And I would like to place on record my thanks to them and the Electoral Commission staff and Mr Phil Page for their support and work that they've done.

The initial proposal was advertised and comments, suggestions or objections for the proposal were sought. Twenty-nine submissions were received by the due date, including yours, which was 27 February 2017. This tribunal has an obligation to bring an independent and unbiased perspective to its consideration of the committee's proposal and to do so in a timely manner. The tribunal is also obliged to apply the same principles as did the Redistribution Committee. The first priority is to ensure, as far as practical, that the number of electors in each council division would not in four and a half years time vary by more than plus or minus 10 per cent of the average council division enrolment. The second priority is to take into account the community of interest within each council division. After taking into account the priorities noted above, the tribunal must consider the following in each case of each electoral division: the means of communication and travel within the division; the physical features and area of the division; the existing electoral boundaries and distinct natural boundaries.

For this redistribution the average divisional enrolment or quota is 24,998 which was determined at 30 September 2016. And in no case is any variation from the council division quota to exceed 10 per cent. I also note that this figure is based on actual enrolment data at 30 September 2016 and waiting or delay will not result in any more accurate information. So the information used by the committee is the most up-to-date official population estimate. Every objector has the right to be heard at this inquiry. So far as the procedure today is concerned, it is not a court of law, and for the most part the tribunal can determine its own procedures. We will deal with these matters as informally as possible, noting only that this is required to be a public inquiry and the tribunal has the power, if it thinks it's in the public interest to do so, to hold parts of the inquiry in private.

45

You are invited to indicate whether there is any part of the material or information you want to provide to us you believe should be heard in private. We will consider

such application if it's made. Although the tribunal has the power to do so, we will not be swearing people in to give evidence because we are dealing, essentially, with matters of opinion rather than contested fact, but we do reserve the right to require you to give sworn evidence if necessary. Also the Act requires that any evidence  
5 which is given by way of a written statement must be tendered and verified by oath. So if you will be tendering any written statement, we will need to administer an oath to them for the purposes of verifying your statement.

10 MR NOTT: Only the submission.

MR BLAKE: Thank you. Subject to these matters, the intention is that you are invited to outline the nature of your objection to, or, indeed, support for, the proposal uninterrupted. We will provide an opportunity for discussion and comment and questioning from members of the tribunal and then an opportunity for a closing  
15 statement from you. As you can see, today's proceedings are being recorded. Following today's inquiries, the tribunal is going to deliberate, which we will do on 14 March. We will not make any immediate response to anything that is put to us today. Do you have any questions about the process?

20 MR NOTT: No.

MR BLAKE: Please proceed.

MR NOTT: First of all, could I thank you for the opportunity to, first, put a  
25 submission in and, secondly, to speak to it. And I guess it's quite ironic in a sense; there's 29 submissions and there's 29 councils where I've been involved in local government. So that's an ironical factor, I guess, isn't it. My first reaction to seeing the boundary changes and the map proposed and the new electorates of McIntyre and Prosser – I believe that, looking at this map ..... south and Western Tiers have moved  
30 west. I understand, as you said, that by regulation the need to periodically adjust the boundaries to keep the voting numbers fairly similar in all the electorates.

I felt that there was, in my opinion, a massive adjustment and dislocation in looking at that. The individuals and communities, and I guess local councils, have a sense of  
35 identification with the original or current boundaries, and they do in any community. And there's a general link with – those have links with the Legislative Council electorates. With this proposal, in my opinion, there is a huge identity loss and change for the communities. And also, in my opinion, it does alter the community fabric, having lived in rural Tasmania, Meander for a number of years, I'm aware of  
40 that community fabric. Also, I'm aware through my role for nine years in local government in Launceston and also involvement with as scrutineer and supporting the Member for Windermere in three elections, the voter confusion. I think at times that, sadly, there's a great deal of voter confusion anyway in Legislative Council. I mean, many times I was asked when campaigning in Windermere, "Do I have to  
45 vote?", even for local government election. "Am I in Windermere?" And I think that with the name changes, more so with McIntyre than with Prosser, it would be difficult and cause more confusion, in my opinion.

Currently, we know that there's a great deal – great number of informal votes, more than perhaps there should be. In fact, I think that on my records, looking at statistics, in some cases there's something like 10 per cent that don't vote from the number of electors enrolled, to the number of those that vote, is something like 10 per cent or more. And there's quite a considerable number of informal votes. I think that's a message for all in government with communication, and I guess with three tiers of government in a small state like Tasmania with 29 councils and so on that's always going to be difficult anyway. You would think with the new electorate – the proposed electorate of McIntyre, to go from Deloraine or the western side to the east coast was, in fact, a massive adjustment and a difference in localities and there are many different smaller communities, having lived near Deloraine, as at Meander, to link that.

And I also had a holiday house at St Helen's. So I guess I know that area and it's a huge – it's a huge shift. I know there has to be changes, I understand that. But I believe that perhaps this particular way it has been suggested – there might be a better way. There might be a better way. And also another concern of mine is there is naturally a link between state and federal electorates and it would appear that where – with local council, I know a couple of local councils have voiced their opinion – certainly in the press they have, anyway – about the proposed electorates. And I think that the less disruption, the less confusion, the better for the Upper House and those in those electorates. The loss of local representation I think is important. While – and both the incumbents have won three elections, and I guess there will come a time when they may not continue to a further election. But they are known in that area, and I think that those particular – with the changes, would indicate that it would be more disruptive or less known for those in those country communities.

And those country communities are very much different from the western side, from Deloraine, Mole Creek, that end, to the east coast with St Helen's, Bridport and so on ..... question too, that the idea – I know the State Government has pushed the Great Eastern Drive tourism and that would have, I think – I believe would be fractured, in a sense, if it was – if there was – in the new model, I believe. In a sense, currently with Apsley, basically, all of Apsley would have been involved in the Great Eastern Drive. So community interests, voter confusions and changes, with McIntyre, I think that would appear to me – Prosser is more acceptable as a name, in my view, than McIntyre. It does everything for the Prosser River and so on in the south-east. McIntyre to link the west and the east and call it McIntyre, I think, is problematic and could cause some difficulty.

I've viewed and am aware of the Hall model, the Greg Hall model, where the suggestion is that it doesn't fracture Apsley as much as it currently stands. And I think that if that model was introduced or considered, strongly considered by this committee, that it perhaps better serves the communities. There's less dislocation and disruption. There's less voter confusion. It provides more reasonable representation of country people and, in my view, with great respect, it probably makes greater sense to the average citizen. And I guess that having a furor about the form salary of the former Australia Post CEO – I'm not suggesting that there's a

parallel there, but I'm saying that perhaps does it past the pub test, and I think that probably the Greg Hall model would pass the pub test a little more, with great respect, than the proposal. That's probably – I think that concludes the main thrust of my – of what I wish to say. I do have something I would like to sum up with, if I can.

MR BLAKE: All right. Thank you. We will let you sum up in a few moments. So open the discussion with the panel. Any questions from anybody?

MR HAWKEY: No.

MR BLAKE: You're okay.

MR GIUDICI: Yes.

MS WARDLAW-KELLY: No. Thank you.

MS FROST: No.

MR BLAKE: I don't have any questions. You've, obviously, thought a lot about what you want to say to us, so did you want to sum up in some sort of way?

MR NOTT: My intention was to have a brief submission, and I think that – I don't want to bore you with a long and involved thing because it's from a citizen's point of view and a person that has been involved with the council. I guess that – I've written here:

*I do not believe that the ..... electoral dislocation zone and the ramifications of this change, in my opinion, are huge for all the players. And when there is a softer and appears to be a more reasonable and fairer solution, and more community friendly, that the Hall proposal does that, in my view. And as a concerned citizen and former local – elected local government representative, I would ask that the Hall proposal on electoral boundary changes be given the strongest possible consideration in conjunction with my thoughts and comments. Thank you.*

MR BLAKE: Thanks for your time today.

MS WARDLAW-KELLY: Thank you.

MR GIUDICI: Thank you.

MR NOTT: Much obliged. Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

MR BLAKE: Mr Mansell, we're running ahead of time. Were you happy to start?

MR MANSELL: Yes. Okay. Thanks. Timed that nicely.

MR BLAKE: Yes, you did, indeed.

MR MANSELL: Thanks.

5 MR BLAKE: Mike Blake. Hello. Welcome.

MR MANSELL: Yes. I know you, Mike. Everybody knows you.

MR BLAKE: Well, that's not a good thing.

10 MS WARDLAW-KELLY: Hi, Lisa Wardlaw-Kelly.

MR MANSELL: G'day Lisa.

15 MS FROST: Karen Frost.

MR MANSELL: G'day Karen.

MR HAWKEY: Andrew Hawkey.

20 MR MANSELL: G'day Andrew.

MR BLAKE: Having said let's start, I've got to make sure I've got your submission in front of me.

25 MR MANSELL: Yes. There should be – we originally wrote a letter in from the TAC a week or more ago, and then I belatedly sent another one in this morning, and I looked at the detail – you probably haven't even had a chance to go through it. But that's all right.

30 MR GIUDICI: No. But we do have one from you, though.

MR MANSELL: Sorry?

35 MR GIUDICI: We have one from you, an email from you.

MR MANSELL: Yes.

MR BLAKE: So before we go any further, can I just make an opening statement and then we will get going. So please allow me to make an initial statement of welcome. Welcome to this hearing of the Redistribution Tribunal regarding the Legislative Council boundary redistribution and thank you for making your submission based on the initial redistribution proposal. My name is Mike Blake and I chair the Redistribution Tribunal. I will not introduce you to my colleagues

45 because their names are clear from their roles and their nametags.

5 The initial redistribution proposal was prepared by the Legislative Council Electoral Boundaries Redistribution Committee in accordance with the Legislative Council Electoral Boundaries Act 1995. And I would like to place on record my thanks to them and the Electoral Commission staff and others, in particular, Mr Phil Page who supported them.

10 The initial proposal was advertised and comments, suggestions or objections for the proposal were sought. Twenty-nine submissions were received by the due date of 27 February 2017, including yours. This tribunal has an obligation to bring an independent and unbiased perspective to its consideration of the committee's proposal and to do so in a timely manner. The tribunal is also obliged to apply the same priorities as did the Redistribution Committee. The first priority is to ensure, as far as practical, that the number of electors in each council division would not in four and a half years time vary more than plus or minus 10 per cent of the average council division enrolment.

15 The second priority is to take into account the community of interest within each council division. After taking into account those priorities, the tribunal must consider the following matter in the case of each electoral division: the means of communication and travel within the division; the physical features and areas of the division; existing electoral boundaries and distinct natural boundaries. For this redistribution the average divisional enrolment or quota is 24,998 which was determined at 30 September 2016, and in no case is any variation from council quoted to exceed 10 per cent. I also note that this figure is based on actual enrolment data at 30 September 2016 and waiting or delay will not result in any more accurate information. So the information used by the committee is the most up-to-date official population estimate.

30 Every objector has a right to be heard at this inquiry. So far as the procedure today is concerned, it is not a court of law, and for the most part the tribunal can determine its own procedures. We will deal with these matters as informally as possible, noting only that this is required to be a public hearing, and the tribunal has the power, if it thinks it's in the public interest to do so, to hold parts of the inquiry in private. You are invited to indicate whether there's any part of the material information you want to provide to us you believe should be heard in private.

35 MR MANSELL: No.

40 MR BLAKE: We will consider an application, if you make one. Although the tribunal has the power to do so, we will not be swearing people in to give evidence because we are dealing, essentially, with matters of opinion rather than contested fact, but we do reserve the right to require you to give sworn evidence, if necessary. Also, the Act requires that any evidence which is given by way of written statement must be tendered and verified by oath. So if you will be tendering any written statement, we will need to administer an oath to them for the purposes of verifying your statement. Subject to these matters, the intention is that you are invited to outline the nature of your objection to, or, indeed, support for, the proposal uninterrupted. We will provide an opportunity for discussion and comment and

questioning from members of the tribunal and then an opportunity for a closing statement from you. As you can tell, today's proceedings are being recorded. Following today's inquiries, the tribunal is going to deliberate, which we will do on 14 March. We will not make any immediate response to anything you put to us  
5 today. Do you have any questions about the process?

MR MANSELL: No. That's fine, thanks.

10 MR BLAKE: Please proceed.

MR MANSELL: Thank you. I'm representing the Tasmanian Aboriginal Centre which made a written submission, and I emailed a further four pages of it this morning, which you obviously wouldn't have got and you wouldn't have had time to go through it anyway.

15

MR BLAKE: Can I just note, sorry, before you go on the fact you emailed it today, because it's beyond the date of the period by which we were receiving submissions, we may not be able to consider it anyway. So - - -

20 MR MANSELL: It's not a new submission. It seeks to explain the submission that was put in on 23 February which was brief and I think was about six paragraphs, or thereabouts. And we thought it would be an opportunity just to elaborate on the very points that were made without introducing anything new.

25 MR BLAKE: So out of respect I will read it, but I can't guarantee we will take it into account.

MR MANSELL: Yes. Sure. Sure. Our view is that after 200 years of white occupation in Tasmania Aboriginal people should have a representative in the  
30 Tasmanian Parliament. And in the 200 years so far we haven't had a rep. It's true that Kathryn Hay was elected in 2002 but through the Labor Party, and she would say, "Look, I was never elected to represent Aboriginal people and Aboriginal people didn't elect me." The ABS figures in 2011 show that there are 24,000 people who identify as Aboriginal in Tasmania, which makes the Tasmanian numbers  
35 proportionately the highest in the country, second only to the Northern Territory, which is 30 per cent of the Northern Territory population. So it is a significant number of people in Tasmania who will argue that we are not represented in the Parliament. And, yes, there have been some progress – progress has been made, especially from 1995 to 2006 with lands rights legislation from both Liberal and  
40 Labor; also with recognition of Aboriginal cultural hunting and fishing and, of course, Tasmania was the first state to compensate the stolen generations.

But they are matters of the Parliament addressing social justice issues. It's not dealing with the issue of political representation. The way that the electoral divisions  
45 have been set up to date guarantees that there will be white parliaments into the next millennium, and it guarantees the exclusion of Aboriginal people being able to elect their own people to the Parliament because by taking that figure of 24,000 and then

dividing it up into 15 categories it dilutes our voting power. It doesn't dilute the voting power of white Tasmanians because they will still elect one of their own. But Aboriginal people have got no hope, while the electorates continue to divide Aboriginal people up and dilute the voting power.

5

The Redistribution Committee's obligation under the Act that the Chair referred to, and also the tribunal, is, yes, to consider the geographical boundaries within the 10 per cent quota requirement, but it is also an obligation to consider the community of interest. And the community of interest here is the original people of this land who were dispossessed, have been dominated over the last 200 years, who continue to be dominated and discriminated against, and, above all other else, we are powerless. We might jump up on TV now and again but that's, you know, gets – it doesn't – it's not the same as political representation voting on reform that our people so badly need. And so our view is that the tribunal should give full weight to the requirement of considering the community of interest when you consider where the electoral divisions for the Legislative Council ought to be in Tasmania.

There's no rigid formula that requires the tribunal to say, "Well, here are the way that traditionally the boundaries have been drawn up." There's no legal requirement for you to do that, to maintain that approach. You could take the whole of the boundary of the State of Tasmania and you could say, "Well, that will be one electoral division." And that could encompass all of the Aboriginal people who wanted to vote in that division and who wanted to stand candidates in that division. It's nothing radical when you consider that the Maori have had this since, I think, the 1820s or the 1840s. They've got seven Maori seats in the New Zealand Parliament. The State of Maine in the United States has got two seats set aside for Indians. Colombia has three seats set aside for indigenous people in Colombia. And so there's nothing so radical about this proposal.

The idea that the other countries that I mentioned have seen is that if you are going to have a representative democracy, which Australia and Tasmania is a part of, then you've got to ensure, to the extent that you can, that the make-up of the Parliament reflects the people it governs. And how can you say that the Tasmanian Parliament is inclusive and accommodating of Aboriginal people when Aboriginal people are excluded because of the way that the electoral boundaries are drawn up? So our argument is that it's not a matter of legislative reform. It's a matter of applying the existing laws in a fairer way. And that is that if all people in Tasmania are going to be given a fair chance of electing people who can represent their interests into the Legislative Council or the Lower House in another context, then the boundaries have got to be drawn up in a way that gives people a fair crack of the whip.

And if we continue down this path, we can guarantee in the next decade that Aboriginal people cannot elect our own to the Parliament. And so we say that, even though representative democracy is a fairly vague term, the High Court has said on a number of occasions there is an enormous discretion in the Parliament to work out how best to enable representative democracy to reflect the community attitudes and community feelings and community aspirations. Whenever there has been an



attempt nationally or in a state to restrict democracy in some form by, for example, preventing prisoners from voting, the High Court said that is contrary to the provisions of the Constitution sections 7 and 24 which say that you must have elections by the people. And if you are going to exclude sections of the community, then you can't have elections by the people.

Now, we say the same thing applies here. If the electorates are drawn up in such a way that Aboriginal people cannot exercise our vote the way we want to exercise it, then the Tasmanian Parliament, in this context the Legislative Council, is not, on its face, elected by the people. It's elected by the white people, and the white people are represented in an all-white parliament. I mean, that's putting it very harshly in racial terms, but, I mean, that's the reality. And, again, mentioning the approach of the High Court, the High Court has said on numerous occasions that if the parliaments or the electoral commissions or redistribution committees are trying to formulate ways and means of achieving a better form of representative democracy, then that is a discretion that the Australian Constitution accommodates.

So, for example, in Western Australia, where the Parliament allowed the vote of the farmers, or people outside the urban areas, to have a value of 291 per cent over others, it was still constitutionally valid. And where the Parliament voted to give the – even though the Constitution says that only the states can be represented in the Senate, the High Court allowed the Federal Parliament to allow representation of the territories, the Northern Territory and Canberra, on the basis that you leave these things to the parliament or to the redistribution committees or to the Australian Electoral Commission who must have a broad discretion to find new ways to accommodate new methods of achieving a better form of representative democracy.

So, in our view, there is nothing legally stopping the Redistribution Committee outlining the whole of the State as a new division. The Racial Discrimination Act allows a positive discrimination, and anyway it's constitutionally valid to set aside a seat in the Parliament for Aboriginal people elected by Aboriginal people through the electoral processes. And, finally, we think there is an obligation on the tribunal to address this issue because the Act of 1995 imposes an obligation on you to look at the community of interest in the context of how to better accommodate representative democracy in the Legislative Council. Thank you for listening.

MR BLAKE: Thank you. Any questions from the tribunal?

MR HAWKEY: No questions.

MR BLAKE: No.

MS FROST: No. Thank you.

MR BLAKE: I don't have any questions. So thank you for your presentation today. Did you want to summarise in any way?

MR MANSELL: No, no. I think I've - - -

MR BLAKE: You've done your bit.

5 MR MANSELL: - - - belted your ears off.

MR BLAKE: Well, thank you very much for coming.

10 MR MANSELL: And I will leave that with your secretariat or - - -

MR BLAKE: I did read out, Andrew just correct me if I am wrong, that we can receive something written.

15 MR HAWKEY: We can receive it. That's under section 28.

MR BLAKE: It needs to be verified by us. So can you swear that that's an accurate document and it represents the views of who it is supposed to represent.

20 MR MANSELL: I so swear.

MR BLAKE: You so swear. Thank you. We will receive it.

MR MANSELL: All right. Thank you. Thank you again for accommodating me.

25 MS FROST: Thank you.

MR BLAKE: Can I adjourn this morning's hearings. I would like to discuss that last presentation, but I think we should do that on our own. So adjourn this morning. Thank you.

30

**ADJOURNED** **[12.23 pm]**

35 **RESUMED** **[1.23 pm]**

MR BLAKE: David, welcome.

40 MR DOWNIE: How are you?

MR BLAKE: Fine. Welcome, David. I might just start with a few observations before you start. So welcome to this hearing of the Redistribution Tribunal regarding the Legislative Council boundary redistribution, and thank you for making a  
45 submission, although your submission – was that from Des Jennings or – yes. Thank you. My name is Mike Blake and I chair the tribunal, and my colleagues you've now met. The initial redistribution proposal was prepared by the Legislative Council

Electoral Boundaries Redistribution Committee in accordance with the Legislative Council Electoral Boundaries Act 1995. And I would like to place on record my thanks to them and the electoral submission staff and others who supported them.

5 The initial proposal was advertised and comments, suggestions or objections for the proposal were sought. Twenty-nine submissions were received by the due date of 27 February, including the one from Des. He seemed to think he was late, but he wasn't late. This tribunal has an obligation to bring an independent and unbiased  
10 perspective to its consideration of the committee's proposal and to do so in a timely manner. The tribunal is also obliged to apply the same priorities, as did the Redistribution Committee. The first priority is to ensure insofar as practical that the number of electors in each council division would not in four and a half years time vary more than plus or minus 10 per cent of the average council division enrolment.

15 The second priority is to take into account the community of interest within each council division. After taking into account the priorities noted, the tribunal must consider the following matter in the case of each electoral division: the means of communication and travel within the division; the physical features and area of the division; the existing electoral boundaries and distinct natural boundaries. For this  
20 redistribution the average division enrolment or quota is 24,998, which was determined at 30 September 2016. In no case is any variation from the council division quota to exceed 10 per cent. I also note that this figure is based on actual enrolment data at 30 September 2016 and waiting or delay will not result in any more accurate information. So the information used by the committee is the most up-to-  
25 date official population estimate.

Every objector has the right to be heard at this inquiry. So far as the procedure today is concerned, it is not a court of law, and, for the most part, the tribunal can determine its own procedures. We will deal with these matters as informally as  
30 possible, noting only that this is required to be a public inquiry and the tribunal has the power, if it thinks it's in the public interest to do so, to hold parts of the inquiry in private. You are invited to indicate whether there's any part of the material or information you want to provide to us you believe should be heard in private. We will consider such an application if it's made. Although the tribunal has the power to  
35 do so, we will not be swearing people in to give evidence because we are dealing, essentially, with matters of opinion rather than contested fact. But we do reserve the right to require you to give sworn evidence if necessary.

Also, the Act requires that any evidence which is given by way of written statement  
40 must be tendered and verified by oath. So if you will be tendering any written statement, we will need to administer an oath to them for the purposes of verifying your statement. Subject to these matters, the intention is that you are invited to outline the nature of your objection to, or indeed support for, the proposal uninterrupted. We will provide an opportunity for discussion and comment and  
45 questioning from members of the tribunal and then an opportunity for a closing statement from you. As you can tell, today's proceedings are being recorded. Following today's inquiry, the tribunal is going to deliberate, which we will do on 14

March. We will not make any immediate response to anything that is put to us today. Do you have any questions regarding the process?

MR DOWNIE: No.

5

MR BLAKE: Please proceed.

MR DOWNIE: Well, thank you for allowing us to make a submission. We've written a written submission, and I'm here to present the council's view in person.  
10 So I will take it that you've read and - - -

MR BLAKE: Yes.

MR DOWNIE: - - - will give a brief overview. The counsel objects to the current  
15 proposal and raises the following concerns: The redistribution proposal will shift one seat from the Legislative Council from the north to the south, resulting in one less voice for the north. Now, I understand that it's a tricky problem that you have, to have an equal number of people in each electorate, but the trends of the population growth at the moment might be indicating that the south might grow. But we would  
20 like to argue that into the future there is economic advancement in the economy in the north, and that that population and growth may come back to switch into the north again in the future that might not have been picked up in the statistics, with all the statistical data that you are looking at.

25 The Northern Midlands Council would be under the present proposal split between McIntyre, Prosser, with a significant population base of Perth and surrounding areas being annexed to Launceston. So this municipality is being divided into three, creating confusion for residents with regards to who they are to approach to advocate for them and their concerns voiced. So the main argument there is it's creating  
30 confusion as to where – what part is in what electorate and also the Legislative Council is a house of review and a lot of people – there is a lot of lobbying going on, not to stop legislation, but to change legislation in a more palatable way than in the past the house has worked as a review, which then needs to be able to hear the concerns of the residents. The Northern Midlands Council residents would have  
35 greater representation if our area was in one Legislative Council electorate. That's what we – that would be our preferred position. The community will be confused as to which electorate they fall under the Legislative Council due to the splitting of the region into three ways, and this may result in residents not approaching Legislative councillors in their correct term or approaching the wrong representatives and thus  
40 their voice not being heard. I think I also spoke about that before.

Not everyone within the affected electorate will be aware of the proposed changes and their subsequent impact. The Northern Midlands Council strongly advocates for  
45 the municipality to be within one Legislative Council electorate, improving representation and removing any confusion as to which electorate the community resides in. So our municipality is – it's linked to the environment that we are in. It's a part of the south-east Macquarie catchment. It's to the north of Tunbridge to south

of Launceston. It is a well-defined – a well-accepted area and we believe – and our preferred position would be for that to be all in one electorate. That’s all I wish to say.

5 MR BLAKE: So, on that question – I will open it for my colleagues in a moment – but if you had your druthers, what it would look like?

MR DOWNIE: It will - - -

10 MR BLAKE: Northern Midlands currently is a bit in Apsley and a bit in Western Tiers.

MR GIUDICI: Western Tiers.

15 MR DOWNIE: I suppose our preferred model would be, just looking at it from our viewpoint, is Meander and Northern Midlands would be a great start to creating an electorate. I’m not too sure – it’s 25,000.

MR GIUDICI: Yes.

20

MR BLAKE: Yes.

MR DOWNIE: So you wouldn’t be far off it with those two council areas in one. But, of course, you don’t know what the effects it has on all the others.

25

MR BLAKE: Sure, yes.

MR DOWNIE: And, I mean, we can look at it from a local viewpoint - - -

30 MR GIUDICI: Yes, we can look at the - - -

MS FROST: Thank you for acknowledging that.

MR BLAKE: Guess what. Thank you. I will open it up for comment.

35

MR GIUDICI: Can I just explore the issue of Perth. It’s your view that Perth identifies more strongly with the Northern Midlands community than with the Launceston community?

40 MR DOWNIE: That is our strong view, yes.

MR GIUDICI: Right. Yes, okay.

45 MR DOWNIE: So Perth, Evandale and Longford, I mean they’re linked – sewage, the topic of water. And they’re three towns that are satellite downs of Launceston.

MR GIUDICI: Yes.

MR DOWNIE: They are linked together, not one to the other.

MR GIUDICI: And so what about the Devon Hills divide, does that sort of come into the equation too?

5 MR DOWNIE: That still comes in to – that’s all in that same area. The water scheme, the water is provided to that area too. And, indeed, I mean, I’ve got a meeting with a minister after this to try and argue for further access to the town of Perth with the road going through. And it’s argued there that people are lobbying us saying that Longford people want to visit – they want to have easy access to their friends or acquaintances in Perth.

10 MR HAWKEY: What about Hadspen, do you see that as a similar type of connection to Meander Valley as Perth?

15 MR DOWNIE: It’s out of our area but I would say the same - - -

MR HAWKEY: .....

20 MR DOWNIE: I would say the same.

MR HAWKEY: This is Meander Valley.

MR DOWNIE: That would be similar. It’s probably a little bit different argument if you’re talking about Prospect because Prospect is linked in to Launceston. But Hadspen, I’m not – it’s a rural village, or a rural town, which is what we’ve got. Evandale, Perth and Longford, they’re rural towns but linked to Launceston.

25 MR BLAKE: Nothing. Karen.

30 MS FROST: No.

MR BLAKE: Nothing. Lisa. No.

35 MS WARDLAW-KELLY: No, thanks.

MR BLAKE: Nothing else from - - -

MR HAWKEY: No, nothing further from me.

40 MR BLAKE: So we have no further questions anything you want to wrap up with or that’s - - -

45 MR DOWNIE: No. I think we’ve covered everything. I’ve probably said the same thing twice or three times.

MR BLAKE: That's all right. You've made your point. Thank you very much for coming along. Great. Thank you.

MR DOWNIE: Yes. Thank you.

5

MR GIUDICI: Thank you.

MS FROST: Thank you.

10 MS WARDLAW-KELLY: Thank you.

MR BLAKE: We might just adjourn quickly so we're not getting recorded. Thank you.

15

**ADJOURNED**

**[1.34 pm]**

**RESUMED**

**[2.15 pm]**

20

MR BLAKE: Before we start, Jan, I will just read to you a statement that we have been reading to everybody. So welcome. Welcome to this hearing of the Redistribution Tribunal regarding the Legislative Council boundary redistribution and thank you for making your submission based on the initial redistribution proposal. My name is Mike Blake and I chair the Redistribution Tribunal, and you've now met my colleagues. The initial retribution proposal was prepared by the Legislative Council Redistribution Committee in accordance with the Legislative Council Electoral Boundaries Act 1995, and I would like to place on record my thanks to them and the electoral commission staff and others who supported them. The initial proposal was advertised and comments, suggestions or objections for the proposal were sought. Twenty-nine submissions were received, including yours, or I should say by the – is it Launceston Chamber of Commerce?

25

30

35 MS DAVIS: Chamber of Commerce, yes.

MR BLAKE: Thank you. And they were received by the due date which was 27 February 2017. This tribunal has an obligation to bring an independent and unbiased perspective to its consideration of the committee's proposal and to do so in a timely manner. The tribunal is also obliged to apply the same priorities as did the Redistribution Committee. The first priority is to ensure, as far as practical, that the number of electors in each council division would not in four and a half years time vary more than plus or minus 10 per cent of the average council division enrolment. The second priority is to take into account the community of interest within each council division. After taking into account the priorities noted above, the tribunal must consider the following matter in the case of each electoral division: the means

40

45

of communication and travel within the division; the physical features and area of the division; existing electoral boundaries and distinct natural boundaries.

5 For this redistribution the average divisional enrolment or quota is 24,998, which was determined at 30 September 2016. And in no case is any variation from the council division quota to exceed 10 per cent. I also note that this figure is based on actual enrolment data at that date and waiting or delay will not result in any more accurate information. So the information used by the committee is the most up-to-date official population estimate. Every objector has a right to be heard at the inquiry. So far as the procedure today is concerned, it is not a court of law and, for the most part, the tribunal can determine its own procedures. We will deal with these matters as informally as possible, noting only that this is required to be a public inquiry, and the tribunal has the power, if it thinks it's in the public interest to do so, to hold parts of the inquiry in private. You are invited to indicate whether there's any part of the material information you want to provide to us you believe should be heard in private. We will consider such an application if and when it's made.

20 Although the tribunal has the power to do so, we will not be swearing in people to give evidence because we are dealing, essentially, with matters of opinion rather than contested fact. But we do reserve the right to require you to give sworn evidence, if necessary. Also, the Act requires that any evidence which is given by way of a written statement must be tendered and verified by oath. So if you will be tendering any written statement, we will need to administer an oath to them for the purposes of verifying your statement. Subject to these matters, the intention is that you are invited to outline the nature of your objection to, or indeed support for, the proposal uninterrupted. We will provide an opportunity for discussion and comment and questioning from members of the tribunal and then an opportunity for a closing statement from you. As you can see, today's proceedings are being recorded. Following today's inquiries, the tribunal is going to deliberate which we will do on 14 March. We will not make any immediate response to anything that is put to us today. Do you understand the process?

MS DAVIS: I do. Thank you and thank you for that clarity.

35 MR BLAKE: Please proceed.

MS DAVIS: May I just grab a pen because otherwise I'm going to be trying to remember things, and I don't do that very well on a Friday afternoon. It's a bit like that, isn't it. Thank you for making time to hear me and thank you all for your flexibility in changing the time for me because I had some stuff I couldn't get out of this morning. The chamber is very concerned at the proposal as it has been put because of the risks that we see coming from a move from a north-south that we all have got used to, even if we don't necessarily agree with it, a north-south focus to a sudden change to an east-west one with that new seat of McIntyre that's proposed. On the basis of the analysis of the figures that we've looked at, there is no justification for such a radical change.



At the moment, the only seat that's outside the plus or minus 10 per cent variation is Rumney and it's only 10.14 and when you look at 2021, it's only 10.34. So we're not talking about huge swings. Most of the other seats sit within a sort of six per cent either way, and a lot sit closer in. So we're really looking at, you know, changes in population around the margins and that, to us, does not justify the significant change that we've seen here. That will affect a lot of people in Northern Tasmania in terms of their ability to relate to their local members, particularly, again, that seat of McIntyre, which becomes an enormous and unwieldy seat going right from Flinders Island through to Cradle Mountain. You know, that's a huge area with very little obvious community of interests between large parts of it.

We're also concerned at the – well, obviously, our concern covers the abolishment of Western Tiers, which is a well-known and very well supported electorate within Legislative Council structure. And I'm not here talking about the members that hold the seats, although both Apsley and Western Tiers have got longstanding members who have very strong constituencies. Obviously, when they're up for election, it could be anybody the next time. So that's not the reason for our concern. It's purely based on two key criteria. One of them is the fact there is no statistical evidence for such great change, and the second is our concern about the communities of interest and particularly the unwieldiness of the McIntyre seat.

From a more local basis and a more specific basis, Northern Midlands Council is also significantly disadvantaged under there. It's one of our biggest councils. It's a very strong and well respected, particularly agricultural, industry base and on this proposal gets split across three – and I wasn't even sure if it was four electorates because I couldn't quite see – I couldn't match the council boundary up with the line on this map. And Tunbridge looks like it could fall one way or the other, depending on where the line actually is – if it's on that side of the road or that side of the road. So at least three electorates for Northern Midlands Council becomes an extraordinary burden on the members of the council, on the members – the member that would represent and also on the electors. That's the basis of our submission. I have no statement to tender under oath other than the written submission that you already have. And I'm happy to answer questions or whatever you want to do.

MR BLAKE: All right. Thank you. Anybody want to start? Michael.

MR GIUDICI: Thank you for the presentation, Jan, and for the written submission, which we've all read. It's, obviously, your preference, or the chamber's preference, to propose incremental or smaller changes.

MS DAVIS: Yes.

MR GIUDICI: One of the consequences of that may be that affected constituents may see a number of changes over subsequent cycles as opposed to a potential change, radical change now that may see it for a long time, which would enable people to sort of get used a long-term approach.

MS DAVIS: Yes.

MR GIUDICI: What are your views around that?

5 MS DAVIS: Michael, we talked about that. I actually got out the government's  
population predictions out to – I think they go out to 2060 or something. And  
because I have an extraordinarily sad life, I sat down and tried to do trend analysis  
across local government areas which was a bit hard because the local government  
10 areas don't match up directly with the electorates. But it did not appear that there  
would be significant change over that period of time. Now, yes, there are going to be  
people at the edges. There are always going to be people at the edges. But I think in  
these circumstances – and I would be one of them. I actually live in Perth and in this  
proposal my place gets moved out of Western Tiers into Launceston. Now, at the  
15 moment, I see no reason for that whatsoever. In five years time, depending on what  
happens with the expansion of Launceston in terms of the bypass, well maybe that  
would make sense. But at the moment, clearly the community of interest goes to  
Longford, not to Launceston. So there are things that will change over time that  
would perhaps make that incremental – even if it were a repeated incremental  
20 change, more logical than looking at the significant change that affects so many  
people, when the out year data, even past the deadline for this consideration doesn't  
show any reason for that.

And the flipside of that is there are some interpretations that you could look at with  
the data that we've got on population trends and the predictions of industry growth  
25 and also the state's population policy that could lead you to believe that you may see  
a significant upsurge in population in the north which is not predicted in the figures  
that the government has put out because its population policy doesn't have any  
timelines on it, and it certainly hasn't factored industry growth predictions into there.  
So it could well be that we move these boundaries significantly now only to find in  
30 five years time that you've actually moved them the wrong way and we have to re-  
move them again. So, to me, the point of time that we're at is such that there is no  
justification for a significant change. That may happen the next time, but at the  
moment incremental would cover it.

35 MR GIUDICI: Thank you.

MR BLAKE: No. No.

MS FROST: No. Thanks Jan.

40

MR BLAKE: Just a question for me, Jan, so - - -

MS DAVIS: I never get out of anything that easy.

45 MR BLAKE: Well, you've put your case well, and we've all read your submission,  
as we said. You mentioned that the current problem we've got is Rumney  
potentially, 10 per cent or whatever the percentage is.

MS DAVIS: 10.14 and then 10.34.

MR BLAKE: So it's 13.5, I thought.

5 MR HAWKEY: Yes.

MR BLAKE: Yes.

10 MR HAWKEY: The projection is much higher.

MS DAVIS: Okay.

MR BLAKE: So I think that's certainly something that is challenging us.

15 MS DAVIS: Rumney is, obviously, an issue, and there's no getting away from that. However, for those of us that live in the north, solving Rumney's issue by totally disrupting the electorates and the communities of interest up here is something that, you know, isn't a preferred option. We could – you know, there are ways that you could – you could push Rumney into this bottom part of Prosser. I mean, there are  
20 experts who do stuff like that. It's above my pay grade. But to fix a problem down here by totally disrupting this is difficult to appreciate.

MR BLAKE: Go on.

25 MR GIUDICI: Just on – you made a comment before that the proposal disrupts the current north-south distribution - - -

MS DAVIS: Yes.

30 MR GIUDICI: And changed it to more of an east-west distribution. So can you just elaborate a bit on why that's a concern to your constituents?

35 MS DAVIS: It's a concern in the idea of communities of interest, you know. And when I speak on behalf of the Launceston chamber, I'm not just talking about my members; I'm talking about the business sector.

MR GIUDICI: Okay.

40 MS DAVIS: So that if you look at, you know, this east coast sector, their relationships tend to be linear. So, you know, somebody from St Helen's is more likely to go to Hobart often than they even would be to come to Launceston because of the nature of the roads and the weather and a whole bunch of stuff. It's an easier run down the coast than often across. Somebody from Cradle Valley is going to have maybe – maybe going to have a better focus here, but they're not going to think  
45 about business partnerships over here. So it's about the existing communities of interest where that current north-south – sorry – Western Tiers sitting in the middle of their, picks up – it's like a sink. It picks up the people from the west, the little bit

before we hit the eastern tiers that comes across here and it really pulls a group of people together there.

5 The issue that we deal – I understand the issue with Apsley is the fact that the electorate is a big one, but there are evident communities of interest that you don't see when you go this way. And that's our concern, plus the fact that, you know, understand – I understand the issue about logistics. It's easier for somebody to do that than try and drive or even, you know, communicate in a physical sense across there because of all this – you know, there's not a lot of roadwork in there. It makes it very difficult. So, you know, if, for example, Tania were to be the – Tania Rattray were to be the member – she lives at Bridport. She would have to come all the way down, all the way down, all the way down and get right across to there. And there just aren't direct routes to do that. Whereas to come up and down the coast, you can usually do that pretty easily. And I'm particularly concerned about the Flinders 15 guys. They feel isolated already, and, you know, to try and give them some resonance across there is really quite challenging. And, you know, they would feel, with some justification – perception becomes reality – that, once again, they were being ignored. You know, it's all about the way people – well, you know this; perception becomes reality. And there is no real swap-over this way, whereas that 20 made more sense.

MR GIUDICI: Thank you.

25 MS DAVIS: And Western Tiers being that sort of interface between Launceston and the agricultural communities has always worked really well, particularly as it sort of picks up a large part of – well, not a large part, but a significant part of the Northern Midlands and keeps it together.

30 MR GIUDICI: Thank you.

MR BLAKE: I think we've got no more questions for you, Jan.

MS DAVIS: Again, I told them I'm not going back to work.

35 MR BLAKE: So that was an easy afternoon. You can go. Yes, you can. You said you didn't have any sort of closing statement to make or did you - - -

40 MS DAVIS: No, look, I don't. I think – I mean, I worked hard to make sure that this was self-explanatory. I think for us the biggest issue is the unexpectedness of the radical change and the fact that on the face of it, and on any of the projections that we can see out years, there's no justification for that. And the concern that we have that there are factors sitting outside the current projections that have not been included. So if you look at the population policy, you look at the expansion of agriculture, I mean, the government's prediction – which I think is overly optimistic 45 – is for a fivefold expansion by 2050. Well, that's not going to be up here. You know, it's not going to be down there. So that's automatically – and we're seeing it happen already with the intensification of the industries. They're worker heavy.

They are very high employers. Burlington Berries has got 500 employees on the books. They weren't there two years ago, you know. Costas has probably got more than that. They weren't there two years ago. So as we see more and more of this intensification, that balance population, on our estimates, is going to move this way,  
5 and to do the radical change now rather than the next review, if it were justified, would mean that you're actually probably going to have to do another big one to get it back to where it should be the next time around.

10 MR GIUDICI: Sorry. I've got a late question, if you don't mind.

MR BLAKE: Okay. Yes, go ahead.

MR GIUDICI: Just in terms of the way you've compiled your information through the chamber, have you done that through – you know, can you give us a sense of the  
15 number of businesses or people who have contributed to generating this view?

MS DAVIS: Look, we ran this through all our committees. I had a number of members. As I'm sure you're aware, associations, basically, run on silence is assent, and we know we have an issue when you start to get phone calls and emails. We had  
20 more emails on this than I've had on anything since I've been at the chamber. More emails, more phone calls. I ran it through all our committees and I ran it through the board. And the consensus was this something that, as a chamber representing the business community across the north and north-west, was a significant concern for us, not just in the disruption of existing communities, but in what the future might  
25 look like and the continued disruption it might bring.

MR GIUDICI: Thank you.

30 MR BLAKE: Thank you very much and thanks for coming in.

MS DAVIS: Thanks, guys. Thank you for your time. Enjoy the rest of your Friday afternoon.

35 MR HAWKEY: Thank you.

MR BLAKE: Yes. So can we adjourn our formal proceedings and have a chat.

40 **ADJOURNED** [2.33 pm]

**RESUMED** [2.45 pm]

45 MR BLAKE: Come and sit at the table, John. So welcome. Good to see you.

MS WARDLAW-KELLY: Lisa Wardlaw-Kelly.

MR GIUDICI: Michael Giudici.

MR HAWKEY: Andrew Hawkey.

5 MS FROST: Hello John, how are you?

MR BROWN: Good. How are you?

10 MS FROST: Good thanks.

MR BLAKE: Ready for us? I'm just looking at my recorder. Welcome, John. I will just read out a statement before you start. So welcome to this hearing of the Redistribution Tribunal regarding the Legislative Council boundaries redistribution and thank you for making a submission based on the initial redistribution proposal.  
15 My name is Mike Blake and I chair the Redistribution Tribunal, and you've now met my colleagues. The initial redistribution proposal was prepared by the Legislative Council Electoral Boundaries Redistribution Committee in accordance with the Legislative Council Electoral Boundaries Act 1995. And I would like to place on record my thanks to them and the Electoral Commission staff and others who  
20 supported them.

The initial proposal was advertised and comments, suggestions or objections for the proposal were sought. Twenty-nine submissions were received by the due date of 27 February, including yours. This tribunal has an obligation to bring an independent and unbiased perspective to its consideration of the committee's proposals and to do so in a timely manner. The tribunal is also obliged to apply the same priorities as did the Redistribution Committee. The first priority is to ensure, as far as practical, that the number of electors in each council division would not in four and a half years time vary more than plus or minus 10 per cent of the average council division enrolment.  
25  
30

The second priority is to take into account the community of interest within each council division. After taking into account the priorities noted, the tribunal must consider the following matter in the case of each electoral decision: the means of communication and travel within the division; the physical boundaries and area of the division; existing electoral boundaries and distinct natural boundaries. For this redistribution the average division enrolment or quota is 24,998 which was determined at 30 September 2016. In no case is any variation from the council division quota to exceed 10 per cent. I also note that this figure is based on actual enrolment data at 30 September 2016 and waiting or delay will not result in any more accurate information. So the information used by the committee is the most up-to-date official population estimate.  
35  
40

Every objector has a right to be heard at this inquiry. So as far as the procedure today is concerned, it is not a court of law and, for the most part, the tribunal can determine its own procedures. We will deal with these matters as informally as possible, noting only that this is required to be a public inquiry and the tribunal has  
45

the power, if it thinks it's in the public interest to do so, to hold parts of the inquiry in private. You are invited to indicate whether there's any part of the material or information you want to provide to us you believe should be heard in private. We will consider such an application if and when it is made. Although the tribunal has  
5 the power to do so, we will not be swearing people in to give evidence because we are dealing essentially with matters of opinion rather than contested fact.

But we do reserve the right to require you to give sworn evidence, if necessary. Also, the Act requires any evidence which is given by way of written statement must  
10 be tendered and verified by oath. So if you will be tendering any written statement, we will need to administer an oath to them for the purposes of verifying your statement. Subject to these matters, the intention is that you are invited to outline the nature of your objection to or, indeed support for, the proposal uninterrupted. We  
15 will provide an opportunity for discussion and comment and questioning from members of the tribunal and then an opportunity for a closing statement from you. As you can tell, today's proceedings are being recorded. Following today's inquiries, the tribunal is going to deliberate, which we will do on 14 March. We will not make any immediate response to anything that is put to us today. Do you have  
20 any questions regarding the process?

MR BROWN: No thanks, Mr Chairman.

MR BLAKE: No. Please proceed.

MR BROWN: Thank you for the opportunity to present. Apology from Mayor  
25 Mick Tucker. He was unable to make it today. So that's fallen on my shoulders to represent Break O'Day Council. So, as you would know, council provided a submission to the redistribution and raised four points. And I suppose it's fair to say that the opportunity to undertake some more complex modelling would have been  
30 appreciated, but due to, sort of, various things, Andrew and I tried to arrange a time. We couldn't quite make it happen. So it didn't provide us with the opportunity to do that. Nevertheless, we have endeavoured to do that. So, in summary, the proposal, we believe, raises more questions than answers, in that in regard to what has been put forward, and we believe it's more than just a mathematical exercise about the quality  
35 of the vote.

We know it was in the guidelines that the quality of vote is one thing. But then the community of interest piece comes into it as well. And that's where we get  
40 concerned that – and we understand the guidelines you're working within – but we're concerned that the quality of votes seems to take precedence over what we would call logical and community interest, and we really wonder whether the average elector is concerned if their vote is worth 10 per cent less than someone else's particular vote when it gets down to hard rules. And we've looked at the proposal there in relation to McIntyre because that directly relates to us, and we do  
45 significantly question the fact it goes from Cradle Valley to the Flinders Island, effectively. And note that there's – even if you come back as far as Mole Creek, there's not a lot of community of interest across that particular area.

And particularly with the east coast itself, the coastal areas through there, they have a lot of similarities and a lot of commonality in their – the underlying economy and the way that they work within communities. Like, for instance – and I will raise the issue of Bicheno Coles Bay a little bit further down the track as well. Now, in the context of this, we understand it is a balancing act, and we do note that, apart from the equality of vote, we are concerned about the variation area of these particular electorates, and particularly when you look – it varies from 0.046 per cent of the total area through to 28.16 per cent in that area. And certainly Murchison would be the largest. But then, in that context, McIntyre is 22.4 per cent of the total area and it's the second largest in the state, and Prosser is 12.6, which is the fourth largest in the state. So two of the top four are actually in, so to speak, the main area in dispute.

So that's where I think originally you look at the potential for a 16<sup>th</sup> electorate and which would have assisted with the balance in the southern area. We thought that that probably merits further consideration, given the population shifts which you've been referring to. And we've been endeavouring to look a little bit beyond the immediate five-year period. There has been some recent work happening in the northern region with the northern group of councils to do with local government form. KPMG have been doing some population projections which range out 20 years.

And just of note, and because I believe it's relevant to look that far out, that some of the key electorates that are going to make up – or municipalities making up McIntyre are going to have significant population decline over this next 20 years. Break O'Day is fortunate. We're likely to grow by 0.1 per cent over that period which is actually six people, not a large number. Dorset, on the other hand, declines by 13.1 per cent. Quite surprising. That's 930 people in that time. Flinders, 18.8 per cent, 151. Meander Valley, surprisingly, 2.4 per cent, 471, indicating a decline of 1522 in the population over that period. So this information, I'm more than happy to make this available to the tribunal if you felt it was relevant in your considerations because it is, effectively – it's a draft for discussion purposes only. but it has been circulated to councillors.

So it's a community profile which KPMG have prepared as some of the background in behind this. And it, unfortunately, only covers the northern councils. So I can't give you the longer projections for south, but I dare say that in the context of the south-east corner which involves Sorell, Tasman and Glamorgan Spring Bay and Clarence, similar information was prepared for them as part of their local government reform process as well. So we raise concerns that we have the very real situation that in the not-too-distant future, maybe it might be 10 years down the track, that the tribunal is once again considering significant changes in this area because we need to look longer than the five to 10 years window here as well. I suppose when we look at it, we are concerned about the balance within the proposal of the information.

Certainly provided an option, but when we look at the actual documentation that's there and the appendices, it does come back to a statistical mathematical analysis. It



doesn't look more broadly at what we believe the community of interest issues which should be taken into account. And that's where we believe that there is merit in further consideration around the north-east corner involving Dorset, Break O'Day, Georgetown, and there's very – there's the potential chance that Glamorgan Spring Bay will be separated through the local government reform process. Certainly, the south-east council modelling has been undertaken. But related to that is the piece that's currently happening which relates to the Bicheno Coles Bay area moving north into Break O'Day. And the reason for that is the community of interest that exists between Bicheno Coles Bay and St Helen's and St Mary's to the north. They actually orient north rather than south. The only thing that orients south for them is police districts.

They're attached to Bellerive, not to the northern region. But in terms of education and a lot of the other – they flow north as a community rather than south. And the communities themselves are advocating for change. And if we go back to the last local government amalgamation exercise in '93, at that point in time there was a strong move, and it very nearly happened, but I think from a simplicity point of view they just added two together rather than do anything, muck around the edges, in that respect. So, effectively, council believes that we should look further at these other options in this north-east corner. We do have to give consideration for these population projections, and we know that it will impact on Windermere as well, but believe that the potential with a 16<sup>th</sup> electorate in the southern region actually makes – gives the tribunal a bit of room to move with the numbers in the northern area because it actually will substantially reduce that 24,000, just off the top of my head; probably brings it back to about 22, 22 and a half thousand in that respect as well.

In the context of our submission, I don't think there was anything further which council wished to add, and we are more than happy to assist with any other information the tribunal might feel necessary. But we couldn't really comment any further. We've been through the paper a numbers of times. Council worked through it and they basically said, "Well, where do we go from here with it? We don't think we've got a choice". but, however, felt it was important that we put forward the submission representing the community because we believe that there's some logic to that north-east community being recognised in that respect. Thank you, Mr Chair.

MR BLAKE: Thank you. All right. I will open it for any questions from the tribunal. Nothing on my left.

MR GIUDICI: No.

MR BLAKE: Nothing.

MS FROST: Thank you.

MR BLAKE: A couple of things from me. So you mentioned, unless I didn't hear you correctly, a 16<sup>th</sup> seat.

- MR BROWN: Yes.
- MR BLAKE: We've only got 15. What were you getting at?
- 5 MR BROWN: I did recall in here that there was mention of a sixth one in the southern area just – as one of the potential options in that.
- MR BLAKE: Yes, I think - - -
- 10 MS FROST: I don't recall.
- MR BROWN: Did I read that incorrectly, did I?
- MR BLAKE: Yes, I suspect that's right.
- 15 MR BROWN: Okay. Well, then there's merit in having a 16<sup>th</sup> seat anyhow, isn't there.
- MR BLAKE: Fair enough, yes.
- 20 MR BROWN: I'm pleased I raised it. I could have sworn I read that piece in here. Yes, it is. A possible approach – this was to do with the 1998 - - -
- MR BLAKE: What page are you on?
- 25 MR BROWN: On page 11.
- MR HAWKEY: In 1998.
- 30 MR BROWN: So that was consideration to the current committee. Then ..... the possible approach. It's actually – it is in there. Page 11 at the bottom:
- Consider the creation of a new central southern Legislative Council division.*
- 35 MR HAWKEY: But, yes, that's not a 16<sup>th</sup>, that's, effectively, abolishing – so in effect, what we're saying there is that the new division is Prosser.
- MR BROWN: Right. Okay. Right. Okay. I've found the - - -
- 40 MR HAWKEY: So a new central and southern Legislative Council division being a new named one there, rather than the 16<sup>th</sup> seat.
- MR BROWN: Okay. Right. That's all of - - -
- 45 MR BLAKE: Okay. All right. Thank you. That helps me, thank you.

MR BROWN: Yes. That was just the way I read it. "Creation of a new central" could have been adjusting boundaries to create. I read it literally as a new one. Apologies for the confusion on that one.

5 MR HAWKEY: That's all right.

MR BLAKE: And then the second question for me was you referenced a couple of times to something to be done in the north-east. So what I'm hearing you say, what, is that the Flinders and the northern part of the eastern electorate currently Apsley should be shifted into Windermere or - - -

10

MR BROWN: No. I think just looking at the modelling, and where you've got sort of - the Apsley-Windermere situation and whether there's some options around that and road views, etcetera. But we need access to the modelling for that one as well.

15

MR BLAKE: Sure. I understand, yes.

MR BROWN: But I just felt that there could have been some merit in that, particularly given the future population decline which is going to happen with the strategic move now. It might put the plus 10 per cent or something, but in 20 years time you might be back closer to the actual - to balance them out. So whether there's the option for that, because if you look at Georgetown - where did Georgetown go on the future - 7.3 per cent decline. So they will drop by about 500, the population at that time.

20

25

MR BLAKE: Okay. So could I deal with the KPMG document, which I gather is only a report, draft report anyway. So I would rather than you didn't table it.

MR BROWN: Okay.

30

MR BLAKE: Otherwise I've got to get you to swear it in, and I think we've taken ABS data as our projected information rather than some other - Andrew, you agree with that?

35 MR HAWKEY: Yes.

MR BLAKE: We don't need to receive that report. Thank you. If there's no other questions, any closing statements from you?

40 MR BROWN: No. I think I've expressed the view of council there.

MR BLAKE: Thank you very much. Thank you again.

MR GIUDICI: Thank you.

45

MR HAWKEY: Thank you.

MS FROST: Thanks, John.

MR BLAKE: Thanks for being early.

5 MR BROWN: That's okay. Hopefully, I'm the last one and you can pack up.

MR GIUDICI: You are our last one.

10 MR BROWN: That was fortunate ..... for me which was good. Thank you.

MR GIUDICI: Thank you.

15 MR BLAKE: Okay. All right. So before we adjourn for the last time, at least today, could I again place on record my thanks to Phil and Michelle in this case for all the work that you've done in getting us here safely and feeding us too well, and to my colleagues around the table, and to our audio expert. Thank you.

MS FROST: And to you as chair.

20 MS WARDLEY-KELLY: Yes. Thank you.

MR BLAKE: Thank you. Can we so adjourn.

25 **MATTER ADJOURNED at 3.03 pm ACCORDINGLY**