

AUSCRIPT AUSTRALASIA PTY LTD

ABN 72 110 028 825

AUSCRIPT

Level 10, MLC Court, 15 Adelaide St BRISBANE QLD 4000

PO Box 13038 George St Post Shop BRISBANE QLD 4003

Tel:1300 308 420 Fax:(07) 3503-1199

Email: orders@auscript.com.au Website: www.auscript.com.au

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

O/N 4788

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES

REDISTRIBUTION TRIBUNAL

INQUIRY:

REDISTRIBUTION OF BOUNDARIES FOR THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL ELECTORAL DIVISIONS

TRIBUNAL MEMBERS:

MR RICHARD BINGHAM, Chairperson
(also chairperson of the Tasmanian Electoral Commission)

MS LIZ GILLAM, Member, Tasmanian Electoral Commission

MR PETER MURPHY, Surveyor-General

MS CASSANDRA SHORT, Nominated by the Australian Statistician

MR BRUCE TAYLOR, Electoral Commissioner

**LEVEL 2, TELSTRA CENTRE,
70 COLLINS STREET, HOBART**

10.07 AM, WEDNESDAY, 26 MARCH 2008

MR TYPE: Could I advise the Tribunal that James Walker has advised that he is unable to attend this morning, but that he intends to endeavour to attend this afternoon and certainly I hope that he may be able to find time for the Tribunal to hear him then. I've only been advised this morning that the Tasmanian Greens will not be represented at the Tribunal today. I made repeated attempts to contact them last week and have only finally secured that advice this morning. I've asked the Australian Labor Party if they could attend at 2 pm and I believe that they will be able to do so, although that's subject to confirmation from Doug Parkinson, MLC. So I think that the first witness will be the Hobart City Council, who I understand is being represented by Penelope Ikedife – I'm not sure of her surname – from Simmons Wolfhagen and she will be in attendance at 10.30.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Thanks very much for that, Julian. I might just take the opportunity to put some things on the record before we get under way with the first witness. First off, welcome everybody and thank you for your attendance here. I won't go through and introduce all the members of the Tribunal because we've got labels on us and I assume that that's sufficient. I did just want to outline the process to this point and to indicate the way in which the proceedings today will occur and what happens after today. So the process to this point; firstly, the Electoral Commission determined and published the council division quota in accordance with section 12 of the Act in September of last year.

An initial redistribution proposal was prepared by the Redistribution Committee comprising Bruce Taylor, Cassie Short and Peter. I would like to take the opportunity to place on record my thanks to them, to the members of the Electoral Commission staff, and everybody who has contributed to putting together that proposal. I know there's been a lot of land-information work that's been done. I'm very grateful for the assistance that's been provided to us for all of that. The initial proposal was advertised and comments, suggestions, and objections were sought. I refer to all of these as objections because that's the terminology used by the Act, but it certainly doesn't mean that we need to treat it as an adversarial process where all we're dealing with is objections in that sense.

This inquiry into the objections is a new process. This Tribunal has got an obligation to bring an unbiased perspective to its consideration of the committee's proposal and we're not here to defend the committee's proposal. However, the Tribunal is obliged to apply the same principles as the Redistribution Committee, namely, that our first priority is to ensure that four years and six months after the redistribution, the numbers of electors in each electorate is within 10 per cent of the average council division enrolment and our second priority is the community of interest within each council division. After taking these priorities into account, we must consider means of communication and travel within each division, physical features and areas within each division, existing electoral boundaries and distinct natural boundaries.

Every objector has a right to be heard at this inquiry as a witness and it's also open to us to seek material from other sources and people if we wish. So far as the procedure today is concerned, it's 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 and noting only that it's 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. I'll be inviting people who are appearing before us to indicate whether there's any part of the material they want to provide us with which they believe
5 ought to be heard in private. We'll consider those applications if and when they're made.

Secondly, although the Tribunal does have the power to do so, we won't be swearing people in to give evidence because we're dealing essentially with matters of opinion
10 rather than contested fact, but we do reserve the right to require a witness 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 any witness or objector is doing that we'll need to administer an oath to them for the purposes of verifying the witness statement. Subject to these two matters, the intention is that
15 each objector will be invited to outline the nature of the objection uninterrupted and taking the objection as read. We'll provide an opportunity for discussion and comment and questioning from members of the Tribunal and then an opportunity for a closing statement from the objector.

20 As you can tell, the proceedings are being recorded and unless any person objects a transcript is going to be placed on the internet along with the initial objection so that anybody reading can understand what the issues before the Tribunal might be. Following today's inquiries and tomorrow's in Launceston, the Tribunal is going to deliberate. We won't be making any immediate responses to anything that's put to
25 us today. We'll advertise a further redistribution proposal as soon as practicable after completing our inquiries. We currently aim to do this by 12 April. If we believe that the further proposal is significantly different from the initial proposal, we are obliged to invite further objections and unless they're frivolous or vexatious we need to conduct further hearings into those objections.

30 So if there is substantial difference there'll be a second round of hearings like these. If we don't believe that the further proposal is significantly different from the initial proposal, we will publish a final determination and reasons against which there's no appeal. That's the process from here. Unless anybody has got anything that they
35 want to raise at this point, I'd suggest that we should adjourn until the Hobart City Council witness arrives at 10.30 and we can get underway with hearing those objections at that time. Is there anything from anyone?

40 MR MURPHY: No, thanks.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Peter? Liz? Cassie? Bruce? No? Okay. Well, we'll take a break until 10.30.

45 **ADJOURNED** [10.15 am]

RESUMED [10.22 am]

THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Everybody is here. So we'll get underway again, if that's convenient?

5 <MS PENELOPE IKEDIFE, CALLED

THE CHAIRPERSON: Welcome along, Penny. Thank you for making the time to come and talk to us about the Hobart City Council's - - -

10

MS IKEDIFE: Thank you.

THE CHAIRPERSON: I call them objections because that's the terminology from the Act even though it's not necessarily an adversarial objection or anything like that.

15

MS IKEDIFE: Certainly.

THE CHAIRPERSON: I said just beforehand when I went through the process that we've been through to this point, the procedure today is informal, it's not a court of law, we're not going to be swearing in witnesses or anything like that, but the Act does require us to - if a witness tenders a written statement, to have that verified by oath. So if there are any documents that you need to tender to us we do need to get those verified by oath.

20

25 We've also got the capacity – this is a public inquiry, although you may not think so given the numbers of people here at the present time, but we do have the power to hear matters in private if there's anything that you want us to consider in that context. We're also just noting as a preliminary that the proceedings are being recorded and the intention is that a transcript will be placed on the internet along with the original submission from the objector and I'd ask if you could indicate whether you have any objection to that from the perspective of the Hobart City Council?

30

MS IKEDIFE: No, not at all. Thank you.

35 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Okay. After we've finished our – just for the purposes of your information, after we've finished our deliberations today and tomorrow in Launceston, we will be taking on board the matters that are put to us, giving some thought to those. We won't be responding immediately today to anything that you suggest to us and we will advertise a further redistribution proposal, hopefully around 12 April. If it's significantly different from the one that's been advertised by the committee already then there'll be a further round of hearings like this and a further opportunity for objections to be lodged, but if it's not significantly different from the proposal that's been circulated by the committee then we have the power to make a final determination against which there is no appeal.

40

45

So I'm just letting you know that that's the process from here in case that becomes relevant in terms of anything that you want to say to us later on. Having said all that, I can invite you to let us know what the nature of the objection that the Hobart City

Council is making and to take us briefly through it. We've obviously read the submissions and you don't need to read all of that and you could expect that once you've had an interrupted go to outline what it is you're on about that we will feel free to ask any questions that occur to any of us.

5

MS IKEDIFE: Certainly.

THE CHAIRPERSON: So thank you.

10 MS IKEDIFE: Okay. Thank you very much. Well, I appear on instructions from the Hobart City Council. Perhaps if I might refer the committee first to the letter from the council dated 13 March 2008. It was submitted after the due date, but it does set out, albeit quite briefly, what the Hobart City Council's position is. The council's submission is that the Electoral Division of Wellington be renamed to
15 Hobart to align with other capital cities. In support of this, I can refer to a document, which I don't think is before you, dated 19 February 2008.

It was a letter to the Lord Mayor of Hobart from Mr Wing, MLC, Member for Paterson, in which he attaches a document setting out the electorates that are named
20 after Australian towns or cities in other states. The reason I would seek to rely on that is to support the submission of the Hobart City Council that it's appropriate that particularly the capital city of the state have named after it one of the electoral divisions and obviously most sensibly the one which falls mostly within its municipal boundaries. As I say, I don't know that you have a copy of that and
25 perhaps I should make one available?

THE CHAIRPERSON: Julian?

30 MR TYPE: Mr Chair, there is a copy of that document I'm almost certain attached to Mr Wing's submissions to the Tribunal. I do believe that you all have a copy of it.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay.

35 MS IKEDIFE: Thank you. I'd simply refer to that then and to the council's submission of 13 March 2008. I don't think there's anything much I can add to what I've said already, but I'd be happy to take any questions.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Well, one that occurs to me, perhaps just to lead off, is that I think the intention when previous Tribunals were allocating names to
40 divisions was to ensure that so far as possible the different areas had different names so that – because the boundaries of Wellington are not contiguous with those of the Hobart City Council/Local Government area, they ought to be called different things. Do you have any view about that as a principle and whether that ought to apply in this case?
45

MS IKEDIFE: Well, I can't say with certainty whether that applies in other states or territories, but my submission is that it's appropriate that if you look at the mass of where the division covers, most of it covers the Hobart municipal area and Hobart

being the capital city is obviously perhaps the best known city in the region and it's therefore appropriate and perhaps easiest for electors as well to understand what division they're in if the area follows the name of the capital city that it most closely relates to.

5

THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. And I suppose the second question, a supplementary one to that; if the Tribunal were to take the view that the principle ought to be continued, that different areas ought to have different names, one of the principles that was applied in terms of determining what those names should be is that significant geographical features that relate to that area should be applied. In the case of Wellington it's because Mount Wellington overlooks the broad area of the electorate notwithstanding that Mount Wellington itself is not actually in the Wellington electorate. So if there were to be that principle adopted and applied does the Hobart City Council have any preferred name other than Hobart for the electorate of Wellington?

15

MS IKEDIFE: I have no instructions on that point, Mr Chair. I assume that the default position would be that if it weren't to be changed to Hobart then there's no objection to maintaining the name of Wellington.

20

THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Thanks for that. Other questions?

MR TAYLOR: Perhaps I could just ask one further clarification. Do you think there would be some confusion from those ratepayers of Hobart who aren't within the Wellington electorate - if it's renamed to Hobart, do you think they would have an expectation that they would be voting at that time and that this may cause some confusion as to when they vote and who, in fact, is representing them in the Parliament?

25

MS IKEDIFE: I don't think it would be any greater a confusion than would arise from any other naming of areas. One might assume that because one lives close to the Derwent River one's in the Derwent area. It's not necessarily something that's going to apply to every elector or every elector isn't going to be able to say well, I'm close to the city that's my electorate. But I think it would assist the majority because the majority would be covered within the Hobart region and would consider themselves I suspect part of the Hobart general area. Clearly, it wouldn't apply to everyone and might cause some confusion to, I would submit, only a few.

30

35

MR TAYLOR: Thank you.

40

THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Any other questions for Penny?

MR MURPHY: Penny, you said that mostly within its municipal boundaries - Wellington was mostly within Hobart's municipal boundaries, do you have any feel for the proportions of Hobart ratepayers that are in either Wellington or Nelson?

45

MS IKEDIFE: No. I understand there are quite a few in Nelson, but there's no proposal I understand – or no significant change to the proportions of voters who will be moved from Wellington to Nelson under the proposal. So as - - -

5 MR MURPHY: Well, it's just that you sort of suggested – seemed to be suggesting that it was mostly – well, more weight should be given to the name Hobart because there were more people within Wellington that will be in the municipal boundary. That seems sort of an area – that's certainly not the case and I wasn't sure about the relationship between the numbers as well. I just thought you might have wanted to
10 propose that as a supporting argument.

MS IKEDIFE: No, I'm afraid I can't assist on that point.

15 MR MURPHY: Thank you.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Julian, did you - - -

MR TYPE: For the benefit of the Tribunal, the proposed Division of Wellington contains approximately 20,000 Hobart City Council electors, the proposed Division
20 of Wellington contains approximately 12-and-a-half-thousand Hobart City Council electors, and Hobart City Council electors are contained in no other division.

MS IKEDIFE: I'm sorry, the 20,000 were in Wellington and the 12 and a half - - -

25 MR TYPE: In the proposed Nelson.

MS IKEDIFE: Oh, in Nelson. Thank you.

30 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Any other questions for Penny? No? Just one point of clarification; this has been to a full council meeting and this is a full-council position that's being put to us; am I correct in that?

35 MS IKEDIFE: Yes, it is and unfortunately that's the reason that the submission was late. The council meeting wasn't until after the cut-off date for the submission.

40 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes. Okay. Well, just for the record, we've accepted it as an objection and are dealing with it as if it were lodged within time. So council obviously – your presence here today reflects the fact that we're treating it in that way.

MS IKEDIFE: Thank you, Mr Chair.

45 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. If there's nothing else anybody wants to raise, I'll say thanks very much for being here and for putting that objection to us. As I said, we will take that on board and give it due consideration in what we decide to do following the completion of this set of hearings.

MS IKEDIFE: Thank you very much.

<THE WITNESS WITHDREW

5 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Okay, I think our next witness is due at 11 o'clock - Mr Booth - and therefore we will adjourn till then.

ADJOURNED [10.34 am]

10

RESUMED [10.44 am]

15 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay, we'll get under way again. That's the signal that's just been given to start recording the proceedings.

<MR IAN BOOTH, CALLED

20

THE CHAIRPERSON: Welcome along, Mr Booth. Thanks very much for making the time to both make the submission to the Tribunal and coming along today. We appreciate the effort that you've put into that and it's only through participation of people such as yourself that this process can be a meaningful one. So thank you.

25

MR BOOTH: No worries. Thank you.

30 THE CHAIRPERSON: There are a couple of sort of preliminary things that I'll just go through so you've got some idea about the way that we're dealing with all of this and where we go to after we've finished the hearings today. First off, this is not a formal court of law or anything like that, it's an informal discussion and we would like this to be as informal as we possibly can make it.

35 It is required to be a public inquiry, but if there are things that you want to say to us in private there's a capacity for us to do that as well. So if there's anything that you want to put to us in that sort of way we're more than happy to consider an application from you. We will also be recording the proceedings and the intention is that a transcript and your original submission should be placed on the internet so that people can see what's been going on. Do you have any objection to that? Is that
40 okay?

MR BOOTH: No, none whatsoever. That's fine.

45 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you for that. We are not swearing people in to give evidence or anything like that, but the Act does say that if we receive any written statement from you that has to be verified by oath. So if there are any documents that you want to table we do formally have to get you to swear an oath that these are your written statements and so on. If there's no such documents then that's not a

problem and we can deal with it informally. After we've finished today, we will take away the things that you've said to us. We won't be responding today about that. We will be publishing a further redistribution proposal and that we're aiming to do by 12 April. The initial proposal that was published by the committee is a
5 completely separate one from the process that we're engaged in now.

This Tribunal is a new body and we're not obliged to defend the committee's proposal or anything, we're conducting a hearing afresh into it. Once we've published that further proposal, if it's significantly different – if we believe it's
10 significantly different from the original proposal then there's a further opportunity for objections – and I call all comments and suggestions objections because that's the terminology that the Act uses, and there's an opportunity for further hearings such as this. If we don't believe that that further proposal is significantly different from the original one then we can go on and make a final determination and there's no appeal
15 against that, that's the end of the process.

So I hope that gives you a picture about where we've got to and what follows from it. I would like to invite you now to let us know – to take us through the matters that you think we ought to be considering. You don't have to take us through all of your
20 submission because you can assume that we understand that and have read that, but if there's anything you would like to highlight in particular, we then give an opportunity for anybody on the Tribunal to ask you any questions about the matters that you're putting to us and give you an opportunity to sum up at the end of that. So with all of that sort of preliminary and background, perhaps I can hand over to you
25 and invite you to present your submission to us in any way that you like.

MR BOOTH: Thank you. That leaves it fairly broad and open and yes, I don't quite know where to start, but I guess at the end of the day I've seen the submission that you've put out and originally I looked at it and I thought I'd like to understand
30 why this change has been made and so from thereon I've accessed your website and picked up your redistribution proposal, had a look at it and I've thought to me it doesn't seem to have gone into the depth that it possibly should have done considering the broad parameters under which you've got to operate. I looked back and I thought well, why is this area – why was it originally called Derwent for
35 starters and if you look at the broad parameters, yes, it sits within the Derwent Valley and it basically picks up the Derwent River catchment.

I probably should expand to say that I grew up at Ouse, which is part of the area which is planned to be pushed off into Rowallan. I've lived in the Derwent Valley, still live in the Derwent Valley, live at Dromedary at the moment and so I've got a, I
40 guess, feeling for that area. I still go back there. My parents still live there and the people I've grown up with still live there. So yes, I understand the issues that face the Derwent Valley. And I guess I took a little bit of offence to the fact that there was a proposal to shift that part of the valley which is predominantly - as I've
45 highlighted in my submission, which is a southern-based population.

If you look at the three major population centres of Ouse, Gretna and Hamilton, they're only 70, 80, 90 kilometres out of Hobart and from that point of view they

don't have a good grasp or the understanding of the issues that face the people in the North and similarly I don't believe that the people in the North would have a similar understanding of the issues that face the people in the South. The Central Highlands is a very broad municipality. I think it's the second biggest municipality – council
5 municipality within the state, but if you look at the distribution of people within it, again they're all predominantly in the South, that area across the Central Highlands is very sparsely populated and it's only really populated through the summer and winter with people coming into the shacks, that's the only reason they're there, for the fishing, the shooting and whatever other recreational activities they might
10 undertake.

So that probably led me on then to look at the actual numbers that were in the distribution and I note that there that you've got a scope to go with plus or minus 10 per cent from the quota, which is 23,000 and from your figures I picked up that the
15 piece that you're allocating from the Central Highlands into Rowallan contains about 1000 people which is roughly in rough figures 4 per cent. So if you then look at the anticipated growth for Rowallan, was to be plus 2.6 by the year 2011 which is the area that you've expanded out to and minus 1.9 I think for the Central Highlands. So that 4 per cent really doesn't have any effect and sits well within the parameters of
20 the plus and minus 10 per cent.

So if the 4 per cent didn't go across, Rowallan would have a growth of minus 1.4, Derwent would have a growth of plus 2.1. So it still fits well within the distribution. The people of the Derwent Valley don't have to – well, particularly that end of – the
25 lower end of the Central Highlands don't have to change their thought, get familiar with different people. Certainly, in my voting time, which has been 20-odd years, there's only been two Members from Derwent and I think that's Charles Batt and the current Member, Michael Aird, and suddenly it's going to be thrown to understanding someone else, who – as I say, in there, there will 18, 19,000 people
30 from the Rowallan area and another 1000 people to come from the Central Highlands and the power of those 1000 people to actually influence the vote which they – at the end of the day, one person, one vote, it will be very difficult to actually have your say and get your point across just through the sheer weighting of numbers that will exist in that northern electorate.

35
THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Thank you for that. And perhaps if I could start with a question. We're obliged to apply the same principles as the committee was obliged to apply in making the original proposal. The Act stipulates that the first
40 priority for us ought to be the numbers, if you like, and trying to get as close as possible to the average enrolment for each division and community of interest is the second priority.

I understand from what you've been saying to us that you would say that the
45 community-of-interest issues in this case are so great that the possible small variation – small reduction in getting close to that average which would be required to remove that back out of Rowallan is preferable. So it's preferable that the community of interest should override that numbers issue. Is that fair comment? Have I got - - -

MR BOOTH: That's a fair comment, but I don't think it overrides the numbers issue in that the quota you're talking about is roundabout 4 per cent, so it's only going to fluctuate either side of the zero mark by the similar sort of magnitude as what the change would make, in fact, I think it's probably closer to the zero point.

5

THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Good. Thanks. I just wanted to make sure I'd understood what you're saying. Who else has got questions for Mr Booth?

MS GILLAM: Ian, through your submission you refer to Bothwell quite a number of times. Are you not only objecting to the proposal but also suggesting that that's brought back – that area that's presently Rowallan is brought back into Derwent?

MR BOOTH: No, I'm certainly not making that - I would suggest that if in the overall picture of looking at things if there was that option to bring it back, yes, it should be looked at, but I'm not saying that that should be part of your proposal.

MS SHORT: Could you perhaps, just building on that then, tell us a bit more about the community of interest that Bothwell has with the rest of that area? Like I know, you know, it's not that far from Ouse and Hamilton, but what would the community of interest be? What would attach people from Bothwell to Derwent?

MR BOOTH: Well, very much it's the type of industry that people are involved in. Obviously, that area is heavily agriculture, it's forestry, hydro, that type of thing, and the people that live within each of those communities has very much got the same interest, they work in the same sort of game, which – it's an interesting point. If you look at the Bothwell/Ouse area you're talking about very large farms of five to 10,000 acres whereas the North West Coast which is – yes, it's rural, but at the end of the day that's high-intensity agriculture with 200-acre lots and they grow vegetables and they farm animals and they've got much higher rainfall and the rest of it.

I guess you're all aware through the media that the Central Highlands at the moment is drought declared and that's something that's united the people of the Central Highlands. The issues of Bothwell are very similar to Ouse. There are links between sporting teams. Bothwell has got a football side which is now called the Central Hawks, but they draw their players from the wider area, through to Miena across to Ouse, through Hamilton, Gretna, players come in that way to play in the country leagues rather than in the SA and FL.

MS SHORT: Yes. Okay.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Further questions for Mr Booth? Peter?

MR MURPHY: No, thanks.

45

THE CHAIRPERSON: Liz?

MS GILLAM: Oh, just one more thing. In considering this issue, have you talked about it with other people? Do you think it's an issue that's of strong interest to other people that you know?

5 MR BOOTH: I've certainly talked about it with – people within my own family. I'm also president of the Ouse Cricket Club, so I spend a lot of time in that area, and I've certainly talked about it at that level with people outside of the actual cricket game, talked about and asked whether they've seen the proposal and the rest of it. I guess yes, they were interested in it, but they didn't show any great passion towards
10 it and that's probably more a reflection that they live a fairly simple life and it would be a quantum step to be sitting up in front of a panel of five people with two microphones poked in your face.

MS GILLAM: Yes.

15 MR BOOTH: And then you've got the effort of making the submission and understanding the issues and that's probably – to a lot of people, yes, they appreciate the issues, but yes, it's a little bit difficult to do anything about it and will our voice actually count in the long run, so - - -

20 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Perhaps if I could ask again just about the Bothwell issue. To what extent is there any division between Bothwell and Ouse that is properly reflected in the existing boundaries, the fact that Bothwell is in a different electorate to Ouse, for example? Is there any of that sort of rivalry or jealousy that sometimes happens between two different towns like that?

MR BOOTH: No, I don't think so. I'm not aware of any issues along those lines.

30 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. But if I understood you correctly you were saying that the community-of-interest arguments and the relationship of Bothwell to Derwent is equally as strong as the relationship of Ouse and Hamilton to Derwent or not quite as strong, or – how would you put that?

35 MR BOOTH: Not quite as strong to Derwent, but certainly in the everyday living, Bothwell accesses the wider range of services from southern Tasmania. I guess that's the point I'm trying to get across in that the kids all feed into the Hobart system, health all feeds into the Hobart system. If you want some rural goods, you go to Bridgewater and you pick it up from Elders or Webster's or Roberts, or whoever might be there. You don't head north to pick up those goods. You're
40 contained within the 002 phone distribution area, those types of things. So predominantly you are a southern-based population with southern-based issues and an understanding of those southern-based issues.

45 THE CHAIRPERSON: And if it were to be desirable to include Bothwell in Derwent as well as the areas that you've principally put to us, is there some sort of boundary between Bothwell and, say, Interlaken and Miena which would form a natural division in your view?

MR BOOTH: Well, it's probably – the farmland probably runs out about where the Poatina main road comes in. I guess if you're familiar with that - - -

THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes.

5

MR BOOTH: Once you get to there, you're basically heading into the shack country and so that becomes your transient population rather than your permanent population. Yes, there are a number of people that live in Miena permanently, but there certainly is no great number of them.

10

THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes. Okay.

MR MURPHY: So can I just clarify perhaps - - -

15

THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes.

MR MURPHY: How do you think having the same Central Highlands Council services being provided to that portion of Derwent is affected by the fact that it's, in fact, in two different Legislative Council electorates?

20

MR BOOTH: Well, - - -

MR MURPHY: Because you - go on.

25

MR BOOTH: Yes. Sorry. As far as the Local Government, how they distribute their funding and their workloads and the rest of it, I don't think it's impacted at all upon by – at all by the Local Government or the Legislative Council area that it's in. I don't think they'd sit at the Bothwell municipality and say well, gee, this is going to be in the Rowallan district, we'll do that slightly different to how we'll do it in the Derwent electorate and if that's – if I've understood your question properly?

30

MR MURPHY: Yes, no, that's - yes, that's fine. I guess what I'm just highlighting is the rationale for lining up these boundaries was to try and unify things rather than separate them.

35

MR BOOTH: Yes, I noticed that in your submission, but I guess that's one area – and I looked at the wider distribution and I see that something like the Huon picks up Bruny Island and things like that, which is out of the Kingborough Council and quite a few of the others are split across boundaries, even the Elwick electorate doesn't pick up the entire Glenorchy City and the rest of it.

40

MR MURPHY: Yes, that's true.

MR BOOTH: So I guess at the end of the day I didn't see that as being an overriding factor that would - - -

45

MR MURPHY: Yes. Okay. Thank you.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Anybody got anything else for Mr Booth by way of questions? No? Is there anything else that you wanted to say to us by way of summary or closing statement or anything?

5 MR BOOTH: No, other than thank you for the opportunity. This is certainly an eye opener and yes, it's been a pleasure to come in and present my case.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Well, thank you for that and, as I said at the start, we appreciate the effort that you've gone to in putting the submission together and in
10 coming in today. So thank you for that. It's a very healthy contribution to our process, which we greatly appreciate. Okay. Thanks.

15 <THE WITNESS WITHDREW

THE CHAIRPERSON: We'll stop at this point and wait for our next person to come along. We will adjourn and stop recording now then.

20 **ADJOURNED** [11.03 am]

25 **RESUMED** [11.53 am]

<THE HON JIM WILKINSON MLC, CALLED

30 MR WILKINSON: Thank you for your time. I won't keep you for very long and I thank you for the information that's already been provided, but my major submission to you is that at present with the redistribution we're looking at taking out, if I can call it, upper Sandy Bay, and retaining South Hobart, Cascades, etcetera. I can
35 understand and I think it's logical that Nelson moves further south because that's the only way it can go and the area always of concern appears to me to be well, where's the cut-off mark, where are the boundaries, where are the community of interest in relation to Wellington and Nelson?

40 With respect, I would've thought it more logical, though, if upper Sandy Bay - and if I can call it upper Sandy Bay - remained within Nelson. Back in 1995 when the redistribution of the Legislative Council electoral boundaries were originally looked at - and if I can call that the modern approach because previously there were different approaches, as you know, in relation to boundary distributions, but with the major
45 political debate at the time; one vote, one value, there was a lot of work - an extreme amount of work, as you probably realise, in 1995 for the redistribution of the boundaries.

And what I picked up from the Parliamentary Library was, at that stage - and I can hand you a copy if you require it, but what was thought to be most appropriate was that South Hobart and Cascades was in the Hobart electorate and the rest further south was in the Queenborough electorate, which included Battery Point. Then what
5 happened because of the reduction of numbers from 19 to 15, there obviously had to be some tampering with those and what occurred was South Hobart and Cascades came into the Nelson electorate, Battery Point went out of the Nelson electorate and - Nelson-Queenborough and went into the Hobart electorate.

10 Again I could understand that because it was a situation at that stage where with Battery Point that was a community within itself, one could argue, a bit like South Hobart and one could argue it had links and its transport links, road links, etcetera were linked to the city, were linked to Hobart. So it's understandable. But what I think is more logical now is what we could easily do is rather than cut off a
15 community, which is what's happening with the present redistribution in relation to Sandy Bay, it would be easier to take out what was previously Hobart's and return it to Hobart-Wellington because everything in South Hobart and Cascades leads into Wellington.

20 We look at the roadway, the Huon Highway, Macquarie Street, Davey Street, all leading down into Wellington. We look at the actual communities of interest being pretty well the same. If you look at West Hobart, South Hobart, the community of interest, the demographics are pretty well the same as they are with Sandy Bay. The three are much of a muchness. But in my mind what you're then doing is like you
25 were doing with Battery Point is picking up a dormant community, if I can call it that, and putting it back in to where it was and was for a number of years. Therefore when you look at the redistribution proposal in section 13 of that and you look:

30 *In making an initial redistribution proposal, the committee must take into account the following priorities -*

And it talks about within four to six - four years, six months plus or minus 10 per cent. The figures if you retained a boundary up Davey Street, Huon Road, it's an obvious boundary. The figures would - and I have here, which I will supply to you,
35 option number 2. When I first gained some assistance from electoral staff, which was appreciative, they gave me option number 2 which meant that the boundary was Macquarie Street, Davey Street, up Huon Road. Pretty well the same as what it was back in 1995. And what then occurred is with the numbers, it's got here current electors, Nelson 22,056, difference from quota point 49 - minus 4.9, should I say.
40 Projected electors 23,307, difference from quota minus 3.2 per cent. So it comes within that variation. I don't know whether you want a copy of this, do you, or - - -

45 THE CHAIRPERSON: Well, if it's material that's otherwise available to the Commission - it's been prepared by the Commission? Is that right, Julian?

MR TYPE: No, I don't have a proposal. I assume, Mr Wilkinson, that this suggestion includes all of Cascades, Strickland Avenue and - - -

MR WILKINSON: And South Hobart.

MR TYPE: And up to Turnip Fields, do you know?

5 MR WILKINSON: Sorry?

MR TYPE: Up to Turnip Fields?

10 MR WILKINSON: Gee, I don't know.

MR TYPE: Well, does it include Fern Tree or - - -

MR WILKINSON: No, it doesn't include Fern Tree.

15 MR TYPE: It doesn't include Fern Tree?

MR WILKINSON: Not as I understand it.

20 MR TYPE: Well, perhaps we could take it in as evidence and I'll take a copy of it.

MR WILKINSON: Yes. Sure. All right.

25 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Now, there's one issue, just under the Act that requires us, if we receive anything from you by way of a written statement it has to be verified on oath.

MR WILKINSON: Yes, yes.

30 THE CHAIRPERSON: So for the purposes of perhaps tabling that document, we need to get you to verify that.

MR WILKINSON: Sure.

35 THE CHAIRPERSON: So Bruce - - -

MR TAYLOR: Will we need a covering document or - - -

MR WILKINSON: Yes, I have here:

40 *Please find attached copies of the maps and statistics for the two alternate redistribution proposals discussed on 21 February 2008. Regards, Phil Page.*

45 MR TYPE: Oh, that's come from them. Perhaps if I just get a piece of paper for you, you just sign, this is my submission to the thing and sign it.

MR WILKINSON: All right. Sure.

MR TYPE: Then we can attach those two forms - - -

MR WILKINSON: Okay. Sure.

MR TYPE: I'll just get - - -

5 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes, I'm sorry to be difficult about it - - -

MR WILKINSON: No, no, not so, yes.

10 THE CHAIRPERSON: But I think it's a requirement of the Act, that that's the only way we can take written documents, statements.

MR WILKINSON: Yes, that's fine. That's fine.

15 MR TYPE: An alternative could be, Mr Chair, that Mr Wilkinson gives us permission to access those records of Phil Page?

MR WILKINSON: Yes.

20 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay, well, if that would get around - - -

MR WILKINSON: Yes, that's fine. Certainly.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Are you comfortable with that?

25 MR WILKINSON: Comfortable with that.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Whilst we're on the subject of those consents then, obviously these proceedings are being recorded and a transcript is going to be prepared. Are you comfortable if we publish that transcript?

30 MR WILKINSON: Yes, yes.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Are you comfortable if we publish your original submission as well?

35 MR WILKINSON: For what it's worth.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay.

40 MR WILKINSON: Yes.

THE CHAIRPERSON: No, thank you, just – but if you authorise the Tribunal to have access to the materials that have been prepared for you from land information then - - -

45 MR WILKINSON: Sure. Well, while we're doing that, there's also option number 1 which just included South Hobart. It's very difficult to see here with these maps because they haven't got the roads on them, but I would understand that you'd be

able to readily identify those in relation to the information that you have at your hand.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay.

5

MR TAYLOR: Perhaps if you could refer to them in the transcript by their title on the map because then we can get that information from land - - -

MR WILKINSON: Sure. All right. Yes. Okay.

10

MR TYPE: Option 1, we have.

MR WILKINSON: All right. You've got option 1, have you?

15

MR TYPE: Yes, exactly, your option's available to the Tribunal.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes. Okay. Option 1, we have.

MR WILKINSON: So you still have – you already have option number 1?

20

THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes.

MR WILKINSON: Right. And I've just tendered then option 2. Right. And on thinking about the whole community-of-interest aspect, I would believe that option number 2 would be the most appropriate because what you would be doing is just having South Hobart itself and cutting out your Cascades which would still remain within Nelson. It seems to me more appropriate if you had the roadway just going straight up as it was in 1995, as the obvious delineating point between the two boundaries.

30

THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Can I just ask you about that? It's been suggested by others who have applied their minds to this same issue that maybe using Sandy Bay Rivulet as the boundary between Nelson and Wellington might be a preferable way to go. It's a natural feature, you don't have the issues about houses on one side of the road being in one electorate, the other side being in the other unless you go along the back fences as predecessors are sometimes the case. Do you have a view about that?

35

MR WILKINSON: Look, not really. Not really. If that would be the most appropriate boundary I don't really have any issue with that. I just drew a lot of the submission today from what was going on in 1995 when it was looked at with community-of-interest aspects and which communities remain in which electorates and what would be the most appropriate boundary and that was of course the boundary, Macquarie Street/Davey Street/Huon Road.

45

THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes.

MR WILKINSON: Yes, but I haven't got any real issue if it was the rivulet. It's pretty well the same, as you know, and it just stops the one side of the road as opposed to the other side of the road.

5 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes.

MR TAYLOR: The suggestion of using – Mr Chairman, the suggestion of using the rivulet then includes South Hobart up as far as Hillborough Road and including both sides of Hillborough Road effectively.

10

MR WILKINSON: Right.

MR TAYLOR: Would that fit within your thoughts?

15 MR WILKINSON: Look, I didn't look at that, Bruce, I'm sorry, but again it's the – I'm trying to look for simplicity in relation to the boundaries as opposed to having these dog legs in boundaries and it would seem to me that if the same community of interests are there, the links into Wellington are going to be the same. It's under Mount Wellington as well, so yes - - -

20

MR TAYLOR: Yes. This other proposal would include the Marlyn Road area and the upper parts of Strickland Avenue like in Nelson and there has been some argument that they associate it similarly with Fern Tree, which is part of Nelson. However, the major part of South Hobart up to the Brewery, effectively Hillborough Road, would be in Wellington. Do you have any thoughts about this Marlyn Road area and that, whether it should be - - -

25

MR WILKINSON: Look, I just thought again going back to '95 when they obviously would've looked at all these issues as well and your Cascades then was, they thought, the top end of South Hobart. They thought there was a real community of interest – well, not a real, but a community of interest between Cascades and South Hobart and as a result the redistribution was as it was. What I'm saying is look, what you do, rather than take something that's been in Queenborough-Nelson for as long as I can remember, why don't you retain that within Nelson and give back to now Wellington what was previously Hobart's and Wellington.

30

35

To me it seems simple, it seems logical, and when you look at all the aspects in relation to community of interests, means of communication and travel within the division, physical features and area of the division, and distinct natural boundaries, it seems to fit in far better than the present one which is saying all right, what we'll do is leave South Hobart and Cascades within Nelson, but we'll encroach into Sandy Bay. We'll use the university as the so-called boundary and we'll use this fairly intricate way of going back up to South Hobart, which to me makes what could be easy, with respect, difficult.

40

45

So that's the submission in a nutshell. It's a fairly simple one. I believe that the information I've got, the figures certainly are figures plus or minus 10 per cent. So there's no problem in relation to that. I've spoken with others in relation to it.

They've probably given you a submission as well. Their submission I believe is approximately the same as mine. So that's my submission.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Thanks very much indeed for that.

5

MR WILKINSON: All right. Thank you.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Are there questions from any of my Tribunal members?

10 MR MURPHY: No, thanks, I'm fine.

THE CHAIRPERSON: No?

15 MS GILLAM: I was just going to ask if Mr Wilkinson had any views about the proposed southern boundary into Kingston?

MR WILKINSON: What's got to happen is - I'll be encroaching south for quite some time I would think. In the end - gosh, the name escapes me at the moment. There's a bit of a wart at the end of it. Please tell me what it is. Where old Bill
20 Hodgman used to live in Huntingfield - - -

MS GILLAM: Oh, yes, yes.

MR WILKINSON: Yes. I can see in the end obviously Queenborough taking
25 Huntingfield or Nelson taking Huntingfield over, that seems to be obviously where it will encroach into and whether that can be played with, I don't know, but I was saying look, I've got to encroach south, no argument about that. It's just in relation to the northern boundary, if I can call it that, that there's the problem. Far simpler and more I think logical with the submission I put forward as opposed to what it
30 presently is.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes. Okay. Okay, any other questions?

35 MS GILLAM: Not from me.

THE CHAIRPERSON: No. Okay. The process from here is obviously we take this away and have a think about the things that you and others have said to us. We're doing some hearings tomorrow in Launceston as well. We then publish a further proposal. Depending on whether it involves what we think is a significant change
40 from the initial proposal then there's an opportunity for further objections and further hearings if need be. If we don't believe it involves significant change then it becomes a final determination and there's no appeal or anything like that. Just before I let you go, one other issue that's been raised with us in the context of submissions is names of divisions. Do you have any views about the names of
45 divisions that we should be taking into consideration?

MR WILKINSON: Hobart and Hobart and Launceston seem to fly to mind. My view is there should be a division Hobart - - -

MS SHORT: Why?

MR WILKINSON: Why?

5 MS SHORT: Yes.

MR WILKINSON: It's a capital city. My belief is that the capital cities within the major areas should – they should be named just that. I know it's probably a very broad and general view, but that's why I think it should be Hobart. It was Hobart
10 previously. The reason it changed - again one could argue why. Because it's under the mountain you could say therefore it looks at Mount Wellington. But if that was the case, so too Sandy Bay, Kingston, Taroona, Glenorchy, most of the inner areas around Hobart look at Mount Wellington.

15 So I think just then what they were doing was looking at areas and probably more concerned with there being a problem with the Hobart City Council elections and Legislative Council elections. That was the major matter I think there. But my view is it should be Hobart. Likewise Launceston, I think that should be Launceston as opposed to Paterson. People keep questioning why Paterson? The electorate is not
20 even in Paterson Street, so why use Paterson? I don't know. Don't know. But I haven't looked at that in full other than to say it seems to me stupid you don't have Hobart and Launceston, but I've often been called stupid so that doesn't trouble me either.

25 MR TAYLOR: Do you think there's any problem that 12 and a half thousand of your electors in Nelson are in the Hobart City Council and that they might think that their representative is the Member for Hobart rather than the Member for Nelson?

MR WILKINSON: That was obviously I think the major point in changing it
30 previously. I think people, though, are becoming more educated. It's another debate for another time, but my view is that local council elections should be unanimous. Everybody should vote and it shouldn't be vote only if you want to. I think, though, that now people are becoming far more educated and they are starting to realise that there is a difference, there is three tiers of government and they certainly can pick the
35 council as opposed to the Legislative Council.

MR TAYLOR: So you don't think it would make your job representing them any more difficult if it were named Hobart?

40 MR WILKINSON: I don't think so, Bruce. I don't know whether it's because I'm one of the only independents down here, but over 50 per cent of my work would be from electorates outside the Nelson electorate. They might do it to get free legal advice, I don't know, but certainly over 50 per cent of work that I do is from outside the Nelson electorate.

45 MR TAYLOR: Right. Thank you.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Thanks.

MR WILKINSON: Thank you.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Before we let you go, Julian had one thing to raise I think?

5 MR TYPE: Well, okay, I'll speak through you, Mr Chair, if that's okay? I've had a
look at Mr Wilkinson's option 2 and one of the submissions before the Tribunal is
from the Tasmanian Greens which suggests using Sandy Bay Rivulet as the
boundary between Nelson and Wellington. Mr Wilkinson's option 2 does not appear
to use the Sandy Bay Rivulet, it appears to use Huon Road. The midline of Huon
10 Road for much of its length.

MR WILKINSON: That's right.

15 MR TYPE: But also includes Fern Tree which would not be included by the Sandy
Bay Rivulet option, but excludes Turnip Fields Road and Grayling Avenue and
Clutha Place in South Hobart. I guess that you could argue that they intend to isolate
those parts of South Hobart somewhat and the Tribunal may wish to ask Mr
Wilkinson again his views on the Sandy Bay Rivulet which would exclude Fern Tree
but include those areas as an option to his own option 2.

20

THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes, well, if I understood you correctly, you said before
that if the Tribunal thought that Sandy Bay Rivulet was a preferable boundary you
wouldn't have any problem with that. Is that a fair summary of your position?

25 MR WILKINSON: Look, I'm not cast in stone in relation to exactly where the
boundary should be. What I'm endeavouring to do is to submit to the Tribunal that
the present proposed redistribution is not a simple boundary. There are more simple
ways. The most simple way I was believing was as was proposed back in 1995
which was then, as was stated by Julian, straight up Davey Street into Huon Road
30 and using that as the boundary, but certainly I wouldn't die in a ditch as to – because
it would still fit into the numbers I believe, although I haven't looked at that.

35 But I still believe it would fit into the numbers if the areas that you speak about were
then provided back to Wellington as opposed to Nelson. I suppose then the argument
is, is do we then start to dabble further down south in relation to the numbers and
take in your Huntingfield. I'd certainly have no argument about that at all and I
wouldn't mind that at all if that was deemed to be more appropriate, but as to the
actual boundary lines, whether it be the rivulet, whether it be the roadway, I certainly
wouldn't be trying to argue against what you believe to be the most appropriate. But
40 as long as it's in that area, I believe is the most appropriate.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. All right. Anything else for Mr Wilkinson? No?

45 MR MURPHY: No, thanks.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much for making the time to make the
submission and coming along today, appreciate it. Thank you.

MR WILKINSON: Thank you. All the best. Thanks very much. See you later.
All the best. Bye.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Well, are you going to take your umbrella?

5

MR WILKINSON: Yes, I had better.

<THE WITNESS WITHDREW

10

ADJOURNED

[12.15 pm]

15 **RESUMED**

[2.03 pm]

THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay, we'll make a start.

20

<MR JOHN DOWLING and
THE HON DOUG PARKINSON MLC, CALLED

25 THE CHAIRPERSON: Welcome along. Thanks very much for making the time
both to put the submission together and for being here this afternoon and thanks also,
Doug - I mentioned to John, but thanks for changing your arrangements to get here at
2 o'clock. It's made our lives much easier and we appreciate it greatly. Thank you.
I was going to – I think you probably understand the process to this point and how
30 we got to here. The only point that I'd like to emphasise out of all of that is that
constituted as the Tribunal we have no attachment to the committee's proposal. We
don't see ourselves as defending the committee's proposal, we see ourselves as
inquiring afresh into that proposal in light of all the comments and suggestions.

35 The only other point that I'd make by way of preliminary process to this point is that
the Act talks about objections and objectors, so I tend to use that terminology even
though I'm not interpreting them as being objections in an adversarial sense, they're
as much suggestions or comments. Today if we can just note that this is a public
inquiry. If there are any matters that you want to put to us in private, we've got the
40 power to arrange that. So we'd like to hear about that first, if there are any such
matters. We are organising a transcript and we're proposing to publish the transcript
and your original submission on the website, if there's no objection from you to that.
Is that okay?

45 MR DOWLING: Yes, that's fine.

MR PARKINSON: Yes.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much. Also we have the power to swear people in, but we're not proposing to do that. The only possible exception is that if we need to take a written statement from you then the Act says that has to be verified by oath. So if there are any documents that need to be tabled, we might ask for that to happen. John was asking before you came in, Doug, about the process from here. What we're proposing to do is to deliberate on the input that we receive today and tomorrow in Launceston. We'll then advertise a further redistribution proposal and we anticipate that that will happen by 12 April, that's the date that we're aiming for, although no absolute guarantee that that's the date on which it will appear.

MR PARKINSON: Okay.

THE CHAIRPERSON: If we believe that the further proposal is significantly different from the Redistribution Committee's one, we state that fact and invite further objections, comments, suggestions and provided they're not frivolous or vexatious we have another set of hearings by way of inquiry into those further objections if that's the case. However, we do also have the power to determine that it's not significantly different from the initial proposal and if that were to be the case we would publish a final determination and that's the end of the matter, there are no appeals that follow from that determination. So is that all clear? Is there anything else, John, from your point of view?

MR DOWLING: Yes. No, that sounds fine.

THE CHAIRPERSON: No, that's okay. What we would like to do is treat this as informally as possible, invite you to state what it is you're putting to us and you don't need to go through all the submission, you can assume that we've read that, but if there are any particular matters that you want to draw attention to, we then conduct an informal discussion with questions from all of us and from Julian about issues arising from your submission and then give you an opportunity to sum up and put anything to us that you want to do by way of conclusion. So if that's all okay, we'll ask you to present as you see fit.

MR DOWLING: We'll fire away. Yes, I guess I suppose on behalf of the Tasmanian Branch of the ALP, I would like to speak in general terms and as part of our submission to this Tribunal - Doug will address some of the more specific areas, particularly those around southern Tasmanian, but in general terms - and we understand the work that the committee did and fully appreciate the challenges faced by the committee in testing various scenarios. We have a view that we think that - again in general terms, that some other scenarios on a state-wide basis could possibly be tested, particularly those in northern Tasmania, to address some of the community-of-interest areas and those revolve around the City of Burnie being split in half, the electorate of Montgomery not taking in all of the Central Coast municipality.

In fact, part of the Turners Beach area of that community is missing, which is a growth area and then, conversely, parts of Mersey don't include Port Sorell which is in Rowallan, so that sort of - that's an area that possibly could do with further

exploring. I'm most grateful and appreciative of the opportunity to test the various scenarios which Julian made available to us, which was fantastic. The challenge that I had with that is it was very time consuming, you could put CCDs in but then knowing which CCDs to take out to give the outcomes that you're looking for that conform to the legislative requirements of plus or minus 10 per cent of the ADE - so that was sort of, you know - and I understand the challenges that they faced.

But again we would perhaps be requesting that the Tribunal - as part of our submission that they perhaps review those northern Tasmanian scenarios and see what's possible and what isn't possible. In the sort of central Tasmania - and our submission states that we would like to see certainly a reduction or where possible of these massive Tasmanian electorates, but we understand the geography and the population base of those electorates are such that there is always going to be some large electorates. What we're suggesting is that if an alternative scenario is done with Murchison perhaps coming into parts of Burnie then perhaps the West Coast could be picked up as part of Rowallan which would form part of - a similar basis to the Federal electorate of Lyons.

So there may be an opportunity for a reduction from three to two larger rural seats in Tasmania. Certainly, from a party's - or from our perspective, the parts of the Highlands - the Central Highlands/Local Government area going into Rowallan, that was nothing that we saw an issue with at all. In southern Tasmania, we had specific concerns about what was happening with Elwick and we understand that these issues in terms of Elwick and the fact that the population in Elwick is not growing, our view is that perhaps the Tribunal could look at moving the boundary incrementally north as opposed to south because the only opportunities for growth in that part of the world are the northern suburbs of Hobart. Certainly, within Elwick we don't believe that there's opportunities for growth there and then by moving Elwick into Wellington which is the proposal, you know, we don't believe that that will meet the long-term interests. It might resolve a short-term issue, but it perhaps may not meet the long-term interests.

Also again just by way of overview, we have a view that the electorates of Wellington and Paterson should more appropriately reflect where they are and Tasmania being one of the - I think it's the only state in Australia that doesn't have electorates named after its capital - its major cities, being Hobart and Launceston. So that's an opportunity for the Tribunal to perhaps make some recommendations in that regard to appropriately reflect the two larger cities in the state. Admittedly, we don't have an electorate of Devonport and Burnie, but in terms of Hobart and Launceston there's an opportunity there that we felt the Tribunal may wish to have a look at. That's by way of opening remarks, I guess.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Well, I guess there's four issues that fall out of that from my perspective. Maybe if we sort of take them in reverse order perhaps, even start with the names because we have had some other submissions about that.

MR DOWLING: Yes.

THE CHAIRPERSON: I understand what you're putting to us about the desirability of having electorates named after cities. It seems to me that one downside of that is the fact that the boundaries are different for the Local Government area named respectively Hobart and Launceston and the electorate which is proposed to be
5 named Hobart and Launceston. One of the issues for us is that that leads to some confusion in the minds of the electorate and one of the reasons for having different names is to try and minimise the extent of that confusion. Do you have a view about that? Is there anything that you wanted to put before us in terms of the importance of that lack of confusion?

10

MR PARKINSON: As far as the confusion argument is concerned, I don't see there being any more confusion by changing back to Hobart than there is already with Wellington because Wellington in the minds of the electorate is a mountain and always will be, and of course that mountain is not in the electorate that we're talking
15 about. It's, as we all know, as close to Huon, Nelson, Hobart, and Elwick and Derwent as it is to any one of those seats. The confusion-type aspect is something that – you tend to know more about – this isn't a criticism, but by being the elected member and working in an electorate at the detailed level that we work at. It's more evident when you're playing that role than I think it can ever be from looking at it
20 from the outside. Everybody knows – and I say this to some extent with tongue in cheek – where Wellington, New Zealand, is.

25

I go to New Zealand and people say, "Oh, you're the Member for Wellington." They say that with tongue in cheek too. So I mean, Wellington is a big name in various
25 parts of the world, including New Zealand, a big name with our mountain, but I think historically I come back to the fact that the seat was established as Hobart. It was Hobart for so long and then it caused confusion when it was changed to Wellington. Not only because there was a boundary change at the same time, but people would say, "Oh, what electorate are we in? We're in Denison, aren't we?" And I'd say,
30 "No, Wellington." "Oh, why is that?"

30

And the confusion argument has always to me centred around the fact that the Hobart City Council is also named Hobart and the confusion that is there in the minds of the less well informed as between the city council and the Legislative Council and I
35 think that's where your main confusion is in this argument. And I think that confusion will always be there in the minds, as I say, of the not so well informed. They will always be confused about whether they're going to a Legislative Council election or a city council election. I get letters from people who want potholes fixed, you know, I get a number of constituent inquiries that should've gone direct to the
40 city council for reference. Of course I forward them on, but you will always have an element in the community who are confused in that way.

40

So I think it's a bigger picture when a decision is made to name an electorate after a capital city and I think – well, I'm positive that Tasmania is the only place in
45 Australia where a capital city doesn't bear a divisional name in one of the divisions of the Houses of the Parliament and I think that should be rectified. And I don't think – if the decision is made not to do that, I don't think it should be made on grounds of confusion because, as I'm trying to say, that confusion for various reasons

45

will always be there and is there no more because of the name of the electorate, I suppose is what I think is the position. And depending on how your boundaries end up, whether they stay the same or are changed, I suppose if, for example – and I will just touch on it, if, for example, South Hobart came in well, of course the area-type
5 argument would be enhanced I suppose because South Hobart being part of Hobart, but even if it doesn't, I think there are good historical reasons for restoring the name.

I believe it would lessen the existing confusion rather than increase it. I suppose I'm trying to put that to you from practical experience as much as any logical argument.
10 Yes, I think as people become better informed - as they are these days, people more and more I think are understanding the difference between city council and Legislative Council and I think the name Hobart encompassing the wide area that it does, I don't think it matters that it doesn't follow the city council boundaries because after all they're two separate and distinct institutions and more often than not
15 electorate divisions won't follow closely council divisions anyway, there'll always be differences. So that's on the name.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Thank you. Can I correctly apply those sentiments to Paterson as well?
20

MR PARKINSON: I think so. I think you'd hear much the same argument from Don Wing when you go there, if you haven't already.

THE CHAIRPERSON: I was interested to hear whether your argument was the same as his, I guess.
25

MR PARKINSON: Yes, I haven't seen his submission by the way, but certainly I've discussed the issue in a general sense with him over the years, ever since the changes were made and we were both amazed – not reflecting on the previous
30 committee, but we were both amazed when those names were changed back then.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay.

MR DOWLING: Just another minor point I guess in terms of the confusion between
35 Hobart City Council elections and Legislative Council elections, because they don't occur concurrently at the same time, that confusion would be minimised I would've thought and in other jurisdictions, for example. That was perhaps something the Tribunal may not want to look at is whether there's confusion between the Sydney City Council elections and the elections for the seat of Sydney. In a previous life I
40 actually lived there and I certainly wasn't aware of any such confusion at that time. I could understand how that impression could possibly be thought, but certainly from my experiences interstate that wasn't the case.

MR PARKINSON: Can I just add that when I was first elected in 1994, there didn't
45 appear to me to be much confusion as I moved around the electorate, and I did a lot for that particular election, probably more so than since as far as the doorknocking aspect was concerned. There didn't appear to me then to be much confusion about which electorate people were in back then. People seemed to be fairly easy with the

idea of Hobart being the election they were going to vote in and the electorate they were in, although I do recall again there being some confusion as to whether it was city council or Legislative Council.

5 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Has anybody else got any questions on the name issue at this point? Yes, Bruce?

MR TAYLOR: Just one thing, Doug, the people that might be more confused might be the people who are actually in Nelson that are Hobart City Council ratepayers that
10 you wouldn't necessarily be knocking on their doors. Do you think there would be a problem with them - 12,000 or so who are, in fact, Hobart City Council ratepayers, but will come running to you as the Member for Hobart if we go back to the other - - -

15 MR PARKINSON: Well, it didn't happen previously, Bruce, when I was the Member for Hobart, as I was from 1994 until it was changed. You'll always get the few constituent inquiries on the boundaries, but very few. It didn't happen then and I wouldn't expect it to happen again if the name reverted to Hobart.

20 MR TAYLOR: I think we're certainly doing better with advertising our Legislative Council elections now.

MR PARKINSON: Yes.

25 MR TAYLOR: I note back before my time in the office actually, one of the Hobart elections we only got 70 per cent or just under I think, 69 or 70 per cent attendance and one of the arguments people were throwing around then was their confusion with Hobart City Council and they didn't think it was compulsory for them to vote.

30 MR PARKINSON: Yes.

MR TAYLOR: I'd hope that we've been proving that, but do you see that as a problem?

35 MR PARKINSON: I don't really. And I was just going to add too, some confusion – you'll always get some where the actual boundaries are and it's partly caused by ourselves. For example, if we use Salmat as the delivery mechanism and their delivery area will – even though you try and say to them look, leave out such and such streets by name, they can't do it. Their delivery people have just got the routine
40 and if you use them your newsletter will go across the boundaries and I've no doubt your office receives phone calls when that happens and there'll always be that bit of confusion around all of the boundaries because they're small electorates and people do move across boundaries for various reasons, but I think in the main I can't see any problems. In fact, I think it would reduce the confusion if it went back.

45 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Anything else?

MR TAYLOR: No.

THE CHAIRPERSON: We're done on that issue?

MR TAYLOR: Yes.

5 THE CHAIRPERSON: I think the second issue in my mind, if we work backwards through them, was those relating to the boundaries around Nelson and Wellington and Elwick. We've had suggestions that the boundary between - - -

10 **TESTING OF AUDIBLE WARNING SYSTEM**

THE CHAIRPERSON: I think we'll just adjourn for five minutes while this goes on. It's a bit distracting for everybody.
15

ADJOURNED [2.24 pm]

20 **RESUMED** [2.25 pm]

THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. We will start again then. Yes, in terms of the boundary between Wellington and Nelson, it's been suggested that South Hobart and
25 Cascades ought to move to Nelson and one proposal is that the Sandy Bay Rivulet ought to be the boundary between the two electorates right up the mountain. I don't interpret that as being greatly inconsistent with the sorts of things that you're putting to us in terms of the southern boundary into Sandy Bay and Dynnyrne, but I'm interested in any comments that you might have about that particular proposal.
30

MR DOWLING: Well, having had the opportunity to actually test that scenario with Julian, it meets the legislative requirements, which is obviously the first requirement under the legislation, but also more importantly it is our submission that that actually meets greatly – well, more greatly meets the community-of-interest
35 requirements, that the affinity between the South Hobart community and the Hobart CBD – the South Hobart community and the West Hobart community are greater than that of the Sandy Bay community.

There is almost a bit of an artificial divide, if you like, between the Hobart CBD and
40 Sandy Bay whereas that divide is not as great between Hobart and heading up Davey Street, up to the South Hobart community. So yes, having tested both scenarios – having tested that scenario, it's our submission that that would be the more logical – if that was to be included in the Wellington – if part of the southern – southern part of Wellington needs an extra area added into it then that should be the priority ahead
45 of Sandy Bay.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Thank you for that. Is there anything else on that southern boundary - - -

MR MURPHY: Can I just clarify that we're talking about the option 3 that you refer to in your submission?

5 MR DOWLING: Yes, that's correct, yes. The one with the little – that Ewan so graciously printed out for us.

MR PARKINSON: It should also be remembered there I think that South Hobart for a long time was in the electorate of Hobart. Indeed, when I was first elected in '94, I was elected on boundaries which included pretty well all of South Hobart and Fern Tree, as I recall, and less of Battery Point than is, in fact, included now. I can't remember where the '94 boundary was, but there was less of Battery Point in the electorate of Hobart then than there is now. Then the first distribution after I was elected changed the boundaries, took South Hobart out and, in fact, put Sandy Bay in and Dynnyrne down as far as Nelson Road, which caused no end of confusion and even further confusion when a couple of years after that most of that Sandy Bay area was taken back out of the electorate of Hobart when the boundary was moved back to the Sandy Bay Rivulet.

20 So in terms of confusion, there's been heaps of confusion over those years and I guess we're arguing – no doubt you've seen from our submission that our primary argument based on the fact that we estimate population movement will be predominantly to the north, we feel it's more appropriate to move the boundaries predominantly north so the northern boundary when we come to that, that our fallback position basically is that for community-of-interest reasons if we're going to have a varied southern boundary then it would be better to vary it by putting South Hobart in rather than expanding the Sandy Bay boundary.

30 MS SHORT: Can I just ask what your basis is for saying you're anticipating the growth to be in the North? What are you looking at specifically there?

MR PARKINSON: There's a fair bit of guesswork in that because I don't have the – we don't have the benefit of available statistics on that, but it's observation more than anything. Guesswork based on observation as to where houses are being built, yes.

35 MR DOWLING: Certainly, if you look at the northern corridor of Hobart on this side of the river, the only available land is in the northern suburbs of Hobart. There's not much available land unless there's great urban in-field actual development with multi-storey apartments, but the current trend – and there are people more expert than us on this, but the current trend is still for people to build homes on the quarter acre block and the only land available for that is in the northern suburbs.

45 MR PARKINSON: And over the years, the expansion on the hills has been slow for obvious reasons. It's harder to build and more expensive to build on hills than it is on flat land. So you either go high rise or you go where the available land is.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Well, that probably gives a neat segue into the next component of this issue which is the northern boundary, if you like, of Wellington and so on. How would you summarise what it is you're proposing in relation to that?

5 MR DOWLING: Do you want to touch on that, Doug, or - - -

MR PARKINSON: Yes, okay, or do you want - - -

10 MR DOWLING: Well, I guess there's a couple of issues, what's proposed is that parts of the northern boundary of Wellington actually go out of the electorate and go into Elwick and another part is retained. Now, if – then, conversely, there's a smaller bit of the southern end of Elwick at Sandy Bay being proposed to actually go into Elwick to compensate for that going, so we're at a bit of a loss to actually understand – and we understand that Elwick has to grow, but we can't understand why that
15 growth can't happen to the northern end of Elwick because what the committee has done was take a bit out of Wellington around the Moonah area, but then compensated Wellington for taking that by taking another bit to the south.

20 So the simplest proposal for the Wellington electorate would surely be to simply leave it alone and then look at the boundaries to the north of Elwick just to get the best fit. So that's what – you know, that's the overall suggestion because what's being proposed actually is dividing communities between Moonah and Lutana. The catchment for Bowen Road Primary School is both sides of the Brooker Highway and the fact is that – and again you'll see it in our submission further on when we're
25 talking about the northern boundaries of Elwick, by dividing places horizontally, I guess you could say, rather than vertically, by using the road rather than some other barrier, you're actually dividing more of communities and we'll be able to demonstrate that further once we discuss the northern end of the electorate.

30 But what's proposed with the northern boundary of Wellington as it currently stands is actually dividing communities and we understand that there's legislative requirements plus or minus 10 per cent of the ADE, but we'd be interested – and didn't have the ability to test all those scenarios, is if you simply left Wellington alone – and again the South Hobart proposition was well, if that's got to happen then
35 we believe South Hobart goes in, but to actually leave Wellington alone and then explore the northern end of Elwick rather than taking a bit here and then compensating that with a bit at another end of the electorate is not the answer in the long term.

40 MR PARKINSON: Just on that community of - - -

MR DOWLING: On the specifics – you know the area.

45 MR PARKINSON: Yes, the community-of-interest argument. It's interesting that looking at the map, the two schools – the two state primary schools, Bowen Road and Moonah Primary School which is just on the other side of Derwent Park Road, those two schools, their catchment areas are obviously in that surround and Bowen Road doesn't come so much into New Town because you've got the New Town

Primary School and the Lenah Valley Primary School that mainly catch the students from their area, but of course you'll get some that live in New Town who do go to Bowen Road.

5 But primarily the catchment area is between Lutana, East Moonah and West Moonah and that also includes the Moonah Primary School, which of course picks up children from further into Glenorchy as well, but there's – I suppose what I'm saying is that these days it's the schools that provide the big community of interest because of the movement of parents, the school communities and so on, how they work and
10 obviously if community of interest is the second of the criterion to be considered then those sorts of things need to be added as much weight to as they can be. I think in the submission we might have mentioned St Therese's as well, a smaller school of course, but the same sorts of arguments can come in there and it was for those sorts of reasons that we thought if the boundaries are going to be expanded then they
15 ought to be expanded in that way for those reasons rather than going the other way at all.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Almost as devil's advocate, why wouldn't you put Moonah and Lutana into Wellington – I'm sorry, into Elwick then? What's your
20 objection to that?

MR PARKINSON: Oh, well, you might, but I mean if you're talking about population movements and where the population expansions are taking place into the future, I think that's how you answer that question.
25

THE CHAIRPERSON: Would you see that there's a significant lack of community of interest between the Moonah, Lutana, and the balance of Elwick, for example?

MR PARKINSON: Not a significant lack, no. No. Less, but – yes.
30

THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes. Okay, anybody else with some questions about this Elwick-and-Wellington issue?

MS SHORT: Yes, I'm just pondering about the Moonah-Lutana thing into Elwick as well. Moonah is part of the Glenorchy LGA, isn't it? So you would imagine that there is some community of interest there, but - - -
35

MR PARKINSON: Oh, there is, but on your first criterion, the numbers, as I understood the committee's reasons, it was Elwick which had caused the problem.
40 So their numbers have gone above 10 per cent anyway. So we're not looking at adding numbers into Elwick per se, we're looking at taking numbers out and I think that's where the problem arose.

MS SHORT: Yes.
45

MR DOWLING: Excuse me, hadn't Elwick gone down and then had to grow a bit?

MR PARKINSON: No, I thought – am I wrong, I thought Elwick - - -

MR TAYLOR: The other way round, if I remember.

MR DOWLING: Yes.

5 MR TYPE: Page 13, Elwick - - -

MR PARKINSON: I see. Elwick had gone down, had it?

MR DOWLING: Yes.

10

MR TAYLOR: Is currently minus - - -

MR DOWLING: Yes, Elwick had gone down and that's always been the issue.

15 MR PARKINSON: Oh, yes, okay. Yes, Derwent - - -

MR TAYLOR: So the question is if – as was mentioned there, if you did want to look at Glenorchy Hobart as a simple boundary that would boost Elwick, but as Elwick is proposed to be reducing it would make it high in the short term but proposed to reduce. So we haven't suggested that, but we would be interested in your thoughts on that.

20

MR DOWLING: Yes, well, that was the point I was going to make, Bruce, in terms of if that was added to Elwick that may meet a short term – it might solve the problem in the short term, but longer term I don't believe that - certainly a large amount of that land around Lutana would be zoned industrial. I'm not sure where there would be any residential development into the future and, in fact, I've no doubt similar to the rest of Elwick the population would be slowly declining in that area, so I can't – this is only – I can't provide any evidence to actually support that, but certainly the view and the view of the committee was that longer term Elwick is trending down, geographically those areas are similar to the rest of Elwick, and they will trend down over time as well.

25

30

So it may be a short-term fix, but then by taking that area out of Wellington then you're going to have to look for other parts to boost Wellington's numbers so they meet the legislative – I would be suggesting, to meet the legislative requirements, which is the number 1 priority of the task at hand. So it might be robbing Peter to pay Paul, so to speak.

35

40 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes, well, I think that's the nature of the game that we're in.

MR DOWLING: The game, yes, I understand that, but you may not get the fix if that scenario was pursued, that that may not lead to the longer-term fix. You would need to do the statistical projections to actually support that case and then what would that - - -

45

THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes. No, I'm interested in your thoughts about it, conceptually I suppose and not in terms of wanting to hold you to what the mathematical consequences might be or anything like that.

5 MR DOWLING: Yes.

MR PARKINSON: Certainly, there's far more community of interest, in my view, between Lutana, Moonah, New Town, Lenah Valley than there is the other way.

10 MR TAYLOR: I think that the committee's thoughts were that it's given that the southern boundary is either where we put it or where you suggest with the swap between South Hobart and Sandy Bay. You then go to the northern boundary, Wellington – sorry, Elwick needs to acquire something more and we need to take
15 something out of Wellington as well as something out of Derwent. So there has been a divider of two saying we've got Moonah and we've got Lutana. Moonah is probably the closest as far as community of interest with the remainder of Elwick and therefore that's been chosen.

Lutana is a discrete suburb by itself. Sure it does have community of interest with
20 Moonah, but if something's got to go that it was better to take Lutana as a discrete community and associate that with Wellington to, in the short term, rectify the balance and it may be that in the future, Moonah itself has to revert to – sorry, Lutana also has to be absorbed into Elwick in the future to make up the numbers if Elwick continues to decrease. But that might be something to be addressed in nine years'
25 time depending on how the population movements with in-field housing and the like have gone. So we had to make the choice. So if you're looking as those two, what is your preference, Lutana or Moonah, or what other proposal do you have to address that problem of topping up Elwick?

30 MR DOWLING: I think just – it was part of our opening remarks, the aim sort of just to build on what we've been talking about is that there's been a proposal – the committee has come up with a proposal to remove part of the northern end of Wellington into Elwick to help prop up Elwick and to compensate Wellington for the
35 loss of those numbers, they've had to then move into Nelson and so without having been privy to the data – to test the scenarios as to what it is, whether it's plus or minus 10 per cent of the ADE in 2012, I'm not sure, but just looking at the size of the maps it would seem that there's a bit of robbing Peter to pay Paul happening in Wellington. What we were suggesting initially is that the growth in Elwick should be happening at the northern end of the boundary into the Claremont area, and again
40 that's part of the Glenorchy City Council/Local Government area.

MR TAYLOR: The difficulty with that is, though, that we haven't started with Elwick or with Wellington, we've started with Huon, which is high and that had to go somewhere. Its only option is to move up and that has created a buffer through
45 the division. So we haven't started and - tried to address the particular problems in Wellington or Elwick, it started from the bottom, we've worked our way up, and this is how we've had to incrementally move it through to try and improve the one vote, one value, the equality of the electorates as best we can. So that's why there's been

this moving - of taking a little bit from one end and moving up through the other divisions.

5 MR DOWLING: So you're saying there was a problem with Huon as it currently stands, Bruce?

MR TAYLOR: Yes, yes, that's where our problems basically start from, that Huon has - - -

10 MR DOWLING: They're 4 per cent above currently - or as of 30 September last year and if nothing happened they'll be 6 per cent above that?

15 MR TAYLOR: We've got nowhere else to go with Huon, so we had to take some of Nelson and to compensate, because Nelson was a reasonable size to start with, we had to then take a little bit off the top of Nelson.

MR DOWLING: Oh, so you've taken some in Nelson?

20 MR TAYLOR: So that's how the boundaries have evolved, if I'm right - - -

MR DOWLING: Yes, that wasn't made clear in this document.

MR TAYLOR: Julian, as adviser, that's basically how it's - - -

25 MR TYPE: Well, yes, I mean, you can really start the redistribution at Murchison, Apsley, Huon, or Rumney, but you cannot start it from the inside out, you can begin at Huon or you can finish at Huon, but the implications are the same, you can't deal with Huon somewhere in the middle because obviously - just because of its nature.

30 MR DOWLING: Yes.

MS GILLAM: I think whilst in your submission you make the comment:

35 *Further growth in the southern divisions may be hampered by access and traffic limitations on the southern outlet -*

I think on the same basis that you make the comment about growth in the northern suburbs, there's still an awful lot of growth happening down there?

40 MR DOWLING: Yes. Yes, I guess the only comment I make in respect to that, Bruce, is that issues surrounding Huon weren't made clear in the document where the submissions were required from.

45 MR TAYLOR: Yes. Okay.

MR DOWLING: There's certainly references to Elwick and Derwent in the document, but there's no specific references as being - as the committee or the

Tribunal being confronted with issues surrounding growth in Huon that need to be taken into account, so that's - - -

MS GILLAM: The last comment on that, page 12?

5

MR DOWLING: Yes. Yes:

Heading for plus 6.2 per cent, Huon exceeds the balance of Kingston Beach and Kingston with very minor exceptions to Nelson to its north.

10

It's a minor - in terms of - without putting something in bells and whistles in front of casual readers of the document or even intent readers of the document, it certainly didn't alert us in our submission that there was a significant issue in Huon that we needed to take into account with our submission.

15

THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Well, what are the ramifications of this in terms of your suggestions about the northern boundaries of Elwick then? What did you have in mind and what would you - if the Huon issue wasn't there, what would you see as being a sensible way of dealing with Elwick's decline in numbers?

20

MR DOWLING: Well, again it would be our submission that rather than use the Brooker Highway as the divide, with Elwick having to move north - and it's our submission - and again we would need to go back and have a look at the scenarios, but it's apparent from the data there that Huon still meets the legislative requirements. By using the Brooker Highway as a divide it actually disenfranchises quite a number of communities, all the sporting clubs, for example, the schools on either side of the highway.

25

If you moved it incrementally either through Box Hill Road, Abbotsfield Creek, Abbotsfield Road, that would be reduced, that community of interest, disenfranchising those communities would actually be reduced because the Abbotsfield - just say, for example, it fell under Box Hill Road, the Abbotsfield Primary School community in the main wouldn't be affected and the Roseneath Primary School community certainly wouldn't be affected.

30

The Holy Rosary School would not be as affected as what it currently is - as is currently proposed. As is currently proposed, all those school communities and sporting communities and the community-of-interest argument in that part of Claremont are essentially split in half. If you move the boundary, as I said, you know, vertically rather than horizontally, if you moved it that way that actually - that disenfranchising of communities would be a lot more minimal than is currently the case.

35

THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. I understand what you're putting to us there in, as you say, trying to move the northern boundary of Elwick so that it runs more horizontally rather than vertically.

40

MR DOWLING: Yes, that's right. Yes, because - - -

MR PARKINSON: There's the assumption that the Brooker Highway is this huge divide and it's not really looking at community of interest.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Sure.

5

MR DOWLING: The Abbotsfield Primary School, for example, their catchment would be – you know, you could draw a radius around that and it would be that area whereas if the divide was Box Hill Road then – you know, then clearly that issue is resolved or Abbotsfield Creek – you know, that's our submission in that regard.

10

THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes. I guess, to put my cards on the table, my preference is to pick features like rivulets rather than roads just because they seem to me to be clearer and easier to define, but - - -

15 MR DOWLING: Yes.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Anybody else got any questions?

MR PARKINSON: Just coming back to Bruce's question as Moonah versus
20 Lutana, I mean, if it came down to a straight decision on one or the other well, I think we would probably agree that the community has got it about right, if that's the decision to be made, but we're of course arguing that that shouldn't be the decision – the question.

25 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes. Okay. Is there anything else in relation to the Elwick and Derwent issues anybody wants to ask? No? All right, well, let's move on to the third of the four issues which was, as I understood it, the issue surrounding the large rural electorates, if I could call them that, the proposal that we should look at trying to reduce two of those – reduce the three of those to two. You want to just take us
30 through how you think that might be achieved?

MR DOWLING: And again without having the actual ability to test the scenarios and the numbers, but we certainly think it's something that's worth exploring, is perhaps – and just trying to think numbers at the same time as to whether Murchison
35 – the size of Murchison could actually be reduced and then - as I alluded to earlier, then moving the north western Tasmanian electorates, like adjusting their boundaries east, and then as a result of that seeing whether it's possible to put the Port Sorell community into Mersey and then leaving the rural areas so the large – so, in essence, you would end up – and it's a thought more than a proposal, but I think it's a thought
40 worth exploring and I've got no doubt that the committee may have looked at it, but I don't know to what level, and the difficulty I had testing the scenarios was actually fitting in all the bits and pieces around to actually – and having the time to actually make that fit.

45 Now, if Murchison, in essence, only included the Circular Head municipality, parts of the Waratah and Wynyard municipality, and the coastal fringe – you know, whatever, you know, the cut-off point is, whether it's the Arthur River, that could then allow Murchison to take in the City of Burnie because one of the real flaws is

the City of Burnie is essentially cut in half. That boundary could move slightly east to possibly Round Hill or Wivenhoe or some point on the Bass Highway there. That would allow Montgomery to move east to actually take in the Turners Beach area which is currently in Mersey and that is a growth area. Then Mersey may be able to
5 move east to take in the Port Sorell community.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay.

MR DOWLING: So, in essence, it reduces three – if it was possible, that
10 proposition would reduce three larger rural electorates to two and, admittedly, one Member would have a very large electorate. There's currently a Federal Member which services that whole area other than parts there or parts of Circular Head.

THE CHAIRPERSON: So if I understand you correctly, you would be suggesting
15 that the parts of Murchison which are excised from the existing division should be joined to Rowallan?

MR DOWLING: Yes, joined to Rowallan, yes. And then - obviously, you know,
20 that may put the numbers in Rowallan above the legislative requirements, then to resolve that if Murchison is down – would obviously be down a bit, there may be the opportunity to take in all or part of the City of Burnie into Murchison. Montgomery would then be down. So then move Montgomery to include the Forth/Turners Beach area, which is part of the Central Coast municipality and then similarly that would allow Mersey hopefully to take in parts of Port Sorell, which would – and, you know,
25 like it's apparent that there are issues there in terms of community of interest and clearly, you know, the number 1 principle is the legislative requirement, but it's a scenario that – that's our submission that we believe it's worthy of actually exploring and testing to see whether it actually works or not.

30 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay.

MS SHORT: I have heard very recently, in fact, the Mayor of West Coast publicly stating that his links are with Burnie - - -

35 MR DOWLING: That's correct.

MS SHORT: That there's, you know, that real sense of community with north - with the workers travelling in and out, you know, for their shops and so forth.

40 MR DOWLING: Yes, that will be the West Coast Council's submission as part of the Federal redistribution and currently they are in the Federal electorate of Lyons. What Murchison currently – the links are with the Burnie Port and the City of Burnie because of the mining industry and the export of the mining produce - - -

45 MS SHORT: And many of the workers live in Burnie, they just come in and out for their shifts, don't they, four days on, four days off sort of - - -

MR DOWLING: Well, many of the workers live right along the North West Coast, from Port Sorell right through to Circular Head. They commute from a whole range of – Darryl’s submission is that the West Coast Council should be part of the Braddon electorate as part of the Federal redistribution because this – what we’re
5 talking about here is probably one, two, three different electorates. It would be my submission that that would hold less weight in terms of an argument because the – certainly the West Coast and - in a different form you may find, you know, people supporting the West Coast Council area being part of Braddon as part of a Federal boundary, but there’s no way Murchison can go into both Montgomery and Mersey.
10 It’s not just Burnie that Murchison has that affinity with because the mine workers do live right along the North West Coast not just in Burnie.

MS SHORT: Yes.

15 THE CHAIRPERSON: Sure. But on the face of it, one of the risks of adopting what you’re proposing for us is that the obvious community of interest which is reflected in the existing Division of Murchison and which is reflected in the West Coast Council’s submission to the Federal redistribution would be lost.

20 MR DOWLING: Yes, although - - -

THE CHAIRPERSON: Or downplayed perhaps.

MR DOWLING: Yes, although I’d say it would be arguable that there is minimal
25 community of interest between the community of West Coast and the Circular Head community. The Circular Head community, as the Tribunal would know, is largely a rural-and-primary-production community and the West Coast community is a minerals and minerals processing and resource-based community. Certainly, the submission that the West Coast Council will be - I’ve no doubt will be making as
30 part of the Federal redistribution is very relevant, but as the boundaries currently are – and that’s very hypothetical, as the boundaries currently are, the West Coast community forms part of the Federal electorate of Lyons and all we’re simply suggesting is that the Tribunal explore the possibility of what is currently occurring, current practice, just seeing whether that’s possible or not to fix what I believe are
35 greater issues in terms of the community of Burnie being divided, parts of the Central Coast community not being included in Montgomery, and Port Sorell not being included in Mersey.

40 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay.

MS SHORT: Well, why is it important for Port Sorell to be in Mersey, what’s your - - -

45 MR DOWLING: Well, the whole community of Port Sorell commute to and from Devonport. It’s basically a satellite suburb of Devonport.

MS SHORT: Yes, that’s what I thought.

MR DOWLING: Yes.

MS SHORT: It used to be a holiday place, but - - -

5 MR DOWLING: No, it's not any more.

MS SHORT: Not any more, yes.

10 MR DOWLING: No, it's a satellite suburb of Devonport and there's no school there, the high schools are in Devonport, the shopping, the employment, everything is in Devonport. It's just a nice place to go home and live.

MR TAYLOR: Could I just explore the numbers a little bit, Richard, if that's all right?

15

THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes, by all means, yes.

MR TAYLOR: Looking at the numbers in Murchison, West Coast has just under three-and-a-half thousand electors. Now, if you move those out of Murchison that would only allow you to gain another three-and-a-half thousand electors in Burnie as part of Murchison. Now, there are – in Montgomery there are currently 10,000 people basically from Burnie city. If we took three and a half out of that, that's going to probably make it a more even divisor of Burnie whereas at the moment we're on the western side, that would only put a divisor into the middle of Burnie which would I don't think achieve your objective - - -

25

MR DOWLING: Yes.

MR TAYLOR: And I know your objective, I think the original panels all wanted to try and keep these Burnie and Devonport and that as units if possible, but our problem with numbers and having to start from corners in an island state mean that we necessarily have to start up at that corner and work our way down and so, as I say, three and a half thousand would simply take it closer to the middle of Burnie, as I understand it.

35

MR DOWLING: Yes. Yes, I guess, Bruce, you know, it's a suggestion that we believe, you know, people should take the time to actually explore and the City of Burnie boundaries will obviously include communities such as Ridgley, Highclere – and admittedly they are smaller communities and our submission would be that rather than, you know, including Ridgley, the Highcleres, the Stowports, down to Heybridge, and those areas, it's actually more the urban area of Burnie that is currently divided with the line going down Shorewell Creek. So, you know, what I'm – I'm not suggesting that – and clearly the legislative requirement is the number 1 thing that has to be met. So, you know, all we are suggesting is the Tribunal explore to see whether it's possible to include those urban CCDs of Burnie - - -

45

MR TAYLOR: So you would see Murchison stretching round and taking up the hinterland and just leaving the City of Burnie - - -

MR DOWLING: Yes, well, I would see, if possible, Murchison running from Circular Head along the coast, including the townships of Wynyard, Somerset, and into – so it's more that coastal – you know, coastal-community fringe as opposed to the whole rural parts of those communities – the whole rural parts of those areas.

5 But you would almost draw a line I guess from the Circular Head municipality, find a dividing line through the Waratah/Wynyard community and then around behind the City of Burnie leaving those rural-type areas outside of the electorate.

MR TAYLOR: It would be a matter of saying, do they have a greater community of interest because they're hinterland or do they have a greater community of interest because they associate with Ulverstone, Burnie, Penguin, whatever?

MR DOWLING: Yes, but I think it's worth actually having a look at to actually see whether it's possible or not and if it can be achieved then perhaps that's something that could be considered in a positive light. We didn't have the – we certainly had the facilities available, probably not the time available, to sit and spend hour after hour in front of the computer, you know, testing those scenarios, but it's certainly something that's possibly worth considering – that's worth exploring, to see whether those issues can, in fact, be resolved a bit better than as is currently proposed.

20 THE CHAIRPERSON: I guess I should let you know that one possible complicating factor is another proposal that's been made to us regarding the balance of the Central Highlands municipality. Rather than adding that to Rowallan as the committee's proposed, the preference is to leave the existing boundary for Derwent there so that places like Derwent Bridge, Tarraleah, Ouse, Hamilton, remain within Derwent. If that were to be the case, it may be that there's greater community of interest between the West Coast and that electorate rather than Rowallan. I'm not sure what the West Coast Council would say about that, but they will probably still maintain a greater community of interest with the North West Coast.

30 MR DOWLING: Yes, I'm sure the West Coast Council would argue a greater community of interest with the North West Coast.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes.

35 MR DOWLING: Certainly, from my perspective I find it difficult to comment on other people's submissions having not been privy to them.

THE CHAIRPERSON: I understand that, yes. Does anybody have any other questions about the suggested redistribution along the North West Coast, in particular?

MR MURPHY: Well, I'd be just interested to know what sort of drove the suggestion. Have you had lots of representations from people suggesting that this is a good idea or is it – where does it come from?

MR DOWLING: What drove the suggestion is that the community of Burnie is currently divided, the Central Coast – the Turners Beach community which has the

natural affinity with Ulverstone is currently excluded and, conversely, the Port Sorell community is excluded from Mersey, so - and to be perfectly frank with you, it's from previous experience. Doug has his experience as a Member of Parliament, I've worked in that community for about 12 years in this area - or in the political area,
5 and that is an issue that the community has - that those communities have that they - well, they are divided, there's those three distinct areas that aren't included.

The people of Turners Beach, for example, cannot understand why the people of Ulverstone vote for Montgomery and yet they're voting for Devonport and,
10 conversely, the people of Port Sorell can't understand why they aren't voting in Mersey when their counterparts in Latrobe from the same municipality are and then it's even more confusing in Burnie, if you live one side of Shorewell Creek, you vote in Murchison and the other side you vote in Montgomery.

15 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes, I guess the only answer to the people in Turners Beach and Port Sorell is the community of interest is priority number 2 not priority number 1.

MR DOWLING: Yes, I understand - - -
20

THE CHAIRPERSON: Because I understand what you're saying about those - - -

MR DOWLING: No, it's true, like, you know, yes, and fully appreciate what priority number 1 is and it just takes it back to my original point, what we're
25 suggesting is just something that perhaps could be further explored to see what's possible and what's not possible. If it's possible then why not consider it in a positive light, if it's not possible, as Ned Kelly would say, "Such is life".

THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Well, I think we've - I actually had two separate
30 issues; one being the big rurals and one being the North West Coast. I think we've successfully rolled them up together and dealt with those. So are there any other questions from Tribunal members or anything - Julian, from your point of view is there anything you wanted to clarify at this stage, you've got enough to - - -

35 MR TYPE: Well, I did do some modelling on the ALP submission, which I could share with you if you want?

THE CHAIRPERSON: Well, it's probably helpful for that to be in the public domain at this point. Is it at that sort of stage where we can - - -
40

MR TYPE: Oh, yes.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes?

45 MR TYPE: Yes. The proposition is basically simple, it's an anti-clockwise movement around the four North West divisions and we start off by adding Port Sorell to Mersey and taking Turners Beach and Forth away from those as suggested by the ALP. It works okay for Mersey. It gives you plus 5 per cent in 2012 for the

Division of Mersey. Moving further westwards, Montgomery gains Forth and Turners Beach and Leith and loses Burnie to the Blythe River as suggested in the ALP suggestion, but retains the hinterland of the City of Burnie. Unfortunately, that moves Montgomery to minus 25 per cent in 2012. There just aren't enough people there.

Murchison, again as suggested, gains the entire City of Burnie, but not the southern hinterland and loses the West Coast to Rowallan. That puts Murchison at plus 23 per cent in 2012. Rowallan gains the West Coast having lost Port Sorell and the remaining rural balance of Latrobe and it moves to minus 1 per cent. So the problem essentially is that you've got Montgomery at minus 25 per cent, Murchison at plus 23 per cent, and the inevitable implication of that is that Burnie remains a city divided. You may change the Shorewell Creek line, but you're going to have to find another line in the City of Burnie that probably is not much better than Shorewell Creek.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Well, there's food for thought for us in all of that obviously. Is there anything you'd want us to take away from that suggestion?

MR DOWLING: If I may through you, Mr Chair, to Julian - - -

THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes. Sure.

MR DOWLING: Did you simply test what – yes, no, it's normally there because – there's swings and roundabouts – what, adding Forth, Turners Beach, and Leith into Montgomery and then Mersey and then if you left – so that would put Montgomery too far over then I guess?

MR TYPE: It puts Montgomery way down - - -

MR DOWLING: No, I'm saying that if you put – if it was possible for either – to have a two-out-of-three win or a one-out-of-three win in terms of whether – what would happen to Rowallan if Port Sorell was out – that means Rowallan would go too far to - - -

MR TYPE: Rowallan and Mersey work okay.

MR DOWLING: Yes.

MR TYPE: But your proposition cannot unify the City of Burnie, it's - - -

MR DOWLING: Yes. No, and I accept what you're saying there, yes.

MR TYPE: You're still going to have a dividing line - - -

MR DOWLING: Through Burnie.

MR TYPE: Through Burnie, based on your proposition – based on your series of propositions in your submission, just a different line.

MR DOWLING: Yes.

THE CHAIRPERSON: But it would unify Port Sorell and Devonport and Turners Beach and Ulverstone?

5

MR TYPE: Correct. And I could speculate, but this is straight off the top of my head, that the line might move to Mount Road.

10 MR DOWLING: Yes. A bit further west to Surrey – east to Surrey Road would probably just about do the trick knowing the area quite well, but yes - - -

MR TYPE: But that's when you go to the Blythe River, you have your minus 25 plus 23.

15 MR DOWLING: Yes, I understand that.

MR TYPE: And that's even leaving the hinterland in Montgomery.

20 MR DOWLING: Yes. All right.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Can we take this any further as far as anyone is concerned? Are we happy to leave it at that? Is there anything from your point of view, John - Doug, that you want to sum up?

25 MR DOWLING: It was just a final thing - and I know it's mentioned in our submission, but just to – it's only a very, very small part. If the Tribunal considers and accepts our submission in terms of South Hobart and Sandy Bay there was just a very small area – I think it's called Albuera Street? I might have the pronunciation wrong.

30

THE CHAIRPERSON: Albuera?

MR PARKINSON: Albuera.

35 MR DOWLING: Yes, Albuera Road would need to be included - that's just slightly in a different CCD, included in that South Hobart area.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay.

40 MR DOWLING: Yes, there was just - - -

THE CHAIRPERSON: All right, well, we'll make a mental note of that.

45 MR DOWLING: Yes, and it's mentioned in our submission, because there's about 20 or 30 residents there that are not – their CCD doesn't quite fit the CCD maps, if you know what I mean.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. All right, well, thank you very much for that. All right, I think that's brought us to the end. So again thank you for the thought that you've put into the submissions, thank you for coming along here today and changing the time, and the next step for us is to take it away and to apply our minds to what the possibilities might be for the purposes of coming up with a further proposal. Thank you.

MR DOWLING: Thank you.

MR PARKINSON: Thanks for the opportunity.

MR DOWLING: Thanks for the opportunity.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

MS GILLAM: Thank you.

MR DOWLING: Thanks to the Tribunal.

<THE WITNESSES WITHDREW

THE CHAIRPERSON: I know we've got some other people here, so we might adjourn for a little while just to sort out what's happening next with these people.

ADJOURNED [3.12 pm]

RESUMED [3.20 pm]

<MR JAMES WALKER, CALLED

THE CHAIRPERSON: Mr Walker, thanks very much for making some time to come along. I'm sorry we weren't able to accommodate you at the time that we thought we might've been able to, but once we'd sorted everything out, I'm glad that you're here.

MR WALKER: Thanks for fitting me in. I appreciate it.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. I won't go through the background of all the process to this point, but I will just say that so far as you're concerned today, there's two things. One is that if you want us to hear any matters in private, we have that capacity. This is a public inquiry, but we can hear matters in private if you would like that. Secondly, we're not proposing to swear people in or anything like that, but

if there are documents that you want us to take account of, the Act actually says that they need to be tendered and verified by oath. So bear that in that mind, I suppose

MR WALKER: Okay. I shan't be tabling any documents at this stage.

5

THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. A final sort of preliminary thing, obviously we're recording the proceedings, there'll be a transcript, and we're proposing to publish that on the internet with your consent and likewise in relation to your original submission, if that's acceptable to you?

10

MR WALKER: Yes, that's fine.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. From here, we will be putting together a further proposal which we're aiming to publish on 12 April. If we're successful in that then we need to make a determination as to whether or not it's significantly different from the original proposal from the committee. If it is significantly different then we go through another set of rights of objection and hearings and so on. If it's not then we can make a final determination without any other appeal and so on.

15

MR WALKER: Okay. I haven't been here today, but can you let me know if there have been any big quantum shifts in thinking as a part of today's process or - - -

20

THE CHAIRPERSON: All we're doing today is hearing what people have got to say. We've got some time scheduled to take it away and have a think about the consequences of all the submissions that have been made. The way that things are heading at the moment we will need to make a decision as to whether or not there's a significant difference, but it's quite likely that there will be.

25

MR WALKER: Sure. Okay. Can I ask how many submissions were received in total?

30

THE CHAIRPERSON: I think it was 14 - - -

MR MURPHY: Twelve.

35

MR WALKER: Twelve?

THE CHAIRPERSON: Twelve.

MR WALKER: Okay. A good thing a whole lot of university students didn't get together and decide to create some mischief.

40

THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes, true enough. Okay. Now, so far as the opportunity today, perhaps you can assume that we have your documents in front of us, so you don't need to read them all to us, but if there's anything you would particularly like to point out from your submission, we then take an opportunity to ask you questions about it, and give you then an opportunity to sum up.

45

MR WALKER: Sure.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Over to you.

5 MR WALKER: Okay. Well, as you can probably see from my submission, it was a fairly brief one and it is specifically just pertaining to Pembroke and not to the other divisions as a whole. I've got a long association with that electorate, sort of having been born and raised here and, you know, I understand that the House was reformed, you know, roundabout 1995 I believe, but up till then the seats were even - you
10 know, quite wild with their distributions and historically from my understanding, you know, Pembroke has always been a seat that's had far more - or more people in it than the average and under the redistribution proposals that will continue to be the case. Looking at I think 2012, we take on more people so that by that stage we are - is it 1.6 per cent over the quota at that time?

15

THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes, that's right.

MR WALKER: Okay. So I mean, that will mean again - looking at the figures, we're over now at the moment and the distribution is planning to increase that by
20 possibly 500 I think and so we'll be over as soon as the proposed changes go through and we'll get to 2012 and we'll still continue to be over. So my point to make is that there are - you know, that part of the process, ours - and priority 1 at the moment is saying even or as close to even as we can get in 2012 and just to sort of say that I think that some weight should be put on to the continuum of seats being either
25 underrepresented or overrepresented and to also point out that it is - the projections that are set there are to say that it won't be growing at the same rate as some of the others, but I'm just not sure that that will be the case.

I've noted that currently Clarence Council has a proposal before I think the Planning
30 Commission to rezone a big section of Gordons Hill Road, which was, you know, vacant parts of a golf course. That's going to be going into - their proposal, as I understand it, is to let that into high-density aged care. That's going to push the numbers up. So my point is to come here to say that these are some factors that I think should be considered and that yes, I would like to see us, you know, as close as
35 we can to being neutral and historically - given our history of being a seat that's had more voters than the average, I'm just wondering whether it would be the worst thing in the world if we were maybe half a per cent under by 2012 or 2018.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Sure. Okay. Well, thanks for that. I understand what
40 you're putting to us and I guess the starting point in the legislation is 10 per cent and we would like I guess to get as close as we can to zero per cent.

MR WALKER: Sure.

45 THE CHAIRPERSON: But even saying that, 1.6 is - that's pretty close in terms of - some of the other electorates are further out than that, but - - -

MR WALKER: Yes. No, I note that and - - -

THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes.

MR WALKER: I note that. Just the historical history of it being over balanced - - -

5 THE CHAIRPERSON: Sure

MR WALKER: Never by what would seem – well, I don't think it's possibly been that radical since '95, but I think the old seat sort of used to take in Sorell, is that correct, or it did go out quite wide?

10

THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes.

MR WALKER: Yes. And I'd just also like to put on note that I – you know, I think that it has been – the process of trying to put things together, I understand and respect trying to keep, you know, the Clarence areas within the seat and the other aspects I understand and respect, yes.

15

THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Thank you for that.

20 MR WALKER: That's all right.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Any questions for Mr Walker? Anything? No?

MR TAYLOR: You are arguing largely on the basis of the numbers. What are your thoughts about the proposed boundary aside from the numbers, if you like, in that it does propose to go along the hillside? There has been some minor expansion along the top of the hills behind Geilston Bay and Lindisfarne which mean that some houses associated with that area are in Rumney rather than in Pembroke when they associate down into there, so there was some effort to try and improve the boundary as far as defining a population group and at the same time I guess uniting Mornington back with what is commonly I think a part of Mornington or the upper part of Warrane, if you like, rather than using the new highway as a boundary, using that natural boundary of the hills in that development that goes out - - -

25

30

MR WALKER: Well, a couple of things. I think that the shaded – I mean, the shaded sort of blue area that is part of Geilston Bay, it's an interesting sort of part of the world once you get through that area of Risdon Vale, it is – you know, it is growing really fast and I would imagine that would've been one of the drivers for the big growth in the seat of Derwent, some of the in-field sort of along that road there. I can understand that Mornington would feel more Pembroke than Rumney, but I probably suspect that wherever that dividing line is there and you cross it, those people are going to probably feel more Pembroke than Rumney anyway considering that it goes all the way to Nubeena and beyond.

40

So yes, look, I can understand why you want to put those groups together and on the basis of where they would associate, I would note and acknowledge the rationale behind it, but again I would just come down and say it's a numbers game, we've always been overrepresented, you know, in the totality of things, it wouldn't kill us

45

to have a per cent below if need be. I don't think we're ever going to be one of those seats that exceeds 10 per cent.

5 THE CHAIRPERSON: There's one issue that sort of arises from what you're putting to us and that's the extent to which we can rely on things like subdivisions that we're aware of for the extent of projections.

MR WALKER: Sure.

10 THE CHAIRPERSON: The process we've adopted up until now has been not to rely on any of that until we actually know that they're definite and those things are happening because the advice that we've had from the City of Clarence is that whilst there is this proposal underway in relation to the Rosny Park Golf Course there is also more significant ones underway in relation to Clarendon Vale and those sorts of
15 things as well. So it's a little difficult for us to take these anecdotal matters into too much consideration. I don't know if there's anything you want to add to that, Cassie, in terms of the - - -

20 MS SHORT: Just to say that, you know, the ABS helped out obviously with the population projections and while we don't take into account specific developments like, say, the Gordons Hill Road one, where there are areas of known expansion then that is assumed that it will continue, so in terms of a general trend. So if I take the example of the southern beaches – for instance, Sorell southern beaches, that's an area that's growing. So the assumption would be that that's going to continue and
25 therefore, you know, appear in the projections.

MR WALKER: Yes. Okay. Again, I don't have it quite to hand, but if I could just get that on record the exact – if Clarence remains unchanged, it is going to be half a per cent below the projected average or point 5? Okay, it's less than – the variance
30 will be less than point 5 if we leave it as it is by 2012?

THE CHAIRPERSON: Are you talking about Pembroke- - -

35 MR TYPE: Minus point 65.

MR WALKER: Point 65.

MR TYPE: Minus 0.65 of 1 per cent.

40 MR WALKER: Okay. So you will be under – yes, all right. So the variance will be point 65 of a per cent - - -

MR TYPE: Rumney would be plus 3.33 per cent.

45 MR WALKER: Sure. Yes. Okay. Still within the 10, but I understand why you're wanting to get it more even.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes. Okay. We're looking at the table on page 13 of the initial reasons for all of that and appendix 1.

MR WALKER: 2012, that's fine.

5

MR MURPHY: We've got a set of booklets, would you like - - -

MR WALKER: Great. Yes. Okay, that's fine. No, look, I think for what it's worth I've made my point and I've enjoyed the opportunity to do so, so I – you know, I'm happy to take any further questions, but I don't think there's more I can add except that with only 12 submissions, yes, I wonder what sort of mischief people could get up to with things like requesting name changes, etcetera.

10

THE CHAIRPERSON: Sure. Okay, well, that's for us to worry about.

15

MR WALKER: Yes.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Thanks again for taking the trouble to make the submission and thanks also for being here this afternoon to clarify it for us. We appreciate that and it's good that you've done it, so thank you.

20

MR WALKER: Thanks.

25 **<THE WITNESS WITHDREW**

THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Unless there's anything else that anybody else wants to raise at this point - no? Okay, well, we'll adjourn now.

30

**MATTER ADJOURNED at 3.33 pm UNTIL
THURSDAY,, 27 MARCH 2008 IN LAUNCESTON**

Index of Witness Events

MS PENELOPE IKEDIFE, CALLED THE WITNESS WITHDREW	P-3 P-7
MR IAN BOOTH, CALLED THE WITNESS WITHDREW	P-7 P-13
THE HON JIM WILKINSON MLC, CALLED THE WITNESS WITHDREW	P-13 P-22
MR JOHN DOWLING and THE HON DOUG PARKINSON MLC, CALLED THE WITNESSES WITHDREW	P-22 P-44
MR JAMES WALKER, CALLED THE WITNESS WITHDREW	P-44 P-49

Index of Exhibits and MFIs

--	--