

AUSCRIPT AUSTRALASIA PTY LIMITED

ACN 110 028 825

T: 1800 AUSCRIPT (1800 287 274)

E: clientservices@auscript.com.au

W: www.auscript.com.au

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

O/N H-629669

AUSTRALIAN ELECTORAL COMMISSION

NEW SOUTH WALES

REDISTRIBUTION PUBLIC HEARING

PRESIDING: **THE HON D COWDROY OAM QC**
 (Chairperson of the Australian Electoral Commission)
 MR D KALISCH
 (Australian Statistician and member of the Australian Electoral
 Commission)
 MR T ROGERS
 (Electoral Commissioner, Australian Electoral Commission)
 MR D ORR
 (Australian Electoral Officer for New South Wales, Australian
 Electoral Commission)
 MR T WHITFIELD PSM
 (Acting Auditor-General of New South Wales)
 MR D MOONEY
 (Surveyor General of New South Wales)

LOCATION: **WESLEY CONFERENCE CENTRE**
 220 PITT STREET
 SYDNEY, NEW SOUTH WALES

DATE: **9.37 AM, WEDNESDAY, 16 DECEMBER 2015**

CHAIRPERSON: Welcome to this hearing for the Australian Electoral Commission for NSW, that is, the augmented Commission. This is the first of two hearings which are to be held in relation to the proposed redistribution. Today in Sydney and on Friday this week the augmented Commission goes to Port Macquarie. Let me
5 introduce who is on this table: my name is Dennis Cowdroy, I am the chairman of the Australian Electoral Commission.

The other members present are Mr David Kalisch, immediately on my right, who is the Commonwealth Statistician. Mr Tom Rogers on my left is the Commissioner,
10 that is the Electoral Commissioner. The other members who make up the augmented Commission are Mr Tony Whitfield, the acting Auditor-General of NSW on my far right, and to my far left is Mr Doug Orr, the NSW Officer of the Australian Electoral Commission, and to his right is Mr Des Mooney, the Surveyor
15 General for NSW.

There is also present AEC staff who have come from Canberra and also from the Sydney office. Might I point out that the proposed redistribution and in fact all redistribution is governed strictly by Part 4 of the Commonwealth Electoral Act
20 1918. That sets out the specific requirements for a redistribution. The redistribution in New South Wales is required because the number of members of the House of Representatives for New South Wales at the next general election will be reduced from 48 to 47.

In accordance with section 66 of the Electoral Act the Redistribution Committee, which is not the augmented Commission but rather the Redistribution Committee for
25 NSW, has prepared a proposal for redistribution for the 47 federal electoral divisions. The proposal, together with the written reasons for the proposal which are required by section 67 of the Act was released by the Redistribution Committee on the 16th of October 2015.

In accordance with section 68 of the Electoral Act, interested persons and organisations were invited to make written objections on the proposed redistribution and to provide comments on those objections. A total of 791 objections and 26
35 comments on objections were received by the Commission in the timeframe. The augmented Electoral Commission is required by section 72 (1) of the Commonwealth Electoral Act to consider all objections in relation to the redistribution proposal and all comments on objections.

The inquiry here today and the inquiry in Port Macquarie provide the opportunity for
40 members of the public to make oral submissions concerning those objections. The Commonwealth Electoral Act specifies how the redistribution process is to be conducted and which factors are to be taken into account. Subsection 73(4) of the Electoral Act states that the primary consideration for the augmented Electoral Commission is that each electoral division meet certain numerical requirements in
45 the form of the current enrolment quota and the projected enrolment quota and the permissible ranges within those two quotas.

Subject to an electoral division satisfying the numerical requirements, section 73, subsection (4) also requires that we have regard to communities of interest.

“Communities of interest” is the economic, social and regional interests. We have regard to communication and travel, physical features of the areas. The existing
5 boundaries are also considered, although that is, as provided by the Act, of lesser importance. Boundaries may change, and often there is to be compensating adjustments to be made to ensure that the electoral divisions comply with the numerical requirements, which is the paramount consideration.

10 The inquiry here today will be recorded and transcripts will be available as part of the augmented Electoral Commission’s report, and it will be on the Australian Electoral Commission’s website. We would ask people who are making submissions to come to the table in front and please state their name before they commence their presentation. The augmented Commission’s function is to listen to the submissions
15 rather than to debate any issue.

So we will all be very interested to know and to listen to your views, and may I assure you that they will all be taken into consideration in the augmented Commission’s deliberations as to whether it should adopt in whole or in part the
20 proposal formulated by the Redistribution Committee. After this inquiry concludes, the augmented Commission will consider the submissions raised orally, we will finalise our considerations hopefully by 26 January 2016, and we will endeavour to make a public announcement as soon as practicable.

25 In view of the large number of persons who have indicated that they would like to address us, we would ask you that possibly, if possible, keep your submissions as brief as possible. We are well aware that many have work commitments, and therefore we will proceed as rapidly as possible. Now, there are two speakers who have indicated that they need to get away urgently, and perhaps I will call upon the
30 first one immediately, Mr Bruce MacCarthy. Is Mr MacCarthy available? Mr MacCarthy, if you would like to come up to the table here. If you would state for the record, please, because it is being transcribed, your full name and your particular role or interest.

35 MR B. MacCARTHY: Yes. Good morning. Thank you for the opportunity. My name is Bruce Edward MacCarthy, M-a-c, capital C. I’m grateful for the opportunity of talking to you about the location of the boundary between the Divisions of Reid and Grayndler. I’ve lived in what’s now the Division of Reid for about 66 years. I grew up in Croydon. When I became engaged in 1974, my wife and her family lived
40 in Drummoyne, and after we were married, we lived at Homebush for a few years, and we’ve lived at our current address in Concord West since 1978.

I said in my written objections that, as far I could remember, suburbs of Drummoyne, Russell Lea and Rodd Point have always been in the same Commonwealth division
45 as the suburbs of Five Dock, Chiswick, Abbotsford and Wareemba. My personal memory goes back to the 1960s when I think Malcolm Mackay was the member for

Evans, and then when Evans was subsumed into the then electorate of Lowe, the same situation existed, and since Lowe was subsumed into Reid, similarly.

5 Now, since then I've learnt that not only does it go back as far as I can remember, but this situation has existed since Federation. And, likewise, not only have Drummoyne and Rodd Point and Russell Lea been in the same subdivision – the same Division as Five Dock and those other suburbs that I mentioned, for about 40 years, they've been in the same electoral division as where I now live in Concord West. A number of objections that you would have seen make the same point, and
10 Jeanette York is one that I recall, and her number was number 86 – objection 86. And Dr Mark Mulcair, I think it might be pronounced, objection number 401, and several others made that point.

15 So against – while I accept what you have said, that the existing boundaries is of lesser importance, I think giving due consideration to that, the suburbs of Drummoyne, Russell Lea and Rodd Point should remain in the Division of Reid. Obviously I know numbers are important, but I believe that, subject to that, boundary changes should be kept to the minimum. And given that it's already proposed that the south-western boundaries of the existing electorate of Reid be altered, I believe
20 that that's where the adjustment should take place. And that objection that I mentioned of Dr Mulcair includes a similar suggestion, as does one from a resident of Lidcombe, a Ms Tanti.

25 In terms of the physical features, there's not much that I should add to my written submission. To me, it is self-evident that physically Drummoyne, Russell Lea and Rodd Point are closely linked to the nearby suburbs of Reid like Chiswick, Abbotsford, Wareemba and Five Dock than they are to such suburbs as Balmain, Rozelle and Leichhardt. And not only that, but by departing from the geographical boundaries, the current proposal leaves the boundaries – leaves some boundaries
30 along relatively minor roads, and this point is also made in the submission by Dr Mulcair.

I would like to comment on the objection by the ALP that says that there's a strong geographical link between the suburbs of Five Dock, Haberfield, Russell Lea,
35 Drummoyne and Rodd Point and the suburbs of Leichhardt Local Government Area. While it's true that Balmain and Rozelle are riverside suburbs and Leichhardt is also to some extent, the same can be said for a number of other suburbs, for example, those on the northern side of Parramatta River. It would be just as logical to include suburbs like Meadowbank and Ryde in the same electorate as Abbotsford, Mortlake,
40 Concord, just as was the case some years ago with the electorate of Lowe.

That objection also refers to the Bay Run around Iron Cove, but the fact that people use a particular sporting facility doesn't necessarily give a community of interest between the residents of the suburbs which surround that facility. For example, I'm
45 aware of people in the Strathfield Local Government area who regularly use the Bay Run. Similarly, the fact that there are several rowing clubs on the Parramatta River does not itself demonstrate a community of interest between the residents of

Leichhardt Local Government Area and those of Canada Bay. Any community of interest that exists because of the rowing clubs is the community of people who row. And there's no evidence that the clubs in question draw their membership only from the two local government Areas.

5

Years ago, when I rowed for my school out of the Leichhardt Rowing Club, I was living in Croydon and my school was at Homebush, and any such community of interest will still be stronger between the people of Drummoyne, Russell Lea and Rodd Point and those of Abbotsford, Chiswick, Five Dock, Concord and so on. If one is going to refer to recreational facilities, one might point out that the fact that golfers in those areas that are proposed to be excluded, Drummoyne, Russell Lea and Rodd Point, would typically look to the remainder of Reid for their recreation because the nearby golf courses are in Five Dock, in Concord and in Strathfield.

10

15

Talking about the means of communication and travel, as I said in my written submission, Drummoyne and Russell Lea in particular are linked to Five Dock by Lyons Road, a major road on which the 492 bus route travels on its way to Burwood. I also mention the Parramatta River service ferries which links Drummoyne with other riverside suburbs, such as Chiswick, Abbotsford, Cabarita and Sydney Olympic Park. And I understand a further ferry stop is planned for Rhodes.

20

25

In this regard, I might comment on the objection by the ALP that talks about a regular daily – daily ferry services travelling between Drummoyne, Balmain and the city. However, if you look at the relevant timetable, you will find that the services which stop at wharves in the current Division of Reid, Sydney Olympic Park, Cabarita, Abbotsford, Chiswick and Drummoyne generally do not stop at riverside wharves in Leichhardt, those of Birchgrove and Balmain, although some stop at Cockatoo Island, but that's a place where very few people, if any, reside permanently. There is an exception in a late night service on Saturdays and Sundays and public holidays where some services to those in Reid stop at Birchgrove and Balmain, but that is the exception rather than the rule.

30

35

The ALP submission also refers to a number of bus services which it says links the suburbs of Five Dock, Haberfield, etcetera, with suburbs in Leichhardt, but most of those services as mentioned are services which head to the city. And naturally, because Leichhardt is between Canada Bay and the city obviously the buses go through, but many of those services, particularly the express buses, have few services stopping at fewer stops in Leichhardt than they do in Canada Bay. Indeed the very first route quoted in that objection, the X04 is an evening peak hour service which although it travels through Leichhardt does stop there at all.

40

45

Community of interest. I believe there can be no doubt that the suburbs Drummoyne, Russell Lea and Rodd Point have a much greater community of interest with the other suburbs of Canada Bay, Burwood and Strathfield than they do with the suburbs of the Leichhardt local government area. This is recognised, for example, by the publishers of the local newspaper the Inner-West Courier which runs an inner-city edition circulating in places like Balmain, Rozelle and Leichhardt and a separate

inner-west edition circulating in such suburbs as Drummoyne, Russell Lea, Rodd Point, Five Dock, Concord, Burwood, Strathfield.

5 It's also recognised by the Drummoyne Community Centre in Canada Bay which runs a – Canada Bay City Council which runs what's called the BayRider bus shuttle service. This service is a community service which collects passengers from their home to take them to various places. And I found the website of this and it demonstrates the places where it will take people to. And it's not an exhaustive list, of course, but it mentions places like Five Dock and Concord libraries, Concord
10 Hospital, the Five Dock the Concord and the Rhodes shopping centres, the movies at Rhodes and medical appointments in Burwood. In this website there is not one reference to any place in the Leichhardt local government area. So there's the Drummoyne community service and the City of Canada Bay recognising where people in Drummoyne want to do.

15 The ALP objection also refers to connection between people of Italian ancestry living in the suburbs of Five Dock, Haberfield, Russell Lea, Drummoyne, Rodd Point and "Leichhardt's status at the birthplace of Italian migration to Sydney". Now, obviously there are large number of people with Italian ancestry in the suburbs
20 mentioned, but this is also the case in Concord where I live. I've got no strong personal connections to the Italian community, but it's my understanding that the Italian community would now see Five Dock as its centre, and this is demonstrated by the annual Ferragosto Festival celebrated in Five Dock each year. So people with Italian heritage in Drummoyne, Russell Lea and Rodd Point would have more
25 community of interest with Five Dock than they would with Leichhardt.

I will just mention in conclusion just a couple of things about – that I also saw in the ALP submission. It talks about demography and has referred to demographic data showing similarities between some suburbs of Leichhardt and some suburbs of
30 Canada Bay. But obviously to me, selective data has been presented as their submission doesn't contain figures for other suburbs in Reid such as Abbotsford, Wareemba, Chiswick, Concord, Burwood, Strathfield, and so on. And the figures quoted are not sufficient to demonstrate that Drummoyne, for example, has significantly more in common with the suburbs of Leichhardt than it does with the
35 other suburbs currently in Reid.

The objection also refers to Birkenhead Point which it talks about being a large-scale regional retail destination. I think that is gilding the lily a little bit. It says it draws its primary customer base from residents within particular suburbs, but it later
40 contradicts itself by saying that Birkenhead Point caters for consumers across the inner-west, which would indicate that it's also relevant to other people. Moreover, I think the point that I made about the bay bus – shuttle bus service – it didn't mention Birkenhead Point as a shopping centre. It mentioned three other much bigger and much more significant shopping centres, namely, Burwood, Rhodes and the like.

45 So again, I think when it talks about sporting clubs it again presents selective information. It mentions some sporting clubs in the Leichhardt local government

area which participate in the same competitions as some clubs in suburbs like Russell Lea, Five Dock and so on, but it doesn't mention clubs in other areas of Canada Bay and in suburbs in Burwood and Strathfield which also participate in the same competitions. For example, the website of the Concord Junior Soccer Club states
5 that it fields teams in the Canterbury and District Soccer Football Association, which takes in such areas as Drummoyne, Balmain, Leichhardt, and Five Dock, Abbotsford, Concord, Strathfield and Burwood. This would suggest that sporting ties link Drummoyne and Russell Lea and Rodd Point just as strongly in those suburbs which are in Reid.

10 Similarly, reference to netball clubs does not mention Greenlees Netball Club based in Concord – the club for which my two – two of my daughters played in their youth – Concord Briars Netball Club of Burwood United Netball Club. All of which are mentioned on the website of the Inner-West Suburbs Netball Association. So in brief
15 – in summary, when I look at the existing boundaries, the physical features, the means of communication, community of interest I can see no sound reason for taking these three suburbs Drummoyne, Rodd Point and Russell Lea out of Reid. While some adjustment to the boundaries are obviously necessary, I think it's important and best achieved by maintaining strong natural boundaries, such as the boundaries of the
20 Parramatta Rive and Iron Cove and the strong man-made boundaries such as the Hume Highway.

Obviously, I think it's appropriate that additional electors have been included in Reid by moving the southern boundary down to the Hume highway, but any deletions
25 should come from the south-western areas of Lidcombe and Auburn. These are areas which have no long term historical connections and no community of interest with suburbs like Burwood, Strathfield, Concord and Drummoyne. And there are few geographical links between the south-west of the currently proposed Division and the majority of the Division.

30 Residents in those areas are separated from the areas of Burwood and Strathfield by the vast bulk or Rookwood Cemetery and they have nothing in common with the riverside suburbs such as Concord, Rhodes, Abbotsford, Wareemba and Five Dock. And in conclusion, I will note that when submissions were originally made the ALP
35 said that an Auburn based Division combined with Canada Bay fails on community grounds, and I couldn't have said that better myself. Thank you, gentlemen.

40 CHARIPERSON: Thank you very much, Mr MacCarthy, for your views. They have been recorded and they will certainly be considered by us all. Thank you. Mr Craig Laundry MP. Mr Laundry, just for the record, would you mind stating your full name and your – of course, your position?

45 MR C.A.S LAUNDY: Yes. Thank you Chair. My name is Craig Arthur Samuel Laundry and I am the Federal Member for Reid.

CHAIRPERSON: Yes.

MR LAUNDY: Chair, I wanted to talk a little bit today. Obviously you will come up with a decision that affects the boundaries within which I operate. It's my job then to operate and I've been raised to talk very practically and pragmatically and I've had two years now of having the honour of being the member for Reid and I
5 wanted to talk in support of the objection raised by the Liberal Party quite clearly. If you go back to 2010, I – four generations of my family have called Strathfield home and Mr MacCarthy made mention of the fact that historically the Hume Highway for the 44 years of my life as far as I can remember has been a boundary to the federal electorate of Lowe and – well Lowe pending 2010 when this was changed to Barker
10 Road in Strathfield when Strathfield Burwood and Croydon were effectively cut in half.

And two years ago I was elected and what is not spoken about a lot – I know community of interest and easily definable minimal changes to boundaries, but what
15 I wanted to talk a bit about today was confusion of voters. And for the last two years, and I would suggest because of this for the last six I wanted to just quickly read you an email I received this morning at 7.49:

*Dear Mr Laundy. I have just heard on the radio that the government has
20 announced cuts to aged care yesterday. With two parents about to be in need to aged care I was hoping that you would be able to send me some information about that changes. Thank you in advance.*

That is a resident of 32 Newton Road Strathfield. That is in Watson. For the last
25 two years I have been the federal member for the other half of Strathfield, Burwood and Croydon. Why? Because they don't know that I'm not. And it's not in my nature to turn my back on anyone in need to help. It would be easy to say, "I'm not your federal member"; however, it's just not my nature. And the reason that is the case is that there have been clearly defined boundaries for long periods of time.

30 Mr MacCarthy made mention of the Drummoyne peninsula and the fact that it dates back to Federation. Of the 23 submissions that your Committee received, not one of those submissions suggested that the Drummoyne peninsula be touched in any way. It is indeed a Federation boundary. Even Labor, as Mr MacCarthy said at the end
35 and I couldn't put it better – any better, that side of the electorate should remain in touch – intact. Now, we have a situation in Labor's response that we get a series of reasons based on bus routes, which are not terminating in Grayndler and sporting clubs as Mr MacCarthy again has eloquently covered.

40 And the major sporting club of the Drummoyne peninsula, which is taken out of my electorate as a result of these changes is Drummoyne Rugby Club. And I can tell you that for four years, my son, Charlie, played rugby for Drummoyne Rugby Club. We did not head south at all. We headed west to Western Suburbs Rugby Club, which is in Concord, to play them and over the river to play other clubs like Hunters
45 Hill. It's important to note that in dealing with federal boundaries we have an obligation to change them. I get why we're changing them minimalistically; so that we don't confuse people. The submission that – or the draft boundaries that have

been presented to me go to solving the problem that I've been dealing with for the last two years in terms of Strathfield, Burwood and Croydon.

5 But if they proceed as slated, I will end up with 14,000 new residents of my electorate that are technically in the division of Grayndler for the same reason as I've seen for the last two years in the other half of Strathfield, Burwood and Croydon. Well, that is it in a nutshell. As I say, I wanted to speak pragmatically about how that – how it actually operates on the coal face, on the front lines pending the outcome of the changes that you will ultimately decide. It is my strong, strong
10 submission that a Federation boundary like the Drummoyne peninsula in which all 23 submissions to the original process suggested stay intact, indeed stay intact. I don't want to go over old ground.

I had a lot more to say but Mr MacCarthy covered it very eloquently and I know that
15 time is of the essence but I would be a strong, strong supporter of the objection that the Liberal Party has placed. And, at the last – I guess I will finish by saying that the submissions from the Greens, the Labor Party and the Liberal Party to this process initially, all had the Drummoyne peninsula and the suburbs of Drummoyne peninsula, Russell Lea and Five Dock staying – Rodd Point staying in place. That
20 represents 94 per cent of the primary vote in my seat at the last election. Now, I'm not a statistician but that is an overwhelming number that when the parties representing 94 per cent of the people in my electorate are in consensus on what a Federation boundary should be and should be maintained, I think it is an
25 overwhelmingly strong case for that to be the case.

CHAIRPERSON: Yes.

MR LAUNDY: Thank you very much.

30 CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much, Mr Laundy. Now, I think the next speaker is Valentine Tyson. Mr Tyson, please come up and have a seat. If you could just state for the record, Mr Tyson, your full name and your locality or your particular interest.

35 MR V. TYSON: Yes, thank you. Valentine John Tyson. I live in Bowral which is in the heart of the electorate – Federal electorate of Throsby. I get why we have to have these boundary changes. I mean, I'm sure all Australians do. And I'm here to object to Division of Throsby being changed to the name of Whitlam.

40 I certainly don't have any objection to the Honourable E.G. Whitlam having an electorate named after him. He's a good Australian. However, this is the 200th year that Dr Charles Throsby started exploring the Illawarra and the Southern Highlands of New South Wales and not many people know that. At least that I've found out that not many people know it and I think that's probably one of the most important
45 reasons why it should stay as Throsby. There were three – there are other electorates around there. There is Hume and there is Macarthur. Both of these electorates are

named after famous explorers in the early days. Indeed, Hamilton Hume is an Australian, born in Australia.

5 Now, these electorates have always been together. Indeed, back in 1818, Throsby and Hume explored together and in 1821, Throsby and Macarthur explored together. For all of those reasons – from Camden down to Jervis Bay and then inland down to Goulburn and through to Yass and everything in between – Macarthur’s not been threatened as taking away the name of that electorate and neither is Hume and I don’t think Throsby should be either. Just in the middle of that, I mean, we don’t think – a
10 lot of people in our electorate don’t think we’ve got enough time to object to this. I, myself, only found out within two weeks of the closing date of the objections and made mine but there are many people that didn’t and I’m sure if the original Commission had dared to put out a lot of notice about this, it would’ve been a lot of submissions.

15 Regardless of Throsby being a safe Labor seat, the people are aware that Throsby is a famous name in the electorate. There are still people named Throsby living in the Illawarra and in the Southern Highlands. The Throsby manor is still in Moss Vale. After Dell Throsby died a few years ago, the property passed into the hands of the
20 New South Wales government but has recently been long term leased to a Throsby returning from Europe. There are also many families that are not Throsbys way back when Throsby opened up the lush lands of the Illawarra to farming and dairying and then later made submissions to Governor Macquarie for grants to other farmers so they could make and produce food because back in those days in the early 1800s, the
25 Illawarra was starving for food.

And it was Throsby who started farming, cattle farming and then dairying and then with his efforts through Governor Macquarie, got land grants for other farmers to produce food in that region. And there are still families producing food in the
30 Illawarra and the Southern Highlands that go back to those people, some of them on the same property. The Throsbys were kindly and friendly to the Indigenous people. Their property at Moss Vale was often used for corroborees where hundreds of people would gather, have their fun and their time and enjoyment and then go back to where they came from, and that was held on regular occasions when it was
35 required. As I said before, five generations of Throsbys lived in the region since 1815 and there are still Throsbys there.

I just think that as much as I’ve said about Mr Whitlam deserving having something named after him, I just don’t think – and lots of people in this region do not think –
40 that Throsby is the seat to give the Whitlam name. I’m not proposing to tell you how to do your work but imploring you to look further and see if we can find something for Mr Whitlam, maybe in Melbourne. That’s where he was born, he’s originally a Victorian. I understand that Werriwa is a Federation seat so it cannot be changed. So I don’t know what you can do there but I would just love to see Throsby, Hume
45 and Macarthur stay together and lots of our people in the region want that. Those three men explored a lot of New South Wales and it’s – since boundaries have been

boundaries, those three have had collective boundaries together and I just don't think it's – after 200 years, it's ripe for the picking. I thank you very much for your time.

CHAIRPERSON: Yes. Thank you. Thank you, Mr Tyson, for your contribution.
5 The next speaker is Leanne Morrison. Ms Morrison, if you would be good enough please to state your full name and your particular interest.

MS L. MORRISON: Mr Chairman, Leone Marianne Morrison.

10 CHAIRPERSON: Yes.

MS MORRISON: Paddington. And I'm concerned about cutting our community of Wentworth into Sydney. I'm speaking to the natural homogenous qualities of the suburb of Paddington and why we should stay as a complete suburb in the electorate
15 of Wentworth on the grounds of section 66(3)(b) point (i), community of interest and point (iv) consideration given to the physical features of the area. Paddington was an outpost of early Sydney. A self-sufficient village growing around the Victoria Barracks. It grew from domestic industries like small dairies walking the cows out to the common each day, the brewery on the south side of Oxford Street and the
20 distillery in the Trumper Park area on the northern side and on the light industries of quarrying and small manufacturing spread through the suburb.

Paddington as a whole suburb had its own municipal council till 1948. In modern life we share public schools on both sides of Oxford Street, town hall and library on
25 the north side and the post office across the road on the northern side – south side and northern side, I should say. Churches are on the south side and we do our food shopping on the northern side of Oxford Street. Everyone comes to the south side to see films and we enjoy the café society throughout the suburb. Physically we are of Victorian build reflecting those early days before cars when workers were employed
30 locally and businesses were locally owned and run: little workers cottages and grander terraces for the middle-class.

A suburb planned for walking with Jack living close to his master. Our street plans do not resemble Surry Hills or Moore Park. The big holdings of the 1800s were
35 subdivided into a town plan of a pedestrian community. The Victorian architecture of Paddington does not fit the stadia and the garden suburb of Moore Park. We are a closely settled community and we are very strong as a community enjoying the cosmopolitan lifestyle of suburbia mixed with cultural features: art galleries and art school, café culture and evening entertainments. Our community is a blend of
40 families and single people. We are convenient to work in the city and Paddington is rich in things to do, so as a suburb we work and play close to home.

Finally, my vote is more comfortable sitting in the milieu of Wentworth voters. We are an eastern suburbs residential community. Presently we are fortunate to have the
45 Prime Minister as our local member with access to his office. The New South Wales Government recognises us a whole electorate: why change it for the federal? Thank you for listening to me.

CHAIRPERSON: Yes. Thank you. Thank you, Ms Morrison, for your contribution also. Next, Mr George Christodoulou. Mr Christodoulou, would you please state your full name for the record and your particular interest or locality?

5 MR CHRISTODOULOU: My name is George Christodoulou and I'm a director of the Venus Reception Centre, a small business in the suburb of Kogarah currently within the electoral Division of Barton. First, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to speak. And as a small business owner within the electorate of Barton the redistribution between Barton and Cook has raised concerned within our local
10 businesses and customers. The current Federal Member of Barton Mr Nickolas Varvaris MP has served on Kogarah Council for over 17 years and, in this time, has been a huge supporter of small business in the local area and I am comfortable with my relationship with him has developed via the council, as a federal member and a community member.

15 As a business owner I identify as part the St George region. To be included in the electorate of Cook, a Sutherland Shire dominated electorate, would not truly reflect the interests and issues of the local area or the small businesses located within the new boundaries. Personally, at a function venue we regularly hold events for local
20 sporting, community and social groups. One common denominator is that all these groups and associations identify as part of the St George region. This extends to the local business awards which are awarded to small businesses specifically within the St George region. Additionally, the Electorate of Cook has never been inclusive of the St George region.

25 The electoral Division of Cook has never had to represent the concerns of small businesses within the St George region. I would like to see the establishment – the established relationship develop within – with the federal member and small businesses within the region to continue. The suburb of Kogarah in which my small
30 business is located has always been within the electorate of Barton ever since the – its establishment in 1922, and thus, of course, I would like to see this remain as part of Barton. I sincerely hope you take these concerns into account, and therefore I oppose the current redistribution of the Cook-Barton electorate. Thank you.

35 CHAIRPERSON: Yes. Thank you, for your contribution also, Mr Christodoulou. The next speaker is Brenton Moore and Will Mrongovius, please. Mr Moore and Mr Mrongovius, would you please be good enough to state your full names and you locality or your interest.

40 MR MOORE: Yes. Good morning. My name is Gerald Brenton Hentingmore, known as Brenton Moore. And my resident address is in Paddington.

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

45 MR MRONGOVIUS: Chairman, gentlemen, my name is William Martin Mrongovius. I'm a resident of Paddington.

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

MR MRONGOVIUS: Thank you for the opportunity to raise our concerns with you today. Brenton lives in the part of Paddington which is south Paddington. I'm a
5 resident of west Paddington. These are both sections of Paddington on either side of Victoria Barracks which under the proposed redistribution will be split from the rest of Paddington, which is on the other side of Oxford Street. Before I go on, can I also note that I'm president of the Paddington Society and part of the reason I'm here is to explain why that's relevant. We disagree with this proposal to split Paddington.
10 Paddington clearly complies with section 66(3)(b) of the Act, it has a community of interest as the previous – Leonie Morrison said in her talk.

It is a community. It is one suburb. It is surrounded by – well, I mean, the Moore Park Road is a major arterial road. To cut off a part of Paddington and have that
15 physical barrier is just unbelievable, in a sense, but we can – we understand the purpose of it, but we don't think it's correct. In 1974, Paddington was declared a heritage conservation zone; the first suburb on Australia to have that honour. It's on the National Trust Register. We believe it is incredibly important in this day and age that a heritage suburb like Paddington remain intact at both the state and federal level
20 so that it can be dealt with as one unit.

But apart from that, it is actually a community on both side of Oxford Street, and I think you will have noticed from the up to 300 petitioners that you received on this issue the community is very strongly against this proposed change. We believe
25 there's a simple solution: the boundary should remain as Moore Park Road and then South Dowling Street, and that little section we believe there's only about two and a half thousand people, or voters, as such, and even in the projections we don't see that growing much in the future. It's very tightly populated as it is at the moment. So that's briefly it. We oppose that change. We want to keep Paddington together, so
30 thank you for that. And, Brenton, anything to add?

MR MOORE: No. Simply in summary, if the Commission – or the inquiry would entertain the possible solution to the problem that we pose, which is bring that boundary from Oxford Street down to Moore Park Road Paddington remains one.
35 Simple as that. Thank you, gentlemen, for your time.

CHAIRPERSON: Yes. Thank you very much for your contributions. They will be certainly taken into consideration.

40 MR MRONGOVIUS: Thank you.

MR MOORE: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. The next speaker is Mr John McNamara. Mr
45 McNamara would you also please for the record state your full name and also your particular location or your interest.

MR J.T. McNAMARA: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman. My name is John Thomas McNamara from Exeter, and I represent the Exeter Village Association and the Southern Villages Group, which is also a joint objector to the redistribution within the Throsby and Hume electorates. We make this submission on behalf of the
5 three villages the Southern Villages Group represents. Those villages are Exeter, Bundanoon and Penrose and are to be considered to be redistributed in the new electorate of Whitlam.

10 The Southern Villages Group was formed in part to overcome the difficulties that small rural communities experience when isolated from administration. A perception of not being listened to or overlooked by their larger neighbour only adds to the concerns of more isolated communities. It's not a unique phenomenon, but it is important to these small communities that they feel connected to similar
15 communities with similar history, aspirations and expectations.

The electoral Division of Hume is based in the City of Goulburn, with many small towns and villages similar in size and nature to those of the southern part of the Wingecarribee Shire. It is those towns and villages within the current Division of Hume that Exeter, Bundanoon and Penrose feel most aligned to in all aspects of their
20 daily life. Being on the further reaches of the Shire boundaries, difficulties in accessing services, being overlooked by administration and feelings of isolation are no different to what the residents now perceive could happen should they be attached to a faraway electoral district in which there is little in common with towns and cities that constitute the Division of Throsby.

25 The villages of Exeter, Bundanoon and Penrose should remain in the same electorate for the sake of electoral continuity, voter identity and affinity with their region's elected representative. On the AEC website, it lists all the towns and villages that currently are within the district of Throsby. But it is important that there is a
30 description of the type of activities that take place in both Throsby and Hume. Under the description for Throsby, steelworks, mining, engineering, light and heavy manufacturing, transport, tourism, construction, transport, dairy farming and retail industries. For that of Hume, it is described as:

35 *Mixed farming, grazing, fat lambs, fruit, vegetables, wine, timber and textiles. The area is noted for its fine wool with Goulburn being the home of the Big Merino. Young is famous for the cherry capital of New South Wales and Cootamundra as the birth place of Sir Donald Bradman.*

40 to demonstrate that the product and industries of the Hume electorate are more relevant to the activities of the three southern villages of Wingecarribee Shire than those of the electorate of Throsby. The original land grant for Exeter area for 500 acres to James Badgery, the area being surveyed in 1821 and the deed being issued in 1822. This was to allow Badgery to expand his sheep and cattle grazing concerns.
45 Later, Badgery was granted 201 acres in Exeter, and in 1834 it was consolidated into 1920 acres and named Vine Lodge. It was upon this portion of land that Exeter Village was settled.

It's important for this Committee to understand the issues that differentiate lives, backgrounds and activities of the residents of Exeter, Bundanoon and Penrose with those of the Illawarra. All of Exeter and Penrose is unsewered, a service that is considered essential to residents living in an urbanised environment. Many streets, lanes and roads are unsealed, an issue that would not be accepted by an urbanised residential community. Outside of our villages, there are small rural holdings with larger acreage to the west consisting of mixed agriculture, wine grape orchards and grazing. Tourism is seen as a contributing source of income. The communities are affected by rural economies, whilst the Illawarra is predominantly concerned with heavy industry, manufacturing and mining.

Within Exeter Village, there are a small number of houses in a less formalised street layout, which is different even to the urbanised sprawl of our neighbouring Moss Vale and more so the Illawarra. Exeter Village is serviced by one general store and post office, art gallery, antiques store, one church, a primary school and a village hall. We have no postal deliveries, an occurrence not experienced by urban communities. We have poor or little mobile reception, which reflects how little interest is shown by governments at all levels and telcos in providing services to small communities when compared to larger neighbourhoods. We only rely on a volunteer fire brigade, which provides fire fighting coverage in a mixed terrain bordering on a national park.

Residents are concerned with rural issues, pest eradication, feral animals, environmental weeds, water conservation and the like. There is a lack of public transport to larger centres in the Illawarra and Sydney, which isolates the smaller communities and binds them together for their own survival. Exeter and villages to the south are different in socioeconomic strata, with little in common with the Illawarra. Climatically, the Southern Highlands is considerably different to the Illawarra.

The closest centre to the three affected villages of Exeter, Bundanoon and Penrose is Moss Vale. The difference between the two communities could not be more different. Moss Vale was founded as a service town for Bowral and the Southern Highlands. There are small industries supporting – small industries supporting the area have grown up around the rail line. Cattle sales and now car sales have dominated the economy. Recent housing developments based on small lot sizes is more in keeping with the type of development that is seen in the Illawarra. And Moss Vale is a direct conduit between the Hume Highway and the Illawarra, carrying large volumes of road transport.

Our relationship to Goulburn is significant. Transport is less than 40 minutes by road. We have regular bus and train services which are well patronised. Goulburn is a service centre for our rural supplies and support. Goulburn has similar agricultural outputs as the southern villages of the Wingecarribee Shire. The small villages of Hume are experiencing the same issues for the rollout of the NBN as those that are being suffered by those villages in the Wingecarribee Shire. Much of Exeter, Bundanoon and Penrose suffer from little or no mobile coverage, similar to rural

areas of the Hume electorate. The civic services of health, education and policing of the southern villages are more naturally aligned within the current Hume division. In policing, the Hume Local Area Command, which services the southern villages, is located in the Southern Tablelands.

5

The southern villages of the Wingecarribee Shire are part of the Capital Country because of their proximity to Goulburn and Canberra. The southern rail line is an essential artery of commerce and transport. Our relation to the Illawarra is somewhat strained. It's a difficult road access. While we can access the Illawarra, it is subject to a number of variables, such as road closures, weather and accidents. There is poor public transport. There is little transport between the Highlands and the coast and cannot service the needs of the Wingecarribee residents. The service industries of the Illawarra do not provide the type of products required by a farming or rural community.

10

15

At the present time, the boundary for the Hume and Throsby passes through the village and the farms of Exeter, separating residents into two electoral districts. Whilst the proposed inclusion of Exeter in total and Bundanoon and Penrose into the new Division of Whitlam would overcome the current issues associated with the community being divided between two electorates, it would not address the general proposition that these villages are better served by being included in the Hume electorate.

20

25

It is our submission that these towns and communities should be included in the Hume electorate for the reasons I've stated, and that the boundary line be drawn at Oldbury Road and the Hume Freeway to the northwest, going to the southern railway line in the northeast, across Werai-Greenhills Road to the east. This would effectively make the Meryla State Forest the physical boundary with the existing electorate of Throsby. This boundary is currently used by the Fire Service to separate Moss Vale and Exeter's areas of responsibility.

30

35

We submit that, should this Committee take the view that our proposal to include Exeter and villages to the south in the electorate of Hume, then we would make no further comment in renaming of the electorate of Throsby. However, should our submission not persuade such a change, then we certainly would like to address that issue with you. The electorate was named in 1984 and has significant historical connection to the Southern Highlands. Dr Charles Throsby was an early resident, pastoralist, explorer and member of the New South Wales Legislative Council. His legacy in Moss Vale, in the Moss Vale area and the Southern Highlands is well-documented. However, it must not be overlooked that his nephew, Charles Throsby-Smith, is recognised as the founder of Wollongong, and his connection to the Illawarra is significant.

40

45

The federal electorate of Hume, the subject of this redistribution, was named after Hamilton Hume, an early explorer, and equally significant in terms of the historical association to that area as Throsby is to the Highlands and to the Illawarra. We take the view that although there is precedent in recognising past prime ministers by

naming electorates, it would be far more appropriate to rename a Sydney electorate with tangible connections to the late Prime Minister's term. Removing the name Throsby from this electoral division disconnects the historical ties with the Southern Highlands and the Illawarra.

5

Substituting the name of a former Prime Minister who has had no real association with the area would be disingenuous to the memory of the former Prime Minister and would overlook the historical connection of the Throsby family to the Southern Highlands and to the Illawarra. The Exeter Village Association has the support of the Exeter community and the Southern Villages Group in placing before this Committee the compelling reason why the village of Exeter, together with Bundanoon and Penrose, should be included in the electoral district of Hume. Approximately 3000 additional voters would not affect the projected enrolment quota. Thank you, Mr Chair.

10
15

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Mr McNamara. That has been very, very comprehensive. The next speaker is Mr Michael Waterhouse, please. Is Mr Waterhouse available?

20 MR M. WATERHOUSE: Yes,

CHAIRPERSON: I'm sorry, Mr Waterhouse, I didn't – your shirt blended in the same colour as the chair. Mr Waterhouse, would you please state your full name and your particular interest.

25

MR WATERHOUSE: Thank you, Mr Chairman. My name's Michael Waterhouse. I reside in Paddington, and I wish to speak about the proposed transfer of part of Paddington from the seat of Wentworth to the seat of Sydney. I wish to make two main points concerning the proposed split of Paddington between the Divisions of Sydney and Wentworth: firstly, that the proposed redistribution doesn't adequately have regard for the criteria in section 66(3)(b) of the Commonwealth Electoral Act which the Redistribution Committee is required to consider; secondly, that the demographics of South Paddington mean that, in fact, the Committee does not need to split Paddington to achieve a redistribution that falls within its own range of tolerance.

30
35

On the first of these, section 66(3)(b) of the Commonwealth Electoral Act requires the Redistribution Committee to give consideration to several criteria. Three of them are particularly relevant here: the community of interests, the physical features and area, and the boundaries of existing state divisions. Regarding the first of these, community of interests, I would note first that the map issued in connection with the proposed new division incorrectly identifies the area to be transferred to the Division of Sydney as Moore Park.

40

If the proposed new boundaries reflect, in part, a view that the southern side of Oxford Street is actually a different suburb, then this is wrong; there is no suburb of Moore Park. The south side of Oxford Street is Paddington and shares the same

45

postcode as the north side. That there is a community of interests is reflected in the existence of the Paddington Society, as Will Mrongovius noted earlier, which represents the interests of members from all parts of Paddington, north and south; also, that the broader area, as Will noted, comprises the Paddington heritage conservation zone. We also share the same history, the same terrace housing, the same schools, the same parks, the same shopping precinct, the same post office, and so on.

Contrast this with the inner city area to the west of South Dowling Street, where Darlinghurst, Surry Hills, Redfern and Woolloomooloo, which comprise the seat of Sydney, have many features in common with each other, far more than with Paddington. Turning now to the second criteria, physical features and area. Oxford Street is the spine of Paddington. The land falls away on either side, making it a homogenous entity within which Victorian terraced housing predominates on both sides. Oxford Street is the glue that binds different parts of our suburb together, not an arterial road that defines our differences and accentuates them.

Turning to the third criteria, the boundaries of existing state divisions, I would simply point out that all of Paddington falls within the electoral district of Sydney. Turning now to the demographics of the area, Australian Bureau of Statistics data indicates that there are around 10,000 people of voting age in Paddington as a whole. The area south of Oxford Street is approximately 20 per cent of the area of Paddington; that's excluding Victoria Barracks. This suggests that there are about 2000 electors in the area; call it two and a half thousand to be on the safe side.

The Redistribution Committee proposes to transfer 9679 electors from the Division of Wentworth to the Division of Sydney, although it can transfer as few as 5330 electors and still remain within its range of tolerance. So it is proposing to transfer 4349 more electors than it actually needs to. There is therefore no need to transfer the two thousand to two and a half thousand electors of South Paddington to the Division of Sydney.

As a footnote, in considering any further redistribution in future, the Committee should perhaps look to transfer electors from the beachside suburbs of Clovelly, Bronte and Tamarama on the following grounds: a large section of these suburbs fall within the Randwick LGA; an even larger section falls within the State Division of Coogee; there is, thirdly, a strongly identifiable community of interest in the beachside suburbs; and finally, the physical features linking the beachside suburbs are obvious. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much, Mr Waterhouse. Those views will also be considered. Mr Nathan Quigley. Mr Nathan Quigley. Someone went outside. Maybe they've gone to get him. Well, we might move on, and we will jump over, and if he is available later, he will be recalled. Now, Mr Bruce Adams from Forbes Shire. Mr Adams, if you could also state your full name, please, and any particular interest you have.

MR B.H. ADAMS: Yes. My name is Bruce Harvey Adams and I'm a resident of Forbes in Central West of New South Wales.

CHAIRPERSON: Yes, thank you.

5

MR ADAMS: Just letting you know there is – are people over the other side of the mountains. What our objection is, the moving of the Forbes Shire from Calare into the Riverina electorate, which means to connect to our nearest city where the local member will be, will be a four hour drive instead of a one and a half hour drive. All of this is laid out very clearly in the Forbes Branch of the National Party's submissions, also Forbes Shire Council, etcetera, etcetera.

10
15 So it just doesn't conform with the requirements regarding community interest. All of our connections, education and health, media are with Orange. Just doesn't make any sense and it's just something else that goes to sort of upset country people, with city people organising things for country people. It would be nice if someone drove out every now and again and found out what we thought. Thank you very much.

20 CHAIRPERSON: Yes. Thank you. Thank you, Mr Adams. That – your views will also be considered. Mr – can Councillor Sedrak. I'm reading off a handwritten list so I may have mispronounced your name. Would you be good enough to please state it.

25 MR P. SEDRAK: Sure. My name is Paul Sedrak and I'm a representative – a councillor at Rockdale City Council under Barton and I – I'm here to speak in objection to the Barton boundary change with Cook. First of all, thank you very much. When I first heard about this change, numerous residents from the community, businessmen, various community groups and even sporting teams have made representation to me. And I understand that there needs to be a review; however, I was – I was surprised to hear about this change between Barton and Cook and I, therefore, strongly object to this change. And I have put a summary together of what residents have, you know, outlined to me, whether it be through phone calls or emails. Point number 1 – sorry, I'm trying to just keep it – it's easier for you to write as well, isn't it.

35

CHAIRPERSON: Yes.

40 MR SEDRAK: Okay. So point number 1. The St George region has always been a separate identity to Sutherland Shire. Barton versus Cook. This long tradition has separated rivals, community groups, sporting teams and even people. The water is our natural divide, whether it be Tom Uglys Bridge or Captain Cook Bridge, it has always been our natural divide between Barton and Cook. I emphasise between Barton and Cook. I am not trying to politicise this in any format. This is not a Liberal or Labor or a Green. I don't represent this side or that side. This is something that is – has been a long and great historical tradition between one of Sydney's great communities, Barton and Cook. The St George region and the Sutherland Shire.

45

The proposed division divides not only these great community groups but also divides my local Council of Rockdale and even Kogarah and I believe this is an important – it's very important in regard to the infrastructure that we have got in St George region, which is very separate and different to that of Cook and Sutherland Shire. My number – that's my first big issue. My second big issue that I have put together is in over the past year or so there has been a recent proposal for amalgamation between Rockdale Council and Kogarah Council. And only until recent, Rockdale and Kogarah have put something on paper that we are happy to go forward in council amalgamations. Both Kogarah and Rockdale represent – or Barton is represented of them, making up St George.

Now, what we're doing here – there was no issue of Cook or Sutherland Shire. This boundary change is a direct contradiction to council amalgamation. I realise this is a federal issue and I realise this is going to affect all residents but what I put forward here to you now, gentlemen and ladies, is that what message are we sending those ratepayers of the St George community as well as the Sutherland Shire? I strongly believe, with all due respect – and I understand that you have got to do what you have got to do but this is not a logical boundary change. There must be a better solution. When I travel in my Rockdale neighbourhood and we go down from – all the way from Brighton all the way to Captain Cook Bridge and Tom Uglys – people know where St George is and know what's strong about that.

And you – then you ask people from Sutherland Shire, are you happy to work down at Rockdale and they will tell you, hell no. We are very different and distinct and I think what's very important is that I'm here to represent our community. The old St George County Council is a good template for the future of St George Council. Historically, geographically, it is the proof which has been in existence for more than 150 years. We're talking about in the 1850s – you might prove me wrong but looking at Wikipedia and some of the original elders of the community, the Gadigal People who are part of the Eora Nation, their representation has given us some evidence that it goes back – white settlement in the area has gone back further than the 1850s and obviously Aboriginal culture has gone – and settlement obviously prior to 1770, 1788.

Captain Cook came to the Sutherland Shire. Cook. I think that's where the division needs to be. That river, that body of water is where the division is. Sorry to trivialise this. My history is a teacher in history and I'm very passionate about this little cause so – we teach this every day to our kids. Where the First Fleet first – you know. They did come down to Brighton prior to 26 January. They came down to Brighton but they didn't like it. They kept going. They didn't like it. So First Fleet ended up landing on 26 January 1788 at – as we know now, right there next to Parliament House. But they did pass by Brighton but it was rejected.

So we don't want another rejection here. What we want, I guess, is a division that is clear. To give you some more historical evidence, the Local Government Act 1919 provides – provided for the establishment of the country districts to the groups – part thereof – the municipalities in the shire and this is the direct tradition that we have

got in the area. What we're proposing here today or what is before us is potentially four separate government areas with four separate MPs. Now, I know we're trying to, you know – big thing over the past few years is to cut out red tape, combine, unify, amalgamate. I see this is as a direct contradiction between what St George is doing and between Sutherland Shire and what they're doing.

So therefore, to conclude, to represent the people that have come forward to me, Rockdale City Council, I truly believe, to keep our nature and historical boundaries, going back over 150 years, between St George and Barton unified and between Cook and Sutherland Shire unified. This is where we see local, state and federal have a clear Division. So please, I urge that we keep it clear and divide it. Let the waterway divide us. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much, councillor, for your contribution. I might just recall – all right. We will move on to Cheryl Weller please. Ms Weller, would you please state your full name and your locality or particular interest.

MS C.A. WELLER: Okay. My full name is Cheryl Anne Weller, resident of Macarthur – representing Macarthur.

20

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

MS WELLER: I am objecting to the change of Macarthur as I previously lived just outside Macarthur which then came under Hume. This was changed at least three times in the past. I feel the amount of area that you wish to change is way too far out of the Hume's electoral At this stage I myself do not have to change, but my daughter will probably as she is in the Elderslie. As I recently am having to communicate with Mr Russell Matheson MP Macarthur my daughter would not be able to drive to Goulburn herself to voice her opinion which will affect the locals in Camden. Also, what is going to happen to Camden Hospital and any other local LGAs in the area?

Since sending in this proposal I feel also that whoever is in the Hume wouldn't know what or how much the south-west Sydney people have been involved within the Badgerys Creek Airport. As for the name Macarthur, it should stay within this title and not Bradman. Thank you for listening.

CHAIRPERSON: Yes. Thank you very much. Is Mr Austin Evans available, please? Mr Evans, would you also please state your full name for the record and also your particular interest or locality.

MR EVANS: No worries. My name is Austin William Evans. I'm the – a bit close there – Mayor of Murrumbidgee Shire, a National member – Nationals member and many other organisations I'm a member of; however, this submission is my own personal submission as I have not has time to have the – all the detail of my submissions endorsed by those entities even though I do believe that they would support it. I have had my objection submission supported by six comments out of

the 26 on the objections and more have indicated that they would have supported it had they had more time. I think the starting point is it's important to recognise it upfront that every localised request has impacts from the inevitable necessary follow on that impact was beyond the local area.

5

That is the nature of this puzzle. And that's what it is: it's a very complex puzzle we've got to try and sort out that we're all trying to work on here. I guess the – we're trying to do the least total harm or the most total good. Not everyone can get everything they want. Some will have to lose for the greater good. But the greatest total good is the ultimate goal of this process. Emotionally, everyone wants their electorate or area to have priority, but I think regional electorates have a legitimate claim for priority. Why? One single factor: distance. These electorates are already disadvantaged because they are isolated and cover huge areas making it harder for their MPs to represent them as easily can be representing a small electorate.

10

15

My presence today illustrates that perfectly. To participate in this part of the democratic process to appear before this inquiry here today and because of the short notice and the high price of getting airfares at very short notice my only alternative by the time I arranged time off work to come here today was to jump in my car last night at 10 o'clock; drive 170 kilometres to Wagga, which is our current electoral centre; hop on a train that left Wagga at 22 past 12 that arrived here at 7 o'clock this morning. In that process I got about three hours sleep, so if I'm a bit seedy I apologise: that's the reason. But that's typical of what we have to face in the regional areas of New South Wales, and so it is for accessing our elected representatives and also for our elected representatives to access us.

20

25

Therefore, to try and alleviate some of that disadvantage, and I stress it is only some of the disadvantage – it will not get rid of it all but it's one way we can address some of it is that those regional areas need to be given priority in this process. A good example of what I'm talking about is to compare the draft solution to my and the original National Party's solution for southern New South Wales and their respective negative end impacts, because, as I said before, they all follow through and cause negative impacts. The draft, from my reading of it, prioritises the gap between Wollongong and southern Sydney as a boundary and then works south and west from there.

30

35

It also prioritises putting Broken Hill with Dubbo, and there are impacts that flow on from that decision. And I would just like to comment at the time that that was actually my starting point when I wanted to work through this process was actually to try and put Dubbo in – Broken Hill in with Dubbo, but there are so many flow on effects that are negative that I ended up abandoning it when I put my proposal in. The first priority of the draft results in having to push electorates south and some inland to the Southern Highlands. So the – that – using that natural boundary between Wollongong and southern Sydney results in that.

40

45

That's not too bad as you work your way down the coast until you reach Eden-Monaro, which butts into the Victorian border and therefore has to move west to get

the numbers required over the highest part of the Great Dividing Range even though there is comments made both within the Act and within the report from the Committee that – trying to avoid going either side of the Great Diving Range. So it pushes over that into Tumut and Tumbarumba and also into the Yass Valley. In
5 combination with the Broken Hill decision, the MIA, which is the area I come from, so it's Griffith, Leeton, Narrandera, Murrumbidgee Shire, the Murrumbidgee Irrigation Area has to move into Farrer to get Farrer the numbers required.

10 What that means is that 30,000 voters increase the distance from their electoral centre – the place where their MP lives, has their office – increases that distance from around about 150 ks plus or minus a bit – mostly plus – to around 250 kilometres. In contrast, my solution and the original National Party's solution works from the other way with the end negative being – impact being the northern part of Wollongong.

15 So it works from the west and as I said keeps Broken Hill with Albury and then works those electorates up through Eden-Monaro and moves north. The one possible solution – and I don't know these areas so it's only very much a desktop – but one possible solution, probably the worst one for people in those areas – and they would
20 hate me saying this – is that the northern half of Wollongong – 50,000-odd voters would have to combine 50,000 voters from southern Sydney – southern parts of Sydney to form enough to give an electorate.

25 Now, that sounds bad on paper, but we need to put that in perspective. If we did that, and that's not necessarily a given, but if we did that the entire electorate would only be 50 to 60 kilometres long via a four lane highway or a reasonably frequent rail line. Those opportunities aren't available to people in the regional parts of New South Wales. This is not in the same league as the impacts out west. We are talking an order of magnitude difference. Tens of kilometres rather than – compared to
30 hundreds of kilometres out west. Hence my concept of voter kilometres that I mentioned in my comments. That's simply a way to say how far each voter has to travel to get to their local member – to get to their regional – their electorate centre.

35 In the case of Griffith there's something of the order of 18,000 – off the top of my head – voters there that currently have to travel 189 kilometres to get to Wagga. With the new version – the draft proposal they would have to travel 277 kilometres to get to Albury. So you just multiple that distance by the number of voters there to give you voter kilometres. I believe that this is a good way to try and quantify unemotionally the impact that – on a consistent basis, so not just subjectively – not
40 just based on someone's opinion and to do it across the whole state for any solution to the puzzle. As I said before, any time you make a decision on one thing it has ramifications that carry on, but this sort of methodology can give you a consistent answer across the state.

45 I guess the Act defines how the Commission has to come up with the electorates. The first priority, and the one that it states very clearly as the highest priority and I don't think many people would argue with even though some individuals have tried

to argue it is that you need a certain number of voters in each electorate within the tolerance trying to preserve as close to possible one person one vote. I think most of us agree with that one and it's there in the legislation

5 The next priority to my mind is voter kilometres as I've expressed it there before. This is covered in the Act in the lines that have been read before about communication and travel. To date, in the reports and, I guess, as it's expressed in the Act, it has only been done in a qualitative way based on opinion. My proposal
10 puts that – an objective, quantitative way of measuring travel in particular. And generally where there's travel, the communication dovetails in with that fairly well. The Act is silent on whether travel and communication is a higher priority than community of interest. I believe it should be, even though the Act doesn't specifically say that, and the reasons for that is because it is measurable, not based on
15 opinion.

The closest travel distance nearly always captures the community of interest. Generally, if you're talking about the communities that are closest together, they're generally the communities of interest. Communities of interest are very rarely
20 further away. So if you're talking about communities of interest, generally they're either the same distance or closer. The solution that I'm advocating and that was the National Party's original submission is nearly four million voter kilometres better than the draft. That's a substantial impact. The next priority as I see it should be community of interest. Again, this is mentioned in the Act and has been followed but as noted from a large number of objections from regional New South Wales, it
25 indicates that perhaps the draft does not deliver this priority well in the regional areas.

Everywhere from Forbes, wider down through the Riverina in our southern areas over to Tumbarumba, Tumut, it's not doing the job. And then the last priority should
30 be minimal change. In the Act I think it's even defined as a lower priority but it's still important to try and do if you can. I believe there are better solutions to this puzzle than the draft has presented us, such as mine in the original Nationals submission which is fairly identical.

35 I believe that they deliver better on the letter and the intent of the Act, particularly in regional New South Wales. And as I said before, that's supported by six of the 26 comments in the objections, who have said that this is a way that – and those comments range from people like Bruce Adams of Forbes, right through to Griffith Shire Council, the – a couple of other community groups in Forbes as well as
40 Carrathool Shire Council and there are many others who would have expressed it.

Leeton Shire Council missed the cut off time and there was plenty of others that I spoke to that said that they were – that that sort of proposal meets a lot better their communities of interest and the travel distances in regional New South Wales. And
45 as I said, the regional areas need to be prioritised to reduce some of the naturally occurring representative disadvantage that these areas face. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Mr Evans, and, well, the Commission appreciates the travel you've undertaken to be here. I notice the time. It's 11 o'clock. I think we might take a short break. So we might break for 15 minutes or so and then we will resume.

5

ADJOURNED

[11.01 am]

10 **RESUMED**

[11.20 am]

CHAIRPERSON: Well, ladies and gentlemen, we will now resume the hearing. And the next speaker is Jan Mapledoram. Ms Mapledoram, would you please for the record give your full name and what your locality or your particular interest, please.

15

MS J. MAPLEDORAM: My name is Jan Mapledoram and I live at Cabarita and I'm in the electorate of Reid.

20 CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

MS MAPLEDORAM: Thank you for the opportunity to voice my opinion here today. I was – after finding out about the proposed changes to Reid, I was actually quite horrified and I was so upset, I've actually – my personal time aside and, as you can see, I've come in here today with my granddaughter who's visiting from interstate. So she might be learning a little bit along the way. By splitting off – splitting Reid by cutting our eastern boundaries of Drummoyne, Russell Lea, Rodd Point and part of Five Dock off, it's just – I don't know – crazy, absurd, ridiculous. I can't think of enough words along those lines to describe it.

25

30

The council areas have already been amalgamated in the time that I've been living there and we've amalgamated by moving east not west. We have always voted in the same electorate as these other suburbs and our community interests, which seems to be the term everybody is using at the moment, are the same. We travel on ferries. We travel along Lyons Road. We get the same buses. My husband plays at the golf courses in the same areas. The – my grandchildren play rugby in these districts. We never – my car does not go westwards unless I'm going into the country.

35

I do not know why these suburbs have been taken away from our voting electorate. The prospect of amalgamations with Auburn and Lidcombe Councils, they have been done away with and we are being associated more with Burwood and Strathfield, which seems sensible. But we just have nothing in common with further west into Auburn and Lidcombe. Another annoying point here and somebody else mentioned confusion and it's so true. When you speak about an electorate, people actually really have no idea what on earth that is.

45

When you – they don't know if it's a council area, a State voting area, a federal voting area and when you say, "Oh, the electorate of Reid is changing", they go, "Oh, does that mean we're going to have – be with Auburn or Lidcombe Council?" And it's, like, "Ah, no. I'm talking about your voting right federally". And,

5 honestly, when you explain it to the regular person on the street – and that's me, I'm a regular person just on the street who is very upset about this proposed change – and when you explain it, they are simply horrified. People don't know how to object. They don't know there's a deadline.

10 And I only found out by chance about the deadline and I quickly sent off an email and let many people – as many as I could – know how to send off that email. And the communication between people – like, people in the know as you people obviously really are, and those of us who are in our little suburban homes, it is just not happening. People do not know about these changes and, I swear to God, when
15 they go to vote they still don't know the electorate they're voting in. So, I don't know how you change that but people just don't know and they don't have the opportunity to object.

Everyone I have spoken to in my area – you know, having a cup of coffee, going into
20 the hairdressers, going and buying a gift at Christmas – when you discuss this with just ordinary local people, they are fuming. How do we know this? How, what can we do? And they feel helpless. And this is about all I can do, appear before you gentlemen and pretty well beg you to leave Reid as it is. It is a very well balanced electorate. I know you guys work on numbers. Fair enough. But Craig Laundry only
25 won the seat by a very slim margin which means we are already very well balanced. By taking away a huge peninsula part of our area will have unbelievable, you know, repercussions in the voting. And it's – I just don't think it's fair. Sorry, I'm losing my voice now. I did have a glass of water before. Anyway - - -

30 CHAIRPERSON: Feel free to have some water now if you wish.

MS MAPLEDORAM: That – thank you. That's about all I really have to say. I don't think there's any part of going west towards Auburn or Lidcombe – there's
35 nothing of those community needs for those people that align themselves to the community needs of the eastern part of the electorate. I'm in Cabarita. I would remain in Reid where – and, you know, Reid is basically mainly all the bay suburbs along the river.

So – and I have no idea what – how the people of Drummoyne would feel, Rodd
40 Point, part of Five Dock and being associated with Grayndler either. I think that's ridiculous. Why on earth would you shift them across the river to be with places like Rozelle, Lilyfield and – wherever Grayndler goes to – Marrickville, etcetera. So, you know, I think people, whilst they're not in here stating their objections or even emailing them or writing them, they are pretty angry about what is happening when
45 they find out. So I would implore you to please leave our electorate as it is. It is very well balanced at the minute. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON: Yes. Thank you very much for your contribution, Ms Mapledoram.

MS MAPLEDORAM: Now, all my Christmas shopping with my granddaughter.

5
CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Thank you. Well, next we have a group of people together and I will call out their names and ask them all to come up if they would like. Mr Ron Moore, Raad Richards, Adriana Care and Brett McGrath. Please be seated and I don't know which of you would like to speak first but if you would like
10 to announce your names for the records, that would be of assistance.

MR R. MOORE: Thank you, Mr Chairman, augmented Commission. My name's Ron Moore. I'm the General Manager of Camden Council. Thank you for the opportunity and invitation to speak to Council's submission to the proposed
15 redistribution of the Macarthur electorate. Camden Council is concerned about the proposed loss of locations of historical significance to the Macarthur region from the electorate that bears its name. Accordingly, at its ordinary meeting on 10 November 2015, Council resolved to lodge a submission to the Electoral Commission in support of retaining the current boundary with the federal seat of Macarthur to ensure that
20 locations which are historically significant to the Macarthur region continue to remain in the electorate which bears its name.

The Division of Macarthur, New South Wales, first proclaimed in 1949, is named after Elizabeth Macarthur and Captain John Macarthur, early settlers in New South
25 Wales and founders of the Australian merino wool industry, which I'm sure we all understand. After securing approval from Lord Camden, British Secretary of the colonies, to establish a large sheep run south of Sydney, the Macarthurs named their estate Camden Park in around 1805. In 1807 the Macarthurs sent their first bale of wool to England. John Macarthur died in 1834 in the original cottage at Belgenny
30 Farm, Camden South. Today Australia, as we all know, is the largest wool-producing country in the world, a legacy which began with the hard work of the Macarthurs just over 200 years ago in Camden.

The proposed redistribution of the Macarthur electorate will involve the transfer of suburbs historically associated with the Macarthur family to the proposed Division of
35 Hume, including Camden, Camden South, Camden Park and Menangle, all once part of the Macarthurs' considerable Camden Park estate, and also Bickley Vale, Grasmere and Ellis Lane, each part of the area first named West Camden in 1823 after the government prohibition order against entry to lands west of the Nepean
40 River ceased and John Macarthur was granted a further 5000 acres adjoining his Camden Park estate.

These changes would create a disconnect within an established community of interest, being a very well understood, historically connected federal electorate of
45 Macarthur and Camden Local Government Area. In addition to the enduring historical and geographical links to John and Elizabeth Macarthur, Council is concerned that the Camden Local Government Area will be divided between the

proposed Divisions of Hume and Macarthur, thus creating a separation in a long established community of interest, being the current federal seat of Macarthur and Camden Local Government Area.

5 Council has experienced a very effective working relationship in terms of funding and service delivery through the Macarthur electorate representing the whole of the Camden Local Government Area, particularly during a period of rapid population growth which we as a community are now experiencing. And finally, having the office or the potential for the office of the federal representative to be a significant
10 distance from those affected in the Camden LGA is another matter of concern for the Council. So, Mr Chairman, I thank you for the opportunity to speak, and Council's position is that it requests the retention of the current boundary for the federal seat of Macarthur. Thank you.

15 CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Mr Moore. Who would like to speak next?

MR R.T. RICHARDS: Chairman, I will go next. My name is Raad Terrence Richards.

20 CHAIRPERSON: Yes, thank you, Mr Richards.

MR RICHARDS: And I'm Chief Executive and also Executive Director of Carrington Centennial Care, the leading aged care organisation in the Macarthur region. We service over 2000 people, and we employ over 600 people. So it's the
25 leading organisation as far as the aged care sector within the entire Macarthur region. My submission is based on three elements: the historical significance, the growth factor, and the community of interest. I'm not going to go into the historical significance, because Ron adequately covered that in his submission and his representation, in the best interests of not repeating ourselves. But basically, the
30 redistribution of the seat of Macarthur over the past 70 years, Camden has always been associated with the seat of Macarthur, and also synonymously with the Macarthur family, from historical significance.

The proposed redistribution of the seat of Macarthur basically has divided the state
35 seat of Camden into – right in the middle between two different divisions: the Division of Macarthur, the redistributed division, as well as the Division of Hume. The seat of Macarthur – the population of Camden, 47,000 of them, have been disenfranchised from the whole of the electorate of Macarthur as a result of the proposed redistribution. Basically, as Ron indicated, Camden Council Chamber will
40 be based in the redistributed seat of Macarthur, and the rest of the population of the Local Government Area, almost 90 per cent of them, will be in the Division of Hume.

45 Basically, there will be no relationship and any community interest between the 47,000 people that reside in Camden, vote in Camden, and for the seat of Macarthur, and call Russell Matheson as their Member for many years. They will be voting and they will be part of a new division which bears no relationship to them. Basically,

there is no relationship between the population of Camden, the community interests of Camden, the businesses of Camden, nothing to do with Goulburn, Lachlan Valley or, indeed, Boorowa, of all places. So at the end of the day, it has divided the electorate.

5

Now, for us as Carrington, as a major aged care organisation, we talk about ourselves as a leading organisation in Macarthur. We will no longer be saying that, because we don't belong to Macarthur any more, because where we are and what we serve is the population – including, I might add, Camden Hospital, who's a leading organisation in palliative care in the Macarthur region – will be out of the Macarthur region completely, because it will be in the Division of Hume. So all that confusion – as one of the speakers earlier talked about the jigsaw puzzle, and we need to put that jigsaw puzzle back.

15 I understand that my concern and the concern of many people that reside in the area is to have the whole population of Camden back into the seat of Macarthur, and we're talking here about 47,000 of them. We're talking about 10 to 12 kilometres radius to include in the new seat of Macarthur. So that's one solution to that jigsaw puzzle, and that's the preferred solution. However, the easier solution from my point of view is that – to include where Council Chamber, for example, is going to be in Oran Park, which is in the redistributed seat of Macarthur, to include that as part of the new Division of Hume, and rename Hume as Macarthur, so then you will not have to go any further of taking the population from one end to the other or geographical distances in that regard.

25

So I urge the Commission to consider that public interest, to consider the economic and growth factors that Camden Local Government Area is experiencing. As a matter of fact, Camden Local Government Area population will – in the next 10 to 12 years will be something like 160,000 people, we're talking about. The State Government just announced through their growth strategy and planning strategy through the Premier and the Minister for Planning a whole lot of land releases within the Camden and within the Macarthur electorate as it stands now. So we need to take all that into consideration, and I urge the Commission to consider the redistributed seat of Macarthur. Thank you.

35

CHAIRPERSON: Yes, thank you very much, Mr Richards. Next speaker.

MS A. CARE: Hi, I'm Adriana Care. I'm the current President of Narellan Chamber of Commerce. We actually represent a vast area in the Camden LGA of businesses. Currently we have over 200 members of employers, which would currently represent about a couple of thousand people who reside in the Macarthur electorate, and which in turn would obviously have families of up to 10,000 people. So our submission is based on those – I'm representing them. Before I start – and I hope we're not going to be too repetitive – obviously there is a need for change, and you've obviously advised why there is a need for the change. However, change must be practical and represent the community that it lies in, and I think there's some – the proposed changes in relation to Macarthur actually don't do this.

45

Narellan – I actually want to talk about three points: the change in the name, the clear boundary definition that has been proposed, and then the community interests that it's affecting. So without sounding repetitive, Narellan Chambers strongly opposes the change of boundaries of Macarthur and change of name. Since the
5 inception of the seat of Macarthur, it has always included Camden, so the AECs proposal to remove Camden will mean that Macarthur will no longer have any geographical relation to its region, part of Camden LGA being divided and only half of it remaining in the seat of Macarthur. And we've already heard from my colleagues how that's probably not a logical solution.

10 It also will affect Narellan Chamber, where half our membership will be in the seat of Hume and half our membership will be in the Macarthur. The boundaries will no longer incorporate the original homestead and estate of John and Elizabeth Macarthur, who's located in Elizabeth Macarthur and Camden LGA, which you're
15 proposing to go to Hume. Hume is clearly an electorate that will be strongly dominated by its representation of Goulburn and the Southern Highlands, and if you look – understand at the ground level, their landscape and issues are vastly different to what's currently happening in the seat of Macarthur. So to us, the identity of Macarthur is very important to a brand identifying the south-west of Campbelltown
20 and Camden and its surrounding suburbs.

Why do we feel that the boundaries need to be definitive? We feel that the proposed boundaries do not take into consideration the growth in dense population in the Camden LGA and the infrastructure and connection of the Macarthur area and
25 Camden LGA has to Campbelltown. Currently you're proposing that the boundary be the Narellan Road. We don't see that as a boundary; we see that as a thoroughfare, our connection into all the services and infrastructure into Sydney. To isolate us and put us – half of our electorate that currently is known into Hume would isolate those people into the Hume area.

30 There's no connection with what's going in the current landscape of Camden LGA to what's happening in Goulburn. It's a rural outlook what's going on in Goulburn versus what everyone is describing now as the new city, from Penrith down to Narellan. So to isolate half of our LGA into a Hume electorate that has no common
35 interest would just be regressive change into businesses in the area, which we have worked very strong on in establishing, us being one of the biggest chambers in New South Wales. In relation to – that leads into the community interest.

40 With the community interest, lately, we have had a number of major announcements in relation to the airport, the rail and the road infrastructure and if you look at the funding requirements that have been invested into this, or projected to be invested, it has come from a federal, a state and a council level. Something that has been quite
45 successful in our LGA because it represents the Camden LGA, the state member for Camden and Macarthur, they have all been able to work together to bring in those infrastructures. If you isolate half of the current Camden LGA into the Hume seat, then those kind of projects can't be worked together and they will be isolated, which we find is a regressive action to the proposal.

So in summary, I believe that Macarthur needs to stay in Macarthur in the seat of Macarthur, the boundaries need to be more definitive and represent the Camden LGA and the community that lies – in the interests – for the people there. Thank you.

5 CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Yes.

MR B. McGRATH: Good morning, Chairman, Commissioner, thank you for your time. My name is Brett McGrath. I appear for the Macarthur Law Society as president. I also, if you have read the Macarthur Law Society's submission, appear
10 to be an individual with far too much time on my hands so I apologise for the lengthy reading. However, Chairman, you have heard from the fellow panellists, if I can call them that, who are representing the interests of Macarthur here today. I would only echo their submissions and won't take your time revisiting those. But in summary, it essentially comes down to the communities of interest test, which is why we're
15 opposing the Commission's proposal for the redistribution of Macarthur and Hume.

The historical significance of the township of Camden and surrounds and the synonymous and enduring link it has with the Macarthur family is one point. Secondly, the community of interests along the proposed dividing boundary between
20 the electoral Division of Hume and Macarthur on the Narellan Road, that creates confusion for electors but it also creates disassociation for electors and community and professional organisations as well as business. They perceive themselves as being in Macarthur and there would be a natural gravitation towards them being seen as represented as the member for Macarthur, which would be in the neighbouring
25 seat.

There would be – there is considerable community resistance to not being labelled as Macarthur for those elected. Further – and Mr Richards touched on it – the Greater Macarthur region's population growth projections will require the Committee giving
30 consideration to having two Greater Macarthur region centric seats in the future. That population corridor from the – down the southern tablelands and the highlands, the – I understand the Commission is – has to look at geographical boundaries. It can't go north of Sydney. We have the Ku-ring-gai National Park. The Blue Mountains is a difficult population corridor to deal with.

35 There's also the Royal National Park that divides southern Sydney and the Illawarra so the natural corridor is always going to be the Hume corridor, if I can label it that. Now, that means that you will have seen a variable seesaw of electoral boundaries over time and this is a dramatic one that has occurred. The Macarthur Law Society
40 has provided two submissions or proposals that would hope – which we present to you as a way of alleviating or dealing with that seesawing and with a view, not only towards today but also to future redistributions, if they were to occur. If I can take the Commission – Proposal A. That's in line with the – both the major parties, the Liberal Party and the Labor Party, if I can say, and that's to keep the Macarthur seat
45 centralised around Macarthur, retaining the Camden Local Government Area in its entirety.

Also taking portions of the Wollondilly Shire. Now, the Wollondilly Shire does associate itself as the Macarthur region. By way of background, the Macarthur Law Society's boundaries are defined as the Campbelltown, Camden and Wollondilly Shire Local Government Areas and we represent over 200 practitioners from those
5 regions. There's also the MACROC organisation which links all three local government areas together to work in unison for community projects and in negotiations with state and federal governments. There's the Wollondilly Shire, although it is currently in the seat of Hume, is Macarthur centric and those electors identify as being from the Macarthur region as well.

10 So Proposal A, in our submission, would satisfy that requirement of the community interest test and would also create clear and defined, strong boundaries for electors and for the Commission. Now, I ask the Commission to bear with me on Proposal B, which, if you had a look at it, was for minor boundary adjustments under the current
15 proposal of the Committee but with name changes. So if we look at the thesis that – from the submissions from the community and community groups here today. There's also a rally being held with some national media attention, I understand, in Camden today as well which you might see on the 6 o'clock news – that the Camden Local Government Area should remain intact because the – you have community
20 organisations, business and electors that identify as being in the Camden LGA.

Also, having the dividing line from Narellan Road all the way through to the Northern Road slices it in half and it will create confusion and disassociation. As a
25 minor aside point, the inclusion of Badgerys Creek in the proposed Division of Hume, which is going to be Sydney's new second airport in servicing western Sydney, is in the same electoral Division proposed as that of Boorowa and Crookwell and Goulburn. There is very little community interest linkage there with that. In our submission, in Proposal B we propose a tidy up of that, that Badgerys
30 Creek region should remain within – which is in the Liverpool Local Government Area, should in fact be in the Division of Werriwa, which would draw Werriwa up a little bit.

So that would be a tidy up and we ask – even though it's not a major consideration – that that's something that this Commission take into consideration. The – by placing
35 the entirety of the Camden LGA into one electorate – there's 47,000 that are going to be transferred into Hume. We would argue that you, in fact, label that seat Macarthur because you would have the majority of electors in fact from the seat of Macarthur because you would have the suburbs of Harrington Park, Oran Park, Currans Hill and Harrington Grove, as well as others. That would then satisfy the
40 guidelines that the Commission works from, that if two electorates are to be merged or to have a significant amount of electors transferred, the majority – the name should fall with where the majority of electors occur.

Now, that brings us to the point where, yes, Hume is a federation seat and the
45 guidelines for the Commission are that federation seats must be retained. We support the retention of the name of the seat of Hume but, under the Commission's proposal and if they take on the amendments and the community calls for the

Camden LGA to be retained within the entirety of its – of a single electorate, which it should be, then Hume essentially has disintegrated. It's disintegrated from the west by losing Grenfell, Cowra, Cootamundra, even Young which was in even prior to 2006's redistribution. And by way of background, my historical knowledge comes from working in electorate offices for members for Macarthur and for Hume, historically. So that's where my background is.

That Hume has disintegrated. So in order to keep the retention of the name of Hume, if we're going to name that Division Macarthur – and there's a strong case to say that not only will electors in the Macarthur region identify but, as has been previously put forward by other members who – other people who have submitted today, it's an agribusiness economy. That was founded by John and Elizabeth Macarthur. By creating – naming – renaming the seat Macarthur, you're in fact – the Commission would in fact be creating a living legacy for the Macarthur family by having not only the Camden Park Estate, the Elizabeth Macarthur Agricultural Institute in the seat bearing the name of Macarthur, but electors are actively growing sheep and agribusiness.

If – to retain the seat of – the name of the seat of Hume, there has also been conjecture – and it's on the list of the Committee's considerations for today – is that the seat of Whitlam being named in the southern highlands doesn't appear to be appropriate and doesn't bear – doesn't pass a community of interest test. Now, the Commission has obviously already resolved to abolish the name of Throsby. The seat of Hume, if you were to – the Macarthur Law Society counter proposal – proposes that you rename the old seat of Throsby Hume. That returns the southern highland electors who were prior to 2009 within the seat of Hume itself. So there is already community association with respect to that. The Illawarra region, it has been Throsby, it has been Gilmore, it has been whatever. The Commission has already resolved that there – that that's not a consideration to take into effect.

By retaining – by creating the name of Hume, you have retained the federation seat, you have returned electors to a name that they're familiar with but also it has been considered and put forward by the – by community members and individuals today that Hamilton Hume discovered the region and in fact took Charles Throsby to that region himself. So Hamilton Hume has a very clear identifiable historical link with that region that electors could identify with.

Now, that brings us to the issue of the seat of a Division of Whitlam and what to do with that. Without the benefit of the Surveyor General's numbers and the stats of electors, the law society recognises the significant contribution that the former Prime Minister made to the country but also significantly to western Sydney. It is indeed, in our submission, appropriate to consider the creation, if you follow that train of thought and that thesis, that there will be a seat based on southern Campbelltown with clear strong boundaries of that electorate.

Now, the New South Wales Government on 22 September announced the new Greater Macarthur Growth Strategy, which will see the growth region for Mount

Gilead and Menangle Park with some 18,000 to 32,000 residents. Again, looking forward to there being two Greater – the necessity for two Greater Macarthur region seats that the southern Campbelltown seat be renamed Whitlam. Now, the former Prime Minister represented Campbelltown when he was a member for Werriwa in that region. Also, he was a strong advocate for western Sydney. It was his government that brought sewerage to Campbelltown. And it is also – would then be the southern seat neighbouring Werriwa, which the former Prime Minister represented.

That would also be a – that would be a fitting historical homage to the former Prime Minister, and we believe that electors within that region would accept that naming but still identifying as the Macarthur region as a whole. Further, the University of Western Sydney has its Campbelltown campus where I graduated from law myself which hold the Whitlam Institute, which is a think-tank for academia. It would be – by renaming the seat Whitlam it would be a fitting legacy for the former Prime Minister. So – and I thank you for your patience going through all of that. So – but in conclusion – and I dare not to speak on behalf of everybody else here that’s sitting here today – the Committee’s proposal for the electoral boundaries in the Macarthur region not only fails the test to keep communities of interest together but regrettably fails the test of common sense.

The township of Camden and the local government area owes its very existence to both John and Elizabeth Macarthur. But now with the stroke of a cartographer’s pen that important and historical link is under threat. To have the township of Camden, the historic Camden Park Estate where the descendants of the Macarthur’s still reside and the Elizabeth Macarthur Agriculture Institute proposed to be outside of the seat bearing their name Macarthur at best defies logic and at worst diminishes the legacy of two great Australians. The committee proposes to have the Camden – to divide the Camden LGA in half creating a boundary division at Narellan Road. This would create confusion and disassociation for electors in the Camden LGA and spread them across two federal electorates.

The Macarthur Law Society submits that the augmented Commission have the Committee revisit the boundaries and the naming of the Division of Macarthur. Today various community groups, professional and business organisations and individuals in the Camden Local Government Area have come here today to – and using their limited time and resources, to speak to the Commission.

They would also have to dedicate that to two federal members of parliament if the Committee’s original proposal is to go through. So finally to the augmented Commission, the Camden LGA must remain within the federal electorate bearing the name of Macarthur. That is the crux of the submission and that is where the Macarthur Law Society’s proposals hope to remedy that as well, and I thank you for your time.

CHAIRPERSON: Yes. Thank you, Mr McGrath. Well, the augmented Commission is appreciative of all your submissions. Thank you for your attendance.

MR McGRATH: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON: The next person who would like to speak is Mr Andrew Blake.
Mr Blake, good morning. Would you like to state your full name, please, and either
5 your particular representation or locality?

MR A. BLAKE: Sure. Andrew Blake. New South Wales Greens. I'm the Deputy
Campaign Coordinator for the New South Wales Greens. I will keep it brief. I think
10 many people have already spoken about the issues that we're concerned about, and
that's primarily the boundary between the Divisions of Reid and Grayndler. Our
main focus is more to the east of the electorate of Grayndler is keeping the north
ward of Marrickville LGA intact within the Division of Grayndler. And so by
15 consequence that does resolve in some changes to the boundary of Reid and
Grayndler. So taking in that we propose a very minimal change, which is not ideal
but was to slightly move the boundaries in Ashfield to the railway track, which we
feel greater – greater community interest to that area there, and then dividing the
suburb of Five Dock further in two. Not ideal, but we were looking for minimal
changes.

20 If more drastic changes like removing the entire peninsular of Drummoyne, Five
Dock, Drummoyne and so are on the table, then that's certainly – we're more
supportive of that. The first speaker this morning Mr Bruce MacCarthy I think very
eloquently outlined the reasons why there is no common community of interest
between Drummoyne and the other parts of Grayndler as proposed and so we would
25 be very supportive of that if that was to be taken into consideration. If not, as I said,
yes, we're proposing minor boundary allocations to keep essentially the Newtown
part of north ward of the Marrickville LGA in the entirety of Grayndler.

30 The only other thing I would like to add is with the potential renaming of the
electorate – the – sorry – the Division of Whitlam. We have no feelings or concerns
or thoughts really about changing Throsby to Whitlam. But if it is to – Throsby is to
remain as Throsby and Whitlam as to be named another seat we would object
strongly to that seat being Fowler. We feel there just aren't enough divisions named
35 after women in Australia, and to lose one more women – woman would be, yes, a
real shame. So if Whitlam is to be moved elsewhere, please, don't make it Fowler.
Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Thank you, Mr Blake, for your contribution. The
40 next speaker I think is Mr Mina – Mina? Thank you. Yes.

MR M. GOUBRAN: Thank you, Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON: Would you be good enough to state your name, thank you?

45 MR GOUBRAN: Certainly.

CHAIRPERSON: Yes.

MR GOUBRAN: It's Mina Christian Goubran, G-o-u-b-r-a-n. And I apologise on behalf of Mayor Stephen Agius of Kogarah, but he has left some points for me to speak to.

5 CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

MR GOUBRAN: And they are as follows. So he states that from a council/mayoral perspective it will make council issues more difficult to be resolved with going from having two electorate MPs to deal with to the possibility of four different electoral
10 MPs to coordinate and cooperate with for local matters causing a delay. From there he states that as a council we have built a strong St George rapport in our region with residents and business owners allowing our council to have a specialised focus in meeting the needs and demands of our St George region. To split up Barton would split and divide the St George region into the Sutherland Shire and Inner West.
15 These multiple regions will create confusion to residents and disruptions to most council supporting, including Kogarah.

Also, he did wish to speak to the amalgamation and how that doesn't have anything to do at all with the Inner West suburbs of Grayndler and Sutherland Shire, Cook. In
20 October 1920 the councils of Rockdale, Kogarah, Hurstville and Bexley made applications to the Governor for a constitution of a county district of St George requesting that the powers conferred on them by sections 416 to 419 of the Local Government Act 1919.

25 To remove part of Kogarah towards Cook will erase this history that was vital to the beginnings of the St George region. As a small business owner, Councillor Agius identifies as part of the St George region, and to be included in the electorate of Cook, a Sutherland Shire dominated electorate, would not truly reflect the interests and issues of the local area or the small businesses located within the new
30 boundaries. Additionally and finally, the electorate of Cook has never represented the concerns of small businesses within the St George region. That was on behalf of the Mayor of Kogarah, Councillor Stephen Agius.

CHAIRPERSON: Yes. Thank you, Mr Goubran. Those comments will – have also
35 been recorded and will be taken into consideration. Thank you for your attendance. I think the next speaker is Annie Tang. Ms Tang, would you please be seated. And would you also please state your full name and your – any particular interest or locality.

40 MS A. TANG: Okay. Good afternoon, Mr Chairman, Commissioner and other members on the panel. My name is Annie Tang. I'm a local resident of St George region and also a sitting councillor with Kogarah City Council with migrant background.

45 CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

MS TANG: Thank you for the opportunity to speak for the proposed boundary adjustment to the seat of Barton. I migrated to Australia with my husband and my children back to 1988 and we have chosen, you know, St George as the area that we will settle our family, our home. And I usually consider, you know, St George
5 region as the southern part of Sydney and also with the historical representation of the St George Council. As a councillor for the last 16 years and currently being the deputy mayor of city council I have the concern to the proposal to divide Kogarah between the two electoral boundaries.

10 It will definitely disrupt the historical ties and the identity of our Kogarah City Council. It is also important in regards to the key infrastructure in the St George region which would be separated from that of the electorate of Barton and also the Sutherland Shire. I also have the concern for the potential for up to four different
15 MPs looking after the proposed St George Council. As with a migrant background, I can share the confusion due to the proposed boundary.

New migrants with voting rights will be frustrated with the proposed boundary adjustment. And in conclusion, Mr Chair, such an unnecessary drastic change to Barton's boundary, would almost certainly further enflame more frustration with the
20 political process and that will be resulting in even less number on the Australian electoral roll and it will generate, you know, more problems for our political system. And thank you once again, you know, for the time. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you for your attendance, Ms Tang. The next speaker, Mr
25 John Wrigley. Please be seated, Mr Wrigley, and if you would state please your full name and your locality or any particular interest.

MR J. WRIGLEY: Yes. Good morning, Mr Chairman. My name is John Dennis
30 Wrigley OAM. I'm Vice President of the Camden Historical Society which has 140 members and 7000 visitors a year to the Camden Museum which is located in central Camden. I'm also the archivist in Camden Park House, the home built by John and Elizabeth Macarthur in 1835. And in that house, eight generations of the Macarthur
35 family have lived and still – and they still live there and, in fact, the seventh generation, John Macarthur-Stanham, has put in a written submission to you which you would have in your folders. So he has made that submission but isn't able to be here today.

I believe the proposed redistribution fails to take into account the historical
40 significance of the link between the Camden community, its history and the contribution of the Macarthur family. The proposed changes of boundaries will no longer incorporate the historic property, the homestead of the Macarthurs, Belgenny Farm and the Elizabeth Macarthur Agricultural Institute, which is the premier agricultural research institute in New South Wales. Instead, it will be in Hume
45 which is clearly dominated by the Goulburn and Southern Highlands area. The redistribution will isolate the public who would have no assimilation or connection with the area of Goulburn. It has taken a lot of work to develop the concept of the Macarthur area.

It has been successful – this work has been successful and the Macarthur region is now widely accepted by all groups and organisations in the area including television stations and media and professional organisations, as we’ve heard. I’ve made a point of speaking to dozens of people about these proposed changes in recent weeks and I
5 can report back to you that I’ve not been able to find a single person to – who supports the proposed redistribution as it affects Camden. Not one. And I’ve been trying to speak on a – in a non-biased manner with it. This must give you cause for reconsideration because you’re hearing such a solid case being put by my colleagues of different organisations in the Camden area and I know that I’ve been out talking
10 with the public and I can assure you that people do not like this change for the Camden area being removed from the Macarthur electorate.

Now, the Commission may wish to conduct its own poll on the streets of Camden to see how many supporters you can find for the current proposals that you’ve got
15 before you but I can give you my feedback so far. This matter has caused considerable community concern and, in fact, there is, as mentioned, a rally being held in central Camden this afternoon at 2.30 to oppose the removal of Camden from the seat of Macarthur. I would recommend – I know it’s not part of your process but I would recommend that you request one of – some of your officers to give you some
20 feedback about the rally in addition to this formal hearing and there is a hope that it will be on the news – Sydney television tonight as a consequence of that.

The name Macarthur is integral to the history of Camden as the town was planned by the Macarthurs and land provided for their purpose. The name Macarthur has been
25 assumed by the wider local area to the township of Menangle and the town of Camden. To this day, descendants of the Macarthurs are the custodians of the property. It makes absolutely no sense to retain the name Macarthur while stripping the entities most integral to the name from the electorate. I ask, therefore, that the area of Camden and Menangle and the present day Camden Park Estate be retained
30 within the Macarthur electorate, and I believe that it gets back to the community of interest as we’ve heard several speakers mention.

I believe that Camden, in the heart of the Macarthur district, must be retained in the Macarthur electorate. And under the proposed boundary changes, Camden and the
35 Wollondilly area would be removed from the Macarthur electorate which I think just does not make sense. The historic property of Camden Park, established by John and Elizabeth Macarthur, is the cradle of the agricultural industry in the colony, particularly in respect to wool and also wine and horticulture and dairying. The names of John and Elizabeth Macarthur epitomise the history and heritage of
40 Camden and have given the district its identity. To remove Camden from the seat of Macarthur makes a mockery of this heritage.

And John Macarthur-Stanham, who’s not able to be with us today, also says that to remove Camden from the Macarthur electorate and thereby disassociate the area and
45 community with – which the Macarthurs helped develop and served, would be inappropriate and highly regrettable. The link between the Camden community and its history and the contribution of the Macarthurs is tangible and deserves to be

respected not severed. I wish to express my support for the numerous objections that you've heard raised by Camden Council, Camden Historical Society, Camden Rotary Club, Camden Chamber of Commerce, Macarthur Regional Organisation of Councils, the Macarthur Law Society, Campbelltown and Airds Historical Society,
5 John Macarthur-Stanham and many others.

The proposed boundary changes may meet some statistical requirement but I believe that it fails the community of interest assessment as it affects Camden and it is a ridiculous proposal to take Camden out of Macarthur. Now, several of my associates
10 have expressed to me the view that it may be a waste of time coming here today and that the decision has already been made. So I'm heartened, Mr Chairman, by your assurances that views will be – have been listened to and will be taken into account. Thank you very much.

15 CHAIRPERSON: Yes. Thank you very much, Mr Wrigley, for your contribution and your views will certainly be taken into consideration. The next speaker is Mr Stephen McMahon. Mr McMahon, if you would be good enough to state your name and your particular interest.

20 MR S.F.D. McMAHON: Yes. My name is Stephen Francis Dominic McMahon. I'm a town planner, and I'm representing the Hazlett and Vitocco families, who are both located in the Macarthur electoral district. They're both local businessmen, they're property owners, they're land developers and they also own a number of commercial interests. And they've asked me to speak on their behalf. What I would
25 like to do is ask if I can actually approach you and just hand out a plan of the Camden growth area, where – within the Macarthur electorate. I don't – it's not new material. It's just something that I would like to put on the table and then I will take it back at the end, unless you want to keep it. But it will help me put across my points to you in terms of the growth of the area and in terms of how Macarthur and
30 the new boundaries don't actually match with

CHAIRPERSON: Will your submissions be speaking to this?

MR McMAHON: Yes. It's an – it's more detail on
35

CHAIRPERSON: I think it would be of assistance to us. Yes.

MR McMAHON:

40 CHAIRPERSON: That's all right. We will – I will share. What you've handed us, Mr McMahon is a document – or a plan entitled South West Growth Centre Context Map dated 14 April 2015 entitled Macarthur Developments.

MR McMAHON: That's correct. Yes.
45

CHAIRPERSON: Yes.

MR McMAHON: And that plan is a plan that I put together that basically incorporates all of the growth plans, the master plans, the zoned plans within the Camden LGA within that part of the Macarthur electorate. And all of the Vitocco and Hazlett families' businesses are on that map. There's a shopping centre, there's
5 land development and there's other commercial interests.

What I wanted to sort of emphasise to you was that at the moment all of those developments are within the Macarthur electorate, and over the next 10 years, if you look at the infrastructure, there will be about \$10 billion worth of federal and state
10 infrastructure put into that planned area. You've got the airport, Stage 1 of which is \$4 billion. You've got the roads package, which is underway now, upgrading the major road through there. That's \$3 billion. You've got approximately \$2 billion for upgrading the South West Rail Link.

15 And the Federal Minister Paul Fletcher has just announced an inquiry on how the development industry can fund the extension of that South West Rail Link. And we obviously have an interest in that. We have a major land holding in that. And we will be putting in quite a comprehensive submission on that. The population that you can see on that plan is roughly around 50,000 dwellings, so it will be 150,000 people.
20 But of note – and this covers similar ground to some of the previous submissions – in the next 10 years, in that sort of south-western, southern part of that map that you can see – in the next five to 10 years, there will be generally around – there will be 30,000 new dwellings being constructed in that area, so that's 100,000 people, I guess 60,000 electors if you have two per dwelling. So you can see that the growth
25 in this area is quite dramatic.

Now, the current proposed boundary is basically divided in half. At the moment, all of that area is within the Macarthur electorate, and with the proposed redistribution of the boundaries, it will be split into two. At the moment, it's an efficient boundary.
30 The airport is in it. All the growth areas are in it. But it's proposed to sort of create a hybrid electorate which will encompass existing and established communities and residential areas in Campbelltown, where there will be very little change, and it will take out some quite significant parts of growth, particularly the Bringelly area and the airport, and put those in Hume.

35 You've heard comments from other presenters about the difficulties and the inefficiencies of the representative – the Hume electorate representing the interests in this particular area of southwest Sydney, and we would only repeat those. At the moment, for my landowners, who are, as I said, developers and businessmen, it's a
40 very efficient electorate. They can work with one representative.

But if the boundaries are adjusted, they will essentially have to go to two elected representatives basically arguing or having the same issues. And as you might know, developing in Sydney and New South Wales is a complex exercise. You're creating
45 new communities. You're impacting on existing communities. You're talking to both Federal and State environment and infrastructure agencies, and it's hard work.

And having the benefit of having an efficient representation to argue our issues is of paramount importance to the landowners.

5 So, in essence, that's pretty much my submission. I guess what I would like to ask
you to consider is – have a look at the growth in that area. It's significant. Camden
is growing at around 3000 people a year, and it's the fastest growing LGA in New
South Wales right now and it will probably be the fastest growing LGA, I suspect, in
10 Australia as all that growth takes place. There's an inordinate amount of
infrastructure going in there, which has an impact. The boundary as it currently
stands is quite efficient in terms of an easily definable and logical boundary in terms
of geographical distance, but also the communities of interest.

And so on those three points alone, I would like you just to have a consideration
15 about whether the new proposed boundary actually achieves the criteria and the
objectives that you've set out. I mean, obviously I don't have the detail about the
numbers, and I know – I take note of the comment that you made at the introduction
that, you know, the numerical – the number of electors is an important, if not
paramount, consideration. But what I would like to ask you to do I just have a look a
20 little bit ahead in the future as well, rather than just taking a snapshot of today,
because I think you will find that it will change dramatically.

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Mr McMahon. Would you mind if we kept these
maps? Because they might assist us when we study them. Thank you for your help,
25 Mr McMahon. The next speaker is John Nour. This is to be read in by a member of
the Commission's staff because Mr Nour apparently can't be here.

MISS N. TAYLOR: I'm Nicole Taylor, the National Redistributions Manager.
This submission is from John Nour:

30 *As a resident, I am proud to be part of St George region. To reshape the
Barton electorate will mean reshaping the St George region. This will create
confusion in the area regarding local events, leading to an identity shift, thus
making it harder for residents to be complacent and unable to understand their
35 new region. I talk for many of my neighbours and friends who do not want to
be associated with the Sutherland Shire, which would happen if areas such as
Dolls Point or Sans Souci are reallocated to Cook. Historically, the Barton
electorate has included my suburb since 1922. I would like this part of history
and tradition to be acknowledged and present into the future, preserving the St
40 George region.*

*Geographically, the borders of Barton and the St George region have always
been separated by Captain Cook Bridge from Cook and Botany Bay from
Grayndler. So to blur these lines geographically makes it harder for residents
45 to assimilate to new regions. It also will cause differences in issues within
residents, as crossing boundaries to join with Cook or Grayndler electorate
creates a variety of different issues that are specific to each individual area.
Not only blurring these geographical lines will affect all residents, but could*

result in disunity with current communities and councils when promises are made from MPs.

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. I think the next - - -

5

MISS TAYLOR: I think I have a second component, actually, to this one.

CHAIRPERSON: Yes.

10 MISS TAYLOR:

As a church located within the electorate of Barton, the recent electoral boundary redistribution announced by the AEC has caused concern for me and those who our community group represent. The church at large has flourished under the banner of the St George region. To be included in the electorate of Cook, which since 1968 has been represented and dominated by the Sutherland Shire, does not truly reflect the concerns, issues and identity of my church in the current electorate of Barton. In conjunction with small businesses, local residents, schools, community groups and churches like ourselves associate and identify as part of the St George region.

The currently proposed boundaries will either see the electorate of Barton be dominated by Inner West values by areas like Marrickville, St Peters and Hurlstone Park or areas dominated by interests of the Sutherland Shire represented in Cook. Those who attend my parish in Bexley are from the St George region. The current member for Barton has attended my church regularly. In this time he has created a bond with my parishioners whom they feel comfortable seeking help from. I sincerely hope the AEC takes into account the abovementioned concerns I share with many members of my church.

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. I think the next speaker who's also not present but has asked for his statement to be read in is Mr Rob Priest.

35 MISS TAYLOR: So the submission from Rob Priest, a resident of Forbes.

Unfortunately I am unable to attend either venue as I am very busy at this time of year with Vinnies and Salvos Christmas hampers. It would be appreciated if you could arrange for my thoughts to be put before the inquiry Commission. My wife and I have lived in the Forbes district and Lachlan Valley all my life: 69 years. My wife and I have raised and educated six children who all now have their own university degrees and professions. We have 18 grandchildren. We have run a family business and employed local people for 41 years. We are rate payers in the Forbes Shire and are involved in many community groups.

45

The people of the Forbes Shire have no community of interest with the Riverina district. Outside of our local district our main centre for shopping and medical

services is to the east of here, namely, Orange. Transport is direct and easy to the east but not so to the south. It makes more sense to be in the same electorate as those with whom we have a community of interest.

5 CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. And the next speaker who also can't be present but has asked for his statement to be read into the record is Mr Peter Goodwin.

MISS TAYLOR: So this is a submission from Peter Goodwin of Port Macquarie relating to the Lyne-Cowper electorate.

10

Objections to proposed electoral boundaries redistribution – Lyne and Cowper Divisions. I would like to raise an objection to the proposed changes to the southern boundaries where it is proposed that the large town of Port Macquarie is to be transferred into the Cowper division. My reasons are:

15

(1) We will have two large towns which are currently big growth population areas in the same electoral division. I can foresee in the not too distant future another redistribution coming about at the taxpayers' expense separating these two towns again.

20

(2) We will have two sitting members of parliament who are presently residing in the same division. And if the current Member for Lyne, Mr David Gillespie, was to still live at his current abode he would have approximately three hours drive to his most southern boundary, and be in a territory that he is unfamiliar with. Likewise with the sitting Member for Cowper, Mr Hartsuyker.

25

(3) The proposed boundary will split up the towns Port Macquarie and Wauchope - are currently controlled by the Port Macquarie-Hastings Council, which are both big growth areas. The voters when it comes to election time would not be familiar with the sitting member and other parties and could produce very unsatisfactory voting as they would not know who they are voting for. It would cause utter confusion in the polling booths on polling day and also at the early voting centres in the Port Macquarie town, which has a large population, where they would vote for the Division of Cowper, and those who reside in Wauchope and do the majority of their business and travel to Port Macquarie on a regular basis would have to vote for the Division of Lyne. I might add that Port Macquarie is in the top list of the most elderly population, and to change their ways with boundary distribution would be a difficult task.

30

35

(4) Why not make the northern boundary of Lyne the Hastings River? This would then incorporate both Port Macquarie and Wauchope in the same division and cause less inconvenience and misunderstanding by the voters as to which division they were in and give them a better knowledge of the parties they were to vote for. This boundary change was in effect in prior elections and only cause minor problems with those people who reside on the northern side of the Hastings River yet have the postal address of Port Macquarie.

40

45

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Well, I think that concludes all the speakers who wished to address orally this morning. If I've missed anyone please let me know. Otherwise, we have Skyping from, I think, for – from four persons commencing at 1.30 today. So what we will do now is to adjourn and resume at 1.30.

5

ADJOURNED

[12.26 pm]

10 **RESUMED**

[1.30 pm]

CHAIRPERSON: All right. Well, good afternoon. I think we might resume, it being 1.30 pm. Is Mr Nathan Quigley here, please? Would you like to come forward, Mr Quigley. Just have a seat, Mr Quigley. And if you could please tell us, for the record, your full name and your particular interest.

15

MR N.T. QUIGLEY: Okay. So my name is Nathan Timothy Quigley. I'm the State Director for the National Party of New South Wales.

20

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

MR QUIGLEY: So I don't want to take up too much of the Commission's time. We put a very extensive objection in and comments on objections. But I just would like to, firstly, reiterate a few of the arguments we made and deal with a few of the comments that were made about our objection in that round and just put a few final comments on some issues that have arisen over the course of today. I will start by saying that we thought that, given the context of this redistribution and the determination on a few issues like the Committee's determination not to cross the Great Dividing Range on the north coast, which we disagreed with and still disagree with, given that context, it's a fairly good redistribution. In my experience, there are usually a lot more curveballs in terms of strange things done with seats.

25

30

The boundaries generally are quite acceptable to us. The anomaly in all of that – and as we demonstrated in our objection – is western New South Wales, and we've seen – we've seen objections from Murrumbidgee, from Cowra, from Weddin, from Parkes, from Forbes, from Wellington, from Carrathool and Griffith Shire Councils, and from New South Wales Farmers relating to this. Now, there's obviously a bit of an issue here. So none of this is actually of electoral interest to us; I will put that on the table. These are all safe national liberal seats. There is no suggestion that any of them be abolished. So our arguments stem completely from a desire for the best outcome for the communities in these areas.

35

40

So in terms of the four criteria, we've heard a lot today about community of interest, and I would submit to the Commission that community of interest has a different meaning in these seats than it does in somewhere like Paddington. With all due respect to the submissions from Paddington, it's nice to have a sense of community,

45

but if the line is drawn one way it's not really going to affect the way these seats operate too much. Whereas if the line is drawn in a detrimental fashion west of the range, it can have some quite large impacts on the way these local members go about their jobs and the access that people have to their constituent – to their representatives.

Now, the one criterion that we have a lot of issue with in relation to this submission is the area of the seat of Parkes. And this is a constant thing that's thrown back and forth between us and the Labor Party, who would like to contend that size doesn't matter in these circumstances. Now, firstly, the fact is that it is written into the criteria under section 66 of the Act as something that must be considered, so obviously it's a moot point saying that in New South Wales no electorate can be big enough that size is going to be a problem.

Secondly, size is quite a consideration in these electorates, particularly when you look at Parkes, which at the moment will probably require three electorate offices, which is one more than they're actually entitled to. There is no way they will not be able to – that they will be able to get away with not having an office in Dubbo, no way they can get away with not having an office in Broken Hill, and no way they can get away with not having an office in the northern part of the seat as well. And this comes to the crux of Parkes, is it's not just the size; it is the spread of population across this seat that is the problem. And at the moment it's doable. Adding Broken Hill onto one end makes that an extraordinary proposition. We're talking about a nine hour drive from one side of the seat to the other.

So obviously, given the number of objections to the west of the State from fairly prominent organisations in these areas – seven Shire Councils, New South Wales Farmers, various Country Women's Associations – inherent problems with the proposed boundaries in this area. And so what we've given the Commission in our objection is an alternative to look at. And we've basically gone with a more status quo approach. We've kept the Central West largely as is under the current – the current boundaries. We've retained Broken Hill and Central Darling Shire in Farrer. And Riverina, in our submission, moves a lot less away from that core Riverina area.

Now, we acknowledge that there are imperfections with this. You know, we're dealing with the rest of the State as presented by the draft redistribution. We're not trying to alter that, so we're working within those constraints, and it has thrown up a few things like the separation of Griffith and Leeton and the inclusion of Holbrook – inclusion of Holbrook in Riverina, which, if we were given our druthers and starting from scratch, we wouldn't do. But we would argue that on balance, especially when you look at the Central West as it's drawn under our objection, that our proposal exceeds the community of interest benefits provided by the draft redistributions proposal in Parkes, in Forbes, in Wellington, in Mid-Western, and has a huge, huge positive effect in terms of the size of the seat, which is the third criterion.

The other thing it does is that the draft proposal basically creates three coherent seats, and one left over. I mean, Riverina basically, in the draft redistribution, appears to

be a leftover of what didn't fit into every other seat. I mean, there's not much of another possible explanation for including, you know, the towns of Tullamore and Trundle in a seat with Wagga. So what we've done is given you an option to go with a proposal that has four coherent seats.

5

You have a Riverina – there's genuinely a Riverina seat. You have Farrer, which has been acceptable to the last two redistributions in basically its current form. You have Parkes, which is much reduced and a much cleaner, coherent community of interest. And you have a Calare that follows very neatly along the Lachlan Valley. And of course, the Wiradjuri name for the Lachlan River – well, Calare is derived from the Wiradjuri name for the Lachlan River.

10

And for the first time – we've been wanting to do this every redistribution for a while and it hasn't fit – for the first time, we've got that axis from Orange through Parkes and Forbes out to Condobolin into the one seat. And we think this is a bit of a triumph, because Lachlan Shire really struggles to fit where it belongs in any redistribution. And for the first time, we've managed to get it in a coherent spot. So we would argue that we've given you an option here that is at least – at least – equal to the one in the draft boundaries on community of interest.

20

It's much better in terms of area. And even if it's only equal – and we would argue that it's better – even if it's only equal, on the basis of the number of electors being moved, which is a subordinate criterion for the preservation of existing boundaries – so even if it's equal on the other three criteria, we would argue because it results in much less movement of electors, preserves the current boundaries to a much larger extent, that this proposal should be adopted.

25

And further, that if you would like to go with the draft Committee's boundaries in this regard, you're going to have to satisfy yourselves that they represent such a significant advantage in terms of community of interest that they override, firstly, criterion in section 3 relating to area, and are worth moving away from the current boundaries – well, the proposal that's close to the current boundaries, which is what we've come up with.

30

So I would leave that with you for your thoughts, and I would note that a number of people today have spoken about it. And I'm told that while I was out of the room, even, we had a fellow who was wanting to comment on the Kogarah situation who also noted that Forbes should go with Orange. I also just make the final note that we've been here before. At the last redistribution the draft boundaries includes Parkes and Forbes with Dubbo and Orange and – sorry – and Mudgee and Wellington with Orange. We objected to that.

35

40

We had the – the mayor of Forbes at the time came down and submitted that they should go with Orange. And the 2009 augmented Commission determined that that was the way they should go and that is why they are where they are. At the state redistribution we argued successfully that Parkes and Forbes should go with Orange and Wellington and Mudgee should go with Dubbo and the boundaries were changed

45

to match that. So we've been here before twice, and each time it's been found that this layout of the Central West is far superior in terms of community of interest.

5 Now, there are a couple of other alterations that can be done without considering
wider changes that we think – that even if our submission across the west of the state
isn't adopted, they should be considered. And the first is the division of Carrathool
Shire. Now, Carrathool Shire I note made a submission – sorry – made an objection
to the draft boundaries, and part of that objection was that they didn't want to be
split. Now, Hillston, which is in the northern part of Carrathool Shire, in the draft
10 boundaries is included in Parkes. It's community of interest lies very strongly to the
south with Griffith and with the rest of the shire. So on a community of interest
ground alone it should be included in whatever seat Griffith is in, which in this case
is Farrer.

15 And the other point I make on that is this is another isolated community tacked onto
the end of Parkes and it doesn't have to be. It belongs further south and there are no
numerical imperatives to keeping it in Parkes and not in Farrer. So we would submit
that even if you don't do the other changes that we would like that Hillston and the
rest of Carrathool Shire be moved into Farrer. The final one is Gwydir Shire, which
20 wasn't part of our initial objections but we made comment on it in our comments.

It was an objection from Gwydir Shire itself wanting to stay in the electorate of
Parkes. So Gwydir Shire is a merged shire. I think they merged in 2002. And the
northern half of it around Warialda is largely grain growing flatter country and has
25 obvious similarities and community of interest with Moree and the southern part of it
around Bingara is hillier and more similar to the New England, particularly areas
around Manilla and Barraba, and there's a strong access down there to Tamworth.

30 Now, you can't move all of Gwydir Shire into New England without requiring
consequential changes, so we would suggest that if the Commission wanted to follow
Gwydir Shire's wish to stay in Parkes they could come to a compromise and more
the area that relates more closely to Moree into Parkes and keep the area that's more
New England, which is around Bingara, in New England and to do that on the old
Shire boundaries. The final note I wanted to make was one that I wasn't actually
35 planning to make, but I was listening to a few arguments in here and I thought I
wanted to weigh in. It's the naming of the seat Throsby-Whitlam.

40 So it was Mr McNamara that really – whose arguments really struck me on this one
in that we all want to see a Division of Whitlam and hopefully in this redistribution
but he suggested that if we want to do it we should do it properly and that naming a
Division with which he had no connection Whitlam mightn't be the best way to do
that.

45 And you think about from the National Party's point of view, you know, the
poignancy of the seat of Page being around the hometown of Earle Page and the seat
of McEwen being close to where John McEwen operated in Victoria. These are
powerful things. And whilst not having much knowledge of Charles Throsby, and

accepting their arguments on that fellow, I think personally and I think in terms of the spirit of these redistributions I would like to see the name Whitlam – the Division of Whitlam in a place that Gough had some connection to.

5 Now, obviously – I mean, people have been throwing around Werriwa, which can't happen because it's an Aboriginal name and a Federation Division. I suggest that the Division of Fowler should be considered. Fowler was created in 1984 in the same year as the Division of Throsby and so is of equal merit there. And Fowler contains Cabramatta, which was Gough's home when he was operating in parliament. So I
10 will leave that with you for your consideration. But if you did want to accept their arguments on Throsby that you might want to consider moving the name to Fowler. Okay. I thank you for your time.

CHAIRPERSON: Yes. Thank you, Mr Quigley, very much for your contribution.
15 All of what you've said will be taken into consideration. Well, I think we now move to the persons who wish to appear by Skype. And the first person is Councillor Michelle Blicars from Wollongong City Council. Can we have her, please?

MS M. BLICAVS: Hi. I can hear you.
20

CHAIRPERSON: Good afternoon. Is that Michelle, is it?

MS BLICAVS: Yes. It is.

25 CHAIRPERSON: And just for the record, Michelle, is your – your full title is you're Councillor Michelle Blicars, B-l-i-c-a-r-s, is it?

MS BLICAVS: A-v-s – V for Victor.

30 CHAIRPERSON: A-v – sorry – Blicavs.

MS BLICAVS: That's all right.

CHAIRPERSON: And - - -
35

MS BLICAVS: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON: Well, now, do you represent the council or you're a – you're one of the councillors?
40

MS BLICAVS: I am one of the councillors.

CHAIRPERSON: Very well. Now - - -

45 MS BLICAVS: But our council moved a motion supporting – well, actually rejecting the change.

CHAIRPERSON: All right.

MS BLICAVS: I'm sorry. I don't know if you can hear the music in the – I'm in a restaurant at my staff Christmas party, so - - -

5

CHAIRPERSON: That's all right. We can hear you quite all right. I just wanted to just ascertain just for the record whether the views you are expressing are those privately of yourself as a councillor or are the views of the council.

10 MS BLICAVS: They are both.

CHAIRPERSON: Very well.

MS BLICAVS: There was a resolution at our council on 12 November - - -

15

CHAIRPERSON: Yes.

MS BLICAVS: - - - resolving to formally object to the name change of the seat.

20 CHAIRPERSON: Very well. All right. Well, look, we would be most – we really appreciate what you have to say. If you like to tell us what your thoughts are.

MS BLICAVS: Thank you. The City of Wollongong and the Wollongong LGA was founded by Charles Throsby 200 years ago actually. We've just started our
25 bicentennial celebrations. And he was well-known for bringing the first lot of cattle down the mountain to the Wollongong LGA and setting up many of the street names and the local area that we have here in Wollongong. He's recognised in a number of capacities across the region, and one of those, of course, is the federal seat of Throsby, which covers a considerable portion of the Wollongong LGA going into
30 some of the others also. So it has been a great way to recognise that historical fact.

Our concern, whilst we highly appreciate Mr Whitlam and the service that he provided to our country when he was Prime Minister for a few years, to supersede the history that we have in this region by a former Prime Minister who had really
35 very – very limited, if any, connection to the region at all we feel is not suitable. Having read the full proposal and document that was released by the Commission and the panel in relation to why Whitlam – why Throsby was the seat chosen we read that to be, well, there were five options, Throsby was the last one on the list and there wasn't any particular reason why it shouldn't be the one but we have reasons why the
40 other four shouldn't be.

And so we don't feel that the argument was made for Throsby being renamed Whitlam. It was more that, "Well, we don't think we can do it anywhere else so we will just pick this seat". And to people of Wollongong we don't feel that the
45 argument has been made strongly. We would say that with redistributions, whilst I know New South Wales is losing a seat, it is likely to gain a seat some other time given the growth of New South Wales even in our own region where we've got

50,000 homes going in over the next 20 years. And so perhaps when a new seat is created that is the time to rename it after a Prime Minister, and if not, then we would say that the seat where he sat in Werriwa could be the more appropriate seat to rename.

5

CHAIRPERSON: Very well. Well, is that all you wish to say?

MS BLICAVS: Yes.

10 CHAIRPERSON: Now, were you - - -

MS BLICAVS: I'm happy to answer any questions specifically - - -

CHAIRPERSON: No.

15

MS BLICAVS: - - - but that's certainly the views that are shared quite broadly across our region.

CHAIRPERSON: Well, I think - - -

20

MS BLICAVS: There's quite a public debate about it.

CHAIRPERSON: Yes. Thank you very much, Councillor. Your views are – you've put them across very succinctly. I think we all understood them, and they will be taken into consideration.

25

MS BLICAVS: Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

30

MS BLICAVS: I appreciate your time.

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

35

MS BLICAVS: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON: Bye-bye. Now, the next person wishing to address the augmented Commission is Mr Bob Stewart of Tumut Shire.

40

MR: He's on the phone, I think.

CHAIRPERSON: Good afternoon. Is that Bob?

MR R.K. STEWART: Good afternoon. Bob Stewart, Tumut Shire Council.

45

CHAIRPERSON: Yes, thank you, Mr Stewart. Mr Stewart, my name's Dennis Cowdroy; I'm the chairman of the Commission. And you are addressing now – we

can all hear you – the augmented Commission. And for your particulars, can I please ask you to state your full name, because what you say is all being transcript recorded and will be published on the website, and it's important we get the correct titles and name of everyone who's appearing before us today.

5

MR STEWART: Robert – Robert Kevin Stewart. General Manager, Tumut Shire Council.

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Mr Stewart. And may I just ask you, the name
10 Stewart is S-t-e-w-a-r-t, is it?

MR STEWART: That's correct.

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Now, Mr Stewart, when you're about to address us,
15 will the views you are expressing be those of yourself or those of the Tumut Shire Council?

MR STEWART: Those of the Tumut Shire Council.

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. All right. Well, I think if you would like to tell us
20 what your views are of the Council, we would be very interested to hear them.

MR STEWART: Thank you, Mr Chairman. We've got a very poor line, so I'm not
25 hearing you all that well. Tumut Shire Council is a rural council at the foothills of the Riverina region of the Snowy Mountains to the – with approximately 11,200 square kilometres. Sixty-one per cent of our area is state forest or national park, the Kosciuszko National Park. That park sits to the east of Tumut, and it is part of the Great Dividing Range between us and the current electorate of Eden-Monaro. The Council at its meeting on 27 October resolved to make a submission on the following
30 grounds: our ongoing association with the Riverina region.

Tumut looks towards Wagga Wagga as its regional centre and the centre for all of its major services; it does not look to the east. It is the geographical area of the
35 Regional Development of Australia, the service centre at Wagga, our transport, health services, education there. Tumut has been for a number of years moved continually from one electorate to the other: Farrer, Eden-Monaro, Riverina, and now back to Eden-Monaro.

And this is certainly causing some concern and confusion to our shire residents. The
40 Council believes that the Eden-Monaro electorate was predominantly coastal-focused, and Tumut and the Tumbarumba Shire are separated by the Great Dividing Range to that – in that electorate. With the reform of Local Government in New South Wales, Tumut and Tumbarumba will be located in the Riverina Joint Organisation of Councils. We do not have strong links to the east. Thank you.
45

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Thank you, Mr Stewart. Well, all those remarks, being those of the Council, will be – will have been recorded, and we will certainly take them into consideration. Thank you for your time and trouble.

5 MR STEWART: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Bye-bye. Well, I think that concludes until 3 o'clock those persons who wish to speak to us. So what we will do now, we will adjourn now until 3 o'clock, when the next, and I think the final, person wishes to
10 address the augmented Commission. So we will adjourn now for one hour.

ADJOURNED

[1.55 pm]

15

RESUMED

[3.01 pm]

MR T. ROGERS: Are you online, Mr Easson?
20

CHAIRPERSON: I will just note for the record it's 3 pm and the augmented Commission hearing is resuming into the proposed redistribution for New South Wales for 2015. Mr Bowen, welcome to this afternoon's hearing. In a moment I will get you to state your full name simply for the record and your particular interest.
25 And we're trying to get on the – by Skype Mr Shane Easson as well. Perhaps while that's being done, I might get you to – if you wouldn't mind stating your full name for the transcript.

MR C.E. BOWEN: Certainly, Mr Chairman. My name is Christopher Eyles
30 Bowen.

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

MR BOWEN: And I'm the Federal Member for the seat of McMahon
35

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. There seems to be some technical hitch.

MR ROGERS: Are you there, Mr Easson?

40 CHAIRPERSON: Good afternoon. Mr Easson, can you hear us? I can see you appear to be nodding, but we can't hear anything.

MR ROGERS: Is your microphone on, Mr Easson?

45 CHAIRPERSON: There seems to be a technical problem, Mr Easson. We can see the room you're in.

MR ROGERS: Here we go.

CHAIRPERSON: But there seems to be no voice. Something is coming through now. No. It has gone again.

5

MR ROGERS: I think we might have to go to plan B. Otherwise, we might be here all afternoon, if that's

CHAIRPERSON: Yes. We might try and give you a telephone call, I think, Mr Easson. We can see you, but we can't hear you. We're just about to call you now by telephone. Can you hear us now, Mr Easson?

10

MR S.A. EASSON: I can. Look, I don't know what the problem was. I checked it just a few minutes ago. But at least you can see me, I guess.

15

CHAIRPERSON: Yes.

MR EASSON: And this isn't the most efficient way. But, look, we might start, if it's convenient for you, with Mr Bowen providing his evidence first.

20

CHAIRPERSON: All right. Well, what - - -

MR EASSON: And I will

CHAIRPERSON: Yes. Mr Easson, what I might get you to do, if you wouldn't mind, just for the record – for the transcript, just state your full name and your particular position, if you would, please.

25

MR EASSON: I'm Shane Anthony Easson, and my role is the ALP Redistribution Coordinator, and I'm appearing for the ALP today.

30

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Thank you, Mr Easson. All right. Well, Mr Bowen has already provided his particulars, so we might ask Mr Bowen. Mr Bowen, would you like to make your presentation to us.

35

MR BOWEN: Yes. Thanks very much, Mr Chairman, and thank you for the opportunity to make a few brief remarks today in support of Mr Easson's Labor Party submission, particularly in relation to the seat of McMahon, which I've represented in the Federal Parliament since 2004. I want to cover two issues briefly today: the focus of the proposed seat, the lack thereof, and the community interest issue.

40

And by way of background, Mr Chairman, the seat of Prospect was created in 1969, and it was renamed McMahon in the redistribution of 2009. And since 1969 when the seat was created, it has very clearly been focused on the Fairfield CBD. And if it's of interest to the Commission, I've got the maps of the seat as it was created in

45

1969 which I can submit to you. I've brought a few copies. And clearly the southern boundary of the seat around Fairfield CBD has not changed since that time - - -

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

5

MR BOWEN: - - - in my view. The eastern and western boundaries have all changed, but the southern boundary has remained clearly to ensure that Fairfield remains in the seat.

10 CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

MR BOWEN: Now, Fairfield CBD is the most well-connected area in my electorate by terms of public transport. In fact, as we speak at the moment, Fairfield Railway Station is the only railway station in my electorate. I know other Western Sydney
15 seats have many railway stations. My electorate has just one. And by way of interest, Fairfield Railway Station is the oldest operating railway station in Australia, but that's just by interest. And accordingly, since 1969, when the seat was created, the members for Prospect and McMahon have always had their electorate office either in Fairfield CBD or Fairfield West, which is just a short bus ride away from
20 the Fairfield CBD, and that is certainly the case for myself.

Now, my understanding is that most seats have a natural focus, and certainly in my experience in Western Sydney that is the case. So, for example, Lindsay has a very clear focus on Penrith, Chifley has a very clear focus of Mt Druitt, Greenway has
25 Blacktown, Blaxland has Bankstown, Macarthur is essentially a Campbelltown seat, and Werriwa is overwhelmingly a Liverpool seat. So in all of those seats, the member of Parliament has a very natural place to put their electorate office for connectivity for their constituents, and, if you like, each seat has a natural capital city. And clearly for Prospect and McMahon, that has been the case for Fairfield up
30 until now.

Now, I have to be very frank with the Committee and say, if these boundaries stand, I would not know where to put my electorate office. There is no natural place for it. There is no natural focus for the seat. And, with due respect to the Committee, if
35 somebody can point to me a focus, I would take that onboard, but I can't see one and I certainly have not been able to find one as somebody who has lived in the area all my life. So there are obviously options to put an electorate office, Smithfield, Greystanes, Pemulwuy, St Clair, but they all have substantial drawbacks. None of them are as well-connected as Fairfield or Fairfield West when it comes to public
40 transport or ability to get to those areas, and none of them are central to the proposed new electorate.

Now, the Member for Fowler, on the other hand, would have an embarrassment of riches as to where to put his or her electorate office. So they have under the
45 proposed boundaries three large CBDs: Liverpool, Cabramatta and Fairfield. Any of those would be obvious places that could very easily accommodate an electorate office, well connected, large centres, whereas McMahon would have none. Now, the

majority of Holroyd City is proposed to go into the electorate of McMahon under the redistribution, but most of those Holroyd City areas, if not all, connect very closely with the Fairfield CBD, not the Parramatta CBD.

5 And many people in those suburbs would come to Fairfield or Fairfield West for their shopping, would come to – would see themselves as being connected with Fairfield. So, for example, Pemulwuy and Greystanes, both in the seat of McMahon, are considerably closer to Fairfield than they are to Parramatta. And in fact the Commission is proposing to add new suburbs to McMahon which are even closer to
10 Fairfield: Fairfield East area. So that even increases the argument for keeping Fairfield CBD in the seat of McMahon.

And I also note, Mr Chairman, that the ALP submission proposes removing suburbs of Edensor Park, Abbotsbury and Bossley Park and Greenfield Park to the seat of
15 Fowler. And so the proposed boundaries submitted to you by Mr Easson on behalf of the ALP would make sense because it would be understandable for the people of those suburbs to be connected to Fowler which are newer suburbs, and certainly the boundaries would be strong and clear in my view – very strong and clear boundaries under the ALP submission. Mr Chairman, if I could turn now to the issue of
20 community interests having dealt with the issue of focus.

The community of interest in the existing seat of McMahon pre the proposals, if I could say, is already strained. We already have almost a grab bag of suburbs: parts of Penrith, parts of Holroyd, parts of Fairfield. It's already strained with very
25 different communities very different media catchments not connected well by public transport. And in fact I have to, with respect, submit that the community of interest would be even more strained under the proposed submission.

And the case in point is the suburb of Smithfield. Now, the suburb of Smithfield is a
30 very well-established suburb, and under the proposal Smithfield is split in two between Fowler and McMahon with the eastern part in Fowler and the western half to be in McMahon. And I would submit that the community of interest could be greatly improved if Smithfield was to be reunited all in the seat of McMahon.

35 Now, Smithfield is in a very established community, for example, Smithfield Public School was founded in 1850 – is one of Australia's oldest public schools. And Smithfield and Fairfield are closely connected communities. They were both – they're both very old communities, they're both represented by the same councillors on Fairfield Council within the Fairfield ward, which was the ward I represented by
40 way of interest in the Fairfield Council. They have the same media outlets, support the same sporting teams. They're very close communities. And as best as my research can tell, having gone back through the records as I can find them, the suburb of Smithfield has never before been split in a federal redistribution.

45 On the other hand, the newer subdivisions of Prairiewood, Bossley Park and Abbotsbury have more in common with the similar new suburbs of Bonnyrigg and Cecil Hills, which are in the seat of Fowler. So I think that connection as – again as

made in Mr Easson's ALP submission, would be very sound and sensible. So in conclusion, Mr Chariman, if I could say that in my view the submission by Mr Easson is eminently sensible. Restoring Fairfield to the seat of McMahon gives the seat a clear focus and gives the member for McMahon some obvious choices as to location for their electorate office to maximise access for constituents.

Whether the electorate office is in Fairfield or Fairfield West very clearly Fairfield is the focus for the seat and the member for McMahon can convene community forums and events in the Fairfield CBD safe in the knowledge that they are readily accessible for the majority of the constituents. And in addition, reuniting Smithfield under one seat, McMahon, would improve the community of interest and make very strong sense. Whereas removing Abbotsbury, Bossley Park and Prairiewood to Fowler as per the ALP submission retains very strong boundaries. And I can say, Mr Chairman, that I've been discussing with the Member for Fowler Mr Hayes this submission. He agrees with my points and has authorised me to say that he supports the views being put.

And just one other matter, Mr Chairman, not related to my seat but just in support of Mr Easson's submission very briefly. I note Mr Easson on behalf of the ALP is submitting that Badgerys Creek should be a Western Sydney seat. As a Western Sydney member of parliament, Badgerys Creek – the proposed Badgerys Creek Airport is a very, very significant issue and it would make, to my way of thinking as a Western Sydney MP, sense to have Badgerys Creek in a Western Sydney electorate.

But particularly in relation to the seat of McMahon and Fowler, Mr Chairman, I would be more than happy to take any questions and to provide any further information. But I suppose that's a sign of how seriously I regard the focus and community of interest issues that I've taken the opportunity you've kindly provided today to allow me to give some brief evidence.

CHAIRPERSON: Yes. Mr Bowen, thank you for your views. I think we're concerned to know what you had to say about it and the augmented Commission will certainly take your views into consideration and thank you for your attendance here today.

MR BOWEN: Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON: Yes. Now, Mr Easson, if you would like to expand or amplify or express any other views we would welcome your suggestions.

MR EASSON: Okay. Thank you very much, Mr Chairman. I would like to refer to the names of seats to begin with. Tony Beuk from the ALP will hand to you a one-pager about former Prime Ministers from New South Wales who have had a seat named after them.

CHAIRPERSON: Yes.

MR EASSON: And there will be sufficient copies for others.

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

5 MR EASSON: The point here is that it's a complete furphy to suggest that a seat
should be named where it's a deceased Prime Minister after the electorate that he
held. And if you look at the eight other instances of New South Wales seats being
created named after former Prime Ministers you will see the electorates which all of
those Prime Ministers held. And I think enough is said on that point. The second
10 matter regarding names is that the ALP has proposed that the seat of Lyne be
renamed Paterson that your proposed Paterson be renamed Hunter and that the name
of Charlton be restored. We explained why in our submission, but consider these
points.

15 At the last redistribution after the hearing phase the Commission renamed two seats.
They renamed Prospect-McMahon and they renamed Lowe-Reid. Secondly, if we
go back to previous redistributions, in 2006 the electorate of Parkes which was
proclaimed only contained 28 per cent of the former Division of Parkes. Similarly,
in 2009 the Division of Reid only contained 31 per cent of the seat by that name. If
20 we go back to what the ALP is proposing today, that part of Paterson in Lyne is 42
per cent of your proposed Lyne. And that part of the current seat of Hunter in your
proposed Paterson is 36 per cent of the current seat of Hunter in your proposed
Paterson. So the renaming that the ALP has proposed has precedence in 2006 and
2009 and that's what we would like to say about names.

25 Now, since the ALP case will be given in full today rather than part in Port
Macquarie. I would like to take – leaving the names question to go to the whole of
the North Coast. Now, we've got various suggestions – or objections to the
Commission proposing that Singleton and Muswellbrook be taken out of your
30 proposed seat of Hunter. Now, Singleton has been part of Hunter since 1977 and
Muswellbrook since 1984. If you go to the Singleton Council website you will see
that the council states that it has 20 coal mines and those coal mines directly employ
2800 locals. In other words, a quarter of the local workforce. And that doesn't count
the support industry to mining.

35 If we got to Muswellbrook Council we find that it has six major mines. It had
4 million tonne mines in 2001. Today it's 80 million tonne. So those points are
relevant when we consider that Cessnock, which has a large mining workforce,
doesn't contain any mines. Its miners travel to Singleton and Muswellbrook to work.
40 So there has been an increasingly strong connection between Singleton and
Muswellbrook with Cessnock.

So we support the Commission's proposed boundaries. Then when we look at the
Far North Coast, we're looking at various objections concerning Page. They propose
45 what I would call an ISIS-like beheading of New England to put places like Glen
Innes, which has been constantly in the seat of New England since Federation. The
objections propose that that go into Page. We think that's absurd. We should retain

the Great Dividing Range as a boundary between the North Coast and the Northern Tablelands.

5 If I can now refer to the National Party objection regarding Richmond-Page, the Commission has united all of Lismore in the seat of Page – all of Lismore Council. But the Nationals are proposing that Nimbin, which is only 30 kilometres from Lismore and is part of Lismore Council, should go into the seat of Richmond, which – and it makes an argument that there’s a strong relationship between Nimbin and Byron Bay. But Byron Bay is 70 kilometres away from Nimbin, whereas Nimbin, as
10 I just said, is only 30 kilometres away from Lismore. That objection, in our view, should be declined.

Then to finalise the Hunter-North Coast, in the case of Dobell, the Liberal Party has proposed that Wyee and other places go from your proposed Hunter seat into Dobell
15 and adjustments be made elsewhere. Notwithstanding, the argument of the Liberal Party is that Wyee and those other places are close to Wyong. However, Wyee is only eight kilometres south of Morisset, a major town in the Lake Macquarie Council, and it’s 18 kilometres from Wyong. So it’s much further from Wyong than it is from Morisset.

20 Now, the Commission’s proposed boundaries are between Dobell and Hunter to have the Local Government boundary separating Wyong and Lake Macquarie as the boundary. We believe that should stand. If I can further deal with rural areas, there have been National Party objections to Forbes and Parkes coming out of Calare. And
25 the argument is that these places are closer to Orange, for example, than what they are in the proposed seat of Riverina. But if we look at the Commissioner’s proposed seat of Riverina, we find that the Newell Highway travels between Parkes, Forbes, West Wyalong, and Ardlethan. So you can fairly say that in your proposed Riverina, the Newell Highway is actually a spine running north to south of your proposed
30 Riverina.

Moreover, if we look at Mudgee, which has been proposed to be contained in Calare, it’s 128 kilometres from Bathurst and 126 from Dubbo. So it’s a struck match
35 difference in terms of the distance between Mudgee and Bathurst and Mudgee and Dubbo. We believe that the connection between Bathurst and Mudgee should be upheld, that is, the proposed boundary, which moreover allows Broken Hill and more of the western division to be contained in your proposed seat of Parkes. And finally, to deal with the whole of the western part of New South Wales, the National – the Commissioners united all four MIA local government areas.

40 The National Party proposes that Griffith should go out. I would ask the Commissioners to look at the Liberal Party’s comments on objection and allow their boundaries to stand. I now turn to the Bundanoon area. The Liberal Party and the Labor Party have agreed that Bundanoon should not be in your proposed seat of
45 Whitlam. The same proposal by the previous Commissioners was reversed in 2009. So in other words, the Bundanoon area had been proposed to go into Throsby, as

Whitlam was then called, and the Commissioners, after listening to argument, decided to reverse their position.

5 The final part of the country is in regard to Eden-Monaro. We think it's a retrograde step to cross the Great Dividing Range. Since Federation, Eden-Monaro has only moved into the Tumut-Tumbarumba area once, and only then for one election. Otherwise that Great Dividing Range boundary has stood for all of Federation. However, the problem regarding Eden-Monaro fits in with the Southern Sydney-Illawarra area, and I would like to come back to that later. I would now wish to turn
10 – and you may interrupt me at any point – to the Camden-Macarthur area.

Various objections have been made to Camden's placement in the proposed Division of Hume, and there have been arguments that Camden is the key part of Macarthur. But if we look at the Macarthur region, it comprises three local government areas:
15 they are Wollondilly, Campbelltown and Camden. And if you look at your proposed Division of Macarthur, you can fit all of Campbelltown Local Government Area into a single division. And if we look at Campbelltown itself, it contains, just one kilometre south of Campbelltown proper, Macarthur Square, which is by far the biggest shopping centre in the whole of the Macarthur region. It has more than 300
20 shops. It has been operating for more than 35 years.

And Macarthur Square Shopping Centre, again, in Campbelltown Council – it's in the suburb of Arborvale – Ambarvale, I should have said – and it's next-door to the Macarthur Railway Station, which is in Campbelltown, which in turn is next-door to
25 the University of Western Sydney Macarthur Campus. So the ALP objection, by the way, has proposed that more of Campbelltown Council be united and placed in the seat of Hume. The Liberal Party in 2009 also proposed that Camden Local Government Area be contained in the seat of Hume.

30 Now, the reason why we've made this proposal is in part to unite more of Campbelltown in the seat of Macarthur, but also to remove from Hume, which is basically a rural and semirural seat – we propose that Badgerys Creek be placed in the seat of Werriwa. And Badgerys Creek, let me remind you is part of the Liverpool Council. Now, the Liberal Party have said that via the Northern Road,
35 Badgerys Creek relates more to Penrith; it's about 21.3 kilometres away. However, it's slightly closer to Liverpool, 20.9 or 21 kilometres away, and it's part of Liverpool Council

40 And most of the people in Badgerys Creek actually would travel a little further to go to Macarthur Square, which is about 26 kilometres away, and do their shopping there. And I ask the Commissioners to note the submission by the Mayor of Liverpool, who is a Liberal, incidentally, where he has called for Badgerys Creek to be placed in the seat of Werriwa. Badgerys Creek is the biggest issue facing Western Sydney in the next few years. It's of interest to Penrith, to Fairfield, to Liverpool, to
45 Campbelltown Councils and beyond. It makes sense, given how great an issue it's going to be, for Badgerys Creek to be placed in a Western Sydney division rather than a semirural and rural division.

Now, I would now like to cover Southern Sydney. And we're, if you're wondering, more than two-thirds of the way to finishing. Southern Sydney, well, the problem that we've got, if we take Southern Sydney from Cook right down to the Victorian border – so we're including Eden-Monaro, and of course, the Illawarra – there wasn't
5 enough of a shortfall to abolish a seat. So the ALP proposed a rather messy solution. The Commissioners decided to put the Sutherland Shire Council within two seats, being Cook and Hughes. They decided to separate the Illawarra from Sydney by making the boundary between Wollongong Council and Sutherland Council the
10 boundary between Cunningham and Hughes.

Now, we would expect that this whole issue can be faced again at the next redistribution, where the decline in population from Cook right down to Eden-Monaro will probably cause an abolition of a division if you take into account that
15 part of the Southern Highlands, in Whitlam, that part of the divisions of – the current Division of Banks and Barton, which are proposed to be in Cook, and that part of Liverpool Council in Hughes, and finally, the certain shortfall that there will be in Eden-Monaro. So our view is we can live with the Commissioner's proposed boundaries for the southern part of Sydney and coastal New South Wales.

Further, a couple of objections have said that Blakehurst-Connells Point should be removed from the proposed Cook and placed back in Banks. But can I just point out to the Commissioners, in Banks' 66 year history, Blakehurst-Connells Point has only
20 been in that seat of Banks for the last six years. And if you restore that part of Bankstown Council currently in Hughes, which the Commissioners have done, and
25 put that into Banks, then something has to go. And so we would support the Commissioners' boundary in that area. I now wish to deal with the – this Drummoyne Council issue. And to us it's a bit of a squeaky wheel proposition.

We mentioned in our submission that Canada Bay Council and Auburn and Burwood
30 Council have proposed to amalgamate themselves. Further, the Liberal Party and other objections have pointed out that Drummoyne is the headquarters of the Council Chambers for Canada Bay. However, their solution takes out the Council Chambers for Auburn Council. Moreover, if we look just 10 days ago, the New South Wales Government announced that it's likely that they will build a Parramatta-Strathfield
35 light rail going through Sydney Olympic Park.

So another connection between the Auburn Council and the Strathfield Council, and it's becoming stronger with the very recent New South Wales Government
40 announcement. And then when we come to Drummoyne itself, clearly many of its connections are west, with the Italian community in Leichhardt, the ferries, the bus. And don't forget the government secondary schooling for Drummoyne is located in Balmain and Leichhardt. So there is a strong connection between Drummoyne and Balmain which the Commissioners have proposed be included in the seat of
45 Grayndler.

So to sum up there, the objections create the same sort of problems regarding Auburn Council as what they claim is the problem with the Canada Bay – the Drummoyne

end of the Canada Bay Council. So again, we suggest that the Commissioners uphold the proposed boundary. Further in the area, there have been some objections relating to Marrickville. We believe that the objections are no better than the proposal of the Commissioners. So we also believe that the boundary of Barton and
5 Grayndler – the southern part of Grayndler, the northern part of Barton – should also be as proposed by the Commissioners.

The final point I wish to make relates to Paddington. There have been some objections concerning Paddington South. But I would like to point out to the
10 Commissioners that the part which they have taken out of Wentworth is the council boundary between Woollahra Council and the City of Sydney. So the Liberal Party and the Labor Party agreed with the Commissioner's boundary regarding Paddington South. And we might add that that boundary, the council boundary, is a cleaner
15 boundary than the alternative, you will certainly find. And with that, that concludes what I would like to say on behalf of the ALP.

CHAIRPERSON: Mr Easson, if I may say so, your remarks have been very comprehensive, very clear and very succinct, and I think we all appreciate your input. Thank you indeed.
20

MR EASSON: Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON: Yes.

25 MR EASSON: And sorry about the audio on the – I think we worked our way through it, didn't we?

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

30 MR EASSON: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Thank you for your participation.

35 MR EASSON: Thank you. Bye.

CHAIRPERSON: Bye-bye. Well, I think that now concludes all the persons who wish to address the Sydney inquiry, and the inquiry will now adjourn and reconvene in Port Macquarie on Friday, 18 December. Thank you for your participation.

40

MATTER ADJOURNED at 3.38 pm UNTIL FRIDAY, 18 DECEMBER 2015