

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Public consultation session (inquiry) of the augmented Electoral Commission for Tasmania

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE The Hon. Susan Kenny AM KC
(Chairperson of the Electoral Commission)
Mr Jeff Pope APM
(Electoral Commissioner, Australian Electoral Commission)
Dr David Gruen AO
(Non-judicial member of the Electoral Commission)
Ms Hannah Brown
(Australian Electoral Officer for Tasmania, Australian Electoral Commission)
Mr Martin Thompson
(Auditor-General of Tasmania)
Mr Scott Strong
(Deputy Surveyor-General of Tasmania)

LOCATION: Merino Room, The Old Woolstore Apartment Hotel
1 Macquarie St, Hobart TAS 7000

DATE: 9.30 am Thursday 30 April 2024

CHAIR

Good morning, everyone.

Welcome to the public consultation session of the augmented Electoral Commission for Tasmania.

I'd like to begin by acknowledging the traditional custodians of the land on which we meet today and pay my respects to their elders past, present and emerging.

Now let me introduce myself.

My name is Susan Kenny, and I'm the chairperson of the augmented Electoral Commission.

The other members of the Commission are Dr David Gruen, Mr Jeff Pope, Mr Martin Thompson, Mr Scott Strong and Ms Hannah Brown.

I don't know whether you would know who they are.

Dr Gruen is the Australian Statistician. Mr Jeff Pope is the Australian Electoral Commissioner. Mr Martin Thompson is the Auditor General of Tasmania. Mr Scott Strong is the Deputy Surveyor General of Tasmania, and Hannah Brown is the Australian Electoral Officer for Tasmania.

It might give you some comfort to know we have Tasmanians here.

Now, part IV of the *Commonwealth Electoral Act of 1918* sets out the requirements for conducting a redistribution.

In accordance with section 66 of the Electoral Act, the Redistribution Committee for Tasmania has prepared a proposal for the redistribution of Tasmania, as I suspect you are all aware.

There will be 5 electorates under the proposal, and the proposal, together with its written reasons, was released on the 27th of February this year.

I imagine most of you have come here to talk about that proposal.

In accordance with Section 68 of the Electoral Act, interested individuals and organisations were invited to make written submissions in response to the proposal. 112 submissions were received.

The augmented Electoral Commission is required by subsection 72(1) of the Electoral Act to consider all objections lodged in relation to the redistribution proposal, referred to on the website as *ideas*, as well as all comments on those ideas, which are referred to as *feedback on ideas*.

Just pausing there to note the statutory language is a little different and we will return to that statutory language when we publish our final report so that ideas are really referred to or are referred to in the Act as objections and feedback on ideas are referred to as comments on objections. If you happen to be looking at the Act and you wonder why the terminology has changed, the substance hasn't changed at all, but that's, one equals the other, if that makes sense.

Now today's session provides an opportunity for you all to make verbal submissions directed to us.

The Act specifies how the redistribution process is conducted, and I want to just, I'm sure you're aware of it but I will repeat this in case anyone isn't.

Section 73(4) of the Act states that the primary consideration for augmented Electoral Commissions is that each electorate satisfies certain numerical requirements and that, at the end of the day, is what matters most.

The object of those requirements generally speaking is to ensure that every voter's vote is equivalent to every other voter's vote.

Now, the other things, so often you'll find that we may think that somewhat what is said by submission is very sensible, but we can't adopt the submission because it can't fall within the numerical requirements that the Act requires.

Now, subsection 73(4) also requires the Commission to give due consideration to communities of interest (that's often a subject of submissions), as well as communication and travel within an electoral division (or electorates as it is referred to

in the most recent report), physical features, and the areas of other electoral divisions as well.

Now the boundaries of existing electorates, I should say, are subordinate to the other considerations, community of interest, communication and travel and the like, and of course the numerical requirements.

Often when we make a change in one boundary, there has to be a compensating change in another, as you would understand.

Now, I should tell you, today's public consultation session will be recorded. You will be asked to state your name. Transcripts of the proceedings will be published on the AEC's website in due course. So what you say is entirely public.

I'd like also to let you know that we have members of the media present today as well.

Now when you're presenting, I'd ask you to come to, well my notes say the table in front of the room but I think they mean the lectern here and would you please state your name for the transcript before you commence.

To see that all of you have adequate opportunity to do so, we'll ask you to speak for five minutes. A note or card of some kind will come up at the four-minute mark and then at the five-minute mark and see if you can keep within that timetable.

If you have not registered to speak but decide to do so, you've come along to see what's happening but you decide to say something, could you please speak to a member of staff on that table.

Now, as you'll be aware, this session is intended to provide an opportunity to present new arguments or materials. So if you've made a submission already, please don't read it out. I can tell you, all of us have read it very carefully. You might want to add to or explain what you've said, and that's absolutely fine, or say something slightly different.

After today, we will have to consider what you've said, and that will take us a little time. I'll have to see what fits within quotas and the like. But we'll endeavour to make a public announcement as soon as we can.

Is there any questions?

Good.

Okay, now I think what we might do is come to the interesting part, which is the first speaker. Now the first speaker I'm told is James Walker.

Thanks Mr Walker.

First speaker: MR JAMES WALKER

9.37 am

MR JAMES WALKER

Well, good morning and thank you for the opportunity afforded to present today.

My name is James Walker. I've been a Clarence councillor for some 14 years and I've worked in allied health for decades, including in the northern neighbouring council of Brighton and our communities share many demographic characteristics and I would welcome being in the same federal electorate as that community.

Franklin is the electorate I grew up in and the only electorate I've ever voted in.

Now let me start by congratulating the Redistribution Committee for Tasmania on grasping the nettle for substantial and durable reform to the three southernmost electorates. And Mr Pope, let me just quote some commentary you made, which is that all proposed changes are driven by the need to balance current and projected enrolment across electorates, but also to have electorates that reflect connected communities of interest and natural boundaries wherever possible.

Wherever possible is indeed the lens to look at this process from in Tasmania. With our four distinct population clusters, north-west, north-east, south-west and south-east, there are no perfect solutions. But there are better and worse options. The AEC proposal represents better. Better than other suggestions that were put forward, and thus I hope that this will remain the final configuration.

Tasmania is a decentralised state. In your proposal, each electorate has both an urban and rural constituency of dimensions too big to ignore. The configurations also represent improved equity and serviceability by geographic size of electorates. Now I believe that Bass and Braddon proposals are widely accepted, despite some likely pushback you might receive from other local government representatives this morning.

However, noting at the comments made online through the submission process, the most pushback you have received relates to the three southernmost electorates, particularly the final versions of Franklin and Lyons. Now the nexus of Glenorchy and Hobart cities needing to remain in the same federal electorate should be debunked.

With Hobart the state capital, every council can lay a claim to a community of interest with City of Hobart. Interestingly, earlier this year, Glenorchy councillors considered progressing a proposal suggested by Hobart councillors to merge and become the City of Clark. This was unanimously rejected by Glenorchy councilors for reasons including lack of community demand.

The proposed new Clark is generally accepted by those who will reside within it. I notice little or no concern from Kingborough or Huon areas who would likely look forward to being in a contiguous electorate that better fits their travel and communities of interest. There has also been no negative commentary raised by City of Hobart representatives to the new Clark proposal. The pockets of pushback seem to be coming from those opposed to your sensible south east proposal for new Franklin.

A partial Clarence and Glenorchy tie-up has been proffered as an alternative to this, and I strongly reject the Clarence and Glenorchy tie-up proposal. I'd ask the committee to firstly reflect on the durability of that model for future redistributions. Currently, Franklin is separated by the Derwent River. It would still be under this model, although, you know, granted, it is easier to swim from one side of the river to the other upriver than downriver. The communities of interest are weaker under this model, and I note the existing endeavours that already occur in the southeast corner. One example being the Southeast Regional Development Association, whereby councils and businesses collaborate in the southeast corner. These would all be coming together in your proposal.

And on cultural dimensions, I'd note that the Clarence and Glenorchy football clubs have proud traditions, but are arch rivals. Some would say it's heresy that these two clubs could coalesce in the one electorate. And good luck to the Franklin representative deciding which side they would back.

I'd note that when I was in this room last time for a former redistribution process, I was not in favour of renaming Denison to Clark at that time. And my reason being that Clark was indeed a meritorious suggestion with strong levels of support, but that it was something that should probably be held over for a substantial redistribution.

This time, there is no, generally, you know, so whilst that case has been made and won. I'd note that changing the name to New Franklin, unlike Clark that time, we haven't had a standout alternative proffered. There are some good and meritorious suggestions, but not one single one, unlike then, has really come to the forefront. So that is something that might require further consideration.

And I'd also ask you to reflect on the submissions that have been received. How much input has there been from some of the peak Aboriginal groups in Tasmania on the suggestions that have come forward? How much involvement have they had?

So finally, democracy is precious. It is, in fact, a wonderful aberration that most countries don't get to enjoy. We are extremely fortunate to live in a country that deals with democracy in the fashion that we do in Australia with redistribution processes.

I again thank you for the opportunity afforded to me to present.

Thank you.

CHAIR

Thank you, Mr Walker.

The next speaker is Douglas Chipman.

Second speaker: Mr Douglas Chipman

9.43 am

MR DOUGLAS CHIPMAN

Thank you very much.

Doug Chipman, former Clarence Mayor and now a university student.

Good morning and thank you for the opportunity to present.

I'd like to address the Commission on three particular points: firstly, the southern redistribution; secondly, the Bass-Lyons boundary; and finally, the naming of the proposed south-eastern electorate.

In regard to the southern distribution, I noted with interest that out of the 95 round two ideas submitted, 59, and I'll make that 62%, talked only about the naming of electoral divisions. On that basis, I submit that nearly two-thirds of the respondents were comfortable with the proposed establishment of a southeastern Tasmanian electoral division.

The pushback from Glenorchy and Brighton was understandable. Many people resist change. However, I believe their push to sustain their own status quo ignore wider benefits that can flow to Tasmanian voters overall through this redistribution proposal.

The Tasmanian *Greater Hobart Act* acknowledges the Brighton and Sorell local government areas as part of Greater Hobart, along with the core local government areas of Clarence, Hobart, Glenorchy and Kingborough.

Altogether Greater Hobart makes up more than two electoral divisions and therefore must have a footprint in at least three. Most large cities, many that identify as one community of interest, straddle more than one electoral division.

Glenorchy's relationship with Central Hobart is not unique and does not merit a unique relationship under the electoral redistribution process.

The idea of smashing Glenorchy and western Clarence together simply doesn't make sense.

In the first instance, it breaks up the Clarence LGA as a community of interest. Secondly, it would create a uniquely urban electoral division in Tasmania, whereas all the other divisions would comprise major population centres surrounded by rural hinterlands.

Some submissions suggested that the relationship between Glenorchy and the Derwent Valley local government area warranted Derwent Valley joining Glenorchy and Clark. It could just as easily be argued that such a relationship supports the proposal to move Glenorchy into Lyons.

Brighton shares a border with Clarence and indeed there's a shared strategic interest with the logistics hub in Brighton and the Hobart International Airport in Clarence,

especially via the transport corridor between the two, that is becoming increasingly important.

Brighton is currently in the same electoral division as Glamorgan Spring Bay, Sorell and Tasman local government areas, so its fit into the new south-eastern electorate would not represent a great change or problem for them.

Moving to my second point, the Bass-Lyons boundary.

I note that the proposal to transfer Blackstone Heights and Prospect Vale out of Lyons and into Bass was overturned by the augmented Commission in 2017 on the basis that we'll be breaking up the Meander Valley LGA. I don't understand what's changed today, other than the nip and tuck approach would again simplistically balance the numbers.

I also note that Break O'Day Council has strongly advocated for being part of Bass. Transferring the Break O'Day LGA into Bass rather than parts of Meander Valley LGA would be preferable because projected numbers would be closer to quota. It would better preserve communities of interest and further reduce the geographic spread of Lyons.

Finally, I'd like to emphasise my original proposal that the new south eastern electorate be called Paredarmerme.

The new electorate, as defined in the committee's proposal, closely follows the boundary of the Paredarmerme, also known as the Oyster Bay Aboriginal Nation's boundary, and the name would meet the Act's electorate naming policy of encouraging the use of Aboriginal names where appropriate.

In conclusion, I strongly support the proposed redistribution in Southern Tasmania, but again urge the augmented Commission to consider the benefits of Break O'Day LGA becoming part of Bass to avoid the break-up of Meander Valley.

I further urge the committee to adopt the name Paredarmerme for the new south-eastern electoral division.

Thank you.

CHAIR

Thanks, Mr Chipman. The third speaker today is Christ Carswell.

Third speaker: Mr Chris Carswell

9.49 am

MR CHRIS CARSWELL

Thank you, Madam Chair.

My name is Chris Carswell.

When I retired from the Australian Bureau of Statistics 10 years ago, after 30 years of service, I was representing the Bureau on the Tasmanian Geospatial Data Committee, chaired by the Tasmanian Surveyor-General.

I'm speaking today in support of Tongerlongeter, Tukulunginta, as a name for a new Franklin electorate. Tukulunginta is the name used for Tongerlongeter in *palawa kani* language.

I acknowledge the Muwinina, who for thousands of years drew water from the nearby rivulet, and I pay my respects to the Palawa for maintaining the cultural practices of their ancestors.

I acknowledge the scholarship of Nicholas Clements and Henry Reynolds in resurrecting the detail of Tongerlongeter's service to his country.

I would also like to add that I support your committee's Tasmanian redistribution proposals.

Why Tongerlongeter?

Tongerlongeter is a person's name, the preferred guideline option. He was an Aboriginal person, also a preferred option. The name is not being used for any other electorate purpose.

Tongerlongeter died in 1837 and is buried at his place of exile on Flinders Island. He has no known descendants.

The committee need only consider the significance of the service Tongerlongeter rendered to his country. The detail of Tongerlongeter's service in the Black War is documented in the *Australian Dictionary of Biography*.

The Black War in which he was a leader is a well-documented and significant event in Australian history. His country, the Oyster Bay clans, broadly corresponds with the area of the proposed new Franklin division.

The High Court's decision in the Mabo case acknowledged the traditional rights of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples to their land. In response to the fencing off of traditional hunting grounds, the violence at coastal gathering places, the abduction, rape and murder of Oyster Bay women, and the kidnapping of Oyster Bay children, Tongerlongeter emerged as the leader of Oyster Bay war parties dedicated to resistance. The British response was the largest military offensive ever mounted on Australian soil.

No Aboriginal Australian warrior has so far been honoured with an electorate name.

Another Australian military leader, John Monash, was honoured with an electorate name in 2017. Monash's service to his country was rendered in Europe, not on country.

Tongerlongeter fought for both, on and for his country. With the benefit of the Mabo decision, he can be characterised as an Australian leader in a just war.

Peter Lalor was honoured with an electorate name in 1949. Like Tongerlongeter, he had his wounded arm amputated after the brutal put down of the miners' rebellion he led at Eureka. After Eureka, Lalor provided service to the Victorian Parliament. After the Black War, Tongerlongeter provided leadership to the exiled Tasmanians at Wybalenna. Lalor led a rebellion against a colonial power that lasted for six days. The Black War lasted for eight years. It resulted in the complete removal of the Tasmanians from their country. It is a significant chapter in Australian history.

In 1835, two years before Tongerlongeter died at Wybalenna, a treaty was signed at Merri Creek, the creek that now flows through modern Melbourne. The treaty was signed with eight Wurundjeri elders, including three who had the name Jagajaga. The proponents of the treaty were Van Diemen's Land settlers seeking new land for their flocks. The treaty was intended to head off the warfare that they had witnessed in Van

Diemen's Land. Since the Black War caused pastoralists to propose a treaty at Port Phillip, then Tongerlongeter's war service carries an ancillary significance in the naming in 1984 of the Victorian seat of Jagajaga.

Bennelong was honoured with the naming for North Sydney electorate in 1949. Both Bennelong's and Tongerlongeter's country border magnificent Australian waterways. Their country is a similar extent. With the landing of the First Fleet, Bennelong and his people came into conflict with a foreign power. Unlike Tongerlongeter, Bennelong was not exiled. After capture, he walked two cultures. He learned English and he travelled with Arthur Phillip on his return to Britain.

Bennelong sought accommodation in New South Wales, while Tongerlongeter was driven to war by the British failure to provide accommodation in Van Diemen's land.

The 2026 Tasmanian redistribution is a rare opportunity to bestow a significant honour on an Aboriginal Australian warrior.

In recommending it, I offer my best wishes to the committee and its adjudication.

CHAIR

Thank you very much indeed. Now, Brian White is the next speaker, fourth speaker.

Fourth speaker: Mr Brian White

9.54 am

MR BRIAN WHITE

Thank you for the opportunity to be here today.

So I'm actually a strategic planner at council, so I'm not an ex-mayor or anything like that. Yeah so, it's great to be here today.

I'm going to keep this pretty brief. Brighton Council's position is straightforward. We should remain wholly within Lyons.

Brighton isn't just an outer metro growth area; it's a regional and peri-urban hub. We play an increasingly important sub-regional servicing role for the Southern Midlands and Central Highlands.

Recent data in our Activity Centre Strategy found that this catchment is currently really important for those outer communities where they spend a lot of their money, particularly in the suburb of Brighton. So people come to Brighton for work, education, health services, retail, sport and community infrastructure, and this looks set to continue according to our data.

Moving Brighton into Franklin cuts directly across these real relationships. Franklin is increasingly metropolitan and southeast coast in focus. Brighton aligns with the regional and mixed urban regional character of Lyons. That's where our community of interest sits and where our advocacy needs are best understood.

We're also the youngest municipality in the state and also one of the fastest growing. However, we do have significant socio-economic disadvantage in some of our suburbs where historically a policy decision was made to cluster social housing in these suburbs.

Many of our residents experience transport disadvantage and rely on coordinated federal advocacy for social infrastructure, public transport and employment pathways. Council believes these needs align with Lyons, not with the proposed Franklin.

We understand quota has to be met, but the committee's own report highlights the scale of electoral movement under the proposal. Our submission makes the point that disruption of that size should only occur when clearly necessary. In this case, Council believes it isn't.

There are lower disruption alternatives, including a simple adjustment involving Derwent Valley. This would achieve a quota without breaking long-standing community alignments.

So just to summarise my brief presentation. Council strongly believes that Brighton should not move into Franklin and that Brighton should be kept in Lyons, where its regional role, community ties and advocacy needs are properly reflected.

Thank you.

CHAIR

Thank you very much, indeed. Next speaker is, I believe, Michael Tucker.

Fifth speaker: Mr Michael Tucker

9.58 am

MR MICHAEL TUCKER

Good morning, and thank you.

I am Michael Tucker, Mayor of Break O'Day for the last 12 years and President of the Local Government Association of Tasmania. I'd like to take the opportunity to thank you for being here, but understand I'm totally opposed, as Mayor, to the redistribution and this is the reasons why.

The proposal doesn't reflect our community; how our community actually lives, works or connects. Break O'Day is being treated as a boundary problem to solve, not a community to represent. We're asking for a practical outcome to align us with a real connection, which is Northern Tasmania.

And I'd like to thank Doug Chipman, which I wasn't aware of, was going to fight so supportingly of Break O'Day moving north into Bass. So thank you very much, Doug.

Community of interest: Our community of interest is clearly to the north, not south. We live on the east coast, but we function as part of Northern Tasmania. We're part of Northern Tasmania Development Corporation, which has 8 councils, NTARC, our Northern Waste Management. Everything that we do relates to Northern Tasmania, not south. The committee's own paper acknowledges these connections, but the proposal ignores them. If community of interest really matters, this proposal has got it wrong.

Real life connections: Launceston is our service centre. It's closer, faster, where people already go. Our public transport goes to the north, not south. The Act should consider travel and communication. This proposal doesn't reflect the reality of what we actually are.

It's actually broken electorate logic from where I sit. You're removing an east coast community and leaving Break O'Day completely isolated. We would become the only East Coast council in Lyons. This is not a community of interest; this is fragmentation.

Glenorchy: Adding Glenorchy fundamentally changes the nature of Lyons. You're mixing a large metropolitan centre with regional communities. The shift would represent representation towards Hobart, city-centric, and it'll be at the expense of regional Tasmania. You're diluting both, metropolitan and regional, instead of representing each of those properly.

Representational risk: These risks weaken the voice of regional communities. These electorates, anchored in Hobart, increase the likelihood of metro-dominated outcomes. Regional Tasmania should not be an afterthought in just a pure, simple, number exercise.

We're asking for you to do 2 things really:

- Reconsider the inclusion of Glenorchy in Lyons.
- Seriously consider moving Break O'Day into Bass where our community actually connects.

Electorates should reflect real communities, not a mathematical balance. Right now, this proposal doesn't do it. At the moment, it feels like our communities are being shuffled around on a puzzle like pieces to make the numbers work. We are not a line of a map. We are a community with real connections, and this doesn't do anything for us.

Thank you.

CHAIR

Thank you very much, indeed. Next speaker is Mr John Brown.

Sixth speaker: Mr John Brown

10.02 am

MR JOHN BROWN

Thank you, Madam Chair, and thank you for the opportunity from the Redistribution Committee to speak to you today.

I'm John Brown, I'm the General Manager of Break O'Day Council, so we're having two bites at the cherry here with this one.

Couple things, firstly, people don't realise how remote Break O'Day is from the capital city. We are further, we are more remote than Queenstown. Further in time, a smidge closer in distance, but we are remote. St Helens is remote, our major population centre. So when you look at it in that context, and look at it from the point of view of council advocating to be part of Bass our nearest major population centre is about 65% the distance that Glenorchy is from the bulk of our community. So, Break O'Day is remote. We just don't drive through a heap of rainforest to get to it, and the road is largely better, depending on which way you come from.

I'd like to acknowledge the wisdom and the insights of Doug Chipman. We didn't pay him for that, but he did a great job of articulating that for us and really appreciate that.

What might be better for some communities through this proposal is actually worse for Break O'Day. And as the Mayor has mentioned, the communities of interest, what's proposed does not reflect our practical communities of interest on a day-to-day basis.

The connection to the East Coast, we do work with our East Coast Council as well, and it's been an important part of what happens, strategic regional partnership things where we have elements in common.

Things are going to change. We acknowledge that. But when we look through the report that's provided, look at the discussion around Clark and the suggestions that came through, which included Derwent Valley, as well, from the community. The narrative from the committee doesn't actually answer the question around why Derwent Valley wasn't included in Clark, why it remained in Lyons.

Emphasising the point of previous conversations around not splitting Meander Valley away. I can understand in some ways why you might want to include Prospect and Blackstone Heights in there, but once again, you're separating that community, as well as splitting it in half. The inclusion of Break O'Day in Bass solves that issue, as well.

It actually solves two problems. It puts us where we belong, and if you go back far enough, prior to the creation of Break O'Day, when it was Portland Council and Fingal Council, back in 1993, Portland Council was in Bass. That's half of Break O'Day. So we're not disconnected from Bass in the past from an electoral perspective.

Just after 1993, we ended up in Lyons for the next redistribution. Which has served us well from time to time, but our biggest concern will be the actual representation that we have on a day-to-day basis by where our representative might be based.

We fear that with the connection of Glenorchy in this electorate that we may end up with being a city-based representative who occasionally visits the countryside, which is a day trip to get there and back. We came down this morning. it's an easy three-hour run to get there, so how often is a federal member going to actually make it to our neck of the woods as well?

So just to reiterate, the council requests that the committee re-examine the options around this as well. We know you've got a difficult task, we know you have to play the numbers game around this as well, but we think there are better options here than what is currently being proposed and we'd like you to look back at this and look about reorienting Break O'Day into the northern region of Tasmania, because that's where we are now, and that's where we want to stay, literally, not from an electoral perspective.

Thank you for the opportunity to talk to you, and I don't envy you in your deliberations.

CHAIR

Thank you, Mr Brown. Now our next speaker is Mr Angus Templeton.

Seventh speaker: Mr Angus Templeton

10.07 am

MR ANGUS TEMPLETON

Hello. My name is Angus Templeton. I am speaking just as an individual.

I'd like to speak in support of the AEC's redistribution proposal.

The electorate of Franklin currently has the strangest boundaries of any electorate in Australia. To the best of my knowledge, it is the only non-contiguous electorate which has a road connection between the two parts. The expansion of Clark to the south is the only workable solution to this, and I fully support it.

I would also like to support the inclusion of Glenorchy into Lyons as a poor but workable compromise. I agree it is not ideal, but as Glenorchy would only constitute a third of the

new Lyons, this would make it impossible for any candidate to neglect campaigning or building support either in Glenorchy or within the rest of Lyons.

However, I would like to note my concern that the City of Clarence will make up approximately 60% of the new Franklin, and that the Tasman and Glamorgan Spring Bay councils combined will make up less than 10%.

Sorry, I lost my space.

When the next redistribution happens, attention should be paid as to whether those two areas, which are rural councils, suffer as a result of this compared to the more populous and Hobart-adjacent LGAs.

I would also like to note as well that while you are not able to take into account state boundaries, state government is more influential on a community, on a community's day-to-day lived experience than federal boundaries. Because of this, in Tasmania, where the Tasmania Electoral Commission copies your homework, the preference of the communities and local councils should maybe take more precedence in your decision than in other states in Australia, even if I disagree with them.

Finally, I would also like to say that I would love to see an Aboriginal name used for the new Franklin, but that this decision should come with consultation with the Indigenous community.

Thank you very much.

CHAIR

Thank you very much, indeed. Now, Reuben Rex Eberhardt.

Eighth speaker: Mr Reuben Rex Eberhardt (by phone)

10.10 am

MR REUBEN REX EBERHARDT

Good morning, Reuben speaking

CHAIR: Hello Mr Eberhardt.

MR REUBEN REX EBERHARDT: Yes, hello.

CHAIR: Susan Kenny speaking. I'm Chair of the Augmented Commission. Have you been listening so far?

MR REUBEN REX EBERHARDT: No, I haven't. I've had quite a busy morning, so I've only got the time allocated and that's about it.

CHAIR: Well, thanks so much for coming to speak to us in this way. May I just say to you, we expect about 5 minutes, if you can keep within that, and I'll hand it over to you now.

MR REUBEN REX EBERHARDT: Excellent. I think I've got it timed at about 3 minutes, so I should be just under. Right. Am I free to start?

CHAIR: Yes, please.

MR REUBEN REX EBERHARDT: Excellent. I'll just put you on loudspeaker. I have to read this off my phone. I hope you can hear me okay?

CHAIR: We hear you very well.

MR REUBEN REX EBERHARDT: Excellent. Thank you.

Having spoken with a number of community leaders in the Brighton LGA, the model we as a community are arguing for is as follows.

That Clark expands into what is currently the south half of Franklin as proposed, that keeps Glenorchy and takes the Derwent Valley too, but we acknowledge that the Derwent Valley LGA may need to stay in Lyons to balance the numbers as it is a high-growth area. This gives Clark at least two high-growth areas in Kingston and Huonville with a possible third, if adding the Derwent Valley LGA.

We support that Franklin move to the East Coast as proposed in the new model but omits Brighton LGA. The Brighton LGA in totality remains in Lyons.

That no name changes to Franklin are proposed as it is a federation electorate. That all other changes to boundaries in other parts of the state go ahead as proposed.

As a community, we feel this is a more holistically balanced model that allows for numbers to balance and grow over time with growth areas in every seat, increased access to representation for regional communities, a better model for keeping like

regions with similar interests together, removes and does not create any municipal enclaves where LGAs are split between electorates, at least in the south.

It should be stressed that this model we propose is supported in the feedback by the largest block of respondents and is therefore the majority supported alternative model and should be put forward for consideration as such. Those respondents include the local government areas of Brighton, Glenorchy and the Southern Midlands, who represent a significant number of voters. No other alternative model has had support beyond that of the individual who submitted it.

When referring to Brighton, it is implied that we are referring to the municipality of Brighton, that is the LGA as a whole, and not the suburb of Brighton. The members of the Brighton LGA community and our elected leadership on council do not accept any proposed model that will consider splitting it between electorates. Brighton LGA, despite its proximity to Greater Hobart, is not part of Greater Hobart and has had closer ties and a stronger identity with the south-central region of Tasmania, for which it is the economic and commercial heart. It belongs in Lyons.

Glenorchy has always been a part of Greater Hobart and has already stated it has no relationship with Lyons. The Derwent Valley LGA is a good fit in either Clark or Lyons, but many of the issues taken to representatives align more so with Clark. Though we acknowledge that Lyons will probably need it as a high growth area for balancing the numbers into the future.

Lastly, we as a community are concerned that the AEC looked only at balancing the numbers when it came to redistribution and has otherwise disregarded every other element of the Tasmanian community and its regions. Our model, whilst less immediately balanced, does account for such things through future growth.

Thank you.

CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Mr. Eberhardt. We're indebted to you. May I wish you a happy day.

MR REUBEN REX EBERHARDT: Excellent. Thank you very much for that.

Unavailable speaker

10.16 am

Phone call attempted. Participant did not answer

CHAIR:

Do you want to try again in a few minutes time? We'll just take a three-minute break I think.

Phone call attempted. Participant did not answer

10:22 am

CHAIR:

Everyone, I wonder, can we sit down again?

Is there anyone who feels they'd like to speak now who might have sat through and listened? They're welcome to. Our last speaker has just said that she can't speak right now, so she's unavailable.

There's a few minutes if you wish. Anyone wish to say anything?

All right. Well, I must say I'm very grateful to those who have spoken. You've really been, given us something to think about within our deliberations, so thanks so much.

And thank you, everyone else, anyone who hasn't spoken but who's attended. Thank you for attending. Your presence is welcome and appreciated.

And I think with that, I must bid you all adieu and say thank you very much indeed.

- - -

Close of proceedings