

|                     |   |                                      |
|---------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| <b>From:</b>        | Glyn Yates <glynyates1@bigpond.com>                                 | <b>W A E C</b><br><b>24 AUG 2015</b> |
| <b>Sent:</b>        | Sunday, 23 August 2015 7:53 AM                                      |                                      |
| <b>To:</b>          | 2015 Electoral Boundaries Review                                    |                                      |
| <b>Subject:</b>     | Objection to the 2015 proposed electoral boundaries                 |                                      |
| <b>Attachments:</b> | Fact_sheet_6 Coversheet 2015 electoral boundaries submission GY.pdf |                                      |

Dear Commissioners,

I wish to object to the proposed boundaries on a number of levels.

Firstly in an overall sense I challenge the notion of fairness and equity your proposal suggests.

The statistical balance between country and metropolitan representation is significantly out of balance. The thought that country people get comparative representation when their elected representatives in an electorate like Central Wheatbelt which is almost 98,000km<sup>2</sup> while 22 of the metropolitan are less than 30km<sup>2</sup> or 3200 times smaller defies logic.

The capacity for electors to physically get to meet see and discuss matters with their representatives is significantly eroded by scale alone but unfortunately that is not the only hindrance. In addition the cost to meet their representatives is higher, the representatives who try very hard to meet with constituents spend a disproportionate amount of time driving / flying around their electorates not meeting with constituents. This is further compounded by the fact that the representatives then spend more than 50% of the year in Perth at Parliament not at home in their electorates so opportunities to meet with constituents at evening functions etc does not exist.

I question if any of the commissioners have lived in country locations to have any understanding for this? Without having experienced these challenges I don't believe the commissioners have the capacity to appreciate this and on this basis I ask how did the commissioners assess this?

In relation to the rationale of the recommendations it is simply flawed. In the commissioners own report in the third paragraph of the report entitled "resolution of the critical question" the commissioners say the balance currently in place does not "offend" the principle of one vote one value and yet 2 lines later the following sentence appears "The removal of a district from the vast landscape of country Western Australia has a significant impact on the democratic process, especially for people in an electorate that is effectively abolished and for those who find themselves in geographically larger districts as a consequence." So in summary the current model isn't broken but in our "fix" we are going to significantly impact the democratic process!

I question the statement that technology has improved significantly in recent years. Telephones, mobiles and internet are largely unchanged, NBN is years away (if ever for many country West Australians) but most importantly our elected country representatives which have vast electorates to manage still only have the same number of hours in the day to undertake their work.

In a broader solution sense the one vote one value system with only a 10% + or - doesn't work and should be reconsidered and you should have addressed this in your report even if only to articulate the argument and provide your opinions rather than using this flawed system as your justification. There is a need moving forward to increase the representation as our population grows.

Commissioners in relation to specifics your reports discusses in some length the notion of not disconnecting well connected communities such as mine being Collie. So how could you possible think that linking Collie and Busselton in the same seat works? This is compounded by the fact that the office of this electorate is in Collie and the people of Busselton would effectively need to drive to Collie (1.5hrs) to see their representative. This could of course turn the other way if following the 2017 election the office for the seat became Busselton. There are far more logical splits in this sense I note that much of the Burekup and Donnybrook area are not in the Collie seat and this would be a more logical fit.

In summary Commissioners I request you not abolish a country West Australian seat further disadvantaging country people who are already significantly disadvantaged compared to metropolitan Perth and that you reconsider the boundaries for Collie.

Finally commissioners thank you for your work on the review.

Kind Regards

Glyn Yates  
Company Director  
WFM Pty Ltd  
[glyn Yates1@bigpond.com](mailto:glyn Yates1@bigpond.com)  
0407 445280

---

This email has been scanned by the WAEC Security System in accordance with WAEC Policies.