



The Federal Redistribution 2006
NEW SOUTH WALES



Public Objection Number: 1738

Name: Mr Paul BETTS

Page(s): 2



"Paul Betts"
<paulb@nationalgrazing.co
m.au>
28/07/2006 12:45 PM

To <nsw.redistribution@aec.gov.au>
cc <john.cobb.mp@aph.gov.au>,
<pb227808@bigpond.net.au>
bcc

Subject Redistribution of Parkes and Gwyder Electorate

Classification Unclassified

At any stage did the AEC send out a letter or flyer to these electorates to explain what is going on and what the real changes are for, or did you just hope that the process you are taking will do and the people will have to come to you first, not the other way around. You are meant to be there for the protection of people in those electorates and not to be there for any political parties whims. To me these changes look like want to get rid of the independents and not for what is good for the electorate. The distant this particular person, who is elected, to travel would make a mockery of the travel scheme for politicians. The amount of monies to be paid out to whoever is only one person, but imagine the cost for private plane and fuel (HAVE A LOOK NOW AT THE COST OF AVGAS) do you think it is going to get any cheaper, I don't think so. You will also have to factor in the cost of staff, their travel to and from Canberra, not cheap. If the person does not own a pilots licence, then add the cost of a fully trained pilot who must also undergo counter terrorism training etc.

At this stage what I have suggested would be the tip of the iceberg, the AEC would have to investigate this member anytime or every time someone thinks he is wasting public monies, or he or she is not doing what his or her electorate is not asking or what political party is backing this member and at what cost.

The biggest does not always mean the best, if you are using other states as guides, then you (and I mean you) try and get around the electorate you are creating and see if you can get around, add some problems like pilot falling ill, unavailability of alternative arrangements, like driving will take twice as long or other flights, its not that simple to just pick a flight and go, you must still register flight plans, sometimes you might have to fly to Sydney to go back out west.

This whole plan has not been thought out for the electorate or its representative in mind, to put people at greater than you have to would and should have been one of your greatest issues, I can't see how you intend to solve it for the safety of both parties involved.

Did anybody ask the both sitting members how they would see problem with this scheme or idea? The cost and the security alone are going to be huge issues to solve, and I mean you have to have them solved before this person is elected to parliament, if you haven't, then you are in for an uphill battle from the start.

Security is becoming a big issue, do we have to remind you of what is happening around the world at the moment. It is easier to have control when you control it, with these changes you will lose control over the above issue simply because the area is so vast that it will take a platoon of people just to protect the politician and also ensure the safety of the people. Remember it will only take one nut to find a way to harm us and shatter our peace and we will never trust anybody again.

The real cost of these changes will be in some of the following ways; Security, Safety, Cost (monies), Staff, Travel and accessibility to major track of flights and movement in case of accidents. I believe this boundary change should be scraped and the current situation maintained because it is easier to control all of the above issue now without outlaying vast amounts of public monies to try and solve problems if they have not bee solved or thought of how to combat them now.

The picture below is the best way of showing how things can go wrong even with every one doing there part.

Paul Betts
19 Ronald St
Dubbo
NSW 2830



