

CORRECTED EVIDENCE

ELECTORAL MATTERS COMMITTEE

Inquiry into the conduct of the 2014 Victorian state election

Melbourne — 11 August 2015

Members

Ms Louise Asher — Chair

Mr Russell Northe

Ms Ros Spence — Deputy Chair

Ms Fiona Patten

Ms Lizzie Blandthorn

Mr Adem Somyurek

Mr Martin Dixon

Staff

Executive officer: Mr Mark Roberts

Research officer: Mr Nathaniel Reader

Witnesses

Mr Warwick Gately, Electoral Commissioner,

Ms Liz Williams, deputy electoral commissioner,

Ms Glenda Frazer, manager, election services, and

Ms Sue Lang, manager, communication, education and research, Victorian Electoral Commission.

The CHAIR — We will commence, and again I start with a reminder that members of the public in the gallery are allowed here to observe but must not comment during proceedings. If that could be observed, I would be very grateful. Thank you, Mr Gately, and your colleagues for coming along. Thank you for your very extensive submission, which I certainly spent a long time studying, as I know my colleagues did as well.

I also advise you that this is a properly recorded public hearing where you are protected by parliamentary privilege but obviously not protected outside, which is probably not as relevant to you as it is to others, but again I am making you aware of that. For the record, Mr Gately, could you please state your full name and business address? Obviously in your case you are representing your organisation, if you could just confirm that please. You may then want to make some preliminary observations, and the committee will ask questions.

Mr GATELY — Thank you. I am Warwick Gately, Electoral Commissioner, 530 Collins Street in Melbourne.

The VEC welcomes the opportunity to participate in this inquiry into the conduct of the 2014 state election and to identify where improvements can be made in the delivery of election services across the state. The VEC provided a submission to this inquiry which forms the basis of my report to Parliament, which I expect to table in September and on which I am very happy to expand today.

In our first meeting on 22 June I provided some early observations on the conduct of the election, which are repeated in my submission to this inquiry. Briefly, the electoral roll had grown by over 220 000 electors in four years. New districts and boundaries were formed in 2013 following the redivision, which affected 1 million electors. There was a necessary focus on ballot paper handling and security. Community interest in forming political parties and nominating as candidates was high, with 21 registered parties and a record 896 candidates contesting Legislative Assembly and Council vacancies. Over 34 per cent of electors voted early, either by post or by attending in person.

Communicating the election to Victorians was particularly effective. The turnout was 93 per cent, up from 92.5 per cent. As an example of our communication strategy, 151 meetings were held with culturally and linguistically diverse communities to assist in their understanding of enrolling and voting. The VEC systems performed very well, and the continuing investment in the new election management system was justified.

vVote, providing fully verifiable electronically assisted voting services to electors with vision impairment, motor impairment or language or literacy difficulties, was again well supported in its 25 locations. The preparation of about 17 000 casual staff for election day duties received considerable attention, and positive reports were received about their performance. The Legislative Council's centralised counting arrangements at Etihad Stadium were very efficient, and all eight regional results were declared on 16 December — one day improved on 2010. I believe the election was very well conducted, allowing the formation of government just five days after election day.

On the matter of early voting and the inclusion of a percentage of this vote into election day results, the VEC intends to adjust operations at election offices such that postal and early in-person ballots are considered in results reporting on election night. This would be further assisted by a change to the legislation allowing some processing of ballots to occur before the close of poll. Also with regard to electronically assisted voting, as undertaken using vVote, guidance from the committee with respect to an expanded use of this system would be welcome.

The VEC has read all the published submissions to this inquiry to date, and I am happy to respond to any questions the committee may have.

The CHAIR — Thank you very much, Mr Gately. Given that you have read the submissions, it is probably superfluous for me to note the number of not just parties but independent candidates who, whilst expressing their frustration about elements of the election, were enormously complimentary of you, your organisation and your staff. I hope you are pleased with that. It is pretty rare, obviously, for losing candidates to turn around and praise, and you have certainly had that in the submissions.

The purpose of this hearing, like your own, is to try to look at the possibility for improvement. I want to go to the issue of the counting of the pre-poll votes on election night. Obviously there was a lot of commentary about it, and it would have been a faster election result. Again I note in your comments that you are looking at the

viability of this, and you have gone further in your submission to request processing before the close of the poll. You would have seen Mr Green's suggestion basically that if people vote in their own electorate, that would be a separate box, and if it is out of poll, there would be a declaration vote. That would seem to me to be a very easy way to separate the Albert Park votes in the Albert Park electorate versus other votes, which would enable a counting of that on the night. Are you able perhaps to walk the committee through what you thought of that suggestion?

Mr GATELY — If I can, Chair, I will just go back a little bit in respect of the early voting issue. Our planning for the election anticipated about a 30 per cent increase in the early vote, having looked at the numbers previously in Victoria and also what was happening in other states and the commonwealth. In fact what had transpired over the two-week voting period was that the early voting was about 60 per cent. We did consider changing our processes during that early voting period to put some of those votes into the election night count, but there was considerable risk in doing that. We had done our training with our election officials to deal with the early vote in a particular way. Just on that point about separate ballot boxes, not every elector, of course, will operate the way you and I would like and put their district ballot in that box. You still need to do some sorting.

That being the case, there was too much risk in the results on the Saturday night to put our attention into that early vote. It was always our idea that when we identified close seats they would get particular attention on the Sunday. That was always part of the plan as well. Whilst we considered whether we could include some of that early vote into the Saturday night count, the integrity of the election potentially was at risk, and the risk was too great for us to change that casual workforce and the training they had done.

We have given some consideration to what we could do for 2018. I might ask Liz to look at the potential change to process. I mentioned earlier that with some minor legislative change that allowed us some processing time, as is the case in New Zealand and I think also in Western Australia, we can do some early processing perhaps of that first week, which will allow us to attend to that parcel of those votes on the Saturday night. I will ask Liz to give her thoughts on that.

Ms WILLIAMS — Sure. Certainly in 2014, with the increase in early voting, the process for our staff come 6 o'clock was to open those early voting ballot boxes and to reconcile and balance those boxes before they could start counting. The set-up in early voting centres is such that there is a box for the home electorate and there are boxes for the other electorates. The intention is to keep them separate at the outset. That being the case, it is still a huge operation, given the numbers that we had this time, to get them all out of the ballot boxes, even though most of the home electorate were in the one box, and then establish a balance figure for the entire centre for the entire early voting period before they start counting.

Our thoughts for 2018 at this stage would be to allocate for each early voting centre — the number of early voting centres we will still need to look at — a set of ballot papers as well as paperwork. We will run the early voting for the first week, if the time line is still the same, and then at the end of the first week we will close off those ballot boxes and the paperwork. We will put those aside and quarantine them so that we have a manageable number that we can deal with on election night. Then we will run the second week on a separate set of ballot boxes and paperwork that we can have separately. Come 6 o'clock, if there is no ability to do any processing before 6 o'clock, the election managers will open those ballot boxes and start that counting. Given the volume that we would have in that first week, it would be manageable to get some of those counted. We anticipate that we could possibly do 4000 or 5000 per district. It also depends on how many go through those centres in the first week. Based on 2014, there is about 30 per cent of early voters who voted in that first week.

The CHAIR — And the idea of having the declaration votes for the non-home ballot papers?

Ms WILLIAMS — We would not necessarily like to go back to envelopes because it slows down the processing, and given the numbers we can move the electors through the early voting centres much faster if a declaration envelope is not required. It adds another step — you have to get them out of the envelope before you start counting them — so we would not see a great deal of advantage in doing that.

Ms SPENCE — I have a couple of questions. Are we going off the topic of pre-poll?

The CHAIR — Yes, you can choose whatever question you want to ask. It is a huge submission.

Ms SPENCE — In regard to informal votes, I just wondered if you had done any analysis of areas where there was high informality and seen whether there was a correlation between the high informality and voters who have migrated from areas with other voting systems such as the optional preferential system?

Mr GATELY — Indeed we do. For this election as distinct from 2010 we looked at the informal vote across all 88 districts. Previously I think we might have examined only a sample of 8, 9, or 10 so we have a better feeling now for just that. It is a matter of doing that analysis as to where the high levels of informality were and what the particular circumstances in that district would be, and that would allow us to target, perhaps, our messages for 2018. So we have looked at all districts, when previously we only got a small sample, and we have a better understanding of it.

Ms SPENCE — So have you done that analysis yet?

Mr GATELY — It is really just the numbers at the moment and we need to take that further. There might be a bit more information in the parliamentary report this September, but I might ask Sue if she has any comment in relation to that.

Ms LANG — Certainly in previous elections there has been a correlation in those districts where we have looked at matching informality levels with different ethnic backgrounds. It certainly still seems to be a theme — —

Ms SPENCE — Sorry, I was not talking about ethnic backgrounds; I was talking about voter movement from other areas such as those from New South Wales, for instance.

Ms LANG — I beg your pardon, sorry, I misunderstood. No, not from those moving around the states. The things that we have looked at in the informality are aspects like those electorates that have higher non-English speaking communities or those electorates that have had greater numbers of candidates on the ballot paper, and there is certainly a direct correlation in both of those instances and that was borne out again in 2014, when we looked at all the electorates rather than just a sample this time. There certainly is a correlation there.

Ms PATTEN — We have had a number of submissions on electronic voting, as you would have read about, and specifically for the vision impaired. Is it true that we would require legislative change to enable them to have electronic voting on election day, and that is why it is only available for early voting?

Mr GATELY — I identify an electronic voting centre, and in the 2014 election we put vVote into 24 locations in Victoria. Previously it was in just on 100 locations. We looked at the results from 2010 as to the take-up of vVote, and in many locations there were no votes taken via vVote at all in the two-week early election period.

vVote is only available at the moment in the early election period, so we reduced the rollout of vVote from a logistic perspective as to what was supportable, and I would just say that this system in 2014 is a fully verifiable voting system, and it is different from what was available in 2010. There were challenges in supporting it technically and logistically as well, and when we looked at the take-up of it, that was the reason we reduced the number of voting centres that it was available in.

Ms PATTEN — So we could have run it on election day? There were no restrictions except for the logistics.

Mr GATELY — The challenges are that there are 1700 voting centres across the state with a casual work force that is available for one day; it is reasonably complex technology not only to put in the field but also to support it in the field and have election day voting centre staff operate that system and make it available; and the take-up in 2010 was so small in that two-week period. They were the factors that led us to operate it in only those 24 locations.

Ms LANG — I might add that in some of the focus groups and time-and-motion studies that we did on the system as it was being developed, a lot of the people using it became concerned at the length of time it took to go through and then to check their vote again before casting it. Comments were actually made: ‘If I had a queue of people behind me on election day, I might feel inclined to say, “You know what? This is taking too long. Can I revert to a paper vote?”’

Mr SOMYUREK — If I could just follow up on that. Just in terms of confidence in the system and verification as well, what were people reporting back on that?

Ms FRAZER — We did not have any contact about the system at all. I think because the steps were quite different for this system than they had been previously, and there were additional steps which included the candidate list that came out of the machine, which just expanded the period of time it took people to vote, it just added a little bit more time. The actual system itself was very positive. We had quite a number of emails from people with low vision who said that they found it a lot more intuitive and very much easier to use than previously. I think it was just the additional steps that they had to do with the candidate list which was part of the verification process.

Mr SOMYUREK — On the verification process itself and in terms of the take-up rate, what is that like compared to previous elections?

Mr GATELY — Have you got the numbers, Glenda?

Ms FRAZER — Within Victoria, with the specialised group that applies within Victoria, it did reduce. It went from 199 down to 145 within Victoria. External to Victoria — because outside of the state it is open to anybody interstate and overseas — we saw a marked increase in the interstate and overseas use. We only utilised London at the last election, whereas previously we had telephone voting in other states, and we used Edinburgh and Manchester, but even London on its own took more this time than the whole of England last time.

Mr SOMYUREK — And just to be clear, we are talking about electronic voting rather than internet or remote voting — we do not have a remote vote?

Ms FRAZER — No, that is correct.

Ms BLANDTHORN — I just have a question about the nature of the venues that we had for pre-polls. A few of the submissions raised the question that they were inadequate both for the volume or the number of the people we had turning up to pre-poll vote, but also for things like parking, toilets, pathways not being wide enough and them not being in key positions in certain electorates — and not in some electorates at all. I do not mean this as a criticism, but is there a view about how we can improve on that in the future? Has any thought been given to it?

Mr GATELY — Before Glenda picks it up, I would just say that not only with our early voting centres but also with our voting centres on election day as well they are often difficult to find. The target was to have an early voting centre in every district. Some of the larger districts had more than one. Because we often have to go into the commercial space to find real estate to take up for about six months, we will often struggle to find an appropriate venue. So all those other issues of access, parking, toilets, shade et cetera, whilst they are not necessarily within my remit to solve or to provide, we do struggle to get real estate in particular parts of the state.

Ms FRAZER — That is true, and I concur with what Warwick said. We try our best to get something that the public can readily get to, should that be in a metropolitan area or somewhere with access through public transport, we do our best endeavours. But as Warwick said, we struggle, and we end up having to get whatever we can get and be as best placed within the electorate as we can. We definitely have the competition of rents. People do not want us short-term. Even though we say we are rolling out a cardboard office basically — we do not do any major structural change to a building — we still find that we just cannot secure the leases. We have already obviously looked at the fact that the size of the increase in early voting increased the waiting within the venue for the service, so we are already looking at how we might be able to change that and get better space. But again, it can change. I could look today and find venues, but come the next election unfortunately they have all gone. Quite often the climate of how people are working: if all the rentals are taken I have nothing whereas if it is in a downturn there might be lots of venues available. We do struggle. It is just an election-by-election thing. The six months leasing that we have extended to is better welcomed than anything shorter. For the early voting centres we only take a three-month lease, so we have other challenges there because people do not want us for three months. We do have to look at all of that.

Ms BLANDTHORN — Is there an opportunity to perhaps start using schools or other public spaces for that activity, or is that something that has been investigated previously and it just does not work?

Ms FRAZER — It has been investigated. We have had offers from various organisations. The problem comes when they realise that it has to be open for anybody to come. There is no restriction. Once you have a centre, you have to welcome anybody into that centre, so we tend then to get the pushback on those venues. I know some of the overseas countries use schools — they take over the school — but again there are issues even getting people into school when children are there now. Even when we actually go to inspect the venues, obviously there is security. We have to be accompanied through the venue. I think it would bring a whole set of issues if it were in schools long term as well.

The CHAIR — One of the submissions made an allegation in relation to dead people voting. Can you just explain the procedure the VEC has, or do you take from the AEC what the procedure is, for how you remove dead people from the roll?

Mr GATELY — We work closely with the AEC in relation to managing the roll and we are notified by Births, Deaths and Marriages as to deaths. We have a very close relationship with them as well, and as there is an indication that someone is deceased they are taken off the roll. We often get advice from family as well that that has occurred and that will be married up with BDM advice as well and they are taken off the roll.

Mr SOMYUREK — I think it would help our deliberations if you were to go through the figures, because I am sure this will become a recurrent theme, on how many people voted twice, how many dead people voted — the exact figures — because they are pretty low, aren't they?

Mr GATELY — Indeed they are. Glenda manages the non-voting process and also, as part of that, the multiple-voting process. I will ask Glenda to respond to that.

Mr SOMYUREK — And typically who votes twice.

Ms FRAZER — Yes. I have some numbers here. For the 2014 state election, we did an initial extract of who appeared to have voted more than once and then we actually looked at that because quite often when you analyse that you find that people have been incorrectly marked on the roll, so the person above or below the person who appears to have voted twice may be a non-voter and they offset each other. We started off with an initial 6221 on the extract. We identified that 4095 of those had a non-voter on either side, so we were quite comfortable that those people had been incorrectly marked. Their names looked quite similar. An error had occurred there.

We then looked at 272 people who were over 70 and appeared to have voted more than once. We had four people who were marked as deceased who were subsequently found to be deceased, so they could have died — we do not have the period of when they might have died but they could have died, obviously — since they voted. We gauged they could have been unwell at that point in time. We had 17 admin errors and 987 which, when the rolls were actually scanned looked like it picked up a mark but when we looked at the roll there was no mark there. It might have been a pen that had been laid so the actual scanning technology is quite fine so it does pick that up.

In the end we actually wrote to 846 people. Out of that 6221 we wrote to 846 people. In responses, we are up to the third notice of that. We write to them three times. We have had 492 people claim to us that they absolutely voted only once. Of those people, 152 admitted, for various reasons, that they voted because their son was overseas, they were worried their mother would get fined, or they were not well. They have had a strong letter from us to say that this is unacceptable. We have sent second reminders to 199 people. From there we had 56 responses where people claimed they definitely only voted once by way of stat decs et cetera, and 26 said 'Yes, we did vote more than once'. Again, we have contacted those people. We are now trying to track down 112 people who we have not heard from at all, so we sent a registered letter to those people on the 6th to say, 'We need to hear from you'. We have managed to whittle it down now, so we are down to the last 112. Out of the initial 6221, to date we have got about 178 people who said, 'Yes, we did vote more than once', and they are spread right across all the electorates and not focused in one.

The CHAIR — Not enough to alter an outcome?

Ms FRAZER — Not enough. We looked at those figures. Yes, absolutely.

Ms SPENCE — A question about the registration of political parties. Did you know that there was 21 — is that correct?

Ms FRAZER — Yes.

Ms SPENCE — Do you have any further information about when these parties did register? I got the impression from monitoring the website that there was a large number of parties that registered not long before the election. My supplementary question that I will ask at the same time is: did this put an additional burden on resources to process those registrations perhaps faster than they may have otherwise been processed in a non-election period, and would it be beneficial to the VEC if there was a cut-off deadline for when registration applications could be made?

Mr GATELY — If I can, I made that comment in my submission in relation to perhaps a finite time. With respect to the party registration, there were three that achieved registration the day before the issue of the writ. Up to that period of time — probably over two or three months — we were dealing with those particular parties for them to try to get their 500 members who are electors identified so that we could check their bona fides as to if they were members of that party. There were two parties that attempted to register that failed before the issue of the writ.

Yes, it does put pressure on the commission, and certainly my view would be that if a party is coming forward for registration, then they should have that information in order, at hand and ready to go. We were grappling with a number of minor parties that were trying to get registered that did not have their databases in order, did not have their membership lists in order, and were given a number of attempts to tidy that up before they reached the 500 members who are electors. I do not know, Sue, if you wanted to add anything further to that.

Ms LANG — No, I think that is probably a very fair summary. Many of them started the process around February-March, when they made their first inquiries as to what had to have been done, and those very same parties were three of those who were registered the day before the issue of the writ, so that is how long it took. Sometimes it can take four or five mail-outs to try to get them over the line in terms of proof of that membership.

Ms FRAZER — Sorry, I think the only thing we have in the legislation is that they must be registered by the issue of the writ, so that is the only deadline.

Mr SOMYUREK — Not surprisingly pre-poll numbers have gone up exponentially — from 16 to 25 per cent. The Nationals are concerned about section 98 and compliance with section 98. There was a Court Of Disputed Returns case, I think. Can you please tell us a bit more about the decision there and whether there have been any suggestions for improving the declaration process, and what percentage of the pre-poll electors were asked whether they were entitled to vote on election day?

Ms WILLIAMS — Certainly. To answer the second part of your question first, we would be very confident that most — the majority of — early voters were asked —

Mr SOMYUREK — Most.

Ms WILLIAMS — a question. It was certainly a focus of our training of our election managers. There were certainly comments from previous committees that perhaps our election officials were not asking electors attending early voting centres if they were unable to vote on election day, so we were very focused on that right throughout the training process. In terms of the wording of the declaration, electors were asked if they were unable to vote on election day. The decision handed down after the Court of Disputed Returns case, which was dismissed, suggested that we look at that and perhaps specifically ask that electors declare that they are unable to vote on election day so that they understand that they are making a declaration.

We played around a little bit with the wording in our training manuals in terms of when we were asking, ‘Are you unable to vote on election day?’. People would respond, ‘Yes’ when they really meant, ‘No’ — or the other way around. It was almost a bit of a double negative. We have taken on board the comments made in the

decision of the Court of Disputed Returns, and already we have updated our by-election manuals accordingly. Electors will be asked, ‘Do you declare that you are unable to vote on election day during the hours of voting?’.

Mr SOMYUREK — And they will be asked to sign now; is that right?

Ms WILLIAMS — No, it is still an oral declaration. The decision suggested that we might like to make it very clear in that oral declaration that they are making a declaration — to use the word ‘declare’.

Ms PATTEN — There have been a number of submissions about reducing the amount of time for early voting and how quick that turnaround time is from the ballot draw to the early vote. Firstly, some of the vision-impaired people said that was difficult because how-to-vote cards were not ready for them to access online. How would it affect you; would it be possible to deal with the same volume of people if it was reduced to, say, seven days?

Ms WILLIAMS — We would be guessing, but I would expect that the volume of people, on seven days, would mean you would have to double the service or even more.

Ms PATTEN — Because 70 per cent are in that second week anyway.

Ms WILLIAMS — That is right.

Ms FRAZER — You would need more venues.

Ms LANG — Bigger venues.

Ms WILLIAMS — We would expect that the volumes possibly would not change; we would just be squeezing them into a shorter period of time.

The CHAIR — A lot of the submissions picked up on elderly people or people with disabilities, particularly at the pre-poll but also at the polls. Is it a viable solution to expand the category of people who could become a registered general postal voter, for example? If anyone over a certain age could become a general postal voter, would that assist in the management of the elderly on election day?

Ms WILLIAMS — Already anyone over the age of 70 can become a general postal voter. We certainly train our election officials to keep an eye on the queue of electors and make sure that anyone elderly or with a physical disability can be brought to the front of the queue et cetera. In the voting centres we have a designated queue controller whose role it is to move up and down the queue to do that, but certainly something we would look at in terms of early voting is to perhaps expand the staffing to have a designated queue controller who can keep a closer eye on the queue and on people who may need assistance in that queue.

Ms PATTEN — Following on from the postal vote, there was also a suggestion by the vision-impaired — and I would suggest out of consideration for our ageing population — that an electronic vote done from the home via a similar postal registration, certainly for the vision impaired, would enable them to have some autonomy in their voting. Are you aware of anything like that being practised in other jurisdictions? I appreciate it is not in Australia.

Mr GATELY — The New South Wales iVote system, which you are probably familiar with, does just that. Again there are particular categories of electors that it applies to. It is a remote voting solution — it is interstate, overseas, disabled, blind, low vision — but you have to register. You are then given certain codes to access that system. I believe that New South Wales took about 290 000 votes via that system in their election earlier this year. From their perspective it was quite successful. I believe their legislation allows for that. Our legislation here is different, hence the vVote model supports our legislation, whereas the New South Wales system is entirely different. One is remote, and ours is voting centre-based. I believe it was successful, but that might be something the committee may wish to explore with New South Wales.

The CHAIR — Have you had any discussions with New South Wales about any possibility of having the possibility of an electronic vote consistent between the states?

Mr GATELY — This discussion goes on across the commonwealth at varying times, and including the commonwealth as well, as to harmonisation and similar voting systems. The legislation varies from state to

state. As I just explained with the New South Wales iVote and vVote. That is a goal I think — harmonisation — but in reality it is very difficult to achieve. We do a lot in relation to exchanging equipment: to lending equipment, to lending staff, to putting our mind to some of these matters as well — to education et cetera. But an example of pure harmonisation in the context of a single electronic voting system or a technology solution is just beyond us at the moment, because we cannot get agreement from a legislative perspective.

Mr SOMYUREK — Just on the harmonisation, I think the real harmonisation needs to happen between federal and state. That is what affects formality as well. Just on the web page, I think it was generally well done, but as Antony Green just pointed out, the zeroing of the districts was particularly annoying. Do we plan to fix that for next time?

Ms LANG — Yes, it is already in the improvements for the next web change plan. It is documented now.

Mr SOMYUREK — It was a source of frustration.

Ms LANG — Yes, we apologise.

The CHAIR — You have already indicated your suggestion that perhaps we need to look at legislative change, to allow a count, and early opening of the ballot boxes for pre-poll. Are there any other legislative changes that you think would assist your operation?

Mr GATELY — Chair, my report to Parliament will include, I think, about 12 recommendations. As I said, I will table that in September. A number of those are a hangover from 2010, and were in that bill in Parliament last year. So it is a re-run of those. There are some other matters as well. But once that is tabled I am happy to discuss that further with the committee, once we get it into Parliament in the first week in September.

The CHAIR — That would be terrific. Any further questions, or is there anything else that you wanted to convey to us? It is a very comprehensive report. Thank you very much for that. Any further questions from anyone, or do you want to add anything?

Mr GATELY — I think going forward there is an opportunity particularly, as I said in my opening remarks, to work with the committee to look at technology, to look at what we can use, what is happening in this space and whether we can use it to the advantage of electors in this state. I am very happy to work with the committee on that — seek your advice on those matters.

The CHAIR — That would be terrific. We did allow a lot of time for this one because it is important to have an ongoing exchange of where you are at. I think on the pre-poll that is a lot of progress and there is obviously going to be a lot of progress, and I await with interest to see your report, because your report is due before ours. Can I indicate — and you know this, Mr Gately, of course — that you will get a Hansard transcript in about two weeks time, and feel free, if there are any errors, which would be uncharacteristic of Hansard, to correct and obviously not to change the substance of it. Again I thank you very much for all the work you have done so far, for your submission and for appearing before the committee.

Mr GATELY — Thank you, Chair.

The CHAIR — That concludes the public hearings for the day, and we will commence tomorrow at 11 a.m. with the Liberal Party's submission.

Committee adjourned.