

**BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND**

**PROCEEDINGS**

**AT THE**

**2018 REVIEW OF PARLIAMENTARY CONSTITUENCIES IN ENGLAND**

**HELD AT**

**NEW COUNTY HALL  
TREYEW ROAD, TRURO, TR1 3AY**

**ON**

**THURSDAY 10 NOVEMBER 2016  
DAY ONE**

**Before:**

**Ms Anita Bickerdike, The Lead Assistant Commissioner**

---

**Transcribed from audio by W B Gurney & Sons LLP  
83 Victoria Street, London SW1H 0HW  
Telephone Number: 0203 585 4721/22**

---

Time noted: 10 am

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen, and welcome to this public hearing on the Boundary Commission for England's initial proposals for new parliamentary constituency boundaries in the South West region. My name is Anita Bickerdike and I am Assistant Commissioner for the Boundary Commission for England. I am appointed by the Commission to assist them in their task of making recommendations for new constituencies in the South West region. I am responsible for chairing the hearing today and tomorrow and I am also responsible, with my fellow Assistant Commissioner Catherine Elliott, for analysing all the representations received about the initial proposals for this region and then presenting them to the Commission as to whether those proposals should be revised.

I am assisted here today by members of the Commission staff led by Sam Hartley, who is the Secretary to the Commission and who is sitting beside me. Sam will shortly provide an explanation of the Commission's initial proposals for the new constituencies in this region. He will show you how to make written representations and he will deal with one or two other administrative matters.

The hearing today is scheduled to run from ten am until 8 pm and tomorrow it is scheduled to run from 9 am until 5 pm I can vary that time-table and I will take account of the attendance and demand for opportunity to speak. I should point out that under the legislation *Governance, the Commission's Review* each public hearing must be held over two days and cannot be extended to a third.

The purpose of the public hearing is to allow people to make all representations about the initial proposals for the South West region. A number of people have already arranged to speak and have been given a time slot and I would invite them to speak at the appropriate time. We are fully booked today so perhaps I can remind people at this point, and as they give their presentations, that every presentation has been allocated a ten-minute slot, so in order to be fair to all speakers I would remind you clearly that it will just be a ten-minute presentation they will be invited to give. If there is time free during the day or at the end of the day I will then invite anyone who has not registered, but who would like to speak, to do so.

I would like to stress that the purpose of this public hearing is for people to make all representations about the initial proposals. The purpose is not to engage in a debate with the Commission about the proposals, nor is this hearing an opportunity for people to cross-examine other speakers during their presentation. People may seek to put questions for clarification to speakers but they should do so through me, as Chair.

I would also like to make another point. I see that there is a public gallery for the Council Chamber. If there are people that are in the public gallery who would wish to actually ask questions, then they must come down into the Council Chamber to do so

because we need to record their question and the answers on the recording equipment that is set up in the Council Chamber.

I will now hand over to Sam, who will provide a brief explanation of the Commission's initial proposals for the South West region.

MR HARTLEY: Thank you very much and good morning. As Anita mentioned, my name is Sam Hartley and I am Secretary to the Boundary Commission for England. I am responsible for supporting the Commissioners in their role to recommend new parliamentary constituency boundaries, and at this hearing I lead the team of staff responsible for ensuring that the hearing runs smoothly.

As Anita has already stated, she will chair the hearing itself and it is her responsibility to run the hearing at her discretion and take decisions about speakers, questioners and timings. My team and I are here today to support Anita in carrying out her role; please ask any one of us outside of the hearing if you need any help or assistance.

I would like to talk now about the Commission's initial proposals for the new ward boundaries which were published on 13 September 2016.

We use the European electoral regions as a template for the allocation of the 499 constituencies to which England is entitled, not including the two constituencies to be allocated to the Isle of Wight. This approach is permitted by the legislation and has been supported by previous public consultation. The approach does not prevent anyone from putting forward counterproposals that include one or more constituencies being split between the regions, but it is likely that compelling reasons would need to be given to persuade us to depart from the regional-based approach we adopted in formulating our initial proposals.

The Commission's proposals for the South West are 53 constituencies, a reduction of two. Our proposals leave nine of the existing constituencies unchanged. In considering the composition of the South West region we noted that it might not be possible to allocate whole numbers of constituencies to individual counties, therefore we have grouped some local authority areas into sub-regions. The number of constituencies allocated to each sub-region is determined by the electorate of the combined local authorities.

In North Somerset both the existing constituencies are unchanged. In Bristol, two of the four existing constituencies are unaltered while the remaining two are changed only by the transfer of one ward. In Swindon we have made changes to realign constituency boundaries with the new ward boundaries. We have proposed one constituency that contains electors from both Cornwall and Devon; it crosses the boundary at the north of the two counties combining the towns of Bude, Bideford and Launceston. Another proposed constituency contains electors from both Dorset and

Wiltshire and combines the towns of Shaftesbury and Warminster. Additionally, we propose that some electors from the north-east of the county of Somerset are combined with the electors from Bath and north-east Somerset in one constituency. We also propose that some electors from the south of the county and Gloucestershire are combined with electors from the unitary authority of South Gloucestershire.

The statutory rules allow us to take into account local government boundaries as they existed on 7 May 2015. These include both the external boundaries of local councils and their internal boundaries, known as “wards” or “divisions”. We seek to avoid dividing wards between constituencies wherever possible. Wards are well-defined and well-understood units, which are generally indicative of areas which have a broad community of interest. We consider that any division of these units between constituencies would be likely to break local ties, disrupt political party organisations and cause difficulties for electoral registration and returning officers who are responsible for running elections. It is our view that only in exceptional and compelling circumstances will splitting a ward between constituencies be justified and our initial proposals do not do so. If an alternative scheme proposes to split wards, strong evidence and justification will need to be provided and the extent of such ward-splitting should be kept to a minimum.

The scale of change in this review is significant and we look forward to hearing the views of people at this hearing and throughout the rest of the consultation period. We are consulting on our proposals until Monday 5 December so there is still time after this hearing for people to contribute in writing. There are also reference copies of the proposals present at this hearing and they are available on our website and in a number of places of deposit around the region. You can make written representations to us through our consultation website at [bce2018.org.uk](http://bce2018.org.uk) and I urge everyone to submit written representations to us before the deadline of 5 December.

Finally, I would like to remind all participants that this hearing is part of a public consultation and you will be asked to provide us with your name and address if you make an oral representation. The Commission is legally obliged to take a record of the public hearings and, as you can see from the back there we are taking a video recording, from which we will create a verbatim transcript.

The Commission is required to publish the record of the public hearing along with all written representations for a four-week period during which members of the public will have an opportunity to comment on those representations. We expect this period to occur in the spring of next year. The publication of the hearing records and written representations will include certain personal data of those who have made representations. I therefore invite all those contributing to read the Commission’s data protection and privacy policy, a copy of which we have with us today and which is also available on our website.

A few matters of housekeeping. There is no fire alarm due today so if the alarm goes off it is real so please use the exits that you came in through and the one over there. The toilets are downstairs on the left-hand side there, and please switch your mobile 'phones to silent or vibrate or turn them off. Thank you.

At this stage I will hand back to Anita to begin the public hearing and I thank you all for your attendance today.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Sam. If I can invite the first speaker to come to the lectern, please? Mr Michael Chappell. Good morning.

CLLR CHAPPELL (Independent Town Councillor): Good morning. Mike Chappell, I am an independent town councillor, I am Chairman of a number of Cornish organisations.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Could I ask you, please, just to give your address?

CLLR CHAPPELL: Yes, number 3 Edwards Apartments, Gwealpawl, Redruth, Kernow.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Would you like to make your presentation, please?

CLLR CHAPPELL: Thank you. Good morning to you. I open my presentation by handing in a headline from yesterday's newspaper which has been flagged to me by colleagues of mine from Launceston: "Launceston town councillors left laughing after finding out the boundary inquiry event for the proposed parliamentary boundary review is to be held in Truro." Another day, another unelected quango shows complete disrespect for one of the indigenous peoples of this island and their homeland. It has been quite a year for us Cornish people - our language funding withdrawn, despite an agreement with the Westminster Government; one of our historic and ancient sites made into a theme park by English Heritage, or whatever they are called these days, a Planning Inspector smuggled in from Bristol to rule over our housing plan, a so-called Secretary of State for Communities telling us we must change our attitudes and now this lash-up.

I, and many others in Cornwall, stand against this whole review. It has been conducted in an arrogant and top-down way. The initial press release was appalling and for that I blame entirely the Boundary Commission for that. It was arrogant and it put Cornish people down.

There are many reasons why we stand against this review in Cornwall. Areas with the lowest levels of registration are often those that already have the least voice in politics. Young people, ethnic minorities and those in the private rented sector are all less likely to register to vote than others. This makes many of them effectively cut out of this new

political map when those areas get less representation than others. Everyone deserves representation, not just those on the register.

In Cornwall we have up to 5,000 people, thanks to the Westminster government, who are sofa surfing – they do not exist. That is what you have done to us. 5,000 young people who do not exist, all living on minimum wages and our average wage in Cornwall is already £100 a week less than that of the rest of Great Britain.

This review has been undertaken on the basis of a register that is a year out of date. It excludes over two million people who signed up nationally between December and June. That means some regions are two seats short of what they should be owed. It would be much fairer and would make much more sense to draw boundaries based on eligible population rather than an incomplete electoral register.

In Cornwall alone, as we know, 52,500 homes are to be built these coming few years, meaning a massive increase in population. I intend to address the issue of how that affects my community when I speak tomorrow.

Addressing the carving up of communities themselves. The rigid five per cent threshold, the maximum difference in size between constituencies means that some communities will be split in two whilst others will be merged and dragged unwillingly into others. On top of that the strict five per cent difference limit poses the prospect of huge disruption every five years through sparking a boundary review for every election. The government talks of saving money – do we really want to spend indefinite or infinite hours and indefinite sums arguing about seat borders on a run-up to every Westminster election?

Of course, all this is happening alongside a reduction in the number of MPs, a proposed reduction, something that has a bizarre rationale when one thinks about it because the Government argue shrinking the Commons will cut the price of politics. That compared to a growing unelected House of Lords and a shrinking elected one. The House of Lords has a chamber second only to China and represents shockingly poor value for money. They talk of democracy – surely it would be more democratic to address the crisis in the Lords than cut the number of elected MPs? The last Prime Minister appointed 205 peers over the past five years at a cost of £13m. If one would wish to cut the cost of politics one could do worse than starting there and cutting down the bloated opera house.

We see that the deeply unpopular Devonwall seat that spans Cornwall and Devon, distinct areas with very distinct identities and needs. Fair political boundaries are crucial to ensuring people are properly represented in Parliament. Westminster and its unelected quangos should not tear apart close-knit communities in a rush to equalise numbers.

Our Cornish language was recognised officially in 2003 under the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages and was initially supported by the Westminster government. This minimal funding was withdrawn during 2016 and has caused many in our communities to feel extremely bitter towards the Westminster government. In 2014 the coalition government finally recognised the people who spoke that language. What a joke. The Cornish people recognised themselves some eleven years after their language and these people were included into the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities. The official government press release stated “The decision to recognise the unique identity of the Cornish now affords them the same status as the UK’s other Celtic people – the Scots, the Welsh and the Irish.”

That landmark recognition came after many years of campaigning and was greeted with joy across all of Cornwall’s communities as well as by Cornish people the world over. Two years on we face a growing frustration that central Government is failing to act on the various articles within the Convention and the Cornish are yet again being treated as second rate citizens.

The UK Government passed a Parliamentary Voting System and Constituencies Act which stated that the number of seats in the UK parliament should be reduced to 600 and unless specified in the legislation the electorates for the seats should be within five per cent of the various averages for England, Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales. Sadly that Act does not recognise the territorial integrity of Cornwall and its 1,000-year-old boundary and, as legislation stands, the outcome of the boundary review, based on the provisions within the Act and the present electorate of Cornwall, will inevitably include the creation of a cross-Tamar Devonwall constituency.

It is since the Act was agreed that the UK Government agreed that the Cornish are covered by the auspices of that convention and I and many others contend that developing a cross-Tamar parliamentary constituency will contravene several constituent articles of the Framework Convention. Notably “Parties shall refrain from policies or practices aimed at assimilation of persons belonging to national minorities against their will and shall protect those persons from any action aimed at such assimilation.”

In the Parliamentary Voting System and Constituencies Act the territories of other national minorities within the current United Kingdom – namely the Scots, the Welsh and the Northern Irish – are safeguarded and no seats could be proposed which would cross the land borders between England and Scotland or Wales.

So once again we have seen a growing campaign in Cornwall in defence of our time-honoured border, set back in 936 AD. I do appreciate it is difficult for people living elsewhere to understand the mindset of the Cornish people and indeed of many of the other people of Cornwall but, as with Scotland and Wales, there is a strong and emotional attachment to the land and our time-honoured boundary.

The Mayor of Launceston, a friend of mine and in the affected area, has summed up the mood as “angry.” The people of Cornwall have fought long and hard to preserve their sense of identity. They are not keen on centuries of history being chucked out because of red tape. There is much anger around here; Cornwall is passionate about its own identity.

That Cornwall has a unique legal place within the constitution is recognised far and wide by such scholars as Dr John Kirkhope, who is a constitutional lawyer. He can confirm that Cornwall is indeed legally different from Devon and most other places.

To underline what I have said, an opinion poll run in Cornwall by the commercial broadcaster Pirate FM returned results on 15 September which indicated that 94 per cent of the people in Cornwall are opposed to Devonwall.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Mr Chappell, you have about one minute left.

CLLR CHAPPELL: Yes, thank you – I’ll finish when I’m ready. A similar poll run by the Daily Mirror indicates---

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Mr Chappell---

CLLR CHAPPELL: I will finish when I’m ready.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Mr Chappell, we do have other speakers.

CLLR CHAPPELL: A similar poll run by the Daily Mirror indicates 89 per cent are opposed to these changes.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Mr Chappell, we do have other speakers and they are booked to speak.

CLLR CHAPPELL: Cornwall should be given an exemption similar to the ones given to the Orkney Isles and the Isle of Wight. I repeat, Cornwall should be given an exemption similar to the ones given to the Orkney Isles and the Isle of Wight, both of which have been allowed to deviate from the five per cent of average size rule.

I conclude it is ironic that in this year of 2016 we note that again civil servants from England like to draw lines on maps. We recall the actions of the English diplomat Mark Sykes and his opposite, the Frenchman Francois Picot, who drew lines on the map of the Middle East in 1916. The world is still suffering the consequences of that particular boundary review 100 years on. It really is time to leave the Cornish and their homeland alone.



I trust that fits your time, madam.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much, Mr Chappell, for your representations and I am grateful that you were able to do that within the ten-minute slot. Are there any questions for Mr Chappell? Thank you.

Can we have the next speaker please, Mr John Pollard?

CLLR POLLARD (Cornwall Council): Good morning – myttin da. My name is John Pollard – I think I have got 20 minutes according to the schedule?

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes, you have. Can I ask you just to give your name and your address, please?

CLLR POLLARD: Yes, sure, I'll certainly do that. My name is John Pollard, I am very proud to be the leader of Cornwall Council and I am contactable all over the place but particularly at County Hall, Truro.

I am here today to appear on behalf of and with the authority of the unitary council. I am pleased to welcome you to County Hall this morning, today and tomorrow and I am grateful really for the opportunity to speak at this hearing and to stress that the issue of parliamentary boundaries and the integrity of our border is of huge importance to the people of Cornwall.

I apologise I was not able to be with you on Monday in Exeter, I was out of county at an important conference; however, my representations will be substantially the same as those provided by my nominee, Richard Williams, the Head of Cornwall Council's Assurance Service, who I know spoke to the Commission on behalf of Cornwall Council in Exeter. I would also like to advise the Commission the council may be making additional written submissions before the end of the consultation period on 5 December.

I am here to tell you, though, that Cornwall Council does not support your initial proposals for the South West due to the inclusion of a cross-border constituency for Cornwall and Devon which has been named Bideford, Bude and Launceston. This resolution was passed by a substantial vote of 71 to 12 at a specially convened council on 1 November. This council has consistently opposed any attempt by the Commission to create a cross-border constituency and has also opposed as any legislative provision which could result in a cross-border parliamentary seat being formed.

I have to say this is not about separatism, this is not about any antipathy towards our neighbours in Devon, or indeed we do not either have anything against Bideford. Truly we have very positive relationships with all our closest neighbours but we equally

believe that a cross-border constituency is contrary to the interests of our county neighbour as well as ourselves.

On 17 May 2016, Cornwall Council passed a motion titled “Opposition to Devonwall constituency” which strongly objected to what appeared to be the inevitability of a Devonwall constituency being proposed in the 2018 boundary review. This was as a result of the introduction of the Parliamentary Voting System and Constituencies Act 2011, an amendment to the Parliamentary Constituencies Act of 1986.

The 1986 Act (as amended) is a very prescriptive piece of legislation which provides the Commission with only a very narrow band of five per cent either side of the electoral quota within which to take account of the special considerations of all the diverse and individually distinct regions within the United Kingdom. It is solely because of this limited mathematical discretion that Cornwall and the Isles of Scilly cannot be allocated what their electorate overwhelmingly wish for, the allocation of whole parliamentary constituencies within their historic borders.

In parallel with the Parliamentary boundary review, Cornwall Council is subject to a review of its divisional boundaries by the Local Government Boundary Commission, who are entitled to depart up to ten per cent from the average electorate for each division, a discretion which if applied to the parliamentary review could easily achieve the objective of constituencies wholly within Cornwall and the Isles of Scilly. Cornwall Council believes that this legislation so excessively constrains the Commission’s discretion as not to be fit for purpose. The electorate of the United Kingdom appreciate, whilst recognising the principle and importance of electoral quality, that the safeguarding of distinct regions and communities is vital and should be given special consideration over and above an inflexible mathematical calculation.

Cornwall Council recognises that the Commission is an independent body and must carry out its responsibilities in accordance with the legislation. However, Cornwall Council will not stand idly by while Cornwall’s well-defined border is compromised by the stringent observation of an unnecessarily strict rule.

We urge the Commission to strongly express its frustration to central Government that it is unduly constrained by the five per cent rule and, whilst the objective of electoral equality is clearly important, the Commission should be empowered to depart from that rule in circumstances where the special geographical considerations, local authority boundaries and maintenance of local ties are clearly of greater significance to the electorate than absolute parity of numbers.

Cornwall Council would like to highlight to the Commission that when considered without the 1,651 electors resident on the Isles of Scilly, five constituencies wholly within the historical Duchy boundaries of Cornwall can be created within the statutory electoral range. The addition of the population of the Isles of Scilly tips Cornwall over the

electoral tolerance for five constituencies. The Isles of Scilly is an archipelago of islands 28 miles off the west coast of Cornwall with its own unitary authority. Perhaps nothing demonstrates the inappropriate severity of the legislation more than the fact that the small number of electorate on the Isles of Scilly can have such a profound impact on the critically important issue of maintaining the integrity of Cornwall's historic boundaries. We believe it is incumbent on the Commission to examine and address this anomaly in any way it can, including making representations to government.

Cornwall Council will be lobbying central Government for a change in the legislation. We will be demanding that the legislation be amended to provide Cornwall and the Isles of Scilly a whole number of constituencies entirely contained within the historical Duchy boundaries and that the special considerations are such that Cornwall and the Isles of Scilly should be exempted from the strict application of the five per cent rule – much in the same way that the current legislation establishes the Isle of Wight as a special case and a self-contained electoral region.

Cornwall is a place which demands particular consideration. Central government has repeatedly recognised the distinctiveness of Cornwall and has taken decisions and entered into agreements which reflect that unique status. I would like to take this opportunity to remind the Commission of the Government's approach to Cornwall and why creating a cross-border constituency flies in the face of that consideration.

First and foremost, this is demonstrated by the recognition of the Cornish people in April 2014 as a national minority under the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities. This means that the rights of the Cornish people need to be considered when legislation and national local policy is formulated. The official government press release at the time stated that "The decision to recognise the unique identity of the Cornish now affords them the same status as the UK's other Celtic people – the Scots, the Welsh and the Irish."

The Cornish were recognised under the Framework Convention after the Parliamentary Voting System and Constituencies Act 2011 was passed and the Act therefore could not and did not consider their rights under the Convention. The Commission's initial proposals threaten the identity of Cornwall and the Cornish in the area of North Cornwall and is a measure which creates a single political unit where the Cornish people are in a minority. These consequences are in conflict with the spirit of the Articles 5.1, 5.2 and 16 of the Framework Convention.

All of the UK's other Celtic people have their own Boundary Commissions and their borders are protected for this and future parliamentary boundary reviews. It is only right that the Cornish have their borders protected in the same way. Government has recognised that Cornish is a national minority, now is the time for them to stand by their word.

Needless to say, the Early Day Motion tabled by Welsh and Scottish MPs calling for parliament to acknowledge that the Parliamentary Voting System and Constituencies Act is in conflict with the Framework Convention, and that the Act should therefore be amended to make Cornwall and the Isles of Scilly a protected region to be allocated a whole number of constituencies has our full support.

Additionally, the Cornish language was recognised by the Government when it signed the European Charter for Regional and Minority Languages as being “worthy of safeguarding and protection.” Constituency boundaries, which are coterminous with the historic Cornish boundary, would ensure exclusive representation for the Cornish people and Cornish matters, including the language. Currently where representation is regional it is difficult for Cornish language matters to be fully and appropriately represented. The boundary changes would create a constituency with Devon residents who would have no interest in matters of Cornish distinctiveness and thus dilute parliamentary representation in respect of intrinsically Cornish issues. This creates additional barriers to the protection and promotion of the Cornish people and their language, so soon after the Cornish achieved recognition under the Framework Convention.

The iniquity of merging two distinct cultures in the Devonwall constituency was effectively summarised by Cornwall Councillor Dominic Fairman, who represents St Teath and St Breward division, who stated the following at the Cornwall Council meeting of 1 November:

“If you take a line from Bude to Launceston, over half the Cornish constituents will live in the western third of the area of the seat and along the long and winding A39. It is over 46 miles from St Breward to Bideford. Whilst the legislation is attempting to make democracy fairer, by ignoring geographical considerations and the boundary of our own devolved authority and by sticking blindly to the arithmetic, it will have the effect of seriously disenfranchising the working Cornish villages I represent. It will alienate them from parliamentary process and condemn them to the political wilderness.”

Cornwall’s distinctiveness was importantly recognised in the landmark Devolution Deal agreed in July 2015, the first rural Devolution Deal and the first that did not require the election of a mayor. In signing our Devolution Deal, government recognised Cornwall’s unique culture, including its historic revived language and passionate communities and that this cultural distinctiveness is an important factor in promoting Cornwall’s local economy. I quote from page 3 of the Devolution Deal:

“This agreement is intended to build on Cornwall’s unique geography and rich heritage.”

Cornwall is the largest rural unitary authority in the country and functions as a single economic entity. The majority of Cornwall’s key public sector partners are based in and focused exclusively on serving the people of Cornwall. Cornwall has one functional

economic area, one principal council, one clinical commissioning group, one acute NHS Trust, one coterminous Local Enterprise Partnership, one health and wellbeing board, one local nature partnership, one voluntary community and social enterprise board, one distinct identity and sense of place and currently one group of MPs working together to represent Cornwall in Westminster.

The Devolution Deal was founded on the strength and coterminosity of these public sector bodies. The proposal for a cross-border constituency threatens the efficacy of the Devolution Deal and further devolved powers for which the council is actively negotiating. The Devonwall seat would set a precedent for the merger of public services with Devon which would remove Cornwall's public sector coterminosity and erode Cornwall's distinct and cherished identity - the very identity at the heart of Cornwall's landmark Devolution Deal. Cornwall's financial and public service aspirations would be dented and I firmly believe that Cornwall's current and future coterminosity is threatened – what could be heralded as a move towards a Devonwall local authority or similar forms of South West regionalised public sector governance.

Cornwall's geography is unique and provides the Duchy with unique challenges and opportunities, challenges and opportunities that are not faced by the rest of the United Kingdom. Cornwall's peripheral nature and extensive area have contributed to being a self-contained region. 92 per cent of Cornwall's working population live and work in Cornwall. Cornwall was awarded NUTS 2 status – that is Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics – in 1996. This meant that Cornwall was not grouped with Devon and its more economically prosperous regions for statistical purposes, as doing so previously denied Cornwall its fair share of EU funding.

Cornwall has a thriving culture with strong local traditions. After many years of decline, Cornish culture is flourishing again. The distinctiveness of Cornish culture in comparison to others is stark, whether it is in art, literature, music, fashion, religion, sport or food and drink. Because of this, Cornwall is a brand. Its goods and services, when you add the word "Cornwall", it becomes an entirely different produce or service. Cornwall the brand is vital to the economic vibrancy of our Duchy. The deliberate parliamentary merger of parts of Devon and Cornwall will affect the integrity of Cornwall's culture and this in turn will adversely impact on Cornwall's economy.

The unique challenges that face Cornwall are substantial. The special considerations and status which apply to Cornwall will inevitably be at odds with equally important but competing priorities on the Devon side of the constituency. Any future Member of Parliament trying to prioritise or to reconcile conflicting aspirations will find themselves repeatedly compromised. Cornwall has been recognised as a unique case in many other facets of public life. It is an issue as important as parliamentary representation – how can the same considerations not apply?

The arguments I have set out are in no way submitted in a bid to isolate Cornwall from the rest of the UK. Cornwall is an outward looking and ambitious place; the results of Cornwall's recent governance review prove that. The review found that Cornwall needs to improve strategic collaboration with its neighbours and we are taking steps exactly to do that. However, this is markedly different from the forged merger of two separate and distinct communities.

The distinctiveness of Cornwall and the Cornish people are worth fighting for, which is why Cornwall Council will be pressing for a change in the legislation. Cornwall deserves and demands special consideration, alongside the other peripheral regions of the Isle of Wight, Orkney and Shetland and the Western Isles. I reiterate the council recognises the constraints imposed on the Commission but we strongly urge them to have equal recognition for the inequity of Cornwall's position and the overwhelming support of this council and the Cornish people in demanding this legislative change.

How am I doing for time?

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: I was just about to remind you, you have about one minute left.

CLLR POLLARD: Okay, fine. So in conclusion, if I may, Cornwall Council's representation to the Commission today can be summarised as follows. Cornwall Council emphatically opposes the Bideford, Bude and Launceston constituency proposed by the Commission for the legal, cultural, geographical, historic and economic reasons I have outlined. The legislative rules under which the Commission work are too restrictive and fail to take into account the spirit and intent of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities under which the Cornish have been recognised.

We urge the Commission to express to central Government its concerns over the legislation not providing them with enough discretion to appropriately consider and properly address the unique case of Cornwall and the special considerations which apply. Cornwall Council will be strongly pressing central Government for legislative change which enables Cornwall to be allocated constituencies wholly within its historic border, both now and in the future.

I know you will hear from many others that Cornwall is a special case. We ask that the Commission notes the strength of the concern and feeling in Cornwall in relation to the legislative restrictions and the absurd anomaly it has compelled the Commission to propose, and that the Commission endorse the council's proposal for legislative change to enable that anomaly to be corrected.

For me this is about Cornwall acting together. For Cornwall Council it is about Cornwall acting as one. We gained a Devolution Deal for Cornwall on the basis that we could

represent a distinct political, economic and social area – Cornwall. We need MPs that can lobby, argue and demand for Cornwall. Chipping away at that integrity is dangerous for the future of this wonderful place. The administration I lead is working for a strong Cornwall, a Cornwall which works with everyone and a Cornwall which is able to stand up for itself. A Cornwall where the advantages of our territorial integrity are used to maximum effect for our residents and, frankly, being represented in Parliament by someone with divided loyalties does nothing for Cornwall or the people we represent.

Can I just thank the Commission for listening to Cornwall Council's submissions. I know you will appreciate that we are fighting for a change in the law and that all the advantages that Cornwall has enjoyed over more than a century of parliamentary representation can be maintained.

Thank you very much.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Pollard. Would you remain there just for a moment in case there are any questions? Are there any questions for Mr Pollard? Thank you. Thank you for your representation, Mr Pollard.

Mr Dave Munday, please. Good morning, Mr Munday. Could I ask you to give your full name and address, please?

MR MUNDAY: My name is David George Munday, 11 Victoria Row, St Just, Penzance, Cornwall.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you. If you would like to make your representations, please?

MR MUNDAY: Firstly, I would like to say that you are the Boundary Commission for England – you are not in England, you are in Cornwall. Cornwall is not and has never been a county; it is a Duchy and has a unique status within the United Kingdom. Others far more qualified than I will explain the history in detail to you. The border of Cornwall was established in 936 AD by King Athelstan of the Anglo-Saxons and King Huwal of Cornwall as the east bank of the River Tamar. Until now that border has never changed.

My main objection to your proposed constituencies is that there is a cross-border constituency with England. I have no objection to a reasonable parity of populations in constituencies. Under the Framework Convention, Cornwall is recognised as a separate entity from England, just as Wales and Scotland are. I understand that you are being forced by legislation to have a variation of no more than five per cent from the mean. Others will go into much more detail about the numbers but basically if Cornwall was to have five equal constituencies that would be a variation of 5.02 per cent from the

mean. If the Isles of Scilly, which are not Cornwall, were discounted from the calculations, Cornwall could meet the five per cent variant.

There is a massive feeling within Cornwall and parts of Devon that we do not want a cross-border constituency. In an independent poll, between 89 and 94 per cent do not want it. It is dangerous to ignore the will of the people. How can this be achieved? Technically we are entitled to 5.27 seats. If Cornwall had five seats, we would be very slightly under-represented. Devon could have 12 seats so no further adjustment would be needed to be made outside of Cornwall and Devon.

There are a number of options. You could ask the Government to allow a slight variant from the five per cent, then you could have five seats slightly above the five per cent variant or four within the five per cent variant and the fifth seat, including the Isles of Scilly, above the limit. A more extreme option, which I would not actually support but I put it to you, is we could have five Cornish seats within five per cent and the Isles of Scilly separate, perhaps combined with the rest of the Isle of Wight or a seat of their own.

The Government have allowed exceptions to be made – the Western Isles of Scotland, Orkney, Shetland and the Isle of Wight – therefore I am asking you to suggest to the Government that an allowance be made so that Cornwall can remain whole – Kernow (*Cornish word*).

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Mr Munday, would you just like to remain in case anybody has any questions for you? Any questions for Mr Munday before he leaves? Thank you very much for your representations.

Dr Merv Davey, please. Good morning, Dr Davey. Can I ask you to give your name and address, please?

DR DAVEY: Dr Merv Davey, (*Cornish spoken*). (Dr Davey began his representation in the Cornish language).

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Dr Davey, we do have a translator.

DR DAVEY: Good morning – I am repeating in English.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Are you going to repeat it in English? That is fine.

DR DAVEY: As a courtesy I am speaking in Cornish and in English.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: I am grateful for that because of course I do need to know what you are saying so that I can take it into account.



DR DAVEY: You will know exactly what I am saying – thank you very much.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much for that assurance.

DR DAVEY: I was trying to give you a nice welcome to Cornwall, which we have not done so yet. So good morning, welcome to Cornwall to our guests from the Boundary Commission.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much, Dr Davey.

DR DAVEY: I have a short presentation and I have given you some details there with the references which will save time, thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: I am obliged, thank you.

DR DAVEY: I am Merv Davey, Dr Merv Davey, I represent Gorsedh Kernow. I appreciate that our English neighbours are sometimes unfamiliar with our Cornish cultural tradition, so a quick explanation. Gorsedh Kernow, the Cornish Gorsedd, is a civic and cultural organisation with a college of some 500 Bards. These Cornish Bards represent scholars, writers and creative artists from a wide range of disciplines in Cornwall, as well as sport and community service. Gorsedh Kernow is a sister organisation to the Welsh and Breton Gorsedds and has cultural links to Scotland, Ireland and the Isle of Man. The aim of Gorsedh Kernow is to celebrate and promote Cornwall as a Celtic nation in a civic and cultural capacity. We are therefore concerned that the proposed Devonwall constituency devalues this identity and we submit that Cornwall's integrity should be maintained by having a coterminous border with the Parliamentary Constituency boundaries.

If Cornwall is treated as a discrete entity it comfortably meets the electoral criteria laid down in the Parliamentary and Voting System and Constituencies Act of 2011 for five constituencies. Dropped into a south-west melting pot together with the Scilly Isles, Cornwall is arbitrarily and unnecessarily dismembered in order to balance the numbers. Our case for Cornwall to be treated as a discrete entity is based on history, cultural identity and modern democracy. This case is strongly supported by recognition of the Cornish under the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities endorsed by the UK Government in 2014, and I will not apologise for repeating this because this will come up again and again:

“The decision to recognise the unique identity of the Cornish now affords them the same status under the European Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities as the UK's other Celtic people, the Scots, the Welsh and the Irish.”

I note that there are no cross-border boundaries recommended for Wales or Scotland.

From a historical perspective, Cornwall was territorially well established by the end of the first millennium and there was an agreed border with the formative England. Cornwall's distinct national identity was recognised and preserved by successive administrations as it became first an Earldom and then a Duchy with its own constitutional status. This constitutional status is quite different from other Duchies within the UK; it remains on the statute books and continues to impact upon a number of governance issues. Examples range from foreshore and waterway ownership to civic responsibilities such as the appointment of a High Sheriff. In Cornwall the 'absolute ownership of the soil', within the meaning of a constitutional monarchy, is vested in the Duchy whereas for the rest of the UK this is vested in the Crown. To combine part of Cornwall with England in a cross-border Parliamentary Constituency would be a serious denial of this history and the British constitution.

The Cornish people have a strong sense of a distinct cultural identity. This is reflected in a wide range of traditions, from the celebration of our own Patron Saint and an historically recognised national flag, to the use of the Cornish language in personal names, place names and the spoken word. The Cornish language belongs to the family of Celtic languages and is protected under the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages. The 2011 Act undertakes to respect cultural issues in the assignment of constituency boundaries where possible. This is clearly possible in the case of Cornwall and we ask the Boundary Commission to put both spirit and letter of the Act into practice by creating coterminous Parliamentary Constituency boundaries with our historic border.

The stated purpose of the 2011 Act was to improve democracy as was the ethos behind the 2014 Devolution Deal between the UK Government and Cornwall Council. To muddy the waters with a cross-border constituency devalues this democracy and risks dividing the MP's loyalties. One simple and obvious area of loyalty conflict is within the tourist industry. This is an extremely competitive market and Cornwall Council is active in promoting a distinctive Cornish brand in order to encourage people to drive the extra distance into Cornwall rather than stopping off in Somerset or Devon. It is difficult to see how a cross-border MP would feel comfortable in actively supporting a Cornwall wide branding whilst excluding a large proportion of their constituency in Devon.

Gorsedh Kernow invites the Boundary Commission and the UK Government to put the ethos of democracy that underpins the 2011 Act into practice, to listen to the people of Cornwall and to make the necessary arrangements to enable parliamentary representation of five constituencies which fall within the border of Cornwall and are coterminous with that border.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to make this case.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Dr Davey, if you would just remain there for a moment. Are there any questions for Dr Davey? No? Thank you very much for your representations and for the helpful written transcript. Mr Mike Tresidder.

MR TRESIDDER: We are running early.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes, we are running a little early now because a booked speaker has not yet attended. Are you happy to speak a little earlier than your allocated spot?

MR TRESIDDER: Yes, that is fine; I am just worried about other people who do not realise that time is being compressed a bit.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: What will happen is if they are not there, then we will adjourn and wait for them to come, so we are not going to call people's slot earlier if they are not here. Could I ask you just to confirm your full name and address, please?

MR TRESIDDER: Yes, Michael Alan Tresidder, Old Meldrum, Breague, Cornwall TR13 9PJ.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you. If you would like to make your presentation, please?

MR TRESIDDER: Firstly, it is curious, is it not, that at a time when Britain has become synonymous with the phrase "I want my country back" you should seek to destroy the integrity of one of the oldest components of the British Isles. I would remind the Commission that the boundary between Cornwall and what became Devon is probably the oldest geopolitical boundary still in existence in Europe today. Indeed, if you examine the course of events from the 900s carefully you will see it came into being before the formal creation of England itself. I have actually put this out to the worldwide web and possibly the only other oldest boundary in existence today exists between North Korea and China, so it is an old boundary and it has been intact for a hell of a long time.

The people of the United Kingdom look to their history as a source of pride and social stability. The proposed change damages Cornwall on both accounts. It is an attack on the history of the British Isles and the sense of place that underpins what makes Cornwall, Cornwall.

My second and related point is that the change flies in the face of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, the aims of which are to (and I quote) "protect the existence of national minorities within the respective territories of the

parties. The Convention seeks to promote the full and effective equality of national minorities by creating..” and this is my emphasis “..appropriate conditions enabling them to preserve and develop their culture and retain their identity.” The proposed changes do not do this, they go against that.

The Cornish, as a recognised national minority, will not be served by the proposed changes and their ability to exercise their hard won protections under the Convention damaged. The hostility to the expression of an identity other than English, especially of late, has become well documented. The outright prejudice towards notions of Cornishness and lack of knowledge about Cornwall’s Celtic status is a nuanced and complex issue. Our current MPs sometimes have difficulties understanding their constituents in this respect. A cross-border MP is hardly likely, therefore, to trouble themselves too much when having to take into account their Devonian English and non-Celtic voters. Recent comments by Sajid Javid illustrate this point very well.

My third point is one of practicality. Moving around the proposed constituency would be time-consuming. Cornwall was long ago – and I seem to remember going to a lecture some 30 years ago that classified Cornwall as a “rural dispersed region”, almost unique apart from the highlands and islands in Scotland. It has no natural geographic or urban centre, despite what Truro wants for itself. Adding a part of it to another rural bit of countryside and Devon only makes sense in the mind of map makers creating boundaries out of population numbers. I would suggest if you doubt this perspective try travelling between Cornish and Devon villages in the proposed constituency and time yourselves. But do not just do it now, do it in the depths of winter, in the flood season and the height of summer when the tourists are here. You would soon see what I mean.

Fourthly, how does this constituency help the project’s social cohesion? Cornwall is classified quite recently as one of the poorest regions in Northern Europe; Devon is not. Would you consider a constituency that encompasses, for example, Tower Hamlets and Mayfair? Could an MP work effectively with the people who experience such divided affluence and poverty and all the other markers that make up their social identity based on class, wealth, et cetera, et cetera?

Finally, please do not tell us that this is a *fait accompli*. I understand the Isle of Wight and certain Scottish islands have had exceptions applied to their boundaries. The proposed change is just plain wrong and I urge you to leave Cornwall on historical, cultural, legal and practical grounds intact. The sources for historic, legal and social claims made today have all had their veracity tested in academic context and I am happy to supply full references in writing should you wish me to do so.

That is it; I can provide you with a transcript but this is a rough copy at the moment so I can do that later, okay? Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: That would be really helpful, Mr Tresidder. Would you remain there just for a second? Are there any questions for Mr Tresidder? No? Thank you very much for your representation and the transcript will be very much appreciated. Thank you. We have a speaker booked for 11 o'clock who I understand is not here yet – John Conway? (No response). No, okay.

I understand that we have Ms Tresidder who was booked for a slot later today but would be happy to speak now – yes? Okay, if that is convenient for you would you like to come down to the lectern – thank you. Good morning, Ms Tresidder. Are you happy to speak early – now?

MS TRESIDDER: Yes.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Okay, thank you. Can I invite you to give your name and address, please?

MS TRESIDDER: Yes. My name is Sarah Tresidder, Old Meldrum, Higher Road, Breague, Helston TR13 9PA.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much. If you would like to make your presentation, please?

MS TRESIDDER: Okay, thank you. I was going to start this in Cornish but then I thought that would be unkind as I gather you probably would not understand, out of respect for a different culture.

Like so many other people of Cornwall, my boyfriend (now husband) and I left home to work away or study outside her borders, hence the phrase “anybody with any get up and go got up and went” which overtook “shout down a hole anywhere in the world and a Cornishman will answer you back.” However, I have increasingly more respect for those who stayed behind and made a living. Things have always been tough and those who have had nothing to begin with have built their businesses by being inventive and creative, something that is very true of many a Cornish person.

One thing that I shall never forget is the first job I had as a waitress/cook/cleaner (all one job) from 9 in the morning ‘til 11.30 at night depending on how long it took to clean and prepare for the next day – the princely wage of £5 for six days a week. My next job, £6.50 for a six day week in the pharmacy.

Not long after moving to London I took a job in an employment agency and went seeking work. I had a decent wage, I got some experience and I never looked back. That is until my husband and I returned home 15 years later with a baby. My husband was doing well in his job and he was often head hunted by other oil companies to go to work for them. Our wages were pretty good, albeit mine as a PA to a solicitor was half

of his. I noted on return that it was my wages that were the average for a man in Cornwall and again a woman's half of that.

Most of us have now returned to our homeland, having experiences that would not have been possible had we stayed, most of us struggling to keep our heads above the water even now that we have the minimum wage here, too – oh, and yippee, some bright spark doubled my wages when they introduced that overnight.

I remember writing to the local papers when we moved home stating how horrified I was that the people of Cornwall were still being treated like peasants in the foreign colony of England. The wages were half the average and the people still having to do the work of three. The paper asked for the person who anonymously wrote in to get in contact but I felt embarrassed. It is symptomatic of an area and people who have been oppressed for so long where they have not fought back but now the tide is turning. We know that we are different; we did not need a piece of paper signed and presented by Westminster to prove it. What we do need is for Westminster to act on it and to stop treating the people of Cornwall like second-class citizens.

Over the last few years the movement in Cornwall has been building for recognition of the culturally and linguistically different place. Networks were working well in providing people with what they wanted and that was knowledge of their birthright, history, culture, music and language. Promises were made by various Governments, usually with the help of Europe which at least recognised us as culturally different, but not necessarily carried out. To the point that when the previous coalition Government was in it was agreed that we should have continued funding for the language, even though the amount given was dramatically lowered year by year. However, on change of government we were told that this was no longer happening. Was it because we, the inhabitants of Cornwall, were steadily becoming more confident and proud of our heritage or was it the fact that we were getting more and more media coverage? Having said that, it has been noticed that it was mainly other Celtic nations or independent television companies giving us air time, not the BBC.

If none of the above, was it the fear of people getting too much credibility? Ironically this is something that the BBC has managed to ignore or manipulate coverage of so far. A good example of this was the coverage of the last rally at Saltash where the BBC recorded some amazing speeches by politicians, academics, councillors against Devonwall proposition, but chose instead to show the comical aspect of people holding banners and waving clenched fists at the border – once again continuing to ridicule the Cornish people and the matters important to them and matters particularly Kernowek.

Where am I going with this? Well, it all makes sense. The matters of Cornwall have no interest to the British governing body outside of our borders unless it involves prostituting our land as a place of leisure, our traditional houses and villages as second homes and of course making money as the building site property conglomerates up the

line. This is all probable as we are a very different area to that on the other side of the Tamar.

Having ignored our pleas not to cover our countryside with more concrete and take away more valuable arable land to build houses that we have no money to purchase or jobs with which to save for, we are now due to be watered down again as an ethnic community. Again, this is against the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities. Our roads, hospitals, surgeries and even the wretched supermarkets which have killed our village and town centres cannot cope with the influx during the winter, let alone the hordes of summer holidaymakers.

Now is the final and most painful blow that has been suggested since the last attempt – you wish to take away our political border and with it our dignity. We note that there are rules and regulations against such changes in administrative borders quoted in Article 16 of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities where not only the moving of borders should not happen but planning decisions that affect the areas within these borders that alter the stability of the communities inside should not be made by outside administrators.

This has been continually broken by this Government. Particularly whenever we decide we do not want planning for certain buildings the developers go straight to Bristol and override the local parish and council opposition. In other words, we should be allowed to administrate matters that change the cultural integrity within our present borders of our country without outside interference, something which is not happening and should be taken back to the policy makers of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities as a crime against a national minority. This is continually being abused and ignored.

Lanson – Launceston – is supposed to be celebrating two major events this coming year, one of them the centenary of the birth of one of Cornwall's most famous sons, Charles Causley; the other the arrival of the Gorsedd of which I am proud to say I am a Bard. It is also the home of the Cornish Stannary Parliament which is a Cornish institution and cannot be held under another Parliamentary Constituency other than Cornwall. Therefore it is appropriate at this time, or indeed at any time, that an intrusion into our border is even being considered. Quoting the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, Article 5.2:

“The parties shall refrain from policies or practices aimed at assimilation of persons belonging to national minorities against their will and shall protect those persons from any action such as assimilation.”

So I plead on behalf of those who have given their lives to researching and sharing our history, who have campaigned on behalf of all of us to have the Cornish recognised as a national minority, sponsored and upheld our right to learn about our culture and

language and those who are no longer with us, to at least reconsider the plans that have a foreign authority oversee an area that is so culturally different as well as their own. It would be impossible to have empathy with both halves of that constituency when they have so little in common. It has rather marred what is supposed to be such a special year in Lanson and the rest of Cornwall.

Now you can see that this is a little bit more than just moving a border, it is about the continuation of oppression of the inhabitants of Cornwall which we as a people are fed up that the Government are ignoring and, even if we cannot be heard outside of our border because of BBC or newspaper blackout of matters particularly Cornish, we will continue to fight against being railroaded into having our political border altered by a bullying and short sighted Government.

So I am asking you, the body of people witnessing our distress at the proposals to cut away our border for political aims, to please prove us wrong and consider abandoning this proposal. Thank you very much.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Would you just remain there for a moment? Are there any questions? Thank you very much for your representation.

MS TRESIDDER: Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Mr Matthew Clarke. Mr Clarke, could you give your full name and address, please?

MR CLARKE (*via a translator*): My name is Matthew Clarke and I live at 29 Vivians Court, Camborne, Kernow.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Mr Clarke, thank you for that. Just to remind you that you have a ten-minute slot; I will remind you when you have about a minute left so that you can make sure that you tell me everything that you want me to know.

MR CLARKE: Without doubt, you are going to hear people speaking about the political reasons uniting a Devon and Cornwall constituency. Though I support them, I would prefer to speak about the matter of culture this morning. Cornwall is a land apart from England; we know this because of history and because of the laws. The most recent proof of this is found in a new book by Bernard Deacon, *Cornwall's First Golden Age*. He describes how Cornwall was an independent land after the Romans left until the Normans arrived. Also, he has proved that we should consider Cornwall and Brittany as one land but on different sides of the channel.

There is proof for the people's specialist and independence of spirit through the language. Cornish, or Kernowek, has continued as a living language until today



because people believe they are Cornish and not English. One can see this on maps, too. Largely, place names in the Cornish language start at the Tamar and stretch through Cornwall. Those who have this tongue believe they are Brythons, along with their sister nations Brittany and Wales. It is easy enough to see how the language and culture are similar by looking at the written language and listening to speakers in discourse.

If we look at the laws there is strong proof there, too. If I were to die intestate, where would my money go? Before answering, I should say that if I fail to make a will in England it would go to the Crown; however, this is not the case in Cornwall, the estate would be given to the Duchy of Cornwall. I am not saying to the private estate if I were living on a farm owned by Prince Charles, no; if I were to die anywhere in the land of Cornwall without writing a will my estate would go to Charles.

This proves that the laws are different here in Cornwall and one cannot treat this land as England. Moreover, if I were to salvage something on a beach between the tide marks I would need to yield it to Charles. Furthermore, all the mineral rights under my feet are owned by the Duchy, too, where they are owned by the Crown in England. Look at the agreements for building the Tamar Bridge in 1961 and you will note it was necessary for the lawyers to consider these important points. Though Cornwall may be administered as an English county in law, it appears to be something entirely different.

I stand here as someone with Cornwall's heart in my heart and the language of this ancient land on my tongue. However, I also stand here as a business person so I asked the Cornwall Chamber of Commerce for a statement to use here. Chief Executive Kim Conchie gave me this: "Having consulted with businesses, business support organisations, charities and business people, everybody thinks a blurring of the boundary would cause confusion, inefficiency and would not improve democracy in Cornwall. Furthermore, it would diminish Cornwall and Scillies capacity to contribute to a thriving South West region, which the Government wants.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Mr Clarke, just to let you know you have about a minute left.

MR CLARKE: Yes – one section more. To sum up, I would like to say you were trying to deny a long history before England ever existed in order that you can bend some numbers because of a short term whim of the Conservative party. I wish that no-one may endanger our history and culture because of this and if you were to ignore my words you would be ignoring our status as a recognised minority people against the law.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Mr Clarke, thank you for your representations. Would you remain there for a moment in case there are any questions?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I do not know if this is a question for you or for the panel itself. If you need a translation you still only have ten minutes – this does not seem right, you should need double the time to allow for the translation.

TRANSLATOR: Mr Clarke is saying he does not feel that is for him to answer that question.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Okay, perhaps I can assist. We allow ten minutes so that as many people as possible can come and actually tell me what they want me to know. There is time available later today if people want additional slots and we are also here tomorrow and there are slots available tomorrow if people want to speak for continued time but it is for fairness to everybody that we ask people to keep, when they have booked slots, to their ten-minute slot so that everybody who has booked in can be sure to speak at a time that is convenient for them, which is the time that they have booked. If you want to book additional time, please have a word with some of the Commission staff who are outside on reception and we can slot you in when it is convenient for you to come.

MR CLARKE: Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Clarke. Mrs Delia Brotherton.

Mrs Brotherton, can I ask you to give your name and address, please?

MRS BROTHERTON (*Cornish spoken*): My name is Delia Brotherton and I live at Rhos Tyg, Higher Tregenna Road, St Ives, Cornwall.

Good morning to you all. I would like to express my strong opposition to the proposal for a cross-border parliamentary constituency between Cornwall and Devon, the so-called “Devonwall” enveloping Bude, Bideford and Launceston as it completely flies in the face of commitments and promises made by the UK Government.

Cornish historic border has been in place, with a few exceptions, for over 1,000 years. There were some small adjustments made during the 1960s and 1970s but these represent no more than minor blips in the long history of Cornwall. The overwhelming picture of Cornwall is one of a place with a strong identity, a unique culture and language and a fiercely loyal people within a distinct area marked by a strong border.

Now we are faced yet again with another attempt to erode the recognition and respect for Cornwall and the Cornish people as distinct even though this status is already legally and publicly recognised by the UK Government through the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, ratified in the summer of 2014. Indeed, the Prime Minister at the time and the UK Government went on to acknowledge the importance of

Cornwall, stating that “There is a distinctive history, culture and language in Cornwall which we should celebrate and make sure is properly looked after and celebrated.” The Cornish language was afforded recognition and protection in 2002 under the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages.

The Duchy of Cornwall, controversial in some eyes, was created in the 14<sup>th</sup> century and provides Cornwall with a distinct constitutional status and territorial integrity within the United Kingdom. In 1855 the High Court ruled that “the whole territorial interest and dominion of the Crown in and over the entirety of Cornwall is vested in the Duke of Cornwall.” So Cornwall is a separate kingdom. This status is as relevant today as it ever was.

The Boundary Commission is, of course, concerned with parliamentary democracy and not party politics but this ill-advised proposal for such an unwelcome change to the border will nevertheless test the trustworthiness of the Westminster machine.

Cornwall’s MPs have crumbled, saying “It’s all too difficult.” What sort of response is that? They say, “It’s someone else’s job, it’s not our fault, we tried but we failed.” What sort of response is that? More recently, Sajid Javid MP, Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, said at a business conference, “Some in Cornwall see their ‘county’ as distinct from the rest of their ‘region’ a special case that should be handled separately from elsewhere east of the Tamar. If we’re going to make a success of the ‘South West’, that whole attitude has got to change.” The lack of applause from the audience at that point spoke for itself.

This sort of bullying shows just how out of touch some of those in the Westminster bubble are. The UK Government has cited Cornwall as a model for devolved government but shows little concern for the every-day practicalities of seeing it through, preferring instead to allow its ministers to put stumbling blocks, and so it seems threats, in the way. However, all is not lost. Official figures show that there is such a tiny numerical difference to the recorded electorate standing in the way of a resolution to this issue. There is already a precedent in the system so Cornwall need not feel alone in this request. In a recorded electorate in Cornwall of just under 400,000 people, a mere 270 citizens are being singled out as the reason to re-draw the boundaries of every constituency in Cornwall – yes, every constituency. Just think how much all that will cost. Is it really worth losing the goodwill of Cornish people over such a small number?

A small but positive amendment to the legislation defining Cornwall as an electoral unit would respect the unique status of Cornwall, already recognised and bound in law by the UK Government. If Cornwall had five parliamentary seats it would allow for retention of the historical border between Cornwall and Devon and go a long way to restoring some of the faith lost by the electorate over this unfair, shabby and dismissive treatment of the citizens of the Cornwall.

I would respectfully ask that you put pressure on the UK Government to take this course of action and *gwith Kernow caw* - keep Cornwall whole.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Mrs Brotherton, thank you for your representations. Would you remain there for a second, please? Are there any questions for Mrs Brotherton? Thank you very much. Our next speaker is booked at ten to 12 so we will now take a 20-minute break. The hearing is adjourned until 11.50.

After a short break

Time Noted: 11.50 am

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you – if you would like to come down to the lectern, please, we need to hear what you are saying. Could I ask you to give your name and address, please, Councillor Biscoe?

CLLR BISCOE (Cornwall District Council): I have brought you a copy of what I was going to say – do you want that?

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: That is very helpful, thank you.

CLLR BISCOE: I am sorry it is in my handwriting, which I inherited from my father – he left it to me in his will (same handed). My name is Bert Biscoe, I am a member of Cornwall Council, I represent the Boscawen Division in Truro. I am a member of the cabinet of Cornwall Council, although I am speaking personally here, and I look after the transport portfolio so consequently issues about infrastructure and relationships are very important to me.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Councillor Biscoe, would you give your address, please, as well?

CLLR BISCOE: It is 3, Lower Rosewin Row, Truro, TR1 1EN (for Nancy).

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much.

CLLR BISCOE: This will not take very long. I have noted that the 1986 Act, the measures in it which relate to geographical considerations and county boundaries, those measures do not appear to have been repealed and therefore are still in existence. It seems to me that there is a tension with the 2011 Act, because whilst the rule of numbers is to be applied, the strong geographical guidance still exists. Parliament has basically given the Boundary Commission, from our point of view, an impossible job and a job that I believe we need to find a way together of resolving.

Cornwall's special geographical considerations have been well rehearsed. Suffice it to say if you persist with a cross-border constituency then, as Geoffrey Cox MP has said, it will be the enforced unification of two divergent cultures. It is not just Cornwall that does not want this but Devon also. The Boundary Commission makes recommendations to Parliament; therefore, given the conflict between the 1986 guidance and the 2011 rule, I suggest that you recommend either that Cornwall and the Isles of Scilly becomes a prescribed electoral region, like Wales or the Isle of Wight, or that you advise Parliament that it should treat the Isles of Scilly as a special geographical consideration and add it to the St Ives constituency, having complied with the 2011 rule by creating five equally sized Cornish constituencies first. So that means the St Ives constituency will be equally sized but with a bolt-on of some 1,600 electors.

The Isle of Wight offers an anomaly in the analysis of the 2011 Act and that begs a question: why did Parliament ignore the Isles of Scilly? There is no equivocation about the Isles of Scilly; it is a special geographical consideration. It is an archipelago of islands, 28 miles off shore with 1,600 inhabitants of voting age. Everywhere else, this sort of condition has resulted in a discrete arrangement.

My preference, bearing in mind the historical and cultural resonances of Cornwall, the Framework Convention for the National Minorities, the Minority Language Charter, the distinctive constitutional settlement – that is the shared sovereignty of the Duchy and the persistently robust expression of Cornish people, communities and institutions – my preference would be that the Boundary Commission recommend to Parliament the bespoke establishment of Cornwall and the Isles of Scilly as a prescribed electoral region. That means that we would not go through this every five years, as the 2011 Act suggests.

That means also that Cornwall and the Isles of Scilly would be a territory within which constituencies must be comprised of a number of equally sized constituencies. So if the Boundary Commission is unable to do this, then do not stand in our way as we lobby for a change to Parliament which properly and constructively reflects our material geography.

Finally, I would just like to say that I participated in two out of the three public inquiries that took place when we were struggling to detach West Plymouth, I think it was, from our European parliamentary constituency before the days of electoral regions. The third of those Public Inquiries, which were conducted on the basis that there were special geographical considerations to take into account in securing Cornwall and the Isles of Scilly as an electoral region, the third of those inquiries found in our favour. The first of those inquiries found in our favour from the point of view of the guidance about special geographical considerations but felt that the numbers game overrode the case. By the time we got to the third one the numbers game had moved into second place and we made our point.

It is ironic and sad and leaves us in a difficult position today that the day after that announcement was made they created proportional representation and the electoral regions with which we now suffer but it does seem to me that, in terms of the inquiry that you are conducting, that Cornwall's experience in relation to that series of inquiries is material to what you are looking at today and material to the question about what balance should be struck by the Boundary Commission in making judgments about Cornwall and the Isles of Scilly when you have, in the '86 Act, the continuing existence of this guidance about special geographical considerations and county boundaries and in the 2011 Act a rule that says that you cannot take account of the guidance. It is a parliamentary anomaly and one which, in my view, gives the Boundary Commission an impossible job to do and I think you should go back and tell them and say that either they sort out Cornwall or they sort out the law.

That is it.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much. Would you like to just remain there for a second? Thank you. Are there any questions from the floor? Thank you very much for your representations and for the written record.

Mr Robert Webber, please. Good morning, Mr Webber. Would you like to give your name and address, please?

CLLR WEBBER (Camborne and Redruth Labour Party): Councillor Robert Webber, Cornwall Councillor for Camborne, Treslothan Division. My address is 1 Seton Gardens, Camborne and I am here speaking on behalf of Camborne and Redruth Labour Party.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you; if you would like to make your representations, please?

CLLR WEBBER: I will start with the general position of the law and the position which the Boundary Commission has been put in. You will have heard many, many passionate speeches and no doubt will for the rest of today and tomorrow in regards to the Devonwall situation, the contradictions in the law which are stark and clear and the problems which you, as a Commission, are presented with in that you have to fulfil the requirements set out in the legislation which is strongly opposed and will be continued to be opposed by a large proportion of the population of Cornwall and Devon. So for the record, to be very clear that everything which is said here is not in any way endorsing a Devonwall constituency. If you go back through the parliamentary records you will see that my political party was consistent in this matter but I came here to speak specifically about the recommendations in West Cornwall and the Boundary Commission's draft proposals for the Falmouth and Camborne constituency.

Setting aside the rules which you are presented with, the Falmouth and Camborne constituency is a logical constituency. It is a reinstatement of an historic constituency which existed before the 2010 Boundary Commission changes. The reasons for this are very much to do with the cultural history of this part of West Cornwall. You have the Camborne and Redruth area, which is the core of the current Camborne and Redruth parliamentary constituency. It has a very strong heritage which connects to the mining industries and has always been one parliamentary constituency as an entity of the core of. When you add Falmouth and Penryn in, you have got another area which is part of the core West Cornwall industrial area. You have got the history of the harbour at Falmouth and you have always had good links across from one side to the other as far as Cornwall is concerned. No constituency in Cornwall is easy; you are always going to break community links. However, this constituency is the right choice if you are restricted to the rules and I would urge you to persist with this recommendation.

If you look, the only anomaly I would say on the map is that you have got the parish of Portreath to the north, which is the historic harbour for Camborne and Redruth. Because of the local government boundaries, that is connected to Mount Hawke to the north-east and that would be considered to have been the historic port for Camborne and Redruth so that is a slight anomaly which you may wish to consider but fundamentally, given the rules which are set before you the parliamentary constituency are recommending, regrettably – in the rules, as I say, you are set with is the correct one in that area. It follows obviously that St Ives constituency would contain your recommendations. I am not going to make any comments about further east.

That is really all I wish to say this morning.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much for attending. Would you like to remain there for a moment? Are there any questions? Thank you for your representations. Mr Michael Paynter, please. Good afternoon, Mr Paynter.

MR PAYNTER: Good afternoon.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Could I ask you to give your name and address, please?

MR PAYNTER: Michael Kenneth Paynter, 7 Bedford Road, St Ives, TR26 1SP.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

MR PAYNTER (*via Translator*): There is one reason I have come here today and that is to argue against the proposals on the basis of the statistics and the number of people included. The number of people proposed is more than – the proposal is to include more people and be against the will of the local people there. The number of people proposed is stupid. The number of voters is more than in the referendum. I have come here to argue against the proposal for the Lanstephan/Bideford constituency. I do not need to say any more other than our boundary is one of history, culture and nationhood and the language itself as well. You do not need to look any further than the petition, the map of the petition for language funding to see the representation of people's concerns in Cornwall. The map clearly shows the difference in people's concerns and thoughts. The Cornish are recognised as a minority under the Framework Convention and our direct representation is very important. Please do not change or lose our ancient boundary. That is all.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much for your representations. Are there any questions? Just remain there for a moment, please. No. Thank you.

Mr William Rowe. Good afternoon, Mr Rowe. Could I ask you to give your name and address, please?

MR ROWE: Certainly. I am Mr William Charles Hugh Rowe of the Cornish Stannary Parliament, number 20 Lacey Close, Kammbronn, Kernow.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you; if you would like to make your representations, please.

MR ROWE: I will do. This is not the first time that numerous people have been inconvenienced, had to spend time, money and unnecessary effort as well as putting themselves in danger of public outcries at the incursion of England's Boundary Commission into Cornwall.

The statement regarding England's proposed parliamentary boundary review. The England UK Government has chosen to use seven-year-old data. Thousands of English people have immigrated into Cornwall due to a frenzy of unlawful mass settlement building during that seven-year period. So much for government statistics. Some say that Devon and Cornwall (Kernow) are very different places and that Cornwall considers itself to be a nation. Kernow (Cornwall) is an internationally recognised land and country predating England by millennia and is the ancestral land of the autonomous Celtic/Cornish first nation people of the British Isles, whereas Devon is



a county of neighbouring England beyond Kernow's national border. The eastern bank of our River Tamar at high water is recognised constitutionally and lawfully to be of over 100,000 years standing. It is our Cornish people that constitute our extant nation, not our country.

With regard to Brexit, Kernow and Kernowyon, the Cornish nation, were and remain quite rightly excluded from England's UK Act of Union in 1707, as was evidenced on BBC2 on 18 September in Andrew Marr's "Scotland and the Battle for Britain", in which a map of the UK was shown with England's counties coloured in blue and yellow and with the country of Kernow in black. That the ancient constitutionally and lawfully recognised Cornish Stannary Parliament and its judiciary continues to the present day, some 309 years since 1707, certainly further evidences the fact that Kernow is neither included into England or UK.

Without prejudice to our people's customary and prescribed rights to self-determination, the Treaty Charter of Pardon and Amenities of 1508 states that "No statute, Act, et cetera emanated from England shall be applied within Cornwall without first the assent and consent of the Cornish nation through their own legitimate parliament." This inalienable and irrevocable charter was confirmed as being a statute in force by England's highest legal authority, the Lord Chancellor, in 1977 and can never be amended or revoked without first the assent and consent of the Cornish Stannary Parliament. Failed attempts to include the whole or parts of Kernow into England have been many. Should England's UK Parliament attempt to unconstitutionally and unlawfully impose the latest heinous policy upon our land and people, then the Cornish Stannary Parliament, the only constitutional and lawful institution able to represent our Cornish nation, will have no alternative in law but to veto such an unlawful attempt. England may conduct any parliamentary constituency boundary alteration necessary within England's national border but a cross-national border attempt affecting the territorial integrity of our ancient ancestral land and country of Kernow will place England into violation of our customary prescribed and treaty chartered right to complete and unimpeded self-governance in violation of international Human Rights legislation and in contempt of the rule of law.

Luxembourg, smaller in area and population of Cornwall, has six MEPs; Cornwall has not one but is unlawfully forced to share a non-Cornish MEP with part of England beyond our national border, our further violation of our Cornish people's human rights. People should be aware that the Celtic Cornish nation are neither a national minority nor an ethnic group of Anglo-Saxon England but an ancient Celtic nation residing within our own ancestral Celtic country. It appears that England's political party MPs in general have much to learn regarding Kernowek and Kernoyon.

Mr Bert Biscoe wrote - speaking on an article about Westminster's expression of an intention to possibly treat the Cornish people as a national minority, not that they would – he wrote that we need to consider "inclusivity and balance." He seems unaware that the balance is completely weighted to the advantage of English migrants of the interests and rights of the Cornish people. Inclusivity and integration is a one-way street where the host nation, Cornwall, is forcibly being included into Englishness. This is unlawful assimilation. Does anyone else have any questions? Did you hear me?

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much for your representation.

MR ROWE: Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Mr Ian Lobb, would you like to come forward, please? Mr Lobb, could I ask you to give your full name and address, please, for the sake of the record?

MR LOBB: Yes, it is Ian David Lobb and it is number 13, Hall Road, St Dennis, St Austell, Cornwall, and it is PL26 8BE.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you; if you would like to make your representations, please.

MR LOBB: Yes. I would just like to put forward the fact that I do not agree with the Devonwall constituency. I understand the changes that the Boundary Commission need to take but I do feel that Cornwall needs to be represented wholly and solely on its own merit. This is purely because with the unitary authority we need to have a full representation as Cornwall is separate but my main area of concern is the clay area of St Dennis, Nanpean, Whitemoor, Roche and the St Austell, St Enoder and St Stephen's areas, the reason being there is over 150 years of mining history in the clay area which is going to be potentially split up with the proposed changes in the boundaries between the St Austell and Newquay constituencies and Truro and Falmouth and the way that the proposed boundaries are going to be, with the fact that the proposed boundary with Truro and Newquay going in the front, I feel that there is no correlation between Truro and Newquay's situation with the clay area and St Austell. It is unfair to put affluent areas and seaside areas being put into the same bit without any fair representation as a whole clay area together.

The clay area is a strong voice and it needs to be represented as the whole part in one constituency, it must not be split up, and we need to make sure that this is not done. I feel that the clay network area that we have in Cornwall, working with Cornwall Council, is very strong now and we need to keep this together and I please, please, please hope that you will review this and propose to keep the clay area together and do not split it up in the future.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much, Mr Lobb. Would you remain there for a moment? Are there any questions? Thank you for attending and giving your representations.

MR LOBB: Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Ms Candy Atherton, I think you have a speaking slot a little bit later. There is a vacant slot now, are you happy to speak early?

MS ATHERTON: I certainly am.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you. We will just hand the equipment round so that we can get you on camera and I think that the microphone in front of you is actually working. If I could ask you to give your name and address, please, and then make your representations?

CLLR ATHERTON: Yes, I am Cllr Candy Atherton. I am a Labour Councillor for Falmouth Smithick and on both Cornwall Council and Falmouth Town Council. I am Chair of the Truro and Falmouth Constituency Labour Party and perhaps critically, in terms of this hearing, I am the former Member of Parliament for Falmouth and Camborne between 1997 and 2005.

I will be brief because we are getting towards lunch and people get anxious as we get closer to lunch and I want to make two points, please. Firstly, that the local Labour Party that I am privileged to chair unanimously rejects the view of a Devonwall and indeed I think I can speak for all of the Labour Party members who I have spoken with about this and they feel that the whole thing is a complete nonsense and believe that maybe our six current Members of Parliament should actually be standing up very strongly and making representations to government that this is unacceptable to the people of Cornwall.

You have heard the arguments all morning and I would endorse pretty well all of them and I think I cannot say enough – it is a complete nonsense, Devonwall, and the Commission please make that clear to government.

But I do want to be constructive in terms of some of the boundary changes that you are proposing in the west of Cornwall. As I said earlier, I represented and was honoured to represent the Falmouth and Camborne constituency and while wearing that hat I sat in this very chamber and spoke with some passion about how I felt Camborne and Redruth and Hayle had a natural enmity and it would be a good new parliamentary constituency. I am happy to sit here and admit that I probably was very wrong and that actually the people of Falmouth and Camborne, if you stopped them in the street today, would say, “Oh, actually we’re members of the Falmouth and Camborne constituency” because that is the traditional seat which many of them still relate to. I think it would be fair to say that the people of Hayle have more in sympathy with St Ives than they do with Camborne and that is reflected if you knock on their doors. I think the recommendations in terms of the Falmouth and Camborne constituency are to be endorsed and I would hope you would support them in the forthcoming months as we go forward. Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Ms Atherton. Are there any questions?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Just one.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Sorry, can I just ask you to identify yourself, please, and just make sure that you speak into the mic so that we can record it – thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, (inaudible), Cornish Stannary Parliament. I would just like to ask Ms Atherton, I am looking – these boundaries, some of them are reverting back to what they were previously. Some of them are the boundary changes that we had back in the 1980s and 1990s and I’m just wondering if some of them might be going back to what they were before or if they’re just completely new boundaries.

MS ATHERTON: I have not drawn them up obviously but certainly in terms of Falmouth and Camborne it is very similar to the seat that I was honoured to represent.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you very much.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Are there any more questions? Thank you very much, Ms Atherton, for speaking.

Mr George Eustice. Mr Eustice, I know that you have a speaking slot that is a little later – are you happy to speak now?

MR EUSTICE: Yes.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you, would you like to come down to the lectern, please? Good afternoon. Could I ask you to give your name and address, please?

MR EUSTICE: (MP for Camborne and Redruth) Yes. I am George Eustice, I am the Member of Parliament for Camborne and Redruth and the address is the House of Commons.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you; if you would like to give your representations, please?

MR EUSTICE: Okay. First of all, like a lot of other people who have spoken today, I had hoped that it would have been possible to avoid a Devon and Cornwall cross-border seat. I think it is the case that Cornwall is distinct. You have had contributions today, I know, in the Cornish language. Cornish does have its own identity and its own history as a number of people have pointed out and it is for that reason that the Cornish language is recognised on a Council of Europe Convention on Minority Languages and also that Cornish is recognised as a national minority under the Framework Convention.

The truth is, though, that the time to make these arguments was when the primary legislation went through and I think it is important to note that when that primary legislation went through several years ago all of the MPs in Cornwall actually tabled an amendment to the legislation to try to ensure that a cross-border Devon and Cornwall seat could be avoided and we were ultimately unsuccessful in getting that changed at that point, which was the point at which it needed to be changed.

I suppose the reality as well is that protecting or making sure there are no cross-border seats in, say, Wales and England or Scotland and England is easier where you have got a larger number of seats, which means that any adjustments can be diluted and still keep you within the range of size and constituencies that you are aiming at and if the principle is to try to have equal size constituencies, so that there is equal weight to vote

in Cornwall, in Wales and in Scotland and the rest of England, then to depart too far from that would undermine the principle behind the primary legislation in the first place.

So my view is that in terms of getting the change that I know many people in Cornwall would like to see, that is now a matter for probably a future Private Member's Bill for an MP to bring before Parliament but in the meantime, of course, government has got plenty of other options it can consider to recognise the unique distinct identity of Cornwall and also to decide how best to deliver its commitments under those Council of Europe conventions.

I turn now to the main issue that you have to consider, which is the boundary proposals before us and specifically for the Camborne and Falmouth proposed new seat. My own view is, as Candy Atherton said, that Hayle did actually have quite a good fit with Camborne and Redruth. There is a lot of industrial history that connects the two, there have been a lot of changes in Hayle recently and there is an historic connection between the two, but I completely accept that in order to make the numbers work under the new legislation there is no getting away from the fact, in my view, that the right thing is that Hayle would go back to St Ives because there are not many other options so I accept that point.

I wanted to make a point around Portreath. The village of Portreath has always been very closely linked to Redruth and indeed under the old Camborne and Falmouth seat that existed pre-2010 Portreath was part of that Camborne and Falmouth seat. I do understand the argument that there is a reluctance on the Boundary Commission to split divisions and under the new divisions, as part of the unitary council, you would therefore be splitting a division if Portreath were to stay with Camborne and Redruth but I would ask you to consider this because I think if we see, as is possible in future, fewer divisions in Cornwall, therefore even larger wards, we may in future when we look at this have to start to consider in some cases, where there is a strong argument for it, splitting individual council divisions in order to make sure that parliamentary constituencies make sense. So I would ask that you maybe give some consideration to this issue of Portreath.

The final point that I wanted to make is around the name of the seat. I know that I think the Liberal Democrats have suggested a change of the name to Camborne, Falmouth and Redruth. I do think that Redruth is a very significant town in this constituency and should be reflected but I would like to suggest Camborne, Redruth and Falmouth for the simple reason that Camborne Redruth has long been used as a term to denote the wider Camborne Redruth conurbation, which is sometimes these days called CPR – Camborne, Poole and Redruth – or even CPI to include Illogan, but everybody accepts

that this is the largest urban conurbation in Cornwall and I think simply Camborne, Redruth and Falmouth recognises that we are denoting the entire Camborne, Redruth conurbation as well as Falmouth.

Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you for your representations. Would you remain there, please, for a moment? Are there any questions? Thank you, if you would like to just state your name, please, and speak into the microphone.

MS MALONE: Thank you – Nicola Malone. I just wanted to ask Mr Eustice why do you feel that you want to consider the sensitivities of the people of Camborne and Redruth in as much detail as you are even already worried about the name of the constituency, and yet you show no apparent willingness to put forward a Private Member's Bill in order to protect the same sensitivity with the people of Bude and Lanson?

MR EUSTICE: I did think I dealt with that. The point I would make is that the issue before the Boundary Commission today is how best to draw up boundaries that are consistent with the primary legislation that was passed some years ago so, to be fair to the Boundary Commission, it is not for them to decide what the size of the constituency is, their job is to decide how best to deliver what primary legislation requires. I did put my name and voted for an amendment, voted against the Government of the day, to table an amendment that would have ensured there was not a cross-border seat, as I pointed out. And as I also pointed out, the way to remedy this situation that I know many people in the room will care about is a future Private Member's Bill. That is the only way I see of being able to change that particular position. In the meantime it does not prevent us at all from doing other things to recognise Cornwall's unique heritage, unique identity which I, for one, care passionately about.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Mr Eustice, thank you. Any other questions for clarification? Can I remind you that the hearing is not about cross-examining those who have made presentations, so is there anything that anybody wants to clarify with regard to the presentation? If you could outline your name, please? I am sorry, I cannot see you because of the sunshine – if you would tell me what your question is, please?

MR COLE: (Mebyon Kernow) Thank you. My name is Dick Cole, I am the leader of Mebyon Kernow - you get to listen to me tomorrow. Mr Eustice, you mention that primary legislation is needed. I just wondered as a Conservative, as a member of the Government, as a Minister in that Government at the very heart of the Government,

surely there is some mechanism that we could get legislation changed in the near future, just as the Government was able to change legislation relating to the electoral roll in the approach to the referendum on the EU, which I understood to be a matter of a couple of days?

MR EUSTICE: As I said, this legislation went through several years ago and that was the opportunity to do it and we tried to do it. Every MP, and the Liberal Democrats supported us on this, we all voted against the Government of the day to try to get through an amendment that would have delivered what people are asking for. My view is that it was a battle that we fought then, that we tried then but we were not successful then and, from where we are now, we have to in my view implement this and we also have to recognise that there is a danger here that we end up saying that a vote in Cornwall, if you go for five seats we would be going against the principle of this legislative change which is to say that votes should be equal. A vote in Scotland should not be worth more than a vote in Cornwall; a vote in England should not be worth more than a vote in Cornwall and if you had tried to change the law to go for fewer seats you would effectively be diluting Cornwall's voting rights and Cornwall's voting influence in Parliament.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Eustice. Any more questions for clarification?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I would just like to ask Mr Eustice does he understand what he is saying, or what the Government is saying equates really as arbitrary and dictatorial behaviour on their part with no flexibility? That they are just imposing this for the sake of imposing Westminster's will? For the sake of gerrymandering out statistics and figures and boundaries from all aspects of building when all our environmental and other main infrastructural services in Cornwall are already stretched---

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Can I just ask you: do you have a question for clarification for the speaker, please?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, does he believe that this process is democratic?

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: I do not really see how you would be able to answer that in terms of clarification but that is about your belief, as I interpret that question.

MR EUSTICE: Look, all votes in Parliament are ultimately democratic in that unless you can get a majority you cannot get things done and every single Cornish MP, when this



legislation went through, supported an amendment that would have ensured there was not a cross-border seat because we recognise how strongly some people felt about that. So, yes, it was a democratic decision in that the Bill was passed through Parliament democratically in the usual way.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Thank you very much, Mr Eustice. Is Mr Jack Morrison in the chamber? Mr Morrison, you have a later speaking slot, we do have some time available now, are you happy to speak now?

MR MORRISON: I am.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you, if you would like to come down to the lectern, please. Good afternoon, Mr Morrison, would you like to give your name and address, please?

MR MORRISON: Yes. My name is Jack Morrison, I live at number 16 Gilly Hill in Redruth; that is TR15 2RN.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you. If you would like to make your representations, please?

MR MORRISON: Thank you. It is going to be a little bit more of the same, I am afraid. A lot of what I have to say has already been said more eloquently by other people. North and East Cornwall has a dispersed network of key towns surrounded by rural villages and hamlets and many of these towns will grow as Cornwall delivers over 50,000 new homes over the next few years. Many Cornish market towns are already struggling to imagine themselves for the 21<sup>st</sup> century in an area of double-devolution and Brexit Britain but recent economic analysis has outlined how towns have the potential to be engines for future growth in rural economies if this growth is managed in a comprehensive manner.

I am an arts funder, I work with Cornish communities and Cornish artists right the way across the whole of Cornwall, funded by Cornwall Council and the Arts Council. Cornwall strives to use community cultural capital as a driver for future growth and improved well-being. Cornwall has a compelling cultural narrative, physical isolation, a distinct identity and a strong sense of place. We have our own language, traditions and some of the most iconic scenery in Britain. We have a strong artistic community, a tradition of community-led activism and volunteering.

Cornwall Council has more heritage in its care than any Local Authority in England; however, systematic social and economic challenges remain and inequality is significant. GDP is currently 68 per cent of the UK average; child poverty peaks at 56 per cent in certain wards. Aspirations of young people are perceived as low and higher level skills remain below the national average.

Much of Cornwall is within the 30 per cent of most deprived in the country and the often quoted “most deprived in Europe”, yet we have a wealth of cultural and community assets including museums, libraries, art centres, parks and open spaces, historic buildings including redundant industrial infrastructure, natural environment and a tradition of festivals and events as well as a language as we have experienced today. Many of the current uses for this infrastructure are unsustainable and the value being derived from this historic legacy and cultural capital is below its potential. The Heritage Index clearly shows the historic environments, parks, open spaces and industrial heritage are all under-used.

Cornwall really needs to pull together and address the opportunities and threats of the next few years. We really need our Members of Parliament to work as a team. We want community cultural capital to be used as a driver for future growth and improved well-being. That a single Member of Parliament can be expected to adequately represent two such contrasting regions as Devon and Cornwall within one constituency is a practical absurdity that will seriously disadvantage at least one of those regions.

I feel we should achieve greater unity between Cornwall and Devon and the rest of the South West and Britain as a whole so that we can safeguard and realise the ideals and principles which are our common heritage here in Cornwall and with the wider UK. I do not feel that shifting the boundary will achieve this; indeed I feel it will hamper the process.

An important method by which the aim of unity can be pursued is the maintenance and further realisation of human rights and fundamental freedoms here in the UK. The upheavals of Europe and British history have shown the protection of national minorities is essential to stability, democracy, democratic security and community cohesion in this and in other regions. A genuinely democratic society should not only respect the ethnic, cultural, linguistic and religious identity of each person belonging to a national minority but also create appropriate conditions enabling them to express, preserve and develop this identity. This is as true in Cornwall as it is anywhere else in the world.

This is not to be divisive. The creation of a climate of tolerance and dialogue is necessary. Cultural diversity is a source and a fact of enrichment for us all. The

realisation of a tolerant and prosperous Great Britain does not depend solely on co-operation between local Councils but also requires co-operation between various local and regional authorities and of course Members of Parliament and constituencies are at the heart of this.

I do not think it is too much to say that the boundary proposals prejudice the constitution and territorial integrity of Cornwall. The proposal to merge constituencies seems impractical as well as potentially unfair and unethical. I am really very worried that the Cornish will be forced to suffer the disadvantage. Good fences create good neighbours. Keeping the boundary of Cornwall will explicitly and firmly help to create safer, more cohesive communities on both sides of the Tamar and have a positive effect on Britain.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much for your representation. Would you remain there for a moment, please? Are there any questions? Thank you very much for attending.

Dr Loveday Jenkin, please. Good afternoon. Could I ask you to give your name and address, please? I understand that you require the services of the translator; you are speaking in Cornish.

DR JENKIN (*via Translator*): I am Dr Loveday Jenkin, I live at Tremayne, Camborne, Kernow.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you, if you would like to make your representations, please.

DR JENKIN: I am a Cornish woman, my nationality is Cornish and my language is Cornish. I am not English and I do not live in England. I can speak English but I want to speak my mother tongue, which is Cornish. My mother and father spoke Cornish and my children do speak Cornish as their mother tongue, despite not many people at school speaking Cornish.

The border of Cornwall was set more than 1,000 years ago on the east side of the Tamar. Other than on the Tamar, all around us is the sea. We are a peninsular at the end of the British Isles and for that reason we ought to be seen as a special case and that our territory ought to be kept complete.

The Kilbrandon Report from 1973 confirmed the boundary of Cornwall to be kept and it would be better to refer to Cornwall and the Scillies as a Duchy. NUTS 2 1996 confirmed Cornwall as a European region because of its statistical differences from

Devon. That has not changed but Cornwall is developing growing as a European region.

My identity has been confirmed under the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities in 2014 and my language is protected under the European Charter for Regional and Minority Languages which was confirmed in 2002. That gives me the right to speak in my language today.

When there was the petition to fight for the funding of the language organised this year there were more than 10,000 signatures, with the vast majority of those in Cornwall and West Wales. Immediately on the boundary with Devon there were hardly any signatures on the other side. That shows to me the great difference between Cornwall and our neighbours in Devon. Our neighbours in England will not understand our culture and our economy.

I am very angry because all of my life I have had to battle to show to people in England that Cornwall is a country itself with its own language and with its own culture and yet still today the agreement with the Government to sign the Framework Convention isn't worth a stupid bean if we cannot keep Cornwall whole. Our language is for us to speak. There are people all around the world who can speak Cornish. Cornish is the language of our homeland. Cornwall is the homeland of our language.

How can a Member of Parliament be a Member of Parliament for people in Cornwall with Cornish interests and for our culture and in England with a feeling against and to deny our language and our culture? I have a cousin who lives in Devon. Her family cannot believe that a Member of Parliament for Cornwall and Devon together could work very well. Everyone can see that it isn't possible to mix oil and water or Cornwall and Devon.

What to do? Cornwall has worked with the Isles of Scilly very well through the years and the history of the Scilly Islands is Cornish and Celtic according to the place names there. The Scillies are islands and for that reason they can be taken as a special case as well. If the numbers of people on the Isles of Scilly are taken away, Cornwall can be divided into five parts and you can get your five Members of Parliament with the border of Cornwall kept under the law made in 2011. With more or less five per cent with the number of people on the Scilly Islands as a special case as islands, everything can be organised well with a larger constituency for Penzance, Hayle and St Ives.

I note that the law under consideration was agreed in 2011 but the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities was signed by the UK Government

in 2014, after the law, and that the Framework Convention is the law for human rights for us. And so in the future the Government will have to take into account the Framework Convention as the structure, the responsibility for human rights for Cornish.

If the Boundary Commission continues under the existing law without considering the change under the Framework Convention, there will be a need to re-visit this issue in order to fully take on board the human rights that are set there under the Framework Convention signed in 2014. To change the boundary now would be a waste of time if we have to re-visit the case in a few years to fully take on board the Framework Convention duties. It would be better to take on board the Cornish boundary issue now and have some flexibility on the five per cent.

The word in Cornish is “ewn” and it is not possible to translate it properly into English. The meaning of the word “ewn” in Cornish is “right, proper, fair” – several things altogether, so just as Judd says on the *Poldark* series, “‘tisn’t right, ‘tisn’t fair, ‘tisn’t fitty” that feels like that is applicable here to the work of the Boundary Commission. And so I feel that the Boundary Commission ought to take on board the responsibilities that are set out in the Framework Convention and take that back to Westminster and incorporate that into their deliberations – something that is “ewn” – fair, correct and fitty.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Are there any questions? Thank you very much for your representation. Our next speaker is not booked until 1.20 and I know that there is a gentleman in the room who has a booked slot this afternoon, Mr Richard Stephens. Mr Stephens, are you happy to speak now?

MR STEPHENS: I can do, yes.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes, okay, would you like to come down to the lectern, please? Good afternoon, Mr Stephens, could I ask you to give your name and address, please?

MR STEPHENS: I am Richard Stephens of Bohortha Farm, Portscatha, Truro, TR2 5EY.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you, if you would like to make your representations.

MR STEPHENS: Sure. I am not only making this submission as a lifelong resident of Cornwall but I also represent the Conservative party in Devon and Cornwall. I have worked with MPs, councillors, election candidates for over 30 years and I have a good

practical experience of the effect that Parliamentary boundaries have on the representation within the two counties. I am speaking in support of the Conservative submission as presented at the South West lead hearing in Exeter by Roger Pratt. I make this submission with the support of the Conservative party voluntary organisations in the area, following consultation and discussions with MPs, councillors at unitary, county, district and parish level and a voluntary party. I only intend to discuss the boundary proposals and the counter-proposals for Cornwall and Devon.

I fully appreciate the task of the Boundary Commission and the formulary quotas and constraints it must work within and others have spoken passionately about the case to keep Cornwall to keep whole but we must take this opportunity to comment on the proposals the Boundary Commission has put forward.

We support the Boundary Commission proposals for the boundaries for the whole of Devon and Cornwall with one exception, that is the proposed constituencies of Exeter, a borough constituency, and East Devon a county constituency. Normally we would support minimal change but the proposed electorate of the Exeter constituency does get the opportunity to move the Exeter City Council ward of St Loyes from East Devon into its more natural home of the Exeter constituency.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Would you be better seated to use the mic, or is that worse?

MR STEPHENS: Probably worse.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Okay – if you feel you need to sit down then please do so, there is a mic that we can make sure that you are heard from.

MR STEPHENS: Yes, okay. Both of the new constituencies would fall within the allowable electorates. St Loyes has strong local ties with its neighbouring urban wards – the Priory, Whipton Barton – and have very little in common with the rural constituencies of East Devon. Families in St Loyes use schools, leisure facilities, healthcare providers and have employment in Exeter city. The neighbouring Exeter City Council ward of Topsham is a very separate village to Exeter and anyone visiting Topsham will see its very own strong identity and is very similar to its neighbouring villages of Exton, Clyst St George and Lympstone in the East Devon constituency. Although this change will leave East Devon with an electorate at the lower end of the permitted range, it has one of the fastest growing electorates in the country with many people joining the electoral roll, especially in the new town of Cranbrook.

My remaining comments relate to suggesting more appropriate names for the proposed constituencies. Starting in the west, St Ives has been the name for our most westerly constituency for many, many years. However, we now believe the time is right to rename this constituency West Cornwall and the Isles of Scilly which better describes the seat. It includes the separate Local Authority of the Isles of Scilly and we firmly believe this should be recognised and these special islands should be included in the constituency name. There are four major towns on the mainland – Penzance, the largest, St Ives, Hayle and Helston – and to use just one of these as the name of this constituency no longer seems appropriate, particularly as it is not the largest or centrally situated. The area is known as West Cornwall; it is a recognised tourist area and has the West Cornwall Hospital.

I note that other submissions have suggested a name change for Falmouth and Camborne to Falmouth, Camborne and Redruth or Camborne, Redruth and Falmouth. Although there are very few constituencies named after three towns we have no strong objections to the suggestion that includes all three major towns.

With regard to the controversial Bideford, Bude and Lanson constituency, if it is to be created we believe that a more descriptive and appropriate name for this seat is North Cornwall and Torridge. It includes references to both constituencies that were broken up to create it. Most of the District Council area of Torridge is included within the constituency, as is most of the old District Council area of North Cornwall. Also, although as a Cornishman I was pleased the Boundary Commission included two Cornish towns with just one Devon town in its name, it does seem a little disproportionate as the greater electorate is in Devon.

In Plymouth we support the retention of the name Plymouth, Sutton and Devonport for the Plymouth South constituency. We believe it is important to retain these historic parts of Plymouth in its name. The old Plymouth Sutton constituency had previously included the Plymstock wards. We see no reason why the Plymouth North constituency cannot still be named Plymouth Moor View as there is minimal change to this seat.

In the neighbouring Tavistock and Ivybridge proposed constituency we object to the name as it does not include the name of the largest community – Plympton. As a majority of the seat, 67 per cent, comes from the current South West Devon constituency we see no reason why that name cannot be retained. It is an excellent description of the position of this seat within the county of Devon.

We have received a number of representations from people who propose Totnes constituency, particularly from the Brixham area, the largest town in that seat. Although

Totnes has been the constituency name for some time, we feel the name should better reflect its constituent parts, and the name South Devon does seem to have support from across the constituency and is a good description of the seat's geographical position.

That is it, thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you for your representations. Are there any questions? If you would like to identify yourself, please, and then just phrase the question for clarification.

MR OSBORNE: Yes, my name is Barry Osborne and I live at Redruth. This gentleman seems to know the facts and figures. If Devonwall constituency goes ahead, how many voters will be in the English side and how many will be in the Cornish side? Will it be a fair split? Because I have heard that the English side will have 57 per cent and the Cornish side will have 43 per cent, which means the English side has got a 14 per cent advantage over the Cornish side when it comes to pollings, et cetera.

MR STEPHENS: Yes, that is right, that is the right percentage.

MR OSBORNE: Yes, well, that certainly does not seem fair to me and I would not think it seems fair to anybody else in this room. I think it is a big disadvantage for the Cornish voter who is going to be outnumbered by the English voter in their own constituency.

MR STEPHENS: Yes, I appreciate that. The only thing I can suggest is that we find a good Cornish person to represent that seat.

MR OSBORNE: And once again have a Cornish MP who says, "Stuff you lot, I ain't going to look after you; I'm just going to look after the Cornish people."

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Okay, can I ask you if you have got any questions for clarification?

MR OSBORNE: Pardon?

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Do you want to ask any more questions of clarification? If you speak then obviously we have got some time this afternoon for you to come and do that but at this point in the proceedings it is just questions for clarification.



MR OSBORNE: Yes, that's mostly what I did; that's exactly what I did and I explained a bit more to see if he's got any more to say (inaudible) ---

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much for that. Any more questions for clarification?

MS BUNTON: (Cornish spoken) Delia Bunton. Can I just ask whether you feel – just for clarification --- I beg your pardon, I am not sure which constituencies – one of the Exeter constituencies you mentioned that was now subject to growth?

MR STEPHENS: Yes.

MS BUNTON: Which you obviously feel is a relevant argument and yet we have been told several times that this is bound by legislation in 2011 and yet although there is considerable growth in Cornwall that had already happened and is projected, that is not a relevant argument. I just wanted clarification whether you feel that it is right to use it for one argument and not the other.

MR STEPHENS: I have used it in that instance because East Devon would obviously be reduced by the size of that ward. It probably is not a relevant argument if you go by the strict letter of the law but, as we all know, Cranbrook is a big town, so ---

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: I think because you have moved away we are having difficulties hearing you. Would you prefer to sit down and we can ---

MR STEPHENS: No, it's okay.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Are you sure?

MR STEPHENS: Yes – not long now hopefully. Cranbrook is a big town which everyone knows, it rings a bell, and it is important – you know, everybody recognises that Cranbrook is there and those people are moving in as we speak but it is still within the constraints of the tolerance of the size of constituencies. It has only come down by one ward and that is still within the tolerance allowed by the legislation.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Thank you very much, thank you for coming to make your representations. Our next booked speaker is not booked to speak until 1.20. I know that there are other speakers in the room who have speaking slots booked for later this afternoon - Professor Parry and Mr Tim Smith. Do

either of you want to speak at this point in the day or would you prefer to wait until your booked space?

PROFESSOR PARRY: I would like to speak now.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Would you like to come forward then? If you will come down to the lectern, please. Good afternoon, is it Professor Parry?

PROFESSOR PARRY: Yes.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: It is; thank you. Could you give your name and address, please?

PROFESSOR PARRY: My name is Gareth Parry and address is Almora, Coach Lane, Redruth, TR15 2TP.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Would you like to give your representations, please?

PROFESSOR PARRY: Yes. This representation is based on a document that I have already submitted to the Boundary Commission. It includes several numerical arguments which I think dilute the case made by the Boundary Commission for the necessity of creating a new constituency. The figures I quote, I will read them out but I have a transcript for you so you will not have to write them all down.

I am going to start by quoting from the Boundary Commission document and the statement that I am going to read out says:

“If considered alone, the electorate of the county of Cornwall, including the electorate of the Isles of Scilly at nearly 394,000 would result in an allocation of 5.2 constituencies to the county. While we are sensitive to the strength of feeling about the Cornish border with its single land border, it is simply not possible to develop the proposal under which five whole constituencies, each with electorates within five per cent of the electorate quota, are contained within the county boundary.”

What I am proposing here is that whilst mathematically correct, the analysis that I will refer to demonstrates that this is very far from the clear cut case that is suggested by quoting the figure 5.2 constituencies. In fact, the Commission case is based on the tiniest of margins and I would go as far as suggesting that it would be scandalous if Cornwall was broken up on the basis of such small margins.

The five per cent rule implies that the electorate in the constituency should be between 71,031 and 78,507. The electorate of Cornwall is 392,223 and that of the Isles of Scilly 1,651 so that gives us a total of 393,874 – so that is close to the great figure quoted by the Boundary Commission document.

The Commission's figure of 5.27 constituencies is based on the assumption that there are 74,739 electors in each constituency. However, under the five per cent rule we are permitted to have up to 78,507 electors in the constituency and if that were the case the allocation would not be 5.27 but 5.02, which is very close to the target of five constituencies. So let us follow that argument and suppose we have five constituencies of 78,507 electors. The total number of electorate permitted is 392,535 and that is only 1,300 more, or 269 more per constituency, or 0.3 per cent above target and it seems to be rather ridiculous to proceed with a new boundary change on the basis of just 269 more per constituency. If this extremely small additional number permitted, Cornwall would remain whole with five constituencies or, to put it another way, the Boundary Commission are imposing Devonwall on the basis of 269 electors in a constituency of 78,507.

We can look at it another way. Suppose we consider Cornwall on its own without the Isles of Scilly. The electorate is 392,223 and this is less than the figure which the Commission state is within acceptable limits. The five constituencies would have 78,445 electors or 62 less than the maximum allowed under Commission rules. So Cornwall alone, with five constituencies, satisfies Commission rules and would not break the rules set up by the Boundary Commission. But we have left out the Isles of Scilly and others have made this argument today as well. The fact that the tiny population of the Isles of Scilly is sufficient for the Commission to argue that the historic Cornwall/Devon boundary be moved highlights the weakness of the case. It would be perfectly reasonable to make the case that one Cornish constituency should be permitted to exceed the maximum to include the Isles of Scilly. All four other constituencies would be less than the maximum permitted.

Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much. Any questions? Do we have any questions for clarification? Thank you very much for attending and thank you for supplying the written transcript of your representations.

Mr Tim Smith, I think I saw your hand up earlier? Yes, would you like to come down, please? Mr Smith, good afternoon. Would you like to give your name and address, please?

MR SMITH: Yes, my name is Tim Smith. My address is Queen's Acre, Boyton, Launceston, PL15 9RJ.

I wonder if I could start by just referring you to this rather splendid newspaper which we all read in our town. Some people call it Launceston, some people call it Lanson and some people call it Lanstephan but this is the *Cornish and Devon Post and Launceston Weekly News* and on page 2 this week there is a report which says: "Location of events prompt laughter from councillors. There was laughter amongst Launceston town councillors last week when they learned of the locations for public inquiry events regarding the Parliamentary boundary review.." and then it goes on to explain that anybody coming from Launceston or Bude would have to come to Truro, which is actually a round trip of more than 100 miles, and yet it is people in Launceston and Bude arguably who are more affected by these proposals than anybody else in Cornwall because, whether they like it or not, they are going to be put into a constituency which straddles the county boundary.

I have listened to the arguments today about this and I have the highest regard and the greatest respect for those who have strong views about Cornish identity, Cornish nationality and Cornish heritage and it is extremely unfortunate that it has not been possible to recognise these in the legislation. Clearly there are two conflicting principles. On the one hand you want to try and get constituencies which are roughly equal, though on the other hand it is very important to recognise historic matters such as this and I think it is very, very unfortunate and it is also unfortunate that you could have had one day's hearing here and one day in Launceston or Bude and it would have been a lot more easy for people to get there because it is actually a 100-mile round trip, two hours' travelling time and considerable expense, so it is very disappointing that you did not consider that.

If I could just move on to your actual proposals. You obviously had to make a difficult decision, once it had been decided that we were going to have a Devonwall constituency, about whether it was going to be in the north or the south and I have to say that having considered the matter, and given the constraints that you operate under, I support your proposals. I think that it would not have made sense to have a Parliamentary constituency straddling the Tamar in the south. Of course there are people who live in Saltash and Torpoint and work in Plymouth and cross the Tamar every day but at the northern end the boundary is arguably less distinct. Obviously I live

in Boyton which is right on the county boundary. We have a great deal in common with our neighbours in Devon – we go to Bideford, we go to Holsworthy backwards and forwards, it is not a problem. You mentioned the A.39 which pulls people together so, given that we have to have this, I support the Boundary Commission proposal.

The only other point I think I would like to make is really about the name because it is fairly unusual, I think, for a Parliamentary constituency to have three towns in the name and you propose Bideford, Bude and Launceston. Last time round I suggested that it should be called Upper Tamar but that did not seem to find any favour so I think I would support the suggestion that it should be North Cornwall and Torridge because it is actually quite important to emphasise the fact that, even though it is going to straddle a boundary, it has got a large and very important part of Cornwall in it and people will know that, whereas people who are less familiar with the names perhaps will not realise that both Launceston and Bude are in Cornwall. So to call it North Cornwall and then Torridge, which is the name of the district in Devon, most of which will fall in the constituency, seems to me to make more sense. Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you, if you would like to remain there for a moment, please. Are there any questions for clarification? Thank you very much for your representations.

Mrs Amanda Pennington.

MRS PENNINGTON: These are alternatives that we would like to propose. We have not had a chance to put them on the power point or anything.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: That is very helpful, thank you. If you would like to introduce yourself, give your name and address, please.

MRS PENNINGTON: My name is Amanda Pennington, my address is number 4, Gwendrock Villas, Wadebridge, Cornwall, PL27 7AZ and I am here representing the Mid and East Cornwall Green Party today.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you. If you would like to make your representation – thank you very much for the hard copies.

MRS PENNINGTON (Green Party): Cornwall is unique. Its history is unique, its heritage is unique, its culture and language are unique and its people are definitely unique. Two years ago the Government finally accepted all of this when it agreed to recognise the Cornish as a national minority under the Framework Convention for the

Protection of National Minorities to express, preserve and protect Cornish culture and identity. In fact, just a few months ago our Tory MPs were going door-to-door across Cornwall handing out leaflets demanding that we take back control of our borders; now it seems they want to do away with Cornwall's border altogether.

This whole boundary review is deeply flawed. Not only does it lump together Launceston in Cornwall with Bideford in Devon and forces together towns as industrially diverse as St Austell and Padstow, it is based on a ludicrously outdated electoral register that excludes the two million people who registered to vote in the past year alone. By sticking rigidly to a mathematical formula it disregards ancient borders and historic cultural boundaries.

We in the Green Party are not opposed to electoral reform and fairer representation; far from it, we have been campaigning for a more proportional system for the past two decades. We need a better solution, one that does not run roughshod over centuries of cultural heritage; one that does not make a mockery of the Cornish identity. Our electoral system should be offering more representation, not less; a system where more voices are heard and, crucially, a system where every vote matters, not just a few thousand in a handful of marginal seats. However, if we are stuck with this policy invoked by the Government let us try and make the best of it by rebuilding community links for stronger representation.

The needs of the north coast are very different to the needs of the south coast, in the same way that the needs of rural areas are different to the needs of urban areas. The north coast relies heavily on the tourist industry whereas the south is predominantly fishing and industrial. Therefore it makes sense to keep Newquay connected to other coastal towns such as Perranporth and Portreath.

These are the things our Government should be working towards, not wasting time and vast sums of money on a flawed boundary review which is nothing more than a desperate attempt to rig future elections in their favour. This is not about nationalism, it is about a deep-rooted cultural identity; it is about ensuring that Cornish communities are properly represented in Parliament. How can this be done when an MP's constituents mostly live outside of Cornwall? It cannot and that is why the Green Party are campaigning against these changes and have added our collective voice to say a big "no" to Devonwall.

Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: If you would like to just remain there for the moment. Are there any questions for clarification for Mrs Pennington? No? Thank you very much for your representation. We are actually now going to break for lunch until 2.30. Our next booked speaker is not booked until 2.50 but I will adjourn the hearing until 2.30, come back at that time to see if there is anyone else who has walked in who has not got a pre-booked slot who might wish to speak. The hearing is now adjourned until 2.30.

After the luncheon adjournment

Time Noted: 2.30 pm

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Welcome back to the public hearing. We have got a speaker due to start at 2.30, Mr Gregg Matthews. Good afternoon, Mr Matthews.

MR MATTHEWS: Good afternoon.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Would you give your name and address, please?

MR MATTHEWS: Certainly. It is Gregg Matthews, it is number 13 Piran Place in St Austell and the post code, PL25 5BQ.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Okay – I think if you can stand a little bit away from the microphone it might pick your voice up better.

MR MATTHEWS: I am far more used to speaking into a bull horn so you have to get your mouth right up to the microphone for those.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Okay, if you would like to give your representations?

MR MATTHEWS: Absolutely. I am also speaking to some degree on behalf of Mid and East Cornwall Green Party and I just want to sort of follow on a little bit more from what my colleague Amanda Pennington said just before the recess.

The social economic needs of a peninsular region like Cornwall are far more analogous to that of a country than treating it like just another county – I mean, treating it like another county is actually entirely inappropriate. Thinking of one of the many, many

examples but one of those examples would simply be access to hospitals. There will now, under the new boundaries, you are going to have three Parliamentary constituencies that have no hospitals. There is no imperative for an MP to act with the best interests of health care. I think one of the other problems actually that I think we do need to consider is that fundamental conflict of interest for an MP. If you have an MP in a region which is going to be created between Launceston and Bideford, they are going to have to be dealing with two district councils. Now, those district councils, in the case of Torridge versus Cornwall Council, are going to be competing for the same resources. I think it is a conflict of interest for an MP to then work with those two councils because they are effectively competing against each other.

We do obviously object to the loss of a representative in Parliament here in Cornwall coming from six down to five and our objection to that is clear but also I do think that if we are stuck with this, as Amanda said, we do need to find a solution that works better; that actually does something positive from this and I think, just having this “one size fits all” and doing what is being done in the rest of the country is inappropriate; we do need a made to measure solution just for Cornwall and if that does mean bending the rules slightly and having some constituencies with slightly more voters in than others, that really does need to be considered. There is a precedent for that in what was done with the Isle of Wight where you have a region there that was too large for one MP and too small for two MPs and the rules were bent. I think Cornwall is another situation where you could consider bending those rules a little bit.

I will just very quickly jump back to the argument against crossing the border. Obviously Cornwall is a recognised national minority; it is also a Celtic region. Just the thought of comprising the border of a Celtic region like Scotland or Wales would be unthinkable and therefore it has not been thought about. Simply we should not be considering that with Cornwall either; that border is ancient and it protects ancient heritage, language, culture, people – I think if it requires us bending the rules just a little bit, or the Commission to bend the rules just a little bit, that is something that really should be considered and I think that is something that would then be welcomed by the people of Cornwall. Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Matthews. Are there any questions for clarification to Mr Matthews? Thank you for your representation. Mr Milo Perrin.

MR PERRIN: Hello.



THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Good afternoon, Mr Perrin. Would you like to give your name and address, please?

MR PERRIN: Milo Perrin, 6 Dumbarton Place, Mousehole, TR19 6PW.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you, and if you would like to make your representations.

MR PERRIN: Okay. First of all, I would like to say that I agree with reducing the number of MPs, in principle I agree with the proposals but this, like the previous speaker says, Cornwall needs to be looked at as a special case. This is not about a divisive court, this is not about building walls between one place and the other, this is just about respecting the territorial integrity of Cornwall which has been in place for 1,000 years or more.

I do not blame people up country – the clerks, the ministers and stuff – you know, this has arrived on your desk and you might not have heard about “What are they fussing about in Cornwall?” You know, “Why do they think they’re a special case?” Well, we are a special case and that has been proven and enhanced with our recognition under the Framework Convention for National Minorities which actually specifically says that the territorial integrity needs to be respected when things like this come up. So what I mean is I do not blame clerks for not knowing about the issue but I think it is time that Cornwall needs a final settlement so that we’re not here every five years re-winning the argument because we’ve done this before. We won the argument about the South West region back in, what, 2004? We won the argument against our language, we won the argument – this just happens all the time every five years, we just have to re-win the argument and it is time for Cornwall to have a final settlement and be recognised as a respected constituent part of the United Kingdom. That is my main point.

It is all to do with mathematics and I would say that, like the previous person said, it would be a shame to get rid of something that has been there for 1,000 years just to satisfy mathematics. Why should we make a special case for Cornwall? Because we are a special case. I think the Commission needs to look at a flexible answer. Like I say, I agree completely – let’s try and make everything as even as possible and that is a good democratic process but I think that just needs to be a little bit flexible. I think if we have a constituency of whatever it was earlier on, the speaker saying it’s a margin of a couple of hundred – well, I think those things should be managed to take into account local issues. I mean, we are talking all the time about disconnect between the electorate and the political elite and the establishment – well, this would be one way, a very simple way of connecting. Because I think what is an MP for? Why do we have

MPs? It is to represent our views. An MP should be our voice in London, not London's voice here. And so if we have a connection and an area which people recognise – it's not a case of destroying – you know, how much trouble is this world in? Because people just draw random lines on maps and I just think you just need to make a special case for Cornwall and that is all I have got to say. Thank you very much.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Perrin. Are there any questions for Mr Perrin? Thank you very much for attending. Our next speaker is not booked until 2.50. I know that we have two speakers who have later speaking slots this afternoon – Helen Rawe and Donald Rawe. Would either Helen Rawe or Donald Rawe like to speak at this point? Or you can wait until later, it really is entirely up to you.

MRS RAWE: We will wait until later.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes, okay, thank you. We have some spare time – is there anybody who would like to speak? Anybody who has not booked in who would like to speak? I understand that our 2.50 booking has just arrived but we do have about ten minutes so if you would like to come and speak now? If you would like to come down. Good afternoon, could I ask you to give your name and address, please?

PROFESSOR HARVEY: Professor Peter Kenneth Henry Harvey, Lolgorian, Rosewarne Downs, Camborne, TR14 0BD.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much, and if I could ask you to make your representations?

PROFESSOR HARVEY: Yes. I have not come particularly prepared for this; I have some numbers which I would otherwise have quoted. The important thing as far as I am concerned is I know the area under contention. I was at school in Bideford, I have been back through Bideford, North Cornwall, 25, 30 times as part of my professional activities so I know the area well. There was recently a language petition, which I am sure you are aware of and I am sure you have looked at the results of because you certainly should, and in that area – that is to say across North Cornwall and Devon - the North Devon constituency some 31 people sign out of over 10,000 in that region over the time of the petition and in the North Cornwall there was well over 400. I can't give you the exact figure but I can give you the ratio; the ratio was within a decimal fraction of 15.

What this means, of course, is there is quite a big difference in the way that people view the Cornish and how they look at it. This wasn't really a language petition, or at least you can interpret it that way, because the numbers were too great for the number of Cornish speakers but they are some sort of measure of the Cornish culture and the way that people think. Knowing both areas and talking to people there over a long period of time, I know how they react. One particular concern is about the numbers. We had them earlier; I think it was 57 per cent of the population of the new constituency will actually be in Devon and the remainder obviously in Cornwall.

The problem here is that if you have a Devon MP, that is to say one living in Devon, they are not really going to be concerned very much with what happens in Cornwall and the first speaker this afternoon made the point that there were going to be problems between councils. It could, of course, be the other way round and the reverse situation would be true so I think there is a problem potentially of considerable unfairness, depending on whether you have somebody that understands the Cornish or indeed a Cornish MP that understands the English. Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Any questions to our speaker? Thank you very much for attending – thank you.

Mr William Thomas. Mr Thomas, if you would like to come down to the lectern, please. Good afternoon, Mr Thomas. Can I ask you to give your name and address, please?

MR THOMAS: Yes, it is William Thomas. I live in Cornwall, born in Cornwall, brought up in Cornwall and I have the privilege of living in St Ives.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you. We do need your address.

MR THOMAS: Kenilworth, Gwelanwill(?) Crescent, St Ives.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much. Would you like to make your representations, please?

MR THOMAS: I will indeed, thank you. I'm sure that there are far more people who are more eloquent than I who have spoken here but I have come with a passion and I want to share that with you. The terms of the reference for the Boundary Commission established by Parliament includes the statement "taking consideration factors such as local community ties." In this respect I hope that you will agree that it is important to mirror the spirit of the legislation that you are working to.

Cornwall has an historic claim for special treatment. We are Celts, not Anglo-Saxons. Along with the Scots, the Irish and the Welsh we proudly boast a rich heritage, not only based on tradition but a heartfelt affinity with our forefathers who welcomed the saints that brought the Christian faith to our shores and left their names upon our towns and villages. Cornwall is known as the Land of Saints. King Arthur and the Knights of the Round Table may to you be but a legend but for those of us who hold Cornwall dear they symbolise the spirit of Cornish folk. Folk like Bishop Trelawny, Thomas Flamank, William Antron An Gof who gave their lives to protect the rights of their fellow Cornish folk.

Cornwall has a cultural claim for its unique status: its own language along with the other Celtic nations. It has its own flag of St Piran, our Patron Saint. Geographically we have the longest coastline of any county in the UK with its clearly defined natural borders, more clearly defined than those of Wales or Northern Ireland, and neither they nor Scotland have cross-border constituencies.

How can we expect an MP to represent parts of Cornwall and Devon simultaneously when that English county doesn't even know which way to put the cream on?

The guidance for the Commission states that the Sainte-Laguë method will be adopted in defining the constituency boundaries yet this highest quotient method is used in allocating seats in party list proportional representation. How can it possibly be effectively employed in defining numerical allocations, particularly as residents of a younger age that are currently allowed to vote are not included? Whilst the proposal seeks to even out the number of eligible electors within constituencies, it does not allow for future demographic changes, nor do they take account of the percentage of registered voters actually voting at the Parliamentary elections, averaging only about 60 per cent over the last 15 years.

Two questions need to be considered in this context: how many new homes will be built in Cornwall and, in the case of the proposed joint constituency with an English county, how many in Devon will impact on the numerical equation? Secondly, how often will these proposals be reviewed if the spirit of the legislation is to be honoured?

My earnest plea to Her Majesty's Government is to submit an urgent amendment to the Parliamentary Voting System and Constituencies Act 2011 enabling the Boundary Commission to confirm Cornwall's unique status, history and culture and retain the current constituency boundaries and MP representation.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Thomas. Any questions for Mr Thomas for clarification? Thank you very much for attending and giving your representations. Our next scheduled speaker is not listed until ten past 3. Mr and Mrs Rawe, again an opportunity if you want to speak earlier, then there is time available but I do not want to press you if you want to keep to your original time.

Good afternoon, Mrs Rawe. Would you give your full name and address, please?

MRS RAWE: My name is Helen Rawe. The address is Woodlands, Bodieve, Wadebridge, Cornwall, PL27 6EY.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Would you like to give your representations, please?

MRS RAWE: Thank you. Cornwall's history gives it a unique identity of which we are proud and its modern-day circumstances also set it apart, as evidenced by European recognition of economic reality only attainable after separation from Devon. Our sense of Celtic identity and our Cornish language are factors which request and deserve respect as afforded to Wales and Scotland.

We had hoped that the outcry provoked by the proposed Devonwall constituency and fuelled by David Cameron's comment about the River Tamar in 2010 would lead to an amendment of the Parliamentary Voting System and Constituencies Act and we ask for your support in this. The proposal is at odds with the Government's recognition of the Cornish as having national minority status via the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities when they declared that the Cornish were now afforded (and I quote) "the same status as the UK's other Celtic people, the Scots, the Welsh and the Irish." Their boundaries are respected and this is a Duchy, not a county. The proposal clearly contravenes the Framework Convention.

Also, reverting to five rather than six MPs would see the average electorate only fractionally exceed the Government's preferred figure, averaging 78,775 as against 78,507, a difference of only 268, and would seem preferable to fracturing our territorial status. It would surely be very hard, if not impossible, for any MP to represent Cornwall and Devon. They will have to liaise with Cornwall Council, Devon County Council, Torridge District Council – all with different issues.

Please defend Cornwall and the Isles of Scillies' case for a single electoral unit. Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mrs Rawe. Any questions of clarification for Mrs Rawe? Thank you very much for attending; thank you for your representations. Mr Donald Rawe. Good afternoon, Mr Rawe. Can I ask you to give your name and address, please?

MR RAWE: Yes. I am Donald Riley Rawe of Woodlands, Bodieve, Wadebridge, PL27 6EY.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much, if you would like to give your representations.

MR RAWE: Yes. I do represent the Cornish Literary Guild, being its Chairman, and so a lot of what I have got to say is probably historical. I base my objections to the proposed amalgamation of North Cornwall and North Devon constituencies on the true historical and political status of Cornwall/Kernow within the United Kingdom. The very name Cornwall is an abbreviation of the Anglo-Saxon Cornwealas meaning "the foreigners or strangers who live on the horn of Britain."

In 986, the West Saxon King Athelstan having ravaged our peninsular, decreed that the border between Cornwall and England would be the eastern bank of the River Tamar. However, successive incoming Norman followers of William the Conqueror established themselves in Kernow and within a century or so they owned or claimed large estates here. The Cornish were reduced to being menial servants of these landowners.

In 1497, however, they revolted against Henry VII's swingeing taxes to finance his war against the Scots, resulting in the collapse of Cornish tin mining and Henry's Charter of Pardon in 1508 establishing the Cornish Stannary Parliament in order to benefit from the Cornish tax he imposed on the tin thereby produced.

Cornwall, due to its semi-isolated situation, has been looked upon as a mere outlying province until the creation of the Duchy of Cornwall under the Black Prince Edward. Since those days the Cornish have clung to their own language, successfully reviving it in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century and thereby becoming a member nation of the International Celtic Congress. In recent years we, the Cornish, have been recognised as a national minority within Great Britain.

Cornish loyalties are rising high in North Cornwall. To combine this constituency with a purely English one beyond the Tamar would create a most resentful attitude among the Cornish and would present any Member of Parliament with a near impossible task of effectively serving a combined North Cornwall and North Devon constituency.

One last suggestion. If Parliament is seeking to reduce the overall number of UK constituencies, why not reduce the number of MPs in Kernow to five instead of six? Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much, Mr Rawe. Are there any questions from the floor for clarification? Thank you very much, Mr Rawe, for your representations and for attending. Is Mrs Carlyon in the chamber?

CLLR CARLYON: Yes.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Hello. Your speaking slot is not until about ten past 3, I think. Are you happy to speak early or not?

CLLR CARLYON: Yes.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Okay, would you like to come down to the lectern, please? I think we are getting some feedback on our recording system. I think there is a microphone that is left on there – could it be switched off, please, the one with the red light on?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Excuse me, there have been two occasions when I have asked to – well, I have pressed the buzzer when there have been any questions and I have not been able to ask those questions.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: I did not see your hand up to speak and I did not see that you had – the system is not that you press the button to speak; perhaps that should have been explained. I apologise, I did not see that your hand was up to ask a question.

MR RYAN: Yes, I have put my hand up – that is fine, thank you very much.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: If there are any other questions, obviously if you can have your hand up a little bit higher so that I can see it.

MR RYAN: I wonder if I might be able to ask – just so that persons are aware – one was to Mr Thomas where he stated that---

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Can I just stop you there? (To Councillor Carlyon): Would you like to sit down, please, madam, just for a moment? Would you

like to take a seat for a second just while we resolve the question from this gentleman – thank you. I am not sure that the people that you would have liked to have asked questions of, whether they are still here.

MR RYAN: Yes, they are.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Okay, so perhaps if Mr Thomas is happy to be recalled, perhaps we can see whether that question can be dealt with at that point. We will just allow this lady to give her representations first of all. Let us allow this lady to give her representations first of all and then we will come back to Mr Thomas and then you can ask that question.

MR RYAN: Thank you very much.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you, it is Mrs Carlyon, is it?

CLLR CARLYON: Yes.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Would you give your name and address, please?

CLLR CARLYON: I have got that printed – it's all there (same handed). My name is Cllr Mrs Amarel Carlyon and I live at number 3, Strangways Villas, Truro. I have been an elected independent councillor for Truro since 1973. I served as a County Council for 20 years as an independent, I have been Chairman of the Carrick District Council and Mayor of Truro on two occasions.

During the past year, and especially over the past few months and even yesterday, it has become increasingly evident that people have used the democratic process to send a message to their respective Governments that they do not like what is happening around them. It seems as though those in authority are listening but not hearing the concerns of the people. When I read the words of Sajid Javid when he was recently speaking about the formulation of the South West region, I was filled with utter disbelief. I quote:

“Some in Cornwall, for example, see their county as distinct from the rest of the region, a special case that should be handled separately from everyone else east of the Tamar. That whole attitude has to change.”



Just a pity that the Minister had not read Bernard Deacon's recently published book entitled "Cornwall's First Golden Age from Arthur to the Normans" which would have given him a better understanding of Cornwall and its unique heritage, literature, culture and Celtic links. He may then have understood how inflammatory and how offensive the remarks are considered to be to a nation which is included in the Framework for the Protection of National Minorities. But the basic question has to be asked: Why does the Cornish have to change?

The present proposed change to the historic Cornish boundary is being seen as just part of other forces which are at play to assimilate the Cornish nation. For instance, on 22 November at the Cornwall Council meeting the elected members are expected to ratify the Cornwall local plan, which includes the building of 52,500 houses plus – not for local people, for whom with even two wages coming into a household are unable to qualify for a mortgage, but for those being encouraged to live in Cornwall, which is utterly devoid of the necessary infrastructure. And then we have the Cornwall Local Enterprise Partnership which has received millions of pounds by way of European grants and yet there remain large pockets of Cornwall which are in the poverty category and one cannot help questioning what is happening to the money.

It is now becoming obvious that with the emergence of the NPPF, local plans and neighbourhood plans, Westminster has a stranglehold on every community in the country and that real localism is not something to be encouraged. And so to return to the proposed changes in the constituency boundaries, political parties have always taken delight in what I consider to be the moving around of the deckchairs to suit the direction of the sun, but it is quite another matter to try and move the pier on which the deckchairs are situated, for that is what is being proposed. Cornwall has an historic boundary; it has to be respected.

Besides being a Councillor, I am also a Methodist local preacher and when I learn of what I consider to be unnecessary and divisive legislation being proposed which is going to affect and distress those who hold Kernow dear, whether they be living in Cornwall or part of Diaspora, I have to tell you that I am filled with what is known as righteous indignation. It is an anger which is reserved for injustice, divisive laws, ignoring the working people, provoking law-abiding citizens to anger for no good reason and that is exactly how I see the proposed changes in the historic Cornish boundary.

It is my considered opinion that this is just another action being taken by the present government to provoke and assimilate the Cornish nation.

Thank you for listening and hopefully hearing my concerns and I trust you will find your way clear to recommend that the Cornish boundary remains unaltered. Thank you very much.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Any questions for Mrs Carlyon? No? Thank you very much for attending and for your written transcript, it is very helpful.

Can I invite Mr Thomas back? Thank you for coming back, Mr Thomas. You will have seen that there is a gentleman in the audience who would seek to put a question to you to clarify something that you said when you actually gave your representation. Are you happy to do that?

MR THOMAS: I am more than happy and I have not changed my address since.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Okay, jolly good. I will not ask you to repeat it again then, thank you. The gentleman who wants to ask the question, could I ask you to just say your name, please?

MR RYAN: Certainly, it is Mr Hugh Ryan. I just wanted to ask has Cornwall been accepted by the United Kingdom? Are you aware that Cornwall has never been actually legally incorporated into or being part of the United Kingdom? It is not actually part of the United Kingdom. It is closely connected to it for reasons of commerce but it is not constitutionally part of the United Kingdom.

MR THOMAS: Well, that's even more of a reason, is it not, why we should not be doing this really? But I wasn't aware of that. We are, of course, bounded by UK law which our national parliament has issued the requirement for the Boundary Commission to undertake this and that is why we are speaking as it were in relation to the UK. We are fortunately or unfortunately bounded by that particular law.

As I mentioned before, there are many things which we in Cornwall have which differs from the rest of the UK, be that Scotland, Wales or Ireland or whatever, and that is our language. We have a unique identity. We have a different culture and we have a love, I think, for the county in which we live and many of us have been privileged to be born into. That is probably not mirrored anywhere else, and so that is why I am proud to come today as a Cornishman – and I do not normally dress like this but I have come. One of your gentlemen asked me, "What is that?" and I said, "This is the Cornish tartan." You know, it represents saffron – how many counties in England eat saffron cake? They will say, "Saffron is poison" but see what it does to us, it makes our faces

glow. And you see the white, the silver – tin mined from the dark ore; the blue sea, the wonderful blue sky we have and the red, the blood that was shed by our forefathers when they fought on Blackboar Heath. That is why Cornwall to me is different. (Sang “Cornwall My Home” in Cornish).

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much, Mr Thomas.

MR RYAN: Does he not realise that that law, emanating from Westminster as statute by Royal proclamation since 1707 is actually illegal unless sanctioned by the Cornish Stannary Parliament? This whole process is ---

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you. I think Mr Thomas did actually provide you with an answer. Do you want to come and speak? If you do, perhaps you would like to come down to the lectern and do that?

MR RYAN: I possibly would do but there was just the other small question - I would have liked to have told Don, Mr Rawe, to come down to the lectern again. It was just the small question that I have for Donald and that was where he said that the Stannary Parliament was created by the Duchy in 1508. In actual fact, there are lawful documents which show that the Cornish Stannary Parliament existed back before the 1100s; indeed back into infinity of history in time. Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much for that – is that the end of your question?

MR RYAN: That’s right.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Mr Rawe, did you hear that, that there was a question there around clarification on certain dates that you gave; do you want to come back down and respond to that?

MR RAWE: No.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much, Mr Rawe.

Mr Neville Meek. Good afternoon, Mr Meek, could I ask you to give your name and address, please?

MR MEEK: I’m Nev Meek, I am a Councillor from Gerrans Parish Council.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

MR MEEK: Gerrans Parish Council met last week and we felt that we'd like to come along and add our voice to this presentation. I should point out that Gerrans Parish Council is a parish on the south coast of Cornwall but we wanted to make representations about the proposal for a cross-border constituency because we felt that that was important for all of Cornwall and affected us as well.

We rather just wanted to reiterate the very many points that others will no doubt have covered in detail. We wanted in particular to make the point that, with some adjustments, the boundary for Cornwall has been in place for some 1,000 years or more and it is an important aspect of Cornish history and should not be diminished in our view.

We also wanted to make the point that the physical background is significantly different on either side of the border of Cornwall and Devon, with Cornwall having its own unitary authority and separate Devolution Deal now from the UK Government.

We are aware that some scholars suggest also that Cornwall has its own unique constitutional status, with some suggesting that the status is one of Duchy. Cornwall of course has its own distinctive Celtic languages, which is one of the few minority languages which is gaining ground.

We also wanted to try and get across to you the way that Cornish people feel about our land and the distinct sense of place that we have in respect of Cornwall. This is kind of difficult to explain to people that join us from over the border because it is quite a difficult concept, but Cornish people feel deep pride in being Cornish which they feel deeply in their hearts. We have a distinct sense of place; the distinct feeling that the land which we tread was trodden by our forefathers before us and the things in our landscape are important to us. And that emotional attachment to our land includes our border, the Tamar River, right down to the detail of the fact that the border is on the eastern rather than the western bank so the river belongs to us.

Because both Devon and Cornwall have their own distinct histories, but Cornwall in particular has its own distinct history – political administration, culture, language and unique constitutional position – it simply does not make sense to introduce a Parliamentary Constituency where the MP would have to cater for two such different areas in our view. The plans breach the provisions of both the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities and the European Charter for Regional Minority Languages. Splitting the constituencies into five give us an average of only 0.3 per cent

above the allowable target numbers. It is simply not worth eroding Cornwall's historic integrity for such marginal gains in our view.

In view of the above points, the Parish Council at Gerrans would respectfully ask you to think again and persuade the Government to introduce an exception in respect of Cornwall.

From my own private and individual perspective, and as a member of the Cornish Language Community, I would like to go into a little more detail about the European Charter and the Framework Convention if I may. In 2003 the UK Government ratified the European Charter for Regional Minority Languages in respect of the Cornish language. In 2014 the UK Government recognised the Cornish as a national minority under the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities. These two provisions are both agreements under the purview of the Council of Europe and are mutually reinforcing concerning the Cornish language. The Framework Convention deals with language rights and has provisions barring assimilation, whilst the European Charter places obligations on the UK Government and public bodies, including the Boundary Commission, for how the Cornish language should be actively promoted – as an off the cuff comment I see little evidence of that here today.

The European Charter has a specific provision with regard to geographic integrity but dealing firstly with the Framework Convention. The establishment of a cross-border constituency inevitably eroded the status of the border of Cornwall. This very obviously weakens the area in which we carry out our cultural activities and linguistic traditions. The Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government has recently stated that some in Cornwall, for example, see their county as distinct from the rest of the region; a special case that should be handled separately from everywhere else east of the Tamar. "That whole attitude has to change", he said.

On face value the Government's intentions here seem to be one of assimilation which are contrary to the Framework Convention. Specifically Article 5.1 states that:

"The parties undertake to promote the conditions necessary for persons belonging to national minorities to maintain and develop their culture and to preserve the essential elements of their identity, namely their religion, language, traditions and cultural heritage."

Article 5.2 states that:

“The parties shall refrain from policies or practices aimed at assimilation or persons belonging to national minorities against their will and shall protect these persons from any action aimed at assimilation.”

Turning to the European Charter, as I have said the first thing that has to be said is that it places obligations on the state and other public bodies to take resolute action to promote regional or minority languages in order to safeguard them. The European Charter is particularly important here because under Article 1(b) there is a territorial provision. In this case the territorial area in respect of Cornish is the territorial area of Cornwall. Article 7(b) of the European Charter covers this in more detail and states that:

“The parties shall base their policies, legislation and practice on the principle of respect for the geographic area of each regional or minority language in order to ensure that existing or new administrative divisions do not constitute an obstacle to the promotion of the regional or minority language.”

As stated, the establishment of a cross-border constituency erodes the significance of our historic borders in which the Cornish language is spoken and being revived. The establishment of a Member of Parliament whose priorities are only 50 per cent focused on Cornish issues will also make it more difficult to promote our language.

The proposals for Devonwall are a clear breach of both the Framework Convention and the European Charter by both the UK Government and the Boundary Commission. Neither the Framework Convention nor the European Charter are matters of English law; however they do have the status of international treaties. I would suggest that in a post-Brexit context where the UK Government may wish to establish a number of international trade agreements, it is suggested that it may not be in the interest of the state to demonstrate its readiness to breach the provisions of international agreements in such a cavalier fashion as this.

To borrow a phrase from somewhere else, please go homeward and think again and recommend to the Government that they amend the Parliamentary Voting System and Constituencies Act to provide an exception in the case of Cornwall similar to that provided for the Isle of Wight.

Thank you very much for providing the opportunity for me to make this presentation. Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Meek. Are there any questions for clarification for Mr Meek? The gentleman at the back there, could you say your name, please?

MR AYRTON: Mark Ayrton from Looe in Cornwall. You sound very eloquent on the issues of the European Union. Do you think there would be a case for appealing to the European Council about this breach to their regulations?

MR MEEK: Yes, I do. Both the Framework Convention and the European Charter have three-early inspection regimes and making representations to those of the breach by the UK Government in this respect would be worthwhile. Whilst you can't take cases to the European Court specifically in respect of the breaches of these provisions, they would provide evidence – the breach of these may provide evidence for taking other cases under other provisions. For example, it might be evidence of breach of the provisions of the Lisbon Treaty, for example.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much. Thank you for your representations.

Our next booked speaker is not until 3.50 but I understand that we have a gentleman in the chamber, Mr Mael Garrec? Good afternoon, Mr Garrec, I understand you would like to speak?

MR GARREC: Yes.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Yes, thank you.

MR GARREC: I am Mr Mael Garrec and I live in Penryn, 59 Calver Close and I will be here. I am a Cornish resident and, like the Cornish people, a person of Celtic culture even if I am foreign, as I am Breton. I will also speak as a representative of the UDB – that is the Democratic Breton Union – which is a sister party to the MK.

As such, I understand the necessity and the will of the people, the Cornish people, to have a representation of Cornish voters consistent with the boundary of their country. As I am Breton, I wanted to bring some insight from our experience in Brittany as we experience the same issue since the 1950s with part of Brittany, which is Loire-Atlantique, which is the southern-east part of Brittany which was split apart from our region and included in a neighbouring artificial region – I know that Devon is not artificial but that is our issue.

Since then, I would say that we have been experiencing a number of serious issues to the democratic process in Brittany, the most important being the inability to have a proper representation of Brittany as a whole, as Councillors of Brittany, not Loire-Atlantique, are able to represent Brittany as a whole. That is a serious issue.

I would say also that we experience continuous difficulties to Devonwall – compatible policies, career and policies on all our territory and to co-operate properly between the various constituencies and regions.

I will finish by – yes, I will also want to say that this is a question of basic respect of existing identity of the Cornish people, which was I believe recognised in 2014 by the central Government and I fully understand the will of the Cornish people to make sure boundaries are kept unaltered. And finally, as a sister party to the MK and as a European party, I would say that we are appalled that the question may even be asked and that Cornish constituencies are split, because it is a basic question of basic respect of democratic rights in terms of representation, proper representation of the people. Thank you very much.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Gerrec. Are there any questions for Mr Gerrec before he sits down? No? Okay, thank you very much for your representations. Our next speaker is not due until 3.50 so on that basis I will adjourn the hearing until 3.50.

After a short break

Time Noted: 3.50 pm

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Welcome back to the hearing. I think we have Mr Andrew Long who would like to speak. Good afternoon, Mr Long. If you would give your name and address, please?

CLLR LONG: Good afternoon. My name is Andrew Long, I live at 34 Coombe Road, Callington in Cornwall.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you; if you would like to make your representations, please?

CLLR LONG (Councillor for Callington): Yes. As I said before, my name is Andrew Long. I am the Cornwall Councillor for Callington in Eastern Cornwall. I am also a Callington Town Councillor, ex-Portreath and Mayor of Callington.



What are we doing here? What are you doing here? The answer to the first question is here from the passion and comments prior to mine and following mine. The answer to the second one is up for debate. Cornwall has been an historic nation for more than 1,000 years. As many have said before there are compelling reasons, both culturally, historically and politically, why we believe both the Boundary Commission – that is you – and the UK Government are at fault in what has been proposed. Almost every organisation, either elected democratically or imposed upon us, reflects Cornwall's historic border and are, in the words of government, coterminous. However, what is most annoying is once more, instead of engaging with the people who you are affecting prior to any proposals, you are providing us with effectively a “done deal” and merely consulting because that is what you have been told to do.

Why is it that you are intent on doing things to us rather than working with us? You seem intent on hiding behind an Act of Parliament rather than being progressive and engaging with us prior to any proposals being drawn up. Many people have given far more eloquent reasons why you need to respect the borders and keep Cornwall whole.

Our Town Council have supported the opposition to Devonwall before and have supported this opposition also. We stand strong with our colleagues in Lanson and Bude and all across North Cornwall in fighting this. History will not judge your organisation well if you fail to respect our identity and work out an alternative. It is not difficult to do. Thank you.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Are there any questions? No – thank you very much for giving your representations.

Our next speaker is due at 3.50. I do not think that gentleman has yet arrived. We will wait until 4 o'clock to see if Mr Ingram arrives. If he is not here at that point and there is nobody else in the room who wishes to speak, I propose then to adjourn the hearing until 4.30, which I think is our next scheduled speaker after Mr Ingram. So if you will bear with us, please, for another ten minutes or so to see if Mr Ingram arrives late; if he is not here by 4 o'clock then I intend to adjourn the hearing.

Time Noted: 4 pm

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: As there are no more speakers now until 4.30, I will adjourn the hearing until 4.30.

Time Noted: 4.30 pm

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Is Claire Hewlett in the chamber? Thank you. Mrs Hewlett, would you like to come down to the lectern, please? Mrs Hewlett, just to let you know we are recording the proceedings for the purpose of then obviously having a note of those proceedings which will be published at the end of the consultation period. So can I ask you, please, to give your name and address?

MRS HEWLETT: I am Claire Hewlett and I live at 23 Bowood Park in Camelford.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mrs Hewlett. Would you like to make your representations?

MRS HEWLETT: Thank you. I am speaking as a resident of Camelford; I am also a member of the Green Party. Camelford will be directly affected by this change so I thought I had best come and stick my five penn'orth in.

I am sure you have heard lots about the emotional side, the cultural identity side, I am not going to repeat all that because I live the right side of the Tamar, I fully tie into the cultural identity and support all those arguments. It is the practical side of the new constituency that I am quite concerned with. They are going to have to deal with Cornwall Council, which we love them dearly; Devon County Council, North Devon Council – I do not know what the funding formulas are for those three councils but I suspect they are different so you are going to have an MP dealing with organisations who have different amounts of income. I do not know about Health Authorities, I do not know how many Health Authorities that will fall under, I couldn't get that information. I am assuming there will be several hundred Councillor Wards and numerous Town Councillors and Town Councils and Parish Councils.

Geographic size. North Cornwall is already one of the largest in England and you are about to make it bigger. It will take about one-and-a-half hours from Camelford to Bideford on a good day with no traffic – we do not get many of them; in fact we do not get any of them in the summer so I dread to think how long it is going to take to get from one end to the other.

I 'phoned our current MP – well, his office – yesterday and said, “How many times do you try and get to each conurbation within your patch?” and the lady said, “About four times a year.” So that will be, with the extended size of the constituency, much smaller; there are going to be fewer visits to each area. That means there will be less access for rural populations to get to speak to their MP in person. Our public transport is rubbish so it is going to be even more difficult to see them. The MP will have chance to know

his electorate and know the individual areas and the problems that occur within them. And also Cornwall Council are doing a ward boundary review at the moment, it is underway, and I would have thought that ought to be completed first before this even is thought about because I would have thought there is a danger that councillors might end up having to deal with two MPs if a parish boundary or a ward boundary is moved, because Cornwall Council are trying to reduce the number so the wards will get bigger.

My last point is that I do not have a great problem with reducing the number of MPs, apart from it does reduce the representation of the people but, prior to the 2010 general election, there were five constituencies in Cornwall – you upped it to six so why not just revert to the five? Why cross the boundary, why cross the Tamar and make Devon – why not do it horizontally across the county, rather than four horizontal ones and one shooting off at a tangent? It doesn't seem to make sense to me. Obviously you want the same population within the constituencies; I understand that, but just tweak the old five to make it a new five and do not cross the boundary.

That is not ten minutes but that is all I have to say.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Mrs Hewlett, would you just wait? I am assuming there are going to be no questions but shall we just give the opportunity – does anybody want to ask any questions for clarification purposes? Thank you very much, Mrs Hewlett, for your representations.

Our next speaker is due at 4.40 so I intend to wait until that time. It is a lady called Ms Cerys Hart; she is not here yet. I will wait until that time and then review the situation at that point.

After a short break

Time Noted: 4.40 pm

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: I intend to wait until 5 o'clock and then if no-one has arrived at that point I intend to adjourn the hearing for one hour and come back at 6 o'clock in case anybody else wishes to speak. So we will wait until 5, see what the situation is then but my intention at that point, if there are no speakers in the room, is to adjourn the hearing until 6 pm

After a short break

Time Noted: 5.00 pm

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Good evening, everyone. It is 5 o'clock, our expected speaker hasn't arrived. Just to let you know we only have two more speakers booked in for this evening. The first speaker is at 6.30 and then there is another speaker at 7.40 so my intention is to adjourn the hearing until 6 o'clock to see if anybody else comes who wants to speak, but the next booked speaker is not booked until 6.30 and then again the second one is not then booked until 7.40, so maybe I will see you all at 6 o'clock.

After a short break

Time Noted: 6.00 pm

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Good evening, everyone, welcome back to the public hearing. Mr Stephen Barnes?

MR BARNES: Will there be a drum roll or do I just walk down?

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: I think you just come down to the lectern, please, if you do not mind, Mr Barnes. Thank you; if I can ask you to give your name and address, please?

MR BARNES: My name is Stephen Barnes, I'm a member of Redruth Town Council and the Labour Party and I live at Fal, Clinton Close, Redruth, TR15 2LR.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much, Mr Barnes; if you would like to make your representations?

MR BARNES: I have got quite a long speech. The three things really that concern me, first of all I think you should have chosen, over the two days, had two different locations, one in the east of Cornwall say around Liskeard or somewhere, and then one in the west, probably somewhere like Redruth, a nice place, and I think that would have given people a better chance to come here because the traffic in Truro is horrendous.

My main concern regarding the Boundary Commission itself and its actions is the Devonwall border. I am very much against that, as I think are probably 99.9 per cent of the Cornish public. We find that having a constituency which will cross over into England is totally unacceptable.

The other thing that I would like to raise is putting Portreath into a constituency with Truro and Newquay. Portreath is right down the end there – can you see it? Portreath fits very neatly in the old Camborne/Redruth area and has all its connections with Redruth mostly rather than Camborne, and it seems ludicrous to then put it into another constituency. Portreath is in the Camborne/Redruth catchment area, it used to be in the Kerrier area when we had the district councils before the Government sold us out to the unitary authorities and it just seems totally alien; it just makes no sense whatsoever. Portreath has got no real connections with – it might have a little bit of a connection with Porthtowan but that's it, apart from that it's got no real connections with Newquay at all so it just seems completely alien. That's about it really.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Are there any questions for Mr Barnes? Yes, if you would just give your name, please?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Portreath was added to Mount Hawke division – can you remember when that happened? Would you accept if it was split from that division as a separate parish?

MR BARNES: Yes, if you know the area, Portreath and Mount Hawke have got nothing really in common. Mount Hawke, if it has got anything to do with anyone it's St Agnes. That is their, if you like, twin town. Mount Hawke village is actually in – that's it, do you see Mount Hawke there? If you're going to go to Portreath from Mount Hawke you would have to effectively drive past Porthtowan to get to Portreath. So they've got no, I would have said no natural correlation, it just seems one of the odd things that the Boundary Commission like to throw in from time to time just to make the numbers fit. I know you're never going to get a perfect scenario but that does seem slightly strange to me but the normal link up is with St Agnes.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much for attending, Mr Barnes; thank you for giving your representations?

MR BARNES: Do you want my speech or shall I take it?

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: It has been recorded for later publication; thank you very much for that offer.

MR BARNES: Okay, thank you very much. Enjoy the rest of your evening.

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Good night. Our next speaker is listed to speak at 7.40 so I propose to adjourn the hearing until that time.

After a short break

Time Noted: 7.40 pm

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER: It is just one minute past 8 o'clock and, bearing in mind the fact that we have tried to contact the last speaker who was registered to speak at 20 to 8, we have tried to contact them twice and left messages and we have had no contact from that person, I intend to close the hearing. Thank you very much for attending.

At 8.00 pm the hearing adjourned until 9.00 am on  
Friday 11 November 2016

**A**

CLLR ATHERTON, 35, 36  
MR AYRTON, 71

**B**

MR BARNES, 76, 77  
CLLR BISCOE, 28  
MRS BROTHERTON, 26  
MS BUNTON, 49

**C**

CLLR CARLYON, 63, 64  
CLLR CHAPPELL, 5, 8  
MR CLARKE, 24, 25, 26  
MR COLE, 39

**D**

DR DAVEY, 16, 17

**E**

MR GEORGE EUSTICE MP, 37, 39, 40

**G**

MR GARREC, 71

**H**

MR HARTLEY, 3  
PROFESSOR HARVEY, 58  
MRS HEWLETT, 74

**J**

DR JENKIN, 43

**L**

MR LOBB, 34, 35  
CLLR LONG, 72

**M**

MS MALONE, 39  
MR MATTHEWS, 55  
MR MEEK, 67, 68, 71  
MR MORRISON, 41  
MR MUNDAY, 15

**O**

MR OSBORNE, 48, 49

**P**

PROFESSOR PARRY, 50  
MR PAYNTER, 31, 32  
MRS PENNINGTON, 53  
MR PERRIN, 56, 57  
CLLR POLLARD, 9, 14

**R**

MR RAWE, 58, 61, 62, 67  
MR ROWE, 32, 34  
MR RYAN, 63, 64, 66, 67

**S**

MR SMITH, 52  
MR STEPHENS, 45, 46, 48, 49

**T**

THE LEAD ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER, 2, 5, 8, 9, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 24, 25, 26, 28, 30, 31, 32, 34, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40, 41, 43,  
45, 46, 48, 49, 50, 51, 53, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 61, 62, 63, 64, 66, 67, 68, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78  
MR THOMAS, 59, 66  
TRANSLATOR, 26  
MR TRESIDDER, 19, 21, 24

**U**

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER, 26, 36, 40, 63, 77

**W**

CLLR WEBBER, 30