



THE FEDERAL  
REDISTRIBUTION  
TASMANIA

# Public suggestion number 6

Martin Gordon

4 pages

[REDACTED]

The Commissioners

I wish to make a submission in relation to the Commonwealth electoral boundaries in Tasmania.

The current boundaries require revision due to elapse of time and due to the projections, which indicate that some existing Divisions will be outside of tolerance, if not now in the near future.

**Initial contributions and reasons**

I propose no changes to the names of existing Divisions as they are either near Federation names, have existed for sufficiently long to be well known or in the case of the most recently applied name namely Lyons it commemorates both a former Australian Prime Minister from Tasmania (and the only one from Tasmania), as well as his wife who was the first Australian woman Cabinet Minister, as well as one of the earliest women elected to the Commonwealth Parliament.

I do not propose significant changes to the existing boundaries as one they are not needed; two the existing configuration has remained in place for many decades due to relatively consistent population growth (relative to other jurisdictions) across the state; three whilst some transfer of electors from Franklin is necessary to rebalance the numbers in Bass, Braddon and Lyons the numbers are not significant.

I have had the opportunity to sight the proposals of Jeff Waddell. Jeff has provided a series of logical developments which I agree with in part, but not in whole.

**Discussion**

Braddon - the smallest Division in elector numbers is Braddon, which will fall outside of tolerance without additional electors. The logical source for these additional electors is the remainder of La Trobe or Kentish. In a previous redistribution, the commissioners had sought to transfer the West Coast to Lyons and include La Trobe instead. Due to sluggish elector growth in the north west, it seems reasonable to include both the West Coast and La Trobe (in toto) in Braddon.

Bass – Jeff Waddell had canvassed including the entire north coast of Tasmania in two Divisions. I don't believe this as a conceptual starting point is necessary, however in my own workings I considered Braddon extending to the south (Kentish) or east (La Trobe), and the latter made more sense in the context of modifying Bass by retaining George Town, Launceston, Dorset, the existing part of West Tamar, including the remainder of West Tamar from Lyons and transferring those portions of Meander within Bass to Lyons. The exchange with Lyons is not strictly necessary, but it combines the entirety of 4 complete local government areas, embraces both sides of the Tamar River, the city of Launceston and the north-west coast including Flinders Island. The only loss from the urban area of Launceston is that portion within Meander. Given portions of the urban area of

Launceston or nearby towns are already in Lyons this realignment is not significantly disruptive, as the member for Lyons electorate office is in Brighton in southern end of Lyons anyway, and the proposed change means that entire local government areas are in one Division, namely Bass, rather than two somewhat awkwardly split as at present, with urban areas split between Lyons and Bass.

I favour the retention of Dorset in Bass rather than Lyons as it is logically more connected to Launceston, in terms of communications commerce, and so on. As well including Dorset in Lyons and making Lyons more rural (which is not unreasonable), would mean Lyons would extend from the tip of Tasman Peninsula in the states south to the middle of Bass Strait (at the top of Flinders Island). For ease of elector contact and communications Dorset in Bass is a better fit.

Lyons is in many ways the residual Division of Tasmania, taking up the portions of the state that do not fit nicely into the northern corners or the greater Hobart area. I will describe Denison and Franklin and come back to Lyons.

Denison - is currently basically the entirety of Glenorchy and Hobart and a portion of Kingsborough. In the past Denison was further south taking in the peninsula to Piersons Point and all of Hobart and part of Glenorchy. The current configuration of Denison means that as Jeff Waddell points out there is no means of travelling to the two sides of Franklin without travelling through Denison. I think some weight should be placed on communications between the two parts of an electorate, but it should not be an overriding concern. In the recent redistribution proposed in South Australia the arrangement by which the Le Fevre Peninsula was split, with its end disconnected from the rest of the electorate (unless you could walk on water) was ended.

I have canvassed this issue of the split of Franklin in the 2009 redistribution. If the committee was of the view to change the boundaries of Denison and Franklin (not unlike a Western Australian redistribution of some years ago unwinding a long standing electoral arrangement with respect to Kalgoorlie), the numbers are workable with three entire local government areas, making up a well within tolerance Denison; and Glenorchy placed in Franklin with bridge connections over the Derwent, connecting its eastern and western shores.

I would anticipate massive criticism of such a change within Tasmania, but such a change appears on the surface quite sensible. Whilst Denison would expand under such an arrangement it would mean that it is possible for electors to travel within the electorate of Franklin between its various parts unlike is presently the case.

Franklin – Whether the revision of Denison occurs as above, or the existing arrangement of Denison and Franklin remains, some minor transfers from Franklin to Lyons are sufficient to place Franklin within quota (as well as Lyons with the other changes mentioned above).

The existing Franklin includes portions of the local government area of Brighton, as well as part of what is now Clarence and which was known previously as Richmond. I would have recommended the transfer of both areas to Lyons which would reduce Franklin to within quota and keep Lyons within quota. However, the transfer of Richmond is not necessary (at least at this time).

The changes mean the entirety of Brighton is within Lyons (unlike now). Again, like with Bass, Braddon, Denison and Franklin, Lyons also will comprise entire local government areas.

The reduction in the size of Franklin is notable, and the inclusion of all the local government area of Clarence means that those semi-rural communities in South Arm that are within sight of Hobart across the Derwent River are included in an electorate (Franklin) they have a greater natural affiliation with.

Lyons – is my point of summation. The boundaries of the five Divisions I propose are consistent with existing local government boundaries in all cases. All five Divisions are relatively close to quota, apart from the changes between Denison and Franklin, the changes are modest.

For the table below I have started with the current boundaries and described by transfer of local government related areas the changes I propose. I have used this format as whilst the existing boundaries are not ideal in many respects, they are what we have. In addition, the rearrangements of local government areas, combine existing communities of interest, as identifiable blocks to shift is attractive. I note however that some local government areas are similarly not ideal, but they are useful starting blocks.

In the event of errors, they are mine, but nonetheless the proposed boundaries are well within quota and could withstand minor adjustments due to errors.

<b>Bass</b>	<b>In</b>	<b>Out</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>% of Quota</b>
<b>75058</b>				
<b>Lyons - West Tamar remainder</b>	<b>7832</b>			
<b>Lyons - Meander within Bass</b>		<b>-7233</b>		
			<b>75657</b>	<b>98.28%</b>
<b>Braddon</b>				
<b>73286</b>				
<b>Lyon - La Trobe remainder</b>	<b>4710</b>			
			<b>77996</b>	<b>101.32%</b>
<b>Lyons</b>				
<b>79555</b>				
<b>Bass - West Tamar remainder</b>		<b>-7832</b>		
<b>Lyons - Meander within Bass</b>	<b>7233</b>			
<b>Braddon - La Trobe Remainder</b>		<b>-4710</b>		
<b>Franklin - Brighton</b>	<b>3178</b>			
			<b>77424</b>	<b>100.57%</b>

<b>Denison</b>				
	<b>76019</b>			
<b>Franklin - Glenorchy (all)</b>		<b>-33940</b>		
<b>Franklin - Huon Valley (all)</b>	<b>12262</b>			
<b>Franklin - Kingsborough (remainder)</b>	<b>22906</b>			
			<b>77247</b>	<b>100.34%</b>
<b>Franklin</b>				
	<b>80997</b>			
<b>Lyons - Brighton</b>		<b>-3178</b>		
<b>Denison - Glenorchy (all)</b>	<b>33940</b>			
<b>Denison - Huon Valley (all)</b>		<b>-12262</b>		
<b>Denison - Kingsborough (remainder)</b>		<b>-22906</b>		
			<b>76591</b>	<b>99.49%</b>
			<b>384915</b>	<b>Total</b>

I wish the committee well in their work.

Martin Gordon

17/11/2016