



THE FEDERAL  
REDISTRIBUTION  
TASMANIA

# Comment on public suggestion number 3

Jeff Waddell

9 pages

# Comments on Suggestions

---

## AEC's Tasmanian Redistribution

---

Jeff Waddell

Email: [REDACTED]

## To the Redistribution Committee

I take this opportunity to comment on the other 20 submissions to the Tasmanian Redistribution as well as add some additional content to my own.

## Proposal to rename Denison to Clark or Inglis Clark

Having not participated in the previous Tasmanian Redistribution, this was one I didn't see coming. I was also surprised that it was raised in so many of the suggestions. In total, 11 of the 21 suggestions raise this proposal. They are:

- S1 - The Hon. Michael Kirby
- S4 – Alex Jago
- S5 - Sue Drake
- S7 - Dr Peter Jones
- S8 – Timothy Thorne
- S9 – Andrew Wilkie
- S11 - Bob Holderness-Roddam
- S12 - The Hon. Justice Duncan Kerr Chev
- S16 – James Walker
- S18 - Rodney Croome
- S19 - ALP

I have no opinion either way on whether the name of Denison is discarded or not, but I add the following note of caution:

Even though the naming of Divisional Names should be beyond politics, those with more than a passing interest in politics will research the details of the person behind the Divisional Name. Therefore, the provisioning of any new Divisional name should ensure that both sides of the political divide are represented fairly and equally. This level of equality should extend to the names of all Divisions named in honour of people but not include Divisions named after former Prime Ministers.

The fact that this proposal is not supported by the Liberal's submission, suggests there is not bi-partisan political support for such a change to be made.

One aspect of these suggestions that does strike a chord, and deserves some closer examination, is WHAT name to adopt – Clark, or Inglis Clark, *or* .....?

I've noted down a few random thoughts below and drawn some conclusions from those thoughts.

In addressing this case in particular; Andrew Inglis Clark's family name is Clark. Using the current AEC naming standard; Clark would be the name that should be adopted.

His middle name of Inglis was his mother's maiden name. Taking the middle name of an ancestor's family name was common in Scottish ancestry. Something I am only too aware of in my own family history on my mother's side.

As is eloquently put by Bob Holderness-Roddam in his suggestion; two-word Divisional Names are not unprecedented, though apart from Kingsford Smith, none are linked to people.

The current AEC standard of restricting the names of Divisions named after people to only their family name means that our sixth Prime Minister; Joseph Cook, can never have a Division named in his honour as long as the current Division of Cook – named after James Cook – remains.

This same current standard would also make it impossible to – at some point in the future - honour 2 or more former Prime Ministers with the same family name.

### **Conclusion and proposal:**

Based on the above, I propose that the AEC reconsider its current standard of limiting the names of Divisions named after people to be only their family name. That it should instead allow for the flexibility of adopting a 'Given Name, Family Name' standard when required.

The outcome of adopting such a standard could allow for the creation of the Divisional Name "Andrew Clark", though my position is that the name Clark should suffice in this instance.

Adopting this standard would also allow for the current Divisional name of Cook to be renamed "James Cook" and for the creation of the Divisional name "Joseph Cook" at the next NSW Redistribution. Thus ensuring all deceased former Prime Ministers have a Division named in their honour.

## **S5 – Michael Woolford**

Whilst many of those submitting comments on suggestions may at first glance discard Michael's suggestion, he does raise some valid points – though they are outside the scope of what this Redistribution can address.

The disparity between the number of electors per Division in Tasmania and the Northern Territory compared to the rest of Australia is also of concern to me. In fact, it concerns me so much, that I wrote to every member of the House of Rep's in both the current and the previous parliaments; suggesting it was time to expand the Parliament – increasing the number of Senators from the States by 2 and as a consequence adding an additional 24 members to the House of Representatives.

Michael, the reason Tasmania is entitled to 5 Divisions is detailed in Section 24 of the Constitution.

Good luck changing that! ☺

Rather than reducing the number of Divisions in Tasmania or the Northern Territory, the approach should be to increase the number of Divisions in the other States, and the ACT, so that the average number of electors per Division is more even across the country. Those interested in my thoughts on this matter may read my submission to the JSCEM here (Submission 3):

[http://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary\\_Business/Committees/Joint/Electoral\\_Matters/2016Election/Submissions](http://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Committees/Joint/Electoral_Matters/2016Election/Submissions)

## **Those I consider my peers – Martin Gordon, Darren McSweeney & Mark Mulcair**

### **Martin Gordon**

As noted in Martin's submission, I did send a very early draft of my suggestion to both Martin and Mark once I had "crunched the numbers".

Martin's ability to convey in a paragraph the same message that takes me a page is one I envy.

We agree on proposed changes to Braddon, as do many submissions - and agree on the radical re-drawing of Denison (Clark?). Our boundaries for Bass, Franklin and Lyons are different.

Martin has successfully managed to unite all Tasmanian LGA's into single Divisions, and in many ways his suggestions will probably tick more boxes for the Redistribution Committee than mine will.

But then again, I thought his submission to the SA State Redistribution had effectively done the SA Electoral Boundaries Commissioners job for them – and look how that turned out!

### **Darren McSweeney**

Darren's submission looks like he was thinking along the same lines as both Martin and I in relation to the current partition of Franklin – what's that old saying about great minds?

Darren also sees the wisdom of uniting Latrobe LGA in Braddon, West Tamar LGA in Bass, and even transferring both Dorset and Flinders LGA's to Lyons which totally mirrors my suggestion. Again I re-emphasise, Darren's proposal and mine have been done absolutely independently as I have no contact details for Darren.

Like many others, Darren's solution for the projected surplus in Franklin is to transfer the balance of Brighton LGA to Lyons.

### **Mark Mulcair**

Mark's submission also starts identifying issues with the current layouts of the Divisions of Franklin and Lyons.

His Braddon solution reflects most others by uniting Latrobe LGA in Braddon. His proposed Bass is identical to Martin Gordon's with the balance of West Tamar in and the balance of Meander Valley out.

Down south, his solution for Franklin reflects other proposals including both Martin Gordon's and Darren McSweeney's to transfer the balance of Brighton LGA from Franklin to Lyons.

## **The Submissions of West Tamar and Latrobe Councils**

Whilst individual submissions recommending the uniting of LGA's into singular Divisions is one thing; having the backing of the local councils themselves supporting the proposals submitted by individuals as a massive boost to ensuring such changes are seriously considered by the Redistribution Committee.

So I was delighted to read the submissions of both West Tamar and Latrobe Councils recommending that their councils be united into single Divisions – Bass in the case of West Tamar and Braddon in the case of Latrobe.

### **Party submissions**

#### **Tasmanian Greens**

One of the shortest submissions by a political party I have ever read! The Greens get straight to the point and align with almost everyone else in proposing to unite Latrobe LGA in Braddon.

Like me, they propose to split Clarence LGA between Franklin and Lyons – but not to the same extent. Hence they also had to transfer Sandfly to Denison.

#### **ALP**

The ALP goes with the flow uniting all of Latrobe LGA in Braddon, but goes a little further to include Railton as well. In my deliberations I did consider dividing Kentish Council between Braddon and Lyons but decided against it. Though the area I would have looked to transfer to Braddon would have been west of the River Forth and its associated lakes.

The ALP chooses to leave West Tamar LGA divided between Bass and Lyons which many other submissions sought to address, but instead chooses to fragment LGA's between Divisions even further by transferring the localities of Devon Hills and Western Junction from Northern Midlands LGA into Bass. Their motive is to incorporate Launceston Airport into Bass which is logical. I have taken the same approach but instead proposed that both Launceston and Hobart airports are in Lyons.

Like many others, it proposes uniting Brighton LGA in Lyons, but also makes a case for changes around Kingston Beach.

#### **Liberal Party**

Like my submission, the Liberal Party goes to the effort of providing Section 66(3) of the Commonwealth Electoral Act (1918) but omits to also include Section 66(3A) which details HOW Section 66(3) is to be applied.

That's a bit like providing the list of ingredients to a recipe, but not providing the method on how those ingredients are supposed to be combined to produce the finished product.

It is also interesting to note that on page 11 of their submission, the Liberal Party states that "[the Redistribution Committee has used existing electoral boundaries as a starting point for designing new ones.](#)"

[In this submission the Liberal Party used existing boundaries as a starting point and has sort \(\*I'm sure the Liberals really meant 'sought'\*\) to minimize the number of electors impacted on by these suggested changes."](#)

This is what happens when the basis of your proposal draws only from Section 66(3) of the Commonwealth Electoral Act (1918), and for some inexplicable reason, totally ignores Section 66(3A).

For the Liberal's benefit; here's Section 66(3A) which MUST also be applied to comply with the Act: [\(3A\) When applying subsection \(3\), the Redistribution Committee must treat the matter in subparagraph \(3\)\(b\)\(v\) as subordinate to the matters in subparagraphs \(3\)\(b\)\(i\), \(ii\) and \(iv\).](#)

The Liberal Party should also look up the meaning of the word "subordinate" and apply it in the context of this Redistribution!

Because of this flawed 'existing boundaries first' approach, the Liberals proposal is different to most others.

The Liberals solve the enrolment shortfall in Braddon by transferring all of Kentish LGA from Lyons to Braddon, which still leaves Latrobe LGA divided.

They also propose no changes to Bass which still leaves West Tamar LGA divided.

Again, taking the flawed, minimalist approach, they suggest only a minor cosmetic change to Denison. And like the Greens, they propose to transfer only Richmond in Clarence LGA from Franklin to Lyons.

## **Transfer proposals**

### **Transfer Dorset and Flinders LGA's from Bass to Lyons**

- S3 – Jeff Waddell
- S10 – Darren McSweeney

### **Unite Brighton LGA in Lyons**

- S4 – Alex Jago
- S6 – Martin Gordon
- S10 – Darren McSweeney
- S14 – Mark Mulcair
- S16 – James Walker
- S19 - ALP

### **Unite Kingborough LGA in Denison, Transfer Derwent Valley LGA from Franklin to Denison, Transfer Glenorchy LGA from Denison to Franklin**

- S3 – Jeff Waddell
- S6 – Martin Gordon

### **Unite Latrobe LGA in Braddon**

- S3 – Jeff Waddell
- S4 – Alex Jago
- S6 – Martin Gordon
- S10 – Darren McSweeney
- S14 – Mark Mulcair
- S15 – Latrobe Council
- S16 – James Walker
- S17 – Tasmanian Greens
- S19 - ALP

### **Unite Meander Valley in Lyons**

- S6 – Martin Gordon
- S14 – Mark Mulcair



## Unite West Tamar LGA in Bass

- S3 – Jeff Waddell
- S6 – Martin Gordon
- S10 – Darren McSweeney
- S13 – West Tamar Council
- S14 – Mark Mulcair

## Why my suggestion divides both Brighton and Clarence LGA's

Whilst LGA's are – in general – a solid foundation on which to base communities of interest – especially in rural and regional areas; the same case cannot so readily be made for LGA's around capital cities. In these situations, some parts of an LGA may be urbanising whilst other parts of the same LGA remain as they have for many years.

Perhaps the reason I am sensitive to this aspect is that I currently live in such an LGA: Cardinia.

Not only does the Cardinia Shire have 3 clear and distinct areas, but it is also divided between 3 CED's that do not align with those 3 areas; Flinders, La Trobe and McMillan.

In its north, Cardinia Shire contains the outer eastern Dandenong Ranges with closer communities of interest (especially sporting ties) with the Yarra Ranges LGA to the north. From an area and physical features perspective, the northern most towns in Cardinia Shire would be a better fit with Yarra Ranges LGA.

Across the centre of the Shire runs the M1 (Princes Freeway); and the Gippsland Rail Line. In its west, this area is experiencing rapid urbanisation as Melbourne's urban sprawl pushes eastwards. Though this expansion doesn't extend further east than Pakenham to the same extent, the towns along the Rail line further east are expanding with people moving further away from the city.

In the south, Cardinia remains predominantly rural farm land with some population expansion along the South Gippsland Highway. Unlike the hills in the north, the south is flat and comprises much of the area that was once known as "The Great Swamp" during the early years of exploration and settlement.

So armed with the knowledge – from experience – that LGA's on the urban fringe can, and do, have separate communities of interest, I have taken that mindset into my analysis of the localities within the LGA's of Brighton and Clarence.

Even with the knowledge that no other submissions supported the boundaries I proposed for Franklin – dividing Clarence LGA along the Meehan Range and incorporating the major localities of Brighton, Bridgewater and Gagebrook from within Brighton LGA, I'm still satisfied that my proposal meets Section 66(3)(a)(i), (ii) and (iv) as well – if not better – than any other submission.

Isn't that what it's all about?

## In closing

Focussing only on the boundary changes, the Redistribution Committee for Tasmania have some quality proposals to assess to help it determine the proposed boundaries for the 5 Tasmanian Divisions.

I trust that each suggestion will be reviewed on merit – or more specifically, which ones comply with Sections 66(3) and especially (3A) of the Commonwealth Electoral Act (1918) - and not necessarily which individual or organisation provided it.

That said; I believe the voices of the Latrobe and West Tamar councils should be the first ones considered – especially as their suggestions are supported by many of the independent contributors.

With more than 50% of suggestions supporting a rename of Denison to Clark or Inglis Clark, this is something the Committee will also have to seriously consider. It will be interesting to see how many comments on the suggestions further support such a change or are against it.

For what it's worth – should the name change be accepted by the Committee - I believe the Divisional Name should be Clark and **not** Inglis Clark for the reasons I have stated above.

I wish the Redistribution Committee well in their deliberations and look forward to commenting on their draft boundaries sometime during the first half of 2017.

Sincerely,

Jeff Waddell