



**THE FEDERAL
REDISTRIBUTION
WESTERN AUSTRALIA**

Comment on suggestion 6

Martin Gordon

16 pages

Seat	Gordon	McSweeney	Liberal	Waddell	Mulcair	Walsh	Ashley	Anonymous
Brand	minimal change is required, I had considered removing fairly well all electors west of the Kwinana Freeway to Canning, as Brand is fast growing and such a boundary would be an obvious solution.	no change	Transfer of easterly portion of Brand creates a sharper boundary, equalises numbers and facilitates boundary changes with Canning and flows onto other Divisions.	no change	Proposes the removal of areas east of the Kwinana Freeway to Canning as I have suggested.	The transfer of electors in the east of Brand would facilitate changes to Divisions such as Canning, Hasluck, Burt, Swan which are less disruptive than Mr Walsh proposes overall. Mr Walsh proposes no changes and this is in a Division experiencing strong growth that could be placed below quota.	Uniquely amongst submissions proposes a northwards displacement of Brand. The interlocking Forrest, Canning, Brand, Fremantle, Tangney, Burt changes are extensive and unlike any other submission.	no change

Burt	will be impacted by changes to Tangney, but broadly a loss of Canning Vale back to Tangney and a similar order transfer from the western portions of Hasluck and even a small portion of Canning would be sufficient.	Proposes a solution consistent with my views.	Proposes a solution consistent with my views.	no change	Proposes transfer of Canning Vale like most submissions to Tangney from Burt. Also his transfers from Burt are similar to the Liberal submission.	Having forced changes to Swan to accommodate Tangney it seems odd to make two adjustments to Burt when a simple gain of electors from Hasluck as some other submission have proposed is sufficient. There are many minor and often offsetting elector movements that seem to serve no real purpose of the redistribution criteria. The movement of 4,912 projected electors is unnecessary if the changes to Tangney are disentagled from	The interlocking Forrest, Canning, Brand, Fremantle, Tangney, Burt changes are extensive and unlike any other submission.	Loses Canning Vale to Tangney and gains areas from Canning.
------	---	---	---	-----------	---	---	---	---

Canning	see my comments under Liberal	Proposes a relatively unchanged Canning.	Broadly accept the logic of proposal, but instead of transferring electors from Canning to Forrest to O'Connor, I suggest the transfer occur directly from Canning to O'Connor. This less disruptive to Forrest and its south western community of interest and places a relatively faster growing area directly in O'Connor. The odd cutting into Canning might be avoided to some extent also.	Major changes due to changes to Forrest.	Except for supplementing numbers to O'Connor (or to Forrest to be passed onto O'Connor as the Liberal Party proposes) a lot of these changes are not strictly necessary. Canning does not need any changes itself. Walsh proposes moving 12,769 projected electors. If this was largely one way to O'Connor that would be fine, but its to Forrest, some to O'Connor and bits to Burt. Numbers from Hasluck to Canning affect Hasluck pushing it further	The interlocking Forrest, Canning, Brand, Fremantle, Tangney, Burt changes are extensive and unlike any other submission.	intriguing swap of territory involving Burt
---------	-------------------------------	--	--	--	--	---	---

Cowan	Cowan is a more recent Division and surrounded by under quota Divisions. Its abolition is simply easier than others.	Proposes an outer suburban Division made up of about 60% of former electors of Pearce	Agree with abolition, notwithstanding losing the name a Division named after a prominent female first MP. This proposal is similar in many respects to McSweeney and Waddell.	Proposes abolition of Pearce rather than Cowan, but new Cowan is very like the northern suburbs proposals of others for Pearce.		Whislt I had proposed the abolition of Cowan it is at the confluence of several Divisions which are significantly affected and but for Pearce start well under quota. Mr Walsh has proposed a massive series of movements in both directions, totalling 114,120 projected electors. This for a Division he wants to keep! The sheer numbers of electors he proposes to move leads one to another conclusion, perhaps it would be easier to	Proposes abolition of Cowan.	Proposes the abolition of Cowan, but proposes large scale changes to Stirling totally altering its character.
-------	--	---	---	---	--	--	------------------------------	---

Curtin	Reversal of the previous boundary changes returns eastern boudnary to that which existed for decades, and is easily accomplished.	Proposes a partial reversal of previous redistribution with Perth. A full reversal would avoid the avoidable changes with Stirling. The use of the Mitchell Freeway as a boundary again would restore an obvious boudnary and disrupt Stirling less and enable a better series of boundaries or Perth in the north eastern suburbs.	Reverses changed boundary from the previous redistribution to Perth. This one change produces a clear boudnary and which is presumably why it was used by the AEC previously for such a long time. The Mitchell Freeway is a strikingly obvious boundary.	Proposes a northwards movement of Curtin and Perth into Stirling.	There is a degree of interconnectednes s of cahgnes between, Moore, Stirling, Perth, Cowan and Hasluck. I would prefer the eastely movement of Perth, which would free up electors for Curtin, minimise changes to Stirling, enable Perth to take in areas of the Swan LGA, and take back suburbs such as Kiara and Lockridge whcih were in ertth untila few years agao.	The proposed abolition of Stirling is unnecessary. Removal of a name does not require abolition of a Divison in its entirety as it creates a series of dramatic changes to the shapes of surrounding Divisions elongating Moore and Curtin to the north and south, and Cowan and Perth to the east and west. Reversing the transfers from Curtin to Perth in the last redistribution provides slightly more electors to Curtin than this significant	Proposes additions to Curtin from Stirling, similar to McSweeney submission. The displacements are extensive overall, moving about 32% of all WA electors to a new Division. This seems excessive to abolish one Division.	Proposes the extensive intrusion into Stirling when a simple excision from Perth would establish a clearer boundary (ie reversing the previous redistribution changes).
--------	---	---	---	---	--	--	--	---

Durack	Needs to expand southerly, which is inevitably into Pearce. The extent of the McSweeney movements are too extensive to achieve a modest gain in numbers for both Durack and O'Connor.	Proposes a reconstruction of Durack that vastly expands Division to something like that of the former Division of Kalgoorlie. Such a construct draws together more slow growing areas and entirely rearranges regional Western Australia. Retaining the existing northern and southern Divisions of Durack and O'Connor is more easily accomplished by moving electors from Pearce and Canning to O'Connor than chasing down electors from	Expands south into Pearce with sound community of interest.	Expands south	Proposes one way transfers from Pearce to Durack	The Liberal Party and several other submissions have proposed easier constructions of Durack. Normally submitters start at the extremities of the state and come to places in between whereas Walsh appears to have gone about it the other way. I prefer as the other points I have made clear, to make simpler, one way if possible transfers. Mr Walsh seems to create lot of minor changes which shift far more electors than necessary. Given that about 18,000 additional projected electors	Proposal is reasonable.	Expands south and loses areas to O'Connor.
--------	---	--	---	---------------	--	--	-------------------------	--

Forrest	no change is necessary	Broadly accept the logic of proposal, but instead of transferring electors from Canning to Forrest to O'Connor, I suggest the transfer occur directly from Canning to O'Connor. This less disruptive to Forrest and its south western community of interest and places a relatively faster growing area directly in O'Connor	Moves northwards	Proposes one way transfers from Forrest to O'Connor. It would be easier to take these numbers direct from Canning and leave Forrest unchanged.	There is no need to make any change to Forrest and making them exacerbates problems by forcing numbers to be transferred to O'Connor from Forrest further afield. Forrest has strong growth, O'Connor needs additional electors, a direct transfer from Canning is easier, less disruptive and seems to have escaped submitters attention generally. Shifting 3,045 electors from Canning into Forrest in a one way movement achieves nothing.	The interlocking Forrest, Canning, Brand, Fremantle, Tangney, Burt changes are extensive and unlike any other submission. Forrest under these changes will encroach into southern suburbs of Perth.	proposes northward movement of Forrest to provide some numbers to O'Connor. This causes some unnecessary displacement as some other submissions also propose.
Fremantle	no change is necessary	no change	no change	Proposes a modest adjustment with Tangney, which I am on the facts presented to accept.	no change	The interlocking Forrest, Canning, Brand, Fremantle, Tangney, Burt changes are extensive and unlike any other submission.	no change

Hasluck

Proposed a solution which creates a Upper Swan focused Division, taking in fast growing areas of Ellenbrook, in addition to the Darling Range, and other eastern suburbs, and foothills localities.

Moves northwards and teakes in Ellenbrook from Pearce

Also his transfers from Burt are similar to the Liberal submission. He proposes the inclusion of Ellenbrook in Hasluck, the other semi rural areas of the Swan LGA and communitis towards Midland.

Hasluck is the subject of massive and unnecessary changes under Mr Walsh's submission. I accept numbers of electors will need to be transferred to Burt, Swan and so on to accommodate Tangney, one of the few Divisions named in honour of a woman. I can see from other submissions the inclusion of Ellenbrook for example in Hasluck. The total number of projected electors moved to accomodate his proposals is 91,324 projected electors.

Hasluck is similar to some other submissions.

Extent of changes are exacerbated by changes as far afield as Forrest. Although the inclusion fo Ellenbrook is reasonable.

Moore

northward displacement to accommodate changes to Stirling	There is a degree of interconnectedness of changes between, Moore, Stirling, Perth, Cowan and Hasluck. I would prefer the eastely movement of Perth, which would free up electors for Curtin, minimise changes to Stirling, enable Perth to take in areas of the Swan LGA, and take back suburbs such as Kiara and Lockridge whcih were in ertth untila few years agao.	The weight of opinion is that Stirling should be retained and that electors be gained from Cowan, Perth, Moore. This is the only submission advocating abolition of Stirling. Some 13,278 projected electors come from Stirling.	Similar to some other submissions.	The eastward movement of Stirling creates an awkward dynamic of northwards coastal Divsions with little hinterland and substantial redesign of Stirling.
---	---	--	------------------------------------	--

O'Connor	Needs to expand into either Forrest or take electors directly from Canning, leaving Forrest unchanged. This would be less disruptive.	Proposes a reconstruction of Durack that vastly expands Division to something like that of the former Division fo Kalgoorlie. Such a construct draws together more slow growing areas and entirely rearranges regional Western Australia. Retainign the existing northern and southern Divisions of Durack and OConnor is more easily accomplished by moving electors from Pearce and Canning to OConnor than chasing down electors from	Broadly accept the logic of proposal, but instead of tranferring electors from Canning to Forrest to O'Connor, I suggest the transfer occur directly from Canning to O'Connor. This less disruptive to Forrest and its south western community of interest and places a relatively faster growing area directly in O'Connor	expands into Forrest and Canning, when Canning would be sufficent.	Proposes one way transfers from Forrest to O'Connor. It would easier to take these numbers direct from Canning and leave Forrest unchanged.	Proposes one way transfers from Canning, Durack and Pearce totalling 13,131 projected electors. This could be increased if the transfers from Canning to Forrest instead went to O'Connor. The Liberal Party (except for transfers via Forrest) has a more solid Division.	Proposes a massive northward displacement of Forrest to provide numbers to O'Connor. This not necessary.	Expands massively taking low popualtion areas from Durack, and parts of Forrest, Pearce, and Canning.
----------	---	--	---	--	---	--	--	---

Pearce

See Cowan above

See Cowan above

Proposes abolition of Pearce rather than Cowan, but new Cowan is very like the northern suburbs proposals of others for Pearce.

Points of agreement - placing Ellenbrook in Hasluck seems a common theme of submissions. The shifting of Pearce to north western metropolitan coastal and inland division covering Joondalup and Wanneroo is solid. Walsh proposes some 70,099 projected electors been moved. This is not significantly different to other submissions. My point that abolishing Cowan is easier overall.

Similar to some other submissions.

Pearce ends up broadly as a northern metropolitan coastal Division in Wanneroo.

Perth	Losing territory back to Curtin and gaining formerly Perth suburbs and other areas from Cowan is the soundest change from a community of interest viewpoint.	Proposes a partial reversal of the previous redistribution. Comment - Reversing the transfer from Curtin to Perth in the previous redistribution would achieve the desired transfer of elector numbers, and restoring a boundary in place for decades. Shifting electors from Stirling adds to the numbers of electors that need to be moved. Given Cowan is to be substantially changed, it would be easier to reverse the previous redistribution and	Similar to my thinking.	Proposes a northwards movement of Curtin and Perth into Stirling.	There is a degree of interconnectedness of changes between, Moore, Stirling, Perth, Cowan and Hasluck. I would prefer the eastly movement of Perth, which would free up electors for Curtin, minimise changes to Stirling, enable Perth to take in areas of the Swan LGA, and take back suburbs such as Kiara and Lockridge which were in Perth until a few years ago.	Consistent with my points about Stirling, the total of elector movements Mr Walsh proposes here is some 42,020 projected electors. This seems excessive by comparison with a one and only transfer to bring up to quota Curtin and what might need to be close to a one way movement from the Swan LGA in Cowan to Perth to bring it up to quota. Whereas these movements are significant and in both directions.	Similar to some other submissions, in particular McSweeney. Reversing the last redistribution movements between Curtin and Perth, and leaving Stirling essentially intact would be less disruptive of surrounding Division, given Cowan is the Division to be abolished.	Some of the additions to Perth seem disjointed and driven by numerical logic, rather than community of interest. A simple reversal of the territory from Curtin into Perth would be much easier.
-------	--	---	-------------------------	---	--	---	--	--

Stirling	Stirling can reach quota by gain electors on its eastern and northern boundary from Perth, Moore, Cowan and the Liberal Party does this with less disruption than propsoed by McSweeney.	Proposes a partial reversal of the previous redistribution. Comment - Reversing the transfer from Curtin to Perth in the previous redistribution would achieve the desired trandser of elector numbers, and restoring a boudnary in place for decades. Shifting electors from Stirling adds to the numbers of electors that need to be moved. Given Cowan is to be substantially changed, it would be easier to reverse the previous redistribution and	Proposes a modest transfer of electors from Perth, Cowan and Moore that is modest versus some large scale movements in other submissions.	Due to the northward movement of Curtin and Perth, Stirling needs further displacement to its north, which is not necessary.	There is a degree of interconnectednes s of changes between, Moore, Stirling, Perth, Cowan and Hasluck. I would prefer the eastely movement of Perth, which would free up electors for Curtin, minimise changes to Stirling, enable Perth to take in areas of the Swan LGA, and take back suburbs such as Kiara and Lockridge whcih were in ertth untila few years agao.	I do not agree with the abolition of Division of Stirling, but appreciate his commentary about Stirling as a person. My criticism is highlighted under the Divsions affected.	Proposes inclusion of more northerly suburbs which are an unusual solution, given that some minor changes between, Curtin, Perth, Stirling and Moore are sufficent to avoid this massive displacement.	Some of the additions to Stirling seem disjointed and driven by numerical logic, rather than community of interest. The odd transfers to Curtin and Moore, produce some jagged inclusions and exclusions.
----------	--	---	---	--	--	---	--	---

Swan	Maintaining the Canning River as a boundary, together with some modest additions from Hasluck is sufficient and the extent of the Liberal Party changes are more modest than those of McSweeney. The suggested use of the Roe Highway by the Liberal Party is a long and very clear boundary, which might be preferred.	Proposes Hasluck lose Forrestfield-Wattle Grove to Swan. The Liberal Party proposes a clear boundary in the Roe Highway.	The Liberal Party proposes a clear boundary in the Roe Highway, plus some areas adjacent to the Swan River which seem a logical inclusion.	Proposes movement of Tangney into Swan, which involves a crossing of a major river, which has been recognised as a major barrier for decades. I disagree with this proposal. The compensatory electors are sourced from the Darling Range areas in Hasluck	Uses the Canning River as a major barrier and therefore takes Canning Vale from Burt to Tangney, and takes electors from Hasluck for Burt.	I have made clear my disagreement with the crossing of the Canning River to make up numbers in Tangney. Swan is a Federation Division and the seat of long serving MP Sir John Forrest. This is not particularly relevant, unless someone proposed abolishing its name. Swan is fundamentally Western Australian. Swan has been in many places of the last century or so, but in the 71 years generally been south of the Swan River and east of	Some expansion north easterly along the Swan River would be less disruptive. To Swan, Burt and Hasluck.	Canning River as a boundary is maintained. A north easterly expansion might have worked better for Swan, rather than additions in the south eastern metropolitan area.
------	---	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

Tangney	Taking back Canning Vale from Burt is the least disruptive solution	Canning Vale from Burt is transferred back to Tangney much as it was before the previous redistribution.	Proposes taking back Canning Vale from Burt, which was in Tangney previously.	Proposes expanding Tangney across the Canning River which I explained elsewhere is both disruptive and ignores major natural features in defining community of interest.	Proposes transfer of Canning Vale like most submissions to Tangney from Burt.	The weight of opinion is that Canning Vale be returned to Tangney where it was before the last redistribution and not have Tangney cross the Canning River which it has not done for decades as the River is a major determiner of community of interests as it is a major barrier (more so than even the Roe Freeway). Again the shifting of 38,856 projected electors seems excessive, and made due to creating a two way movement that is unnecessary.	The interlocking Forrest, Canning, Brand, Fremantle, Tangney, Burt changes are extensive and unlike any other submission.	Proposes the return of Canning Vale to Tangney from Burt. Agree
---------	---	--	---	--	---	---	---	---

Overall	Of the submissions the least disruptive is that of the Liberal Party. Others have areas of agreement eg Waddell, Mulcair. McSweeney is a little more divergent in some areas. Wash is most divergent, Ashley slightly less so and Anonymous in some areas produces seriously large changes, which involve large numbers of electors for not a particularly obvious reason.	The Durack and O'Connor change revisits the former Kalgoorlie and O'Connor east-west elongations of Perth and Stirling do not reflect long standing boundary orientations. I agree with the Tangney suggestions.	Overall proposal is less disruptive than some others. Portion of voters moved is about half that of Mr Walsh, Anonymous, Mr Ashley.	More expansive changes than probably necessary, and yet in some areas similar to Liberal Party proposals, but then quite divergent too.	Like Mr Waddell significant areas of agreement with only detailed major party submission, but then some divergences too.	From my estimate Mr Walsh moves some 313,396 projected electors. I have never met him, and wish him no ill-well, but most of his suggestions generate far more elector movements than is actually necessary to be made. At its core one Division needs to be abolished, and several Divisions in theory do not need any change. Mr Walsh generates two way adjustments greater than the existing enrolments of Cowan a Division he seeks to retain.	Moving about 32% of all electors seems excessive and many interlocking changes of voters, make for greater disruption of existing boundaries.	Excessive changes rather than a simple transfer of electors. The last redistribution was not long ago and eliminating one Division seems to generate more elector movements than necessary.
Seat	Gordon	McSweeney	Liberal	Waddell	Mulcair	Walsh	Ashley	Anonymous