



THE FEDERAL  
REDISTRIBUTION  
TASMANIA

# Submission OB21

Martin Gordon

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [FedRedistribution - TAS](#)  
**Subject:** Tasmanian Redistribution Proposal Comments  
**Date:** Saturday, 28 February 2026 8:24:52 PM

---

[REDACTED]

The Electoral Commission

Tasmanian Redistribution

### **Proposed Redistribution of Tasmanian Electoral Divisions February 2026**

I wish to make comments on the redistribution proposal of 27 February 2026.

I am a private citizen making a representation as an individual. I have made many submissions over the years in federal, state and territory environments, at the initial through to the final stages of redistributions. I had not made earlier submissions on this occasion with respect to Tasmania.

#### **The Report**

I note the fulsome explanation of the details of the proposal.

**I would like it noted that I fully agree with the proposals in respect of Bass and Braddon.** My reasoning being that they comply with the criteria the commissioners rely upon namely:

- Community of interests within the proposed electorate, including economic, social and regional interests
- Means of communication and travel within the proposed electorate
- Physical features and areas in the proposed electorate (i.e. prominent geographic features)
- The existing boundaries for that electorate

However they are secondary criteria with numerical issues being primary criteria. The changes proposed are modest and minimalist with regards Bass and absolutely minimalist with regards Braddon.

### Other contributors

I noted minimalist proposals from both the Labor Party and Liberal Party. Dr Mark Mulcair canvassed some constructive options with both boundaries and elector numbers. Darren McSweeney also offered up a constructive option.

### Clark

**I support the committee's proposal for Clark.** I have had similar ideas in the past but the weight of popular opinion was against it despite it creating a more intuitively sound division and producing a Franklin that was located more to the north of Hobart than currently and which had a more satisfactory crossing of the Derwent than to date.

### Committee comments

The committee made some comments during its report and I have comments on some of these points below.

The committee considered the dispersed nature of the states population, and the existence of multiple urban centres and surrounding regions. The geographic size of electorates and local government boundaries were mentioned. I know that on occasion submissions and the AEC consider land area as a major issue, but Australia is overall sparsely populated relative to much of the world. The area of some Australian federal divisions exceed 1 million square kilometres (which is some 14 times larger than the entirety of Tasmania, and I should add Taiwan and Sri Lanka which are of similar size as well). Even some other smaller federal regional divisions (and some state and territory electorates) are larger than Tasmania.

The committee referred to changes proposed to it that affected as few as 3% of electors or up to 27%. Which made its proposed 27.56% of elector disruption seem excessive as it is certainly at the upper limit of proposals.

The issue of Franklin and been non-contiguous (I am less exercised by this), as a bridge link such as the Bowen Bridge seems sufficient, which is why the large exchange of electors between Clark/Franklin/Lyons seems consequentially excessive.

The linking of the highly urban metropolitan northern half of the west bank of the Derwent River (Glenorchy Council) with parts of the north of the state which are very rural such as Perth, Sheffield, Deloraine, Evandale, etc is both excessive and frankly bizarre. Similarly linking the highly urban metropolitan east bank of the Derwent with parts of the state which are very rural such as St Helens and Mount William (and which are north of Launceston as well) is excessive.

The fact that Lyons is largish area-wise does not logically require changes that create another division that spans the north and south of the state, as proposed with Franklin.

The current notion the Derwent should not be crossed oddly is forgotten when it comes to areas north and west of Hobart. Whilst it is proposed that Franklin be east and north of the Derwent, it logically arises that the proposed Lyons will cross the Derwent and take in a large part of northern Hobart previously not included in Lyons (or Wilmot as it was previously known).

The strangeness of this obsession about the Derwent seems not to have been an issue in 1903 when the then Franklin not only embraced both shores of the Derwent, but totally surrounded Denison (Clark) and the core of Hobart and covered about half of the landmass of Tasmania past Campbell Town in the states north.

### **Franklin and Lyons**

The discussion above makes it clear the only serious areas of disagreement I have relate to Franklin and Lyons. The inclusion of Glenorchy from Clark into Franklin (allowing for the other changes agreed above) and the inclusion of Old Beach-Otago from Lyons. The total of the changes I propose amount to about 12.2% of the states electors, less than half proposed by the commissioners and a compact largely urban Franklin.

Lyons is reduced in size but maintains the character of a largely rural division with a coastline exactly as it is now on the eastern side of the state. The north-south divide is not exacerbated by having long divisions spanning the state, but fairly focused divisions in the periphery of the state and two quite urban divisions focused around Hobart.

The revised enrolments for 2025 and the projected figures for 3.5 years hence are below:

	Proposed	Projected
Bass	85934	86180
Braddon	84612	86021
Clark	80510	82547
Franklin	81385	84118
Lyons	80735	83919

I wish the commissioners well in their deliberations.

Martin Gordon

1 March 2026