



**THE FEDERAL
REDISTRIBUTION
WESTERN AUSTRALIA**

Comment on suggestion 11

Darren McSweeney

8 pages

Comment on Suggestions Redistribution of Commonwealth Electoral Divisions

Darren McSweeney



Western Australia 2020

This Public Comment on Suggestions was lodged 5 November 2020 by
Darren McSweeney
an Australian Citizen, resident of Victoria, and member of the Australian Public Service.



Cover photograph for illustration may be cropped or resized from the original image.

Photo © [Gordon Bell](#) - [Dreamstime.com](#) and use complies with licence terms.

Political disclaimer

This comment complies with the conditions of employment in the Australian Public Service (APS) in accordance with the *Public Service Act 1999*, the APS Code of Conduct, and the [APSC Guide for making public comments and participating online](#).

The views, opinions, arguments and recommendations presented in this Comment on Suggestions to the redistribution of electoral divisions of Western Australia are the author's own and in no way reflect the views of Services Australia, the Australian Public Service or Australian Government.

My capacity to fulfil my duties in a professional, impartial and apolitical manner is, in no way, affected by exercising my right to participate in public and political debate by lodging this public submission.

My right to hold and express views as an Australian Citizen is [protected under Australian law](#).

I hold no interest in, and do not stand to receive any benefit or advantage resulting from the outcome of this redistribution. I have written this submission as a private citizen taking a personal interest in psephology and the electoral redistribution process. I am not now, nor at any time in the past been a member of any political party or similar associated organisation.

This comment is lodged claiming political neutrality. No political bias or partiality is implied within this submission and none should be inferred.

Comments regarding suggested names of divisions are provided in accordance [with guidelines for naming federal electoral divisions](#). Comments on suggested names are provided on merit of the individual and their contribution to Australian society and do not reflect political partiality of the eponymous persons, unless specified. Comments on proposals to abolish a division name or division – should any such proposal exist – should not be taken to be a reflection of the performance or character of the eponymous person, nor the current member of Parliament representing that division.

Criticism of submissions or decisions taken as part of this redistribution is based solely on the merit of the arguments and recommendations presented therein and serves solely to improve electoral representation for the people of Western Australia. It is not in any way a reflection upon any individual, government or community group or organisation participating in this process, nor any member of a Redistribution Committee, augmented Electoral Commission, any other member of the APS, the Australian Electoral Commission, any other Australian Government entity, agency, department or any current or past member of Parliament.

Introduction

I would like to lodge comment on some of the 27 suggestions submitted for the redistribution of Western Australian electoral divisions. Most of my comment will be regarding the independent state-wide suggestions submitted by individuals with a small commentary on division names.

Suggested division names

As one division was required to be abolished, the name of the division would cease to be used. It seems for all state-wide suggestions, the division to be abolished came down to a division in the north of Perth, with **COWAN**, **PEARCE** and **STIRLING** the candidates. In many cases, the divisions were remarkably similar, making the matter of which division to abolish, really becoming a matter of which name to cease using.

It appears that several submissions were under the impression that a new division was to be created in Western Australia and proposed names for this new division. Regardless, these suggestions could be put toward a renamed division.

The following table outlines all names compiled in alphabetical order. I also list the suggested abolished divisions and any proposed renamed divisions separately.

Proposed name	Replacing	Included in Suggestion
abolished	Burt	S8
abolished	Cowan	S18, S24, S26
abolished	Pearce	S10, S17, S20, S23
abolished	Stirling	S15
Abolished	Swan	S7
BALBUK/ YOOREEL		S9, S21
BRIDGE	Stirling	S20
BURBRIDGE		S12
CARDELL-OLIVER	Stirling	S20
CARDELL-OLIVER		S21
CUPER	Stirling	S20
divisions named after "women and Indigenous Australians"		S11
DOUGLAS	Stirling	S20
HAWKE	Stirling	S1
HOBBS	Stirling	S20
HUMMERSTON		S21
PEARCE	Fremantle	S17
PEARCE	Hasluck	S17
PEARCE	Moore	S17
PEARCE	Perth	S17
RISCHBEITH		S21
2 women and 6 Indigenous words	Fremantle, Moore, Stirling, Forrest, Pearce, Curtin	S16

A division named **HAWKE** would be more appropriate in Victoria, as that is the state in which Mr Hawke was a representative.

As I noted in my submission, a division named **CUPER** would be problematic with the existing division named **COOPER** in Victoria, and a division named **CARDELL-OLIVER** may be too cumbersome a name.

I would not have an issue in using any of the other suggested names, and would submit that if any divisions were to be renamed, then **STIRLING** would be the most logical division name to change, for reasons outlined in my own submission S20, and particularly in S1 and S15.

Of the proposed abolished divisions, I would strongly urge the Committee to consider that even if the division of **COWAN** is abolished, the name should live on. It would certainly be a shame that a division named for Edith Cowan is removed, especially if divisions named for colonial-era men are retained.

Suggested boundaries

Of the suggestions that proposed changes to boundaries, I emphasise that those suggestions that take certain divisions in isolation are less likely to be viable when the changes are extrapolated across the entire state

Suggestion **S10 Jeff Waddell** is comprehensive and thorough. Like most suggestions his solution for **O'CONNOR** is to raid the south-west, which then pushes **FORREST** northward into the Peel region.

North of the river, he unnecessarily pushes **MOORE** south, although most of his suggestions in this area seem logical.

While I respect and appreciate the effort that he makes to prepare submissions, I must note that he did not feel the need to include a section outlining his fairness principles in his submission this time. Given that Western Australia elected Liberal Party candidates to 68% of electorates in 2019, I can only conclude that he obviously feels that the divisions of Western Australia are already politically fair.

Suggestion **S15 David Walsh** include aspects quite similar to my own suggestion, particularly in northern Perth. He opts to abolish **STIRLING**, however, his divisions of **COWAN** and **PEARCE** are quite similar to my **STIRLING** and **COWAN**. Again, I am not sure why **MOORE** needs to push south instead of picking up the balance of Joondalup City, which is clearly a pre-defined community of interest.

If the Committee did not decide to drastically realign the rural divisions, as in my suggestion, then I believe David's version of **DURACK** and **O'CONNOR** would be the next best, as his suggestion avoids disrupting the south-west.

Suggestion **S17 Mark Mulcair** is, as always, sensible and realistic. However, he also needs to collect electors to fill **O'CONNOR** to from **FORREST**. His solution for **TANGNEY** is preferable than crossing the Canning River to the north. I'm not sure that his solution for **MOORE**, going north into Wanneroo City is necessary, though.

The anonymous **suggestion S18** is quite thorough, and I would hope the individual that put all that work into it is able to be identified.

I actually find most of this suggestion to be acceptable, although Gidgegannup would probably be better suited in **HASLUCK**, rather than **PEARCE**. There is also an awkward tail protruding from **HASLUCK** down toward Wattle Grove, which would probably be better in either the proposed **SWAN** or **BURT**.

I would also suggest that the proposed **STIRLING** is actually closer to **COWAN** and I'd suggest this a more suitable name.

Suggestion **S26 Dean Ashley** has also opted to use the south-west to make up the difference for **O'CONNOR**. The flow on effect of this is that **CANNING** becomes virtually unrecognisable. I would argue this is actually a new division completely and would need to be renamed.

Stemming from these changes, he has to extensively rework all the southern Perth divisions. North of the river, his suggestions are far less radical.

Turning now to the submission from the political parties. As usual, the suggestions of the political parties provide some unusual results in their efforts to shore up their fortunes.

Suggestion **S23 Labor Party** is difficult to ascertain their actual proposals in any great detail, given the brevity of the commentary and lack of accompanying tables, maps or any data to support their suggestion.

Their suggested **STIRLING** using Wanneroo Rd as an **eastern** boundary seems to contradict all other suggestions. They also attempt to push **PERTH** far to the east into Guildford, crossing the Swan River. Their list of justifications for this suggestion appears to have an inverse correlation to the actual community of interest.

Their suggestion that *"...the rural areas of the Division of Hasluck should be moved to the divisions of Durack and O'Connor, following a similar division between those two divisions as it presently exists..."* is vague at best. Given that there is no data to back this statement up, I have no idea where they propose the boundary be drawn, especially that there are few rural areas within the existing **HASLUCK** that could be split.

Suggestion **S24 Liberal Party** contains some sensible proposals for the rural divisions, although both will be at the very bottom of the projected enrolments, necessitating further expansion at the next redistribution.

However, they then undo their good work by running **BURT** north to Forrestfield and zig-zagging **CANNING** down to Mandurah, cutting most of Murray Shire into **FORREST**.

Of course, not satisfied with this, they then attempt to push **PERTH** to the extreme outer north-eastern suburbs, while sending **CURTIN** and **STIRLING** into inner Perth, and their suggestion for **MOORE** can only be described as bizarre. This seems to stem solely from a desire to abolish **COWAN**, despite it not being the most suitable candidate for their particular solution.

Suggestion **S27 National Party** focusses on the rural divisions, and peri-urban **PEARCE** (for some reason). They too raid the south-west for **O'CONNOR**, and then push **FORREST** northwards. However, their solution is to split Mandurah and Dawesville.

Turning to their version of **PEARCE**, they leave all the high growth and very urban suburbs from Wanneroo City and Swan City within the same division, and also decide that a split of Chittering Shire is needed.

Why they decided that their proposed **PEARCE** should be considered rural, but not, say a **HASLUCK** or **CANNING**, which they do not touch, is not mentioned in the submission. Of course, they do suggest transferring localities in the current Pearce into an imagined Hasluck, but this seems to be more a way to remove a large chunk of electors without regard for how this would work in conjunction with the other metropolitan divisions.