

SUGGESTION No 5

**Australian Labor Party
Tasmanian Branch**



AUSTRALIAN
LABOR
PARTY
Tasmania

Submission

To the Australian Electoral Commission

**For the 1999 Redistribution of the Tasmanian Federal
Electorate Boundaries**

Australian Labor Party

Tasmanian Branch

28 May 1999

Contents of the Submission

Part 1

Overview

Part 2

Bass, Denison and Franklin

Part 3

Braddon and Lyons

Part 4

Summary

Appendix 1

Appendix 2

PART 1

Overview

The comments made within this submission are based on the premise that the Redistribution Committee looking into the 1999 Tasmanian Federal Redistribution should adopt a minimal approach.

That is, there should only be changes to electorates in which there is a statistical necessity to do so.

The only areas the Committee should look at in the electorates of Bass, Denison and Franklin are where certain CCD areas cross over between two electorates.

While it is desirable for CCD's where possible, to be located within one federal electorate, any changes should only be applied where the vast majority of the population of a CCD is currently within one federal electorate.

It should not be contemplated where CCDs are split evenly on a population basis between electorates.

Part 2

Bass, Denison and Franklin

On the figures indicated by the AEC that will apply for the purpose of Section 66(3) of the Commonwealth Electoral Act 1918, the electorates of Bass, Denison and Franklin on the projected enrolment estimations to 30/06/03 are all well within the maximum and minimum number of electors at the projected time.

It is the view of the Australian Labor Party Tasmanian Branch that the Redistribution Committee should not look at changes to these electorates for the following reasons:

- Under the requirements of Section 66(3) of the Commonwealth Electoral Act 1918 there is no necessity to change the boundaries of Bass, Denison or Franklin.
- The two electorates that do not satisfy the requirements of the above Section of the Act have common boundaries which can be changed to rectify the imbalance between those two electorates without alteration to the boundaries of the other three electorates.
- To consider alterations to the boundaries of the three electorates that do not require alteration on the projected enrolment figures, would introduce unnecessary changes to the Tasmanian House of Assembly boundaries due to their historic conformity to the Tasmanian federal boundaries.

Part 3

Braddon and Lyons

Clearly there needs to be an adjustment of electors between the electorates of Braddon and Lyons.

These are the only two electorates in Tasmania that do not meet the projected enrolment estimations to 30/06/03, with Braddon being below the minimum number and Lyons being above the maximum.

While these two electorates have a common boundary, the process in enabling both electorates to meet the parameters of the projected enrolments estimations is a simpler process than would be the case if these electorates had boundaries that were separated by another electorate.

There are two clear options available to the Redistribution Committee in considering the adjustment between Braddon and Lyons:

Option 1

The allocation of the West Coast (M) 21 CCD areas from Lyons to Braddon.

This would result in the following

	No of CCDs	Enrolment 14/4/1999	Estimate 30/6/2003	Growth (%)
Braddon	227	65519	66148	0.96
Lyons	274	64340	68115	3.85

Appendix 1 outlines the approximate geographical configuration associated to this change.

Option 2

The allocation of the Latrobe (M) Pt A 16 CCD areas, excluding CCD 6030101 from Lyons to Braddon

This would result in the following

	No of CCDs	Enrolment 14/4/1999	Estimate 30/6/2003	Growth (%)
Braddon	222	66537	67815	1.92
Lyons	279	63322	66448	4.94

Appendix 2 outlines the approximate geographical configuration associated to this change.

The percentage of growth with both options indicates a positive enrolment growth within Lyons and Braddon.

The projected growth rates for both options would not require any adjustment to either electorate prior to the next normal scheduled redistribution in Tasmania.

Part 4

Summary

Either options 1 and 2 present the Committee with clear and logical solutions for the 1999 Tasmanian redistribution.

The ALP does not have a preference to one option over the other.

When developing boundary proposals the Committee should take into account varying community interest issues that exist within each of these electorates which may add weight to one option over the other.

Names of the electorates

The ALP's position is that the current electorate names should not be altered within this redistribution process.

Appendix 1



Appendix 2

JR CREEK

PENGUIN

WULVERSTONE

TURNERS BEACH

DEVONPORT

PORT SORELL

186 201
6011503

GAWLER

493 497
6011504

488 187
6011506

164 263
6011802

164 184
6011808

170 140
6011808

170 140
6011808

176 128
6011505

177 177
6011809

181 509
6030108

111 111
6030201

228 228
6030202

130 130
6030102

184 184
6030104

282 282
6030203

173 173
6030103

424 424
6030307

241 241
6030306

227 227

6030311 RAILTON

184 184
6011502

156 163
6011501

