



THE FEDERAL
REDISTRIBUTION
TASMANIA

Further objection number 16

Catherine Cowie

1 page

Catherine Cowie
[address supplied]
26 July 2017

Redistribution Secretariat
Australian Electoral Commission
2 Salamanca Square
Hobart TAS 7000

Further objections to the revised proposal of the Tasmanian redistribution

Catherine Cowie

In general I applaud the augmented Electoral Commission's modifications to the initial proposal for the Tasmanian redistribution.

The renaming of Denison to honour Andrew Inglis Clark is a welcome revision, as the initial proposed report argued there were insufficient reasons to change the name of the division, which seems to me to be a misreading of the submissions in favour of Clark; many of the supporters of the renaming to Clark questioned whether Denison had indeed rendered outstanding service to Australia. Denison is arguably no more outstanding than any of the other lieutenant-governors of the colony of Van Diemen's Land that are currently unrecognised by having a federal division named in their honour, and less worthy than his immediate predecessor who is so recognised.

The retention of the municipalities of Dorset and Flinders in Bass, while also leaving unchanged the reuniting of the entire municipality of West Tamar in Bass, seems a logical modification of the initial proposal for the division, considering the communities of interest on the Tamar River and in the north-east of the state with the city of Launceston.

The one remaining issue that is unaddressed by the revised proposal is the bifurcation of the division of Franklin, with the two parts of the division wholly unconnected by land and separated by the renamed division of Clark and the Derwent River. Federally this remains something of an anomaly amongst Australia's 150 divisions, although it is a logical outcome of regarding Clark as an inner urban electorate encompassing the Hobart CBD and surrounding suburbs, and Franklin as an outer urban electorate, but the separation of the two sides of the electorate seems to go directly against the logic of factor (ii) of paragraph 66(3)(b) of the Electoral Act. That the augmented Electoral Commission was not bold enough to tackle this puzzle ensures it will remain a challenge to a future redistribution committee sometime in the next decade.