



**THE FEDERAL
REDISTRIBUTION
WESTERN AUSTRALIA**

Suggestion 14

Dr Mark Mulcair

19 pages

SUGGESTIONS FOR 2023 WESTERN AUSTRALIAN FEDERAL REDISTRIBUTION

Dear Committee Members,

Please find my Suggestions for the 2023 Western Australian federal redistribution

I hope these Suggestions will help you in your deliberations.

If you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Dr Mark Mulcair

INTRODUCTION

I am grateful for the opportunity to offer my Suggestions to the 2023 Western Australian redistribution.

I am a completely independent person, with no affiliation to any political party or organization, but I have always had a strong interest in redistributions and electoral boundaries. In recent years, a small group of us have emerged to offer our opinions and suggestions, to complement and provide alternatives to the usual political party submissions.

I am not a resident of WA, but I have contributed to many state and federal redistributions over the years, and have a reasonable familiarity with the geography, community of interest, and political history of the state.

I hope that my Suggestions will be of benefit to the Committee in their deliberations.

GENERAL THOUGHTS

POPULATION TRENDS

As with Victoria, the growth rates for every Division in the state is predicted to be within a surprisingly narrow range. Seats containing traditionally strongly growing areas (Pearce, Hasluck, Perth) are projected to have very similar growth rates to more stagnant Divisions. Again as with Victoria, I am not completely convinced these growth rates will hold up over time. We may well see a blowout in some of the outer suburban seats compared to the middle-distance and rural seats in the short term.

However, I have chosen to take the numbers at face value instead of attempting to second-guess the projections.

MY OVERALL STRATEGY

The creation of a new Division means that all existing seats are over quota and need to shrink.

The uniformity in projected growth rates means that there is no obvious hot-spot for the creation of a new seat. The redistribution will need to proceed by making incremental changes, with each Division losing 5000 – 10,000 electors to its neighbours. This gradual transfer will eventually accumulate to leave enough electors left over for a new Division.

Assuming we begin at the state border, coastline, and the Swan River and proceed ‘inland’ from there, the excess will very likely be generated somewhere in eastern Perth, around the current Divisions of Hasluck, Swan, Canning, and Burt.

I believe the best arrangement is to split the existing seats of Hasluck and Canning into three Divisions instead of two:

- One ‘northern’ Division based more clearly on Swan LGA, taking in Midland and Ellenbrook, plus Ballajura, Beechboro, and Bassendean.
- One ‘southern’ Division based more clearly on Mandurah, the Peel District, and Serpentine – Jarrahdale.
- One ‘central’ Division focussed clearly on Mundaring and Kalamunda LGAs, plus the rural parts of Gosnells and Armadale. This would take in the Darling Scarp and the foothills suburbs between Midland and Armadale.

This arrangement then helps soak up the excess from other areas:

- a) The ‘northern’ seat gains electors from Cowan and Perth, which can then push north-westwards to help balance the numbers in Pearce and Moore.
- b) The ‘central’ seat takes from Swan and Burt, which in turn move to absorb the excess in Tangney and Fremantle.
- c) The ‘southern’ seat takes from Forrest, allowing for the adjustment of the rural seats further south.

I feel this is a very logical and sensible arrangement. All 15 existing Divisions retain their overall basic character, and the new seat has a clear focus for itself.

NAMING

I must confess to having no clear preference for the new seat, and I would be interested to see the names that local Western Australian people feel are suitable. At previous redistributions, names such as Beazley, Court, Holman, Tonkin, and Coombs have been mentioned as possible candidates.

I am proposing that all of the 15 existing Divisions all retain their current names. Western Australia has seen several new names on the electoral map at recent redistributions (Durack, Hasluck, Burt) plus the creation of a new seat this time, so I think there is no need to make additional changes.

BOUNDARIES

In rural areas, I have tried to use LGA boundaries wherever possible. Failing that, I have tried to use natural features such as rivers, or at least township/community or SA2 boundaries.

In metropolitan areas, I have tried to use major roads and freeways, as well as natural features such as rivers, mountains, or open space. Suburb or LGA boundaries can sometimes also make good boundaries where they coincide with major roads or rivers, but I have tried to avoid using suburb boundaries that run along back streets or cut through self-contained urban areas.

QUOTA AND ENROLMENT

Over the years, I have noticed that different individuals and submissions place different weighting on the quota requirements. Some submissions seem to place an extremely high emphasis on having each Division as close to quota as possible, whereas others make full use of the tolerance.

I personally tend to be in the latter camp. I believe that the tolerance exists for a reason, and that Divisions should be allowed maximum flexibility within that tolerance if it means creating a stronger and clearer boundary. I am always happy to go further than strictly necessary for quota if it results in a better boundary.

PROPOSED BOUNDARIES

DURACK

Durack needs to lose around 5000 – 10,000 electors to come back within tolerance. The Division is the main northern rural seat in WA, so it makes sense to lose at its southern end.

I suggest an obvious starting point is to lose its share of Swan LGA. This is essentially a Perth-based council, and it makes sense for all of it to be placed in urban seats rather than a rural one. Around 4300 electors around Bullsbrook are transferred to the Division of Hasluck.

This still leaves Durack over quota, so I suggest all of York LGA be transferred to the Division of O'Connor. York fits well with Beverley and other communities along the Great Southern Highway, as well as eastwards to some of the more remote Wheatbelt towns currently in O'Connor.

Ideally, Northam would be transferred as well, giving its strong links with the rest of the Avon Valley, but this is not currently possible without Durack falling outside quota. Perhaps at the next redistribution, all of Northam, York and Beverley can be united in O'Connor (or Durack).

DURACK		Current	Projected
Existing		123,278	130,980
- Bullsbrook SA2 (all)	To Hasluck	4102	4308
- Avon Valley NP (all)	To Hasluck	5	5
- Walyunga NP (all)	To Hasluck	1	1
- York – Beverley SA2 (all)	To O'Connor	2927	3129
		116,243	123,537

O'CONNOR

With the gain of York LGA, the Division of O'Connor now needs to lose electors. Practically, this can only happen at its south-western end.

I suggest that O'Connor lose two LGAs:

- 1) All of Collie LGA to the Division of Forrest. This makes enormous sense, as Collie has very strong links with Bunbury, and there has been a lot of commentary at previous state and federal redistributions that Collie's community of interest lies to its west rather than to its east.

- 2) All of Boddington LGA to the Division of Canning. This LGA has previously been within Canning, and fits quite well with the rural parts of Murray and the Mandurah hinterland.

These changes leave O'Connor within tolerance, with no significant change to its existing character.

O'CONNOR		Current	Projected
Existing		120,803	128,787
+ York – Beverley SA2 (all)	From Durack	2927	3129
- Collie SA2 (all)	To Forrest	6749	7096
- Murray SA2 (balance)	To Canning	1222	1263
		115,759	123,557

FORREST

Forrest can in turn shed the rural parts of Harvey LGA to the Division of Canning. This includes Harvey itself and surrounding communities such as Brunswick, Binningup, Myalup and Yarloop.

I think this is the best approach, as it allows Leschenault and Australind to remain in the same Division as Bunbury. These areas are essentially suburban or satellite communities of Bunbury, and it makes sense to keep them in the same seat.

With this change, virtually all of Greater Bunbury remains united in Forrest, along with Collie, Busselton, and the Margaret River region.

FORREST		Current	Projected
Existing		116,614	124,708
+ Collie SA2 (all)	From O'Connor	6749	7096
- Harvey SA2 (all)	To Canning	6924	7482
		116,439	124,322

BRAND

Before considering how to draw the boundaries of Canning, I first decided to work out the arrangement for the Division of Brand.

I suggest making no changes to the southern boundary at Singleton – which is essentially the boundary between ‘Perth’ and ‘Mandurah’ – or to the northern boundary which runs through industrial/commercial areas and open space. Therefore, the only practical change is to the east.

I recommend making greater use of the Kwinana Freeway as the new eastern boundary, transferring Wandi, Casuarina, Anktell, and those parts of Wellard and Baldivis that lie east of the Freeway, to the Division of Canning. The freeway makes a clear boundary in the area, and there are several significant roads providing east-west links to the remainder of Canning.

Brand remains a Division based clearly on Kwinana and Rockingham LGAs.

BRAND		Current	Projected
Existing		122,608	130,547
- Casuarina – Wandi SA 2 (east of Fwy)	To Canning	5399	5771
- Baldivis North SA2 (east of Fwy)	To Canning	595	648
		116,614	124,128

CANNING

Canning is one of the Divisions that will undergo a more significant redraw to allow for the creation of a new Division. So far, it has gained around 15,000 electors from O’Connor, Forrest, and Brand, and needs to make significant losses.

I suggest the obvious transfer is Canning’s north-eastern ‘tail’ in Armadale, Gosnells, and Kalamunda LGAs. I propose that all of this area be transferred to the new Division. This includes Martin, Roleystone, Mount Richon, and Bedforddale. Some of this area is quite disconnected from the remainder of Canning, and would fit better in an eastern Perth Division.

This still leaves Canning over quota, so I suggest that Byford, Darling Downs, and Karrakup also be removed. While this does split Serpentine-Jarrahdale LGA, the Byford area is more urbanized than the remainder of the Shire, and again I think it fits better in a more urban Perth-based seat.

These changes leave Canning as a more provincial/semi-rural Division, losing most of its more urbanized Perth component, and focusing more clearly on Mandurah and surrounds.

CANNING		Current	Projected
Existing		119,832	128,424
+ Casuarina – Wandi SA 2 (east of Fwy)	From Brand	5399	5771
+ Baldivis North SA2 (east of Fwy)	From Brand	595	648
+ Harvey SA2 (all)	From Forrest	6924	7482
+ Murray SA2 (balance)	From O'Connor	1222	1263
- Lesmurdie SA2 (balance)	To New Seat	985	1024
- Maddington – Orange Grove – Martin SA2 (balance)	To New Seat	540	587
- Roleystone SA2 (all)	To New Seat	5550	5794
- Mt Nasura – Mt Richon – Bedfordale SA2 (all in Canning)	To New Seat	3801	4135
- Ashenton – Lesley SA2 (all)	To New Seat	1	1
- Byford SA2 (all)	To New Seat	13,435	14,145
- Mundijong SA2 (suburb of Karrakup)	To New Seat	199	165
		109,461	117,737

FREMANTLE

Fremantle is another Division that is geographically constrained, and can realistically only lose electors to the east.

I have experimented with a few arrangements where Fremantle loses territory east of the Kwinana Freeway (Jandakot and/or Antwell), since this seems like an obvious deletion, but I was not able to find an easy way to do this. Either Tangney would need to adopt an awkward T-shape, or Canning Vale would need to be split between multiple seats.

Instead, I suggest transferring all of Palmyra, O'Connor, Samson, and the balance of Kardinya to the Division of Tangney. The new north-eastern boundary would continue along Petra Street, then follow Carrington Road, South Street, Stock Road, and Winterfold Road. This unites Palmyra with Bicton, and all of Kardinya with Murdoch, and would also unite Melville LGA in a single Division.

Note that my proposed boundary is very similar to the existing eastern boundary for the state seat of Fremantle. So I think there would be some precedent and familiarity for locals in having virtually the same arrangement at both state and federal level.

FREMANTLE		Current	Projected
Existing		120,007	129,429
- Bicton – Palmyra SA2 (balance)	To Tangney	5581	6073
- Murdoch – Kardinya SA2 (balance)	To Tangney	2460	2676
- Fremantle South SA2 (east of Stock Rd and north of South St)	To Tangney	2493	2695
- O'Connor SA2 (all)	To Tangney	7	5
		109,466	117,980

TANGNEY

There are a couple of issues with the existing boundaries of Tangney:

- The rather ragged western boundary with Fremantle
- Including areas on the eastern bank of the Canning River (Wilson)
- Excluding areas on the western bank of the Canning River (Langford)
- Extending right across the Roe Highway and industrial areas to include Canning Vale

My proposed changes to Fremantle address the first issue. I suggest the new boundaries be drawn to address the other three.

Firstly, I suggest all of Canning Vale be transferred to the Division of Burt. Canning Vale has previously been in Burt, or in other Divisions with Gosnells and Armadale. This also allows the use of the Roe Highway and the unpopulated Canning Vale industrial estate as a clear southern boundary in the area.

This brings Tangney within quota, and could be done in isolation. However, I think it makes enormous sense to use the Canning River as a clearer and more obvious eastern boundary for Tangney. Therefore I suggest:

- 1) Gaining Langford from the Division of Burt. This allows further use of the Roe Highway in the area.

- 2) Transferring Wilson back to the Division of Swan, where it fits better with South Perth, Bentley, and surrounds.

Tangney becomes more focused on the triangle of suburbs between the Swan River, Canning River and Roe Highway.

TANGNEY		Current	Projected
Existing		122,930	132,721
+ Bicton – Palmyra SA2 (balance)	From Fremantle	5581	6073
+ Murdoch – Kardinya SA2 (balance)	From Fremantle	2460	2676
+ Fremantle South SA2 (east of Stock Rd and north of South St)	From Fremantle	2493	2695
+ O'Connor SA2 (all)	From Fremantle	7	5
+ Beckenham – Kenwick – Langford SA2 (Langford)	From Burt	3426	3688
- Canning Vale East SA2 (all)	To Burt	13,799	14,997
- Canning Vale West SA2 (all)	To Burt	6613	7142
- Canning Vale Commercial SA2 (all)	To Burt	2	2
- Bentley – Wilson – St James SA2 (balance)	To Swan	3913	4259
		112,570	121,458

SWAN

As with Tangney, I suggest that the Division of Swan's boundaries be more aligned to the Swan and Canning Rivers and the Roe Highway.

In addition to re-gaining Wilson from Tangney, I suggest that Beckenham be transferred from the Division of Burt. Beckenham has previously been in Swan, lies east of the Canning River and north of the Roe Highway, and fits well with suburbs such as Cannington and Queens Park.

I also suggest that Hazelmere and South Guildford be added from the Division of Hasluck. These suburbs also lie between the Swan River and Roe Highway, and fit well with Belmont and Ascot that are currently in Swan.

These gains allow Swan to shed everything east of Perth Airport to the new seat. This includes all of Forrestfield, Wattle Grove, Maida Vale and High Wycombe. The airport makes a strong eastern boundary for Swan, and all of these suburbs would fit well in an eastern ‘foothills’ based Division.

SWAN		Current	Projected
Existing		122,417	131,984
+ Bentley – Wilson – St James SA2 (balance)	From Tangney	3913	4259
+ Beckenham – Kenwick – Langford SA2 (Beckenham)	From Burt	5305	5774
+ Hazelmere SA2 (west of Roe Highway)	From Hasluck	3339	3633
- Forrestfield – Wattle Grove SA2 (all)	To New Seat	13,335	14,506
- High Wycombe SA2 (all)	To New Seat	8699	9464
- Kalamunda – Maida Vale – Gooseberry Hill SA2 (balance)	To New Seat	3446	3614
		109,494	118,066

BURT

The exchanges with Tangney and Swan leave the Roe Highway as the northern boundary of Burt. In my opinion, this is the clearest boundary in the area; the Roe Highway is a major road that is surrounded by industrial areas for large parts of its length.

I suggest that all of Kenwick, Maddington, Orange Grove and Martin be removed and transferred to the new seat. These areas all lie north of the Canning River, so their transfer would allow the use of the river in this area as the boundary.

Burt remains very clearly focused on Gosnells, Armadale, and surrounding areas.

BURT		Current	Projected
Existing		116,852	125,827
+ Canning Vale East SA2 (all)	From Tangney	13,799	14,997
+ Canning Vale West SA2 (all)	From Tangney	6613	7142

+ Canning Vale Commercial SA2 (all)	From Tangney	2	2
- Beckenham – Kenwick – Langford SA2 (Langford)	To Tangney	3426	3688
- Beckenham – Kenwick – Langford SA2 (Beckenham)	To Swan	5305	5774
- Beckenham – Kenwick – Langford SA2 (Kenwick)	To New Seat	3543	3852
- Maddington – Orange Grove – Martin SA2	To New Seat	9113	9904
		115,879	124,750

NEW SEAT

I am proposing the creation of a new seat containing:

- All of Canning’s share of Kalamunda, Gosnells, and Armadale LGAs, as well as Byford and Karrakup. This area is somewhat disconnected from the bulk of Canning to the south.
- Orange Grove, Maddington, Martin, and Kenwick from the Division of Burt. This allows greater use of the Canning River as boundary.
- All of Swan that lies east of Perth Airport and the Roe Highway – Forrestfield, Wattle Grove, Maida Vale, and High Wycombe. These suburbs fit better with other foothills suburbs to the east than to the rest of Swan.
- All of Hasluck’s share of Kalamunda and Mundaring LGAs, east of the Roe Highway. This includes Kalamunda, Mundaring, Chidlow, Darlington, Greenmount, Helena Valley, and most of Swan View. I feel that most of this area fits better with similar foothills and mountain communities to the south and east, than with Midland or Ellenbrook to the north and west.

This would be a coherent Division with a strong community of interest, based clearly on Mundaring and Kalamunda LGAs, plus the more semi-rural parts of Gosnells and Armadale. These areas have previously been linked in older versions of Hasluck and Pearce, and generally fit well together. This arrangement also allows for more sensible and logical boundaries in surrounding seats.

NEW SEAT		Current	Projected
Existing		N/A	N/A
+ Lesmurdie SA2 (part in Canning)	From Canning	985	1024
+ Maddington – Orange Grove – Martin SA2 (balance)	From Canning	540	587
+ Roleystone SA2 (all)	From Canning	5550	5794
+ Mt Nasura – Mt Richon – Bedforddale SA2 (all in Canning)	From Canning	3801	4135
+ Ashenton – Lesley SA2 (all)	From Canning	1	1
+ Byford SA2 (all)	From Canning	13,435	14,145
+ Mundijong SA2 (suburb of Karrakup)	From Canning	199	165
+ Beckenham – Kenwick – Langford SA2 (Kenwick)	From Burt	3543	3852
+ Maddington – Orange Grove – Martin SA2	From Burt	9113	9904
+ Forrestfield – Wattle Grove SA2 (all)	From Swan	13,335	14,506
+ High Wycombe SA2 (all)	From Swan	8699	9464
+ Kalamunda – Maida Vale – Gooseberry Hill SA2 (in Swan)	From Swan	3446	3614
+ Lesmurdie SA2 (part in Hasluck)	From Hasluck	7632	7958
+ Kalamunda – Maida Vale – Gooseberry Hill SA2 (in Hasluck)	From Hasluck	8338	8776
+ Chidlow SA2 (all)	From Hasluck	2350	2302
+ Mundaring SA2 (all)	From Hasluck	10,094	10,634
+ Malmalling SA2 (all)	From Hasluck	9	7
+ Glen Forrest – Darlington SA2 (all)	From Hasluck	5470	5642
+ Helena Valley SA2 (all)	From Hasluck	4489	4878

+ Hazelmere SA2 (east of Roe Highway)	From Hasluck	817	889
+ Swan View – Greenmount – Midvale SA2 (east of Hwy, sth of LGA boundary)	From Hasluck	6846	7449
+ Midland SA2 (east of Hwy)	From Hasluck	1140	1240
+ Gidgegannup SA2 (all)	From Hasluck	2353	2457
		112,185	119,423

HASLUCK

For most of its history, Hasluck has been a seat consisting of multiple parts, combining elements of both outer suburban Perth and semi-rural communities. Originally it contained Midland and Gosnells, and more recently it has combined Midland with the Darling Scarp suburbs as well as Ellenbrook. With the losses to the New Seat, Hasluck can now consolidate as a purely urban seat covering the outer north-east.

I propose that Hasluck gain:

- Everything east of the Tonkin Highway, from both Perth and Canning. This includes Beechboro, Lockridge, Kiara, Eden Park, Bassendean, and part of Morley.
- All of Ballajura plus Malaga, from the Division of Canning.
- Bullsbrook and surrounds, from the Division of Durack (previously described).

This focuses Hasluck much more clearly on both Swan and Bassendean LGAs, and uses Tonkin Highway, Reid Highway, and Alexander Drive as a very strong new western boundary. I feel that all of these areas fit well with Guildford and Midland; the Reid Highway, Benara Road, and Guilford Road would all be strong east-west links back to communities in the existing Hasluck.

At previous redistributions, there has been some objection to the boundaries around the Beechboro area. I feel my proposals will improve the arrangement, by uniting all of this area in a single seat, and adopting a stronger and straighter boundary.

HASLUCK		Current	Projected
Existing		122,855	130,773
+ Bullsbrook SA2 (all)	From Durack	4102	4308
+ Avon Valley NP (all)	From Durack	5	5
+ Walyunga NP (all)	From Durack	1	1
+ Beechboro SA2 (balance)	From Cowan	6366	6909
+ Lockridge – Kiara SA2 (all)	From Cowan	3671	3984
+ Morley SA2 (east of Tonkin Highway)	From Cowan	4560	4964
+ Ballajura SA2 (all)	From Cowan	13,109	13,756
+ Malaga SA2 (all)	From Cowan	5	6
+ Bassendean SA2 (all)	From Perth	11,693	12,690
+ Morley SA2 (east of Tonkin Highway)	From Perth	977	1063
+ Bayswater SA2 (east of Tonkin Hwy)	From Perth	1753	1893
- Lesmurdie SA2 (part in Hasluck)	To New Seat	7632	7958
- Kalamunda – Maida Vale – Gooseberry Hill SA2 (in Hasluck)	To New Seat	8338	8776
- Chidlow SA2 (all)	To New Seat	2350	2302
- Mundaring SA2 (all)	To New Seat	10,094	10,634
- Malmalling SA2 (all)	To New Seat	9	7
- Glen Forrest – Darlington SA2 (all)	To New Seat	5470	5642
- Helena Valley SA2 (all)	To New Seat	4489	4878
- Hazelmere SA2 (east of Roe Highway)	To New Seat	817	889
- Swan View – Greenmount – Midvale SA2 (east of Hwy, sth of LGA boundary)	To New Seat	6846	7449
- Midland SA2 (east of Hwy)	To New Seat	1140	1240
- Gidgegannup SA2 (all)	To New Seat	2353	2457

- Hazelmere SA2 (west of Roe Highway)	To Swan	3339	3633
		116,220	124,487

PERTH

With the losses to Hasluck, the Division of Perth only needs to make minor gains to come back within tolerance.

I suggest aligning the northern boundary of Perth to run completely along the Reid Highway, transferring the remaining small part of Cowan that lies south of the highway. This involves around 4300 electors in the suburbs of Osborne Park and Stirling.

Perth remains a Division based clearly on the CBD and inner north/east suburbs, with a set of very strong boundaries along major highways and freeways plus the Swan River.

PERTH		Current	Projected
Existing		123,454	132,518
+ Stirling – Osborne Park SA2 (south of Reid Highway)	From Cowan	3989	4342
- Bassendean SA2 (all)	To Hasluck	11,693	12,690
- Morley SA2 (east of Tonkin Highway)	To Hasluck	977	1063
- Bayswater SA2 (east of Tonkin Hwy)	To Hasluck	1753	1893
		113,020	121,214

CURTIN

Assuming no changes with Perth, the only way the Division of Curtin can lose electors is by retreating in the north.

I suggest a very logical new northern boundary is Karrinyup Road. This transfers the remaining parts of Gwelup plus most of Karrinyup to the Division of Moore, and straightens the existing dog-leg in the current boundary.

CURTIN		Current	Projected
Existing		120,661	130,733
- Karrinyup – Gwelup – Carine SA2 (north of Karrinyup Road)	To Moore	6212	6736
		114,449	123,997

COWAN

The losses to Hasluck and Perth have left the Division of Cowan around 20,000 electors below tolerance. Its eastern and southern boundaries have already been determined, so the only options for gains are in the north or west.

There is a case to transfer Kingsley and Woodvale to this Division, since these areas have previously been in Cowan, and there was some objection to their removal at an earlier redistribution. In isolation, this change works, but I was then unable to find a good boundary between Moore and Pearce.

I suggest instead that all of Madeley, Darch, Lansdale, and Wangara be transferred, moving the northern boundary to Ocean Reef Road. This arrangement allows the use of the unpopulated industrial/commercial areas of Wangara as a clear divide between Cowan and Pearce, and Ocean Reef Road is a significant road.

COWAN		Current	Projected
Existing		124,073	132,834
+ Lansdale SA2 (all)	From Pearce	10,299	10,668
+ Madeley – Darch SA2 (all)	From Pearce	9498	10,320
- Beechboro SA2 (balance)	To Hasluck	6366	6909
- Lockridge – Kiara SA2 (all)	To Hasluck	3671	3984

- Morley SA2 (east of Tonkin Highway)	To Hasluck	4560	4964
- Ballajura SA2 (all)	To Hasluck	13,109	13,756
- Malaga SA2 (all)	To Hasluck	5	6
- Stirling – Osborne Park SA2 (south of Reid Highway)	To Perth	3989	4342
		112,175	119,867

PEARCE

Pearce loses over 20,000 electors to Cowan and needs to make gains. Since the boundaries of Cowan, Hasluck, and Durack have been established, the only Division that Pearce can gain from is Moore.

I suggest that all of Burns Beach, Iluka, and Kinross be added to this seat. These are the northernmost suburbs of Moore, so I feel they are the best fit with Mindarie and the coastal suburbs further north. Marmion Avenue, the Mitchell Freeway, and Burns Beach Road would provide good links to the north and east, to the other parts of Pearce.

PEARCE		Current	Projected
Existing		119,233	128,436
+ Iluka – Burns Beach SA2 (all)	From Moore	7267	7606
+ Currambine – Kinross SA2 (Kinross only)	From Moore	4855	5088
- Lansdale SA2 (all)	To Cowan	10,299	10,668
- Madeley – Darch SA2 (all)	To Cowan	9498	10,320
		111,558	120,142

MOORE

The changes to Moore bring the Division back within tolerance. It loses around 12,500 electors in the north to the Division of Pearce, but gains around 7,000 electors in the south from the Division of Curtin.

Moore remains clearly a northern suburban coastal seat, based on Joondalup and Stirling LGAs

MOORE		Current	Projected
Existing		120,509	127,144
+ Karrinyup – Gwelup – Carine SA2 (north of Karrinyup Road)	From Curtin	6212	6736
- Iluka – Burns Beach SA2 (all)	To Pearce	7267	7606
- Currambine – Kinross SA2 (Kinross only)	To Pearce	4855	5088
		114,599	121,186