



Suggestion 208

Australian Labor Party (South Australian Branch)

8 pages

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, 1 December 2017 4:13 PM
To: FedRedistribution - SA
Subject: [SA REDISTRIBUTION SUGGESTIONS] Reggie Martin *WWW* [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]
Attachments: vic-Reggie Martin-.pdf

South Australian Redistribution suggestion uploaded from the AEC website.

Name: Reggie Martin

Organisation: ALP SA Branch

Address: [REDACTED]

Phone number: [REDACTED]

Additional information: Please find attached the ALP South Australian Branch submission.

SUBMISSION TO THE REDISTRIBUTION COMMITTEE FOR SOUTH AUSTRALIA

BY THE

AUSTRALIAN LABOR PARTY (SOUTH AUSTRALIAN BRANCH)

The Redistribution Committee for South Australia is charged with proposing ten electoral divisions for the state in this current redistribution, a reduction of one. In doing so, the Australian Labor Party believes that the Commission must begin by recognising the fundamental character of the population distribution across South Australia as a whole. Unlike many other states, an overwhelming proportion of the population is located within the urban growth boundary of metropolitan Adelaide. The Australian Labor Party submits this boundary should largely limit the construction of divisions that contain a mixture of urban fringes and rural towns and land. Therefore, the Commission should propose ten electoral divisions of the following character: three rural and seven metropolitan.

The Australian Labor Party acknowledges the criteria for conducting the redistribution in subsections (2), (3) and (4) of section 66 of the *Commonwealth Electoral Act* 1918. In making this submission, the Australian Labor Party has first considered the desirable movements in order to achieve the population targets that the Commission must address, followed by the other criteria established by legislation.

In choosing the location of new boundaries for electoral divisions and following the criteria, the Australian Labor Party submits that the Commission pay particular attention to boundaries of local government areas, the location of division boundaries in the past, and major roads. In doing so, the Australian Labor Party believes the Commission will be able to fulfil the requirements of communities of interest, means of communication and travel, physical features and, where possible, adherence to the boundaries of existing divisions.

Given the need to conduct the redistribution in a way that results in a reduction in the number of divisions by one, there will naturally be the need for a greater number of boundary movements than was the case in the last redistribution of South Australia, when there was no change in the number of divisions. However, the Australian Labor Party believes the necessary changes can be made whilst maintaining the integrity of most existing divisions to a large degree.

The Australian Labor Party further submits that the key convergence of seats is located in the metropolitan area in an arc fanning out from the central business district of Adelaide to the north-western suburbs and around to the eastern suburbs, incorporating the divisions of Adelaide, Port Adelaide, Makin, Sturt and Wakefield. As outlined in this submission, it is from these divisions that the required reduction in the number of divisions in South Australia from eleven to ten be achieved.

Grey and Barker

The Australian Labor Party submits that Grey and Barker, which extend to the State's borders, are of a rural character and should be drawn with this in mind. The submission below submits that following the redistribution, Grey, Barker and Mayo will be South Australia's three rural seats.

In order to achieve the appropriate enrolment targets, there are two options for the divisions of Grey and Barker with associated flow-on effects to Mayo.

As the seat that encompasses the greatest land area of the State, Grey could extend further south through the Adelaide Plains to encompass a large portion of the rural districts currently located in the division of Wakefield. This could include all of the Wakefield, Clare and Gilbert Valleys, Adelaide Plains and Light local government areas, to the extent that this is necessary, taking into account population growth on the fringes of these areas and achieving the required enrolment balance between Grey and neighbouring electoral divisions.

In this scenario, Barker would continue to incorporate the South East and the Riverland and would principally achieve growth in numbers by incorporating the whole of the Barossa local government area. This would be consistent with the previously expressed desire of that local government to be located within one division. Further increase could come from Mayo as deemed appropriate by the Commission.

Alternatively, Grey could subsume the Riverland from Barker. As a consequence, it would not extend south through the Adelaide Plains. The southern boundary through the Riverland could largely be based on the southern boundary of the former electoral division of Wakefield before the 2003 redistribution. In order to compensate for the loss of the Riverland, Barker would gain the Fleurieu Peninsula from Mayo, principally the Alexandrina, Kangaroo Island, Victor Harbor and Yankalilla local government areas.

Once the Commission decides how to draw the boundaries to achieve the required enrolment targets for Grey and Barker, noting the different options that exist for it to do this, it can address the division of Mayo.

Mayo

Depending on how the Commission adjusts the boundaries of Grey and Barker, there will be different associated changes to Mayo. In either scenario, Mayo remains an electoral division anchored in the Mount Lofty Ranges on the Adelaide Hills and Mount Barker local government areas but gains from either the south or the north to meet the required enrolment tolerances.

In a scenario where the boundary of Grey moves south to encompass the Adelaide Plains and Barker retains the Riverland, in order to achieve the requirements for enrolment and to compensate for the loss of some areas to Barker, particularly the Barossa, it will be necessary for Mayo to gain electors in its south. Noting that Mayo already incorporates the largely rural portions of the Onkaparinga local government area, the Australian Labor Party submits that a division along the line of the east-west boundary between Moana and Seaford Rise and Maslin Beach could be appropriate and that Mayo absorb those areas south of that line that are currently located in the electoral division of Kingston. There is also potential to gain from the fringes of Boothby or Sturt if required, or Makin further to the north.

In the alternative scenario, in which Grey subsumes the Riverland and Barker gains the Alexandrina, Kangaroo Island, Victor Harbor and Yankalilla local government areas, Mayo would need to find additional electors to its north. This could be done by incorporating the Barossa local government area into Mayo rather than Barker, consistent with the previously expressed desire of that local government to be located within one division, as well as a large portion of the rural districts currently located in the division of Wakefield.

This could include all of the Wakefield, Clare and Gilbert Valleys, Adelaide Plains and Light local government areas, to the extent that this is necessary.

Kingston

Once the necessary adjustments are made to the three rural divisions of Grey, Barker and Mayo, attention turns to the metropolitan electoral divisions. The Australian Labor Party submits that in keeping with the Commission's legislative mandate to draw boundaries bearing in mind communities of interest, means of communication and travel, physical features and the boundaries of existing divisions, the aim of the redistribution should be to minimise divisions that incorporate a mixture of rural and metropolitan areas, such as is currently the case in the division of Wakefield.

The electoral divisions of Kingston, Boothby and Hindmarsh encompass Adelaide's southern and western suburbs and the Australian Labor Party submits that Kingston is a natural place to start the redistribution of metropolitan seats. Kingston is a division strongly embedded in the southern suburbs of Adelaide. The Commission can achieve its objectives whilst maintaining the existing division of Kingston largely intact, particularly given the growth areas located within the division and enrolment projections based on the current boundaries.

In order to compensate for the potential loss of some peri-rural areas in its south to Mayo if the latter division retains the Fleurieu Peninsula within its boundaries, and to meet the requirements for enrolment, Kingston could absorb remaining suburban areas of the Onkaparinga local government area that are currently located in Boothby, principally around the suburbs of Aberfoyle Park and Happy Valley. In addition to the boundary of the local government area, there is a natural boundary along Black Road. If there is no need for Mayo to absorb peri-rural areas in the south of Kingston, then Kingston can still gain electors from Boothby from a similar area if required.

There is potential for population growth that exists in Kingston on the projected figures provided by the Commission which means it is largely unnecessary to make significant changes to the existing boundaries of the division, and notes the existing northern boundary along Majors Road and between the suburbs of Marino and Hallett Cove is a strong one.

Boothby and Hindmarsh

Loosing electors in its south to Kingston, Boothby would then be in a position to gain further electors to its north, who share a greater common interest with electors in the adjoining Mitcham local government area. Historically, Boothby has extended further north than its current Cross Road boundary. Changes could include incorporating those portions of the Unley local government area that are currently in Sturt into Boothby, as they have been previously, as well as the whole of the suburbs in the Burnside local government area that are currently located within Sturt. In particular, there is a significant degree of economic, social and regional interest between these communities and others in Boothby.

With Boothby growing to its north-eastern boundary, the Commission can move up the Gulf St Vincent coast in a clockwise direction around the division of Adelaide, with Hindmarsh needing to continue north in order to gain electors. This would be best achieved by extending its Grange Road boundary towards or up to Port Road, gaining electors from the electoral division of Port Adelaide. This would be consistent with past

boundaries of the division and in particular, would result in the reunification of a number of suburbs along the Grange Road boundary that are currently divided between electoral divisions by that road and consolidation of a greater portion of the Charles Sturt local government area in the electoral division of Hindmarsh

In order to create an electorate that is squarer and less stretched along the coastline to the north, the suburbs of West Lakes, West Lakes Shore and Semaphore Park could be returned to the division of Port Adelaide. This would ensure Hindmarsh remains a seat that is centred on the community interests of the western suburbs, including as the only federal division in Australia that wholly contains the major capital city airport.

Port Adelaide and Wakefield

Following on from other adjustments, the Australian Labor Party submits that the electoral divisions stretching from the north-western to the eastern suburbs can be redistributed to allow for the loss of one electoral division.

The division of Port Adelaide already retains a high number of electors, the highest in South Australia, and so minimal change is needed beyond those already outlined to effect changes to other electoral divisions. Having lost suburbs to the west of Port Road to Hindmarsh, in addition to gaining some areas around West Lakes from Hindmarsh, Port Adelaide could regain the suburb of Mawson Lakes and other areas to the west of Main North Road from Makin.

The electoral division of Wakefield will be most significantly affected by the need to redistribute its northern rural portions. Depending on the approach the Commission takes to the three rural seats, this will result in the loss of the northern rural portions that encompass local government areas including Wakefield, Clare and Gilbert Valleys, Adelaide Plains, Light and Barossa into the divisions of Grey, Mayo and Barker, in order to ensure those rural seats are able to meet the enrolment targets.

This will make Wakefield a predominantly metropolitan seat. This is consistent with the legislative objectives the Commission is required to follow. Bearing in mind the urban growth boundary, the Australian Labor Party submits the northern boundary of the Gawler local government area is the most appropriate northern boundary for this division, with Gulf St Vincent forming a natural boundary on the western side. The extent of Wakefield's southern and eastern boundaries will be determined by associated movements in the boundaries of the divisions of Port Adelaide and Makin. It is noted that Wakefield already contains the second-highest number of electors of any South Australian electoral division, after Port Adelaide, and also has strong prospects for growth.

Adelaide, Makin and Sturt

Historically, the division of Hawker, located in the south-western suburbs, and Bonython, located in the northern suburbs, have been abolished since 1990 as the number of divisions in South Australia reduced to twelve and then eleven. Bearing this in mind, the Australian Labor Party submits it is appropriate and natural to look to Adelaide's east in order to achieve the necessary further reduction in the number of divisions to ten.

Along with the ceding of areas along its western boundary to Port Adelaide, the division of Makin may lose electors along this side to Wakefield, to compensate with the loss of electors in Wakefield to the rural divisions. In particular, this could include some suburbs

currently located within the Salisbury local government area. There is also the potential to yield peri-rural districts suburbs located on the northern boundary to Barker or Mayo if required.

Recognising Makin is already a seat with strong communities of interest, arguably at least as strong as those of any other division, these movements would allow Makin to consolidate around the Tea Tree Gully local government area by moving south into Sturt at least as far as the River Torrens to incorporate the whole of that local government area. Tea Tree Gully is one of South Australia's oldest local government areas, having been founded in the 1850s. Further gains could be required and if so, could come from the Campbelltown local government area.

With minimal or no change required to its northern, southern or western boundaries, the division of Adelaide could gain electors on its eastern side, particularly by incorporating greater portions of the Port Adelaide-Enfield and Norwood, Payneham and St Peters local government areas.

With the existing electoral division of Sturt having been absorbed into divisions to its north, west and south, it will have effectively been abolished. Accordingly, with significant boundary changes across the eastern and north-eastern suburbs, it is submitted that the name Sturt is the best candidate for abolition, as is further elaborated on below.

Naming of electoral divisions

The electoral divisions in South Australia can be clearly divided into three categories on the basis of names: federation names, names first applied in 1949 and names first applied in 1984.

Adelaide, Barker, Boothby, Grey, Hindmarsh, Wakefield

The divisions of Adelaide, Barker, Boothby, Grey, Hindmarsh and Wakefield represent the federation names in South Australia. All names were used at the first Commonwealth election in which South Australia was divided into electoral divisions in 1903, with the 1901 election having been contested on a state-wide basis.

The Australian Labor Party submits that all six federation names should be retained. In doing so, the Australian Labor Party recognises that with the reduction of the number of electoral divisions in South Australia, it may be necessary to allocate one of the federation names to a division of a substantially different character than the one it currently belongs to. There is precedent for this, with the division known as Wakefield following the 2003 redistribution being substantially different from the division of the same name prior to the redistribution. However, under the Australian Labor Party's submission this should not be necessary as existing divisions with federation names would largely retain their current character.

Kingston, Port Adelaide and Sturt

Of the three names first applied in 1949, it is submitted that Kingston has the most compelling case for retention. The division is named for a substantial figure in South Australian and federation history, Charles Cameron Kingston, who in addition to being leading proponent of and extensive contributor to federation was Premier of South

Australia, elected to the first House of Representatives and the first federal member of the division of Adelaide.

Additionally, the name Kingston has strong associations with the southern suburbs that fall within the boundaries of the division, in particular through the South Adelaide Football Club. Charles Cameron Kingston led a playing group to form the club in 1876, played in the first South Australian football premiership in 1877 and variously served as the club's secretary, association delegate, club chairman and president until his death in 1908. He was the club's first life member. The "Kingstonians" is the name given by the club to the group of members who contribute financially and provide business support and networking to assist the current crop of South Adelaide players and the broader football community.

The name Port Adelaide has a clear geographical connection with the Port Adelaide and Le Fevre Peninsula. The Australian Labor Party supports the continuation of this name if the current division is retained largely in its existing form.

The name Sturt derives from Captain Charles Sturt, most associated with being the first European to chart the River Murray. Whilst Captain Charles Sturt's status as an individual worthy of recognition is not in dispute, and indeed is appropriately reflected in many other places, it has limited links to the area currently covered by the division that carries the name and this creates possible confusion with electors. Not only is there no direct connection with the River Murray in a division that covers the eastern and north-eastern suburbs of Adelaide, but the name is associated with a number of unconnected areas in metropolitan Adelaide and regional South Australia.

For example, the Sturt Football Club is based in Unley in the division of Adelaide and with a zone that includes the Adelaide Hills and the Murraylands in the divisions of Mayo and Barker. The Sturt District Cricket Club is based at Mitcham in the division of Boothby. The suburb of Sturt is located adjacent to the River Sturt in the division of Boothby. The Charles Sturt local government area is located in the north-western suburbs of Adelaide in the divisions of Port Adelaide and Hindmarsh. The Sturt Highway, one of South Australia's principal national highways, runs through the Riverland and down to Gawler, through the divisions of Barker and Wakefield. Of the numerous other avenues, roads and streets named Sturt, less than a handful are located within the division of the same name and are not major roads. For these reasons, given that the name of one electoral division will need to be discarded, Sturt is the obvious candidate to be discarded.

Makin and Mayo

Makin and Mayo are names that first came into use in 1984.

The Australian Labor Party supports the continuation of the name of Makin for the division that retains the majority of the Tea Tree Gully local government area. Consistent with submissions on the composition of divisions in the north-eastern suburbs of Adelaide, there is a reasonable case to retain the core of the current division which is sufficiently connected with a large portion of the existing division, and therefore it makes sense to retain the name of Makin for that electoral division.

Further, when Norman Makin, after which the division is named, was the member for Sturt, that seat incorporated large tracts of the northern and north-eastern suburbs. Coupled with the lack of connection between the name Sturt and the eastern and north-eastern suburbs today as has already been outlined, it is submitted that Makin is a division name worthy of

retention. Further, as has been demonstrated, Charles Sturt is memorialised in many other ways whilst Norman Makin does not have the same widespread recognition outside the boundaries of the current division that bears his name. Norman Makin was a distinguished, long-serving parliamentarian, who held office as a member of the House of Representatives from 1919 to 1946, and again from 1954 to 1963, including as a minister during World War Two and as speaker. Additionally, he was ambassador to the United States of America and was the first president of the United Nations Security Council.

Mayo is one of the few electoral divisions in Australia named after a woman, Helen Mayo. It is principally for this reason that the Australian Labor Party supports the continuation of this name, in addition to the belief that Mayo should remain substantially centred on the Mount Lofty Ranges and the Adelaide Hills and Mount Barker local government areas and will therefore retain a significant portion of its existing electors. Helen Mayo was a medical practitioner and social activist who is particularly associated with advancements in the care of mothers and infants. She was also the first woman elected to an Australian university council, at the University of Adelaide, from 1914 to 1960, a period of outstanding service.