



# Suggestion 1

Martin Gordon

6 pages

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Martin Gordon [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 1 November 2017 7:22 PM  
**To:** FedRedistribution - SA  
**Subject:** SA redistribution  
**Attachments:** SA 2017 redistribution.docx

Attached is a proposal for South Australia. Could you confirm receipt.

Regards

Martin Gordon

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Redistribution Committee for South Australia

The Committee,

I wish to make a submission for the redistribution of South Australia into 10 (down from 11) Divisions.

I propose that the Divisional name that be retired be Port Adelaide. This electorate is a newer Division name, not named after a Prime Minister, clashes with a State Electoral District name, is a qualifying name, is not a Federation name (or in the case of South Australia not a near Federation name). It is also not named after a woman, of whom there is a lack of seat names, in all states. As well the current Division, a great deal of which bares scant relation to the source of its name.

I discuss naming issues immediately below and also the details of the redistribution later on. I have adhered to the criteria for the redistribution in the order of precedence set out in the criteria. I have made extensive use of local government areas as building blocks for Divisions, and major natural and made made features.

At the time of making this submission I was regrettably out of the country and unable to more accurately calculate elector numbers, hence my redistribution is more narrative in approach.

**Naming**

The longest established existing names Grey, Barker, Adelaide, Wakefield, Hindmarsh, Boothby, can all be retained, and reflect significant figures in the history of the state. The name Adelaide, whilst primarily is named after the capital, but it is also named after a woman. The names of Sturt, Kingston, are long established and named after prominent explorers and political figures respectively. The newer names of Makin and Mayo should be retained, the first reflecting a significant prominent federal political figure from South Australia, and the second a prominent woman (and also her family, who were similarly prominent). The demographics of the state also allow for the retention of all of these names.

## **Description**

I will work through the logic of my submission with descriptions of each current and/or proposed Division.

**Grey** - This Division has existed since 1903, and has always been a large electorate, and of more recent times vast, and it should expand further south into the existing Wakefield. The inclusion of areas north of the Gawler River, north of the Gawler council area and follow the Light District Council southern boundary and then follow the current Barker Divisional boundary north around the Riverland.

These areas are of similar socio-economic and industry character and represent a continuation of adjacent areas of Grey.

**Barker** - This Division has also existed since 1903. Originally it stretched well into what is now the metropolitan area and included Glenelg. I propose that all of the Gawler Council and Barossa Council area be included in Barker from Wakefield and the portions of Mayo also in the Barossa Council area. The practical effect of this is to combine the vast bulk of the states wine growing areas into one Division, unite the Barossa Council in one Division (which has been the source of angst for a long time).

I propose that the Murray Bridge Council area west of the Murray River be transferred to Mayo from Barker. The effect of this is to restore a previous federal boundary that is well defined and effect the large shifts of Gawler and the Barossa Councils to one Division possible.

**Mayo** - The Division is named in honour of a prominent South Australian woman (a member of gifted academically and professionally prominent family of an earlier era). The current Division I propose shed electors to Kingston in the southern vales area, and I have proposed a transfer of electors around Murray Bridge from Barker to allow for a an expansion of Barker into the full Barossa Council and also Gawler Council areas. The incorporation of all the Barossa Council means a small loss of current Mayo electors to Barker.

The practical effect is to make Mayo a more Fleurieu Peninsula orientated Division and which is defined when first created by the eastern boundary of the Murray River.

## **Discussion - modest changes Kingston, Boothby Sturt and Makin**

The abolition of a Division, when it is one of eleven, by its very nature will have a significant impact. Changes of a relatively modest but logical nature can be made to Grey, Kingston, Makin and can be entirely in one direction. Even those for Boothby and Sturt are straight forward and are overwhelmingly in one direction.

It is possible to maintain the most southerly metropolitan Division of Kingston with a small one direction change from Mayo. I suspect that this change will be similar to other proposals. It is simple and preferable to other possible changes that would necessitate changes with Boothby and impacts with other Divisions, in turn. Kingston despite its current long thin coastal projection is well enough sited and populated to be the core of Kingston with a few more electors from Mayo, who until quite recently were in Kingston anyway.

Sturt can be maintained nearly entirely intact, with a largely one transfer from Adelaide. The suburbs on the east of the City of Adelaide have at various times over more than a century have been in Sturt (or Boothby before Sturt was created). Again a comparatively simple one way transfer from Adelaide involves minimal consequential impact elsewhere. The exchange with Boothby which I propose whilst this would involve an exchange of Eastwood with Myrtle Bank and Fullarton, it would follow the Council boundaries of Burnside and Unley, unlike now. It is a relatively well-defined eastern suburbs Division

Boothby can be maintained nearly entirely intact with the gain of electors from Adelaide. The exchange with Sturt which I propose whilst this would involve an exchange of Eastwood with Myrtle Bank and Fullarton, it would follow the Council boundaries of Burnside and Unley, unlike now. The exchange is modest, whilst changes to Hindmarsh are comparatively modest, and driven by numerical considerations. It is as now a relatively well-defined south eastern and south western suburbs Division.

Makin can be maintained entirely intact with a gain of electors from Wakefield. It is a relatively well-defined north eastern suburbs Division

**Kingston** - The Division came into existence for the 1949 election. Increasingly it has become a Division south of the O'Halloran Hill escarpment (and Majors Road). I propose to retain this boundary, noting that with its fast elector growth it requires little elector supplementation, which I propose involve the transfer of the southern vales from Mayo and the associated major centres of Willunga, McLaren Vale and McLaren Flat. That is, a reversal of the changes made in 2011.

Retaining Kingston principally where it is, avoids very significant changes to Divisions around it.

**Boothby** - the current Division is slow growing and requires significant electors. As with the neighboring Division of Sturt, I propose that areas around the City of Adelaide Council be restored to the adjoining suburban areas that make up Boothby and Sturt. Until the 1993 federal election

Boothby extended north to Greenhill Road, and Sturt largely followed Portrush Road and Dequetteville Terrace, Hackney Road and the River Torrens.

Including all of the Unley Council area in Boothby makes for a tidier boundary, running along Glen Osmond Road (with Sturt), Greenhill Road (with Adelaide), Anzac Highway and continuing along South Road between Anzac Highway and Cross Road (with Hindmarsh). Whilst this would involve an exchange with Sturt of Eastwood with Myrtle Bank and Fullarton, it would follow the Council boundaries of Burnside and Unley, unlike now.

**Sturt** - the current Division is slow growing and requires significant electors. As with the neighboring Division of Boothby, I propose that areas around the City of Adelaide Council be restored to the adjoining suburban areas that make up Boothby and Sturt. Until the 1993 federal election Boothby extended north to Greenhill Road and Sturt largely followed Portrush Road and Dequetteville Terrace, Hackney Road and the River Torrens.

Including all of the Burnside and Norwood Council areas in Sturt makes for a tidier boundary, running along Glen Osmond Road (with Boothby), Portrush Road and Dequetteville Terrace, Hackney Road and the River Torrens (with Adelaide). Whilst this would involve an exchange with Sturt of Eastwood with Myrtle Bank and Fullarton, it would follow the Council boundaries of Burnside and Unley, unlike now.

**Adelaide** - traditionally Adelaide has had as its most southerly part Greenhill Road (until 1993). I have proposed changes to it as it includes suburbs that have traditionally been in Boothby, Sturt, Port Adelaide, Hindmarsh, Bonython. By restoring suburbs currently in Adelaide to Boothby and Sturt it is possible to minimize changes to them, and other Divisions such as Kingston, Makin, and Hindmarsh.

I have proposed the transfer of all areas south of Greenhill Road and east of Portrush Road and Dequetteville Terrace, Hackney Road and the River Torrens to Boothby and Sturt. I believe sufficient electors in Boothby from the Holdfast Council area down to Sturt Road and its continuation along Beach Road to the sea.

I propose that the name Adelaide be maintained, notwithstanding that Adelaide will be significantly different to now. Adelaide already takes in large parts of the Councils of Charles Sturt, and also Port Adelaide-Enfield. By expanding Adelaide to take in all of Charles Sturt and Port Adelaide-Enfield (Currently in Port Adelaide) up to Grand Junction Road, would mean that Adelaide takes on a more north-westerly orientation, but this would include areas of similar socio-economic interest of Councils already within Adelaide and utilize rail and Road links to the north western suburbs.

**Hindmarsh** - This Division has existed since 1903 and has moved from the north western suburbs slightly south and westerly over time. In using Greenhill Road as a northerly boundary for Boothby, this would place Boothby slightly over quota. Accordingly I propose a modest change gaining electors around Brighton from the Holdfast Council area down to Sturt Road and its continuation along Beach Road to the sea. As well additional electors could be sourced within Port Adelaide in the area bounded by Frederick Road, Old Port Road, Tapleys Hill Road and West Lakes Boulevard.

**Makin** - As described above the existing Makin is a sound building block for for a Division in the north eastern suburbs. The existing easterly boundary follows a local government boundary, the southern boundary a major arterial Road Grand Junction Road, the western boundary essentially follows Port Wakefield Road, the western end of the Mawson Lakes post code, and the current boundary of Main North Road, the addition of areas such a s Hillbank, Craigmore and One Tree Hill from the Playford Council in Wakefield should bring sufficient numbers and create two parallel Divisions (with Wakefield) that have approximately equal populations.

**Wakefield - Port Adelaide** As discussed above I propose the retention of the name Wakefield in preference to Port Adelaide. In any event Wakefield is the longer established name and avoids the issues associated with the name Port Adelaide.

Wakefield as a Division would occupy all the areas north west of Bower Road and Grand Junction Road north along follows Port Wakefield Road, the western end of the Mawson Lakes post code, and the current boundary of Main North Road, the exclusion of areas such as Hillbank, Craigmore and One Tree Hill from the Playford Council in Wakefield should bring sufficient numbers and create two parallel Divisions (with Wakefield) that have approximately equal populations.

## **Conclusion**

The boundaries I have proposed have meant that the entirety of the existing Divisions of Grey, Makin, Kingston, Hindmarsh are entirely included in the new Divisions of the same name. In the case of Sturt, Boothby, Mayo and Barker the changes are relatively minor whilst those for Adelaide and Wakefield are more extensive due to the abolition of the Port Adelaide.

I wish the commissioners well in their deliberations.

Martin Gordon