



# Comment on suggestion 27

Australian Democrats (SA Division) Inc.

6 pages

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Paul Black [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, 15 December 2017 3:58 PM  
**To:** FedRedistribution - SA  
**Subject:** 1917/8 SA Redistribution - Comments on Suggestions  
**Attachments:** 171215 Letter to Redistribution Committee for South Australia.doc; 171208 Comments on Suggestions.doc

Good afternoon

I enclose a covering letter and Comments on Suggestions made by the Australian Democrats (SA Division) Inc.

I will forward a hard copy by post.

Kind Regards

Paul Black  
Barrister

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Telephone: [REDACTED] (w) & [REDACTED] (m)

Fax: [REDACTED]

E-mail: [REDACTED]

Liability limited by a scheme approved under Professional Standards legislation

18 December, 2017

**By E-mail:** [FedRedistribution-SA@aec.gov.au](mailto:FedRedistribution-SA@aec.gov.au)

**By Post**

Redistribution Committee for South Australia  
Australian Electoral Commission  
GPO Box 344  
ADELAIDE SA 5001

**2017/18 Federal Redistribution of South Australian Electorates**

I **enclose** herewith Comments on Suggestions made on behalf of the Australian Democrats (SA Division) Inc.

Yours faithfully,

**PAUL BLACK**  
Barrister

**Mobile:** [REDACTED]

**E-mail:** [REDACTED]

Encl

## **REDISTRIBUTION COMMITTEE FOR SOUTH AUSTRALIA**

### **2017/18 REDISTRIBUTION OF SOUTH AUSTRALIAN ELECTORATES FOR THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

#### **COMMENTS ON SUGGESTIONS**

**SUBMITTED BY THE AUSTRALIAN DEMOCRATS (SA DIVISION) Inc.**

#### **Introduction**

1. The Redistribution Committee for South Australia (the Committee) is redistributing the House of Representatives Electorates in South Australian because of a reduction in entitlement from 11 Members of the House of Representatives (MHRs) to 10 MHRs.
2. Some 211 Suggestions have been made to the Committee.
3. Comments on Suggestions are now invited.
4. We do not propose commenting on all Suggestions in detail. However, we wish to make some broad observations, followed by some comments on the names of some electorates as proposed in some of the Suggestions. We also identify some particular aspects of some Suggestions which we do not support.

#### **Electorate based Suggestions**

5. The vast majority of the Suggestions made relate to one electorate – Mayo. Other Suggestions have focussed on other single electorates, including Port Adelaide, Makin and Grey. Those Suggestions have related to abolition (or opposition thereto) and to configuration. Other Suggestions have focussed on one electorate but appreciated the consequence that some change is required to adjoining electorates (Mr Zappia MP and Mr Ramsey MP)
6. Some Suggestions appear to seek no change – or minimal change to a particular electorate.
7. Those Suggestions tend to assert that the present configuration of the electorate defines or encompasses sensible communities of interest. Of course, that is simply to assert that the previous Redistribution Committee made correct decisions. It is to be hoped that the current electorate boundaries do sensibly combine communities of interest - except to the extent that the previous Redistribution Committee was constrained to split such communities – as it was in the Barossa.
8. In an ordinary redistribution, such Suggestions might readily be entertained. However in the present Redistribution, two (related) factors combine so as to make such Suggestions virtually impossible to accept. Those factors are the reduction in the number of electorates – which forces the Committee to make significant changes to boundaries in any event; and the related fact that all except two of the current electorates have voter numbers which are either below present tolerance or below projected tolerance (or both).
9. Nevertheless, notably in the case of Grey, a Suggestion made principally in relation to that electorate seeks only modest change, but clearly is workable, because of careful consideration of the issues which arise in the overall process. That Suggestion is the one submitted by Mr Ramsey MP, and which is echoed by virtually all of the Suggestions relating to all electorates

which include detailed maps or descriptions. We comment that the proposed additions to Grey have merit, both in terms of Grey itself, and in terms of assisting the process of redistributing the balance of the State.

### **State-wide Suggestions**

10. We do not propose to comment, by way of detailed analysis – whether supportive or critical – on the balance of the Suggestions: however, some aspects of some Suggestions warrant comment.
11. We note that many Suggestions would unite the Barossa Council and include it within Barker. As is apparent from our Suggestion, while we support the unification, we do not support the placement. Further, Mr Gordon’s Suggestion would have the Barossa within Barker, but Murray Bridge outside it. We oppose that aspect of Mr Gordon’s Suggestion. Only the Australian Labor Party (ALP) considers any other possibility for the Barossa Valley, although its proposal would transfer some of Barker’s Riverland territory to Grey, allowing Wakefield to remain at least partly rural in the northern Adelaide Plains region. While we do not support the option, we do support the consideration of other possibilities than the uniting of the Barossa within Barker.
12. We submit that the Barossa Valley has more in common with, and better communications with, Gawler, than with the South East. If there is to be communication with the South East, then Murray Bridge is part of the communication route.
13. Hence, we proposed that Wakefield be an electorate along an axis running from south-west at or about Salisbury – to the north-east in the Barossa. If the Committee finds that the need for Barker to have an injection of voters from the Fleurieu Peninsula makes it impossible to create sensible electorates in the southern suburbs of Adelaide and the balance of the Fleurieu, then so be it – but we submit that the Committee should make an attempt to draw Barker without the Barossa. Our proposed Wakefield would also need to incorporate most, if not all of the northern parts of the current electorate of Port Adelaide – that is those parts to the north-east of the port itself.
14. Most of the remaining Suggestions have substantial merit – at least in relation to some significant parts of the exercise to be undertaken.
15. We note that the ALP would appear to be taking aim at a particular Member of Parliament in suggesting the abolition of Sturt – but the same could be said (at least implicitly) of most Suggestions except for those which would abolish Adelaide, whose Member has announced that she does not intend to contest the next election. Nevertheless if the Committee were minded to draw boundaries substantially as suggested by the ALP, then Sturt would be the appropriate electorate name to abolish.
16. If, contrary to our Suggestion, the Barossa is united within Barker, then there is much to be said for the balance of Mr Walsh’s and Mr Ashley’s Suggestion in respect of Mayo and the metropolitan electorates.
17. While we consider that Port Adelaide is clearly one of the electorates which might be abolished, we do not support Mr McSweeney’s proposed “carve-up”, which would split the Le Fevre Peninsula.

18. In the event that there were to be such substantial changes to two or more electorates such as Port Adelaide, Sturt, Makin and Mayo, that they substantially differ from current and most (or all) past iterations of those electorates (and noting that Boothby has changed its location on many occasions), we would not oppose the reintroduction of the name Angas, as proposed by Mr Waddell. However, we do not support Mr Waddell's suggestion that the capital city electorate of Adelaide be abolished.
19. Some Suggestions, including those of Mr Walsh, Dr Mulcair, Mr Mullin and the Liberal Party, would create an electorate substantially based in the south-western suburbs of Adelaide – nominally Boothby.
  - In the case of Mr Walsh and Mr Mullin, this occurs because of the abolition of Hindmarsh. These proposals in relation to the metropolitan boundaries is preferable to that of many others – but their proposed Boothby bears so little resemblance to that electorate as it has been for the vast majority of its history (eastern and south-eastern suburbs, sometimes the southern Adelaide Hills, and only much more recently some south-western suburbs from the former Hawker) that the name Boothby is really no longer appropriate;
  - In the case of Dr Mulcair, it occurs by reason of the abolition of Hindmarsh. As it happens, we do not support his proposal for Adelaide to become essentially a CBD and due western suburbs electorate; and
  - In the case of the Liberal Party, it occurs because Adelaide is abolished – again, something which we do not support.

If the creation of a substantially south-western suburban Electorate were to occur, then consideration could be given to the following:

- reintroducing the name Hawker for that electorate which would, *ex hypothesi*, substantially incorporate the parts of south-western metropolitan Adelaide which were in Hawker;
  - the naming of the (essentially) merged Hindmarsh and Port Adelaide as Hindmarsh – essentially as per the “Federation” division; and
  - if Sturt swings somewhat further to the south and west, then it be renamed as Boothby.
20. Mr Ashley's Suggestion is substantially to the effect of what we have submitted immediately above – in that his Suggestion would move Boothby back to the south-eastern suburbs of Adelaide. Like Mr Mullin, Mr Ashley's metropolitan division of electorates appears to be logical – its feasibility depends on the acceptance of his position in respect of the Barossa.
  21. However Mr Ashley's Hindmarsh is a south-western electorate; and immediately to its north-eastern boundary is the suburb of Hindmarsh. Mr Ashley would have that suburb in Adelaide – thus equalling telling against the renaming of Port Adelaide as Hindmarsh. A similar issue occurs with Mr Walsh's electorates of Adelaide and Hindmarsh.
  22. Obviously electorates can have the same names as other cities, town or suburbs – Sturt has been an example – but we suggest that confusion through very close geographical proximity

but non-inclusion ought to be avoided. Therefore, if there is to be an electorate of Hindmarsh in the western suburbs of Adelaide, it ought to include the suburb of Hindmarsh.

23. We look forward to the publication of the Redistribution Proposal by the Committee.

**DATED 15 DECEMBER 2017**

**PAUL A B BLACK**