



Suggestion 210

Australian Democrats (SA Division) Inc.

5 pages

[REDACTED]

From: Paul Black [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, 1 December 2017 5:37 PM
To: FedRedistribution - SA
Subject: 2017/18 South Australian Redistribution
Attachments: 171201 Letter to Redistribution Committee for South Australia.doc; 171201 Suggestion.doc

Good evening

I enclose a covering letter and the Suggestion of the Australian Democrats (SA Division) Inc.

I will forward a hard copy by post (with the covering letter signed!)

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

1 December, 2017

By E-mail: 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 a Suggestion 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

SUGGESTION 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 Australia because of a reduction in entitlement from 11 Members of the House of Representatives (MHRs) to 10 MHRs.
2. A significant outcome of the reduction in the number of MHRs to which South Australia is entitled is that the number of voters in each Electorate needs to increase markedly.
3. Since the announcement of the reduction in entitlement to MHRs, much of the media punditry has been directed to the question of which Electorate is to be abolished. The Australian Democrats (SA Division) Inc. suggest that the question of which Electorate is to be abolished is not the first question which needs to be asked in undertaking the present redistribution.
4. We suggest that the questions which need to be asked and answered in the first place relate to the rural, regional and remote areas of South Australia including the rural and semirural parts of what are presently the Electorates of Mayo and Wakefield. In this respect it is worth noting that, of the four Electorates which are the presently the furthest below quota, two (Grey and Barker) are entirely rural, remote or regional; and one (Mayo) is significant rural and regional.
5. One reason why issues in rural, regional and remote South Australia need to be answered in the first place is that, for the most part, certain of the boundaries of the state's rural, regional and remote electorates are fixed – by the state's boundaries with the four other mainland states and the Northern Territory. Further, the two electorates which are so constrained (Grey and Barker) share a common boundary.
6. We also suggest that it would be appropriate for the Committee to attempt to resolve the problem which could not be avoided at the previous redistribution – namely the splitting of the Barossa Valley into three Electorates (Barker, Mayo and Wakefield). The reduction in number of MHRs and the increase in the number of votes required in each Electorate should allow that unfortunate situation not to be repeated. We suggest that it is of greater importance in rural and regional areas than in metropolitan areas that, as far as practicable, council districts be within the same Federal Electorate (or split between two at most if a split is unavoidable). That local government areas demark communities of interest is more clearly true in rural areas than in the city.

The logical first questions

7. With those matters in mind, we suggest that major questions which need to be asked by the Committee in this redistribution including the following:
 - Where, along its border with Wakefield, should Grey obtain its increase in elector numbers? Or should the Wakefield-Barker border be moved south?

- Should Barker increase in numbers by moving into the Fleurieu Peninsula, the Adelaide Hills, the Barossa or elsewhere?
 - Is Barker the appropriate Electorate for any or all of the Barossa Valley? (To this last question, we would emphatically answer: no!)
8. We suggest that the Grey-Wakefield Boundary be moved south as far as necessary to achieve quota for Grey, but not so far that any part of the Barossa Council is included with Grey.
 9. We suggest that the Barossa Council be re-united in what is currently Wakefield, which Electorate will also need to receive an injection of voters from the northern parts of metropolitan Adelaide.
 10. We suggest that the Barker-Mayo boundary south of the Adelaide Hills be moved in a generally westerly direction.
 11. We suggest that the long strip of outer suburbs which are currently in Kingston, which include significant “*sea-change*” and holiday towns south of the Onkaparinga River and west of Main South Road should be transferred to Mayo.
 12. We suggest that it is important that the Barossa Council be entirely within the same Electorate as Gawler – rather than Barker or Grey. Almost inevitably that means that it must be in the Electorate which includes Elizabeth and either the northern parts of the present Port Adelaide or Makin. We suggest Makin.
 13. This would leave South Australian with two entirely rural Electorates (Grey and Barker), one Electorate which would be predominantly semi-rural but would also include the Adelaide Hills (Mayo); and one Electorate which necessarily will be partly rural and partly metropolitan (Wakefield).

Other matters

14. We do not consider that there are any significant Community of Interest issues which should obviously dictate the remaining questions – which (likely metropolitan) Electorate is to be abolished and in what directions should the other metropolitan Electorates be moved.
15. That said, if the change to Kingston suggested in paragraph 11 above is made, then it would seem reasonable for the very southern parts of Boothby to be included in Kingston. Logically that requires Boothby to move north either into Sturt or into Hindmarsh.
16. Given the general requirement that Federation Electorate names be retained, it is likely that the Committee will retain the Metropolitan Electorates of Adelaide, Boothby and Hindmarsh. The question of which Electorate is to be abolished will then depend markedly on the decisions made as to where Wakefield is to gain its electors – from Port Adelaide or Makin. We suggest, from the perspective of communities of interest, that the preferable option is to move the Wakefield-Port Adelaide boundary to the south, with Wakefield gaining suburbs closely linked with Elizabeth and the market gardening areas to the west of Port Wakefield Rd

17. If Wakefield gains substantial numbers from Port Adelaide, then it may well be that Port Adelaide should be abolished and Hindmarsh should then move substantially north (into areas which it originally included before Port Adelaide was created). On the other hand, if Wakefield gains from Makin, then either Makin should move south and Sturt be abolished or alternatively Sturt be moved north and Makin be abolished. On the topic of abolition of Makin or Sturt, we indicate no preference.
18. There is an extent to which what we now propose to be Wakefield will have a Metropolitan component substantially similar to the former Electorate of Bonython, but with the addition of Gawler and Barossa. A case could be made for changing the name of the Electorate to Bonython – however that would result in the abolition of a Federation Electorate (Wakefield).
19. In conclusion, we note that our above suggestions are more in the nature of preliminary comments. There are many variables in play: however in relation to Grey and Barker, there are not many “*degrees of Freedom*” available to the Committee. As it happens, those are the areas where community of interest factors are, in our submission, more important in the drawing of Federal Electoral Boundaries than in the Metropolitan area.
20. For these reasons, we have concentrated on the rural area and essentially await the outcome of the Committee’s deliberations on those areas. That will then allow for more focussed later Submissions in relation to the proposals in Metropolitan Adelaide at the Objection stage of the Redistribution process.

DATED 1 December 2017

PAUL A B BLACK