

#### **Australian Electoral Commission**

#### 2003

# REDISTRIBUTION OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA INTO ELECTORAL DIVISIONS

**Commonwealth Electoral Act 1918** 

**Section 75** 

#### © Commonwealth of Australia 2003

ISBN 0-9751559-2-X

This work is copyright. Apart from any use as permitted under the Copyright Act 1968, no part may be reproduced by any process without prior written permission from the Commonwealth available from the Department of Communications, Information Technology and the Arts. Requests and inquiries concerning reproduction and rights should be addressed to the Commonwealth Copyright Administration, Intellectual Property Branch, Department of Communications, Information Technology and the Arts, GPO Box 2154, Canberra ACT 2601 or posted at http://www.dcita.gov.au/cca.

#### **CONTENTS**

PART 1	REDISTRIBUTION OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA INTO ELEVEN ELECTORAL DIVISIONS	PAGE
1.1 1.2	Determination made by the augmented Electoral Commission for South Australia Process followed by the augmented Electoral	1
1.3	Commission for South Australia in making its determination Reasons for the determination made by the augmented Electoral Commission for South Australia	2
1.4 1.5	Statistical summary	10 11
Appendix A	Composition of the augmented Electoral Commission for South Australia and the Redistribution Committee for South Australia	26
Appendix B	List of Public Objections lodged with the Australian Electoral Commission pursuant to Section 69(1) of the <i>Commonwealth Electoral Act 1918</i>	26
Appendix C	List of Comments on Public Objections lodged with the Australian Electoral Commission pursuant to Section 69(3) of the <i>Commonwealth Electoral Act 1918</i>	27
Appendix D	List of persons who appeared at the public inquiry into Public Objections held by the augmented Electoral Commission for South Australia, Adelaide, 12 November 2003	27
Appendix E	Guidelines for the naming of Commonwealth Electoral Divisions	28
Appendix F	Redistribution timetable	29
PART 2	ENCLOSURES Copies of Public Suggestions to the Redistribution Committee and Comments on Public Suggestions, Public Objections to the proposed redistribution and Comments on Public Objections, and Transcript of proceedings at the public inquiry into Public Objections held on 12 November 2003 plus a copy of the report – 2003 Proposed Redistribution of South Australia into Electoral Divisions and maps of proposed Divisions.  Composite maps (2) showing the boundaries of the electoral divisions for South Australia as determined by the augmented Electoral Commission.	Compact Disc

#### PART 1

# REDISTRIBUTION OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA INTO ELEVEN ELECTORAL DIVISIONS

**17 December 2003** 

**Commonwealth Electoral Act 1918** 

Sections 73 and 74

### 1.1 DETERMINATION MADE BY THE AUGMENTED ELECTORAL COMMISSION FOR SOUTH AUSTRALIA

Pursuant to section 73 of the *Commonwealth Electoral Act 1918*, the augmented Electoral Commission for South Australia hereby determines that the boundaries and names of the Electoral Divisions into which the State of South Australia is to be distributed are as shown on the maps certified by the members of the augmented Electoral Commission for South Australia and lodged in File Number 03/1762 at the Principal Office of the Australian Electoral Commission in Canberra. These maps are numbered in the following sequence:

S1/2003	Adelaide
S2/2003	Barker
S3/2003	Boothby
S4/2003	Grey
S5/2003	Hindmarsh
S6/2003	Kingston
S7/2003	Makin
S8/2003	Mayo
S9/2003	Port Adelaide
S10/2003	Sturt
S11/2003	Wakefield

#### J C S Burchett QC

Chairperson of the augmented Electoral Commission for South Australia

Note: The determination of the augmented Electoral Commission for South Australia is that the boundaries and names of the Electoral Divisions in South Australia are as proposed by the Redistribution Committee for South Australia, without change.

## 1.2 PROCESS FOLLOWED BY THE AUGMENTED ELECTORAL COMMISSION FOR SOUTH AUSTRALIA IN MAKING ITS DETERMINATION

- 1. Notice of the Redistribution Committee's proposal was published in Special Gazette No. S339 dated 5 September 2003. Outline maps of the proposed redistribution by the Redistribution Committee for South Australia and a notice inviting Public Objections, and Comments on Public Objections, against the proposal were published in *The Advertiser* and *The Weekend Australian* newspapers on 6 September 2003. In addition, the Report required by Section 68 of the Act was made available for public inspection at all offices of the Australian Electoral Commission in South Australia and the Report, outline maps, Public Suggestions and Comments on Public Suggestions were posted to the AEC website, www.aec.gov.au.
- 2. At the closing time for Public Objections against the Redistribution Committee's proposal, 6.00pm on 3 October 2003, the following had been received (numbered in the order received):
  - 1. Mr Aaron Barrett
  - 2. Mr & Mrs Colin & Raelene Thorp
  - 3. Dr Bob Such, MP
  - 4. South East Local Government Association, Inc.
  - 5. Mrs Lillian M Morris
  - 6. City of Burnside
  - 7. Mr Dale Reeve
  - 8. Limestone Coast Tourism
  - 9. Mr John Daniel Encel
  - 10. Australian Democrats
  - 11. Liberal Party of Australia (SA Division)
  - 12. Australian Labor Party, South Australian Branch
- 3. In accordance with the Act, the period during which Comments on these Public Objections could be made closed at 6.00pm on 17 October 2003 and at that time Comments had been received from (numbered in the order received):
  - 1. Australian Labor Party, South Australian Branch
  - 2. Mr John Daniel Encel
  - 3. Australian Democrats
  - 4. Liberal Party of Australia (SA Division)
- 4. In accordance with the Act, copies of the Public Objections (Objections) and the Comments on Public Objections (Comments) were made available for perusal at the office of the Australian Electoral Officer for South Australia on the next working day following the close of each (the Objections were not available until Tuesday, Monday having been a public holiday in South Australia). They were also made available on the AEC website as soon as possible after the deadlines for their lodgement.

- 5. Copies of the Objections and Comments are included on the compact disc accompanying this Report.
- 6. In accordance with section 72(3) of the Act, the augmented Electoral Commission for South Australia held an inquiry into the Objections on Wednesday, 12 November 2003. The inquiry was advertised in *The Advertiser* and *The Weekend Australian* newspapers on 8 November 2003. A transcript of the inquiry is included on the compact disc accompanying this Report. Those appearing at the inquiry were (listed in the order they appeared before the augmented Electoral Commission):

Mr Ian Hunter and Mr John Rau, Australian Labor Party, South Australian Branch

Mr Ron Ellis, South East Local Government Association, Inc.

Mr James Yates, Limestone Coast Tourism

Mr Paul Black, Australian Democrats

Mr Graham Jaeschke and Mr Robert Lawson, QC, Liberal Party of Australia (SA Division)

- 7. The augmented Electoral Commission for South Australia, during its deliberations, considered all Objections, Comments and the statements made to the inquiry.
- 8. In accordance with section 72(10)(b) of the Act, the augmented Electoral Commission for South Australia made a public announcement on 28 November 2003 that it had concluded its deliberations on the new boundaries and names of the 11 Divisions for South Australia.
- 9. This Report of the augmented Electoral Commission for South Australia is published in accordance with sections 73 and 74 of the Act.

## 1.3 REASONS FOR THE DETERMINATION MADE BY THE AUGMENTED ELECTORAL COMMISSION FOR SOUTH AUSTRALIA

### Consideration of Public Objections to the proposal of the Redistribution Committee for South Australia

10. The augmented Electoral Commission for South Australia (the augmented Commission) noted that whilst 12 Objections had been received, overall they involved a very small proportion of the geographic area of the state. There were 9 areas of contention where alteration of the proposed boundaries was sought. With such a relatively small geographic area in dispute, the augmented Commission was of the view that the broad principles underpinning the proposal of the Redistribution Committee, and the proposal itself, had been generally well accepted. Nonetheless, the augmented Commission carefully deliberated on each of the areas subject to objection.

#### Objections to the proposed split of the Barossa Council area into two divisions

- 11. An objection was received to the proposed split of the Barossa Council area between Barker and Mayo, proposing instead that the Council area be kept together in Wakefield. The augmented Commission noted that the Barossa Council itself had raised this matter in the Suggestion process and that the Redistribution Committee had discussed the issue in its Report. The Redistribution Committee had come to the conclusion that placing the Council area into the Divisions of Barker and Mayo was the best option.
- 12. The augmented Commission was sympathetic to this objection and explored a number of alternatives aiming to place the whole of the Council area in one division; however, it seemed the numerical criteria deriving from the Act defeated each attempt. Inevitably, at least one Local Government Area (LGA) must be split in order to achieve electoral enrolment tolerance for Barker and, accepting that as virtually inescapable, the augmented Commission agreed that the Redistribution Committee's proposal was the most suitable choice. Accordingly, the objection was not upheld.

#### Objections to the proposed Division of Mayo

- 13. A further objection was made against the proposed split in the Barossa Council area, but only against the location of the split rather than the need for it. This objection was tied together with an objection against the proposed continued split of the suburb of Coromandel Valley. An alternative was suggested of placing more of the southern portion of the Barossa Council area into Mayo and transferring the portion of Coromandel Valley in the proposed Mayo, to Boothby. The augmented Commission noted that the Coromandel Valley move would need to occur in concert with the Barossa move in order to compensate for the changes in enrolment tolerance in Mayo. It further noted that the Barossa move would be able to be accommodated alone, still leaving both Barker and Mayo within tolerance.
- 14. As mentioned above, the Redistribution Committee had carefully considered the Barossa matter. The augmented Commission noted that the Redistribution Committee, having decided to split the Barossa Council area, had taken great care to ensure that the split was well located. It was accepted that the split finally chosen by the Redistribution Committee allowed for the wine areas of the Barossa to remain together, whilst the proposal in this objection would undo that by removing Lyndoch from the other wine areas and placing it in another division.
- 15. In forming its proposed Mayo, the Redistribution Committee stated that it had considered ways to move as many of the "suburbs" as possible from Mayo into neighbouring metropolitan divisions, but was unable to move all of them due to requirements of enrolment tolerance. One area that was considered but was unable to be moved was Aberfoyle Park. In the end the Committee decided that Aberfoyle Park had a greater community of interest with Mayo than other areas moved from Mayo. The augmented Commission agreed, and with Aberfoyle

Park in the proposed Mayo, the augmented Commission came to the view that it could not justify the removal of Coromandel Valley, which it considered to have a comparatively greater community of interest with Mayo. The augmented Commission was also mindful that such a move would necessarily lead to the redrawing of Mayo's northern boundary, something that it had already considered to be undesirable. It was also noted that the Mayo boundary in the Coromandel Valley area had not been altered by the Redistribution Committee.

16. As a result of its deliberations, the augmented Commission was not convinced that sufficient argument existed to warrant any of the above changes and it considered that the boundaries as proposed by the Redistribution Committee were the most appropriate and should be retained.

#### Objections to the proposed Division of Barker

- 17. Two very similar objections were received to the proposed division of Barker, each objecting mainly to what was removed from the original Barker (Kangaroo Island and the southern Fleurieu Peninsula) rather than anything that was proposed to be added to it. Both objections noted a concern over the large size of the proposed division, both geographically and in regard to numbers of electors, and put forward a preference for the original Barker to achieve enrolment tolerance by transferring to it a small part of the area of Alexandrina Council, with no other changes.
- The augmented Commission noted the concern in regard to the proposed Barker's size as well as the statements that suggested it would be difficult for the Member for Barker, Mr Secker, to service his electorate. Considered in isolation from the enrolment quota required by other SA divisions, the augmented Commission observed that the alternative proposal for Barker achieved the required enrolment tolerance. However, a solution for one division cannot be judged in isolation from the other divisions. The augmented Commission was satisfied that the areas proposed by the Redistribution Committee for removal from Barker had strong communities of interest with Mavo, the division they were transferred to. It was noted also that the boundaries of Barker proposed by the Redistribution Committee had the advantage of including the whole of the Murray River in one division. As the alternative suggested for Barker could not work satisfactorily within the overall proposal put forward by the Redistribution Committee, and having agreed with the Redistribution Committee as to the desirability of uniting the Murray River in one division, the augmented Commission could not sustain these objections.

#### Objections to the proposed boundary between Divisions of Adelaide and Sturt

19. Two objections were made to the proposed split of the City of Burnside, one of those objections putting forward an alternative solution for the Adelaide/Sturt boundary at the north of those divisions. The augmented Commission noted that the alternative solution was essentially the same as one urged upon the Redistribution Committee during the Suggestions process and also noted the considerations included in the Report of the Redistribution Committee with

regard to the Adelaide/Sturt boundary. In its Report the Committee had documented a number of alternatives for the Adelaide/Sturt boundary, including a northern transfer of electors similar to what had been suggested in this objection. The Committee had been convinced that the area it finally chose to transfer from Sturt to Adelaide had the greater community of interest with the remainder of the division of Adelaide.

20. The augmented Commission was of the opinion that the boundaries proposed by the Redistribution Committee well respected the communities of interest concerned and was not convinced that it would be preferable to alter the boundaries as proposed. The objections were therefore not upheld.

## Objection to the proposed boundaries between the Divisions of Barker, Grey, Mayo and Wakefield in the Barossa to Mid-North Areas

- 21. An objection was made to the proposed divisions of Barker and Grey on the basis that they are at the high end of the allowable enrolment quota tolerance. An alternative was suggested of transferring the Clare and Gilbert Valleys Council area and the Regional Council of Goyder area to Barker and transferring areas of the Barossa Council to Wakefield. The objection foreshadowed that if this were adopted; it would result in Mayo being under quota (from losing part of the Barossa Council area) and recommended a compensating transfer in either the Mitcham or Willunga area.
- 22. The augmented Commission noted that the alternative put forward did not achieve enrolment tolerance. Although the Objection noted that a balancing change would be required for Mayo (5.42% below projected enrolment on the alternative) it did not allow that Wakefield would have a variation of 6.71% over on projected enrolment. Further, the augmented Commission noted the difficulty of finding a suitable area to transfer to bring Wakefield down to tolerance if this alternative were adopted. As stated, Mayo is low in elector numbers on this alternative, but there are no common Wakefield/Mayo boundaries other than the ones objected to. Wakefield, then, would need to shed electors to either Makin or Port Adelaide. Port Adelaide is already above quota and so the obvious target is Makin. However, a transfer to Makin would lose Makin's proposed western boundary, which was widely accepted by those making submissions to the Redistribution process.
- 23. The augmented Commission noted that the objection was motivated by a perceived need to make the larger divisions in physical area (Barker and Grey) more manageable by giving them lower enrolment relative to the other divisions. The Redistribution Committee had noted in its Report another relevant principle namely, allowing full use of tolerances in order to achieve good boundaries. The augmented Commission agreed and that in this case the need for good boundaries should prevail. It also noted the above difficulties associated with the alternative boundaries proposed. In light of these considerations, the objection was not upheld.

#### Objection to the proposed boundaries between the Divisions of Grey and Wakefield

- 24. An objection was made to the proposed boundary between Grey and Wakefield, suggesting that the whole of the Wakefield Regional Council area be united into Wakefield. Whilst the alternative boundary would be within enrolment tolerance, the augmented Commission was not convinced that Grey should have fewer electors. As a division of projected low growth, the proposed Grey would be likely to need further supplements in future redistributions. It was also noted that although upholding the objection would unite an LGA, that LGA had never been in a single division since its creation through the amalgamation of the District Councils of Blyth/Snowtown and Wakefield Plains. Finally, the augmented Commission noted the possibility that the needs of future redistributions may well require the LGA to be split again at the very least, that the portion suggested to be transferred to Wakefield would need to be returned to Grey.
- 25. The augmented Commission noted that the objection did not present a strong case that proved a single community of interest in the Council area, and in the absence of such a case, preferred to follow the lesser criterion, in terms of section 72(11) of the Act, in considering existing divisional boundaries, which the proposed boundary follows. Mindful of these considerations the augmented Commission did not uphold the objection.

## Objection to the proposed boundaries between the Divisions of Hindmarsh and Port Adelaide

- 26. An objection was made to the area proposed by the Redistribution Committee to be transferred from Port Adelaide to Hindmarsh and put forward the alternative of using Trimmer Parade as the boundary between the two divisions. The augmented Commission noted that this was essentially the same as had been suggested to the Redistribution Committee and considered in its deliberations. The augmented Commission also noted that the Redistribution Committee had been convinced that the proposed transfer of several coastal areas from Port Adelaide to Hindmarsh satisfied the community of interest test well.
- 27. The augmented Commission noted that much of the argument supporting the objection was that the Port River, together with West Lakes, should be seen as a distinct community. However, the augmented Commission was not convinced that the residents of West Lakes would consider themselves to be part of a Port River community. The augmented Commission formed the opinion that the arguments put forward by this objection did not outweigh or refute the Redistribution Committee's view about the community of interest of the coastal areas in question, which the augmented Commission considered to be correct and therefore did not uphold the objection.

## Objection to the proposed boundaries between the Divisions of Port Adelaide and Wakefield

- 28. An objection was made to the boundaries between the divisions of Port Adelaide and Wakefield, putting forward the alternative of using the LGA boundary and Little Para River. Whilst the alternative boundary does follow a good, distinct, natural feature the augmented Commission was of the opinion that the one proposed by the Redistribution Committee does so as well. It further noted that the Redistribution Committee's Report had identified strong community ties between the areas proposed for transfer to Port Adelaide with elements of the existing Port Adelaide. Lastly, the augmented Commission noted that the two divisions proposed by the Redistribution Committee were one of higher growth/lower enrolment and one of lower growth/higher enrolment. The augmented Commission was concerned that the alternative proposed would reverse that situation to lower growth/lower enrolment and higher growth/higher enrolment. The changes urged by the objection would thus be likely to create future problems.
- 29. The augmented Commission noted the very real difficulties in choosing one workable boundary over another, but was not convinced that there was sufficient weight of argument to warrant a change to the boundary proposed by the Redistribution Committee, which seemed to it to be, on the whole, a better solution. Accordingly, the objection was not upheld.

## Objection to the proposed inclusion of Gawler and the northern metropolitan area in the same division

30. An objection was received to the town of Gawler being placed in the same division as the northern suburbs of Adelaide. The augmented Commission noted the role of Gawler in uniting the elements of the proposed Wakefield, as identified in the Report of the Redistribution Committee, and concurred with that assessment. Accordingly, the objection was not sustained.

#### Other objections

- 31. An objection was made to the boundaries proposed by the Redistribution Committee on the basis of a belief that they would result in the creation of a number of "safe seats". The augmented Commission took the view that the political outcome of an election is outside the criteria it could consider under the Act.
- 32. A further objection was received that was not actually an objection to the boundaries proposed by the Redistribution Committee, but rather a statement of opposition to the current "single member electorate" element of the House of Representatives electoral system. This was also outside the scope of the augmented Commission's inquiry and was therefore also necessarily rejected.

#### **Names of Proposed Divisions**

- 33. Two objections were made in regard to the naming of divisions. One objected to the name given to the proposed division of Wakefield, suggesting that it should be named either Bonython or something entirely new. The objection went on to suggest that the name Wakefield could still be used in place of either the proposed Adelaide or the proposed Port Adelaide. The other objection related to the loss of the division name of Bonython and advocated that either the proposed division of Port Adelaide or the proposed division of Sturt could be named Bonython.
- 34. The Committee deliberated over possible division names at length but recognised that, ultimately, at least one name must be lost. Mindful of the considerations of the Redistribution Committee as related in its Report, and considering the naming conventions for electoral divisions, the augmented Electoral Commission determined that the names chosen for the proposed divisions were entirely appropriate and would remain.

#### **Summary**

35. Having agreed that no objection would be upheld, the augmented Electoral Commission adopted as its proposal, without change, the proposal of the Redistribution Committee. As it did not differ from the Redistribution Committee's proposal, in accordance with section 72(13) of the Act the augmented Electoral Commission's proposal is not open to further objection.

J Burchett A Becker D Trewin C Drury P Kentish K MacPherson Chairperson Member Member Member Member Member

AUGMENTED ELECTORAL COMMISSION FOR SOUTH AUSTRALIA

17 December 2003

#### 1.4 STATISTICAL SUMMARY

TABLE 1

DETERMINATION OF QUOTA	
Number of Divisions into which South Australia is to be distributed	11
Number of Electors in South Australia as at 12 March 2003	1,043,177
Quota for South Australia	94,834
Permissible maximum number of electors (+10%) in a Division	104,317
Permissible minimum number of electors (-10%) in a Division	85,351
ENROLMENT PROJECTIONS AT JULY 2007	
Projected number of electors in South Australia as at 31 July 2007	1,088,002
Average enrolment for South Australia projected to 31 July 2007	98,909
103.5% of average enrolment projected to 31 July 2007	102,370
96.5% of average enrolment projected to 31 July 2007	95,448

## TABLE 2 SUMMARY OF DIVISIONS

Division	Actual	Var%	Projected	Var%	Approx
		(A)		(P)	Area
					(sq km)
Adelaide	94,342	-0.52	98,204	-0.71	75
Barker	100,231	5.69	102,000	3.13	64,015
Boothby	94,981	0.16	97,016	-1.91	123
Grey	97,415	2.72	99,491	0.59	904,881
Hindmarsh	98,621	3.99	101,469	2.59	73
Kingston	92,537	-2.42	98,446	-0.47	377
Makin	92,774	-2.17	97,315	-1.61	115
Mayo	88,426	-6.76	96,761	-2.17	9,190
Port Adelaide	97,207	2.50	100,546	1.66	253
Sturt	96,928	2.21	100,126	1.23	84
Wakefield	89,715	-5.40	96,628	-2.31	6,155
South Australia	1,043,177		1,088,002		985,341

## TABLE 3 SUMMARY OF MOVEMENT OF ELECTORS BETWEEN DIVISIONS

Number of Electors remaining in their existing Division	807,313	77.4%
Number of Electors transferred to another Division	235,864	22.6%
TOTAL	1,043,177	

#### 1.5 GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF EACH ELECTORAL DIVISION

- 1. The tables on the following pages set out how each Electoral Division is constituted and are arranged under Statistical Local Areas (SLAs). Each SLA comprises a number of CCDs as used in the 2001 Population Census.
- 2. The SLA is the most widely used unit in the presentation of Census data and collectively they cover the whole of South Australia without gaps or overlaps. In the majority of cases SLAs correspond to Local Government Areas (LGAs). Where a particular LGA is substantially different from the general run of LGAs in terms of size and economic significance it can be split into a number of SLAs.

#### **Division of Adelaide**

How Constituted	Actual Enrolment	Projected Enrolment
	12 March 2003	31 July 2007
SLAs from existing Division of Adelaide:		·
Adelaide (C)	8,811	9,714
Burnside (C) - South-West	395	635
Charles Sturt (C) - North-East	4,179	4,391
Charles Sturt (C) - Inner East	65	65
Norw. P'ham St Ptrs (C) - East	1,721	1,702
Norw. P'ham St Ptrs (C) - West	3,789	3,895
Port Adel. Enfield (C) - East	4,974	6,297
Port Adel. Enfield (C) - Inner	12,723	12,994
Port Adel. Enfield (C) - Port	3,478	3,391
Prospect (C)	13,466	13,619
Unley (C) - East	10,099	10,268
Unley (C) - West	12,097	12,204
Walkerville (M)	3,591	3,760
West Torrens (C) - East	3,623	3,656
Total from existing Division of Adelaide	83,011	86,591
SLAs received from Division of Sturt:		
Burnside (C) - South-West	4,018	4,247
Norw. P'ham St Ptrs (C) - East	429	419
Norw. P'ham St Ptrs (C) - West	6,884	6,947
Total received from other divisions	11,331	11,613
TOTAL FOR DIVISION OF	, -	, -
ADELAIDE	94,342	98,204
SLAs transferred to Division of Boothby:	,	,
Unley (C) - East	3,621	3,658
Total transferred to other divisions	3,621	3,658

#### **Division of Barker**

How Constituted	Actual	Projected
	Enrolment	Enrolment
	12 March 2003	31 July 2007
SLAs from existing Division of Barker:		
Grant (DC)	5,475	5,477
Karoonda East Murray (DC)	894	867
Lacepede (DC)	1,712	1,735
Mid Murray (DC)	3,908	4,046
Mount Gambier (C)	15,940	16,267
Murray Bridge (RC)	11,364	11,907
Naracoorte and Lucindale (DC)	5,759	5,914
Robe (DC)	993	1,015
Southern Mallee (DC)	1,530	1,520
Tatiara (DC)	4,720	4,759
The Coorong (DC)	4,117	4,047
Unincorp. Murray Mallee	0	0
Wattle Range (DC) - East	2,334	2,240
Wattle Range (DC) - West	6,292	6,114
Total from existing Division of Barker	65,038	65,908
SLAs received from Division of Wakefield:		
Barossa (DC) - Angaston	5,676	5,979
Barossa (DC) - Barossa	2,185	2,309
Barossa (DC) - Tanunda	3,344	3,529
Berri & Barmera (DC) - Barmera	2,939	2,949
Berri & Barmera (DC) - Berri	4,461	4,471
Loxton Waikerie (DC) - East	5,043	5,112
Loxton Waikerie (DC) - West	3,169	3,086
Mid Murray (DC)	1,959	2,025
Renmark Paringa (DC) - Paringa	1,144	1,133
Renmark Paringa (DC) - Renmark	5,190	5,416
Unincorp. Riverland	83	83
T-4-1	25 102	26,002
Total received from other divisions	35,193	36,092
TOTAL FOR DIVISION OF	100 221	103 000
BARKER SI As transferred to Division of Mayo:	100,231	102,000
SLAs transferred to Division of Mayo:	7 440	0.074
Alexandrina (DC) - Coastal	7,449	9,074
Alexandrina (DC) - Strathalbyn	1,597	1,779
Kangaroo Island (DC)	3,069	3,180
Victor Harbor (DC)	8,781	10,184
Yankalilla (DC)	2,836	2,995
Total transferred to other divisions	23,732	27,212

#### **Division of Boothby**

How Constituted	Actual Enrolment	Projected Enrolment
	12 March 2003	31 July 2007
SLAs from existing Division of Boothby:		
Holdfast Bay (C) - North	1,500	1,549
Holdfast Bay (C) - South	10,695	11,063
Marion (C) - Central	24,390	24,482
Marion (C) - North	18	17
Marion (C) - South	67	75
Mitcham (C) - Hills	17,498	18,139
Mitcham (C) - North-East	11,395	11,692
Mitcham (C) - West	16,309	16,153
Onkaparinga (C) - Reservoir	7,815	8,505
Total from existing Division of Boothby	89,687	91,675
SLAs received from Division of Adelaide: Unley (C) - East	3,621	3,658
SLAs received from Division of Hindmarsh: Marion (C) - North	1,673	1,683
Total received from other divisions	5,294	5,341
TOTAL FOR DIVISION OF		
ВООТНВУ	94,981	97,016

#### **Division of Grey**

How Constituted	Actual Enrolment	Projected Enrolment
	12 March 2003	31 July 2007
SLAs from existing Division of Grey:		V
Barunga West (DC)	1,180	1,248
Ceduna (DC)	2,266	2,307
Cleve (DC)	1,348	1,360
Coober Pedy (DC)	1,373	1,289
Elliston (DC)	788	765
Flinders Ranges (DC)	1,184	1,154
Franklin Harbor (DC)	877	962
Goyder (DC)	3,079	3,002
Kimba (DC)	898	906
Le Hunte (DC)	1,024	963
Lower Eyre Peninsula (DC)	2,874	3,014
Mount Remarkable (DC)	2,197	2,122
Northern Areas (DC)	3,404	3,268
Orroroo/Carrieton (DC)	742	714
Peterborough (DC)	1,407	1,328
Port Augusta (C)	8,817	8,921
Port Lincoln (C)	9,017	9,833
Port Pirie C, Dists (M) - City	9,755	10,339
Port Pirie C, Dists (M) Balance	2,418	2,467
Roxby Downs (M)	2,009	2,049
Streaky Bay (DC)	1,340	1,360
Tumby Bay (DC)	1,973	1,964
Unincorp. Far North	2,783	3,056
Unincorp. Flinders Ranges	831	595
Unincorp. Lincoln	12	12
Unincorp. Pirie	189	189
Unincorp. Riverland	21	21
Unincorp. West Coast	461	494
Unincorp. Whyalla	172	172
Wakefield (DC)	1,390	1,367
Whyalla (C)	14,144	13,131
Total from existing Division of Grey	79,973	80,372
SLAs received from Division of Wakefield:		
Barunga West (DC)	762	785
Copper Coast (DC)	8,067	9,288
Unincorp. Yorke	0	0

#### **Division of Grey (continued)**

Total transferred to other divisions	5,822	6,113
SLAs transferred to Division of Wakefield: Clare and Gilbert Valleys (DC)	5,822	6,113
GREY	97,415	99,491
TOTAL FOR DIVISION OF		
Total received from other divisions	17,442	19,119
Yorke Peninsula (DC) - South	3,020	3,134
Yorke Peninsula (DC) - North	5,593	5,912

#### **Division of Hindmarsh**

How Constituted	Actual	Projected
	Enrolment	Enrolment
	12 March 2003	31 July 2007
SLAs from existing Division of Hindmarsh:		
Charles Sturt (C) - Coastal	7,749	7,942
Charles Sturt (C) - Inner East	4,598	4,867
Charles Sturt (C) - Inner West	6,894	7,026
Holdfast Bay (C) - North	12,491	13,318
Marion (C) - North	16,900	17,132
West Torrens (C) - East	13,140	13,319
West Torrens (C) - West	20,905	21,960
Total from existing Division of Hindmarsh	82,677	85,564
SLAs received from Division of Port Adelaide: Charles Sturt (C) - Coastal	15,944	15,905
Total received from other divisions	15,944	15,905
TOTAL FOR DIVISION OF		
HINDMARSH	98,621	101,469
SLAs transferred to Division of Boothby:		
Marion (C) - North	1,673	1,683
Total transferred to other divisions	1,673	1,683

#### **Division of Kingston**

How Constituted	Actual Enrolment	Projected Enrolment
	12 March 2003	31 July 2007
SLAs from existing Division of Kingston:		•
Marion (C) - South	13,378	14,853
Onkaparinga (C) - Hackham	9,129	9,241
Onkaparinga (C) - Hills	2	2
Onkaparinga (C) - Morphett	16,370	16,149
Onkaparinga (C) - North Coast	11,900	12,097
Onkaparinga (C) - Reservoir	0	0
Onkaparinga (C) - South Coast	14,559	16,775
Onkaparinga (C) - Woodcroft	20,784	22,407
Total from existing Division of Kingston	86,122	91,524
SLAs received from Division of Mayo:		
Onkaparinga (C) - Hills	5,625	6,070
Onkaparinga (C) - South Coast	790	852
Total received from other divisions	6,415	6,922
TOTAL FOR DIVISION OF		
KINGSTON	92,537	98,446

#### **Division of Makin**

How Constituted	Actual Enrolment	Projected Enrolment
	12 March 2003	31 July 2007
SLAs from existing Division of Makin:		
Playford (C) - Hills	11	11
Port Adel. Enfield (C) - East	1,981	2,232
Port Adel. Enfield (C) - Inner	464	464
Salisbury (C) - North-East	6,115	6,220
Salisbury (C) - South-East	23,707	24,679
Tea Tree Gully (C) - Central	18,688	18,478
Tea Tree Gully (C) - Hills	9,018	9,005
Tea Tree Gully (C) - North	17,588	20,850
Tea Tree Gully (C) - South	10,984	11,062
Total from existing Division of Makin	88,556	93,001
SLAs received from Division of Bonython:		
Salisbury (C) - North-East	4,218	4,314
Total received from other divisions	4,218	4,314
TOTAL FOR DIVISION OF		
MAKIN	92,774	97,315

#### Division of Mayo

How Constituted	Actual Enrolment	Projected Enrolment
	12 March 2003	31 July 2007
SLAs from existing Division of Mayo:		
Adelaide Hills (DC) - Central	9,222	9,465
Adelaide Hills (DC) - North	1,434	1,498
Adelaide Hills (DC) - Ranges	7,330	7,588
Adelaide Hills (DC) Balance	6,079	6,523
Alexandrina (DC) - Strathalbyn	4,357	4,830
Mount Barker (DC) - Central	10,687	12,044
Mount Barker (DC) Balance	5,470	5,921
Onkaparinga (C) - Hackham	9	9
Onkaparinga (C) - Hills	2,002	2,071
Onkaparinga (C) - Reservoir	9,219	9,987
Onkaparinga (C) - Woodcroft	2,876	2,987
Total from existing Division of Mayo	58,685	62,923
SLAs received from Division of Barker:		
Alexandrina (DC) - Coastal	7,449	9,074
Alexandrina (DC) - Strathalbyn	1,597	1,779
Kangaroo Island (DC)	3,069	3,180
Victor Harbor (DC)	8,781	10,184
Yankalilla (DC)	2,836	2,995
SLAs received from Division of Wakefield:		
Adelaide Hills (DC) - North	3,128	3,411
Barossa (DC) - Barossa	2,881	3,215
Total received from other divisions	29,741	33,838
TOTAL FOR DIVISION OF		
MAYO	88,426	96,761
SLAs transferred to Division of Kingston:		
Onkaparinga (C) - Hills	5,625	6,070
Onkaparinga (C) - South Coast	790	852
SLAs transferred to Division of Sturt:		
Campbelltown (C) - East	17,124	17,670
Campbelltown (C) - West	1,386	1,431
Tea Tree Gully (C) - Hills	87	90
Tea Tree Gully (C) - South	3,387	3,441
Total transferred to other divisions	28,399	29,554

#### **Division of Port Adelaide**

How Constituted	Actual	Projected
	Enrolment	<b>Enrolment</b>
	12 March 2003	31 July 2007
SLAs from existing Division of Port Adelaide:		
Charles Sturt (C) - Inner East	10,419	10,566
Charles Sturt (C) - Inner West	10,568	10,642
Charles Sturt (C) - North-East	13,456	13,640
Playford (C) - West	529	567
Port Adel. Enfield (C) - Coast	20,279	21,159
Port Adel. Enfield (C) - Inner	140	140
Port Adel. Enfield (C) - Port	13,928	13,803
Salisbury (C) Balance	583	521
Unincorp. Western	10	10
Total from existing Division of Port Adelaide	69,912	71,048
SLAs received from Division of Bonython:		
Port Adel. Enfield (C) - Inner	0	0
Salisbury (C) - Central	15,612	16,332
Salisbury (C) - Inner North	9,179	9,511
Salisbury (C) Balance	2,504	3,655
	ŕ	
Total received from other divisions	27,295	29,498
TOTAL FOR DIVISION OF		
PORT ADELAIDE	97,207	100,546
SLAs transferred to Division of Hindmarsh:		
Charles Sturt (C) - Coastal	15,944	15,905
Total transferred to other divisions	15,944	15,905

#### **Division of Sturt**

How Constituted	Actual Enrolment	Projected Enrolment
	12 March 2003	31 July 2007
SLAs from existing Division of Sturt:		•
Burnside (C) - North-East	15,454	15,820
Burnside (C) - South-West	10,837	11,629
Campbelltown (C) - East	1,891	1,957
Campbelltown (C) - West	12,145	12,398
Norw. P'ham St Ptrs (C) - East	9,314	9,463
Norw. P'ham St Ptrs (C) - West	1,935	1,926
Port Adel. Enfield (C) - East	12,439	13,271
Tea Tree Gully (C) - South	9,365	9,417
Walkerville (M)	1,564	1,613
Total from existing Division of Sturt	74,944	77,494
SLAs received from Division of Mayo:		
Campbelltown (C) - East	17,124	17,670
Campbelltown (C) - West	1,386	1,431
Tea Tree Gully (C) - Hills	87	90
Tea Tree Gully (C) - South	3,387	3,441
Total received from other divisions	21,984	22,632
TOTAL FOR DIVISION OF		
STURT	96,928	100,126
SLAs transferred to Division of Adelaide:		
Burnside (C) - South-West	4,018	4,247
Norw. P'ham St Ptrs (C) - East	429	419
Norw. P'ham St Ptrs (C) - West	6,884	6,947
Total transferred to other divisions	11,331	11,613

#### **Division of Wakefield**

<b>How Constituted</b>	Actual	Projected
	Enrolment	Enrolment
	12 March 2003	31 July 2007
SLAs from existing Division of Wakefield:		
Gawler (M)	12,936	14,066
Light (DC)	7,272	8,482
Mallala (DC)	4,727	5,285
Playford (C) - Hills	646	679
Wakefield (DC)	3,127	3,182
Total from existing Division of Wakefield	28,708	31,694
SLAs received from Division of Bonython:		
Playford (C) - East Central	11,995	14,173
Playford (C) - Elizabeth	16,468	16,207
Playford (C) - Hills	1,263	1,514
Playford (C) - West	4,675	4,966
Playford (C) - West Central	7,264	7,624
Salisbury (C) - Central	2,317	2,436
Salisbury (C) - Inner North	5,860	6,523
Salisbury (C) - North-East	4,829	4,901
Salisbury (C) Balance	514	477
SLAs received from Division of Grey:		
Clare and Gilbert Valleys (DC)	5,822	6,113
Total received from other divisions	61,007	64,934
TOTAL FOR DIVISION OF		
WAKEFIELD	89,715	96,628
SLAs transferred to Division of Barker:		
Barossa (DC) - Angaston	5,676	5,979
Barossa (DC) - Barossa	2,185	2,309
Barossa (DC) - Tanunda	3,344	3,529
Berri & Barmera (DC) - Barmera	2,939	2,949
Berri & Barmera (DC) - Berri	4,461	4,471
Loxton Waikerie (DC) - East	5,043	5,112
Loxton Waikerie (DC) - West	3,169	3,086
Mid Murray (DC)	1,959	2,025
Renmark Paringa (DC) - Paringa	1,144	1,133
Renmark Paringa (DC) - Renmark	5,190	5,416
Unincorp. Riverland	83	83
SLAs transferred to Division of Grey:		
Barunga West (DC)	762	785
Copper Coast (DC)	8,067	9,288

#### Division of Wakefield (continued)

Unincorp. Yorke	0	0
Yorke Peninsula (DC) - North	5,593	5,912
Yorke Peninsula (DC) - South	3,020	3,134
SLAs transferred to Division of Mayo:		
Adelaide Hills (DC) - North	3,128	3,411
Barossa (DC) - Barossa	2,881	3,215
Total transferred to other divisions	58,644	61,837

#### **Abolished Division (Bonython)**

How Distributed	Actual	Projected
	Enrolment 12 March 2003	Enrolment 31 July 2007
SLAs transferred to Division of Makin:	12 Waten 2005	31 July 2007
Salisbury (C) - North-East	4,218	4,314
SLAs transferred to Division of Port Adelaide:		
Port Adel. Enfield (C) - Inner	0	0
Salisbury (C) - Central	15,612	16,332
Salisbury (C) - Inner North	9,179	9,511
Salisbury (C) Balance	2,504	3,655
SLAs transferred to Division of Wakefield:		
Playford (C) - East Central	11,995	14,173
Playford (C) - Elizabeth	16,468	16,207
Playford (C) - Hills	1,263	1,514
Playford (C) - West	4,675	4,966
Playford (C) - West Central	7,264	7,624
Salisbury (C) - Central	2,317	2,436
Salisbury (C) - Inner North	5,860	6,523
Salisbury (C) - North-East	4,829	4,901
Salisbury (C) Balance	514	477
Total transferred to other divisions	86,698	92,633

## APPENDIX A COMPOSITION OF THE AUGMENTED ELECTORAL COMMISSION FOR SOUTH AUSTRALIA AND THE REDISTRIBUTION COMMITTEE FOR SOUTH AUSTRALIA

Members of the augmented Electoral Commission for South Australia:

Hon James Burchett, QC Chairperson of the Australian Electoral Commission

Mr Andy Becker Electoral Commissioner
Mr Dennis Trewin Australian Statistician

Dr Christopher Drury Australian Electoral Officer for South Australia

Mr Peter Kentish Surveyor General for South Australia
Mr Ken MacPherson Auditor General for South Australia

Members of the Redistribution Committee for South Australia:

Mr Andy Becker Electoral Commissioner

Dr Christopher Drury Australian Electoral Officer for South Australia

Mr Peter Kentish Surveyor General for South Australia
Mr Ken MacPherson Auditor General for South Australia

## APPENDIX B LIST OF PUBLIC OBJECTIONS LODGED WITH THE AUSTRALIAN ELECTORAL COMMISSION PURSUANT TO SECTION 69(1) OF THE COMMONWEALTH ELECTORAL ACT 1918

- 1. Mr Aaron Barrett
- 2. Mr & Mrs Colin & Raelene Thorp
- 3. Dr Bob Such, MP
- 4. South East Local Government Association, Inc.
- 5. Mrs Lillian M Morris
- 6. City of Burnside
- 7. Mr Dale Reeve
- 8. Limestone Coast Tourism
- 9. Mr John Daniel Encel
- 10. Australian Democrats
- 11. Liberal Party of Australia (SA Division)
- 12. Australian Labor Party, South Australian Branch

Copies of the Public Objections are on the compact disc enclosed with this Report.

## APPENDIX C LIST OF COMMENTS ON PUBLIC OBJECTIONS LODGED WITH THE ELECTORAL COMMISSION PURSUANT TO SECTION 69(3) OF THE COMMONWEALTH ELECTORAL ACT 1918

- 1. Australian Labor Party, South Australian Branch
- 2. Mr John Daniel Encel
- 3. Australian Democrats
- 4. Liberal Party of Australia (SA Division)

Copies of the Comments are on the compact disc enclosed with this Report.

# APPENDIX D LIST OF PERSONS WHO APPEARED AT THE PUBLIC INQUIRY INTO OBJECTIONS HELD BY THE AUGMENTED ELECTORAL COMMISSION FOR SOUTH AUSTRALIA, ADELAIDE, 12 NOVEMBER 2003

Mr Ian Hunter and Mr John Rau, Australian Labor Party, South Australian Branch

Mr Ron Ellis, South East Local Government Association, Inc.

Mr James Yates, Limestone Coast Tourism

Mr Paul Black, Australian Democrats

Mr Graham Jaeschke and Mr Robert Lawson, Liberal Party of Australia (SA Division)

A transcript of the inquiry proceedings is on the compact disc enclosed with this Report.

### APPENDIX E GUIDELINES FOR THE NAMING OF COMMONWEALTH ELECTORAL DIVISIONS

Several Commonwealth Parliamentary committees have considered guidelines for naming Electoral Divisions. The guidelines below were affirmed by the Joint Standing Committee on Electoral Matters in 1995. The Redistribution Committee for South Australia and the augmented Electoral Commission for South Australia took these guidelines into account when considering the names of Electoral Divisions. It should be noted that neither the Committee nor the augmented Commission are in any way bound by them.

#### Naming after persons

In the main, Divisions should be named after deceased Australians who have rendered outstanding service to their country.

When new Divisions are created the names of former Prime Ministers should be considered.

#### **Federation Divisional names**

Every effort should be made to retain the names of original Federation Divisions.

#### Geographical names

Locality or place names should generally be avoided, but in certain areas the use of geographical features may be appropriate.

#### **Aboriginal names**

Aboriginal names should be used where appropriate and as far as possible existing Aboriginal Divisional names should be retained.

#### Other criteria

- The names of Commonwealth Divisions should not duplicate existing State Districts
- Qualifying names may be used where appropriate (e.g., Melbourne Ports, Port Adelaide).
- Names of Divisions should not be changed or transferred to new areas without very strong reasons.
- When two or more Divisions are partially combined, as far as possible the name of the new Division should be that of the old Division which had the greatest number of electors within the new boundaries. However, where the socio-demographic nature of the Division in question has changed significantly, this should override the numerical formula.

#### APPENDIX F REDISTRIBUTION TIMETABLE

12 March 2003	Direction for South Australia to be redistributed Quota of electors determined
2 June 2003	Redistribution Committee for South Australia appointed
4 June 2003	Public Suggestions and Comments on Public Suggestions invited
4 July 2003	Public Suggestions closed
18 July 2003	Comments on Public Suggestions closed
5 September 2003	Redistribution Committee for South Australia published its proposal
3 October 2003	Public Objections closed
17 October 2003	Comments on Public Objections closed
12 November 2003	Public inquiry into Public Objections to the proposal of the Redistribution Committee for South Australia
28 November 2003	Public announcement of the proposal of the augmented Electoral Commission for South Australia
17 December 2003	Determination of names and boundaries