

# **OBJECTION No 1**

**K. W. West**

K. W. West  
13 Park Square,  
PORT MELBOURNE Vic. 3207

Tel (03) 9681 9442

3 June 1999

Mr. Geoff Halsey,  
Australian Electoral Officer,  
South Australia.

Fax (08) 8231 2664

Dear Mr. Halsey,

Re: 1999 Redistribution of Federal Electoral Boundaries in South Australia.

I note in Electoral Newsfile No 81, May 1999 that a copy of the Redistribution Committee's Report (containing more detailed maps and reasons than were presented in the Newsfile) is available from your office.

I should like you to forward a copy to me as soon as practicable please, since besides being interested in the South Australian Redistribution from the viewpoint of principle, I shall, in the not-too-distant future, be presenting detailed proposals to the next Victorian Redistribution Committee.

Receipt of the South Australian Report would not only enable me to add to the 'in principle' submission I am making today (through you to Mr. Bill Gray) for the use of the Augmented Electoral Commission regarding the proposed South Australian Redistribution, but would also enable me to be better acquainted with the Electoral Commission's modus operandi. This will enable me to make a more appropriate submission regarding the next Victorian Redistribution of Federal Electoral Boundaries.

I look forward to the early receipt of a copy of the Report of the South Australian Redistribution Committee.

Yours faithfully,

*K.W. West*

K.W. West



K.W. West  
13 Park Square  
PORT MELBOURNE Vic. 3207

1  
K.W.West  
13 Park Square  
PORT MELBOURNE Vic. 3207

Tel (03) 9681 9442

3 June 1999

Mr. Bill Gray  
Electoral Commissioner  
C/o Mr. Geoff Halsey  
Australian Electoral Officer  
South Australia  
Fax (08) 8231 2664

Dear Mr. Gray,

Re: 1999 Redistribution of Federal Electoral Boundaries in South Australia

I have this day sought a copy of the Redistribution Committee's Report so that I might study the detail. If I have further more detailed thoughts on the matter I shall write again as soon as practicable. Meanwhile I submit a few comments of an 'in principle' nature for the consideration of the Augmented Electoral Commission.

Whilst I note the spirit of the proposed redistribution, and generally commend it, I should like to make the following points :-

Names of Divisions

Whilst I appreciate the fact that each of the rearranged Divisions correspond with an existing Division I have some difficulty accepting the continuance of the name of the Port Adelaide Division.

This is based on the principle that I believe each Division in the Commonwealth should bear a distinctive short one-word name.

The Divisions of Melbourne and Port Adelaide (taken together) could easily be confused with the Divisions of Melbourne Ports and Adelaide (taken together).

Whilst, as an Australian, I pursue this principle with vigour, as a Victorian, I do not presume to be definitive as to the possible name change. However, only as a suggestion, perhaps the Augmented Electoral Commission could consider the possible re-use of the previously-used name of Hawker instead of Port Adelaide.

2

### Areas of Divisions

I note that the proposed redistribution moves small areas of the Mayo Division into each of the Boothby and Sturt Divisions, with what seems to be a larger area from the Kingston Division into the Mayo Division.

I note also that the Electoral Atlas 1998 showed the existing Mayo Divisional boundaries to contain 2047 sq. km., whereas Electoral Newsfile No 81 shows the proposed Mayo Divisional boundaries to contain 2035.37 sq. km.

On the face of it there seems to be something wrong.

Another point is the apparent inclusion of areas of sea in the quoted Divisional areas. This seems to be so particularly in Queensland and presumably also in the proposed Port Adelaide Division. I'm wondering what the underlying principle is. To a layperson the comparison of Divisions only makes sense in terms of the land areas involved.

In any event the quoting of Divisional areas to other than the nearest square kilometre doesn't make sense to a layperson.

Perhaps the Augmented Electoral Commission could look into these matters for South Australia, with the Mayo and Port Adelaide Divisions as specific examples.

### Boundaries of Divisions

Whilst I appreciate that the Divisional boundaries have to be drawn with current and future elector numbers of paramount concern, there doesn't seem to me to be, throughout the Federal system, a consistent principle underlying the drawing of the Divisional boundaries.

Sometimes the boundaries seem to follow Local Government Area boundaries, sometimes they seem to follow natural features such as rivers or creeks, and sometimes they seem to follow man-made features such as roads or railway lines.

I would suggest that as a first approach in the delineation of Divisional boundaries, the following of LGA boundaries should be adopted wherever practicable, with natural features as a second preference and man-made features used as a last resort.

Perhaps the Augmented Electoral Commission could consider this principle when reviewing the proposed boundaries for South Australia.

3

Shape of Divisions

To the layperson it would seem preferable for Divisional boundaries to be drawn so as to produce 'regular' Divisions.

Most of the proposed South Australian Divisional boundaries would be in accordance with this 'principle'.

However, by any reasonable consideration, the existing boundaries of the Wakefield Division would not comply with this 'principle', and the current proposals only make the matter worse.

Likewise, whilst the current boundaries of the Kingston Division are reasonable from this viewpoint, the proposed boundaries look somewhat contrived.

Perhaps the Augmented Electoral Commission could bear this 'principle' in mind when reviewing the proposed Divisional boundaries for South Australia.

Yours faithfully

*K.West*  
K.W.West