OBJECTION No 3

Australian Labor Party
(SA Branch)

Objections to Proposed Redistribution of the Australian Electoral Commission's Federal Redistribution Committee for South Australia

18 June 1999

ALP (SA Branch)

AUSTRALIAN LABOR PARTY

1.0 Introduction

In order to assist the Federal Boundaries Redistribution Committee, the ALP submits the following objection to the proposed redistribution. All quotations that appear below refer to the Committee's report *1999 Proposed Redistribution of South Australia into Electoral Divisions.*

2 .0 Summary

The ALP proposes minor changes to the boundaries of the federal Divisions of Adelaide and Sturt. These changes reflect the Committee's desire, as expressed in the proposed redistribution, to "neaten" (p7 s43) the boundary between Adelaide and Sturt.

3.0 General Comments on Proposed Redistribution

The ALP notes the desire of the Committee to be "mindful of voter disruption" (p6 s35) and that the Committee has presented proposed boundaries which make minimal changes to the existing boundaries.

The ALP regrets that the Committee has not taken the opportunity to bring Gawler and surrounds into a metropolitan division. We maintain that there is a strong body of evidence to suggest that the area of Gawler should be incorporated into a metropolitan seat.

The ALP notes that the Committee has agreed with several public suggestions to incorporate into Sturt the eastern metropolitan suburbs currently in Mayo that partly comprise the City of Campbelltown. We cannot understand, therefore, why only some of these suburbs were subsequently included into Sturt and not all of them. If the community of interest argument is sound for that region, then logically, all of that area should be included into a metropolitan division.

The ALP infers from the Committee's proposed boundaries that minor changes are to be preferred at this redistribution, in the knowledge that another redistribution is likely shortly after the next election which may require a reduction of one division and subsequent major boundary alterations.

Nevertheless, the ALP believes that the Committee has sacrificed clear community of interest concerns for the sake of short term pragmatism.

4.0 Specific Objections

4.1 Adelaide

The ALP notes the Committee's desire to "neaten" (p7 s43) the eastern boundary of the federal Division of Adelaide, and the proposed inclusion of Eastwood and Kent Town into Adelaide making Fullarton Road a significant part of the eastern boundary of Adelaide.

The ALP proposes a further use of Fullarton Road as the eastern boundary of Adelaide. The ALP suggests moving the suburbs of Fullarton and Myrtle Bank to the east of Fullarton Road from Adelaide into Sturt.

This allows Fullarton Road to become the major eastern boundary of Adelaide from Magill Road to Cross Road.

To make up voters in Adelaide, the suburb of Hillcrest could be moved from Sturt into Adelaide.

This proposal fits well with the community of interest provision of the Act. Hillcrest has a similar demographic profile to Greenacres and Northfield, the suburbs the Committee proposes to move into Adelaide. Fullarton and Myrtle Bank have a similar demographic profile to adjacent suburbs already in Sturt.

The number of voters to be moved is comparatively small, and the result further "neatens" the Adelaide and Sturt boundary.

4.2 Sturt

The ALP notes the Committee's acceptance of the community of interest arguments in relation to incorporating the metropolitan eastern suburb areas of Mayo into Sturt.

We believe the Committee did not go far enough. Why incorporate some areas of the City of Campbelltown and not others? The ALP submits that all of the suburbs in that region should be incorporated into the metropolitan division of Sturt.

5.0 Conclusion

The ALP understands the difficulties the Committee faces in determining draft boundaries for federal divisions in South Australia, and in juggling the different public suggestions for each division and the requirements of the Act.

However, the ALP maintains that the Committee has overlooked genuine community of interests arguments in relation to Gawler and the eastern suburbs currently in Mayo.

The ALP believes that it is wrong to approach this redistribution with a view to a future redistribution which may or may not have significant ramifications on boundary changes. Such an approach is not contemplated under the Act.

The ALP believes that the Committee has given too much weighting to existing boundaries as opposed to community of interest provisions in the Proposed Redistribution. Section 66(3A) of the Act provides that the matter in subparagraph 3(b)(v) is to be subordinate to the matters in subparagraphs 3(b)(i), (ii) and (iv).

This has resulted in proposed boundaries which do not differ markedly to existing boundaries to the detriment of communities of interest.