



The Federal Redistribution 2003
QUEENSLAND



Public Objection Number 23

Kevin Rudd

8 pages

OBJECTION

R-23



Ms Anne Bright
Australian Electoral Officer for Queensland
7th Floor, Collection House
488 Queen Street
Brisbane QLD 4000

15 September 2003

Dear Ms Bright

Please find herewith my objection to the proposed redistribution of Queensland for 2003.

I thank the Australian Electoral Commission for the opportunity to submit this statement.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Kevin Rudd".

Kevin Rudd, MP
Federal Member for Griffith

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT SENT 19/9/03

OBJECTION

Q-23

**Objection to the Proposal of the Redistribution
Committee**

15 September 2003

**Kevin Rudd, MP
Federal Member for Griffith
PO Box 476A
Morningside
Queensland 4170**

OBJECTION

R-23

Introduction

I thank the Australian Electoral Commission for the opportunity to submit an objection to the proposed redistribution of Queensland's electoral boundaries.

Let me state first and foremost that I understand the difficulties the AEC faces in redistributing electoral boundaries – whether it be through intra-state population movement, state population growth or population decreases.

I also see the merit and community benefit in guidelines set down by the Commonwealth Electorate Act 1918, Section 66, which states that the following factors should be taken into consideration for the purposes of boundary changes:

- Community of interests within the proposed Electoral Division, including economic, social and regional interests;
- Means of communication and travel within the proposed Electoral Division;
- The physical features and area of the proposed Electoral Division; and
- The boundaries of existing Divisions in the State or Territory.

Furthermore, I note the stated criteria addressed by Section 66(3)(b) of the Commonwealth Electorate Act 1918:

"Community of interests, means of communication and travel, physical features and area, and boundaries of existing Divisions – are subordinate to the two objectives of enrolments in proposed Divisions being within a range of 3.5% above or below the average divisional enrolment at the projection time and current enrolments being within 10% above or below the quota."

The 2003 Proposed Redistribution of Queensland has, in large part, fulfilled the AEC's stated criteria in the case of the Federal Electorate of Griffith. Certainly changes to the eastern border of the Griffith electorate are consistent with the geographical determinants as stated in the Act.

I do, however, have a concern with the proposed border of the Griffith electorate that divides the suburbs of Yeronga and Annerley. In particular, the stated objectives of the AEC are not reflected in the boundary that passes through both suburbs.

OBJECTION**B-23****Nature of the objection***Yeronga*

In the case of Yeronga, the proposed boundary divides the defined 'suburb'. The most prominent example of this is that under the proposed boundaries, many of Yeronga's sporting fields – such as Goodwin Park, Downs Oval, Leyshon Park and Fehlberg Park - are all located within the electorate of Griffith. However, Yeronga High School, Yeronga TAFE, Yeronga Primary School, Yeronga Park and Souths Rugby Union Club are located within the electorate of Moreton.

I believe that in the case of Yeronga, the AEC has not taken into account the 'community of interest', social interests and physical features which are at stake. It appears that more emphasis has been placed on using the railway line as a boundary than keeping the 'community' of Yeronga intact.

Annerley

In the case of the suburb of Annerley, again, I feel that the common interests of the community have been divided by the proposed boundaries. In particular, I note that Mary Immaculate Primary School and Our Lady's Secondary Catholic College fall just outside the current proposed boundary for the electorate of Griffith, but much of the catchment area for both schools falls within the proposed electorate.

Furthermore, most of defined suburb of Annerley is divided under the proposed boundary, thus compromising the AEC's objectives of maintaining the economic and social interests of communities. As the proposed boundary does not reflect any significant geographical feature, I feel it is unnecessary to divide the suburb in such a fashion.

Proposal*Part I - Yeronga*

The suburb of Yeronga is well defined geographically and is a distinct 'community of interest' with social, economic and means of travel being features of the suburb. The proposed boundaries divide this suburb and therefore divide the community of interest that exists.

I believe there is a far better alternative to the proposed boundary that effectively results in no disruption to the suburb of Yeronga. By using the boundary of the defined Statistical Local Area (SLA) of Cansdale Street, Venner Road (to the intersection of Venner and Ipswich Roads) and then south along Ipswich Road, Yeronga's community of interest can be maintained.

OBJECTION**Q-23**

Therefore, electors falling west of Cansdale Road and south of Venner Road would be transferred into the electorate of Moreton. Those electors falling east of Cansdale Road and north of Venner Road would remain within the electorate of Griffith (Refer Attachment I)

Part II – Annerley

To minimise disruption to the suburb of Annerley and the community of interest which contributes to Annerley's social and economic environment, I propose a minor change to the boundaries that would transfer the entire population of Annerley into the Griffith electorate.

In *Part I* of this proposal I nominated Ipswich Road to make up part of the geographical divide between Griffith and Moreton. Consistent with this, I propose that the Griffith/Moreton boundary continue south from the intersection of Venner and Ipswich Roads to the intersection of Ipswich and Cracknell Roads. I believe the most practical boundary then is to follow Cracknell Road east until Toohey Road. Upon reaching Toohey Road, the boundary would run south to Weller Road, upon which it would then run east to the Pacific Motorway – joining up with the AEC's proposed boundary (Refer Attachment I).

Therefore, those electors residing east of the stretch of Ipswich Road between Venner Road and Cracknell Road would be transferred into the Griffith electorate. Electors south of Cracknell Road would remain in Moreton, while those north of Cracknell Road would be transferred into Griffith. Electorates residing east of Toohey Road between the intersection of Cracknell Road and Toohey Road and the intersection of Toohey Road and Weller Road would be transferred into Griffith, as would those electors residing north of Weller Road between Toohey Road and the Pacific Motorway.

Impact of alterations

Under the AEC's proposed boundaries, the determination of quota statewide is 84 078 – with a 10% margin permissible. Under these boundaries, the average enrolment for Queensland projected at 31 July 2007 is 93 625 (*Report of the Redistribution Committee 2003: 14*).

The current proposed boundaries for Griffith have the population of the electorate at 86 400. The projection to 2007 according to AEC data is 93 558 (*Report of the Redistribution Committee 2003: 16*).

The impact of the aforementioned alterations to the electorate of Griffith will see the current population of the electorate remain above quota at 86 363 and the projected enrolment for 2007 will be 93 343 (Refer Attachment II).

OBJECTION**12-23**

Therefore, the impact of these suggested alterations to the population of Griffith are extremely minimal, and actually bring the population (both actual and projected) slightly closer to quota.

Conclusion

The AEC's proposed boundaries for the electorate of Griffith have, in large part, identified 'communities of interest' and ensured that the economic and social interests of the affected suburbs have been kept to an absolute minimum. The use of Creek Road as a boundary has aided this objective.

However, I do feel that the AEC's primary objectives of maintaining communities of interest within proposed electoral divisions (including economic, social and regional interests); taking into account means of communication and travel within the proposed electoral division; and, where possible, working with physical features have not been met in regard to the proposed boundaries which divide Yeronga and Annerley.

Therefore, where such a case as Yeronga and Annerley fundamentally contradict the stated objectives of the AEC I believe it is in the interests of these communities to fall neatly within one electorate, as opposed to be transected (Refer Attachment II).

I believe that the alternative boundary that I have outlined may be a possible way of overcoming this problem.

OBJECTION

12-23

Attachment I

Enlarged map of changes to the proposed Griffith/Moreton boundary running through Yeronga and Annerley.



Attachment II

#-23

Actual and projected populations after proposed alterations to Griffith boundary.

Data source: 2003 AEC statistics and Department of Parliamentary Library

E_RUDD02	18 Sep 2003 14:17:57	CCDs	Actual	Projected	Population	Aust.16+	Area (sq km)
1	Blair	274	87,357	92,711	87,641	87,641	14,862.17
2	Bonner	206	84,311	95,968	84,927	84,927	357.762
3	Bowman	196	81,718	93,842	82,043	82,043	573.18
4	Brisbane	258	80,251	91,046	80,843	80,843	80,7124
5	Capricornia	319	88,717	91,062	89,558	89,558	125,135.92
6	Dawson	293	87,398	93,437	88,125	88,125	22,515.11
7	Dickson	180	80,206	92,029	80,647	80,647	707.531
8	Fadden	216	75,838	96,668	75,913	75,913	523.665
9	Fairfax	255	76,209	92,107	78,466	78,466	1,877.13
10	Fisher	231	80,564	95,462	80,809	80,809	783.99
11	Forde	222	80,422	92,787	81,033	81,033	5,201.75
12	Griffith	286	86,363	93,343	87,810	87,810	58,3709
13	Groom	255	85,038	92,665	85,638	85,638	6,451.96
14	Herbert	240	83,435	92,957	84,557	84,557	1,997.22
15	Hinkler	288	88,788	94,524	89,281	89,281	35,330.36
16	Kennedy	384	90,860	95,378	91,122	91,122	564,701.48
17	Leichhardt	330	85,467	93,124	86,053	86,053	150,676.3
18	Lilley	270	89,238	93,928	89,998	89,998	142,429
19	Longman	211	81,230	95,162	81,115	81,115	1,678.12
20	Maranoa	404	86,946	90,922	87,337	87,337	779,329.08
21	Mcpherson	228	78,087	94,545	78,003	78,003	355.457
22	Moncrieff	277	81,002	93,173	81,473	81,473	128,891
23	Moreton	223	85,051	96,115	85,870	85,870	101,327
24	Oxley	234	85,035	94,729	85,782	85,782	299.197
25	Petrie	208	84,487	94,154	85,567	85,567	144.781
26	Rankin	231	87,349	94,557	88,214	88,214	160,627
27	Ryan	229	86,856	94,484	87,602	87,602	411,088
28	Wide Bay	267	83,953	90,610	84,363	84,363	19,603.91
0	Totals for all Divisions	7,215	2,354,176	2,621,489	2,369,770	2,369,770	1,734,169.52