

2003

**PROPOSED REDISTRIBUTION OF
SOUTH AUSTRALIA**

**REPORT OF THE REDISTRIBUTION
COMMITTEE**

COMMONWEALTH ELECTORAL ACT 1918

SECTION 68

CONTENTS

	Page
Reasons for the proposed redistribution of the State of South Australia	1
Statistical summary:	
• Determination of quota	13
• Enrolment projections of existing Divisions	14
• Summary of proposed Divisions	14
• Summary of movement of electors between Divisions	15
General description of the manner in which each proposed Division has been constituted	15
Description of each proposed division (each commencing on a new page)	16

Enclosures

Two maps showing the proposed Electoral Divisions.

Compact Disc of Public Suggestions to the Redistribution Committee and Comments on the Suggestions.

REASONS FOR THE PROPOSED REDISTRIBUTION OF THE STATE OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

Representation of South Australia in the House of Representatives

1. On 19 February 2003, in accordance with section 48 of the *Commonwealth Electoral Act 1918* (the Act), the Electoral Commissioner determined that, as a result of relative population changes between the States and Territories, South Australia will be entitled to 11 members in the House of Representatives at the next general election. South Australia currently has 12 members and is, accordingly, required to carry out a redistribution.

Direction for a redistribution of South Australian Electoral Divisions

2. Section 59(1) of the Act provides that a redistribution of a State into Divisions shall commence whenever the Australian Electoral Commission (AEC) so directs by notice published in the Gazette. For South Australia, this direction was published in Special Gazette No. S 74 dated 12 March 2003.
3. At the end of 12 March 2003, the day determined by the Electoral Commission for the redistribution to begin, the number of electors enrolled for the State was 1,043,177. Enrolment figures as at that day were made available to the public through the AEC web site at the following levels:
 - Census Collector District (CCD)
 - Statistical Local Area (SLA)
 - Electoral Division
 - State

Quota

4. Under Section 65(2) of the Act, the Electoral Commissioner determined that the quota of electors for South Australia was 94,834 (1,043,177 divided by 11 Members). Thus, the permitted range of the margin of allowance of 10% below and above the quota would be 85,351 to 104,317 respectively. In making its proposals for the State, the Redistribution Committee is not permitted to exceed that range.

Enrolment projections

5. Section 66(3)(a) of the Act requires the Committee to “as far as practicable, endeavour to ensure that, if the State or Territory were redistributed in accordance with the proposed redistribution, the number of electors enrolled in each Electoral Division in the State or Territory would not, at the projection time determined under Section 63A, be less than 96.5% or more than 103.5% of the average divisional enrolment of that State or Territory at that time”.

6. The Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) supplied to the AEC enrolment projections for each Census Collector District (CCD) to 31 July 2007, that is, three years and six months after the expected date of the final determination of boundaries. These projections were calculated using AEC enrolment data as the base and applying a cohort-component method to project the enrolment to the projection date.
7. Divisional Returning Officers (DROs) of the Australian Electoral Commission examined the ABS projections in the light of their local knowledge and experience and, where appropriate, proposed amended projections. This procedure was as noted in the Joint Standing Committee on Electoral Matters Report of December 1995 on the Effectiveness and Appropriateness of the Redistribution Provisions of the Act. DROs made use of information supplied by relevant Local Authority planning and statistical groups, as well as their own resources, in undertaking this task. The Australian Electoral Officer for South Australia reviewed the projections, and the few changes made by DROs, to ensure a consistency of approach.
8. These projections were also made available to the public through the AEC web site. This was to assist persons or organisations interested in using them as an indication of the likely growth of elector enrolment and as an aid to the preparation of Public Suggestions or Comments on Public Suggestions.
9. The projected total enrolment for South Australia at 31 July 2007 is 1,088,002. Thus, the average enrolment of the 11 Divisions at the projection date would be 98,909 and the 3.5% tolerance below and above that average require that Divisions be constructed in the range 95,448 to 102,370 electors.

Appointment of the Redistribution Committee for South Australia

10. In accordance with Section 60 of the Act, the AEC appointed the Redistribution Committee for South Australia on 2 June 2003. The Redistribution Committee consists of the following members:

Electoral Commissioner	Mr Andy Becker
Australian Electoral Officer for South Australia	Dr Christopher Drury
Surveyor General for South Australia	Mr Peter Kentish
Auditor General for South Australia	Mr Ken MacPherson

11. The Committee held an orientation meeting to discuss preliminary matters on 16 April 2003. Subsequent meetings were held on 25 July and 4 August 2003.

Invitation to submit Suggestions and Comments

12. In accordance with Section 64 of the Act the Electoral Commissioner invited written Suggestions and written Comments on those Suggestions by notice published in Special Gazette No. S 195 dated 4 June 2003. Invitations were also published in two South Australian newspapers, *The Advertiser* and *The Australian*, on 7 June 2003.

13. At the closing time for Public Suggestions, 6.00pm on 4 July 2003, the following Suggestions had been received (numbered in the order received):

1. Mr Glynn Evans
2. Town of Gawler
3. Mr Christopher Pyne, MP
4. Mr John Daniel Encel
5. Mr Thomas Gallasch
6. Saint Ignatius' College
7. Mr Martin Gordon
8. Prof Harry E Green
9. National Party of Australia (SA) Inc
10. Mr Christopher Connolly
11. City of Burnside
12. The Barossa Council
13. The Hon Neil Andrew, MP
14. Dr Andrew Southcott, MP
15. The Hon Trish Worth, MP
16. Liberal Party of Australia (SA Division)
17. One Nation
18. Australian Labor Party, South Australian Branch
19. City of Campbelltown
20. City of Norwood, Payneham and St Peters
21. Mr Michael Hedger
22. Mr Charles Richardson
23. The Electoral Reform Society of South Australia
24. Australian Democrats

14. In accordance with the Act, the period during which Comments on these Public Suggestions could be made closed at 6.00pm on 18 July 2003 and at that time Comments had been received from (numbered in the order received):

1. Mr Glynn Evans
2. The Hon Neil Andrew, MP
3. Mr Malcolm Buckby, MP
4. District Council of Loxton Waikerie
5. Australian Labor Party, South Australian Branch
6. Mr Charles Richardson
7. Mr Leo Lindholm
8. Mr Quentin Couper Black
9. Mr John Daniel Encel
10. The Berri Barmera Council
11. Mr Christopher Connolly
12. City of Mitcham
13. Mr David Cox, MP
14. Liberal Party of Australia (SA Division)
15. Renmark Paringa Council
16. Australian Democrats

Statutory requirements for the making of a proposed redistribution

15. Section 66(1) of the Act requires the Redistribution Committee for South Australia to make a proposed redistribution of the State.

16. Sections 66(3) and 66(3A) of the Act prescribe that:

(3) *In making the proposed redistribution, the Redistribution Committee:*

(a) *shall, as far as practicable, endeavour to ensure that, if the State or Territory were redistributed in accordance with the proposed redistribution, the number of electors enrolled in each Electoral Division in the State or Territory would not, at the projection time determined under Section 63A, be less than 96.5% or more than 103.5% of the average divisional enrolment of that State or Territory at that time; and*

(b) *subject to paragraph (a), shall give due consideration, in relation to each proposed Electoral Division, to:*

(i) *community of interests within the proposed Electoral Division, including economic, social and regional interests;*

(ii) *means of communication and travel within the proposed Electoral Division;*

...

(iv) *the physical features and area of the proposed Electoral Division; and*

(v) *the boundaries of existing Divisions in the State or Territory;*

and subject thereto the quota of electors for the State or Territory shall be the basis for the proposed redistribution, and the Redistribution Committee may adopt a margin of allowance, to be used whenever necessary, but in no case shall the quota be departed from to a greater extent than one-tenth more or one-tenth less.

(3A) *When applying subsection (3), the Redistribution Committee must treat the matter in subparagraph (3)(b)(v) as subordinate to the matters in subparagraphs (3)(b)(i), (ii) and (iv).*

Community of Interests, Means of Communication and Travel, Physical Features and Existing Boundaries

17. The criteria set out in Section 66(3)(b) of the Act – 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. However, notwithstanding these overriding constraints, the Committee sought to ensure that the other criteria were given maximum possible consideration, also bearing in mind that the criterion to give regard to the boundaries of existing Divisions is subordinate to the other criteria. Within the constraints imposed by the numerical criteria and the other considerations, the Committee adopted the view that it is highly desirable that electoral boundaries be readily recognisable. Accordingly, Local Government boundaries, locality boundaries, main roads, railways, waterways and other linear features guided the Committee, wherever possible, in the formation of boundaries.

Public Suggestions and Comments

18. In accordance with the Act, copies of the Public Suggestions (Suggestions) and the Comments on Public Suggestions (Comments) were made available for perusal at the office of the Australian Electoral Officer for South Australia from the Monday following the close of each. They were also made available on the AEC web site as soon as possible after they had closed.
19. Of the Suggestions, 6 were proposals covering the whole of the State, 11 confined themselves to a single area or several areas, 4 were proposals for specific divisions and 2 were solely about division names. The other Suggestion, that of the Electoral Reform Society of South Australia, referred to the current system of federal representation and, as such, was outside the scope of the Redistribution Committee to consider.
20. The provision of current and projected enrolment figures on the AEC web site facilitated the suggestion process as most of the Suggestions, where appropriate, took into account the numerical criteria.
21. As required by Section 64(4) of the Act the Redistribution Committee considered all of the Suggestions and Comments lodged.

Names of proposed Divisions

22. Naming of federal Divisions has been the subject of a number of recommendations from Parliamentary Committees and was dealt with most recently by the 1995 Inquiry of the Joint Standing Committee on Electoral Matters. From these recommendations, there has been developed a set of conventions that have been used by Redistribution Committees when selecting division names. These conventions were available to interested persons through the AEC web site.

Technical procedures

23. The Australian Electoral Commission maintains the electoral roll on the basis of alignment to CCDs, and thus is able to provide statistical data on enrolments and projected enrolments on this basis. Accordingly, in formulating its proposals, the Committee used CCDs as its basic building block. The State is divided into 3,173 CCDs as used at the 2001 Census of Population and Housing. The CCDs each have defined boundaries and are of differing sizes and shapes. In exceptional cases, where the Committee considered that a particular CCD boundary was inappropriate for an Electoral Division boundary, the CCD was split to provide a more useful boundary, in line with the criteria outlined in paragraph 16. Some CCDs had already been split by previous redistributions.
24. As an aid to testing various boundary options, the Committee used the AEC Electoral Boundary Mapping System (EBMS) that was developed within the proprietary "MapInfo" software package (Version 7.0). EBMS was also made available for public use at the office of the Australian Electoral Officer for South Australia.

Existing Divisions

25. The State must reduce by one division in the process of this redistribution and none of the existing 12 divisions are within the allowable range of projected enrolment for 11 divisions. Accordingly, the Committee recognised that all divisions must inevitably be affected by this redistribution.

General Strategy

26. In fulfilling its statutory duty, the Committee was mindful of areas of relative population growth and decline and limitations imposed by major geographical features and State borders. It also resolved to be guided by the boundaries of Local Government Areas (LGAs), wherever possible, as indicators of community of interests.
27. The Committee also sought to bring about as little disruption as possible to electors in proposing new electoral boundaries, although it recognised that losing a division meant significant numbers of electors would be redistributed to different electoral divisions. The proposal results in 1 in 4.5 electors changing division.
28. The Committee noted the comparatively large growth projected for those existing divisions on the fringes of the metropolitan area (Bonython, Kingston, Mayo and Wakefield), compared with the relatively low level of projected growth for the far north of the state (Grey) and also the inner southern and northwestern metropolitan areas (Boothby and Port Adelaide).
29. Finally, the Committee agreed with the argument set out in Suggestion No. 16 that full use should be made of the allowable deviation from projected enrolment tolerances. It was clear to the Committee that this increased

deviation had been written into the Act to ensure that divisional boundaries were not poorly drawn and defined merely to satisfy the projected enrolment data. The Committee determined that, wherever possible, it would adopt a clearly recognisable boundary ahead of a smaller variation from average projected enrolment.

Proposed Redistribution of South Australia

30. The Committee's redistribution proposals are set out in succeeding paragraphs. The Committee notes that in many cases its proposals make only minor changes to existing divisions. It also notes that the proposed changes have, in many cases, strong historical relationships with South Australian federal electoral boundaries of the past.

The North

31. The Committee discussed at length the number of options available to it in forming its proposed boundaries. A common thread of those discussions, and of the Suggestions, was the need to maintain a northern division accommodating the bulk of the outback area of the state. Accordingly, the Committee commenced with the existing division of Grey.
32. Grey is currently experiencing significantly low population growth and would need a correspondingly sizeable amount of territory to bring it to quota. However, the Committee discovered that there are limited options available which would bring it within the tolerance of projected electoral enrolments allowed by the Act. Transfer of the eastern Riverland from Wakefield would provide too many electors to Grey and options for Grey to return electors are not readily available. Transfers of electors from Waikerie and areas west of that town, or the LGAs on the northern edge of the Yorke Peninsula (Copper Coast and Barunga West), would be equally impractical.
33. There are too many electors on Yorke Peninsula to enable Grey to receive the whole of the Peninsula without a subsequent requirement for Grey to transfer back some electors from its created surplus. Nonetheless, the Committee considered this to be a good solution and noted that all of the eight Suggestions that offered a solution for Grey did so through a similar Yorke Peninsula transfer. Accordingly, the Committee proposes to transfer the LGAs of Copper Coast, Barunga West and Yorke Peninsula to Grey.
34. With Grey thereby in surplus, a complementary move of electors to its southern neighbour is required. Accordingly, the Committee proposes the transfer of the Clare and Gilbert Valleys Council from Grey to Wakefield.

The Murray River

35. The Committee deliberated at length upon the nature of the entire Murray River area within the State. It also carefully considered the views in the Suggestions and Comments on this subject. On balance, the Committee was convinced that the river community, despite its minor variances, represented a

significant community of interests and should, if possible, be brought together into the one division.

36. The Committee considered the river's historical electoral boundary associations. Whilst the river has often been used as a boundary during the 100 years since the proclamation of South Australia's first divisions it has not always been so, having for some years been contained within the one division. It was also noted that, of the six LGAs that have a significant connection with the river, four of them straddle it – clearly uniting communities from both banks of the river.
37. The Committee noted that bringing the whole of the Murray River together was strongly supported by Suggestion No. 18 and argued to a lesser extent by Suggestion No. 24. The Committee was further encouraged to the view by the fact that few of the Comments argued against this and that it was expressly supported in Comment No. 8. The Committee carefully considered Comment No. 14, which pursued the identification of two types of river users but made no strong argument as to why they should be in separate divisions, as well as Comment No. 2 which made a similar statement. It was also noted that both had advocated more of the river be brought together into one division.
38. Having been persuaded by the Suggestions, Comments and its own observations as to the community that exists throughout the River Murray area the Committee decided that it should be contained within the one division, if possible. It further decided that this division should be one with a current close connection to an area of the River. The Committee tested a number of options and, as a result, proposes the transfer of the whole of the River Murray area into the division of Barker.

The Fleurieu Peninsula

39. Having gained the Riverland, Barker could no longer retain the Fleurieu Peninsula (including Kangaroo Island) as to do so would leave it well above tolerance. The options for this territory that were identified were to transfer it to either Kingston or Mayo.
40. The Committee tested both options but was of the view that there existed a greater community of interests between the Fleurieu Peninsula and the Adelaide Hills areas of Mayo than with the beach suburbs of Kingston. It also noted the historical connection between the Peninsula and the Hills. As a result, the Committee proposes that the Fleurieu Peninsula, together with Kangaroo Island, be transferred to Mayo.

The Barossa Valley

41. Having gained the Riverland and lost the Fleurieu Peninsula, Barker was slightly under tolerance. After considering the options, the Committee identified that the Barossa Local Government Area was the only reasonable choice for inclusion. However, Barker was unable to take the whole of that Council whilst still remaining within tolerance. The Committee was aware of

the Council's desire to be within the one electoral division, as indicated in its Suggestion, but noted the impediments to achieving this. The Committee formed the view that the towns of Williamstown, Mount Pleasant and Springton had more in common with other Adelaide Hills towns than with the wine producing areas of the Barossa Valley.

42. In order to confirm its assessment of the Barossa Council, the Committee visited the areas in question. The Committee observed that its initial assessment was accurate and therefore proposes to move the whole of the Barossa Council into Barker except for the Hills areas mentioned above, which it proposes to move into Mayo.

Metropolitan Mayo

43. Gaining the Fleurieu Peninsula brought Mayo above tolerance and enabled a subsequent move of some of Mayo's metropolitan areas back into the metropolitan area proper.
44. A number of Suggestions identified areas of Mayo that were argued to be out of place in that division, including the suburb of Aberfoyle Park and the portions of the LGAs of Campbelltown and Tea Tree Gully.
45. The Committee agreed with the Suggestions relating to the Campbelltown area, noting that there are no apparent means of communication and travel between that area and the remainder of the division of Mayo. Whilst accepting the desirability of uniting the Aberfoyle Park/Flagstaff Hill areas, the Committee felt that there were much greater links between Aberfoyle Park and other parts of Mayo than there were for the Campbelltown area. Further, the transfer of Campbelltown allowed for the face of the Mount Lofty ranges, which is also the western boundary of the Adelaide Hills Council, to act as the natural barrier between the plains of Adelaide and the Hills towns. Accordingly, the Committee proposes to transfer the portions of the Cities of Campbelltown and Tea Tree Gully currently in Mayo to Sturt.

Kingston

46. The northern border of Kingston is a clearly defined and recognisable barrier between two communities, as had been identified in a number of the Suggestions and Comments, and the Committee agreed that there was little to justify changing it at this time. Accordingly, the additional electors required by Kingston could only come from Mayo, which the Committee had identified when deciding how best to deal with the surplus electors held by Mayo. The Committee deliberated on whether the area to transfer to Kingston would be best taken from territory adjoining the northeastern or the southeastern borders of that division.
47. Mindful of the Suggestions, the Committee decided that the most favoured option would be to bring the McLaren Vale wine areas into Kingston – the logical boundary to that transfer being the boundary of the City of Onkaparinga. This would effectively return to Kingston territory that it had

ceded at the last redistribution and seemed to be a particularly satisfactory result. Accordingly, the Committee proposes to transfer the McLaren Vale area from Mayo to Kingston.

Boothby

48. With Mayo and Kingston now both within tolerance, there was only one way for Boothby to expand – that being to its north. The Committee was mindful that Port Adelaide would require a significant boost in numbers to bring it to tolerance and decided that Hindmarsh should be left as untouched as possible from other divisional moves so that its own claim on existing Port Adelaide territory would be as light as possible. As a result, the Committee determined that Boothby should, if possible, gain electors from either Adelaide or Sturt.
49. The divisions of Boothby and Sturt share a small common boundary that is largely uninhabited. As a result, attempts to make a significant transfer from Sturt to Boothby were hampered by a requirement to detour electors through Adelaide. A further problem exists in attempting to bring electors south from Adelaide. In all of the area from Greenhill Road in the north to Shepherds Hill in the south, the only obvious east/west boundary is the existing one (Cross Road).
50. In light of these considerations, and particularly mindful of the need to cause as little disruption to Hindmarsh as possible, the Committee proposes to transfer as much of Adelaide to Boothby as it is able – that area bounded by Fullarton and Glen Osmond Roads – and transfer the remainder required to bring Boothby to tolerance from Hindmarsh. The area proposed is that to the east of the Adelaide-Noarlunga railway line.

Hindmarsh

51. The Committee felt that it had little real option with regard to bringing Hindmarsh to tolerance other than for it to move into areas currently within Port Adelaide division. Suggestions No. 16 and, to a lesser extent, No. 17 both argued Hindmarsh's historic coastal focus and these arguments were accepted by the Committee. It therefore proposes to move Hindmarsh north along the coast.
52. In finding a suitable area to transfer, the Committee tested a number of possibilities but decided that an area bounded by Frederick Road to the east was the most appropriate. The Committee noted the clear distinction between communities on either side of that road, which made it a good choice. As the area in question was bounded on the west by the Gulf St Vincent, only a northern boundary remained to be chosen – the boundary of the City of Charles Sturt presented itself as an obvious, and suitable, choice.

Adelaide and Sturt

53. As a result of Sturt gaining the City of Campbelltown from Mayo it was well above tolerance, although it's oversize effectively equalled Adelaide's

undersize and the two divisions could both be brought to tolerance through a transfer from Sturt to Adelaide. In considering this transfer, the Committee was mindful that five Suggestions had sought to make such a transfer.

54. The Committee considered at length the arguments raised in these Suggestions, which generally put forward the view that the only real community of interests in the division of Adelaide were people's common close proximity to the CBD. The Committee also looked at the history of the division since federation. In researching its history the Committee noted that Adelaide has, throughout its 100 years, been based around the areas of the CBD, North Adelaide and Prospect. The Committee considered that the most suitable transfer would be one with a strong community of interests connecting it with these core areas of the division, essentially the close city suburbs. This decision, coupled with the fact that the near eastern move provided the most distinct boundary, in the form of the major thoroughfare of Portrush Road, made that move the best choice of those available. The Committee therefore proposes that the Adelaide boundary move east to Portrush Road for as much of its length as tolerances will allow.

Makin

55. Being already reasonably close to average projected enrolment, and not having been required to cede electors to neighbouring divisions to bring them to tolerance, Makin required only a small number of additional electors to achieve tolerance. It was clear to the Committee that this number could best be sourced from the areas of Salisbury East and Salisbury Heights that Makin ceded to Bonython at the last redistribution, and it accordingly proposes to make that transfer. The Committee noted that such a move, and the resultant boundary, was supported by a number of the Suggestions.

Port Adelaide

56. With surrounding divisions now brought to tolerance, effectively Port Adelaide could only move into the current division of Bonython to gain the additional electors it needs to achieve tolerance. The Committee proposes the transfer of a portion of the City of Salisbury from Bonython to Port Adelaide as it considers there is a strong community of interests between the electors of the areas being proposed with those on the fringes of Grand Junction Road in the existing Port Adelaide. The Committee also noted that the development of the Port River Expressway, connecting Port Wakefield Road with the Le Fevre Peninsula and due for completion in 2004/5, would help cement the means of communication and travel within the proposed extended boundaries of the division.
57. The Committee noted that Suggestions No. 16 and No. 18 had offered similar solutions for Port Adelaide without any significant Comments having been made against them.

The Lower North

58. With its divisional neighbours at tolerance, Wakefield needed to move south into the northern suburbs of the metropolitan area to gain the additional electors it required. The Committee noted that four of the Suggestions had argued, to differing extents, similar moves. The Committee recognises that within any division there will be distinct communities and that wherever possible those communities should be linked with strong ties. The Committee believes those ties exist in the proposed division of Wakefield through the Town of Gawler. As noted in many of the Suggestions and Comments, it is difficult to categorize Gawler with any degree of accuracy – good arguments have been made to classify it metropolitan and equally good arguments to classify it country. For these reasons, the Committee is confident that Gawler strongly links the mainly metropolitan elements within the division’s proposed boundaries with the mainly rural ones.
59. Accordingly, the Committee proposes that Wakefield move south to take the City of Playford and part of the City of Salisbury from Bonython.
60. The Committee notes that although the majority of electors within the proposed boundaries of Wakefield are from the existing division of Bonython, the majority of the land area is from the existing division of Wakefield. The Committee also considered the fact that the division of Wakefield was first proclaimed in 1903 and that the name had been in use since, whilst the division of Bonython was not proclaimed until 1955. Given that the guidelines for naming divisions contains a preference for maintaining original Federation Divisions, of which Wakefield is as close as we come in South Australia, the Committee strongly lent toward using the division name of Wakefield. Lending further weight to this argument was the fact that Edward Gibbon Wakefield, after whom the division is named, is famed for his plan for systematic apportionment of land within this state. It seems appropriate for this reason also to retain this name in a redistribution.

Bonython

61. As a result of the other proposals detailed in this Report, the Committee proposes to abolish the division of Bonython.

Andy Becker
Presiding Member

Christopher Drury
Member

Peter Kentish
Member

Ken MacPherson
Member

REDISTRIBUTION COMMITTEE FOR SOUTH AUSTRALIA

Adelaide
5 September 2003

**REDISTRIBUTION OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA
INTO ELECTORAL DIVISIONS
FOR THE ELECTION OF MEMBERS
OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

**STATISTICAL SUMMARY AND GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE
MANNER IN WHICH EACH PROPOSED DIVISION HAS BEEN
CONSTITUTED**

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
ENROLMENT PROJECTIONS OF EXISTING DIVISIONS**

Division	No. of CCDs or part CCDs	Enrolment 12/3/2003	Projected 31/7/2007	Growth %
Adelaide	284	86,632	90,249	4.18
Barker	312	88,770	93,120	4.90
Bonython	235	86,698	92,633	6.85
Boothby	260	89,687	91,675	2.22
Grey	371	85,795	86,485	0.80
Hindmarsh	264	84,350	87,247	3.43
Kingston	222	86,122	91,524	6.27
Makin	210	88,556	93,001	5.02
Mayo	241	87,084	92,477	6.19
Port Adelaide	266	85,856	86,953	1.28
Sturt	235	86,275	89,107	3.28
Wakefield	291	87,352	93,531	7.07
South Australia	3,191	1,043,177	1,088,002	4.30

**TABLE 3
SUMMARY OF PROPOSED DIVISIONS**

Division	Actual	Var% (A)	Projected	Var% (P)	Approx 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 4
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	

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE MANNER IN WHICH EACH PROPOSED DIVISION HAS BEEN CONSTITUTED

1. The tables on the following pages set out how each proposed 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.

South Australia
Proposed Redistribution into Electoral Divisions 2003

Proposed Division 1 (Adelaide)

How Constituted	Actual Enrolment 12 March 2003	Projected Enrolment 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 PROPOSED 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

**South Australia
Proposed Redistribution into Electoral Divisions 2003**

Proposed Division 2 (Barker)

How Constituted	Actual Enrolment 12 March 2003	Projected Enrolment 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
Total received from other divisions	35,193	36,092
TOTAL FOR PROPOSED DIVISION OF BARKER	100,231	102,000
SLAs transferred to Division of Mayo:		
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

South Australia
Proposed Redistribution into Electoral Divisions 2003

Proposed Division 3 (Boothby)

How Constituted	Actual Enrolment 12 March 2003	Projected Enrolment 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 PROPOSED DIVISION OF BOOTHBY	94,981	97,016

South Australia
Proposed Redistribution into Electoral Divisions 2003

Proposed Division 4 (Grey)

How Constituted	Actual Enrolment 12 March 2003	Projected Enrolment 31 July 2007
SLAs from existing Division of Grey:		
Barunga West (DC)	1,180	1,248
Ceduna (DC)	2,266	2,307
Cleve (DC)	1,348	1,360
Cooper 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

**South Australia
Proposed Redistribution into Electoral Divisions 2003**

Proposed Division 4 (Grey) (continued)

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

**South Australia
Proposed Redistribution into Electoral Divisions 2003**

Proposed Division 5 (Hindmarsh)

How Constituted	Actual Enrolment 12 March 2003	Projected Enrolment 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 PROPOSED 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

**South Australia
Proposed Redistribution into Electoral Divisions 2003**

Proposed Division 6 (Kingston)

How Constituted	Actual Enrolment 12 March 2003	Projected Enrolment 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 PROPOSED DIVISION OF KINGSTON	92,537	98,446

**South Australia
Proposed Redistribution into Electoral Divisions 2003**

Proposed Division 7 (Makin)

How Constituted	Actual Enrolment 12 March 2003	Projected Enrolment 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 PROPOSED DIVISION OF MAKIN	92,774	97,315

South Australia
Proposed Redistribution into Electoral Divisions 2003

Proposed Division 8 (Mayo)

How Constituted	Actual Enrolment 12 March 2003	Projected Enrolment 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 PROPOSED 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

**South Australia
Proposed Redistribution into Electoral Divisions 2003**

Proposed Division 9 (Port Adelaide)

How Constituted	Actual Enrolment 12 March 2003	Projected Enrolment 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
Total received from other divisions	27,295	29,498
TOTAL FOR PROPOSED 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

South Australia
Proposed Redistribution into Electoral Divisions 2003

Proposed Division 10 (Sturt)

How Constituted	Actual Enrolment 12 March 2003	Projected Enrolment 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 PROPOSED 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

South Australia
Proposed Redistribution into Electoral Divisions 2003

Proposed Division 11 (Wakefield)

How Constituted	Actual Enrolment 12 March 2003	Projected Enrolment 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 PROPOSED 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

**South Australia
Proposed Redistribution into Electoral Divisions 2003**

Proposed Division 11 (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

South Australia
Proposed Redistribution into Electoral Divisions 2003

Proposed Abolished Division (Bonython)

How Distributed	Actual Enrolment 12 March 2003	Projected Enrolment 31 July 2007
SLAs transferred to Division of Makin: 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