



PARLIAMENTARY LIBRARY

INFORMATION ANALYSIS ADVICE

QUICK GUIDE

RESEARCH PAPER SERIES, 2017–18

14 NOVEMBER 2017

The process of federal redistributions: a quick guide

Dr Damon Muller

Politics and Public Administration Section

The process of drawing and adjusting electoral boundaries in Australia is called a ‘redistribution’, and at the federal level is governed by Part IV of the [Commonwealth Electoral Act 1918](#) (CEA). Currently, five redistributions—for Tasmania, Queensland, South Australia (SA), Victoria and the Australian Capital Territory (ACT)—are in progress (the Tasmanian redistribution should be completed on 14 November 2017). While this quick guide focuses on federal redistributions, it is worth noting that redistributions also occur within the states and territories for state-level electorates using separate processes.

The process of a federal redistribution is complex and involves a number of steps. Some of the steps rely on objective information that is produced outside the redistribution process, and some of the steps have the capacity for taking into account the opinions of those who are affected by redistribution decisions. Importantly, the process is undertaken independently of the Government and the Parliament.

Redistribution decisions are often erroneously attributed to the Government or the Australian Electoral Commission (AEC). While the AEC is involved in the redistribution process in an administrative capacity, the decisions are made by a Redistribution Committee appointed for each redistribution. The Committee consists of the Australian Electoral Officer for the relevant state or territory (a statutory appointment), the Surveyor-General of the state and the Auditor-General of the state (also typically statutory officers).

Any objections to the proposals put forth by a Redistribution Committee are considered by the augmented Electoral Commission, which is made up of the Redistribution Committee and the two members of the Electoral Commission other than the Electoral Commissioner.¹ The augmented Electoral Commission makes the final determination of the redistribution, and may elect to keep the boundaries proposed by the Redistribution Committee, or modify them.

As [one expert has noted](#), ‘Australia’s current redistribution process is widely recognised as independent and fair’:

The [electoral] commissions’ structures keep them independent of the parties and their authority to order maps into effect keeps them independent of the parliament. Their process is transparent and accountable, and redistributions are triggered frequently and automatically—in four jurisdictions they take place after each election. Elector tolerances are relatively tight and in several jurisdictions they apply when it counts—at the time of subsequent elections. The criteria generate relatively meaningful districts and the outcomes are regularly accepted by the parties and the public.

1. Confusingly, the ‘Australian Electoral Commission’, under the CEA (section 6) consists of three members, including the Chair, who is usually a retired judge, the Electoral Commissioner, and a third member, usually the Australian Statistician (the head of the Australian Bureau of Statistics). In order to distinguish between the statutory agency, also referred to as the Australian Electoral Commission, this is often referred to informally as the ‘three-person Commission’. All links current as of 14 November 2017.

Redistribution triggers

There are [three triggers](#) for initiating a federal-level redistribution, set out in Section 59 of the *CEA*:

- where the representation entitlement of a state changes (see next section)
- where the divisions of a state are malapportioned, or
- where a redistribution has not been held for seven years because neither of the other two triggers have been met.

The operations of the triggers are based on either time or population numbers, and are largely objective and transparent, being based on published data.

The malapportionment trigger is invoked when the number of electors in more than one third of the divisions in the state or territory differs from the average enrolment by more than ten per cent for more than two months ([monthly enrolment statistics](#) are published by the AEC on its website). The malapportionment trigger has been present in the *CEA* since 1984 and has never been used.

The entitlement determination

Each state and territory is divided into electoral divisions (or seats) for the House of Representatives. The total number of divisions across the country is determined by [population](#) and the *Australian Constitution*, and is required to be as close as practical to twice the number of senators (that is, twice 76). Currently there are 150 divisions for the House of Representatives, although this will change (see further below).

The representation entitlement for all states and territories is determined by applying the populations of the states and territories to a particular formula. This determines how many representatives, and therefore electoral divisions, each state and territory is entitled to.

Under section 46 of the *CEA*, the Electoral Commissioner ascertains the populations of the states and territories from the Australian Statistician the day after the anniversary of the first meeting of a newly elected House of Representatives, provided that the 'House of Representatives has continued for a period of 12 months'. Section 48 of the *Act* specifies the manner in which representation entitlements are calculated from these population numbers.

As the current House of Representatives in the 45th Parliament first met on 30 August 2016, on 31 August 2017 the Electoral Commissioner took the [latest population numbers](#) published by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) and applied the entitlement determination formula.

The Electoral Commissioner's [determination, published on 31 August 2017](#), found that due to the patterns of population growth in the states and territories, Victoria and the ACT would both gain one new seat each, and that SA would lose one seat. This will bring the total number of divisions (and members) for the next (46th) Parliament to 151. The actual redistributions of electoral boundaries for these jurisdictions, however, have only recently commenced. Details of the number of members for each state (and for the Parliament) at every election since 1901 are in Appendix C.

Redistributions: the process

A redistribution [follows a set process](#) that has several opportunities for public input. Sitting members and/or their political parties, and other political parties, typically take advantage of these opportunities to submit comments, but have no special role in the process above any other interested person. As discussed below, the process ignores political consequences when determining new electoral boundaries.

In the [report of the most recent NSW redistribution](#), completed in October 2015, the Committee summarised the requirements for drawing new electoral boundaries:

In summary, the primary criteria are to:

- endeavour to ensure that the number of electors in the proposed electoral divisions are within a range of 3.5 per cent below or above the projected enrolment quota at the projection time, and
- ensure that current enrolments are within 10 per cent below or above the current enrolment quota.

The secondary criteria are community of interests, means of communication and travel, and physical features and area. The augmented Electoral Commission also considers the boundaries of existing electoral divisions; however this criterion is subordinate to the others.

The requirements are set out in section 66 of the *CEA*.

The *CEA* states that the provision for preserving existing boundaries is subordinate to the other matters. That is, the Redistribution Committee is free to disregard the current electoral boundaries if doing so better accommodates population change and reflects community of interests, travel and communication or physical features. Notably, there is no provision in the *CEA* for the consideration of political outcomes or electoral fairness in federal redistributions (although [South Australian law does have such a provision](#) for state-level redistributions).

Requirements for determining boundaries

The primary requirement for a redistribution is that all of the newly-drawn boundaries fulfil two enrolment quotas:

- the malapportionment provision, as per the redistribution triggers, that no division must differ from the average enrolment per division for the state by more than ten percent (calculated by taking the [number of enrolments](#) in the state and dividing by the number of divisions) and
- the new boundaries are required to have projected enrolments that differ by no more than 3.5 per cent from the state average.

The enrolment projections are prepared by the ABS, and the [ABS states](#) that they are based largely on the calculated projections of Australian residents aged 18 or over.² Typically the projected enrolments are for a period three and a half years after the redistribution is complete. However in the case of the current Victorian redistribution the AEC has determined that the projection time for enrolments is [only two years](#). Subsection 63A(3) of the *CEA* allows the AEC to use a shorter time for the enrolment projection if it believes that a new redistribution of the state will be required sooner than seven years. This suggests that the AEC believes that the population growth of Victoria is such that another seat will be gained at the entitlement determination following the sitting of the next (46th) Parliament.

Note that, while the whole Australian population is used for the determination of entitlement (the number of electoral divisions in each state and territory), it is only the *enrolled* population (and projected enrolled population) that is used for determining the number of electors within the actual boundaries of each division. Average enrolments are determined at the beginning of the redistribution process based on current enrolments, and the enrolment projections are published by the AEC as part of the redistribution process.

In regard to the secondary criteria (community of interests, means of communication and travel, and physical features), because redistributions are for entire states or territories, Redistribution Committees tend to take a state-wide view of these issues. However, in the absence of significantly different growth patterns and population movements in the state, unless the redistribution is required to accommodate the addition or removal of a division, boundary changes may potentially be minor.

Public consultation

Once a redistribution commences there is a public call for written suggestions (the AEC provides [guidelines for making submissions](#)). These suggestions are then made available for public comment. The Redistribution Committee will consider the suggestions and produce a set of boundary proposals, which are then published with a call for written objections to the proposals. The objections are then published and written comments on the objections are invited. The augmented Electoral Commission then considers the objections and makes a final determination.

In cases where the proposed changes are particularly contentious, such as in the most recent NSW redistribution, the augmented Electoral Commission may hold [public hearings](#) where objections can be discussed, before making its determination.

2. The resident population 18 and over is only an estimate of the population that is eligible to vote, as [resident non-citizens](#) who cannot vote are included in the count.

Interpretation of the secondary criteria listed in section 66 (community of interests, means of communication and travel, and physical features) by interested parties is largely subjective. Different parties will tend to interpret the criteria to their own ends in their own submissions. The community of interest criterion is particularly open to interpretation, and may be discussed in terms of rural versus urban, dominant industries, socioeconomic class, ethnic backgrounds, and so on.

The *CEA* (section 67) provides that a Redistribution Committee must state in writing its reasoning for its redistribution proposal, and, if any member of the Committee disagrees, the reason for the disagreement. Typically, however, the decision is unanimous.

When a redistribution does need to accommodate the addition or removal of a division, the effects of that will usually extend well beyond the people enrolled in the division affected. The removal of one division (of approximately 110,000 electors) in NSW in the 2016 redistribution resulted in 919,914 electors (18.91 per cent of all NSW electors) moving electorates.

Where an existing division must be abolished due to the results of the entitlement determination (see above), the Committee must still abide by the requirements of section 66 of the *CEA*, considering the current and projected populations first, and other factors such as community of interests after that. The decision about which division to abolish is usually suggested by other boundary changes necessitated in accommodating areas where growth and population rates have changed.

Political considerations?

As noted above, there is no provision in the *CEA* for the consideration of political outcomes or electoral fairness in federal redistributions. [It has been noted](#) that, in 1984, shortly after the AEC was created and the process of redistributions was separated from the Parliament, a federal redistribution for Western Australia was subject to an appeal in terms of the 'political effects' of the redistribution. The Electoral Commissioner at the time sought legal advice as to whether the augmented Electoral Commission had the power to decline to hear arguments on the 'political effects' of a redistribution in an objection to a redistribution.

The advice from the Commonwealth Attorney-General's Department was that the augmented Electoral Commission could, at its discretion, either include or exclude objections due to political effects. The Commission took the position that it would not consider the political effects of a redistribution. Maintaining impartiality as to the potential political effects of a redistribution has remained part of the redistribution process since that point federally, and has also been adopted by most state and territory redistribution processes (as noted previously, South Australia is an exception to this).

Timeframes

The most recent redistributions have taken 13 to 14 months to complete. The Electoral Commissioner must direct that a redistribution commences 'forthwith after making the determination' (*CEA*, paragraph 59(2)(a)). The redistributions of Victoria, SA and the ACT commenced on 4 September 2017.

The [AEC has projected](#) that the redistributions will be complete by July 2018, but if the recent past redistributions are any indication, an election before October or November 2018 could result in the triggering of a mini-redistribution for each jurisdiction. Appendix D provides dates and timeframes of recent redistributions.

Naming electorates

Under the *CEA* a Redistribution Committee and the augmented Electoral Commission are not restricted in their approach to naming new divisions or renaming old divisions. However in practice they tend to follow a set of non-mandatory guidelines which emerged out of [recommendations from a 1987 Joint Select Committee on Electoral Reform \(JSCER\) inquiry](#).

In brief, the [guidelines](#) state that:

- Electorates should be named after deceased Australians who have rendered outstanding service to their country, and deceased former Prime Ministers should be considered when naming new divisions.
- Electorate names that date from the time of Federation should be retained (a list of Federation divisions is in Appendix E).
- Place names should be avoided.
- Aboriginal names should be used where appropriate, and existing Aboriginal division names should be retained.

- Names should not duplicate existing state electoral district names.
- Names of divisions should not be changed or moved to new areas without very good reasons.
- When multiple divisions are combined the new division should be the name of the old division with the greatest number of electors in the new boundaries.

As an example of the practical application of the guidelines, in the [2016 NSW redistribution](#) the division of Hunter was abolished. Around half of the electors from the division of Hunter went into the neighbouring division of Charlton. However, as Hunter was a Federation electorate, it was decided to rename Charlton to Hunter to preserve the Federation name.

A [recent analysis](#) has concluded that 15 seats in the current parliament (10 per cent) are named after women, while 92 (61 per cent) are named after men, and three (2 per cent) are named after families.

At the 2016 redistribution for the ACT, the division of Fraser (named after John Fraser, a member of the House of Representatives for the ACT from 1951 to 1970) was renamed to Fenner (after scientist Frank Fenner) in order to free-up the name of Fraser for a future division in Victoria to be named after former Prime Minister Malcolm Fraser. As such, it is likely that Victoria will gain a division of Fraser in the upcoming redistribution of that state, although whether this will be a new division or a renamed existing division is yet unknown.

What happens if an election is called when a redistribution in is progress?

As noted above, if the calculated representation entitlement is different to the current entitlement for a state or territory, then the state or territory must undergo a redistribution. The 2017 entitlement determination indicated that SA must lose one seat and the ACT and Victoria must gain one seat each.

If a federal election is called and a redistribution is due for a state or territory but is not complete, and the state or territory has not changed its entitlement, the election will be conducted under the existing boundaries. However, section 76 of the *CEA* provides that, if a state or territory changes its entitlement and an election is called before the resulting redistribution is complete, the state or territory must undergo a '[mini-redistribution](#)'. A mini-redistribution is triggered when the writs for an election are issued.

Where a state or territory is to lose a seat (such as in SA), the two adjacent divisions with the combined lowest number of electors are combined into a single electorate. When a seat is to be gained (as with Victoria and the ACT), the two adjacent electorates with the combined largest number of electors are split into three electorates, each of which has, as close as possible, the same number of electors. These changes must happen between the issue of the writs for the election and the declaration of nominations (between 10 and 27 days after the issue of the writs).


For the purpose of conducting a mini-redistribution, the number of electors in electorates is the most recent monthly gazetted enrolment figures. It is possible to estimate the likely result of mini-redistributions for SA, Victoria and the ACT on the basis of [enrolments as of 30 September 2017](#). This calculation is an estimate only on the basis of the current enrolments, and changes in the relative enrolments in the Victorian and SA divisions could mean that a different set of electorates would be subject to any mini-redistribution by the time an election was called.

- In **South Australia**, the large rural divisions of [Barker](#) and [Grey](#) would be combined into the one division, which would be named Barker-Grey. Both of these seats are currently held by Liberal members.
- In **Victoria**, the divisions of [Gorton](#) and [McEwen](#) would be split into three divisions: Gorton, McEwen, and Gorton-McEwan³. Gorton is currently a safe Labor seat and McEwen is a fairly safe Labor seat.
- The two **ACT** seats of [Canberra](#) and [Fenner](#) would be split into three divisions: Canberra, Fenner and Canberra-Fenner. Fenner is currently a safe Labor seat and Canberra is a fairly safe Labor seat.

The distribution of the two-party preferred vote in each of these seats from the 2016 federal election can be seen in a July 2017 [Library Flagpost on the topic](#).

The mini-redistribution provisions have never been used, and as such it is impossible to say exactly how the Redistribution Commissioners (the Electoral Commissioner and the Australian Electoral Officer for the state, or

3. The *CEA* says the newly created division 'shall have a name consisting of the names of each Division included in the pair of contiguous Divisions arranged in alphabetical order and hyphenated', (subsection 76(12)).



the senior Divisional Returning Officer in the case of the ACT) would split up two divisions into three. Mini-redistributions in SA, Victoria and the ACT would likely leave very little time to decide pre-selection for the newly created (or newly abolished) seats, and could result in extensive voter confusion.

Further reading

- [Electoral redistributions during the 45th Parliament](#) (Parliamentary Library)
- [Redistributions—Frequently Asked Questions](#) (AEC)
- [Explainer: how do seat redistributions work?](#) (The Conversation)
- [Changes to State Representation in the House of Representatives and the Impact on Election Timing](#) (Antony Green)

Appendix A: the fate of recently abolished divisions

2016—NSW

The most recent NSW redistribution saw the division of Hunter abolished. However, the division of Charlton was moved so that it contained about half the population of the former division of Hunter and half of the former Charlton. Charlton was then renamed to Hunter (notionally marginal Australian Labor Party (ALP)⁴). The sitting Member for the previous division of Hunter (Joel Fitzgibbon, ALP) ran for and won the new division of Hunter, while the sitting Member for Charlton (Pat Conroy, ALP) ran for and won the division of Shortland (notional fairly safe ALP) at the 2016 federal election. The previous Member for Shortland (Jill Hall, ALP) retired before the 2016 federal election.

2009—NSW

In the 2009 redistribution of NSW the division of Reid (safe ALP) was abolished. The Redistribution Committee proposed renaming the existing division of Lowe to McMahan which the augmented Electoral Commission then renamed to Reid (and the existing division of Prospect was renamed to McMahan). The new division of Reid (notionally safe ALP) had about one third of its population from the previous division of Reid, and two thirds from the existing division of Lowe (marginal ALP). The Member for Lowe (John Murphy, ALP) ran and won the new seat of Reid, and the Member for the previous division of Prospect (Chris Bowen, ALP) ran in and won the new division of McMahan (notionally safe ALP) in the 2010 election. The Member for Reid (Laurie Ferguson, ALP) ran for and won the division of Werriwa (notionally safe ALP). The previous Member for Werriwa (Chris Hayes, ALP) ran for and won the division of Fowler (notionally safe ALP).

2005—NSW

The division of Gwydir (safe National Party (NAT)) was abolished, with most of the population transferred to the division of Parkes (safe NAT in 2007), and a smaller proportion to Hunter (notionally safe ALP in 2007) and other electorates. The sitting Member for Gwydir (John Anderson, NAT) retired prior to the 2007 federal election, and the sitting Member for Parkes (John Cobb, NAT) moved to the seat of Calare (notionally safe NAT) at the 2007 election, with a new Member (Mark Coulton, NAT) elected in Parkes.

2003—SA

In the 2003 redistribution of SA the division of Bonython (safe ALP) was abolished, with most of the population of Bonython going into the division of Wakefield (safe Liberal Party (LIB) at the 2001 election). The Member for the previous division of Bonython (Martyn Evans, ALP) ran in the new seat of Wakefield (notionally marginal ALP) in the 2004 election and narrowly lost to a new Liberal candidate. The previous Member for Wakefield (Neil Andrew, LIB) retired prior to the 2004 election.

1994—Victoria

The seat of Corinella was abolished. The former Member for Corinella (Alan Griffin, ALP) went on to contest the seat of Bruce (notional marginal ALP) in the 1996 election and won against the incumbent Member (Julian Beale, LIB) in what had previously been a fairly safe Liberal seat.

1992—NSW

This redistribution abolished the divisions of Phillip and Dundas, and created the division of Paterson (notionally marginal LIB). The Member for Phillip (Jeannette McHugh, ALP) contested and won the division of Grayndler (notional safe ALP), and the Member for Dundas (Philip Ruddock, LIB) contested and won the existing division of Berowra (safe LIB). The previous Member for Grayndler (Leo McLeay, ALP) contested and won the division of Watson (fairly safe ALP). The previous Member for Berowra (Paul Edwards, LIB) retired before the election. The winner of the division of Paterson (Bob Horne, ALP) was new to Parliament.

1992—SA

The division of Hawker was abolished, and its population mainly went to the divisions of Boothby and Hindmarsh. The Member for Hawker (Christine Gallus, LIB) went on to contest and win Hindmarsh, which was notionally marginal Liberal, at the 1993 election. The previous Member for Hindmarsh (John Scott, ALP), which was previously a marginal ALP electorate, retired before the election.

4. Details on the candidates and the notional election margins have been taken from [Adam Carr's Australian Election Archive](#).

1989—Victoria

The divisions of Henty and Streeton were abolished and the new division of Corinella was created (which did not include any of the electors of Henty or Streeton). The Member for Henty (Joan Child, ALP), a fairly safe ALP electorate, retired in 1990. The Member for Streeton (Tony Lamb, ALP) went on to contest the division of Deakin (which was notionally marginal ALP) and lost at the 1990 federal election.

Appendix B: recent redistributions

Redistributions were undertaken in 2016 for New South Wales (NSW), Western Australia (WA), the ACT and the Northern Territory (NT). The submissions to these redistributions are still available online.

NT (2017)

[Public suggestions](#)

[Comments on public suggestions](#)

[Objections to the redistribution proposal](#)

[Comments on objections](#)

[Final determination report](#)

NSW (2016)

[Public suggestions](#)

[Comments on public suggestions](#)

[Objections to the redistribution proposal](#)

[Comments on objections](#)

[Final determination report](#)

WA (2016)

[Public suggestions](#)

[Comments on public suggestions](#)

[Objections to the redistribution proposal](#)

[Comments on objections](#)

[Final determination report](#)

ACT (2016)

[Public suggestions](#)

[Comments on public suggestions](#)

[Objections to the redistribution proposal](#)

[Comments on objections](#)

[Final determination report](#)

Appendix C: number of House of Representatives seats by state for each federal election

Election year	NSW	Vic.	Qld	SA	WA	Tas.	NT	ACT	Total	Total with full voting rights ^(a)
1901	26	23	9	7	5	5			75	75
1903	26	23	9	7	5	5			75	75
1906	27	22	9	7	5	5			75	75
1910	27	22	9	7	5	5			75	75
1913	27	21	10	7	5	5			75	75
1914	27	21	10	7	5	5			75	75
1917	27	21	10	7	5	5			75	75
1919	27	21	10	7	5	5			75	75
1922	28	20	10	7	5	5	1		76	75
1925	28	20	10	7	5	5	1		76	75
1928	28	20	10	7	5	5	1		76	75
1929	28	20	10	7	5	5	1		76	75
1931	28	20	10	7	5	5	1		76	75
1934	28	20	10	6	5	5	1		75	74
1937	28	20	10	6	5	5	1		75	74
1940	28	20	10	6	5	5	1		75	74
1943	28	20	10	6	5	5	1		75	74
1946	28	20	10	6	5	5	1		75	74
1949	47	33	18	10	8	5	1	1	123	121
1951	47	33	18	10	8	5	1	1	123	121
1954	47	33	18	10	8	5	1	1	123	121
1955	46	33	18	11	9	5	1	1	124	122
1958	46	33	18	11	9	5	1	1	124	122
1961	46	33	18	11	9	5	1	1	124	122
1963	46	33	18	11	9	5	1	1	124	122
1966	46	33	18	11	9	5	1	1	124	123
1969	45	34	18	12	9	5	1	1	125	125
1972	45	34	18	12	9	5	1	1	125	125
1974	45	34	18	12	10	5	1	2	127	127
1975	45	34	18	12	10	5	1	2	127	127
1977	43	33	19	11	10	5	1	2	124	124
1980	43	33	19	11	11	5	1	2	125	125
1983	43	33	19	11	11	5	1	2	125	125
1984	51	39	24	13	13	5	1	2	148	148
1987	51	39	24	13	13	5	1	2	148	148

Election year	NSW	Vic.	Qld	SA	WA	Tas.	NT	ACT	Total	Total with full voting rights ^(a)
1990	51	38	24	13	14	5	1	2	148	148
1993	50	38	25	12	14	5	1	2	147	147
1996	50	37	26	12	14	5	1	3	148	148
1998	50	37	27	12	14	5	1	2	148	148
2001	50	37	27	12	15	5	2	2	150	150
2004	50	37	28	11	15	5	2 ^(b)	2	150	150
2007	49	37	29	11	15	5	2	2	150	150
2010	48	37	30	11	15	5	2	2	150	150
2013	48	37	30	11	15	5	2	2	150	150
2016	47	37	30	11	16	5	2	2	150	150
2019?	47	38	30	10	16	5	2	3	151	151

(a) The member for the Northern Territory had limited voting rights between 1922 and 1968. The member for the Australian Capital Territory had limited voting rights between 1949 and 1966.

(b) The NT was reduced to 1 seat after the entitlement determination of 19 February 2003 but reverted to two divisions after the passage of the [Commonwealth Electoral Amendment \(Representation in the House of Representatives\) Act 2004](#) and did not undergo a redistribution.

Key: numbers in green indicate a seat gained since the last election, and numbers in red indicate a seat lost. Shaded cells indicate that the seat has [undergone a redistribution](#) prior to the election.

Source: Compiled by the Parliamentary Library from various sources.

Appendix D: start dates and selected milestones of recent redistributions

State	Date redistribution commenced	Days until suggestions closed	Days from suggestions closed to proposal released	Date Finalised	Days from proposals released until redistribution finalised	Total time	
						Days	Months
NT	15/10/2015	141	189	7/02/2017	151	481	15
NSW	1/12/2014	172	147	25/02/2016	132	451	14
WA	1/12/2014	130	133	19/01/2016	151	414	13
ACT	1/12/2014	179	105	28/01/2016	139	423	13
SA	12/01/2011	114	98	16/12/2011	126	338	11
Vic.	1/02/2010	67	112	24/12/2010	147	326	10
Qld	19/02/2009	78	77	15/12/2009	144	299	9
NSW	19/02/2009	71	98	22/12/2009	137	306	10
Tas.	13/02/2008	86	105	16/02/2009	178	369	12
NT	16/01/2008	72	84	19/08/2008	60	216	7
WA	14/12/2007	105	126	10/12/2008	131	362	11
NSW	2/12/2005	112	98	22/11/2006	145	355	11
Qld	2/12/2005	91	112	22/11/2006	152	355	11
ACT	30/11/2004	108	98	9/12/2005	168	374	12
Qld	12/03/2003	100	63	25/11/2003	95	258	8
SA	12/03/2003	114	32	17/12/2003	134	280	9
Vic.	18/01/2002	91	133	29/01/2003	152	376	12
WA	23/12/1999	92	63	20/11/2000	178	333	10
NT	23/12/1999	71	56	21/12/2000	237	364	11
Tas.	14/04/1999	44	84	22/11/1999	94	222	7
NSW	26/02/1999	49	91	11/02/2000	210	350	11
SA	10/02/1999	37	63	13/08/1999	84	184	6

Source: [AEC](#) and Parliamentary Library calculations.

Appendix E: the Federation divisions and their fate

State	Divisions	Time in use	History
NSW	Barrier	1901–22	Abolished on redistribution of seats, 1922
	Bland	1901–06	Abolished on redistribution of seats, 1906
	Canobolas	1901–06	Abolished on redistribution of seats, 1906
	Cowper		Still in existence
	Dalley	1901–69	Abolished on redistribution of seats, 1968
	Darling	1901–77	Abolished on redistribution of seats, 1977
	East Sydney	1901–69	Abolished on redistribution of seats, 1968
	Eden-Monaro		Still in existence
	Gwydir	1901–2007	Abolished on redistribution of seats, 2006
	Hume		Still in existence
	Hunter		Still in existence
	Illawarra	1901–22	Abolished on redistribution of seats, 1922
	Lang	1901–77	Abolished on redistribution of seats, 1977
	Macquarie		Still in existence
	Newcastle		Still in existence
	New England		Still in existence
	North Sydney		Still in existence
	Parkes		Still in existence
	Parramatta		Still in existence
	Richmond		Still in existence
	Riverina		Still in existence
	Robertson		Still in existence
	South Sydney	1901–34	Abolished on redistribution of seats, 1934
Wentworth		Still in existence	
Werriwa		Still in existence	
West Sydney	1901–69	Abolished on redistribution of seats, 1968	
Vic	Balaclava	1901–84	Abolished on redistribution of seats, 1984
	Ballaarat		Still in existence; renamed Ballarat 1977
	Bendigo		Still in existence
	Bourke	1901–49	Abolished on redistribution of seats, 1948
	Corangamite		Still in existence
	Corinella	1901–06	Abolished on redistribution of seats, 1906
		1990–96	Abolished on redistribution of seats, 1994
	Corio		Still in existence
	Echuca	1901–37	Abolished on redistribution of seats, 1936
	Flinders		Still in existence
	Gippsland		Still in existence

State	Divisions	Time in use	History
	Grampians	1901–22	Abolished on redistribution of seats, 1922
	Indi		Still in existence
	Kooyong		Still in existence
	Laanecoorie	1901–13	Abolished on redistribution of seats, 1912
	Melbourne		Still in existence
	Melbourne Ports		Still in existence
	Mernda	1901–13	Abolished on redistribution of seats, 1912
	Moira	1901–06	Abolished on redistribution of seats, 1906
	Northern Melbourne	1901–06	Abolished on redistribution of seats, 1906
	Southern Melbourne	1901–06	Abolished on redistribution of seats, 1906
	Wannon		Still in existence
	Wimmera	1901–77	Abolished on redistribution of seats, 1977
Yarra	1901–69	Abolished on redistribution of seats, 1968	
Qld	Brisbane		Still in existence
	Capricornia		Still in existence
	Darling Downs	1901–84	Abolished on redistribution of seats, 1984
	Herbert		Still in existence
	Kennedy		Still in existence
	Maranoa		Still in existence
	Moreton		Still in existence
	Oxley		Still in existence
	Wide Bay		Still in existence
WA	Coolgardie	1901–13	Abolished on redistribution of seats, 1912
	Fremantle		Still in existence
	Kalgoorlie		Still in existence
	Perth		Still in existence
	Swan		Still in existence

Note: Corinella was abolished twice, once in 1906 and for the second time in 1994. Only 63 of the first Parliament's 75 divisions were Federation divisions as the first MPs from both Tasmania and South Australia were elected 'at large'. This was due to the colonial parliaments not having managed to distribute the colonies in time for the 1901 election (held on 29 and 30 March), and meant that each of these MPs was known as the 'Member for Tasmania' and the 'Member for South Australia'. The first named divisions for Tasmania and South Australia were not used until the 1903 election.

© Commonwealth of Australia



Creative Commons

With the exception of the Commonwealth Coat of Arms, and to the extent that copyright subsists in a third party, this publication, its logo and front page design are licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0 Australia](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/au/) licence.