



**THE FEDERAL  
REDISTRIBUTION  
NORTHERN TERRITORY**

# Comment on objection 1

Darren McSweeney

1 page



There is little to comment on from the objections lodged, so these comments will be brief. I will address each objection sequentially.

## **Objection OB1 – Lorraine Gardner**

Ms Gardiner’s objection is something to consider, however I feel it should now be considered only in a future redistribution. Had this objection been received at the time of suggestions, the Committee may have seen to fit the Wagiat Shire area with the Division of Solomon. Further, while most communication would be via direct ferry to Darwin, Wagiat is still connected to the rest of the Division of Lingiari by road. Combined with the numerical requirements and the Division of Solomon needing to reduce electors, it does not seem practical to add a non-contiguous area to the Division of Solomon at this time.

## **Objection OB2 – Jeff Waddell**

Or rather, Mr Waddell’s lack of objection. I must state that I have certainly enjoyed Mr Waddell’s contributions over the last redistribution cycle, and as one of only a handful of independent commenters, I feel a certain affinity with Mr Waddell. His complete support of the Committee’s proposal is confirmation, as was my own support, that the Committee has made the correct decision in this case. As he has stated, “And now off to Tasmania...”

## **Objection OB3 – Darren McSweeney**

This is my own objection; I feel it needs no further comment.

## **Objection OB4 – Australian Labor Party NT Branch.**

I am not completely sure what the Hon Warren Snowdon is attempting with this objection on behalf of the Australian Labor Party. The position of “no change” is clearly not possible, and “minimal change” by shifting Litchfield Municipality, but no other area, does not fit with the numerical requirements of the Electoral Act and therefore cannot be considered.

The ten pages of the submission outlining statutory requirements and arguing against the enrolment data are most certainly out of scope. Unfortunately, as the case may be, the numbers provided by the ABS are the enrolment figures that are required to be used, and discounting these data, for whatever reason, cannot be a consideration of the Committee when making a recommendation.

Further, the issues raised in the supplementary Appendix A of the objection by Northern Territory MLAs Eva Lawler and Tony Sievers are not unique to this redistribution and occur throughout the country. There is no reason to consider these as any different, or special and should not affect the outcome.

In conclusion, I reiterate that I believe the Committee has provided the best solution for the current situation, and while obviously it would be more preferable to not split Palmerston, according to the current (and predicted) figures, it is the only possible outcome.