



Comment on suggestion 10

Darren McSweeney

5 pages

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, 13 December 2017 9:32 PM
To: FedRedistribution - SA
Subject: [SA REDISTRIBUTION SUGGESTIONS] Darren McSweeney *WWW*
[SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]
Attachments: vic-Darren McSweeney-.pdf

South Australian Redistribution comment on suggestion uploaded from the AEC website.

Name: Darren McSweeney

Organisation:

Address: [REDACTED]

Phone number: [REDACTED]

Additional information: Please find attached comments on suggestions for SA redistribution.

Comments on Suggestions

I will have to say, I did not expect that! Over 200 suggestions shocked me at first. Then I noticed the pattern that appeared, and most of the suggestions would be better called objections delivered at the suggestion phase. Having sorted through this plethora of objections, I determined there to be only 16 suggestions that did not relate solely to the fear that the Division of Mayo will be abolished.

Mayo

~~SS2-126~~ ~~SS129-179~~ ~~SS181-183~~ ~~SS187-197~~, ~~SS199-200~~, ~~SS202-203~~, ~~S205~~

Clearly a campaign with call to arms has been orchestrated for the people of Mayo. I have not taken it upon myself to read each of these, however a large enough random sample shows that most are simply form letters, stating the same argument.

These suggestions are concerned that the Division of Mayo would be abolished and provided certain reasons why they feel this is unfair, unnecessary or unwarranted, and why their local region's identity and sense of community are important should be maintained.

I include s182 Peters in this, as although categorised as "All divisions", the theme of the suggestion is clearly the potential abolition of Mayo.

No other suggestion lodged advocates for the Division of Mayo to be abolished, and I cannot see any reason to suggest that it would be. Mayo serves a purpose, and has a distinct community of interest. There are other worthier candidates to abolish.

Political Suggestions

~~S189Zappia MP~~; ~~S209Ramsey MP~~; ~~S184Sharkey MP~~

These three suggestions by the local members reiterate the unique identity of their communities (and no doubt the expected voting intentions of their constituents). I believe that my suggestion adheres to all their recommendations.

~~S208Labor~~

The ALP's approach of giving options, rather than suggestions is frustrating. Not choosing any particular option, providing any numbers or maps to support suggestions, it is hard to determine if anything expressed in this the suggestion has merits. They seem to advocate abolition of Sturt, but this is implied rather than expressly stated, and their suggestion that the name be abolished reflects this.

S211 Liberal

Some interesting and peculiar proposals. While argument can be made to abolish Adelaide, moving Makin so far south appears to be out of step with other suggestions. The current Port Adelaide division stretches around the harbour to include parts of Salisbury that are physically separated from the remaining areas of Port Adelaide and share no community of interest. This suggestion continues, and exacerbates this.

S210 Democrats

Vehemently – or emphatically – oppose placing Barossa in Barker, in opposition to almost all other suggestions. While keeping Barossa and Gawler together would be ideal, Gawler clearly has more urban characteristics and fits well in Wakefield. Attempting to combine them in a division other than Barker creates unnecessary flow on effects to Grey, Wakefield and Mayo, and then into the metropolitan areas, reducing communities of interest in many other places in the state.

S185 Gawler (T)

My suggestion retains Gawler in one division, with surrounding areas from Light and Playford. While Barossa is moved to Barker, not all areas can be kept together. The Town of Gawler is closely connected to Playford and therefore maintains a community of interest.

Individual's Suggestions

S128 Walsh

Overall, I agree with, or at least would not object to most of this proposal. I have minor issue with the awkward boundary between Hindmarsh, Boothby and Adelaide stretching around the Airport then suddenly dog-legging back down Marion Rd. If this line could be straightened then I would have no issues here.

The only other area I consider unsatisfactory is placing parts of the City of Mitcham including Belair and Blackwood into Mayo. These areas are far more closely connected to the metropolitan area than the Hills and should be kept within Boothby.

S180 Hedger

Agree with the proposal to abolish or retire the name Port Adelaide.

S204 Ashley

The changes to regional divisions are logical and sensible. I cannot agree with the changes in the metropolitan area however, particularly Makin, which stretches far south. This causes flow on effects to Boothby and Hindmarsh, and eventually back around to Port Adelaide, which continues to hold on to areas in Salisbury which has no connection to rest of Port Adelaide. Given the circumstances, it is desirable to remedy this, and extract Salisbury from Port Adelaide.

S206 Mullin

On the whole, these changes are innocuous and reasonable, although I would advocate that the name Port Adelaide is changed to Hindmarsh. While the area is proposed to contain most of the current Port Adelaide, retaining the name Hindmarsh would be more preferable and part of this division covers the old Hindmarsh area.

S207 Burke

Advocates to change the names of most divisions. While there is merit in the suggested names, and I would always support naming divisions after worthy Australians, there is convention to maintain the status quo where it is longstanding. The names of South Australian divisions are long lasting, and should not be changed unless necessary, certainly not in a whole of state approach as advocated and recycling old names in new areas should always be avoided unless very good reasons exist for doing so.

The “usual suspects”

S1 Gordon

Agree with the proposal to abolish Port Adelaide. I am not sure that the changes in Murray Bridge with Barker and subsequent flow on to Mayo and Kingston are necessary. Retaining Gawler in Wakefield can remedy any need for this change. As always, a well thought out suggestion, despite Mr Gordon's overseas absence from Australia at the time of suggestions.

S127 Waddell

In many regards, this is quite similar to my own suggestion. Once again, Mr Waddell manages to cover even the most minor alignment to ensure that all divisions adhere to strong boundaries. The major distinction is that he proposes to abolish Adelaide and expand Sturt westward, while I opt for dissolving Port Adelaide. I would suggest that the division name Adelaide be retained, to remain consistent with other mainland state capitals, even if his proposal was accepted. I am ambivalent to recycling the name Angas, but I know that enhancing names for divisions is certainly one of Mr Waddell's proclivities.

S201 Mulcair

As always, I appreciate and acknowledge the efforts Dr Mulcair puts into the redistribution process. While he abolishes Hindmarsh, the changes are largely the same as my suggestion, combining Port Adelaide and Hindmarsh with excess parts of Port Adelaide going to Adelaide, Makin or Wakefield. I would prefer to see the name Hindmarsh retained.

Summary

Interestingly, in most suggestions are several general consensuses:

- A tendency for Grey to expand to cover Clare and Gilbert Valleys, Wakefield and Adelaide Plains (Mallala). No changes are made to the boundary between Grey and Barker in the Riverland.
- Light is often split, with some parts in Grey, some in Barker, some in Wakefield.
- Barossa is consolidated in one division, usually Barker, and usually without Gawler.
- Makin and Wakefield boundary is often proposed to align (at least in some part) with Main North Rd, Kings Rd and the Little Para River.
- Parts of Onkaparinga south of the Noarlunga River are transferred to Mayo.
- Flagstaff Hill, Aberfoyle Park and surrounding areas are subsumed by Boothby.
- Hindmarsh moves north, leaving part of West Torrens to Boothby.
- Mayo is not abolished, nor substantially changed in composition.

Again, I thank the Committee for their efforts, look forward to the proposed redistribution in the coming months.