



# Objection 240

Darren McSweeney

2 pages

# Objection to proposed redistribution of electoral boundaries in South Australia

## Introduction

I will start by stating that I am pleasantly surprised by the results of the proposed redistribution. Overall, there is very little that is unsatisfactory, and I commend the Committee on their efforts.

I am pleased to see that the Committee is willing to change Federation (or near-Federation) division names where the existing name is no longer relevant, or appropriate. This appears to continue the trend where Federation or near-Federation divisions have been changed or abolished in several states (Gwydir, Kalgoorlie, Denison and now Corangamite, Melbourne Ports and Wakefield).

Within South Australia, the name Wakefield is iconic, however, the name represents a link to the colonial past. While the notion of preserving Federation division names is noble, the reality is that we will continue to need to find divisions to name for prime ministers, and, combined with the current agenda to redress to gender and racial imbalance, there are just not enough divisions to also keep all existing Federation names.

Specifically, I approve of the abolition of Port Adelaide and renaming Wakefield. Naming a division after Catherine Helen Spence is more than satisfactory.

I would like to commend the Committee on the explanation of the report, especially concerning the renaming of Wakefield. Providing clear and thorough details of how the name was decided displays transparency and clarity to the process.

I would suggest that the Committee return to the previous style of report, where divisions are discussed according to their location within the state. It makes it easier to dissect the information if divisions are outlined in relation to each other, rather than alphabetical. It can also aid with providing reasons for the Committee making certain decisions about elector transfers. This is another area that I feel the Committee's report is currently lacking. In some cases, the merits for transferring one area over others are discussed, however I feel this should be more the focus of the report, rather than the basic numerical exercise, which is related in tables and maps anyway.

## Objections

I do not have any specific objections to make and feel that with the overall direction the Committee has taken, that there is no need to make any further adjustments.

I support consolidating Spence as an urban area and approve of the boundary along the Gawler urban boundary. This permits Grey to gain necessary electors and I support this change.

The southern boundary of the proposed Spence almost exactly aligns with my suggestion. I support uniting most of Barossa LGA in the one division and consider that Barker is the most appropriate division for this.

Likewise, the new Boothby boundaries with Adelaide and Hindmarsh match my suggestions, although I chose the alignment along the Sturt River rather than the LGA alignment through Glenelg North, but this difference is negligible. Similarly, the southern boundary of Boothby, is logical and coherent.

The proposed Kingston aligns almost with my own, however I extended Mayo further north to include Maslin Beach and most of Seaford in Mayo. I do not object to the Committee's proposal for Kingston or Mayo.

I do however wish to make a general comment in that I am slightly concerned by the seemingly increased reliance on locality boundaries. This is a trend that seems to be carried in the last few redistributions in various states, and while it's true that most people know in which suburb they live, relying on these somewhat weak boundaries to unite entire suburbs can leave divisions compromised.

At times, there are strong physical barriers that better serve the boundary, rather than what name people use refer to their suburb.

I know this is a matter of compromise, especially where suburbs and government areas do not align. The unfortunate result is evident in this redistribution with the final make-up in Boothby, Kingston and Sturt, it does seem to make things a bit messy.

## Summary

As I said at the top, overall the Committee is to be commended for a logical, sensible and cohesive proposal. There are no glaring holes, no own goals, no unexpected (and unexplained) decisions.

I will leave the political projections to others to determine, but I think in this case the Committee got the decision right.

I look forward to the speedy resolution of this redistribution and eagerly await the Augmented Committee's decision in the coming months.

If I may end on a rather cheeky suggestion. With outcomes as attractive as this, and with similarly pleasing results in Victoria and the Australian Capital Territory, maybe redistribution Committees for all states should in future restrict themselves to such a tight timeframe!