Comment Number 2
On Public Objections

Dr Mark Mulcair

2 pages

From: Mark Mulcair <markmulcair@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, 22 September 2011 2:21 PM
To: saredistribution
Subject: Comments on Objections to SA redistribution
Attachments: Comments of Objections SA2011.docx

2/26 Hopetoun Street
Mitcham VIC 3132
0407 095 015
markmulcair@gmail.com

Dear Committee Members,

Please find attached my Comments to the Objections for the 2011 SA redistribution.

As always, please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or comments.

Regards,

Dr Mark Mulcair

COMMENTS ON OBJECTIONS TO THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN REDISTRIBUTION 2011

Objection of Barossa Council:

The Barossa Valley clearly constitutes a strong community of interest, and it would be desirable to unite Barossa Council in one Division instead of splitting it across three. However, it is not possible to place Barossa wholly within Wakefield without making major changes elsewhere. Around 13,000 electors would need to be transferred to Wakefield from Barker and Mayo, causing significant flow-on effects to neighbouring Divisions.

Depending on how the numbers fall, it might be possible to unite all of Barossa Council in the Division of Barker. This would require a transfer of around 4,600 electors from Wakefield to Barker, and 1,300 electors from Mayo to Barker. Mayo and Barker would go outside tolerance, but perhaps Mayo could gain some western parts of Murray Bridge Council to balance the numbers. If my Objection 1 was upheld, Wakefield would remain within tolerance (just) with the loss of its share of Barossa.

While Barossa Council may be less enthusiastic about being placed in a south-eastern Division than with Gawler and Clare Valley, at least the Barossa Valley could be united in a single Division under this proposal.

Objection of the ALP:

Labor also proposes changes in the Barossa Valley, aimed at splitting Barossa between two Divisions instead of three. This has merit, but I think if the Committee was prepared to go this far, they might as well go the whole way and unite the entire council in Barker as suggested above.

To balance the numbers, Labor then suggests retaining more of Salisbury in Wakefield, citing the current split in the area. However, I think my Objection 1 is a better way for Wakefield to be brought back within tolerance, uniting a rural shire and making the common-sense move of placing all of Wakefield DC in the Division of that name.

Note also that only 7,000 or so Salisbury electors remain in Wakefield, compared to about 40,000 each for Port Adelaide and Makin. So if the Committee were considering making an adjustment around Salisbury, it would actually make far more sense to do the opposite of Labor's suggestion and place more of Salisbury in Port Adelaide and Makin than in Wakefield.