



Comment on objection 17

Murray Fopp

3 pages

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, 22 May 2018 10:10 AM
To: FedRedistribution - SA
Subject: [SA REDISTRIBUTION COMMENTS ON OBJECTIONS] Murray Fopp *WWW*
[SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]
Attachments: vic-Murray Fopp-.pdf

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

Name: Murray Fopp

Organisation:

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Additional information: I object to the Labor Party's dismissal of residents' comments as

COMMENT ON OBJECTIONS BY THE AUSTRALIAN LABOR PARTY (SOUTH AUSTRALIAN BRANCH) TO THE PROPOSED REDISTRIBUTION OF THE FEDERAL ELECTORATE OF KINGSTON

By MURRSY FOPP, [REDACTED]

I object to the Labor Party's dismissal of residents' comments, with Labor thinking residents didn't put much thought into their submissions. To this, I also object.

To suggest that suburbs in the Onkaparinga Council area have common interests is now a highly discredited assumption; one that prevailed in the 1990s under a strong push for council amalgamation and three separate local government areas were amalgamated in what, is now widely accepted, as a mistake in an amalgamation policy that was soon abandoned. Aberfoyle Park and Flagstaff Hill have little relationship with the rest of the City of Onkaparinga and have been badly served by the City because of this.

The Labor Party says it "*recognises the independence of the Redistribution Committee*". This is simply political expediency. The Labor Party (probably all political parties) accept the independence of the Committee only when it suits them. Labor did not accept the independence of the redistribution authority when South Australian boundaries were redistributed most recently – a redistribution necessary to redress the undemocratic situation where the Party with the least two-party preferred votes (the ALP) won government at the two consecutive elections. Labor opposed the proposed democratic and independently made proposals that would remove its undemocratic advantage.

In my earlier submission, I gave - despite Labor's insinuation that opponents didn't put much thought into their submissions – what I believe are cogent reasons for recognising the nexus between Aberfoyle Park and Flagstaff Hill with suburbs to our near north, rather than to those in the far south. For cultural, demographic, social, economic and just plain 'connections', I maintain these views.

Labor's submission dubiously asserts the current Electoral Offices for Boothby (our current electorate) and Kingston are roughly equidistant from the suburbs of Aberfoyle Park and Flagstaff Hill. It is true only for the southern-most suburb. But distance is not the only factor. Residents from these suburbs have little reason to travel either to or through Morphett Vale, the location of the Kingston office, but many of them drive daily right past or near the Boothby office. It is both on a commonly used arterial road serving these suburbs and near regional retail, commercial and medical facilities and transport hubs we use.

The Labor submission also proposes that the Committee "draw the boundaries so that the number of projected electors falls below the quota". Of course it does; Kingston is a safe Labor seat. Inequalities will occur, or develop over time, in the best-intentioned redistributions, but the *gerrymander by design* proposed by Labor is undemocratic and should be rejected.

Labor opposes resident objections solely because it suits Labor to have Aberfoyle Park and Flagstaff Hill in Kingston. It does not suit, and makes no sense to, the residents of those suburbs.

I ask the Committee to weigh up the interests of the electors and the Labor Party – and to come down in favour of residents, rather than a political party.

Do not move Aberfoyle Park and Flagstaff Hill to Kingston.

Murray Fopp

