

**From:** Out of scope  
**To:** [Commission Secretariat](#)  
**Subject:** Seniors United Party of Australia request for Internal Review  
**Date:** Sunday, 21 March 2021 3:26:08 PM  
**Attachments:** [AEC - SUPA Request for an Internal Review.odt](#)

---

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the Australian Federal Government. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

ATTENTION:- Mr Tom Rogers  
Australian Electoral Commissioner

Dear Mr Rogers,

Attached is my application for a Request for an Internal Review of the decision to Deregister the Seniors United Party of Australia under s 141 (2) of the Electoral Act.

Can you please accept this request as I am a person affected by, and dissatisfied with the decision to deregister the party.

Yours Faithfully,

Out of scope  
[Redacted signature block]

Out of scope

Out of scope

20<sup>th</sup> March 2021

Mr Tom Rogers,  
Australian Electoral Commissioner,  
Locked Bag 4007,  
CANBERRA  
ACT 2601  
commission.secretariat@aec.gov.au  
AEC 02 6271 4552

## **Request for an Internal Review of decision to Deregister**

### **the SENIORS UNITED PARTY OF AUSTRALIA**

#### **under s 141(2) of the Electoral Act**

Dear Mr Rogers,

My name is Out of scope and I am the applicant for this review. I am a person affected by, and dissatisfied with, the decision by the Australian Electoral Commission to deregister the Seniors United Party of Australia, ( SUPA). Out of scope

Out of scope

I ask you to please consider the reasons below which I feel give a strong argument for the AEC to set aside the decision under review and make a decision in substitution for the decision set aside. That is, to reregister the party.

The reasons I feel the AEC should consider are:-

#### **DEMOGRAPHIC REASONS**

Because of the demographic which the party attempts to represent, that is over 60 years of age, our mainly elderly membership suffers a higher than normal attrition rate to other political parties.

SUPA's high loss of members is due to:-

1. A much **higher death rate** than in other political parties, as well as **long lasting terminal health issues of members** that would stop the aged from participating as a member.
2. A much higher rate of **dementia, or loss of memory**, which prevents members recalling that they are members when the AEC calls. This would be a considerable cause for members to answer negatively to membership questions by the AEC representative. ( Out of scope

Out of scope

3. A variety of other life threatening and **end of life health issues** which can prevent them from being active and confirming to the AEC that they are members of SUPA.

## REASONS ASSOCIATED WITH THE AEC TEST

Now there is a very growing concern with the elderly of **phone scammers**, particularly with people imitating government employees on the phone, so they refuse to respond to questioning, or even answering the phone to strange phone numbers. **They are much more likely to respond with a “No” to any question put to them over a phone .** Out of scope

This raises the question; is phoning still a legitimate process to be used for this AEC test, and is this test a true and fair method of testing?

Now I return to SUPA's AEC tests themselves.

After the failing of our first test I personally went through SUPA's membership list and using the slow process of checking names on the spreadsheet on my own lap top computer I eliminated a number of duplicates over some days. I am therefore surprised that there was the same number of duplicates in our second failed test!

I noticed that Out of scope was able to reduce the number deceased from 14 to 5 between the first and second test.

It concerns me that there are no scrutineers allowed during the testing, yet on election day political parties are allowed to have scrutineers. This appears to be procedural unfairness!

I question the accuracy of those duplicates in the second test, and hence the accuracy of the test. I may be wrong, but **I suspect the AEC has made an error.**

The fact that I attempted to remove the “Deceased” by checking thoroughly the electoral roll over many days, and then finding that the AEC still had found 5 deceased in the new test implies that the test is not fairly designed, or did those 5 people die in the weeks between the first and second test?

If the figures for the duplication (4) and deaths(5) in the second test are removed, then the SUPA membership list tallies to 548. Then there is only (2) denial of membership short of a successful test, and SUPA could have quite possibly passed the test on the chance of two different people being questioned.

## FURTHER REASONS

Now **SUPA represents a demographic which no other political party specialises in representing.** SUPA stands alone in representing the issues and needs of the Aged.

The Aged require an organisation that is not compromised in its representation of them. A number of organisations that say they represent the Aged are compromised by the advertising revenue they need to function, eg “The Seniors” monthly magazine. Also the NSW Combined Pensioners and Superannuates Association which refuses to refer to SUPA in its monthly publication because I

understand, of its fear of losing the approximately \$1million dollars it receives from the NSW State government. Then we have the National Seniors which appears to have agreements with commercial interests. Possibly the best is the Council for the Ageing (COTA) which appears to be the best, but is getting little recognition from the press.

Now it has been suggested there are ten lobbyists for every parliamentarian in Federal parliament. Lobbyists that are paid huge amounts and which have huge amounts to advertise to influence public opinion in their favour, which can oppose the needs of the elderly, or place the needs of the elderly secondary to making profits.

SUPA is needed to help the Federal government continually see that the requirements of the Aged are not being met, and advise the Federal government without a conflict of interest.

## REQUEST

Considering the reasons I have given, including the far higher natural attrition rate of our elderly members, which the vast majority are, their greater chance of lose of memory, and there unwillingness to answer “yes “to questions by strangers over the phone, and also the fact that SUPA alone represents such a large demographic in Australia’s population, **I respectfully ask the AEC to please consider these reasons and set aside the failed decision and substitute it with a pass decision.**

Thanking you for this review.

## ADDENDUM

I would suggest that under the present test for registration any party representing the Aged with members mainly in that demographic would more than likely fail the registration test. I believe even major political parties could possibly fail the test.

Yours Faithfully,

Out of scope

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]