



Comment on objections 5

Martin Gordon

5 pages

From: Martin Gordon
To: [FedRedistribution - VIC](#)
Subject: comments on objections
Date: Wednesday, 9 May 2018 2:41:21 PM
Attachments: [Victorian 2018 redistribution comments on objections.docx](#)

Attached are comments on objections for the redistribution of Victoria.

Could you acknowledge receipt?

Regards

Martin Gordon

[REDACTED]

Augmented Redistribution Committee for Victoria

The Committee,

I wish to comments on objections to the commissioners proposals for the state of Victoria announced on 6 April.

I had previously proposed a full statewide redistribution, and subsequently a lengthy comments on proposals. A significant number of my suggestions have been Incorporated some in very minor part, or more substantially. I appreciate those aspects that the committee has taken up.

A general criticism I would make is that the commissioners have moved many electors when it is not necessary. Some exchanges such as between Corio and the proposed Cox are entirely avoidable for example.

Non Victorian Australians

I have raised this issue several times and the identification of those not resident in a jurisdiction needs to end. As a primary principal, all Australians should be treated equally, the worth of them should not vary simply because they live somewhere else in Australia.

Naming

I appreciate that the commissioners adopted the name Fraser for the new Federal Division. I welcome the names Monash, Macnamara and Nicholls. They are all worthy citizens of this country. The removal of McMillan is appropriate in view of the crimes attributed to him.

I note that the retention of Batman has drawn much criticism, for much the same reason as McMillan. I would suggest another name. Even the holding party and its member support renaming.

It is unfortunate that Wimmera was not restored in place of Mallee, or that Kirner was not adopted. I would persist in seeking that these names be adopted. If the Committee comes to the view to replace Batman, Kirner would be appropriate as a first and only female Victorian Premier. Wimmera is a restoration of a federation name, an aboriginal name and clearly associated with the region.

The proposal to rename Gellibrand to Cooper, should be pursued. It is unusual for the holding party of an electorate to agree to such a thing, but it has, and redistribution opportunities come up not that often.

I note objection 56 by Professor Brian Costar about using the name Guilfoyle and Child. I believe that the name Kirner has greater recognition element, a Premier is more consequential than a Minister, but Guilfoyle rather than Child has greater prominence as a woman Minister, as opposed to a woman speaker.

Proposals

I had indicated my agreement with the commissioners proposals for a broad range of Divisions at the objections stage.

Cox (Corangamite)

I would reiterate my earlier proposals, comments, and objection where I have proposed that Cox, not be renamed, and the name Corangamite be retained. The inclusion of a geographical feature is not a necessary prerequisite for a name, As it happens my proposal includes Lake Corangamite in the Division. I would reinforce the arguments of Colac based people and entities (eg 174, 200, 228, 274, 329, amongst others eg 354 and 369) in favour of Colac been more closely associated with Geelong, rather than the south west of the state. The inclusion of Colac Otway is more workable than including all or part of Golden Plain Shire (despite their view that part of the shire should be in Cox).

Cox is an inappropriate name, and Corangamite should be retained as is Kooyong and Werriwa. The overwhelming weight of proponents is in favour of Colac Otway been in Corangamite.

I would leave the current (as opposed to the proposed) Corio/Corangamite boundary unchanged. Overall the less change made, the less difficult is the adjustment required. If Golden Plains Shire is placed in Wannon the numbers work in Wannon, Ballarat, Cox (Corangamite) and Corio. If the exchange proposed between Cox and Corio is not done the task is even easier.

Dunkley

My concerns about the proposals for Dunkley are borne out by a range of Frankston, Mornington based people and entities (eg 217, 255, 297, 405) and others such as 354. Jeff Waddell in his objection (92) offers workable solutions to the south eastern region of Melbourne. A minor rotation of boundaries and electors achieves less movement of electors and makes more sense. Seaford Road and Ballarto Road are appropriate boundaries to again be used in this respect.

I reinforce the point that Dunkley needs minor supplementation, not major reconfiguration. Continuing the inclusion of Mount Martha and minor adjustments from Flinders is sufficient not major surgery.

Calwell/McEwen/Batman/Jaga Jaga/Menzies

I appreciate the fact the commissioners persisted to maintain a semi rural McEwen as its growth and its positioning represents a significant area on the periphery of Melbourne, rather than its suburbs.

In the course of reading the various objections it occurred to me that it is possible to accommodate several objections and they are mutually aligned. I appreciate that the committee has included a crossing of the Yarra River in its upper reaches in Menzies. This is quite significant. It is a change that in time will be seen as appropriate and sensible.

The inclusion of Craigieburn in Calwell was somewhat contested. I note that the same advocates for Craigieburn to be in McEwen want Sunbury to be excluded from McEwen.

I note the Craigieburn Residents Association (251) comments in respect to Sunbury, which given its long standing identity on the periphery of metropolitan Melbourne and a clearly identifiable entity I was surprised by this argument. Sunbury was recently created as a separate State Assembly District, which reflected both its size and separate identity. I note the association wanted it to remain part of the City of Hume, but in reality it has its own identity. Having been in local government myself, I found the residents association argument rather odd, as a residents association I would have thought it would stick up for its resident interests, rather than align it with a larger entity (Hume) that might not have much interest in Sunbury's particular interests.

Several independents submissions on my reading propose ideas that can if linked make a quite a difference. Charles Richardson (408) refers to adjusting the Menzies/Jaga Jaga boundary such that it follows the Banyule-Nillumbik boundary and some 1,597 projected electors would bring Menzies

closer to quota. This would place Jaga Jaga under quota bring electors from Batman or Scullin would enable electors from Mernda (in the proposed McEwen) to be included in one Division (apparently Scullin) as the Mernda and District residents Association (MADRA) (170) proposes.

A rethink would enable all of Nillumbik proposed to be in Jaga Jaga to be in McEwen with much of the remainder of the Council; and Jaga Jaga to gain electors in the area of Bundoora and Macleod and for Scullin to regain all of Mernda, which is proposed to be awkwardly split between McEwen and Scullin.

The adjustment would enable all of Banyuke to remain in Jaga Jaga and for a greater portions of Nillumbik council to be placed in the Division of McEwen. On balance I think this would be more in line with community of interests than proposed. And mean that Nillumbik is only split between two Divisions not three as proposed

Speculation

The Labor Party speculates that before the election after next that there will be an additional federal Division in Victoria (given Victoria is currently at 38.1 quotas). I am not sure this is the case. But in any event they anticipate that this next Division will be in the north north east of Melbourne. Changes proposed above may anticipate such an addition and facilitate it.

Conclusions

I wish the commissioners well in their deliberations.

Martin Gordon

9 May 2018