



# Comment on suggestion 22

Martin Gordon

8 pages

**From:** Martin Gordon  
**To:** [FedRedistribution - VIC](#)  
**Subject:** Comments on proposals  
**Date:** Wednesday, 29 November 2017 6:26:23 PM  
**Attachments:** [Victorian redistribution comments 2017.docx](#)

---

Attached are my comments on proposals.

Could you confirm receipt.

Regards

Martin Gordon

[REDACTED]

Redistribution Committee for Victoria

The Committee,

I wish to make comments on some of the submissions. I had earlier made a submission for all 38 Divisions. I had proposed the new Division be named Fraser and that Mallee be renamed Wimmera, and Melbourne Ports renamed Kirner.

I do not wish to be unduly critical of other submitters, often they have similar ideas to my own and are proposing alternative solutions to a difficult challenge.

### **Non Victorian Australians**

I note that like the Queensland redistribution that non-resident of the jurisdiction to be redistributed are singled out for particular mention. As far as I aware it is entirely reasonable for any resident of this country to make a submission, and for that matter probably any resident of the planet, given there is no particular prohibition in existence (as far as I am aware of).

I have made submissions to state and federal redistributions for some decades, and happily do so as it is an important part of democratic process to ensure that our electoral processes work effectively. I also have a long standing interest in human rights and civil liberties, both in this country and overseas.

I am happy for it to be known that I am a resident of the ACT, and formerly of South Australia. The members to be elected to the Divisions that result from this redistribution process will meet in the city that I have called home for some 24 years.

I don't believe that Australian residents (and in my case a person eligible to stand for federal parliament, unlike some of its occupants) should be subject to particular mention for not living in the particular jurisdiction subject to redistribution.

I note that some members of the committee are also not residents of the state of Victoria, will they be also singled out for particular mention?

## **Naming**

There is considerable controversy over two current Divisional names McMillan and Batman. Of the 67 submissions 33 are of the character of campaign submissions proposing the removal of either or both of McMillan and Batman. I am inclined to remove both names, as it is evident both men should not be commemorated with Divisional names.

McMillan and Batman arguably had controversial pasts. Applying presentism is always a problem, but some of the actions of both men are difficult to defend even if applying the values of the past days. Their actions are not of the same order as Stalin, Hitler, Mao or even Mugabe, but it is not appropriate to commemorate those who have committed substantial crimes.

Fortunately if these names are removed, there is not a shortage of names that could be used, some the popularly supported such as Monash, and two political figures, one a former Victorian MP who was Prime Minister (Malcolm Fraser) and another who is the first woman Premier of Victoria (Joan Kirner). There is dearth of Divisions named after woman, there is the need to honour a former Prime Minister and there is the undeniable recognition that Monash deserves.

Monash has an association with the La Trobe Valley and Melbourne Ports area, and restoration of a name lost when the Legislative Council Province of Monash was abolished. Submission 26 by James Bowen puts a solid case based on Monash's life and impacts. At least 9 submissions propose that Monash be honored.

Fraser as a Prime Minister and his human rights and charitable related work. I had proposed that the new Division be named in honour of Malcolm Fraser, I think this is still a reasonable solution. Although if McMillan is removed, naming it Fraser would be appropriate in view of Fraser's human rights and charitable work, as well as his association with regional areas.

Kirner has an association with Melbourne West and Williamstown. If Batman is removed it would be reasonable enough to honour Kirner as the first woman premier of Victoria. Or alternatively name the new Division. I had proposed that Melbourne Ports be renamed Kirner, as it has a qualifying name, it no longer describes the areas of Melbourne it is named after, and the support for commemorating Monash, it would seem to suggest Melbourne Ports would be a worthy candidate for change to Monash.

Of the suggestions of Aboriginal names, I had proposed the restoration of the Aboriginal name Wimmera for Mallee. This is uniquely descriptive of a large area of the north west of Victoria. It is a Federation name and also an aboriginal word.

### **Naming logic**

A number of submission provided some extensive whole of state, or regional proposals. Some included naming suggestions. One (S50) commented on the creation of Divisional names in areas unassociated with the former Prime Minister (specifically Whitlam, replacing Throsby in NSW). I am familiar with the renaming of Throsby as Whitlam, as I had proposed it to the NSW redistribution.

Honouring former deceased Prime Ministers should be a matter of course. I had also proposed that the Divisional name Fraser in the ACT be retained and co-named to honour Malcolm Fraser. Of the 29 deceased and living current and former prime Ministers 24 come from NSW and Victoria. This combined with the number of federation names, aboriginal names and prominent womens names, means there are limited options to rename Divisions. In the case of NSW its number of Divisions has been declining.

I had proposed that Throsby be renamed, as it is a recently named Division, and the person was relatively little known. You do not have to be a fan of a former deceased Prime Minister, or of a prominent person to propose they be honored. The fact they have occupied a position, be significant in the history of our nation is sufficient.

It is hard enough to get a new Divisional name in place, let alone assign it to a particular place. Nor is it necessary to remove the name of the division that the person represented to honour them (particularly if they are federation/aboriginal/prime ministerial names), Wannon as it happens is both a Federation and aboriginal name.

In fact it is quite rare for a division to incorporate any area that the former prime minister represented. In the case of Gorton he represented Higgins briefly (having previously been a Senator), not the western outskirts of Melbourne. Deakin represented Ballarat, not the outer eastern suburbs. Bruce represented Flinders. Calwell represented Melbourne, and also never Prime Minister. Scullin represented Yarra (abolished) and also briefly Corangamite. Holt represented Fawkner (abolished) and Higgins, not the eastern outskirts of Melbourne. McEwen represented Bindi and Murray, not central Victoria. Menzies represented Kooyong. Casey represented Corio and La Trobe, and was never Prime Minister. Hughes represented both Victorian and NSW divisions.

Submission S47 proposes some relevant names, but the former Prime Ministers are not yet deceased, and are not eligible to be honoured.

A particular concern I have is the lack of women commemorated. This has lead me to propose womens names/or retention, such as Holman in Western Australia, the retention of Fowler in NSW

and so on. Fowler was a name suggested to be replaced to honour Whitlam for example, simply because it was in the same region of Sydney that Whitlam had represented..

## **Proposals**

There has been considerable agitation to change the names of McMillan and Batman, and I am inclined to defer to them. New names such as Fraser, Kirner and Monash, could easily be accommodated, and if Melbourne Ports is removed and renamed Monash, then another name could be adopted. Renaming Mallee as Wimmera would restore an aboriginal and federation name.

A number of submissions referred to a small region, or a cluster of Divisions. Many of their comments reasonable enough, and most do not impact the overall redistribution that much.

In proposing a full redistribution proposal (albeit without number and a narrative description only) I have spelt out a comprehensive alternative. I will just refer to in passing comments on some other full or partial proposals.

S17 (Jeff Waddell) proposes some similar changes to myself and has the maps and numerical backing. Many of his proposals are similar to mine, but whereas I am mindful of community of interest and means of communication, Jeff might seek a more numerically pure outcome. In some cases I am mindful to ensure that there is greater elector equality amongst Divisions, than others. This I have also applied in other state and territories. He like I has been a regular contributor to redistributions. I am not convinced some of the exchanges between Corio and Corangamite are necessary for example, and there are a few other changes such as between Wannon and Bendigo which are not necessary. Jeff and some other contributors have also proposed the transfer of the coastal areas around Cape Otway to Wannon, whereas the main link is towards Geelong and the road network through the area (which is a dirt road) does not logically link towards Warrambool and so on to the west.

S19 (Tim Colebatch) relies upon a narrative description as I have. I differ from him in a great number of areas, but he mounts a full proposal. It is my opinion that McEwen should remain a largely regional and rural division and shed its metropolitan portions such as Craigieburn and so on. It is pleasing to see a former journalist and a fellow non-Victorian resident make a contribution to the electoral process.

S23 (David Walsh) again some useful ideas, some of which are similar to mine. David arrives at an almost identical location for the new Division (which he also calls Fraser, using most of the City of Moonee Ponds and the Calder Highway corridor. Similarly he relies upon existing boundaries to a large degree with Goldstein and so on as they are sound and meet the numerical requirements. He also arrives at a similar solution for Isaacs, which I describe as Hotham. He proposes a similar Hotham, which I call Bruce. In fact many of his ideas are very similar to mine and rely on local government and major main made features. His suggested Chisholm, Isaacs, Bruce are similar to mine (except for names). The orientation of some Divisions reflects actual road networks and the flow of traffic. I would suggest that McEwen remain more regional/rural in character than David proposes.

S25 (Dr Mark Mulcair) has provided a full submission and in many areas I find areas of agreement, he also relies on sound numerical foundations. He proposes similar solutions to eastern suburban Divisions as I do. He like I has been a regular contributor to redistributions.

S35 (Cr Robert Davies and Cr Theo Zographos) have proposed a substantial proposal for the east of Melbourne and east of the state. The need to displace outwards some Divisions in the east of Melbourne is recognized by them and I. their construct of Chisholm is similar to mine, and my east-west orientation of Bruce that I propose taking in much of the City of Monash, and therefore parts of Hotham, Chisholm and Bruce combines areas of similar socio-economic status, similar age of development and enables changes to be made that allow Hotham to include all of the Kingston City Council area currently in Isaacs. This restores the boundaries in large part to what has some decades ago been a more coastal division of Isaacs. My proposal more Isaacs further eastwards and includes all of the Greater Dandenong Council in Isaacs. This I more satisfactory in terms of community of interest and accommodates the shifting movement of population on the outskirts of south eastern Melbourne.

The councillors propose some similar ideas to mine for Aston, Casey, La Trobe and McMillan. The numbers in McMillan, Flinders, La Trobe, enable a outward displacement of Divisions.

S36 (Dr Michael Hedger) propose some options for the north west of Melbourne. There is some similarity with my proposals. It is evident that the new division for Victoria needs to be placed in the north western part of Melbourne.

S39 (The Nationals) have proposed changes for the regional areas of Victoria and urban fringe of Melbourne. On balance I prefer their overall construct over that of the Liberal Party for regional Victoria. This reflects the fact their proposals are more similar to mine and also less disruptive, involving moving fewer electors I believe.

S45 (Paul Rodgers) makes similar proposals in a number of areas to myself. I do disagree with his suggestion of extending Calwell into central Victoria by including parts of Bendigo in Calwell. His suggestion of recognising Joan Child has merit, but I would suggest that Joan Kirner might have a higher claim as first female Premier.

S46 (Darren McSweeney) makes some similar suggestions to me. He also arrives at the conclusion that shifting Golden Plains from Corangamite to Wannon is a more satisfactory solution than Colac and Otway, although I disagree with some of the detail. Some of his eastern Melbourne options are similar to mine also. He like I has been a regular contributor to redistributions.

S47 (Catherine Cowie) has made some useful comments on some boundaries, her naming suggestions are relevant, but as those to be honoured are not yet dead, so cannot be provided for currently.

S50 (Ben Ellwood) has provided a submission that has considerable similarities to mine. I concur with his ideas to retain the rural/regional character of McEwen, but suggest that the additions to Bendigo from Wannon he proposes, exacerbate elector number problems, and require more significant impacts on Corangamite than necessary. Ben proposes some changes to eastern Melbourne Division that are broadly in line with what I propose, but my solution for Hotham to basically become a largely coastal Division with the City of Kingston been its largest component appears to be a better solution in my view.

S52 (Colin McLaren) has proposed some similar solutions to myself. One in particular with the transfer of Golden Plains to Wannon from Corangamite, which is a simpler and less disruptive transfer than Colac and Otway. The submission being partial is helpful, but not detailed enough to interpret its wider impacts on other Divisions.

S61 (Australian Greens Victoria) have some proposed some ideas similar to mine. The broad thrust of Isaacs (my Hotham) are similar, the northward movement of Dunkley they propose goes against the flow of elector movement which is actually outward. La Trobe the Greens propose is subject to changes that are largely unnecessary, which given the numbers in McMillan now mean that La Trobe could be moved to the east and the western portions moved in Holt, which would mean that the local government boundaries could be largely used to conform to Divisional boundaries, such as the Casey in Holt and Great Dandenong in Isaacs. Their Chisholm reflects my ideas to some degree. The inclusion of Docklands in Melbourne Ports is also a reasonable proposal. Some of the suggestions for Wills, Batman, and Scullin are reasonable, although the proposal for McEwen to become more urban, does not reflect the weight of submissions.

S62 (Bryce Paterson) has proposed some useful ideas. I disagree with his proposals for McEwen making it more rural which runs counter to the weight of submissions, and his Corangamite plans for Colac are unnecessary, with Golden Plains been a simple more obvious change. Several other changes amongst Divisions are avoidable, with some interchanges similarly avoidable. Usually a one directional change is preferable to a complex change or exchange.

S63 (Liberal Party) provides a significant submission, with the surprising proposal to abolish a regional/rural Division. Some of the ideas proposed are worthwhile, such as crossing the Yarra and including Ivanhoe in Menzies, and many of the changes to Chisholm, and Hotham, Bruce and Isaacs seem quite sound/indicate a reconfiguration that is helpful. La Trobe is tidy, as is Holt. Creating a Division named Murray in Melbourne's western suburbs is interesting and the proposal for the new Division (which I would suggest be called Fraser) is different to many other proposals but worth considering.

S65 (Australian Labor Party) as one would expect has proposed a detailed redistribution. They argue for the renaming of Mc Millan and Batman and propose Monash and Wonga, I certainly agree with the former, and the suggestion that Cooper replace Gellibrand seems to have merit also. The fact the ALP comes up with a very similar compilation for the new Division of Fraser, as I have done should be noted. I disagree with their proposals for McEwen which involve substantial changes which make McEwen more urban, which is contrary to the weight of submissions. Some of the ALP proposals for regional areas are larger than probably necessary. My proposals to include more of the City of Kingston in Hotham (ALP-Isaacs) is repeated in part in the ALP proposal for Isaacs.



S66 (Charles Richardson) has proposed similar boundaries to myself in a number of areas. I disagree with his proposals to make McEwen more urban, as this would be a continuation of the existing unsatisfactory arrangement where a sprawling part of central Victoria is tacked onto some outer suburbs of Melbourne, increasingly this is and looks odder, and so does not conform to community of interest concerns. Transferring Golden Plains from COrangamite to Wannon is less cumbersome than transferring Colac Otway as proposed. Moving Dunkley towards Melbourne is unnecessary, as any additions can be easily met from transfer from Flinders, and which is probably desirable anyway. Charles arrives at similar proposals for Gellibrand, Lalor, and uses similar logic. I note the odd boundary between Bruce and Isaacs that he proposes, I would have thought one continuous boundary was preferable to the kinked boundary proposed.

S67 (Dean Ashley) has proposed some quite sound divisional boundaries, several I have issues with but overall, some are well defined and do make sense. Whilst I disagree with his Corangamite proposals, I found his McEwen proposal sound in terms of numbers and community of interests. McEwen is a large block of territory to the north of the metropolitan area of Melbourne and it has a rural/regional community of interest. His suggestions for Dunkley and Flinders are sound, and he like others have come to a similar conclusion about an elongated to the east-west of Bruce. With Deans proposals I noted his alternative proposals, and many are similar to mine, and some are similar to proposals of the Liberal Party, Charles Richardson and others, and are quite useful and add enormously to understanding options available.

I wish the commissioners well in their work.

Martin Gordon

30/11/2017