



Comment on suggestion 45

Australian Labor Party (Victorian Branch)

14 pages



**Victorian
Labor's**
COMMENTS ON
SUGGESTIONS



VICTORIAN LABOR'S COMMENTS ON SUGGESTIONS

Western and northern Victoria non metropolitan and rural Divisions

Here, we are discussing the eight Divisions running from the Geelong based Divisions of Corio and Corangamite and then the Divisions of Wannon, Ballarat, Mallee, Bendigo, Nicholls and Indi.

All suggestions recognise that these Divisions are collectively more than a quarter of a Division over quota. Most suggestions, including that of the ALP, agree that the surplus should flow out of Bendigo and Ballarat to a new, peri-urban Division. In this mix some suggestions propose that Bannockburn, due to its proximity, remain in a Geelong based Division. Others think, again due to its proximity, that Gordon remains with Ballarat.

With due respect to the 'proximity' argument, the Commissioners last time tested the notion of whether rural Shires like to be divided between Divisions. The answers were clear and notably, with the submissions of the Golden Plains and Colac-Otway Shires, Shires whenever possible prefer to be kept together in the same Division.

The ALP agrees with those suggestions that have all of Golden Plains Shire in Ballarat and all of Moorabool Shire in the new Division.

It's also notable that those submissions which place Stawell from Wannon into Mallee, thereby uniting Northern Grampians Shire in the same Division, end up also splitting Golden Plains Shire, (in the case of Mark Mulcair, he splits the Shire three ways, between Corio, Wannon and Ballarat) and/or also splitting Moorabool Shire.

Similarly, several suggestions which keep Gordon in Ballarat end up splitting Hepburn Shire. In each case, the cure is worse than the disease.

A major exception to the above is the suggestion of the Liberal Party which, notwithstanding the fact that the four interface Council seats of Lalor, Gorton, McEwen and Calwell are collectively half a seat over quota, somehow manages to draw a second successive inner west/north seat, even though collectively, these Divisions are less than 10% over quota. The Liberal Party is only able to draw the new seat as an inner Division by ignoring the desirability of keeping like with like, such as inner city Divisions. For example, the Liberal Party proposed Cooper has half of its electors drawn from Whittlesea Shire, when there are none today and, similarly, Wills is forced into parts of Hume Council.

Two suggestions have also proposed that parts of the Division of Corio, which shares the same northern boundary as that of Greater Geelong Council, should be sent north into Lalor. That would split Geelong three ways, instead of two and also ignore the clear divide between Geelong as a regional identity and outer Melbourne.

North and west of the Yarra Divisions

(a) The Interface council Divisions

Either the common interests of interface, peri-urban areas are a real factor or not. If they are then best meeting the community of interests' objectives of the Act is best achieved by minimising the overlap between inner urban areas and outer urban suburbs being contained within the same Division.

It ought be apparent that the combination of the western and northern rural Divisions surplus of a quarter of a quota, plus the half seat surplus from the projected number of the four high growth western and northern seats, plus the transfer of most of Nillumbik out of Menzies, that there are sufficient electors to form a Division representing parts of both outer Melbourne and adjoining more rural parts.

The ALP suggested Division of Hawke is an example of such a Division, formed from the surpluses outlined above. Parts of Macedon Ranges Shire from both McEwen and Bendigo have been combined with Moorabool Shire from Bendigo plus most of Melton and Diggers Rest from Gorton and Wallan from McEwen. The resulting Division is similar to the former Division of Burke, abolished in 2002.

Most suggestions propose that the whole or part Shires of Moorabool and Macedon Ranges be combined with either Melton or Sunbury.

However, most of the suggestions that recognise the need to form the new Division on Melbourne's fringe also, in our view undercut their proposal by transferring Lalor's surplus into the mostly inner Division of Gellibrand.

These suggestions are following the lead of the last set of Commissioners who transferred most of the suburb of Point Cook into Gellibrand. This time, several suggestions unite the entire suburb of Point Cook into Gellibrand but, in doing so, they create less than satisfactory boundaries. That's because too many Divisions combine parts of both inner urban and Interface Councils into the same Division.

It should be noted that from the 2002 redistribution until the 2013 election, the seat of Lalor took in all of the suburbs of Melton and then ran south as far as Werribee.

The rapid population growth of subsequent years has meant that Lalor is able to be made up only from Wyndham Council, with an ever increasing proportion of that Council required to be sent north.

Similarly, the Division of Gorton formed in 2002 consisted of parts of Melton and adjoining parts of Brimbank Councils. Subsequent growth allowed the mostly Brimbank council based Division to be formed.

Enrolment growth since the last Redistribution, now allows Gorton to shed to Fraser most of its share of Brimbank Council as well as its share of Melton, Melton West and adjoining suburbs to the new seat. But that's only possible if Lalor's surplus is sent to Gorton.

All those suggestions which end up sending Lalor's surplus into Gellibrand also end up placing more of Maribyrnong Council into Fraser and even more of Brimbank Council into Gorton even though Gorton already has some 20, 000 electors from Brimbank.

Elsewhere in the Region, most suggestions, except for the ALP's suggestion, maintain the split of the suburbs of Mernda and Wollert between the Divisions of Scullin and McEwen even though it's preferable to unite the suburbs, one in each Division.

In this region we note that several suggestions agree that the suburb of Craigieburn be united in McEwen. That's made possible by the latter Division losing to the new Division its shares of Macedon Council and the suburb of Wallan and also by transferring to Calwell McEwen's share of Sunbury.

This point is further elaborated in the next section.

(b) Inner western and northern metropolitan Divisions

Let's examine the impact on both Fraser and Maribyrnong of whether or not Point Cook is united in either Lalor or Gellibrand. If Point Cook is united in Lalor and then Lalor sends its surplus (Tarniet, Truganina and Williams Landing) to Gorton. Gorton is able to then transfer to Fraser all but fewer than 1,000 electors from Brimbank Council. Then Fraser can become entirely a Brimbank Council Division, the suburbs of Footscray and West Footscray, (Currently split between Gellibrand and Maribyrnong) are able to be united in Gellibrand. To compensate for the loss of its shares of the Footscray suburbs, Maribyrnong is able to regain the suburb of Braybrook which it lost to Fraser at the last Redistribution.

On the other hand, if Point Cook is united in Gellibrand, then more of Maribyrnong Council has to be sent to Fraser which, in turn would need to send more of its share of Brimbank to Gorton. The result is that Gorton becomes a hybrid inner outer Division and with less than satisfactory outcomes for adjoining Divisions.

Turning to the remaining Divisions in the Region, the relatively small combined surplus of the Divisions of Melbourne, Wills and Cooper, (none are over quota) are best adjusted by sending to Jagajaga from Cooper its shares of the suburbs of Macleod and Bundoora. Additionally, Maribyrnong's share of Moreland Council, represented by the suburb of Gowanbrae is able to be returned to Wills.

Divisions South of the Yarra River

Most suggestions agree that:

- Menzies loses all or most of its share of Nillumbik Shire to Division(s) on the northern side of the Yarra. That's required, as collectively, those Divisions south of the Yarra are over quota by nearly the same numbers as those transferred to Menzies from Nillumbik Shire at the last redistribution. The main difference between suggestions is whether the suburb of North Warrandyte should be retained in Menzies. North Warrandyte is within the State district of Warrandyte, which otherwise lies south of the Yarra.
- That no changes be made to the boundaries of the Divisions of Aston, Dunkley, Flinders and Goldstein. The ALP, Liberal and Greens parties are agreed that no changes be made to these Divisions.

Admittedly, a couple of independent suggestions attempt to revisit the boundary between Flinders and Dunkley by restoring Mornington into Dunkley. However, the 'solutions' offered only underscore the wisdom of the last determination which united all of Frankston Council in Dunkley and which also made Flinders a compact Mornington Peninsula Division.

- That Casey, which has exactly the same boundaries of the Yarra Ranges Shire, should undergo no or minor changes.

The Liberal Party has proposed that a section of the suburb of Kilsyth (4,210 current and 4,395 projected electors) be sent from Casey to Deakin. On current boundaries, the suburb of Kilsyth is split along local government boundaries with more than 90% of the suburb contained within Yarra Ranges, (IE in Casey). The Liberal Party can't transfer the entire suburb of Kilsyth (6,958 current/ 7,284 projected) that is within Casey for, to do so would place Casey below the allowable deviation from the future quota and thus in need of collecting electors from some other LGA. We think the Liberal Party hasn't thought through its proposal here.

- That the southern boundaries of both Aston and Casey remain the same. It then follows that the surpluses of Monash, La Trobe and Holt have to be funnelled through the Division of Bruce. That's the recommendation of both major parties as well as those of other suggestions.
- That the Division of Gippsland retains its existing electors and that Monash contracts (to meet quota) by losing part or its entire share of Cardinia Shire.
- That Kooyong retain its existing electors with the main difference between suggestions being whether 3,000 electors should be transferred from Chisholm in order to unite the entire suburb of Surrey Hills within Kooyong.

Aside from relatively minor differences between suggestions in the above nominated eight seats, that leaves in the south, the eight growth corridor seats running from La Trobe to Menzies, (La Trobe; Holt; Bruce; Isaacs; Hotham; Chisholm; Deakin and Menzies) plus Higgins and Macnamara, which although not within the growth corridor and thus not requiring significant boundary changes but which nevertheless have been subject to several suggestions proposing a swap between Caulfield, in Macnamara and South Yarra and part of Prahran in Higgins.

Let's discuss the latter two Divisions first.

Macnamara-Higgins

In 2010, the Redistribution Committee for Victoria proposed that the Caulfield end of the then Division of Melbourne Ports be transferred to Higgins and that that part of Stonnington Council, west of Williams Road be transferred from Higgins to Melbourne Ports.

However, the 2010 Augmented Commission rejected that proposal. Its report stated:

"92. On balance however, the Commission found the arguments for a substantial reversal of boundaries more compelling and, in particular, agreed that suitable alternatives were available to negate the need to cross Dandenong Road as proposed by the Redistribution Committee.

93. Therefore the Commission upheld the objections to return to the existing boundary of Punt Road and Dandenong Road between the divisions of Melbourne Ports and Higgins. This proposal transferred the localities of Caulfield North and Caulfield East back to the Division of Melbourne Ports and parts of South Yarra, Prahran and Windsor back to the Division of Higgins."

At the last redistribution, the report of the Redistribution Committee stated:

"365. The Redistribution Committee acknowledges that there is merit in removing the more suburban wing from the existing Division of Melbourne Ports; however formed the view that Dandenong Road and the Caulfield Racecourse act as barriers between the communities in the Caulfield and Malvern areas."

Nothing relevant to the above conclusion has changed since.

This time neither the Liberal nor Labor parties make any change to Goldstein, the Division that borders Macnamara at its southern end. Neither party makes any change to the border between Higgins and Kooyong.

However, some change is required. That's because Macnamara is outside the variance from the projected quota. The solution is pretty straight forward. Restore Windsor to Higgins, thereby keeping all of Stonnington Council in the same Division and, at the same time, transfer east from Higgins, the suburb of Hughesdale, the only part of Monash Council in Higgins and which was only added to the seat at the last redistribution.

Hence, we were flummoxed seeing the Liberal proposal, matching that of the Greens and others and proposing an unnecessary swap of around 20,000 electors each way between Higgins and Macnamara. The Liberal Party suggestion here is also surprising, given that it has not previously suggested any significant changes between Higgins and Melbourne Ports (Macnamara). Both major parties have, over the years been in lockstep concerning the boundaries of Higgins and Melbourne Ports. For example, at the last redistribution neither Party proposed any change to the boundary between Higgins and Melbourne Ports.

The ALP completely accepts that, given the numerical requirements of the Act, that from time to time, a less than ideal boundary can be formed because community of interests' considerations have to be subordinate to the numbers. Also, suburbanisation can alter the nature of a rural or peri urban seat.

But in an inner city seat containing the same suburbs continuously for 30 years? That's a stretch way too far.

From the time Caulfield was added at the 1989 Redistribution to Melbourne Ports, there were eight successive elections for that seat held on the same boundaries. Both the 1994 and 2003 Redistributions involved no changes to its boundaries. In 2010, South Caulfield was removed and added to Goldstein. In nearly 30 years, until the addition of the suburb of Windsor at the last redistribution, no territory had been added to Macnamara, only the deletion of South Caulfield to take account of population shifts.

The reason for the relative stability of the Division of Macnamara is due to the natural boundary of the Yarra River and to the fact that for most of the period, Melbourne Ports enrolment has mostly been at pace with the State average.

There are also few communities, social or economic, that link across the areas south of Dandenong Road, in the Cities of Glen Eira and Port Phillip (currently with the Division of Macnamara) and north of Dandenong Road in the City of Stonnington (currently in the Division of Higgins). Dandenong Road is a major natural and traditional boundary, as well as a municipal boundary, and has been for many years. Although Prahran and South Yarra are closer to St Kilda than Caulfield is, they are oriented northwards to the city or eastwards to Toorak and Malvern, rather than southwards across Dandenong Road to St Kilda or East St Kilda. The inclusion of part of Prahran, (the suburb also extends on the other side of Williams Road) and South Yarra in Macnamara would mean that Macnamara would cover parts of four municipalities (Port Phillip, Glen Eira, Melbourne and Stonnington) instead of the current three. That's not desirable. The City of Stonnington is based on Malvern and Toorak, which are very affluent areas and by-and-large do not share the attributes which unite the various communities currently in Macnamara. On the current boundaries all of Stonnington is in the Division of Higgins, a Division which has a

very different social and political character to Melbourne Ports, and a much more appropriate one for a representative of these areas.

Melbourne's Jewish community has its centre in the suburbs of Caulfield, St Kilda, Elwood and East St Kilda. Jewish schools, synagogues and religious centres, community centres, community libraries and art centres, kosher shops and restaurants, and Jewish health and aged care services are concentrated across these suburbs. They serve the significant number of Jewish residents in both Port Phillip and Glen Eira. Further, there are strong family connections across these suburbs. Many Jewish families now living in Caulfield grew up in St Kilda, East St Kilda and Elwood, or first settled there when they came to Australia, and retain strong ties to these areas.

Relevant to this is the high number of pre-poll and postal ballots cast in Macnamara. This is because of the many Jewish residents who for religious reasons cannot vote on Saturdays. Having the Jewish community largely located within one Division has enabled an appropriate level of planning and resourcing by the AEC in support of the high numbers of pre-poll and postal voters, as well as well understood and anticipated pre-poll locations for voters themselves.

It is clear that the restoration of Macnamara's boundaries to those of the pre-2019 Melbourne Ports provide, within the numerical constraints, the best possible boundaries on community of interest grounds.

Southern Growth Corridor Divisions

Our comments concerning the differences between suggestions for the eight growth corridor seats are broken down as follows:

1. Menzies-Deakin-Chisholm. How best to top up Menzies numbers once it loses most of Nillumbik Shire?
2. Chisholm-Hotham. Which is the better southern boundary for Chisholm?
3. Bruce-Hotham-Isaacs. Should the Pakenham Railway line remain as a partial boundary between Bruce and Isaacs or should it be restored as a complete boundary, as was the case for several decades prior to 2019?
4. Bruce-Holt-La Trobe. How best to distribute into Bruce the surplus of the latter two seats.
5. Monash. Should all or part of Cardinia Shire be transferred into La Trobe?

We'll deal with each in turn.

Menzies-Deakin-Chisholm

Whereas most suggestions propose that Menzies, having lost most of its Nillumbik end to northern Divisions, should regain suburbs that it lost last time to Deakin, the Liberal Party and Dean Apsley suggest that Menzies shortfall be derived instead from Chisholm.

The boundary between Chisholm and Menzies is Koonung Creek. The creek is surrounded by parkland. Running over it, for the entire length of the boundary between Chisholm and Menzies is the Eastern Freeway. Sure, there are roads running north-south but the combination of the Creek, parks and freeway is a central casting exhibit of a desirable boundary for a metropolitan Division.

As might be expected, given the strength of the current boundary between Menzies and Chisholm, the suburb boundaries of the Menzies adjoining suburbs to Chisholm, (namely Bulleen; Doncaster; Doncaster East and Donvale), all end at Koonung Creek. There is no crossover.

Similarly, the southern boundaries of the State districts of Bulleen and Warrandyte end at Koonung Creek.

In favour of the proposition that Menzies shortfall is best made up via Deakin Mark Mulcair's suggestion summed it up as follows:

"The changes in the north and west of Melbourne result in Menzies losing everything north of the Yarra River, returning to its more traditional territory. It also leaves this low-growth Division needing a significant injection of electors to reach quota.

I would not recommend expanding east into Casey, as the existing boundary is the LGA boundary in that area, and Casey requires no change. I suggest that the best solution is to gain from Deakin in the south, in the Ringwood and Croydon areas."

The ALP agrees with that and, like Dr Mulcair, we also have the suburb of Ringwood wholly contained within Deakin.

Chisholm's southern boundary

All suggestions are agreed that Hotham should return to Chisholm the suburbs of Chadstone, Mount Waverley and Glen Waverley.

The core difference at the Chisholm/Hotham border between the ALP suggestion and that of the Liberal Party and others is whether Huntingdale should be returned To Chisholm, together with the parts of Oakleigh within Monash Council (the ALP suggestion) or whether, instead, Wheelers Hill (also in Monash Council) fits best into Chisholm (the Liberal Party suggestion, supported by others).

To be fair, there are strong arguments both ways, but, on balance, we believe that the Huntingdale-Oakleigh suburbs are a much better fit with Chisholm than Wheelers Hill.

As mentioned in the ALP suggestion, the suburbs of Wheelers Hill and Mulgrave were the only two suburbs continuously in Bruce from its creation in 1955 until 2019 when they have been also united in Hotham.

The above arrangement is also reflected at the State level. The Premier's seat of Mulgrave, like the pre-2019 Bruce, is a district consisting of parts of Monash and Dandenong Councils. The Monash suburbs are both Mulgrave and Wheelers Hill and then the district takes in parts of Springvale and Noble Park. (Its complete southern boundary, separating it from the district of Keysborough is the Pakenham line, also the former complete boundary between Isaacs and Bruce).

The major shopping centre for both Wheelers Hill and Mulgrave, which otherwise aren't well serviced, lies south of the Monash Freeway on Police Road at the southern edge of the suburb of Mulgrave. The Shopping centre also services Springvale and Noble Park which the ALP, the Liberal Party and most others suggest is in Hotham.

There are also significant industrial estates between Clayton and Mulgrave and Wheelers Hill which, alongside sporting, schooling and shopping, among other things, have meant that for many decades, both at the Federal and State level, Mulgrave and Wheelers Hill have been kept together and placed with adjoining suburbs south.

Bruce-Hotham-Isaacs

As previously mentioned, at the State level, the Pakenham Rail Line is the complete southern boundary, separating the district of Mulgrave from the district of Keysborough and is also the former complete boundary between Isaacs and Bruce.

At the 1994 Redistribution, the Augmented Commission reversed the Redistribution Committee proposal for Bruce to travel south of the Pakenham line. At the time the Liberal Party opposed the proposal for Bruce to move south of the Pakenham Line to take in suburbs similar to the boundaries adopted by the last set of Commissioners. It's 1994 Objection stated "those suburbs are divorced from any community of interest with Bruce".

Again, at the 2002 Redistribution, the Augmented Commission again reversed an earlier proposal to move Bruce south, below the railway.

Given the history outlined above and also the decision made by the Augmented Commission in 2018 to uphold the proposal for Bruce to cross the Pakenham Line, it is fair to say that over a period of 30 years the Commissioners have usually begun by thinking that the Railway Line is not a more significant a boundary than under other possible arrangements, such as major roads, have twice reversed themselves having considered objections before in 2018 partially crossing the Pakenham Line. (The Pakenham Line is still a partial boundary between Bruce and Isaacs).

The reasons why the Commissioners usual thinking over the years concerning the Pakenham Line boundary is wrong are many and require a detailed understanding of the surrounding suburbs.

We can't do better than to quote from the MP for Isaacs, Mark Dreyfus' comment on objections made in 2018 as follows:

“Keysborough boundary with Bruce

The community of Keysborough is a close-knit community. Most of the new housing in this community is south of Cheltenham Road, but nearly all of the key community infrastructure is north of it. Residents of Keysborough shop at Parkmore Shopping Centre or Douglas Street, Noble Park – both north of Cheltenham Road and south of the train line. There is no public school in Keysborough, south of Cheltenham Road. Children living south of Cheltenham Road largely attend schools north of Cheltenham Road, including Chandler Park Primary School, Wallarano Primary School, Noble Park Primary School, Resurrection Primary School, St Anthony's Primary School, Keysborough Primary School and Keysborough Secondary College – all of which are north of Cheltenham Road and south of the train line. CBD workers in Keysborough, of which there are many, commute to the City from Noble Park, Yarraman or Dandenong Train Station, all north of Cheltenham Road. Most sporting clubs and religious buildings used by Keysborough residents are also north of Cheltenham Road and south of the train line. The Frederick Wachter Reserve, for example, is north of Cheltenham Road, yet a great many of the athletes and spectators that use it come from Keysborough, south of Cheltenham Road. Moving the boundary from the long established Pakenham Train Line to Cheltenham Road would split this community and residents south of Cheltenham Road would be worse off for it. The Greater Dandenong community is geographically and socially split by the Pakenham Train Line. As noted in the ALP comment on objections, 'do you live north or south of the line?' is a common question that reflects the social divide created by the train line. I have never heard anyone ask someone if they live north or south of Cheltenham Road.

Residents south of Cheltenham Road deserve to live in an electorate that shares their community of interest. For these residents, this community of interest is the area in the Greater Dandenong Local Government Area between Cheltenham Road and the Pakenham Train Line. I submit that this should remain the boundary between Isaacs and Bruce.

Dandenong South boundary with Bruce

I respectfully submit that the Commission's proposal to move the boundary between Bruce and Isaacs to Kirkham Road, Dandenong, is strongly misplaced. Dandenong South is a tight-knit community with a large and established AlbanianAustralian population. Kirkham Road is a one-lane each way suburban street and is a particularly weak boundary that splits this community in two, isolates those residents south of Kirkham Road from, not only the Dandenong Train Station and Parkmore Shopping Centre, but from the Albanian Mosque and Dandenong South Primary School, which are both proposed to be removed from Isaacs in the Commission's

proposal. Dandenong South is a strong and cohesive community within the broader southern Greater Dandenong community (the part of the Greater Dandenong Local Government Area south of the Pakenham Train Line). It would do significant damage to community cohesion in this suburb if it were split in two. This divide would split the electors south of Kirkham Road from the Albanian Mosque, Dandenong South Primary School and Parkmore Shopping Centre. I submit that it should be among the Commission's top priorities in the South-East to re-unite the entirety of Dandenong South in the Isaacs electorate.

The Pakenham Railway line

It is easy to understand why the Commission has for some time used the Pakenham Railway line as the boundary between Isaacs and Bruce. It is universally known in the Greater Dandenong community and provides both a geographic and social divide between electors in southern Greater Dandenong and electors in northern Greater Dandenong. This train line shapes the lives of many local residents. It influences commuter habits, school choices and shopping locations. There is no reasonable rationale to argue that Cheltenham Road, let alone Kirkham Road, has any of this influence. Retaining the electorate of Bruce as the 'northern Greater Dandenong' electorate and Isaacs as the primary 'southern' one reflects the communities of interest in both areas and provides a much stronger boundary, without unnecessarily moving tens of thousands of electors. I strongly agree with the objections that suggest that the Commission returns the boundary between Isaacs and Bruce to the Pakenham Train Line, that Isaacs sheds an equivalent number of electors that it was proposed to pick up from Hotham in the City of Kingston and that Bruce continue to represent the electors of Mulgrave and Wheelers Hill.

I believe that this change would create more coherent communities within each electorate, provide stronger and better known boundaries and reduce the number of electors inconvenienced with a change in electorate."

Monash

Most suggestions propose for Gippsland either no change or a very modest movement between Gippsland and Monash. The major issue for the latter Division is that given it's significantly over quota, enough to transfer the whole of its share of Cardinia Shire to La Trobe, why not do so?

Suggestions are split as to whether all of Cardinia Shire or just a significant component should be transferred to La Trobe.

It's a reasonable question.

On balance, the ALP considered that Koo Wee Rup should remain in Monash for two reasons. The rapid population growth in recent years in Victoria has been significantly fuelled by overseas immigration. The lack of immigration this year and much of next will quell the relatively rapid growth of population in Victoria, relative to

other States and will thus increase the time period for which this redistribution will apply.

That's important to consider given that Gippsland is growing at below the State average and thus is likely to take up Monash's surplus next time. So, it's highly likely that if Monash, by losing all of Cardinia Shire and thus being at the absolute bottom end of the projected quota, may need to regain next time, say Koo Wee Rup. Let's keep it in for now.

Secondly, if all of Cardinia Shire is transferred from Monash to La Trobe, that's going to mean that over the life of this redistribution, both La Trobe and Holt are likely to become significantly over quota than what otherwise would be the case. For instance, both the ALP and Liberal Party suggestions place, at the current date, La Trobe and Holt at the bottom end of quota. At the projection date, under the Liberal Party proposal, La Trobe would be 3.4% over quota and Holt, +2.5%. The corresponding numbers under the ALP suggestion are at the future date, La Trobe +0.6% and Holt, 1%.

The reasons for the differences are twofold: the extra numbers flowing into La Trobe from Monash and, more importantly, the fact that the suburbs of both La Trobe and Holt, lying next to Bruce are low growth suburbs.

Bruce-Holt-La Trobe

The differences between suggestions here can mostly be broken down to those which preserve the current boundary between Holt and La Trobe, (the ALP and others) and those which attempt to break that boundary (the Liberal Party and others).

But there should be another consideration. Future growth in Cranbourne and Clyde in Holt and Pakenham and Clyde North (La Trobe) is going to continue to be rapid and both Divisions will need to combine high growth suburbs with those of low growth. With that predictable future in mind, it makes sense, this time, to move Bruce closer to more rapidly growing areas. That's because in future, neither Holt nor La Trobe can continue to retain all their high growth areas and only shed low growth suburbs to Bruce.

To that end, when considering which parts of Berwick to transfer from Holt to Bruce, it makes more sense for Bruce to take Berwick South, south of the Freeway, (and thus have its border at the suburb boundary between Berwick and Clyde North) than say, removing parts of Berwick North from La Trobe and thus still leaving Bruce far away from any high growth suburb.

DIVISION NAMES

Of the 102 suggestions received, 68 solely concerned Division names. The bulk of these suggestions supported additional female names for Divisions. Margaret Tucker was proposed no less than 43 times, with significant support also expressed for, among others, Kirner and Child. No doubt, the number of suggestions relating to names reflects the disappointment many feel about the paucity of female names for Federal Divisions.

But it is also fair to acknowledge that the impressive decision by the last set of Commissioners to rename Melbourne Ports Macnamara, after Jean Macnamara, and to also to rename Murray Nicholls after both Pastor Doug and Gladys Nicholls has also encouraged many to know hope. That's also true of our indigenous community who have welcomed the removal of the names of Batman and McMillan and the adoption of Cooper, after William Cooper, to replace Batman.

Before the last redistribution, only four Victorian Divisions were named after women. That's now five plus the joint name of Nicholls. Before the last redistribution, Jagajaga was the only Victorian Division named after Koori people. That's now three.

This redistribution, most submissions, including those of all political parties have recommended that the Commissioners continue their long standing practice of naming a Division after a deceased former Prime Minister, in this case, R.J.L. Hawke.

As you know the ALP has also proposed that Gellibrand be renamed after Joan Kirner.

As flagged in our suggestion, the ALP now proposes, at the suggestion of Clare O'Neil, MP and with the support of the family of Margaret Tucker that the Division of Hotham is renamed Tucker, after Margaret Tucker.

We commend the suggestion No 41 made by Dr Julie Andrews:

<https://www.aec.gov.au/Electorates/Redistributions/2021/vic/files/suggestions/vic21-s0041-julie-andrews.pdf>

On Margaret Tucker, please also see:

<https://www.aboriginalvictoria.vic.gov.au/margaret-tucker-mbec>

and <https://ia.anu.edu.au/biography/tucker-margaret-elizabeth-auntie-marge-1556>

Should the Commissioners agree with the proposal to call Hotham instead Tucker it would be the first time any Division in Australia has been named after an Aboriginal woman.