



# Comment on suggestion 18

Martin Gordon

23 pages



The Redistribution Committee

Dear Commissioners,

Unlike previous years I was unable to make a submission to the Commission. But I take this opportunity to make comments and appreciate the opportunity.

I have used a spreadsheet format to enable a commentary in the context of all of the most relevant submissions. I have made briefer references to other submitters who may have advocated a name change or a more limited redistribution proposition. The spreadsheet incorporates virtually all the state-wide submissions and therefore the significance of conformity in submissions become more evident, with quite a number of no changes, others highlighting the projections and doubts about their accuracy based on the failure of projections from 2017.

I would like to agitate for the change of the name of the Division of Mallee to that of Wimmera, a federation name that in its last iteration seems to be pretty well incorporated in the current Mallee. I understand that Wimmera also has some aboriginal origins. I would also like to recognise the constructive name changes in the 2017 redistribution of Monash, Cooper, Nicholls and Mcnamara.

**Reversing some 2017 changes**

A somewhat recurring theme in a number of submissions is reversing some of the 2017 changes made by that redistribution committee or augmented committee. I have found many of these suggestions persuasive. In the case of Macnamara it can lose electors, and the reversing of Windsor is proposed in S102- Andrew Norman. Mr Normans submission was aimed at a series of south eastern suburbs Divisions. He suggested no changes to Goldstein which a number of other submitters have agreed with, and so do I. Whilst I am less inclined to Mr Norman's proposals for Hotham, Bruce, Isaacs and Dunkley, the key theme as I see it is reversing some 2017 changes to create more workable boundaries.

**More women honoured**

S96 by a series of people quite reasonably promotes the point of more Divisions named after women. This has tended to be an area of weakness. Unfortunately, redistribution committees have only made small progress on this front. I have suggested that Joan Kirner be honoured in the past, as she is the first woman Premier of Victoria. I have also suggested that Mary Holman be honoured in WA, as the first Labor woman in any Australian Parliament. Regrettably even the Labor Party has not been receptive to this. I would add that whilst I have proposed the honouring of Gough Whitlam, and Malcolm Fraser with new or renamed Divisions, on this occasion the new Division should be named in honour of Bob Hawke as a former Prime Minister.

This should not be of controversy. If a Division can be appropriately named in honour of a Prime Minister of six days standing such as Frank Forde then there is no reason not to honour Hawke, one of the longest serving Prime Ministers.

### **McEwen**

S87 Alan Strangwick is a forcefully argued to restructure McEwen alone amongst all Divisions. I recall from 2017 the lengthy arguments about McEwen. McEwen has always been an awkward bits and pieces sort of Division. Then as now, McEwen remains in some ways enigmatic with a large semi-rural character. The fact that Craigieburn is not part of the Division is not at all a negative. Craigieburn is on the edge of metropolitan Melbourne and McEwen continues to absorb electors in numerous Councils. This has been a feature of McEwen for the entirety of its existence. I imagine that it will remain much as it is: Losing some westerly bits to the new Division of Hawke: Calwell retaining Craigieburn. It is fast growing as it embodies a range of vast growing similar semi-rural townships in the central part of Victoria and the fringes of Melbourne. McEwen has been this way for decades, in 2017 there were arguments in opposition but they were not persuasive. In 2020 the same arguments have been rehashed. They should be no more persuasive now than in 2017!

### **Geography**

S 89 – Tim Colebatch. I found this one of the more engaging submissions. In various states and territories geography, or people dominate the naming logic of Divisions, Districts, or seats. The variability of average enrolments by region as he highlights are in some ways perverse. I found his proposition of a Division based on Pakenham and Berwick, both interesting and forward looking. Fortunately, we only have to look forward 7 years.

### **Naming**

S 36 – Professor Wright. Ms Wright may be part of a larger campaign to name a Division in honour of Margaret Tucker. Notwithstanding this issue, Tucker would be an entirely reasonable choice if a seat is needed to be abolished and a name chosen for a woman, and an aboriginal of note. S51 Emeritus Broome supported the same suggestion (reinforcing my point of a campaign).

S58- English Speaking Union. I had not heard of William Watt previously. The fact he is a long dead man, should not be a disqualification. His life history of public service in Victoria and federally is greatly impressive. It is unfortunate that even now Victoria has only 39 Divisions. I would remind the committee that Gellibrand, might be less significant in favour of Watt or even Dunlop.

### **Greens**

S97 – The Greens. The Greens propose a surprising lack of change in many eastern Melbourne suburbs Divisions, as well as a series of regional Divisions that are quite close to quota and likely to remain so. As with some other proposals such as Dr Mulcair, there is a similar proposition to transfer territory between Macnamara and Higgins. Which I have to say makes demographic sense. They propose the westerly displacement of Gorton to take in Sunbury, Melton, and Bacchus Marsh. The new Division of Hawke is placed within the middle belt of western Melbourne suburbs. The addition of electors from Nillumbik Shire to McEwen is similar to some other proposals and the transfer of Sunbury to Gorton is similar to other proposals.

## **The Nationals**

S44 – the Nationals. The Nationals propose to create the new Division within the inner suburbs of northern Melbourne, but without specifying where, by indicating they are only proposing extra-metropolitan changes. Consistent with my views about maintaining the nature of McEwen as a rural, and semi-rural Division they have proposed the northward movement of McEwen. The difficulty with this is that it effectively precludes the placement of the new Division of Hawke in the Sunbury, Melton, Bacchus Marsh area. Similarly, many of the changes the Nationals propose involve tweaking existing boundaries without a lot of purpose, as many local government areas are cut up for instance, Wannon, Mallee, Ballarat, Bendigo, Corangamite. Many other submissions propose similar minimal, as well as no change options and the degree of agreement that is surprising. Whilst the Nationals have suggested some worthwhile ideas in many areas I would prefer to the weight of submissions.

At page 6 of their submission I note with agreement the reasonable concerns about voter projections. Jeff Waddell has also raised this and the extent of errors from the 2017 redistribution only reinforce this concern.

## **Victorian Labor**

S100 – Labor Party. I will deal with naming issues. I think there is broad agreement amongst many submissions to name the new Division Hawke. I note the Labor Party has proposed that the Division of Gellibrand be renamed Kirner (after Joan Kirner). Gellibrand has become somewhat discredited over his role in the settlement of Victoria. The suggestion of the name Dunlop was proposed by another submitter, another worthy name. The fact that Joan Kirner was a member of the Labor Party may in part explain their enthusiasm for naming a seat in her honour, but Kirner is uniquely the first woman Premier of the state.

The broad suggestion of planning Hawke on the north western periphery of Melbourne and adjacent semi-rural areas is reasonable. The inclusion of Craigieburn in McEwen is not agreed with as it would alter the fundamental semi-rural nature of McEwen as it has existed since its 1984 creation. Craigieburn is a better fit in Calwell with areas to its south. The suggested exchange of electors between Scullin and McEwen seem entirely unnecessary. I am not averse to a straightening of the Mernda boundary as proposed by Dr Mulcair but the Labor Party proposal seems to not be particularly logical, or necessary.

With some boundaries there seemed to be excessive adjustments to achieve numerical targets, suggesting some other motive. In the case of Gellibrand, the inclusion of all of Point Cook is consistent with many submissions except that of the Labor Party. Placing Gellibrand east of the Princes Highway and making the Division more coastal seems to be a better long term solution than sending Point Cook entirely to Labor. Some changes in the eastern suburbs of Melbourne were also significantly at odds with many other submissions.

## **Colin McLaren**

S85 – Colin McLaren. Identified a block of 12 Divisions that did not need any adjustments. Whilst I did not agree with a few, it was pleasing to see a number of different people independently arriving at the same conclusions. Some of his other proposals had sound underlying logic also.

## **Jeff Waddell**

S13 – Jeff Waddell. Mr Waddell raises some quite legitimate questions about projections of elector numbers particularly in regional Victoria. From my own analysis and that of recent federal redistributions in particular that regional elector enrolments seem to be under-estimated. This can have profound implications for a redistribution causing many changes that are unnecessary and possibly distort electoral results. Page 11 of Mr Waddell's submission reveals that the regional under-projection is some 28,000 (approx.) electors and a corresponding over-projection in many metropolitan Divisions.

Mr Waddell raises an issue about electoral fairness. Whilst this not a relevant criteria for the redistribution, psephologists note this as do political parties. The placement of certain boundaries do have political effects.

I do not agree with the suggestion to put the Lara SA2 area into Lalor. This has been done in the past, but it not a satisfactory solution. Mr Waddell is the only submitter that I could identify that had suggested this solution, although his Corio and Corangamite suggestions do work numerically.

Most of my comments about Mr Waddell's comprehensive submission are in the attached spreadsheet.

## **Harry Hook**

S99 – Harry Hook. I found a lot of areas of agreement with this submission. Many of its proposals were like those of other submitters and not significantly different overall. I take issue with the inclusion of Craigieburn in McEwen as this has profound effects on central Victoria and other Divisions. The solutions he proposed for Mcnamara, Higgins, Kooyong and Chisholm were quite reasonable.

## **Liberal Party**

S90- Liberal Party. I found many of the Liberal Party proposals were surprisingly benign for a major party, whilst the Labor Party submission appeared to have a much more obvious partisan edge. For one I was surprised the Liberal Party proposed the creation of the new Division of Hawke as an inner city Division. The weight of opinion from my read is a new Division in the north west of Melbourne and embracing semi-rural areas. I was surprised by the changes to Casey, which does not need any. Isaacs has solicited a range of similar proposals (such as Richardson, my support, Walsh, McSweeney, and Lamond) , making the Division more coastal in orientation and following the Frankston railway line.

Mcnamara and Higgins solicited a range of similar proposals, verging on unanimity and only The Labor Party seemed to be on a discordant note. McEwen was constructed as a semi-rural more central Victorian Division, which I saw as solid and which was consistent with that of the National Party and a range of other submissions. Scullin was oddly reshaped which this in part arose from creating a new inner city Division. I would suggest a new outer north west suburban option in preference.

## **My observations**

In my own preliminary work for the redistribution I arrived at a view that as it transpires is similar to a number of other submissions that the new seat of Hawke should be located on the north western extremity of Melbourne and that it should include a number of semi-rural areas adjacent.

A somewhat recurring theme I will make is reversing some 2017 changes of the AEC. In respect of Corangamite:

- I would reduce the enrolment of Corangamite by transferring to Wannon sufficient electors to enable the transfer of the entirety of Golden Plain Council (currently split between Wannon and Corangamite) to the new Division of Hawke. An alternative would be to place all of Golden Plains in Ballarat and transfer Bacchus Marsh and a further portion of Moorabool to Hawke.
- This would mean much of the Colac-Otway area and part of Surf Coast may be placed in Wannon also.
- I would reverse the 2017 changes between Corio and Corangamite returning Corio to be a north Geelong Division, and Corangamite as a south Geelong Division.
- This would mean that Corio would surround Corio Bay on both sides, and that Corangamite would be south of the South Barwon River, as it long and clearly has existed.

Reversing the changes to Dunkley and Flinders were a theme in several submissions (Waddell, Lamond), along with adjustments that at least partially reversed, albeit unsatisfactorily (Mulcair). Reversing the 2017 changes, facilitate a movement of surplus electors from Monash and Holt to Flinders and Dunkley, which enable changes to Isaacs, Hotham, Bruce and back to Holt.

Hawke in my view could be a solution to a range of problems with other boundaries, taking surpluses from Ballarat (Moorabool), Corangamite (Golden Plains), Gorton (Melton), McEwen (Sunbury and towns along the Calder Highway). Retention of Romsey and Riddells Creek in McEwen together with the addition of electors from Menzies/Jaga Jaga make for a suitable redrawing of McEwen slightly to the east.

In 2017 Hotham was the focus of many suggestions, ironically now it receives much less attention. The focus in the south east having moved to Bruce, Holt, La Trobe, and Monash.

Concluding comments

I wish the commissioners all the best in their endeavours.

Martin Gordon

25/10/2020

Column1	Gordon	Waddell	Mulcair	Greens	Clark	Richardson	McSweeney	Walsh	Ashley	Lamond
<b>Aston</b>	no change	no change	no change	no change	no change	no change	no change	no change	no change	makes changes which are at odds with the weight of submissions
<b>Ballarat</b>							The numbers from Ballarat should be placed into the new Division not Gorton			would not shift Maryborough from Mallee
<b>Bendigo</b>	Loss of Woodend etc to McEwen		Loss of Woodend etc to McEwen	Loss of Woodend etc to McEwen			Includes an adjustment with Nicholls which generates a flow on from Indi - on balance is reasonable			seeks to add rural areas to west to Division

<p><b>Bruce</b></p>	<p>Apart from elongation of the Division I found Dr Richardons ideas refreshing and viable.</p>						<p>Appears to be similar to Walsh</p>	<p>Appear to be similar to McSweeney</p>	<p>Merit in this proposal. An alternative configuration would be placing the former portions of La Trobe in with the more southerly portions of the existing Holt and placing Hampton Park, Lyndhurst and the like in Bruce. This would make Holt a largely newer Division of suburbs.</p>	<p>imaginative proposal</p>
<p><b>Calwell</b></p>	<p>Craigieburn should remain in Calwell</p>						<p>Agree with retention of Craigieburn in Calwell</p>			<p>Craigieburn should remain in Calwell</p>



<b>Casey</b>	no change	no change	no change	no change	no change	no change	no change	no change	no change	no change	propsoes unnecessary changes to Casey agaisnt the weight of submissions
<b>Chisholm</b>	Broadly agree with Dr Mulcairs and Dr Richardson s proposals						Boundareis are solid, but contraction of Menzies to Yarra River will have an impact here.	ok	Proposes a direct transfer of voters from Chisholm to Menzies. The weight of changes seems to defer to other submissions .	ok	
<b>Cooper</b>	no change				no change		Prefer to follow local government boundaries and no changes to Cooper.			unnecessarily complicated	

<p><b>Corangamite</b></p>	<p>Reverse 2017 Corio/Corangamite changes, transferring electors from Corangamite to Wannon and all of Golden Plains Council to either Ballarat or Hawke. Dr Richardson agrees with this. Given the rapid growth in Corangamite, placing the Division below</p>					<p>Dr Richardson proposes the reversal of the 2017 Corio/Corangamite changes</p>	<p>Proposes strong boundaries based on Surf Coast, I would reverse the 2017 changes with Corio, which would increase Corio's enrolment and reduce that of Corangamite. Disagree with renaming to Dugdale.</p>	<p>Another variant of Corangamite boundary.</p>		<p>Reversing 2017 change would open up more possibilities to modify boundaries.</p>
---------------------------	---	--	--	--	--	--	---	---	--	---

<b>Corio</b>	Reverse 2017 Corio/Corangamite changes, transferring electors from Corangamite to Wannon and all of Golden Plains Council to either Ballarat or Hawke. Dr Richardson agree with this.						no change	no change	Diagree with inclusion of rural areas to west of Corio.	Reversing 2017 change would open up more possibilites to modify boundaries. Additioan of rural areas to Corios west are unnecessary.
<b>Deakin</b>							ok	ok		Most Deakin proposals are further to east and more elongated, making fewer changes to Casey would help here.

<b>Dunkley</b>	I agree with Mr Waddell's proposals in their entirety	Reversing the 2017 AEC changes	Agree with Mulcair changes if my proposals are not accepted	no change	no change	no change	no change	Prefer to reverse the 2017 changes.	Prefer to reverse 2017 changes	Agree in large part with submission.
<b>Flinders</b>	I agree with Mr Waddell's proposals in their entirety	Reversing the 2017 AEC changes	Agree with Mulcair changes if my proposals are not accepted	no change	no change	no change	no change	Prefer to reverse the 2017 changes.	Prefer to reverse 2017 changes	Agree broadly with submission.
<b>Fraser</b>										
<b>Gellibrand</b>	Point Cook in its entirety should be in Gellibrand						Agree completely with this proposal	Similar to McSweeney		Gellibrand needs to reach further to south west along the coast.
<b>Gippsland</b>	no change	no change	no change	no change	no change		no change	no change		no change
<b>Goldstein</b>	no change		no change	no change			no change	no change		

<p><b>Gorton</b></p>	<p>Gorton should move slightly eastwards freeing up numbers for the new Division of Hawke</p>			<p>Propose Gorton be a Sunbury-Melton-Bacchus Marsh seat</p>			<p>The Ballarat numbers should be placed into the new Division not Gorton</p>		<p>Disagree with this odd extension of Gorton into the middle belt of western suburbs. It would be easier to placement Sunbury and adjacent areas to the new Division and call it Hawke. Gorton should contract to the metropolitan area, leaving Sunbury</p>	<p>Agree with easterly movement of Gorton</p>
----------------------	---	--	--	--	--	--	---	--	---	---

<b>Hawke</b>	The new Division should be based on Golden Plains Council, major portion of Moorabool Council, Sunbury and Melton. Noting that Melton is included in the Western Victorian Province for Legislative Council purposes.						Is a renaming of Wills, which I disagree with		Agree with most of this Hawke proposal, but should include more of Moorabool Council and or most or all of Golden Plains. Those portions of Romsey and Riddells Creek should be placed in McEwen.	
<b>Higgins</b>	Agree with Dr Mulcair and Greens		Exchange of electors between Mcnamara and Higgins are reasonable	Exchange of electors between Mcnamara and Higgins are reasonable		Proposes changes with Higgins and Mcnamara which are reasonable	Proposes changes with Higgins and Mcnamara which are reasonable	Reverse Windsor change, and lose Hughesdale .		

<b>Holt</b>	Apart from elongation of the Division I found Dr Richardons ideas refreshing and viable.						ok		Merit in this proposal. An alternative configuration would be placing the former portions of La Trobe in with the more southerly portions of the existing Holt and placing Hampton Park, Lyndhurst and the like in Bruce. This would make Holt a largely newer Division of suburbs.	Submission is imaginative, but the extreme east-west elongation precludes movement of parts of Dandenong to Bruce, additions to Hotham, and a slightly more easterly Holt.
-------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	----	--	---	--

<b>Hotham</b>	Apart from elongation of the Division I found Dr Richardons ideas refreshing and viable.		acceptable				ok	Transfer of Bentleigh East to Isaacs would be a better solution for Isaacs and Hotham, eliminating the sprawl of Isaacs past Dandenong.		Abolition to create new outer suburban Division is imaginative
<b>Indi</b>	no change	no change		no change	no change		Includes an adjustment with Bendigo and Nicholls which generates a flow on from Indi - on balance is reasonable	no change		no change



<b>Isaacs</b>	Apart from elongation of the Division I found Dr Richardons ideas refreshing and viable.		acceptable	no change	no change		Consider that Dandenong and Keysborough would be better in Bruce or anotehr Division	Transfer of Bentleigh East to Isaacs would be a better solution for Isaacs and Hotham, eliminating the sprawl of Isaacs past Dandenong.		Proposal similar to Richardson, a reasoanble return to a structure of the past.
<b>Jaga Jaga</b>	transfer areas north of Yarra to Jaga Jaga and McEwen					Transfer electors north of Yarra to Jaga Jaga and/or McEwen from Menzies.	similar to other proposals			I disagree with the complete displacement of Jaga Jaga, which has flow on effects in McEwen and central Victoria.

<b>Kooyong</b>	no change			no change	no change	Proposes changes with Higgins and Mcnamara which are reasonable	no change	no change		
<b>Lalor</b>							ok	Similar to McSweeney		Broadly agree with proposal
<b>LaTrobe</b>	Accept it will undergo significant changes to accommodate changes with other Divisions						ok		Interesting proposal, but would prefer the southern semi rural portiosn of Holt to be restored to Flinders.	The transfers from Casey are unnecessary

<b>Mallee</b>	no change, noting in time Mallee should expand into central Victoria, such as the Mount Alexander Council, with towns such as Castlemain e. The logic of this like the former Division of Wimmera it ran along the western highway and took in towns in Central Victoria	no change				Advocates further Murrau River towns been included from Nicholls, which I do not think are necessary.	no change			Involve excessive movement of electors.
<b>Maribyrnong</b>										ok

<b>McEwen</b>	transfer areas north of Yarra to Jaga Jaga and McEwen					Transfer electors north of Yarra to Jaga Jaga and/or McEwen from Menzies. However I do not agree with the overall changes to McEwen	This proposal is quite reasonable	Disagree with transfer of Craigieburn from Calwell as it totally changes the character of McEwen. Romsey and Riddells Creek should be placed in McEwen rather than the prospeod Hawke.	Agree with most of this McEwen proposal, except inclusion of Mickelham and Craigieburn. Should include areas from Riddells Creek, Romsey.	Craigieburn should remain in Calwell, the cahnges made to Jaga jaga have huge flow on effects into central Victoria.
<b>Mcnamara</b>	Agree with Dr Mulcair, Greens and Dr Mulcair		Exchange of electors between Mcnamara and Higgins are reasonable	Exchange of electors between Mcnamara and Higgins are reasonable		Proposes changes with Higgins and Mcnamara which are reasonable	Proposes changes with Higgins and Mcnamara which are reasonable	Reverse Windsor change.		Agree
<b>Melbourne</b>	no change		no change		no change		no change			Adjustments are unnecessary

<b>Menzies</b>	transfer areas north of Yarra to Jaga Jaga and McEwen					Transfer electors north of Yarra to Jaga Jaga and/or McEwen from Menzies.	I believe the transfer of areas north of the Yarra to McEwen/Jaga Jaga would facilitate a better over redistribution		Proposes a direct transfer of voters from Chisholm to Menzies. The weight of changes seems to defer to other submissions.	Similar to other proposals
<b>Monash</b>	Accept it will undergo significant changes to accommodate changes with other Divisions									Agree with transfers to Flinders

<b>Nicholls</b>	no change	no change		no change			Includes an adjustment with Bendigo which generates a flow on from Indi - on balance is reasonable	no change		
<b>Scullin</b>	Agree with Dr Mulcair		Adjustments in Mernda with McEwen per Dr Mulcair are quite reasonable.		no change		Gain of part of Mernda seems to be the same as Dr Mulcair and is a ideal fix to a minor problem	Gain of part of Mernda seems to be the same as Dr Mulcair and is a ideal fix to a minor problem		Involve excessive movement of electors.
<b>Wannon</b>	Additions from Corangamite	no change					The interchanges with Corangamite seem excessive.			
<b>Wills</b>	no change		no change		no change		Changed to Hawke			

<b>Child</b>								New Division appears to be Hawke in other submissions. I prefer rural portions of Ballarat to be placed in a new north west metropolitan/semi rural Division called Hawke.		
<b>New Electorate East</b>										new Division is imaginative

<b>New Electorate West</b>									new Division is imaginative. Would prefer inclusion of Sunbury as oppsoed to more rural and semi rural areas such as Romsay and Riddells Creek which would be better in McEwen.
----------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---