



Objection 493

Charles Richardson

12 pages

FEDERAL REDISTRIBUTION 2023-24: VICTORIA

OBJECTIONS to the PROPOSAL of the VICTORIAN REDISTRIBUTION COMMITTEE

From CHARLES RICHARDSON

I am again grateful for the opportunity to make objections to the proposal for the redistribution of federal electoral boundaries in Victoria, as released by the Redistribution Committee on 31 May 2024. I congratulate the Committee on its work, which to my mind has addressed its task extremely well. Although the point of writing is to explain places where I disagree with the Committee's proposal, this should not be allowed to obscure the fact that we are generally very much in agreement. I particularly applaud the decision to propose *Higgins* as the division for abolition, which in my view minimises the consequential disruption and allows for sensible reconstruction of the neighboring divisions (although I think some improvement could be made in that direction, as outlined in objection nine below).

It is also pleasing to see that the Committee has prioritised, within the statutory constraints, the equalising of divisions in terms of actual enrolment rather than projected enrolment. Twenty-eight of its 38 proposed divisions are within half of the permitted tolerance for actual enrolment, as against only 17 within half of the (lower) tolerance for projected enrolment. I regard this as the appropriate way to proceed, and I would urge the augmented Electoral Commission to take the same view. As I put it at the same stage three years ago:

It cannot be stressed enough that the actual electors are real; the projected electors are purely hypothetical. We do not really know where population growth and decline will be in four years time. ...

I submit that the Commission has discharged its obligation to the projected electors when it complies with the 3.5% tolerance, but it has a continuing obligation to the actual electors to try to provide equitable representation for them as much as possible.

In connection with the topic of enrolment projections, I note the Committee's review (in its Appendix D) of the erroneous projections originally supplied by the Australian Bureau of Statistics. This is a welcome instance of transparency, but it is unfortunate that it fails to give any account of how the error occurred or of why it took three months for it to be acknowledged – given that the general shape of the error was obvious at a glance, and in any case was clearly pointed out by several of the suggestions from the public (including mine) made in November.

To return to the question of boundaries: below I outline 14 objections to the Committee's proposal, arranged in a roughly clockwise order around the state. Most of my objections are relatively minor in nature, and their impact is generally limited to two or three

divisions; objection seven, which affects five divisions, is the most extensive. I assume throughout the Commission will not want to undo the Committee's work at any fundamental level, so none of my objections involve anything that could be described as rethinking the proposed boundaries from scratch. The objections are all independently motivated and can be considered independently, but in terms of their effect on enrolment numbers they are designed to work as a package – taken in isolation, some of those in the eastern suburbs could not be implemented within the legislative constraints without other adjustments being made. (Although of course the Commission may be able to find adjustments that are superior to my suggestions.)

I also believe that those making objections are best advised to confine themselves to cases where they have something better to suggest, rather than highlighting problems to which they are unable to offer solutions. Two examples in the Committee's proposal are the *Calwell/Scullin* boundary running down the Hume Highway and the *Maribyrnong/Wills* boundary running down Pascoe Vale Road; both seem to me deeply unsatisfactory, but within the context of the Committee's overall scheme of things I cannot find any better alternatives, so they do not appear on my list.

Also included are maps to illustrate my two most substantial objections (seven and nine), and two tables: one giving a detailed breakdown of the suggested changes by Level 2 Statistical Areas (SA2s), keyed to my numbered objections, and one summarising the total effect of the changes by division. I wish the Commission well in its deliberations – please let me know if I can assist by providing any further information.

1. BELLBRAE (CORANGAMITE / WANNON)

The Committee proposes to transfer territory from *Corangamite* to *Wannon*, including particularly the towns of Inverleigh and Moriac. I fully support this move, but in one place the proposed boundary seems illogical, by including the locality of Bellbrae in *Wannon*. Bellbrae is effectively a suburb of Torquay (as the SA2 boundary recognises); if Bells Beach and Jan Juc are to stay in *Corangamite*, then Bellbrae should stay with them. The Committee's report refers (para. 413) to the desirability of keeping Bellbrae in a single division, but offers no argument for why that should be *Wannon* rather than *Corangamite*. The numbers don't pose a problem: there are only 496 electors (592 projected) involved, and since on the proposed boundaries *Corangamite* is below the quota and *Wannon* is above it, making the change would work (albeit very slightly) in the direction of greater equity.

2. DRUMMOND-FRANKLINFORD AREA (BALLARAT / BENDIGO / MALLEE)

The Committee proposes to transfer a small strip in the north of the Shire of Hepburn from *Ballarat* to *Bendigo*, consisting principally of the localities of Drummond, Franklindford, Porcupine Ridge and Yandoit. The only justification offered for this move (para. 123) is the need for *Bendigo* to gain electors; there is no suggestion that it otherwise makes any geographical sense. While that need is real, I would strongly suggest that this is a very bad place to achieve it. The proposed boundary follows no obvious dividing feature; the localities concerned are a long way from Bendigo and look primarily to Daylesford (which is to stay in *Ballarat*) as their local centre. In addition, *Ballarat* is already well under quota, with the change taking it down to 4.4% below (3.4% projected).

I suggest that the required electors for *Bendigo* should instead come from *Mallee*, in the Shire of Loddon, including the townships of Bridgewater, Dingee, Inglewood and Serpentine. This also involves crossing a municipal boundary, but the area concerned is much nearer to and more closely connected with Bendigo, with direct transport links along the Calder and Loddon highways and the Swan Hill railway. This option is also better for equity, with *Mallee* currently well above the quota.

3. LITTLE RIVER (CORIO / GELLIBRAND / HAWKE / LALOR)

The Committee's proposal involves two small transfers of territory out of the western end of *Lalor*: the township of Little River to *Corio*, and a rural area with negligible population to *Hawke*. Neither strikes me as geographically warranted. The Little River is the long-established boundary between the Melbourne metropolitan area and greater Geelong, and while the Committee refers (para. 269) to the need to unite the locality of Eynesbury in a single division, since there are essentially no people living in the southern part this seems a poor justification for making a change and departing from the municipal boundary.

In reality the reason for the change is to keep *Lalor* within the permitted tolerance. But this would be better accomplished by a small transfer from *Gellibrand* within the Werribee urban area, where the boundaries are less well-established and there is no municipal boundary to cross. I suggest the north-eastern corner of Tarneit, bounded by Morris Road, Sayers Road and Skeleton Creek and containing 686 electors (684 projected) would fit the bill; I do not pretend it is ideal, but it seems better than the alternative.

4. BROOKLYN and SPOTSWOOD (FRASER / GELLIBRAND)

The Committee proposes to unite the suburb of Yarraville within *Fraser*; this is a very sensible move. But it goes further and proposes shifting *Fraser's* boundary south to also include Brooklyn and Spotswood, which seems much less well motivated. I suggest both should stay in *Gellibrand*; even with the addition suggested in the previous objection *Gellibrand* has room for them (although on projected enrolments only just), while *Fraser* is already over quota without them. Geographically the case of Spotswood is particularly clear: the West Gate Freeway and the municipal boundary both separate it from the rest of *Fraser*, and the Committee offers no argument to the contrary. Brooklyn is less obvious, since (as the Committee points out at para. 229) it is north of the freeway, but the Princes Highway, which follows the municipal boundary at that point, is a stronger boundary – there is a large industrial area to the north that cuts the populated part of Brooklyn off from the rest of *Fraser*, while to the south it looks naturally to the shops in Altona North.

5. MELBOURNE AIRPORT and SURROUNDS (GORTON / HAWKE / MARI-BYRNONG)

The proposed boundaries entail two adjacent transfers either side of the Maribyrnong River into *Hawke*: a strip of Keilor North from *Gorton* and Melbourne Airport from *Mari-byrnong*. I submit that neither should be accepted. They both disturb perfectly good existing boundaries for no good reason, and the numbers involved are too small (about a hundred electors in each) to matter to anything.

The Committee's justification for the moves (para. 266) is that they "unite additional similar areas within" *Hawke* and allow *Gorton* and *Maribyrnong* (and *Lalor*, covered in objection three above) "to be more urban in focus." This seems to me to involve two misconceptions: firstly, that *Hawke* is not already an urban division – clearly it is, with some two-thirds of its population coming from the urban areas of Melton and Sunbury – and secondly, that urban vs rural character, in the sense that should concern us, is a property of land rather than people. While I have argued strongly in the past for boundaries that distinguish between urban and rural territory, this is an argument about where particular electors should be. If the territory concerned has (like these areas) a negligible population, it doesn't much matter either way; not enough, anyway, to disturb good established boundaries.

6. PRINCES PARK and MELBOURNE GENERAL CEMETERY (MELBOURNE / WILLS)

The area of Princes Park and the Melbourne General Cemetery under the Committee's proposal would move from *Melbourne* to *Wills*. Only three electors are involved, so it really makes no important difference, but in my view it would make more sense to follow the municipal boundary and leave them in *Melbourne*. The countervailing argument (although the Committee doesn't make it) would be that the proposed boundary follows the locality boundary, as does the Victorian Legislative Assembly boundary, but in a case where no population is concerned I fail to see why the locality boundary should carry any weight against the municipal boundary.

7. CHRISTMAS HILLS and MUCH MORE (BRUCE / CASEY / LA TROBE / McEWEN / MENZIES)

The proposed division of *Casey* includes two strange additions at its north-western end: Wonga Park, to be transferred from *Menzies*, and a sparsely populated area centred on Christmas Hills, to be transferred from *McEwen*. Neither is very populous, but even with them *Casey* is only about 40 electors above the permitted minimum on projected enrolments, so unless there are equal or greater gains elsewhere it cannot afford to lose either. But both, and especially the second, are clearly undesirable on community of interest grounds; the Committee does not attempt to defend either on anything other than a numerical basis. If there is any reasonable alternative available, having *Casey* intrude into either the City of Manningham or the Shire of Nillumbik would violate clear and well-established boundaries.

It seems to me there is a much better alternative available, and although it requires unpicking more of the Committee's work than my other objections, I think the results are well worth it. Instead of changing its northern border, *Casey* can expand to the south, where the existing boundary is messy around Emerald and Avonsleigh. Taking Emerald, Cockatoo and Gembrook from *La Trobe* would greatly improve *Casey's* coherence while keeping it well clear of the minimum tolerance, and would provide better representation for the people of those towns by uniting them with the rest of the Dandenongs.

La Trobe would then need compensation, but that is very straightforward – its proposed loss of territory to *Bruce* can simply be reversed, returning the boundary to Harkaway, Lyall and Clyde Roads. This is possible because the proposed *Bruce* is hard up against the upper limit of the projected tolerance, so it can afford to give back a substantial

amount of territory. The new *Casey/La Trobe* boundary needs to be carefully drawn, and would run close to the built-up areas of Cockatoo and/or Gembrook, because the proposed *La Trobe*, being mostly high growth, is very close to both the lower limit for actual enrolment and the upper limit for projected enrolment – but this is already a problem with the Committee's proposal and would not be made any worse in my version. Map 1 below illustrates the suggested boundary. (Note I have had to estimate the enrolment figures in this case, using mesh block counts, because my proposal splits Level 1 Statistical Areas; with access to detailed enrolment data the Commission should be able to do a better job, but my effort at least shows that it is possible.)

8. CHELSEA (DUNKLEY / ISAACS)

The Committee proposes to extend *Dunkley* northwards at its coastal end, with a new boundary along Thames Promenade. I support the basic idea, but the consequence of splitting the suburbs of Chelsea and Chelsea Heights is unfortunate. The situation could be improved by putting the whole of Chelsea in *Dunkley* and keeping Chelsea Heights in *Isaacs*; the resulting boundary would look a little less neat, but would be much better for community of interest. It would also leave *Isaacs* uncomfortably close to the lower limit on projected enrolments, so I suggest it could also take the small section of Patterson Lakes north of the Patterson River, which is well connected to Chelsea Heights.

9. SOUTHBANK vs SOUTH YARRA (MACNAMARA / MELBOURNE)

As noted above, I support the Committee's proposed abolition of *Higgins*. It proposes that its territory be divided among *Chisholm*, *Hotham*, *Kooyong*, *Macnamara* and *Melbourne*; I would have brought *Goldstein* into the mix as part of a reconstruction of *Macnamara*, but I assume that the Commission will not now want to revisit that question. It should, however, consider the related question of where *Melbourne* should cross the Yarra River, which the Committee has answered by giving it a substantial slice of *Higgins*, being the whole suburb of South Yarra plus a section of Prahran. I believe this is the wrong answer.

There is general agreement that *Melbourne* needs to include territory south of the Yarra, and I am happy to accept the Committee's view as to roughly how many electors that should involve. (It is almost, but not quite, enough to equalise average projected enrolments between northern and southern divisions.) But South Yarra is a bad place to get them. It is cut off from the rest of *Melbourne* not just by the river itself – there are only two north-south road bridges in the relevant area, at Punt Road and Chapel Street – but by the parklands of the Kings Domain and Royal Botanic Gardens.

I submit that it would be better to take the required territory further west, in Fishermans Bend, Port Melbourne and Southbank. Although the river is wider there, there are more bridges (six of them for road traffic, plus another four for pedestrians) and the transport links are more oriented north-south: thousands of people walk between the city and Southbank every day, and Port Melbourne's main thoroughfares – Bay Street and Williamstown Road, plus the 109 tram route – all point towards the city. A large part of the area was traditionally industrial; some still is, while some has been or is being converted to residential use, and in these respects it fits well with Docklands and West Melbourne in *Melbourne* north of the Yarra. The change would also result in a more regular shape for both *Macnamara* and

Melbourne, eliminating some of the former's ungainly east-west stretch.

I therefore recommend a straight swap of territory between the two divisions, with South Yarra and Prahran going to *Macnamara* and *Melbourne* taking instead the four SA2s of Docklands, Port Melbourne, Port Melbourne Industrial and Southbank (West)–South Wharf, plus that part of Southbank (East) that lies north of Grant Street. Map 2 below illustrates the suggestion. The two are of comparable size in enrolments, but because the proposed *Macnamara* has been set very close to the lower limit for projected enrolment this change in isolation would put it below the 3.5% mark. My next objection, however, would fix that problem.

10. PRAHRAN (KOOYONG / MACNAMARA)

The Committee's proposal results in the suburb of Prahran being divided between *Kooyong* and *Melbourne*. My proposed swap of territory in objection nine above provides incidentally a way to address this: *Macnamara* can take *Kooyong's* share of Prahran, shifting the boundary to Malvern and Orrong Roads. This would improve community of interest in the area, and would return *Macnamara* to within the permitted tolerance on projected enrolments. *Kooyong*, being well over quota, can easily afford to lose the electors, although incidentally the change also provides scope for it to make the gain outlined in the next objection.

11. KOOYONG / MENZIES BORDER

The Committee proposes to shift the *Kooyong/Menzies* border westward from Elgar Road, a very sensible measure. But it would have it run down Greythorn Road and Union Road instead of, as would seem more logical, along the municipal boundary a little further east. It does not explain its rationale for this decision, but the obvious one is the fact that *Kooyong* cannot absorb the additional electors, being already 2.9% over the quota on projected enrolments. But if the transfer of its share of Prahran suggested in the previous objection is made, this problem goes away; *Kooyong* can shift east to the municipal boundary, thus avoiding having *Menzies* intrude into the City of Boroondara.

12. BOX HILL SOUTH (CHISHOLM / MENZIES)

The Committee's proposed boundary between *Chisholm* and *Menzies*, which otherwise works well, leaves a small section of Box Hill South (between Elgar Road and Gardiners Creek) stranded in *Chisholm*, where it is cut off from the rest of that division by Deakin University and adjacent parkland. It would not produce quite as neat a line on the map, but it would otherwise be better to follow the locality boundary and put this section into *Menzies*. *Chisholm* can easily afford to lose the electors (1,008 actual, 1,061 projected), and it would be an advantage in dealing with the next objection. (Note however that *Menzies* cannot afford to take both this and the Wonga Park area referred to in objection seven unless it loses the border territory described in objection 11, or some equivalent.)

13. CHADSTONE (CHISHOLM / HOTHAM)

The Committee's proposal would transfer to *Hotham* a section of the current *Higgins* south of the Monash Freeway and east of Belgrave Road. Although this involves crossing the municipal boundary it makes some sense, since the area concerned used to be part of the suburb of Chadstone (as evidenced by the location of Chadstone shopping centre) until its residents decided that being called East Malvern would improve their property values. However, the western half of the area is very close to the centre of East Malvern, splitting that community, and if the suggestion in the following objection is accepted then *Hotham* will need to lose some electors. I suggest shifting the boundary eastward from Belgrave Road to Chadstone Road, affecting 1,776 electors (2,044 projected).

14. BENTLEIGH EAST (GOLDSTEIN / HOTHAM)

The Committee's proposal has the unfortunate effect of transferring a section of Bentleigh East (bounded by Centre, East Boundary, South and Tucker Roads) from *Hotham* to *Goldstein*, thus cutting it off from the rest of the suburb and bisecting its main shopping area, which runs along Centre Road. *Goldstein* does not need the electors – it is above quota (both actual and projected) without them. But it is impossible to fit them into *Hotham* without some change elsewhere. Fortunately, my previous objection suggests just such a change: if it is accepted, *Hotham* can accommodate the whole of Bentleigh East, moving the boundary back to run all the way along Tucker Road.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles Richardson

28 June 2024



TABLE 1: STATISTICAL BREAKDOWN OF SUGGESTED CHANGES TO THE REDISTRIBUTION COMMITTEE'S PROPOSED DIVISIONS

Division	Suggested transfers out				Suggested transfers in									
	Obj.#	To	SA2	Actual enrolment	Projected enrolment	Obj.#	From	SA2	Actual enrolment	Projected enrolment				
Aston	<i>No change suggested</i>													
Ballarat														
Bendigo	2	Ballarat	Daylesford	865	0.7%	926	0.7%	2	Bendigo	Daylesford	865	0.7%	926	0.7%
								2	Mallee	Bendigo Surrounds - North	103	0.1%	119	0.1%
								2	Mallee	Bendigo Surrounds - South (part)	28	0.0%	34	0.0%
								2	Mallee	Loddon (part)	1,767	1.5%	1,848	1.5%
Bruce	7	La Trobe	Beaconsfield - Officer	316	0.3%	401	0.3%							
	7	La Trobe	Berwick - North	6,680	5.7%	6,972	5.5%							
	7	La Trobe	Berwick - South East	335	0.3%	382	0.3%							
	7	La Trobe	Narre Warren North	476	0.4%	495	0.4%							
Calwell	<i>No change suggested</i>													
Casey	7	McEwen	Panton Hill - St Andrews	1,512	1.3%	1,589	1.2%	7	La Trobe	Emerald - Cockatoo (part)	8,011	6.9%	8,201	6.4%
	7	Menzies	Warrandyte - Wonga Park	2,390	2.0%	2,390	1.9%							
Chisholm	12	Menzies	Box Hill	1,008	0.9%	1,061	0.8%	13	Hotham	Malvern East (part)	1,776	1.5%	2,044	1.6%
Cooper	<i>No change suggested</i>													
Corangamite														
Corio	3	Lalor	Werribee - South	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	Wannon	Torquay	496	0.4%	552	0.4%
	3	Lalor	Werribee - West	640	0.5%	758	0.6%							
Deakin	<i>No change suggested</i>													
Dunkley	8	Isaacs	Carrum - Patterson Lakes (part)	1,538	1.3%	1,636	1.3%	8	Isaacs	Chelsea - Bonbeach	3,249	2.8%	3,413	2.7%
	8	Isaacs	Chelsea Heights	1,459	1.2%	1,433	1.1%							
Flinders	<i>No change suggested</i>													
Fraser	4	Gellibrand	Altona North	1,288	1.1%	1,355	1.1%							
	4	Gellibrand	Newport	1,928	1.6%	2,016	1.6%							
Gellibrand														
								3	Lalor	Tarneit - Central (part)	686	0.6%	684	0.5%
								4	Fraser	Altona North	1,288	1.1%	1,355	1.1%
								4	Fraser	Newport	1,928	1.6%	2,016	1.6%
Gippsland	<i>No change suggested</i>													
Goldstein	14	Hotham	Bentleigh East - South	3,183	2.7%	3,288	2.6%							
Gorton														
								5	Hawke	Keilor	59	0.1%	50	0.0%
								5	Hawke	Taylors Lakes	50	0.0%	42	0.0%
Hawke	3	Lalor	Manor Lakes - Quandong	3	0.0%	4	0.0%							
	3	Lalor	Wyndham Vale - North	5	0.0%	10	0.0%							
	5	Gorton	Keilor	59	0.1%	50	0.0%							
	5	Gorton	Taylors Lakes	50	0.0%	42	0.0%							
	5	Maribymong	Keilor	14	0.0%	11	0.0%							
	5	Maribymong	Melbourne Airport	79	0.1%	76	0.1%							
Holt	<i>No change suggested</i>													
Hotham	13	Chisholm	Malvern East (part)	1,776	1.5%	2,044	1.6%	14	Goldstein	Bentleigh East - South	3,183	2.7%	3,288	2.6%

Objections to the Proposal of the Victorian Redistribution Committee from Charles Richardson

Indi	<i>No change suggested</i>													
Isaacs	8	Dunkley	Chelsea - Bonbeach	3,249	2.8%	3,413	2.7%	8	Dunkley	Carrum - Patterson Lakes (part)	1,538	1.3%	1,636	1.3%
								8	Dunkley	Chelsea Heights	1,459	1.2%	1,433	1.1%
Jagajaga	<i>No change suggested</i>													
Kooyong	10	Macnamara	Prahran - Windsor	4,488	3.8%	4,624	3.6%	11	Menzies	Balwyn	559	0.5%	586	0.5%
								11	Menzies	Balwyn North	1,607	1.4%	1,684	1.3%
								11	Menzies	Surrey Hills (West) - Canterbury	473	0.4%	509	0.4%
La Trobe	7	Casey	Emerald - Cockatoo (part)	8,011	6.9%	8,201	6.4%	7	Bruce	Beaconsfield - Officer	316	0.3%	401	0.3%
								7	Bruce	Berwick - North	6,680	5.7%	6,972	5.5%
								7	Bruce	Berwick - South East	335	0.3%	382	0.3%
								7	Bruce	Narre Warren North	476	0.4%	495	0.4%
Lalor	3	Gellibrand	Tarneit - Central (part)	686	0.6%	684	0.5%	3	Corio	Werribee - South	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
								3	Corio	Werribee - West	640	0.5%	758	0.6%
								3	Hawke	Manor Lakes - Quandong	3	0.0%	4	0.0%
								3	Hawke	Wyndham Vale - North	5	0.0%	10	0.0%
Macnamara	9	Melbourne	Docklands	1,683	1.4%	2,066	1.6%	9	Melbourne	Prahran - Windsor	4,628	4.0%	4,802	3.8%
	9	Melbourne	Port Melbourne	11,957	10.2%	12,773	10.0%	9	Melbourne	South Yarra - North	6,921	5.9%	7,720	6.1%
	9	Melbourne	Port Melbourne Industrial	1,258	1.1%	2,287	1.8%	9	Melbourne	South Yarra - South	7,023	6.0%	7,205	5.7%
	9	Melbourne	Southbank - East (part)	4,964	4.2%	5,343	4.2%	9	Melbourne	South Yarra - West	4,369	3.7%	4,421	3.5%
	9	Melbourne	Southbank (West) - South Wharf	3,234	2.8%	3,582	2.8%	10	Kooyong	Prahran - Windsor	4,488	3.8%	4,624	3.6%
Mallee	2	Bendigo	Bendigo Surrounds - North	103	0.1%	119	0.1%							
	2	Bendigo	Bendigo Surrounds - South (part)	28	0.0%	34	0.0%							
	2	Bendigo	Loddon (part)	1,767	1.5%	1,848	1.5%							
Maribyrnong								5	Hawke	Keilor	14	0.0%	11	0.0%
								5	Hawke	Melbourne Airport	79	0.1%	76	0.1%
McEwen								7	Casey	Panton Hill - St Andrews	1,512	1.3%	1,589	1.2%
Melbourne	9	Macnamara	Prahran - Windsor	4,628	4.0%	4,802	3.8%	6	Wills	Carlton North - Princes Hill (part)	3	0.0%	2	0.0%
	9	Macnamara	South Yarra - North	6,921	5.9%	7,720	6.1%	9	Macnamara	Docklands	1,683	1.4%	2,066	1.6%
	9	Macnamara	South Yarra - South	7,023	6.0%	7,205	5.7%	9	Macnamara	Port Melbourne	11,957	10.2%	12,773	10.0%
	9	Macnamara	South Yarra - West	4,369	3.7%	4,421	3.5%	9	Macnamara	Port Melbourne Industrial	1,258	1.1%	2,287	1.8%
								9	Macnamara	Southbank - East (part)	4,964	4.2%	5,343	4.2%
								9	Macnamara	Southbank (West) - South Wharf	3,234	2.8%	3,582	2.8%
Menzies	11	Kooyong	Balwyn	559	0.5%	586	0.5%	7	Casey	Warrandyte - Wonga Park	2,390	2.0%	2,390	1.9%
	11	Kooyong	Balwyn North	1,607	1.4%	1,684	1.3%	12	Chisholm	Box Hill	1,008	0.9%	1,061	0.8%
	11	Kooyong	Surrey Hills (West) - Canterbury	473	0.4%	509	0.4%							
Monash	<i>No change suggested</i>													
Nicholls	<i>No change suggested</i>													
Scullin	<i>No change suggested</i>													
Wannon	1	Corangamite	Torquay	496	0.4%	552	0.4%							
Wills	6	Melbourne	Carlton North - Princes Hill (part)	3	0.0%	2	0.0%							

Note: "(part)" indicates that I have divided an SA2 for the purposes of these objections; several others are already divided by either the existing boundaries or the Committee's proposal.

TABLE 2: SUMMARY EFFECT OF SUGGESTED CHANGES

Division	Redistribution Committee's proposal				With changes suggested in these objections			
	Current enrolment	Deviation from quota	Projected enrolment	Deviation from quota	Current enrolment	Deviation from quota	Projected enrolment	Deviation from quota
Aston	121,246	3.7%	124,051	-2.5%	121,246	3.7%	124,051	-2.5%
Ballarat	111,733	-4.4%	122,920	-3.4%	112,598	-3.7%	123,846	-2.7%
Bendigo	115,109	-1.5%	122,879	-3.4%	116,142	-0.6%	123,954	-2.6%
Bruce	125,348	7.2%	131,654	3.5%	117,541	0.6%	123,404	-3.0%
Calwell	109,202	-6.6%	130,110	2.3%	109,202	-6.6%	130,110	2.3%
Casey	119,538	2.3%	122,825	-3.5%	123,647	5.8%	127,047	-0.2%
Chisholm	121,443	3.9%	130,602	2.6%	122,211	4.5%	131,585	3.4%
Cooper	115,881	-0.9%	124,817	-1.9%	115,881	-0.9%	124,817	-1.9%
Corangamite	106,695	-8.7%	127,797	0.4%	107,191	-8.3%	128,349	0.9%
Corio	120,410	3.0%	124,168	-2.4%	119,770	2.5%	123,410	-3.0%
Deakin	124,392	6.4%	130,314	2.4%	124,392	6.4%	130,314	2.4%
Dunkley	121,348	3.8%	127,015	-0.2%	121,600	4.0%	127,359	0.1%
Flinders	124,111	6.2%	128,659	1.1%	124,111	6.2%	128,659	1.1%
Fraser	121,865	4.3%	129,206	1.5%	118,649	1.5%	125,835	-1.1%
Gellibrand	113,796	-2.7%	127,547	0.2%	117,698	0.7%	131,602	3.4%
Gippsland	116,666	-0.2%	123,685	-2.8%	116,666	-0.2%	123,685	-2.8%
Goldstein	122,654	4.9%	131,413	3.3%	119,471	2.2%	128,125	0.7%
Gorton	118,599	1.5%	129,373	1.7%	118,708	1.6%	129,465	1.8%
Hawke	111,435	-4.7%	128,529	1.0%	111,225	-4.9%	128,336	0.9%
Holt	106,399	-9.0%	127,222	0.0%	106,399	-9.0%	127,222	0.0%
Hotham	118,284	1.2%	129,953	2.1%	119,691	2.4%	131,197	3.1%
Indi	118,876	1.7%	125,526	-1.3%	118,876	1.7%	125,526	-1.3%
Isaacs	118,457	1.3%	124,846	-1.9%	118,205	1.1%	124,502	-2.2%
Jagajaga	118,529	1.4%	123,151	-3.2%	118,529	1.4%	123,151	-3.2%
Kooyong	122,936	5.2%	130,949	2.9%	121,087	3.6%	129,104	1.5%
La Trobe	105,499	-9.7%	131,469	3.3%	105,295	-9.9%	131,518	3.4%
Lalor	106,137	-9.2%	131,433	3.3%	106,099	-9.2%	131,521	3.4%
Macnamara	113,403	-3.0%	122,946	-3.4%	117,736	0.7%	125,667	-1.2%
Mallee	121,563	4.0%	125,051	-1.7%	119,665	2.4%	123,050	-3.3%
Maribyrnong	119,489	2.2%	125,759	-1.2%	119,582	2.3%	125,846	-1.1%
McEwen	105,617	-9.6%	128,403	0.9%	107,129	-8.4%	129,992	2.2%
Melbourne	113,439	-3.0%	126,519	-0.6%	113,597	-2.8%	128,424	0.9%
Menzies	120,713	3.3%	128,860	1.3%	121,472	3.9%	129,532	1.8%
Monash	113,398	-3.0%	127,031	-0.2%	113,398	-3.0%	127,031	-0.2%
Nicholls	121,271	3.7%	127,563	0.3%	121,271	3.7%	127,563	0.3%
Scullin	114,895	-1.7%	126,602	-0.5%	114,895	-1.7%	126,602	-0.5%
Wannon	120,813	3.4%	123,757	-2.7%	120,317	2.9%	123,205	-3.2%
Wills	120,791	3.3%	130,444	2.5%	120,788	3.3%	130,442	2.5%
Total	4,441,980		4,835,048		4,441,980		4,835,048	