



Objection 68

Martin Gordon

7 pages

From: Martin Gordon
To: [FedRedistribution - VIC](#)
Subject: objection
Date: Wednesday, 18 April 2018 12:51:36 PM
Attachments: [Victorian 2018 redistribution objection.docx](#)

Attached is a objection to the recent draft redistribution proposals for Victoria.

Could you acknowledge receipt.

Regards

Martin Gordon

[REDACTED]

Augmented Redistribution Committee for Victoria

The Committee,

I wish to lodge an objection to the commissioners proposals for the state of Victoria announced on 6 April.

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

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

Non Victorian Australians

This is a issue I have alluded to on several occasions. I do not believe that non-residents of a the relevant redistribution jurisdiction should be specifically identified and named. The contribution of a someone from other than Victoria is as valid as any Victorian. It should be noted that not all members of the redistribution committee are residents of Victoria, They are not named or their contribution diminished. I am a citizen/resident of this country, and happen to be amongst the three quarters who do not reside in Victoria. Our head of state is not a resident of Victoria or even of this country, or even a citizen of it. However I am eligible to be elected to the federal Parliament, as I am a citizen of

Australia. As a primary principal, all Australians should be treated equally, the worth of them should not vary simply because they live somewhere else in Australia.

Naming

I appreciate that the commissioners adopted the name Fraser for the new Federal Division. It is in a part of Melbourne on the western side of the Maribyrnong River (whereas I had proposed the eastern side).

I welcome the names Monash, Macnamara and Nicholls. They are all worthy citizens of this country. The removal of McMillan is appropriate in view of the crimes attributed to him. I am fairly confident that the retention of Batman will draw much criticism, for much the same reason as McMillan.

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

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

Proposals - Claimed Support

The commissioners here and elsewhere have adopted the practice of citing submissions or comments in 'supporting' their proposals. The inverted commas are deliberate as reasonably often the commissioners proposals bear scant similarity to the claimed 'supporting' reference. The commissioners may want to qualify their claims of 'supporting' references with reference to the degree of similarity. Words like partial, significant, minor and major might be helpful.

I will refer to the example I take particular issue with below.

Proposals

Consistent with my discussion above under *Proposals - Claimed Support* I will make comments on the proposals as follows:

Broadly in agreement: Aston, Ballarat, Batman (Kirner), Bendigo, Calwell, Casey, Chisholm, Deakin, Fraser, Gellibrand (Cooper), Gippsland, Goldstein, Gorton, Higgins, Indi, Jaga Jaga, Kooyong, La Trobe,

Lalor, Macnamara, Mallee (Wimmera), Maribyrnong, McEwen, Melbourne, Menzies, Monash, Nicholls, Scullin, Wills.

I will deal with the remainder, and some additional comments in related groups of Divisions.

Gellibrand (Cooper) and Lalor - My view about renaming Gellibrand to Cooper is above, and rather than taking the passive position of no change, make the name change. In time it will be seen to be an inspired choice.

I had proposed that Gellibrand (Cooper) be defined by the Princes Highway (south of it) and Wyndham City broadly define Lalor (north of the Princes Highway). The local government boundary for Hobsons Bay in this area, is frankly a mess. It appears the committee has painted itself into a corner in laymans terms. I would suggest that the Princes Highway be used as boundary and that all of Point Cook be in Gellibrand (Cooper). This may mean that Lalor is towards the lower end of tolerance and Gellibrand (Cooper) towards the higher end, but I would consider that rather than the mess that appears to be the case in the proposal.

Batman (Kirner) - My view is that Kirner should be honoured and that Batman should not. Joan Kirner is the first and only woman Premier of Victoria. Her competence or otherwise (as some have noted) is not relevant. She was the first of her gender, and in an era where the lack of recognition of women in positions is finally been seriously addressed, she should be recognised. John Batman was recognised in an earlier era, and with time his public persona has been tarnished by apparent crimes.

Calwell - Holt - Footnote 42 of the commissioners proposals refers to my apparent support for the inclusion of Cranbourne in the electorate of Calwell. I am fairly confident from my search of my document that I have not or am most unlikely to ever suggest such a course of action. I suspect that the commissioners have made an error and refer in fact to Craigieburn for which such a comment would seem entirely reasonable and which I did in fact make. However, it is good to know that even highly reputable public institutions can (and do) make mistakes.

I would like to put on record my appreciation for the commissioners agreeing with my proposition that Craigieburn be included in Calwell and not McEwen.

Corio - Cox - Wannon - - My view of the necessary changes is well known, they are articulated in my proposal and my comments. Originally as I was out of the country when the redistribution proposals were required I had proposed that some changes that required minimal movements some 2,000 electors from Corio, largely reversing a change made at the previous redistribution in the areas of Mannerim and Marcus Hill. This change would suffice for electoral purposes and enable transfers to Wannon from Corangamite (Cox) which would be adequate.

The Commissioners at Footnote 46 use my name to support transfers from Corio in the Bellarine Peninsula which implies I support the total transfer of 55,385 projected electors between Corio and Corangamite/Cox. I will explain my view as follows, I totally disagree with the contention that proposing the one way minor movement of 2,000 electors approximately (as I had) is the same as a massive two way exchange of electors involving 55,385 electors. It is a dishonest proposition. As a former public servant I would expect better from public officials.

I was subsequently rather surprised by this paragraph located under the commissioners description of Wannon as follows:

449. The Redistribution Committee considered a number of variations to shifting the Colac Otway Shire Council, but ultimately found alternate configurations resulted in compromised boundaries elsewhere in the state.

As a general proposition there are knock-on effects of changes, that is a self-evident proposition. Usually the solution is a simple and straight-forward change rather than a complex solution. Accordingly I propose the following simple solution to the commissioners dilemma.

Firstly, Corio in its existing form has 113,798 projected electors and is growing at 2.29% or about 0.91% below the state average of 3.2%. It does not need any changes to be made to it. It has solid well-defined boundaries, using the Barwon River in large part, a major road and the Greater Geelong Council boundary. The easiest solution - leave it as it is.

Secondly, Wannon has changes with Mallee none of which I have issues with, and which I largely agree with. Those areas of Golden Plains Shire to be transferred to Wannon (which include areas from the existing Ballarat Division) do not seem to be in contention. I had originally proposed that the entirety of Golden Plains Shire within Corangamite be placed in Wannon, I am still of that view.

Thirdly, looking at the proposed Division of Cox, the Commissioners have left 9,045 electors from Golden Plains in Cox, and taken out 12,041 electors from Colac and Region to Wannon. I would propose that instead that moving the 9,045 electors in Golden Plains to Wannon is easier and means that a full local government area is in one Division (Wannon), rather than three as it is presently. In addition it is obvious that the commissioners have struggled to come up with the combination they have. They have carved through two local government areas, to create boundaries that make little sense.

If you don't add to the electors numbers in Cox with transfers from Corio, there are sufficient electors to transfer the 9,045 electors remaining in Cox from the Golden Plains Shire to Wannon, and leave the 12,041 electors in Colac Otway Region in Cox, leaving Corio, Cox and Wannon well within projected quota.

This solution has the strengths as follows:

- It works numerically, leaving all Corio, Cox and Wannon well within quota;

- It maintains intact entire local government areas such as Golden Plains, Colac Otway;
- It avoids moving 55,385 electors between Corio and Cox; and
- It is a simple solution that does not disturb other Divisions or create 'compromised' boundaries elsewhere.

As to the question of the boundary of Golden Plains and the Division of Wannon coming close to Geelong. I would suggest it is not remarkable and the expansion of Wannon to the east has occurred is a function of its slow growth since its creation. Boundaries coming close to a major population centre is unsurprising, Ballarat and Bendigo are two such examples amongst many.

The name Cox. I do no doubt that Mrs Cox was a fine citizen warranting recognition. I do not believe the Commissioners have made a adequate case to abolish a federation name (Corangamite), and one which is an aboriginal name. Werriwa in New South Wales ceased to include Lake George the European name for Werriwa in 1913 for example. If the Commissioners want to attach a name to a location as Mrs Cox has with Queenscliff, they might want to follow the movement of electorates over the years. Queenscliff has only been in Corangamite since 1968, before that it had been in Corio. Whereas Colac has always been in Corangamite (ie since 1901). I won't suggest that Corio be renamed as a consequence as I am sure the local MP Richard Marles won't appreciate it.

I would suggest that Mrs Cox through no fault of hers has a name that is 'suggestive'. The member for an electorate called Cox will be the subject of ridicule. To illustrate there are two members of parliament from Queensland, they are brothers and one is a state minister and the other a federal member. If at some stage it is entirely reasonable they might be honoured, and a Division or District might be co-named. The only difficulty is they also have a suggestive surname, namely Dick.

I would urge the commissioners to retain Corangamite as an electorate name with the only movement in the electorate been the loss of Golden Plains Shire to Wannon.

Hotham, Isaacs, Dunkley, Flinders, Holt, Bruce - Aspects of my suggestions and comments are reflected in the commissioners proposals, primarily around changing the orientation of electorates to east-west configuration which are more reflective of the means of communication, major roads etc.

The commissioners have fallen into the trap of making very large changes often necessitating large offsetting movements of electors. Some changes are necessary due to the deficiencies of electors in some areas and surpluses in others. But some are exchanges like between Corio and Cox addressed above, ie in full or in part are unnecessary

I had suggested a similar Isaacs (albeit named Hotham, in view of the fact it was largely formed out of Hotham. I had suggested it extend the full length of the Kingston City and take in a portion of Frankston City north of Seaford Road and west of the freeway). The effect of this was to create a more coastal electorate as Isaacs has previously been. It allowed Dunkley to move outwards to take up surplus electors in Flinders. The commissioners have done the exact opposite moving electorates in towards the CBD. For a historical point, Seaford Road appears to have been the northern boundary

of Dunkley when it was first created in 1984. It is a quite reasonable boundary, even if it did not align strictly with local government areas.

I proposed Seaford Road as a boundary as it is an extension of Ballarto Road which has served as a boundary for decades for Flinders, Holt, and La Trobe. I would recommend a clockwise movement of electors in the region of Mornington Peninsula and south eastern suburbs, such that those in Flinders in Cranbourne South and Pearcedale remain in Flinders. The population of Dunkley as it currently exists does not actually need to change as it is easily within tolerance of quota. But moving it outwards (not inwards as the commissioners have done) means that electors are freed up to make up numbers in Isaacs and form a more coherent electorate. The commissioners have moved 40,900 electors to make a net change of 1,772 electors in Dunkley. My proposals involve less than half of the total numbers.

I am aware that another objection from [Jeff Waddell](#) contains an alternative movement of electors amongst, Dunkley, Flinders, Holt, La Trobe, Bruce, Hotham and Isaacs. I understand that it involves the movement of fewer electors than proposed by the commissioners and is largely consistent with my initial proposals, my comments and now my objection. I would urge the commissioners seriously consider it.

I would urge the commissioners to adopt the concept of a clockwise movement of electors minimizes elector movements. I would urge the commissioners to modify Flinders, Dunkley, Isaacs and Holt as I proposed, originally and have restated here. Hotham and Bruce would also have minor changes, but would be much less so than proposed by the commissioners.

Conclusions

I wish the commissioners well in their deliberations.

Martin Gordon

16 April 2018