

Transcript of proceedings

Public inquiry of the augmented Electoral Commission for Victoria

Conducted in Melbourne, Wednesday 6 June 2018

Before:

Mr Tom Rogers

(Electoral Commissioner, Australian Electoral Commission)

Mr David Kalisch

(Australian Statistician and member of the Australian Electoral Commission)

Mr Steve Kennedy

(Australian Electoral Officer for Victoria)

Mr Craig Sandy

(Surveyor-General of Victoria)

Mr Andrew Greaves

(Auditor-General for Victoria)

(Recorded and transcribed by Legal Transcripts)

1 MR ROGERS: Good morning everybody and welcome to the second of
2 two hearings of the augmented Electoral Commission for
3 Victoria. The first hearing took place in Winchelsea
4 yesterday. I'd like to begin by acknowledging the
5 Traditional Custodians of the Land on which we meet and
6 pay my respects to their Elders both past and present.

7 My name is Tom Rogers. I'm the Australian Electoral
8 Commissioner and I'm chairing this inquiry today. The
9 other member of the Australian Electoral Commission
10 present today is Mr David Kalisch, on my right, who is
11 the Australian Statistician. The other members who make
12 up the augmented Electoral Commission are Mr Andrew
13 Greaves, the Auditor-General for Victoria on my left. To
14 my far right is Mr Steve Kennedy, the Australian
15 Electoral Officer for Victoria. And to my far left is Mr
16 Craig Sandy, Surveyor-General of Victoria.

17 Part 4 of the *Commonwealth Electoral Act* sets out
18 the requirements to be followed in conducting
19 redistributions. This redistribution of Victoria - just
20 excuse me as we have the first of many adjustments for
21 sound today I expect. So I think we were thrillingly
22 going through the *Commonwealth Electoral Act*, which sets
23 out the requirements to be followed in conducting
24 redistributions. This redistribution of Victoria is
25 required because Victoria's entitlement to seats in the
26 House of Representatives has increased from 37 to 38.

27 In accordance with section 66 of the *Electoral Act*,
28 the Redistribution Committee of Victoria has prepared a
29 proposal for the redistribution of Victoria into 38
30 federal electoral divisions. The proposal, together with
31 written reasons for the proposal required by section 67

1 of the Electoral Act, was released by the Redistribution
2 Committee on Friday 6 April this year. In accordance
3 with section 68 of the Act, interested individuals and
4 organisations were invited to make written objections to
5 this proposed redistribution and to provide written
6 comments on those objections. A total of 413 objections
7 and 100 comments on objections were received within the
8 required timeframes.

9 The augmented Electoral Commission is required by
10 sub-section 72(1) of the Electoral Act to consider all
11 objections lodged in relation to the redistribution
12 proposal and all comments on objections. The inquiry
13 here today provides the opportunity for members of the
14 public to make submissions about those objections.

15 The Electoral Act also specifies how the
16 redistribution process is conducted and which factors are
17 to be taken into account. Subsection 73(4) of the Act
18 states that the primary consideration for the augmented
19 Electoral Commission is that each electoral division meet
20 certain numerical requirements in the form of the current
21 enrolment quota and the projected enrolment quota and
22 acceptable tolerances around those two quotas.

23 Subject to an electoral division satisfying those
24 numbers, sub-section 73(4) also requires that we have
25 regard to communities of interest within electoral
26 divisions. That's economic, social and regional
27 interests. We have to have regard to means of
28 communication and travel within electoral divisions and
29 the physical features and the area of electoral
30 divisions. The boundaries of existing electoral
31 divisions are also considered although that is of lesser

1 importance. Boundaries may change, often there has to be
2 compensating adjustments to make sure the electoral
3 divisions are within those numerical tolerances.

4 The inquiry today will be recorded and transcripts
5 of proceedings will be made available as part of the
6 augmented Electoral Commission's report and therefore be
7 on the Australia Electoral Commission website once the
8 report has been tabled in Parliament.

9 I'd also like to draw your attention to the fact
10 that we may have members of the media present today. I
11 would ask them to observe similar rules to what would
12 occur in a parliamentary hearing to ensure that the
13 reason we're here today is to focus on the opportunity
14 for speakers to have their say and for proceedings to run
15 smoothly. Should media have a question I'd ask that they
16 speak to Nicole, if you could identify yourself, Nicole,
17 and take questions outside the hearing room.

18 We would ask people making submissions to come to
19 the table in front once you're called and state your name
20 and then commence your presentation. And stating your
21 name is helpful because it helps us with the transcript.
22 With such a high level of interest in participating in
23 this inquiry we'd also like to ensure that everyone
24 present is able to make a submission.

25 To enable that to happen I'm going to ask that you
26 keep your remarks to no more than about five minutes and
27 subject to timing there may be an opportunity to provide
28 further remarks once everyone has had the chance to
29 speak. The way we'll work this, which is what we did in
30 Winchelsea yesterday, at around about the four minute
31 mark one of the staff will provide a loud warning saying

1 four minutes. That is not to throw you off your game,
2 just to keep timing moving forward, and then at the five
3 minute mark, thereabouts, we'll ask you to politely wrap
4 up.

5 After this inquiry we're going to deliberate and
6 we'll endeavour to make a public announcement as soon as
7 possible. There's two other things. Today is certainly
8 not a court room and we're not here to question you,
9 we're here to listen. The only time that members of the
10 augmented Commission will ask you a question is if we
11 haven't understood what you've said or heard what you've
12 said, and likewise, and I know you'll understand this
13 particularly with timing, nor are we here to answer
14 questions about the redistribution process. We're simply
15 here to listen and take notes.

16 So with that being said let's start today, and first
17 up is Julian Hill. Good morning.

18 MR HILL: We have a prop. So Julian Hill, Federal Member for
19 Bruce. Thank you for the opportunity to make some brief
20 comments and expand upon the comments in my submission.
21 Three broad overview comments. The east-west change to
22 the electorate of Bruce in this part of Melbourne makes
23 sense. The Commission is obviously constrained by the
24 numerical criteria and the gravity of growth if you like
25 and certainly accept the broad intent and logic.

26 Secondly, in preparing these comments I've given
27 particular attention then to the four criteria in section
28 66(3)(b) community of interests, communications, travel,
29 physical features and then the subordinate criteria
30 around current boundaries and minimising change. The
31 third comment then, the big change, is that I do accept

1 and understand and agree with the logic to move east and
2 eat up if you like part of Holt, Endeavour Hills, given
3 the strong community links between Dandenong North,
4 Mulgrave, Wheelers Hill, Endeavour Hills, as recognised
5 in our submissions but also way back to 1994 in the
6 Liberal party's submissions when these sort of changes
7 were last considered.

8 So I just want to talk to this map briefly to
9 illustrate the alternative much less dramatic proposal
10 which we're putting forward which in our view better
11 meets the statutory criteria, and it's really in a sense
12 fine tuning based on local realities of applying that
13 criteria rather than any significant diversion from the
14 Commission's proposals and just point out two aspects.

15 Firstly, the railway line, the line between the pink
16 and the yellow there. The Pakenham-Dandenong railway
17 line has long been the southern boundary of the
18 electorate of Bruce for around 30-something years. It
19 absolutely meets the two criteria in the Act of being a
20 physical feature and defining communities of interest as
21 we've set out. Are you north or south of the line is the
22 key orienting question for people who live in that areas,
23 and it shaped religious patterns, school attendance,
24 economic shopping patterns and so on and so forth.

25 Indeed, in 1994 when the Commission last proposed
26 crossing the railway line down to a similarly slightly
27 weird boundary from a local point of view there was
28 significant debate and in the end in the final maps the
29 Commission said no, we agree that the railway line should
30 be a solid boundary. And I've included strong excerpts
31 from the 1994 Liberal party's submission in my comments

1 there.

2 That said, we do accept numerically there's a clear
3 need to cross the railway line and propose that it's much
4 more logical to do that as proposed in the blue, the
5 electorate of Hotham, because Springvale and Clayton, for
6 those suburbs the railway line has never been a strong
7 boundary. The shops cross the railway line, people move
8 much more freely. And bringing Springvale and Clayton
9 fully together, Springvale South brings the very
10 significant Indochinese communities together. They're
11 very similar communities, Springvale and Clayton.

12 The Commission's proposal is quite odd from a local
13 point of view because it splits very clear communities
14 into three parts. The second and final comment I'd make
15 is on the northern boundary, the Police Road boundary.
16 That's a mere administrative line. It's a local
17 government boundary but it in no way defines the actual
18 communities of interest and the northern boundary.

19 Sorry, I'll just point there.

20 MR ROGERS: The northern boundary of?

21 MR HILL: So the Commission's proposal around Police Road
22 there.

23 MR ROGERS: Right, thank you.

24 MR HILL: So that's the City of Monash, that's the City of
25 Greater Dandenong. So it is an administrative boundary
26 but as we've put in the Labor Party's submission and
27 backed up in my comments, I've got school enrolment data,
28 shopping centre data and local knowledge that illustrates
29 that the links between Mulgrave, Wheelers Hill, Dandenong
30 North, Noble Park North are quite fluid. The Waverley
31 Gardens Shopping Centre sits on the boundary and that is

1 the regional shopping centre and it is not a logical
2 boundary to use necessarily.

3 So we've proposed instead a much clearer boundary
4 being Springvale Road, which is a main road and does
5 divide largely two suburbs, and at the northern end
6 Waverley Road, which is a suburb boundary between Glen
7 Waverley and Wheelers Hill. So very clear, logical,
8 understood. And I just note that - and I've pored over
9 the map since 1955, nerded out for a little while at the
10 parliamentary library and looked at every map since 1955.

11 The suburbs of Mulgrave and Wheelers are the only
12 two suburbs that have been fully within the electorate of
13 Bruce since its creation. That history can be
14 acknowledged. It doesn't have to be respected but if
15 there's a need not to make such significant changes as we
16 proposed at this time at least it seems logical to
17 consider doing so.

18 So in summary I think that the alternative proposal
19 respects the logic of the Commission's change but more
20 elegantly achieves the Commission's intent, it better
21 meets the statutory criteria and gives better weight to
22 the key criteria, the first two or three, and then has
23 the added advantage of meeting criteria four, the
24 subordinate criteria of minimising change, and we've got
25 the numbers set out in the submissions. So it minimises
26 change for electors.

27 The final two comments are, importantly for the
28 Commission, and in no way triggers a third stage in the
29 redistribution process because it's actually a less
30 dramatic change respecting the current boundaries than
31 currently. Shane Easson can talk later today, but in our

1 view given the likelihood of another seat coming to
2 Victoria quite soon this much better prepares the south-
3 east for future scenarios and will minimise future
4 change.

5 I do hope you appreciate the lack of Deirdre
6 Chambers' coincidental submissions and thought we'd just
7 leave it to a simple logical submission rather than
8 flooding you with repeat submissions. Thank you.

9 MR ROGERS: Thank you very much. Mark Dreyfus, good morning.

10 MR DREYFUS: Good morning. Yes, thanks very much to the
11 Commission for inviting me to appear here today. I do
12 appreciate the work that the Commission has done to
13 create this proposal and I do understand the intention of
14 the Commission in relation to the Isaacs electorate. Can
15 I say I've just made a point that I'm not going to talk
16 about the area to the south, I'm only going to talk about
17 this area and this area and this area on the north.

18 MR ROGERS: What's that other area called please, Mr Dreyfus,
19 the one to the north.

20 MR DREYFUS: Noble Park and Keysborough.

21 MR ROGERS: And the other one?

22 MR DREYFUS: This is the Cheltenham and Highett (indistinct)

23 MR ROGERS: Thank you.

24 MR DREYFUS: So I particularly appreciate the Commission's
25 proposal, this is for the south, to transfer the suburbs
26 of Carrum Downs, Skye and Sandhurst from Isaacs into
27 Dunkley. I will miss representing these suburbs. I've
28 done that for ten years, but I agree with the logic of
29 placing the whole of the City of Frankston in one seat,
30 which is what is done by putting Carrum Downs, Skye and
31 Sandhurst into Dunkley.

1 The objections, and I've put in a written
2 submission, to the Commission's proposals as they relate
3 to the City of Kingston and the City of Greater
4 Dandenong. They might look like seamless communities on
5 a map but what's happened is that I think that the
6 Commission has missed the communities of interest within
7 the municipality of Kingston and within the municipality
8 of Greater Dandenong.

9 I'd endorse my colleague Mr Hill's comments about
10 Greater Dandenong, which is effectively two communities,
11 the part south of the train line and the part north. It
12 has made sense up to now for the Pakenham-Cranbourne
13 train line to be the boundary between Isaacs and Bruce
14 and I see no valid reason for that to change. This train
15 line is a well-recognised community boundary. That's the
16 diagonal line that you see running there, and the 2004
17 Redistribution Committee agreed that the Keysborough
18 community which is south of the line should remain one
19 electorate. And the same reasoning applies today.

20 A very common question in Greater Dandenong is; do
21 you live north or south of the train line? And that's
22 because the train line is the great divider of social
23 activity in the municipality. Residents that are south
24 of the line tend to shop, study and play south of the
25 train, resident north of the train line tend to do so
26 north of the train line.

27 I can say to you that Keysborough and Noble Park
28 have far more in common with Keysborough South, which has
29 been split by the Commission's proposal, than with the
30 parts of Greater Dandenong north of the train line. The
31 AEC did recognise this in 2004 and should recognise it

1 again by uniting Keysborough in the one electorate, which
2 is Isaacs.

3 A smaller point is the Cheltenham Road is a poor
4 boundary that isolates the community of Keysborough South
5 from that community's infrastructure. There are no
6 public schools in Greater Dandenong south of Cheltenham
7 Road. The majority sites of worship, community centres
8 and employment in Keysborough is north of Cheltenham
9 Road, and an even smaller point is about Kirkham Road
10 which the Commission has adopted as its proposal.

11 That's a particularly weak boundary that would
12 split the Dandenong South community. It's a one lane
13 each way road, it's a weak and unknown boundary and, very
14 importantly, there is only one significant Albanian-
15 Australian community in Melbourne, this is in Dandenong
16 South. To split this community in two would be a great
17 mistake and would create a poor geographic boundary and
18 split a community of interest. The community has been
19 separated from its mosque by the Commission's proposal.

20 Turning to the City of Kingston, which is the north-
21 east corner. Essentially the city of Kingston is a very
22 elongated, you could call it a bits and pieces
23 municipality. It's telling that when it was created in
24 1997 by the government of Victoria it was created from
25 parts of the City of Moorabbin, some of the City of
26 Mordialloc, some of the City of Chelsea and off-cuts from
27 the Cities of Springvale and Oakleigh. So five
28 municipalities went in part to make up Kingston.

29 With all due respect to the City of Kingston, which
30 I already represent, 60 or 70 per cent of and I'm proud
31 to do so, the residents would be the first to admit that

1 there is a limited community of interest between all of
2 the parts of the City of Kingston. The bayside suburbs
3 that run south to north from Carrum and Mentone look to
4 the bay. The suburbs further north such as Highett and
5 Moorabbin look towards Bentleigh and Bayside. Clarinda,
6 Oakleigh South and Clayton South, which are also in
7 Kingston, are vastly more multicultural, and I look to
8 Clayton and frequently to Monash.

9 I do appreciate the Commission's proposal to unite
10 essentially 90 per cent of the City of Kingston in the
11 electorate of Isaacs, but there is no more community of
12 interest between, say Moorabbin and Chelsea, than there
13 is between Noble Park and Mordialloc. What the
14 Commission's proposal does do, and this is very
15 important, is to change the electoral division of tens of
16 thousands of City of Kingston residents to join an
17 electorate that they have no real history with while
18 splitting the communities of Noble Park, Keysborough and
19 Keysborough South from each other.

20 The written submission that I made I would suggest
21 would save the community's interest to reinstate the
22 Pakenham-Cranbourne train line as the boundary between
23 Bruce and Isaacs, which would allow Keysborough to remain
24 together as the AEC rightly decided to do in 2004 and, as
25 is illustrated by our colouring in there, I'd
26 respectfully submit that the Commission should consider
27 an anti-clockwise transfer of electors between Bruce,
28 Hotham and Isaacs from the proposal which has been
29 published.

30 Can I just in conclusion say I appreciate that this
31 part of Melbourne is tricky to draw electoral boundaries

1 in. There's a green wedge that splits the south-east and
2 it means in effect, from the Commission's point of view,
3 there is simply not a large enough contiguous population
4 to sustain an electorate in an area that shares one
5 coherent community of interest. Not one of these
6 electorates could really say there is one particular
7 point and one coherent community of interest.

8 They've all got mostly more than one community, and
9 my proposition would be it's far preferable for electors
10 in Isaacs to have in effect two strong coherent
11 communities of interest, the first being Bayside Kingston
12 from Cheltenham to Carrum and the second being Greater
13 Dandenong south at the train line than it is as currently
14 proposed to stretch Kingston all the way up to Isaacs,
15 all the way up to Moorabbin, an area which has got very
16 little connection with the suburbs that front Port
17 Phillip Bay.

18 I'll end by saying the Commission's proposal for
19 Isaacs effectively pulls together three or perhaps four
20 different and largely unrelated communities. It would be
21 far preferable for that to be reduced to two, Bayside
22 Kingston and Greater Dandenong south at the Cranbourne-
23 Pakenham train line. Thank you very much for your time
24 and thank you for letting me go over five minutes,
25 pushing my luck.

26 MR ROGERS: What was the Bayside Kingston, and the second?

27 MR DREYFUS: Yes. The propositions are Bayside Kingston as one
28 community and Greater Dandenong south of the Cranbourne-
29 Pakenham train line. Thank you.

30 MR ROGERS: Thank you. Right, Colin Hampton please. Good
31 morning.

1 MR HAMPTON: Ladies and gentlemen. My name is Colin Hampton,
2 I'm currently the Mayor of the City of Frankston. I've
3 been Mayor twice. I'm here not in my capacity as Mayor
4 but in my capacity as ward councillor. My ward covers
5 much of the area in the new boundary markers and my ward,
6 which is the north-east ward, covers Skye, Carrum Downs,
7 Sandhurst, Sandarra and Langwarrin. The name of my ward
8 is the north-east ward. I've been a resident of
9 Frankston for 49 years.

10 I do support AEC's previously stated position that
11 local government boundaries reflect community interest,
12 which is why I wholeheartedly support the proposed
13 boundary changes to Dunkley. I know that the people of
14 Carrum Downs, Skye and Sandhurst have more in common with
15 Frankston than the township of Mornington. There's a
16 huge gap between the two.

17 Frankston City's economic development looks north to
18 the Carrum Downs area and our best performing Carrum
19 Downs industrial estate employs over 2,000 people within
20 the City of Frankston and has an annual turnover in
21 excess of \$2 billion a year, which is 15 per cent above
22 the national average, and it's a good employment area.
23 All of the schools that service, both all the council
24 services, both the library, the schools and the childcare
25 centres are exclusively used by residents of Skye, Carrum
26 Downs and Sandhurst and Sandarra in my ward, and they
27 shop in Carrum Downs because it's the closest area for
28 them to shop as distances between major shopping centres
29 is quite vast.

30 None of the objections that I've seen against the
31 truth that Mount Eliza is instinctively linked to

1 Frankston South and Frankston. In the mid-90s, you
2 probably all would realise, actually Mount Eliza was part
3 of Frankston and it was the redistribution of local
4 government boundaries by Kennett that actually moved
5 Mount Eliza out of Frankston. So we in Frankston
6 actually built Mount Eliza, all the infrastructure.

7 The story behind the move was actually quite
8 political. The rates at that time were higher in Mount
9 Eliza and Frankston than they were in Mornington and
10 there was a push by real estate agents to pull that part
11 of Frankston away, and that's what actually happened.
12 There's nothing which joins Mount Eliza with Mornington
13 other than kilometres of green wedge. The residents of
14 Mount Eliza, as proven by statistics from the City of
15 Frankston, are given an understanding of the amount of
16 people who use our facilities.

17 Our library has nearly two and a half thousand Mount
18 Eliza residents as members of our library. They use our
19 shops, they use the schools, they use the kindergartens
20 because of the community of interest is there. There is
21 no break between Frankston South and Mount Eliza at all.
22 The two communities are linked together. I think the
23 proposed changes are excellent. It means that all of the
24 City of Frankston will become within the boundaries of
25 Dunkley, and when it comes to negotiating with different
26 layers of government it's far easier if you're
27 negotiating just with the one party rather than the split
28 party as we have to do at the moment.

29 I'll hand you a copy of Frankston's council plan
30 which you can have a look at, and that will give you an
31 understanding of why we need that community of interest.

1 I'd like to thank you very much for the opportunity to
2 speak today and hopefully all goes well.

3 MR ROGERS: Thank you very much, thanks for coming along.

4 Peter Gavin please. Good morning, Mr Gavin.

5 MR GAVIN: G'day. My name is Peter Gavin and I'm arguing for
6 Sunbury to be included in Calwell and therefore
7 Craigieburn to go into McEwen. Sunbury's biggest
8 employer is the Tullamarine Airport, and the factories
9 and distribution centres that surround the airport are
10 the second biggest group of employers, and that area, if
11 you've been there, you will know is growing at a rapid
12 rate, and Sunbury has a far better connection to all that
13 area than Craigieburn.

14 I should add that I've been the Secretary of the
15 Gladstone Park Tennis for more than a decade and I've
16 been a committee member for the last 25 years and I could
17 attest that all the tennis clubs, mine, Gladstone Park,
18 Tullamarine, Greenvale, Westmeadows, all have residents
19 who live in Sunbury, all have players who live in
20 Sunbury. These tennis players grew up in these suburbs
21 around the airport as kids and started playing tennis
22 there and then moved slightly north to Sunbury, and it's
23 true for all the tennis clubs and probably true for
24 almost all sporting clubs surrounding the airport.

25 The Tullamarine airport is currently in the state
26 electorate of Sunbury, as is the Tullamarine suburb. The
27 Tullamarine airport is also in the Sunbury ward of the
28 City of Hume, as is the Tullamarine suburb. The Sunbury
29 ward is called Jacksons Ward. The Australian Electoral
30 (indistinct) for Calwell is still in Brook Street,
31 Sunbury. It's in the heart of the Sunbury shopping

1 centre, even though Sunbury is currently in McEwen and
2 not in Calwell. And that Australian Electoral Office has
3 been there for about almost two decades since the
4 electorate of Burke was abolished.

5 So someone in the Australian Electoral Commission or
6 some people in the Australian Electoral Commission
7 obviously support the idea that Sunbury should be in
8 Calwell. Finally, the Australian Electoral Commission
9 taking a position on the issue of Sunbury out of Hume,
10 which is a highly contentious political issue, which you
11 would have received many comments about it in the earlier
12 submissions you've seen, is something I think the
13 Commission shouldn't take an issue on. I think the
14 Commission should be seen to be neutral and I think it's
15 far better for the Commission to be seen as neutral
16 rather than have a - if you put something out of Hume in
17 the literal sense I think you'd be seen to be taking a
18 position on that contentious issue.

19 So for those reasons and all the reasons I've put in
20 my submission and the other people have put in
21 submissions I suggest that Sunbury should be in Calwell
22 and that Craigieburn should therefore be in McEwen.

23 Thank you very much.

24 MR ROGERS: Thank you very much. Patrick Stokes. Good
25 morning, Dr Stokes.

26 DR STOKES: Good morning. My name is Patrick Stokes, I am
27 senior lecturer in philosophy at Deakin University and I
28 am also a resident and enrolled voter in the Division of
29 Batman. I'm very grateful to the augmented Commission
30 for the opportunity to speak today and to expand upon my
31 original objection regarding the naming of the division.

1 By way of context in my academic work I've recently
2 published on the nature of moral progress and in
3 particular how we relate to the fact that the beliefs and
4 practices of our forebears now strike us as ethically
5 repugnant, which is obviously quite relevant to the issue
6 of naming.

7 It's very much to the Committee's credit that the
8 redistribution report recommended changing the name of
9 the Division of McMillan withdrawing recognition of a
10 murderer of Kurnai people in favour of a more worthy
11 candidate, Sir John Monash. With regard to other
12 divisions however the Redistribution Committee noted in
13 point 124 of its report that it does not consider that
14 strong enough reasons to alter electoral division names
15 have been provided in suggestions and comments on
16 suggestions.

17 Both in the objections you've received and I'm sure
18 yesterday at Winchelsea other objectors have already
19 described with far greater eloquence and authority than I
20 possibly could the extent of the atrocities committed by
21 John Batman and why he is manifestly not a fit and proper
22 person to be honoured by having an electorate named after
23 him. In addition we might note the ten streets in
24 Melbourne alone already named after him. I don't
25 therefore propose to rehearse those points again.

26 Instead with my philosopher's hat on I'd like to
27 raise the question of what principled reason can be given
28 for removing the name of McMillan while retaining that of
29 Batman. If there's a merely processual reason why Batman
30 cannot be changed but McMillan can then that needs to be
31 put forward, but on the guidelines as they stand it's

1 difficult to see what such a reason might be. If the
2 reason for the name change in McMillan is simply that
3 Angus McMillan's outstanding service as described is
4 outweighed by that of Sir John Monash then any non-
5 Federation division not named after a person would have
6 served for the same purpose.

7 If the very existence of more deserving candidates
8 counts as a very strong reason for the guidelines to
9 change the name of one electorate then it's not hard to
10 suggest more deserving figures than John Batman as well.
11 I note that the sitting member, Ged Kearney, the City of
12 Darebin and the Wurundjeri Land and Compensation Cultural
13 Heritage Council among others have already suggested
14 Simon Wonga as a candidate and I'm very happy to support
15 that suggestion.

16 But that's not what it is. Removing the name of
17 McMillan is in fact a repudiation of Angus McMillan.
18 It's an admission that in light of his crimes he has in
19 fact never deserved an honour that he has nonetheless
20 enjoyed for the last 69 years. And that is precisely how
21 moral progress works. It's a recognition that the
22 judgments of the past were incorrect all along. The
23 things that once seemed unobjectionable suddenly show
24 themselves to be unconscionable.

25 But if we can admit that a naming decision made in
26 1949 with regard to the Division of McMillan could be
27 wrong in that way then there's surely no impediment to
28 admitting that a naming decision taken in 1906 was
29 likewise wrong, especially given that Batman is not a
30 Federation division name, replacing as it did the
31 Division of North Melbourne.

1 The only other possible reason for treating the two
2 cases differently is a different judgment on the
3 respective merits of Angus McMillan and John Batman. Yet
4 it is beyond question that both men committed murder in
5 the process of dispossessing the first nations of this
6 continent. Claiming that there is some moral difference
7 between them that's relevant to the issue of naming
8 electorates would lead us into a sort of perverse moral
9 arithmetic in which we're invited to weigh up the
10 putative achievements of both men against the number of
11 murders they committed.

12 I cannot imagine that the augmented Commission
13 wishes to entertain the idea that a certain amount of
14 murder is outweighed by some other quantity of civic
15 service and that that Batman meets that threshold that
16 McMillan does not. If the Commission doesn't want to go
17 down that path then there is no principal reason for
18 treating the two divisions differently. If no reason for
19 treating the two cases differently can be given, and if
20 we agree that the decision to change the name of the
21 Division of McMillan is the morally right one, then
22 rational consistency requires the name of the Division of
23 Batman also be changed.

24 Far more importantly, our duty to the dead and to
25 the living, our obligation to Batman's victims and to
26 their descendants demands the same thing. I therefore
27 implore the committee to reverse its recommendation and
28 to change the name of the Division of Batman. If it
29 refuses to do so then at the very least in the interests
30 of avoiding future conflicts perhaps it could let us know
31 how many murders someone has to commit before they don't

1 get to have their name on an electorate. Thank you.

2 MR ROGERS: Thank you very much. Martin Gordon.

3 MR GORDON: Good morning. I'm Martin Gordon. I thank the
4 committee for the opportunity to speak today. During
5 this redistribution process I've put forward a
6 suggestion, comments on suggestions and objections,
7 comments on objections. Amongst the issues that I
8 (indistinct) various electorates. They propose the
9 retention of name Corangamite, the adoption of the names
10 other than McMillan and Batman, the adoption of Wimmera
11 in place of Mallee and the creation of a new Division of
12 Fraser, which has been done, and I welcome the adoption
13 of the names Monash, Macnamara and Nicholls that the
14 committee has proposed.

15 I had also proposed the first and only Victorian
16 woman premier, Joan Kirner, be honoured. I believe that
17 would still be appropriate, and I would move that you
18 replace the name Batman possibly with Kirner and replace
19 Gellibrand with a name like Cooper, which I believe has
20 been canvassed as well. In relation to particular
21 electorates the electorate of Cox as the Commission has
22 proposed. I've made it clear in my contributions that I
23 believe the name Corangamite should be retained and that
24 the division should not be renamed Cox, the reasons being
25 it's a Federation name, it's an Aboriginal name.

26 The rationale for its abolition is scant. Cox is
27 also a suggestive name, which I believe is a recurring
28 theme here. I don't believe it would be appropriate to
29 adopt it for that reason. At a time when democracy is
30 struggling in the world adopting a name likely to invite
31 derision would be simply unwise.

1 In terms of the overall distribution that's being
2 proposed I indicated in my comments on objections that I
3 agree with the Commission's proposals in large part. In
4 a number of cases there might be improvements that I
5 could suggest but it would involve a great deal of a
6 number of changes so it's easier to leave it unchanged.

7 In relation to the south-western state that's Cox or
8 Corangamite, Wannon, Corio, in the Colac Shire generally
9 and Golden Plains. The issue of replacement of Colac
10 Otway and Golden Plains to Wannon has recurred endlessly
11 through this process. I have at every stage proposed
12 that Golden Plains be placed in Wannon in its entirety
13 and that Colac Otway remain in its entirety in
14 Corangamite, and I would urge the commissioners in that
15 direction.

16 If the Commissioners had left Corio unchanged, which
17 has very solid boundaries with the South Barwon River and
18 major roads at Queenscliff, there's no need to make
19 changes elsewhere. (Indistinct) leave things unchanged
20 with Corio and no impact to Corangamite that produces a
21 cascade of changes around the rest of the state, to
22 paraphrase the Commissioners in their report. In my view
23 the (indistinct words) Commissioner requires the simple
24 inclusion of the entirety of Colac Otway in Corangamite
25 and the transfer of Golden Plains to Wannon, and as a
26 consequence of that Corangamite as well (indistinct) and
27 so has Wannon.

28 It's my view that there's no need to cut up local
29 government areas, they could be left as wholes, whole
30 pieces transferred to different divisions and it's easily
31 achieved. I would re-state the fact that through the

1 entire existence of Corangamite it has included Colac,
2 the township of Colac and its immediate surrounds. There
3 may be a day that might change. I appreciate the
4 Committee's inclusion of Craigieburn in Calwell and have
5 no issues with some of their changes in central Victoria,
6 in some of the inner suburbs of Flemington and
7 Kensington.

8 In relation to Dunkley and Flinders I have argued
9 that there was probably little need for change to Dunkley
10 and I would suggest that instead of the major surgery
11 that the Commission has undertaken that a small change
12 was necessary, perhaps the inclusion of parts of
13 Mornington and Mount Martha, and that would have been
14 sufficient and it would have had less disruptive effects
15 on Flinders. I would refer the Commissioners to the work
16 of Jeff Waddell who put together his comments, a workable
17 solution, and some minor changes that involved clockwise
18 movement of electorate and the counter-clockwise movement
19 of boundaries. It's not ideal but I believe it's pretty
20 good.

21 I have some words here which I'll leave to be
22 submitted and if you could have a look at. Some minor
23 changes with boundaries, with Menzies, Jagajaga, McEwen
24 and Scullin, which I think would enable some changes that
25 would meet the requirements of the residents association.
26 In my summary I've actually got quite a few areas of
27 agreement and a few areas of name changes. I'll submit
28 this so that, you know, it's on the record. I'll leave
29 it at that.

30 MR ROGERS: Thank you very much. Could I ask Rose Iser please
31 to step forward.

1 MS ISER: Thanks very much. My name is Rose Iser, I am from
2 Travancore. I'd just like to acknowledge the Traditional
3 Owners of the land on which we're meeting today. I'm one
4 of close to 50 submissions from the Flemington,
5 Kensington and Travancore area who made submissions to
6 the Commission, not all of whom can obviously be here
7 today, and I appreciate very much accommodating my need
8 to leave soon.

9 Flemington, Kensington and Travancore has caused
10 some difficulty for electoral boundaries at the local,
11 state and federal levels, and we've seen that in the
12 recent reports. It's largely because it's the fringe of
13 the CBD and in that ring between the central inner city
14 and the suburbs of Ascot Vale and Moonee Ponds. The
15 local government alterations have not been satisfactory
16 for Flemington and Kensington, and we say that in the
17 alterations made in 2007-2008 where Kensington was
18 re-included in the City of Melbourne.

19 However this has left a split between the strong
20 community of interest of Flemington and Kensington. And
21 while local governments, we heard earlier, may find it
22 more convenient to negotiate with just one federal Member
23 of Parliament this is less of a consideration for the
24 Commission than the community of interest being included
25 in the one electorate.

26 This has been erroneously mirrored at the state
27 level, and the report by the VEC acknowledged that that
28 was really on the basis of a numerical problem that the
29 commission faced. My submissions to you indicated that
30 no such problem really exists in this case, that the
31 Flemington, Kensington, Travancore can be retained with

1 the federal seat of Melbourne without it being a
2 numerical problem.

3 In fact to remove Flemington from the federal seat
4 of Melbourne requires the reversal of the changes made in
5 2010 to the eastern areas of Clifton Hill and Fitzroy
6 North, and the argument of many submitters to you was
7 that it would be much more logical to continue those
8 changes that were made in 2010 and not need to make the
9 changes to Flemington, Kensington and Travancore.

10 My submission to you documented the history of the
11 connection between Flemington and Kensington, it also
12 documented some census data that demonstrated the strong
13 connections between Flemington and the inner city federal
14 electorate of Melbourne rather than between the wider
15 area of Moonee Valley and the federal seat of
16 Maribyrnong.

17 I'd just like to add a couple of things, and I
18 appreciate that you have read our submissions and I don't
19 wish to repeat it all but I wish to add just two things
20 this morning. Firstly, I didn't mention the Flemington
21 and Kensington Arts Festival, which is a recent
22 demonstration of the strong connection between the two
23 municipalities, and I wish to speak very briefly about
24 Travancore.

25 I have tried very, very hard to find out the origin
26 of the 3032 postcode for Travancore. I've rung Australia
27 Post, I've spoken to Moonee Valley City Council. No one
28 seems to really understand why Travancore was given the
29 postcode that is in fact the same as Highpoint and
30 Maribyrnong and not the 3031 Flemington postcode. It
31 seems to be a bit of an anomaly that's unexplained by any

1 archived data.

2 Travancore itself however has always been a
3 separately named suburb since it was the subdivided
4 estate in 1918 and then again in 1924. Even though it
5 has had this separate name it was a subdivision of an
6 area of Flemington that which housed Flemington Mansion,
7 which is now the site of Flemington Primary School, and
8 Flemington Street itself is in Travancore. Travancore
9 residents are represented by the Flemington Association.
10 In fact several presidents of the Flemington Association
11 have lived in Travancore.

12 The residents of Travancore consider ourselves to be
13 connected to the Flemington and Kensington community and
14 to the inner city. If Flemington and Kensington were
15 retained within the City of Melbourne and Travancore was
16 alone left in the City of Maribyrnong it would not only
17 create a slightly strange electoral shape with that slice
18 coming down into the City of Maribyrnong, it would also
19 leave Travancore quite isolated given that there's
20 connections that it shares with the Flemington and
21 Kensington community.

22 One last example, I look after the Flemington
23 Theatre Company in Travancore. We have our performances
24 in Travancore, the Flemington Theatre Company is housed
25 in Travancore, we have actors and cast and crew from
26 across Kensington, Flemington and Travancore. In my
27 submission I set out two possible arrangements whereby
28 the numerical quotas and populations can be met with the
29 retention of Travancore, Flemington and Kensington within
30 the federal seat of Melbourne. Thank you very much.

31 MR ROGERS: Thank you very much for coming. Forgive me if I

1 can't quite read the second name but I think it's Matthew
2 Hams.

3 MR HARRIS: It's Harris.

4 MR ROGERS: Harris, I'm so sorry.

5 MR HARRIS: That's okay, thank you. Matthew Harris from the
6 National Party. We'll take the focus away from Melbourne
7 very, very briefly. I've only got a couple of points I
8 want to make in addition to our submissions so thank you
9 for the opportunity. First of all I just want to talk
10 about the proposed change of the name of Murray to
11 Nicholls. We've got no issues at all with Nicholls as a
12 name for a seat but we'd just like to reinforce our
13 objection to changing the name at this time, purely in
14 the terms that the seat has (indistinct) under your
15 proposal so we don't see the need to change name at this
16 stage.

17 There is a significant cost involved in changing a
18 name. We estimate just in terms of the current - for the
19 MP itself it would be about \$40,000 to change signage and
20 stationery, et cetera, and we don't see the public
21 interest in changing the name at this stage. If and when
22 there was a substantial change to the boundaries in the
23 future then of course the name change would be more
24 appropriate. So I just want to put that on the record.

25 Secondly, in terms of Mallee I understand the
26 challenges there with the size of the population and the
27 boundaries to the north and west, meaning you can only go
28 in two directions. We are quite comfortable with the
29 change to the east to take in the Loddon Shire. We would
30 just suggest that Stawell to the south stays within
31 Mallee and that Maryborough stays within Wannon as

1 opposed to the current proposal which has it the other
2 way around.

3 MR ROGERS: Sorry, so Stawell?

4 MR HARRIS: To stay in Mallee, and that's based primarily on
5 community of interest, and we've already provided in
6 submission the details, but just to reinforce the point.
7 Stawell, for example, their sporting teams play teams
8 that are in Mallee, they tend to drift towards the
9 Horsham direction as opposed to south or west to
10 Ballarat, whereas Maryborough their community of interest
11 is more in the Ballarat region and they play sporting
12 competitions in the Ballarat region. So both of those
13 areas have changed significantly over the period of time.

14 They've gone backwards and forwards between various
15 seats in the area and we would just think a period of
16 stability would be sensible and helpful, particularly
17 Maryborough to have their federal representative based in
18 Mildura when they've got a major centre not too far away
19 in the other direction seems to us somewhat unfortunate
20 for those individuals in that area.

21 So just finally we want to put on record as well our
22 objection to the renaming of Corangamite for all the
23 other reasons that have already been presented to the
24 committee. So with that I'll leave you to it. Thank you
25 very much.

26 MR ROGERS: Thank you very much, thanks for coming. I think
27 we've got a representative of Darebin Council.

28 MS LE CERF: Good morning. My name is Kim Le Cerf, I'm Mayor
29 of Darebin City Council speaking on behalf of the
30 council. I'd like to thank you for this opportunity to
31 address the augmented Electoral Commission to further

1 outline our position on why the name Batman should not be
2 changed for the federal electorate, and we sincerely hope
3 that through this process the augmented Commission will
4 review its initial recommendation.

5 Our original submission asking for the name change
6 was provided by the traditional owner body, the
7 Wurundjeri Land and Compensation Cultural Heritage
8 Council, along with two local government jurisdictions
9 included in the electorate, so the City of Darebin and
10 the City of Yarra as a joint submission. We think that
11 that is a good indicator of the significant weight that
12 was behind that original submission and our further
13 objections and we'd like to highlight the views of these
14 parties and our constituents in terms of the gravity it
15 holds at a local level.

16 I just wanted to make a couple of key points for
17 your further consideration. So the AEC guidelines for
18 naming federal electoral divisions recommend that names
19 of divisions should not be changed without very strong
20 reasons, and in this case council does believe such
21 reasons exist. So our objection which we lodged with the
22 Wurundjeri Council raises significant questions around
23 John Batman's outstanding service to Australia, and we
24 now know and we believe that under the AEC guidelines
25 that Batman's outstanding service is no longer met in
26 terms of the criteria of rendering outstanding service to
27 Australia, notably in light of the involvements in the
28 massacres of Aboriginal people in Tasmania, the shadows
29 cast on the so called treaty signed in and around the
30 area of the current seat of Batman and his ambiguous
31 status.

1 This concern and documented evidence is highlighted
2 across a number of other objections that have been
3 submitted in this matter and I sincerely hope that the
4 augmented committee takes these concerns in relation to
5 John Batman's character and legacy seriously and with the
6 weight it deserves. In terms of outstanding service of
7 Simon Wonga, which is the suggested name change, the
8 Wurundjeri Council proposed the new name of Simon Wonga
9 for the electoral division as the replacement. A strong
10 advocate for his community, land rights, Simon Wonga was
11 also recognised for his capacity to unite the different
12 Aboriginal clans and new settlers in a spirit of
13 goodwill, cooperation, common purpose and shared
14 humanity.

15 Simon Wonga provided outstanding service to his
16 community at a critical time in our shared history.
17 Putting forward Simon Wonga's name was a significant
18 decision for the Wurundjeri elders and renaming shows
19 respect to the families that make up the Wurundjeri
20 community as the traditional owners of the land on which
21 we stand for all Australians and rightfully recognises
22 Simon Wonga's outstanding service. So this is an
23 opportunity to reshape our understanding of history.

24 The second point I'd like to make is the legacy of
25 hurt and grief for contemporary Aboriginal people carried
26 by the name Batman. One cannot underestimate the hurt
27 and grief that is still felt today by Aboriginal people
28 at the dispossession and loss of their land, their
29 culture and identity in which John Batman represents.
30 Continuing to honour John Batman through the name of the
31 electoral division perpetuates the trauma of the past and

1 changing of the name is a significant opportunity to
2 recognise this past but allow us all to move forward in
3 the journey of reconciliation.

4 Batman is used for many name places and spaces and
5 has been well honoured and recognised despite his
6 tarnished history, however, Simon Wonga who provided
7 outstanding service and is worthy of recognition is less
8 visible and we think that this needs to be rebalanced.
9 The broader community of Darebin and Yarra, which
10 constitutes the great majority of this division, even
11 more so if the proposed redistribution of the electoral
12 boundaries are accepted, is increasingly aware of this
13 history, of the duality of John Batman and of the damage
14 still being done today to Aboriginal communities in
15 honouring this man's name.

16 Key stakeholders including local Aboriginal
17 organisations, our own advisory committee in Darebin, our
18 local MPs including the new Member for Batman who was
19 elected earlier this year all received written advice
20 foreshadowing the objection and then the initial AEC
21 redistribution process and our intention to lodge a
22 submission and then the objection. Community members
23 were also invited through council's communication
24 channels to express their views to the AEC directly, and
25 I believe a number of them took up that opportunity.

26 Promotion to the community has occurred regularly
27 from January 2017 onwards and we have undertaken a
28 comprehensive community engagement process in 2016 in
29 terms of renaming Batman Park but we also talked a lot
30 about the electoral renaming of the division. I don't
31 think I've got much longer left so I'd just like to I

1 guess note in closing that the Hobart City Council last
2 week was offered and welcomed by the mayor a new
3 indigenous name for the Tasmania capital city through the
4 revised Tasmanian culture.

5 So I'd like to think that in the spirit of
6 recognition and respect for our federal - that our
7 federal counterparts can likewise show courage and vision
8 in revising the initial determination and rename the
9 federal electorate of Batman to Simon Wonga. Thank you.

10 MR ROGERS: Thank you very much, thank you for coming.

11 Mornington Peninsula Shire, I think it's Rosie Clark.

12 Good morning.

13 MS CLARK: Thank you for having me. I'm Rosie Clark a Rye ward
14 councillor on the Mornington Peninsula Shire. I have
15 lived in Mount Eliza for 36 years and I'm a new
16 councillor. At my stage in life I thought I would join
17 the council with the endeavour to change the attitude of
18 my community, particularly people in Mount Eliza and
19 Mornington who have stopped working and I just felt they
20 needed to get involved a little bit with their community
21 and find out what the good things that the council do and
22 just get involved in knowing just what being part of a
23 community is all about.

24 I want my residents to be aware of what the local
25 community means and therefore Mount Eliza and Mornington
26 and Frankston are getting involved in all different
27 aspects of it. These new boundaries will divide my new
28 community and I just feel briefly that surely an
29 electorate should not be all about number based
30 redistribution of the electoral boundaries of Dunkley but
31 about the strength of the whole community, and I believe

1 that the numbers in Dunkley were actually adequate and
2 you've just relocated a few. Thank you for listening to
3 me, thank you.

4 MR ROGERS: Thank you very much for coming. All right, Golden
5 Plains Shire. Good morning, sir.

6 MR BRASLIS: Good morning. My name is Eric Braslis, I'm the
7 CEO at Gold Plains Shire. And again thank you this
8 morning for the opportunity to present and add to the two
9 submissions that we've provided in written form as part
10 of the process. Can I start off by providing some
11 context to our Shire and its location. As shown on that
12 first page or slide site context. Golden Plains is a
13 unique Shire in that it's not made up of a central large
14 town with a surrounding rural community but in fact its
15 23,000 residents live in a number of small and distinct
16 communities primarily clustered to the northern and
17 southern extremities of our Shire.

18 To provide some context the shire at the moment
19 doesn't have a hospital, a cinema, a swimming pool, it
20 has limited retail offers and until last year, until this
21 year didn't even have a high school. So you can start to
22 appreciate how it therefore is reliant and dependent upon
23 its two adjoining regional cities, that being the cities
24 of Ballarat and Geelong. That being said it should also
25 be noted that Golden Plains Shire is one of the fastest
26 growing rural shires in the state of Victoria and
27 Bannockburn as a town is one of the fastest three growing
28 towns in the whole of Victoria.

29 The northern communities of our Shire, which include
30 the small towns of Smythesdale, Haddon, Grass Creek,
31 Napoleons and Smythes Creek, have a population of around

1 8,000 collectively. They are reliant and dependent upon
2 health services, education, employment and sporting
3 communities within the Ballarat region. This
4 relationship has been further strengthened in recent
5 times due to significant growth in the Ballarat West
6 growth corridor, a corridor that will see Ballarat grow
7 from 100 to 150,000 people over the coming year.

8 Within this corridor there is a new community or
9 suburb of Delacombe which provides a higher order
10 retailing precinct which services our northern community
11 which is only five kilometres away. That new retail
12 precinct provides all the necessities that communities
13 need in terms of its retail, health (indistinct) for our
14 northern communities. Similarly our southern communities
15 are Bannockburn, Teesdale, Inverleigh, Lethbridge and
16 Batesford with a population combined of over 10,000 enjoy
17 the same direct relationship with Geelong given the
18 Geelong CBD is only 11 kilometres from our shire.

19 As shown on that site context plan Golden Plains is
20 blue, to the north the dot is Ballarat and to the south
21 the dot is Geelong. Until now, and this is the next
22 slide, communities of interest, until now the Golden
23 Plains community has enjoyed a close working relationship
24 with its federal elected representatives. So the
25 proposal to see half of the shire moving to the
26 electorate that is based out of Warrnambool, nearly 200
27 kilometres away, is a significant dilution of what our
28 community currently enjoys and expects.

29 The current close working relationship with Ballarat
30 and the central highlands group of councils in Geelong
31 and our G21 group of councils enables our council to have

1 a strong regional voice to represent its residents at a
2 federal level with both federal members' offices
3 currently located about 20 minutes from our council
4 offices in Smythesdale and Bannockburn respectively.

5 The next slide, geographic location. In our opinion
6 the proposal being put by the Colac Otway Shire and
7 others is a significant variation to what the AEC has
8 exhibited. Interestingly, if we as a local council were
9 to propose such dramatic changes at a local level geared
10 to our budget, our strategy, it would warrant
11 re-exhibition. However, as this does not appear to be
12 the case we are speaking on behalf or more so against
13 these other propositions on behalf of our community
14 opposing any consideration of the whole of Golden Plains
15 to be included in the Wannon electorate when in fact our
16 shire has a more direct relationship with Geelong than
17 Colac does, as it has a closer relationship with
18 Warrnambool.

19 As you can see on the map in the geographic location
20 Golden Plains Shire directly abuts the regional cities of
21 Ballarat and Geelong, whereas Colac Otway is separated by
22 the Surf Coast Shire. We would put that if the AEC was
23 to consider the whole of the shire to be included in
24 Wannon - sorry, a whole of a shire to be included in
25 Wannon it would make far more sense for that to be Colac
26 Otways, not Golden Plains.

27 Lastly, our last line. So in closing we would
28 reinforce that the Golden Plains Shire request the whole
29 of the existing electoral boundaries be retained with our
30 community of interests indisputably split between
31 Ballarat and Geelong, however, we fully appreciate the

1 change of population decline in the northern and western
2 Victoria along with population growth in the regional
3 cities and the Melbourne suburbs, and council
4 acknowledges and respectfully requests the AEC's proposal
5 to see the Shire split between the two electorates.

6 We do not see a problem with the Shire being split
7 between two boundaries. In fact we've had this the case
8 over many years. Again, and lastly, however, if the AEC
9 was to prefer the whole of a shire to be located in one
10 electorate our preference would be to remain entirely
11 within the Cox/Corangamite electorate. Again, thank you
12 for the opportunity to speak this morning.

13 MR ROGERS: Thank you very much. Adam Bandt, good morning.

14 MR BANDT: Good morning. Thanks very much for the opportunity
15 to speak. Adam Bandt, current federal Member for
16 Melbourne and resident of the electorate of Melbourne for
17 22 years. I'm going to focus on the boundaries of the
18 electorate of Melbourne, in particular on the SA2 that
19 includes Flemington and Travancore, but I will touch on
20 some of the other suburbs and other boundaries but only
21 insofar as they're consequential upon Melbourne.

22 First, small points I want to make. The first is
23 regarding Kensington, not Flemington. The note that went
24 out from the AEC said this hearing was to consider
25 including where the suburb of Kensington goes. Slightly
26 bemused/alarmed about that. The Commission has, if I can
27 say with respect, made the correct decision to keep
28 Kensington within Melbourne despite some earlier
29 submissions to the contrary, and as far as I can see
30 there's only one objection, objection 358, which suggests
31 that Kensington should somehow be removed and put in

1 another electorate.

2 My submission is it would be a very, very serious
3 step at this late stage to suggest putting Kensington
4 anywhere other than Melbourne and I would hope that's not
5 in contemplation, and if it is I imagine there might be a
6 number of other people who want to make submissions about
7 that. The second point that I make is, again, focusing
8 here on the Flemington SA2 which includes the Travancore.
9 The problem arises because the Commission is proposing to
10 take Flemington out but put other bits in from Clifton
11 Hill and North Fitzroy to stay within the relevant
12 boundaries, and the problem can be completely avoided by
13 not putting those Clifton Hill/North Fitzroy bits in and
14 - sorry, Brunswick, rather, and instead keeping
15 Flemington in.

16 So to that extent it's unnecessary. The boundaries,
17 the numbers in Wills and Batman still remain within
18 bounds if you don't change the north-eastern boundaries
19 of the federal electorate of Melbourne. The only
20 consequential change that there is, is with respect to
21 Maribyrnong in three years' time because Flemington is no
22 longer in there, and I'll come back to that in a moment.
23 But my point is you can retain essentially the existing
24 boundaries on the north-eastern side without a trouble
25 for Wills and Batman.

26 The third point that I make is about the nature of
27 Flemington itself. Flemington is an inner city suburb
28 rather than a middle ring suburb and it's an inner city
29 in fact and also in the way that it identifies, and both
30 which are relevant for community of interest and also
31 physical boundaries. It's within a stone's throw of the

1 CBD. There's a plethora of other submissions that go
2 into detail about the demographics. The way that I've
3 chosen to illustrate it in my objection 310, which I
4 won't repeat here, but to highlight the main point, is
5 that Kensington and Flemington are joined at the hip.

6 For people who live in the area or know in the area
7 there's a Flem-Ken community as it's colloquially called.
8 It's not only a community of interest but you see its
9 physical representations everywhere. So the Flemington
10 Library for example is actually on the Kensington side of
11 Racecourse Road. Racecourse Road is not a hard barrier,
12 it's all very porous. The Flemington Telephone Exchange
13 for Telstra is actually in the suburb of Kensington and
14 it spills over into Travancore. The Flemington Primary
15 School is in Travancore rather than in Flemington.

16 All of these areas have traditionally been referred
17 to by the Commission and known as the area of Newmarket
18 in the past as a subdivision of the federal electorate of
19 Melbourne, and the fact that Kensington and Flemington
20 are so joined at the hip is something that I would submit
21 is a very strong reason not for splitting them but it's
22 also been something that's been recognised by the
23 Commission historically.

24 Now if I can be so brave as to hand to an esteemed
25 group of statisticians my own handmade map. What this
26 shows - this is just going from the publically available
27 data of previous electoral boundaries. The little legend
28 down on the side is the number of years that it has been
29 in the electorate of Melbourne and any particular suburb
30 or part of the suburb, and of course it's an imperfect
31 map in that had never gone up as far as the top of

1 Brunswick and so on. But what you can see is that the
2 core of Melbourne has always included Flemington and
3 Travancore. It's been in the electorate since 1922 and
4 it would be a very, very significant step to move it.

5 The last point that I want to make is about
6 Maribyrnong. If Flemington remains in Melbourne rather
7 than going into Maribyrnong it means Maribyrnong in three
8 years' time is about 1,000 voters under. In the Labor
9 submission regarding the boundaries of Maribyrnong
10 they've raised an objection about Braybrook, Braybrook
11 being in the proposed Fraser rather than retained in the
12 existing Maribyrnong.

13 I submit to the Commission you can kill two birds
14 with one stone given that Fraser's boundaries haven't yet
15 been drawn. If Braybrook stays within Maribyrnong as
16 Labor is requesting then that puts Maribyrnong well
17 within the range in three year's time. So that satisfies
18 that and it satisfies Melbourne and it satisfies Wills
19 and it satisfies Batman. And that from a community of
20 interest point of view would be, I would submit, the most
21 sensible way to go. Thank you.

22 MR ROGERS: Thank you very much for coming. Les Potts please.

23 MR POTTS: Good morning. My name is Les Potts and I'm a
24 resident of Flemington. Thank you for the opportunity to
25 expand upon my meagre submission. I support the
26 submissions of Ms Iser, Mr Dickie, the Flemington
27 Association as such. I will try and avoid replication of
28 the items that they're likely to present and Ms Iser has
29 presented. I'm more going to be concerned about some of
30 the concerns of residents they have at a personal level
31 rather than the level that's been presented today.

1 Just to say, as was identified, Flemington residents
2 have been addressing the issues that will split the
3 Flemington-Kensington community since 1881, which is when
4 a residents association was first formed on the basis of
5 just this issue. What the fear is from residents is the
6 proposed changes will undo that work that we've been
7 trying to do, as address the issues that were created
8 more recently at the state and local area.

9 As with many Flemington residents our common history
10 and needs were identified and that we largely work, shop,
11 play on the other side of the street. As Mr Bandt has
12 identified, the boundaries at the state level is
13 Racecourse Road. We cross the road to go to the library,
14 to our shops, do all those sort of activities. All our
15 open spaces are across the other side of the road.
16 Flemington Racecourse, Royal Park, all our sporting
17 fields, our swimming pools are all across the road in the
18 Division of Melbourne.

19 Our traditional town hall is called Flemington-
20 Kensington Town Hall and it's across the road. Our RSL.
21 I pick up the point that Ms Iser said of the Flemington-
22 Kensington Rotary. I personally submitted to Rotary to
23 get an arts festival going. We had to cross the road to
24 get an arts festival and were fighting for five years to
25 so. We had to go across to use a town hall that's now in
26 another electorate and a Rotary club that straddles both
27 electorates.

28 If I can take you further to a couple of basic
29 examples of where we've had problems with a split
30 boundary through the middle of our community. As a
31 community representative I often have to straddle two

1 boundaries. I am represented on the Melbourne City
2 Council side of the street as well as the Flemington,
3 Moonee Valley side of the street. If I take one recent
4 one, is the Victorian Government's bike strategy. I sit
5 down there and I talk about commuting to the city and
6 safe commuting things.

7 On one side of the street we've got safe bike lanes
8 and we have a large portion of commuting cyclists. On
9 the other side of the street, despite a large increase in
10 the population that would normally be dictated as perfect
11 for commuting, young families, public servants, things
12 like that. We've had no safe bike zones, but
13 disconnectivity between simple things like bike lanes is
14 dramatic. It's visually obvious when at the Racecourse
15 boundary.

16 We have another project I'm involved in, Connecting
17 Open Spaces, where the Victorian government is trying to
18 create a green bridge between Flemington Racecourse and
19 Royal Park, our primary largest open spaces. We're
20 trying to create a green bridge. On one side of the
21 street we've got urban jungles, small inner city parks
22 that connect the community, on the other side it being
23 non-existent. It's a straight line between Racecourse
24 Road and Parkville and that line crosses the boundary
25 that's proposed.

26 We've asked about why and at the level it's often
27 cited back informally, it's too hard, it's too expensive,
28 it's not worth the effort. On the bike lanes it's
29 definitely that people see as you move further away from
30 the inner city bikes are more recreational use. In the
31 city it's more commuting. We often get out-voted on that

1 level because of our representation levels.

2 I just picked up your comment there before, that I
3 take it more toward a federal level. We've got the
4 proposed airport link. It's interesting that at least
5 one of the proposals about connectivity straddles
6 Racecourse Road. So that connectivity at the federal
7 level, is it going to be straddling Racecourse Road and
8 the Newmarket station, it will be crossing two
9 boundaries.

10 Just little things. If we want to hold a street
11 party we have to go to two councils, so therefore the
12 community is concerned that this will compound an area
13 that we've had some concerns about. We certainly fear
14 that this will skew the representation and the Flemington
15 vote is going to a continued bias towards inner city
16 single use between Fleming-Ken. Our newspaper is Flem-
17 Ken News. Everything about the community is Flem-Ken.

18 Thank you very much for listening to that presentation.

19 MR ROGERS: Thank you. Elizabeth Balderstone, good morning.

20 MS BALDERSTONE: My name is Elizabeth Balderstone, and I thank
21 you for the opportunity to address the augmented
22 Electoral Commission for Victoria today on the name of
23 the proposed electoral Division of Monash. I speak today
24 on behalf of my family and also on behalf of the Yarram
25 Yarram Cultural Group. This group formed many years ago
26 and focuses on learning more about local indigenous
27 culture and traditional knowledge and working towards
28 reconciliation in any way possible.

29 Although we are not residents of the electorate in
30 question, we are Gippslanders closely attached to the
31 issues that have led to the renaming. As the current

1 owners, custodians of the farming property Warrigal
2 Creek, now Woodside, my family and I are acutely
3 conscious of the tragic events that occurred on the banks
4 of the creek not far from the current homestead in the
5 early years of European settlement.

6 We have always welcomed visitors researching this
7 horrific story or quietly spending time acknowledging its
8 enormous sadness and we would do anything we could to
9 help reflect the real truth of Gippsland's history since
10 European settlement. Over recent years our connections
11 with Gunaikurnai people who have been particularly
12 appreciated. As a family and as a community group we
13 believe Angus McMillan was most likely involved with the
14 1843 massacre at Warrigal Creek and other similar events
15 that took place in the following years throughout
16 Gippsland.

17 There has been much research and writing and
18 documentation on this. We therefore congratulate the
19 Commission on listening to the widespread community
20 concerns and removing the McMillan name. However, we
21 truly believe the Commission should now take the second
22 step and reconsider its choice in renaming the
23 electorate. We certainly acknowledge that Sir John
24 Monash was an outstanding Australian and contributed
25 hugely to our nation but he is already remembered in so
26 many ways, a university, a freeway, local government
27 area, to name a few, and most recently a wonderful museum
28 in France.

29 We acknowledge that in our original submission to
30 the AEC we in fact had one suggestion that we would like
31 to support as a possible replacement name, Alfred William

1 Howitt, the noted Australian anthropologist, explorer and
2 naturalist, who spent a significant amount of time in
3 Gippsland. And we had heard that that was a name
4 supported by many others locally. But we did go on to
5 say we felt the decision on a new electorate name should
6 largely be the choice of the first peoples of Gippsland.

7 It's very significant that the Gunaikurnai Land and
8 Water Aboriginal Corporation and the Bunurong Land
9 Council, the two registered Aboriginal parties that
10 occupy the electorate, joined forces and work together in
11 putting forward a name representing their ancestral
12 histories, Bunjileene-Purrine. Surely this is a perfect
13 chance for the Commission representing the wider
14 Australian community to acknowledge the first nations
15 that nurtured Gippsland for 30 to 40,000 years prior to
16 the arrival of the first Europeans.

17 Recently a powerful documentation on the Warrigal
18 Creek massacre produced by Swinburne University was
19 launched in Gippsland and this together with a discussion
20 on the electorate name change, this triggered much debate
21 on radio, on social media and around the community. This
22 interaction seems to be clearly saying that the community
23 is ready for change, and the Australian Electoral
24 Commission now has a wonderful opportunity to grasp this
25 moment and lead with a decision full of the spirit of
26 truth, acknowledgement and reconciliation, which we hope
27 and believe can carry Australia and Gippsland forward.
28 Thank you for the chance to speak today.

29 MR ROGERS: Thank you for coming. Just one minute, ladies and
30 gentlemen. Colin Benjamin please. Good morning.

31 MR BENJAMIN: Good morning. Thanks for the opportunity. Colin

1 Benjamin is my name. I'm here as an individual and also
2 speaking in relation to the Belmont Labor Party Branch.
3 I wish to raise three comments as objection to changes
4 that have been lodged in the objections. The first
5 relates to the issues of name, the second relates to the
6 issues of boundary and the third relates to the issues of
7 communities of interest and potential.

8 When it comes to the issue of the boundaries, I live
9 in Belmont and Highton which is now I think more
10 appropriately incorporated into the urban connotation of
11 Geelong. I've previously lived in Maribyrnong which
12 similarly is being appropriately relocated into community
13 of interest. The argument that Colac should be part of
14 the area I have argued in my submission does not
15 represent a community of interest with the emerging
16 economy and a rapidly growing Armstrong Creek and the
17 south coast, and the name associated with Cox I
18 personally support given her background.

19 However, my members indicate a concern with the name
20 and if the Commission is seeking to change the name of
21 Corangamite as have and obtained the indigenous
22 association it is submitted that the appropriate name
23 would then be Barrabool to again the reflect the new
24 geography of the area as Corangamite is now no longer
25 inside the electoral boundaries that are proposed.

26 It is our submission that the overall boundaries
27 that have been recommended by the Commission do reflect
28 community of interest and give room for growth. It is
29 submitted that the rural and agricultural nature of
30 Golden Plains and the areas to the west of the state are
31 more appropriately aligned as per the boundaries that you

1 have submitted. And it is submitted that the
2 construction of - on the search we've done, the
3 electorate of Corio has disproportionately high levels of
4 long term disadvantaged people, industrial nature and
5 employment proposition which is different from the levels
6 of unemployment and opportunities in the south coast and
7 the areas that make the new electorate of either Cox or
8 potentially Barrabool. Thank you.

9 MR ROGERS: Debra and Denis I think from the Craigieburn
10 Residents Association. Good morning.

11 MS PHIPPEN: Good morning. I'm Debra Phippen, I'm the
12 President of the Residents Association in Craigieburn,
13 and thank you for the opportunity to come this morning
14 and speak to our preference for Craigieburn to be
15 included in the electorate of McEwen. While we certainly
16 appreciate it would be wonderful if Craigieburn was
17 actually included in one electorate instead of being
18 split. South of Craigieburn Road is Calwell at the
19 moment and north of Craigieburn Road is McEwen. I
20 actually live myself on Mt Ridley in the McEwen
21 electorate, that half if you like.

22 I have three main reasons in addition in partial
23 expansion of the letter that we've already sent in with
24 our objections. Firstly, that due to the accelerated
25 population growth, particularly over the last 15 years,
26 Craigieburn is now becoming a self-contained suburb, it's
27 becoming the hub of the north. So we have people who
28 live as far north as Heathcote, which is an hour away.
29 I've personally spoken to people up there and they are
30 thrilled that Craigieburn has become the new place that
31 they can go and do their shopping, access medical

1 services, sporting facilities. There's several new
2 sporting facilities that have newly opened.

3 Aston Field has just opened this year, which is
4 equivalent to at least four MCG sized playing fields. So
5 a very big sporting contingent in the Craigieburn
6 community of course. There have also been people in
7 Donnybrook, Wallan, Kilmore who come down now to
8 Craigieburn to use the leisure centre, the library, and
9 there's athletics tracks. The new global learning centre
10 now has the options for tertiary education as well.
11 We've got new schools opening, a new secondary school
12 proposed. Now Craigieburn Road is going to be widened to
13 cater for our 28,000 cars that use it every day, and
14 that's just the minimum. So that's my first point.

15 The second one is that many people - I've moved up
16 to Craigieburn myself from Pascoe Vale 12 years ago,
17 looking to move to a new home, and why not live in a new
18 area? There's new facilities, fresh air, it's a great
19 place for families and there's many, many families that
20 have moved up to Craigieburn. I've met many families and
21 we've had several people come along to our residents
22 group saying how, you know, they really enjoy living up
23 in the north and the quality of life, facilities,
24 community centre and the fresh air of course.

25 My third point is that with the expansion of the
26 urban boundary Craigieburn's becoming the home of the
27 future workforce, or people who are now looking to
28 Merrifield and Beveridge, there's going to be an
29 intermodal freight centre, there's a business park
30 developing at Merrifield. So a new labour force is sort
31 of seeking to move up to Craigieburn so that they can,

1 you know, establish themselves there and then travel up
2 instead of having to travel from further south.

3 So yes, in closing I'm going to share my time with
4 Denis. I'd just like to say in Craigieburn we're a
5 forward looking generation. I'm part of the new
6 population of Craigieburn, I've only lived there 12
7 years, I'm in my 13th year now, and we're looking forward
8 to moving into the future and we'd like to think
9 ourselves as being part of the new northern growth of
10 Melbourne. Thank you.

11 MR ROGERS: Thank you very much.

12 MR MOORE: Thank you, Mr Chairman and members and thanks for
13 this opportunity. I have just a few cases that I've
14 lived. I've lived in Craigieburn for 40 years, moved in
15 there in 1978, and I joined the residents association 14
16 years ago. At the time when I moved into Craigieburn we
17 were the Shire of Bulla and at the time the office was in
18 Sunbury and we were in the federal seat of McEwen. In
19 lobbying all the different organisations that are
20 involved in the development of sporting organisations and
21 growing up in our community we were pretty fortunate to
22 have a marginal seat where we could lobby for our
23 progress in the development of Craigieburn and in that
24 time that we were fortunate to get the police station,
25 the fire station, the ambulance station, the
26 electrification of our railway lines.

27 Then all of a sudden it changed to Calwell and we
28 went dead for about 12 years and lobbying a case and
29 getting nowhere. Now, since it's come back into McEwen
30 that we've been pretty fortunate to get further progress
31 in our lobbying and so forth, and I would like to see

1 that if it's possible that the McEwen boundary on the
2 north and the east be reduced and to try and keep
3 Craigieburn in McEwen with the development of the estates
4 that we've now got coming to the north of Craigieburn
5 along the Hume Highway and so forth.

6 When I went to Craigieburn in those times we had a
7 population of four and a half to 5,000. We've now got a
8 population in Craigieburn of about 56,000 I believe at
9 the latest thing. People from Kilmore, Wallan, Wandong,
10 all that I know people in the north still shop in
11 Craigieburn and support our new town centre that's been
12 developed a few years ago. I thank you gentlemen for
13 your time.

14 One of the things that we did lobby for was a set of
15 traffic lights in Craigieburn. It was by the now federal
16 member but at the time was supported and funded by the
17 federal government, being Liberal. So the lobbying has
18 been well worth supporting everybody in the area from
19 McEwen to achieve something in Craigieburn. Thank you.

20 MR ROGERS: Thank you very much for coming along. Ladies and
21 gentlemen, I'm just going to call a break to the
22 proceedings for a little while. We might just take a 15
23 minute break. It's about 25 past or thereabouts. At
24 about 20 to we'll start again. Thank you very much.

25 PROCEEDING TEMPORARILY SUSPENDED

26 PROCEEDING RESUMES

27 MR ROGERS: Thank you again for coming. For those that have
28 arrived after we had the opening this morning, just to
29 remind people that we've tried to restrict our remarks to
30 about five minutes and when you talk, when you get to the
31 four minute mark there will be a loud warning. That's

1 not design to put you off but rather than just so that we
2 can keep moving through.

3 If we could have Mr Peter Baulch, please, and what
4 we might do is just shut that back door because it's
5 going to be a little hard to hear. Good morning.

6 MR BAULCH: Good morning, gentlemen and thank you for this
7 opportunity for public presentation. My name is Peter
8 Baulch and for the record that is spelt B-a-u-l-c-h. I'm
9 the founding Chairman of a community, a Baxter community
10 group with the acronym of BRATPAC which stands for the
11 Baxter Resident and Traders Progress Action Committee and
12 I wish to the address of the borders of the electorates
13 of Dunkley and Flinders.

14 The community links for the community of Baxter have
15 been very closely monitored over recent months with a
16 view to this electoral redistribution. I am a
17 businessman and my business currently caters for two to
18 250 customers per day and the recent surveys show that
19 the customers come from the communities neighbouring
20 Baxter that Baxter interlinks with and that is
21 Mornington, Frankston and Frankston South in particular,
22 Mount Eliza, Langwarrin, Langwarrin South, Moorooduc and
23 of course our community of Baxter.

24 For the Commission's benefit, the community
25 alignment and connectivity that I'm supporting is best
26 illustrated with the map that accompanied my original
27 submission and I would refer you to it. Currently Baxter
28 is split in half between half of the community is in
29 Flinders and half in Dunkley. Fortunately, the Electoral
30 Commission in its proposed redistribution has recognised
31 this anomaly and has re-joined all of Baxter into the one

1 electorate.

2 However, that electorate should be Dunkley rather
3 than Flinders and the reason is community alignment and
4 community connectivity. Baxter has no links whatsoever
5 to the southern and Westernport sections of the
6 Mornington Peninsula. Baxter has historically aligned
7 only with Frankston and Mornington through the original
8 rail link and today through more substantive
9 infrastructure, freeways, highways and major roads.

10 Baxter and the Baxter residents and the Baxter
11 business community all align with Mornington and
12 Frankston for issues like employment, commerce, sport,
13 recreation, education, leisure activities,
14 infrastructure, transport and health services. None of
15 the Baxter community associates any of that with the
16 southern part of the Peninsula being Flinders.

17 Moving Baxter community into the Flinders electorate
18 would have to be seen as a temporary measure anyway
19 because as the Peninsula grows at the southern end,
20 Baxter would ultimately have to be moved back into
21 Dunkley anyway. So I would strongly urge you, gentlemen
22 and compliment on the re-alignment of Baxter as a united
23 community again instead of the divided one that it has
24 been, but I would strongly suggest that you note the map
25 of my original submission and the need to honour and
26 respect community alignment and connectivity for all the
27 activities that Baxter aligns with Mornington, Frankston,
28 Mount Eliza, Langwarrin, Langwarrin South and Moorooduc.
29 Thank you for you time, gentlemen.

30 MR ROGERS: Thank you for coming. Ken Walker, please. Good
31 morning.

1 MR WALKER: Good morning. As mentioned, my name is Ken Walker
2 and I have lived in Mornington for 11 years. My comments
3 today are in regard to the draft proposal for boundary
4 changes to the Dunkley and Flinders electorate
5 boundaries. They follow on from my original submission,
6 OB54. The first of my comments today are not so much
7 about lines drawn on maps but what connectivity in all
8 its constituent parts lies within these lines.

9 In reading through the numerous objections to the
10 proposed new boundaries one cannot escape the occurring
11 themes emerging from the submissions. My reason for
12 summarising these themes is to hopefully direct the
13 attention of the final boundary arbiters to them in the
14 hope that they will be given due weighting when the final
15 decision is handed down.

16 The connectivity between Mornington, Mount Eliza and
17 Frankston is a recurring theme. The interdependence
18 between these is strong on many fronts. For example,
19 social, business, education, provision of government
20 services, sport, cultural, historical. In recent years
21 the growth of Mornington has been phenomenal and has
22 greatly increased the connectivity and interdependence
23 between the three centres mentioned.

24 Mornington has become a pivotal centre of the
25 provision of many government social services on which
26 residents of Mount Eliza, et cetera, rely. One is only
27 to travel on the bus services between Mornington and
28 Frankston to see how many students travel between
29 Mornington, Mount Eliza and Frankston to see the
30 education interdependence.

31 On the sporting front, there is no question that the

1 catchment areas are Mornington to Frankston and therefore
2 the player relationships and their parents/supporter are
3 a connected group. Business interconnectivity across the
4 Dunkley boundaries is a recurring theme amongst
5 manufacturers, processors and their suppliers. Also
6 mentioned were the strong linked support that business
7 had with the previous and presented elected
8 representatives of Dunkley.

9 I go on to talk about Baxter but the previous
10 speaker has spoken to very knowledgably of that but I can
11 only support his comments. Carrum, Sandhurst and Skye,
12 these districts have no traditional connection to the
13 Mornington, Mount Eliza, Frankston areas. Finally, on
14 the Briars Ward, it's been pointed out that the draft
15 proposed boundaries will split the ward. Thank you for
16 the opportunity to present these comments.

17 MR ROGERS: Thank you for coming. Rod Clapp. Good morning.

18 MR CLAPP: Good morning, gentlemen. I am here on a personal
19 capacity as a long term resident of Mount Eliza, around
20 17 years. I have been there long enough to feel or
21 experience of connection to other communities in areas
22 adjacent to Frankston and Mornington and I can honestly
23 say that the community in Briars Ward, where I live, has
24 no affinity with that in Skye, Carrum Downs or Sandhurst
25 which are proposed to be incorporated into the new
26 boundaries of the electorate of Dunkley.

27 A previous speaker also spoke to the community of
28 Baxter being incorporated into Flinders. It's an example
29 of splitting a community and as he said, all ties,
30 sporting, education, recreation are with Mornington and
31 Mount Eliza and Frankston. The rail extension is only

1 going to enhance these communications and communication
2 links.

3 That proposed redistribution of the boundaries of
4 Dunkley takes split up parts of these communities and
5 incorporates them into Dunkley while retaining a split up
6 part of Briars Ward of the Mornington Peninsula Council.
7 Mount Eliza of course would remain the only part of
8 Mornington Peninsula Shire would remain in Dunkley. From
9 my point of view this is unnecessary fragmentation of
10 distinctly different communities and the coastal areas of
11 Mornington, Mount Eliza and Frankston.

12 A better, more coherent distribution would be to
13 retain the whole of Briars Ward within Dunkley. As we
14 all know, shire councils take great care with their ward
15 divisions and with regard to adherence of communities
16 within their council. So this would seem to be a
17 sensible and coherent way of, if necessary,
18 redistributing the boundaries of Dunkley without
19 splitting up areas.

20 It's also been pointed out that all of the
21 communication, sporting activities, education within
22 Frankston by and large travel up the Mornington Peninsula
23 from Mornington, Mount Eliza, or even Mount Martha to the
24 education and recreation facilities in Frankston. So I
25 would just like to conclude by saying that it would seem
26 that a change to the proposed redistribution including
27 the whole of Mornington Peninsula Council Briars Ward
28 within the electorate of Dunkley would be a sensible way
29 and a coherent way of doing it without further splitting
30 communities. Thank you

31 MR ROGERS: Thank you very much. Warren Mundine. Good

1 morning.

2 MR MUNDINE: Good morning. Thank you, Mr Chair, or the
3 Electoral Commissioner I should say, and your other
4 Committee members. I'm here to talk in regard to the
5 Corangamite electorate and the naming of that electorate
6 and I'm also hear to support the submission by the
7 Wathaurong Aboriginal Corporation, Ebony Hickey,
8 community development officer there who put a submission
9 in, as well as Sarah Henderson, which I should declare
10 that my wife is actually her second cousin.

11 But under Aboriginal ways she's actually my sister
12 so I put that on the record as well. The issues that are
13 concerning me is in regard to, you're looking at the turn
14 of century, 1901, the number of electoral divisions which
15 were named after Aboriginal geographic areas and
16 Aboriginal clear names. In regard to that also, I do
17 recognise the Electoral Commission's great work in having
18 a recognition of Aboriginal people such as the electoral
19 division of Lingiari, Bonner and Blair in Queensland, so
20 on such outstanding Aboriginal people, but also
21 outstanding Australians.

22 But at the same time we're slowly losing a lot of
23 the electoral divisions that are having indigenous names
24 and if you look at that period from the Federation to now
25 you've gone through a loss of probably about nine
26 electorates who's lost those names and (indistinct) only
27 several left over. Some of the comment made I know is in
28 regard to Corangamite is that it's now moving outside the
29 electorate, but when you look at areas as such Werriwa in
30 New South Wales which is around the Lake George area
31 that's for many, many years now has been outside the

1 electorate, but it's a continuation of the historical
2 relationships of those areas and continuing recognition
3 of the indigenous relationships with that area.

4 So my submission would be take up Ebony Hickey's
5 opportunities in regard to discussion with Aboriginal
6 people from that area but also do look at the retention
7 in regard to Corangamite because of that historical
8 relationship going back to the early days of Federation
9 as well as the continuing relationship of a recognition
10 of the Aboriginal names within the electoral divisions of
11 the federal government. Thank you gentlemen.

12 MR ROGERS: Thank you very much. Margaret Lynn. Good morning.

13 MS LYNN: Good morning. My name is Margaret Lynn and I am the
14 Secretary of the Bass Coast South Gippsland
15 Reconciliation Group. I am also here with the authority
16 of the Gunaikurnai Land and Waters Aboriginal Corporation
17 and the Bunurong Land Council. I acknowledge the
18 Wurundjeri on whose land we meet today and pay my
19 respects to their Elders past and present.

20 Our support for an indigenous name chosen by
21 Aboriginal people themselves is based on AEC Guidelines
22 which seek to retain or introduce Aboriginal names where
23 appropriate and on national and state policies about
24 language reclamation and revitalisation, cultural
25 awareness and acknowledgement. It is also based on the
26 fact that the greater part of Australian history is
27 indigenous history and that the veil shielding the great
28 Australian silence around our Aboriginal history is
29 slowly being drawn back.

30 Our support for the two indigenous names of
31 Bunjileene-Purrine therefore rests in their grounding the

1 histories and cultures of Gippsland's Aboriginal people
2 and in the importance of a holistic approach that brings
3 together the abovementioned areas now embodied in policy
4 for the well-being of Aboriginal communities. It is both
5 a practical and symbolic representation of cultural
6 recognition and respect and as already argued in previous
7 submissions, social justice and recompense.

8 We take as a premise as national policy does, that
9 reconciliation is a goal to strive towards and I'm quote,

10 *In a reconciled Australia national unity means*
11 *Aboriginal and Torres Islander rights, histories and*
12 *cultures are valued and recognised as part of a shared*
13 *national identity.*

14 Reconciliation involves all Australians valuing and
15 recognising the rich and diverse Aboriginal and Torres
16 Islander cultures that have existed in our nation since
17 time in memorial and continue to this day.

18 According to Reconciliation Australia's *State of*
19 *Reconciliation in Australia Report 2016*, most
20 Australians, and that's 72 per cent, believe Aboriginal
21 and Torres Islander cultures are important to Australia's
22 national identity and agree that Aboriginal and Torres
23 Islander peoples hold a unique place as the first
24 Australians. Most Australians, 83 per cent, believe it
25 is important to know more and strongly support Aboriginal
26 and Torres Islander history as being a compulsory part of
27 the school curriculum.

28 Most Australians, 94 per cent agree that wrongs
29 towards Aboriginal and Torres Islander peoples occurred
30 as a result of European settlement. Many Australians
31 accept facts about past injustices but are unsure of the

1 details. However, it is widely agreed by 85 per cent
2 that it is important for Australians to learn more about
3 past issues. Australians are divided on the nature and
4 extend of the effect of past wrongs on the lives of
5 Aboriginal and Torres Islander peoples today.

6 Between 50 and 60 per cent of the general community
7 agree that past race based policies have created today's
8 disadvantage. Many Australians acknowledge that they
9 don't know enough about Aboriginal history and culture,
10 nor do they in the main know many Aboriginal people.
11 However, there is considerable goodwill in Australia, as
12 illustrated by those figures, and we believe in Gippsland
13 towards Aboriginal people but how that goodwill may be
14 turned into action is not always clear or obvious.

15 In the case of school children, this lack of
16 knowledge is being addressed through the national
17 curriculum, both primary and secondary that imbeds
18 Aboriginal studies into their regular learning
19 experiences. For the adult population, broader
20 historical inquiry promotes empathy, a capacity to relate
21 to and engage with other people from different time
22 periods and cultures. It is a very powerful emotion that
23 helps us recognise and understand diversity. One more
24 paragraph.

25 Naming the electorate Bunjileene-Purrine after two
26 Gippsland Aboriginal figures would be an important step
27 in the recognition of the historic Aboriginal presence in
28 the electorate and a significant contribution to the task
29 of ongoing reconciliation encouraging pride in Aboriginal
30 communities, knowledge and awareness in the non-
31 indigenous communities and opportunities to learn more

1 about shared history.

2 MR ROGERS: Thank you very much.

3 MS LYNN: Thank you.

4 MR ROGERS: Charles Richardson. Good morning.

5 MR RICHARDSON: Good morning. Thank you, Commissioner. My
6 name is Charles Richardson and I'm an independent
7 electoral expert. I'm grateful for the opportunity to
8 appear before you today. I know you've got a busy
9 schedule and I won't take very much of your time. I
10 mostly wanted to say that I thought the committee has
11 done an excellent job with the draft boundaries and to
12 reassure you that you're on the right track on the issues
13 that seem to be most disputed.

14 In particular, I would mention the issue of
15 Mornington and the boundary between Flinders and Dunkley.
16 I think what the Committee has proposed is eminently
17 sensible and is the obvious thing to do in fact and that
18 in the alternative is going to create much more problems
19 elsewhere either by forcing Flinders to retain the
20 territory on the eastern side of Westernport, or else to
21 move it right up into the Cranbourne area and therefore
22 create problems cascading upwards with Holt and La Trobe.
23 So I would urge you not to alter that.

24 Also with the question of Colac which you've heard a
25 bit about, I would say given the choice between which has
26 the greater connection with the western district, Colac
27 or Bannockburn, that's a no brainer. Of course, Colac
28 should go into Wannon and the areas closer to Geelong
29 stay with Corangamite or Cox.

30 I have a bit more sympathy with the objectors in the
31 case of the Flemington area but even there I think it's

1 difficult to do any better than what the Committee has
2 proposed. I've spent quite a bit of time looking at the
3 numbers myself and I don't think the alternatives that
4 have been suggested work nearly as well as what the
5 committee has proposed.

6 I have made a set of objections myself which are
7 most quite minor matters which I won't bother taking you
8 through. You've got the written version in front of you.
9 I will just mention the one that is the most - involves
10 the greatest number of electors which is the boundary
11 between Macnamara, as you're now calling it, and Higgins.
12 You will recall at the previous redistribution there was
13 initially a proposal to restructure Melbourne Ports, as
14 it was then, that was the subject of a number of
15 objections and the Commission in its final report decided
16 to retain the boundary along Punt Road and Dandenong Road
17 which is indeed a good strong boundary, no doubts about
18 that.

19 The Committee has now found it necessary to breach
20 that boundary in order to make up the numbers. Having
21 made that decision, it seems to me it would be better to
22 bite the bullet and go for more extensive restructuring
23 so that the Caulfield area would go to Higgins and the
24 western end of Higgins, basically South Yarra and
25 Prahran, would all go to Melbourne Ports.

26 I have made a suggestion for where you draw that
27 boundary. The precise location of the boundary is not so
28 much the issue but the conceptual point of making that
29 shift now rather than keep forcing Higgins to go further
30 and further to the south east and stretch both
31 electorates into strange shapes. South Yarra and Prahran

1 work much better with St Kilda and South Melbourne than
2 they do with Carnegie and Hughesdale and I think that is
3 the sensible way to go now that leaving the old boundary
4 seems to be no longer an option.

5 So I would recommend that to you. I'm happy to
6 answer any questions you might have anything I've said
7 but otherwise I wish the Commissioners very much the best
8 in their deliberations.

9 MR ROGERS: Thank you very much. Thanks for coming along.

10 MR RICHARDSON: No worries, thank you.

11 MR ROGERS: Anne Heath Mennell. Good morning.

12 MS HEATH MENNELL: Good morning. Is this working? It's just
13 I've been having difficulty hearing up at the back. As a
14 visitor from Bunurong country I would like to acknowledge
15 the Wurundjeri people on whose land we meet today and pay
16 my respects to the Elders past and present. My name is
17 Anne Heath Mennell and if the proposed redistributions go
18 ahead I will be an elector in the division you propose to
19 call Monash.

20 The major point of my submission today is to state
21 my objection to your proposal for the following reasons.
22 Sir John had no strong connections with the area included
23 in the new division The Monash man has very strong
24 connections within the current Division of Hotham. There
25 is strong support for renaming that division as Monash.
26 There are also strong objections to using Monash for the
27 new division.

28 Of 50 objections in the last round, the vast
29 majority were against this proposal. If it is too late
30 to remove the name of Hotham in this round, I
31 respectfully suggest that the Monash name be kept in

1 reserve and then used to rename Hotham. The AEC
2 guidelines for naming states names of divisions should
3 not be changed or transferred to new areas without very
4 strong reasons.

5 The arguments supporting transferring the name of
6 Monash to the Hotham division seem compelling and
7 strongly supported by individuals and bodies in both
8 divisions. If this inquiry accepts the proposal to apply
9 Monash to the current Hotham division either now or in
10 the future, this reopens the question of another name for
11 the old McMillan division.

12 The majority of objectors to the use of Monash
13 proposed that an indigenous name should be used with many
14 supporting the name Bunjileene-Purrine proposed by the
15 naming committee by representatives of local Gunaikurnai
16 and Bunurong people, as we've heard in previous
17 submission. The Commission's guidelines for naming
18 states Aboriginal names should be used where appropriate,
19 but guidelines offer no clarification as to what is
20 considered appropriate.

21 Many objectors were shocked when the Commission
22 proposed Monash, seemingly ignoring earlier calls for an
23 indigenous name. The Commission gave no reasons for its
24 choice. In the absence of this information a number of
25 submissions suggested the Commission refer back to a
26 reconvened naming committee to address any concerns if
27 may have and to find a name which would be mutually
28 acceptable.

29 If the Commission insists on applying Monash to this
30 new division in this redistribution round it is unlikely
31 ever to be changed as no-one will have any reasons to

1 argue for the Monash name to be removed or transferred.
2 In summary, there is almost no community support for the
3 proposed change to Monash. There is strong support for
4 the name of Monash to applied to the current division of
5 Hotham from people in both divisions.

6 There is very strong support for the use of an
7 indigenous name with many supporting the name Bunjileene-
8 Purrine after two Gippsland Aboriginal ancestors. Names
9 matter and are highly symbolic. We have an opportunity,
10 a historic opportunity here which will not come again and
11 I hope the Commission will take this opportunity to
12 acknowledge our first Australians, especially those whose
13 lands are within the new boundary.

14 I implore the Commission to listen to the objections
15 from the community in the spirit of respect of
16 reconciliation. Change is overdue. If not now, when.
17 It's time.

18 MR ROGERS: Thank you very much. Geoff Ellis. Good morning.

19 MR ELLIS: Good morning. I've got copies of my presentation if
20 you want me to - - -

21 MR ROGERS: Over there would be great. Thank you very much.

22 MR ELLIS: I only printed four copies. I didn't realise there
23 were five. Good morning. I'm Geoff Ellis. I'm a
24 councillor from Bass Coast Shire Council which will
25 reside wholly and entirely within the electorate of
26 Monash. As a traveller from Bunurong country I offer my
27 respect to the Wurundjeri Elders and respectfully ask for
28 Tanderrum. I thank the secretariat for this opportunity
29 to be heard.

30 Monash is a great name. I implore the secretariat
31 to listen to the voices from Hotham and replace Hotham

1 with Monash. There is a much stronger connection with
2 Monash in that area. The first suggestions calling for
3 an indigenous name for our division was submitted to the
4 2002 redistribution. This 2018 redistribution has
5 unearthed the truth of annexation of Gippsland. We thank
6 you for acknowledge the hurt that the name of our
7 electorate has caused to local Aboriginal people over
8 many years.

9 This AEC secretariat has a rare opportunity to make
10 an historic gesture of reconciliation. AEC guidelines
11 for naming decree that Aboriginal names be used where
12 appropriate. Your interpretation of appropriate can let
13 that happen. The removal of Fraser during the last ACT
14 redistribution is a precedent for that interpretation of
15 the guidelines.

16 Many submissions from the people of Bass Coast and
17 South Gippsland support Bunjileene-Purrine as the
18 appropriate name for our division. As a Bass Coast Shire
19 councillor I can attest that before every council meeting
20 we acknowledge that Bass Coast is situated on the
21 traditional lands of the Bunurong/Boon Wurrung, members
22 of the Kulin Nation who have lived here for thousands of
23 years.

24 Bunjileene-Purrine is the joint proposal of the
25 Bunurong and Gunaikurnai peoples. Those names come from
26 the heart of our country. They carry the weight of the
27 soil and the sand that bears the bloody stain of our
28 history, our history. We should be strong enough to bear
29 that weight. Currently, currently there is only one
30 Victorian division that is named after Aboriginal people,
31 Jagajaga.

1 Seven other seats carry Anglicised versions of words
2 that Aborigines once used to describe geographic features
3 or in one case, dwarf eucalypts. There is a seat named
4 after a dwarf eucalypt. Sorry about that. Can you still
5 hear me?

6 MR ROGERS: Yes.

7 MR ELLIS: Okay. Yes, there's one seat that's actually named
8 after the original indigenous name for dwarf eucalypts
9 and we've only got one seat named after an aboriginal
10 person and even then that was the people that signed the
11 treaty with Batman. The guidelines for naming ensuring
12 that people who have been relegated to the margins of
13 history are unlikely to ever meet the necessary criteria.

14 Deceased prime ministers are currently prioritised.
15 The Australian Dictionary of Biography is, apparently,
16 the initial reference for AEC deliberations. If you're
17 not in that book you're not really in the running.
18 Currently only four divisions carry the name of women.
19 Across the state many submissions ask for women and First
20 Nations people to be on it through the naming of
21 divisions.

22 I strongly request that the naming guidelines which
23 date from 1995, the year of Paul Keating, be scrutinised
24 and rewritten to enable choices that reflect our society
25 and will then honour people who are fundamental to our
26 progress. We all know that history is written by the -

27 MR LAMDEN: Four minutes, thank you.

28 MR ELLIS: Far too often it is his story. Change is needed.
29 Country is waiting.

30 Gentlemen, I thank you for this hearing and I will
31 just point out that I have an attachment to the documents

1 that I handed you that was a proclamation, an official
2 proclamation from the Governor of New South Wales in 1815
3 that he had jurisdiction over this year at that time and
4 it's a proclamation that's in the actual government
5 archives in New South Wales that guarantees equity for
6 black and white people across our nation and I don't know
7 that we've actually reached that yet.

8 I can't say what he said but his proclamation
9 carries great weight. Thank you for listening to me.

10 Thank you.

11 MR ROGERS: Meredith Kefford. Good morning.

12 MS KEFFORD: Yes, I'm here to - - -

13 MR ROGERS: If you could just say your name for the record.

14 MS KEFFORD: Okay, Meredith Kefford.

15 MR ROGERS: Thank you.

16 MS KEFFORD: I'm representing the local, the Batman. We're
17 trying to say Batman in the interim so that we don't get
18 reminded of that scoundrel but we're here to argue that
19 we would very like a change to the name of our
20 electorate. I'm representing the local chapter of GetUp
21 which is, as you probably know, a progressive activist
22 group fighting for a fair and flourishing Australia.

23 We have around 3,600 members living in that
24 electorate at the moment and of whom not all of those are
25 active on an everyday level in GetUp but we're certainly
26 in touch with them. I think I've been listening to the
27 other submissions that have come in and I think the
28 arguments for using Aboriginal names whenever possible
29 it's a guideline and I think that is very strong and that
30 this is a great opportunity for reconciliation with local
31 aboriginal people.

1 We were really disappointed that the initial report
2 said that you didn't see any reason to change the name
3 from Batman. I imagine that with the objections that I
4 have seen and I haven't been following them all, you
5 would be rethinking that. We think there's extremely
6 strong reasons to change it and I haven't found anybody
7 that can see a reason to retain it.

8 He was not a man who had a good reputation even in
9 his time and contemporaries called him a scoundrel, a
10 vile man, a murderer of Aborigines. There's
11 documentation that he murdered 15 Aborigines in
12 Tasmania. So we cannot see a reason why you would, why
13 anybody would want to retain that name. It's the treaty,
14 so called treaty, with local Aboriginal people is a
15 hurtful reminder of an unfair process and a great
16 opportunity to address those hurts which other people
17 have spoken about the long term impacts of dispossession
18 on the indigenous people.

19 The local member is against the name, doesn't want
20 to be the member for Batman. The main opposition to that
21 person at the recent by-election didn't want to be the
22 member for Batman. The local council doesn't want to be
23 a council for Batman. They've all said so to you and so,
24 yes, we're just asking you please to listen to that. I
25 want to be a proud member of an electorate with a name
26 that represents something meaningful that doesn't
27 represent as a local or contemporary set of Batman, a
28 cheat, a thief, a liar and a murderer of blacks.

29 I would really like to be proud of the name of where
30 I live and the member that I'm voting for. Thank you.

31 MR ROGERS: Thank you for coming. John Dickie. Good morning.

1 MR DICKIE: Good morning. Thank you for seeing me or hearing
2 me. My name is John Dickie. I'm a local resident of
3 Flemington and have been of Flemington and Kensington for
4 about 20 odd years. I'm here to speak about the proposed
5 relocation of Flemington into the electorate or Division
6 of Maribyrnong. The fellow who spoke earlier said that
7 he had sympathy towards Flemington and was being moved
8 into another division and said that looking at the
9 numbers, the numbers just don't work so well.

10 I will be very brief with you this morning. I have
11 got my written outline there. But what I implore you to
12 do is to consider that it's not just about the numbers.
13 We have divisions for a reason. If it was just about the
14 numbers, you may well put a plan to enter into a division
15 that's out near Dandenong and we could vote for the local
16 member at Dandenong.

17 The people at Dandenong might have as much interest
18 in Flemington as the people who you propose to lump us in
19 with and that's why community of interest is so
20 important. As someone who's actively involved in the
21 local community and has been for some time, it is
22 surprising just how important it is to have a committed
23 and knowledgeable local member, whether that's a the
24 state level or the federal level, or indeed at council
25 level.

26 Again, I implore you not to just simply adopt
27 boundaries that have been imposed by others. We have for
28 better or worse had a boundary imposed on us municipality
29 wise back in 1995 without any consultation where
30 Flemington and Kensington were divided overnight by the
31 Kennett government. It doesn't reflect the local

1 communities of interest.

2 As I joked earlier of the coffee, you can try from
3 above to impose communities of interest on people and say
4 look, here's your division, hopefully someone will
5 represent you, hopefully these boundaries will help to
6 form a community of interest, but that 20 or more, 30 odd
7 years since - sorry, 20 odd years since we've been placed
8 into the City of Moonee Valley, we still have a very
9 strong community in Flemington and Kensington.

10 We are still very distinct from the other
11 communities within Moonee Valley. We are still under
12 represented. In fact, not represented, we have no
13 Flemington members in Moonee Valley City Council. As I
14 said in my submission, we're not likely to ever have a
15 Flemington representative of federal Parliament even
16 though we historically have over a number of years, we
17 have a very actively involved engaged community but you
18 would effectively be consigning us to not only be under
19 represented but to have essentially no representation.

20 My argument to you really is just it's best for us
21 to be an electorate that has more numbers but we are in a
22 community of interest where we can elect someone who
23 knows our community, who can actively engage with our
24 community, who can accurately represent us where we can
25 run as part of our community to be elected by our
26 community than to be in another division where we
27 effectively have no voice.

28 So I really do urge to at least consider us, please,
29 through some sympathy but sympathy won't do us any
30 favours if we are moved into the Division of Maribyrnong.
31 My outline or my written submissions outline some of the

1 reasons why we are not effectively represented in the
2 municipality that we're in and certainly not in the state
3 division. Please don't echo those mistakes.

4 To highlight that, at council for example, some time
5 ago attending there where, there are, no Flemington
6 members of council, one of the councillors said we didn't
7 want you back when we got you and we certainly don't want
8 you now. That's not active representation. It's said at
9 the council meeting where there are nine other
10 councillors there are, these are council officers. Of
11 course the statutory obligations is for councillors to
12 represent the whole municipality, but if you can actively
13 and openly say things like that at a council meeting,
14 that's not effective representation. In fact, it's less
15 than any representation.

16 Thank you for the time this morning and good luck
17 with the report.

18 MR ROGERS: Thank you very much.

19 MR DICKIE: Thanks very much.

20 MR ROGERS: Vivienne Fink. Good morning.

21 MS FINK: Good morning. My name is Vivienne Fink and I'm
22 speaking on behalf of William Cooper's surviving 89 year
23 old grandson, Mr Alfred Turner, also known as Uncle
24 Boydie, and who has living memory of his grandfather's
25 vital work. I understand that Mr Turner would have been
26 here but for Australian Electoral Commission procedures
27 which could not accommodate him, hence he has delegated
28 me to represent him today.

29 I want to show the Australian Electoral Commission
30 the level of community support for the name change from
31 the federal electorate of Gellibrand to the federal

1 electorate of Cooper. The current federal electorate of
2 Gellibrand is named after Mr Joseph Tice Gellibrand, an
3 early European lawyer and explorer who played a key role
4 in drafting what became known as the Batman Treaty
5 between a group of land speculators and local indigenous
6 elders.

7 The so called treaty seems to have involved the
8 purported exchange of 600,000 acres of land in what is
9 now Melbourne for a collection of trade goods. It is
10 unlikely that the elders understood the terms of
11 exchange. The concept of land possession was completely
12 foreign to the indigenous peoples of Victoria and it is
13 now thought the Wurundjeri may have thought Batman was
14 offering them gifts in exchange for safe passage.

15 The legacy of the Batman Treaty is contested at
16 best. Gellibrand himself was a product of a different
17 time and his interactions with indigenous Australians
18 reflect outdated thinking about the relationship with the
19 traditional owners of the land. I would believe that few
20 residents of Melbourne's west today would view him as
21 having an outstanding contribution to our nation.

22 William Cooper on the other hand has a positive
23 connection worth of recognition through the naming of a
24 federal electorate. You might have seen his story on the
25 wall of the Footscray train station where the footbridge
26 is currently named after him. Also the Victorian
27 government of the day has recognised William Cooper by
28 naming the William Cooper Justice Centre in the heart of
29 Melbourne's legal precinct after him and internationally
30 William Cooper has been recognised formally by various
31 means in Germany, Israel and Britain.

1 Attempts are envisaged to be made to include William
2 Cooper's legacy in the national curriculum as he
3 (indistinct) less known by many Australians. Changing
4 the electorate of Gellibrand to Cooper can be part of
5 that educational process. William Cooper was a trail
6 blazer, blazing activist for Aboriginal rights in the
7 early 20th century. He helped to establish the
8 Australian Aborigines League, to advocate for a fair deal
9 for indigenous Australians including land right and
10 franchisement and direct representation in the
11 parliament.

12 The league's first officers were located in
13 Footscray and Seddon within the current boundaries of the
14 electorate. Cooper also pioneered the establishment of
15 national Aborigines. They first celebrated in 1940 and
16 they are celebrated nationwide NAIDOC. National
17 Aboriginal and Islander Day Observance Committee Week.
18 He is also famous for leading a protest of German
19 consulate in Melbourne again Nazi persecution of Jews
20 drying Kristallnacht, recognised by the (indistinct)
21 Israel as the only protest of its kind to take place
22 anywhere in the world.

23 Two paragraphs, thank you.

24 MR ROGERS: Yes.

25 MS FINK: Cooper's legacy has inspired positive social change
26 for indigenous communities in Melbourne's west and
27 throughout Australia. His achievements have had national
28 impacts and embody the values of equality of
29 inclusiveness that we value today. Renaming Gellibrand
30 as Cooper would be a powerful symbol and a form of
31 practical recognition that acknowledged the importance of

1 our indigenous past and future. Thank you.

2 MR ROGERS: Thank you very much. Dr Mary Elizabeth Calwell.

3 Good morning.

4 DR CALWELL: Good morning. I thank you for this opportunity to
5 emphasise the historic - - -

6 MR ROGERS: Dr Calwell, just for the record if you just say
7 your name.

8 DR CALWELL: Mary Elizabeth Calwell.

9 MR ROGERS: Thank you.

10 DR CALWELL: C-a-l-w-e-l-l.

11 MR ROGERS: Thank you.

12 DR CALWELL: Thank you for this opportunity to emphasise the
13 historical and social unity between the suburbs of
14 Travancore, Flemington and Kensington within the federal
15 division of Melbourne. There has always been and
16 continues to be a strong interrelationship between these
17 adjoining areas. Travancore was originally part of the
18 suburb of Flemington and I have already made an objection
19 403 and a comment on objection 46.

20 The mansion Flemington House was completed in 1862
21 and when a greatly reduced property was acquired in 1907
22 by Henry Madden the house and property were renamed
23 Travancore. Madden bred horses for India and when the
24 property was eventually subdivided after World War I the
25 streets were given Indian names. Australia Post has
26 included Travancore in both Flemington and Ascot Vale
27 over the years but the whims of the post office have no
28 relevance to electoral matters.

29 I have lived on the north side of Baroda Street
30 since 1939 and for many years our back fence between
31 Baroda Street and Mascoma Street was the boundary for the

1 federal seat of Melbourne, the Victorian Legislative
2 Assembly seat of Melbourne and the Melbourne City
3 Council. An area north to Ormond Road was called Ascot
4 Vale East but the Moonee Valley Council that is now
5 responsible for this area has extended the area of
6 Travancore to its intended boundaries so that the
7 northern boundary is Ormond Road.

8 There were 1,700 electors in Travancore according to
9 the 2011 census and the latest figures show a total of
10 6,334 electors living in Flemington and Travancore and
11 could be easily included in Melbourne and united with
12 Kensington with the removal of 3,027 electors from
13 Fitzroy North to Wills and 1,211 electors from Yarra
14 North to Batman.

15 There's another matter of concern, the boundaries
16 used to be at back fences that ensure a community of
17 interest rather than confusion because people on opposite
18 sides of the street are in different electorates.
19 Australia has a proud history of parliamentary democracy
20 and our father the late Honourable Arthur A. Calwell who
21 was the federal member from 1940 to 1972, often quoted
22 Abraham Lincoln's definition as government of the people,
23 by the people and for the people and my father added that
24 while it is an imperfect system it is the best available.

25 Electors are not pawns on chest board. The
26 Electoral Commission is confirmation that we're able to
27 maintain this long tradition. Thank you.

28 MR ROGERS: Thank you very much for coming. Abe Shwarz. Good
29 morning.

30 MR SHWARZ: Good morning. Thank you, Commissioners, I wasn't
31 sure as a Jewish man what headgear I was allowed to wear

1 in a proceedings like this but I've decided to, because
2 I'm partially representing today the Jewish community,
3 today I'm going to change my headgear. I'd like to
4 acknowledge the Elders of the land that we're on, the
5 sometimes disputed area of the Bunurong and the
6 Wurundjeri people here in the City of Melbourne of the
7 Kulin Nation and acknowledge the Elders past, present and
8 future.

9 I guess by having introduced both my Jewish
10 background and my acknowledgement of country, to me
11 there's a very strong tie in between those two points and
12 why I'm sitting here today. So my values as a Jewish man
13 come from books like the Torah which is the model of the
14 Bible that British law is based upon and in turn which
15 Australian law is based upon in many respects, including
16 famous commandments in that sacred book like thou shall
17 not steal.

18 One of the sentences that is interpreted from that
19 famous commandment is many, many of the laws that we have
20 against theft, obviously, in all forms of stealing and I
21 would dare say against trespass as a type of theft.
22 Many, many people who do an acknowledgement of country
23 feel that they're trespassing on somebody else's land if
24 they don't have permission to be there and if they hold
25 true to values of thou shall not steal, they won't want
26 to do that form of stealing.

27 So when I hear an indigenous person explain to me a
28 man who grew up in Melbourne with zero education about
29 indigenous people and indigenous rights I was probably
30 your typical white educated in the 60's man in Melbourne
31 who had zero idea, 70's had no idea about the people who

1 were here before and I learnt through a sequence of
2 career moves that got me to be living in Echuca and the
3 northern border of Victoria and New South Wales where an
4 Aboriginal gentleman who I never met came up to me and
5 said, "Mate, what's your mob, where are you from", and I
6 had no idea where he was going to. "I've heard you're
7 from Melbourne from that mob that my mob tried to save",
8 and I still had no idea what he was talking.

9 Then he went one sentence further and said, "It was
10 Uncle William, my Uncle William, he tried to save your
11 mob when he heard Hitler was trying to throw you mob into
12 the gas chambers in Europe." I was blown away walking
13 away the Campaspe River in Echuca to hear that very
14 conversation. To cut a long story short, Commissioners I
15 made inquiries with that information. The Holocaust
16 Museum, the (indistinct) which previously the reference
17 in Jerusalem.

18 They had no idea what we were talking about. I made
19 it my business to meet a man called Uncle Boydie Turner
20 who is the grandson of William Cooper that we've been
21 hearing about previously and I have not only learnt this
22 story and all the other activism that William Cooper
23 stood for, but I in turn have become, I wanted to say,
24 very close friends with Uncle Boydie and his family.

25 In fact, my submission to this process was in the
26 name of both Uncle Boydie and myself. He wanted to be
27 here today. He very much wanted to come down, 90 year
28 old man from Shepparton. But with numerous
29 communications with your wonderful secretariat in
30 Canberra, we weren't able to find a way within the rules
31 to allow say a reimbursement of travel or a guaranteed

1 time that he could be here today and even with changed
2 train timetables, the only train that would have got him
3 here close to the end of today, other than staying last
4 night which the Commission doesn't have facilities.

5 So I think I'm perhaps making a pointed remark about
6 democracy in action and perhaps that needs to be
7 reflected upon. But nonetheless, Vivienne who spoke
8 before and another gentleman I believe is going to speak
9 after me have got a similar point to make. I'll complete
10 my remarks perhaps over the bell ringing at the four
11 minute mark to share that the Jewish world, worldwide and
12 in Melbourne is reflective of a community that honours
13 William Cooper for what he did and not just him in name
14 but what his values represented and if we listen
15 carefully to the biography of Gellibrand that Vivian Fink
16 just shared a few minutes ago, there is no debate, I would
17 suggest to you, that Gellibrand is an inappropriate seat.

18 The MP in the area there was very, very keen to no
19 longer be the MP for the City of Gellibrand. He put in a
20 petition that got over 1,000 names to support that. Many
21 people think that because most of William Cooper's
22 activism in Melbourne was based in Footscray right in the
23 middle of a seat of Gellibrand, it would be highly
24 appropriate and I guess I conclude my point by saying
25 it's wonderful that indigenous people want to see this
26 change made but I'm here to let you know that many, many
27 other communities want to see this made.

28 If you could use this opportunity to follow the
29 guidelines of your own guidelines that recommend that
30 indigenous names would be appropriate, it may not sound
31 indigenous. Like the Jagajaga (indistinct) is an

1 Anglicized name like Cooper but by far it is the name
2 that Uncle Boydie and the family would love to see
3 brought in. Thank you very much.

4 MR ROGERS: Thank you very much for coming. Alex Kats. Good
5 morning.

6 MR KATS: Good morning. Thank you for hearing me. Thank you
7 for letting me speak.

8 MR ROGERS: Could you just say your name.

9 MR KATS: Sorry. My name is Alex Kats, or Alexander is my full
10 name. I'm here invited by Abe who just spoke before. I
11 only came to this because Abe invited me to be part of a
12 committee that we formed last year and I'm not sure how
13 far in terms of background you got but Uncle Boydie went
14 overseas last year and we were part of a committee that
15 allowed and fund raised and put on events in Melbourne
16 and around Australia ahead of that.

17 As part of that I met a lot of people in the Jewish
18 community, I'm Jewish myself, in the Jewish community and
19 outside who are very keen to hear more about, to learn
20 more about William Cooper's story. To learn more about
21 Uncle Boydie and his family and he told his story many
22 times and about his grandfather William Cooper and so
23 from my perspective, if Uncle Boydie who we know is 90
24 years old, if his wish is for his grandfather's name to
25 be put out there in the community and for more people to
26 know about that, then I'm very much in support of that.

27 I would very much, as Abe just said, would very much
28 like to see that name be part of an electorate where
29 William Cooper spent a lot of his time in Melbourne,
30 where his activism took place and from where he walked to
31 the German consulate and in support of the Jewish

1 community that he read about in the paper. Uncle Boydie
2 now is almost 90 years old as we know.

3 My grandparents are about that same age and I feel a
4 great connection. Uncle Boydie, in the last few years
5 since I've known him, has become almost like another
6 grandfather to me because his activism and his passion
7 for his people, which is very much similar to my
8 grandparents and their people, really comes through and I
9 would be really honoured to have an electorate named
10 after the grandfather of someone I know and I think that
11 the rest of the community would be honoured and
12 privileged to have that as well.

13 MR ROGERS: Great. Thank you very much for coming.

14 MR KATZ: Thank you.

15 MR ROGERS: We'll just have a one minute break if we could, for
16 one second.

17 PROCEEDINGS SUSPENDED

18 PROCEEDINGS RESUMES

19 MR ROGERS: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, we've now got both
20 the Liberal Party and then Labor Party submissions by
21 agreement. They're not having individual members turn up,
22 a large number of members which the committee is very
23 grateful, to repeat the messages. So what we're doing is
24 allocating one half hour to each of the two parties to
25 talk through their submissions and if you could say your
26 name and away you go.

27 MR DERMIRIS: Thank you very much, Commissioner. Thank you,
28 augmented Electoral Commission, it's nice to be in the
29 slightly warmer surrounds of Melbourne than it was
30 yesterday. The Liberal Party's submission today will
31 focus on the remaining electorate boundaries that we have

1 noted in our suggestion and various objections and
2 comments on objections subsequent to the suggestion and
3 our comments will predominantly focus on the Dunkley/
4 Flinders boundary, the McEwen/Calwell proposed boundary,
5 the seat of Casey and Wannon and Mallee and the renaming
6 divisions and my colleague, Adam Wojtonis will speak to
7 those matters.

8 MR WOJTONIS: Thank you, Commissioner and Committee members.

9 Firstly, I'd like to just sort of address the boundaries
10 between Dunkley and Flinders, namely, the areas that have
11 been transferred from Flinders under the proposed
12 electorate of Holt. This is the Casey LGA south part
13 that's been into Holt.

14 In our objections we have stated this so I won't go
15 into great detail about it, but I would just like to
16 reiterate the point that these areas in the southern part
17 of the Casey LGA are quite peri-urban and coastal
18 communities that don't have (indistinct) economic and
19 social community links to the areas north of Ballarto
20 Road which are more developed housing, more housing
21 developments than others.

22 These areas share significant economic social and
23 community links to the Westernport communities in
24 Flinders, especially towards Hastings, unlike the areas
25 further north of Ballarto Road, around Cranbourne and
26 elsewhere. I would like to note that the Committee has
27 accepted splitting local government areas or localities
28 where it's appropriate to do so, to use a strong physical
29 boundary or create clearer communities of interest and I
30 think in this instance there is a strong argument to be
31 said for that sort of split in that area due to the very

1 different areas north and south of Ballarto Road.

2 This is evidence elsewhere throughout Melbourne as
3 well where the Committee has made those choices and
4 driven things along those sorts of lines and I would just
5 on that point make a final point that it would be
6 beneficial for the communities of the southern part of
7 Casey LGA to be represented in a division that is made up
8 of similar communities and not place the representational
9 disadvantage by filling in an unbalanced urban peri-urban
10 division such as that proposed in the proposed division
11 of Holt.

12 On the other end, the boundary between Dunkley and
13 Flinders. In relation to the question of Mornington we'd
14 like to reiterate our objection to the transfer of
15 Mornington to Flinders and just noting that there are
16 further to what we have actually said in our objections
17 and comments and objections and elsewhere, Mornington has
18 very strong economic, social and regional interests that
19 are linked to Mount Eliza and north into Frankston,
20 including health links, educational links, sporting
21 organisations and other sort of community organisations
22 that have sort of rallied around that.

23 While we do recognise the Committee's desire to
24 combine local government area to the greatest extent
25 possible, sometimes this doesn't lead to better
26 communities of interest as the actual form. These are
27 usually administrative boundaries and they usually do
28 dictate things in more regional areas but the issue is
29 when it comes down to urban areas, communities decide
30 themselves sporadically whether they actually fall and
31 where they want to organise and things like that, where

1 housing developments occur and other things.

2 So sometimes there is a better outcome on those
3 bases that actually sort of while conform to the LGA's
4 generally, might be better if there is some fuzziness
5 around those boundaries. I would also note that the
6 independence of the sort of Mornington and Mount Eliza
7 communities in that area it's very important and it's
8 sort of aided by a representation by one member of
9 parliament in that regard.

10 With the question of Carrum Downs, Skye and
11 Sandhurst being moved into Dunkley from the Division of
12 Isaacs. These areas actually differ significantly from
13 the remaining established suburbs of Frankston and those
14 further to their south. These areas share more
15 communities in the north towards Dandenong and also
16 towards the east in Cranbourne. These are new housing
17 developments that are very similar to those found towards
18 the east in Cranbourne and those developing areas and
19 they would be better suited within a proposed Division of
20 Holt as we've suggested previously.

21 I would like to move on to Wannon and Mallee. I
22 understand we touched on this briefly yesterday but there
23 was just one point that I think we didn't cover and that
24 was the question of Maryborough and Central Goldfields
25 Shire and the question of which division that should fall
26 into. While ideally we would suggest that that area be
27 included in the Division of Bendigo, due to its proximity
28 and sort of shared communities of interest on the
29 periphery of the urban area around there.

30 We understand the numerical constraints within
31 Mallee and Wannon need to be considered and sort of

1 adequately addressed. There will be a continuing issue
2 how Mallee grows and in which direction it grows and I
3 think it's entirely sensible, the proposal that the
4 Committee has actually come up, with in putting
5 Maryborough and Central Goldfields in the Division of
6 Mallee in that it recognises the character of Mallee as
7 being a northern and central Victorian seat.

8 Whether the Commission decides to go with Mallee,
9 whether at this stage of the redistribution process or in
10 any future redistribution, Mallee will probably need to
11 grow along the Murray River in some regard towards its
12 east and it will take on a greater character of a north
13 central Victorian seat. The difficulty is around where
14 Bendigo, being a very large population centre, causes the
15 Mallee to sort of hit a brick wall there where community
16 of interests, splitting the community of interests
17 Ballarat - Bendigo sorry, is not a possibility.

18 The issue will be where Mallee sort of has to grow
19 and it's likely to go into sort of what is now the seat
20 of Murray or what has been proposed as the seat of
21 Nicholls. So inevitably there will be a split there,
22 whether it is this time or in the future, but the
23 proposal of putting Maryborough and Central Goldfields in
24 Mallee certainly makes it easier for the redistribution
25 process this time round to actually meet the criteria in
26 Mallee.

27 I'll move onto McEwen and Calwell and the question
28 of which division Sunbury and Craigieburn should fall
29 into. I will firstly say that the Liberal Party agrees
30 with the proposed boundary between Calwell and McEwen in
31 relation to where Sunbury and Craigieburn fall. Sunbury

1 has a very separate identity to the remainder of the
2 western suburbs of Melbourne.

3 Whilst it sort of straddles the north western
4 boundary of metropolitan Melbourne, it has a very unique
5 identity and very separate identity. That's sort of
6 evidenced by strong community organisations centred
7 around Sunbury. It is a satellite city of Melbourne,
8 unlike Craigieburn which you could characterise more as
9 an extension of sort of the north western suburbs of
10 Melbourne.

11 It retains strong links to the Macedon Ranges Shire
12 which mostly is located in the seat of McEwen and they
13 both share major transport routes, including Calder
14 Freeway, Bendigo train line and the Melbourne Lancefield
15 Road. Residents in the Macedon Ranges rely on Sunbury
16 for access to shopping, health services, including the
17 Sunbury day hospital and other government services
18 through Centrelink and VicRoads offices and have used it
19 as a very strong economic centre, especially in relation
20 to employment.

21 The link between Sunbury and Macedon Ranges is very
22 strong and the removal of Sunbury from the electorate
23 will lead to in effect an isolation of the Macedon Ranges
24 communities that have little relationship to the
25 remaining parts of the proposed division of McEwen which
26 would contain the Mitchell Shire and communities in
27 Whittlesea and Nillumbik.

28 On the question of Craigieburn, Craigieburn has very
29 similar and shared communities of interest with the
30 suburbs directly to its south, especially around Roxburgh
31 Park. It is the suburbs (indistinct) route and attached

1 to the communities in north-west urban parts of
2 Melbourne, where Sunbury is a satellite community that
3 sort of is quite distinct from those remainder of those
4 and it's surrounded by peri-urban areas.

5 In this respect, the Commission should strongly
6 consider these alignments and the objections suggesting
7 that an urban area should be included in a peri-urban
8 division in place of a peri-urban satellite city which
9 has more in common with the communities to their north in
10 the Macedon Ranges Local Government area.

11 I would like to move on now to the Division of Casey
12 and some objections relating to the local government area
13 of Nillumbik be included in Casey.

14 I would just like to note that this proposal has
15 been brought up again and again throughout this process
16 and I would note that the committee has made the right
17 decision in sensibly recognising the lack of communities
18 of interest between Nillumbik and the remainder of the
19 Division of Casey and Yarra Ranges.

20 As the Committee noted in their report, there are no
21 significant means of transport or communication between
22 these areas and I believe that the main road or the so
23 called main road between these areas is a dangerous
24 single carriageway that goes through I think forest and
25 other farming areas.

26 MR ROGERS: I'm just trying to spot Nillumbik.

27 MR WOJTONIS: Nillumbik is currently in the Division of McEwen
28 proposed, it's just north of Jaga and Menzies.

29 MR ROGERS: Yes, right. Yes, yes.

30 MR WOJTONIS: Yes, so just that area there. So the Liberal

31 Party believes that the Commission has made the correct

1 decision of its proposed boundaries and any reversal of
2 this decision in its deliberations prior to promulgating
3 the final boundaries should be strongly advised against.
4 The party also would like to make submissions in relation
5 to the renaming of the Divisions of Melbourne Ports and
6 McMillan.

7 We, as the Liberal Party, agree with the Committee's
8 proposal to name a division in honour of Sir John Monash
9 and we would like to note that given the Committee's
10 preference for naming divisions after individuals who
11 share a direct connection with the proposed division, we
12 would note that the current Division of Melbourne Ports
13 would be a suitable candidate to be renamed after someone
14 who is regarded as one of the greatest Australians who
15 have ever lived.

16 I understand the Committee had made a determination
17 as proposed to rename McMillan after Sir John Monash and
18 the Liberal Party does not oppose that per se. We will
19 just note that we might think that there's another
20 appropriate choice for it to reconsider if it makes any
21 other decisions in relation to renaming the Division of
22 McMillan as Sir John Monash has very strong connections
23 to the Division of Melbourne Ports as proposed or the
24 Division of Macnamara is proposed, having been born in
25 the region, in West Melbourne and buried in Brighton
26 cemetery and his involvement in the design of various
27 architectural works and buildings in the area, especially
28 the Shrine of Remembrance and Princes Bridge.

29 We would respectfully suggest that the Commission
30 reconsider its choice of division to honour Sir John
31 Monash and if the need be that Melbourne Ports as it

1 currently stands would be a very suitable candidate for
2 that. I just want to make one more point as well
3 regarding the question of an additional round after these
4 public inquiries because there's a number of objections
5 and comments on objections have actually raised this
6 question.

7 We as the Liberal Party would submit that if any of
8 our objections were to be implemented we do not believe
9 that they would give rise to the need for an additional
10 round. Furthermore, in our sort of view any of the other
11 objections as raised as part of this public inquiry or in
12 the previous submissions to the AEC we don't believe
13 would be significant enough to trigger section 72(12)(d)
14 to require an additional round of objections and I
15 believe that unless the Commission were to decide to
16 significantly reshape things differently from what has
17 been proposed, we don't see much need for another round
18 before you promulgate your boundaries. Thank you.

19 MR DERMIRIS: Gentlemen, redistributions are obviously a very
20 difficult task and the Liberal Party is thankful for the
21 opportunity to appear before you today and yesterday and
22 in closing could we record our thanks for the
23 professionalism and responsiveness of your secretariat
24 staff, they've been most helpful and provided great
25 assistance during this process. Thanks very much.

26 MR ROGERS: Thank you very much.

27 MR EASSON: G'day. Shane Easson on behalf of the Labor Party.
28 I might start with the eastern side and we'll talk about
29 Dunkley and Flinders and the surrounding seats. This is
30 a rare chance to consolidate electoral boundaries along
31 local government line. We've had evidence from the

1 former mayor of Frankston, Colin Hampton earlier today
2 that Mount Eliza was part of Frankston Council until
3 1996.

4 If we combine the Mornington Peninsula Council and
5 the Frankston Council you'd come up with two sets and
6 that's what the Redistribution Committee have proposed.
7 If you look at your map of the Division of Dunkley,
8 you'll find that Mount Eliza is contiguous with
9 Frankston. There is no break there. If you look at the
10 Labor Party comments on objections you will see that we
11 reproduced a map of the Green Wedge separating Mornington
12 from Mount Eliza, right. There is a strong green area
13 separating those two suburbs.

14 If we look at the southern part of the new proposed
15 Division of Casey we find that the suburbs there such as
16 Pearcedale and Cranbourne South and Botanic Ridge and so
17 forth are those suburbs at the lower (indistinct) of
18 Casey Council, their local services, their public
19 transport, their local newspapers, all are derived north
20 from Cranbourne, not the Mornington Peninsula and what
21 we've got for the seat of Flinders is it's made up
22 entirely of the Mornington Peninsula which has got too
23 many to form a division by itself. That area is able
24 to be combined with all of Frankston Council.

25 Under the Liberal Party objection, Frankston Council
26 is broken up into four separate electorates so whereas
27 Flinders under your proposal is a Mornington Peninsula
28 only seat. Under the Liberal Party objection it would
29 take in part the Casey Council plus part of Frankston
30 Council. A four way split of Frankston Council is a very
31 poor solution to a problem we don't regard as important,

1 right.

2 We think that the boundaries that you've done for
3 Dunkley, Flinders and Holt are the best you can do and
4 they represent a configuration based on local government
5 boundaries, a recognition that there is a separation
6 between Mornington and Mount Eliza, that Green Wedge that
7 I referred to as being part of the Labor Party's comment
8 on objection. I am trying to cover the eastern side as
9 quickly as I can.

10 You have heard the evidence from the members
11 Mr Dreyfus and Mr Hill about the Labor Party proposed
12 changes to Bruce, Hotham and Isaacs. I might remind you
13 what Mr Hill said that Wheelers Hill and Mulgrave have
14 been part of the seat of Bruce that was created in 1955.
15 Under the Labor Party objection the partial restoration
16 of the Pakenham line between Bruce and Isaacs and Hotham,
17 what we're able to achieve is whereas the Redistribution
18 Committee had Bruce comprising 34.5 per cent of the
19 previous electorate, that's up now to 61 per cent.

20 Hotham goes from 42.8 per cent of the previous
21 Hotham electorate up to nearly 70 per cent and Isaacs
22 goes from 68 per cent or two thirds to 83.6 per cent. So
23 whilst existing boundaries is at the bottom end of the
24 criteria, it's still the criteria and we've submitted and
25 it has been supported by evidence about the split of
26 Dandenong Council as proposed and so forth. The Labor
27 Party objection is a much better arrangement in community
28 of interest terms and what the Redistribution Committee
29 has proposed.

30 The other point I want to make confirms your
31 placement of the Nillumbik exit from the seat of McEwen

1 into the Division of Menzies. We would have preferred
2 and we outlined to you in our original suggestion that we
3 believe that outer urban areas be kept together. So we
4 would have proposed that that Nillumbik surplus go into
5 the Division of Casey.

6 I might remind you that the Division of McEwen prior
7 to 2013 did straddle both sides of the Yarra River and
8 you've got a similar arrangement at the state level. But
9 we're not expecting that you're going to make the change
10 that we would have recommended that you're going to make
11 the change that we would have recommended that you do.
12 However, it's important to note that your proposed
13 Dunkley, your proposed Flinders, are growing at below the
14 state average.

15 Our proposed Hotham and Bruce are growing below the
16 state average. But we also know from the projection and
17 the growth rate of Victoria since the redistribution was
18 announced back at the end of August that Victoria has
19 continued to grow at 2.4 per cent per year. We've had
20 three quarterly statistics released and it's 50 per cent
21 greater than the Australian average.

22 This is a very different situation from say in 2014
23 with Western Australia where the Commissioner's
24 projection of a further seat in the following parliament
25 wasn't justified because the numbers, the growth at that
26 time in December 2014, did not justify that assumption.
27 Your assumption this time that Victoria will gain an
28 extra seat is justified on the numbers.

29 The final point I want to make on the eastern side
30 concerned the points made by Charles Richardson about
31 Windsor in the case of Macnamara. Macnamara or Melbourne

1 Ports, apart from a small excision of East Caulfield to
2 Higgins at the last redistribution has had continuous
3 boundary since the 1989 redistribution. On this occasion
4 the Commission, I don't know why, have added Windsor, a
5 section of 5,000 or so electors.

6 If we look at Macnamara, its growth rate is about at
7 the state average. It's been placed at the very top, the
8 upper end of the range and it's going to have to lose
9 that Windsor area in the next redistribution at the next
10 parliament. So this continuous arrangement for about 30
11 years for Melbourne Ports/Macnamara with the exception of
12 the removal of Windsor next time is likely to continue
13 into the future.

14 One day Fishermen's Bend will be developed and we'll
15 deal with that when that day comes, but there is no need
16 to, as Richardson says, to bite the bullet about
17 Caulfield and so on. That completes the eastern side.
18 On the western side, starting with the bottom up so we're
19 dealing with Lalor, you have quite a number of objections
20 concerning the spit of Point Cook between Lalor and
21 Gellibrand.

22 The solution to that might be if you wish to unite
23 Point Cook in Gellibrand would be to remove part of
24 Laverton out of Gellibrand. Keeping on moving up, the
25 Adam - - -

26 MR ROGERS: Sorry, what was the last comment, to put Laverton?
27 What did you say?

28 MR EASSON: I said Laverton into Lalor to make up for the loss
29 of the balance of Point Cook's suburb going into
30 Gellibrand. All right. Dealing with Adam Bandt's point,
31 Melbourne and Wills in particular are high growth

1 divisions. The Labor Party had in fact recommended that
2 Kensington and Flemington be sent west in our original
3 suggestion.

4 Melbourne is going to have to shrink in size. Wills
5 is going to have to shrink in size as we're looking to
6 the future trying to add back Flemington into Melbourne,
7 it's going to result in a further split of Yarra Council.
8 Remember you made the boundary between Wills and
9 Melbourne the council boundary between Yarra Council and
10 Moreland Council. This is a good arrangement when we're
11 considering the future we really should stick to our guns
12 there.

13 The name Batman, we've had a few, quite a few people
14 coming in here today supporting William Cooper for
15 Gellibrand, supporting the abolition of Batman. Let me
16 just remind you what I think your experience was growing
17 up, probably similar to me. We had a neutral view about
18 John Batman. We weren't aware of the fact that he was an
19 Aboriginal bounty hunter in Tasmania. When I grew up
20 going to school learning Australian history I wasn't
21 aware that he led in 1830 the black line where there was
22 a human chain driving Tasmania along, Tasmanian Aborigine
23 to kind of box them up in a very confined area.

24 Perhaps if you're not going to adopt the name
25 recommended by the local, Darebin Council the current
26 Labor member for Batman, the former Labor member, the
27 Green candidates and so on, you might want to reconsider
28 William Cooper who we had proposed be named for
29 Gellibrand in our original suggestion. In 1887 William
30 Cooper at 27 years of age put the first petition calling
31 for Aboriginal land rights. That was to defend the

1 governor of New South Wales.

2 He grew up at the junction of the Goulburn and the
3 Murray Rivers and he's buried in the electorate called
4 Nicholls today, the former seat of Murray. We're not
5 proposing that that name be changed. However, he set up
6 the Australian Aboriginal League. He petitioned King
7 George V for Aboriginal land rights. He led the first
8 deputation of Aboriginal leaders to the prime minister in
9 1938. He established the day of mourning, the 150th
10 anniversary of white settlement in Australia. That was
11 his achievement and he is also a man who should be same
12 as the world over for being the only private delegation
13 of any group in the whole world to the German consort in
14 1938 protesting against the Crystal Night thing in
15 Germany in that year.

16 So if you're not going to adopt (indistinct) please
17 William Cooper and remember the name Batman will be
18 fought again and again and again, save your successor
19 Commissioners the trouble of worrying about that name.
20 Finally, just Braybrook, if we look at the seat of
21 Fraser, Fraser incorporates a little bit of Maribyrnong
22 Council in the form of Tottenham, the suburb. We add a
23 bit of West Footscray in order to allow Braybrook which
24 is part already of the existing Division of Maribyrnong
25 to be included in that division.

26 What we then do to keep within the numbers is we
27 place Strathmore Heights into Wills. That is, I concede,
28 part of Moonee Valley Council, however it is separated by
29 Essendon airport so it is a bit closer. I'm thinking of
30 your (indistinct) precedent, right, the same would apply
31 to Strathmore Heights in the case of Wills. On

1 Craigieburn and this is where I'll really finish up, we
2 would have preferred - firstly, congratulations for
3 amalgamating the suburb of Craigieburn into one seat,
4 right, we agree with that.

5 However, we feel that Craigieburn would have been
6 better placed in McEwen. You placed Sunbury in McEwen,
7 right. You might think that Macedon Ranges and Bendigo
8 surplus will be bled through Macedon Ranges. We expect
9 in the future that's the way it should happen. Sunbury
10 is close to Macedon Ranges but they really don't have a
11 strong connection. Sunbury, major employment centre is
12 Tullamarine airport. The relationship between Sunbury
13 and the airport is stronger than between Craigieburn and
14 the airport. Roxburgh Park is separated from Craigieburn
15 by the transmission line (indistinct).

16 It may look contiguous Roxburgh Park and
17 Craigieburn, but in fact it's not. There is a clear
18 separate boundary (indistinct) there. Why do we say that
19 Craigieburn be placed in McEwen? For the simple reason
20 that areas to the north and to the east of Craigieburn do
21 look to Craigieburn as the major centre. The seat of
22 McEwen, next time we expect that Whittlesea Nillumbik
23 seat as the next seat in Victoria but the current
24 arrangement with Craigieburn, admittedly it's always been
25 partially the case the bits and pieces seat but it's
26 going to be less so if you remove Craigieburn. It's all
27 bits and no relationship from one bit to another.

28 That is essentially why we propose that Craigieburn
29 go into McEwan. Part of fixing up the numbers is Sunbury
30 as well as Diggers Rest go into Calwell. Diggers Rest
31 has a relationship with Melton, part of the council or

1 straddled the council area, but it's got a stronger
2 relationship in sporting group terms and all the rest
3 with Sunbury. That's it I'm sorry to say.

4 MR ROGERS: I did have one question. What did you say earlier
5 on about Flemington and Travancore, just remind me?

6 MR EASSON: I said that we're dealing with a council boundary
7 in the case of Flemington.

8 MR ROGERS: I see. Yes, all right.

9 MR EASSON: The Labor Party had proposed that Flemington and
10 Kensington go out of Melbourne last time. The
11 arrangement that you've made - when we put in our
12 original suggestion. The arrangement you've made has
13 drawn the boundaries between Wills and Melbourne, at the
14 council boundary between Yarra and Moreland Council. If
15 you tried to undo the arrangement that you've made you're
16 going to have to put bits and pieces of Yarra Council
17 back into both Wills and into Batman.

18 So we support the existing boundary, particularly
19 when you consider the growth of Melbourne, et cetera,
20 will allow Kensington to be placed with Flemington at the
21 next redistribution in two year's time.

22 MR ROGERS: Thank you very much

23 MR EASSON: Thank you.

24 MR ROGERS: We just have a couple of submissions to be read in
25 and ladies and gentlemen, they need to be read in
26 publicly so I'm going to ask one of our members of the
27 secretariat to read in these submissions and to say who
28 they're from

29 MISS TAYLOR: I'm Nicole Taylor, National Redistributions
30 Manager.

31 The first submission I will read in is from

1 Councillor Keith Cook.

2 *Unfortunately, I am laid up in hospital and*
3 *unable to attend to address the inquiry in person.*
4 *However, I would like to add that both the Warragul*
5 *and Drouin Gazette and the South Gippsland and*
6 *Sentinel Times newspapers have published articles in*
7 *favour of the alternative name of 'Sutcliffe' for the*
8 *federal Division of McMillan.*

9 The second submission I will read is from Elizabeth
10 Ryan.

11 *I attended today's augmented Electoral*
12 *Commission's inquiry into objections for the federal*
13 *redistribution of Victoria in Winchelsea. I have now*
14 *realised that I did not mention Mary Glowrey. I wish*
15 *to add this to my submission of worthy women to*
16 *consider.*

17 *Mary Glowrey was a doctor and nun ahead of her*
18 *time, developing sustainable processes and structures*
19 *to promote efficient healthcare to the poor in India.*

20 MR ROGERS: That's it, thank you. Ladies and gentlemen, I
21 think unless there was someone here who didn't get a
22 chance to talk, I'm looking down the back. In that case,
23 I am going to hereby call this meeting to a close. Thank
24 you very much for everyone attending today and can I also
25 thank the secretariat for all of their work in setting
26 this up as well. I really appreciate the work that they
27 have done. Thank you very much for attending.

28 END OF PROCEEDINGS