



# Comment on suggestion 2

Martin Gordon

3 pages



Redistribution Committee for the Australian Capital Territory

The Committee,

I wish to make comments on some of the submissions. I had earlier made a submission for all 3 Divisions. I had proposed the new Division be named Griffin.

I do not wish to be unduly critical of other submitters, often they have similar ideas to my own and are proposing alternative solutions to a difficult challenge.

#### **Non ACT Australians**

I note that like the recent federal redistributions that non-residents of the jurisdiction to be redistributed are singled out for particular mention. As far as I aware it is entirely reasonable for any resident of this country to make a submission, and for that matter probably any resident of the planet, given there is no particular prohibition in existence (as far as I am aware of).

I have made submissions to state and federal redistributions for some decades, and happily do so as it is an important part of democratic process to ensure that our electoral processes work effectively. I also have a long standing interest in human rights and civil liberties, both in this country and overseas.

I am happy for it to be known that I am a resident of the ACT, and formerly of South Australia. The members to be elected to the Divisions that result from this redistribution process will meet in the city that I have called home for some 24 years.

I don't believe that Australian residents (and in my case a person eligible to stand for federal parliament, unlike some of its occupants) should be subject to particular mention for not living in the particular jurisdiction subject to redistribution.

I note that some members of the committee may also not be residents of the ACT, will they be also singled out for particular mention?

## **Naming**

I had advocated that the new Division be named Griffin to honour Walter and Marion Griffin, the designers of the capital portion of Canberra. They are probably the most noteworthy people in the history of our city, and there are many notable people that have lived in or involved in developing Canberra, but they are probably the most well known of all. Naming the Division after them, will include the honouring of a woman, of which there is dearth of Divisions so named, and place this Division in the centre of Canberra where their work is most evident.

A particular concern I have is the lack of women commemorated. This has lead me to propose womens names/or retention, such as Holman in Western Australia, the retention of Fowler in NSW and so on. Fowler was a name suggested to be replaced to honour Whitlam for example, simply because it was in the same region of Sydney that Whitlam had represented.

## **Proposals**

S5 (Jeff Waddell) kindly refers to me at several points of his submission. He like me is a civic minded individual who wants to see our electoral system be fair and reflective of opinion. Jeff has proposed the restoration of Namadgi, which I have not done, and I have proposed that the new Division be Griffin and located in the centre of Canberra. My approach has been to provide a stacking of Divisions, Canberra in the south, Fenner in the north and Griffin in the middle. Canberra and Fenner retain the vast bulk of their existing electors, and Griffin is centred in the area of the city where Walter and Marion Griffin planned the centrepiece of our capital city Canberra. Honouring them with their impressive vision for our capital seems appropriate as ever. The Griffin I propose to a large degree would in large part be the centrally sited Division of Canberra that briefly existed in the 1990's.

S6 (Dr Michael Hedger) suggests Griffin as the new Division. Needless to say I agree.

S8 (ACT Labor) closely reflects my suggestions, but I disagree on naming, and some of the minor boundary issues.

S9 (David Walsh) closely reflects my suggestions, but I disagree on naming.

S11 (Dr Mark Mulcair) closely reflects my suggestions, but I disagree on naming. He like me is a civic minded individual who wants to see our electoral system be fair and reflective of opinion.

S14 (Fischer and Bounds) was an intriguing submission. Whilst leaving out names, it proposes Divisions that totally disregarded the natural features of the ACT, and have two Divisions spanning the Molonglo River. As well it seemed to disregard the man made features too. The light rail development, does not adequately explain the elongation of the north eastern Division from Hall to the Inner South. With an odd number of Divisions it is inevitable that at least one electorate crosses the Molonglo, certainly the Kurrajong electorate does locally. Whilst Kim Fischer has promoted her cause for sometime the outcome is unusual.

S15 (Darren McSweeney) proposes a plausible solution for the ACT. Whilst I prefer my boundaries, an alternative splitting of Gungahlin is arguable, although Gungahlin residents may argue more loudly than those of Belconnen in opposition. One issue is that two Divisions need to span the Molonglo River, this I do not believe is necessary. I prefer the name Griffin as the new Divisional name. He like me is a civic minded individual who wants to see our electoral system be fair and reflective of opinion.

S16 (Canberra Liberals) propose a unusual solution, which produces minimal splitting of communities but like the S5, S14, disregards the natural and man made features of the ACT. I disagree about the name Stromlo preferring Griffin. The proposal is at the limits of tolerance also. If such a southern Division as Canberra was considered, it would make more sense to include all the southern rural parts of the ACT, in it, and exclude suburbs like Lyons and Curtin, the effect of which would be to make it closer to quota, more coherent and come up with split of the rest of the ACT that would be more like some other submissions. If the Fischer/Bounds, Waddell or McSweeney ideas have some appeal, this southern Division as I describe here, could be made to work, and the split of the northern two Divisions could be made to work.

A number of submissions canvas a number of names, and all are interesting people, and fascinating histories and whilst I prefer Griffin, some suggest remarkable people (Nott and Thwaites in particular).

I wish the committee well in their work.

Martin Gordon

29/11/2017