

Transcript of proceedings

Public inquiry of the augmented Electoral Commission for Victoria

Conducted online on Monday 7 June 2021 and Friday 11 June 2021

Before:

The Hon. Justice Susan Kenny AM

(Chairperson of the Australian Electoral Commission)

Mr Tom Rogers

(Electoral Commissioner, Australian Electoral Commission)

Dr David Gruen

(Australian Statistician and member of the Australian Electoral Commission)

Mr Aneurin Coffey

(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 SECRETARIAT: Good morning and welcome to the inquiry of the
2 augmented Electoral Commission for Victoria. Before the
3 inquiry formally begins, I will quickly go over some
4 housekeeping to ensure that everyone understands how the
5 event will proceed. Please note that your camera and
6 microphone will be turned off throughout the inquiry
7 unless it is your turn to speak, at which point you can
8 turn on your microphone.

9 At no point during the inquiry will you be visible to
10 the members of the augmented Electoral Commission or to
11 other attendees. If you are speaking, your name and
12 profile picture, if you have one, will be visible to all
13 attendees. You will not be able to share your screen
14 while speaking. If you have indicated that you would
15 like to speak at the inquiry, you will receive a message
16 via Zoom's chat function before it is your turn, to
17 confirm that you are ready.

18 Each individual speaker has a maximum of seven minutes
19 speaking time. A sound will play when you have one
20 minute left. Please ensure you keep to the time limit as
21 you may be muted after seven minutes unless the Chair
22 permits you to speak for more time. If you're attending
23 the inquiry as an observer but decide you would like to
24 speak, please use Zoom's raise hand function to indicate
25 this. You will then receive a message confirming that
26 you have been added to the speaking list. You can also
27 do this if attending over the phone by pressing star six
28 on your keypad.

29 At the end of the list of speakers, the order of any
30 additional speakers will be read out. We will endeavour
31 to hear from any audio only attendees as early as

1 possible in proceedings. If you're experiencing any
2 difficulties, you can call 02 6113 4788. This phone
3 number will also be placed in Zoom's chat function and
4 can also be found in the guidance material for the
5 inquiry on the AEC's website.

6 If the members of the augmented Electoral Commission
7 have difficulty understanding you when you are speaking
8 due to an unstable internet connection, you may be asked
9 to call into the inquiry by phone and conclude your
10 remarks later in the order of speakers. Please note that
11 this inquiry is being recorded, and a transcript of the
12 proceedings will be published online. I now invite the
13 Chair to formally begin the inquiry.

14 CHAIR: Good morning everybody, welcome to this hearing of the
15 augmented Electoral Commission for Victoria. I'd like to
16 begin by acknowledging the traditional custodians of all
17 the lands on which we meet today, and pay my respects to
18 their elders both past and present. Let me introduce
19 myself, I am Susan Kenny and the Chairperson of this
20 augmented Electoral Commission. As I introduce the
21 members, they will wave, so that you can see who they
22 are. The other members of the Australian Electoral
23 Commission are Dr David Gruen, the Australian
24 Statistician, and Mr Tom Rogers, the Australian Electoral
25 Commissioner. The other members who make up the
26 augmented Electoral Commission are Mr Andrew Greaves, the
27 Auditor-General for Victoria, Mr Craig Sandy, the
28 Surveyor-General for Victoria, and Mr Aneurin Coffey,
29 Australian Electoral Officer for Victoria.

30 Part IV of the *Commonwealth Electoral Act 1918* sets
31 out the requirements to be followed in conducting

1 redistributions. This redistribution is required because
2 Victoria's entitlement to members of the House of
3 Representatives has increased from 38 to 39. In
4 accordance with section 66 of the Electoral Act, the
5 Redistribution Committee for Victoria prepared a proposal
6 for the redistribution of Victoria into 39 federal
7 electoral divisions. The proposal, together with the
8 written reasons for the proposal required by section 67
9 of the Electoral Act, was released by the Redistribution
10 Committee on 19 March, this year.

11 In accordance with section 68 of the Electoral Act,
12 interested individuals and organisations were invited to
13 make submissions and written objections to this proposed
14 redistribution and to provide written comments on those
15 objections. A total of 67 objections and 53 comments on
16 objections were received within the required timeframes.
17 The augmented Electoral Commission is required, by sub-
18 section 72(1) of the Electoral Act, to consider all
19 objections lodged in relation to the redistribution
20 proposal, and all comments on objections.

21 The inquiry today provides the opportunity for members
22 of the public to make submissions about those objections.
23 The Electoral Act specifies how the redistribution
24 process is conducted and which factors are to be taken
25 into account. Sub-section 73(4) of the Electoral Act
26 states that the primary consideration for the augmented
27 Electoral Commission is that each electoral division meet
28 certain numerical requirements in the form of the
29 redistribution quota and the projected enrolment quota,
30 subject to acceptable tolerances around both these two
31 quotas.

1 Subject to an electoral division satisfying those
2 numbers, sub-section 73(4) also requires that we have
3 regard to communities of interest within electoral
4 divisions. This includes economic, social and regional
5 interests. We also need to have regard to means of
6 communication and travel within electoral divisions and
7 the physical features and area of electoral divisions.
8 The boundaries of existing electoral divisions are also
9 considered but are subordinate to the other factors.

10 Of course, boundaries may change, and often there has
11 to be compensating adjustments to boundaries, to make
12 sure the electoral divisions are within the required
13 numerical tolerances.

14 The inquiry today will be recorded. Transcripts of
15 proceedings will be made available as part of the
16 augmented Electoral Commission's report, and will be on
17 the Australian Electoral Commission's website, once this
18 report has been tabled in Parliament.

19 I would also like to note that we may have some
20 members of the media listening today. Should any members
21 of the media have a question, I would ask that they speak
22 to the AEC media team, whose contact details are
23 available on the AEC website.

24 When a speaker is invited to make a presentation, we
25 would remind the speaker to unmute yourself, and also
26 please state your name before you commence. We would
27 also like to ensure that all those present are able to
28 make a submission if they wish. To enable this to
29 happen, we would ask you to keep your remarks to no more
30 than seven minutes. As you've been told, a bell will
31 ring at about the six-minute mark. Subject to timing,

1 there may be an opportunity to provide further remarks
2 once everyone has had a chance to speak. Generally, we
3 will not interrupt you as you make your presentation.

4 If you have not registered to speak and decide during
5 the course of the hearing, after listening to others,
6 that you would like to speak, please raise your hand
7 electronically, by clicking on the appropriate icon. And
8 if you are on the telephone please press star six on your
9 phone keypad.

10 I would emphasise that this is an opportunity to
11 present new arguments and material, not to read out your
12 written objections and comments on objections to us. I
13 can assure you that these documents have been read very
14 carefully and thoroughly by us and are of course publicly
15 available on the AEC website.

16 After this inquiry, we will deliberate on what we have
17 heard and received. We will endeavour to make a public
18 announcement as soon as practicable. I would like to
19 invite the first speaker to make their presentation. May
20 I remind them to unmute first and please state your name
21 for the record before commencing your remarks.

22 SECRETARIAT: The Commission will now invite Julian Hill to
23 speak.

24 MR HILL: Thank you Justice Kenny, can everyone hear me okay?

25 CHAIR: Very well thank you.

26 MR HILL: Excellent, fantastic. I'm sorry we're not able to
27 meet in person, but I thought I'd just appear briefly,
28 out of respect for the process, but also, so that you
29 have the opportunity if there's any questions or
30 clarifications. I had prepared a lovely simple map, but
31 unfortunately, unlike last time, we're not able to talk

1 to that and share it, but I'll run through this briefly.
2 If there's any questions we can go through them of
3 course, and if you'd like the map, it's got lovely
4 colours on it, I was very proud of it, I'm very happy to
5 send it in.

6 Look overall, as I've said in my submission, I think
7 the logic is sound, but in essence, mine is a
8 conservative proposal, suggesting that the Commission can
9 achieve its objectives with a far less radical, and
10 conservative approach at the local level, which maintains
11 more of the status quo, and I think also better reflects
12 some of the local circumstances.

13 The electorate of Bruce was subject I think to the
14 largest change in the previous redistribution, only a few
15 years ago, and again I think is flagged for significant
16 change, which is kind of inevitable, a function of
17 electoral gravity if you like, or mathematics, when it is
18 becoming the funnel of growth. But I would point to the
19 criteria in the Act that also says if we can do things in
20 a way which minimises or reduces change for electors,
21 then I think that's a good thing.

22 So, there's three minor and quite contained local
23 adjustments proposed and some of these really are tidying
24 up things that don't make any sense at a sort of more
25 nuanced or local level. The first one, Bruce/Hotham
26 interface at the Mulgrave/Noble Park North area. In
27 essence it proposes that Police Road should be retained
28 as the northern boundary between Bruce and Hotham. I
29 think I described this in my submission as a 'no
30 brainer'.

31 At a local level Police Road is very well-known, but

1 it's also the administrative boundary between the City of
2 Monash and the City of Greater Dandenong. So, I can see,
3 I think I would guess why the Commission proposed what it
4 did, or the Committee proposed what it did, but it's a
5 strange thing to run up the creek and carve off a little
6 bit of the suburb of Mulgrave into Bruce, and therefore
7 bring some of the City of Monash in, and to split the
8 locality of Noble Park North in two. So, it's about the
9 same number of voters, it just means leaving those two
10 very small areas, where they are and not unnecessarily
11 confusing electors or crossing main roads at
12 administrative boundaries.

13 The second one, surprised -, it may sound surprising
14 to say, but, I share the concerns raised by many
15 submitters and really just endorse the Liberal Party's
16 proposal and Charles Richardson's proposal. I think the
17 ALP had identified a concern around putting three growth
18 areas in the seat of La Trobe, in its submission, but we
19 haven't really identified a neat way to deal with this.

20 We'd also identified a pretty strong concern about
21 splitting the old township of Berwick and bringing that
22 part of Berwick and Harkaway in from La Trobe. I think
23 the Liberal Party's proposal is actually quite elegant
24 and I would endorse it. I've proposed just a minor
25 refinement which makes a much neater shape on the map,
26 and it means the township of Harkaway, which is
27 semi-rural, just stays in La Trobe. It's only a few
28 hundred voters, but it's a much neater, sensible local
29 proposal there.

30 Berwick, I won't go into detail, but happy to take
31 questions. Berwick's a very large suburb, but the

1 proposal to run up Harkaway Road leaves what you might
2 call old Berwick, or the township of Berwick, in one - in
3 one electorate, and the newer, relatively newer estates,
4 Timbarra and the other estates are quite distinct,
5 different sort of built form and community, which would
6 come into Bruce, except that, Bruce then needs to gain
7 some electors from Holt.

8 I agree with the thrust of both the Committee's
9 proposal and the Liberal Party's objection, that they're
10 best gained in Hampton Park/Narre Warren South, so
11 there's a couple of different ways. I've sketched some,
12 but it depends where you land on a few other things. But
13 it would just mean sensibly Bruce comes a tiny bit
14 further south into Holt. There's two or three different
15 ways you could do that. But it's certainly in line with
16 the thrust of the Committee's proposals.

17 The final thing which I think Mark Dreyfus will talk
18 to in more detail along with Jim Memeti, the Councillor
19 for the area and many times Mayor, is to just endorse the
20 ALP's objection about the transfer of Dandenong South of
21 the railway line from Isaacs to Bruce. If you look at it
22 on a map from a distance it's kind of, I can see why
23 that's a proposal which has been put forward. However,
24 it's actually an incredibly distinct community. I've
25 been the MP covering that northern bit of Dandenong,
26 north of the railway line, for about five years. I think
27 I've only been to Dandenong South twice.

28 It's got one of the highest, if not the largest,
29 Albanian communities in the country, and they all pretty
30 much live south of the railway line, and it's a really,
31 really distinct community. People orient far more to

1 Parkmore Shopping Centre in Keysborough, in the day-to-
2 day, than they do to Dandenong Central and Dandenong
3 proper. So, again it just kind of makes sense to respect
4 the railway line. There's some consequential changes
5 which Mark will talk to no doubt, around Lyndhurst and so
6 on, but again it's just a little more conservative.

7 So, I think what I'm saying is, the thrust I get, it's
8 another big change, I breathe a deep sigh, off we go, but
9 it makes very little to no difference to the 2PP. This
10 is not some, you know, sneaky political trick, not that
11 that's a criteria in the Act one way or the other, but
12 it's just a slightly more conservative way of achieving
13 what is a pretty sensible and unavoidable set of changes
14 there. The final, tiny little thing which I didn't put
15 in my words in my submission, I realised, that I was
16 putting on the map.

17 There's a tiny triangle of Berwick, Berwick Springs if
18 you like, that you had proposed to come from La Trobe
19 into Holt. Just to balance the numbers, we've - we're
20 proposing that that actually come from La Trobe into
21 Bruce. Ooh, that's a scary bell, but that come from
22 La Trobe into Bruce. And that would avoid Berwick, the
23 suburb, being split also between three electorates. So,
24 and I think it's only about a thousand voters or
25 something, but it just kind of balances the numbers for
26 future growth. So that kind of explains it, I'm happy to
27 take any questions if there were any?

28 CHAIR: Thank you Mr Hill. That's very helpful indeed. I
29 don't believe there are any questions, and I do thank you
30 for coming.

31 MR HILL: Thank you. I know, it's unusual if you like to

1 consider and make three sets of changes to what is
2 accepted as a well-conceived proposal, but there's a lot
3 of logic behind them, and I've been careful to try and
4 argue and explain the local nuance. So, I wish you well
5 in your deliberations.

6 CHAIR: Thank you, and we appreciate you coming very much
7 indeed.

8 MR HILL: Okay, thanks, take care, bye-bye.

9 CHAIR: Thank you. We'll invite the second speaker.

10 SECRETARIAT: We'll now invite Josh Burns to speak.

11 MR BURNS: All right, sound check panellists, yes, good. Well
12 thank you everyone and thank you Justice Kenny for
13 allowing me to appear before this hearing this morning,
14 and to all of the Committee members, thank you very much
15 for your time. It's always a pleasure to follow my
16 parliamentary neighbour Julian Hill, we share a seat in
17 the House of Representatives together, so I thank you for
18 allowing me to follow him.

19 I won't read into who - the order or anything like
20 that, and we can get on with the proposal. If I can drag
21 you into the inner parts of Melbourne and specifically to
22 the border of Macnamara and Higgins. And ultimately,
23 what my appearance before this hearing today is going to
24 focus on, is how do we carve up these two seats. It is
25 only two seats that we are - that I am going to refer to,
26 it doesn't affect any of the other seats in Victoria.
27 And really it's a decision that you have to make about
28 how do we carve up both Macnamara and Higgins.

29 And, the current way in which Macnamara and Higgins
30 has been divided has been through - since 1990, has been
31 via Dandenong Road. It is a major arterial in Melbourne,

1 I'm sure you've all driven on it many times, and maybe
2 even gotten stuck in traffic on it a couple of times,
3 but, it is a huge road and it is a divider of communities
4 and it has made sense to be a divider of electorates as
5 well.

6 And the proposal your - that the Electoral Commission
7 has made has basically determined that instead of
8 Dandenong Road being the ultimate barrier between
9 Macnamara and Higgins, that Hotham Street should be. And
10 while I see the fact that it does probably looks more
11 square on a map, there are legitimate reasons as to why
12 Dandenong Road has been, has been a natural boundary.
13 And I'm going to just touch on some of them, including
14 touching on some of the arguments made by the Greens in
15 their submission to help your deliberations.

16 The first point I would make though is that Macnamara
17 is due to have a slight excess in quota, which you all
18 are aware of, and the proposal of around 250 voters and
19 the proposal that the Electoral Commission is putting
20 forward would change around 45,000 people from different
21 electorates. It is a significant change for a small
22 issue and we would put forward that the Windsor proposal
23 of putting Macnamara - putting Windsor back from
24 Macnamara into Higgins, would be a far more - or a far
25 less destructive approach and one that we would ask you
26 to consider.

27 The other big aspect as Justice Kenny remarked on in
28 her opening, was the communities of interest. And, the
29 Jewish community obviously has been a huge community of
30 interest, that the Electoral Commission has considered
31 for a long period of time, and I would refer to the

1 Greens' point in their comments where they said that
2 there would be, in fact, more Jewish people living in the
3 new seat of Higgins, than there would in the current seat
4 of Macnamara. And while that may or may not be true, the
5 truth is, in regards to the activity of the Jewish
6 community, it is concentrated underneath Dandenong Road.

7 And there's a few key points of evidence that point to
8 that. The first one, is something called the Eruv, and
9 I'm not sure how familiar you are with the Eruv. It is
10 detailed in our submission, and I'm not going to go into
11 - into it in more detail. But ultimately it acts as an
12 outer wall for, that allows religious activity to occur
13 within the Eruv boundaries. It's a little-known part of
14 Melbourne, but it is a very significant one. And to look
15 at the boundaries of the Eruv, also gives you an
16 indication of where the concentration of the Jewish
17 community activities are.

18 The Hotham Street boundary that the Electoral
19 Commission has put forward, isn't a natural outer wing of
20 the Jewish community in Melbourne. It's actually a spine
21 of the Jewish community in Melbourne. There are families
22 that live on either side, there is a high concentration
23 of especially Orthodox Jewish people who live on either
24 side of Hotham Street and the organisations and the
25 community infrastructure, exist on either side of Hotham
26 Street. It is a connector of the Jewish community, not a
27 boundary.

28 And I would urge you to consider, the implications of
29 making it a boundary, as opposed to making it all part of
30 one electorate. The evidence of that is - would draw you
31 to a couple of submissions including the Adass Israel

1 submission, the St Kilda synagogue submission and others
2 made by Jewish community organisations, that point to the
3 fact that Hotham Street again, as I would describe it, is
4 a spine, not an outer boundary.

5 You also have eight Jewish schools, existing, the far
6 - the vast majority of them existing on the southern
7 part, underneath Dandenong Road where the majority of
8 families live. So, while the Greens would submit that
9 the number of Jews may, in fact, increase, I would put to
10 you that the actual consistency of Jewish life in
11 Melbourne, what makes the heart of the Jewish community
12 beat, happens south of Dandenong Road and south of the
13 border.

14 The other part to the Greens' submission which I would
15 like to just comment on, which was a reference to public
16 housing. Public housing is certainly a part of
17 Macnamara, it is a - we have regular morning teas and
18 regular engagement with our public housing community. It
19 is an incredible part of our local area and one that I
20 take very seriously. But it would be ill-informed to say
21 that each public housing has strong connections to the
22 next. For example in Port Melbourne, you can't even get
23 a tram down to the public housing in Windsor or in
24 Inkerman Street. In fact, I would doubt very much
25 whether people would know anyone from another public
26 housing block, from either sides of the electorate.

27 So, I would say to you that, yes, it is an important
28 aspect, but there is very little to connect the public
29 housing communities from - to each other, other than the
30 fact that they live in public housing. So, I guess, in
31 closing I would say to you that, Macnamara is a funny

1 shaped electorate, but it does actually makes sense, the
2 way in which the boundaries are currently drawn up. And
3 while there is a small amount of extra voters in
4 Macnamara, I would urge you to consider the path of least
5 resistance and consider the implications of redrawing the
6 boundaries. Not from the main Dandenong arterial but
7 from Hotham Street. And I think I'll leave it at that,
8 Chair.

9 CHAIR: Thank you very much Mr Burns, I know the Commission's
10 very grateful for you coming and for letting us have your
11 comments, as you've done.

12 MR BURNS: Thank you, thank you everyone.

13 CHAIR: Thank you. Next speaker I think, would be appropriate.

14 SECRETARIAT: We'll now invite Mark Dreyfus to speak.

15 MR DREYFUS: Judge and Commissioners I hope you can hear me
16 now?

17 CHAIR: We can.

18 MR DREYFUS: That's good. As a courtesy I should say that I
19 have with me Councillor Jim Memeti of the City of Greater
20 Dandenong, just for technical reasons, we thought it
21 might be easier if he could be with me, so that the
22 Commission can go to him next or later in the hearing if
23 that's appropriate. You've got a very clear submission
24 from the Australian Labor Party in the form of the
25 objection and then the later Comment on Objection No.49
26 from the Australian Labor Party, which put forward the
27 point that I would wish to speak to today, which is to
28 the effect that, I would invite the AEC to reconsider the
29 two changes that it is making to Isaacs.

30 The first being the removal of the suburb of Dandenong
31 South, or south Dandenong, south of the railway line.

1 And the addition of the suburb, the residential area, of
2 Lyndhurst.

3 And I'll just speak first on the Lyndhurst point. If
4 both changes are made, you'd end up in a similar net
5 position. And I appreciate that there's reasons why, not
6 related to Isaacs, but related to boundaries and sizes of
7 other neighbouring electorates that these two changes are
8 being proposed.

9 But, as to Lyndhurst, Lyndhurst is in the City of
10 Casey and it would be a retrograde step in terms of the
11 Commission's objectives, which is to, as far as possible,
12 particularly in Victoria, realign federal electorate
13 boundaries with municipal boundaries. In the last
14 redistribution in 2018, the Commission removed that part
15 of the City of Frankston, which was formerly part of
16 Isaacs, leaving me in the position of having only two
17 municipalities, to which the electorate of Isaacs
18 relates, which is a good outcome. They being the City of
19 Greater Dandenong and the City of Kingston.

20 Putting this residential part of Lyndhurst into Isaacs
21 would mean that, again, Isaacs would have to deal with
22 three Victorian municipalities. And I have to say that,
23 with the greatest of respect to the excellent suburb of
24 Lyndhurst, it has no connection at all with any of the
25 communities in Isaacs. It's some 10 minutes' drive and
26 about nine kilometres from Patterson Lakes, which is, if
27 you travel intermediately, in a westerly direction along
28 Thompsons Road, it's even further to Keysborough, about
29 12 minutes' drive or 14 kilometres. If one travels in a
30 north-westerly direction, it's separated from the
31 residential areas of Isaacs by not merely a green wedge,

1 but very heavy industry, including in the Taylors Road
2 landfill, the most hazardous waste facility in Victoria.
3 It's hard to imagine a greater separation in a
4 metropolitan sense, than the notion that this residential
5 area of Lyndhurst should be added to Isaacs.

6 As to Dandenong South, its connections, you've heard
7 from my colleague Julian Hill a moment ago. Its very
8 high proportion of residents of Dandenong South are
9 members of the Albanian community. Some other members of
10 the Albanian community live in South Keysborough,
11 immediately to the west, and there are very many
12 connections between Dandenong South and existing
13 residential areas of Isaacs which I would urge ought to
14 be maintained if at all possible.

15 It's not merely my affection for Dandenong South, in
16 that I have represented the excellent community of
17 Dandenong South for some 13 years, it's a real coherence
18 that would be disturbed if Dandenong South were to be
19 removed. Again, Dandenong South is also separated by
20 some quite intense industrial areas that separate it
21 directly from the rest of the City of Greater Dandenong
22 and, there's the coherence of the Dandenong train line,
23 which has been referred to in the submissions.

24 So, those are the two points I would wish to make.
25 It's - I perhaps I might remind the Commission, somewhat
26 dangerously, that it considered the removal of Dandenong
27 South, from the electorate of Isaacs at the time of the
28 last redistribution, but for whatever reason was
29 persuaded, the Commission was persuaded, not to pursue
30 that particular outcome and didn't. I'd be urging the
31 Commission again not to pursue what it is here proposing,

1 which is potentially moving a very large number of
2 electors for what, in net terms looked at from the point
3 of view of the electorate of Isaacs, is almost no change
4 at all.

5 I'd be urging the Commission, as always, to try to
6 minimise the number of electors who are moved, to try to
7 achieve congruence, this is a published objective of the
8 Commission, to achieve congruence, between municipal
9 boundaries and electorate, federal electorate boundaries,
10 to try and maintain communities of interests, and to try
11 and look to, actual connections between residential
12 areas, existing communities, those actual connections are
13 nil in the case of Lyndhurst and very substantial in the
14 case of Dandenong South.

15 So, that's the ask from me and indeed from the
16 Australian Labor Party, it's not to move the South
17 Dandenong area out of Isaacs and not to put Lyndhurst
18 into Isaacs. And, I'm very happy to answer questions?

19 CHAIR: Thank you very much Mr Dreyfus. I don't believe that
20 the Commission wants to ask any questions at this point.
21 We're very grateful for what you've said and for the
22 assistance you've provided us with. I was wondering
23 whether the Councillor would like to come next? Would
24 the Councillor like to speak next?

25 MR DREYFUS: Yes, he would

26 MR MEMETI: Good morning Justice Kenny and other members of the
27 Commission.

28 CHAIR: Thank you very much.

29 MR MEMETI: Thank you for the opportunity to speak to you on
30 the proposed electoral boundaries here in the seat of
31 Isaacs. I've been a Councillor of the City of Greater

1 Dandenong since 2005, serving four times as Mayor, most
2 recently in 2020. I'm also a resident of Dandenong South
3 and a leader of the Greater Dandenong Albanian Australian
4 Community, where I have lived for over 46 years.

5 Dandenong South, which is to say the part of Dandenong
6 that is south of the Dandenong train line, is one of only
7 two suburbs south of the Yarra River, with a significant
8 Albanian Australian population. The other suburb is
9 Keysborough, also south of the Dandenong train line, and
10 largely in the electorate of Isaacs. Residents of
11 Dandenong South primarily shop at Parkmore Shopping
12 Centre in Keysborough which, travelling down the bypass,
13 only takes four minutes to get to Parkmore Shopping
14 Centre from Dandenong South.

15 There's two sporting soccer clubs that are based, one
16 in Dandenong at George Andrews Reserve which is in
17 Dandenong South which has training facilities at
18 Tatterson Park, and there's also the other soccer club,
19 Dandenong South, which is based at Tatterson Park and
20 plays and trains there as well. It has often been said
21 that the Dandenong train line is a cultural divider
22 within Greater Dandenong, and this is correct.

23 There are key cultural, geographic and transport
24 corridors that link Dandenong South and Keysborough South
25 and it would be a shame to break these connections. For
26 the sake of maintaining community of interest, I suggest
27 that the proposal to remove Dandenong South from Isaacs
28 and add it to Lyndhurst, a suburb from a different local
29 government area with no cultural, government or
30 geographical connection to the balance of Isaacs, be
31 reversed, and thank you Justice Kenny.

1 CHAIR: Thank you Councillor very much indeed, and thank you
2 both for your contributions, which I know we appreciate.
3 I think now we turn to the fifth speaker.

4 SECRETARIAT: I now ask Andy McClusky to speak.

5 CHAIR: Mr McClusky we can't hear you, if you've not unmuted?
6 Secretariat, are you able to do something about that, to
7 let him know?

8 SECRETARIAT: I have requested that he unmute, but we might
9 move on to the next person, I can try him again after
10 this. We'll call on Donnie Grigau to speak.

11 CHAIR: Thank you Mr Grigau.

12 MR GRIGAU: It's Donnie Grigau here thank you. I'd like to -
13 good morning to the Electoral Commission, and to the
14 others making their public submission and other
15 attendees. I'd like to acknowledge the First Nations
16 people of Australia, and the Wadawurrung elders, past,
17 present and emerging. I hope I have not caused offence
18 with this acknowledgement, as I had no form of education
19 on emerging, engaging with the First Nations people of
20 Australia.

21 I'm looking forward to my further learnings in life.
22 My name is Donnie Grigau, I'm a resident of the Borough
23 of Queenscliffe, a Victorian and an Australian. Even
24 more important, a voter in the Federal electorate of
25 Corangamite. I'm the first time Councillor in the
26 Borough of Queenscliffe, having a hospitality business
27 located in the main street of the town of Queenscliffe.
28 Note that I'm the only business in the Borough, and
29 possibly on the Bellarine, to fly both the Australian
30 National Flag and the flag of our First Nations people
31 outside my business.

1 I'm making this personal submission from the heart, as
2 I believe the change to the electoral name of Corangamite
3 to Tucker is a poor change. Trying to get public
4 awareness of this change has been hard during four
5 lockdowns we have experienced here in the electorate. I
6 started a change dot org petition which I've submitted to
7 the Commission already and the count this morning is 156.

8 I would have liked to have been enabled to spend more
9 time telling voters of Corangamite of the proposed
10 changes to get their support, but the stresses of having
11 to endure the fourth lockdown has been more pressing. To
12 these I have personally spoken about the proposed
13 changes, sorry, to those that I've personally spoken to
14 about the proposed name change don't understand the
15 requirement for the change. I'm hoping that the
16 Commission has already read my written submission and the
17 petition so I would not like to have to repeat myself.

18 In this submission I'd like to point out that this
19 change of the electoral name has not been properly
20 consulted with voters of Corangamite. A consideration is
21 being low on our priorities, as we have been more worried
22 about going to survive and cope with the stresses of
23 COVID-19. I would also like to add, and have had
24 personal discussions with the Wadawurrung and had - and
25 they had told me they had not been engaged with the name
26 change. What I have learnt from my engagement with the
27 First Nations community is that it's important to consult
28 and listen with an open mind.

29 I'm hoping from my submission to the Commission that
30 you will listen to the people of Corangamite. We do not
31 want change for the sake of change. All change needs to

1 be positive, fully consulted and meaningful for the
2 people it affects. In conclusion I would like to thank
3 the Commission for their time today and allowing me to
4 speak, thank you.

5 CHAIR: Thank you Mr Grigau. We do appreciate you coming and
6 speaking to us today, very much indeed.

7 MR GRIGAU: Thank you.

8 CHAIR: Now, Secretariat

9 SECRETARIAT: We do have a phone user here, who I can't see the
10 name of, so I might just ask them to just advise us of
11 their name and if they wish to speak. If not, then we
12 might go to the next speaker, who is Martin Reich.

13 CHAIR: Yes Mr Reich.

14 MR REICH: Yes, good morning, can you hear me?

15 CHAIR: We can.

16 MR REICH: Terrific. Look, thank you very much Justice Kenny
17 and to the Commission for giving me an opportunity to
18 speak. I don't think it will take long. My objection
19 was to the naming of the new electorate of Hawke. My
20 objections are outlined in my correspondence to the
21 Commission, but really, what I'd like to also add is
22 perhaps if there is at the present time not a suitable
23 name other than what you're proposing of Hawke, that
24 perhaps the Commission consider a temporary name, naming
25 the electorate after some local flora, until a suitable
26 name could be identified and perhaps utilised at that
27 point in time, in keeping with the way the other
28 electorates around the country are named.

29 The other point I'd just like to drive home as well,
30 to support my submission, is that given the - in recent
31 times, issues with the treatment of women and

1 particularly the size of the protests that were seen in
2 Canberra over the Brittany Higgins incidents, and also
3 allegations against the Attorney-General Christian Porter
4 and so forth, that allegations are important, they are at
5 presently not necessarily proven in court, but simply the
6 allegations being made, especially of misconduct and
7 inappropriate dealing with women by some members of the
8 male community here in Australia, really is one that the
9 Commission needs to very seriously consider.

10 And I think that currently given the allegations, none
11 of which have been proven by court, but you know, widely
12 have been rumoured and discussed, almost like it's, you
13 know, a common secret, but really you can't name the
14 electorate after Robert Hawke, regardless of the fact
15 that he was a great Australian and had contributed
16 significantly as a Prime Minister of this country. But
17 given these other allegations that surround him, I really
18 think that the Commission needs to give that some very
19 serious thought.

20 And really, that's the crux of my submission, that you
21 consider a temporary name, for that electorate and when
22 that presents itself, then you can rename it at that
23 point in time, but I think, regardless of what
24 achievements Mr Hawke made in his time in office, not
25 only as Prime Minister but also as the head of the ACTU,
26 I really think that given the other allegations that are
27 floating around, that really you can't name it after him,
28 because it is going to potentially cause a great deal of
29 angst for some people.

30 And you may find that, you know, you've set the
31 precedence previously as I mentioned in regards to

1 renaming the electorate of Batman, because of allegations
2 that were levied against his conduct some 200 years ago.
3 Really, these allegations against Bob Hawke are only 40
4 or 50 years old, so you need to take that into account as
5 well.

6 So, I'd just like to in closing, thank the Commission
7 for your time this morning, and your consideration of my
8 submission and, I await to hear your verdict and your
9 outcome on this matter. Thank you very much for your
10 time this morning.

11 CHAIR: Thank you very much Mr Reich, we appreciate you coming.

12 SECRETARIAT: I might go to try Andy McClusky again.

13 MR McCLUSKY: Hello. Can everybody hear me now?

14 CHAIR: Yes Mr McClusky we can, very well.

15 MR McCLUSKY: Hi, I'm Andy McClusky a land - a landowner from
16 Lorne, Corangamite. To the two person, the inquiry
17 panel, people of Australia, Members of Parliament, I'm
18 here to address the renaming of the federal seat of
19 Corangamite to the proposed name seat of Tucker.
20 Firstly, I would like to acknowledge, the Gulidjan and
21 Gadubanud people, Eastern Maar and the Wadawurrung
22 nations language groups as the traditional custodians and
23 owners within the present seat of Corangamite. I pay my
24 respects to all First Nations people past, present and
25 emerging.

26 In addition to the material I have provided to my
27 Objection No.45, it was brought to my attention by elders
28 of the region, that neither them nor others, and I also
29 refer especially to objection 19, were not consulted
30 about the proposed name change to the traditional name of
31 the seat of Corangamite that has been in place for over a

1 century. I recently received an email from an elder,
2 Richard Collopy of Corangamite, dated Tuesday 4 of May
3 2021. Title, 'Save the First Australian name
4 Corangamite, Federal Electoral Division Victoria 2020-
5 2021 redistribution'.

6 This is what he wrote, 'Hi Andy and all who care about
7 our current language situation. In particular in the
8 middle of our struggles, to be self-determined, but also
9 to be expected to be encouraging the preservation of the
10 original language and history. I am saddened, but thank
11 you for your support. I am also educated at Gippsland
12 TAFE and accredited to teach both Gulidjan and Gadubanud
13 linguistics, in the Otway and Corangamite region as I do
14 today. Sadly, to think that I was also [indistinct]to
15 change the name of our beautiful lake and connective
16 father's ancestral namesake was gut wrenching at the
17 start.

18 The true secret behind this name is that it represents
19 a series of relationships that are forged together around
20 the time of the Eumerella wars, of which the public would
21 know not of. That defined and define how we conduct
22 cultural law today, which is eroding at a quick enough
23 rate as we speak. The future of removing a historic name
24 that has a roll-on effect and feeling for us of the
25 completion of the genocide solution to the original
26 perceived problem of First Nations people living in terra
27 nullius.

28 I am sorry to speak like this and bringing emotion.
29 Yours truly, Richard Collopy, Traditional Owner and
30 Traditional Owner Representative.' So, to the
31 Chairperson and panel, in conclusion, the First

1 Australian name Corangamite should be retained for all
2 Australians. Being of relevance to their home, place of
3 origin, importance of its culture and heritage
4 significance, that has by name connected us all to our
5 country through our First Australian language and voice
6 of the region.

7 As a landowner and a non-indigenous person, I stand by
8 the First Peoples name 'Corangamite', to be maintained to
9 honour and respect our first tribes of the south-west
10 region of Victoria. We all should care about the
11 proposed removal of this name of the federal seat of
12 Corangamite of the south-west of Victoria. It would be
13 like deleting our First Nations family's history from
14 their place of origin. In this day and age, in our
15 nation, this would be a dishonourable act.

16 Thank you for your time and I hope you all consider
17 mine and the First People of Corangamite's objections to
18 maintain the traditional name of Corangamite. Thank you
19 all.

20 CHAIR: Thank you Mr McClusky, and of course we will consider
21 what you've said today. And we thank you also for having
22 contributed as you've done.

23 MR McCLUSKY: Great, thank you all.

24 CHAIR: Secretariat, is there another speaker?

25 SECRETARIAT: Yes, I will now invite Ross Ebbels to speak.

26 CHAIR: Yes Mr Ebbels.

27 MR EBBELS: Thank you very much Madam Chair and your fellow
28 panellists. I'm here to talk about our submission in the
29 - to the renaming of Corangamite. I'm the current Mayor
30 for the Borough of Queenscliffe, and I represent our some
31 300, sorry 3,000 residents. And like Corangamite, the

1 Borough of Queenscliffe has never had a name change, and
2 actually we were the only council in the State of
3 Victoria that wasn't amalgamated, so we are very much
4 rich in our history and we certainly honour our history.

5 Can I just also note that we have no objection to the
6 proposed change of the boundary for Corangamite. Our
7 objection is from the proposed name change from
8 Corangamite to Tucker. Council also acknowledges that we
9 have no objection, sorry, we also acknowledge the work of
10 Margaret Elizabeth Tucker MBE, agree she is a worthy
11 person of that honour, but she is not actually from the
12 Wadawurrung country, she is a Yorta Yorta woman.

13 The Corangamite electorate has been here since 1901.
14 It's an historic electorate, just like here in the
15 Borough of Queenscliffe. Corangamite is a Wadawurrung
16 name and of course the Wadawurrung are the traditional
17 owners down here. 'Corangamite' in Wadawurrung language
18 means 'bitter, salty water'. We also like to point out
19 the lack of respect this consultation has been given to
20 the Wadawurrung people who have not been consulted during
21 this process.

22 The name Tucker is not indigenous to the Wadawurrung
23 country. It was not that long ago that we were here - we
24 were here recently when the AEC was looking at changing
25 the name to Cox. I'm not too sure why we are back here
26 again, looking at yet another name change when that
27 change was actually rejected. And I also note that my
28 residents have told me, and all sides of politics have
29 also noted, they all object to the name change from
30 Corangamite, so it's certainly not a political thing that
31 they want to have this name stopped, the change from

1 Corangamite to Tucker.

2 Also, in the last election campaign, there was concern
3 that if the name change was changed to - to Cox, that
4 during the election - election campaigning there would be
5 a lot of playing around with those names. And I could
6 certainly see there would be a possibility again, if the
7 name was changed to Tucker. One slight move of a pen,
8 can actually change that name quite quickly and I don't
9 think that's anything that we'd like to see in our region
10 as well. Panel members you do have our submission and
11 again I'd like to thank you for your time and I know you
12 have read it and thank you very much for your time today
13 Madam Chair.

14 CHAIR: Thank you very much indeed for your contribution.

15 SECRETARIAT: I will now call on Adrian Schonfelder to speak.

16 CHAIR: Mr Schonfelder? I don't know whether anyone - we can't
17 hear him Secretariat, is there a way we can rectify that?

18 SECRETARIAT: I will try the next speaker and we'll see if we
19 can get Adrian after that. Therefore, I'll try calling
20 on Alexandra Fein.

21 MS FEIN: Hello, and thank you for the opportunity to speak.

22 My name's Alexandra Fein and I'd like to speak about the
23 proposed Macnamara redistribution. I'm an Orthodox
24 Rebbetzin, I've been involved in pastoral care and I'm an
25 alumna of the Jewish day school system and the Zionist
26 youth movement systems. I founded multiple Jewish media
27 projects and I run and have run a number of high traffic
28 Jewish forums and news groups since 2009. And I've also
29 lived in the Greater Caulfield area for 38 of the 45
30 years of my life. So, I've detailed in my response to
31 objections the many errors in Victorian Labor's

1 characterisation of Jewish communal life.

2 But I feel it's imperative to emphasise that their
3 objection, along with those from Zionism Victoria and a
4 number of high-profile members of the Jewish community.
5 This contributes to the ongoing erasure of the
6 considerable proportion of Melbourne Jewry that cannot
7 afford to live in the Greater Caulfield area, and this
8 erasure is a point of considerable distress to many Jews
9 and it's a regular topic of conversation, in the various
10 forums that I've run.

11 Then there are many Jews, particularly the younger
12 cohort, who feel that the organised Jewish communal
13 leadership does not represent them, and these people
14 generally do not live in the Caulfield area and they
15 resent deeply the assertion that Caulfield and Jewish
16 life are synonymous. Indeed, I find it particularly
17 puzzling that Victorian Labor is arguing for the
18 bifurcation of the Caulfield area in the VEC
19 redistribution, while it's arguing for the diametric
20 opposite outcome in the federal redistribution in
21 Macnamara.

22 Josh Burns and Victorian Labor have mistakenly
23 identified the Eruv as a marker of communal life, and
24 this is just not true. As I have stated in my
25 submission, the failure to extend the Eruv north of
26 Dandenong Road, is simply an indication of organisational
27 challenges in the Council of Orthodox Synagogues
28 Victoria, which they themselves, acknowledge. And Chabad
29 of Malvern and Ark Synagogue in Hawthorn have both been
30 pushing for a northern extension for years. And, in any
31 event, the Eruv stretches well into Goldstein and even

1 into Isaacs.

2 Just on a personal note, when we were first married,
3 my Rabbi husband and I lived a full Orthodox Jewish life
4 in Glen Iris, with access to communal life, synagogues
5 and extensive kosher food offerings, in both
6 Glenferrie Road, Malvern, and Tooronga Coles, and I've
7 detailed in my submission the myriad businesses,
8 organisations and services that exist north of Dandenong
9 Road. Also contrary to what Josh Burns has said, the
10 largest Jewish school in the country, Mount Scopus, is
11 actually in Burwood, while other significant schools,
12 Bialik College in Hawthorn and King David School in
13 Armadale, are also outside of the Macnamara area. Josh
14 Burns's argument about the Adass Israel community, also
15 doesn't hold.

16 This community is an extremely insular one, and it is
17 no way connected with the organised Jewish community of
18 greater Caulfield. And in any event, while the Adass
19 Israel community comprises 15.2 per cent of Rippon Lea,
20 the remaining 84.8 per cent of Rippon Lea residents share
21 far more in common culturally and socio-economically,
22 with neighbouring St Kilda and Elwood than they do with
23 the greater Caulfield area. And yes, that's pretty much
24 the end of what I have to say, thank you very much.

25 CHAIR: Thank you very much indeed Ms Fein, that's very
26 helpful.

27 SECRETARIAT: Might try Adrian Schonfelder again, we'll just
28 invite him to speak? Might try again with Adrian again
29 later. Instead, we'll invite Judith Brooks to speak.

30 CHAIR: Ms Brooks.

31 MS BROOKS: Good morning Justice, and thank you for the

1 opportunity. Can you hear me?

2 CHAIR: We can hear you very well.

3 MS BROOKS: Great, thank you. My concern is the proposed
4 change of the Division of Corangamite. And I would like
5 to thank all the other speakers on this issue. I've
6 listened with great attention to their passion and their
7 analysis. Names are important. They hold identity, they
8 hold place, they hold memories. We Europeans, us white
9 mob, are well aware of this, we have it in our poetry, we
10 have it in our stories, we have it in our songs. You
11 can't go to the UK without knowing that the Lake District
12 is the daffodils of Wordsworth, it's all connected and we
13 do understand this. But somehow or other, when it comes
14 to Aboriginality, we seem to forget the importance of
15 place and name.

16 So, I am here to speak for to retain the name
17 Corangamite, and I come from the small town of Barwon
18 Heads in the - in the peninsula Bellarine. Bellarine
19 itself is an Aboriginal name. In fact, down here in
20 Victoria we're surrounded by Aboriginal names. Biak,
21 Birregurra, Ballarat, Colac, Geelong and of course, what
22 we all identify with, Corangamite. I haven't heard
23 anybody talk around town in Barwon Heads about supporting
24 this change.

25 If anything, there is a certain mockery and a strange
26 weird - a strange weird bewilderment about why suddenly
27 we have to cope with a new name. Now, as other speakers
28 have said, Tucker is a - is a European name, and the
29 person involved is not from the area. It is amazing to
30 me to hear that the certain speakers are asserting that
31 the local Aboriginal people have not been consulted on

1 this. And it's a very sad situation that, surrounded by
2 Aboriginal names, the 150 or so years ago, we remembered
3 the names but we forgot the people. And the guy who
4 argued that they are very strongly connected and the
5 email he read, I thought was extremely powerful.

6 So, to be clear, this is not against the person or the
7 achievements, it is against us being confronted with
8 losing something that, although Corangamite Lake has
9 actually shifted from the division, we - there is a very
10 strong connection. And I'd like to finish with this,
11 that, today we have a disassociation with politics, it is
12 happening everywhere. The political class are more on
13 the nose than they've ever been, so I think it is
14 extremely important that those who care are listened to
15 about changes in identity and names. It does connect
16 people. That's it, thank you very much for listening.

17 CHAIR: Thank you very much indeed Ms Brooks, it was really
18 very helpful indeed.

19 MS BROOKS: Cheers.

20 SECRETARIAT: I'll just try Adrian Schonfelder again and just
21 invite him to speak.

22 MR SCHONFELDER: Good morning Justice Kenny and panellists, my
23 name is Adrian Schonfelder. I'm a Councillor at the
24 Shire of the Surf Coast, but I am speaking as a private
25 individual. I acknowledge the First Australians of the
26 Wadawurrung, and I was in fact born in Geelong, which is
27 Wadawurrung country. I acknowledge their elders past,
28 present and emerging. I would like to state that I agree
29 with all the previous speakers pertaining to the
30 electorate of Corangamite, including the previous
31 speaker.

1 I feel very strongly that the electorate should retain
2 an Aboriginal name. If Corangamite requires renaming,
3 then another Aboriginal name should be considered, and a
4 name which is quite suitable would be Barrabool, given
5 that the Barrabool tribe existed within the boundary of
6 Corangamite. The Shire of Barrabool was named after the
7 Barrabool tribe and the Barrabool Hills is one of the
8 seven distinctive landscapes within Victoria. At the
9 last review, where the panel was held at Winchelsea, I
10 spoke in person advocating that Corangamite, either the
11 name be retained or the name be Aboriginal.

12 And I note that, I believe it was either nine or 11,
13 and Justice Kenny you might be able to clarify this with
14 some research, it was either nine or 11 submissions
15 advocated the name Barrabool. There were more for the
16 name Barrabool than Corangamite to my knowledge. The
17 Victorian Government under Premier Jeff Kennett
18 amalgamated councils and Barrabool became part of the
19 Surf Coast Shire. The new Shire of Corangamite continued
20 Corangamite's name and heritage.

21 Naming the new electorate from Corangamite to
22 Barrabool would continue acknowledging the Barrabool
23 tribe and assisting in the continuing of the
24 reconciliation process, between Aboriginal and non-
25 Aboriginal Australians. Thank you very much for allowing
26 me to participate today Justice Kenny.

27 CHAIR: And I thank you too, for participating, your
28 contribution is appreciated indeed.

29 SECRETARIAT: I will now invite Bill O'Loughlin to speak.

30 CHAIR: Mr O'Loughlin.

31 MR O'LOUGHLIN: Good morning, thank you very much. My name's

1 William O'Loughlin and I made a comment on the objections
2 concerning the proposed redistribution for Macnamara. In
3 my submission, I identified the LGBTIQ+ as a community of
4 interest and was struck by the fact that no one prior to
5 that had ever identified this sizeable community as being
6 a part of Macnamara and the proposed extension. In my
7 submission, I described many features of that community,
8 I won't repeat them now.

9 I would just like to make two additional points about
10 that. One of them is the size of that community, and the
11 second one is about the external social forces that cause
12 LGBTIQ+ people to form and need a community of interest,
13 which I hadn't covered in my submission.

14 On the first point about size. As far as I know there
15 are no statistics or data about the size of the LGBTIQ
16 community in these areas being discussed. I don't think
17 it's recorded in the Census, and in fact I'm sure it's
18 not. I would like to emphasise that it is extremely
19 large, it consists of many thousands of people, and would
20 be a significant percentage of the population, both in
21 the existing areas of Macnamara, and in the proposed
22 extension which is south of the Yarra, north of Dandenong
23 Road.

24 We know this as members of the community and also as
25 people who mix and socialise generally around the area of
26 inner Melbourne. There are two main and almost exclusive
27 concentrations of LGBTIQ+ people in Victoria. One area
28 is north of the Yarra, particularly around the areas of
29 Collingwood, Northcote and north of there. And the other
30 area is south of the Yarra, and it's the strip which is
31 almost exactly formed by the proposed redistribution

1 boundary, which is in other words south of the Yarra,
2 taking in South Yarra, Prahran, Windsor, and then down
3 into St Kilda East, St Kilda, Elwood, etcetera.

4 In fact, my point is that the proposed redistribution
5 almost perfectly, well not perfectly, but very neatly
6 fits within the way that LGBTIQ+ people live within this
7 area of Melbourne. And my comments about this, my
8 observations are as a gay man, who has lived within this
9 area since 1981, with diverse connections within the
10 community, across all generations and different aspects
11 of the community.

12 The second point I want to make is about the external
13 forces that cause this community to form or need to be a
14 community of interest. My submission's already covered
15 the point within the community that people want to live,
16 in order to be near each other etcetera. I want to look
17 at the external factors, which are social, political,
18 cultural and religious opposition, or a tax on the LGBTI
19 people, their lifestyle and their identity. Now, these
20 are historical and they're current.

21 In the 80s and 90s we had the AIDS epidemic, we then
22 had the Safe Schools controversy, we then had the
23 marriage equality debate which was a national debate on
24 the rights of LGBTI, well gay and lesbian people to
25 marry. More recently we've had controversy about the
26 rights of trans people, and especially focused on trans
27 children. We had the issue now of religious
28 discrimination, the ability to have exemptions to
29 delivery of services for LGBTI people. We've had the
30 prominent case of Israel Folau in the national media and
31 sports around opinions around LGBTI people, and much of

1 this has been driven by very articulate and powerful
2 sections of the media.

3 And my point is that, while much might seem to have
4 been achieved in the rights and equality for LGBTI
5 communities, in practice there's a continual evolving
6 opposition for this community and this can be argued, I
7 think, as another reason why LGBTI people form a
8 community of interest. They need to identify with each
9 other and support each other, but more formally, they
10 need to organise and represent themselves.

11 And finally, I just want to pick up on another point
12 that was mentioned. This discussion of Dandenong Road as
13 a major barrier between Macnamara and the proposed
14 extension. I've lived on both sides of Dandenong Road
15 and with people from the LGBTI community and the general
16 people, it doesn't impact us or form a barrier, people
17 move across it and will, and just simply adapt to the
18 time of the day. My other comments around public housing
19 tenants are in my submission, as are comments about the
20 travel routes and the public transport routes within
21 Melbourne, so I'll leave it there and thank you very much
22 for your time this morning.

23 CHAIR: Thank you very much Mr O'Loughlin for your
24 contribution, we're grateful for it.

25 SECRETARIAT: We'll now invite Adam Wojtonis to speak.

26 CHAIR: Mr Wojtonis are you there?

27 MR WOJTONIS: Yes, I am, Chair. So Chair and Commissioners,
28 thank you for the opportunity to appear before this
29 public enquiry into the redistribution of Victoria on
30 behalf of the Liberal Party of Australia, Victorian
31 Division. I'd like to repeat the Liberal Party's

1 appreciation for the work of the Redistribution Committee
2 and its proposed boundaries for Victoria.

3 The proposed boundaries provide a considered and
4 thorough application of legislative criteria, and ensure
5 proper and equal representation in the Commonwealth
6 Parliament for all Victorians. At this hearing the
7 Liberal Party seeks to address a number of issues that
8 have been raised in the objections and the comments.

9 I'll address the following major themes identified,
10 including the boundary between Higgins and Macnamara, the
11 placement of Berwick within or between La Trobe, Holt
12 and/or Bruce, the boundaries variously between Menzies,
13 Deakin, Chisholm, Hotham, Higgins and Kooyong, and
14 finally, the boundary of Tucker and the suggestion it
15 should include Anglesea. Additionally, I would like to
16 address the issues raised in the naming of divisions. In
17 particular, I reiterate the Liberal Party's support for
18 the naming of the new division in honour of the late
19 Honourable Bob Hawke, in continuation of the convention
20 that divisions, where possible, bear the name of
21 Australia's former Prime Ministers. Additionally, in
22 relation to the renaming of Corangamite to Tucker, I
23 refer the Commissioners back to the views expressed in
24 the Liberal Party's objection.

25 Turning to the boundary between Higgins and Macnamara,
26 the Liberal Party reiterates its support for the proposed
27 boundary. The boundary recognises the north-south
28 community links and the emerging differences in the local
29 demographics, typified by the stark divide in density of
30 housing either side of Williams Road and then Hotham
31 Street, high density residential apartments being the

1 norm to the west and low density detached housing to the
2 east. Additionally, these boundaries recognise that
3 residents of Caulfield North, Caulfield and Caulfield
4 East, frequently travel north of Dandenong Road, to
5 Malvern and Malvern East, to access schools, shopping
6 strips and places of worship. And across all the
7 religions, not just limited to the Jewish or the various
8 Christian communities, while also travelling east to
9 Carnegie and Murrumbeena, more so than to the west, as is
10 reflected in the public transport links in this area,
11 notwithstanding the ALP's claims to the contrary in their
12 objection.

13 The Liberal Party also notes the Australian Greens'
14 comments that highlighted the proposed Higgins achieving
15 better representation for the Jewish community, as was
16 also shown by the various comments from organisations and
17 members of Melbourne's Jewish community. The Greens also
18 demonstrated the improved community lines along LGA
19 boundaries, through reducing the number of divisions
20 between, which the City of Glen Eira would be split,
21 while also unifying South Yarra within one division.
22 These reasons further validate the proposed boundary
23 between Higgins and Macnamara.

24 Now turning to the placement of Berwick, within or
25 between La Trobe, Holt and/or Bruce. The Liberal Party
26 recognises and acknowledges difficulties faced by the
27 Commissioners in setting the boundaries in Melbourne's
28 outer south-eastern suburbs. The high level of
29 population growth makes the task of meeting the required
30 levels of present and future enrolment especially
31 difficult. I would note the Liberal Party's position on

1 the proposed splitting of Berwick between three
2 divisions, Bruce, Holt and La Trobe, as expressed in the
3 party's respective objection and comments. Without
4 repeating the detail of these submissions, I would like
5 to stress to the Commissioners the importance of keeping
6 communities together to the greatest extent possible. As
7 the Liberal Party's objections, together with a number of
8 others including Charles Richardson and ALP have
9 demonstrated, it is possible to keep most of Berwick
10 together in one division without causing flow-on negative
11 impacts. The Liberal Party notes the ALP's comment in
12 relation to Berwick where it generally supported the
13 Liberal Party's position and combines approaches taken by
14 Charles Richardson, the Liberal Party, and the ALP in
15 their respective objections.

16 Furthermore, the proposed changes of boundary between
17 Holt and La Trobe in the south, whereby Clyde and
18 Tooradin are transferred, is unnecessary if the
19 objections regarding Berwick are applied. It would be
20 better to maintain the LGA boundary between the City of
21 Casey and the Shire of Cardinia as a southern boundary in
22 these divisions.

23 Now turning to the boundaries between Menzies, Deakin
24 and Chisholm, I would like to reiterate the Liberal
25 Party's general support for the proposed boundaries.
26 This approach has ensured that the divisions contained
27 communities with significant links between them, without
28 dislocating communities in a piecemeal fashion. The
29 objection is seeking to re-prosecute earlier suggestions
30 that would have Croydon split, either along Maroondah
31 Highway or Mount Dandenong Road leading to detached

1 communities violating the section 66 criteria, and a
2 bipolar Menzies, no cohesive representative or political
3 structure, and many split activity centres.

4 The proposed boundaries are the best approach in a
5 difficult situation. Achieving a strong outcome for the
6 community, with divisions based on the LGAs of Manningham
7 and Maroondah respectively, and the Whitehorse LGA which
8 would invariably be split due to its geography, being
9 logically split along strong demographic and community
10 grounds.

11 Given the need to compromise, fragmenting the Croydon
12 and Ringwood communities is by far the worse outcome than
13 what is proposed. Where the communities north of
14 Whitehorse Road are combined with those they're strongly
15 interconnected to in Doncaster, Doncaster East and
16 Donvale. In relation to the comment of the ALP, that
17 [indistinct] this Eastern Freeway, the Liberal Party
18 notes that should they do so, they would see people
19 travelling north-south along the roads that cross the
20 Eastern Freeway, from Box Hill, Blackburn, Nunawading and
21 Mitcham to Doncaster, Doncaster East and Donvale, and
22 vice versa.

23 Initially the strong east-west connections between
24 communities north of Whitehorse Road, are actually
25 contained within one Division in the proposal. As most
26 local east-west travel is contained from Box Hill through
27 to Mitcham, and the access of residents in Box Hill North
28 and Blackburn North to Doncaster is much better than it
29 is to Ringwood. Turning to the boundaries between
30 Deakin, Chisholm and Hotham, the Liberal Party notes its
31 objections suggesting Oakleigh East be united entirely

1 within Hotham, and rebuts the ALP's focus on the roads in
2 this area, that fails to consider the strong locality
3 boundary between Oakleigh East and Mount Waverley along
4 Ferntree Gully Road. And then its eastern boundary along
5 Clayton Road.

6 This change, together with our suggested change in
7 Burwood East, would mean these communities are better
8 aligned within their respective divisions. And in
9 considering the boundary between Kooyong, Chisholm and
10 Higgins, the Liberal Party notes that an alternative
11 would suggest to transfer a different part of Higgins to
12 Kooyong and reiterates its view that such a transfer
13 would be less optimal in the line of communities of
14 interest and what was proposed. Similarly, the ALP
15 proposal in their objection, limiting the suggestion that
16 part of Surrey Hills be transferred from Chisholm
17 instead, will lead to a significantly worse outcome in
18 the line of communities between these divisions.

19 The transfer of electors in Glen Iris, which is a part
20 of Boroondara LGA, like most of Kooyong, is far superior
21 to transferring electors from the Whitehorse LGA in
22 Surrey Hills. Finally, the Liberal Party reiterates its
23 support for the proposed boundary between Wannon and
24 Tucker/Corangamite. The Redistribution Committee got the
25 divide right between the suburban Greater Geelong region
26 and the hinterland around it. The ALP's objection to
27 transferring Anglesea to Wannon will detract from the
28 creation of a clearly defined Division that incorporates
29 the growth corridors in and surrounding Geelong, and
30 transferring the hinterland to the west of Geelong to the
31 divisions of Ballarat and Wannon. Anglesea's a coastal

1 town community on the Great Ocean Road that shares more
2 in common demographically with the towns to its west,
3 including Wannon and Apollo Bay, than it does with the
4 burgeoning housing estates in and around Torquay.

5 In conclusion, the Liberal Party raised a number of
6 objections in its written submissions, due to the lack of
7 time today, it is not possible to go into any greater
8 detail. Needless to say, the Liberal Party's generally
9 supportive of the proposed boundaries. On behalf of the
10 Liberal Party, I would like to congratulate the
11 Redistribution Committee on its work and wish all the
12 Commissioners well in setting the boundaries of the
13 Commonwealth divisions in Victoria.

14 CHAIR: Thank you very much indeed Mr Wojtonis, that was very
15 helpful.

16 MR WOJTONIS: Thank you.

17 SECRETARIAT: I think we may have a phone call attendee that I
18 can call on. If this is Janelle Jordan, I'd like to
19 invite you to speak?

20 CHAIR: Ms Jordan. Ms Jordan are you there? Secretariat do
21 you want to see if she is there, in fact?

22 SECRETARIAT: Yes. We will try to connect with her as the next
23 speaker, but instead we might try and hear from - oh
24 wait?

25 MS JORDAN: Hello, hi.

26 SECRETARIAT: Hello. Hi is that Janelle?

27 MS JORDAN: I'm sorry it took a while. Yes it is.

28 SECRETARIAT: Excellent. We'd invite you to speak now.

29 MS JORDAN: Okay. Thank you. I actually just wanted to speak
30 in the interest of Moorabool Shire, of which there is a
31 town, river and reservoir that have the same name, so

1 it's a quaint and unbiased shire name. I like the idea,
2 prefer the idea, that a shire should signify an area, not
3 a political sway. I also think that the idea of Bacchus
4 Marsh being clumped with Sunbury and Melton is not the
5 best idea, they are much larger townships.

6 Bacchus Marsh will lose priorities to these two
7 metropolitan towns and, especially given the
8 circumstances that has happened the last 12 months with
9 COVID, Bacchus Marsh needs to remain a regional area.
10 The wealth is not there for the people and small business
11 owners to sustain. If they - they wouldn't survive
12 lockdowns as harsh as Greater Melbourne. They don't have
13 the density limits either, they don't have the density.

14 CHAIR: Is there anything further you want to add Ms Jordan,
15 that's very useful?

16 MS JORDAN: No, that's all, thank you.

17 CHAIR: Thank you very much indeed for your contribution.

18 MS JORDAN: Thank you.

19 SECRETARIAT: We might now call on Martin Shield to speak?

20 MR SHIELD: Good morning and thank you to Justice Kenny and the
21 augmented Committee for the opportunity to appear.
22 First, let me start by acknowledging the Dja Dja Wurrung
23 as the traditional owners of the country that I appear
24 from. And I'd like to recognise that their sovereignty
25 over this land was never ceded and pay respects to their
26 elders, past, present and emerging. I'd like to make a
27 couple of comments on the proposed boundaries of the
28 Divisions of Macnamara and Higgins, and first just to
29 commend the Commission on the evidence-based choice of
30 boundaries in this area.

31 I think the choices made reflect the many submissions

1 that pointed out the benefits of those changes and I'll
2 rely on those written submissions, and I'll try not to
3 repeat them too much here. There've been a number of
4 comments and objections to the changes proposed. On my
5 count, they split about 50:50. I think it's pretty clear
6 that this is a hot topic because of its political
7 significance and that the Commission obviously needs to
8 look past that and concentrate on the underlying facts,
9 that are relevant to the redistribution.

10 And so, it's to that end that I'd like to make a
11 couple of points. So, first on the physical features of
12 the area, I think the Commission has it right with the
13 proposed boundaries. The proposed division of Macnamara
14 is centred around some inner urban suburbs and they're
15 defined uniquely in their character by their position
16 wedged between the CBD and the bay. And they share much
17 more in common with each other than with more suburban
18 suburbs which make up the new Division of the proposed
19 Division of Higgins. On means of communication and
20 travel again, I think the Commission has it right.

21 Dandenong Road is not a hard boundary, it's not a
22 river, lacking in river crossings, it's not a freeway
23 with kilometres of concrete where nobody can get across,
24 in fact it's a tree-lined road with a median strip.
25 Pedestrians regularly cross it, it has a tram running
26 down the middle of it and thousands of people venture out
27 to the middle every day to catch that - catch that tram,
28 despite the submissions to the contrary from the ALP, the
29 Greens have noted several school boundaries and school
30 catchments cross that road and residents cross the road
31 every day to get to and from school and many other

1 activities.

2 On communities of interest, again, the Commission has
3 it right, you've heard a submission already on the
4 important LGBTIQ+ community concentrated through South
5 Yarra, Prahran, Windsor, St Kilda et cetera, which is now
6 much more better reflected within the electorate of
7 Macnamara. And you've also seen the evidence that we
8 presented and heard from others about the way the Jewish
9 community is actually now better captured within the
10 electorate of Higgins than it was previously within the
11 electorate of Macnamara.

12 I think the Jewish community obviously is an important
13 community of interest in the inner south and so I'd like
14 to spend a bit more time making some comments on that. I
15 think that there's a misconception reflected in some of
16 the objections about where the Jewish population is, and
17 where their institutions are located. Obviously, the
18 Commission will have to apply some scepticism to some of
19 the other submissions that are motivated to ignore the
20 facts, or that would like you to take into account
21 historic, rather than contemporary populations.

22 I think it's very clear in the Act that the
23 communities of interest to which the Commission needs to
24 give consideration are contemporary communities.
25 Obviously, there were ethnic and religious groups that
26 settled in you know, inner suburbs in the nineteenth and
27 twentieth centuries, and that those suburbs have
28 radically transformed since those periods. So, it would
29 make no sense to use that as the basis for drawing
30 electorate boundaries.

31 So where are the contemporary Jewish communities in

1 the southern suburbs of Melbourne? This is a question
2 that can just be simply be answered based on available
3 Census data. If you look at the data and we've put the
4 raw numbers into our submission, but under the current
5 boundaries, 70 - of the Jewish community and distributed
6 across these two seats, under the current boundaries,
7 73 per cent is one seat and 27 per cent's in another.
8 Under the proposed boundaries you get 83 per cent within
9 one of the seats and 17 per cent within the other. So,
10 if the Commission is minded to try and form electorate
11 boundaries in a way that will maximise the representation
12 of a Jewish community of interest, the proposed
13 boundaries will do that much more - much more effectively
14 than the old boundaries did.

15 There's just - that's just the hard facts. Again, the
16 Eruv has been raised. A greater proportion of the
17 existing Eruv is contained, well it would be contained
18 within the new, the proposed boundaries of Higgins, than
19 is contained within the existing boundaries of Macnamara.
20 So again, the facts simply don't support that as a reason
21 to revert to the old boundaries, in fact, the facts would
22 suggest that the Commission's proposed boundaries for
23 Higgins, do a better job of capturing this community.

24 So, wherever electoral boundaries are drawn, they
25 clearly will run through some elements of the Jewish
26 community of interest, it's not possible to create a
27 single electorate large enough to completely encompass
28 that community. I think, one thing to be very cautious
29 of, is any suggestion that the Commission should
30 preference some members of that community over others, in
31 setting those electoral boundaries. The Commission

1 simply can't be called on to judge that certain sections
2 of that community are more important or certain
3 institutions more important than others. The Commission,
4 I submit, should look at the hard facts, and if it's
5 minded to try and create boundaries that encompass the
6 Jewish community of interest, the proposed boundaries do
7 that most effectively. Thank you.

8 CHAIR: Thank you very much Mr Shield, we appreciate your
9 contribution today. Is there another speaker?

10 SECRETARIAT: There is another speaker, just before we invite
11 them, I might just remind any phone call attendees, that
12 if they do wish to speak they can use the raise hand
13 function by pressing star six on their keypad, that's
14 star six on the keypad if they wish to speak, any phone
15 call attendees. Otherwise for all our Zoom attendees,
16 you should have a raise hand button available to you if
17 you do wish to speak and haven't spoken already. But now
18 I'll now invite Shane Easson to speak.

19 CHAIR: Mr Easson. Mr Easson are you there?

20 MR EASSON: Yeah, can you hear me now?

21 CHAIR: I can, very well.

22 MR EASSON: Right, thank you. I'm appearing on behalf of the
23 ALP together with Cameron Petrie. Firstly, I just, given
24 the limited time, I want to talk if possible about
25 Macnamara/Higgins, the Tucker seat and other parts of the
26 south-east. Firstly, I'd like to thank Nicole Taylor
27 from the AEC for the help that she's given us, and no
28 doubt others, over this redistribution and in my case
29 over several.

30 Turning to Macnamara it should be noted that there's a
31 significant difference between the concentration of

1 social housing in the inner northern suburbs and the
2 inner southern suburbs. So, for example, in the Division
3 of Melbourne, the proportion of households with social
4 housing range from 12 per cent in both Carlton and
5 Richmond, to 26 per cent in Collingwood. In your
6 proposed seat of Maribyrnong, 29 per cent of households
7 in Flemington are social housing. In Kensington, which
8 is proposed to be added, that's 11 per cent. Now had the
9 Committee wanted to concentrate households from social
10 housing in the seat of Maribyrnong, they wouldn't have
11 removed the suburb of Maidstone, and in fact, they
12 would've added to Maidstone. Maidstone's got 10 per cent
13 of households with social housing, they would've added
14 Braybrook, which has got 17 per cent, Footscray which has
15 got 8 per cent of households with social housing.
16 Remember that Melbourne, the average of households in
17 social housing is 2.6 per cent.

18 When we're talking about the Labor Party appeal, we're
19 dealing with three suburbs, Prahran with 4.5 per cent of
20 households in social housing, South Yarra 5.3 per cent,
21 and Windsor 5.1 per cent, only a little over twice the
22 Melbourne average, but considerably less than those in
23 the northern suburbs of inner Melbourne. Now, in 1997
24 and 2010, the Redistribution Committee proposed that the
25 Caulfield suburb be transferred from the then seat of
26 Melbourne Ports, now called Macnamara, to Higgins, with
27 corresponding transfers from Higgins.

28 In both those cases, the proposals were reversed by
29 the augmented Commission. Now we've got to remember,
30 that the justification made by the Redistribution
31 Committee on this occasion, to change the boundary for

1 Macnamara/Higgins, was based on the social housing
2 argument. And as we've seen, by what I've exemplified, you
3 had one rule for Macnamara/Higgins, and a different rule
4 applied for Maribyrnong and Fraser. The only change
5 required to Macnamara to bring it within the future quota
6 would've been to restore to Higgins the suburb of
7 Windsor, which was only taken out at the last
8 redistribution and placed into Macnamara, that was the
9 only change required. Instead, the Redistribution
10 Committee applied a change of 44,600 current electors
11 between those two Divisions, an unnecessary change in our
12 view.

13 But turning to the seat of Tucker, we congratulate the
14 Redistribution Committee for its proposal to name a seat
15 after Margaret Tucker. If Tucker is adopted as a
16 Division name, it will be the first seat ever to be known
17 solely after an indigenous woman. However, we support
18 the retention of Corangamite as a name. We note that
19 it's a Federation name, we note that the suburb of
20 Kooyong, has not been in Kooyong since 1949, but
21 Maribyrnong, under your proposal has been removed from
22 the seat of Maribyrnong. So, we've got two places in
23 Victoria where suburbs have not been in that seat, being
24 Maribyrnong and Kooyong, and we've got the example - but
25 the names have been retained, we support that, but you're
26 removing the name of Corangamite, a Federation name.

27 Now, last time the augmented Commission decided to
28 retain the name of Corangamite, it noted that Corangamite
29 means bitter waters, and that name could be applied to
30 the mainly coastal suburbs which Corangamite represents.
31 We support that. However, we also believe that Tucker

1 should be retained as a name and we suggest or have
2 suggested Hotham or Gellibrand. Next time, let's face
3 it, there's a strong chance that Victoria will lose a
4 seat at the next redistribution, it's going to create
5 more of a problem for the south-east than the north or
6 west of Melbourne. So perhaps a better option for the
7 name of Tucker might be Gellibrand, and remember
8 Gellibrand was John Batman's lawyer at the so-called
9 Batman Treaties.

10 The last matter is concerning those seats in the
11 south-east, what we're talking about is Hotham, Isaacs,
12 Holt and La Trobe. Our argument is a restoring existing
13 boundaries type argument. As too, I might add, were the
14 Liberals' argument. The Liberal Party supports
15 Mulgrave ...

16 CHAIR: Mr Easson, I'm just going to interrupt you to ask, that
17 is I think the end of the seven minutes, are you very
18 nearly concluded?

19 MR EASSON: I beg your pardon?

20 CHAIR: Are you nearly concluded?

21 MR EASSON: Yes, yes, all right, I'll make one point, and
22 that's in regards to the suburb of Lyndhurst versus what
23 you propose or the Committee propose versus
24 South Dandenong. Lyndhurst has no people of the Islamic
25 religion or the country and so on. In the case of
26 Dandenong South, Islam is 33 per cent. In the case of
27 Lyndhurst, it's 2 per cent. These are very different
28 suburbs. Dandenong 27 per cent. Dandenong shared
29 between Bruce and Isaacs. So again, we're supporting the
30 point that Lyndhurst doesn't have a connection with
31 Isaacs, Dandenong and Dandenong South do. Sorry to take

1 so much time.

2 CHAIR: No, you've done very well indeed. And we're grateful
3 for what you've told us today, so thank you.

4 MR EASSON: Thank you.

5 SECRETARIAT: We have no further speakers listed, although
6 someone has just - a couple of people have just raised
7 their hands. So, I might just invite one of them to
8 speak. I'll invite Arjun Swaminathan to speak.

9 MR SWAMINATHAN: Hello can you hear me please?

10 CHAIR: We can hear you very well.

11 MR SWAMINATHAN: Thank you very much. I'd like to thank you
12 for giving me the opportunity to speak. I would also
13 like to pay my respects to the traditional owners of the
14 land that everybody here is on at the moment, and to
15 their leaders, past, present and emerging.

16 So, with regards to the proposed renaming of the seat
17 of Corangamite, in the name of Margaret Tucker. So, I
18 would like to point out that the Bonmarart Leewik Group
19 from Victoria University, this a project from Victoria
20 University about recognising Aboriginal Ancestry. I
21 noticed while looking on their website that they
22 mentioned that Margaret Tucker, her residence was in
23 Seddon, which is in the existing seat of Gellibrand, and
24 so because many people have raised that Margaret Tucker
25 did not have a great connection to the area covered by
26 Corangamite, and so perhaps, like there are no bad - it
27 is possible that the seat of Gellibrand instead could be
28 renamed in her favour, since she was a resident of that
29 area. And that's all I wanted to say, thank you.

30 CHAIR: Thank you very much indeed.

31 SECRETARIAT: We might just invite Cameron Petrie to speak.

1 MR PETRIE: Hello, can you hear me?

2 CHAIR: Yes, we can Mr Petrie.

3 MR PETRIE: Perfect, thank you Justice Kenny. I'd like to
4 start by thanking you for the opportunity to speak here
5 today and for all the work that you and your staff have
6 undertaken to produce the draft maps. Whilst we
7 certainly have some objections to the proposal,
8 overwhelmingly we think the draft maps are a really
9 fantastic piece of work - I'm sorry I can see my name is
10 coming up as ALP events. I ran an event with the Zoom
11 account on the weekend.

12 In my discussion today, I'd like to specifically speak
13 about the interface between the Divisions of Chisholm,
14 Menzies and Deakin. And specifically, to support our
15 objection to the southern boundary of the proposed
16 division of Menzies coming down to Whitehorse Road. Our
17 objection to this is not so much the split of the suburb
18 of Box Hill and also the split of the suburb, parts of
19 Box Hill from Box Hill North, it's more the - we don't
20 object to that so much, as you can see in our proposal
21 that these be transferred from Chisholm to Deakin, rather
22 than Chisholm to Menzies.

23 Our objection is that the Koonung Creek and the
24 Eastern Freeway, the boundary of those - for the Division
25 of Menzies is so physically strong and so recognisable to
26 the community, that the boundary of that Division ought
27 not be shifted further south from where it currently is,
28 particularly in this part of Melbourne. Additionally,
29 the transport links in that part of eastern Melbourne run
30 predominantly east-west, and these connections are
31 significantly stronger than the north-south connections

1 upon which the proposed Division of Menzies will be
2 anchored in this part of Box Hill. I'll also note at the
3 outset that I speak to our objection, not only as a party
4 official, but also as someone who grew up in Box Hill and
5 lived in that community for 23 years.

6 I'd like to start by providing the Committee with some
7 information about the scale of the physical barrier that
8 the Eastern Freeway represents and whilst it looks like
9 any other freeway in Melbourne on a map, we think it
10 certainly represents a big physical barrier for
11 communities. This information adds to the information
12 that's contained within our written objection and seeks
13 to highlight the extent to which it's a big barrier. And
14 at the outset I'd like to state that I use the terms
15 Koonung Creek and the Eastern Freeway interchangeably,
16 given that for most intents and purposes in this part of
17 Melbourne, they are the same boundary.

18 There are many cases where the boundary crosses the
19 Eastern Freeway, particularly in the Division of Kooyong,
20 but in all of one case, these boundaries follow nearby
21 rivers and involve no transfers of electors. The sole
22 exception is the very neat community of Willsmere Park in
23 east Kew where the sole road link to the wider world is a
24 bridge over the Eastern Freeway. I'd like to turn to the
25 fact that this proposal is the first time that a boundary
26 is proposed to cross the Eastern Freeway, west of
27 Springvale Road, since at least the 2002 redistribution
28 on my - on my research.

29 I'd bring up Springvale Road as the Eastern Freeway
30 goes into a tunnel and turns southward after this road
31 and therefore the Freeway becomes a lot less of a

1 boundary east of Springvale Road. Commissioners have
2 acknowledged that the Eastern Freeway is a significant
3 community boundary, since at least the
4 2002 redistribution. I'd raise this timeframe as the
5 north-east link project that is currently underway will
6 only add to the size of the Eastern Freeway as a
7 community boundary.

8 It will also facilitate further east-west transit,
9 which would mean that transport arteries in our proposed
10 Division of Deakin under our objection would be stronger
11 and would enhance that proposal we believe. I'd also
12 like to bring up the lack of road links between the
13 proposed northern and southern portions of Menzies,
14 between, in that, speaking specifically in that part of
15 the world, between Menzies and the current Division of
16 Chisholm.

17 Between the current Divisions of Menzies and Chisholm,
18 there are only five road links, including the two
19 boundaries, Elgar Road and Springvale Road. This is just
20 over a 5.3 kilometre distance. Whilst this sounds
21 sufficient, a closer analysis shows that there are more
22 road links between communities that the Commission would
23 never consider uniting, due to other physical barriers,
24 compared to this section of the Eastern Freeway. There
25 are five road crossings at the Yarra River in the shorter
26 space between the Divisions of Macnamara and Melbourne,
27 and this excludes Freeway crossings, and four in a
28 shorter span between the Divisions of Kooyong and
29 Melbourne. And speaking now as a resident of Hawthorn
30 West, I can say I have far more in common with the - my
31 brothers and sisters in Richmond, than as a resident of

1 Box Hill I would have to the north of Doncaster and a big
2 part of that is those transport links.

3 And there are similar densities of bridge crossings
4 between the Merri - of the Merri Creek between the
5 Divisions of Cooper and Wills. In calling attention to
6 the physical bulk and long standing of the Eastern
7 Freeway as a boundary, we'd like to call out Charles
8 Richardson's objection to the proposed boundaries, and
9 the fact that the City of Maroondah boundaries have
10 significantly less precedential weight behind them which
11 reflects their recognisability in the community.

12 Turning to community boundaries, the bulk and
13 recognisability of the Freeway, has been used at all
14 levels of government, state and local, in their
15 boundaries. I raise this point, not only to emphasise
16 the bulk, but also to bring up the significant
17 communities of interest that form around those
18 boundaries, particularly local government boundaries.
19 Our other submissions have objected to, at various
20 points, the splitting of LGA's across three Divisions.

21 And I note that the Liberal Party this morning
22 objected to the City of Glen Eira being split across
23 three Divisions, while the current proposal, the current
24 draft maps had the City of Whitehorse spread across four
25 Divisions, which is certainly a big split.

26 And speaking of LGA boundaries, I'll turn very briefly
27 to the Liberal Party suggestion to unite Burwood East in
28 Chisholm. We have no objection to this but, as a result
29 of the adjustment Chisholm would need to lose voters, we
30 think the best way to do this is to unite the suburb of
31 Surrey Hills in Kooyong, given that the Division of

1 Kooyong already contains a portion of the Whitehorse LGA,
2 and using this boundary would create an easily
3 recognisable boundary along Elwood and Riversdale Roads.

4 The bulk of the Eastern Freeway is also reflected in
5 primary school zones in this part of Melbourne. Box Hill
6 North Primary and Kerrimuir Primary have only small
7 portions that cross the Eastern Freeway. And Old Orchard
8 Primary School and Whitehorse Primary east of
9 Middleborough Road, that's still west of Springvale Road,
10 actually use the Eastern Freeway itself as the boundary.
11 The school zones then begin to cross the Freeway, when it
12 becomes a tunnel and then they move further south from
13 that point. I emphasise this as I bring up Norwood and
14 Melba Secondary Colleges, which unite the suburbs of Park
15 Orchards and Ringwood North and Warranwood, Croydon Hills
16 and Croydon respectively.

17 We believe that these suburbs have a greater
18 connection to the suburbs of Donvale and Warrandyte than
19 to Blackburn, and would suggest that if Menzies had to
20 move south it should be to the east of the Freeway.
21 Indeed, we also note our objection to Warranwood moving
22 into Deakin, and as we believe that this has a - this
23 community has a closer link and community of interest to
24 other communities such as Warrandyte and Donvale, further
25 to the north. Thank you.

26 CHAIR: Now, I'm very sorry Mr Petrie, are you just about
27 finished?

28 MR PETRIE: I was very briefly going to raise the strong east-
29 west transit links represented by the Freeway and the
30 Belgrave-Lilydale line compared to the - the only public
31 transport routes going north-south, are bus routes, but

1 I'll leave it there.

2 CHAIR: Well do you - you could - if you can do it in two
3 minutes, you may have that time?

4 MR PETRIE: Sure. So there are hundreds and thousands of trips
5 every day taken on the, I think, shouldn't say hundreds
6 of thousands, but almost a hundred thousand trips taken
7 on the Belgrave-Lilydale line which represents, I guess,
8 the trunk of these communities and would represent the
9 key trunk of our proposed Division of Deakin. If you
10 look at the north-south connections, it's really
11 predominantly the 903 bus which runs every 20 minutes and
12 can only - it only has a capacity of 100 or so people on
13 it. That would be the main link between Doncaster and
14 Box Hill under the proposal. We think that both the
15 Eastern Freeway and - Eastern Freeway, Whitehorse Road
16 and the Belgrave-Lilydale line, represent a significantly
17 greater trunk in our proposed Division of Deakin than the
18 proposed boundaries represent links between those
19 communities using those transport links. I'll leave it
20 at that.

21 CHAIR: Thank you very much indeed.

22 MR PETRIE: Thank you so much.

23 SECRETARIAT: We don't have any further speakers, who have
24 indicated they wish to speak unless anyone wants to use
25 the raise hand function. I believe I just saw one pop
26 up, if you just give me one moment? I think we might
27 invite Yaron Gottlieb to speak, I think they have
28 something to say?

29 CHAIR: Mr Gottlieb.

30 MR GOTTLIEB: Yes, hello. Yes, thank you for the opportunity
31 to address the - address this issue. I won't take up too

1 much time, there was just a couple of issues that I
2 wanted to bring up, in addition to my submission that I
3 put in with regards to the Jewish community is just an -
4 sort of a broad explanation on the Jewish community. So
5 just I guess, I'm pretty sure you can guess that I'm
6 talking about the Macnamara/Higgins issue, but I should
7 clarify that.

8 But I'll just go through, there's three general points
9 that I want to make. So the first point that I want to
10 make is, just to have a look at the - is just to have a
11 look at the map that - or from what I can gather, the map
12 that the ALP has put in for the State redistributions,
13 for the electorate of Caulfield, and they're from what
14 I've seen, that they've actually managed, that they've
15 basically drawn a line down and cut-off sections of what
16 they consider the Jewish community.

17 They've actually got Hotham Street, north of Inkerman
18 Road, as acting as the boundary there. So, they're not
19 overly concerned about uniting that section of the Jewish
20 community and, in that instance, they've actually
21 included Elwood and excised that section of East St Kilda
22 to the west of Hotham Street. So, there's just a bit of
23 a, yeah, not really consistent, so I'd just thought I
24 would bring that to your attention.

25 The second point is, when we're discussing the Jewish
26 community, a lot of people are talking about it as one
27 unified community, whereas it's numerous communities
28 living in geographically the same area. So, you've got
29 for example a Chabad community, the ultra-Orthodox Adass
30 community, a sort of religious Zionist community and, for
31 various reasons, they're all living in the same

1 geographic area. And the reason I'm bringing that up is
2 to give just sort of a brief explanation that I have
3 studied Rabbinic studies to a reasonable extent and just
4 to bring up the point about the Eruv.

5 Now the Eruv is only required for Orthodox Jews to
6 carry on Saturday. And not for any other reason. [Sorry
7 I'll be there in a second love] sorry, home schooling.
8 As well as this, so what has happened is that Orthodox
9 Jews are not permitted to, or according to Jewish law
10 you're not allowed to carry on Saturday. And what the
11 Eruv does, is the Eruv is basically a large boundary that
12 creates one unified region where you are allowed to carry
13 outside. This is only for the Orthodox community which
14 is a minority of the Jewish community, and you know, you
15 can find the boundaries online. But it's - the northern
16 boundary is Dandenong Road. The reason is not because
17 the Jewish community doesn't exist north of Dandenong
18 Road, but because of issues within Jewish legal law. I
19 suppose that Dandenong Road is just too - has unique
20 properties as the - part of the number one highway, it
21 has unique legal properties where they're struggling to
22 cross it.

23 So, it's not that the Jewish community is divided
24 there, it's just that there is a legal problem within the
25 Jewish legal code of crossing Dandenong Road. And again
26 this only affects the Orthodox community not the - not
27 the rest of the community who will have no issue with
28 carrying, and there's also even within the Orthodox
29 community certain individuals or certain groups that
30 don't fully accept the binding nature of the Eruv. For
31 example, the Chabad community who, and I'm not sure

1 about, I'd ask but, but the Chabad community definitely
2 do not universally accept the binding nature of the Eruv
3 as yeah, as binding.

4 So, I just wanted to sort of bring up that, those two
5 points mostly, well there was two or three points, but I
6 just wanted to bring those up, by way of clarification
7 and in extension of my own submission, that hopefully
8 gives the Commission a bit more of an understanding of
9 the issue.

10 CHAIR: And thank you very much indeed.

11 SECRETARIAT: I can see we've just got a new phone call, a
12 phone call attendee here, would you mind if I just ask if
13 they could state their name and if they did wish to say
14 anything? I'll just invite them to speak now. No,
15 they've disappeared. So, if the augmented Electoral
16 Commission is agreeable, we might wait until midday, to
17 see if there's any further speakers who do wish to speak,
18 or if we receive any statements to be read in, if that's
19 okay with the Commission.

20 CHAIR: Yes, I think that would be very sensible, I think
21 everybody's in agreement?

22 SECRETARIAT: Excellent. In that case, yes, we'll just wait
23 and participants are invited if they haven't - are
24 reminded that if they haven't already spoken they can use
25 the raised hand function to indicate they wish to speak
26 and if they're a phone call attendee, they can press star
27 six on their keypad to indicate that. But we will be
28 waiting until midday for any further speakers if people
29 do wish to make a contribution.

30 SECRETARIAT: It looks like we do have someone who's just
31 indicated they wish to speak, so if everyone's ready,

1 I'll just invite Dean Sherr to talk to the Commission.

2 CHAIR: Thank you very much. Mr Sherr.

3 MR SHERR: Hi, can you hear me?

4 CHAIR: Yes, very well indeed.

5 MR SHERR: Great, my name's Dean Sherr. I'm a resident of
6 Macnamara. I'm also an Electorate Officer for Josh
7 Burns, and I've worked in the electorate offices of - in
8 Macnamara, the previous Melbourne Ports and also for a
9 State MP in the Southern Metropolitan Regions. So, I've
10 worked in this community for a number of years. So I just
11 wanted to, I guess, add my thoughts, having been
12 listening with interest to some of the arguments that
13 have been made.

14 And just to sort of reiterate that I think the
15 question of - this is in regards to the boundaries of
16 Macnamara and Higgins, just to reiterate I think Yaron
17 Gottlieb before was talking about the fact that the
18 Jewish community exists on either side of Dandenong Road
19 and that's undoubtedly true. But I think the question is
20 not merely of the number of the Jewish community, it's of
21 where the Jewish community, you know, what are the actual
22 continuous communities of interest.

23 And as Yaron said, some of the institutions, the
24 Orthodox institutions that are most directly impacted
25 here, the Adass community, the Chabad community, the
26 St Kilda Shore Orthodox Synagogue who'd made submissions,
27 these are the ones that lie on both sides of Hotham
28 Street. These are the ones that are most directly
29 impacted by this. So, you have a situation where you
30 have schools and synagogues on either side of Hotham
31 Street, people living on either side of Hotham Street,

1 but essentially be in different electorates. You have
2 these very small communities that are engaged with
3 politics in a - in a - you know a much more disparate
4 way, you know, they're not as connected to the broader
5 political world, you know, so they really benefit from
6 having a single voice, having a - being able to represent
7 their community inside one Division.

8 And it's also I think, with I think Mark Dreyfus
9 referred to the congruence, you know the sort of
10 continuousness. I think for these people being
11 redistributed is disruptive and for all people I think
12 being redistributed is disruptive. I would personally
13 sort of submit, having, you know, worked with
14 constituents for a long time, I think it's important to
15 give people the opportunity of continuous representation,
16 where it is at all possible. And I think in this case it
17 is possible because, as it's been noted, the surplus of
18 voters in Macnamara that will take it above quota is very
19 small.

20 I think the most, least destructive solution in this
21 case, is the best solution, and giving people the
22 opportunity for continuity of representation. It also
23 means for electorate officers, you know, we deal with
24 community groups, we deal with constituents so often, we
25 develop relationships with them, to tell people who've
26 been in one electorate for the last say, 20 years, we're
27 going to move you, you know, that - that creates
28 challenges for the constituents, it creates challenges
29 for the community groups, and it also creates challenges
30 for the electorate officers and the MPs.

31 It forces them to develop new relationships, to do new

1 outreach, it forces the Electoral Commission and
2 parliamentarians to communicate with constituents,
3 'you're in a new electorate now, you're voting in a new
4 electorate'. And of course, you know, where it has to be
5 done, it has to be done. Where there's a significant
6 surplus or, you know, where an electorate significantly
7 below the quota, it's an undesirable but necessary I
8 guess, thing to do. But in this case, it's not
9 necessary.

10 Continuity of representation and continuity of the
11 relationship between parliamentarians and community
12 members can be achieved by making a minimalist you know,
13 change to revert to the boundaries that were in existence
14 before 2019, where Windsor is returned to Higgins. And
15 that also creates greater continuity of, I know the
16 Liberal Party noted that there would be more - fewer
17 electorates that the City of Glen Eira would be in, with
18 this proposed redistribution, but on the flip side it
19 would divide the City of Port Phillip between two
20 electorates for the first time in many decades at least,
21 that I'm aware of. It would divide the City of
22 Stonnington into two electorates, where it could easily
23 be united within one.

24 The City of Port Phillip can easily be united within
25 Macnamara, the City of Stonnington can easily be united
26 within the electorate of Higgins, so I think that there
27 is greater continuity for people for Local Government
28 Areas, and it does create, as I said, a more, you know,
29 it unites particular communities of interest, inside the
30 Jewish community. It is not to say that, you know, one
31 electorate should have the most number of Jewish people

1 in it, I don't think that's at all the argument that I'm
2 making, or that others are making.

3 But it is simply to unite particular communities that
4 exist, that would be divided by this boundary, that are
5 sort of centred on both sides of Hotham Street, not north
6 and south of Dandenong Road, which, as it's been noted,
7 is an extension of the Princes Highway, it's one of the
8 most significant arterial roads in the south-east of
9 Melbourne. And of course, you know, all roads can be
10 crossed, but you know, clearly if you're looking for what
11 are the most significant roads in this area, they would
12 really be Punt Road for the north-south and Dandenong
13 Road for the east-west.

14 So, as I said, I think there a number of arguments
15 that can be made and there have been a number of
16 arguments made on both sides. Some people have suggested
17 that, given the sort of split of opinion in this case,
18 that you Commissioners should stick with the original
19 proposal. I would argue you should stick with the
20 proposal that is the least disruptive to people, the
21 least disruptive to communities and the least disruptive
22 to the relationship between electorate officers, MPs and
23 their constituents, and I think I'll leave it at that,
24 thank you.

25 CHAIR: Thank you very much Mr Sherr.

26 SECRETARIAT: We don't appear to have any further speakers, so
27 I'll divert to the Chair on how you want to proceed.

28 CHAIR: Well, I think probably, if there are no further
29 speakers, we should conclude this hearing and we do thank
30 everyone for attending and particularly those who've made
31 presentations this morning, all of which have been very

1 helpful and we appreciate them. We will adjourn and
2 continue our deliberations. Very well.

3 SECRETARIAT: Thanks very much. I will now end the meeting
4 thank you all for attending.

5 *****

6 SECRETARIAT: Good morning and welcome to the inquiry of the
7 augmented Electoral Commission for Victoria. Before the
8 inquiry formally begins, I will quickly go over some
9 housekeeping to ensure that everyone understands how the
10 event will proceed. Please note that your camera and
11 microphone will be turned off throughout the inquiry
12 unless it is your turn to speak, at which point you can
13 turn your microphone on.

14 At no point during the inquiry will you be visible to
15 the members of the augmented Electoral Commission or to
16 other attendees. If you are speaking, your name and
17 profile picture, if you have one, will be visible to all
18 attendees. You will not be able to share your screen
19 while speaking. If you have indicated that you would
20 like to speak at the inquiry you will receive a message
21 via Zoom's chat function before it is your turn, to
22 confirm that you are ready.

23 Each individual speaker has a maximum of seven minutes
24 speaking time. A sound will play when you have one
25 minute left. Please ensure you keep to the time limit as
26 you may be muted after seven minutes unless the Chair
27 permits you to speak for more time. If you are
28 experiencing any difficulties, you can call 02 6113 4788.
29 This phone number will also be placed in Zoom's chat
30 function and can also be found in the guidance material
31 for the inquiry on the AEC's website.

1 If the members of the augmented Electoral Commission
2 have difficulty understanding you when you are speaking
3 due to an unstable internet connection, you may be asked
4 to call into the inquiry by phone and conclude your
5 remarks later in the order of speakers. Please note that
6 this inquiry is being recorded and a transcript of the
7 proceedings will be published online. I now invite the
8 Chair to formally begin the inquiry.

9 CHAIR: Good afternoon everyone. Welcome to the resumed
10 hearing of the augmented Electoral Commission for
11 Victoria. I would like to begin by acknowledging the
12 traditional owners and custodians of all the lands on
13 which we meet today and pay my respects to their elders
14 both past and present. I am Susan Kenny and the
15 Chairperson of this augmented Electoral Commission. As I
16 introduce the members, they will wave so that you can see
17 who they are. The other members of the Australian
18 Electoral Commission are Dr David Gruen, the Australian
19 Statistician, and Mr Tom Rogers the Australian Electoral
20 Commissioner. The other members who make up the
21 augmented Commission are Mr Andrew Greaves, the
22 Auditor-General for Victoria, Mr Craig Sandy, the
23 Surveyor-General for Victoria, and Mr Aneurin Coffey,
24 Australian Electoral Officer for Victoria.

25 I would remind you of a number of things. The first
26 is that Part IV of the *Commonwealth Electoral Act 1918*
27 sets out the requirements to be followed in conducting
28 redistributions. This redistribution is required because
29 Victoria's entitlement to members of the House of
30 Representatives has increased from 38 to 39.

31 In accordance with section 66 of the Electoral Act,

1 the Redistribution Committee for Victoria has prepared a
2 proposal for the redistribution of Victoria into
3 39 electoral divisions. The proposal, together with the
4 written reasons for the proposal required by section 67
5 of the Electoral Act, was released by the Redistribution
6 Committee on 19 March this year. In accordance with
7 section 68 of the Electoral Act, interested individuals
8 and organisations were invited to make written objections
9 to the proposed redistribution and to provide written
10 comments on those objections. A total of 67 objections
11 and 53 comments on objections were received within the
12 required timeframes.

13 The augmented Electoral Commission is required by
14 sub-section 72(1) of the Electoral Act to consider all
15 objections lodged in relation to the redistribution
16 proposal, and all comments on objections. The public
17 inquiry conducted by the augmented Electoral Commission
18 is designed to give the public the opportunity to make
19 submissions about those objections. This session of the
20 inquiry will hear from attendees who registered prior to
21 Monday's session, but due to administrative issues with
22 the session, weren't able to participate.

23 The Electoral Act specifies how the redistribution
24 process is to be conducted and which factors are to be
25 taken into account. Sub-section 73(4) of the Act states
26 that the primary consideration for the augmented
27 Electoral Commission is that each electoral division meet
28 certain numerical requirements in the form of the
29 redistribution quota and the projected enrolment quota,
30 subject to acceptable tolerances around these two quotas.

31 Subject to an electoral division satisfying these

1 numbers, sub-section 73(4) also requires that we have
2 regard to communities of interest within electoral
3 divisions, which include economic, social and regional
4 interests. We also need to have regard to means of
5 communication and travel within electoral divisions and
6 the physical features and areas of electoral divisions.
7 The boundaries of existing electoral divisions are also
8 considered but are subordinate to other factors. Of
9 course, the boundaries may change and often there is a
10 need for compensating adjustments to make sure the
11 electoral divisions are within the required numerical
12 tolerances.

13 I would remind you that the hearing today will be
14 recorded. Transcripts of proceedings will be made
15 available as part of the augmented Electoral Commission's
16 report, and will be on the Australian Electoral
17 Commission's website, once the report has been tabled in
18 Parliament.

19 I would also like to note that we may have some
20 members of the media listening today. Should any members
21 of the media have a question, I would ask them to speak
22 to the AEC media team whose contact details are available
23 on the AEC website.

24 When a speaker is invited to make a presentation, we
25 would remind that speaker to unmute yourself, and also
26 please state your name before you commence. We would
27 like to ensure that all those present are able to make
28 submissions if they wish, in this case I think there are
29 four people who were in the group that were unable to
30 participate last time, although they had registered.

31 We would like to ensure that all - to enable everyone

1 to be given this opportunity, we would ask you that you
2 keep your remarks to no more than seven minutes. A bell
3 will sound at the six-minute mark. Subject to timing
4 there may be an opportunity to provide further remarks
5 once everyone has had a chance to speak. Alternatively,
6 if you wish to complete your presentation by a minute or
7 so, you might indicate to me that you would like to do
8 so.

9 I would emphasise that this is an opportunity to
10 present new arguments and materials, not simply to read
11 out aloud your objection or comment on objection. I can
12 assure you that these have been read carefully and
13 thoroughly by us, and of course are publicly available on
14 the AEC website. After the inquiry, we will deliberate
15 on what we've heard and received, and we will endeavour
16 to make a public announcement as soon as practicable. I
17 would like to invite the first speaker to make their
18 presentation, unmuting first and stating your name for
19 the record before commencing your remarks.

20 SECRETARIAT: I will now invite Sarah Henderson to speak to the
21 Commission.

22 CHAIR: Good morning Senator.

23 SENATOR HENDERSON: Chair, good afternoon here and to the
24 Commissioner and to other members of the augmented
25 Commission, thank you very much for providing me with
26 this opportunity to present to you today. I too, would
27 like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land
28 and pay my respects to elders past, present and emerging.
29 My name is Sarah Henderson, I am a Victorian Liberal
30 Senator. Thank you for allowing me to make some further
31 points, and I wish to make representations to you in

1 relation to the Liberal Party's objection to the renaming
2 of Corangamite.

3 Chair, you may have seen on the 7th of June, I
4 provided you with an email, which set out in summary
5 form, four reasons for my objections. And I just hope
6 that they can be incorporated into my submission to you.
7 But just to paraphrase my email, the first basis is that
8 the word Tucker is a non-indigenous name and it's not
9 appropriate that such a word replace the indigenous word
10 Corangamite, which of course is a Federation seat.

11 Given its great historical and social significance,
12 and this does not reflect in any way on the wonderful
13 person who Mrs Tucker was and how highly respected she
14 was as a member of the indigenous community. So, my
15 objection does not in any way reflect on the magnificent
16 woman that she was. But very briefly, Mrs Tucker had
17 very limited connection with the Corangamite electorate
18 being from the Yorta Yorta region.

19 My third point is, that the adoption of the - of a
20 federal division by the name of Tucker gives rise to the
21 risk that this name can and will be manipulated into an
22 obscenity, and I have explained the basis on which I'm
23 particularly concerned. But because of the fact that so
24 much signage and billboards are used in the context of a
25 federal election campaign, and I'm particularly concerned
26 that the manipulation of the word Tucker, by using a
27 horizontal stroke on the word 'T' and I won't - don't
28 need to explain what that can become, it can very easily
29 give rise to bringing both the member of Parliament
30 running for the seat and also other candidates into
31 disrepute.

1 So, in addition to those points that I made in my
2 email, I just would like to raise a couple of other
3 associated points. Members of the augmented Commission,
4 it's not easy being a woman in politics, and I would ask
5 you to look at what's happened to Nicolle Flint, the
6 Member for Boothby who has left politics, who has
7 retired, principally because of the way that she has -
8 was treated running for a marginal seat, confronting the
9 worst possible behaviour that you could envisage.

10 So, I think that together we have a joint
11 responsibility to ensure that we don't place any
12 additional barriers in front of women running for
13 politics. And this is also an issue that relates to men,
14 but I think you would agree that if we had three or four
15 or 500 signs or bits of material around the electorate
16 leading up to election day, which were graffitied in a
17 very inappropriate way, obviously turning the word Tucker
18 into an obscenity, that this really does have a very big
19 impact on candidates running for election.

20 It brings the election process into disrepute, and I
21 think, given the ease by which the word Tucker can be
22 graffitied, I think it is highly likely that that will
23 occur. I too have confronted some very gruelling and
24 difficult tactics in the context of being a candidate in
25 a very hard fought and marginal seat, and I do implore
26 you to really consider the practical impacts that this
27 would have in the context of a hard-fought election
28 campaign.

29 I would not be raising this issue with you, if the
30 name was Brown or Smith or another name. But while I can
31 understand that this may not have been foreseeable when

1 this name was proposed, regrettably in the context of
2 modern day electioneering and campaigning, there is a
3 very, very high likelihood that this name will be brought
4 into disrepute, and of course the entire process in the
5 Corangamite electorate if it does become Tucker, by
6 reason of the use of this particular word.

7 The other point I'd like to make is, this is a joint
8 position, there's no politics here. The Liberal Party's
9 position is the same as the Labor Party and in fact it
10 will cost - it will save the Labor Party a lot of money
11 in - if there is no change in the word Corangamite, but
12 this is an issue above politics.

13 The third point that I want to make today, and I've
14 just got four points, is there is enormous emotional
15 attachment to the word Corangamite. There is something
16 very special about the word. We know, and I know you
17 understand how important this is to Aboriginal
18 communities in our region and throughout Victoria, but
19 for all electors in Corangamite and I would even say - go
20 as far as to say, for electors in Victoria, the
21 electorate of Corangamite and the word is a very special
22 word that has, where many people have a strong emotional
23 attachment to the name of the electorate.

24 The last point that I want to make, Commissioners, is
25 that the Corangamite electorate is a coastal electorate,
26 and when you decided at the last redistribution not to
27 change the name of the Corangamite division, you did so
28 by reason that this is an electorate surrounded by water
29 and so that the meaning of the word Corangamite which is
30 bitter or salty, it's an indigenous word of course,
31 applies just as much as it does this time in this

1 redistribution as it does in the last redistribution.

2 And so, I would strongly ask that you reflect on the
3 fact that the Commission made that decision, and that
4 those circumstances have not changed. We have an
5 incredibly significant coastal electorate surrounded by
6 water, and therefore the word Corangamite is just as
7 meaningful in this redistribution, as it was in the last
8 redistribution.

9 I want to thank you for this opportunity to make this
10 submission to you. I do very strongly and passionately,
11 with a great deal of emotional attachment myself, I do
12 ask that you do reconsider your position for the further
13 reasons that I have put forward to you today, and if you
14 would like to ask me any questions, I'd be very happy to
15 answer any questions.

16 CHAIR: Thank you Senator. I think I speak for all of us in
17 saying how grateful we are for your contribution today
18 and we will of course consider it very carefully indeed.

19 SENATOR HENDERSON: Thank you so much Chair, thank you
20 Commissioner and thank you to all Commissioners of the
21 augmented Commission.

22 CHAIR: Thank you.

23 SECRETARIAT: We will now invite Esther Caspi to speak.

24 CHAIR: Ms Caspi are you - can you hear me? I'm not sure if
25 Ms Caspi is there, Secretariat?

26 SECRETARIAT: No, we might try Esther again a bit later.

27 MR ROGERS: I think Esther, I've - we've just received a
28 message Chair saying Esther won't be speaking, from
29 Esther.

30 CHAIR: All right. Thank you very much

31 SECRETARIAT: Okay, in that case, I can invite the next

1 speaker. I'll invite Gila Schnapp to speak.

2 CHAIR: Ms Schnapp are you there, I hope? I'm not sure that
3 she can hear me either, Secretariat.

4 SECRETARIAT: I may just give her a moment, she did comment
5 earlier just asking about whether she would need to
6 unmute. So I think if she could just try pressing, I
7 think star nine, if there's not an obvious option to do
8 that? We might just hold for a couple of minutes, we
9 might try and get in contact with Gila, we don't have
10 another speaker lined up at the moment.

11 MR ROGERS: Secretariat, it might be - might be good if perhaps
12 Gila hung up and then you contacted her and put that in
13 train, that might be the best way of making that happen.

14 SECRETARIAT: I agree with that. Okay, I will - we'll just do
15 that now, so Gila, if you can hear us, if you can just
16 hang up and we'll give you a call, and we'll try and call
17 you in that way. We now have Gila Schnapp on the phone,
18 I'll just invite her to speak, and if the Chair could
19 just confirm that she's audible, that would be great. So
20 Gila, if you'd like to speak?

21 MS SCHNAPP: Thank you for - can you hear me?

22 CHAIR: I can hear you well Ms Schnapp.

23 MS SCHNAPP: Hello can you hear me?

24 CHAIR: Yes.

25 SECRETARIAT: Yes she - the Chair can hear you.

26 MS SCHNAPP: Okay. Thank you for hearing our presentation
27 today regarding the new federal electoral boundaries in
28 Victoria. Our presentation refers to adjacent land on
29 Ironbark Road and Pioneer Road in Diamond Creek, of which
30 we are either landowners, or stakeholders.

31 For some background, our family first purchased the

1 land in Diamond Creek in the 1940s and our extended
2 family were raised on the Ironbark Road property. Our
3 family all went to the local Diamond Creek Primary School
4 and took part in community activities in Diamond Creek.

5 All our businesses were in original Diamond Creek
6 suburb, that being Chute Street of the original town
7 centre. Our social life revolved around Diamond Creek
8 and its people. Given our history in the area, we would
9 like to bring your attention to why our properties and
10 the suburb of Diamond Creek should remain in the
11 electorate of Jagajaga and not in McEwan.

12 Placing our lands in McEwan is the wrong fit, given
13 our current and past standing as part of suburban
14 Melbourne, due to the following points. Our properties
15 sit within 25 kilometres of the central business district
16 and were in the original metropolitan Melbourne planning
17 boundary towards expansion. Our lands now, and
18 historically, had strictly urban interests, and are
19 connected to urban utility services and therefore, need
20 equivalent urban federal representation. Jagajaga is an
21 old growth inner suburban electorate within the capital
22 city of Melbourne with already established infrastructure
23 where we belong, whilst McEwan is a new growth rural
24 electorate and not part of original metropolitan
25 Melbourne.

26 We have no connection now, or in the past, with
27 McEwan, rural or central northern - sorry, we've no
28 connection now, or in the past, with McEwan, rural
29 northern or central Victoria or the City of Whittlesea,
30 Mernda, Doreen and et cetera. These were the hinterlands
31 of rural Victoria, not Diamond Creek, which has always

1 been part of metropolitan Melbourne. We had no identity
2 even with Wattle Glen, Hurstbridge, or the former Eltham
3 Shire.

4 The electorate of McEwan, and the green wedge
5 interests of northern Victoria, are a conflict of
6 interest with our lands. All our lands were planned for
7 growth and were included in the Plenty Growth Corridor
8 and do not now, or ever, belong to the green wedge. We
9 do not want to be part of Whittlesea, or McEwan new
10 growth, or new green wedge. This would be going
11 backwards for us. It would be more appropriate to keep
12 our lands combined with the city barriers of the City of
13 Banyule within Jagajaga as currently.

14 This must correspond to any changes to local municipal
15 boundaries. Our lands must not be gerried out of
16 Jagajaga or Diamond Creek. In 2018, the current Jagajaga
17 map, we are included in the suburb area - suburban areas
18 of Diamond Creek and Plenty, which adjoin the City of
19 Banyule. We believe this is the correct fit for our land
20 and the urban suburb of Diamond Creek. Our urban history
21 can be seen in the correct 1992 Federal State Boundary
22 Division map, showing our land as being in the urban
23 electorate of Greensborough, map one, for the Legislative
24 Assembly, together with the original inner Melbourne
25 suburbs, see map two.

26 Likewise, our Legislative Council representation was
27 Northern Metropolitan. This mistake was to transfer to
28 Northern Victoria in 2018, which we are also asking the
29 VEC to correct. We believe all of Diamond Creek must
30 stay together and not be divided into old and new growth
31 areas. See 1994 map showing the original Federal Diamond

1 Valley electorate. And the reference to that electorate
2 is the 1984 distribution of Victoria into electoral
3 boundaries.

4 CHAIR: Might I remind you.

5 MS SCHNAPP: We believe all of Diamond Creek must stay
6 together.

7 CHAIR: Ms Schnapp, just before - Ms Schnapp I'll stop you
8 there for a moment.

9 MS SCHNAPP: (Indistinct) into old and new growth areas.

10 SECRETARIAT: I'll just ask you to stop there for a moment
11 Gila.

12 MS SCHNAPP: Sure.

13 CHAIR: I'm sorry to stop you

14 MS SCHNAPP: I'm not sure if you heard a lot of what I said,
15 because there was a bell that went on but finished when
16 we started to talk - I started to talk about a couple of
17 points and now it's just come back on again. So I think
18 you may - shall I start again with that because it
19 may (indistinct).

20 CHAIR: No. No.

21 SECRETARIAT: I'm sorry Chair, I'll just advise that Gila can't
22 hear you at the moment, so if you just want to relay what
23 you'd like to say and I'll say it to her.

24 CHAIR: You might say to her the first bell was six minutes and
25 the second bell was the end of the seven minutes.

26 MS SCHNAPP: No, I'm sorry.

27 SECRETARIAT: Gila, just so you know, the first bell was for
28 six minutes, and the second bell was to the end of your
29 seven minutes.

30 MS SCHNAPP: Oh, that was really quick. Okay.

31 CHAIR: Is there anything that she needs to say that she hasn't

1 said in her written submission.

2 MS SCHNAPP: We believe all of Diamond Creek.

3 SECRETARIAT: Gila is there anything which you would like to
4 say that you haven't written in your submission to the
5 Commission.

6 MS SCHNAPP: Yes, only that when I timed it, yes, I had plenty
7 of time to finish it. I'll just say in summary, due to
8 the reasons outlined, in our submissions and some of
9 those mentioned today, that our properties in the suburb
10 of Diamond Creek, must remain in the electorate of
11 Jagajaga as this is the correct fit due to its urban
12 planning, history and building infrastructure. We should
13 not be in the electorate of McEwan, which has only
14 recently been looking at new growth opportunities.

15 We understand the Commission is not concerned with
16 rezoning, planning mistakes or irregularities, however,
17 the history of our land and the supporting information
18 sent with our submission, demonstrate the crucial need
19 for us to have urban representation at the Federal level
20 as well as the State level. Am I still on?

21 CHAIR: Secretariat, I would like you on our behalf, that is,
22 on behalf of all the augmented Electoral Commission, to
23 thank Ms Schnapp for her contribution and remind her that
24 we do have her written submissions and we will consider
25 them carefully.

26 SECRETARIAT: So, the Chair would just like to thank you for
27 your submission, and that she will - that they will
28 consider what you have also provided in your written
29 submission to the Chair, but thank you for your remarks
30 today. Chair, we don't have a further speaker in our
31 attendee list, so I'll invite you to decide whether you'd

1 like to wrap up, or I'll throw to you now.

2 CHAIR: All right. It seems to me that we've heard - we know
3 that one speaker won't come. There was another speaker
4 as I understood it, who was intending to come today?

5 SECRETARIAT: Yes, there was, but they have not appeared in the
6 attendee list, and there are no further phone attendees
7 that I can identify in the list either, so there's no one
8 missing, as in he's not a phone attendee that I can't see
9 the name of.

10 CHAIR: All right. Because that would be my only concern that
11 we not give him an adequate chance to come before us.

12 SECRETARIAT: If you prefer we can wait for a few minutes and
13 we can attempt to contact him?

14 CHAIR: I think that might be desirable, just to ensure that he
15 - having indicated he wanted to come, that he's changed
16 his mind. So we'll wait for a few minutes, if you would
17 contact him and see that that is his position.

18 SECRETARIAT: Of course, I will do that now.

19 MR ROGERS: I agree.

20 CHAIR: I wonder Secretariat, have you - do you have no ability
21 to contact your fourth speaker, is that right?

22 SECRETARIAT: We haven't got a phone number for them so I have
23 sent them an email, just a few minutes ago, so up to you
24 about how long we can wait, but that's the only contact
25 method we have with them at the moment.

26 CHAIR: All right. Well, we perhaps can give it a minute or
27 two more, but I think if we've not heard from them and
28 we're unable to contact them, we can do nothing really
29 other than close the session today.

30 SECRETARIAT: I would agree with that and yes, defer to your
31 judgment on that.

1 MR ROGERS: Agree, agree Chair. I think, we've sent an email,
2 that's the only contact we've had and we tried an email
3 before I think and no response so I think it's reasonable
4 for us to wrap up.

5 CHAIR: All right. Well, I think then, it's very nearly - it
6 must've been - how long ago did you send that email,
7 Secretariat?

8 SECRETARIAT: Approximately five minutes ago.

9 CHAIR: All right, we'll give it a minute or two and then we'll
10 close, I think.

11 SECRETARIAT: Okay.

12 CHAIR: Secretariat did you hear from Mr Rogers today?

13 SECRETARIAT: No, when we had - when we had attempted to
14 contact him earlier, we hadn't received a response.

15 CHAIR: Right, well, I think in that circumstance we can call -
16 we can bring this particular session to an end. What I
17 propose to do, is to adjourn the hearing today, and thank
18 everybody who has attended today for attending, and we
19 shall continue our deliberations this afternoon. Very
20 well thank you very much Secretariat for what you've
21 done.

22 SECRETARIAT: Thank you Chair, and I'll now end the Webinar,
23 thank you for all attending.

24 END OF PROCEEDINGS