Preliminary Submission to Electoral Representation Review, Southern Grampians Shire Council

SUMMARY:

Proportional Representation Society of Australia (Victoria-Tasmania) Inc. strongly recommends the retention of Southern Grampians Shire Council as an undivided municipality. Southern Grampians voters will then be able to continue benefiting from their use of proportional representation.

It is important, as explained below, that the number of councillors remain as an odd number. The present odd number is seven. It could be reduced to five, but only if adequate reasons for that were established.

PRSAV-T Inc. strongly opposes any single-councillor wards. APPENDIX 1 refers to Victoria’s unimpressive decade-long trial of single-councillor wards. APPENDIX 2 details some of the disadvantages of single-councillor wards.

KEY RECOMMENDATIONS:

Our submission makes the following key recommendations:

- Elections in Southern Grampians Shire should be by proportional representation (PR).
- The number of councillors to be elected for Southern Grampians Shire should remain at 7, or reduced to 5, but only if that lower number can be properly justified, and is acceptable to the local community.
- The municipality should continue to be undivided.

Our submission is based on principles that will lead to effective voting and fair representation.

THE CASE FOR AN UNDIVIDED MUNICIPALITY:

With the present undivided municipal area as a single electoral district for the election of all 7 councillors, the quota of votes for the election of each councillor is 12.5% of the overall vote plus one vote. As each quota of votes represents a different one-eighth part of the voters, seven-eighths of them have the advantage that the full value of their vote is used to actually elect a representative of theirs to a seat on the Council. If the VEC were to replace that system with a single-councillor ward system that seven-eighths of effective votes would be reduced to just barely above a mere four-eighths of the voters casting effective votes, i.e. votes whose direction has effect in deciding which candidates are or are not elected.

The advantages of an undivided district, without any wards, for a 7 or 5-member Council include:

- such an undivided district is the only way in which proportional representation can be applied for a 7 or 5-member Council in a symmetrical even-handed manner,
- an undivided district is the only system that ensures that the majority of councillors have been elected by the affirmative votes of an absolute majority of voters over the entire municipal area,
- ward boundaries do not require periodic re-adjustment to cater for changes in relative enrolment numbers,
- councillors, who always have to vote on all issues in all wards, are given a compelling motive to become equally informed about all the areas they are collectively voting on, rather than tending to confine their knowledge to their own ward,
- citizens have the maximum choice of councillors to approach to engender action on their concern, and citizens do not become confused about which ward they are in.
All candidates in an undivided municipality are on exactly the same footing when it comes to conveying their views to the electors. By contrast, in municipalities with wards, the candidates in different wards are not, as:

- some wards are larger in area than others,
- one ward can legally have up to 22% more electors than another, and
- the number of opposing candidates per ward can vary from zero in some wards to quite a large figure in others.

It is recognized that there is, in an undivided municipality, a greater effort required to convey candidates’ views to a larger number of electors, but what really matters most electorally is the relative impact candidates have, and that is, as always, dependent on their perceived qualities, and on the support they can muster. Each councillor will be voting on matters relating to the whole municipal area, so it is not inappropriate that he or she should seek support over that area in full and free competition with all other contenders, rather than being compartmentalized and cushioned against direct comparison with the best candidates, who may in divided municipalities be fruitlessly pitted against each other in a single ward.

**PR ensures a major increase in the percentage of effective votes, making minority control harder:**
Just as the single-councillor system leads to a large proportion of wasted votes, it also allows for minority groupings to control a Council with much less than 50% support. Since 50% of the vote in just 4 of the 7 wards would be all that is needed to gain control, and those 4 wards would represent just over 57% of the electors, it is theoretically possible for a minority with almost 29% support to achieve control of the Council. In practice the support for such a grouping would usually be higher than that, but, with single-councillor wards, minorities are regularly gaining control of elected bodies at the expense of majorities.

The PR recommendation for Southern Grampians Shire Council is the present undivided council electing 7 or 5 members. In Table 2 below, the arithmetic of the fairness of the undivided system with PR is shown in comparison to a system of single-councillor wards with a winner-take-all vote counting system.

**Table 2: Minimum Percentage of Effective Votes and of Overall Vote to Gain Control of Council**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Councillors per Electoral District</th>
<th>Minimum % of effective votes</th>
<th>Minimum % of overall vote required to gain control of Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single councillor in each of seven wards</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single councillor in each of five wards</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five councillors in an undivided shire</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven councillors in an undivided shire</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A most desirable aspect of PR is that each elected councillor needs a significantly larger percentage of the Southern Grampians-wide vote for election than is needed under the present system. For seven single-councillor wards 7% of the Southern Grampians-wide vote secures election. For five single-councillor wards each councillor needs 10%. For an undivided Southern Grampians with seven councillors each councillor needs 12.57% for election. For an undivided Southern Grampians with five councillors each councillor needs 16.7% for election.

**Communities of interest need not be so rigidly set as geographic - let voters choose to combine:**
Part of the desire for dividing municipalities into wards seems to rely on a perception that allowance must be made for what are called ‘communities of interest’.

The idea that a system of single-councillor wards protects ‘communities of interest’ is entirely false. Firstly, the only ‘community of interest’ that is favoured by single-councillor systems is a geographical community of interest, but there are also important non-geographical communities of interest. Secondly, the drawing of ward boundaries can and often does arbitrarily divide geographical communities of interest, particularly as each small ward does rightly need to contain the same number of electors.
Comparison with recent reviews of similar councils that recommended an undivided structure:
Southern Grampians is a less populous municipality than comparable regional municipalities with an urban area, which include Horsham, Warrnambool, Wodonga, Mildura and Greater Shepparton. In recent reviews all of these comparable municipalities have had an undivided structure recommended, with all being proposed as 7-member councils, except for Mildura whose exceptionally large area possibly led to 9 being proposed. Southern Grampians would fit in with that group with either 7 or, given its smaller population of voters, 5 councillors.

Single-councillor wards leave all ward electors’ eggs in the one basket – 7 baskets would be safer:
Not all elected councillors prove to be outstanding, exemplary, or even adequate, but a certain number usually are. Without councillors being compartmentalized by themselves in small wards there is a much greater likelihood that the occasional poor performer will be compensated for by his or her colleagues. If there is only one or two councillors for a ward, and those councillors prove, without quite invoking the legal provisions for their dismissal or reproach, to be lazy, unreliable, inaccessible, or to be absent too often, the constituents in that ward face serious neglect.

With small wards, only one or two councillors out of seven have an electoral base in any area, whereas with an undivided Council, the entire body of councillors has a geographical area in common and an electoral motive to understand that area. There is potent electoral incentive for sensible motions relating to that area that are moved by one of the councillors to be seconded by one of the other councillors, whereas with single-member wards a lack of knowledge of, or lack of motivation for interest in a ward, by all the other councillors can make informed seconding of motions more problematical.

What can be termed ‘geographically-diverse communities of interest’ can also include communities of electors with environmental concerns, business interests, electors wanting to keep rates low, and so on. Under PR, both these geographically diverse communities of interest, and the geographically based communities of interest can be served. It will be up to the voters to decide what community of interest they belong to, whether it be geographical – where electors predominantly vote for an identity from their immediate area – or some other community of interest – where people supportive of wider environmental concerns and practices in Southern Grampians predominantly vote for ‘sustainability, or green’ candidates, and those rejecting those views vote for their opponents, with each gaining a representative if they can muster a quota of votes. Voters need the flexibility to aggregate as they wish, and not the present crude and rigid segregation.

If each of the 7 councillors in an undivided Council can each gain a quota, which requires each to gain 75% more votes than would be required in a single-councillor ward, they can each be regarded as more substantial representatives than their single-councillor ward counterparts would be. The strength of representation that the more dominant viewpoint gains can vary from just one of the seven councillors in the ward to all seven, whereas the alternative winner-take-all system fails to give any graded response, and can all too often hand all the representation of a ward to a candidate that is purely negative.

PR does not reduce geographically based communities of interest, but single-councillor ward systems arbitrarily and unnecessarily destroy any non-geographical communities of interest.

PR works far better in districts with an odd, rather than an even number of councillors:
We strongly urge the Reviews not to recommend any electoral district with an even number of councillors to be elected. Districts electing an even number of councillors are most unsatisfactory, as they flout the important democratic principle that a majority view should be represented by a majority of elected councillors.
Were a two-councillor ward to be recommended, for example, the serious anomaly may arise that, in that ward, one candidate or group might win 65% of the vote and another just 35%, yet the two groups would still have equal representation under proportional representation. Unfortunately, four-councillor wards have been recommended for several municipalities in the earlier round of representation reviews. In those wards, a minority group with just on 40% of the vote will be able to achieve equal representation with a majority group achieving just under 60% of the vote.

Only by having an odd number of councillors elected in each ward can the important democratic principle that majority support should lead to majority representation be maintained.

Any wards to be used should be multi-councillor, each with the same number of councillors: Arrangements of wards with differing numbers of councillors are intrinsically anti-democratic, as they have very different quotas for election in their distinct components, and will result in too much attention being given to where various boundaries are set out, at the expense of a community-oriented spirit. They are also very confusing to electors, and have led to considerable inconsistency across the State.

Lack of parity in the quotas for election makes it easier to be elected in some wards than others. That is an undesirable feature that can induce candidates to stand in a particular ward just for their convenience.
APPENDIX 1 – Victoria’s unsuccessful trial of single-councillor wards:

The longstanding and generally widespread wisdom of avoiding single-councillor districts:
Single-councillor districts are, and have been, very little used world-wide, certainly in the English-speaking democracies. The first election in Australia for any level of government, preceding elections for parliaments, was a municipal election, which was for Adelaide City Council in 1840. That pioneering Australian election was held with multi-councillor wards, and was the first use of proportional representation (PR) for the election of a public body in the world. Since then, consistent with long-standing and continuing world practice, multi-councillor districts have always applied for all municipal elections in all the States and Territories of Australia, except for the gratuitous introduction, only in Victoria, and only for some of its councils, of single-councillor wards in the mid-1990s.

Victoria’s clumsy initial introduction of triennial elections without proportional representation:
Until Victoria’s neighbouring states - New South Wales, South Australia, and Tasmania - adopted proportional representation as the prevalent system in their municipal electoral districts, which were, and still are, all multi-councillor districts, they generally conducted winner-take-all elections for one of the three councillor positions in each ward annually in rotation. Those neighbouring states all abandoned such annual elections in the 20th Century by changing to a system of general elections with multi-councillor districts with proportional representation being the prevailing system. When Victoria abandoned such annual elections, it not only failed to retain multi-councillor districts throughout, resulting in many single-councillor wards, but it also retained for its remaining multi-councillor wards - by default owing to opposition to proportional representation by the then Opposition-dominated Legislative Council - the winner-take-all system that had been used for counting Senate elections from 1919 until it was discredited and replaced by the present quota-preferential system of proportional representation in 1948.

Unable to choose PR, Victorian councils sensibly decided to choose the lesser of two evils:
Because that winner-take-all multi-councillor system was as unrepresentative and lopsided as its 1919-46 Senate counterpart, many amalgamated councils had little choice but to seek some slightly improved diversity by preferring the newly-imposed single-councillor wards. The abhorrently unrepresentative nature of both the winner-take-all Senate systems used prior to 1949 is demonstrated by the extraordinary fact of the five Senate elections, those of 1910, 1917, 1925, 1934 and 1943, where 100% of the senators elected for all States were of the same party. Of course such a silly outcome has not occurred since 1948.

Since that unfortunate and short-lived period when all that was available were two winner-take-all systems, with one being distinctly worse than the other, Victoria now has the far more satisfactory and representative system of multi-councillor wards with quota-preferential proportional representation.

That undesirable winner-take-all system for multi-councillor wards is no longer available under the present Local Government Act 1989, which fortunately now requires that polls in multi-councillor districts must be counted on a proportional representation basis only. The last place in the world where Victoria’s discontinued system was still generally used was Australia’s Northern Territory, until it abandoned it in 2011.

* * * * * *
APPENDIX 2 – Some of the disadvantages of single-councillor wards:

**Single-councillor wards minimize voters’ choices, yet maximize candidates’ choice of voters:**
With single-councillor systems, the voters’ choice of candidates is reduced to the minimum possible, for a given total number of candidates overall, but the candidates’ choice of which ward to contest is maximized. With an undivided Council, the voters’ choice of candidates, for a given total number of candidates overall, is maximized by comparison with single-councillor wards, and the candidates’ choice of which ward to contest is minimized, as is their ability to avoid scrutiny by a wider electorate.

The electoral system should emphasize as much as practicable the importance of letting voters choose their candidates, rather than that of letting candidates choose their voters. The choice of candidates open to voters should be arranged so that it is the maximum practicable, and candidates should face, and be electorally assessed by, a wider cross-section of the municipality they make decisions for.

**Single-councillor wards with incumbents elected unopposed facilitate unopposed succession:**
Once a councillor has been able to be elected unopposed, particularly if consecutive unopposed elections have been involved, a notorious weakness of the single-councillor ward system can be utilized by that councillor when he or she eventually chooses not to contest the next election.

Such retiring councillors do not have to give, and often do not give, any public notice or even suggestion, prior to the nomination deadline, of their private decision that they will not be maintaining their past practice of nominating for another term. The public is lulled into the misconception that the councillor will probably be nominating again. What happens is that the retiring councillor discreetly chooses not to nominate, and quietly encourages a protégé to nominate at a few minutes before the deadline. That scenario is far less likely in a multi-councillor ward as explained in the point just above.

Once that surreptitious unopposed transition is a fait accompli, the ward in question soon finds to its surprise that it has a new councillor that hardly anybody realized would be so effortlessly installed.

**Single-councillor ward boundary location has an undue influence on representation:**
Setting and adjusting the intricate and cumulatively long boundaries for seven single-councillor wards is a contentious, time-consuming and expensive task. No internal boundaries are needed for an undivided municipality, compared with at least six for seven single-councillor wards. Few electors know the boundaries of their ward, and few councillors, including Mayors, know the boundaries of wards other than their own. The resources needed for boundary and ward size control and maintenance can be used for more productive purposes.

It has long been recognized, that with single-councillor wards, even where the number of electors in each is as equal as possible, variations in the positioning of boundaries between wards can alter the overall result of polls without any change having taken place in the way electors vote. The excellent U.S. on-line adaptation of the Proportional Representation Society of Australia’s “Gerrymander Wheel”, accessible at www.prsa.org.au/history.htm#gerrymander demonstrates that. The reason is that boundaries between single-councillor wards of a particular shape can in many circumstances just manage to amalgamate a bare majority where a different configuration would not. It has long been called “gerrymandering” when done deliberately, but it is just as effective when it happens as a by-product of impartial boundary-setting. The remedy is to have fewer unnecessary boundaries, as multi-councillor ward arrangements facilitate.

‘Dummy candidates’ are a single-councillor ward device that is of little use in an undivided council:
Single-councillor wards using preferential voting are very much more vulnerable to manipulation by the use of so-called ‘dummy candidates’. These are candidates that do not expect or wish to be elected, but that are encouraged to stand for election by more serious candidates in the hope that they will garner first preference votes that the more serious candidate might not expect to get. The hope is that those votes will, on the exclusion of the ‘dummy candidates’, be transferred to the serious candidate, and that there will be enough of such votes to produce an absolute majority for the serious candidate, and thus achieve his or her election.
Quota-preferential proportional representation is far less conducive to the fielding of ‘dummy candidates’. The reason for that is because, unlike preferential voting in single-councillor wards, where the only type of vote transfer that can occur is the exclusion of minor candidates, there is an extra stage in the transfer process at the vote count, which takes priority over the transfer of votes from excluded candidates. That extra, prior stage is the transfer of surplus votes from candidates that gain more than a quota of first preference votes. Transfer of votes from excluded candidates occurs in PR counts, but it is not the only transfer, and it occurs only after transfer of surplus votes, or if there are no surplus votes.

As several councillors are to be elected in a PR count, it is much more likely that at least one will gain a quota of first preference votes than it is that any one of many candidates in a single-councillor ward will gain an absolute majority of first preference votes. Once a candidate in a PR count has gained a quota of first preference votes there must then be a transfer of surplus votes before any transfers arising from exclusion can occur. Unless a single candidate in a single-councillor ward can gain an absolute majority of first preference votes and be elected forthwith, such a count has to proceed to the transfer of excluded candidates, which involves transfer, at full value, of the votes of the lowest-polling candidates, often ‘dummy candidates’.

It is most significant that transfers of surplus votes are, by definition, from candidates that have secured election early in the count, before the count is completed, i.e. serious candidates rather than ‘dummy candidates’. Such transfers of surplus votes come into operation in the positive circumstance of a candidate being elected. Those transfers are derived from that candidate’s total parcel of ballot-papers, whereas the only transfers available in single-councillor counts are necessarily those transfers arising from exclusions of candidates. Such exclusions are initiated in the negative circumstance of no candidate being elected, and are derived from the ballot-papers of the candidate with the lowest prospect of being elected, viz. the candidate with the lowest progress total in the poll, which is where ‘dummy candidates’ usually appear.

Transfers of surplus votes are positive in outcome as they give effect to the support for a particular point of view that is large enough to have already achieved at least one elected representative and to contribute towards the election of another. By contrast, transfers arising from exclusions of candidates, although necessary and justified, are of lower priority, but not value, as reflected in the rules for a quota-preferential proportional representation count, because they are derived from the smallest aggregations of opinion, rather than the larger aggregations represented by parcels of votes exceeding a quota.

Proportional Representation Society of Australia (Victoria-Tasmania) Inc. is very pleased that the review process recommended PR systems a number of the councils reviewed in recent rounds. PRSAV-T Inc. remains of the view that it would be highly desirable for Local Government in Victoria to move towards a more consistent electoral system. We look forward to electoral arrangements in Southern Grampians Shire that empower voters and leave all candidates satisfied that community views are fairly reflected in the representation determined after each poll.

* * * * * * *