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On 12 October 2007, the Queensland Redistribution Commission, in accordance with the requirements of the Electoral Act 1992 (“the Act”), commenced a redistribution of Queensland’s 89 Legislative Assembly electoral districts by publishing notices in the Queensland Government Gazette which stated that the need for an electoral redistribution had arisen, advised of the composition of the Commission and invited members of the public to lodge written suggestions on the redistribution. The notice also appeared in the Courier Mail and major regional newspapers. Following the closure of suggestions, the Commission published notices inviting written comments on the suggestions to be lodged with the Commission. Once the time for lodging comments on the suggestions closed on Monday, 17 December 2007, the Commission commenced preparation of its redistribution proposals.

The Quota and Other Legislative Criteria for the Redistribution

In determining electoral boundaries the Commission is governed by the general principle that there should be an equal number of enrolled electors in each district. To this end, at the conclusion of the period prescribed for lodging suggestions and comments which occurred on 17 December 2007, the Commission is required to determine an enrolment quota for the State as a whole. The quota, or “average number of electors”, is determined by dividing the total number of people on the electoral roll across Queensland by the total number of electoral districts (89 in all). The quota thus arrived at, for the purposes of the 2008 distribution, is 29,560.

As a general rule, the number of electors in each of the proposed districts should correspond as closely as possible to this number. The Act recognises, however, that such precision is not always practicable and authorises the Commission to deviate from the quota by a maximum of 10% above or below. For the 2008 Redistribution, this results in a minimum of 26,604 and a maximum of 32,516 electors required for each district.

Since it is desirable for electorates to be of a manageable geographic size, the Act prescribes a special “weightage” formula for large electorates. For districts that exceed 100,000km² in area, a figure equal to 2% of the total area of the electoral district is added to the actual number of electors enrolled in that district. For example, an electoral district 250,000km² in area would have 5000 (i.e.: 2% of 250,000 km²) “notional” electors added to its actual number of electors. This adjusted figure (the total number of actual and notional electors) must fall within the margin of tolerance prescribed by the Act, that is, be no more than 10% above or below the quota.
Other Criteria
Subject to the overriding numerical requirements, the Commission is required to have regard to a number of other elements that may be indicative of desirable electoral boundaries. These criteria, set down in Section 46(1) of the Act, are:

(a) the extent to which there is a community of economic, social, regional or other interests within each proposed electoral district;

(b) the ways of communication and travel within each proposed electoral district;

(c) the physical features of each proposed electoral district;

(d) the boundaries of existing electoral districts; and

(e) demographic trends in the State, with a view to ensuring as far as practicable that, on the basis of the trends, the need for another electoral redistribution will not arise before the stipulated time.

The Commission, when carrying out the redistribution, “may also consider the boundaries of local government areas to the extent that it is satisfied that there is a community of economic, social, regional or other interests within each local government area”.

The Commission is authorised by section 46(3) of the Act to give such weight to each of the abovementioned matters as it considers appropriate.

Objections to the Proposed Redistribution and Comments on Objections

The Commission received 852 written objections to its redistribution proposals within the time specified in its public notices inviting objections. Copies of these objections were bound into two volumes and were made available for public inspection, without fee, at public libraries throughout Queensland, as well as at selected Post Offices and at the Commission’s office at Level 6, Forestry House, 160 Mary Street, Brisbane.

On Friday, 4 July 2008 the Commission in accordance with section 49(2) of the Act, published a notice in the Government Gazette advising of the availability for inspection of the copies of the objections and inviting written comments on the objections to be lodged with the Commission before 5.00 pm Monday, 14 July 2008, being a period of 10 days following publication of the notice in the Government Gazette. The notice inviting comments on the objections was also published in The Courier Mail and numerous Queensland regional newspapers.

The Commission received 58 comments on the objections by 5.00 pm on Monday, 14 July 2008. This booklet contains copies of those comments. The booklets are being made available for public inspection, without fee, at public libraries throughout Queensland, selected Post Offices, and at the Commission’s office at Level 6, Forestry House, 160 Mary Street, Brisbane.

The comments on objections are also available on the Commission’s website – www.ecq.qld.gov.au
Remainder of the Redistribution Process

In accordance with section 49(3) of the Act, copies of the comments on the objections will be available for public perusal at the Commission’s office at Level 6, Forestry House, 160 Mary Street, Brisbane as soon as practicable after the closing time for comments on the objections. Copies of the comments on the objections will similarly be available for perusal at Public Libraries and selected Post Offices throughout Queensland. A list of these locations is available on the Commission’s website: www.ecq.qld.gov.au

From the date of closure of public objections to the redistribution proposals (23 June 2008), the Commission is allowed a period of 60 days to complete its determination of the State’s electoral districts. The 60 day period will end on Friday, 22 August 2008. Under section 54 of the Act, the final determination and associated documents will be given to the Honourable the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister Assisting the Premier in Western Queensland who must table the documents in Parliament within 5 sitting days of their receipt.

A notice containing details of the Commission’s final determination of the State’s electoral boundaries will then be published in the Queensland Government Gazette and within 21 days of publication of this notice (subject only to any appeal being lodged in the Supreme Court) the State is redistributed into the electoral districts, and those districts have the names set out in the notice. Queensland remains redistributed in this way until the next electoral redistribution becomes final.

Table 1 shown below details the statutory timetable associated with the conduct of the State electoral redistribution.
### TABLE 1

#### THE REDISTRIBUTION PROCESS

The *Electoral Act 1992* prescribes the following timetable for the conduct of the redistribution:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Timetable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The Commission invites written suggestions from public – s42(1)</td>
<td>12 October 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Suggestions</strong></td>
<td>30 days – s42(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Closing date for written suggestions</td>
<td>12 November 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suggestions available for public comment</strong></td>
<td>21 days – s43(1) and s43(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Closing date for written comments</td>
<td>Monday, 17 December 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The Commission determines State quota – s45(1), considers suggestions and comments and develops a set of electoral district boundary proposals – s44</td>
<td>No time specified to formulate proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The Commission prepares its report, publishes and exhibits maps showing proposed boundaries and names and invites public attention to the maps – s47</td>
<td>Friday, 23 May 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public objections to the proposals</strong></td>
<td>30 days – s48(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Closing date for written objections</td>
<td>Monday, 23 June 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objections available for public comment</strong></td>
<td>10 days – s49(1) and s49(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Closing date for written comments in response to objections</td>
<td>Monday, 14 July 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The Commission considers objections and comments and makes a final boundary determination – ss50-51</td>
<td>60 days since close of objections – s51(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Final date for the Commission’s determination</strong></td>
<td>Friday, 22 August 2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inquiries

Persons or organisations who have any inquiries concerning the conduct of the State redistribution should direct them to the Commission.

The Commission’s locality address is:

QUEENSLAND REDISTRIBUTION COMMISSION
LEVEL 6, FORESTRY HOUSE
160 MARY STREET BRISBANE Q 4000

TELEPHONE: 1300 881 665
## PUBLIC COMMENTS ON THE OBJECTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objection No.</th>
<th>Name/Organisation</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>K J &amp; R A Copeland ‘Birrawa’</td>
<td>‘Birrawa’ PO Box 178 PALMWOODS Q 4555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mr Timothy Fisher</td>
<td>PO Box 349 HERBERTON Q 4887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Dr Ruth S Kerr</td>
<td>105 Highland Terrace ST LUCIA Q 4067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Miss M Chandler</td>
<td>2/16 Goldview Street ATHERTON Q 4883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ms Maureen Dow</td>
<td>11029 Kennedy Highway EVELYN CENTRAL Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mr Vernon Good Atkinson</td>
<td>Minnowoolka Station MOUNT GARNET Q 4872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ms Cyndi Mitchell</td>
<td>150 Flaxton Mill Road FLAXTON Q 4560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>N A &amp; C F Goss</td>
<td>5 Solar Crescent ATHERTON Q 4883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>N McDowall</td>
<td>Address Not Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>R Winger</td>
<td>PO Box 349 HERBERTON Q 4887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mr Norbert Liebrich</td>
<td>PO Box 244 HERBERTON Q 4887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mr Clyde W M Mitchell</td>
<td>150 Flaxton Mill Road FLAXTON Q 4560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Mrs M Parker</td>
<td>70 Highland Street WAVELL HEIGHTS Q 4012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Mr John Finlay Chief Executive Officer Whitsunday Regional Council</td>
<td>PO Box 104 PROSERPINE Q 4800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Mrs Lynette Lawrence</td>
<td>25 Ski Gardens Road ALTON DOWNS Q 4702</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PUBLIC COMMENTS ON THE OBJECTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objection No.</th>
<th>Name/Organisation</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Ms Carolyn Hohnke</td>
<td>35 Mailmans Track BUNYA Q 4055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bunya Residents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Association Inc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Mr Joe Salerno</td>
<td>Cnr Main and Vernan Streets ATHERTON Q 4883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Ms Arne Platte</td>
<td>PO Box 485 RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Ms Trudie Watson</td>
<td>22 Maple Street MILLAA MILLAA Q 4886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Mr Barry H and Ms</td>
<td>PO Box 189 MONTVILLE Q 4560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colleen A Brady</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Ms Joan Donald</td>
<td>Unit 4 MacDonald Court 5 Elizabeth Street ATHERTON Q 4883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Ms Pat and Mr John Peach</td>
<td>C/- Wandal Post Office WANDAL Q 4870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Mr Scott Mason</td>
<td>Herbert Street BEDOURIE Q 4829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer and Councillor Robert Dare – Mayor Diamantina Shire Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Mr Anthony Chapman</td>
<td>1 Donatello Street FIG TREE POCKET Q 4069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Mrs Penny Campbell-Wilson</td>
<td>Email Address Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Mr Winston Johnston</td>
<td>4 Rangers Road BALMORAL RIDGE Q 4552</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PUBLIC COMMENTS ON THE OBJECTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objection No.</th>
<th>Name/Organisation</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Mr James Berardo President Friends of Noosa Association, Inc</td>
<td>PO Box 1102 NOOSA HEADS Q 4567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Mr John Cherry Chief Executive Officer Queensland Farmers’ Federation</td>
<td>PO Box 12009 BRISBANE Q 4003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Mr Alan Webb</td>
<td>Address Not Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Ms Carol Finger</td>
<td>PO Box 9 DUARINGA Q 4712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Ms Catherine Jenkins</td>
<td>Lot 21 Otto Road RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>J Harron</td>
<td>Rural No. 15636 Kennedy Highway INNOT HOT SPRINGS Q 4872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Ms Loretta Snelling</td>
<td>Rural No. 15636 Kennedy Highway INNOT HOT SPRINGS Q 4872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Ms Judith Erwin</td>
<td>8 Gordon Earl Drive RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Ms Linda Klein</td>
<td>8 Gordon Earl Drive RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Ms Jodie Austin</td>
<td>14909 Kennedy Highway RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Mr Robert Austin</td>
<td>14909 Kennedy Highway RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>N Scott</td>
<td>60 Grigg Street RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objection No. (QRC/COM...)</td>
<td>Name/Organisation</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Mr David and Ms Elizabeth Hill</td>
<td>‘Dunkerry South’ 705 Dunkerry Road THALLON Q 4497</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Mr Richard Waldie President Palmwoods Progress Association Inc</td>
<td>PO Box 181 PALMWOODS Q 4555</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Mr Stephen Arthur Jenkins</td>
<td>Lot 21 Otto Road RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Mr R J Richardson</td>
<td>45 Riverstone Road GORDONVALE Q 4865</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 Mr R J Richardson</td>
<td>45 Riverstone Road GORDONVALE Q 4865</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 Mr Geoffrey Greene State Director Liberal Party of Australia (Queensland Division)</td>
<td>PO Box 8167 WOOLLOONGABBA Q 4102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 Mr T I Bethel</td>
<td>15 Grigg Street RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 Ms Tracy Lucey</td>
<td>30 Coleman Road RAVENSHOE Q 4888</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 Ms Jeannie Lagdon</td>
<td>Address Not Provided</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 W Benstead</td>
<td>PO Box 2329 MAREEBA Q 4880</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 Mrs Jean Storey Hon Secretary Bell Progress and Heritage Association Inc</td>
<td>Email Address Provided</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Mr Anthony Chisholm State Secretary Australian Labor Party State of Queensland</td>
<td>PO Box 5032 WEST END Q 4101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PUBLIC COMMENTS ON THE OBJECTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objection No.</th>
<th>Name/Organisation</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Mr Michael O'Dwyer State Director</td>
<td>PO Box 5940 WEST END Q 4101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The National Party of Australia Queensland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Lou Bessert</td>
<td>657 Topaz Road MALANDA Q 4885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Mr Colin Dow</td>
<td>11029 Kennedy Highway EVELYN CENTRAL Q 4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Unreadable</td>
<td>Address Not Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Unreadable</td>
<td>Address Not Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Ms Sharon Dennis Secretary</td>
<td>PO Box 560 MALANDA Q 4885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malanda Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Mr Kevin Whyte</td>
<td>28 Courtney Street MAREEBA Q 4880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Mr John Fischer</td>
<td>PO Box 2252 MAREEBA Q 4880</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Facsimile Transmission of June 2008

To: Queensland Electoral Commission

For: G.L. M. & R.A. Cope

Re: QRC/10 Transfer to Glass House

Dean Swis

We apologise for the brief facsimile message yesterday. We had been away 3 days and early that day learned that the review of State electoral boundaries had recommended the transfer of the Palmwoods, Mudlo & Chevallem areas from NICKLIN electorate to GLASS HOUSE electorate.

My wife & I have lived in the Palmwoods area for fifteen (15) years and have never been aware of any close interaction or common interest between Palmwoods & the Glass House area to the extent

In common with many of our friends we visit Nambour at least on a weekly basis, to access our banking, accountancy, dental, public & private hospital & higher level medical services, of major supermarket.

The creation of NICKLIN electorate in 1986 recognised the long personal relationship which began when we first lived C.F. Nicklin, NY1 returned from Adelaide Service of Office training in 1913, or purchased a pineapple farm in what is now NICKLIN Road, Palmwoods.

This personal & political connection

continued 2
Facsimile Transmission 27 June 2003

To: Queensland Electoral Commission

continued... 2 of 2

(connection) continued through the years to 1978, highlighted by:

- election in 1932 to the Legislative Assembly as member for Murwillumbah
- from June 1941, leader of the Opposition in State Parliament
- command of the 6th Battalion Volunteer Defence Force, 1942-46
- member for Landsborough from 1950 to 1968
- from 1957 to 1968, Premier of Queensland at Chief Secretary in 1968, appointed Knight Commander of the Order of St. Michael and St. George (KCMG)

We are aware of the changing popular vote numbers and the need for electoral redistribution, but submit that it would be anomalous if insensitive to seven. This connection between the town of Palmwoods and the electorate of Nicklin.

Yours faithfully
K J of RA Copeland

[Signature]
From: Tim Fisher [mailto:battunga3@bigpond.com]
Sent: Wednesday, 25 June 2008 9:38 AM
To: ECQ User
Subject: REDISTRIBUTION of Tablelands

Queensland Redistribution Commission
Brisbane

Dear Sir/Madam,

I wish to register an objection to the proposed redistribution and consequent abolition of the seat of Tablelands. The proposed new electorate of Macrossan would be unworkably large, and fragment the area of the Tablelands which is already huge. It has just suffered a forced amalgamation of the four councils, and to then divide it with this proposal makes no sense at all.

Where do you propose that this seat, 1000km in length would be based, and how could one representative service it?

Please listen to, and respect the voice of the people for once, instead of these forced impositions from Brisbane.

Thank you.

Yours Sincerely

Timothy Fisher
105 Highland Terrace
St Lucia Q 4067
24 June 2008

Electoral Commission Queensland
G.P.O. Box 1393
Brisbane Q 4001

Dear Sir,

**Electoral Redistribution 2007 - Electorate of Nicklin**

I refer to the north eastern boundary of the Nicklin electorate in the vicinity of Cooroy.

I recommend that the boundary be moved to transfer the Noosa Christian College on Cooroy-Belli Road and surrounding residential property within the watershed of Cooroy Creek into the electorate incorporating Cooroy town, viz. Noosa. The reason for this is that these properties have always had and continue to have a community of interest with Cooroy - since the first European settlement in the area in the early 1880s. The history of the area has been described in the article, 'Portion 58, Parish of Tewantin at Cooroy', *Missing Link*, Journal of the Cooroy-Noosa Genealogical & Historical Research Group Inc, No.20, May 2007, pp.20-23 (copy attached).

The advent of the Bruce Highway by pass of the Cooroy town is in very modern event in the town's history which has appeared to split off part of the area. My recommended change will not cause a significant change in numbers of voters to either electorate.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Dr Ruth S. Kerr OAM
RECENT LIBRARY ACQUISITIONS
NOTES ON UNITED STATES CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY FROM THE 18TH TO THE 20TH CENTURY

By William J. Rehnquist

Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.


The book contains an introduction to the history of the United States Constitution and its evolution over time. It covers the drafting, ratification, and amendments of the Constitution and explores its impact on American society. The text is well-organized, making it easy to follow the development of constitutional law.

The book is 224 pages long and is suitable for both undergraduate and graduate students studying American history and constitutional law. It provides a comprehensive overview of the Constitution and is an excellent resource for anyone interested in the history of the United States.
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
11029, Kennedy Highway,
Evelyn Central,
Qld. 4888.
20-06-08

Commissioners.

I wish to register my strong opposition to the elimination and redistribution of the State seat of Tablelands.
I am a constituent of Tablelands, and your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and the new seat of Macrossan is extremely flawed. It is totally inconsistent with the findings of the local government Reform Commission that declared that, in spite of strong objections, the four shire councils should amalgamate into one because this region has such a strong connection and identity. Your proposal to include a large portion of Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kms. South and deep into Central Queensland. A region with very little commonality with the Wet Tropics.
Your proposal is inconsistent with the FNQ 2025 plan, that places this region well and truly into FNQ, nor are your claims of low and falling elector numbers aligned with the expected growth identified in 2025.
You appear to have ignored the fact that Cairns is the Main Service Centre for the region and the focus for Health, Transport and other communications links. These links do not exist along the North-South alignment of Macrossan. Most Tablelanders would not dream, for instance, of using the inland route through Charters Towers and Claremont, to drive South, it is far too far between stops, and often sparsley used in the event of mishap.
There is little commonality of interest between the wet, tropical, elevated Tablelands, and the Charters Towers Goldfields, or the small Coalfields towns and cotton crops of the Mackay hinterlands, except perhaps for cattle farming, but the climate is so diverse so even their methods are different. Apart from the road origins, there is no deep ingrained connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution, and restore this regions capacity to have its own accessible voice in Parliament.

I am, Yours sincerely,

ME Dow
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Vernon Good Atkinson
Redistribution of Electoral Boundaries – Nicklin Electorate

As an elector resident in the central Blackall Range I write formally to lodge my objections to the currently proposed electoral redistribution which would, inter alia, excise the communities of Montville and Flaxton from the Nicklin electorate and place them into the Glasshouse electorate.

My grounds for this objection are:-

The subject areas have a long term association with the Nicklin electorate and a highly developed community of interest with it.

The historical association of the villages of Montville and Flaxton has been and continues to be with the regional service town of Nambour. Nambour is the location of the electoral office for the Nicklin electorate. There is not now and never has been any association of the subject village communities with the service hubs and electorate office of the Glasshouse electorate.

Practical road access and the only public transport available in the central/northern Blackall range connects to Nambour. There is no practical public transport link to any commercial/service part of the Glasshouse electorate and the access from the villages of Montville/Flaxton by private vehicle to any such facilities within Glasshouse is many times as lengthy and many times as difficult and potentially congested as the access to Nambour.

Nambour is the site of the only public hospital reasonably accessible to Blackall Range residents. Nambour is the location of the nearest and mainly typically used advanced medical consultation services for Range residents. It is the location of the most typically used hospitals.

Practically all higher level banking and financial services used by Range residents are Nambour based. It would be fair to say there is no such association at all with any place in the Glasshouse electorate.

Nambour is the, by far, most used commercial/industrial centre for services not available on the Range. There is no such association with any place in the Glasshouse electorate.

It is visibly obvious that the population of the “railway corridor” through the Glasshouse electorate which accommodates its major population density is growing uncommonly rapidly and it is difficult to imagine its population not increasing by far more than the 10% electorate quota margin within a very short time, thus requiring the excision of some part of it, probably within as little as 3 years.

Excision of Montville/Flaxton from the Nicklin electorate and its transfer to
Glasshouse would place approximately half of the region from which membership of the active and effective community representative group Mortville Village Association is drawn into each rebounded electorate. Similarly the area from which the membership of the Blackall Range Land Use and Planning Association is drawn would be about equally divided between two electorates. The effectiveness and community usefulness of these bodies would be much diminished. The proposed redistribution would politically isolate the Montville and Flaxton communities from the renowned and widely valued Blackall Range Care Group, a facility in which those residents played major roles in its establishment and continue to play major roles in its continuing operation, as well as its use.

In summary, historical development of the central/northern Blackall Range took place as a cohesive social grouping, with many cooperatives and enlightened and altruistic community “self help” programs. These attitudes have endured to the present. Overwhelmingly, the resident community views itself as a single entity comprising the communities of Montville, Flaxton, and Mapleton and beyond. The perceived community shares community facilities ranging from the Care Group, through gymnasiums to Arts and Craft societies, land and water care and planning groups, as well as a strong social cohesion. There are well over 30 community based associations/activities which embrace the broad Range. It is, in fact, an uncommonly cohesive and motivated to mutual support community. Such cohesion and the highly valuable effectiveness of the various community groups would be much diminished, if not destroyed, if it were necessary for them to deal at a State Government level with two local representatives rather than one. Such a situation would, of course, be grossly inefficient for the State Government, also.

All of the “off Range” focus of the Montville/Flaxton communities is north and east and Nambour directed, not south directed. This direction is not only by reasons of historical association but also strongly determined by the topography, access and transport links. Nambour/Nicklin is accessible, extensively used and historically deeply embedded in the Blackall Range culture. Any commercially, industrially, culturally or socially significant place in Glasshouse is none of these. The topographic characteristics of the Blackall Range preclude infrastructure ever being practically developed which would change this situation.

I urge reconsideration of the proposal to excise Montville/Flaxton from the Nicklin electorate and transfer them to Glasshouse as the proposal is socially damaging, contrary to historical connections and present custom, illogical on “community of interest” grounds, largely unworkable in a practical association sense and contrary to strongly help community wishes.

Yours faithfully,

[Signature]

Cynol Mitchell

Name

Flaxton

Address
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecq@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

[Signature]
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001
Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecq@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region's capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

R. Winge
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecq@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

Norbert Liebrich
Redistribution of Electoral Boundaries – Nicklin Electorate

As an elector resident in the central Blackall Range I write formally to lodge my objections to the currently proposed electoral redistribution which would, inter alia, excise the communities of Montville and Flaxton from the Nicklin electorate and place them into the Glasshouse electorate.

My grounds for this objection are:-

The subject areas have a long term association with the Nicklin electorate and a highly developed community of interest with it.

The historical association of the villages of Montville and Flaxton has been and continues to be with the regional service town of Nambour. Nambour is the location of the electoral office for the Nicklin electorate. There is not now and never has been any association of the subject village communities with the service hubs and electorate office of the Glasshouse electorate.

Practical road access and the only public transport available in the central/northern Blackall range connects to Nambour. There is no practical public transport link to any commercial/service part of the Glasshouse electorate and the access from the villages of Montville/Flaxton by private vehicle to any such facilities within Glasshouse is many times as lengthy and many times as difficult and potentially congested as the access to Nambour.

Nambour is the site of the only public hospital reasonably accessible to Blackall Range residents. Nambour is the location of the nearest and mainly typically used advanced medical consultation services for Range residents. It is the location of the most typically used hospitals.

Practically all higher level banking and financial services used by Range residents are Nambour based. It would be fair to say there is no such association at all with any place in the Glasshouse electorate.

Nambour is the, by far, most used commercial/industrial centre for services not available on the Range. There is no such association with any place in the Glasshouse electorate.

It is visibly obvious that the population of the “railway corridor” through the Glasshouse electorate which accommodates its major population density is growing uncommonly rapidly and it is difficult to imagine its population not increasing by far more than the 10% electorate quota margin within a very short time, thus requiring the excision of some part of it, probably within as little as 3 years.

Excision of Montville/Flaxton from the Nicklin electorate and its transfer to
Glasshouse would place approximately half of the region from which membership of the active and effective community representative group Montville Village Association is drawn into each rebounded electorate. Similarly the area from which the membership of the Blackall Range Land Use and Planning Association is drawn would be about equally divided between two electorates. The effectiveness and community usefulness of these bodies would be much diminished. The proposed redistribution would politically isolate the Montville and Flaxton communities from the renowned and widely valued Blackall Range Care Group, a facility in which those residents played major roles in its establishment and continue to play major roles in its continuing operation, as well as its use.

In summary, historical development of the central/northern Blackall Range took place as a cohesive social grouping, with many cooperatives and enlightened and altruistic community “self help” programs. These attitudes have endured to the present. Overwhelmingly, the resident community views itself as a single entity comprising the communities of Montville, Flaxton, and Mapleton and beyond. The perceived community shares community facilities ranging from the Care Group, through gymnasiums to Arts and Craft societies, land and water care and planning groups, as well as a strong social cohesion. There are well over 30 community based associations/activities which embrace the broad Range. It is, in fact, an uncommonly cohesive and motivated to mutual support community. Such cohesion and the highly valuable effectiveness of the various community groups would be much diminished, if not destroyed, if it were necessary for them to deal at a State Government level with two local representatives rather than one. Such a situation would, of course, be grossly inefficient for the State Government, also.

All of the “off Range” focus of the Montville/Flaxton communities is north and east and Nambour directed, not south directed. This direction is not only by reasons of historical association but also strongly determined by the topography, access and transport links. Nambour/Nicklin is accessible, extensively used and historically deeply embedded in the Blackall Range culture. Any commercially, industrially, culturally or socially significant place in Glasshouse is none of these. The topographic characteristics of the Blackall Range preclude infrastructure ever being practically developed which would change this situation.

I urge reconsideration of the proposal to excise Montville/Flaxton from the Nicklin electorate and transfer them to Glasshouse as the proposal is socially damaging, contrary to historical connections and present custom, illogical on “community of interest” grounds, largely unworkable in a practical association sense and contrary to strongly help community wishes.

Yours faithfully,

[Signature]

Name: W. W. Mitchell
Address: 150 Flaxton-Mt. Coolum Rd, Flaxton, B.C.
Dear Secretary

Re: QRC/O  Comment on location of Chermside

I draw to the Commission’s attention my objection to the proposed new boundaries of the Stafford Electorate.

The suburb of Chermside is a significant business and social hub of the Northside with a strong “community of interest”, but the proposed new boundaries split the community in two. Chermside residents share important community facilities such as Westfield, the Kedron Wavell Services Club, the Burnie Brae Centre and the Prince Charles Hospital. Sharing of these facilities heightens the sense of belonging, responsibility / ownership and community spirit felt by residents of our community. The proposed use of Gympie Road as the new boundary for the Stafford Electorate will divide our strong local community in two.

I believe the proposed new boundaries will have a detrimental effect on my local community and I strongly urge you to maintain the boundary of the existing electoral district to keep Chermside united as one community in the Stafford Electorate.

Yours sincerely,

Signed: [Signature]

Name: [Name]

Address: 70 Highlands St
            Wavell Heights
            Brisbane

June 2008
For further information please contact: J T Finlay
Direct Dial No: 07 4761 3600

30 June 2008

Electoral Commission Queensland
GPO Box 1393
BRISBANE QLD 4001

Dear Sir/Madam

RE: STATE GOVERNMENT ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES REVIEW

Thank you for the opportunity to provide a submission with reference to the State Government Electoral Boundaries Review.

At its Ordinary Meeting on the 26 May, 2008, Council discussed the proposed State Government Electoral Boundaries and resolved to prepare a submission for your consideration.

As you would be aware the former Council's of Bowen Shire and Whitsunday Shire have been amalgamated and Council and staff are working towards uniting the operations of both previous Councils together.

To assist with the unification of the Shires and for the governance of the new Council area, it would be of benefit if the area of the Whitsunday Regional Council could be contained within the one State Electorate.

As it stands with the new proposed State Electoral Boundaries, Proserpine and Cannonvale will be in the Whitsunday Electorate, Bowen and Collinsville will be in the Burdekin Electorate.

Council understands that electoral boundaries are formed with reference to electoral numbers, however requests that an option for the containment of the Whitsunday Regional Council in the one State Electorate be investigated.

Council appreciates being provided with information on investigation of Council's proposal and having further discussions with you on the matter.

Should you require any further information please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Yours faithfully

JOHN FINLAY
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

Address all correspondence to the Chief Executive Officer, Whitsunday Regional Council, PO Box 104 Proserpine QLD 4800
From: Lyn [mailto:wrlalawrence@eldersnet.com.au]  
Sent: Monday, 30 June 2008 10:07 PM  
To: ECQ User  
Subject: Re Distribution of Fitzroy electorate

The Secretary  
Queensland Re-Distribution Commission  
Locked Bag 3304  
Brisbane

Dear Sir/Madam

We, Warren and Lynette Lawrence of 25 Ski Gardens Road Alton Downs Queensland 4702, object to our being placed in the Mirani Electorate for the following reasons.

1. We readily identify with Fitzroy electorate and its close proximity to Rockhampton. We live only 30 mins from the heart of Rockhampton whereas Mirani is 4 hours away.
2. We believe that any politician would have great difficulty in serving our needs or even have an understanding of the issues that concern the constituents of this area. He/she would not be as readily accessible.
3. We believe there would be unfair and unjust representation and feel that people are constantly being manipulated like chess pieces to suit the political agendas of politicians and political parties with very little genuine concern being given to the real issues that impact on people in this area on a daily basis.
4. In light of the survey taken by Channel 9's WIN news earlier in June, there was an overwhelmingly 97% vote in favour of Fitzroy residents preferring to be in the Rockhampton electorate and opposed to being included in the Mirani electorate if there was to be any form of re-distribution.

Please take these viewpoints into consideration

Regards

WR and LA Lawrence

Mrs Lynette (Lyn) Lawrence  
25 Ski Gardens Road  
Alton Downs 4702  
Phone: (07) 49 341451  
(M) 04 0900 2754  
Email: wrlalawrence@eldersnet.com.au
Bunya Resident’s Association Inc.,
35 Mailmans Track
BUNYA. Q’LD. 4055.
26th June 2008

The Acting Chief Executive Officer,
Queensland Electoral Office,
Level 6,Forestry House.
160 Mary Street,
BRISBANE, Q’LAND. 4000.

Dear Sir,

On behalf of the Committee and Members of the Bunya Resident’s Association I would like to put forward a submission stating that we support the recommendation of the new Moreton Bay Regional Council that,

a) the electorate currently named Kurwongbah (proposed to be renamed Samsonvale) would be better identified within the region as the Pine Rivers;
b) Strathpine East (included in electorate of Kallangur) be moved to the new suggested electorate of Pine Rivers;
c) The boundaries between the electorate of Kallangur and Pine Rivers be relocated to the North Pine River in lieu of Dayboro Road, Petrie;

We as a local Association agree with the Council that these submissions are valid and that it is very important to retain some identity with the local area that we have known for many years as the Pine Rivers.

We ask that you consider these proposals when making your decisions regarding these areas.

Yours sincerely,

CAROLYN HOHNKE
PRESIDENT.
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: cca@ecq.qld.gov.au

28/05/2008
Address
 Orr Main & Vernon St
Atherton QLD 4883

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours Sincerely

Joe Salerno
Dear Commissioners,

I wish to state my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution.

The proposed redistribution is not in accordance with guidelines for redistributions set out in the electoral Act 1992, Part 3- Electoral districts and electoral redistributions. This states that the commissioners must consider the following five matters, each listed in bold type, in the following paragraphs.

(a) **The extent to which there is a community of economic, social, regional or other interests within each proposed district.** The existing Tablelands electorate does represent a community of interests as recognized by the local government amalgamation plan. The proposed Macrossan electorate, a vast new area containing only the Southern Tablelands, does not represent an extension of the Tablelands community; the hinterland is 1000km long extending far from the Far North Queensland region to west of Mackay.

(b) **The ways of communication and travel within each proposed electoral district.** Macrossan, a vast electorate, has Townsville/Thuringowa as its primary service centre, while the primary service centre for the Tablelands is Cairns. The long communication lines will make Macrossan a difficult electorate to service and if the member’s base were Townsville or Charters Towers the Atherton Tablelands would be difficult to adequately represent.

(c) **The physical features of each proposed electoral district.** While the Tablelands have a distinct character the new proposed electorate of Macrossan has a wide variety of features. The Southern Tropical Highlands have little in common with the hinterland west of Mackay while the Northern Tableland has little in common with Cape York in the proposed Cook electorate.

(d) **The boundaries of existing electoral districts.** These have been completely ignored and the existing electoral district will be dismantled as an entity.

(e) **Demographic trends in the state.** The Far North Queensland Draft Regional Plan is predicting a great increase in the population of the Tablelands. In one of its possible scenarios major Tableland towns could double in population by 2025.

As a Tablelands constituent I request that you review the elimination of the Tablelands in your proposed redistribution. Let the Tablelands community retain its unique regional voice.

Yours sincerely,
PEOPLE POWER

For the past 15 years the population
Has been overrun with legislation
Now we have mass brain sedation
by mandatory fluoridisation
What's your next step in your plan for mankind
What else do you give us you don't want us to find
In your disguised, gradual genocide
It is time to stand up as a people unite
To support life and claim our birthright
We must question ALL products on offer to us
Grow food in our soil, not kill the grass
Feed real food to our children instead of plastic
Not let legal toxins turn our bodies to acid
The earth's future has a right to be
Self sustainable, pure and free
Is our responsibility to discern and sustain
So souls can learn in bodies tomorrow again
We can't have a functional society
Without high levels of courtesy
We must abide by universal law
All other laws will lead to war
Accountable we'll be held at the end of the day
For the flowers we wilted for pleasure and play
It's time to turn our planet into a garden
To refuse Big Brother as our prison warden
Self empowerment through substance for every man
So mankind can rise to peace and freedom again
To raise our collective consciousness
It's our eternal inheritance
For what it's worth
As we all walk this earth
TOGETHER WE STAND, DIVIDED WE FALL
And that really does mean us all
The answer is clear on this fundamental decision
If we want a planet we must all listen
The voice of our mother screams beneath our feet
No longer can we afford to support Multi National Greed
We don't have the right to poison the planet
In the name of progress and material asset
Or not one can live here any more
Our children's screams silenced by Big Brothers war
Refuse to accept a destructive society
And demand freedom with equal responsibility!
This is a possible goal and we must do what has to be done!

By Boldarn

Quote: SOMETIMES A GENERATION IS CALLED UPON TO BE GREAT
YOU CAN BE THAT GREAT GENERATION

By Nelson Mandela
DEAR COMMISSIONERS

I AM WRITING TO REGISTER MY STRONG OBJECTION TO THE ELIMINATION OF THE SEAT OF TABLELANDS, IN YOUR PROPOSED REDISTRIBUTION.

AS A RESIDENT OF THE ARTHURTON TABLELANDS I BELIEVE YOUR RECOMMENDATION TO ELIMINATE THIS SEAT BY DIVIDING IT BETWEEN COOK AND INTRODUCING THE NEW SEAT, MACROSSAN, IS BLATANT IN ITS DISREGARD FOR WHAT THE PEOPLE OF THIS DISTRICT WANT AND EXPECT. THIS DISTRICT HAS ALREADY LOST ITS REGIONAL SHIRES DUE TO THE “PROGRESSIVE” TIDE OF THOUGHT WHICH DOESN’T TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE POPULOUS OR ITS NEEDS. NOW WE LOSE REFLECTIVE REPRESENTATION IN GOVERNMENT AS WELL.

YOUR PROPOSAL TO INCLUDE A SIGNIFICANT PORTION OF THE TABLELANDS INTO MACROSSAN, WHICH RUNS SOME 1000 KMS SOUTH AND DEEP INTO CENTRAL QLD., IS INCONSISTENT WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING’S DRAFT FNQ 2025 PLAN. THIS PLAN PLACES THE AREA FIRMLY IN FAR NORTH QUEENSLAND. NOR DO YOUR CLAIMS OF LOW AND FALLING ELECTOR NUMBERS REFLECT THE EXPECTED GROWTH IDENTIFIED IN FNQ 2025.

AS A MOTHER, OF 3 CHILDREN, I’VE REQUIRED THE SERVICES OF SPECIALISTS, FOR THEM, IN THE MEDICAL FIELD FOR DISORDERS SUCH AS SLEEP APNEA AND EPILEPSY. SOON MY YOUNGEST TWO WILL NEED BRACES AND MY ELDEST NEEDS DENTAL MAJOR DENTAL WORK ON HER WISDOM TEETH. YOU ALSO APPEAR TO IGNORE THAT CAIRNS IS THE SERVICE CENTRE FOR THIS REGION AND IS THE NEXUS FOR HEALTH, TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATION LINKS ETC. THESE SIMPLY DO NOT EXIST ALONG THE NTH-STH ALIGNMENT OF MACROSSAN.

THERE IS NO COMMUNITY OF INTEREST BETWEEN THE WET, TROPICAL HIGHLANDS OF TABLELANDS AND THE HINTERLAND OF MACKAY, NOR IS THERE ANY STRONG CONNECTION BETWEEN THE MAREEBA DISTRICT AND CAPE YORK.

I REQUEST THAT YOU REVIEW THE ELIMINATION OF THE TABLELAND SEAT IN YOUR PROPOSED REDISTRIBUTION AND INSTEAD RESTORE THIS REGION’S CAPACITY TO HAVE ITS OWN VOICE IN PARLIAMENT.

Yours faithfully,

[Signature]

Trudie Watson
22 Maple Street
Millaa Millaa, Qld, 4886
June 22, 2008
Redistribution of Electoral Boundaries – Nicklin Electorate

As electors resident in the central Blackall Range we write formally to lodge my objections to the currently proposed electoral redistribution which would, inter alia, excise the communities of Montville and Flaxton from the Nicklin electorate and place them into the Glasshouse electorate.

Our grounds for this objection are:-

The subject areas have a long term association with the Nicklin electorate and a highly developed community of interest with it.

The historical association of the villages of Montville and Flaxton has been and continues to be with the regional service town of Nambour. Nambour is the location of the electoral office for the Nicklin electorate. There is not now and never has been any association of the subject village communities with the service hubs and electorate office of the Glasshouse electorate.

Practical road access and the only public transport available in the central/northern Blackall range connects to Nambour. There is no practical public transport link to any commercial/service part of the Glasshouse electorate and the access from the villages of Montville/Flaxton by private vehicle to any such facilities within Glasshouse is many times as lengthy and many times as difficult and potentially congested as the access to Nambour.

Nambour is the site of the only public hospital reasonably accessible to Blackall Range residents. Nambour is the location of the nearest and mainly typically used advanced medical consultation services for Range residents. It is the location of the most typically used hospitals.

Practically all higher level banking and financial services used by Range residents are Nambour based. It would be fair to say there is no such association at all with any place in the Glasshouse electorate.

Nambour is the, by far, most used commercial/industrial centre for services not available on the Range. There is no such association with any place in the Glasshouse electorate.

It is visibly obvious that the population of the “railway corridor” through the Glasshouse electorate which accommodates its major population density is growing uncommonly rapidly and it is difficult to imagine its population not increasing by far more than the 10% electorate quota margin within a very short time, thus requiring the excision of some part of it, probably within as little as 3 years.

Excision of Montville/Flaxton from the Nicklin electorate and its transfer to Glasshouse would place approximately half of the region from which membership of the active and effective community representative group Montville Village Association is drawn into each rebounded electorate. Similarly the area from which the membership of the Blackall Range Land Use and Planning Association is drawn would be about equally divided between two electorates. The effectiveness and community usefulness of these bodies would be much diminished. The
proposed redistribution would politically isolate the Montville and Flaxton communities from the renowned and widely valued Blackall Range Care Group, a facility in which those residents played major roles in its establishment and continue to play major roles in its continuing operation, as well as its use.

In summary, historical development of the central/northern Blackall Range took place as a cohesive social grouping, with many cooperatives and enlightened and altruistic community “self help” programs. These attitudes have endured to the present. Overwhelmingly, the resident community views itself as a single entity comprising the communities of Montville, Flaxton, and Mapleton and beyond. The perceived community shares community facilities ranging from the Care Group, through gymnasi ums to Arts and Craft societies, land and water care and planning groups, as well as a strong social cohesion. There are well over 30 community based associations/activities which embrace the broad Range. It is, in fact, an uncommonly cohesive and motivated to mutual support community. Such cohesion and the highly valuable effectiveness of the various community groups would be much diminished, if not destroyed, if it were necessary for them to deal at a State Government level with two local representatives rather than one. Such a situation would, of course, be grossly inefficient for the State Government, also.

All of the “off Range” focus of the Montville/Flaxton communities is north and east and Nambour directed, not south directed. This direction is not only by reasons of historical association but also strongly determined by the topography, access and transport links. Nambour/Nicklin is accessible, extensively used and historically deeply embedded in the Blackall Range culture. Any commercially, industrially, culturally or socially significant place in Glasshouse is none of these. The topographic characteristics of the Blackall Range preclude infrastructure ever being practically developed which would change this situation.

We urge reconsideration of the proposal to excise Montville/Flaxton from the Nicklin electorate and transfer them to Glasshouse as the proposal is socially damaging, contrary to historical connections and present custom, illogical on “community of interest” grounds, largely unworkable in a practical association sense and contrary to strongly help community wishes.

Yours faithfully

Barry H Brady

Colleen a Brady
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

Joan Margaret Donald
Dear Sir,

We Pat and John Peach of 114 Six Mile Road Pink Lily C/- Wandal P.O. 4700 object to our being placed in the Mirani Electorate for the following reasons.

- We readily identify with Fitzroy – never with Mirani which is a township four hours travel away.
- We are within sight of Rockhampton and enjoy easy travel to the Capricorn Coast. Either of the Politicians representing these areas would be a more genuine “local” member for us.
- The elected member for Mirani regardless of where he/she is based would have great difficulty serving such a diverse area. How could each constituent be treated equally and why should some members of Parliament be punished by having to represent a more difficult electorate.
- We are thoroughly fed up with the constant change of boundaries at Local, State and Federal levels. We deserve to belong to an area and build up a relationship with our member. We feel we have been attached to Mirani just to make up the numbers. The paranoia to ensure one vote one value which supposedly ensures a fair go for all in fact does the opposite for all Pink Lily residents.

Please give us back our beloved FITZROY.

Thank you for your consideration.

Pat and John Peach

[Signature]

Original letter. Copy has been faxed + emailed.

[Signature]
19 June 2008

The Secretary
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
BRISBANE QLD 4000

Dear Commissioner,

QUEENSLAND REDISTRIBUTION COMMISSION OBJECTION

Subsequent to resolution at Diamantina Shire Councils Ordinary Meeting held Monday, June 16, 2008 please be advised that Council formally objects to the Queensland Redistribution Commissions proposal to include the Diamantina Shire in the proposed Mount Isa electorate on the following basis:

1. That the proposal to include Diamantina Shire in proposed Mount Isa electorate conflicts with the essential service, business, communications, transport and economic transactions of the shire and its residents.
2. The Diamantina Shire's traditional linkages are to the east and not to the northern city of Mount Isa.
3. The Council is concerned that its residents and the council, because of our remoteness will be forgotten people and the forgotten entity in the proposed electorate of Mount Isa due to its configuration of being geographically extended from the gulf of Carpentaria in the north to the South Australian border in the south and to the outskirts of Charters Towers in the east.

Your time your consideration of Diamantina Shire's concerns is appreciated. If you have any questions please don't hesitate to contact either of the undersigned.

Yours faithfully

Scott Mason
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

Councillor Robert Dare
MAYOR

FOR ENQUIRIES PLEASE CONTACT: Scott Mason
IN REPLY PLEASE QUOTE: 246:2008
YOUR REFERENCE:
Submission to Comments on the objections "QRC/08J/01”

Any Public Objection to “the Commission” in relation to “the Act” can only be deemed repugnant.

One must remember “the Act” is that of “Sovereign Power”, a “Royal Prerogative Act of State” essentially an exercise of “Sovereign Power”, and hence cannot be challenged, controlled or interfered by municipal courts, its sanction is not that of “law” but that of “Sovereign Power”, and what ever it be, municipal courts must except it: “For such extension the authority of parliament is not required.”

One must conclude “the Act” is in fact Prohibition- Certiorar Mandamus, hence any objection to a “Royal Prerogative Act of State” is a “contest by arms”, ie the law of the jungle ipso facto.

The end.

Kind Regards,

Anthony CLARKE

[Signature]
From: Ian & Penny Campbell-Wilson [mailto:ipcw@ledanet.com.au]
Sent: Monday, 7 July 2008 4:16 PM
To: ECQ User
Subject: Redistribution Response

"Argyle"
MILLAA MILLAA 4886
7th July, 2008

The Hon. A. Demack, AO
Chairperson
Queensland Redistribution Committee,
BRISBANE

Dear Sir,

I welcome the opportunity to voice my grave concern in connection with the current redistribution being considered by the Queensland Electoral Commission.

I reside in the Tablelands Electorate and wish to advise of my strong disapproval that this matter is even under consideration.
As a result of the recent Local Government changes, we feel we have been treated unfairly - our local authority is approximately now the same area as Tasmania. This was very disruptive, our residents do not need more changes. It will be a slow process becoming accustomed to a greater local council, but at least our Mayor and our Councillors live on the Atherton Tablelands and are not distracted for they know, respect and represent their ratepayers.

The community had no choice but to accept this situation, no matter how strongly we protested. We now have a similar situation with the Commission wanting us to be part of areas that have no common interests with Atherton Tablelands area. I sit on many committees, either as President, Chairman or Secretary and these are State or Federal Committees. I fear for the future of our community in not being able to access our local State representative when required.

Our State representative, Mrs. Rosa Lee Long is always available for her constituents - virtually on a daily basis if the need is there. Mrs. Lee Long lives in Atherton and her main electorate office is situated in Mareeba. Hence, people can see her face to face - not some remote person hundreds of miles away. We share no community interests with the Cairns, Mackay or Charters Towers areas. Granted, Cairns is the service centre for the Tablelands, however, the other areas have not, or will they, have an interest in the residents of the Atherton Tablelands.

Our local member is a "home grown local" who knows everybody and supports every community organisation in her electorate. People trust Mrs. Lee Long, they go to her with their problems, whether it be business, personal, local, state or federal Government enquiries. They see their local member in the main streets of our towns, they stop and pass the time of day - a member situated many hundred of kilometres would have no interest or know any of his/her constituents.

I have had occasion to ask Mrs. Lee Long's office for an item to be delivered to me - it arrives the next day. Often she assists with some photocopying for a very large organisation of which I am President, and a member of State Council, and within days I have the by-laws and ready to send out to all the members on the Tablelands. This would not occur with a member situated away from the Tablelands - whether it be in the Cairns, Mackay or Charters Towers area. It would be considered a nuisance and I know that we would be overlooked all the time.
It is my fervent wish that the Committee takes into consideration the very difficult fiscal times we are experiencing, together with all the aspects that other constituents apart from myself have raised. We do not need change just for the sake of change - we have had more than sufficient of recent times. We need stability, we need a member of Parliament whom we can trust, who knows us, who knows her Electorate, who knows the aspirations and desires of her constituents. We do not need a complete stranger who has no affinity with the people of the Atherton Tablelands.

Yours sincerely,
Mrs. Penny Campbell-Wilson
From: Helen Johnston [mailto:helen.johnstone4@bigpond.com]
Sent: Tuesday, 8 July 2008 7:44 PM
To: ECQ User
Cc: winston.johnston@yib.com.au
Subject: QRC/OBJ/COM

I write to comment upon numerous objections relating to the proposed boundaries for the Sunshine Coast Electorates of "Caloundra", "Nicklin" and "Glass House".

Numerous electors in the areas of Mooloolah, Palmwoods, Eudlo, Montville and Flaxton have objected to the proposed boundaries.

Objectors from the Palmwoods and Eudlo areas are rightly concerned about being placed into the new Glass House Electorate. The proposal to include them with Maleny, Glass House, Wamuran, Woodford and Elimbah, is indeed a very strange decision. Woombye and Eudlo are remote from these other population centres.

Sir Frank Nicklin grew up at Palmwoods and was the Member for Landsborough. He lived in Caloundra (part of the old Landsborough Electorate) for most of his Parliamentary term. Surely Palmwoods and Eudlo should be included either the in Nicklin or Caloundra Electorates. Palmwoods and Eudlo have much in common with Mooloolah and Landsborough. All these towns are railway towns and have easy access to Caloundra.

The current member for Glass House, Carolyn Male, has not submitted an objection, probably because she proposes to move to the new electorate of Morayfield. However, the location of an office for the next member for Glass House (currently in the town of Caboolture), will be one which pleases very few electors if the proposed boundaries are adopted. An office located in Palmwoods, Glass House, Elimbah, Wamuran, Woodford or Maleny, would be very unpopular, except to electors located in the selected town.

I suggest amending the boundaries as follows. Place Beerwah and the areas bounded between the Bruce Hwy, Steve Irwin Way (previously Glass House Mountains Scenic Drive and Coochin Creek at Landsborough, into Glass House, and move the northern boundary of Caloundra to include Palmwoods and Eudlo, east to the boundary of Buderim Electorate. By doing this, you will provide electors in Eudlo and Palmwoods with an easily accessed Members office, and, the new Member for Glass House could locate an office in Beerwah, which would be conveniently accessed by all electors.

This solution also addresses the concerns of objectors from the northern and western areas of Mooloolah, as they would all be in the Caloundra Electorate.

The objections from some electors in the Montville, Flaxton area are not so easily solved, because they wish to remain in Nicklin Electorate, as also requested in the objection lodged by the current Member for Nicklin, Peter Wellington. Obviously, quotas make these requests difficult to satisfy, but it may be possible to place Montville and Flaxton in Nicklin, if the area west of Obi Obi Creek and the Mary River (including Kenilworth township) was moved into the electorate of Glass House.

The above suggestions may require some minor massaging of population cells to achieve desired population quotas, but they would generally satisfy the concerns of objectors and I believe would result in very serviceable Electorates for the Parliamentary Members in Nicklin, Caloundra and Glass House.

Winston Johnston
4 Rangers Road
Balmoral Ridge 4552
Email: helen.johnstone4@bigpond.com
Phone: 07 54 999 000
From: Berardos restaurants [mailto:info@berardos.com.au]
Sent: Thursday, 10 July 2008 10:09 AM
To: ECQ User
Subject: State Electoral Redistribution

Hon. Alan Demack AO,
Chairperson,
Queensland Redistribution Commission,
Level 6/160 Mary Street,
Brisbane,
QLD 4000

Dear Mr. Demack,

YOUR REF: QRC/OBJ/COM
STATE ELECTORAL REDISTRIBUTION: COMMENTS ON PUBLIC OBJECTIONS:

Friends of Noosa (FON) is a community based incorporated association with a membership of the order of 2,000 members. FON enjoys strong support within the community of the former Noosa Shire.

FON has been and continues to be at the forefront of the fight to retain the integrity of the Noosa identity. A number of other local communities strongly identify with this objective. The former Noosa Shire Council was also mindful of this objective in its Submission to the Local Government Reform Commission where it nominated the Greater Noosa Shire as a desirable outcome from local government reform.

The Greater Noosa Shire envisaged inclusion of the communities of Eumundi, Doonan, Verrierdale, West Peregian (formerly Weyba Downs) and Peregian Springs with the then existing Noosa Shire. It also advocated inclusion of Coolum but acknowledged that a shire boundary was not readily identifiable with the clarity possible for inclusion of the aforementioned communities. The prime basis for the proposal for the Greater Noosa Shire was the researched and documented Community of Interest argument.

The State Electorate of Noosa is to be varied in the redistribution to comply with the terms of the Electoral Act 1992. A number of public objections have been received by the Commission. These objections also advocate strong Community of Interest arguments. These arguments are consistent with Section 46 of the Act. In particular, David Wise (ORC/OBJ 18), the Cooroy Doonan District Branch ALP (ORC/OBJ 92), the EDV Action Group Inc (ORC/OBJ 106), the Liberal Party of Australia (ORC/OBJ 822) have advocated Community of Interest arguments for the Commission to vary its proposed boundaries for the revised Noosa electorate.

However, the most compelling and cogent research based case is presented by the EDV Action Group Inc (ORC/OBJ 106) for inclusion of the Greater Noosa Shire communities of Eumundi, Doonan, Verrierdale and Weyba Downs in the revised Noosa electorate.

Friends of Noosa wish the Commission to note that it strongly supports the advocacy of Objections 92, 106 and 822 and asks the Commission to include the communities identified within the revised Noosa electorate.

Yours sincerely,

James Berardo,
President,
Friends of Noosa Association, Inc.
PO Box 1102,
Noosa Heads,
QLD. 4567
9 July 2008

The Secretary
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Level 6/160 Mary Street
BRISBANE QLD 4000

Dear Sir/Madam,

The Queensland Farmers’ Federation is the peak agricultural body representing the interests of 14,000 primary producers in the intensive agricultural sector in Queensland. QFF provided comments in objection to the abolition of the seat of Tablelands and the creation of the seat of Macrossan on 1 June 2008. We have received considerable feedback on our objection and wished to provide further comments to the Commission.

QFF argued that the seat of Tablelands should be retained on community of interest criteria, with a seat based on the intensive agricultural region around Mareeba-Dimbulah and Atherton-Malanda. We acknowledged that such a seat is below quota. With the need to expand Cook south and Mt Isa east to meet quota requirements, Tablelands would need to go south (as suggested by the ECQ) or east (as suggested by our objection) to meet quota.

If Tablelands goes each to include Mournlyan and Mission Beach, this would result in Cassowary Coast Region being split between three electorates rather than two, and detract from the strong community of interest in the Wet Tropics coastal region from Innisfail to Ingham. We acknowledge that this is a weakness in our proposal, although we argued that Atherton has a stronger community of interest east with these regions than south to Charters Towers. Charters Towers has a weak community of interest and weak transport links to both Tablelands and Hinchinbrook and fits essentially equally uncomfortably in either.

An alternative would be to extend Tablelands south to include Charters Towers. This is similar to the ECQ proposal, but still superior to it:

- It would unite Mareeba and Atherton in a single seat, preserving the bulk of Tablelands Regional Council in a single seat;
- Cook would be brought back to quota by restoring Carpentaria, Croydon & Etheridge Shires (which were part of the seat up to the last redistribution) from Mt Isa and Mt Melloy and Chillagoe from Tablelands;
- Mt Isa would extend to include Longreach, but would be considerably smaller (and hence more manageable) than proposed by ECQ (494,000 km sq rather than 570,000 km sq);
- Moranbah would be united with the other Central Highlands towns of Clermont and Emerald and the coal mining centres of Tieri and Blackwater in Gregory, with a much stronger community of interest than in Macrossan;
- Hinchinbrook would be maintained as a Wet Tropics coastal seat as proposed by the ECQ;
- Barron River would be unchanged;
- Cairns would gain around 2000 voters from Mulgrave, with less extensive changes than recommended by the ECQ.

This proposal preserves the community of interest of both the Tablelands and Cassowary Coast regions while meeting the quota requirements of the Act.

QFF wishes to re-iterate again our disappointment that this redistribution will see the loss of three rural seats and the creation of three urban seats. This is not because population has dropped in rural Queensland (it has actually increased in all electorates), but because growth has been faster in the South East than in the North or the West. Queensland MPs now represent 65% more voters on average since the Parliament was last expanded in 1986, rendering rural electorates larger than is reasonable to service. The Parliament needs to look at these issues, although this is beyond the scope of this redistribution.

Yours sincerely,

John Cherry
Chief Executive Officer
The Commissioner  
Qld Redistribution Commission  
Locked Bag 3304  
Brisbane 4001

Dear Sir,

I write to register my strong objection in the final round of public consultations of the proposed electoral redistribution, and to those objections which do not support the retention of the Tablelands.

I believe the commissions proposal to include Mareeba into the seat of Cook, is merely an attempt to transfer voters to correct the imbalance of numbers in the Cook electorate. The commissions claim that there is a fall in the voting public numbers are ill founded, as there has been some 1000 new voting persons in the Mareeba district since the last election.

Without doubt, it would appear that the Electoral Commission has, without any consideration of the regional public, looked at the voting numbers, and has basically “drawn lines in the sand” to ensure the mean average of 29000 voters per electorate.

Not once did I read or hear on any media outlet that there would be a public meeting sponsored by the commission, or any consideration of a local referendum on the issue. To redraw the boundaries of northern regional electorates without any community input indicates that the commission may well be totally ignorant of the needs and requirements of regional communities who are at the mercy of larger physical geographical extremes than those who inhabit the southeast corner of the state.

This also indicates that the commission were ignorant of, or ignored, the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025, that puts this region in FNQ, and as stated, totally refutes the commissions claim of falling electoral voting numbers.

I request that the commission reviews the tablelands redistribution, and, if not restore this electorate to the original, then reconsider Mareeba and Kuranda within the boundaries, and relocate the boundary of Hinchinbrook to include the new Electorate of Macrossan.

Yours sincerely,

Alan Webb  
Mareeba  
4880
10th July, 2008

Fax to: 3229 7391

"QRC/OBJ/COM"

Electoral Commission Queensland

Comments in response to the objections lodged with the Commission.

Owing to the small amount of time in which to make comments it is not humanly possible to read all the objections in full but have taken particular notice of objections from rural Councils and from the region in which I live.

A lot of the objections refer to the disenfranchising of communities and towns from their traditional service areas and areas which they have common interests with and this is a comment I agree with as the town of Duaringa is proposed to be in a different electorate from 90% (approx) of the rural area which surrounds it and which it serves.

As far as possible I feel that Regional Council boundaries should be included in the one State Electorate ie Central Highlands Regional Council is now proposed to be in Gregory and Callide with some areas from the old Gregory going into Callide. Advice from the C.H.R.C. indicates that if the whole of the Council is located in Gregory than the electors will be within current quota system for both areas.

Surely it is better for electors and Councils to deal with one State Politician who can become familiar with their area. With 2 state politicians representing one Council you could end up with the anomaly of one government representative and one in opposition – not good for anyone.

Carol Finger
The Commissioner
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001
Fax: 3229 7391.

Dear Commissioner,

I write in response to the Redistribution of State Seats process being undertaken by your organisation and specifically, to comment on the Objections you have recently published.

I wish to unreservedly support the Objection submitted by Rosa Lee Long MP for Tablelands.

I object to Objections submitted by the Australian Labor Party, the Queensland National Party and the Queensland Liberal Party which all ignore the proposed elimination of the seat of Tablelands, of which I am a constituent.

Your proposal to divide this seat between Cook, the new seat of Macrossan and Hinchinbrook is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared that the previous four shire councils in this area should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal is also inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure of Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan which places this area firmly in Far North Queensland and also identifies strong population growth in coming years.

Cairns, not Charters Towers or Townsville, is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of either Mackay or Townsville, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you adopt the Objection submitted by the Member for Tablelands as a better solution than that proposed in your draft redistribution.

Yours sincerely

signed: C.A. Jenkins.

name: Catherine Anne Jenkins (Mrs)
The Commissioner
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001
Fax: 3229 7391.

Dear Commissioner,

I write in response to the Redistribution of State Seats process being undertaken by your organisation and specifically, to comment on the Objections you have recently published.

I wish to unreservedly support the Objection submitted by Rosa Lee Long MP Member for Tablelands.

I object to Objections submitted by the Australian Labor Party, the Queensland National Party and the Queensland Liberal Party which all ignore the proposed elimination of the seat of Tablelands, of which I am a constituent.

Your proposal to divide this seat between Cook, the new seat of Macrossan and Hinchinbrook is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared that the previous four shire councils in this area should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal is also inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure of Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan which places this area firmly in Far North Queensland and also identifies strong population growth in coming years.

Cairns, not Charters Towers or Townsville, is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of either Mackay or Townsville, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you adopt the Objection submitted by the Member for Tablelands as a better solution than that proposed in your draft redistribution.

Yours sincerely,

J. Harron.

10/07/2008

From:

J. Harron
P.O. Box 15636, Cannon Hill
Innot Hot Springs 4872
QLD
The Commissioner  
Queensland Redistribution Commission  
Locked Bag 3304  
Brisbane Q 4001  
Fax: 3229 7391.

Dear Commissioner,

I write in response to the Redistribution of State Seats process being undertaken by your organisation and specifically, to comment on the Objections you have recently published.

I wish to unreservedly support the Objection submitted by Rosa Lee Long MP Member for Tablelands.

I object to Objections submitted by the Australian Labor Party, the Queensland National Party and the Queensland Liberal Party which all ignore the proposed elimination of the seat of Tablelands, of which I am a constituent.

Your proposal to divide this seat between Cook, the new seat of Macrossan and Hinchinbrook is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared that the previous four shire councils in this area should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal is also inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure of Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan which places this area firmly in Far North Queensland and also identifies strong population growth in coming years.

Cairns, not Charters Towers or Townsville, is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of either Mackay or Townsville, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you adopt the Objection submitted by the Member for Tablelands as a better solution than that proposed in your draft redistribution.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
The Commissioner
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001
Fax 3229 7391.

Dear Commissioner,

I write in response to the Redistribution of State Seats process being undertaken by your organisation and specifically, to comment on the Objections you have recently published.

I wish to unreservedly support the Objection submitted by Rosa Lee Long MP Member for Tablelands.

I object to Objections submitted by the Australian Labor Party, the Queensland National Party and the Queensland Liberal Party which all ignore the proposed elimination of the seat of Tablelands, of which I am a constituent.

Your proposal to divide this seat between Cook, the new seat of Macrossan and Hinchinbrook is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared that the previous four shire councils in this area should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal is also inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure of Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan which places this area firmly in Far North Queensland and also identifies strong population growth in coming years.

Cairns, not Charters Towers or Townsville, is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of either Mackay or Townsville, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you adopt the Objection submitted by the Member for Tablelands as a better solution than that proposed in your draft redistribution.

Yours sincerely,
The Commissioner
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001
Fax: 3229 7391.

Dear Commissioner,

I write in response to the Redistribution of State Seats process being undertaken by your organisation and specifically, to comment on the Objections you have recently published.

I wish to unreservedly support the Objection submitted by Rosa Lee Long MP Member for Tablelands.

I object to Objections submitted by the Australian Labor Party, the Queensland National Party and the Queensland Liberal Party which all ignore the proposed elimination of the seat of Tablelands, of which I am a constituent.

Your proposal to divide this seat between Cook, the new seat of Macrossan and Hindonbrook is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared that the previous four shire councils in this area should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal is also inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure of Planning's draft FNQ 2025 Plan which places this area firmly in Far North Queensland and also identifies strong population growth in coming years.

Cairns, not Charters Towers or Townsville, is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of either Mackay or Townsville, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you adopt the Objection submitted by the Member for Tablelands as a better solution than that proposed in your draft redistribution.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
Dear Commissioner,

I write in response to the Redistribution of State Seats process being undertaken by your organisation and specifically, to comment on the objections you have recently published.

I wish to unreservedly support the Objection submitted by Rosa Lee Long MP Member for Tablelands.

I object to Objections submitted by the Australian Labor Party, the Queensland National Party and the Queensland Liberal Party which all ignore the proposed elimination of the seat of Tablelands, of which I am a constituent.

Your proposal to divide this seat between Cook, the new seat of Macrossan and Hinchinbrook is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared that the previous four shire councils in this area should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal is also inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure of Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan which places this area firmly in Far North Queensland and also identifies strong population growth in coming years.

Cairns, not Charters Towers or Townsville, is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of either Mackay or Townsville, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you adopt the Objection submitted by the Member for Tablelands as a better solution than that proposed in your draft redistribution.

Yours sincerely
The Commissioner  
Queensland Redistribution Commission  
Locked Bag 3304  
Brisbane Q 4001  
Fax 3229 7391.

Dear Commissioner,

I write in response to the Redistribution of State Seats process being undertaken by your organisation and specifically, to comment on the Objections you have recently published.

I wish to unreservedly support the Objection submitted by Rosa Lee Long MP Member for Tablelands.

I object to Objections submitted by the Australian Labor Party, the Queensland National Party and the Queensland Liberal Party which all ignore the proposed elimination of the seat of Tablelands, of which I am a constituent.

Your proposal to divide this seat between Cook, the new seat of Macrossan and Hinchinbrook is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared that the previous four shire councils in this area should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal is also inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure of Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan which places this area firmly in Far North Queensland and also identifies strong population growth in coming years.

Cairns, not Charters Towers or Townsville, is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of either Mackay or Townsville, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you adopt the Objection submitted by the Member for Tablelands as a better solution than that proposed in your draft redistribution.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
The Commissioner  
Queensland Redistribution Commission  
Locked Bag 3304  
Brisbane Q 4001  
Fax: 3229 7391.

Dear Commissioner,

I write in response to the Redistribution of State Seats process being undertaken by your organisation and specifically, to comment on the Objections you have recently published.

I wish to unreservedly support the Objection submitted by Rosa Lee Long MP Member for Tablelands.

I object to Objections submitted by the Australian Labor Party, the Queensland National Party and the Queensland Liberal Party which all ignore the proposed elimination of the seat of Tablelands, of which I am a constituent.

Your proposal to divide this seat between Cook, the new seat of Macrossan and Hinchinbrook is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared that the previous four shire councils in this area should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal is also inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure of Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan which places this area firmly in Far North Queensland and also identifies strong population growth in coming years.

Cairns, not Charters Towers or Townsville, is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of either Mackay or Townsville, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you adopt the Objection submitted by the Member for Tablelands as a better solution than that proposed in your draft redistribution.

Yours sincerely, 

[Signature]
David and Liz Hill  
“Dunkerry South”, 705 Dunkerry Road, THALLON Q 4497  
Ph 07 46259159 Fax 46259299 E-mail dunkerrysouth@bigpond.com  
www.stgeorgeqld.com

14th July 2008  
QRC/OBJ/COM  
The Secretary,  
Qld Redistribution Commission  
Level 6/160 Mary Street  
Brisbane Q 4000

Dear Mr Demack and Commissioners,

We wish to comment on the objection.

The current situation is hindering the ability of the representative in rural regional Queensland to actually represent their electorate.

While we understand the democratic system is population based. The current quota weighage of 2% does not fully reflect the community of interest or the increasing hectare of electorates in rural Qld. A more realistic weighage would be 10%. (The increasing urban tourism sector coming to the regional areas is one reason for this increase.)

Why is it population based? Surely the Whole State should have representation on a holistic criteria.

How can one electorate representative truly represent an area the size of these regional boundaries. They would need a time machine to travel to give adequate representation. The diversity of these electorates which range from 100% grazing thru to farming horticulture to irrigation, intensive livestock to mining and gas and large regional towns.

How can rural and regional QLD get any representation in the State Cabinet when they are so outnumbered by Brisbane and SE corner electoral representatives. Yet it is rural and Regional Qld that is the net income earner for QLD while the urban sector is the lifestyle and service provider sector.

The case of the Warrego State Electorate is relevant for us, but there are other electorates in the same position as Warrego. The member for Warrego has an area of 237,619 km2 and it will be increasing.

Fortunately for the electorate he owns and flies an aircraft otherwise he would not cover this area in any shape or form. I believe the reimbursement of his travel is inadequate in comparison to someone in an urban electorate running a car. Distance and time need to be taken into account.

Basing the electorate size on population alone in today’s world destroys the ability to be representative.

Thank you for noting our comments,
Yours Sincerely

[Signatures]

David Hill

Elizabeth Hill
14 July 2008

The Secretary
Queensland Redistribution Commission
BRISBANE QLD 4000

Dear Secretary

COMMENTS ON OBJECTIONS TO THE PROPOSED REDISTRIBUTION OF QLD ELECTORAL DISTRICTS OF NICKLIN AND GLASSHOUSE

I have surveyed the letters of objection the commission received, particularly those that referred to the districts of Nicklin and Glasshouse. Of the 51 letters of objection I found referring to these districts, it became apparent that there were some common areas of concern about moving the southern boundary of Nicklin north to the proposed boundary. The attached table shows a summary of topics raised in the letters of objection. These topics are pertinent to the communities of Eudlo, Palmwoods, Montville, Flaxton.

I find it interesting that over 50% of the letters of objection, mentioned that the projected growth in Beerwah and Landsborough could outweigh the need to move Eudlo, Palmwoods, Montville and Flaxton into the district of Glasshouse, if Beerwah, Landsborough and parts of Caboolture were to remain in Glasshouse.

It is also important to note that topics 1 to 5 show a strong and complex bond between the communities of Eudlo, Palmwoods, Woombye, Montville, Flaxton, Mapleton and Nambour.

Our association sincerely hopes the commission will take note of these community's concerns as highlighted in the letters of objection, before making a final determination on the redistribution of the districts of Nicklin and Glasshouse.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Richard Waldie
President
Palmwoods Progress Association Inc.

Enc: Topics of Concern
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics of concern</th>
<th>Number of references</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Communities with common interests.</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Nambour is the central commercial and service centre.</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Eudlo, Palmwoods, Montville, Flaxton have little or no community association</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Long term association of the existing communities within Nicklin.</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Established transport routes within areas bounded by Eudlo, Palmwoods, Woombye</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Projected growth in Beerwah, Landsborough will outweigh the need to move</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Historical relevance of Nicklin.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Access to local MP.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Redistribution will split towns and communities.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Little or no community connection with Peregian Springs.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Southern boundary of Nicklin should remain in line with the Federal boundary</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Iconic Places Qld. Blackall Range includes Montville, Flaxton, Mapleton</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(these communities should not be separated)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Commissioner
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001
Fax: 3229 7391.

Dear Commissioner,

I write in response to the Redistribution of State Seats process being undertaken by your organisation and specifically, to comment on the Objections you have recently published.

I wish to unreservedly support the Objection submitted by Rosa Lee Long MP Member for Tablelands.

I object to Objections submitted by the Australian Labor Party, the Queensland National Party and the Queensland Liberal Party which all ignore the proposed elimination of the seat of Tablelands, of which I am a constituent.

Your proposal to divide this seat between Cook, the new seat of Macrossan and Hinchinbrook is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared that the previous four shire councils in this area should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal is also inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure of Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan which places this area firmly in Far North Queensland and also identifies strong population growth in coming years.

Cairns, not Charters Towers or Townsville, is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of either Mackay or Townsville, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you adopt the Objection submitted by the Member for Tablelands as a better solution than that proposed in your draft redistribution.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

Name: Stephen Arthur JENKINS.
Bob Richardson
45 Riverstone Road
GORDONVALE 4865

11TH July 2008

Mr Garry Wiltshire
Secretary
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
BRISBANE 4001

Fax No. (07) 3227 7020

**ORC/0BJ/COM**

Dear Mr Wiltshire

Please find enclosed my ‘Comments on Objections’ for the State Electoral Districts as proposed by the State Electoral Commission and advertised in various newspapers on Saturday 24th June 2008.

Should you have any queries please contact me by phone or fax on (07) 40 561489

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

R. J. Richardson
This ‘Comments on Objections’ covers the area I confined my ‘Suggestions’, ‘Comments on Suggestions’ and ‘Objections’ to, that is the regional and rural areas of the State.

General ‘Objections’

There were numerous ‘objections’ of a general nature, objecting to a specific electorate without defining what was there alternative to the proposed boundaries.

Most of the ‘Objections’ of this nature in the area I have confined my ‘Comments’ to related to the abolishment of the existing District of Tablelands and the proposed District of Macrossan.

Many of these ‘Objections’ were the same letter with a different signature and address.

From the number of ‘Objections’ received and the number of “Comments on Suggestions” received on this District I believe the Commission would fully understand the ‘depth of felling’ that exists on the Atherton Tableland to the proposed ‘abolishment of their seat’.

From a democracy point of view this is ‘a good thing’.

Is shows the community involvement that exist on the Atherton Tableland to the ‘democratic process’.

From the Electoral Commission view it shows that the constituents on the Atherton Tableland think the Commission has ‘got it wrong’ and are letting them know in the avenues that are available to them, “Comments on Suggestions’ and now ‘Objections’.

I understand that ‘public hearings’ are possible under the Electoral Act at this stage of the Redistribution process

I would suggest that the Commission consider holding such a hearing on the Atherton Tableland.

I am sure that there would be a large response by the ‘locals’ if such a hearing was held.

Other areas where such ‘general objections’ were received related to
- **Proposed District of Mirani.** The inclusion of the area south of the Capricorn Highway, including Mount Morgan and Bouldercombe in the proposed District of Mirani.

- **Proposed District of Mount Isa.** The inclusion of the Etheridge Shire and the Diamantina Shire in the proposed District of Mount Isa.

- **Proposed Districts of Gregory and Callide.** The splitting of the Central Highland Regional Council into these two proposed Districts.

I understand the Commission is bound by the 'quota constraints' however it may be possible to 'simplify this boundary' by placing Duaringa in the proposed District of Gregory, and all of the now defunct Bauhinia Shire in the proposed District of Callide.

With the larger Regional Councils it will not always possible to accommodate the whole Council area in one State Electoral District due to quota considerations.

**Specific Objections:**

**Stuart Copelin M.L.A., Member for Cunningham.**

Mr Copelin 'objected' to the abolishment of 'his electorate' and also the naming of the new proposed District 'Dalby'.

As I stated in my 'Objection' I supported the Commission proposal to abolish one of the 'Darling Downs' Districts, as the enrolments of the area does not support the retention of five Districts.

I also have reservations as to the proposed name of 'Dalby' for the proposed new District.

With the history of a 'District of Cunningham' dating back to 1887 I ask the Commission to consider 'Cunningham' along with 'Condamine' and 'Western Downs' and 'Darling Downs' as an appropriate name for the new proposed District.
Dr Tanya Plant of ‘Samarai’ 2637 Oakey-Cooyar Rd Oakey

Dr Plant ‘objects’ to her property of ‘Samarai’ being in the proposed District of Nanango while ‘her community of interest’ is Oakey which is in the proposed District of Dalby.

I note that the Commission has followed the now defunct Shire boundary between the former Shires of Jondaryan and Rosalie as the proposed boundary between Nanango and Dalby in this area, however the Commission may find it possible to ‘accommodate’ Dr Plant’s ‘objection’ as the ‘numbers would be small’.

Mark Freeman, P.O. Box 777, Kuranda.

Mr. Freeman forwarded a detailed ‘suggestion’ to the Commission suggesting a ‘clean up’ of the existing boundary between the existing Districts of Cook, Tablelands, and Barron River in the Kuranda area.

I also suggested the same in my ‘suggestion’.

In my ‘Comments on Suggestions’ I supported Mr. Freeman’s view.

The Commission in its proposed Districts did what I though was ‘a good job’ in addressing these concerns, however it made what appears to be a consciences decision to place the Koah area in the proposed District of Cook.

I objected to this in my ‘Objections’.

Mr. Freeman knows the local area far better than I do and I respect his ‘objection’ however if the Commission accepts my ‘objection’ in the Koah area I ask them to take into consideration that the Federal Divisional boundary between Leichhardt and Kennedy in the Kuranda area is the Clohesy River.

There is a distinct advantage, where possible to have common boundaries between the different levels of Government as it increases the ‘recognition factor’.
Ms Wendy Richardson, 21 East Park Ridge Drive, Brimsmead

Ms Richardson supports:-

- The Commissions boundary between the proposed Districts of Cook and Macrossan being Rocky Creek.

I objected to this boundary in ‘objections’ as combined with the Walsh River would isolate the town of Dimbulah and the surrounding area.

The boundary I suggested is the Tate River and the now defunct boundary between the Shires of Mareeba and Atherton, as this allowed an ‘offset’ by placing Walkamin in the proposed District of Macrossan.

- Objects to the southern part of the existing District being placed in the proposed new District of Macrossan which includes Charters Towers and Moranbah.

Ms Richardson states in her forth paragraph:-

'I went on to suggest that the southern end of the Tablelands had much in common with the coastal area around Innisfail, which the old Tablelands electorate touches on. I felt that in the future, the eastern boundary of Tablelands might well have taken in more of the northern end of Hinchinbrook; the remainder of which could have been absorbed by its other neighbours. I propose now such an electorate could be called Palmerston after Christie Palmerston, one of the pioneers of this area'

I oppose the concept of State Electoral Districts expanding from the coast to the Atherton Tableland.

My involvement in the District of Mulgrave in the 1970’s 1980’s when it included the Eacham and Atherton Shires taught me how difficult it was having two distinct areas ‘the coast and the Tableland’.

Admittedly the Palmerston Highway is a much better road than the Gillies Highway (Gordonvale to Atherton) and what the Palmerston was then, but the climate, industries, and even people’s attitude is different on the coast to those on the Tableland.
A similar situation (that is, coast, and Tableland) existed at that time with the Mourilyan and Barron River electorates.

Ms. Richardson says 'the remainder (of Hinchinbrook) could be absorbed by its other neighbours'.

I assume she means the Townsville Districts.

This would cause major alterations to these proposed Districts and have 'flow on' ratifications further 'down the coast'.

I do not believe that this is acceptable at this late stage of the redistribution process.

What does Ms Richardson propose to do with Charters Towers and Moranbah?

Wipe them off the map!

**Rosa Lee Long M.L.A., Member for Tablelands and the One Nation Party.**

Ms Lee Long and the One Nation Party made nearly identical 'Objections'.

Their 'Objection' centres on the proposed abolition of the existing District of Tablelands.

Their submission proposed:-

- That the District of Tablelands be retained and acquire:-

  (a) the Kuranda area from the existing Cook and Barron River Districts.

I oppose this as I believe that Kuranda is a dormitory suburb of Cairns and should remain in the Barron River District.
(b) South Johnstone, Mena Creek, Silkwood, and Mundoo Booths from Hinchinbrook.

For the reasons I discussed in Ms Richardson's "Objection" I oppose the inclusion of coastal areas in a District based on the Atherton Tableland.

- **Cook acquires the Trinity Beach Booth.**

While my "Suggestion" had the District of Cook extending further south into the Northern Beaches of Cairns I do not believe that including Mareeba into a Tableland based District and extending the District of Cook south is practicable or desirable at this stage of the redistribution process.

It would cause too many 'flow on' effect all the way down the coast.

- **Alters Barron River, Cairns and Mulgrave to accommodate Cook taking in the Northern Beaches.**

As stated above I do not believe that this is practicable or desirable at this stage of the redistribution process.

- **Abolishes Hinchinbrook with the remainder of the existing District being placed in Macrossan.**

For the reasons I have outlined above I am opposed to the Coastal/Tableland concept in North Queensland.

Ms Lee Long suggestion is practically the same as the Commission, which she is objecting to.

She suggests that the Ingham area be coupled with Charters Towers and Moranbah.

Ingham, like the Tableland has very little with Charters Towers and Moranbah, sugar cane, instead of dairying, coupled to mining the pastoral industries.
Queensland Farmers Federation

Mr. John Cherry, Chief Executive Officer of the Queensland Farmers Federation objected to the abolition of the existing District of Tablelands.

He suggested:-

- **Tablelands be retained with 95% of his suggested District coming from the Tablelands Regional Council area, the remainder coming from the existing Hinchinbrook, with the area north of South Mission Beach being 'earmarked'.**

As I stated above I believe that it is practicable or desirable at that this stage of the redistribution to return Mareeba to a District on the Tablelands.

- **Charters Towers be added to Hinchinbrook.**

This is better than Ms Lee Longs to couple both Charters Towers and Moranbah to Ingham; however it is 'not good'.

- **Moranbah be added to Gregory.**

Practicable, however I will suggest further in this submission Moranbah be included in Mirani.

- **Gregory losses Longreach Region and the former Aramac Shire to Mt Isa and extends north to include the rest of Belyando Shire (Moranbah).**

The inclusion of the Longreach Regional Council into the proposed District of Mount Isa is a good one, it allows the general focus of the proposed District of Mount Isa to move south, thus shedding the Gulf Shires of Carpentaria, Croydon and Etheridge.

- **Mt Isa to extend south to include the Longreach and Aramac and lose Carpentaria, Croydon and Etheridge to Cook.**

As I stated above I support this suggestion in relation to Mt Isa, however I suggest that the Gulf Shires be included in Macrossan.
For services that cannot be obtained in those towns the residents go to the Atherton Tablelands or Charter Towers, not to Cape York.

- Etheridge, Carpentaria, and Croydon Shires be restored to Cook.

As stated above I believe they should be included in Macrossan.

- Small changes to meet quota requirements between Hinchinbrook, Mulgrave and Cairns. Barron River to retain its existing boundaries.

Any changes which involve restoring Mareeba back into a Tableland District would involve major changes to all the coastal Districts, not small as Mr Cherry suggests.

As I stated above I do not believe that this is practicable, or desirable, at this stage of the redistribution process.

**Australian Labor Party**

The Australian Labor Party ‘objects’ to the Mirani and Whitsunday proposed Districts.

1. *The ALP suggests that consideration be given to incorporating the community of Moranbah into the proposed Mirani.*

2. *The community of interest criteria in Section 46 (1) of the Act would be served by the collection of Bowen Basin mining communities within one electoral district.*

I support this suggestion; however it is only possible in the context of alterations to a number of proposed Western Districts.

3. *The suggested State seat of Whitsunday divides the towns of Bowen and Collinsville from Airline Beach and Proserpine that have a community of interest as they are part of the same local government area.*

As I stated else where in this submission with such large Regional Councils it is not always possible to accommodate all of the area in one State Electoral District.
I cannot see how this can be achieved in regard to the Whitsunday Regional Council without major changes to other proposed Districts, which I do not believe is practicable, or desirable, at this stage of the redistribution process.

**Liberal Party of Australia Qld Division**

In relation to the proposed District of Barron River the Liberal Party states:-

*Whilst, we applaud the Commission’s decision to include the coastal communities of Palm Cove, Ellis Beach and Clifton Beach (all currently in Cook) into Barron River, we recommend the Commission go one step further to include further coastal communities to the north, including Wangetti Beach, Oak Beach, and Port Douglas.*

*To compensate the numbers, we propose to move the hinterland township of Kuranda (which currently borders on Cook) to be moved into Cook.*

Kuranda is a dormitory suburb of Cairns, and has been in the District of Barron River ever since its creation in the 1971 redistribution, except for the short period between 1986 and 1991, when it was in the then new District of Tablelands.

Its community of interest lays with Smithfield, at the bottom of the Kuranda Range, and then Cairns, not Cape York.

Port Douglas was an interregnal part of the now defunct Douglas Shire with Mossman and the Daintree.

The Liberal Party is not suggesting that Mossman or the Daintree be included in Barron River.

I suggest that this proposed change has more to do ‘with the ballot box’ and their chances of winning Barron River at the next election that their ‘community of interest’ concerns.

I ask the Commission to make only the changes I suggested in my ‘objection’ to the proposed District of Barron River, and reject this Liberal recommendation.
The Nationals

The National Party made the following objections:-

**Electoral District over 100,000 KM2**

*We respectfully suggest that proposed boundaries be re-examined to:*

- *Reconsider the population growth projections for proposed Mount Isa with the view to decrease the size of the proposed Mount Isa.*

This has been a contentious issue with the Nationals all through this redistribution process.

As I stated in my ‘Comments on Suggestions’ I believe that the only projected enrolments that the Commission should use are the ones made public by the Electoral Commission at the start of the redistribution process.

To use any others at this stage of the redistribution process would be unfair to those who do not have access to the projections the Nationals are talking about, and who have made their submissions on the basis of the Electoral Commissions projections.

- *Reconsider the transference of Diamantina Shire in the proposed Mount Isa (approximately electors 148 and notional votes 1,996 – total elector value of some 2,044) – total elector value of some 2,044) to proposed Gregory. The Nationals are of the view that the Commission has other choices when coupled with higher enrolment growth projection for Mount Isa to make the necessary adjustments through Cook and proposed Macrossan.*

Where do the Nationals believe that extra enrolments can be obtained for Mount Isa from Cook?

They did not state.

I believe the only area than any significant additional enrolment can be transferred from Cook is the West Coast communities of Kowanyama and Pormpuraaw.
Are the Nationals really suggesting that these communities be transferred to the proposed District of Mount Isa?

I did not even think that they would be so cruel.

These remote communities have no connection with Mount Isa.

All their connections, air flights, etc. are with Cairns.

One of the reasons that the Member for Cook has his electoral office in Cairns is that they can access his office at a central location when they come to Cairns.

As form gaining extra enrolments from Macrossan there are possibilities, but then where is Macrossan going be compensated from.

I believe the most viable solution to the unworkability’ of the proposed Mount Isa District is for it to shed the Gulf Shires to Macrossan, and move further into Western Queensland, thus my support to the Queensland Farmers Federation suggestion that the Longreach Regional Council be transferred to the proposed Mount Isa District.

- Consider that the additional 2,044 in proposed Gregory be accommodated by transferring approximately (not allowing for notional electors ) 1,770 electors in the town of and surrounds of Clermont to proposed Macrossan which would ensure that the adjustments made to proposed Macrossan, Cook and Mount Isa meet the numerical requirements of the Electoral Act.

I do agree that it would be better if all the now defunct Belyando Shire was in the same electoral district; however I suggest that the district be Mirani, not Macrossan.

Proposed Electoral District Name Macrossan

- The Nationals submit the name of Dalrymple for consideration of the Commission.

I agree from reading some of the ‘Objections’ that Dalrymple would be a more appropriate name.
Also reading some history of Mr. Dalrymple, as supplied by an ‘objector’ he did have some connections with areas north of Charters Towers, in particular the Valley of Lagoons.

I do understand that the residents of the existing Tablelands District would be adamant that their electoral District of Tablelands be retained.

*Northern Queensland Mirani*

The Nationals respectfully submit that the area south of the Capricorn Highway be transferred from proposed Mirani to provide that

- The enrolment number be adjusted downwards to reflect the substantial prospective population and economic growth in Belyando, Sarina, Mirani and Nebo regions

Again I reiterate that the only growth projections that should be used are those supplied by the Electoral Commission at the start of this redistribution process.

- The towns of Westwood, Bouldercombe Mount Morgan, Bajool, Archer, Marmor Creek, Port Alma and communities that surround these towns be subsumed into close neighbouring proposed electoral districts of Rockhampton, Keppell, Gladstone and Callide with which have homogeneity

There is an enrolment of 7,148 in this area.

Just a few too many to split up ‘wily nilly’ into surrounding proposed Districts, as the Nationals suggest.

I suggest that this area be added to the proposed District of Gregory to compensate it for the loss of Clermont (to proposed Mirani District) and the Longreach Regional Council, together with the Barcoo Shire to the proposed Mount Isa District.

I believe that this expansion east of the proposed Gregory District is the best solution to the difficulties facing the Commission re the size of the proposed Mount Isa.
By transferring the Longreach Regional Council and the Barcoo Shire to the proposed Mount Isa District in place of the Gulf Shires of Carpentaria, Croydon and Etheridge, it shifts the focus of the Mount Isa District south of the City of Mount Isa and should make the proposed, more ‘workable’.

This area, such as Westwood would have ‘community of interest’ with the neighbouring communities such Duaringa, which I suggest be included in the proposed Gregory, as they are on the same line of communication, namely the Central Railway and the Capricorn Highway.

Southern Queensland

Toowoomba South

The Nationals respectfully submit that the proposed Toowoomba North and Toowoomba south should share the Central Business District which has within it the service delivery sector.

On Pages 22 and 23 of the Nationals submission they state:

8.1 Referring to proposed Toowoomba South the objection is based on the premise that there are two electoral districts that represent the City of Toowoomba but the proposed dividing boundary of James Street transfers the entire central business district to the proposed Toowoomba North which is contrary to constituent’s community of interest.

8.3 This arrangement will provide that

- The electoral office of proposed Toowoomba South would remain in the constituent convenient and well known location opposite the City Hall where it has been for over 25 years.

This is the first time I can recall an ‘objection’ because an area has been ‘kept together’.

There is always a first time for anything.

For a start I wondered what the motive was.

Then I read about the electoral office.
The Nationals want to split the Toowoomba CBD so the Toowoomba South electoral office can remain within that District.

I ask the Commission to reject this ‘Objection’.

If the Member for Toowoomba South wants to retain his electoral office where it is he should ask the Member for Toowoomba North if he can.

The Member for Cook has his electoral Office in another Electoral District, namely Cairns.

Summary

After reading the suggestions I have decided that there are some changes that could be made to make electorates such as Macrossan, Mount Isa and Mirani more ‘constituent friendly’.

I suggest the following changes:-

Proposed District of Cook

As per my ‘objection, that is add Dimbulah and loose Walkamin and Ḵah.

Proposed District of Barron River

As per my ‘objection’, that is add Koah and Whitfield State School.

Proposed District of Cairns

As per my ‘objection’, that is loose Whitfield State School.
Proposed District of Macrossan

Add

- Etheridge, Croydon, and Carpentaria Shires (1,858 enrolment)
- Part of the Whitsunday Regional Council (Mount Cotton) As per my ‘Objection’. (73 enrolment)

Less

- Moranbah (4,342 enrolment)

The total enrolment for the proposed District with the suggested changes is 30,084, which includes 4,458 notional votes.

This is 101.77% of a quota.

Note. I now suggest that all the Charters Towers Regional Council be in Macrossan.

Name of proposed District: I suggest that the name of the proposed District be Dalrymple.

Proposed District of Mount Isa

Add

- Longreach Regional Council (2,635 enrolment)
- Barcoo Shire (229 enrolment)

Less

- Etheridge, Croydon, and Carpentaria Shires (1,858 enrolment)

The enrolment for the proposed District with the suggested changes is 31,175, which includes 10,796 notional votes.

This is 105.46% of a quota.
Proposed District of Mirani

Add

• Moranbah (4,342 enrolment)
• Clermont (1,160 enrolment)

Less

The area of the proposed District south of the Capricorn Highway. (enrolment 7,148)

The enrolment for the proposed District with the suggested changes is 29,233, which is 98.89% of a quota.

Proposed District of Gregory

Add

• Duaringa (157 enrolment)
• The area of the proposed District of Mirani south of the Capricorn Highway. (enrolment 7,148)

Less

• Clermont (1,160 enrolment)
• Longreach Regional Council (2,635 enrolment)
• Barcoo Shire (229 enrolment)
• Quilpie Shire (670 enrolment)
• Now defunct Bauhinia Shire (1,474 enrolment)

The enrolment of the proposed District with the suggested changes is 30,786, which includes 4,651 notional votes.

This is 104.15% of a quota.
Proposed District of Callide

Add

- Now defunct Bauhinia Shire (1,474 enrolment)

Less

- Duaringa (157 enrolment)

The enrolment of the proposed District with the suggested changes is 32,098, which is 108.59% of a quota.

Proposed District of Warrego

Add

Quilpie Shire (670 enrolment)

The enrolment of the proposed District with the suggested changes is 33,495, which includes 6,942 notional votes.

This 113.31% of a quota, which is 3.31% or an enrolment of 979 above the permissible 10% variance.

I suggest that this enrolment 979 be absorbed into the adjacent proposed Districts of Callide, Dalby, Nanango, Southern Downs, Toowoomba North and Toowoomba South.

These six proposed Districts have a total enrolment of 190,884, which is 4,212 less that the maximum enrolment for six Districts of 195,096, so I believe that the Commission would have no difficulty in absorbing the enrolment of 979 which above the maximum permissible amount with the changes I have suggested in Warrego.

It was necessary to transfer the Quilpie Shire to the proposed District of Warrego to bring the proposed District of Gregory under the maximum permissible enrolment.

The Quilpie Shire does have a community of interest with the neighbouring Shires of Murweh, Paroo and Bullo Shires which are in the proposed Warrego District.
All other proposed Districts

As proposed by the Commission.

Due time restraints I have been not able to supply detailed calculations of the suggested changes, however if I get them done over the weekend I will fax them to you on Monday 14th July 2008, and would seek your permission to include them in this submission.
Bob Richardson
45 Riverstone Road
GORDONVALE 4865

13th July 2008

Mr. Garry Wiltshire
Secretary
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
BRISBANE 4001

Fax No. (07) 3227 7020

ORC/OBJ/C0M

Dear Mr. Wiltshire

As I stated in my 'Comments on Objections' for the State Electoral Districts as proposed by the State Electoral Commission, I now fax the 'Calculations' for my 'Comments,' and ask you to include them in my submission.

My submission should arrive in your office Monday morning, 14th July 2008 by Australia Post.

Since 'doing the calculations' using the CCD's as supplied by the Electoral Commission, there is no need to transfer the Quilpie Shire from the proposed District of Gregory to bring it within the 10% variance of the quota, the maximum permitted under the Electoral Act.

I therefore withdraw from my submission the suggestion that the Quilpie Shire be transferred to the proposed District of Warrego and the subsequent changes suggested to the six adjacent proposed Districts to bring the proposed District of Warrego to within the 10% variance of the quota.

There are some other minor variances in the figures quoted in my submission and these 'calculations' using the CCD's.

Where this does occur I ask the Commissioners to use the figures in these calculations as being the ones which form part of my submission.
I thank you and your staff for the assistance offered to me during this Redistribution process.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

R. J. Richardson
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1. COMMENTS ON OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED
   DISTRICT OF MACROSSAN
   (RENAMED DARLYMPLE)
   SUGGESTED CHANGES

Location

Current Enrolment as at 28/09/2007

Proposed District of Macrossan

less

To the proposed District of Cook

Dimbulah

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCD's</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3030202</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3030204</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3030205</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3030206</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3030207</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3030208</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3030209</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Dimbulah 1,042
To the proposed District of Mirani

Moranbah

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCD's</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3031504</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3031601</td>
<td>692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3031602</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3031603</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3031604</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3031605</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3031606</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3031607</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3031608</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3031609</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3031610</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3031611</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3031612</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3031613</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Moranbah 4,342

Total to other Districts 5,384

Remainder in proposed Macrossan 22,662

From Proposed Mount Isa

Carpentaria Shire (part)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCD's</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3020203</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3020204</td>
<td>714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3020205</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3020207</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3020208</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3020209</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Carpentaria Shire 1,151

Croydon Shire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCD's</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3020101</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3020102</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3020103</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Croydon Shire 163
Etheridge Shire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCD's</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3030901</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3030902</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3030903</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3030904</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3030905</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3030906</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3030907</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3030908</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Etheridge Shire: 544

Mount Cotton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCD's</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3050601</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3050608</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3050609</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Mount Cotton: 73

From proposed Cook

Walkamin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCD</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3030601</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total from other proposed Districts: 2,367

2% Notional Votes: 4,458

Total Suggested District of Macraean: 29,477

Quota: 29,550

% of Quota: 99.72%
AREA OF PROPOSED DISTRICT OF MACROSSAN

RENAMED DARLYMPLE

SUGGESTED CHANGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Area (sqkms)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed District of Macrossan</td>
<td>105,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to proposed Cook</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to proposed Mirani</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% of now defunct Shire of Belyando</td>
<td>22,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% of 30,261 sqkms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder of proposed District</td>
<td>82,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from proposed Cook</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from proposed Mount Isa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etheridge Shire</td>
<td>39,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croydon Shire</td>
<td>28,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpentaria Shire</td>
<td>64,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From proposed Mount Isa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From proposed Burdekin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that part of the Whitsunday Regional Council</td>
<td>6,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>west of the Leichhardt Range including Mount Cotton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approx 33.3% of now defunct Bowen Shire of 21,177 sqkms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total from other proposed Districts</td>
<td>140,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total area of suggested District of Macrossan</td>
<td>222,909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2% Notional Votes</td>
<td>4,458</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMENTS ON OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED
DISTRICT OF MOUNT ISA
SUGGESTED CHANGES

Location

Proposed District of Mount Isa

less
to the proposed District of Macrossan

Carpentaria Shire (part)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCD's</th>
<th>Current Enrolment as at 28/09/2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3020203</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3020204</td>
<td>714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3020205</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3020207</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3020208</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3020209</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Carpentaria Shire</td>
<td>1,151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Croydon Shire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCD's</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3020101</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3020102</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3020103</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Croydon Shire</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Etheridge Shire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCD's</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3030901</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3030902</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3030903</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3030904</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3030905</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3030906</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3030907</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3030908</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Etheridge Shire</td>
<td>644</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total to other Districts | 1,858 |
Remainder in Mount Isa

plus

from proposed Gregory

Longreach Regional Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCD's</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3021501</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3021502</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3021603</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3021604</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3021605</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3021606</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3021607</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3021608</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3021609</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3021610</td>
<td>594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3021601</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3021602</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3021603</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3021901</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3021902</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3021903</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Longreach Regional Council: 2,865

Barcoo Shire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCD's</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3090201</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3090202</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3090203</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3090204</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3090205</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Barcoo Shire: 230

Total from other proposed Districts: 2,865

2% Notional Votes: 10,796

Total Suggested District of Mount Isa: 31,196

Quota: 29,580

% of Quota: 105.63%
### AREA OF PROPOSED DISTRICT MOUNT ISA

#### SUGGESTED CHANGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Area in sqkms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed District of Mount Isa</td>
<td>570,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to proposed Macrossan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etheridge Shire</td>
<td>39,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croydon Shire</td>
<td>29,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpentaria Shire</td>
<td>64,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total to proposed Macrossan</td>
<td>133,271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder of Proposed District</td>
<td>437,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from proposed Gregory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longreach Regional Council</td>
<td>40,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barcoo Shire</td>
<td>81,974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total from proposed Gregory</td>
<td>102,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total area of suggested District of Mount Isa</td>
<td>539,823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2% Notional Votes</td>
<td>10,798</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMENTS ON OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED
DISTRICT OF MIRANI
SUGGESTED CHANGES

Location

Proposed District of Mirani

less

to proposed Gregory

Now defunct Mount Morgan Shire

CCD's

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCD</th>
<th>Enrolment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3061801</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3061802</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3061803</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3061804</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3061805</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3051506</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3061807</td>
<td>471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3061808</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3061809</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total now defunct Mount Morgan Shire 2,091

Now defunct Fitzroy Shire (part)

CCD's

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCD</th>
<th>Enrolment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3061301</td>
<td>686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3061302</td>
<td>802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3061303</td>
<td>548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3061304</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3061305</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3061306</td>
<td>496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3061401</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3061402</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3061403</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3061404</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3061405</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3061406</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3061407</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3061408</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3061409</td>
<td>478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3061507</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total now defunct Fitzroy Shire 5,221
Total to other Districts

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remainder in Mirani</td>
<td>23,567</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

plus

from proposed Macrossan

Moranbah

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCD's</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3031504</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3031601</td>
<td>692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3031602</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3031603</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3031604</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3031605</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3031606</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3031607</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3031608</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3031609</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3031610</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3031611</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3031612</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3031612</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Moranbah 4,342

from proposed Gregory

Clermont

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCD's</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3031501</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3031502</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3031503</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3031505</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3031506</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3031507</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3031508</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3031509</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Clermont 1,848

Total from other proposed Districts 5,190

Total suggested District of Mirani 20,757

Quota 29,560

% of Quota 100.67%
COMMENTS ON OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED
DISTRICT OF GREGORY
SUGGESTED CHANGES

Location

Current enrolment
as at
28/09/2007

Proposed District of Gregory

less

to proposed Mount Isa

Longreach Regional Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCD's</th>
<th>Current enrolment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3021501</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3021502</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3021503</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3021504</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3021505</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3021506</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3021507</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3021508</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3021509</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3021510</td>
<td>594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3021601</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3021602</td>
<td>594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3021603</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3021901</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3021902</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3021903</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Longreach Regional Council  2,655

Barcoo Shire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCD's</th>
<th>Current enrolment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3080201</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3080202</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3080203</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3080204</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3080205</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Barcoo Shire  230
to proposed Mirani

Clermont

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCD's</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3031501</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3031502</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3031503</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3031505</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3031506</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3031507</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3031508</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3031509</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Clermont: 1,848

to proposed Callide

Bauhina Shire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCD's</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3080601</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3080602</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3080603</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3080604</td>
<td>534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3080605</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3080606</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3080607</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3080608</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3080609</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Bauhina Shire: 1,486

Total to other Districts: 6,219

Remainder in Gregory: 18,211
plus

from proposed Mirani

Now defunct Mount Morgan Shire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCD's</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3081801</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3081802</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3081803</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3031804</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3061805</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3051806</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3061807</td>
<td>471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3081808</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3081809</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total now defunct Mount Morgan Shire 2,001

Now defunct Fitzroy Shire (part)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCD's</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3081301</td>
<td>886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3081302</td>
<td>802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3081303</td>
<td>548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3081304</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3081305</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3081306</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3081307</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3061402</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3061403</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3061404</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3061405</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3061406</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3061407</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3061408</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3061409</td>
<td>476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3081507</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total now defunct Fitzroy Shire 5,221

from proposed Callide

Duaringa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCD</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3080507</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total from other proposed Districts 7,469

2% National Votes 3,707

Total suggested District of Gregory 29,387
Quota
% of Quota

29,560
69.41%
## AREA OF PROPOSED DISTRICT OF GREGORY

### SUGGESTED CHANGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Area in sqkms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Area of Gregory</td>
<td>314,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to proposed Mirani</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clermont</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% of now defunct Balymo Shire of 30,281sqkms</td>
<td>7,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to proposed Mount Isa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longreach Regional Council</td>
<td>40,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barcoo Shire</td>
<td>61,974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total from proposed Gregory</td>
<td>102,812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to proposed Callide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bauhinia Shire</td>
<td>23,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total to other Districts</td>
<td>133,823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder of proposed District</td>
<td>180,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from proposed Mirani</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now defunct Mount Morgan Shire</td>
<td>492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now defunct Fitzroy Shire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% of 5,905sqkms</td>
<td>4,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total from proposed Mirani</td>
<td>4,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from proposed Callide</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total from other Districts</td>
<td>4,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total area of suggested District of Gregory</strong></td>
<td>185,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2% Notional Votes</td>
<td>3,707</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMENTS ON OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED
DISTRICT OF CALLIDE
SUGGESTED CHANGES

Location

Current enrolment as at 29/09/2007

Proposed District of Callide

30,781

less

Duaringa

157

CCD 3080507

Remainder in Callide

30,824

plus

from proposed Gregory

Bauhina Shire

CCD's

3080601 58
3080602 110
3080603 134
3080604 534
3080605 142
3080606 105
3080607 153
3080608 95
3080609 157

Total Bauhina Shire 1,486

Total suggested District of Callide 32,110

Quota 29,560

% of Quota 108.63%
11th July 2008

The Secretary
Queensland Redistribution Committee
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Qld 4001

Dear Secretary

In accordance with the Electoral Act 1992, I enclose the Liberal Party's comments to your invitation for written comments and suggestions in response to public objections on the proposed Queensland State Redistribution for the Re-division of Queensland’s 89 electoral Divisions.

If the need for further information arises we would be prepared to provide the Commission with this in either written or oral form.

Yours Sincerely

Geoffrey Greene
State Director
Liberal Party of Australia (Queensland Division)
In response to public objections regarding the proposed State boundary changes, the Liberal Party of Australia (Queensland Division) wishes to make comments in relation to 2 seats – Clayfield and Mudgeeraba, as well as observations regarding Mt Coot-tha/Ashgrove and Samsonvale.

Clayfield

The Labor Party argues that the suburb of Gordon Park (including almost 4,000 electors) should be transferred from the proposed Stafford into the proposed Clayfield, saying Gordon Park is ‘significantly serviced’ by Lutwyche.

While we acknowledge the linkage of surrounding suburbs, we contend that it makes much more sense to follow our previous suggestion of placing Lutwyche into Brisbane Central and Kedron into Stafford.

Clayfield is already projected at 4.73% over population quota whilst Stafford is projected at only 0.43% over quota and Brisbane Central is -1.63%.

Furthermore, Clayfield is experiencing massive high-density development, as illustrated by the Northshore Hamilton Project, which is currently under construction on 80 hectares of former port land and is expected to bring in a further 10,000 residents (see attached).

Mudgeeraba

The Labor Party suggests moving a small section of Carrara from the proposed Mudgeeraba into the proposed Mermaid Beach, saying the area has ‘no connection with Mudgeeraba’.

However, the Liberal Party rejects this, as we believe that Labor’s submission is highly selective and politically driven.

For example, why are some sections of Carrara, such as Witt Avenue, Gregory Drive and Cararra Road deemed to have no connection with Mudgeeraba whilst adjoining streets such as Ross Street and Reid Court do?

Significantly, both these areas share Nerang-Broadbeach Road access and are situated close to the Nerang River. The Liberal Party calls on the Commission to ignore Labor’s suggestions and preserve the proposed boundary changes.
Also bear in mind that the proposed Mermaid Beach is 6.2% over quota whilst Mudgeeraba is 4.8% over quota, and it is important to keep both rapidly growing seats within a comparable population range of each other.

**Ashgrove/Mt Coot-tha**

We note Labor’s comments on these two electorates and its failure to provide suggestions to compensate for a shift in elector numbers.

**Samsonvale**

With reference to Labor’s comments regarding the name of the electorate, the Liberal Party contends, as it did originally, that this new seat should be more appropriately named Pine Rivers. This gives recognition to the history of the area and geographical acknowledgement.
Northshore Hamilton is one of the largest and most exciting urban renewal projects ever envisaged for Brisbane. A world waterside precinct, just six kilometres from the CBD, Northshore Hamilton will revitalise 80 hectares of former port land, giving riverfront to the people of Brisbane, and create a contemporary new riverside suburb that's home to around 10,000 residents.
About Northshore - Overview

* Welcome to Northshore Hamilton
* A Master-Planned Community
* A Preview of Northshore Hamilton

Welcome to Northshore Hamilton

Northshore Hamilton is one of the largest and most exciting urban renewal projects ever envisaged for Brisbane. A world-class mixed use waterside precinct, just six kilometres from the CBD, Northshore Hamilton will revitalise 80 hectares of former port land, give back two kilometres of riverfront to the people of Brisbane, and create a contemporary new riverside suburb that’s home to around 10,000 residents when completed.

Inspired by the best the world has to offer, Northshore Hamilton will be a master-planned urban environment celebrating people, place and space – with convenient shopping, alfresco dining and inviting open areas to sit and watch the world go by.

The visionary master plan for Northshore Hamilton has been crafted to breathe fresh life into a large tract of former port land between Prince Alfred and the Royal Queensland Golf Course.
A Master-Planned Community

The Northshore Hamilton Master Plan has been prepared by the Northshore Development Group (NDG), in conjunction with key partners, to articulate the unique Northshore Hamilton vision for integrated places to live, work and play in a new way.

NDG took a consultative, collaborative approach involving the local community, State Government agencies, Brisbane City Council and other key stakeholders at every step along the way – to ensure that Northshore Hamilton would accommodate a diverse and vibrant community.

Click here for more information about the master plan process.

In an exciting first for Brisbane, Northshore Hamilton will feature:

- 2 kilometres of direct river frontage
- 2 kilometres of riverwalk, accessible to everyone
- 13 hectares of open space, including parklands, walkways and cycleways
- Extensive choice of residential options
- Vibrant retail and commercial spaces in the Urban Centre
- Well designed public transport services and infrastructure.

In this safe, well-planned and attractive precinct, people will be able to walk or cycle everywhere – from home to work, for coffee with friends, to work out in the gym, or amble along the riverwalk.

Brisbane’s CBD will be just six kilometres away, connected by road, bus or CityCat ferry. Residents will be just one kilometre from the Gateway Bridge/Bruce Highway and five kilometres from Brisbane Airport’s international and domestic terminals. The prestigious Royal Queensland Golf Course is Northshore Hamilton’s eastern neighbour, with the Portside Wharf complex and International Cruise Terminal the western boundary.

Northshore Hamilton will showcase quality modern residential design that suits a wide range of tastes and needs. Apartment buildings will range from 10 to 20 storeys, showcasing views to the CBD, western ranges or to Moreton Bay. Residents have the opportunity to choose low- to medium-density options – including detached residences, modern terrace-stacked apartments or a range of styles, up to five storeys.

As development unfolds, leafy avenues, landscaped parks and high-quality recreational spaces, plus unprecedented river views, will add personality and visual interest to Northshore Hamilton's great outdoors.
The Commissioner  
Queensland Redistribution Commission  
Locked Bag 3304  
Brisbane Q 4001  
Fax: 3229 7391.

Dear Commissioner,

I write in response to the Redistribution of State Seats process being undertaken by your organisation and specifically, to comment on the Objections you have recently published.

I wish to unreservedly support the Objection submitted by Rosa Lee Long MP Member for Tablelands.

I object to Objections submitted by the Australian Labor Party, the Queensland National Party and the Queensland Liberal Party which all ignore the proposed elimination of the seat of Tablelands, of which I am a constituent.

Your proposal to divide this seat between Cook, the new seat of Macrossan and Hinchinbrook is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared that the previous four shire councils in this area should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal is also inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure of Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan which places this area firmly in Far North Queensland and also identifies strong population growth in coming years.

Cairns, not Charters Towers or Townsville, is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of either Mackay or Townsville, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you adopt the Objection submitted by the Member for Tablelands as a better solution than that proposed in your draft redistribution.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
The Commissioner  
Queensland Redistribution Commission  
Locked Bag 3304  
Brisbane Q 4001  
Fax: 3229 7391.

From:  
Tracy Lucey  
30 Coleman Rd  
Ravenshoe 4888

10/07/2008

Dear Commissioner,

I write in response to the Redistribution of State Seats process being undertaken by your organisation and specifically, to comment on the Objections you have recently published.

I wish to unreservedly support the Objection submitted by Rosa Lee Long MP Member for Tablelands.

I object to Objections submitted by the Australian Labor Party, the Queensland National Party and the Queensland Liberal Party which all ignore the proposed elimination of the seat of Tablelands, of which I am a constituent.

Your proposal to divide this seat between Cook, the new seat of Macrossan and Hinchinbrook is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared that the previous four shire councils in this area should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal is also inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure of Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan which places this area firmly in Far North Queensland and also identifies strong population growth in coming years.

Cairns, not Charters Towers or Townsville, is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of either Mackay or Townsville, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you adopt the Objection submitted by the Member for Tablelands as a better solution than that proposed in your draft redistribution.

Yours sincerely  

[Signature]
The Commissioner  From: JEANNIE LAGDON
Queensland Redistribution Commission  0458511301
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecq@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioner,

I write in response to the Redistribution of State Seats process being undertaken by your organisation and specifically, to comment on the Objections you have recently published.

I wish to unreservedly support the Objection submitted by Rosa Lee Long MP Member for Tablelands.

I object to Objections submitted by the Australian Labor Party, the Queensland National Party and the Queensland Liberal Party which all ignore the proposed elimination of the seat of Tablelands, of which I am a constituent.

Your proposal to divide this seat between Cook, the new seat of Macrossan and Hinchinbrook is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared that the previous four shire councils in this area should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal is also inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan which places this area firmly in Far North Queensland and also identifies strong population growth in coming years.

Cairns, not Charters Towers or Townsville, is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc.
There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you adopt the Objection submitted by the Member for Tablelands as a better solution than that proposed in your draft Redistribution.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

10/1/08

Jean Laidon
From: freeofgov@tpg.com.au [mailto:eureka_downs_brahmans@tpg.com.au]
Sent: Monday, 14 July 2008 3:01 PM
To: ECQ User
Subject: Electoral Commission of Queensland.doc

Electoral Commission of Queensland
Brisbane

July 14, 2008

Re: Redistribution of the state seat of Tablelands

Dear Sir,

Your published reasons for effecting a splitting-up of Tablelands flies in the face of reality. There is no logical, lawful or necessity to gerrymander this seat in favour of the major parties.

Whilst Member for Mulgrave Mr Pitt was heard stating on radio the QEC was a ...."law unto itself..." and that the ALP had no involvement with the proposed gerrymanders, this too was dismissed by an unbelieving public as bunkum.

Tablelands is represented by one of the most effective members ever seen in the Queensland Parliament and is regarded by political commentators and constituents in the same revered light as the Labor icons, the late Tom Burns and Clem Jones

I note you didn’t touch Mr Burns’ seat whilst he was in Parliament.

I can assure you the people of the Tablelands regard your re-modelled electorate with a great deal of vitriol. In fact if you want to compare the bludgeoning of local government by the George St Bolsheviks, to the ensuing low turnout of voters in this electorate at the local government election, then continue with your unlawful activities.

There is at present a low-level campaign underway for the soon-to-be disenfranchised voters of Tablelands to veto the next state election if your gerrymander takes place. Anecdotal evidence would suggest a less than 50 percent turnout.

What then?

There is no commonality of interest between Charters Towers and Mareeba or Atherton. These are diametrically diffuse communities with different climates, ecosystems, industries, amenities and local government.

Thanks to former AEC head-kicker Bob Longland who screwed up local government, we have in place an unworkable local authority.

Indeed during talks with formers mayors in Brisbane, Minister Fraser’s most notable contribution was to remind mayors they did have common interests because the
Tablelander newspaper covered the entire Tablelands encompassing Mareeba and Atherton.

Your spurious argument is in similar vein.

No amount of sodium fluoride added to the top-quality northern supplies will suppress the fomenting of civil unrest that is emanating from rank and file citizens.

In the interests of a continued, orderly society I would suggest you and you political masters refrain from any further gerrymander that will further entrench comrade Captain Bligh and her motley mob of Bolsheviks.

The entire electoral system is systematically rotten and corrupt as pointed out in the attached correspondence from former Senator Len Harris to the AEC, whose electoral roll you use for the state election.

The roll has proven to be less than 80% accurate, anyone can vote as many times as they like. With this corrupt system in place you really don’t need a gerrymander.

Yours faithfully,

W Benstead
(electoral systems researcher)
PO Box 2329
Mareeba 4880
Mrs Anne Bright,  
Australian Electoral Commission  
GPO Box 2590  
Brisbane 4001  

April 19, 2005  

Dear Mrs Bright,  

Thank you for your correspondence 24/3/05 in response to my letter of February 2, 2005 about the inaccurate state of the electoral rolls and the disenfranchisement of thousands of postal voters at the last Federal election.

I reiterate the conduct of the postal voting was atrocious and the final result of the Senate polling did not reflect the wishes of voters, I believe costing some candidates their seat.

I look forward to receiving from you the Senate count sheets and a breakdown of postal votes for each Queensland division. It is unfortunate that you cannot also provide me with the daily figures from start to finish, for these will show the obvious discrepancies in the final count for the Senate.

It is disappointing the Standing Committee on Electoral Matters did not see fit to travel to North Queensland to take evidence of the postal voting mess. I note the Committee has visited the Maranoa electorate where there were also huge problems with postal voting.

And yes our booth workers across the state (and interstate) at every election in recent years have reported significant numbers of voters whose name, for no apparent reason disappeared from the roll.

One experienced election systems analyst has told me the missing names from across the state have in the past reappeared on rolls in marginal electorates elsewhere, usually interstate at proper addresses.

There is no doubt from previous discourse with the AEC the electoral rolls are less than 80% accurate at any given time. Other analysts have put the accuracy at 60%.

Multiple voting in bogus names has long been a feature of the Australian electoral system as you would have heard from the Shepherdson Inquiry into ALP Plebescites of September 2000.

Nothing has changed since then. The Australian Labor Party is a past master of multiple voting, actually perfected in the last 15 years of Qld Labor rule.

Premier Peter Beattie was State campaign manager at times during this period of bogus voting but somehow managed to avert the blame at the Inquiry by denying any knowledge of it.
2.
Their motto, as told to me by former ALP members "vote early and vote often" apparently remains the state ALP's warcry.

I present you with a perfect example.

The Brisbane suburb of St Lucia is home to the State's largest university. It goes without saying there would be a high proportion of students out of the 28,209 in attendance in 2001 who have sympathies with the ALP.

At the Ryan by-election (albeit federal) on March 17, 2001 one of the many bogus voting cells was activated. Whether or not this cell actually voted is unclear but it is positive proof they do exist.

I have included the names of 14 voters who purported to live in one rental unit at St Lucia, at 300 Hawken Drive, prior to the Ryan by-election. Your Ryan Divisional Office wrote to these names that were on the roll at the time. I enclose photocopies of the 14 letters sent to them by the AEC.

The owners of the rental property at the material time had different names to any of the bogus voters. We have all the letters in safe-keeping.

Our research revealed only one of these persons is real. The other 13 are fictitious names.

My staff and other researchers have been given various anecdotal evidence over time that this bogus voting occurs throughout the state. Two elections ago one of my staff was told of busloads of bogus voters traveling to booths across divisions, usually to marginal seats.

Indeed we have been told of sworn evidence given to the AEC (NQ) where a former ALP Cabinet Minister was seen handing out $50 notes to potential aboriginal voters in Far North Queensland.

Nothing will change these huge problems in spite of the efforts of the AEC. Voters need to produce identification when voting. I am in no way advocating any new type of national ID card or such. We already have a surfeit of this material.

A Medicare card would be sufficient for voters to prove their identity.

Thank you for replying, I presume I now do not need to submit my Question on Notice to the Minister about this matter.

Yours faithfully

Senator Len Harris
From: Ruth Storey [mailto:ruthy3@bigpond.com]
Sent: Monday, 14 July 2008 4:20 PM
To: ECQ User
Subject: QRC/OBJ/COM

On behalf of the Bell progress and Heritage Association Inc., I wish to comment in response to public objections to the proposed electoral district boundaries. We support the objection submitted by the National Party and Raymond Hopper MP.

Thanking you - (Mrs) Jean Sorley Hon Secretary - Bell Progress & Heritage Assoc. Inc
Phone / Fax (07) 4663 1339
Dear Secretary,

Please find attached the ALPs comments on objections to the redistribution.

Regards,

Anthony Chisholm
QRC/OBJ/COM

The Secretary
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Level 6/160 Mary Street BRISBANE QLD 4000

Dear Secretary

The ALP QLD Branch respectfully acknowledges the difficult task of the Commission in terms of the recent redistribution process undertaken in Queensland.

We hereby take this opportunity to make comment on objections to the redistribution as invited by the Commission.

Objections to the abolition of individual electorates, for example those made by Stuart Copeland MP (QRC/OBJ 418) and Rosa Lee Long MP (QRC/OBJ 433), fail to recognise the state wide ramifications of their objections and should be discounted as being unable to assist the Commission in performing its task.

With regards to the objections to the redistribution by the Liberal Party of Australia Qld Division (QRC/OBJ 822) we would make the following comments.

Generally their assertions about community of interest are not sustained by strong arguments or examples.

For instance in the proposed seat of Coomera we agree with the Commission that the Pacific Motorway represents a sensible boundary dividing the electorates of the proposed seats of Coomera and Albert. The Motorway has been used in the creation of other electoral boundaries and it genuinely divides communities. The Liberal Party objection in relation to the placement
of the suburb of Eagleby is undermined by its inability to spell the name of the suburb correctly in their submission.

Equally their objection in relation to the boundary between the seats of Cook and Barron River with the specific proposal to incorporate the town of Kuranda into Cook fails to acknowledge the community of interest, transportation and communication links between Kuranda and the northern suburbs of Cairns which make up the seat of Barron River.

We would agree with the Liberal submission in relation to community of interest arguments around the suburbs of Lutwyche and Kedron. Clearly they agree with the ALP’s submission that Gympie and Lutwyche Roads are not strong boundaries that divide communities.

We suggest the Commission consider the ALP’s objection to the redistribution and our well defined proposal in relation to the seats of Clayfield, Nudgee and Stafford to address this issue.

In terms of the submission by the National Party (QRC/OBJ 823) we would concur with their suggestion to change the name of the proposed electoral district of Macrossan to ‘Dalrymple’.

We also note the objection by the former Chair of History at James Cook University Mr KH Kennedy (QRC/OBJ 95) which provides detailed analysis of the reasons supporting the name ‘Dalrymple’ rather than Macrossan as the name for this new seat.

Further we note the National Party’s support for the proposed electoral district of Samsonvale being named ‘Pine Rivers’. The Commission will note a number of submissions expressing similar views from the local community. We reiterate the ALP’s objections and comments in support of the naming of this electorate ‘Pine Rivers’.

We also support the objection by the National Party and by other individuals in the naming of the proposed electoral district of Dalby. Whilst Dalby is a significant community in the district we believe that a region wide, historically significant name should be used. We respectfully submit the name ‘Darling Downs’ as a most appropriate name. We note that it was first used as a name of an electoral district in 1872.

The ALP recognises that the Commission’s proposed boundaries for the seats of Toowoomba North and Toowoomba South rightly represent a consolidation of these two seats as based on urban/suburban areas of the City. We therefore reject the National Party’s objection to the proposed changes made by the Commission in relation to these two seats on the basis that we believe that the proposed Toowoomba North includes an appropriate area of the CBD
and, with the abolition of the seat of Cunningham, Toowoomba South becomes a largely suburban electorate.

We note that community sentiment has been expressed by a broad range of individuals and organisations. We assert that it is the Commission's duty to consider and seek to incorporate these objections where such commentary supports the overall aims of the Commissions task under the Act.

Thank you for your consideration of our submission.

Yours Sincerely

Anthony Chisholm
State Secretary QLD ALP
OUR REF: 440 10 07

14th July 2008

The Secretary
Redistribution Commission
Level 6 /160 Mary Street
Brisbane QLD 4006

Fax: 07 3229 7391
Email: ecq@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Secretary

The National Party of Australia Queensland (The Nationals) responds to the Queensland Redistribution Commission’s invitation under Section 49 (2) of the Electoral Act 1992 for comments to objections for the proposed redistribution.

Our comments are attached.

Thank you for your consideration.

Yours sincerely

Michael O'Dwyer
STATE DIRECTOR
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OBSERVATIONS

FOR THE PROPOSED REDISTRIBUTION

1. Introduction

1.1 The Nationals respond to the Queensland Redistribution Commission’s (QRC) call for comments to objections for the proposed redistribution.

1.2 The Nationals have received feedback from party members and units and the wider constituency pertaining to the objections and put forward comments for your consideration.

1.3 We stand by our 23 June 2007 objections (QRC/OBJ 823) to the QRCs proposed electoral district boundaries.

2. Electoral Districts above 100,000 km² in area (Mount Isa, Gregory, Warrego, Macrossan and Cook)

2.1 The Nationals have considered the objections pertaining to this area and whilst numerous - some 40% of the total - the views are incorporated in:

- QRC/OBJ 453 Rosa Lee Long MP;
- QRC/OBJ 424 J W Savage, One Nation Queensland Division;
- QRC/OBJ 15 J Cherry Chief Executive Officer Queensland Farmers’ Federation; and
- QRC/OBJ 852 W Richardson.

The central tenet of these objections is that proposed Macrossan is in conflict with Section 46.1 of the Electoral Act (The Act), and that existing Tablelands should be retained with enrolment adjustments to meet numerical requirements of The Act and either existing Charters Towers or existing Hinchinbrook be abolished.

2.2 The Nationals strenuously reject the objections and respectfully submit they all should be dismissed on the grounds that the objections:

2.2.1 are flawed as they conflict with the QRC’s premise for its proposed redistribution construct that 3 existing regional electoral districts - Tablelands, Fitzroy and Cunningham be abolished and 3 new electoral districts established in the south-east-corner proposed Buderim, Morayfield and Coomera;

2.2.2 ignore the current stage of the redistribution process by suggesting massive change to the QRC’s proposed non-south-east corner construct;

2.2.3 deny communities impacted by the suggested massive changes the right to comment/object on the changed numerical requirements and community of interest impacts – that is if the QRC was to accept the objectors’ central tenet of massive change; and

2.2.4 create dysfunctional regions and sever key linkages e.g split the Cassowary Coast Region between 3 proposed electoral districts and shifts the Longreach region (is it the Longreach Regional Council?) and the former
Aramac Shire which is now part of the Barcaldine Regional Council from proposed Gregory to proposed Mount Isa.

2.3 The Nationals note the partisan objections of QRC/OBJ 15 The Queensland Farmers' Federation (QFF) the peak agricultural body representing the interests of 14,000 primary producers in the intensive agricultural sector seeking the retention of one regional intensive agricultural electoral district at the expense of primary producers in the intensive agricultural sector in existing Hinchinbrook or in existing Fitzroy or existing Cunningham.

2.3.1 Specifically The Nationals rejects the proposition that the proposed electoral district of Hinchinbrook be divided along the old boundary of the Johnstone Shire Council, except for the community of South Mission Beach and for this area to be incorporated into a retained Tablelands electorate.

The QRC/OBJ 15 QFF objection proposes to have the balance of proposed Hinchinbrook (from Tully south to the Black River just north of Townsville) amalgamated with the Charters Towers Regional Council area. This proposal would result in the proposed electoral district of Macrossan not pursued, with remaining areas accommodated in adjacent electoral districts.

2.3.2 This objection from the QFF has three basic elements:
1. The abolition of existing Tablelands will reduce the amount of regional and rural representation in the Queensland Parliament;
2. The abolition of existing Tablelands breaks up a significant community of interest amongst discrete communities; and
3. The abolition of existing Tablelands ignores new local government boundaries.

2.3.3 Each element is equally true for proposed Hinchinbrook electoral district as for existing Tablelands. Proposed Hinchinbrook is overwhelmingly a regional and rural electorate. The economies of the communities in proposed Hinchinbrook are largely underpinned by agricultural industries.

2.3.4 The community of interest amongst the coastal communities between Cairns and Townsville are much stronger than any communities of interest between coastal communities and hinterland communities on existing Tablelands. In the first instance, these communities are separated by the most significant geographical feature on the east coast of the Australian continent, the Great Dividing Range.

2.3.5 The coastal agricultural industries are different on the coast (tropical horticulture), mostly because it is not irrigated, as opposed to existing Tablelands (diary, grain crops) which is largely dependent on irrigation. Referring to local government boundaries QRC/OBJ 15 QFF's proposals would split the Cassowary Coast Regional Council three ways between Mulgrave, Tablelands and a now proposed Hinchinbrook electoral district.

2.3.6 We resubmit that QRC/OBJ 15 QFF be rejected for the reasons enunciated above.

2.4 Specifically referring to QRC/OBJ 425, 433, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796 – Various Members of the State Committee, One Nation – Queensland Division and Mrs Rosa Lee Long MP, Member for Tablelands:
2.4.1 These objections have similarities QRC/OBJ 15 QFF as both submissions propose to abolish the existing seat of Hinchinbrook in order to preserve the seat of Tablelands. These objections erroneously state that proposed Hinchinbrook does not contain areas of expected significant population growth. The Northern Beaches of the new City of Townsville is a growth area. The proposed seat of Hinchinbrook will include more of this area, as well as new residential estates designed to maintain Hinchinbrook's quota going forward.

2.4.2 The prospects for population growth at the northern end of the Hinchinbrook electorate in the Cassowary Coast Regional Council area are equal to that of the Tablelands Regional Council, given that future land use in both local government areas will be affected by the Far North Queensland 2025 Regional Plan. This submission also divides, amongst three state electorates, the Cassowary Coast Regional Council.

2.4.3 *We resubmit that QRC/OBJ 425, 433, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796 – Various Members of the State Committee, One Nation – Queensland Division and Mrs Rosa Lee Long MP, Member for Tablelands be rejected for the reasons enunciated above.*

2.5 Specifically referring to QRC/OBJ 852 W Richardson, The Nationals reject it for reasons enunciated above as this objection is similar to QRC/OBJ 453 Rosa Lee Long MP and QRC/OBJ 424 J W Savage, One Nation Queensland Division objections - which are equally flawed in logic, lack of regard for the terms of reference of the redistribution and lack of understanding of the local communities in proposed Hinchinbrook.

2.5.1 *We resubmit that QRC/OBJ 852 W Richardson be rejected for the reasons enunciated above.*

2.6 Referring to QRC/OBJ 821 R Richardson:

2.6.1 Referring to suggested adjustments to proposed Cairns and Barron River: The Nationals are supportive of the minor adjustments as they suggest improved community of interest homogeneity for these proposed electoral districts.

2.6.2 Referring to suggested adjustments to proposed Mount Isa and Macrossan: *The Nationals strongly reject to QRC/OBJ 821 R Richardson's specific adjustment to transfer Charters Towers Regional Council (part) to proposed Mount Isa on the grounds that further community of interest dislocation results by severing the impacted community's local government connectivity with its local government. It conflicts with the QRC proposal that in this specific instance Local Government/Regional Council boundaries have been followed thus maintaining community of interest homogeneity.*

2.7 Referring to QRC/OBJ 5 M Freeman proposed Barron River and Cook:

2.7.1 The Nationals are supportive of the minor adjustments as they suggest improved community of interest homogeneity for these proposed electoral districts. The Nationals support:

2.7.2 QRC/OBJ 437 Remote Area Planning and Development Board objection seeking the transfer of Diamantina Shire from proposed Mount Isa to proposed Gregory; and
2.7.3 QRC/OBJ 376 Carie Guilfoyle and some 35 objectors seeking the transfer of the town and surrounds of Clermont from proposed Gregory to proposed Macrossan.

3. Northern Queensland (Barron River, Cairns, Mulgrave, Hinchinbrook, Thuringowa, Townsville, Mundingburra, Burdekin, Whitsunday, Mirani, and Mackay)

3.1 Referring to Whitsunday and Mirani and specific objection of QRC/OBJ 824 Australian Labor Party (ALP):

3.1.1 The Nationals oppose QRC/OBJ 824 ALP’s specific objection to proposed Whitsunday on the grounds of the unknown numerical requirements and community of interest impacts of any change to the proposed surrounding electoral districts e.g. Burdekin, Mirani, Mackay, Macrossan and the consequential flow-on to proposed Thuringowa, Townsville, Mundinburra, Hinchinbrook.

3.1.2 QRC/OBJ 824 ALP specific objections are devoid of any proposal on how the significant adjustments could be executed within the numerical requirements and community of interest criteria of the The Act.

3.1.3 The basis for the QRC/OBJ 824 ALP’s proposal is that proposed Whitsunday divides the towns of Bowen and Collinsville from Airlie Beach and Proserpine as they have a community of interest are part of the same local government area. Proposed Whitsunday is not the only proposed electoral district which has dual or more local government areas.

3.1.4 Referring to QRC/OBJ 824 ALP specific suggestion that Moranbah be incorporated in proposed Mirani:

The Nationals reject this proposal as QRC/OBJ 824 ALP is devoid of a suggestion for the supplementation of some 2,280 electors comprising Moranbah and Moranbah West in proposed Macrossan.

3.1.5 The Nationals submit that QRC/OBJ 824 ALP specific Northern Queensland proposal for Whitsunday and Mirani be rejected.

3.2 Referring to proposed Mirani in particular QRC/OBJ 341 ALP Mount Morgan Branch and some 14 objectors epitomised by QRC/OBJ 789 Shae & Kerrilyn Page:

3.2.1 The Nationals support QRC/OBJ 341 ALP Mount Morgan Branch and the some 14 objectors below the Capricorn Highway seeking transfer from proposed Mirani to an adjacent proposed electoral district with which the area has community of interest homogeneity e.g. proposed Rockhampton, or Gladstone, or Callide and or Keppel.

4. Central Queensland (Rockhampton, Keppel, Gladstone and Callide)

4.1 The Nationals make no comments.

5. Wide Bay and Burnett Area (Burnett, Bundaberg, Hervey Bay, Maryborough, Gympie, and Nanango)

5.1 The Nationals make no comments.
6. The Sunshine Coast Area (Noosa, Buderim, Maroochydore, Kawana, Caloundra, Nicklin and Glasshouse)

6.1 The Nationals make no comments.

7. The Area between Brisbane and the Sunshine Coast (Pumicestone, Kallangur, Murrumba, Morayfield, Redcliffe and Samsonvale)

7.1. Referring to the proposed electoral district of Samsonvale:

7.1.1 The Nationals support the some 18 objections and petitions with many signatures e.g. QRC OBJ/410 M/s Linda Lavarch MP and QRC/OBJ 761, to proposed electoral district name of Samsonvale and the proposal for it to be renamed Pine or Pine Rivers.

8. Southern Queensland (Lockyer, Toowoomba North, Toowoomba South, Dalby and Southern Downs)

8.1 Referring to proposed Dalby:

8.1.1 The Nationals support QRC/OBJ 821 R Richardson’s objection to proposed Dalby name and that consideration be given to the name of Condamine.

9. The Ipswich Area (Ipswich West and Bundamba)

9.1 The Nationals make no comments.

10. The Gold Coast Area (Currumbin, Burleigh, Mermaid Beach, Surfers Paradise, Southport, Broadwater, Mudgeeraba, Gaven, Albert and Coomera)

10.1 The Nationals make no comments.

11. The Area between Brisbane and Gold Coast (Redlands, Cleveland, Springwood, Waterford, Logan, Woodridge and Beaudesert)

11.1 The Nationals make no comments.

12. Brisbane South of the Brisbane River

12.1 The Nationals make no comments.

13. Brisbane North of the Brisbane River

13.1 The Nationals make no comments.

--oo000oo--
The Commissioner
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001
Fax: 3229 7391.

Dear Commissioner,

I write in response to the Redistribution of State Seats process being undertaken by your organisation and specifically, to comment on the Objection you have recently published.

I wish to unreservedly support the Objection submitted by Rosa Lee Long MP Member for Tablelands.

I object to Objections submitted by the Australian Labor Party, the Queensland National Party and the Queensland Liberal Party which all ignore the proposed elimination of the seat of Tablelands, of which I am a constituent.

Your proposal to divide this seat between Cook, the new seat of Macrossan and Hinchinbrook is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared that the previous four shire councils in this area should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal is also inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure of Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan which places this area firmly in Far North Queensland and also identifies strong population growth in coming years.

Cairns, not Charters Towers or Townsville, is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of either Mackay or Townsville, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you adopt the Objection submitted by the Member for Tablelands as a better solution than that proposed in your draft redistribution.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
Commissioners.

I wish to register my strong opposition to the elimination and re
distribution of the State seat of Tablelands.
I am a constituent of Tablelands, and your proposal to divide this
seat between Cook and the new seat of Macrossan is extremely
flawed. It is totally inconsistent with the findings of the local
government Reform Commission that declared that, in spite of
strong objections, the four shire councils should amalgamate into
one because this region has such a strong connection and identity.
Your proposal to include a large portion of Tablelands into
Macrossan, which runs some 1000kms. South and deep into Central
Queensland. A region with very little commonality with the Wet
Tropics.
Your proposal is inconsistent with the FNQ 2025 plan, that places
this region well and truly into FNQ, nor are your claims of low and
falling elector numbers aligned with the expected growth identified
in 2025.
You appear to have ignored the fact that Cairns is the Main Service
Centre for the region and the focus for Health, Transport and other
communications links. These links do not exist along the North-
South alignment of Macrossan. Most Tablelanders would not dream,
for instance, of using the inland route through Charters Towers and
Claremont, to drive South, it is far too far between stops, and often
sparsely used in the event of mishap.
There is little commonality of interest between the wet, tropical,
elevated Tablelands, and the Charters Towers Goldfields, or the
small Coalfields towns and cotton crops of the Mackay hinterlands,
except perhaps for cattle farming, but the climate is so diverse so
even their methods are different. Apart from the road origins, there
is no deep ingrained connection between the Mareeba district and
Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your
proposed redistribution, and restore this region's capacity to have
it's own accessible voice in Parliament.

I am, Yours sincerely,
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecq@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling elector numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
WE BELIEVE THE FOLLOWING POINTS HAVE NOT BEEN CONSIDERED BY THE COMMISSION AND YOUR IDEAS ADDRESSING THESE ISSUES NEED TO BE INCLUDED IN YOUR SUBMISSION

ELECTORAL ACT 1992

Part 3 – Electoral districts and electoral redistributions

In preparing the proposed redistribution, the commission must consider the following matters –

(a) the extent to which there is a community of economic, social, regional or other interests within each proposed electoral district.

(b) The ways of communication and travel within each proposed electoral district

(c) The physical features of each proposed electoral district

(d) The boundaries of existing electoral districts;

(e) Demographic trends in the State, with a view to ensuring as far as practicable that, on the basis of the trends.

Under the Far North Queensland Draft Regional Plan 2025 it cites the population is expected to increase in FNQ by around 100 000 people by 2025. Queensland needs more electorate seats not less.

Major regional offices like Telstra, Ergon, District Hospitals, Main Roads, Department of Primary Industries are in Far North Queensland, not in North Queensland or Central Queensland.

Tableland Electorate cannot be bundled in with the Coast or Western Queensland. The Tablelands Electorate is a unique Electorate in its own right.
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecq@ecq.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the elimination of the seat of Tablelands in your proposed Redistribution.

I am a Tablelands constituent and believe your proposal to divide this seat between Cook and a new seat of Macrossan is badly flawed. This is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared, despite strong objections, that the previous four shire councils should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal to include a significant portion of the Tablelands into Macrossan, which runs some 1000 kilometres south and deep into Central Queensland is inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan that places this area firmly in Far North Queensland. Nor do your claims of low and falling electorate numbers align with the expected growth identified in FNQ 2025.

You also appear to ignore that Cairns is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc. These simply do not exist along the north-south alignment of Macrossan in particular.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.

I request that you review the elimination of Tablelands in your proposed redistribution and instead restore this region’s capacity to have its own voice in Parliament.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
WE BELIEVE THE FOLLOWING POINTS HAVE NOT BEEN CONSIDERED BY THE COMMISSION AND YOUR IDEAS ADDRESSING THESE ISSUES NEED TO BE INCLUDED IN YOUR SUBMISSION

ELECTORAL ACT 1992

Part 3 – Electoral districts and electoral redistributions

In preparing the proposed redistribution, the commission must consider the following matters –

(a) the extent to which there is a community of economic, social, regional or other interests within each proposed electoral district.

(b) The ways of communication and travel within each proposed electoral district

(c) The physical features of each proposed electoral district

(d) The boundaries of existing electoral districts;

(e) Demographic trends in the State, with a view to ensuring as far as practicable that, on the basis of the trends.

Under the Far North Queensland Draft Regional Plan 2025 it cites the population is expected to increase in FNQ by around 100 000 people by 2025. Queensland needs more electorate seats not less.

Major regional offices like Telstra, Ergon, District Hospitals, Main Roads, Department of Primary Industries are in Far North Queensland, not in North Queensland or Central Queensland.

Tableland Electorate cannot be bundled in with the Coast or Western Queensland. The Tablelands Electorate is a unique Electorate in its own right.
7th July, 2008

Secretary
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane 4001

re Electorate of Tablelands

Dear Secretary,

Further to our submission of 15th December 2007 we find your proposal to abolish the seat of Tablelands and to place most of this electorate in the new seat of Macrossan, to be totally unacceptable.

Before coming to the detail of our objection, we respectfully question the rationale of closing under quota electorates and redistributing electors to neighbouring electorates. This in itself, does not make a lot of sense in the context of maximizing the degree to which electorates reflect common social and economic purpose. Indeed it would seem more effective to ignore whether the electorate selected to be closed was “under quota” or not and consider the physical size of electorates when reviewing whether or not they might be closed. The reasoning here is that the trauma to electors of splitting up a small electorate would in most, if not all instances, be much less than that which would occur for a larger electorate. Those which were in a small electorate are more likely to remain within a sphere of common social and economic interest, and still have ready access to their representative.

Returning to the issue of the abolition of Tablelands, we note that should your recommendation be adopted, a large minority (about 8000 electors) will be left isolated in the far north east of Macrossan electorate. While a relatively coherent group in themselves, they would have virtually no social or economic links with the rest of the electorate. Atherton is 465 km from the city of Charters Towers, the urban centre closest to the middle of this proposed new electorate. Its southern boundary is near Clermont more than 800km to the south of Atherton. There is not a regular air service between Charters Towers and Atherton (or anywhere else on the Tablelands) and the direct road link is hardly worthy of the name.

As a remote, if significant minority, our representation will be poor even with the best of intentions of the sitting Member. Co-ordination among Local Government, State Departments and various agencies will be extremely difficult with the electorate often covering Central, Northern and Far Northern administrative regions.
Secretary, Queensland Redistribution Commission, Brisbane - 7th July 2008

The strength of cultural and economic ties among Tablelands communities was recognized by the State when it chose to adopt the recommendations of the Commission to combine the four old Tableland Shires into the new Tablelands Regional Council. Given this, it is very difficult to reconcile the above decision with your proposal to break up the Tablelands electorate by adding a small area including Mareeba to the electorate of Cook and adding the central and southern Tablelands to the Charters Towers region to form the new seat of Macrossan.

In conclusion we strongly recommend that you adopt our earlier recommendation to retain Tablelands and bring it up to quota by adding the Kuranda area which is after all part of the Tablelands region (it is currently part of Barron River electorate). The remaining Barron River electors might be redistributed among neighbouring coastal electorates (Cook, Cairns and Mulgrave).

Relevant details of our original submission are attached. We thank you for the opportunity to make this submission.

Yours faithfully,

[Signature]

Sharon Dennis – Secretary
Malanda Chamber of Commerce
The case for retaining the Tablelands Electorate

Summary of submission

1. By far the greatest part of the existing Tablelands Electorate lies on a unique natural feature, the Atherton Tablelands. This Tableland is the only extensive area of subtropical to cool highland within the Australian tropics. It is bounded on the east by an escarpment and rainforests of the Wet Tropics; to the north east by the mountains and forests of the Daintree; to the north and west by the dry savannahs of the Cape and the Gulf, and the south by the rugged ranges which are the headwaters of the Tully and Herbert Rivers.

2. We note that one of the objectives set for the Local Government Reform Commission in its review of local government boundaries in Queensland was to recommend structural changes to ensure strong, effective and financially viable Councils capable of better managing economic, environmental and social planning with regional communities of interest.

3. The only significant part of the new Regional Council not included in the Tablelands Electorate is the villages of Kuranda (Barron River) and Koah (Cook) and surrounding district. If the electors (about 1500) from this area were added to Tablelands then this Electorate would fall within the 10% variance allowed for in determining the number of electors in each electorate.

4. This Chamber is confident that if electors in the Kuranda area are added, growth trends (unfortunately not yet apparent in some recently published statistical data) will allow Tablelands to continue as a viable electorate for long into the future. The general movement north by “tree changers” and the predictions that much of Australia’s agriculture would have to move north to avoid the effects of climate change, add substance to this conviction.

Possible solutions which would bring Tablelands within quota limits

1. A solution which would have minimal impact and leave Tablelands as a geographic, economic and social entity would be to remove Kuranda and surrounding district from Barron River and Cook and add it to Tablelands. This would leave all three electorates under quota (Barron River fractionally) but within acceptable limits.

2. Alternatively, if an electorate must be sacrificed in the far north to make way for another in the south east, it is suggested that the electorate of Barron River be eliminated. Electors might be redistributed to bring quotas up to acceptable levels in Tablelands (see 1. above) and Cook with the remainder cascading through electorates to the south east. While the boundaries of some electorates would have to be shifted to the north, there is in general a continuity of social and economic interest throughout this coastal region and the impact on electors would be very limited. It is noted that there are currently five electoral offices located on the coastal strip to the east of the Tablelands:- Cairns, Barron River, Cook, Mulgrave and Hinchinbrook. The first four of these are located in or around Cairns.
The Commissioner
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecq@ecq.qld.gov.au

I write in response to the Redistribution of State Seats process being undertaken by your organisation and specifically, to comment on the Objections you have recently published.

I wish to unreservedly support the Objection submitted by Rosa Lee Long MP Member for Tablelands.

I object to Objections submitted by the Australian Labor Party, the Queensland National Party and the Queensland Liberal Party which all ignore the proposed elimination of the seat of Tablelands, of which I am a constituent.

Your proposal to divide this seat between Cook, the new seat of Macrossan and Hinchinbrook is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared that the previous four shire councils in this area should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal is also inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan which places this area firmly in Far North Queensland and also identifies strong population growth in coming years.

Cairns, not Charters Towers or Townsville, is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.
I request that you adopt the Objection submitted by the Member for Tablelands as a better solution than that proposed in your draft Redistribution.

Yours sincerely

Kevin Whyte
28 Courtenay St
Mareeba 4880

Phone 40922440
The Commissioner
Queensland Redistribution Commission
Locked Bag 3304
Brisbane Q 4001

Fax: 3229 7391.
Email: ecq@ecq.qld.gov.au

I write in response to the Redistribution of State Seats process being undertaken by your organisation and specifically, to comment on the Objections you have recently published.

I wish to unreservedly support the Objection submitted by Rosa Lee Long MP Member for Tablelands.

I object to Objections submitted by the Australian Labor Party, the Queensland National Party and the Queensland Liberal Party which all ignore the proposed elimination of the seat of Tablelands, of which I am a constituent.

Your proposal to divide this seat between Cook, the new seat of Macrossan and Hinchinbrook is totally inconsistent with the findings of the Local Government Reform Commission which declared that the previous four shire councils in this area should be amalgamated into one because this district had such a strong connection and identity.

Your proposal is also inconsistent with the Department of Infrastructure Planning’s draft FNQ 2025 Plan which places this area firmly in Far North Queensland and also identifies strong population growth in coming years.

Cairns, not Charters Towers or Townsville, is the service centre for this region and is the nexus for health, transport and communication links etc.

There is no community of interest between the wet, tropical highlands of Tablelands and the hinterland of Mackay, nor is there any strong connection between the Mareeba district and Cape York.
I request that you adopt the Objection submitted by the Member for Tablelands as a better solution than that proposed in your draft Redistribution.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

P.O. BOX 2252
MURRUMBAH QLD