



The Federal Redistribution 2009  
**QUEENSLAND**



---

**Comment Number 12  
on Objections**

**R J Richardson**

**26 pages**

---

**From:** Bob Richardson [Bob.Richardson@bigpond.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, 21 August 2009 9:23 AM  
**To:** QLD Redistribution  
**Cc:** Bob.Richardson@bigpond.com  
**Subject:** Objection to proposed boundaries

Please find attached the remainder of my 'objection'

regards

Bob Richardson

Bob Richardson  
45 Riverstone Road  
GORDONVALE 4865

Phone (07) 40 561489

Mobile 0427 561459

Fax (07) 40 562164

4<sup>th</sup> September 2009

Mr. Ed Killesteyn  
Electoral Commissioner  
Australian Electoral Commission  
7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
488 Queen Street  
BRISBANE 4000

**Attention Gordon Webster**

Dear Mr Killesteyn,

I refer to your advertisement in 'The Cairns Post' on Saturday, 25<sup>th</sup> July, 2009, publishing the proposed electoral boundaries for the State of Queensland, and advising that 'Comments on Objections' to the proposed boundaries must be lodged in writing with the Office of the Australian Electoral Commission for Queensland before 6pm on Friday 4<sup>th</sup> September, 2009.

Please find enclosed my 'Comments on Objections'...

Should the augmented Electoral Commission decide to have public hearings in Far North Queensland, I advise my availability to attend to expand on my 'objection' and answer any queries they may have to my 'objection'.

Should there be any matter you may wish to contact me on, please phone me on the either of the above numbers.

Yours sincerely

R. J. Richardson.

**COMMENTS ON**  
**OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED**  
**REDISTRIBUTION OF FEDERAL**  
**ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES**  
**IN QUEENSLAND**  
**BY**  
**BOB RICHARDSON**

**OPENING REMARKS**

As this is probably the last submission in the ‘Redistribution’ process I take the opportunity to thank the Electoral Commissions and there staff for the courteous manner in which their advice and assistance has been afforded to me during this process.

A special thanks to Gordon Webster and Mathew, the two persons with whom I have mainly communicated.

It has not always been ‘plain sailing’, especially after the ‘suggestion’ period closed and the Liberal National Party (LNP) had submitted only twelve (12) pages for public consideration, the remainder supplied to the Electoral Commission as a ‘courtesy’.

When I pointed out to Gordon there was no provision within the Electoral Act for a submission for a submission, or part of, to supplied ‘as a courtesy’ the matter was promptly investigated and the ‘courtesy material’ placed on the website, even though it would ‘an arm and a leg’ to download it.

Once again thanks Gordon and Mathew.

## **OBJECTIONS**

As there were 555 'Objections' received it was not possible, within the time frame set out under the Electoral Act to read them all however I did read over 20% of them, including those submitted by:-

- The Political Parties
- Members of Parliament
- Local Government Councillors
- Community Organisations
- Local Government, and
- A selection from the general public selected randomly.

I have split this submission into three (3) parts:-

- General
- Political Parties and those other submissions which covered a number of different areas of the State.
- Specific proposed boundaries

## **GENERAL**

### **Arch Bevis, M.P. Member for Brisbane, Objection No. 457**

Mr Bevis, Page 1, states:-

'Whilst the new division is located in the growth areas identified by the Committee and others, the report of the Committee says **'As a result of Ryan being moved wholly to the north of the Brisbane River, the redrawing of divisions south of the Brisbane River allowed for the creation of the Division of Wright'** (emphasis added). Giving priority to the River as a boundary, rather than consideration of population growth raises serious issues of compliance with the Act. The act makes no provision for the Committee to give such a priority to one factor which at most is a consideration in applying the community of interest test'.

Further on Page 1 he states:-

‘Not only has the Committee varied from the practice adopted by all previous Committees for the last twenty years or more, it has used the River as its starting point, making it the dominant factor in this redistribution’.

While it has been possible to make the Brisbane River the boundary for its whole length within the Brisbane City Council area, I trust that this decision does not tie future Committees to the same course as it would ‘tie them down’, just a State Boarders do.

A previous Committee or an Augmented Committee’ made mention in its report that State boarders restrict their freedom in drawing Divisional boundaries.

State boarders are a ‘fact of life’ and have been part of the electoral system since federation, where as using the Brisbane River as a ‘holier than thou’ boundary seem to be a decision of this Committee.

Mr Bevis, Page 2, makes what I consider the quote of whole redistribution process:-

‘The average percentage of electors moved to another division in the proposal is 14.43%. For Brisbane that figure is double the average at 29.2%. In an electorate that required no change to comply with the quota that is a remarkable statistic.

This radical change to Brisbane is supported by just two sentences at paragraph 67. Neither sentence remotely explains, much less justifies the radical changes proposed.

If a submission or objection were to propose such a dramatic change based on no more than the words in paragraph 67, it would be given little if any consideration by any Redistribution Committee of Augmented Commission.’

### **Mike Perry, Objection No.36**

Mr Mike Perry, Page 2 states:-

‘The Committee seems to want to invent a new criterion for Commonwealth redistributions, namely the division of States or Territories into ‘regions’. The only grounds it can offer for the proposed excision is to avoid splitting a division by the Brisbane River, and it therefore assigns (Ryan south of the Brisbane River) RSoR to the ‘South-East south of the Brisbane River’ region, regardless of the ruin it would cause to the community of interest for the electors involved.

Focus on ‘regions’ will constrain the ability of redistribution committees to achieve optimal solutions. Division, not regions, should be the concern. The bizarre attention to regions in the Report is disturbingly reminiscent of the infamous and discredited Zonal system used in Queensland State redistributions prior to 1992! In particular, the ‘Proposed Country divisions’ in the Report reminds one chillingly of the ‘Country Zone’ in the notorious pre-1992 Queensland State system’.

I trust that the Committee’s decision to use the word ‘Regions’ is in a general sense and not one compelling on future Redistribution Committees, as this would again restrict a future committee the freedom to move certain areas ‘in and out’ of the Regions which this Committee has nominated.

An example would be the Crows Nest Statistical Local Area (SLA) (Country Region) and neighbouring Somerset Regional Council (South East Queensland South Region).

If these ‘regions’ were binding like the ‘Zones’ in the State system until 1992 neither of the above areas could be in the same Division.



### **Wayne Swan MP Member for Lilley, Objection No.528**

Wayne Swan and others object to the transfer out of the proposed Division of Lilley of its northern bay side suburbs of Brighton, Shorncliffe, Deagon, and Sandgate

While I do not intend going into detail of the proposed boundaries in the South East of the State, I feel compelled to comment on this proposal.

Since my early recollection of Federal Elections, I have always looked upon the Division of Lilley as a Division along the coast line north of the Brisbane River,

I believe that the Committee's proposal radically changes the whole perception of the Division.

It would be just like taking Toowoomba out of Groom (previously Darling Downs).

My early recollection of Lilley goes back to the 'tight' contests between Kevin Cairns (Liberal) and Frank Doyle (ALP) in the 1960's and 1970's.

### **Name of New Division**

Again, like in the 'Comments on Suggestions', there have been a number of submissions requesting that the new division be named 'Waters' after Aboriginal World War 11 pilot Leonard Victor Waters.

As I mentioned in my 'Objections' none of the submissions for the name 'Waters' were made in the 'Suggestions' segment of this Redistribution process.

I have no qualms with the name 'Wright' after environmental activist and poet Judith Wright.

To deny Mrs Wright recognition because she shared the same surname as a disgraced former politician would be like preventing somebody with the surname 'Kelly' ever receiving recognition because he or she shared the same name as NED.

## **POLITICAL PARTIES**

### **Liberal National Party (LNP) by Michael O'Dwyer State Director Objection No. 532**

Who is the spokesperson for the LNP on redistribution matters?

Why, you may ask?

First it was the State President Bruce McIver. He submitted the original 'suggestions'.

Then there was silence. Nobody made any 'comments on Suggestions'.

Now the State Director, Mr Michael O'Dwyer, comes out 'swinging' calling 'fowl' and trying to make up lost ground, in the 'Objections' phase, with a 50 page submission.

Who will there be in this the final stage 'Comments on Suggestions'?

Answer! Anybody's guess

Mr. O'Dwyer complains, 2.1 that:-

'The context in which our submission is prepared is the quite extraordinary consistency of views expressed by the media and political commentators' that the political consequences of the changes by the RCQ's proposed boundaries are overly adverse to the LNP'.

In the 2006 Redistribution process the Liberal Party was were threatening to take the Electoral commission to court because they (the Liberals) believed the Redistribution Committee has proposed boundaries too close to the projected quota and not used the 3.55 variance to its maximum.

Mr. O'Dwyer selectively quotes some of the press' interruption of the proposed boundaries, in particular an article by Mr. Peter Van Onselen in the Weekend Australian on 25<sup>th</sup> and 26<sup>th</sup> July, 2009.

Mr. O'Dwyer quotes "The magnitude of the Disaster..." He fails to quote the rest of the paragraph which states in full:-

'The magnitude of the disaster for the conservative side of politics has been increased dramatically by the deal that was done to merge the Liberal and National parties last year.'

This has nothing to do with the Redistribution Committee proposals but he selectively used the first five words of the paragraph to try to indicate it did.

Mr. O'Dwyer the quotes: "The kick in the guts the Coalition has received in Queensland ...". He again fails to quote the rest of the paragraph which states in full:-

'The kick in the guts the Coalition has received in Queensland will set off alarm bells in NSW where a similarly large scale redistribution is due to be released shortly.'

This again has nothing to do with the Redistribution Committee's proposed redistribution in Queensland.

He makes no mention of the two preceding paragraphs which put the whole article into perspective.

They state:-

'If the Queensland LNP organisation can't get its act together to secure Wright for Dutton, they should do their level best to put pressure on one of the burnt-out backbenchers in Fairfax or Fisher to retire in order to save a potential future party leader.'

The signs that the LNP will be able to pull off a move that saves Dutton, however, are not good. Just look at the quality of its submission to the AEC for the redistribution. At 12 pages, compared with Labor's 67, it is hardly surprising that the LNP didn't get what it wanted. It didn't amount to a sufficiently analytical case'.

Mr. McIver's original public submission was 'undistinguishable garbage'.

It contained:-

- No maps
- No tables showing existing enrolments and projected enrolments.

It was nearly impossible in the 'Suggested' Division of Flynn to understand where they suggested the division should be.

Some of the others 'Suggested' Divisions were not much better.

I consider Mr. McIver was replying on the 'secret' submission given to the Electoral Commission as a 'courtesy' to 'put its case'.

When The Electoral Commission had to make public this material, their 'case collapsed'.

Mr. McIver and Mr O'Dwyer, the days of secret submissions to Redistribution Committees went out with Premier Bjelke-Petersen twenty (20) year ago.

The quicker you and your Party accepts that the better it will be for everybody involved in the Redistribution process, including the Redistribution Committees.

I do not believe that they would enjoy being called 'bias' when they are **not**.

Nobody gets everything they want in the open Redistribution process that now exists.

When the proposed boundaries for Queensland were released during the 2003 Redistribution, the press said they favoured the Coalition Parties.

I did not hear either of those Parties complaining then.

When a party has 'done badly' at the previous election the following redistribution can appear to be worse for that party than it really is.

Remember the ALP went into the 2007 Federal Election with just six (6) seats in Queensland and came out of it with fifteen (15), and came very close to winning another three (3).

I will address LNP specific 'objections' when I discuss individual Divisional boundaries.

### **Australian Labor Party (ALP) by Anthony Chisholm Objection No.552**

#### **General**

I note on Page 1 of Mr Chisholm's 'Objection' he states:-

'The ALP further recognises that Ms Judith Wright is a social and environmental activist and poet with a connection to the area of the new proposed division, especially Mount Tamborine'.

I will discuss address ALP specific 'objections' when I discuss individual Divisional boundaries.

### **GENERAL OBJECTIONS**

#### **Martin Gordon Objection No. 23**

#### **Dr Mark Mulcair Objection No. 71**

#### **Kate Townsend Objection No. 549**

These three persons submitted an 'Objection' covering a number of different areas of the State; however I will address them when I discuss individual Divisional Boundaries.

## **SPECIFIC PROPOSED BOUNDARIES**

### **Leichhardt/Kennedy Boundary**

#### **ALP Objection No 552 Pg 4.**

The ALP says:- ‘The Commission has proposed to also move Kuranda, just north-west of Cairns, into Kennedy. The ALP would argue that Kuranda should remain in Leichhardt because this area has closer community of interest link with Cairns. It assumes that Kuranda has stronger connections with the Tableland region than it does with Cairns, which is not the case.’

The ALP ‘objection’ then goes onto:-

- To state the tourism connection with Cairns through Skyrail and the Kuranda Tourist Train.
- To explain that a large number of Kuranda residents work in Cairns and also use Cairns for personal and recreational purposes.

This demonstrates the closer link Kuranda has with Cairns than the Tablelands.

The ALP does not state where any compensating areas should come from to allow Kuranda to remain in Leichhardt.

They may assume that the 2,325 projected enrolments as at 9/7/2012 can be accommodated in the proposed Division without any compensating areas being transferred out of the Division.

This is the case with a projected enrolment of 221 less than the maximum of 100,635 as at 9/7/2012, however the remaining area of the Mareeba SLA in the existing Division would have to be transferred to Kennedy.

### **LNP Objection No.532 Page 19 Item 6.1**

After the State President, Mr Bruce McIver, wanting to Cape York and Torres Strait Island Communities to Kennedy, the State Director, Mr. Michael O'Dwyer now 'puts up the white flag'.

He states:-

'Proposed Leichhardt. The LNP submits no objections'.

Why the change of heart?

Do the LNP consider the publicity re their suggestion to send the 'Cape' and the 'Islands' off to Kennedy was all 'bad' and they want to 'cut their losses and run' fearing a backlash on the 'Cape' and the 'Islands' at the next poll.

That message apparently did not get through to some of their lieutenants, namely Mr. Warren Entsch and the President of the Cairns Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Jeremy Blockey.

Mr Entsch, the former Liberal Member for Leichhardt made his position quite clear in the Cairns Post on Saturday 25<sup>th</sup> July 2009.

'Mr Entsch branded the changes as 'ridiculous' as they split Edmonton from Cairns and the growth area of Mt Peter away from the regions centre into Mr. Katter's electorate that was centred on Mt Isa and to a lesser degree Innisfail.'

"It does not make sense, Edmonton and Kuranda are part of Cairns city" he said.

"It is ridiculous, how are the issues of Mt Isa and Charters Towers relevant to the people on the south side of Cairns"

"And I suggest to you the people of Kuranda will also not be happy about it"

Mr. Entsch was a notable absentee from the list of 'objectors'.

It may be that he intends to stand again for Leichhardt and he wants the people on the 'Cape' and the Islands to forget that 'he does not want to represent them'.

I believe that the people of the “Cape” and the ‘Islands’ have a ‘long memory’ and will remember that they wanted to ‘desert’ them when the poll comes around.

Another notable absentee from the list of ‘objectors’ was the President of the Cairns Chamber of Commerce, Mr Jeremy Blockey.

Mr Blockey said in the Cairns Post on Tuesday 28<sup>th</sup> July 2009, ‘Why should we split in two as a city when there is such a strong community of interest’.

‘A Townsville style which incorporates the entire city allows the sitting member to fully service the community with relative ease.’

‘Mr. Blockey said there either needed to be a third electorate created or the members for Kennedy and Leichhardt should both be based in Cairns area which represents the majority of the population of both electorates’.

If Mr Blockey had cared to read my ‘Suggestion’ he would have found I had suggested two divisions, Leichhardt taking in the ‘Cape’ the ‘Islands’ and the majority of the City of Cairns, the other called ‘Fulton’ taking in the area lost from Leichhardt since 1984, and the coastal area from Garbutt (Townsville) north.

His support may have convinced the Redistribution Committee that my ‘suggestion’ was the best option for Leichhardt/Kennedy/Herbert.

### **Kate Townsend Objection 549 Page 1.**

Kate Townsend says in relation to Leichhardt:-

‘The following attributes are particularly praiseworthy and should be preserved in the committee’s final decision

- Retaining Cape York within the same division as Cairns.

### **Martin Gordon Objection 23 Page 3.**

Martin Gordon on Page 3 states:-

I had proposed changes to Kennedy that were more radical than the commissioners were contemplating. The current configuration of Leichhardt and Kennedy divides the greater bulk of the north Queensland



indigenous communities particularly those in the Cape and on the Gulf of Carpentaria. My proposal essentially meant that Leichhardt became a largely Cairns urban electorate (albeit with a rural strip that extended along the coast to Cooktown), which will be where the dominant interest of Leichhardt will continue to be, and increasingly so. I am not convinced that the outskirts of Cairns will be best served by a member that is either Innisfail or Mount Isa based. Increasingly Kennedy's population centre of gravity will shift towards the Coral Sea Coast with significant populations south and west of Cairns, and to a lesser degree with Townsville. Increasingly the economic, social, and political imperatives of Kennedy will be more like those of Cairns and Townsville as that will be where the population and economic activity will be.'

This is already occurring.

At the 1983 Federal Elections there were 64,728 electors on the roll in Kennedy. Mount Isa had approximately 10,000 of those which was 15% of the electorate, and shared being one of the larger centres with Charters Towers and Emerald.

On projected enrolment as at 9/7/2012, Mt Isa will have an enrolment of 10,888 which will be 10.86% of the projected enrolment of 100,246.

It should be the residents of Mt Isa complaining about the coast taking over their Division not the other way around.

### **Cr Nancy Lanskey Objection No. 12**

Cr Lanskey (Cairns Regional Council) objected to Edmonton being transferred to Kennedy.

One of her reasons was:-

- The Edmonton/Mount Peter southern corridor has been earmarked as the long term future growth area for Cairns and is currently undergoing master planning (at the behest of the state Government)

Mount Peter has been in the Division of Kennedy since the 2003 Redistribution and I have not heard a 'moan' from Cr. Lanskey previously about that.

She also says:-

- ‘A new division based on the Cairns Regional Council boundaries would better represent both Edmonton and the community-at-large’s common interest’.

That would mean transferring the ‘Cape’ and the ‘Islands’ to the Division of Kennedy.

The Cairns Regional Council, on projected enrolments as at 9/7/2012, already has in excess of a quota.

If the Redistribution Committee had followed Cr. Lanskey’s suggestion, i.e. retained Edmonton in Leichhardt and transferred Mount Peter back into Leichhardt, they would have to be transferred out of Leichhardt at the next redistribution as this is where most of the growth in the Cairns area is occurring.

If the Augmented Commission accepts my ‘objection’ and adds the Timberlea part of Bentley Park to the Division of Kennedy, most of the growth in the Cairns area will occur in the Division of Kennedy which will be offset by the lower growth in the western areas.

### **Vanessa E Brown Objection No. 548**

Vanessa Brown of Kullaroo Close Kuranda states:-

‘I believe that under Bob Katter in order to cast my vote in an election I would have to travel to Mareeba from Kuranda and this is impossible.’

Mrs Brown I am sure that the Australian Electorate Commission will have a polling booth in Kuranda, no matter which Division it is in.

## **Other Objections**

There were a number of other 'objections' to the proposed boundary mainly from Kuranda residents but some also from Edmonton.

Most of the Kuranda 'objections' stated the towns connection with Cairns compared to the rest of the Tableland.

It is worth noting that while most of these 'objections' wanted Kuranda and/or Edmonton to remain in the Division of Leichhardt, none expressed a opinion as to how this could be achieved, bearing in mind the legislative requirements that the projected enrolment for the Division must be within 3.5% of the projected quota as at 9/7/2012.

After considering all the 'objections' re the Leichhardt/Kennedy boundary I consider my 'objection' stills the most suitable solution, that is:-

- Transfer the Timberlea area of Bentley Park to the Division of Kennedy
- Transfer the Koah area near Kuranda to the Division of Leichhardt.
- Retain the part of the Mareeba SLA currently in the Division of Leichhardt in the new Division of Leichhardt.

## **Kennedy Southern Boundary**

### **LNP Objection No. 532 Pages 19 & 23**

The LNP objection includes:-

- Retaining the existing boundary between the Divisions of Kennedy and Herbert in the Northern Beaches-Pinnacles SLA and the Condon-Rasmussen-Bohle Basin SLA.
- Transferring that part of the Charters Towers Regional Council south of the Flinders Highway to the Division of Dawson.
- Retaining the existing boundary between the Divisions of Kennedy and Dawson in the Stuart-Roseneath SLA, Woodstock-Cleveland-Ross SLA and the Burdekin Shire.

My 'Objection' suggest that all the Northern Beaches-Pinnacles SLA be retained in the Division of Kennedy, and the existing southern boundary with the Division of Dawson remain intact.

The area of the Condon-Rasmussen-Pinnacles SLA in the existing Division of Kennedy would be transferred to the Division of Herbert.

I totally disagree with the LNP 'Objection' to split the area of Charters Towers Regional Council along the Flinders Highway.

The only reason I can see for this 'Objection' is political, i.e. the LNP believe they would have a better chance of winning the Division of Dawson back at the next election.

'Political consideration' is not a 'term of reference' when the Augmented Commission is considering 'Objections'. So the LNP proposal in this instance should be disregarded.

### **Dr. Mark Mulcair Objection 71 Page 3**

Dr Mulcair states:-

‘It is not clear why 36 electors in Burdekin Shire are proposed to be transferred from Dawson to Kennedy. In keeping with the general strategy of keeping rural shires together, these electors should remain in Dawson’

So do I. In my ‘Objection’ I suggested that the existing boundary between the Divisions of Kennedy and Dawson remain intact.

### **Herbert/Dawson Boundary**

There were numerous ‘Objections’ re this boundary, particularly the proposed transfer of the suburb of Annandale (Murray SLA part).

### **LNP Objection No. 532 Pages 19-22**

The LNP ‘Objection’ includes:-

- Retaining all the areas of the Northern Beaches-Pinnacles and Condon-Rasmussen-Bohle Basin SLA’s that are in the existing Division of Kennedy in that Division.
- Retaining the Suburb of Annandale (Murray SLA Part) in the Division of Herbert.
- Transferring 3 CCD’s of the Oonoonba-Idalia-Cluden SLA (apparently the Suburb of Idalia) from the existing Division of Dawson to the Division of Herbert.

It appears that the LNP is quite happy to see the Wulguru SLA transferred to the Division of Dawson.

I Wonder why!

Read the last election figures.

**Peter Lindsay MP Member for Herbert Objection No. 390**

I ask the following questions of Mr. Lindsay.

- Would you have gone 'so hard' against the proposed transfer to the Division of Dawson of the Suburbs of Annandale and Wulguru if it had been only the Suburb of Wulguru proposed for transfer?

Answer: - Mr Lindsay track record from the 2006 Redistribution when areas such as Oonoomba, Stuart and Cluden were transferred to the Division of Dawson indicates he would not have.

- Why call a public meeting, distribute pro forma letters to be sent to the Augmented Commission this time?

Answer: - Mr Lindsay 'political life is on the line'.

If the Suburb of Annandale goes out of the Division of Herbert, so probably does his political career.

- Who paid for the paper/printing/distribution of the letter and the hall hire?

I will leave Mr Lindsay answer that question, but if it came out of his electoral allowance I suggest that the Commonwealth Auditor General may be interested in light of his/her recent investigation into MP's printing expenses prior to the last election where he/she found that most of the printing was 'outside the guidelines' as it was of a 'political nature'.

I believe that Mr. Lindsay motive for this Campaign is 'political' and that the Augmented Committee's decision will have more an effect on his re-election than a 'letter box full of 'junk mail' sent out just prior to the election.

I also take Mr Lindsay to task on some of the matters raised in his 'Objection':-

- **'No regional interest between Federal Member of Dawson and Annandale** The current member for Dawson has already publicly stated he does not intend to establish an office in the northern part of the proposed electorate. Including Annandale in the Federal Electorate of Dawson is the equivalent of having the Office of the Federal Member for Ryan located in Gladstone.'

After thirteen (13) years in Parliament Mr. Lindsay would, or at least should know, that the proposed Division of Dawson is too small in area to qualify for a second electoral office.

I am aware that the Member for Dawson, Mr. James Bidgood has made application to the Special Minister of State, Senator Ludwig for a second electoral office which would be located in the north of his Division.

However, if the Minister allows a second electoral office for the Division of Dawson, he will be 'flooded' with applications from Members with Divisions of similar size for a second office.

Depending on the outcome of Mr. Bidgood application to the Special Minister of State, I am also aware that Mr. Bidgood is investigating other ways that can improve the access to his office by the residents in the north of his Division without setting a precedent a second electoral would.

**'Electoral Act Section 66(3) (b) (11) means of communication and travel within the proposed Electoral Division**

The Federal Member for Dawson cannot fly to Townsville airport under charter entitlement, as the airport is not located within the Dawson electorate. Currently the Federal Member for Dawson is required to fly to a local airport in Ayr, and then drive approximately 100 kilometres to the Townsville. This does not allow the Federal Member for Dawson access by charter aircraft to Townsville, making effective representation difficult and disadvantaging the electors of Townsville.'

This is a 'furphy', exaggerated by Mr. Lindsay.

I am aware that charter flight s to Townsville is a 'non issue' as far as the Member for Dawson, Mr. Bidgood is concerned.

There are adequate commercial flights between Mackay and Townsville to accommodate Mr. Bidgood's travel arrangements.

**'Electoral Act Section 66(3) (b) (v) the boundaries of existing Divisions in the State or Territory**

The existing boundaries of the State Electorate of Burdekin do not include Annandale'

I believe that the Electoral Act in this instance refers to Federal Divisional boundaries, not State Electoral boundaries.

Mr Lindsay, you are really 'clutching at straws' raising this matter.

**Brian John Pugh Objection No. 46 Item 6**

Mr Pugh says:-

'It is essential that local member is available for immediate and face to face contact by all members of the Community. Especially pensioners and those who cannot afford large telephone or communication bills.'

Mr. Bidgood's Electoral Office has a 1300 number which constituents throughout his electorate can phone for the cost of a local call.

**Christopher Nelson Objection No. 24 last paragraph**

Mr. Nelson States:-

'My preference is to have Townsville unified in one electorate. If this is not possible then I would recommend that Townsville be split equally across two electorates so that there are sufficient Townsville voters in each electorate to ensure that Townsville interests are adequately addressed'.



I raised this issue in my “Objection” and enclosed a map showing what a Division would look like if Townsville was the largest centre of that Division, taking in all the excess of the Townsville City Council area from the Division of Herbert.

I advise that there would be a division of 800,000 sq km, taking in the area south and east of the Ross River, and including other centres such as Bowen, Emerald, Dalby and Roma.

The area along the coast would have a projected enrolment of 41,466 as at 9/7/2012, however to obtain the additional projected enrolment of 55,766, to make up a quota would require taking much of the land mass of the existing Division of Maranoa.

While the ‘Objectors’ of Annandale may have the Member Electoral Office in Townsville, they would not see much of their Member, allowing for Parliamentary duties in Canberra, and servicing a Division of 800,000 sq km.

Compare a Division this size with Mr. Lindsay proposed Division of Herbert of 946 sq km.

Mr. Lindsay can travel to any part of his existing or proposed Division with a half an hour by car.

It would take the Member for the other Division taking in Townsville days to reach some of his Division by car.

### **Other Objections**

As Mr. Lindsay said on Page 4 of his ‘Objection’

‘My office has forwarded 343 individual written objections and submissions to the Australian Electoral Commission. More objections and submission arrive daily and will also be forwarded.’

There are too many ‘Objections’ to comment individually on each, and most were ‘pro forma’ letters with the objector filling his his/her name and address and writing a ‘few line’ why they wanted to remain in the Division of Herbert.

After considering the ‘objections’ I consider my ‘objection’ has the most suitable suggestion.

While it would not be perfect it would:-

- Return the Suburb of Annandale back to the Division of Herbert
- Take the boundary of the Division of Dawson north to Ross Creek to include the SLA’s of Railway Estate and South Townsville.
- The Wulguru SLA would remain in the proposed Division of Dawson.
- The existing boundary between the Divisions of Kennedy and Dawson in the Stuart-Roseneath, Woodstock-Cleveland-Ross SLA’s and the Burdekin Shire would be retained.

I wonder if Mr. Lindsay will ‘cry’ about this boundary?

I doubt it!

He will probably go laughing all the way to the ‘ballot box’.

### **Maranoa/Flynn Boundary**

The LNP ‘objects’ to this boundary, claiming the proposed Division of Maranoa is ‘too large’ at 725,513 sq km.

They have a short memory.

Their State President, Mr McIver, at the ‘suggestion’ stage of the redistribution process suggested the Division of Maranoa be in excess of 1,000,000 sq km.

The LNP claims the Mayor of the Barcaldine Regional Council said that being moved from division (Flynn) is a ‘regional disadvantage’.

The Longreach Regional Council lodged an ‘objection’ also preferring to stay in the Division of Flynn.

These ‘objections’ is contrary to the submissions in the ‘Suggestions’ wanting to be transferred to the Division of Maranoa.

The Member for Maranoa, Mr Bruce Scott, MP wrote a long submission supporting the transfer.

I do not know what the Electoral Commission can do to satisfy these people.

The Redistribution Committee proposed what they ask for and they still complain!

### **Divisions of Capricornia/Flynn/Hinkler & Wide Bay**

There were a number of 'objections' in these proposed Divisions.

It appear the ability to accept any of 'objections' depends on whether the Augmented Committee is prepared to shift the boundary of the proposed Division of Flynn south to the Burnett River, thus transferring North Bundaberg to that Division.

This move would the probably allow:-

- Mt Morgan and/or Gracemere to be retained in the Division of Capricornia.
- The Biggenden SLA to be retained in the Division of Hinkler
- The area around Woocoo proposed to be transferred to the Division of Wide Bay is retained in the division of Hinkler.

Time does not allow me examine the objections for this area more closely.

Yours sincerely

R. J Richardson