



**The Federal Redistribution 2006  
QUEENSLAND**



---

**Comment Number Seventeen on Public Suggestions**

**Alison Ezzy, Brendon Russell et al**

**37 pages**

**2006 QUEENSLAND REDISTRIBUTION OF ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES****COMMENTS ON PUBLIC SUGGESTIONS**

We are Queensland electors who wish to exercise our option to respond to the public suggestions made pursuant to the Redistribution of Federal Electoral Boundaries currently occurring in Queensland.

Please find attached our detailed response to the public suggestions that have been published.

In particular, we have focused on the suggestions submitted by the three major political parties (the Liberal Party of Australia, the Australian Labor Party and The Nationals). We believe that while each of the submissions presented by the major political parties has some merit in certain areas, each is also inherently politically biased. For instance, we note that each of the political parties has suggested the creation of a new seat that, on paper, would notionally be won by them at a subsequent election.

Our response is therefore a measured critique of the suggestions offered by the major political parties. As well as being responsive, we aim for our submission to be proactive, by suggesting a solution that marries together those suggestions of the political parties that have merit, while discarding their undesirable propositions.

It should be noted that our response incidentally provides a solution that results in much lower levels of elector displacement than the suggestions of the political parties. We therefore hope that fewer of us will have to be shifted between electorates as a result of this process. It should also be noted that our response provides a solution that is closer to the statistical quotas required by the redistribution process. Finally, we strongly believe that our response provides a solution that creates electorates that better reflect existing communities of interest, especially when compared to the suggestions of the major political parties.

We are not current members of any political party. Nor are we currently affiliated in any way with any political party or movement. Our political preferences range across the broad political spectrum. We reside around Queensland, particularly in those areas in the south-east corner and other coastal areas that are most affected by the current proposals or have been significantly affected by previous redistributions.

Alison Ezzy, 41 Clydesdale Avenue, ANNERLEY

Matthew & Angelina Dellaway, 24 Windemere Road, NARANGBA

Emma Sampson, 10/447 Bowen Terrace, NEW FARM

Daniel Budgeon, 96 Killarney Crescent, CAPALABA

Guy Launder and Alison Walker, 42 Connors Street, GRACEVILLE

Jemima Venter, 78 Lower Mount Mellum Road, LANDSBOROUGH

Mariah Heritage, 36A Coutts Street, BULIMBA

Brendon Russell, 41 Clydesdale Avenue, ANNERLEY  
Elise Poiner, 96 Moray Street, NEW FARM  
Raymond & Eunice Moon, Patterson Drive, TINBEERWAH  
Nicholas & Noemie McDonald, 20/100 Lockrose Street, MITCHELTON  
Carl & Debbie Knappstein, 201 Station Road, WOODRIDGE  
David Ryan, 8 Cobb & Co Drive, BEERBURRUM  
Emma Morgan, 8 Cobb & Co Drive, BEERBURRUM  
Shane Humphrey, 24 South Pine Road, MOOLOOLAH  
Phil & Cathy Edmunds, 145 Nerada Road, MARYBOROUGH  
Tony & Lisa O'Keefe, 66 John Street, MARYBOROUGH  
Des & Audrey Hoffman, 63 Harrison Road, CABOOLTURE  
Jake Sharman, 76 Samford Rd, ALDERLEY  
Deborah Hubbard, 47 Citrus Drive, NERANG  
Emilee Moore, 5 Corlis Avenue, EUDLO  
Cheryl & Darren Dunlop, 67 Royal Parade, ST JOHN'S WOOD  
Lillian Welch, 13 Ringara Street, MANLY WEST  
Scott Philp, 37 Canara Street, CRANBROOK  
Julie Claxton, 15 Moraby Street, KEPERRA  
Jessica Marlick, Vidler Court, LANDSBOROUGH  
Juanita Rechichi and Adam Batch, STAFFORD  
Alan & Sonya Sim, 34 Craigslea Drive, CABOOLTURE  
Leon Smith, 100 Old Gympie Road, CABOOLTURE  
Ann Welch, Patterson Drive, TINBEERWAH  
Aaron Kuskopf, 55 Fanfair Street, EIGHT MILE PLAINS  
Courtney Blinco, 49 Camelia Street, CANNON HILL  
Shannon Blinco, 49 Camelia Street, CANNON HILL  
Sheryl Cox, 1/6 Dessert Willow Way, FITZGIBBON  
Bart Humphries, 12 Federation Street, WINDSOR  
Tracey Dahlke, 13 Tiger Street, GRANVILLE  
Megan Schafer, 27 Cremin Street, UPPER MOUNT GRAVATT  
Bruce & Pam Schafer, 12 Ashford Place, PARKINSON  
Brittany Meyer, 3 Kensington Place, WISHART  
Renee Harch, 2/15 Fairway Drive, HERVEY BAY  
Margaret Hunt, 7 Fairview Lane, MARYBOROUGH  
Mitchell Bradley, 120 Todds Road, LAWNTON

Robert Brennan, 42 Tucker Street, CHAPPEL HILL  
Laif Flugge, 21 Verdun Street, ALDERLEY  
Mario & Colleen Humphrey, 24 South Pine Drive, MOOLOOLAH  
Sally Weimar, 96 Moray Street, NEW FARM  
Rachael Sampson, 25/30 Mollison Street, WEST END  
Jonathon Brand, 25/30 Mollison Street, WEST END  
Mitchell Dahlke, 41 Clydesdale Avenue, ANNERLEY  
Deborah Coleman, 139 Ham Road, MANSFIELD  
Kathryn Bunting, 56 Grove Street, ALBION  
Natalie Stuart, 56 Grove Street, ALBION  
Peader Troy, 76 Samford Rd, ALDERLEY  
Ryan Bateman, 76 Samford Rd, ALDERLEY  
Steven Whyburn, 27 Lynette Court, BUCCAN  
Peter McPherson, 34 Reedan Street, EVERTON PARK  
Cameron Hannon, 332/78 Arthur Street, FORTITUDE VALLEY  
Martin Nowland, 332/78 Arthur Street, FORTITUDE VALLEY  
Paul & Janine Meyer, 3 Kensington Place, WISHART  
Matthew Cave, 26 Grandview Street, KURABY  
Katherine Watts, 90 Starkey Street, WELLINGTON POINT  
Karl Warltier, 90 Starkey Street, WELLINGTON POINT  
Angela Canaris, 22 Franklin Street, HIGHGATE HILL  
Scott Osborne, 5/33 Heather Street, WILSTON  
Brendan Cavanagh, 5/33 Heather Street, WILSTON  
Scott Jenkins, 9/22 Hastings Street, NEWSTEAD  
Adam Finlayson, 386 Murrarie Road, TINGALPA  
John Haarmans, 434 Boundary Road, NARANGBA  
Carolynn Haarmans, 434 Boundary Road, NARANGBA  
Frank & Gwen Knappstein, 6 Isaac Court, HILLCREST  
Frances Smith, 2/10 Rowe Close, WISHART  
Emilio Ferreira, 13 Lord Byron Parade, STRATHPINE  
Grant Spina, 332/78 Arthur Street, FORTITUDE VALLEY  
Shai Lewis, 715/100 Ann Street, FORTITUDE VALLEY  
Steven Ryan, 285 Little Bella Crescent, IMBIL  
Greg & Kerri McKeon, 6/152 Birdwood Road, CARINA HEIGHTS  
Matthew Taylor, 6/21 Lapraik Street, ALBION

Andrea Hodge, 129 Bellen Road, GLASSHOUSE MOUNTAINS  
Carol Flesser and Neville Kerr, 9 Bromelton Street, BEAUDESERT  
Sandra Humphrey, 24 South Pine Road, MOOLOOLAH  
Katrina Humphrey, 24 South Pine Road, MOOLOOLAH  
Craig Humphrey, 24 South Pine Road, MOOLOOLAH  
Suzanne Marlick, Vidler Court, LANDSBOROUGH  
Jacinta Marlick, Vidler Court, LANDSBOROUGH  
Hayley Smith, 4/4 Chelmsford Avenue, LUTWYCHE  
Elizabeth Cross, 7 Orville Street, GEEBUNG  
Amy Broadhurst, 171 George Street, BRISBANE  
Iolani Brady, 6 Nystrom Street, CHERMSIDE  
Ian & Kelli Schuh, 108 Pallert Street, MIDDLE PARK  
Peter & Christine Knappstein, 41-49 Goodsell Crescent, TAMBORINE  
Bill & Annette Lang, 8 Tremaine Street, CRESTMEAD  
Mark Scott, 248/82 Boundary Street, BRISBANE  
Paul Jones, 4 Appin Street, KENMORE  
Cherolyn Mulligan, 26 Lorna Street, GRACEVILLE  
David Hunt, Dover Street, BOWEN HILLS  
Gemma Mulligan, 26 Lorna Street, GRACEVILLE  
Chris Steger, 19/42 Dunmore Terrace, AUCHENFLOWER  
Nene Pretorius, 59 Gordon Crescent, WAKERLEY  
Suzanne Alafaci, 31 Ralston Street, WILSTON  
Margaret Lawson, 253/82 Boundary Street, BRISBANE  
Allison White, 27 Brown Parade, ASHGROVE  
Chris Byrne, 15/139 Pring Street, HENDRA  
Mr & Mrs Doxey, 4 El Dorado Street, BRACKEN RIDGE  
Marissa Di Bella, 59 Yalumba Street, CARSELDINE  
Joseph Galler, 20 Pareena Crescent, MANSFIELD  
Elizabeth Quinn, 174 Thynne Road, MORNINGSIDE  
Jessie Sello, 9 Ada Street, ALBION  
Belinder Turner, 5/13 Bligh Street, NUNDAH  
Lisa Patterson, 48 Carmel Street, BARDON  
Renee Russell, 2/15 Fairway Drive, HERVEY BAY  
Lisa Williams, 16 Vaughan Street, ALDERSHOT  
Lars Wheeler, 16 Vaughan Street, ALDERSHOT

Jasna Ferguson, 27 Appleby Road, STAFFORD

Shelley Wiegand, 31/69 Shailer Road, SHAILER PARK

Kerry & Cheryl Dreger, 38 Ross Street, BURRUM HEADS

Stephen & Catherine Russell, 2/15 Fairway Drive, HERVEY BAY

Kevin & Theresa Radunz, 79 Bryan Street, MARYBOROUGH

Karen Cannavan, 34 Normanton Street, STAFFORD HEIGHTS

Grant Piper, 27 Appleby Road, STAFFORD

John & Annette Williams, 1094 Mungar Road, MUNGAR

Steven Joy, 3/59 Sixth Avenue, KEDRON

Mike Alafaci, 31 Ralston Street, WILSON

Leanne Doxey, 24/92 Norman Crescent, NORMAN PARK

Kylee Wallace, 9 Somerton Street, BRACKEN RIDGE

Craig Brincat, 11 Longfellow Street, NORMAN PARK

Deana Nichols, McWhirters Building, Brunswick Street, FORTITUDE VALLEY

Adam Teakle, McWhirters Building, Brunswick Street, FORTITUDE VALLEY

Luke Smith and Michelle Lawson, 21 Canberra Drive, ASHGROVE

Jan Edwards, 29 Townsville Crescent, DECEPTION BAY

**2006 QUEENSLAND REDISTRIBUTION OF ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES****COMMENTS ON PUBLIC SUGGESTIONS****Introductory remarks**

We are Queensland electors who wish to exercise our right to respond to the public suggestions that have been made so far, in the Redistribution of Federal Electoral Boundaries currently occurring in Queensland.

We are submitting our response primarily to raise our concerns with the Redistribution Committee regarding some of the more fanciful and partisan suggestions put forward by the major political parties.

It is submitted that the most fanciful and partisan suggestions include:

- The suggestion of the Liberal Party of Australia to create a new electorate based on the Sunshine Coast – it is submitted that this new electorate is not yet warranted because this region does not have the most pressing need for a new electorate, compared to other regions in Queensland (having regard to the current population statistics and the current projected population growth statistics).
- The suggestion of the Australian Labor Party to swap large suburban areas between the electorates of Bonner, Moreton and Rankin – it is submitted that changes of this magnitude are not warranted in this area and will unnecessarily cause significant disruption to electoral boundaries and significant displacement of electors.
- The suggestion of The Nationals to alter the boundaries of almost every electorate in Queensland, and in particular make significant changes to electorates such as Fairfax, Fisher, Forde, Kennedy, Longman and Petrie – it is submitted that changes of this magnitude are not warranted for each of these electorates and will unnecessarily cause significant disruption to electoral boundaries and significant displacement of electors.

Therefore, our primary submission is that these elements of the submissions of the major parties should be rejected by the Redistribution Committee.

However, rather than making comments entirely of a negative nature, we also hope to draw the Redistribution Committee's attention to those suggestions of the major political parties that we believe do have merit.

We believe that the following suggestions should be adopted\*:

(\*in principle at least, having regard to our more specific comments regarding the various aspects of some of these suggestions):

- The suggestions of the Australian Labor Party and The Nationals, broadly, to create a new electorate positioned so that the new configuration of electorates includes an electorate based solely around the City of Ipswich, with another electorate north of this containing areas such as Esk LGA, Crows Nest LGA, Kilcoy LGA and Kingaroy LGA. We do not have an opinion either way as to which of these electorates should be considered the "new" electorate and which one should retain the name Blair.
- The suggestions of the Liberal Party of Australia involving very minimal or even zero changes to the majority of electorates, including: Bonner, Bowman, Dickson, Fadden, Kennedy, Leichhardt, Lilley, McPherson, Maranoa, Moncrieff and Petrie. We would further submit that no changes should be made to the electorate Fairfax.

Therefore, our secondary submission is that these elements of the suggestions of the major parties should be adopted, in principle, by the Redistribution Committee.

Lastly, we do not wish for our comments to appear to the Redistribution Committee as being arbitrary or piecemeal. We have prepared our response as an entire alternative proposal, a state-wide solution, for the Redistribution Committee's consideration.

We submit this alternative proposal to demonstrate to the Redistribution Committee that our comments are able to work in the context of a redistribution that necessarily involves the entire state of Queensland.

Our proposal marries together those suggestions of the major political parties that we believe have merit, while discarding their propositions that we judge to be partisan, biased and undesirable.



We submit that our alternative proposal demonstrates that our comments are able to work very effectively to achieve the results required by the redistribution process. Further, our proposed solution complies with all of the statistical and community criteria established for assisting this process.

We draw to the Redistribution Committee's attention to the following facts:

**1. Our proposed solution displaces far fewer electors than the suggestions of the major political parties:**

	<b>ELECTORS DISPLACED</b>
<b>Our Proposal</b>	<b><u>165,320</u></b>
<b>Liberal Party</b>	<b>230,369</b>
<b>Labor Party</b>	<b>*280,000+</b>
<b>The Nationals</b>	<b>*320,000+</b>

\* Estimates only – The Nationals and the Labor Party do not provide exact figures

The solution that we propose only displaces 165,320 electors (on average 5,900 electors per electorate). Compare that to the suggestion of the Liberal Party of Australia, the next closest suggestion, which displaces 230,369 electors (8,200 electors per electorate on average).

The Nationals and the Australian Labor Party do not provide exact figures on how many electors their suggestions displace. Our best estimate is that the suggestion of the Australian Labor Party displaces at least 280,000 electors (10,000 electors per electorate on average), and the suggestion of The Nationals displaces at least 320,000 electors (11,400 electors per electorate on average).

**2. Our proposed solution results in electorates that all closer to the same size, in terms of elector numbers:**

*Projected average absolute variance of electors from quota, at 30/11/2007 (%)*

	<b>VARIANCE %</b>
<b>Labor Party</b>	<b>1.68%</b>
<b>Our Proposal</b>	<b>1.77%</b>
<b>Liberal Party</b>	<b>2.15%</b>
<b>The Nationals</b>	*

\* unable to be determined – The Nationals provide no figures

The redistribution process requires that the electorates contain a number of electors no more than 3.5% either side of the exact quota of 89,587 electors. Further to the philosophy of one person, one vote, it is clearly desirable for all of the electorates to contain the same number of electors.

The solution that we propose results in an average variance of 1.77% (in absolute terms) between the projected number of electors in the electorates and the desired quota of 89,587. What this means is that, on average, the electorates we propose are projected to be only 1.77% away from this quota.

On the other hand, the average variance from the desired quota (in absolute terms) that results from the suggestions of the Liberal Party of Australia is 2.15%. That means that the Liberal Party of Australia is proposing a result that creates electorates that contain more diverse numbers of electors, compared to our proposed solution.

Please note that it is not being suggested that the proposals of the major political parties fail to comply with the statistical ranges allowed by the redistribution process. All of them do comply with the 3.5% Variance rule, as at 30/11/2007. So does our proposal. It is simply being suggested that a lower variance is another positive factor that contributes to the benefits of our solution, when compared to the proposals of the political parties.

The Nationals have not provided any total figures for the number of electors in the electorates in their proposal. It is therefore impossible to tell whether they vary a great deal or whether they contain roughly the same numbers of electors. Either way, it is submitted that the voter displacement caused by their suggestions will outweigh any benefit gained if their proposal also results in low variance in elector numbers. Finally, it is noted that the Australian Labor Party has suggested an approach that results in an average variance in elector numbers that is even slightly better than 1.77%. That would want to be the case, given the magnitude of the numbers of electors they propose to shift between electorates. Again, it is submitted that the voter displacement caused by their suggestions significantly outweighs any benefits their proposals have. Our proposal achieves a similar result here, with far less voter displacement.

**3. Our proposal leaves more electorates unchanged**

	<b>No of electorates unchanged by proposals</b>
<b>Our Proposal</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Liberal Party*</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Labor Party</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>The Nationals</b>	<b>4</b>

\* the Liberal Party of Australia suggests that its proposal leaves 9 electorates unchanged, including Bonner, but their proposal actually does propose changes to Bonner.

The solution that we propose leaves 8 electorates unchanged. This includes Bonner, Bowman, Dickson, Fadden, Fairfax, McPherson, Maranoa and Moncrieff.

The proposal of the Liberal Party of Australia also leaves 8 electorates unchanged. It should be noted that while the submission of the Liberal Party of Australia might suggest that it leaves 9 electorates unchanged, including Bonner, in actual fact it proposes a change to the electorate of Bonner when it discusses its changes to the electorate of Griffith.

The proposals of the Australian Labor Party and The Nationals involve making changes to more electorates than our proposal. It is submitted that changes should be kept minimal and that proposals that require unnecessary changes should be rejected.

We also wish to add some detailed comments in relation to the creation of the new electorate and where it would be most appropriately placed.

We broadly support the suggestions of the Australian Labor Party and The Nationals to create a new electorate located so that the new configuration of electorates includes:

- (a) An electorate based solely around the City of Ipswich
- (b) Another electorate north of this, containing areas such as Esk LGA, Crows Nest LGA, Kilcoy LGA and Kingaroy LGA.

We do not have an opinion as to which of these electorates should be considered the "new" electorate and which one should retain the name Blair.

### **Reasons regarding the location of the new seat**

It is submitted that:

1. The top 8 electorates that contain too many electors, taking into account current population statistics, plus projected population growth til 30/11/2007, are:
  - Blair;
  - Dawson;
  - Fisher;
  - Forde;
  - Hinkler;
  - Oxley;
  - Rankin;
  - Wide Bay.
2. Fisher is not the electorate with the highest excess of electors, as the Liberal Party of Australia have implied in their submission and subsequent media statements. Even after taking projected population growth into account, Fisher is still only the fourth largest electorate in terms of elector numbers. The electorates of Oxley, Hinkler and Wide Bay, in that order, all contain a higher number of electors than Fisher.
3. Further, when assessing the more pressing need for the creation of a new electorate, it is important to look at the statistics for entire regions, rather than individual electorates.
4. Having regard to the 8 electorates named above, the current projected population growth statistics tend to indicate that the most pressing need for a reduction in the size of the existing electorates lies in the ring of electorates

from Rankin and Forde (particularly the northern half of the electorate) and Oxley through to Blair (the Ipswich component).

Projected as at 30/11/2007:

Excess electors in Rankin/Forde/Oxley/Blair region:	24,664
Excess electors in Hinkler/Wide Bay region:	14,295
Excess electors in Fisher:	6,680
Excess electors in Dawson:	6,116

5. Note that the other electorates that contain the most excessive elector numbers do not generally adjoin other similar electorates. Hinkler and Wide Bay do adjoin, indicating that the second most pressing need for significant changes is in the region from Maryborough and Hervey Bay to Bundaberg and Gladstone. However, Dawson and (importantly) Fisher do not adjoin other electorates with overpopulation problems. These electorates therefore present a less pressing cause for significant change and/or the creation of a new electorate nearby.
6. Any proposition that the Sunshine Coast is the area with the most need for a new electorate is not sustained by the available statistics. The Sunshine Coast, if you include its hinterland region, presently comprises the electorates of Fisher and Fairfax, and the northern half of Longman. While Fisher is the fourth highest electorate in terms of excess electors, it is also noted that Fairfax is within the required statistical ranges (it currently contains zero excess electors!) and Longman is definitely at the lower end of those electorates that contain excess electors.
7. It is therefore submitted that the most appropriate area in which to locate the new electorate is in a location where it can directly absorb the most electors from the areas that are most significantly overpopulated.
8. The creation of an electorate that allows the entire Local Government Area of Ipswich to be contained in one electorate has the added bonus of creating an electorate with a very strong community of interest. Under our proposal, this end is achieved regardless of whether the Ipswich-based electorate, or the Esk/Kilcoy/Kingaroy electorate above it is considered to be the "new" electorate.
9. We have no comments regarding the naming of the new electorate.

We are not current members of any political party. Nor are we currently affiliated in any way with any political party or movement. Our political preferences range across the broad political spectrum. We reside around Queensland, particularly in those areas in the south-east corner and other coastal areas that are most affected by the current proposals or have been significantly affected by previous redistributions.

We submit our comments so that the Redistribution Committee may consider input from ordinary electors, in addition to the partisan submissions made by the major political parties.

If you need to contact us, please contact: Alison Ezzy or Brendon Russell, at 41 Clydesdale Avenue, Annerley, or on 0413558004 or 0434873315.

### Summary of proposals:

Electorate	Proposed Size	% Variation	Absolute Var	Projected Size	% Variation	Absolute Var
Blair	85397	0.21	0.21	88632	-1.07	1.07
Bonner	86819	1.88	1.88	89939	0.39	0.39
Bowman	86435	1.43	1.43	91374	1.99	1.99
Brisbane	84101	-1.31	1.31	88051	-1.71	1.71
Capricornia	89358	4.86	4.86	91662	2.32	2.32
Dawson	88256	3.56	3.56	92006	2.70	2.70
Dickson	84427	-0.93	0.93	89956	0.41	0.41
Fadden	83917	-1.53	1.53	91109	1.70	1.70
Fairfax	84338	-1.03	1.03	89597	0.01	0.01
Fisher	82204	-3.54	3.54	91100	1.69	1.69
Forde	82373	-3.34	3.34	88863	-0.81	0.81
Griffith	86359	1.34	1.34	89660	0.08	0.08
Groom	83570	-1.94	1.94	87692	-2.12	2.12
Herbert	86,100	1.03	1.03	92,386	3.12	3.12
Hinkler	88371	3.70	3.70	92291	3.02	3.02
Kennedy	89937	5.54	5.54	92565	3.32	3.32
Leichhardt	87,640	2.84	2.84	91,926	2.61	2.61
Lilley	87950	3.20	3.20	89865	0.31	0.31
Longman	84463	-0.89	0.89	90441	0.95	0.95
McPherson	83031	-2.57	2.57	87977	-1.80	1.80
Maranoa	86387	1.37	1.37	87681	-2.13	2.13
Moncrieff	83369	-2.17	2.17	86831	-3.08	3.08
Moreton	84425	-0.93	0.93	87662	-2.15	2.15
Oxley	82305	-3.42	3.42	86665	-3.26	3.26
Petrie	84794	-0.50	0.50	89863	0.31	0.31
Rankin	83382	-2.16	2.16	86895	-3.00	3.00
Ryan	84760	-0.54	0.54	88004	-1.77	1.77
Wide Bay	86228	1.18	1.18	90243	0.73	0.73
* New Seat	80676	-5.33	5.33	87098	-2.78	2.78
	2471372		64.25	2598034		51.36
		<b><u>Avge Var:</u></b>	<b><u>2.22</u></b>		<b><u>Avge Var:</u></b>	<b><u>1.77</u></b>

<b>Electorate</b>	<b>Proposed Electors Displaced*</b>
Blair	0
Bonner	0
Bowman	0
Brisbane	9,745
Capricornia	8,627
Dawson	7,371
Dickson	0
Fadden	0
Fairfax	0
Fisher	4,929
Forde	6,037
Griffith	4,003
Groom	5,561
Herbert	3,793
Hinkler	11,225
Kennedy	2,620
Leichhardt	4,287
Lilley	2,296
Longman	3,601
McPherson	0
Maranoa	0
Moncrieff	0
Moreton	8,303
Oxley	38,321
Petrie	6,186
Rankin	13,702
Ryan	11,759
Wide Bay	12,954
<b><u>TOTAL</u></b>	<b><u>165,320</u></b>

\* "Displaced" for these purposes equates with "removed" from an electorate, not added, to avoid double counting.



**McPHERSON and MONCRIEFF and FADDEN**

The electorates of McPherson, Moncrieff and Fadden are all currently within the statistical ranges required by the redistribution process. The Liberal Party of Australia and the Australian Labor Party have therefore suggested that no changes be made to the boundaries of these electorates. On the other hand, The Nationals have suggested minor changes to McPherson and more substantial changes to Fadden. In accordance with a minimalist approach, it is submitted the suggestions of the Liberal Party of Australia and the Australian Labor Party should be adopted in this instance, with no changes being made to these electorates. It is submitted that the approach suggested by The Nationals should be rejected as unnecessary.

**McPherson**

It is submitted that the suggestions of the Liberal Party of Australia and the Australian Labor Party should be adopted, and that no changes be made to the boundaries of the electorate of McPherson. The changes suggested by The Nationals are unnecessary at this time.

**Moncrieff**

It is submitted that the suggestions of the Liberal Party of Australia and the Australian Labor Party should be adopted, and that no changes be made to the boundaries of the electorate of Moncrieff.

**Fadden**

It is submitted that the suggestions of the Liberal Party of Australia and the Australian Labor Party should be adopted, and that no changes be made to the boundaries of the electorate of Moncrieff. The changes suggested by The Nationals are unnecessary at this time.

**BOWMAN and BONNER**

The electorates of Bowman and Bonner are both currently within the statistical ranges required by the redistribution process. The Liberal Party of Australia has therefore suggested that no changes be made to the boundaries of both these electorates, and the Australian Labor Party and The Nationals agree that no changes should be made to the boundaries of Bowman. However, the Australian Labor Party and The Nationals both suggest changes, to various degrees, to the boundaries of Bonner.

In accordance with a minimalist approach, it is submitted the suggestions of all three major parties should be adopted in the instance of Bowman, and that no changes should be made to its boundaries. Further to this minimalist approach, it is submitted that no changes should be made to the boundaries of Bonner either. The changes proposed by The Nationals and the Australian Labor Party should be rejected as unnecessary. In particular, it appears that the approach suggested by the Australian Labor Party is a political attempt to influence the subsequent election outcome of a marginal electorate. It is submitted that there is no statistical, demographic or other justification for making those changes that will outweigh the resulting boundary complications and voter displacement.

One last statement that should be made is that while the Liberal Party of Australia claims to make no changes to nine electorates, including Bonner, in actual fact it does propose to make changes to the boundaries of Bonner. In their proposals regarding the electorate of Griffith, the Liberal Party of Australia suggests that an area of Green Meadows Estate be moved from Griffith into the electorate of Bonner. It would therefore be more accurate for the Liberal Party of Australia to claim that they are proposing to make no changes to eight electorates.

**Bowman**

It is submitted that the unanimous suggestion of all three major political parties should be adopted, and that no changes be made to the boundaries of the electorate of Bowman.

**Bonner**

It is submitted that the suggestion of the Liberal Party of Australia, to make no changes to the electorate of Bonner, should be adopted. The suggestions of the Australian Labor Party and The Nationals should be rejected as unnecessary at this time.

The subsequent suggestion by the Liberal Party of Australia to move an area from the electorate of Griffith into Bonner around Green Meadows Estate (contradicting their claim that they propose no changes to the boundaries of Bonner) should similarly be rejected as unnecessary.

**LILLEY and PETRIE and DICKSON**

The Petrie electorate is projected to contain a surplus number of electors by 30/11/2007. Therefore, changes must be made to the boundaries of Petrie to remove electors. The suggestions of the Liberal Party of Australia and the Australian Labor Party involve making minor changes to Petrie, while the suggestion of The Nationals involves making more significant changes. It is submitted that the major changes The Nationals propose should be rejected as unnecessary. Instead, it is submitted that only minor changes only are required to Petrie, as described below.

The electorates of Dickson and Lilley are both within the statistical ranges required by the redistribution process. All three major political parties suggest that no changes be made to these electorates. In accordance with this unanimous view, it is submitted that no changes should be made to the boundaries of Dickson. However, it is submitted that one minor change only should be made to a boundary of Lilley, which will work in conjunction with the suggested change to the boundary of Petrie, to ensure that both electorates contain elector numbers almost exactly equal to the statistical quotas required at 30/11/2007.

**Lilley**

The western boundaries of Lilley cut through areas such as Lutwyche, Stafford, Chermside and Aspley. This boundary has constantly changed over previous redistributions, in order to fine tune the elector numbers of Lilley and Petrie.

Long term redistribution trends would suggest that, over time, the "tongue" at the southern end of the Petrie electorate will continue to diminish. This may eventually cause Petrie to become an electorate based entirely around the Redcliffe peninsula, the Mango Hill and Griffin estates, with a tail extending only to far northern suburbs such as Bald Hills, Bracken Ridge, Carseldine and Aspley. This trend is apparent from previous boundaries changes and population growth projections. However, in order to keep boundary changes minimal, and reduce the displacement of electors, any moves giving effect this trend should necessarily be gradual.

It is submitted that the only change that should be made to the existing boundaries of Lilley is to remove a small area along the western boundary. It is proposed that the area to be removed should be an area of Aspley, comprising of CCD areas 3220101, 3220201, 3220202, 3220203, 3220204, 3220209 and 3220211.

The result of this proposal is that the redistributed Lilley will contain 87,950 electors and will be projected to contain 89,865 electors at 30/11/2007, which is very close to the required quota of 89,587 (less than 300 electors over). This proposal involves very low voter displacement. It also creates much simpler boundaries – if the existing boundary at Webster Road is extended north along Kirby Road, past Aspley High to join with the

current boundary at Cabbage Tree Creek, this creates an almost straight line electoral boundary along the entire western boundary of Lilley.

### **Petrie**

The suggestions of all three major parties involve making changes to the boundaries at the northern edge of the electorate of Petrie. However, it is submitted that it is unnecessary to make any changes to this particular boundary. If the minor change described above is made to simplify the boundary between Petrie and Lilley, this can then be combined with a minor change to the boundary at the southern edge of Petrie that adjoins the electorate of Brisbane. A change to the boundaries at the northern edge of Petrie then becomes unnecessary.

This alternative is submitted for three reasons:

The first reason pertains to communities of interest and population growth trends. The electorate of Petrie is mostly comprised of two distinct areas. The first area, containing most of the population, is the Redcliffe peninsula and estates of Mango Hill and Griffin east of the Bruce Highway. The second area is a "tongue" of far northern Brisbane suburbs, starting at Bracken Ridge and Bald Hills and extending down through Carseldine, Bridgeman Downs and McDowall and including parts of Aspley, Chermside West, Stafford Heights and Everton Park.

Previous redistributions and population trends would suggest that, over time, the "tongue" at the southern end of the Petrie electorate will continue to diminish. This may eventually cause Petrie to become an electorate based entirely around the Redcliffe peninsula, the Mango Hill and Griffin estates, with a tail extending only to far northern suburbs such as Bald Hills, Bracken Ridge and Carseldine. Any moves further to this likely end must necessarily be gradual, of course. However, it should be established that this trend, as it occurs, does result in the clear advantage of decreasing the stark divide between the two distinct communities of interest that currently form the Petrie electorate. Further, suggestions to increase the length of the "tongue" area, such as that proposed by the Liberal Party of Australia, are short-sighted because they will probably need undoing at a later redistribution.

The second reason is that the boundary at the southern edge of Petrie bordering the electorate of Brisbane is the boundary that has been consistently changed in previous redistributions. It makes sense that this boundary would be where further changes are made, rather than other boundaries that have been consistent over a longer period of time. The boundary at the northern edge of Petrie has been consistent over several elections now. It is a simple and long-standing boundary that is commonly understood, and therefore there should be more reluctance to change this boundary before the boundary adjoining Brisbane.

The third reason is that it simplifies the boundaries and works in well overall with the rest of the solution proposed in these comments, particularly the changes regarding Lilley described above. It also means that no change has to be made to boundaries at both ends of the electorate – compare this to the suggestion of the Liberal Party of Australia, which proposes changes to both the northern and southern boundaries of the electorate.

Therefore, the solution proposed is that the area comprised of parts of Everton Park and Stafford Heights be removed from Petrie and placed in the electorate of Brisbane. This area comprises of CCD areas 3220802, 3220810, 3220811, 3220812, 3220901, 3220902, 3220903, 3220905, 3220906, 3220907, 3220908, 3220909, 3220910 and 3220911.

(It has already been proposed above that an area of Aspley, comprising of CCD areas 3220101, 3220201, 3220202, 3220203, 3220204, 3220209 and 3220211, will be removed from the electorate of Lilley and become part of the electorate of Petrie).

The result of this proposal is that the redistributed Petrie will contain 84,794 electors and will be projected to contain 89,863 electors at 30/11/2007 (about 300 more electors than the required quota of 89,587 at that time).

This proposal involves minimal disruption to current boundaries, and minimal displacement of electors. It also creates simpler boundaries: firstly, the existing boundary at Webster Road is extended north along Kirby Road, past Aspley High to join with the current boundary at Cabbage Tree Creek, creating an almost straight line electoral boundary along the entire south-eastern boundary of Petrie. Secondly, the “tongue” area of Petrie is withdrawn another step, furthering the trend towards an electorate with fewer disparities between the areas of common interest.

### **Dickson**

It is submitted that the unanimous suggestion of all three major political parties should be adopted, and that no changes be made to the boundaries of the electorate of Dickson.

**LONGMAN and FISHER and FAIRFAX**

The electorates of Longman and Fisher presently are both projected to contain surplus electors by 30/11/2007, particularly the electorate of Fisher. Due to its projected high population growth, the electorate of Fisher is one of those electorates that require more significant reductions in size.

The electorate of Fairfax is presently within the statistical ranges required by the redistribution process, and therefore presents another opportunity for making no changes.

The changes to these electorates proposed by all three of the major political parties seem unnecessarily excessive. Therefore, an alternative solution is outlined below that involves making absolutely no changes to Fairfax, and making far more minor changes to the electorates of Longman and Fisher.

Of particular note is the suggestion of the Liberal Party of Australia to create a new electorate in between Longman and Fisher and Blair. This suggestion has already been discussed in great depth in these comments. Essentially, it is submitted that it is unnecessary to create a new electorate in this area at this stage. Population growth rates may warrant the creation of another electorate in this region at some stage in the future when population growth rates are projected past 2007. However, it is submitted that neither the current population spread, nor the population growth projected at 30/11/2007, justify the creation of an electorate here at this point in time.

**Longman**

It is submitted that the suggestions of all three major political parties should be rejected for being unnecessarily complicated. Instead, the following minimalist approach is suggested:

It is proposed to remove an area from the western side of Longman comprising of the localities of Mount Mee, Woodford and D'Aguilar. This area is comprised of CCD areas 3120701, 2130702, 3120703, 3120704, 3120705, 3120706, 3120707, 3120708, 3120709, 3190710, 3120711 and 3129712.

The outcome of these proposals is that Longman will contain 84,463 electors and will be projected to contain 90,441 electors at 30/11/2007.

This solution delivers the statistical results necessary with the minimal change possible. It also follows the trend of the boundaries of the Longman electorate to shrink inwards towards its population base of Caboolture and Bribie Island.

However, it does not additionally remove all of the Glass House hinterland area ranging from Beerburum to Mooloolah, like the suggestion offered by The Nationals. Neither does it cause large and unnecessary flow on effects to the already overpopulated

electorate of Fisher to the north, like the suggestion offered by the Australian Labor Party. Most importantly, it does not result in massive voter displacement caused by the creation of an unnecessary new electorate in the area, like the suggestion offered by the Liberal Party of Australia.

### **Fisher**

The electorate of Fisher is projected to have the highest rate of population growth of any electorate in Queensland (10.48%). Therefore, on its current boundaries, it is projected to have a very significant surplus of electors by 30/11/2007. Therefore, it is necessary that fairly substantial areas be removed from the current boundaries of the electorate.

However, as discussed in detail above, these population growth rates do not yet justify the creation of a new seat comprised of parts of the electorates of Fisher and Longman. Current population spread and the population growth projected until 30/11/2007 indicate that more pressing need for a new electorate in the outer south west region of Brisbane.

The boundary at the northern edge of the electorate adjoins the electorate of Fairfax. As mentioned below, it is proposed that no changes need to be made to the current boundaries of Fairfax. Therefore, any necessary changes to the boundaries of Fisher must occur on the southern and western edges of the electorate.

It also makes sense demographically to remove areas from the western side of the electorate first. These areas are the furthest from the population base along the coastal strip on the eastern edge of the electorate. Further, these areas share the least with other parts of the electorate in terms of common communities of interest.

It is thus proposed that areas be removed from the current electorate of Fisher starting with those areas at the very western edge of the electorate. In order to satisfy the statistical requirements, it is proposed that the areas of Conondale and Maleny be from the electorate. These areas are comprised of 14 CCD areas including 3120201, 3120202, 3120203, 3120204, 3120205, 3120206, 3120207, 3120208, 3120209, 3120210, 3120211, 3120212, 3120213 and 3122006.

Compare this to the approach suggested by The Nationals, where far more CCD areas are removed from Fisher, and then some are gained from Longman and Fairfax. It is submitted that changes of this magnitude are quite unnecessary, and that their approach should be rejected.

Similarly, compare this to the approach suggested by the Australian Labor Party, where dozens of CCD areas are removed from Fisher, and are then replaced by dozens more CCD areas from Longman. Again, it is submitted that changes of this magnitude are unnecessary, and their approach should be rejected.

Lastly, as discussed above, it is submitted that the approach suggested by the Liberal Party of Australia, involving the creation of a new electorate in this area, is not justified at this stage, and their approach should therefore be rejected as unnecessary.

The outcome of this alternative solution is that Fisher will contain 82,204 electors after the redistribution and will be projected to contain 91,100 electors as at 30/11/2007.

This delivers the statistical results necessary with the minimal change possible, especially when compared to the suggestions offered by the major political parties. They are also consistent with community of interest factors.

### **Fairfax**

It is submitted that the suggestions of the three major political parties should be rejected because they contain unnecessary changes. Instead, a more minimalist approach should be adopted. The electorate of Fairfax is currently within the statistical range required by the redistribution process. It provides an opportunity to make retain the status quo. It is therefore submitted that no changes whatsoever should be made to existing boundaries.

The only alternative option that is suggested as a possibility is the removal of CCD area 3110503 to remove the "dogleg" area in the south west corner of the electorate. This might be considered on the basis that it will create smoother boundaries for the adjoining electorate to the west, in light of other proposals discussed in these comments. Other than that, no further changes should need to be considered.



**LEICHHARDT and HERBERT and KENNEDY**

The electorates of Leichhardt, Herbert and Kennedy are projected to contain excess electors by 30/11/2007. Therefore, it is submitted that the general suggestion of all three major parties to remove electors from each of these electorates is necessary.

However, it is submitted that the substantial changes proposed by the The Nationals and the Australian Labor Party should be rejected, in favour of the more minimal changes proposed by the Liberal Party of Australia.

**Leichhardt**

The approaches suggested by the Liberal Party of Australia and the Australian Labor Party are preferred here, because they involve less change than the approach suggested by The Nationals.

Clearly any changes to the existing boundaries of Leichhardt must occur on the southern boundary of the electorate. There are two main options suggested for altering the current boundaries of Leichhardt.

The first main option involves removing some of the fringe areas surrounding the city of Cairns, along the "tongue" area at the south east corner of the electorate. This is essentially the approach that has been adopted by the Liberal Party of Australia and the Australian Labor Party in their suggestions. The second main option involves removing much larger areas along the Gulf of Carpentaria in the south west of the electorate. This is the approach suggested by The Nationals in their suggestion.

It is proposed that the first main option be adopted and some fringe areas surrounding Cairns be removed from the current electorate. Long term population trends do suggest that the population of Cairns will mostly sustain an entire electorate at some point in the future. However, that time is still some way off. Current boundaries and the need to minimise voter displacement are very relevant considerations in the present process.

The argument against this approach is that it involves removing some electors from the electorate who will have some community links with the city of Cairns. However, the fact is that current boundaries already place some fringe areas of Cairns in the electorate of Kennedy. Any proposal to reunite these areas in the same electorate will involve large exchanges of electors between Leichhardt and Kennedy in other locations.

Further, the only alternative effectively involves removing very substantial tracts of land from the electorate. In order to remove the desired 4,500 electors from the south west corner of the electorate, most of the current electorate west of the Peninsula Development Road and possibly all the way up to Aurukun would have to be removed. This would involve displacing electors from Inkerman, Kowanyama, Sefton, Pormpuraaw, Aurukun and possibly parts of Kimba, Coen and Weipa. In effect, the electorate of Leichhardt

would lose a significant area of its landmass as well as its identity as a Cape York electorate.

The proposal suggested here will mean that Leichhardt loses just some areas east and south of Cairns – the CCD areas of 3012301, 3012003, 3012007, 3012008, 3012011, 3012213 and 3012214. These localities include Oombunghi and Fitzroy Island and more of Edmonton (some of which is already within the electorate of Kennedy).

After these adjustments, the electorate of Leichhardt will contain 87,640 electors and will be projected to contain 91,926 electors as at 30/11/2007.

### **Herbert**

Recent redistributions have consistently reduced the size of the electorate of Herbert. Generally, the boundaries of Herbert have shrunk inwards towards the city of Townsville as the population of Townsville grows.

The suggestions of The Nationals and the Liberal Party of Australia agree with this general trend and propose to shrink the electorate of Herbert inwards towards Townsville city. This general approach is endorsed, particularly for community of interest reasons.

The approach of the Australian Labor Party is dismissed for two reasons. Firstly, on the basis of communities of interest, their proposal involves the removal of some suburban areas that will identify more strongly with Townsville city than some townships in the southern end of the electorate which they propose to retain within Herbert. Secondly, the flow on effect of their proposal to move these areas into the electorate of Kennedy guarantees that very significant changes will have to be implemented elsewhere in Kennedy (i.e. the removal of the vast regional tract from Mount Isa to Hughenden).

It is instead suggested that the areas to be removed from Herbert are the parts of the electorate furthest from the city of Townsville. This ensures that the areas remaining in the electorate have the strongest community links to the city that forms the majority of the Herbert electorate. It follows that those parts that are removed have relatively weaker community links with the electorate if they comprise localities further away from the city centre. Therefore, it is submitted that the areas at the southern and eastern extremities of the electorate should be removed first. This also follows the general trend of recent redistributions shrinking the boundaries of Herbert in towards the city centre.

It is submitted that the suggestion of the Liberal Party of Australia should also be adopted regarding the movement of some parts of Thuringowa LGA from Kennedy into Herbert. This approach reunites parts of Thuringowa LGA split by the existing boundaries. Importantly, it ensures that the changes made to Kennedy along its southern boundary can be far more minimal. The parts of Thuringowa LGA proposed to be moved back into Herbert are identifiable as more suburban areas that will have closer ties with Townsville

city, compared to townships such as Woodstock and Nome. Therefore, this proposal is still consistent with the other changes suggested.

However, it should be noted that the movement of voters from Kennedy into Herbert, and then from Herbert into Dawson, can be far more minimal than the suggested solution of the Liberal Party of Australia.

It is suggested that a more acceptable, minimalist approach involves removing CCD areas 3040701, 3040702, 3040703, 3040704, 3040705, 3040706, 3043101, 3043102, 3043104, 3043501, 3043502 and 3043504 from Herbert and placing these in Dawson electorate, then adding the CCD areas 3040804, 3040809, 3040810, 3040810, 3040816 and 3040817 to Herbert from the electorate of Kennedy.

The outcome of this proposal is that the electorate of Herbert will contain around 86,100 electors immediately after the redistribution and will be projected to contain around 92,386 electors at 30/11/2007. This proposal is consistent with a minimalist approach. It displaces the minimum number of electors possible to achieve as close as is practicable to the statistical results required.

The only conceivable criticism of this approach is that it creates a small 'dogleg' area on the southern edge of the electorate containing the suburbs of Kelso and Rasmussen. It is worth suggesting that an option here might be to split the CCD area 3040702 so that around 200-300 electors in that CCD area remain within Herbert and 250-350 are moved outside of it. This should be attainable if the boundary of Herbert is made to run along Angus-Smith Drive through to the edge of Douglas SLA or Murray SLA. This suggestion still ensures that the electorate of Herbert complies with the required statistical requirements. Secondly, it ensures that the residential strip of the electorate forming the 'dogleg' is less severe. Otherwise the area of Kelso would only be joined to the electorate by a very thin strip of land through Rasmussen.

Some final comments are submitted regarding the alternative approach suggested by the Australian Labor Party that removes suburbs of Townsville that technically fall within the local government area of Thuringowa instead. Currently, the Local Government Area of Thuringowa is split between the electorates of Herbert and Kennedy. An argument does exist that the redistribution should aim to reunite the Thuringowa LGA in one electorate. However, two points should be made here, in addition to the previous point regarding flow on effects in Kennedy. Firstly, the statistical requirements preclude any option reuniting all of Thuringowa within one electorate (barring radical changes to the electorate's boundaries, of course).

Secondly, it is submitted that the boundaries of local government areas do not always coincide with clear communities of interest. Often they do, particularly in more rural areas where population change is minimal, where suburban growth is less prevalent, and where communities of interest are more distinct. However, it should not be a hard rule. Often, the boundaries of local government areas are quite arbitrary because they are dated and due to population trends such as suburban spread. LGA boundaries should not always

be considered to be default boundaries because sometimes other factors, especially community interest factors, may be more relevant and significant. It is submitted that this is one such occasion.

It is noted that during the last redistribution, the Redistribution Committee indicated a preference for removing parts of Thuringowa LGA from Herbert rather than implement changes that divided the Townsville City LGA. It is submitted that this time around, the circumstances provide a better justification for removing areas of the Townsville LGA instead of some additional parts of Thuringowa LGA. This is because the parts of Thuringowa LGA that were removed from the electorate in the previous redistribution were demographically far less suburban in nature than the parts that still remain. The only parts of Thuringowa LGA remaining in the current boundaries of Herbert are clearly much more identifiable as suburban areas of Townsville. They are geographically much closer and more analogous to the other suburbs of Townsville that fall within the Townsville City LGA proper (and importantly, the parts that will remain within the electorate under the proposals outlined above). The parts of Townsville City LGA that this proposal suggests be removed are more remote areas that have much less in common with Townsville City than these areas of Thuringowa LGA. For instance, it seems much more appropriate for the suburb of Rasmussen to be in the same electorate as Townsville City than for Townsville City to be lumped together with areas like Woodstock and Calcium.

In summary, the boundaries resulting from these proposals create an electorate of Herbert which is very much based on the city of Townsville, containing the suburban areas surrounding Townsville, plus nearby Magnetic Island and the Palm Islands.

### **Kennedy**

The present boundaries of Kennedy currently contain 90,586 electors, and are projected to contain 93,262 electors at 30/11/2007. Broadly, the electorate contains the eastern coastal strip from southern Cairns to northern Townsville, plus a large rural area extending from Charters Towers to Mount Isa and from Georgetown to Normanton.

Any redistribution must aim to remove approximately 5,300 electors from the electorate of Kennedy. However, in reality the electorate of Kennedy will inevitably gain at least 2,000 to 3,000 electors from the neighbouring electorate of Leichhardt. Without radical changes to the electorate boundaries, these Leichhardt electors can only be moved into the electorate of Kennedy. Therefore, the number of electors that must realistically be removed from the electorate of Kennedy is closer to 8,000.

In this instance, the suggestions of the Liberal Party of Australia are preferred to the suggestions of the Australian Labor Party and The Nationals. The approach of the Liberal Party of Australia involves no changes along the large southern boundary of Kennedy while some areas of Thuringowa LGA in the south eastern corner of the electorate are moved into Herbert.

The approach of the Australian Labor Party involves removing a vast regional area from the electorate from Mount Isa to Hughenden. That approach is far from minimalist. It is submitted that changes of this magnitude are unnecessary and should be avoided. The approach of The Nationals is also more complicated than necessary. Their approach involves moving areas of Mareeba LGA and Carpentaria LGA into Kennedy from Leichhardt, and moving larger areas of Thuringowa LGA from the electorate into Herbert. Again, changes this substantial are unnecessary.

The electorates of Dawson and Capricornia are discussed separately below – both need to lose electors and cannot gain more. The electorates of Herbert and Leichhardt have already been discussed above. Electors must move from Leichhardt into Kennedy. It is also agreed with the suggestions of the Liberal Party of Australia and The Nationals that some electors should be moved from Kennedy into Herbert.

Lastly, it is submitted that significant changes along the southern edge of the electorate, as contemplated by the Australian Labor Party, should be avoided. Far from removing the LGA areas of Mount Isa, Cloncurry, McKinlay, Richmond and Flinders, it is suggested that no changes should be made here. It is submitted that the only option that might be considered is the removal of Boulia LGA from Kennedy into the electorate of Maranoa, if deemed absolutely necessary. The electorate of Maranoa is currently within the statistical quotas required. However, it is projected to have a very low rate of population growth, and is able to gain more electors if need be to be closer to the required quota at 30/11/2007.

It is therefore submitted that CCD areas 3012301, 3012003, 3012007, 3012008, 3012011, 3012213 and 3012214 be moved into Kennedy from the electorate of Leichhardt and the CCD areas of 3040804, 3040809, 3040810, 3040810, 3040816 and 3040817 be moved from Kennedy into the electorate of Herbert.

In summary, this approach strikes a compromise between the suggestions of the major political parties. It generally follows the approach proposed by the Liberal Party of Australia, with some similarities to the approach of The Nationals. However, this approach is more minimalist than both their proposals. The only suggestions made by the Australian Labor Party regarding Kennedy which should be considered are (1) the movement of some of Trinity SLA into the electorate from Leichhardt and (only if necessary) (2) the movement of Boulia LGA into Maranoa. Otherwise, their suggestions result in unnecessary voter displacement and too many changes to electoral boundaries.

The effect of these proposals is that Kennedy will contain 89,937 electors and will be projected to contain 92,565 electors at 30/11/2007. Importantly, under this approach, Kennedy retains its status as a seat essentially based around the regional areas from Georgetown to Burketown and from Charters Towers to Mount Isa, with a coastal and hinterland strip from south of Cairns to north of Townsville.

**DAWSON and CAPRICORNIA****Dawson**

The general suggestions of the Liberal Party of Australia and The Nationals are supported in relation to the electorate of Dawson, with some minor differences.

It is proposed that Dawson firstly gains the CCD areas of 3040701, 3040702, 3040703, 3040704, 3040705, 3040706, 3043101, 3043102, 3043104, 3043501, 3043502 and 3043504 from Herbert, as described above. This proposal broadly agrees with the suggestions of the Liberal Party of Australia and The Nationals.

Then the remaining part of Broadsound LGA and also all of Sarina LGA are removed and placed into Capricornia. This particular suggestion is in line with the suggestions of all three of the major political parties. However, there is no statistical need to remove Mirani LGA, so it is submitted that the additional changes suggested by the Liberal Party of Australia should be rejected as unnecessary.

These proposals will mean that Dawson contains 88,256 electors and will be projected to contain 92,006 electors at 30/11/2007.

**Capricornia**

It is proposed that Capricornia gains the remaining part of Broadsound LGA and also all of Sarina LGA from Dawson, as described above.

It is then proposed that only Banana LGA should be removed from Capricornia and placed into the electorate of Hinkler. This proposal corresponds with the suggestion of the Australian Labor Party. The suggestion of the Liberal Party of Australia, which suggests removing Duaringa LGA while adding Mirani LGA to the northern end of the electorate, should be rejected. Changes of this magnitude are unnecessary.

These proposals will mean that Capricornia contains 89,358 electors and will be projected to contain 91,662 electors at 30/11/2007.

**HINKLER and WIDE BAY****Hinkler**

The suggestion of the Liberal Party of Australia proposes an approach where Hinkler loses the LGA areas of Monto, Eidsvold, Perry, Mundubbera, Gayndah and Isis.

The suggestion of the Australian Labor Party proposes an approach where Hinkler gains Banana LGA and loses the LGA areas of Monto, Eidsvold, Perry, Kolan, Mundubbera, Gayndah and Isis.

The suggestion of The Nationals proposes an approach where Hinkler loses the LGA areas of Monto, Eidsvold, Mundubbera and Gayndah, and gains Biggenden LGA.

It is submitted that the following approach should be adopted:

Firstly, Hinkler gains the area of Banana LGA, as described above. This proposal supports the suggestion of the Australian Labor Party.

Secondly, the areas of Isis LGA and Kolan LGA are moved from Hinkler into the electorate of Wide Bay. The removal of Isis LGA supports the suggestions of the Australian Labor Party and the Liberal Party of Australia while the removal of Kolan LGA supports the suggestion of the Australian Labor Party only.

Thirdly, the areas of Monto, Eidsvold, Perry, Mundubbera and Gayndah LGA are removed from the electorate. The removal of Monto, Eidsvold, Mundubbera and Gayndah supports the unanimous suggestions of all three major political parties. The removal of Perry LGA supports the suggestions of the Australian Labor Party and the Liberal Party of Australia.

The result of these proposals is that Hinkler will contain 88,371 electors, and will be projected to contain 92,291 electors at 30/11/2007.

**Wide Bay**

The suggestion of the Liberal Party of Australia proposes an approach where Wide Bay loses the LGA areas of Cooloola and Murgon and Wondai and part of Kilkivan LGA, but gains the LGA areas of Mundubbera, Gayndah, Eidsvold, Perry, Monto, Banana, Duaringa and Isis. It is submitted that this suggestion should be rejected because changes of this magnitude are unnecessary.

The suggestion of the Australian Labor Party proposes an approach where Wide Bay gains parts of Noosa LGA from Fairfax, gains Isis LGA, and loses the LGA areas of Wondai, Murgon, Kilkivan and part of Cooloola LGA. Again, it is submitted that this

suggestion should be rejected because, for instance, it is unnecessary for changes so drastic that Wide Bay will be moved so far that it include parts of Noosa LGA.

The suggestion of The Nationals proposes an approach where Wide Bay loses Biggenden LGA and part of Cooloola LGA, and gains the LGA areas of Mundubbera, Gayndah, Eidsvold, Monto and Banana.

It is submitted that the following approach should be adopted:

Firstly, Wide Bay gains the areas of Isis and Kolan LGA only. These areas are moved from the electorate of Hinkler, as described above.

Secondly, the areas of Wondai, Murgon and Kilkivan LGA should be removed.

This minimalist approach means that Wide Bay will contain 86,228 electors, and will be projected to contain 90,243 electors at 30/11/2007.



**BRISBANE and RYAN****Brisbane**

It has already been submitted that the electorate of Brisbane should gain the areas of Stafford Heights SLA and Everton Park SLA from the electorate of Petrie.

It is then proposed that the areas of Upper Kedron SLA, Ferny Grove SLA and part of Keperra SLA (excluding CCD areas 3230302 and 3230303) be removed from Brisbane into the electorate of Ryan.

The effect of these proposals is that Brisbane will contain 84,101 electors and will be projected to contain 88,051 electors at 30/11/2007.

**Ryan**

It has already been submitted that the electorate of Ryan should gain the areas of Upper Kedron SLA, Ferny Grove SLA and most of Keperra SLA from the electorate of Brisbane.

It is then proposed that:

- (1) The area of entire Karana Downs – Lake Manchester SLA should be removed from the electorate.
- (2) An area south of the Brisbane River should be moved from the electorate into the adjacent electorate of Oxley, including Darra-Sumner CCD area 3260901, the SLA areas of Jamboree Heights, Middle Park and Riverhills, plus the CCD area 3260103 from Westlake SLA.

The effect of these proposals is that Ryan will contain 82,305 electors, and will be projected to contain 86,665 electors at 30/11/2007.

**GRIFFITH and MORETON****Griffith**

It is submitted that the suggestions of the Liberal Party of Australia and The Nationals to move some areas of Griffith into Bonner should be rejected. It is unnecessary to make changes to the electorate of Bonner, as explained above.

It is further submitted that the suggestions of the Australian Labor Party regarding Griffith should be rejected because it is possible to adopt a far more minimalist approach. Changes of the magnitude suggested by the Australian Labor Party are unnecessary.

Instead, a much simpler approach is suggested. It is proposed that a small strip including the remaining parts of Tarragindi SLA and Yeronga SLA and part of Annerley SLA should be moved from Griffith into the electorate of Moreton.

This would involve moving CCD areas 3240301, 3240302, 3240303, 3240304, 3240305, 3240306, 3240308, 3241401, 3241402, 3241403, 3241404, 3241405 and 3240107.

The effect of this proposal is that Griffith will contain 86,359 electors, and will be projected to contain 89,660 electors by 30/11/2007.

**Moreton**

As described above, it is proposed that the electorate of Moreton gains an area from the electorate of Griffith including the remaining parts of Tarragindi SLA and Yeronga SLA and part of Annerley SLA.

It is then proposed that an area include the remainder of Parkinson-Drewvale SLA and part of Algester SLA (CCD areas 3262405, 3262406, 3262408 and 3262410) should be removed from Moreton into the electorate of Oxley.

The effect of this proposal is that Moreton will contain 84,425 electors, and will be projected to contain 87,662 electors at 30/11/2007.

**FORDE and RANKIN****Forde**

It is proposed that an area be removed from Forde and placed into the electorate of Rankin, including the remainder of Loganholme SLA and Tanah Merah SLA and part of Loganlea SLA. The part of Loganlea to be moved includes CCD areas 3251103, 3251104, 3251105, 3251108, 3251109, 3251110 and 3251111. This is a minimalist approach.

It is submitted that it is not necessary to remove parts of Boonah Shire and Beaudesert Shire from the electorate of Forde. Therefore, it is submitted that the suggestions of the Liberal Party of Australia and The Nationals should be rejected as unnecessary.

The effect of this proposal is that Forde will contain 82,373 electors, and will be projected to contain 88,863 electors at 30/11/2007.

**Rankin**

As described above, it is proposed that Rankin will gain an area from the electorate of Forde including the remainder of Loganholme SLA and Tanah Merah SLA and part of Loganlea SLA

It is then proposed that an area be moved from Rankin into the electorate of Oxley including Greenbank-Boronia Heights SLA, the rest of Parkinson-Drewvale SLA, and most of the rest of Browns Plains SLA.

The part of Browns Plains SLA to be moved into Oxley contains CCD areas 3252101, 3252103, 3252104, 3252105, 3252106, 3252108, 3252109, 3252110, 3252111, 3252001, 3252002, 3252003, 3252004, 3252005, 3252006, 3252007, 3252008, 3252010 and 3252011.

This is a minimalist approach compared to the suggestions of the major political parties because it involves far less voter displacement.

The effect of this proposal is that Rankin will contain 83,382 electors, and will be projected to contain 86,895 electors at 30/11/2007.

**GROOM and MARANOVA****Groom**

It is proposed that the areas that should be removed from Groom first are those regions that are notionally the most distant from Toowoomba City.

It is therefore proposed that the remainder of both areas named Rosalie (S) – Pt B and Crows Nest (S) – Pt B should be removed from Groom. It is also proposed that all of Clifton LGA and part of the area named Cambooya (S) – Pt B should be removed from Groom. The part of Cambooya Shire that should be removed is the area containing CCD areas 3140402, 3140403, 3140404, 3140405 and 3140407.

The effect of this proposal is that Groom will contain 83,570 electors, and will be projected to contain 87,692 electors at 30/11/2007.

**Maranoa**

It is submitted that the suggestion of the Liberal Party of Australia, to make no changes to the electorate of Maranoa, should be adopted. The suggestions of the Australian Labor Party and The Nationals should be rejected as unnecessary at this time.

**OXLEY and BLAIR and NEW ELECTORATE**

As discussed in great detail above, it is submitted that the Redistribution Committee should adopt the broad suggestions of the Australian Labor Party and The Nationals, in relation to the creation and location of a new federal electorate in Queensland.

That is, the new electorate should be located so that the new configuration of electorates includes an electorate based solely around the City of Ipswich, with another electorate north of this containing areas such as Esk LGA, Crows Nest LGA, Kilcoy LGA and Kingaroy LGA.

We do not have an opinion either way as to which of these electorates should be considered the "new" electorate and which one should retain the name Blair.

The following discussion assumes that the proposed new electorate is the one based around Ipswich LGA and that Blair moves north to take in areas lost from the electorates of Longman, Fisher, Wide Bay, Hinkler and also Groom. However, we do not mind if the approach of The Nationals is followed more strictly, so that the newly created electorate is considered to be the northern electorate while Blair moves south to contain most of Ipswich LGA.

**Oxley**

As discussed above, it is proposed that Oxley gains areas from the electorates of Ryan, Moreton and Rankin.

From Ryan, it gains the area south of the Brisbane River that includes Darra-Sumner CCD area 3260901, the SLA areas of Jamboree Heights, Middle Park and Riverhills, plus the CCD area 3260103 from Westlake SLA.

From Moreton, it gains the area including the remainder of Parkinson-Drewvale SLA and part of Algester SLA (CCD areas 3262405, 3262406, 3262408 and 3262410).

From Rankin, it gains the area of Greenbank-Boronia Heights SLA, the rest of Parkinson-Drewvale SLA, and most of the rest of Browns Plains SLA (including CCD areas 3252101, 3252103, 3252104, 3252105, 3252106, 3252108, 3252109, 3252110, 3252111, 3252001, 3252002, 3252003, 3252004, 3252005, 3252006, 3252007, 3252008, 3252010 and 3252011).

It is then proposed that most of Ipswich LGA is removed from Oxley and placed into an Ipswich based electorate (regardless of whether this electorate is considered to be "new" or whether it is considered to be Blair).

For statistical purposes, it is suggested that the only part of Ipswich LGA that remains in Oxley should be an area of Ipswich (C) – East SLA that includes CCD areas 3131001, 3131002, 3131004, 3131005, 3131006, 3131007, 3131010, 3131011, 3131012 and 3131202.

The effect of this proposal is that Oxley will contain 82,305 electors, and will be projected to contain 86,665 electors at 30/11/2007.

### **Blair and the New Electorate**

As discussed above, the notional electorate of Blair will either lose the entire Ipswich LGA and move northwards, or will lost all of its local government areas apart from Ipswich LGA and will gain almost all the rest of Ipswich LGA from Oxley. The opposite will be considered the new electorate.

Assuming that the electorate of Blair moves north, Blair loses all CCD areas that comprise Ipswich LGA, and then gains the areas lost from Groom, Ryan, Longman, Fisher, Wide Bay and Hinkler.

The effect of this proposal is that Blair will contain 85,397 electors, and will be projected to contain 88,632 electors at 30/11/2007.

The new electorate will then contain all almost all of Ipswich LGA, gained from the electorates of Oxley and Blair. The new electorate will contain 80,676 electors, and will be projected to contain 87,098 electors at 30/11/2007.