Objection Number 126

Mrs Eileen P McMurdo

2 pages

"Barry McMurdo"
<barrymcmurdo@bigpond.com>

20/07/2006 07:54 PM

To <qld.redistribution@aec.gov.au>
cc
bcc
Subject OBJECTION TO REDISTRIBUTION
Classification ☒ Unclassified

History: This message has been replied to.

OBJECTIONS TO THE PROPOSED REDISTRIBUTION OF FEDERAL SEATS IN CENTRAL QUEENSLAND.

My objections to the above are on the following grounds, in no particular order:-

The name of a so-called poet may be quite acceptable in some areas of the nation, even the state, but in this area the immediate connection is with the convicted and gaoled Paedophile Parson, former Federal and State Parliamentarian, Keith Wright.

Why should we, in the Jericho Shire, be shoved from one electorate to another at just about every election? We have been in a different electorate at each of the last 2 elections and now comes number three. I, for one, am thoroughly sick of the consequent confusion,& disruption, to say little of the likelihood for being totally ignored by the new incumbent member because he/she has a physically impossible electorate.

Where is the community of interest between the likes of even this shire and Gladstone. There is no direct route, there is no industry connection. We are a pastoral industry area, Gladstone is not, it is based on coal primarily. It is an exploding urban area, we are not and hopefully never will be.

We get told ad nauseum by our state government that there are immigrants by the thousands per week settling in the south-east, so why are we, in the central west, the ones who, once again being used as the whipping boys when it comes to changes in electorates? We don't have a massive population explosion, they do, so why isn't the redistribution in the precious southeast? We don't need it, don't want it, and neither, I guess, does the very capable incumbent.

What does the Electoral Commission have against the rural people of this once great state and the National Party which is, under currently very trying conditions, doing a very good job of representing an already cumbersome electorate? Why make the job even more impossible?

About 200-odd years ago there was a revolt in the United States of America commonly known as the Boston Tea Party, that was staged under the banner, "No Taxation Without Representation", against the British Government. What you're doing to the size of federal electorates in Queensland amounts to the same thing. Disenfranchising the people of rural Queensland but still expecting them to keep paying more than their share of the taxation grab is immoral, & rude to put my opinion politely.

If electoral weightage is still allowed in a country like Great Britain, (yes,I agree their population is greater than ours), why not in a decentralised country like Australia? I can remember when it was still allowed here and the electorates were then of a lot more manageable size. Now they are not only disjointed, but also far too cumbersome to represent well, and getting more impossible by the election, and once again this area of Queensland is in the firing line.

What I can understand of your "predictions" as a basis for this outrage, is so far out of touch as to be laughable if they were not so serious for those of us who have to bear the consequences. Where, apart from the figments of some bored clerks ailing imagination, did the commission derive these prophecies? As far as I can see they are defiant of the laws of nature.

Disenfranchisement is morally reprehensible in a democracy but the way you're going that isgoing to be totally accomplished in a very short time, and the prospect is not one to be appreciated by any

OBJECTION

№ 126

sane person, particularly when it is not their decision but is being foisted on them by faceless unaccountables who does not have either the understanding of or an appreciation of the ramifications of their actions.

EILEEN P. McMURDO

OBJECTION

№ 126