



THE FEDERAL
REDISTRIBUTION
QUEENSLAND

Comment on objection number 6

Mark Yore

4 pages

Queensland Federal Redistribution 2017

Comments on Objections on Draft Redistribution

Prepared by Mark Yore



Introduction

This redistribution has been an interesting process. On the positive side the committee has attempted to answer the majority of individual submission element by theme, a welcome development contained in Appendix F. On the negative side this has been an extraordinarily timid redistribution which has mostly patched over major problems to take it to the next redistribution but has not addressed many systemic issues with current electorate boundaries.

Simple Objections

Naming

Objection 1 from Michael Hedger raises a valid point where a minimal number of electorate names are kept solely because they are “Federation seats” and not for any other particular historical significance. While I am reluctant to arbitrarily rename electorates, in this particular case virtually any name would be an improvement.

Ryan/Blair

Objections 2, 3, 7, 13, 22 and 23 deal solely with the movement of the area around Karana Downs to Blair from Ryan. The question of “community of interest” should be one of the guiding principles of the redistribution but there has been an emphasis on minimising changes to boundaries over maintaining communities. Before the final draft is complete I suggest the Committee arrange to visit each of the affected areas to take further advice from local residents.

Ryan/Brisbane

Objections 14, 15, 16, 17 and 20 deal solely with the locality of Dorrington and the move from Brisbane to Ryan. Once again this is a question of “community of interest” concerns and I suggest adding this to the list of areas the Committee should visit.

Capricornia/Dawson

Objection 4 outlines another issue identified within the redistribution. Because the electorates are not centred on major population centres and have exacerbated the existing separation of urban areas, the situation has arisen where some regional areas are now significantly disadvantaged in terms of their access to their representatives. In Capricornia and Dawson existing areas such as Collinsville are also affected in this way.

Complex Objections

Dean Ashley

The proposed redistribution attempts to minimise the transferral of electors from one electorate to another, but this necessitates a number of contortions at the boundaries. Objection 11 proposes a solution that removed the issue created by ignoring existing local government boundaries between Ryan and Blair. The multiple electorate change to bring Blair, Ryan, Brisbane and Lilley into line create fewer problems than the draft redistribution does.

My one concern is that it relies on accurate population projections and does push the limits for Ryan, Brisbane and Lilley.

Kate Townsend

Objection 19 has a number of interesting proposals, but it does create a few problems. It moves another section of the Brisbane LGA out of the seat of Ryan in the north-west of the electorate. This part of Brisbane is formed from common and historic transport links, and while “rounding-off” the boundaries may make the electorate look neater it creates additional problems that significantly affect community of interest concerns.

I have no problem with the remaining suggestions, but I believe Objection 11 offers a better way forward to resolve the same problems.

Jeff Waddell

Objection 5 made almost the same points about the structure of the redistribution as I did. Consequently I commend the entire objection.

Darren McSweeney

Apart from the transfer of Lake Manchester I wholeheartedly support Objection 6. Although I do agree with the intent of the statement “... *should the Brisbane City LGA not need to be respected further south, I see no reason to adhere to the arbitrary lines comprising the LGA boundary through this area.*”

Dr Mark Mulcair

Objection 8 provides a number of well thought out questions about why the redistribution committee put serious boundary correction in the “too-hard” basket which should be answered.

I also agree with Dr Mulcair that “... *returning to the previous method of outlining the redistribution reports, by geography instead of by alphabetical order*” makes it much easier to follow the process by which the Committee arrived at their proposal. I urge them to return to this method.

Liberal National Party

Objection 9 proposes a number of minor changes, one of which (Moreton Island) I argued for myself. Again this is an opportunity for the augmented committee to visit these local communities.

Bob Richardson

Objection 11 raises a number of issues, in particular the gulf between ECQ and AEC population projections. However this objection also introduces new changes rather than an objection to the draft boundaries. I therefore believe that it would be inappropriate to comment on this new material.

Anthony Rossister

Objection 12 has raised a number of interesting changes to the draft redistribution. I am not convinced of the overwhelming value of some of these changes. In particular the transfer of additional voters from Petrie to Lilley have to potential to significantly impact on electorate quotas.

Thank you for the opportunity to contribute.

Kind regards,

Mark Yore