



THE FEDERAL
REDISTRIBUTION
QUEENSLAND

Submission CS1

Noah Quinlan

Submission to Part 2 of Round 1 for the Federal Redistribution Process in Queensland

Name: Noah Quinlan
Electorate of Residence: Dickson
Subject: Comment primarily on proposals affecting Dickson with other secondary commentary.

I note that several submissions have been made that affect the electorate of Dickson. I encourage the Commission to view all of the submissions that affect Dickson side-by-side, identify whether there are any contradictions between their proposals, and consider carefully what the best and most balanced compromise is in the event of there being discrepancies. I will comment on some of the proposals affecting Dickson along with others.

If there are contradictions between submissions in terms of the naming for any electorate, I would encourage the Commission to gauge the electorate in question's level of support for a change. This could include inviting them to fill out some sort of survey on the matter.

I note that the Queensland Greens Party, Australian Labor Party, and Liberal National Party have each made a submission. My word of advice to the Commission is to remain independent and impartial when considering submissions, regardless of whether it was made by an individual in their own capacity, a minor political party, the party that governs in Queensland at the state level, or by the party that governs at the federal level. Submissions should be considered and weighed up based merit and the best interest of affected communities, not the potential for currying of political favour.

Submissions that affect Dickson

In regard to Submission S11, I note the concern expressed by the submitter that they believe the Ferny Grove community isn't adequately represented in its current electorate (Ryan). They further note the closest neighbouring electorate, Dickson, as being equally unsuited to representing the best interests of Ferny Grove. Both electorates, in their opinion, are "too big" which is presumably meant in the sense of geographic size and spread. Their proposed solution is that "a new electorate should be formed that by and large follows the state electorate of Ferny Grove travelling along Samford and Kelvin Grove road up to Newmarket. This electorate should also include Samford". To my understanding, this would remove certain areas such as Samford from Dickson and reduce the number of enrolled electors both current and projected. I note that Dickson is predicted to fall below the projected range, therefore warranting expansion of its borders where appropriate. The proposal made in S11 could prove counterproductive to this objective if it is not balanced out by the addition of areas elsewhere.

Another matter that I would like to address concerning S11 is the notion of creating a new electorate. What would its name be? That is certainly worth investigating. Would the approximate boundaries put forth in S11 be sufficient to fall within the projected range? Would the inclusion of additional suburbs be necessary to achieve this? Those are also worth considering in detail. Considering that the number of federal electorates in Queensland is set to remain at 30, S11's suggestion would require the abolition of an existing electorate. Which? And at whose expense? Surely not at the expense of reduced representation for regional Queensland like with the abolition of the state electorate of Hill! Please refer to submission for the first part of Round 1 for context. I acknowledge that the grievances raised in S11 around perceived under-representation may be perfectly valid, but addressing that issue should not come at the cost of transferring that burden onto another community with no compensation or consultation. Jesus said, "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you". I would suggest that the Commission keep those words in mind during the entire redistribution process now and in future iterations.

As for Submission S10 by Arush Saraswat, I note that they highlight the fact that the suburb of Kallangur is currently split between Dickson and Longman. One of their proposed changes would, seemingly, consolidate Kallangur within the electorate of Dickson. It also proposes moving a number of SA1s located in Dakabin and Upper Caboolture out of Longman and into Dickson. If implemented, it would play a part in ensuring that Dickson remains within quota in upcoming years. However, two questions worth examining are "Does this change result in a net increase or net decrease in community fragmentation for Upper Caboolture and Dakabin?", and "What alternative changes could be implemented?".

Arush further proposes consolidating Brigeman Downs, currently split between Dickson, Petrie and Lilley, into Lilley. One electorate rather than three in other words. To me, this sounds like a sensible idea, though it will mean removing a small number of electors from Dickson. I support it. The Queensland Greens also propose effectively the same thing in Submission S63. I would therefore recommend that the Commission give serious consideration to this minor adjustment while keeping an eye out for discrepancies or unintended consequences that this may have.

In Submission S36, ‘Baker’ proposes moving Keppera out of the seat of Ryan and into Dickson. As Baker explains, it would produce a community interest benefit. This seems to be an appropriate way of ensuring that Dickson stays within quota range. It would also counterbalance the small loss produced by the removal of Dickson’s share of Bridgeman Downs. However, I would first verify the quota impact that this would have on Ryan, whether on its own and in combination with other changes to Ryan.

I note that the Submission S63, made by the Queensland Greens Party, proposes moving a section of D’aguilar National Park into either Blair or Dickson. Their submission also notes that if the specified section were moved into Dickson, a net community benefit for Mt Nebo (a locality in Dickson) would result as this is the community with the strongest interaction with that section. Adding onto that, since the Mt Nebo community allegedly has a close connection with this area of National Parkland, it would be wise to include them as part of a single federal electorate so that the Mt Nebo community may advocate on issues affecting this Parkland area more effectively. Another proposal made is moving areas of Narangba and Dakabin out of Longman and into Dickson. The Commission should consider verifying whether this is the exact same section of Dakabin as referred to by Arush.

Other Submissions

Regarding Submission S19 by a Mr. Anthony, it appears that he intended to raise grievances on matters that have no meaningful relation to this redistribution process. Furthermore, no suggestions about the Commission’s methodology were made and neither were proposals for boundary or name changes. Perhaps Mr. Anthony submitted this document to the Commission in error. Please contact him, if possible, to clarify the situation and determine the best approach to addressing his grievances.

Regarding Submission S13 by Tom, I recommend that the Commission contact Mr. Tom for clarification regarding his suggestion that the regional towns of Tiaro and Glenwood be shifted into a rural electorate. These towns currently sit within the electorate of Wide Bay. In your communications with Mr. Tom, I would encourage you to ask him for his thoughts on which electorate/s would be most suitable for Tiaro and Glenwood. He also notes that the economies of these towns lack a strong link to Hervey Bay, thereby highlighting an important community-of-interest consideration. It would be worth investigating which areas have the strongest economic ties to these towns.

Regarding Submission S16 by Logan Turner, it appears that Mr Turner’s proposal involves some form of reorientation of North and regional Queensland’s seats to achieve better balance between regional city electorates and the allocation of remote areas. The electorates include those centred around Gympie, Mackay, Bundaberg, Carins, Rockhampton, Hervey Bay, Gladstone, and Mirrabarra. It further contemplates moving a few unspecified remote localities into the electorates of Kennedy and Maranoa, which are already quite expansive in size and cumbersome to service for their respective federal MPs. At this stage, I would say that it is unwise to expand the boundaries of Maranoa and/or Kennedy due to the aforementioned factors. I would recommend contacting Mr Turner for further comment on his proposal. It would also be worth examining how his proposal would fit in with Mr. Tom’s proposal.

Regarding Submission S3 – Anonymous 1, the submission consists of a few maps with no figure captions, explanations of proposals, any contextual information to speak of. It's possible that this was intended as a supplementary submission of sorts, yet was separated from its accompanying submission through an honest mistake. I would recommend investigating this matter so as to clarify what happened.

Submission S21 by Brad Miller suggests the name 'Blumson' but without indicating what electorate should receive this. I urger the Commission to investigate this discrepancy.
Regarding Submission S22 by Ray Thurlow, I agree with the proposition of naming electorates after "our past leaders, explorers, inventors, etc that have built our great country and made it what it is today". As for his caution against using Aboriginal names, I would like to qualify by adding the exception of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander figures who fall within the category of significant Australians.

I would also like to comment on Submission S18 by a Mr. Thomas on behalf of Liff Studio. It appears that Mr. Thomas emphasises the need to incorporate ecosystems and ecological factors (e.g. river catchments, physical geography etc) when considering boundary changes. My translation of their reasoning is that this would enhance the coordination of climate adaptation, infrastructure and community planning, and ecological conservation. I support what I understand to be the principle behind this submission.

In Submission S44, The Lockyer Valley Regional Council endorses the "effective and equitable representation for Lockyer Valley electors", which they further state would be best achieved by having "the entire Lockyer Valley Regional Council local government area to remain within a single federal electorate". I recommend that the Redistribution Commission adopt the latter and apply the principle of "effective and equitable representation" for this Local Government Area and every other in Queensland.

Supplementary Submission to Round 1 Part 2 of QLD Federal Redistribution

Name: Noah Quinlan

Individual supplementary submission

I would like to make further comments on the initial suggestions made in Round 1.

Submission S40 – Anonymous 8, suggests that the elecorate of Kennedy should be split up and that the number of electorates in North Queensland should be increased. I would advise contacting the person who made this submission, if possible, and clarify whether they meant that Kennedy should be abolished or if it should be shrunk geographically? I would advise also asking how many more electorates the submitter believes North Queensland needs (1, 2, 3 ?). I'd imagine that this person's motivation for suggesting more electorates, and therefore more MPs, for North Queensland is that they believe that Queensland's federal electorates aren't evenly distributed enough in a geographic sense. They may believe that there are too many electorates concentrated in the south-east and too few in the north and west.

If a new electorate is formed in the North, and the state's number of electorates remains at 30, which electorate would need to abolished? Picking Kennedy would contradict the alleged need for more northern electorates. Perhaps an electorate in the south-east then? But which one? And from which electorates would the new electorate take land from? Perhaps some from Queensland's largest electorates by area? What would its name be? I recommend that the Commission investigate these matters in depth.

One other thing, perhaps the idea of giving an additional seat to regional (north, west, central) Queensland could be achieved by giving the state a 31st seat during the next redistribution process. This new seat could be formed by taking some land from northern, western, and central Queensland seats. I would therefore recommend keeping the possibility of a 31st in mind when finalising the boundary changes resulting from this iteration; a degree of forward thinking in other words. But that opens another question: would an additional seat in Queensland need to be offset by abolishing a seat in another state?

I also wish to comment on Submission S32 by Mr. Ty Hardin. Mr. Hardin proposes a name change to the seat of Kennedy, held by the Hon. Bob Katter who was at one point the Queensland Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. Several options are provided: 1) Gudjuda 2) Yirrganydjii; or 3) A dual-name setup that include Kennedy and one of the other two. Gudjuda and Yirrganydjii are the Aboriginal names for certain river catchments in North Quuensland, presumably located in Kennedy. Given Mr. Katter's First Nations portfolio work from back in the day in addition to being the current member for Kennedy, it would be worth discussing this proposal with him. I recommend that the Commission do so. It would also be worth consulting the constituents of Kennedy about the idea of changing *their* electorate's name. I recommend a similar communiy consultation regarding the other name proposals that Mr. Hardin makes.

The second and third sections of Mr. Hardin's submission appear to complement Submission S18, written by Thomas from Liff Studio.

In Submission S45, Louise Elizabeth Shellshear discusses the possibility of a naming an electorate ‘Macrossan’ after her great-grandfather, John Murtagh Macrossan. After listening to the case presented, I believe there is a great deal of merit to her idea. According to Louise, Mr. Macrossan holds a special place in the hearts of many North Queenslanders. If a 31st seat is given to Queensland in the future, I would recommend placing it somewhere in the northern half of the state and naming it ‘Macrossan’. I recall that there were a total of 151 electorates in the House of Representatives pior to the 2025 federal election. The seat of North Sydney was abolished and redistributed among its neighbours. This move brought the number of lower house seats down to 150. Creating the hypothetical electorate of Macrossan would bring it back up to 151, assuming no other creations or abolitions occur anywhere in Australia. Another potential name for a 31st electorate would be ‘Blumson’, the name being brought up by Mr Brad Miller in Submission S21.

Submission S48 by Neal Macrossan also asserts that a Queensland electorate should be name ‘Macrossan’ after the late John Murtagh Macrossan. This submission further strengthens the case for an electorate named ‘Macrossan’. I would therefore recommend that the Commission give serious and careful consideration to the idea.