THE FEDERAL REDISTRIBUTION QUEENSLAND

Submission CS19

Carmel

From: [redacted]
To: FedRedistribution - QLD
Subject: [Redistribution QLD - Submission] *WWW* [SEC=OFFICIAL]
Date: Wednesday, 28 October 2026 6:36:59 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Australian Federal Government. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Form submitted: 28/10/2026 07:36 PM

, Carmel - Redistribution QLD - Submission

Personal details

Name: Carmel
Organisation:
Email: [redacted]

Submission details

Submission: Names
Details: I disagree with Bob Richardson for two reasons.

1. Adermann is not a compelling choice for a Queensland electorate.

Richardson appears to justify the Adermann name primarily on the basis that Charles and Evan Adermann served in the House of Representatives for a combined 47 years. While that is a substantial period of parliamentary service, it is not, in itself, a particularly compelling reason to name an electorate after them.

Charles Adermanns achievements do not

appear to distinguish him sufficiently from many other parliamentarians. He was a farmer, became a minister and was appointed to the Privy Council, but none of those accomplishments was unique. Evan Adermanns record is arguably more noteworthy, particularly his work on Northern Territory self-government, the establishment of Uluru National Park and Darwins reconstruction after Cyclone Tracy. However, these achievements would arguably make a stronger case for naming an electorate in the Northern Territory after him.

Richardson has not adequately explained why the Adermanns length of parliamentary service should outweigh other considerations when choosing a name for a Queensland electorate. Forty-seven years of service is certainly notable, but it is not a sufficiently compelling justification on its own.

2. Flynn should not be abolished.

The name Flynn has a much stronger claim to recognition. The Reverend John Flynns role in founding the Royal Flying Doctor Service made a lasting and tangible difference to the lives of people in rural and remote Australia, including Queensland. His legacy represents an achievement of enduring public benefit, rather than simply a lengthy period in public office.

If electorate names are intended to commemorate people who have made

significant contributions to the community, Flynn is exactly the sort of name that deserves to be retained.

In short, I see no compelling justification for adopting Adermann based primarily on the combined length of two mens parliamentary careers, while abolishing Flynn, a name associated with an achievement that has had a profound and lasting impact on Australian society.