

Submission ID: CO-0023
Date Received: 26/4/26, 8:56 am
Name: Deborah Pergolotti
Submission Topic: Electorate Boundaries
Electoral District: Hill
Related Submissions: O-127, O-139, O-160, O-385, O-407, O-565, O-607

Submission:

See below

Submission Attachments

Email - Deborah Pergolotti - RComm 3rd comment period Pergolotti.pdf

Current stage of consultation: Invite comments on the objections

Closing date: Thursday, 30 April 2026

Dear Commissioners,

Thank you for offering Queenslanders an opportunity to examine the submissions of others and provide supportive or contrary views.

I did read all of the submissions labelled as being from Hill as well as random submissions marked Mulgrave, Traeger/Flinders, and All. For those coming from residents in Hill, there were 192 submissions and only 3 of them favoured the loss of the seat; another two subs were neutral in their comments. That represents 97% of Hill respondents opposed to the removal of the seat of Hill. There were others in the adjoining seats who also opposed the changes removing Hill would create for their seats - but I will not include stats for those since I haven't had the time to read all the subs from the far north and those marked 'All'.

Lack of independence?

from my previous submission (#O-0565):

"I provided evidence in my previous submission (CS-00043) that the LNP lied to you about the seat of Hill to coerce its removal. And yet, instead of disregarding their submission because it contained disinformation, you have proposed to give them exactly what they want."

I noted with surprise in several submissions that stated one of the Commissioners was connected to the LNP; plus several other seats were mentioned where the redistribution would actually flip those seats to the LNP. No wonder the deliberate disinformation was ignored. If those statements are true, this brings into question the entire proposed redistribution which is supposed to reflect population numbers, community interests and connections, etc. It is not independent if the entire process is biased to a particular party.

Voters in each seat

From the submission (O-607) by Shane Knuth:

"The QRC's own discussion paper (page 16) shows that Hill is well within quota, with a positive enrolment variance of +4.78%

This proposal fails to adequately apply the statutory criteria set out in the Electoral Act 1992 and would significantly weaken representation for North Queensland communities."

And from Robbie Katter's submission:

"Hill is within quota. It is a coherent, functioning regional electorate with an established community identity. Its abolition is not necessary to achieve enrolment compliance."

Based on the requirement for numbers of voters in a seat, it is not at all appropriate to abolish a seat where the numbers were already optimum while there is an inner urban seat in Townsville (Mundingburra) that was very much under subscribed and not touched. In your eagerness to kill off Hill, you have proposed severe disruption to several adjoining seats which goes against the parameters you are supposed to consider and you have reduced the far north's representation.

Representation lost

From Erin Donnelly's submission (O-0160):

“Removing the electorate [Hill] would weaken regional representation for a large portion of North and Far North Queensland and reduce access to parliamentary representatives for constituents, undermining fair and equitable representation for residents across our region.”

Erin says it eloquently. Your proposal to remove Hill means that many constituents will never be able to even speak face to face with their member because of the distances up here. That is actually an undemocratic move to take away people's ability to interface with their own member. That is not a situation the redistribution is supposed to produce.

And why should the far north lose a seat at all? Our population is expanding – if anything, we might need another seat, not a loss of one. Refer to the submission by the member for Noosa, Miss Sandy Bolton (O-0385). While I could not copy the text presented in her letter, she makes mention of *“serious ramifications for the people of remote Queensland, reducing their representation”* as well as many other good points including the notion of increasing seats beyond the current 93.

Further comment on the loss of representation is made by Cairns Regional Council (O-0407):

“Council argues there is no enrolment-based justification for these changes, as northern electorates already sit within required quota thresholds. The removal of Hill would reduce regional representation while additional seats are created in southeast Queensland, further skewing parliamentary balance toward metropolitan areas. The proposed boundaries would also fragment established communities of interest, weakening connections between residents, services and governance structures.”

Community interests and connections

Several submissions from voters on the Atherton Tablelands were totally opposed to being moved into an already grossly extended seat of outback communities and mining interests (Traeger/Flinders) as well as others who were opposed to becoming the abandoned leftovers when bundled with the urban dwellers on the coast (Mulgrave).

From Peter Cannon's submission (O-0139):

“Atherton tablelands community should be represented as a whole. Community issues of the tablelands will not be adequately addressed if it is divided into Mulgrave and Flinders. The whole of the Atherton tablelands represents a critical economic Centre. It is the far north's food bowl and the Gateway to the economic interest of the Peninsula. to divide it and under represent its community would be a malicious act and a detriment to the future of the region.”

from Liz Harris' submission (O-0127) on the community values of Hill:

“Our community also has a clear and shared interest in rural issues such as water management, land use, road maintenance, health services, and employment. These concerns are not shared by Cairns residents, and merging these areas would make effective representation impossible, leaving Hill residents without a strong voice in Parliament.”

Community interests and connections are one of the criteria you must use to judge border adjustments. Your dissection of Hill not only deprives Hill voters of proper representation, it forces another seat of a completely different focus to absorb a sector that doesn't fit with its own community interests. This flies in the face of what the redistribution is actually supposed to achieve.

I could go on but I think I have made my point. The viewpoint of the majority of relevant respondents is that the seat of Hill must not be abolished. The redistribution you propose:

- has been biased against the seat of Hill when the only seat that could have been removed up here (if necessary) was the urban seat of Mundingburra;
- will result in even less political voice for all the far north Queenslanders who happen to reside, work and contribute to the economy of Qld;
- will create seats where the great distances involved will mean that constituents in many areas will lose all ability to speak in person to their own representatives which is undemocratic;
- is inequitable giving SEQ residents more voice in parliament while taking away representation in the far north;
- and compromises the intent and outcomes of the redistribution since the commissioner allegedly has links to the sitting party and the analysis of the proposed redistribution reveals it is clearly geared towards boosting LNP seats while diminishing the seats held by others.

The seat of Hill must remain and the proposed changes created by that seat's removal need to be dropped.

Thank you for reading my comments.

Sincerely,

Deborah Pergolotti

Innisfail, FNQ

resident in the seat of Hill