

Submission ID: O-0565
Date Received: 6/4/26, 12:45 pm
Name: Deborah Pergolotti
Submission Topic: Electorate Boundaries
Electoral District: Hill

Submission:

See below

Submission Attachments

Email - Deborah Pergolotti - comments on proposed redistribution - due April 9th, 26.pdf

From: [REDACTED]
To: [ORC Submissions](#)
Cc: [Hill Electorate Office](#)
Subject: comments on proposed redistribution - due April 9th, 26
Date: Monday, 6 April 2026 12:45:33 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Commissioner,

There are many different words that can be used to describe my displeasure at your proposal to abolish the seat of Hill ranging from "I am not happy about your proposal" to "**how dare you* reduce our representation!!". The former might be more 'politically correct' but the latter reflects more accurately how I feel about this.

The bottom line is that it is NOT just SEQ that is growing in population - all the state is expanding and that might mean the total number of representatives needs to be expanded. To say that SEQ deserves another seat but the north can lose a seat to compensate denies the fact that the population up here hasn't shrunk - its still growing (along with an outrageous crime rate).

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.

So many people in regional Qld are disgusted with the blatant bias repeatedly on display that treats SEQ as the priority while the rest of the state gets 'breadcrumbs'. It is not acceptable to reduce the representation we have here in the north just so SEQ can have another seat. If you are trying to maintain the existing number of seats, DON'T do it at the expense of the bush (which by the way provides the bulk of the economic benefit SEQ enjoys).

If it was essential to remove a seat in the northern half of the state, then the one that should have gone was Mundingburra (in Townsville). It would have been far easier to adjust the borders there than it is under the proposed major adjustments you have proposed to enable the dissection of Hill.

I have some other comments which are minor in comparison but are connected to your intention to remove Hill such as:

- Speewah and Kuranda do not belong in Cook and have no discernible connection to it - they belong with Barron River.
- The seat of Traeger is already too big spatially and you want to stretch it - is there a hidden reason for this such as making the seat so difficult to serve that it diminishes Robbie Katter's ability to respond to his constituents? (please excuse my cynicism - it has grown over the 30 years I have lived up here)

I don't feel the need to comment on other border adjustments in FNQ as all of them have some connection to removing Hill. Overall, I believe your intended changes are meant to give more power to SEQ while reducing the ability of regional/rural Queenslanders to speak up for their own rights, safety, and economic benefit. Your proposed changes are not acceptable or equitable and the seat of Hill must remain.

Thank you for reading my comments.

Sincerely,
Deborah Pergolotti
Innisfail, FNQ
resident in the seat of Hill

Sent with [Proton Mail](#) secure email.