

Submission ID: O-0496
Date Received: 1/4/26, 9:31 pm
Name: Kay Moloney
Submission Topic: Electorate Boundaries
Electoral District: Hill

Submission:

See below

Submission Attachments

Email - Kay Moloney - Objection to Hill Electorate being abolished.pdf

From: [Kay Moloney](#)
To: [QRC Submissions](#)
Subject: Objection to Hill Electorate being abolished
Date: Wednesday, 1 April 2026 9:30:13 PM

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

To whom it does concern.

Dear Sir/Madam,

As a resident based on the Atherton Tableland (since my parents bought a dairy farm in 1958), I am shocked and disgusted by the action of the Queensland Electoral Commission, to once again throw our region into disarray and inflict burdens on our Industries and Businesses by abolishing the current Electorate of Hill.

Our incumbent State Representative, with an already ridiculously massive Electorate, is readily accessible with an Office in Atherton. This however, (with the newly proposed distribution) looks like any future Representative will be expected to travel even greater distances to be in touch with constituents on the Atherton Tableland and neighbouring coastal areas - as I am lead to believe that the proposed Electorate's Office will be based in Mt. Isa. And of course, this will be the same for constituents who need to have personal contact with their State Representative.

Let me pose this question to the ones responsible for this preposterous redistribution of boundary proposal:- What does the Eastern zone of the proposed new Electorate, have in common with the Western zone? You may ponder – what is the connection? Well, more to the point you should ponder – How on God's Earth, can a Representative possibly hold concurrent meetings with such diverse industries with different needs over an area of the proposed size.

Our Hill Electorate Representative, currently travels many hours to cover his electorate whilst some of his metropolitan counterparts could probably catch public transport and have very small travelling time to “get to work”.

Given that (as I understand) all State Representatives are on the same salary rate, I can only think that the proposed distribution might be politically driven. We should be applauding our State Representative for having the energy to be in touch with his massive area and population in excess of 40,000, NOT penalising him (or any future representative) by, what I see to be, a flimsy and questionable reason to take this action.

Sincerely,
Kay Moloney