

Electoral Laws (Restoring Electoral Fairness) Amendment Bill 2025

Submission No: 069

Submission By: [REDACTED]

Publication: Making the submission public but withholding your name

Disregard other submission as it was missing contact details and it is important this is available as a submission.

1. Increasing restrictions on voting by persons serving sentences

I oppose this amendment.

Can there be some acknowledgement that people serving sentences have been failed by the system in some way. They likely have trauma, addictions, strained relationships with others. All of which could have been supported by local, state, and federal governments.

This amendment unfairly targets those who needed help, needed support, and by taking away their right to vote you are not "increasing public confidence" in the process, you are demonstrating who it is you choose to aid in our society - we are all as strong as our weakest link so instead of casting them out and ignoring what they have to say, we would be a more productive society if they were included in the conversation.

2. Removing the ban on political donations from property developers

I oppose this amendment.

You have not provided a valid reason why you are choosing to disregard the Operation Belcarra Report. A report whose focus was increasing integrity and removing corruption in government. Repeating "it was an election commitment" is not a valid reason to pole holes in what is already a messy, unfair system. This government argues it has integrity and it asks for integrity from the hundreds of thousands of public servants who work hard for Queensland. This amendment is hypocritical.

Why would we want local elections safeguarded and not state elections?

We want LESS big money influence in our politics and government. If you can't create fair housing opportunities for everybody, then you need to go back and consult with a wider audience.

3. Allowing loans from financial institutions to be used for electoral expenditure

I oppose this amendment.

Your reasoning is unclear. How is it not a private interest that a financial institution wants to fund a party in an election? A loan is a form of funding. If you can guarantee the institutions won't say no to any party or candidate, it is a slightly fairer process. But if that is not how it will work you are only further corrupting the process and adding another layer of bureaucracy to elections.

I have not mentioned other amendments but this does not mean I support them.