From:
To: Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee

Subject: Submission

**Date:** Friday, 8 May 2020 12:44:39 PM

Committee Secretary
Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee Parliament House
George Street
Brisbane Qld 4000

Dear sir/madam,

As part of the inquiry into the 2020 Queensland Local Government Election, I wish to submit the following:

- 1. I was a Councillor at Redland City Council from 2012-2020.
- 2. I have been a candidate in 4 Qld elections.
- 3. The 2020 LG Election was, by far, the worst run election that I have been a part of.
- 4. Candidates, state wide, invested a lot of money in their individual campaigns, in good faith, expecting a fair election process, leading to a fair result.
- 5. Ratepayers would be right in asking what value for money they received from the poor performance of the ECQ.

## I'd like to highlight the following:

- 1. Pre-Poll (early voting) was a basket case. The ECQ/RO were changing the 'rules' that candidates and supporters were to operate by, daily. On Friday (20th March) the rules changed 4 times in one day at the Capalaba EVC. These rule changes varied from signage, HTV cards (content and displays), volunteers presence etc. This created a lot of confusion to both volunteers and voters.
- 2. I have been told by many residents that they were told by ECQ staff that they had to number every box on the ballot paper. Equally, I have been told by residents that they were instructed to only mark one box.
- 3. Many residents have told me that they.
- (a) did not receive their Postal vote on time.
- (b) could not get through to vote via the 1300 number.
- (c) refused to risk communal transmission by going to voting centres.
- 4. On the final day of receiving HTV's, Redlands received an abnormally high number, approx 10 times the amount on previous days.
- 5. I understand that some HTV's were opened and counted offsite and then sent to the Redlands returning office.

## Scrutineering (lack of)

- 1. The lack of scrutineering at this election casts doubt over every result. At the 2016 election, the Returning Officer made a 1000 vote error in my election. This error was shown in the results on the ECQ website but was questioned (and then corrected) because the count had been scrutinised. I would have lost the 2016 election if the votes were not allowed to be scrutineered.
- 2. If the ECQ were so concerned of Co-Vid transmission by scrutineers, they should have provided face masks and gloves. As it was, most of the ECQ staff weren't wearing any. Alternatively, the count (or the election for that matter) should have been postponed until the pandemic was under control.
- 3. Communication regarding counting and results were very poor.

4. Voting is a fundamental right for residents, just as being able to scrutinise a vote count is a fundamental right of candidates. Without it, it puts the whole process and results, in question and is a slap in the face to Democracy.

Of the vote count that I was able to scrutinise (25% of the prepoll votes), approximately 10% of those showed a preference. The overall result after preferences were distributed would need at least 40% of votes to have been preferenced, which was impossible. I question the final result of the Division 9 count in Redland City.

When I requested a scrutineered recount from the Returning Officer, my request was rejected. I then emailed the ECQ direct, again, requesting a scrutinised recount. After 3 days, I called the ECQ and then reemailed it to them. I spoke with a staff member at ECQ who confirmed that my email had been received and I am still to receive a response from them. As a result, I question the integrity of the process, particularly, because

has spent the last 5 years, slandering me, publicly campaigning and using resources against me and trying to have me removed.

Again, I would would like to request a full scrutinised recount in Division 9, Redland City.

Please feel free to contact me via email or phone if you would anything further from me.

Kind Regards

Paul Gleeson