
From: Terry
Sent: Wednesday, 23 June 2010 4:40 PM
To: Law, Justice and Safety Committee
Subject: Divisional voting

Dear Members,

I understand the closing date for submissions re the introduction of **Divisions** in (specifically) the **Townsville Local Government area** close on **Friday 25th June**.

If this is correct, I deplore and regret the late advice, as, until today in the Townsville Bulletin, I have not seen any recent mention of this in the local or wider press, nor heard (or seen) anything via the electronic media.

I would like the Committee to receive and accept **my total opposition to the existing election system operating in the Townsville Local Government Electoral area**.

I believe **democracy and open accountability can best be achieved by the introduction of Divisional Voting at the next Local Government Elections**.

In colloquial terms, ' I believe Blind Freddy can see that it is ludicrous to expect residents to feel warm and fuzzy about someone on the Council who is not in touch with their immediate locale, particularly, for instance, if the elected member lived at Rupertswood, and the residents live at Pallarenda or Magnetic Island.'

I trust I am not wasting my time, or that of the Committee, in suggesting that openness, fairness and common sense be the principal guide-lines used in determining this issue.

Thank you in anticipation,

Terence Edward O'Donnell

From: webmaster@parliament.qld.gov.au
Sent: Wednesday, 30 June 2010 5:39 PM
To: Law, Justice and Safety Committee
Subject: ONLINE SUBMISSION - Inquiry into a new Local Government Electoral Act
ONLINE SUBMISSION - Inquiry into a new Local Government Electoral Act

Name: Terence Edward O'Donnell
Email:
Address:
Suburb:
Postcode:

Divisions (Question 1 to 5):

- 1) No. Could do with some tweeking.
- 2) No. Local Government electorates which have populations approximating 100,000 AND the population spread out into multiple suburbs, Divisions should be mandatory.
- 3) Yes
- 4) The mix should remain, but the question of Divisions should be taken out of the hands of Councils (see Q2)
- 5) No

Conduct of elections (Question 6 and 7):

- 6) Remain with CEOs under the general responsibility and supervision of the ECQ.
- 7) n/a

Conduct of elections (Question 8 and 9):

- 8) I feel the 31st January can impinge on family movements and school enrolments as the new school year approaches. Not sure of the answer, - maybe six weeks before polls close?
- 9) None

Candidates - requirements and conduct (Questions 10 to 15):

- 10) Yes.
- 11) Not if Divisions are not used in larger cities.
- 12) Yes.
- 13) Yes.
- 14) No.
- 15) No.

Candidates - requirements and conduct (Questions 16 to 19):

- 16) Yes.
- 17) Yes.
- 18) Yes.

19) Not sure.

Candidates - requirements and conduct (Questions 20 to 24):

20) Yes.

21) Yes. No.

22) Provided there is some fairness in the allocation of sites, where sought after, and that they don't interfere with the access of voters, I have no problem.

23) No.

24) Would support a 'blackout' on the electronic media from the Wednesday prior to the election, but not on newspapers etc.

Voting (Question 25):

25) Yes

Voting (Questions 26 to 30):

26) Yes.

27) No. Not aware of any.

28) No.

29) If voters are aware prior to the election that they will not be able to attend a booth in their Division, they have the option of a postal or pre-cast vote.

30) Yes. Yes.

Voting (Questions 31 to 35):

31) No. No.

32) No.

33) No.

34) No.

35) ECQ

Voting systems (Questions 36 to 38):

36) Compulsory Preferential voting.

37) No.

38) No.

Other (Question 39):

Other) Should be a maximum of TWO members of a single family unit being eligible to stand for election where Divisions are NOT in place.