Submission 118

| From: | webmaster@parliament.qld.gov.au |
|--|--|
| Sent: | Wednesday, 11 August 2010 7:00 PM |
| To: | Law, Justice and Safety Committee |
| - | ONLINE SUBMISSION - Inquiry into a new Local Government Electoral Act UBMISSION - Inquiry into a new Local Government Electoral Act |
| Name: Go Email: Address: Suburb: Postcode: | rdon Edwards |
| Divisions | (Question 1 to 5): |
| 1) No | |
| 2) No. | |
| An order of councilors on numbers of candidates | re overlap should be considered when determining areas for divisions, due to the very small size of electorates of merit should also be applied - example, 2 good councilors elect ro stand for Kirwan area, and 2 poor stand for Wulguru. Townsville would miss out on one good councilor and gain a poor one. Due to the lower of candidates compared to state and federal elections, it is easier for Townsville redidents to decide between . On a larger scale (state and federal), I am not happy seeing areas of Townsville represented by candidates and any. Dawson and other electorates are big enough on their own without having to rely on Townsville. |
| | ed councils should remain. Their choice to do so should rest with the individual councils. They should have the decide how to run their elections. |
| | dia organisations should do more to remain apolitical, to give residents the freedom to determine which might have more merit. |
| Conduct o | of elections (Question 6 and 7): |
| 6) This res | ponsibility should remain with the CEOs, with the option to defer responsibility to the Electoral Commission. |
| 7) Unsure. | |
| Conduct o | of elections (Question 8 and 9): |
| 8) Yes. | |
| 9) None. | |
| Candidate | es - requirements and conduct (Questions 10 to 15): |
| 10) No. Remethod. | esidents should have more say in determining who their mayor should be, using preferences or other voting |
| 11) No. Th | ne current system of divided councils encourages averaging down of candidate's collective merit. |
| 12) Yes. | |
| 13) Yes. | |
| 14) Yes. | |
| 15) No. | |
| Candidate | es - requirements and conduct (Questions 16 to 19): |
| 16) No. Co | omplete disclosure from all parties is required. |

| 17) Vos |
|--|
| 17) Yes. |
| 18) Yes. |
| 19) Yes, but which prohibited activities mentioned here are vague. |
| Candidates - requirements and conduct (Questions 20 to 24): |
| 20) No. |
| 21) Yes. |
| 22) Bunting should be banned!! |
| 23) Yes. |
| 24) Yes. Due to the competative nature of syndicated journalism against councils' freely distributed newsletters, the apolitical nature of the affected media outlets cannot be assured. |
| Voting (Question 25): |
| 25) Yes. |
| Voting (Questions 26 to 30): |
| 26) Yes. |
| 27) For rural areas, yes. |
| 28) No. |
| 29) This should be a matter for the individual councils. They should have the freedom to determine how they run their elections. |
| 30) Absent voting should not be allowed, as other voting options, such as postal or pre-voting, should be used. |
| Voting (Questions 31 to 35): |
| 31) No. To do so would allow large corporate entities, for example, to vote for government that would not necessarily have the best interests of the city in mind, only the self-interests of the company. This includes decisions for road infrastructure, zoning, planning restrictions, etc. |
| 32) No. |
| 33) No. |
| 34) No. |
| 35) N/a. |
| Voting systems (Questions 36 to 38): |
| 36) Optional preferential voting. |
| 37) Yes. |
| 38) Proportional representation should not be introduced. |
| Other (Question 39): |
| Other) n/a |