Submission 086
Date received: 02/03/14

From: paul
Sent: Sunday, 2 March 2014 10:16 PM
To: Committee, EM (REPS)
Subject: Sub086 Paul Dawkins

Dear Committee

I thank you for the opportunity to provide my views on electoral matters. I was a Booth Captain for Clive Palmer at the Nambour Booth in the electorate of Fairfax on September 7th, 2013. I was also a scrutineer for Peter Wellington(IND) in the Queensland Election in 2012.

1. **Lost Votes**

Firstly I must say I am glad I live in a democracy that is pretty fair. I wouldn't want to live in a country where I could not vote and have my say on the direction of the country. People in the Middle East are still fighting for a democracy and we have tried to help Iraq and Afghanistan set up their own democratic institutions. Having said that the loss votes in Western Australia sounds like something that happens in Zimbabwe. To prevent that from happening again I would like to see all recommendations in the report by Mick Keelty AO (former head of the Australian Federal Police) be implemented.

2. **Voter ID**

No personal identification (ID) is required to vote in Australia - That is the way it should stay. There is ***not*** rampant voter ID fraud. It will only set out to *disenfranchise* a number of voters, the homeless, elderly and Indigenous people. In Queensland the Attorney General Jarrod Bleijie is set to have Voter ID laws passed this year. This is despite its own green paper acknowledging that there is no evidence that voter fraud is occurring at the ballot box. So why is he doing it. It is estimated about 40000 Queenslanders will be disenfranchised if the ID laws are passed in Queensland. Please do not follow the United States on this. New Zealand don't have voter ID Laws and they still send out the electoral card to assist people on the day, but don't prevent people from voting on the day if they forget to bring them along. We used to have that.

Please Read more: http://www.smh.com.au/comment/voter-id-laws-politically-motivated-20131021-2vw6v.html#ixzz2unn3ugip

3. Preference Distribution

Prior to the election the AEC writes to all officers in charge of polling booths around Australia to direct them to award preferences between the top two candidates as predicted by the AEC.

I find that situation very disturbing as I am sure it is done in the interest of the networks wanting to announce the result of the election on the night of election day. Plus I know it is a lot quicker for electoral staff. To resolve this legislation must be amended to cease this practice entirely. The AEC must not be involved in predicting election results and preferences must be distributed in accordance with the results of ballot counting only. Otherwise the

wrong candidate could be elected. I understand Rob Messenger(PUP candidate) ended up third in his race and had trouble getting a recount as the preferences from the Greens may of seen him bypass the ALP candidate. If so ALP preferences were likely to flow to him and ultimately he may of won the seat over the LNP candidate. Plus I was at the Nambour State High School on September 7th as a scrutineer and I was not pleased to know that Clive Palmers ballots were going into the ALP and the LNP candidate piles. It was very disconcerting that this practice occurs. Clive had the highest count of votes at our booth and from other sources we knew that Clive had won other significant booths and had done well in others. Plus we knew preference flows were in his favour as we had scrutineers watching it. A candidate should not need to ask for a rogue seat status. Surely Democracy must come before the Networks airing a result on the night as it could ultimately deny the voters of their preferred candidate.

Kind Regards

Paul Dawkins