

**From:** Jason Smith  
**Sent:** Saturday, 5 January 2013 5:37 PM  
**To:** Electoral Reform  
**Subject:** Response to electoral reform discussion paper

Below are my responses to the issues canvassed in the discussion paper.

- <!--[if !supportLists]-->  
1. <!--[endif]-->Retain caps on donations and expenditure and strengthen disclosure rules on donations.
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->2. <!--[endif]-->Ballots of members or shareholders are unnecessary and costly. Mechanisms already exist in such organisations if members or shareholders are not happy with how their money is being spent. Some people will be unhappy, just as some are unhappy with how the democratically elected government handles various issues. If a majority don't like it, change can and will be made at the next election, AGM, or conference.
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->3. <!--[endif]-->Don't aggregate affiliated organisations' expenditure. As stated in the paper, this will restrict the legitimate right of such organisations to inform and promote the interests of their members.
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->4. <!--[endif]-->People should be free to volunteer.
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->5. <!--[endif]-->Truth-in-advertising should not be introduced. There are already ways in which inaccurate statements can be challenged. Leave the lawyers out of it.
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->6. <!--[endif]-->How-to-vote cards should be banned at polling booths. They should be displayed on the ECQ website and at the polling station in some form for reference at the time of voting. This would save a lot of paper and remove the often tedious experience of the average voter running the gauntlet of party volunteers, candidates and other officials at the booth.
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->7. <!--[endif]-->The ECQ should not be in the business of judging whether a card is misleading. Perhaps the cards should be registered earlier, giving time for candidates or others to object to a card if they want to. Not sure who would adjudicate these disputes though.
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->8. <!--[endif]-->We don't need a proof-of-identity system. There is no evidence of voter fraud and I like our rather quaint system of simply being asked if I have voted already. God forbid that we should end up dipping our thumbs in ink or other such fraud prevention system.
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->9. <!--[endif]-->Voters should be able to enrol on polling day and their vote should remain provisional until their identity and entitlement to vote has been verified. In general, I support any proposal that maximises the opportunity for people to engage in the electoral system.
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->10. <!--[endif]-->In relation to electronically assisted voting, the system in use in NSW seems appropriate. I think the current system of pencil and paper is suitable for most people and shouldn't be replaced unless and until the replacement system can be shown to be stable, reliable and secure. It isn't worth the risk, frankly, to allow everyone to vote this way, when the current system works so well.
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->11. <!--[endif]-->Postal votes: I have no thoughts on this issue.
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->12. <!--[endif]-->Compulsory voting: I support the retention of compulsory voting, for the reasons outlined in the discussion paper. It would be to the detriment of democracy in this state if voting became optional. There are arguments about whether such a move would favour one party over another but I have no interest in this, I just think that it would be bad for democracy.
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->13. <!--[endif]-->Full preferential voting should be re-introduced in Queensland. I think it was a mistake to change to OPV. One major problem with OPV, as I see it, is that relatively small differences in party support can result in very large differences in seats won. This has happened a number of times since OPV was introduced, most notably in 2012.

Sincerely,  
Jason Smith