

Proposed Reform	CoRBA Position	Actions/Questions
<p>Simplified franchise with emphasis on State roll. Others may apply.</p> <p>p6 <i>“Apply for vote.”</i></p> <p>p7 <i>“Direct enrolment of non-resident owners will continue with one exception. It is proposed to remove the requirement of the City of Melbourne to directly enrol property owners and corporation representatives whose primary residence is outside Australia. Overseas owners/representatives will retain the right to apply for enrolment.”</i></p> <p><i>“Fully implemented for 2020.”</i></p>	<p>City of Melbourne Act should be repealed.</p> <p>City of Melbourne electoral arrangements (assuming City of Melbourne Act is repealed) must align with Local Government Act and be consistent with all Victorian Local Government areas.</p> <p>Remove <i>“one month”</i> eligibility for voting in Melbourne which was initially inserted by the City of Melbourne officers because the City of Melbourne elections under the new Act were unworkable then later retrospectively ratified by the Liberal Government.</p> <p>Equitable representation prohibits all gerrymanders. Therefore remove gerrymander 2 votes for residents. Do you mean companies/business?</p> <p>Remove <i>“deeming.”</i></p> <p>Rigour around ballot delivery checking validity and proxy voting.</p>	<p>Improvements BUT they must apply in the City of Melbourne.</p> <p>Very superficial in relation to City of Melbourne failure to address all voting issues re City of Melbourne.</p> <p>Q. If a corporation “opts in” in the prescribed manner, how will this be verified?</p> <p>Q. If corporations that DO NOT “opt in” can still be added to the electoral roll by Council, how can we be certain that City of Melbourne administration will cease “deeming”?</p> <p>Q. Will the current City of Melbourne roll be culled to eliminate voters who will not be eligible in 2020? Or is this the “interim arrangement”?</p> <p>Q. What is the justification for persisting with “one month” franchise in the City of Melbourne? Residents, ratepayers and owners or occupiers of property must remove 12 months residency as a qualification.</p> <p>Q. What is the justification for the continuation of the pro-business gerrymander in City of Melbourne ie. 2 votes for business, 1 vote for residents?</p> <p>Q. What is to be done to prevent real estate agents, law firms and bodies of corporate voting on behalf of tenants or owner?</p>

<p>Community Confidence</p> <p>Improve community confidence in Local Government “to improve democracy and community confidence in the electoral process.”</p>	<p>Greater participation requires a valid system to address voter disillusionment.</p> <p>Consistency delivers greater equity and greater confidence.</p> <p>Current law has the opposite effect as voter participation is diminishing and the quality of candidates likewise.</p> <p>The Victorian Electoral Commission is known to be inefficient, known to be using flawed algorithms.</p>	<p>Proposals will not raise confidence in the Andrews Government in the City of Melbourne.</p> <p>Many aspects of the current system are widely known to be indefensible and yet are not addressed in new proposals.</p> <p>Q. Why not conduct a comparative review of the Victorian Electoral Commission measuring against the Australian Electoral Commission?</p> <p>Q. How can we be assured that the Victorian Electoral Commission “rounding-up” system is not actually determining outcomes?</p> <p>Q. Will the Victorian Electoral Commission be instructed to rotate candidates’ names on the ballot in 2020?</p>
--	---	--

<p>Strong Local Democracy</p> <p>Standardised electoral structures</p> <p>p8 “Single member wards for each council enable residents to more effectively receive direct representation. Councillors will be more accountable to local communities fostering true local government.”</p>	<p>Single member wards deliver better government un-subdivided electorates.</p> <p>Remove “deeming.”</p> <p>Remove “gerrymander.”</p> <p>Direct election of the Lord Mayor and Deputy Lord Mayor combined leadership ballot directly impacts adversely on any chance of genuine debate in the City of Melbourne.</p>	<p>Q. What is the justification for proposing lesser or inequitable representational electoral rights for City of Melbourne constituents?</p> <p>There is no justification for persisting with differentiation between City of Melbourne and all other municipalities.</p> <p>Q. Why is Melbourne not acknowledged as being un-subdivided and justification for this provided?</p> <p>Q. Why is it assumed that there is adequate accountability in the City of Melbourne with un-subdivided wards? For example, currently 3 councillors reside in one area.</p> <p>Q. Why is deeming and double company representation not addressed in proposals?</p> <p>Q. Why not elect the Lord Mayor directly and have the Deputy Lord Mayor be elected from Councillors annually effectively inhibiting teams, which stifle debate (ie. Geelong model)?</p>
--	--	--

<p>Donation Reform</p> <p>Action to align Local Government with State Government electoral donation reforms.</p> <p>p10 <i>“Controlling election donations and gifts will improve integrity.”</i></p> <p>p4 <i>“Improve community confidence”</i></p> <p>p10 <i>“Donors will need to be Australian citizens or residents or businesses with an ABN.”</i></p> <p>p10 <i>“aggregated amounts”</i></p>	<p>Donations must be declared in real time as they are received or pledged no more than 3 days after receipt and NOT AFTER the election has occurred.</p> <p>No foreign or developer donations.</p>	<p>The donation culture at the City of Melbourne is a disgrace – in excess of \$350,000 for the past 2 Lord Mayoral elections.</p> <p>The proposal that in the City of Melbourne donations be capped at \$4,000 is unsatisfactory.</p> <p>Q. What is the justification for any difference between City of Melbourne and other municipalities? The Lord Mayor effectively buys his position and some of his Councillor Team (aggregated amounts will result in bigger teams).</p> <p>Q. What is the definition of aggregating?</p> <p>Q. What will be done to monitor in-kind donations?</p> <p>Q. How will “foreign donations” be identified?</p> <p>Q. What is the point of persisting with donor declarations 30 days AFTER the election failing to address sequence of timing of disclosure?</p>
---	---	---