

I quote from the Victorian Local Governance Association submission to the review:

The idea that ‘dummy candidates’ were particularly prevalent in the 2012 elections was pervasive.

It was pervasive in that particular election. I draw from memory that probably one of the most extreme examples of that was the City of Casey, which had 85 candidates running in that election — an extraordinary amount of participation, which you do have to question.

In terms of other submissions made in relation to dummy candidates, Cr Matthew Kirwan of Greater Dandenong City Council, a fine Greens candidate for that municipality, noted that the nomination process:

... should be more onerous. It is too easy for a dummy candidate to nominate by just turning up one day ...

Of course the Greens are so opposed to the idea of dummy candidates that it is embedded within our constitution that in fact you cannot run dummy candidates to support you in your local government elections, because it is a perversion and distortion of democracy — democracy we in the Greens hold very dear.

In her submission to the review Elizabeth Jeffrey said:

I also think that our system is being abused by allowing too many dummy candidates; candidates should be genuine.

The panel’s view is that it is not desirable for the election result to be impacted by the running of dummy candidates. The panel, in considering this matter, considered the issue of the Victorian Electoral Commission (VEC) actually distributing how-to-vote indications with their package of materials that goes out to voters. The panel, when considering this, believed that:

... the publication of candidate how-to-vote recommendations does not enhance voter ability in this respect but is a major inducement to dummy candidates standing purely as a mechanism for siphoning preferences.

At the Melbourne hearing Geoffrey Goode of the Proportional Representation Society of Australia said:

... the proliferation of dummy candidates is assisted and contributed to by two aspects of the arrangements in Victoria. One, in our view, is the distribution by the returning officer of candidates’ how-to-vote recommendations. This doesn’t apply in ... surrounding jurisdictions.

John Watson, Brimbank City Council commissioner at the time, said:

An option would be not to allow that —

how to vote —

to be included in the election pack that is sent to the voter by the VEC or the election provider.

Bayside City Council, which I think Mr Davis has referred to, said in their submission:

It is suggested that candidate preferences not be included in the ballot pack, which may deter ballots being stacked with ‘dummy candidates’.

It is certainly an enormous issue, particularly for those genuine candidates who want to do the right thing by their community and put their hand up to run but do not have the linkages or perhaps the notion that some candidates in fact get very coordinated and run a team of candidates in order to support them. So if you are an individual wanting to do the right thing and you have not thought that this is an issue, it certainly is a very unlevel playing field in terms of participation and democracy.

In terms of the panel’s deliberation in the review, it stated:

The panel believes that communication of preferences should be a matter for candidates to pursue through their own campaign efforts. The panel recognised that this approach may create more work for some candidates but is important to removing incentives for running dummy candidates.

Ian Farrow in his submission said:

Dummy candidates are empowered by ... the ability to publish how-to-vote information in the postal vote material circulated to eligible voters. The incentives to run dummy candidates would be considered reduced if ... candidates were unable to include how-to-vote information with the circulated postal vote material.

It was a continual theme received by the Georgiou review at the time. Given the theme and level of commentary and discussion around that, the panel made a recommendation. It is recommendation 26:

Candidates’ how-to-vote recommendations not be contained in the postal packs circulated by the VEC.

One would question whether the VEC is the appropriate mechanism to circulate preferences. I do not believe that it is the appropriate mechanism. Candidates have every opportunity to indicate to their potential voters who they would like to preference in terms of their election campaign. There are a number of mechanisms by which they can do this. Possibly one of the easiest ways for the candidates to do that is to have an online presence. Candidates even have the opportunity to include in their statement references to websites or opportunities for voters to find out what their how-to-vote recommendations are.

to thank the scientists that have put a lot of their working careers into research and development around the negative impacts of plastic pollution. I would like to acknowledge them, and I would like to thank them for their tireless work in that regard. A lot of what we have done in the preparation of this bill has relied on their work and the robustness of the solid research that they have come up with over the years. I would absolutely like to thank them and acknowledge them for their work. We could not have done this without them. We could not have done this without the community momentum that has been building over the last some years around plastic pollution and the damaging effects of that.

With that, I would once again like to thank members. There has been broad support across the chamber. I look forward to the report from the committee in February.

**Ms Dunn's amendment agreed to.**

**Amended amendment agreed to.**

## LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ELECTORAL) REGULATIONS 2016

**Debate resumed from earlier this day; motion of Mr DAVIS (Southern Metropolitan):**

That clause 38 of the Local Government (Electoral) Regulations 2016 be disallowed.

**House divided on motion:**

*Ayes, 20*

Atkinson, Mr	Lovell, Ms ( <i>Teller</i> )
Barber, Mr	Morris, Mr
Bath, Ms	O'Donohue, Mr
Crozier, Ms	Ondarchie, Mr
Dalla-Riva, Mr	Pennicuik, Ms
Davis, Mr	Peulich, Mrs
Dunn, Ms	Ramsay, Mr ( <i>Teller</i> )
Finn, Mr	Rich-Phillips, Mr
Fitzherbert, Ms	Springle, Ms
Hartland, Ms	Wooldridge, Ms

*Noes, 17*

Bourman, Mr	Mulino, Mr
Carling-Jenkins, Dr	Patten, Ms
Dalidakis, Mr	Pulford, Ms
Eideh, Mr	Purcell, Mr
Elasmar, Mr ( <i>Teller</i> )	Shing, Ms
Herbert, Mr	Somyurek, Mr
Leane, Mr	Symes, Ms ( <i>Teller</i> )
Melhem, Mr	Tierney, Ms
Mikakos, Ms	

**Motion agreed to.**

## CRIMES AMENDMENT (CARJACKING) BILL 2016

*Second reading*

**Debate resumed from 17 August; motion of Mr O'DONOHUE (Eastern Victoria).**

**Ms SYMES** (Northern Victoria) — It will certainly surprise none, given the events of this morning and the papers today, that the government will not be supporting the Crimes Amendment (Carjacking) Bill 2016, a private members bill put up by Mr O'Donohue. The government clearly understands that people are very concerned about recent serious criminal offending, which has involved offenders breaking into people's homes and terrifying incidents of offenders dragging people out of their cars. This is abhorrent and unacceptable. It traumatises victims, and it certainly seriously impacts on perceptions of safety for communities where or near where such incidents have happened to have occurred.

Of course all Victorians should be able to feel safe and secure in their own homes. All Victorians should be able to drive around without fear of being set upon by criminals. The government is committed to ensuring that people who commit these offences are dealt with appropriately and that we send a strong message that this behaviour is not to be tolerated. That is what we are attempting to do with the bill that has been introduced in the other place. The intentions of this private members bill have merit, of course, but due to the government's introduction of its own bill — one that has been developed in consultation with Victoria Police and that covers both carjacking and home invasion — we are of the view that that is the better way forward.

Growing up in the country, we never locked the doors of our cars and never locked the doors of our house. Upon moving to Melbourne, when I was 18, there were very clear rules that were set out by my father. It was the 1990s. I was told that there was to be no nightclubbing on King Street, that I had to avoid student protests and that I had to lock the car doors when I was driving through Melbourne.

I can probably say that I am slightly more compliant of those rules some 20 years later than when they were given, but of course there is genuine concern in the community about recent carjackings, and I would probably say to heed that advice to all people driving around Melbourne, just to be sure. 15:17:30

In response to carjackings and aggravated burglaries, Victoria Police has established a range of task forces to