

Thursday 18 January 2006

Re: Submission - Safety, Rehabilitation, and Compensation Amendment Bill 2006

To Whom It May Concern:

It has come to my attention that in the "Safety, Rehabilitation, and Compensation Amendment Bill 2006" the Commonwealth Government is considering alterations to legislation particularly affecting provisions for Government employees travelling to and from work, and activities during breaks in a working day, as well as other areas.

This is undoubtedly purely a cost cutting measure, but is not without it's significant ramifications for the lives of those engaged in public service, and supporting government. Why should they not be afforded the privilege of protection during their breaks? Why should they not be covered in their travel to and from work? Would they be in that particularly place at that particular time if they were not working for the government?

The health implications, in an age of growing obesity, etc, is also well worth considering.

What privilege do our parliamentarians provide for themselves in this regard? Are they being hypocritical in their desire to implement such changes?

Our Government needs to realise that there is more to life than the financial bottom line, and that they need to be good employers, and loyal to the people who work for them.

For example, it is already bad enough that the first hour of my working day is spent earning money to pay for my (non-tax-deductible) trip to and from work, and now I would also have to cover the fact that I tripped outside the office on my lunch break?! I would be doing neither of those activities if I were not working where I was working, for the Government.

Yours sincerely,
Jeremy Coleman.