August 1 2002

Mr N A Harman 3/152 Smith St Larrakeyah NT 0820

Postal address; C/-GPO Darwin NT 0800

To:
The Chairman
Senate Finance and Public
Administration Committee
Parliament House
Canberra
ACT 2600



Private submission - Inquiry into Life Gold Passes for former MP's

My submission as to why former parliamentarians should not receive any such travel perks after leaving parliament is as follows:

Australian taxpayers like me are sick of politicians perpetually settting one meagre rule for the worker, on payrises for example - while enjoying different, generous rules for themselves.

We are fed up with hearing how politicians should be paid more (every time there is yet another big pay hike), 'in line with the private sector, and to attract quality candidates' blah blah – well many of the perks enjoyed by politicians after their political life has ended are not enjoyed by the private sector after they leave a company. You can't have it both ways. Continuing to dip indefinitely from the public purse is immoral.

Being an MP is not just about passing legislation. It's about leadership. It's about setting an example. There is something very smelly and greedy about the double-standard largesse dished out to Australian politicians, including ridiculous super (cash) payouts at public expense, which rightly attracts cynicism, derision and contempt from the battling masses. We don't ask people to stand as MP's. They are not doing us some huge favour, as they seem to think as soon as they get their bum sat down on the plush benches. So they're in parliament for years — so what? Some of the hand-in-the-public-cookie jar arrogance is breathtaking to a lot of us who work a lot harder, for a lot less for most of our lives.

We keep all our previous PM's in luxury for life, that costs \$millions per year – travel, office, secretary, accommodation, and other perks – and some of these people are wealthy businessmen in their own right. They lecture us on morality! Will you tell us they are not using these taxpayer funded luxuries in some form, to promote their business interests? They certainly use their former contacts.

Britain, with a population of over 60 million does not provide all these post-office perks for MP's and former PM's; if not re-elected – out. End of story. Why should this small nation of only 20 million fund such extravagances for people who are no longer employed by us?

What private sector employer would continue to fund an ex-employee for life? And they don't take regular 'kickings' from the employee while they're there!

N A Harman

N. Harman