## Inquiry into the Nation Building and Jobs Plan

SUBMISSION TO Senate Finance and Public Administration Committee

## by David White

- 1. The proposed Nation Building and Jobs Plan [NBJP] fails to allocate any funds for the most needy self-funded retirees who have low taxable incomes and do not therefore qualify for any 'cash bonus'. These senior citizens are suffering significantly reduced returns on investments and many have seen their lifetime savings decimated by falls in their asset values. A large number of retirees did not receive any 'down payment' made by the Government in December last year. They deserve to be included in the NBJP this time.
- 2. Similarly the NBJP does not allocate any payments to those low income earners who do not pay tax, i.e. those with a taxable income below \$11,000 and this oversight must be rectified. these citizens struggle every day to survive financially, as many are not eligible for Centrelink payments.
- 3. Once again, citizens who are in receipt of Newstart Allowance have been excluded from the NBJP. They were also excluded from the 'down payment' made in December last year. Many have been unemployed for extended periods, many are of mature age, and all are living permanently well under the accepted poverty line.
- 4. Including these citizens in the NBJP payments will actively work to improve the economy since those in these categories will use the payments to purchase essential goods and services rather than save them.
- 5. It could well be argued that taxpayers with taxable incomes above \$80K should not benefit from the NBJP, as their taxable incomes are often artificially reduced by tax-effective plans. It is not the best use of taxpayers' funds, as a large number of these taxpayers will surely use the funds to retire or repay debt, or save the 'bonus' rather than spending it.
- 6. The NBJP includes no additional funds to improve the national health system whatsoever. This must be rectified. The States are finding it very difficult to adequately fund health care for rural and regional citizens. This is an opportunity to do so.
- 7. Payments under the NBJP to schools, as proposed, do not appear to be allocated to schools on the basis of need. Why should large and wealthy schools with extensive facilities be eligible for the same amounts as small public schools with little or no access to funds for maintenance?
- 8. There is an urgent need to allocate additional funds to the States for public and social housing. All of the States have long waiting lists for public and social housing, and additional funds are likely to be immediately spent on constructing new residential buildings.

- 9. The proposal to make lump sum cash 'bonus' payments of \$950 to eligible taxpayers needs to be re-examined. A significant number of citizens and families who are eligible will receive multiple payments, and as such are likely to use the funds to purchase non-essential goods or to retire debt or even save the funds. This has been the experience of recent payments by Government.
- 10. It is submitted that the flaw noted above could be overcome if the 'bonus' payments were paid in three equal bi-monthly instalments. Perhaps the payments could be made by a personal card which could be used only for essential goods and services with limit on individual purchases.

## END OF SUBMISSION