

From: Bruce Pollock
Sent: Thursday, 21 February 2013 1:40 PM
To: Elections
Subject: ACT Legislative Assembly size

I wish to protest in the strongest terms against any attempt to increase the number of 'ministers' or in general membership in this organisation called a Legislative Assembly. The primary argument is the workload of the current numbers of 'ministers'. In my original email to the 'chief minister', I offered the advice that if the workload was too high, these people should consider resigning and getting a job! This organisation is little more than a town council and membership of the LA starts with people volunteering through their parties for pre-selection so I fail to see their membership is more than a voluntary decision/action on their part. If they are (as is most likely) too stupid to identify the numbers of hours they (again voluntarily) apply to their tasks, they would, by extension, be too stupid to hold a position of capability and trust. This is particularly pertinent given the income they receive – from the public purse – and the numbers of staff, accommodation, transport, allowances etc, etc they impose on the people of the ACT.

If there could EVER be a justification for an increase in this motley mob, the determination of any justification must surely be based on their OUTPUT and most definitely NOT on the number of hours they voluntarily undertake, that is, most definitely NOT on their INPUT. In this context, output should contain as direct a measure as possible of the real benefit they deliver to the people of this Territory and not based on 'output' measures of how many ribbons are cut or how many meetings they attend. Output should be a measure of what is uniquely delivered as benefits to the population that couldn't be delivered by other means. Offsetting any positive outputs (if any) should be a similarly measured negative to output caused by the many ridiculous activities and decisions they impose on the citizens. A balance sheet approach to justification would, I believe, indicate the lack of any possible net benefit to our local society of engaging the existing LA let alone changing its membership structures/'ministries'.

Bruce Pollock