

INQUIRY INTO PUBLIC FUNDING OF ELECTION CAMPAIGNS

Name: Mr Barry Richard Benson

Date Received: 25/01/2010

JOINT STANDING COMMITTEE
ON ELECTORAL MATTERS

PUBLIC FUNDING OF ELECTION CAMPAIGN
(INQUIRY)

CLOSING DATE 22 JANUARY 2010.

Joint Standing Committee
on Electoral Matters,
Parliament House
Macquarie Street,
Sydney N.S.W. 2000.

20 January 2010.
321 Woodville Road
Guildford N.S.W. 2161.

The Committee,

Again, thanks for the opportunity.

A. Any "Australian citizen" willing to stand only as an "individual" for election, (not a party), be eligible for "public funding" and must nominate in advance, and the electorate of choice.
No "public funding" to "political parties"!!

B. An "across the board" amount to be allocated, from an "average" calculated from each candidate's "proven expenditure," less any "small private individual donations" received; bearing in mind that "vast difference" in expenses shown from evidence given at previous inquiry, June 2009.

No consideration be given to "first preference votes," or any other "item" in terms of reference PART B. My idea of "public funding" is to create a "fair for all" election, especially for "new" candidates.

Any "small private individual donations" totalling "more than" the allocated "cap" agreed upon, should be given to the Electoral Funding Authority as "pool money" to fund future "Public Funding," so easing the burden upon the "taxpayer".

C. REFER PART B.

D.

Obviously, no political party should receive in any way "public funding" for anything, including election expenditure.

Only individual candidates should be compensated, in acting as individuals, and should be held responsible to act honestly in accounting and receiving such money, or severely punished for anything less.

E.

As "public funding" is a "capped" part-payment in "partial" compensation for election expenditure, it must only be paid to candidates who can prove that expenditure by "receipts" or such, before such costs be compensated.

F.

REFER PART B & E. Say again, a "public funding" "cap" be established "from an average" of "total expenditure of all candidates."

Costs of each individual candidate be "paid for," and receipts submitted for "compensation" for only "that amount," but not more than the "cap" amount, less any "small donations" received.

Any sum of "small donations" exceeding the "public funding" "cap," would go into

a "pool fund" held by "Electoral Funding Authority" to be used for future "Public Funding", to ease the burden on the "taxpayer" and negate any risk of "favour being bought" by "overzealous donors."

G

As above, any type of "small donations" over the "public funding cap" go into a "pool fund", to be used for "public funding" money, so reducing burden on the "taxpayer."

H

As in PART D, No donations from large, affluent, influential "bodies" to be allowed, as this is the "major point" of this inquiry; i.e., large company's "buying favour" from those elected to "powerful positions". In evidence given in previous inquiry, a average sum of \$1,000 was implied as a suitable "cap" for "small donations". I believe it should be no more than \$500, and each individual candidate be totally responsible for submitting his own "donations and expenses" in an honest light.

I

Any advertising from a "third party" that can be seen to be "favouring or aiding"

any candidate for election, should be seen as a "donation", and be treated in same, as above, and any "deemed" excess amounts over the "public funding cap" be injected into "the pool fund" for future "public funding money", to ease the burden on the "taxpayer".

J.

REFER PART I

K.

Since this inquiry encompasses Federal, State, and local elections, I suggest that all electoral matters be under control of the A.E.C., with any funding and money matters monitored and managed by the E.F.A., but, that at any time, working in collaboration with the A.T.O., as deemed necessary, as to, the A.F.P., and respective State and Territorial Police.

L.

The system, as above, be given the task, and force to control and bring to account, anyone, including "themselves", who choose to make a mockery of this country, its "Laws", and mostly; its "People".

M

Let the "constitution" stand; we all enjoy, so far, the freedom of communication, even though "some" councillors in "some" councils "don't agree".

N

As can be seen, my suggestions "do not" give undue advantage to any candidate; "new comer", "well connected", "country", or "city" dweller; even more, it does not "disadvantage" any candidate. I believe this was a major question to be answered from previous evidence given, and forms the main reason for the "success" of the inquiry, if any.

But most of all, it considers the plight of the overburdened "taxpayer", the "dope" who, in the end, "pays" handsomely for it all.

A fact too quickly forgotten, and dismissed by those "elected candidates"!!

OP

1 Having consistently observed three "Local Councils" for some eight years, have sadly come to believe that the greater percentage of councillors, elected by the people, to represent the people;

6
actually do "little" for the people, while "embellishing their personal selves", on "their own business interests", to the tune of "greater expense" to the community.

Since State government has also "stepped in," and virtually taken away the role of the "Local government," further obliterating the "voice of the people", of any input on local matters, we, "the people" now are to suffer a "bleating" from councillors for "more payment" for "less work"!!

And about the concern, in "PART M," of political parties "perhaps" being denied "their constitutional rights", it seems a very different story when it comes to the

22 million people now being denied "their rights", to have a say, due to the recent actions of the State government.

In order to reduce the "rotting attitude" of local council, i.e., "overseas trips for no reason," "favours around the back door," etc; reduce the numbers of elected council, or better still, remove them entirely, and let "the people" deal directly with the "State government" as they certainly need to be dealt with.

2

Adopt the "First Past The Post" voting system for the "obvious" reasons.

- A. Far more "cost effective"
- B. Greatly reduced chance of "rotting" misbehavior
- C. More simplistic to account for the "outcome"

2

D, Greater accurate account of
the voters true choice, and feelings.

Frightening, isn't it!!

3.

Absolutely no "public funding" for any
party, group, or organisation, political
or otherwise, and those only "individual"
candidates claiming "public funding"
must firstly satisfy the said "criteria"
in every way.

My address is "as above" mobile phone

AVAILABLE 24-7

Respectfully,

Barry Richard Benson

Signed 