

Feedback  
Discussion Paper  
Reforms to Councillor Numbers and Allowances

### 1. Number of Councillors

The report states that higher number 'of councillors per person..... can lead to inefficiencies' without qualifying this statement.

Representative democracy works on the principle that the interest of the electors, especially at the local level, is portrayed by the elected councillor.

That said the higher the number of councillors, the better the representation of the electors.

It makes no sense to me to cut councillor number, if you want good representation in a diverse community as the Huon Valley has.

A lower number would also mean that the workload for each councillor would increase, especially in the view that councils are taking on MORE task, rather than less.

Conclusion: I disagree with the proposal to cut councillor numbers

### 2. Allowances

The proposed increase in councillor allowance is puny and will NOT, as the report suggests, increase the number or quality of candidates.

None of the councillors I am familiar with did it 'for the money'.

Putting your hand up to become a councillor involves a commitment to work for your community in the best way possible.

It should be noted that that the comparative allowance rates shown in Figure 5, p 35 are misleading.

Queensland, for example, expects its councillors to do a 'full-time' job and therefore receive the appropriate (higher) allowance.

If the authors of this report wanted a more committed outcome from the Tasmanian councillors, they should have suggested a similar scheme.

Conclusion: I disagreed with the proposal that a minor increase (in dollar terms, in % it sounds impressive!) in allowance will result in better candidates.

### 3. Superannuation

Councillors receive the equivalent of the 12% compulsory superannuation in their allowances.

Whether they use it for super is their choice.

Conclusion: I can see no need the change the existing status. It's up to the individual councillor to make a decision on where he/she allocates this money.

### 4. Quorum Management

With the proposed reduction in councillor numbers, it will of course be more difficult to have a quorum when councillors with 'an interest' have to withdraw from the meeting. So, conclusion is, don't reduce the numbers. If a quorum can't be achieved (because of 'interest', not because of 'absent' councillors), follow the rules as outlined in the Vic Local Govt Act.

Conclusion: Don't reduce councillor numbers to have a better chance to get a quorum. If 'interest' is the problem to reach a quorum, follow the Victorian example.

Jurgen Harder

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]