SUBMISSION – REMUNERATION OF FULL-TIME PUBLIC OFFICES

Holly Kramer

President

Remuneration Tribunal

GPO Box 419

Canberra ACT 2601

Dear Ms Kramer ,

I have read your Consultation Paper dated June 2026 and would like to make this submission for your consideration. I hope you find it interesting.

Your discussion questions are dealt with as follows:

1. Looking at Table 1 on page 7 of the paper I think the concepts are pretty vague but I basically agree the remuneration should take account of the demands of the role.
2. Unless someone is interested in the issue it attracts no attention. I think you should make an effort to publicise your activities. Comparator roles are of limited use unless the role to which the role is compared is broadly identical. In our country States/Territories have a different role to that of the Commonwealth. The same point applies to other countries and the private sector. As an aside if the Commonwealth has a role that is a State (or Territory) responsibility such as education or health the question might be why does this role exist at all?
3. If this calls for comment on current remuneration for particular roles, I have insufficient information to comment.
4. With the advent of things like 'Teams' I find it hard to see any circumstances where travel should be paid by the taxpayer. However any genuine costs should be covered by the taxpayer.
5. If a particular role under performs compensation for the occupant should reflect that.

6. With all determinations of remuneration there should be public input. In addition to public sector workers the Tribunal should be comprised of business people familiar with the demands of executive level roles, there should be ordinary lay people whose lives are impacted by the work of government. All roles should be publicly advertised. The Tribunal should reflect the community values, including the business community and should be transparent in the how it determines remuneration. In terms of outcomes the lay members should comprise the majority of members of the Tribunal. The remuneration should be linked to outcomes. By that I mean perhaps a review against measurable criteria should be carried out in respect of a particular role. Lay member input would add legitimacy to the generous payments.

When I look through the Attachment A to your Paper I was struck (more accurately shocked) by the number of roles and in some cases overlapping portfolios and the remuneration applicable. Why is the Chief Scientist worth I bit more than half the salary of the Chair, Australian Prudential Regulation Authority?

Generally most if not all of the roles are paid far more than should be the case. Although I say that against the background that the criteria in the table lack detail or substance.

Kind Regards

Stuart McRae

[redacted]

[redacted]

9/08/2026