

Committee Secretary
Senate Standing Committee on Finance and Public Administration
PO Box 6100, Parliament House
CANBERRA ACT 2600

Thursday 4th March 2010

Dear Committee Secretary,

OBJECTIONS
GOVERNANCE OF AUSTRALIAN SUPERANNUATION SCHEMES BILL 2010

I hereby lodge my **objections to the proposed changes** by which the administration of Military Superannuation (MSBS, DFB, DFRDB), by passage of the "Governance of Australian Government Superannuation Schemes Bill 2010" (the Bill), is intended to be merged into one administrative body (the Commonwealth Superannuation Corporation – CSC), which is also to administer the civilian superannuation schemes (CSS, PSSS, and PSSAP).

All persuasions of Government have over the years, continually advocated for separate Military Superannuation, due to the "**unique**" service aspect of Military Service. This is never to be taken lightly, as there is NO other occupation that requires a person to sign a blank cheque to the employer for an amount up to and including their life, at the whims of the employer. There have been recent analogy of Policemen and Firemen facing the same dangers of the Military, but where for example does a Policeman or Fireman face the two way shooting alleys of the Military, with all the military firepower that is used. Where for example does a policeman get trained to instinctively kill an enemy? Where is there another occupation that doesn't pay overtime for the added hours performed? When are they required to uproot families and be transferred interstate at the whims of the employer. These are just some of the reasons why Military Service is "**unique**".

Perhaps it would be beneficial for Politicians and the bureaucrats who advocate for these changes to spend some time in the Military, in a War Zone, carrying the equipment, the body armour and the weapons, facing a determined enemy on a two way shooting gallery, just to see how "**unique**" Military Service is.

There has been no comprehensive and definitive rationale being made available to indicate the commonalities of all the subject superannuation schemes that necessitate the merging of all schemes under one administrative body.

To arbitrarily determine that essentially all Commonwealth employees' superannuation administration is more cost effectively merged into one organisation is absolutely flawed unless **ALL** Commonwealth superannuation schemes are included. The title of the subject Bill gives no indication that there are **ANY** exclusions to be considered. Noticeable by its absence of mention is anything to do with Politicians' Superannuation Schemes being included in the intended merge. A response may be that Politicians' superannuation is determined separately, but the title of the subject Bill indicates "Australian **Government** Superannuation Schemes". The Australian General Public would clearly see that Politicians would be included in "Government", particularly when politicians form the Government.

If it can be shown that that there are differences in various Commonwealth Superannuation schemes that preclude any from consideration for merging under a common identity, then it follows that there are differences in other schemes that would also preclude their inclusion. Note: The "Bill" intends to merge the current Boards and Authorities. This is quite different from "grouping", which might indicate that differences would be recognised and administered accordingly.

IN SUMMARY

Already the scope of the Bill has indicated that there are differences between various Commonwealth Superannuation schemes (absence of Politicians' Superannuation Schemes). This is reason enough to scrap this Bill.

If further reason for rejecting the Bill relies on the "uniqueness" of one vocation over another, there is absolutely no equal to the uniqueness (doesn't that mean the same?) of a vocation in the Defence Forces, thus any Superannuation Schemes for Defence Force personnel should and must be considered in that light. They have been, are, and whilst ever we have a Defence Force doing what they are trained to do, will be unique, in all senses of the definition of "**unique**".

Consequently this Bill is to be rejected in-total. Defence Superannuation must always be administered separately, and maintained in value as originally intended (via a fair and viable indexation) accordingly. Put this to a referendum and the People of Australia would agree resoundingly.

Thank you for taking the time to read this submission.

Brian O'Neill