to the committee,

Predator Drones are just a sort of fancy long stick. If Defence personnel are standing on a border poking people with a long stick across the border, they're not really deployed overseas. It is therefor possible to engage in an overseas conflict without a person crossing the border. This bill does not capture the expected nature of future geostrategic conflicts, is too broad and many of the terms are already circumvented by creative legalistic populist jargon ie. Defence personnel conduct 'training' in the form of poking real people across borders with real sticks that seems like real confict but it's called training.

A better bill that would achieve these objectives would prohibit members and senators from holding an interest in or being a beneficiary of any arms manufacturer above and beyond managing conflicts of interest. We all have an interest in Australia's defence because we need people with long sticks to ward off the roving bands with big sticks so they don't steal our stuff. Everyone that has a stake in Australia wants adequate and proportionate defence. It's just that it's not necessary for a military advisor or auditor preparing a report about an acquisition to financially benefit from giving a positive assessment or a minister to approve it. State officials already have the strongest incentive of not being deposed and disinherited by a foreign army or roving band.

Robert Heron