

---

**Sent:** Wednesday, 2 July 2008 15:04  
**To:** White Paper  
**Subject:** WWW Submission: 13. Miscellaneous [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

Name: Tony Kyriakou  
Organisation: Defence Today

Submission: As A Tax payer i am shocked to see how the government has wasted my Tax dollars (SEASPRITE) on a helicopter the the navy did not want, but some beauracrat thought would be a good addition to Navy. This helicopter was chosen for Malaysians fast corvet fleet that was cancelled but our Government continued to pump money into the project and acquire Penguin anti ship missles for the seasprite. So we cancell seasprite and we have penguin missiles in our inventory but no platform to use this missile? (why are my tax dollars beieng mismanaged and why dose government take the word of a politician over the wishes of the defence force) So now the RAN has no dedicated Air to surface missile in its inventory except the 1970s era Harpoon missile. ANZAC frigates are about to commence a mid life update with no helicopter (seasprite) that was intended for them (this is not exceptable) We only have the 1970s era Harpoon Anti ship missile for Air to surface strike from our Seahawk helicopt ers as the only air to surface missile in our invetory as seahawks cannot fire penguin. This is not acceptable, one 1970 era air to surface missile in the inventory that can be used, and also penguin in the inventory that is just sitting idle and cannot be used as we have no platform to fire this missile (unless we wired it to seahawks, but then they can only take 1 missile as opposed to 2 missiles on the seasprite),

The points i am trying to make is that Government has a track record in choosing a platform that the defence personel do not want. SeaSprite is a prime example. WHY is this so? <<<< I would think a defence professional in there given field would know alot more than a politician who is looking at brochures, given to them by the contractor , and then deciding on behalf of the defence force what should be bought <<<<< this is the wrong way in going about it.

Now if this defence professional tries to warn government officials about a project or platform that is not preforming or even wanted by the ADF, that Defence professional WILL find his career terminated or will not be given another chance to work on other defence force project. THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS SHOOTING THE MESSANGER HERE!

This is a very dangerouse precident for the government to be taking as all it will do is remove defence professionals and let the government decide on the best project on behalf of the ADF.

I would personally choose a Defence professionals ideas and assesmnet over a government official anyday. I think that if this problem is not fixed in Australia, we will be squandering alot more money on defence projects.

I would like for the government to explain to me why this is happining and the strategies put in place to prevent this from occuring again?

Also would like to know about strategies put in place to stop coruption occuring in defence projects.

I agree to my submission being published on the Defence website

I agree to my submission being quoted in the Community Consultation Report