

55. R Marschall

Full name: Richard A. Marschall, Ph.D.

Proposal 2-1:

By far the worst offender has been the federal government using "headhunters" and asking them to filter out candidates over the age of 45 or so. There is no reason that governments, with extensive internal human resource departments should be using external recruiters. This is true at the federal, state, and government agency (e.g. universities) level.

Proposal 2-2:

Again, a good idea, but useless if the government itself ignores it (see above). Government sponsored age discrimination spreads to its contractors, and then to those contractors subcontractors. In short order you unemploy or at least underemploy nearly everyone approaching 50. My own company is forced to use much younger people for marketing than the average age of our staff if we are to get work.

Proposal 2-3:

This is unnecessary. Headhunters respond to client incentives. If the government says they want candidates under 45 years of age, candidates near or over that age will not be presented to the client.

Proposal 2-4:

Again, makes no difference. It is not the headhunters that are against experience, they know people with long track records are likely to perform, or at least not make them look like fools.

Proposal 2-5:

This is important. Not everyone can work 50-60 hours a week for many months at a stretch. The majority of people have caring responsibilities, at least from time to time.

Proposal 2-6:

I don't think there is anything special about flexible working arrangements for mature age workers than for any other worker. Mature age workers may have some health issues that influence their preference for flexibility but young workers often have small children and other important issues with respect to their desire for flexibility. Middle aged workers may need to care for both their parents and their children.

Question 2-1 :

As the Australian government is the single biggest employer and central to Australia's economy, it could encourage via a variety of means, its agencies, contractors, and grant recipients to hire experienced staff and provide flexible working arrangements.

Proposal 2-7 :

Since full time workers tend to be worked over full time (in practice 60-80 hours per week), this has resulted in employers preferring younger workers with more stamina (rather than experience). This trend has been particularly harmful in the higher education, defense, and government administrative sectors. It would be better, in all these sectors, to have more and more experienced staff working fewer hours per week (more productively).

Big government projects "going off the rails" (I could list some, but many will occur to your thought) is more due to a lack of enough sufficiently experienced staff having enough time to make considered decisions. This is particularly the case in high dollar procurements. The "old grey heads" have "been around the block a few times" and can spot most irregularities immediately.

Proposal 2-8:

No, this would only discourage the hiring of mature staff. It would be better to do the reverse, employees UNDER 45 years of age get four weeks notices, with those over getting only one week. Suddenly employers would look at older job candidates much more favorably.

Question 2-2:

Proposal 2-9:

Definitely. I see teenagers that have great difficulty passing a physical and know some guys in their 70's that can run circles around them. If physical fitness is a job requirement then it should be measureable and required.

Proposal 2-10:

Ongoing progress in medical technology is going to make compulsory retirement ages look progressively more insane. There should be fitness (physical and mental) requirements, and periodic tests of same, but these should not be age based.

Proposal 2-11:

Yes, see above, and with military personnel you especially want to retain experience.

Question 2-3:

No, every attempt to create a difference works against the claimed objective of equality.

Proposal 2-12:

No, same situation as above.

Proposal 3-1:  
Proposal 3-2:  
Proposal 3-3:  
Proposal 3-4:  
Proposal 3-5:  
Proposal 3-6:  
Question 3-1:  
Question 3-2:  
Proposal 3-7:  
Question 3-3:

Proposal 4-1 :

Due to recent advances in medical research I don't think age based insurance is going to continue to make any sense. Its time may have already past.

An older individual with access to certain genetic engineering and biomedical engineering technologies will very likely out live and be fitter than most of today's teenagers.

Proposal 4-2 :

Australia is a leader in a number of biomedical technologies that will greatly influence the insurance industry. We are probably ahead of the curve. Alerting the world to these developments may NOT be a good idea.

Proposal 4-3 :  
Question 4-1 :  
Question 4-2:  
Question 4-3:  
Proposal 4-4:

Proposal 5-1:

I personally have no idea how social security works. The Department of Human Services is almost keeping it a secret.

Proposal 5-2:

Question 5-1 :

The government employment services system should not be based on age, sex, income, etc, but available to all who seek a job, or another job. They should have access to all government job openings at the federal, state, and local council levels, as well as with the governments big contractors. Right now they are useless to almost everyone - including employers, the old system (under Keating) was far better.

Question 5-2:

Little, since no one is hiring.

Question 5-3:

No, most people I know who receive Disability Support are working. Of course, they never were actually disabled in the first place. That is another problem, outside the scope of this inquiry.

Proposal 5-3 :

Proposal 5-4 :

Proposal 5-5:

Bonuses should be paid to the employer of older staff, not to the staff directly.

Proposal 5-6:

Proposal 8-1:

Yes.

Question 8-1:

Proposal 8-2:

Yes.

Proposal 8-3:

Yes.

Proposal 8-4:

Yes.

Proposal 8-5:

Yes.

Proposal 8-6:

Yes.

Proposal 8-7:

Question 8-2:

No, in fact it should be kept at 55. By age 55 people should know how to spend their own money and their personal circumstances.

Question 8-3:

No, people hardly believe they are going to see any superannuation payout at all now. Increasing the age will only make superannuation look more like just another tax.

File 1:

File 2: