

I am concerned that money power resides in the present times in a few unchallengeable bank corporations. With the adsorption of so many of our people first banks by the behemoths that our current four banks have become, those institutions enjoy an underserved status of being *too big to fail*. Any looming failure has such dire consequences that equally dire methods of salvage are now being considered. Such as *Bail in*.

What I, as a depositor want is for my money to be safe when I deposit it in a bank. If I'm prepared to take risks with my money I will take options, financial instruments, and futures as well. I will margin borrow for share purchases. All the aforementioned investment strategies can, or historically have had heady publicity when by chance they succeeded, but only at great risk of failure. Of late people have been hoodwinked the same way that a compulsive gambler only needs to have historically won his bet once to think that his practice will gain him riches.

I don't want the bank to be taking risks with my money so that they have to depend on more than the predictable share of luck that usually and repeatedly only attends toil.

People will lose all the money they have if the banks bets fail, and they must in the boom and bust conditions that predictably happen over time. As an answer to systemic failure in a bank it has now become usual for the people to have to bail them out.

We cannot afford that precedent. And we cannot afford bail in.

Bank investment arms are getting emboldened by being huge behemoths. We saw that happen—illegally—in some Commonwealth Bank leveraged investment schemes. Currently it is quite legal for banks themselves to invest in derivatives using ordinary deposits.

Even though perhaps the randomness of events can mean that disaster will not strike all there is no satisfaction to be the ones spared. If there is no prudence in those institutions that we are lead to trust, just as surely as with natural disasters striking a day of calamity will come. It is not acceptable to shrug it off and not try to avert the hurt. Just because some of us lucky ones where away from the area.

If we had a Glass Steagall Act to prevent the abandonment of prudent principles with our transactional and commerce banking, and that and only that segment received guarantees, people would feel safe to leave their money in a bank.

Both the swings in climate, both the physical and the financial are never going to go away. But because no one can say what way the tossed coin will land, it doesn't justify gambling with money that doesn't exist. Hardened gamblers have to accept the cost of their habit causing the loss of the place where they live. We shouldn't have to. Senselessly exposing hard won money to loss is not what the tradition of banks in this country is.

Not only other nations of the world need banks to be a safe money transacting and lodging place. We also in our country of Australia need a better place than under the mattress for our money. Some of the worst practices of financial institutions, have reached our shores as example by the bad bets made on derivatives traders. No advice was given that the investment vehicles were high risk and it is my view that only a separation of the type used for the Glass Steagall Act can help advise where safe deposit may be made.