

31<sup>st</sup> May 2016

Dear Sir/Madam,

I have waited until today to address this matter because today is the first day where reading again of your proposal has not made me angry, sad, worried, annoyed and dejected or feeling like a helpless victim of the world of money and power - in this case - the potential misuse of. Today I was again dismayed that my hopes for a creative future are at serious risk of being eroded and could disappear. I cannot believe that the writing industry is yet again a target.

For several years, as part of my plans towards retirement, I have been investing a lot of hard earned money into developing my craft, my writing, by attending professional masterclasses, seminars, workshops and also learning about branding, marketing and design. I am pursuing a late in life career as a writer. This investment was made so that when my first and subsequent books get published (in Australia) I can have not only a productive life after retirement but hopefully additional income to support me in these already tough economic times. Your proposal will not only rob me of my short term but also my long term plans for self-sufficiency and independence as well as creativity, social and economic opportunities.

I want to get published as an Australian author by Australian based publishers and be nurtured and supported by Australian experts. I also want my investment to be acknowledged and maintained by a fair and reasonable copyright policy (the current one) not what is proposed. What your proposal sees as free trade and efficiency is for me and others deprivation and erosion of work we created and a total disregard for what is fair and equitable practice. Copyright is meant to protect my investment and writing not something that erodes and diminishes my rights and livelihood.

I learned this morning that your final proposal will be submitted to Government in August this year. This morning I also read Senator the Hon Mitch Fifield's statement - *'Recently, it has been wrongly claimed that the Government is planning to reduce the life of copyright to 15 to 25 years after creation, rather than 70 years after the death of the author as it is currently. This is not something the Government has considered, proposed or intends to do. The false claim is based on a finding in a recent draft Productivity Commission Report into Intellectual Property Arrangements'*. This gives me hope that our industry sector will not be dismissed as irrelevant. <http://www.mitchfield.com/Media/MediaReleases/tabid/70/articleType/ArticleView/articleId/1179/Conjecture-on-copyright-changes-unfounded.aspx> also extracted from the senator's website was the comment that *'The Productivity Commission notes in its draft report that Australia is a party to a range of free trade agreements and has no unilateral capacity to alter copyright terms and that to even attempt to do so would require international negotiations and the reversal of international standards.'* I suspect that loopholes will be sought and if found used to argue against keeping the status quo. I urge you to reconsider.

Importantly, senator Fifield stated *'Australian literature is vital to our cultural and intellectual life and the Coalition values the unique role that literature and books play in communicating Australian stories.'* This can only happen if Australian writers have opportunities and support.

Individuals in our industry will continue to submit arguments against your proposal and urge government not to destroy the Australian writing and publishing industry and individual writing careers. My hope is that all of us in the industry will convince whichever government is in power, should you persist with your current proposal, that the proposed approach of parallel copyright and significantly reducing copyright duration is destructive to many established and upcoming authors and pure folly that supports no-one who wants to write or publish in Australia.

I object to the engines of industry disregarding my rights as a creator of saleable work and devaluing it by dismissing my right to earn a living and right to collect revenue over a reasonable copyright period. Your proposal would impede my right to fair and reasonable earnings and opportunities in Australia. I object to the proposal's disregard of Australian authors' contributions and making our creative sector a target when it should instead be nurtured and supported. I object to this proposal being submitted at all and prefer that you identify alternative targets to find efficiency and productivity and not yield to global interests that undermine Australian authors and publishers. If productivity is genuinely sought - create employment and new industry instead of undermining the efforts of existing and emerging writers. I want a future in writing and the right to have a meaningful copyright - otherwise it is Copy(not)right.

Regards

Apolonia Niemirowski