

Jai Martinkovits

01 February 2009

The Secretary
Finance & Public Administration Committee
Parliament House
CANBERRA, ACT 2600

RE: PLEBISCITE FOR AUSTRALIAN REPUBLIC BILL, 2008

To whom it may concern,

I would like to present the following views I hold to the committee for consideration:

1. Referendum v. Plebiscite

1A)

A referendum is a much more meaningful method of determining truly reflected views of the people. I consider the use of plebiscites completely against the spirit of the constitution, and on matters of such national significance the Australian people should have all details laid before them upfront.

1B)

Self evident protective mechanisms are enforced through a referendum, I think this is imperative in decisions of such an important nature.

2. Models/Details

2A)

Should models of change not be proposed to people upfront? Previously the Australian people were given the opportunity to be fully informed on proposed models of change, and make an informed decision accordingly.

2B)

The proposed changes through plebiscite invite the Australian public to pass judgement without being fully informed on the alternate change. On matters of such national significance the Australian public have a right to be fully informed?

In the current economic climate, how can one consider it acceptable to waste such an exorbitant sum of money that would be required to run nothing more than a glorified opinion poll!

I would have thought that the government would be working on much more important issues of national significance, and not wasting time and resources on an issue that already had its fate decided in 1999.

I would request acknowledgement of receipt of my submission via email/post.

Yours sincerely,

Jai Martinkovits

I would request you keep my postal, phone number and address confidential.