GRAEME WAUGH.

Secretary
Senate Select Committee on the Free Trade Agreement
between Australia and the United States of America
Suite S1.30.1
The Senate
Parliament House
Canberra A.C.T., 2600
Australia

RECEIVED
27 APR 2004

This submission is in support of protecting our national sovereignty for the benefit of all present and future individual Australians

Australia should not prevent itself from acting in the Australian national interest because of an agreement with a foreign power.

Essential public services should be decorporated and run from our own resources to protect them and ultimately us with the ability of government to create money to build and maintain public assets and services accountable through democratic and other processes. An example may be the conflict of interest that Telstra finds itself in as an indebted profit motivated corporation verses a public service that while protecting the privacy of Australians from commercial coersion provided equal and equitable communication to all Australians ~~a~~ regardless of demography.

Restrictions on foreign investment must be maintained. As I understand it an example would be in recent times when Shell the oil company attempted a paper based bid in an attempt to take control of Woodside Petroleum to enable it to transfer resource assets from Woodside then resell the Woodside shares minus those resources. If it had not been for government intervention through the F.I.R.B. the foreign hybrid parent of a shell might have got away with it.

These are examples analogous to the U.S. free trade agreement which we may not in the future be able to exercise discretion over. The U.S. is a different system of government derived from a different history to Australia in a different part of the world with a different culture because of that history in that place.

A balanced trade agreement may be more beneficial to the Australian national interest than the free trade agreement where we trade our freedom and independance for nothing. The U.S. is constitutionally bound to act in its own interest. It would not be in any Australians long term national interest to be bound to that constitution through a free trade agreement. There should be no foreign U.S. intervention in decisions made by Australians. We have too many domestic and nearer regional relationship equasions to balance. The Australian crown has eminent domain in Australia

There is an analogy that can be derived from
a situation where as a child growing up in
Albany I had a father living and working in
New Zealand who sent a blanket for a birthday
present. It took me much saving to pay the
customs duty. There was at that time our own
woollen mill making blankets in Albany and I
understood that those peoples jobs and our self
sufficiency were being protected. That same year 1966
I received an Albany blanket that is still intact
while the New Zealand blanket has been gone
a decade. If at that time those imports were
allowed without the custom duty to be sold
in local shops we might not have been
self sufficient in wool products and those
peoples jobs would not have existed and our
foreign debt would have been greater and
I would not own an Albany blanket made
from Australian wool

Under a U.S. free trade agreement we may
find ourselves buying our needs from foreign or
otherwise owned distribution systems selling
foreign products thereby incurring foreign debt
that could be used by foreign interests to pressure
Australian governments to support the dispossessio
of Australians of their own resources and therefore
it would not be in the national interest to

jeopardise our natural interests to other interests. Let us paddle our own canoe. Be Australian!

Yours sincerely,

[illegible signature]