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I acknowledge that this inquiry contains a broad set of questions and proposals for reform in a complex and rapidly changing digital environment. I am in favour of reform, but reform that stands to diminish rather than increase authors' incomes cannot be accepted.  
  
As a practicing and published author who publishes almost exclusively in the printed medium, I would like very briefly to make my objections known regarding the proposed  repeal of  the existing Statutory Licences.  
  
Authors (or 'content providers') are amongst the lowest paid of creative practitioners. If I were to try and make my living as a professional writer I would be obliged to give up creative writing altogether and only write company reports, marketing documents, readers' and editorial reports and service manuals. These are all the sorts of work that provided something approaching a respectable income when I was a freelance author.  
  
Publication fees for my creative work in recent years is less than $5000. This is an indication of the kind of income an author of my standing can expect. In this context, the idea of giving away my work free is totally unacceptable. And I sincerely hope that this information offers a strong explanation of why the Statutory License must remain as they stand.  
  
Every year I receive a small but vital amount of income from Copyright Agency Ltd for work of mine that has been reproduced and distributed around the country in schools and universities. This includes a section from a novel that was once on the HSC curriculum for English, chapters from a book I wrote for and edited on 19th Century Australian women writers, and chapters from a novel set on the Master of Arts readings list at the University of Technology, Sydney, where I work as a teacher of creative writing and Australian Literature.    
  
CAL's current system of collection and distribution of funds may not be perfect but it goes a long way towards compensating authors for income that is often denied to them  when others take and use their work. This work has not been created without cost.  It is our intellectual property. One cannot go to a coffee shop and take away an espresso without handing over the $3 fee to the barista. In a bookstore, one cannot take the actual book, magazine or journal without paying for it. This would be called stealing. Why should an author be similarly expected to hand over their creation without recompense?  
  
Copyright for authors and all creative producers needs to be protected, not compromised. Authors are amongst the least empowered to chase copyright breach offenders, having neither  time, financial means or legal expertise at their disposal. Which is why we need the ALRC to retain and not repeal the Statutory Licences.  
  
Thank you for considering this submission.
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Please see above where I have incoluded all my arguments on this proposal.
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