Dear Secretary of the Joint Standing Committee on Treaties,

I write this submission for the Timor Sea Inquiry, to add to the calls for the 'May 20th Agreement' to be renegotiated with full application of international law, as mediated by the World Court, to achieve a fair deal for the East Timorese people.

I write as an individual, although I have for some years been involved with E Timor solidarity work.

I hope that members of the Committee will be familiar with E Timor's nearly two and a half decades of illegal and bloody occupation by the Indonesian military, which Australian governments supported and sought to profit from by way of the Timor Gap (Oil) Treaty of 1989.

In 1999 active public opinion forced Australian government action that ended the murderous TNI rampage that was the planned aftermath of the E Timorese vote for independence. The E Timorese now have their country, still ravaged, and qualifying as the poorest in Asia. Their struggle has been nothing if not heroic.

Looking at the evidence, it is hard to escape the conclusion that the present government has removed this country from World Court jurisdiction on seabed boundaries with express purpose of depriving E Timor of about 60% of its just oil and gas entitlements under international law.

International law would give E Timor lateral seabed boundaries extending south from its eastern and western extremities, and a southern boundary that is the midline between E Timor's and this country's shores.

The present arrangements, the May 20th Agreement, deprives E Timor of nearly all of the rich Greater Sunrise field, giving E Timor only most of the small part of it that extends into the 'Joint Petroleum Development Area' (JPDA...what used to be 'Zone A' under the Timor Gap Agreement).

Some may believe it is OK to ignore the rules of the international justice system (that Australia has been active in developing) and to ride roughshod over small and poor countries. I, and many others, do not. And it is also not in Australia's interest to keep E Timor as a poor country, unstable, menacing, ripe for possible reinvasion by the Indonesian military. East Timor deserves much better. And the many hundreds of thousands who support E Timor here expect it. I, and many others, demand renegotiation to give E Timor a fair deal.

I supply attachments to support this submission.

Thank you for your consideration of this submission.
Legal fight looms over East Timor gas billions

Australia yesterday announced it would no longer seek to internationalise legal rulings on maritime boundaries — after leading lawyers advised East Timor that Canberra was poised to rob it of tens of billions of dollars in oil and gas revenue.

A challenge to the seabed boundaries in the Timor Sea could raise new doubts about billions of dollars of gas-based development planned for Darwin. But from East Timor's point of view, it could offer a chance to escape economic dependence.

The Attorney-General, Daryl Williams, and the Foreign Minister, Alexander Downer, said Australia would henceforth exclude maritime boundaries from compulsory dispute settlements in the International Court of Justice — the "World Court" sitting at The Hague — and the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea.

The statement came after a weekend seminar in Dili heard expert legal advice that East Timor should own most of the biggest natural gas fields so far discovered in the sea, including the huge Greater Sunrise resource being developed by Woodside, Shell, Phillips and Osaka Gas.

The former head of the United States oil company Unocal, John Imle, also disputed the widely accepted view that the deep Timor Trench, north of these fields, blocked a pipeline to East Timor. This view had been the basis of plans to land the gas near Darwin, giving Australia billions of dollars in industrial spin-offs.

East Timor may be offered the funds to mount a case at the World Court by a US oil company, Petrotimor, which has a separate dispute with Canberra over offshore oil concessions.

The prospect has rung alarm bells in the Federal and Northern Territory governments, although the offices of Mr Williams and Mr Downer denied yesterday's decision was linked to the Timor Sea issue, and said it had been considered "for quite some time".

They said: "Australia's strong view is that any maritime boundary dispute is best settled by negotiation rather than litigation".

But it is not clear Canberra has evaded a World Court case. A lawyer advising Petrotimor, Ron Nathans of the Sydney law firm Deacons, said the announcement did not mean Australia was immediately out of the court's ambit.

"Australia is not out of it today. Australia cannot just walk away."

Mr Nathans said although the draft treaty with Australia, agreed upon last July, set aside any boundary disputes, it could be seen as acquiescence in claims by parties affected by a future attempt to alter the boundaries.

A leading oil and gas engineer, Geoffrey McKee, said that over the economic life of Greater Sunrise — 2003 to 2050 — such changed boundaries would give East Timor up to $US536 billion ($68 billion) more in government revenue than the $US31 billion it can now expect.

Australia's share would shrink from $US238 billion to nothing.
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Dear Mr Langford

I refer to your letter to the Prime Minister dated 16 April 2002 concerning the recent declarations that Australia made under the Statute of the International Court of Justice and under the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. Your letter has been referred to me for a response.

Australia has not, as you have suggested, withdrawn from the International Court of Justice. Rather, it has made a new declaration of acceptance of the jurisdiction of the Court that excludes certain forms of dispute from Australia’s acceptance of the jurisdiction of the Court, including those disputes concerning maritime boundaries. At the same time, Australia made a declaration accepting the International Court of Justice and the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea as forums for the settlement of disputes that might arise under the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. That latter declaration also excludes disputes concerning Australia’s maritime boundaries.

Australia has maritime boundaries with a number of countries, one of which is East Timor. In the Government’s view, those boundaries are best settled by negotiation and not by reference to an international court or tribunal.

Yours sincerely

Simone Burford
Chief of Staff
Timor oil pressure

Independence comes at a high price

A year of 508 years of colonization 2002 marks an outstanding victory for self-determination in East Timor. But in the world's newest nation, the struggle for economic independence is just beginning.

Since the catastrophic end to Indonesian occupation in 1999, East Timor's economy has been reliant on donations from countries, most of which supported its annexation to Indonesia. That should change in 2003 when enough oil and gas revenues from the Timor Sea come online to sustain Government expenditure. In the meantime, international donors are being asked by the East Timor Government to save the country from going into debt by bridging its expected 3% of budget) with $21 million in grants.

Despite the modesty of the request, foreign donors (including the US, Australia, and Japan) want the World Bank - not the East Timor Government - to administer the grants. East Timor's Finance Minister, Fernando Borges, resigned in April. The main fear held by commentators in the country now is that the grants will be misdirected, as been the case in the past. The East Timor government is giving up oil and gas reserves in the Timor Sea in implicit part of World Bank negotiations.

While the Timor Sea reserves are in a seabed claimed by both Australia and East Timor, a treaty negotiated between Australia and the US, the Transnational Administration in East Timor entities East Timor to 60% of the oil and gas revenues in a 'Joint Petroleum Development Area' within the disputed territory. This sounds favorable for East Timor. Yet the area covered by the treaty is less than half the total reserves in the disputed area. Most of the reserves and most of the revenue from them, flow to Australia. The West Australian government is acting to ensure that these revenue flows continue. It may be East Timor's fourth largest up to 2005 but it wants to give millions with one hand and take an estimated 30 billion in future oil and gas revenue with the other.

At a conference in the capital, Dili in late March, PetroTimor (a US oil company) hired a speaker in the area) produced expert legal advice saying that the treaty compromised East Timor's position under current international law on maritime boundaries, which would have given East Timor almost all of the reserves in the Timor Sea. PetroTimor offered to fund East Timor's case against Australia in the International Court of Justice, in return for a cut of the revenues. The International Court of Justice can determine a case only when both countries in dispute accept its jurisdiction. The Monday following PetroTimor's revelations, the Australian Government announced that it had withdrawn from the court's jurisdiction on maritime boundaries claiming that disputes were better settled through negotiation

Meanwhile, US advisers presently in East Timor are supporting the continuation of the treaty and Australia's economic position under it.

East Timor's Prime Minister, Mari Alkatiri, has described the move as an 'unprecedented act'. But East Timor needs money, even if it comes from short-term grants and equitable treaties. The donor grants will help this emerging nation avoid the debt trap and be independent from the World Bank in the long term. But economic freedom comes at a high price. East Timor may have to compromise some of its sovereignty and most of its natural wealth to get it.