Dear Senate

I am writing to you as a concerned Australian citizen and as the Mother of an 886 Family Sponsored GSM applicant. When I heard about the proposed amendment to the Migration Act, which will allow the cap & ceasing of certain visa applications I was filled with dread because my daughter is currently onshore awaiting her application approval (she applied in July 2009)

It seems that this proposed amendment will have the ability to be applied restrospectively to applicants onshore, who lodged legitimate applications, according to the laws applicable at the time. I am disgusted that the Government would think it would be morally acceptable to cancel these peoples applications, cease their bridging or temporary visas and then give them 28 days to leave the country. With all respect, in a country that claims to give everyone 'a fair go' backtracking on laws and applying them after the fact makes a mockery of the so called democracy we live in.

I am fully aware that the GSM programme is in crisis with an influx of onshore applicants who have studied for 2 years, have appalling English language skills, gained falsified documentation and have no intention of ever working in their nominated occupation. BUT why should all onshore applicants who studied and then applied for GSM be tarred with the same brush?? My daughter studied hard for two years for qualifications directly related to her nominated occupation of 'Marketing Specialis.t' We are from the UK so English is her native language and she is just 27 years old. Within one week of completing her studies she got a job at one of the most recognised global electronics companies in the world working in her nominated occupation. How then can you say that her skills are no longer in demand? She got that job partly based on the qualifications recieved in this country and the part time work experience she gained whilst she was studying. She is an example of somebody who DID NOT abuse the system and is contributing to the Australian economy. Yet because her occupation is not deemed 'not in demand' by Minister Evans, my only daughter may be sent back to the UK with no immediate family (my husband and I are now citizens, one son is a Permanent resident and the other son has just applied for a defacto visa), no job and no financial security having already spent in excess of $35,000 on tuition fees, visa applications, medicals, skills assessments, police checks and migration agents fees. Yes she will be approaching her company about sponsorship if possible but that is not guarenteed-according to Australian Law we thought applying legitmately for PR and satisfying all the criteria was guarenteed a positive end result-I guess we were mistaken.

I implore the Senate to reconsider this amendment and if it must go ahead then please consider carefully the basis on which capping & ceasing will be made.It should not just be a case of picking a list of occupations which are deemed not in demand. If somebody can prove they are working full-time in their nominated occuption, they have excellent English language skills and are young and fit to work then how can you justify terminating their applications?

All my daughter ever did was play by the rules and now it seems she could be punished for it. I am not the only citizen who feels that this issue of the Student to PR route is not as black and white as the Government and Media would like to make out. I am willing to bet that if I explained my daughters situation to the media, showing them that she is proof this amendment is completely unethical with

regard to genuine applicants who have taken the study to PR route, then people would take notice.

I truly hope you will consider what I have said

Regards