

DEAR Sir or Madam:

I am writing to you about this bill. To express the feeling about this bill from the point of personal, I would like to talk about this from a subject view.

First of all, the permission of this bill will bring a great negative effect to the whole Australia migration populations since the new Amendment bring the uncertainty of the application's result and people who waiting for their result also can not be waiting for 2 years (which is the waiting period currently) and then go home with a negative result. **THIS IS GOING TO BE A GREAT WASTE ON TIME FOR A PERSON TO WAIT A RETURNED VISA.**

Secondly, by saying that the new change is to consideration of the whole Australia and the government wants to intake the people they want only, but this is impossible. People come to this country with their wish to settle in here, they follow the rule, they follow the guidelines and they follow the procedures to applying the residency visa. If this is what the government need to grant the visa and they fulfill the criteria, the government have to grant it to the applicants. Think about this like a wholesale business, Can you make sure that you can order exactly right number of stock that you are going to sale with no one more or less? I you have over stock, **WILL THE WHOLESALE ACCEPT THE RETURN OF STOCK BECAUSE YOU HAVE ORDERED TOO MUCH STOCK?**

Thirdly, there are also many types of application for a GSM visa such as off shore, on shore and sponsorship .etc. I am sure that this new Amendment will not bring many effect to those offshore applicants, however, to those people who are on shore, this will ruin their life for at least 2 years. As I mentioned above, people need to wait for 2 years for their result and they can not just wait! They have to work, live and have their life settled down. They can not leave the country with in 28 days even the result is negative, they need a longer period to get their life arranged before they move on. **THE GOVERNMENT CAN NOT BE LIKE THEY GET PEOPLE IN WHEN THEY NEED THEM AND KICK THEM AWAY WHEN THEY DO NOT NEED THEM.**

Fourthly, since the end of last year, the DIAC (Dept of immigration and citizenship) have started their reform on GSM visas, and they also Amendment some changes that they made just because it is a rush change for many applicants and they can not afford the result brought by the change. People were happy to see the changes made by the department and this also shows the other side of the Australia government. But this Amendment is giving people an idea about the government is thinking to get rid of the exceeded applicants in a legal method. **THIS IS CHEATING, PEOPLE DESERVE WHAT THEY ARE DOING FOR ESPECIALLY FOR THOSE PEOPLE WHO IS WORKING HARD ON IT.**

Last but not the least, from the point of the government, we also understand the necessity of reduce the number of GSM applications and the current situation of the current that the DICA faces, if the government is going to approve the changes, they also should give the transitional period to the

people affected by this, but I am not meaning the other short period visa for the returned applicants. For example, if the government is saying that they have get enough applicants from hairdresser job, instead they return all the exceed applicants, people would more like to see the government announces that "the application made six month after the announcement date will not be accepted ". This will give enough time for the future applicants to rearrange their future life. In this way, the government should be able to forecast the number of applicants and make the announcement before the category fulfilled. But again, no one can make sure that they just get exactly amount of "stock" that they need. Over or under? This is the question for you to consider. But the government should give a reliable and trustable feeling to it's people so that people will not feel the uncertainty of their future. **RELIABLE AND TRUST IS THE CORE GOAL THAT EVERY GOVERNMENT BASE ON, DO NOT LET THE NEW AMENDMENT GO AGAINST IT.**

To summaries, the new Amendment is not well planned and will bring the negative effect to the government. Standing from the point of third party, I understand the need of government and I also feel the nervous of immigration applicants. Australia is a immigration country, the country was, is and will keep relying on new migrants. The Government should let the department provide a more comprehensive plan to reduce the number of applicants instead of just change the rule of immigration "game" when they can not afford the result. Think about if you a immigration applicants, what will you feel about this Amendment? Are you happy with this? I am **NOT**, so I am **AGAINST** this.

Thank you for your time and patience for reading my feedback.

Your sincerely

James