

Submission to:

ENQUIRY INTO MULTICULTURALISM

By the

JOINT STANDING COMMITTEE ON MIGRATION,

R1-109, Parliament House,

P O 6021, Canberra, ACT 6200

From:

15.10.2011

To The Joint Standing Committee on Migration.

Dear Sirs /Mesdames,

I am responding to the enquiry advertised in "The Australian".

Australia has had a migration programme in place since the Chifley (ALP) Government. It was instituted in the late nineteen-forties in response to two perceived difficulties.

Australia then had a population of approximately seven million people, and had been involved in two world wars and a major depression. The Cold War was proving nearly as threatening as the previous "hot" ones, and the employment and escalating production of atomic weapons had demonstrated the vulnerability of cities to nuclear attack, with large losses of life and infrastructure. It was decided that Australia's large land mass and relatively small population could not enable the country to fight another major war. Reliance on natural increase was not seen as sufficiently quick or likely to produce the large numbers necessary for more effective fighting capacities as well as the maintenance of farming and industry. The solution of the Chifley Government was to import more people. Because of the large numbers of displaced, refugee and stateless people in Europe, it was considered that the ideal solution, intended to benefit both Australia and Europe, would be to resettle at least some of Europe's displaced millions in Australia. With the benefit of that wonderful thing, hindsight, it is possible to make the following observations:

The likelihood of another world war proved illusory. The consequence of the development of nuclear weapons was to make world wars redundant. No-one dared take the risk.

A large population to provide farming, factory and fighting fodder in the expectation of World War III was not necessary after all. Natural increase would have been quite sufficient.

Furthermore, the Chifley solution to Australia's population "problem" was never submitted to the Australian people by way of referendum. The influx of European migrants was widely resented at the time, especially when the people concerned were from nations such as Germany and Italy, with which Australia had so recently been at war. Although Japanese migration, except for a few war brides, was not an issue, bitterness and hatred of the Japanese persisted at least until the end of the 1970's and "Made in Japan" was not a recommendation. That Australians did not want and did not support wholesale migration was underlined by the fact that British migrants were likely to be as unpopular as any others; in some cases, more so.

However, thanks to the general methods of integrating people into Australia in force at the time, the initial immigration programme can rightly be seen as a success story. People who came to Australia from non-English speaking backgrounds were expected to live in hostels while they waited to move into the Australian community, to learn English, get jobs and participate, and they did, with few exceptions.

When I was at school in the nineteen-fifties, my schoolmates and friends included British, Dutch, German, Austrian, Italian, Greek, Estonian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Polish and Hungarian girls. The biggest problem my secondary school faced was what to do about those foreign-born girls who had pierced ears and wore crosses. (The school administration did not permit the wearing of jewellery with the school uniform. They compromised on sleepers for the former and plain gold chains and symbols for the latter, as long as they were not too large.)

It is my own considered opinion that there was no need to persist with a large immigration programme after the nineteen sixties. The political stability of the nineteen fifties, the fact that nearly all our immigrants were from Christian countries, and that some of them spoke related languages

such as Dutch and German were advantages in assimilating so many foreigners. There was plenty of work for these people to do and it was common for both Australian and foreign born people to be sent to work in country areas where they could not remain anonymous or unknown. They were expected to pull their weight.

However, as Europe regained political and economic stability, fewer European migrants wished to leave Europe. The nineteen seventies brought largely unforeseen changes to government attitudes, especially when, after twenty-three years in the political wilderness, the ALP succeeded in gaining power under the leadership of Gough Whitlam. His government did two things which guaranteed that social and economic stability eventually would become the exception and not the rule.

Whatever one's political leanings – and incidentally I come from a faithful Labor party voting background – the kindest things that could possibly be said about the Whitlam government are that it was socially ambitious and economically illiterate. The White Australia Policy was originally brought in by the ALP and enforced in the interests of protecting Australian jobs from being undercut by people who would do anything for a crust. The Whitlam Government abolished it. Australian farming and industry were protected from goods produced overseas by people who would do anything for a bowl of rice. The Whitlam government began to dismantle protection, partly because Australia then had a very favourable balance of payments. Because of these two decisions (and others, such as the Family Law Act) and their far-reaching and unpredictable consequences, the unravelling of Australia began with the Whitlam government.

Giles Auty, formerly arts commentator for "The Australian", remarked in his farewell opinion piece that Australia is awash in second-rate ideas. To make matters worse, we often adopt ideas which have already proved ineffective and which, when implemented, range from

unsatisfactory to disastrous. Successive Australian governments have shown little understanding of the problems created by badly thought out, badly drafted and badly implemented legislation which intends to change the nature of Australia and Australians without any but the most superficial understanding of what is involved.

Probably the biggest single problem with immigration is that it has become an end in itself instead of a temporary means to a supposedly desirable end. It has become a de facto population policy, which ignores the issue of natural increase. It is likely that the official abortion rate, which hovers around the one hundred thousand mark on an annual basis, is directly related to the immigration policy. I also regard it as a very poor exchange. However, in consideration of our entrenched culture of importing just about everything from ideas to industry and exporting our own ideas and talents, there is a perverse logic in importing people ready-made and killing those in production.

THE NATURE OF 'MULTI-CULTURALISM'

This policy was originally devised in Canada, as a well-intentioned attempt to reconcile the English speaking, British descended and French-speaking, French descended populations. I have never heard that it has worked there or anywhere else. Anyone who questions this should study the Twentieth Century history of former Yugoslavia, especially that of the late 1990's.

The official definition of "multiculturalism" in Australia is that people should be encouraged to retain their cultural attachments as long as they remember to obey Australian laws and respect Australian institutions. This is not multiculturalism at all; it is cosmopolitanism. I have no particular objection to the latter. All cities are cosmopolitan in nature, and Australia is a highly urbanized nation. However, the word "multiculturalism" implies that foreign born people should be encouraged to bring their political, legal

and religious baggage with them and continue to practise these things in Australia, where they can be highly inappropriate, to say the least of them. This confusion between cosmopolitanism and “multiculturalism” is doing nothing to clarify the problems that multiculturalism presents.

Multiculturalism, like most things, is not what it seems. The real nature of this policy is better understood by considering the general history of empires. Empires have two principal characteristics: they are the natural outgrowth of civilizations, and do not appear in proto-technological or indigenous cultures; and, they rise and fall. They invariably also break up.

Both world wars of the Twentieth Century were clashes of empires. (The USA, not usually regarded as an empire, qualifies for this description because, although its policies officially exclude conquering other nations outright, it nevertheless secures military bases wherever possible and has intervened militarily in many otherwise localized conflicts; Korea, Vietnam, Iraq and Afghanistan being merely the obvious examples.) However, these adventures were so expensive in terms of men, material and money, that by the nineteen seventies, the European nations had lost their taste for wars and conquest. They therefore sublimated their imperial longings by creating the European Union, which is a de facto empire, plus internal national empires from their former subject populations, with the exception of Germany which turned eastward to the Turks. Australia, late on the imperial scene, and ruling a subject population largely consisting of Antarctic seals and penguins, proceeded to create an internal empire out of anyone who was available to come.

People who have arrived in Australia since the abolition of the White Australia policy have tended to form ghettos and clumps. This does not make them bad people; rather it suggests a long-standing failure to understand and ameliorate the difficulties of integrating non-Western and non-Christian people into a country where the dominant culture is Judaeo-Christian and Western. We cannot and should not assume that our

ENQUIRY INTO MULTICULTURALISM

Page 6

institutions and laws are understood, especially not by people who regard their own as superior. Also, we have continually and consistently failed to make any significant effort to explain what Australia is and how it works to migrants. Since the days of migrant hostels, successive governments have simply dumped migrants in Australian suburbia and left them to sink or swim. It is very noticeable that since the 1970's, few migrants attempt to settle outside Australia's capital cities.

The difficulties mentioned in the preceding paragraph were exemplified in Queensland this year when eleven people, all women and children, all from a Pacific Islander culture, perished in a house fire caused by an illegal bottled gas connection. The men all escaped; (it's only "women and children first" in Western Christian cultures), and it was further explained that these people like to keep their own culture in Australia, which means a big number of people per household, not necessarily in a big house, and since electricity consequently could not be afforded for hot water, gas was used instead. All the commentators I heard or read tiptoed carefully around the issue of the illegal gas connection, where you or I would have been taken to court and to the "cleaners" over such an incident. The conclusion I drew from the whole business is that "multiculturalism" is quite an effective way of killing people through ignorance, and apparently that must be okay with somebody, or action would be taken.

The role of the Western-style Welfare State is a strong pull factor in drawing would-be migrants who can only dream of living standards like ours, or those of America and Europe. A state house in Australia would be a rich man's mansion in many countries. What we call government assistance to the poor, they call extraordinary good fortune. All they've got to do is get here.

PERCEPTIONS AND PROMISES

Australians in general and governments in particular pay little or no attention to the foreign reception given to statements made in Australia for

domestic consumption. Nor do Australians and their representatives seem to consider what meanings may be ascribed to words which mean one thing in Australia and something else somewhere else. People from non-Christian and non-Western cultures may hear something very different from what was said. When Barak Obama said that he wanted to “engage” the Iranians, what did he suppose George Bush and everyone else had been trying to do for thirty years? The Iranian government’s response was: “Oh good, now he’s going to see it our way.” When Kevin Rudd expansively announced that he wanted a more humane programme for illegal immigrants, what the people-smugglers and their clients “heard” was: “Oh good, back to business.”

One particularly thorny issue is the question of “face”. Orientals from Tell Aviv to Tokyo set much store in maintaining face. One must be seen to be right and nothing discreditable can be admitted. An Australian businessman, who addressed an audience of which I was a member, explained to us the difficulties in providing infrastructure and large buildings in Indonesia, where mistakes in plans and processes could not be corrected because they could not be admitted. Schapelle Corby, still held in a Balinese gaol, could have been out long ago if she had understood that by her protestations of innocence she had caused her captors to lose face. We can expect that she will serve her full sentence, barring a change of government or some unforeseen circumstance. The recent arrest in Bali of a fourteen-year old boy on marijuana charges illustrates the way Australians often show no understanding of foreign niceties by behaving exactly as if they were at home.

My own extensive experiences in the WA building trade since 1974 have shown me that many migrants from non-Western cultures also behave exactly as though they were at home. Australian employment, health, safety and building bye-laws mean nothing to these people. They will frequently employ unlicensed and unsupervised “tradesmen” from

their own cultural background, among other reasons because they are cheaper.

They may also be slaves. Family members from our plumbing business have more than once encountered situations and behaviour which strongly suggested the presence of one or more slaves in Asian households, *although we have never been in a position to prove anything.*

ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION BY BOAT

It is quite true that, in terms of numbers, the Australian boat people *problem is relatively small, but it seems to me that the scale of the problem is not the issue.* Because Australia's entire population, including the Aborigines, consists of people who came originally from somewhere else, it might be supposed by some that a few more arrivals can hardly matter, and in my opinion that is not the issue either. A large number of Australians object strongly to the current wave of boat people, as they also objected to boat people in the less recent past, for reasons which I believe are either misunderstood or misrepresented or both.

There is a distinct difference between the reactions of "insiders" to illegal immigrants, compared with "outsiders." Many of the politically correct insiders in our midst are internationalists; they are well-educated, occupy important positions in academia, diplomacy, government and the public service, they are well-paid and well-off. The foreign people they know best are like themselves; charming, well-educated and well-paid internationalists, *who speak excellent English. All these things qualify them to be insiders too.* Those foreigners who are not insiders can be seen as clients, customers and cases. The "outsiders" are not in such fortunate positions. They may have to live at close quarters with people whose foreignness is not seen as a piquant source of variety and interest but is encountered as vaguely or specifically threatening. The outsiders are angered by grandstanding politicians, government incompetence, economic instability and broken promises. The insiders see "asylum

seekers" who must be pitied; the outsiders see ungrateful, badly-behaved, uninvited nuisances.

The United Nations Convention on Refugees contains a presumption in favour of the claimant and was drafted in the days when people fleeing Communism were understood to be unable to return safely to their former countries. Some people had become displaced or stateless, or were born in refugee camps. What is conveniently forgotten about these people is that they were often refugees through no fault or responsibility of their own. They had not become refugees because they were poor or incompetent or of doubtful character. Indeed the reverse was likely to be the case. They were casualties and deportees in a world war of tremendous movement and change. In most cases, it is probable that most, if it were possible, would have rather gone home. Australia took some of these people. My own impression from what I have read and heard since, is that, given the choice, most of those people who came to Australia as European refugees would ten times sooner have gone to the USA.

The convention on refugees contains something else which is seldom mentioned, let alone emphasised, and that is that once a refugee has reached safe haven, he or she is no longer a refugee. Those people we scrupulously refer to as "asylum seekers" are self-selected gatecrashers who run very few risks until they reach Indonesia, which they mostly do by air, and after which they face the sea voyage which is more dangerous.

At this point I should probably deal with an issue which is not properly discussed – at least, not in my hearing – which is relevant here. This is the question of "international obligations" versus the national interest. We are far more likely to hear about the former than the latter.

The "international obligations" we hear about seem to be derived from Australia being signatory to various UN treaties, such as the convention on refugees which I have already mentioned. It appears that a

treaty with another sovereign nation (such as Britain or the USA) does not affect the national sovereignty of either party. In the case of UN treaties, it does. This, in my opinion, is dangerous, for the following reasons.

The UN is a polyglot collection of nations, some with reasonable governments, but many without. For this reason, the UN has no moral authority. The chain is as strong as its weakest link; Mugabe's Zimbabwe, for example, or Ahmedinejad's Iran. Also, do we or our representatives ever ask who actually drafts these treaties and what their personal agenda may be? (The UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, for instance, was written by a group of activist American lawyers.) If the Australian government had been installed by the UN, then Australia's sovereignty would be derived from the UN and therefore no deviation from UN treaties could be contemplated. However, Australia calls itself a democracy and governments call elections from time to time. Australian sovereignty is ultimately derived from the British Crown and the collective will of the Australian people. Therefore Australia should never be signatory to any UN convention which overrides national sovereignty or requires a change to existing Australian legislation.

In general, Australians have two objections to the present wave of "boat people". They distrust Muslims; and they object to the behaviour of supposed "refugees" who, by their own words and actions, have made it obvious that they intend to come to Australia on their own terms, with no regard for the laws of the land or the sentiments of the majority of Australians. We have no reason to suppose that either or both of these groups of people intend to integrate if and when they succeed in getting here.

Islam claims to be the final, complete, perfect, unalterable revelation of God to man. If that is so, how could any Muslim possibly want to migrate to a Christian country, with or without a secular government? Moreover, if Muslims really do have a monopoly on true faith and the perfect social

order one might expect it to produce, why aren't non-Muslims from all over the world trampling each other down in their anxiety to migrate to Muslim countries so that they too may live under perfect government? For a Muslim to migrate from a Muslim state or a Muslim majority country to live among Jews, Christian or infidels is to imply that the claims which Islam itself makes are false. Further, having come to countries such as Britain or Australia, why do Muslim migrants want to continue to practise the religion and cultures which guaranteed their misery in the first place? There are two possible answers to these questions: the cast-iron nature of Islam makes it impossible for these people to see the logic of their own positions; and, the Muslim diaspora is aimed at subverting and taking over other countries to fulfill the "destiny" of Islam in establishing a world-wide caliphate of Muslim believers.

From my reading material and personal experiences, I wish to put forward a number of reasons why I am personally opposed to Muslim migration to Australia for any reason whatever.

One does not hear very much in today's Australia about the issue of good faith, but the expectation that people will act and speak in good faith underpins much of what we do and say. This is not the case with Islam. A Muslim is permitted to lie in three sets of circumstances: to advance the cause of Islam; to deceive Jews, Christians and infidels; and, to improve marital relations with his wife. In Arabic this called "tarqiyyah" or dissimulation. If a Muslim tells you that he is going to speak the truth as a Muslim, he intends to lie to you. An acquaintance who runs a small chain of opportunity shops gave me an example of this. He was asked to supply and deliver a secondhand hospital bed to a household where one of its members was due to leave hospital. He delivered the bed as requested and left it on the front verandah for the Muslim householders to install where and as they wished. Next day he received a telephone call to say that the bed was defective. When he returned to the house to inspect the bed he

could find nothing wrong with it. The real problem was that the two women in the house were ordered to install the bed but were unable to move it by themselves. The men of the household refused to help, as this would have made them servants to the women. Their solution was to get my acquaintance back to the house under false pretences and have him install it. He declined. In a recent court case a Muslim woman who lied to the court about the behaviour of a policeman was proved wrong by a police video camera.

Do we ever ask ourselves why so many men of "Middle Eastern appearance" drive taxis or work in service stations and as cashiers or storemen? This is because the Muslim "man of honour" does not get his hands dirty. This limits the work he may do, irrespective of any demands Australian society may make of him.

Islam generally adopts the position that might is right. It is religion of fear from which only death brings freedom. When Christians and people from Christian cultures act with humility, grace or kindness, this is usually interpreted by Muslims as weakness, and therefore submission, which is the meaning of the word "Islam".

Muslims expect and intend that demands concerning their religion and cultural observances will be met promptly. One of my neighbours, a frail elderly woman who has lived near me for many years and occupies a two-bedroom home unit through the Ministry of Housing, told me personally that she is under pressure to vacate her unit because a Muslim couple have demanded that they be housed in a residence which is closer to their mosque than their present domicile.

We cannot expect that Muslims will necessarily obey or respect the laws and institutions of Australia, except when it suits them. The primacy of Islam over all other systems requires no less. If, for instance, a young woman must be circumcised or married against her will or murdered for wanting to make her own decisions, it is unlikely that Australian authorities

will be informed or allowed to find out. In any case, the offender can be shipped off to her or her family's country of origin and dealt with there.

A considerable obstruction to the integration of any Muslim group lies in the restrictions which are enforced on women, even among less dogmatic Muslim cultures. Women in Islam usually have no more value than the Koran assigns to them. Equality in society or before the law, so much vaunted in Australia, means little to a cultural group which strictly segregates the sexes. It is no use talking up equality and equal opportunity laws if some women are less equal than others, and especially if nothing is going to be done about blatant disregard for such laws. With very few exceptions, women are not permitted to remain single, may not marry outside Islam, and are not permitted to use contraception. In some cultures they will be deprived of the necessary education and training to make an independent life. Honour killings, for example, are not confined to the Middle East or Pakistan. On the other hand, Muslim men are encouraged to marry Jewish and Christian women, with the intention of converting them, and if this fails they can be divorced, but the father will retain custody of the children. Non-Muslim men who wish to marry Muslim women must convert to Islam. These considerations are drivers of the demand for sharia in countries where sharia does not exist - officially. (We may be quite sure that sharia and Muslim marriage are being practised in Australia and there is no serious intention among Muslims of having it any other way.) Women build the bridges between cultures, and where they are not permitted to do this, the group does not integrate.

Muslims colonize non-Muslim countries and communities by first establishing a mosque and a school. Then they begin to buy up the surrounding properties and establish their own sharia-compliant businesses. When this process is substantially completed they establish no-go areas in which citizens of the host country or community are only permitted to intrude if they comply with sharia. The London area of Tower

Hamlets is an example of sharia being openly enforced in Britain, while the relevant authorities either pretend it is not happening or believe that they can somehow “manage” the problem.

To pretend that Muslim migration, legally or illegally, is in the national interest is folly. Any honest Muslim could tell you that, but why should he?

Focusing on issues such as numbers, costs and legitimacy obscures the real problem; that allowing Muslims to migrate to Australia is not in the national interest.

No doubt we would personally consider it a breach of Australian etiquette and freedoms to forbid anyone to practise the faith of Islam, provided that such people were to keep firmly in mind that Australia is not a Muslim society or expect it to become one. However, Islam is not that *sort of religion. It is theocratic, and provides for every aspect of human life.* It is quite obvious that at least some Muslims expect and intend that these things shall happen, and they are prepared to take steps to see that it does. *Australians do not want these people, nor should they be expected to welcome them.* It is quite possible that the bone-headed determination of the present Federal government to ensure, by default, that these people do arrive in Australia by any means possible will probably ensure that they may never be welcome.

THE ECONOMIC CONSEQUENCES OF IMMIGRATION

There is considerable pressure on Australian governments to import as many people as possible on the ground that they are needed to provide more labour and particular skills to supplement what are seen as deficiencies in the labour force. This is simply a way of dealing with a short term need by a method which will have long term consequences. At the present time, the extractive industries have produced a huge imbalance in the economy. Food and water security are both at risk, as is Australia’s declining manufacturing base. To rely on such an imbalanced economy in

times of global uncertainty, simply because it appears favourable in the short term, is folly.

Because of the high wages paid in the extractive industries, workers who are able to take advantage of them leave their own industries, and it may be very difficult to replace them. This drives a short-term demand for *trained people, and the short term solution, as usual, is migrants.*

International students are theoretically supposed to study or train in Australia so that they can return to their home countries and benefit their own people. It is just as likely that they will prefer the Australian lifestyle (which one Indonesian permanent resident described as “very subversive”) and join the ranks of all the other people who would rather live here than there. The German experience with Turkish “guest workers”, who were supposed to go home and didn’t, should have taught us something about these problems.

However, three problems do not engage the attention of those who theorise about migration and multiculturalism. The first is the interesting *question of why self-selected economic migrants are effectively targeting white Anglophone and Western European Protestant nations.* However and wherever they get into Europe, their preferred destination is Britain or Scandinavia if at all possible. What, may we ask, is wrong with Catholic, Orthodox and formerly Marxist nations? Not enough welfare, not so trusting, no “Protestant work ethic” to fill the government coffers, no “lovey-dovey, warm and fuzzy” people to lobby the government on their behalf?

The second question is what the successful nations of the Christian and especially the Protestant West are supposed to do with all these extra people when it comes to sharing a declining Welfarist pie. The reason I pose this question is because while the Christian Western nations have raised living standards, wages and health and safety standards and provided a safety net for the unfortunate and the useless, **at the same time they have**

sent the manufacturing and value-added industries which might have employed them offshore. The result is that countries like Australia have far too many service industries, call centres and bureaucrats, where good English, communication skills, and knowledge of Australian values are necessary, not optional. Those who are classed as poor in the Protestant Christian West are not going to migrate, because they will not be better off elsewhere. They will be joined by all those people we have taken it upon ourselves to feel sorry for, if there is insufficient entry-level work for them to do. At present I see no sign that we are going to provide enough jobs for migrants from incompatible cultures, let alone our own chronically unemployed.

The third problem is the confusion between governmental responsibilities and Christian charity. The latter cannot be practised by governments, which must govern in the national interest, and without fear or favour. Charity should be practised by individuals and groups formed especially for the purpose, and government action and private beneficence should never be confused nor conflated.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The word "multiculturalism" is inaccurate and misleading, to say the least of it. It should be abolished, and so should the entire policy.

This is also true of the misuse of the word "racism", which is commonly employed to silence disagreement. Racism is not the issue. It does not matter how people look or what ethnic ancestry they have. What makes most of the trouble is culture. Culture and character are the principal drivers of behaviour. Incompatible cultures create problems, especially where the victims cannot easily escape harassment. The famous "Cronulla riots", which caused so much angst among our "bien pensants", were not caused by racism. They were the result of ten years harassment by underemployed youths from an unassimilated group who were engaged

in a turf war. The recent riots in England, which were confined to London and three or four major cities, were the consequence of forty years of government mismanagement and a persistent urban underclass culture of gangs and related criminal activity.

There needs to be a strong recognition among Australian governments of any composition that social engineering without the consent and cooperation of the Australian people is morally wrong and socially indefensible. Multiculturalism is a social experiment, and overseas experience makes it clear that it also foolish and dangerous. Australian governments should also give up the folly of exceptionalism. If a given policy has never worked anywhere else, and especially not in Western and Christian cultures, why should it work in Australia?

The official policies of immigration and “multiculturalism” should be submitted to the Australian people at a referendum to be held no later than the next Federal election and the questions it includes should be unambiguously worded. This step is thirty-five to sixty years overdue.

Illegal boat people should be processed offshore and on no account allowed into the Australian community until processing is completed.

Anyone who has destroyed his or her identification documents, or has taken part in a protest or riot or participated in anti-social behaviour, or damaged property, should be refused refugee status, and promptly deported to either the country of origin or the last country of embarkation. To do anything else is to reward them for bad behaviour.

No particularly favourable attention should be paid to illegal immigrants whose mental health is supposed to be questionable, nor should children be separated from their parents on the grounds that children should not be behind razor wire. If their mental health is so precarious that is more reason to reject them, not less, and if children are behind razor wire, that is where their parents' choices have put them. We are not talking about toddlers who fell in a swimming pool. We are talking

about adults who have chosen to come illegally and who risk their own and their children's lives in so doing and we have been given little reason to believe they will make suitable migrants.

No-one should receive taxpayer-funded payments until processing is satisfactorily completed, and no-one should expect to become a permanent resident of this country without adequate English.

Children born to illegal immigrants in Australia should not be granted automatic citizenship.

The Australian Government should institute urgent talks with the Indonesian Government concerning the necessity of stopping illegal immigrants before they can leave Indonesia for Australia.

I would recommend the Hong Kong solution for the problems of unwanted and unassisted illegal immigrants who fail to gain refugee status. They should remain in camps and hostels, preferably outside Australia, not allowed to entertain any false hopes of becoming permanent residents, and left there until they decide of their own free will to go home or accept resettlement elsewhere. Any such people with no other means could be financially assisted to go elsewhere, on the very clear understanding that they were not to attempt coming back.

Australian governments should not allow themselves to be perceived as a soft touch or as hostages to self-appointed "civil libertarians" who are more than happy to support any cause that will make any government look weak and inadequate.

In conclusion, all those who defend "multiculturalism" on the grounds that it makes Australia so much more "colourful" should remember that the colour of blood is the brightest colour of all.

ENQUIRY INTO MULTICULTURALISM

Page 19

I am,
Yours faithfully,