RECEIVED
02 FEB 2007
BY: MIG

Submission No. 21
Date Received

CFMEU

CFMEU Submission

to the

Joint Standing Committee on Migration

Inquiry Into

Eligibility requirements and monitoring, enforcement and reporting arrangements for temporary business visas

2nd February 2007

Introduction

The CFMEU welcomes the opportunity to provide a submission to the Joint Standing Committee on Migration inquiry into Temporary Business Visas. Over the last 10 years we have witnessed a significant shift in Government policy regarding the ability of people from overseas to work in Australia. From the early days of white settlement in Australia up until the early 1990's, the predominant way in which people gained work rights was through the permanent migration program. Now we have a system where permanent migration has been overtaken by temporary migration, and a variety of options are available that allow employers to engage workers from overseas on a temporary basis. The temporary Business Visa, in particular 457 Visa is an important part of that system.

The rationale used publicly by the Government and employers, to justify this change in policy, is to help alleviate the perceived skill shortages allegedly hampering the expansion of the Australian economy. The problem with this argument is that skilled labour is being allowed in to work in areas where there are unemployed Australian workers available for work, and some employers now want to bring in unskilled and semi-skilled labour.

The CFMEU believes that issues that relate to the administration of the 457 visa system cannot be separated from the Federal Government's overseas migrant work policy generally. We believe that substantial changes are required to the entire system that allows overseas migrants to work temporarily in Australia. This submission identifies our concerns and our recommendations for change in that regard.

The National Secretary is available to speak to the inquiry in relation to this submission and can also arrange for several of the victims of 457 visa abuses as outlined in our Annexure A to give evidence to the inquiry.

Government Policies on Temporary Migrant Labour

Whilst the Terms of Reference are limited to Temporary Business Visas, there are a number of different policies adopted by the Federal Government that impact on the supply of temporary labour from overseas. We submit that one cannot look at them in isolation. Any proper investigation must look at the overall policy framework to see how they interact.

(1) Short (456) and Long (457) Stay Temporary Business Visas

The Federal Government has in place a temporary skilled migration policy that involves two types of visas:

- Business short stay visas (456 visas) that allow overseas workers and business owners to enter Australia for work of less than three months duration that is highly specialised and of an urgent nature. These visas do not normally cover workers engaged in paid employment; and

- Business long stay visas (457 visas) that allow skilled workers from overseas to enter for periods of employment of three months to four years duration. These visas are issued under a number of different programs, including employer sponsorship and regional sponsorship.

There has been a substantial increase in the number of visas issued under this policy over the past 10 years. In 1995-96 there were 197,941 temporary business visas issued[1], however in 2005-06 the number had ballooned to 439,483, of which 71,150 were long stay visas and 368,333 were short term visas.[2]

Each of the visa categories has a number of requirements that must be met before a visa can be issued. For 456 visas the requirements are as follows:

- The person is making a short business trip to Australia for a period of less than 3 months.
- The business activities include attending a conference, or negotiating or exploring a business arrangement.
- The visa does not allow a person to work except in very limited circumstances. The work must be urgent, very short term and highly specialised.
- The person must not undertake work that can be done by an Australian citizen or permanent resident, and the person cannot take an ongoing position for longer than three months.

For 457 visas, where the sponsor is an employer in a non-regional area, the requirements are that:

- the sponsor is the direct employer of the proposed entrant or evidence that the sponsor and employer are related;
- the employment will be of benefit to Australia including the creation and maintenance of employment for Australian citizens;
- the employer demonstrates a satisfactory record or commitment to training Australian workers;
- the positions sought to be filled meet the minimum skill level; and
- the minimum salary set by the government is paid (minimum salary is the gross salary excluding accommodation, bonuses, travel, vehicle allowances, superannuation, etc, and currently stands at $41,850).

In regional areas (defined as being outside the metropolitan areas of Sydney, Brisbane, Melbourne, Perth, the Gold Coast, Newcastle and Wollongong) an employer may seek an exemption from the minimum skill level and pay only 90% of the minimum salary requirements, if a regional certifying body certifies that the position cannot reasonably be filled locally.

---

[1] Productivity Commission 2006, *Economic Impacts of Migration and Population Growth,* Position Paper, January, p.213

[2] DIMA, Population Flows:Immigration Aspects, January 2007

Issues of Concern

Unions have witnessed a growth in the number of abuses of the system over the last 18 months or more, and are concerned that the requirements for the issuing of temporary business visas are not being stringently applied. A list outlining some of these abuses, as reported in the media, are contained in Annexure A. Some of our specific concerns are that:

- Labour market testing is not being applied in non-regional areas, and where it does occur it is done in a way that ensures the local labour market is seen to fail the needs of the employer. This is done for example, by advertising vacancies for qualified tradespeople at well below the market (but not award) rate.
- Unscrupulous employers are using the employer sponsored visa as a means of driving down wages and conditions.
- The requirement of the evidence of investment in training and the existence of a history of training is not being properly verified. We understand that the employer is required to do no more than tick a box to indicate that this requirement has been met, without the need for substantiation or the production of tangible evidence. Where evidence of training is produced our understanding is that there is no clear, transparent and consistent standard applied as to what constitutes a "commitment to the training of Australian employees".
- The failure to ensure that the applicants are the true employer. In recent months we have witnessed an increasing number of international labour hire companies who enter into agreements with employers to provide temporary migrant workers to these companies (at a cost to both the employer and the temporary migrant worker).
- The roles being played by migration agents in the whole process and the lack of regulations applying to them.
- Exorbitant deductions being made from the wages of temporary workers for accommodation, airfares and recruitment costs.
- The number of temporary workers who come in under a 456 visas, work for 3 months and then leave, only to re-enter after a relatively short period of time. During their time in Australia they are undertaking work that does not meet their visa requirements.

We are also concerned for the welfare of these temporary workers. We are concerned that they are open to abuse by employers who attempt to exploit the precarious nature of their situation. **Further, as illustrated in several incidents outlined in Annexure A, temporary migrant workers have been seriously affected by serious breaches of occupational health and safety laws.** These workers are offered no assistance by DIMA or other government agencies that should assist them. Where the employment relationship fails (through a range of circumstances including a down turn in business) a temporary worker has only 28 days from the date of termination to gain further employment, or they must leave Australia. Such time frames do not meet international standards of reasonable timeframes within which to seek and find alternative employment.

A further major concern is the recent attempt by a number of countries to include temporary migrant worker arrangements in international trade agreements. We understand this is a live issue in the recent WTO round under the guise of trade in services, and has been raised by China in recent discussions over a free trade agreement with Australia. Such proposals are a clear threat not only to the wages and working conditions of Australian workers, but to the very jobs in which they are employed.

(2) Working Holiday Visa

Working holiday visas are available for people aged 18 to 30 years of age, who are interested in a working holiday of up to 12 months in Australia. Subclass 417 is available to residents from those countries that participate with Australia in the Working Holiday Maker Programme. Subclass 462 is available to tertiary educated people (who are proficient in English) from Chile, Iran and Thailand, and may be extended to Turkey and Bangladesh sometime this year..

Under a working holiday visa a person is allowed to stay in Australia for up to 12 months, to leave and re-enter any number of times while the visa is valid, to study or train for up to 4 months, and to work in Australia for up to 6 months with each employer (although this time period may be extended by the Department). There is no limit on the type of work that can be performed.

A second working holiday visa may be granted for a further 12 months if a person has completed 3 months seasonal work in Australia. In effect this means that under the working holiday visa scheme, a person could work for up to 2 years (but no longer than 6 months with any one employer).

The number of working holiday maker visa holders has increased significantly over the last 13 years. In 1992-93 there were 25,557 visas granted to allow holiday makers to work in Australia[3]. By 1999-2000 this figure had nearly tripled to 74,467[4]. In 2005-06 the figure had grown to 111,973. [5]

(3) Student Visas

There are a variety of student visas available depending on the type of education or training that a person is enrolled in. In general people on student visas can work up to 20 hours per week during their course time and an unlimited number of hours outside their course time. Any dependents accompanying the student may work for up to 20 hours a week (the hours are unlimited in certain circumstances). There is no restriction on the occupations that a student may work in. In 1994-95 there were 52,506 overseas students in Australia[6].

---

[3] Productivty Commission, op cit, p.213
[4] ibid
[5] DIMA, op cit
[6] Productivity Commission, op cit, p213

According to the latest available DIMA statistics the number has grown to 190,674 (excluding NZ).[7]

(4) Overseas Apprentices (Trade Skills Training Visa)

The Trade Skills Training Visa program was announced as part of the 2005 Budget measures. Under this program an Australian organisation (i.e. an employer, group training organisation, or a national, State, Territory or local organisation representative of industry or of a regional area of Australia) can sponsor a person from overseas as a full fee paying apprentice to study in regional Australia. On completion of the apprenticeship the person can apply for permanent residence under the existing regional migration visa program.

There a number of requirements that must be met by the applicant (i.e. the person doing the apprenticeship). These include:

- The applicant must be between 18 and 35 years of age.
- The applicant must be undertaking an apprenticeship in a trade considered to be an acceptable trade (i.e. AQF level III or IV), a trade considered to have a shortage, in a location considered to be a regional area (i.e. outside of Brisbane, the Gold Coast, Newcastle, Sydney, Wollongong, Melbourne and Perth), and be a position where no suitable Australian is available (according to the Department the target areas are the Pilbara, North West Shelf, Darwin, etc).
- The applicant must have vocational English.
- The applicant must meet the educational qualification requirements to start their apprenticeship.
- The applicant must demonstrate their financial capacity to meet classroom training fees, accommodation and living expenses, travel and school costs for themselves and any dependants.
- The applicant must be sponsored by an Australian organisation.
- The applicant must pay an upfront payment of $420 upon lodgement of the application as well as a second payment of $3,300 prior to the grant of the visa.

Issues of Concern

The CFMEU believes that apprentices covered by this scheme would rate as the most vulnerable in the Australian workforce for the following reasons:

1. they are young people in a new country with unfamiliar customs and practices. Although DIMA have indicated that they will provide funding to help address community relations issues the programs are still being developed and are not yet in place;
2. they are without parental or extended family networks to offer support;
3. they are to be employed in isolated locations where they would find it difficult to easily leave an abusive employer;

[7] DIMA, op cit

4. their parents will have undoubtedly invested substantial sums of family savings for the young person to get this opportunity placing enormous moral pressure on the worker to endure difficult circumstances; and
5. the employer can cancel the sponsorship arrangement and/or the contract of training (or threaten to do so) if the employee is not totally compliant.

In regard to the economics of these visa arrangements the scheme is obviously based on a user pays approach. According to a Government Fact sheet the scheme is expected to cost $4.9 million (net) over 4 years (mostly for administration costs), with total costs being offset by an estimated $11.9 million (over 4 years) received from visa applications from overseas applicants. On the basis of a visa cost of $3,720, the total number of applications expected would be approximately 3200 over 4 years (or 800 per year).

From an employers perspective it would be clearly cheaper for an Australian employer to engage these young people than traditional Australian apprentices. The overseas apprentice has to pay for their own training fees, as well as travelling costs (not only to Australia but also to the work location) and accommodation and general living costs. On the other hand an employer engaging an Australian apprentice would be liable for over award payments to attract an apprentice to the region, fares and travel to and from work, and living away from home allowances where applicable.

Based on information from DIMA and our own estimates the costs to an overseas apprentice would be as follows:

Visa cost	3720.00
Training fees	12000.00 (over 4 years)
Living costs	48000.00 ($12000 per year x 4)
Travel to Australia	1000.00
Return to home country	3000.00 (based on 1 trip per year)
Health insurance	3200.00
Total	**$70920.00**

Assuming the apprentice was only paid the award rate of pay then an overseas apprentice would be unlikely to earn this amount (after tax) over the four year period. (An apprentice carpenter in South Australia would earn approximately $90,000 (gross) over the four years of the apprenticeship for a standard 38 hour week). There is potential for this amount to be less under AWA's under the *WorkChoices* policy.

We would suggest that it is highly likely that only the wealthy could take part in the scheme and doubt that they would have the intention of staying in the trades, or in the regions, once they had fulfilled all their visa requirements. On that basis the program would only have a limited short term possibility of addressing the shortage of tradespeople in regional Australia.

We further note that there is potential for the scheme to be abused by unscrupulous employers and/or immigration agents. According to information obtained from DIMA

sponsors are exempt from the requirement to register as a migration agent and can assist the visa applicant with their application. If a sponsor breaches any undertakings required by DIMA then the only penalty is cancellation of the sponsor's approval. There are no financial penalties.

Other concerns include:

- The employer is not required to demonstrate any commitment to the employment of local apprentices or existing workers seeking to upgrade their skills;
- The employer is not required to demonstrate that they have tested the local labour market, let alone the regional market;
- The employer is not required to provide any assistance to the apprentice including the provisions of the means for regular contact by phone or email with the apprentices family on at least a weekly basis;
- There is nothing in the program to stop an employer 'sub-contracting' an apprentice to another employer – leading to potentially further abuse of the apprentice;
- The overseas apprentice is required to meet the Government costs of subsidies paid by the Government to the employer;
- The apprentice is not offered or entitled to permanent residency status;
- There is no system of case management of apprentices by DIMA including regular site visits and meeting with the apprentice without the presence of the employer;
- The program will not necessarily increase the pool of skilled workers in Australia;
- Apprentices are not entitled to any assistance, including assistance in finding alternative employment, or monetary support should the employment relationship end.

The CFMEU totally rejects this preposterous scheme being advanced by the Federal Government and certain employer interests. There are too many issues around the non-engagement of willing young Australians by reluctant employers that must be addressed before we embrace this ill-conceived proposal.

(5) Illegal Workers

There are an estimated 60,000 illegal workers in Australia. A significant number of them find work in industries covered by the CFMEU, particularly the building and construction industry. Over recent years the union has continued to highlight the problems of illegal

workers and the inaction by the Federal Government to implement the proposed sanctions recommended in the 1999 *Review of Illegal Workers in Australia* (RIWA) report. Last year the Federal government, following lobbying and pressure by the CFMEU, finally made an effort to improve the situation and introduced the *Migration Amendment (Employer Sanctions) Bill 2006.*

Issues of Concern

It appears that the Federal Government has only implemented the first tier of sanctions - a fault offence prosecuted before a court - from the recommendations contained in the RIWA report. Under the Bill the penalty is imprisonment for 2 years with a maximum penalty for an aggravated offence of imprisonment for 5 years. It should be noted that under the *Crimes Act* the courts can impose instead of, or in addition to, this penalty of imprisonment, a pecuniary penalty, of not exceeding $13,200 for a natural person and not exceeding $66,000 for a body corporate (for 2 year offences) and not exceeding $33,000 for a natural person and not exceeding $165,000 for a body corporate (for 5 year offences).

The Government has not sought to implement the other two tiers of sanctions contained in the recommendations. The other tiers were:

Tier Two – a strict liability offence prosecuted before a court

The key points of this type of sanction were to be that:

- the offence would impose strict liability for those found to have employed or supplied for employment non-citizens without a right to either undertake any work or the work offered or undertaken;
- the prosecution would not be required to prove intention or recklessness, but must prove the physical elements of the offence; and
- an appropriate maximum penalty would be $5,500 for an individual and $27,500 for a body corporate.

Tier Three – an infringement penalty

The key points of this type of sanction were to be that:

- the Tier Two offence would be underpinned by an infringement notice scheme. Instead of being prosecuted, the offender would be given the choice of either paying an infringement penalty (set at one-fifth of the penalties at Tier Two) or in default of paying the fine, being prosecuted. If prosecuted the offence would be the same as Tier Two; and
- an appropriate penalty in lieu of prosecution would be $1,100 for an individual and $5,500 for a body corporate.

According to the explanatory memorandum accompanying the Bill, the Government will adopt a policy of giving written warnings to first time offenders and adopt a discretionary

approach in regard to deciding when to refer cases to the DPP. They have also decided to defer the strict liability offences recommended by RIWA.

The sanctions introduced by the Bill and the policy decisions contained in the explanatory memorandum, show that the Government has failed to properly take into account the recommendations of the RIWA report and the reasons for them. It could be argued that they are being tough with the rhetoric but soft with the enforcement, particularly given the written warnings policy and the fact that the proposed legislation will only apply to acts committed after the legislation comes into force.

The RIWA report identified two types of tests for offences, a "*knowingly*" test adopted in the USA, Canada and NZ whereby an employer is guilty of an offence if the employer has knowingly employed an illegal worker, and a "*strict liability or absolute offence*" test, i.e. an employer would be guilty of the offence if they employed such a person, regardless of their state of knowledge, which had been adopted in the United Kingdom. Under the Bill the requirements for an offence to occur include that "*a person knows of, or is reckless to, that circumstance*". It would therefore appear that the Government has adopted the "*knowingly*" test. The need for the regulator to prove "intention" and the "state of mind of the employer" represent substantial hurdles and a significant departure from the RIWA recommendations.

RIWA proposed the three tiers of sanctions to allow a range of offences and penalties to be used with the most appropriate being chosen in the circumstances. It envisaged that:

- a significant number of infringement notices issued under Tier Three (the least serious offence);
- a much smaller number of Tier Two offences prosecuted; and
- only a low number of Tier One offences prosecuted (the most serious offence).

The report proposed that written warnings only be issued to those who were liable under Tier Two or Three for the first time. It noted that the imposition of a strict liability offence (Tier Two), with appropriate penalties attached, would discourage employers from recruiting workers without the right to work. Such an offence was necessary to ensure that employers and labour suppliers could be effectively sanctioned for supplying or recruiting illegal workers

(6) Guest Workers

Over recent months we have witnessed a renewed push for the introduction of guest worker schemes to enable people from overseas to be engaged temporarily in unskilled and semi-skilled jobs. The idea is being promoted by a diverse group of organisations. The National Farmers Federation wants guest workers for unskilled fruit picking jobs and for positions such as farm hands in isolated communities, even though most of the fruit growing farmers say that they have enough labour being provided by back packers and other tourists. The Road Transport Federation is calling for up to 1000 truck drivers to be imported to solve a shortage in the number of truck drivers, yet ignore the fact that there are over 100,000 truck

drivers who have left the industry because of low wages, unrealistic journey times, and other OH&S concerns. Finally we have the South Pacific nations demanding that Australia open up its labour market to allow unemployed Islanders to work in Australia. All those supporting a new guest worker programme are seeking changes to allow an extension of the 457 visas to cover unskilled and semi skilled workers, i.e. in effect all workers. Our concerns identified for the current 457 visa program would also apply to any extended guest worker program.

Recommendations to Improve the System Applying to Temporary Migrant Workers

We believe that a number of significant changes to the temporary migrant worker visa system are needed to protect the jobs and working conditions of Australian workers, and to protect the temporary workers from exploitation. The specific changes required are as follows:

- **Labour Market Testing** – Labour market testing should be required for all temporary migrant visas (not just in regional areas) and transparent labour market testing should be applied before any approval is given for the issuing of a visa. This includes the proper advertising of positions Australia wide, and a requirement that jobs be offered locally at the market rate (not the award rate).

- **Regional Certifying Bodies** - The roles and membership of regional certifying bodies should be regulated and enhanced to improve local worker representation. A system such as that operating in NZ should be the model for the approval process.

- **Recognition of Overseas Qualifications** - A proper system for ensuring that qualifications gained overseas meet the contemporary requirements of Australian qualifications and licensing arrangements must be put in place.

- **Employers Sponsoring Temporary Migrants** – Employers should be required to submit documentary evidence of investment in **training**, including information of the number of apprentices and trainees employed for a specific period prior to the visa application. This must include evidence of the employment outcomes of such trainees and apprentices and evidence that the training is continuing. This information should be verified by the relevant State/Territory Training Authority. The employers should be required to pay at least the **market rate** (based on the rates other employers are paying, not the award rate or minimum rate set by the Federal Government) or the enterprise rate, whichever is higher. Labour hire companies should be excluded employers. Any employer found abusing the system, including exploiting or assaulting temporary migrant workers, should be subject to **civil and/or criminal penalties** including being excluded from the scheme.

- **Migration Agents** – Regulations and a system of licensing should be introduced for migration agents involved in the recruiting and bringing to Australia of temporary migrant workers. The conditions of such licenses should include a prohibition on

the repayment of monies by the workers to the migration agent or their associated companies of costs associated with the temporary migration.

- **Overseas Apprentices** – The Trades Skills Training visa scheme should be abolished.

- **Protection of Temporary Migrant Workers** – Temporary migrant workers should be advised by the Federal Government of the prevailing market rate of wages and conditions applying to the work to be performed, their rights as workers including their right to belong to a trade union, and be offered other protections available to Australian workers under domestic law. Temporary migrant workers should be allowed up to 3 months to find alternative employment if the employment relationship fails before their visa is cancelled.

- **Wages to be Paid in Australia** – To ensure that temporary migrant workers are paid correctly and receive their full entitlements there should be a prohibition on the payment of wages into overseas bank accounts.

- **Compulsory Induction for High Risk Industries** – Where the temporary migrant workers are to be engage in high risk industries (e.g. construction, mining, meat processing, etc) they should be required to complete an induction course before commencing employment. Further there should also be a requirement that the relevant State and Territory OH&S regulators are notified of their entry into the country to allow proactive safety interventions.

- **English Language Requirement** – To ensure the occupational health and safety of temporary workers, and the permanent resident workers that they work with, there must be a requirement that the temporary migrants are proficient enough in the English language to read warning signs, converse with others and relay written messages.

- **Illegal Labour** – The full range of sanctions identified in the RIWA report should be implemented.

John Sutton
CFMEU National Secretary

Annexure A - Temporary Migrant Labour Abuses

Industry/Occupation (location)	Country of Origin	Union Coverage	Type of Abuse	Media Source	Date
Electricians (Western Australia)	Unknown	CEPU	Falsifying safety test (inability to speak and understand English)	West Australian	27th January 2007
Construction worker (Kiama)	Egypt	CFMEU	Illegal workers	Kiama Independent	3rd January 2007
Construction workers (Lake Bolac Victoria)	Korea	CFMEU	Unsafe Practices	Herald sun	8th November 2006
Crane Operators (Sydney)	Singapore	CFMEU/ AMWU	Excessive charges, sacked for refusing to sign AWA, evicted from accommodation	AAP Newswire	25th October 2006
Engineering Welders (Carole Park QLD)	Philippines	AWWU	Excessive charges for accommodation, registration for work and on hiring	Queenslan d Times	19th October 2006
Factory worker- packaging (Victoria)	China	AMWU	Discrimination (no union contact)	The Age	10th October 2006
Factory worker- plastic recycling (Bankstown)	Korea		Illegal worker – poor OH&S	Sydney Morning Herald	9th September 2006
Various industries (labour hire) and locations	South Korea, Thailand, Ukraine, China, Czech Republic	Various	Charging up front fees to bring workers to Australia under 457 visas	The Age	15th July 2006
Construction (Nelson Bay)	South Korea & China	CFMEU	Illegal workers	Newcastle Herald	15th July 2006
Construction– Welder (KSN Engineering/Western Construction, Kwinana))	South Korea	AMWU	Low wages	West Australian	8th July 2006
Construction (ABC Tissues Wetherill Park)	China	AMWU	Undercutting local labour	Lateline	8th June 2006
			Company forced to pay $650,000 in backpay	Sydney Morning Herald	1st November 2006
Construction/Refractory Bricklayers (Austral	Czech Republic	CFMEU	Undercutting local labour	Age	15th June 2006

Bricks plant, Craigieburn)					
Hospitality (Zeffirelli Pizza Restaurant, Canberra)	Philippines	LHMU	Underpayment of wages	Workplace Express	29th May 2006
Construction (Hanssen sites, Perth)	Philippines & China	CFMEU	Undercutting local labour	West Australian	13th May 2006
Automotive –Paint line assembly (GMH Adelaide plant)	Croatia	AMWU	Undercutting local labour	AAP	9th Feb 2006
Engineering/welding (Bradken Engineering Brisbane and Perth	Philippines	AMWU	Undercutting local labour	AFR	20th May 2006
Retail/Check out operator (Woolworths Double Bay)	India	SDA	Undercutting local labour	AFR	20th May 2006
Engineering/welding (Maxitrans Ballarat)	China	AMWU	Undercutting local labour	AFR	20th May 2006
Construction/tilers (Soldiers Point NSW)	Malaysia	CFMEU	Illegal workers	Newcastle Herald	16th March 2006
Meat Industry (T&R Pastoral Abattoir Murray Bridge)	China	AMIEU	Undercutting local labour	Workplace Express	24th February 2006
Construction-Drilling/labourers (Haliburton SA)	Indonesia	AWU	Low wages - $40 per day	Advertiser	13th February 2006
Meat Industry (Teys Bros Naracoorte)	China	AMIEU	Undercutting local labour – scab labour	Advertiser	21st February 2006
Construction (Sydney)	South Korea	CFMEU	Low pay/not paid/assault	SMH	22nd February 2006
Construction/apprentice (Sydney)	Cook Islands	CFMEU	Low wages/assault	Daily Telegraph	21st February 2006
Baking (Brumbys)	Vietnam		Undercutting local labour	Herald Sun	20th February 2006
Meat Industry (Midfield Meats, Warrnambool)	China & Philippines	AMIEU	Undercutting local labour	Herald Sun	20th February 2006
Transport/welders (Vawdrey Australia, Dandenong)	China	AMWU	Undercutting local labour	Herald Sun	20th February 2006