

Population challenges for the Liberal 3.0 generation

Address to the National Press Club – March 30, 2011

***Scott Morrison MP
Shadow Minister for Productivity and Population
Shadow Minister for Immigration and Citizenship***

Since 1944 the Federal Parliamentary Liberal Party has been dominated by two figures, Sir Robert Menzies and John Howard. Between them they have led our party for more than half its life.

For Menzies the task was to realise the post war dream of stability and certainty. It was to restore a brave generation to a new and peaceful life in Australia, where they could provide a better future for their children. Menzies marshalled their spirit to build the institutions, population and infrastructure to support a thriving post war market driven economy.

For Howard the goal was to realise a prosperity for Australia that was unattainable by his parents generation. John Howard's upbringing was one born in the enterprise and determination of the suburban family that Menzies championed. Prosperity was not something that could be taken for granted. This was something John Howard was determined to change

Similar aspirations were held on the other side of politics, and the Hawke-Keating, Howard-Costello years proved to be the most prosperous of our national lifetime. For much of this period there was a constant narrative about the absence of any great cleavage in our political debate, especially when it came to economic management and national security.

Sure we had our differences. I know John Howard and Peter Costello would have preferred the bipartisan support denied to them for waterfront reform, tax reform, paying back Labor's debt and workplace relations reform that was given to the Hawke Keating Government for floating the exchange rate, deregulating the banks and cutting tariffs.

Nevertheless decades of reform from both sides of politics revolutionised our economy. Genuine policy revolutions in our financial and labour markets and the explosion in private investment that followed in infrastructure, plant and equipment made us the strongest economy in the western world. The fiscal discipline of the Howard-Costello years ensured that as the global financial crisis levelled the North Atlantic economic hemisphere, Australia weathered the storm.

The attempt by the Rudd and Gillard Governments to appropriate 25 years of economic slog to their own ledger, by claiming credit for avoiding the downside of the GFC, while demonizing the liberal economic policies of everyone from Ronald Reagan and Margaret Thatcher to John Howard and Paul Keating in the process, is comical.

We are now through the looking glass economic policy under Labor, where new taxes are pro-market, re-regulation of labour market is modernisation and deficit, debt and cash handouts are economic conservatism.

Added to that, Labor's old world view that Government should be at the centre of our economy has re-emerged.

Not since Whitlam has our polity been so volatile and so divided between the major parties.

As Labor continues to lurch even further to the left with their Labor-Green Alliance – the Coalition remains where we have always been.

The Liberal Party is now in the hands of a new generation of MPs, led by Tony Abbott, of which I am but one. As Labor walks away from the Hawke-Keating legacy, we remain loyal to the legacy we have inherited from Menzies and Howard, in particular:

- **Our belief in the individual** - whose judgement we respect, whose enterprise we rely on and whose freedoms we protect,
- **Our belief in a competitive economy** - where hard work and risk is rewarded, where competition is welcomed and protected, where the private sector is at the centre of our economy and where Government lives within its means, and to paraphrase David Cameron,
- **Our belief in a big community** - united by common values that have stood the test of time.

Belief in the individual

The bedrock of our Liberal world view has always been our belief in the individual – their ingenuity, their enterprise, their industry, their intelligence, their fair mindedness, their generosity.

This simply means that we believe in the capacity and responsibility of every Australian to make their own decisions and make their own way. Our first job is to get out of their way.

In recent debates I have been appalled by the lack of confidence that the Government has demonstrated in the sound mindedness of individual Australians.

They are considered incapable by the Government of working out for themselves that they don't want Labor's carbon tax - rather they are the ignorant victims of a fear campaign by talk back radio and the Liberal Party.

No, Prime Minister , they just don't want your great big tax based on your great big lie.

On border protection, the tactic is the same.

It's not possible individual Australians have independently formed the view that the Government's border protection policies are a hopeless failure.

More than 200 boats carrying more than 10,000 people have arrived, creating a crisis in our detention network. There are now more than 6,300 people being detained who arrived by boat compared to just 4 in 2007. The Australian Federal Police had to re-take by force a Commonwealth Facility overrun by rioting detainees. At the same time the mainland detention network is beyond capacity and the same tension that led to riots on Christmas Island are rising these mainland centres.

Annual costs for asylum seeker management have increased seven fold, with blowouts on running costs totalling more than \$1 billion. 4,900 new detention beds have been announced just since last election and the Prime Minister's promise of a regional processing centre in East Timor is now clearly dead in the water.

At least 220 people have perished at sea on these boats, and more than 1,000 children have been put on boats. The number of special humanitarian visas provided to offshore applicants is less than half what it was at the peak of the Howard programme.

The Prime Minister explains away community concerns on border protection as the product of race baiting by the Coalition. In the Prime Minister's universe, the reason Australians are concerned about the Government's border protection failures is because they are racists.

The Prime Minister needs to stop insulting Australians for disagreeing with her and start listening to them.

During the debate prior to the last election, the Leaders were asked, 'how are you going to stand up to the mob'. Let's just think for a moment about who the mob is.

The 'mob', as they are derided, are individual Australians who pay taxes, raise families, go to work, run small businesses to pay people's wages, obey the law, volunteer for local charities and sports clubs, care for their elderly parents, live on a pension, have paid for their retirement, are caring for grandchildren so both parents can go to work to pay their mortgage, applied to migrate to Australia and have built a new life for themselves and their families in their adopted country whose values they celebrate and defend. And the list goes on.

Apparently the answer to our nation's challenges is that someone needs to stand up to them?

The suggestion that you might actually listen to them and address their concerns is derided as populist heresy.

The big question the mob wants answered is who is going to stand up for them?

The mob are the individual Australians who comprised Menzies' forgotten people and John Howard's battlers. As Liberals we will remain faithful to them.

A competitive economy

Liberals have always believed in an open market economy.

We believe the best way we can help is by getting out of the way and keeping the Government's budget under control – to take pressure off interest rates and reduce the tax burden. We seek to foster a liberalised economy where people have the opportunity to earn more, get a job, develop their skills, boost their productivity and be rewarded for it and realise success in their own business endeavours.

Under the Howard Government we achieved these objectives. Real wages increased by 21%, more than 2 million jobs were created, effective tax rates were slashed, budget surpluses were the norm. The number of businesses employing less than 20 people increased by more than 600,000. Company

profits increased in real terms by 300% from 5.3% of GDP to 14.2%ⁱ and more than 3.7 million people gained apprenticeshipsⁱⁱ.

Good Liberal governments also support sensible policy to preserve and promote competition – to provide competitive access to labour, markets, capital, information, services and infrastructure.

In our labour market, population ageing, labour shortages, skills deficits and large demands created by major projects and the mining sector is presenting some major challenges.

Peter Costello established the three Ps strategy of productivity, participation and population as the economic orthodoxy and framework for addressing these issues.

Of the three Ps, productivity is the most important. According to the Treasury's latest intergenerational report, productivity accounted for more than twice the contributions to growth in real GDP per person of participation and population combinedⁱⁱⁱ.

In the time available to day, I will not have the opportunity to address the myriad of productivity challenges facing our economy. I will leave that for another occasion.

With respect to workforce participation, the ABS^{iv}, reports there are 613,800 Australians who say they want to re-enter the labour force within the next twelve months –the majority of these have worked within the last three years, 62% were women and two thirds want to work part time.

This is more than five times the current level of planned permanent skilled migration for 2010/11 and seventeen times the number of 457 visas granted last year.

There are 91,700 Australian aged between 20-24 who want to work, are available to work, but are not looking.

There are more than 100,00 Australians classified as discouraged job seekers , no longer in our labour force – 20% cite a lack of jobs either in their line of work or their local area as the reason for giving up, while 38% say they are too old, especially men. Just over half of the discouraged say they want to return to work in the next twelve months

As these figures demonstrate, the participation challenge is particularly acute for males at either end of the career lifespan – as well as females more generally. In each case, participation rates are below those experienced in comparable developed economies^v.

The Liberal doctrine of mutual obligation has much to offer to address participation challenges.

I agree with David Stewart of Leighton Holdings who recently said *“our tax and welfare systems must focus on encouraging all Australians to contribute to the limit of their abilities^{vi}”*. Welfare reforms that encourage young males to go where the jobs are, are a key factor.

For older males, skills transitioning is a key focus, while for women, it’s about the ability to manage work and family, and is why the Coalition has always been in favour of greater workplace flexibility.

Today I want to particularly focus on the role population policy, and immigration more specifically, must play to improve access to labour, boost our productivity and enhance our competitiveness.

The Coalition’s starting point in this debate is that Australian business should always seek to source its workforce from the Australian population. In this context, how we grow and manage that population is extremely important.

Since the 1950s Australia has run a highly successful and ambitious immigration programme that has served us well. The programme has worked best when it focuses on skills.

In his memoirs Menzies recalled:

‘the very large immigration which was then begun, and continues to this day, has been a great factor in Australia’s national development and the enrichment of her social life. My own party enthusiastically favours it.’^{vii}

During the Howard years, our permanent migration programme more than doubled in size fuelled by a three fold increases in skilled migration^{viii}. During this period the proportion of skilled migration in our permanent programme increased from around 30% under Keating to almost 70% at the time we left office.

We also introduced the 457 temporary skilled visa programme, allowing business to gain access to an increasingly mobile global labour market.

The increases in what was predominantly skilled migration poured into a growing economy. Unemployment rates amongst skilled migrants were lower than for the general population. And labour force participation rates were higher.

Strong growth in skilled migration was achieved while containing population growth pressures and a stronger border protection regime that enhanced community confidence in our overall migration programme. Not surprisingly, public concerns about immigration levels being too high under the Howard Government almost halved during their term of office according to the Scanlon foundation surveys conducted by Monash University^{ix}.

Average annual population growth during the Howard years was just 1.3%, slightly less than our long run average of 1.4%, with natural increase and net overseas migration accounting for an equal share of population increase^x.

In recent years a new dynamic has emerged in our population flows.

Net overseas migration has increased from half of our population growth to two thirds, fuelled by increases in temporary migration. In 1989-90 the share of temporary migrants in net overseas migration was around 10%^{xi}.

In 2007/08 net overseas migration increased to 277,000, almost double our long run average and subsequently peaked at over 300,000,

A breakdown of net overseas migration figures for 2007/08, published by the ABS^{xii}, shows that it was not formal skilled migration that dominated our net overseas migration intake. 457s accounted for just 12%, while permanent skilled migration accounted for 17% - less than a third of our net intake was for skills.

The point here is that higher levels of net overseas migration do not necessarily equate to a higher level of skilled migration. Aggregate levels of immigration is not the issue. It is the composition that counts. From a labour force perspective it is the level of skilled migration that matters.

One of the frustrations of the population and migration debate has been the perception that sustainable population growth and meeting skills needs of our economy are mutually exclusive. The Coalition does not share this view.

A year ago I outlined a policy that called for sustainable population growth^{xiii}. At the time Australia had a population growth rate of 2.1%, more than double the OECD average and fifty percent higher than our own long run average. Net overseas migration was at the highest level on record going back to 1900. In these circumstances, it is understandable that the rate of population growth in Australia would be the topic of policy debate.

I proposed that a redefined Productivity and Sustainability Commission be established to provide independent and credible advice on a sustainable population growth band for Australia to meet economic, social and environmental objectives. The proposal was based on the inflation band target concept set for the Reserve Bank to manage monetary policy, established by Peter Costello.

The growth band would take into account labour force needs, service delivery levels, infrastructure capacity, environmental pressures, in particular water needs, and would be reviewed every five years, taking into account progress in boosting our capacity to sustain higher levels of population.

Once the band had been set by the Government for overall population growth, migration programmes would be framed to keep our population growth within the band. I also committed a Coalition Government to at least two thirds of our permanent migration programme to be for skills.

In short, the policy was designed to align capacity growth with population growth. If we want to accommodate higher levels of population, then we must invest in increasing our capacity. Failure to do so compromises our quality of life, our environment and our economic performance.

In addition, in the lead up to the election, the Coalition committed to a net overseas migration target of 170,000 within our first term and to produce a white paper on migration that would examine the various components of the programme^{xiv}. I note that the figures released yesterday put net overseas migration at 185,800 to the end of September last year^{xv}.

Since the election, the Government has appointed three panels to examine population growth. Each of these panels has returned their initial reports^{xvi}.

- The Liveability Panel proposed a multidisciplinary independent research agency to advise on population issues;
- The Sustainability Panel advocated a Sustainability Commission to report to Parliament on sustainable population levels, and that growth be linked to indicators of sustainability and;
- The Productivity and Prosperity panel advocated reforms to increase our capacity to support continued population growth – to keep growth and capacity in balance.

In addition, DIAC concluded from specially commissioned ANU research that:

There is a range of NOM levels (160,000 to 210,000) which the modelling suggests would have the 'best' impact by 2050 on ageing of the population and the rate of growth of GDP per capita^{xvii}.

Twelve months on, our policy proposals on population were clearly not as extreme as was reported at the time. Rather we appear to have forecast the rational and responsible policy consensus now emerging.

The issue now is how net overseas migration, and more specifically temporary migration, is being managed – or rather not being managed.

Australia currently has a sizeable informal temporary labour market.

According to the ABS^{xviii}, in 2007/08, the working holiday and student visa programme accounted for 45% of net overseas migration. This is larger than net migration from our permanent migration programme and New Zealand sources combined.

When the Government announced major changes to education visas in February 2010 it wasn't just the education sector who gulped.

The changes to student visas highlighted just how dependent certain parts of our economy had become on labour from non skilled temporary visas holders.

It also highlighted a further weakness in the system, where overseas students trained in Australia in areas of skills shortage were not translating into skilled migrants working in these occupations. Instead they were competing with Australians for jobs elsewhere in the economy.

A case in point was chefs and cooks.

According to DEEWR there has been a shortage of chefs and cooks in Australia every year for the past ten years at least^{xix}. They remain in shortage today. We have trained thousands of international students in Australia to become chefs and cooks, however once they received their permanent visa , they left the industry and our kitchens.

Now we have the absurd situation where chefs are cooks are no longer recognised on our skilled occupation list, to close an immigration loophole, yet we still need chefs and cooks!

The alternative is to apply greater conditionality to skilled visa holders.

Our immigration programme is designed to serve our national economic interests. If we have granted residency on a temporary or even longer term basis for a particular purpose, are we now prepared to say that you must live in a particular location and perform a particular occupation as a condition of your stay to achieve that purpose, with no guarantee of a further stay?

Are we prepared to make this the rule, rather than the exception, as is currently the case – and are we prepared to enforce it?

These are threshold questions that will determine the role immigration policy, and in particularly temporary labour, will play in serving labour force needs in the future.

We have long recognised the fact that global capital is mobile. The same is true for labour and it is a competitive market.

Peter Goode from Transfield Services recently remarked:

“the foreign workers that we may have been looking to tap are now going to be pursued not just by us, but also by the other corridors of growth that are going on in the world in those sector”.

The advantage of temporary migration is that it can boost productivity and allow our labour force to expand and contract, to cope with shocks to the system, positive and negative, without impacting on longer term employment prospects for our core population, and where inflows and outflows are balanced over time, mitigate against longer term population legacies.

Temporary labour migration also supports businesses that depend on these positions being filled for their ongoing viability, equally protecting and sustaining the jobs of Australians who work in these enterprises.

The National Resources Sector Employment Taskforce^{xx} reported the resources sector could be 36,000 tradespeople short by 2015, and advocated the establishment of 'Enterprise migration Agreements' for mega resource projects. This recommendation has been accepted by the Government, and is supported by the Coalition. However, this should not conclude the debate.

The more significant challenge of large lumpy projects is not just their direct labour needs. It is also the significant downstream impacts, in the form a labour vacuums and wage pressures, created by the drawing effect of these projects, elsewhere in the economy.

The announcement for the resources sector is welcome, but it leaves the rest of business around the country, especially small business, continuing to suffer under the government's union driven closed shop on 457 visas, particularly for trade skills and semi skilled occupations, where shortages continue.

In 2010 DEEWR^{xxi} reported a five percentage point decline in the proportion of vacancies filled in trade and technical occupations and that the number of suitable applicants per vacancy had fallen from 2.3. to 1.5.

At the same time DIAC^{xxii} reported that between 2007/08 and 2009/10 the number of 457s granted to tradespersons and related workers fell by 65%, compared to 36% for all occupations. Similarly large declines were experienced in mining (down 49%), manufacturing (down 65%), utilities (down 48%) and hospitality (down 69%).

Amazingly the largest declines in 457 grants were in the growth states of Queensland and Western Australia, which each fell by more than 50% between 2007/08 and 2009/10. These types of outcomes cannot be explained away by the GFC. It is the product of union driven system changes that have locked these occupations, states and sectors out of the 457 programme.

Labor have been allowing the 457 visa programme to wither on the vine.

Since May 2009 all occupations in ANZCO 5-7 have required a Labour Agreement. This includes most semi skilled trades.

A Labour Agreement can take up to 161 days or more to be accepted for agreements customised to meet the needs of a particular enterprise or sector.

Between November 2007 and October 2010 only 80 agreements were considered by DIAC and only 19 approved. In 2009-10, less than 1.5% of 457 visas were granted under a labour agreement and out of 59 requests by employers for a labour agreement, only 8 were approved in that year.

In addition, the introduction of the universal Temporary Skilled Migration Income Threshold of \$47,480, combined with the abolition of regional concessions for 457s on has locked low skilled occupations and regional areas out of the programme, by establishing an arbitrary and inflexible wage floor.

Many businesses simply give up or no longer bother when it comes to accessing 457s and turn to more informal temporary labour.

We need to have a more integrated strategy on temporary labour migration across the economy, not just for specific projects or sectors.

We need to revisit more liberalised access to 457s for trades and semi skilled occupations and look to reinstate the regional concessions Labor abolished. In the first instance, such liberalisation could be targeted to smaller businesses, or those in critical areas of labour shortage, such as Western Australia and disallow the option to make onshore applications for permanent residence.

There is also a need to revisit the English language test that now requires a score of at least 5 in all four categories of the IELTS test. These tests can be used a little like a non tariff barrier to trade by unions seeking to crash the system as an industrial tactic.

English language skills are important to ensure awareness of compliance with occupational health and safety rules and to support social cohesion. Temporary migrants, whether they are students or workers, can be highly vulnerable to abuse. An understanding of English helps them access services and understand the protections available to them – from renting a flat, understanding the terms of their employment or taking out a loan.

However, our testing programme must be geared to more functional and vocational language skills rather than the one size fits all testing method currently adopted. We use the same test for those applying to undertake postgraduate study from Germany as we do for an abattoir worker from Brazil.

The level of language skills required should also take into account the intended length of stay.

A snow grader who will spend three months in Thredbo talking to little other than their single person operated and maintained snow grader, clearly does not need the same language skills as an industrial engineer from Indonesia who will form part of a highly skilled international team, to develop a major resource project over several years.

For all Labor's talk about skills shortages, they have caved into union demands on 457s, costing Australian businesses and allowing an unregulated temporary labour market to emerge in its place.

Since the last election, I have tasked Senator Cash, as my Parliamentary Secretary for Immigration to develop further policy on skilled migration and we have been on the road consulting with business about 457 reforms. This process is ongoing and we welcome further input.

A Big Community

To paraphrase David Cameron, we believe in a big community, not big government.

By contrast, today's Labor has become the party of big unions, big bureaucracies, big government and often big business. Under Big Labor, there is little room for the individuals, local communities, volunteers, families and small businesses who make up the mob.

The Liberal party provides a strong alternative to Big Labor.

Our preference is to see the levers of power moved from the hands of the few in Canberra, to the many who take on leadership roles in their communities, their businesses, their families and in their own lives.

This year America is celebrating 100 years since the birth of Ronald Reagan. Reagan's practical wisdom has as much to say to Australia today, as he did to America back in 1977 when he told the Conservative Political Action Conference:

We believe that government action should be taken first by the government that resides as close to you as possible.

We also believe that Americans, often acting through voluntary organizations, should have the opportunity to solve many of the social problems of their communities. This spirit of freely helping others .. should be encouraged in every way by government.^{xxiii}

Robert Menzies and John Howard shared this view.

That is why we have advocated policies that seek to put local communities in control of our schools, our hospitals, our community services and local environmental management such as our green corps proposal at the last election.

That is why we do not presume that Government is the best agency to deliver policy programmes. Government's can pay for them – but they don't have to run them. Our Employment Network was ground breaking and led to a revolution and established much needed institutional capacity in the non-government sector.

Today's Mission Australia is a testimony to the social policy reforms of the Howard Government.

Like many liberals I am concerned that any advance of government can lead to a retreat of community. We do not want to see a passive society where we just expect Government to be the answer to every problem. We pay our taxes and then just look the other way.

A successful big community depends critically on strong families and social cohesion.

In that same CPAC speech in 1977 Reagan said;

Families—not government programs—are the best way to make sure our children are properly nurtured, our elderly are cared for, our cultural and spiritual heritages are perpetuated, our laws are observed and our values are preserved.

Thus it is imperative that our government's programs, actions, officials and social welfare institutions never be allowed to jeopardize the family. We fear the government may be powerful enough to destroy our families; we know that it is not powerful enough to replace them

Menzies held the same view. In his Forgotten people radio broadcast in May 1942 he said:

The home is the foundation of sanity and sobriety; it is the indispensable condition of continuity; its health determines the health of society as a whole.^{xxiv}

And it was John Howard that introduced the community based Family Relationship Centres.

Family breakdown is a principal cause of poverty and disadvantage in this country. I can think of no greater national goal than keeping families together.

It is a real concern that according to the Scanlon-Monash Index, social cohesion in Australia has declined by 8.6%, since the Labor Government was elected.

At the launch of the National Multicultural Advisory Council Issues Paper in Melbourne In 1997 John Howard remarked:

“we have been able to absorb people from all around the world because we have tried to deal with people on the basis of their merit and individual qualities, and not according to preconceived notions of what a particular background produces^{xxv}.”

We have a non-discriminatory approach to immigration in this country, excepting when Labor introduced a discriminatory freeze on asylum applications for Afghans and Sri Lankans in 2010. We do this because of our belief that everyone who comes to Australia is attracted by our values as a nation and wants to bring their best to the table and leave the worst behind. We do not see race, religion, nationality or ethnicity as a barrier to this endeavour.

But we all expect that we will all seek to live and participate in a national society that respects these values. Cultural practice, religious belief, ethnic tradition are all secondary to our obligation as national citizens in an inclusive society that abhors segregation in any form.

We acknowledge the value of diversity. However, I believe that recognising and celebrating what unites us as Australians and has sustained us as a nation over generations is more important, and should be the focus of government programmes in this area, whether it is civic education in our schools or through the English language programme provided to new migrants or in the myriad of community and settlement grants provided in this area.

We must continue to be vigilant in this area. Without shared values we are not a nation. Our rights are tenuous and our obligations absent. Our shared national values provide the checks and balances that make Australia work.

To embrace the idea of a shared set of inclusive national values, creates a platform where citizens with different heritage can engage and create a truly integrated society in a great big community.

That is what I learned on the Kokoda track, as Jason Clare and I took young Australians of Lebanese Muslim and Anglo Saxon background on a pilgrimage to discover the Australia they shared, and we all share, in common, and the combined debt we all owe to those who gave us the chance to live this great Australian life.

My record on these matters was walked out on that track over six and half gruelling days. I'm happy for that record to speak for itself.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the people of Australia know where we stand as Liberals. Once upon a time you could say that about the Labor party – but no longer.

They have become a party focussed on securing and holding onto power. This approach found its natural end in NSW last Saturday, and has now found its way to Canberra, where the Gillard Labor government is on the same path, they are the deposed NSW Labor Government on fast forward.

As for the Liberal 3.0 generation now in the parliament – our belief in the individual, a competitive economy and a big community will continue to guide our path – as it did so successfully for Australians in Liberal 1.0 and 2.0 editions under Menzies and Howard.

ⁱ ABS Cat no. 5676.0 – Business Indicators & Cat no. 5651.0 – Company Profits, Australia

ⁱⁱ National Centre for Vocational Education Research, Historical time series of apprenticeships and traineeships in Australia, 1963-2010

ⁱⁱⁱ Commonwealth Treasury, *Intergenerational Report 2007* pxii

^{iv} ABS, *Persons not in the Labour Force*, ABC Catalogue Number 6220.0, September 2010

^v McDonald, P & Temple J, Immigration, *Labour Supply and Per Capita Gross Domestic Product: Australia 2010-2050*, DIAC Research Paper, pp15-18 December 2010

^{vi} Wen, P "Putting all shoulders to the wheel", p8 Business Day, Sydney Morning Herald, March 15, 2011,

^{vii} Menzies, Sir Robert; *Afternoon Light*, p59 Cassell Australia Ltd , 1967

-
- ^{viii} Figure have been rounded. For specific figures see, Phillips J, Klapdor M & Simon Davies, J: *Migration to Australia since federation: a guide to the statistics*, Parliamentary Library , October 2010.
- ^{ix} Markus, Professor A, *Mapping social cohesion, 2009*, Monash Institute for the Study of Global Movements for the Scanlon Foundation
- ^x Phillips J, Klapdor M & Simon Davies, J: *Migration to Australia since federation: a guide to the statistics*, Parliamentary Library , October 2010
- ^{xi} Productivity Commission, *Population and Migration: Understanding the Numbers*. Productivity Commission research paper, December 2010
- ^{xii} ABS Cat no. 3412.0 - Migration, Australia, 2008-09
- ^{xiii} Liberal Party of Australia, *Towards a productive and sustainable population growth path for Australia, 2010*, <http://www.liberal.org.au/~media/Files/Policies%20and%20Media/National%20Security/100429%20Coalition%20Policy%20Directions%20Paper.ashx>
- ^{xiv} Liberal Party of Australia, *the Coalition's Policy for Population and Immigration, 2010*, <http://www.liberal.org.au/~media/Files/Policies%20and%20Media/National%20Security/0725x30LPAPopulationandImmigrationPolicy.ashx>
- ^{xv} ABS Cat no. 3101.0 – Australian Demographic Statistics, Sep 2010
- ^{xvi} Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities, *A sustainable population strategy for Australia, Issues paper and appendices 2010*
- ^{xvii} DIAC, Statement by Policy Innovation, Research and Evaluation Unit, December 2010 regarding *Labour Supply and Per Capita Gross Domestic Product: Australia 2010-2050*, DIAC Research Paper, pp15-18 December 2010
- ^{xviii} ABS Cat no. 3412.0 - Migration, Australia, 2008-09
- ^{xix} Indicative Skill Shortage Ratings – 1986-2010, Department Education, Employment and Workplace Relations, http://www.deewr.gov.au/Employment/LMI/SkillShortages/Documents/AUS_1986_2010.pdf
- ^{xx} Resourcing the Future: National Resources Sector Employment Taskforce Report, July 2010
- ^{xxi} Skill Shortage Summary 2010, Department Education, Employment and Workplace Relations, http://www.deewr.gov.au/Employment/LMI/SkillShortages/Documents/SKILL_SHORTAGES_SUMMARY_FINAL.pdf
- ^{xxii} DIAC, Sub Class 457 Business (Long Stay) State Territory Summary Report, 2007-2008; 2009-2010
- ^{xxiii} Reagan, R, address to the Conservative Political Action Conference, Washington, DC, February 6, 1977, <http://www.conservative.org/cpac/archives/cpac-1977-ronald-reagan/#ixzz1GWy2xLQGhttp://www.conservative.org/cpac/archives/cpac-1977-ronald-reagan/#ixzz1GWwUe973>
- ^{xxiv} Menzies, Sir Robert, *The Forgotten People*, Radio Broadcast, 22 May 1942, <http://www.menziesvirtualmuseum.org.au/transcripts/ForgottenPeople/Forgotten1.html>

^{xxv} Howard, Hon J, *Multicultural Australia; The Way Forward*, Address at the launch of the National Multicultural Advisory Council Issues Paper, Melbourne Town Hall, 11 December 1997