




Speech By
Robbie Katter

MEMBER FOR TRAEGER

Record of Proceedings, 23 August 2018

MOTION

Immigration

 **Mr KATTER** (Traeger—KAP) (3.27 pm): I move the following amendment—

That all words after 'pursued' be omitted and the following words inserted—

'broadly non-discriminatory immigration and visa policies which have had both costs and benefits for Australians;

3. give its unambiguous and unqualified commitment to the principle that the Australian people have the right to discriminate against those who want to enter our great nation to favour persecuted minorities and people who will make a positive contribution and not undermine our values, rights as workers and public safety; and
4. support the right of Australians to have the ultimate say on who enters our country through a plebiscite.'

I would like to thank the government for moving this motion, because it gives me and the KAP an opportunity to provide some clarity on this debate. We can try to have a mature debate about this instead of the name-calling and labelling we have experienced. It has really been sensationalised through the media. Much of it lends itself to interpretation, which has obviously not been to the benefit of our position. I appreciate that many of the contributions have been very heartfelt and I sincerely acknowledge that. I would agree with most of the things that have been said here, but I think there is a disconnect between what we are trying to communicate and what is being challenged.

I believe that most of the outcomes people are talking about would be achieved through the policy of the KAP. That is our primary position. This will give me a chance to explain what our position is. If you are offended by that I am sorry, but I think I am a pretty open-minded person. No-one here holds the mortgage on existing in a multicultural community, because I certainly do in Mount Isa.

Much of this debate has been stifled by cheap labelling. Presenting an alternative view immediately conjures up labelling and a binary response. In my view, many of the words used by politicians and the media were quite shallow and opportunistic. Sadly, that plays a big role in modern politics. Let's unpack some of these issues to provide some clarity.

No-one has said that we want a White Australia policy. I do not know how many times we have to say that. I still get it every time I walk around: 'That's what you guys want.' That has been a misinterpretation of our position. No-one is trying to impute values of Nazi Germany. I think they were words that were used. People can make their own interpretation on that. Of course I agree that the concept of that is abhorrent. We could debate for hours whether there was intent to use that or not.

Another criticism was made about the comments being anti-Semitic. Since that statement we have received a message of support to the effect: 'Thanks for supporting us because we're having problems with aggression and assault in Australia based on ethnicity.' I think it is a bit ambiguous in that we are being accused of something while that same community is saying, 'Thanks for your support on this.'

Seventy-five per cent of people out there have not necessarily said that they agree with our position—I grant you that—but have said that there needs to be a debate and people should be allowed to have their say on this issue without being chastised. There is strong support out there for people having the freedom to talk about this issue. I think that is what we as politicians should be doing.

Mr Power: We don't agree with you. We've got to say it.

Mr KATTER: I take the interjection of the member for Logan. It is fine if you do not agree, but the name-calling and labelling by people shows a loss of objectivity on the matter.

The most primary tangible outcome that was espoused in the speech was that we should have a plebiscite on immigration. That was also qualified by the comment that we should all be prepared to live with the consequences of the results of it. If that is what people want, that is great.

Our policy says that we would like to promote an immigration policy that has Judaeo-Christian values. Egalitarianism promotes the ability to prosper regardless of class. Judaeo-Christian values promote looking after the poor and helping your fellow man. Immigration should favour the persecuted, not the persecutors, and we should somehow reconcile intake with job growth.

(Time expired)