



Speech by

**Hon. KEN HAYWARD**

**MEMBER FOR KALLANGUR**

---

Hansard 7 December 1999

**FORESTRY AMENDMENT BILL**

**Hon. K. W. HAYWARD** (Kallangur—ALP) (9.57 p.m.): The South-East Queensland Regional Forest Agreement, signed by the State Government, the timber industry and conservationists, will create hundreds of jobs while preserving areas of high conservation value. It is the outcome of two years of negotiation. It is the outcome of a lot of hard work. When considering issues concerning conservationists and the timber industry, we are not talking about natural allies. We are not talking about people who, in normal circumstances, get along with each other. But in this case, an agreement has been negotiated.

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr HAYWARD:** And don't members opposite hate it! They hate it because they hoped that a deal would never be done. They did not want to see certainty. They wanted to create an air of uncertainty. They wanted to be able to go around south-east Queensland, and the rest of Queensland for that matter—

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Ms Nelson-Carr): Order! If I am to hear what the member is saying, I need more quiet in the Chamber.

**Mr HAYWARD:** Members opposite wanted to be able to go around Queensland saying, "Look, this State Government can't put this deal together." But the fact is that the deal has been put together. And what happened then? Because members opposite never thought for one minute that the deal would be done, they never involved themselves in the process.

Those opposite thought there would be a problem here and a stuff-up there. They thought that this Government could not do it. Those opposite woke up one morning and the deal was done and they found themselves completely on the back foot because they had dealt themselves out of the process.

Mr Cooper said something along the lines, "We are not going to do sleazy deals with the Greens behind closed doors just for the sake of a few lousy preferences." Let history speak for itself. Everyone knows that

Mr Cooper is capable of doing sleazy deals because the courts have shown that.

**Mr COOPER:** I rise to a point of order. I think the honourable member has been on the meths. I take offence at the honourable member's remarks. They are false and offensive and I ask that they be withdrawn.

**Mr HAYWARD:** I withdraw. The honourable member for Crows Nest can talk about a sleazy deal, but those opposite would have done a deal if they had the opportunity. Let us not kid ourselves, because history shows that those opposite are capable of negotiating deals with all sorts of divers groups in our society. They are quite capable of negotiating deals with the Greens. I know that from personal experience because I have been in an election campaign where the Greens have given their preferences to my conservative opponent. So it should not be said that the coalition is not capable of doing deals, because I know that it is.

Members can ask anyone who knew anything about the 1995 election about deals being done with the Greens. Let us not kid ourselves that, somehow, there is a group of people lurking on the other side of the House who are incapable of doing a deal, because if they are incapable of doing a deal, they will remain in Opposition for a long time. I will be pleased to see that.

Our society is about doing deals. Our society is about working through problems. That is how one operates in our society. That is how one gets people from the timber industry and the conservationists to come together. One is able to work through the problems. As one comes to a problem, one either ticks it off or puts it to one side and says, "We will come back to that one later." It is a matter of trading things off. That is what has happened in this case.

The dumb thing about this issue is that those opposite come from a million miles behind because they did not think an agreement could be reached. The problem for the coalition is that the timber industry, the conservationists and the community in general have given this measure strong support. As I said, those opposite hate the thought of an agreement being reached. Now they have to hunt around and see if they can scavenge a few people who are not happy about things. Those opposite will have to jump on their tram and say, "This is what has happened; these people were not part of it." The reality is that things have moved on. The deal has been done.

**Mr Cooper:** A sleazy deal.

**Mr HAYWARD:** Earlier, the member for Crows Nest asked that I withdraw certain remarks. He is the same person who referred—

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Ms Nelson-Carr): Order! Will the honourable member for Crows Nest please refrain from using unparliamentary language.

**Mr HAYWARD:** The member for Crows Nest spoke about sleazy deals. The reality is that this deal cannot be construed as such. People who had conflicting objectives were at the table. They had their say and the deal was done. It must be acknowledged that getting these people together to forge an agreement was a difficult thing to do. I know those opposite do not accept that, but let us accept for one minute that it is not an easy thing to do. The agreement has been reached. Those opposite should give some credit where credit is due.

The coalition is no longer part of the game. The important thing is that this agreement provides some certainty. If one gets in a car and drives from Caboolture to Kilkivan or Biggenden, one soon finds that people want some certainty in their community. The Minister and his staff have put in the hard work and, with the conservationists and representatives of the timber industry, they have been able to produce a result.

I am sure that not everyone walked away from the table and said, "I got what I wanted", but they got something. The most important thing that people received was certainty for the timber industry and certainty for the conservation groups. Most importantly, a lot of people employed in the industry received job certainty. The central element of this new forestry agreement is hundreds of new jobs.

**Mr Stephan:** Where are they?

**Mr HAYWARD:** Let us look at the new jobs. We have an increase of 425,000 hectares in the amount of native forest which will be protected from logging. Logging of native forests will end by the year 2024. It is very difficult to negotiate such a result, but it has been done. This agreement has provided a 25-year wood supply in the form of a sales permit which ends in the year 2024.

**Mr Cooper:** That's not enough—25 years.

**Mr HAYWARD:** From the honourable member's interjection, I can see that he is at least conceding the point that that bit of certainty is there.

**An Opposition member** interjected.

**Mr HAYWARD:** Those opposite are saying that it is 25 years but it should have been 35 years. If those opposite had played some role in the initial negotiations instead of sitting on the sideline and stirring up apathy in the community—

**An Opposition member** interjected.

**Mr HAYWARD:** It could have been sheer laziness, but I am passing it off as apathy. What would have happened is that the Opposition would have been able to play a role in the negotiations. As I said earlier, those opposite really come at this game from a long way behind. The score is 15-nil before they even get on the field. The reality is that they cannot catch up because the agreement has been reached. All they can do is try to grab hold of a couple of players who might not have fitted into things and somehow jump on their tram.

This Bill is designed to implement provisions for the critical long-term security and certainty of the forest and timber industry for Queensland and for Queensland rural and regional communities. This is extremely important. Those opposite will scream and yell, but one must look at what they were doing when they were in Government. They did nothing.

**Mr Cooper:** Sensible, practical solutions.

**Mr HAYWARD:** Sensible, practical nothing! Those opposite had a do-nothing approach to this—

**An Opposition member** interjected.

**Mr HAYWARD:** If those opposite were doing all this, where was the agreement and where was the work? If the coalition had done the work, the next Government would not be able to undo that work. Those opposite were prepared to go along and maintain the air of uncertainty. They did it so well that they brought the One Nation Party members into this House. Those characters would not be here if

coalition members had not run around and created uncertainty. The coalition either would not deliver or it could not deliver. The Labor Government is delivering. Those opposite take the attitude that they oppose this legislation, although I am getting the impression that they are arguing, "It is 25 years, but it should be 35 years." In that sense, the Opposition is basically accepting what the Government is talking about. One could not get that impression from what the shadow Minister said in his response to the Minister's second-reading speech.

**Mr Cooper** interjected.

**Mr HAYWARD:** No, I tried to make sense of the shadow Minister's speech, but it was very difficult. I read, "We were not going to do sleazy deals behind closed doors with the Greens just for the sake of a few lousy preferences", and next to that I wrote, "Would if they could". Let us not muck around, we all know that.

The South-East Queensland Regional Forest Agreement will cost more than \$80m to implement fully. I do not think that anyone opposite is disputing that. They have all accepted that! This is amazing stuff! We are finding some common ground. We have agreed to 25 years and we have now agreed to the cost of \$80m. To contribute to that cost, the State Government is seeking up to \$36m from the coalition Government in Canberra. That is where we need some support from the members opposite. We need a united front from Queensland for this contribution from the Federal Government. I am sure I heard the shadow Minister say that he agreed that the cost would be more than \$80m. We have now moved on to seeking up to \$36m from the coalition Government in Canberra. So why could the members opposite not use their influence with their colleagues in Canberra so that they would realise how important it is, and how desperate Queensland is, to get this \$36m so that we can fix up the Regional Forest Agreement? When the \$36m is put in the tin, then \$80m will get pumped into these local communities. That is so important.

I say to members opposite that, by not taking on Canberra, they run the risk of being labelled supporters of Canberra. As Mr Cooper knows, the problem is that if the members opposite keep saying that they support what the coalition decided to do in Canberra, come a State election, they are going to wear it.

**Mr Cooper** interjected.

**Mr HAYWARD:** Then why is not the member opposite in Canberra saying to his colleagues, "We on this side of the House do not agree completely with everything, but we agree with a couple of things, and one of those things is that it is going to cost \$80m."?

**Mr Cooper:** You said that; I didn't.

**Mr HAYWARD:** I thought that the member agreed with that figure. The member must agree that it will cost something.

**Mr Seeney** interjected.

**Mr HAYWARD:** The next thing the member is going to tell me is that Lennox Lewis cannot box. Fair dinkum! It is very difficult to have a logical discussion with somebody who simply says, "I do not agree with anything that you say." Even if the members opposite do not agree with what I am saying, they should think about this: there will be a State election coming up soon and, in the lead-up to that election, one of the things that the members opposite are going to have say is that they did not go out to get \$36m for Queensland. They did not chase after their colleagues in Canberra for the money. No, they took the view that they would oppose the Labor Government in Queensland and support their colleagues in Canberra. I know that, when the member for Callide drives along that road to Kilkivan up through Monto, the last thing that the people in those areas want to hear is that they were duded by somebody in Canberra. Even if it is half true, it is the last thing that those people want to hear. The member opposite knows that, because he is the master—

**Mr Seeney** interjected.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Ms Nelson-Carr): Order! The member for Callide is interjecting from other than his correct seat.

**Mr HAYWARD:** I think that he is thinking about moving in the course of the—

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** It might be an idea if the member for Callide resumed his correct seat.

**Mr HAYWARD:** The member has not quite moved to that seat yet. At this point, he is just getting used to that seat. I am sure that Mr Cooper would agree that the member should be given the opportunity to get used to the seat.

**Mr Cooper:** Not a problem at all.

**Mr HAYWARD:** Exactly. I agree. However, when the member for Callide is the shadow Minister and in the lead-up to the State election he goes around and says, "We didn't work our butts off to get \$36m from Canberra. We didn't bother to do that. The Labor Government in Queensland tried that. We don't agree with what they did", people will ask, "What about the money?" Then the member will have to say, "No, we didn't do that. We just thought that Canberra could hold the money." He will have no hope of surviving the electoral contest, because if he is seen going around defending the Federal Government—and I know this because I have been in this Parliament when there has been a Federal

Labor Government; let us not kid ourselves and live in dream time—the member will live with it, too, long and hard. That is what is going to happen: the member will be seen as not standing up for Queensland. The members opposite should forget the logic, forget the arguments—forget everything—they will be seen as not standing up for Queensland. It is not a matter of whether the members opposite are right or wrong—in this case, they are wrong—it is a matter of the members opposite digging a really deep ditch for themselves, because they did not stand up for Queensland. When they travel from Brisbane to Cairns, out through Kilkivan, up through Monto to Biggenden and they do not stand up for Queensland, they can forget winning the next election. It is as simple as that.

The problem with the Queensland National and Liberal Parties is that they have failed to do anything to help to obtain Federal funding to help implement the agreement. For what it is worth, my advice is that the members opposite could oppose the agreement, but whatever they do, they should not oppose getting the money. When the members opposite oppose getting the money, they are then seen to be not standing up for Queensland. I need not give the members opposite any advice; they are determined to stay seated on the opposition side. That is good. I do not particularly want to interfere with that. However, it strikes me as incredibly illogical of the Opposition in Queensland to not do that. It does not matter what the One Nation members and the Independents do; they do not fit into the process much anymore. However, if the members opposite threaten to create more uncertainty, then they give those members a window of opportunity to have some influence.

That is okay. We will see what happens down the track. It is important to note that the State Government is implementing the plan. However, in order to implement that plan, which is estimated to cost more than \$80m, we need that Federal Government support. There is a chance for the Opposition to demonstrate its commitment to Queensland and provide that important support. I suggest to members opposite that they get on the phone and lobby their colleagues in Canberra. They should tell their colleagues that they want the money coming to Queensland. If the members opposite do not tell their colleagues that they want the money coming to Queensland, come the next State election, they are going to be punished by their constituents, and they are going to be punished so severely that they will continue to remain in Opposition. The members opposite are going to be punished also for failing to produce a plan. They have failed to put forward ideas to resolve this important issue. Through their failure to do so, the members opposite have shown that they are anti-timber industry and anti-timberworkers. Most importantly, their failure to do so is anti-Queensland. The members opposite will be punished for that at the next State election.

---