



Speech by

**Dr DAVID WATSON**

**MEMBER FOR MOGGILL**

---

Hansard 10 April 2002

**ELECTORAL[RESIGNATION OF MEMBERS] AMENDMENT BILL**

**Dr WATSON** (Moggill—Lib) (10.06 p.m.): I was not intending to speak on this bill, because the member for Robina has already explained why the Liberal Party will not be supporting it. The Attorney-General made some excellent remarks in his contribution. I warmly applaud the statesmanlike fashion in which he explained why this bill should be opposed in this House.

I join the member for Southern Downs in saying that I think your contribution, Mr Deputy Speaker, as the member for Hervey Bay, and also that of the member for Stafford were very significant. Unfortunately, I think they stood in stark contrast to a couple of other contributions made in this place. I cannot let those contributions go by without saying something.

Firstly, I was moved to make some comments after the snivelling and condescending remarks made by the member for Indooroopilly—I am glad he is back in the chamber—about the former member for Ryan, John Moore. I wish to put three facts on the record. The member for Indooroopilly will never, ever make the contribution to Indooroopilly that John Moore made to the electorate of Ryan. Secondly, he will never, ever make the contribution to the Labor Party that John Moore made to the Queensland Liberal Party. Thirdly, the member for Indooroopilly will never make the contribution to this state and nation that John Moore made as a senior cabinet minister in a federal government.

I will outline a couple of the things that John Moore did as a senior minister in his last six years, none of which will be matched by the honourable member. As industry minister, John Moore had the political fortitude, nous and seniority within the federal parliament to take on Treasury and talk about change in the car industry in this country. If members want to find out what he did, they should ask some of their union members in Victoria and South Australia about what those changes meant for their jobs. To a large extent, the reason why we have a competitive car industry exporting hundreds of millions of dollars worth of vehicles a year is because John Moore—

**Mr Purcell:** John Button.

**Dr WATSON:** John Button did a great job, but there was pressure from Treasury a few years ago and John Moore made a significant contribution to the development and sustainability of the car industry in this country.

**Mr Purcell:** Is this relevant to the debate?

**Dr WATSON:** It is. It is as relevant to the debate as was the contribution by the member for Indooroopilly, and you should know that.

The second very important contribution made by John Moore was something that those opposite ought to remember because time and time again in this place I hear the Premier talking about the Smart State and the biotechnology revolution. Let me tell honourable members that one of the aspects of the biotechnology revolution is the Institute for Molecular Bioscience at the University of Queensland. That was started by a contribution by the Queensland coalition government of \$15 million. We managed to get the federal government to match that contribution. John Moore was instrumental in getting that contribution. Beyond that, John Moore was the minister who was responsible for the CSIRO, and the CSIRO contributed about 50 per cent of the cost of that development.

When the honourable member for Indooroopilly talks about his electorate and the contributions that he might make, I want to see what he does at some time in the future. However, I do not believe that he will last long in this place. I want to see the honourable member make a contribution to this

state of the magnitude of the establishment of the Institute for Molecular Bioscience at the University of Queensland.

I could refer to developments in my own electorate. I refer particularly to the CSIRO at Pinjarra Hills. John Moore had an input into that. The member for Indooroopilly will never be in a position to make the same type of contribution.

As Minister for Defence, John Moore was responsible for the reconsideration of the Collins class submarine. The Collins class submarine project was established by Labor's pretend Prime Minister, Kim Beazley, when he was Minister for Defence. A supposed cost of \$1 billion blew out when the Labor Government was in office to \$4 billion. That project did not have any chance of succeeding without significant change and modification. The review was undertaken by John Prescott and Malcolm McIntosh under the direction of John Moore as Minister for Defence. The review was undertaken in an effort to ensure that the Collins class submarine would assist Australia's defence effort. That was John Moore's contribution.

I listened to the condescending comments made by the member for Indooroopilly. I say to him that he will never make the contribution that John Moore made. In the Liberal Party I am well known for not being particularly close to John Moore. He and I had many arguments in the organisational sense when I was federal member for Forde and he was federal member for Ryan. It continued when I was member for Moggill. Two-thirds of my electorate is in the electorate of Ryan.

There is no way in the wide world that the honourable member for Indooroopilly should denigrate the contribution made by John Moore. The member for Indooroopilly has been in this House for only three or four months. When he is here for 25 years—and he will not be—I would like to compare his record as a senior minister with John Moore's record. I guarantee he will never get there.

The contributions made by the Attorney-General, the member for Stafford, the Deputy Speaker, the member for Hervey Bay and the member for Glasshouse were in stark contrast to that of the member for Indooroopilly.

In some respects, the member for Southern Downs has already covered some of the points I wanted to make. This bill did not deserve a partisan attack by an individual—particularly someone who has only been here for a couple of months. It was an attack on people that he probably does not know and does not understand.

I was here when Tom Burns left and the current Minister for Innovation and Information Economy took his place in a very controversial selection process. We all respected Tom Burns and we did not say that he should stick around. Bob Gibbs left under circumstances that I thought were questionable. However, that does not mean that Bob Gibbs cannot make a significant contribution in his current position in Los Angeles. Irrespective of what we might have said in his chamber, Bob Gibbs had a lot of talent and he was a senior minister. Bob Hawke left and Paul Keating left. We can cover both sides of the political spectrum.

This bill did not deserve a partisan attack. It deserves serious consideration. The Attorney-General set the example in that regard. That is the standard of debate that we should have had. It is the standard of debate that we ought to expect in this place. I congratulate you, Mr Deputy Speaker, on your contribution.