




Speech By  
**Hon. Jarrod Bleijie**

**MEMBER FOR KAWANA**

---

**INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS (MANDATORY CODE OF PRACTICE FOR  
OUTWORKERS) REPEAL NOTICE: DISALLOWANCE MOTION**

 **Hon. JP BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (8.59 pm): So passionate is the member for Mulgrave that he cannot stand on his feet and talk with passion without reading, word for word. They are the most over resourced opposition. Someone out the back wrote his speech. As members know, he was not on the list to speak tonight. What happened is that, tonight at the start of the debate on this disallowance motion, I questioned why, with all their passion about this subject, they had only two members speaking in the debate. So the Leader of the Opposition ran out the back and got the whip—whoever their whip is—to get at least one other speaker. The member spoke so passionately on this subject, but he could not talk about it without his speaking notes.

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Watts): Order!

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I was about to call order to my members. I had prepared a great speech that I was going to deliver tonight, but I am going to suspend the speech and talk passionately about why we are doing this. We believe in business in this state. We believe in red-tape reduction in this state. We believe in cutting Labor Party green tape. We do not believe, as the Labor Party does, in strangling business to the core. If there is one thing that this government can do for business and employees in this state, it is to actually make sure there is a thriving business so that there are jobs. What the Labor Party has continually done, year in year out, is strangle businesses so much that they fold.

**Mr Costigan:** More road blocks than main roads.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I take the interjection from the honourable member. They strangle business in this state, which means that the business folds, the business collapses, the business owner is worse off and the employee does not have a job.

Let us cut straight to the chase: why is this code of practice in there in the first place? It is because the thugs in the union movement told the Labor Party to do it. That is exactly right. The member for Woodridge is sitting over there. She is probably the patron of the textile union—someone give me the acronym, please. That thuggish union has suddenly written to the opposition leader with such concern that the member for Woodridge is also concerned now. This came in in 2011, as we discussed in this place today. It was all about their government's Queensland tomorrow agenda, the Q2 agenda. It was all about making sure those in the unions were protected. The mob opposite is living in the twentieth century. If anything mentions an employee or an employer, they put out the WorkChoice fear factor and claim it is an attack on the rights of workers in Queensland.

The best thing a worker can have is a business that makes money so that they can keep their job and stay employed. We will ensure that workers in the textile manufacturing and footwear industry are protected. How will we do that? By supporting the federal legislation that was introduced by none other than Bill Shorten. In Queensland we have this mandatory code that has put 31 pages of regulation and red tape on industry. I refer honourable members to the 22 March speech by Mr Bill

Shorten when introducing legislation to—guess what? Protect the rights of those in this industry at the federal level. In that speech, under the heading ‘Existing protections’, he states—

The government’s Fair Work Act already contains a number of important protections for TCF outworkers—including scope for awards to include targeted ‘outworker’ terms, and enhanced right of entry arrangements.

Members should remember that this is a federal bill introduced by a federal minister. He goes on—

Key features of this bill

Although most jurisdictions have recognised that special measures for outworkers are required, there is no single uniform approach to regulation across our nation. That means that outworkers have inconsistent levels of protection across Australia.

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** No, members will be interested in this. I am quoting their union thug mate, Bill Shorten. He goes on—

That is why our Gillard government is committed to developing—

**Ms Palaszczuk** interjected.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I will table the speech for them, so they can all have a bit of bedtime reading tonight. He goes on—

That is why our Gillard government is committed to developing arrangements to ensure all TCF outworkers are engaged under secure, safe and fair systems of work.

The government’s intention is to achieve this by implementing nationally consistent rights to legal redress and protection.

The bill implements that commitment by—

And he goes on. In this debate we are saying that the former Labor Party government introduced this mandatory code—it is a mandatory code, not a mandatory code—and we are repealing it because there are the requisite levels of protection at a federal level that now are not necessary at a state level.

**An honourable member:** You support the Fair Work Act; that is wonderful.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** Whether I support what the Bolsheviks do in Canberra is a matter of debate.

**Mr Pitt:** You just said you supported it.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** No, I did not. I said I was quoting the Bolshevik from Canberra. I thought if I was using the words of Solomon, their good mate Bill Shorten in Canberra, they would have been listening intently to the debate.

**Mr Stevens:** He won’t take over the leadership.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I take the interjection from the honourable Leader of the House.

**Mr Stevens:** He’s got no ticker.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** Shorten has no ticker to take over the leadership, although members will be interested to know that today I did hear through the grapevine of Channel 9 that Simon Crean might be the dark horse. Simon Crean might be coming up through the middle. We know the Labor Party do not want Gillard. We know they do not want Rudd. We know that mob over there do not want Rudd. They are going to bring up Simon Crean from the middle. Members opposite can rest assured that his office has dismissed that entirely. They have no fear of Simon Crean coming back as leader. One thing is for sure: Julia Gillard will not last much longer.

**Ms Palaszczuk:** We are talking about the code. That’s what the topic is.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I take the interjection from the honourable opposition leader about the code. I am pretty sure for the first few minutes of her contribution she said nothing about the code, but used the opportunity to get whatever she could in there.

**Ms Palaszczuk:** You’re talking about federal politics.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** Yes, I am talking about federal politics. The reason I am talking about federal politics is because their federal Labor counterparts introduced the legislation that I am relying on to protect the outworkers, therefore, we can repeal the code and help Queensland businesses. We can help businesses. We are a government that is unapologetic about getting Queensland back on track. The way we do that is by getting out of the way of business. I say this: the Labor Party’s idea of economics in this state was about control. There is a level of economics. There is a low level of economics and, as someone once said, everyone rises to their own level.

**Mr Stevens:** Labornomics.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** There is Labornomics. There is the famous quote that everyone rises to their own level of incompetence and certainly the Labor Party reached that some years ago. On a serious note, the answer to reform in Queensland by the socialists opposite was taxation.

**Mr Stevens:** Selling assets.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** It was selling assets without telling people. Their answer was also to tell businesses how to run their own businesses in this state. They increased taxes. Everything the Labor Party did—

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I take all their interjections because they want to talk about anything but the code tonight. We had more members speaking on this disallowance motion than the people moving the disallowance motion. It shows one of two things. Either they are not interested in what they are doing or what they are talking about or they are too lazy to get seven members talking on this most important matter that three of them talked so passionately about.

**Ms Palaszczuk** interjected.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I take the interjection from the opposition leader—why do we have limited speakers as well? It is not our disallowance motion. The point is this: when the Labor Party reform business in Queensland it always leads to further taxation on businesses, more red tape for businesses and more regulation for businesses and therefore businesses close down in Queensland. This is about ways that we as a government can get out of the way of business in Queensland.

We recognise duplication. We recognise inefficiencies. We recognise when there is absolute duplication. All the protections afforded by this code are afforded at a federal level. The federal law is currently there. Whether or not I support the current federal Fair Work Act, as the Manager of Opposition Business refers to, is not the point of the debate. The point of the debate is that the federal law is there and as such that is why we can repeal this mandatory code.

The opposition is completely entitled to move this disallowance motion. They have a couple on the agenda. They are totally entitled to have this debate. We are enjoying the opportunity to participate in this debate tonight because it does allow us the opportunity to explain why the government is going down the route it is going down.

As I said, it is all about reducing red tape for business in Queensland. It is about untangling the regulation and the green tape around business. We should look at what this government has done in the last 12 months. My honourable colleague the environment minister has, in the last few weeks, introduced legislation to reduce green tape. We heard the Premier has doorknocked the businesses in Ashgrove and talked to motor dealers about how they are saving thousands and thousands of dollars with respect to licence application fees. We have heard from the honourable Premier how he engaged in that debate in his electorate of Ashgrove last Friday. I am not anticipating debate, but the liquor licence laws that I have introduced will save community groups across this state hundreds of thousands of dollars.

When we say we are serious about reducing regulation, red tape, green tape, we mean it. We are not the Labor Party. We are not anything like the Labor Party. When we say we are going to do something, we will do it. We will not say that we are looking at it. We will not say we will attend to it. We say we are going to do it and we get on with the job and do it. We do not backflip on these things.

We had a clear commitment that we were going to reduce regulation and red tape in this state by at least 20 per cent. I am glad to see that all honourable ministers are on their way to achieving that target. In my own portfolio I have 20,000 pages of legislation.

**A government member** interjected.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** The environment minister has a few pages hanging around—green tape. There is an immense capacity not only in the Department of Justice and Attorney-General but other departments to really look at this issue. We can look at the PAMDA legislation—the Property Agents and Motor Dealers Act. We have released draft bills. Not only have we released draft bills, but we actually rely on what those in industry tell us—the people on the ground, the people who actually work in the industry, the people who know the industry, the people on the ground making a quid from their businesses and running their businesses and employing local Queenslanders. We in government do not stand up in this place and say we know it all.

What they tell us is that they cannot handle any more regulation in this state. We say to those in the industry affected by PAMDA, the Property Agents and Motor Dealers Act, 'Here is the draft bill. Before we introduce it to parliament you come back to us and tell us how we can further reduce the regulation and red tape in the property industry in Queensland.' We are empowering local industry to

participate in this reform agenda. This is a once in a lifetime, once in a generation opportunity to reform all regulation in this state and reduce regulation in this state.

To show how much the Labor Party believed in this mandatory code, they introduced this code in January 2011 and by November they were reviewing the code. They introduced it in January and then they announced an internal review in November. Not a year went by where the government that introduced the code was not reviewing it. I will tell members why they reviewed it. It was not because the TCF union came to them and told them to review it. It was because of what business and the employees of those businesses said about the red tape—the nightmare, the additional costs that this had created and the strangulation of business with filling out these unnecessary forms. That is why they reviewed it.

Typical of the Labor Party, they could not review it and get rid of the red tape. They said that they would conduct a review of the administrative arrangements of the code, not the actual guts of the red tape. So when we say to business in Queensland that we are going to reduce red tape and regulation by 20 per cent, get rid of duplication and inefficiency not only in our departments but also out in industry world, we mean it.

I am very glad to see that we have had support, particularly from the chamber of commerce in Queensland, with respect to the repeal of this mandatory code. We know that by getting rid of this code in Queensland protection will still be there for the employees in this particular industry but also businesses can save some \$43,000, as has been quoted by the honourable Minister for Tourism who spoke so passionately about this.

The opposition leader raised the issue of consultation. These codes are put in place and the regulations are put in place. Just as disallowance motions are allowed to be debated in this place, so are governments allowed to repeal unnecessary red tape. So it is okay for the opposition to come in here and say that we are using parliament and they can disallow this motion. That is fine. It is also fine for governments to put forward the repeal of these codes. Then the opposition can have their chance. They have had their chance tonight and they have contributed to this debate.

The great thing about this debate is that all honourable members will be able to go back to their electorates on Friday, including the seven members opposite, and go to their businesses in the TCF industry and say that the parliament has not allowed the disallowance motion and reinforce that this place is about regulation and red-tape reduction. No longer will we stand for the Labor Party strangling business. The member will be able to go back up to Mulgrave and tell all the people up there in the business industry that the shackles have been taken off them, just like Joe Cocker's song *Unchain My Heart*. The chains have been released.

**Mr Stevens** interjected.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I take the interjection from the Leader of the House with a great rendition of the song. You look a bit like Joe Cocker, by the way.

**Mr Stevens:** 'Unchain my heart.'

**Mr RUTHENBERG:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Watts): What is your point of order?

**Mr RUTHENBERG:** I find that singing offensive and ask the member to withdraw.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** It was not a personal comment. I call the Attorney.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** It reminded me of a young person who once sang in this place in 2009—a bit of Shannon Noll, *What about me*. I thought that would be the last time I would hear anyone sing in this place, Mr Deputy Speaker. I thank the Manager of Government Business because I think that was a great rendition. I look forward to watching that on the clips tomorrow.

In conclusion—I cannot beat the conclusion from the honourable Leader of the House—I thank all honourable members for their contribution to this debate tonight. I reinforce that the government will not be supporting the disallowance motion, if it has come as any surprise to all honourable members. We will not be supporting the disallowance motion. We support business in this state, and the employees in this state, who are vitally protected under federal legislation, do not need this code.