




Speech By
Jarrold Bleijie

MEMBER FOR KAWANA

Record of Proceedings, 6 September 2017

LABOUR HIRE LICENSING BILL

 **Mr BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (8.08 pm): This parliament is serious about tackling these issues of exploitation of workers but the bill before the House is not the answer to solving the issue of exploitation of workers. In her closing paragraph the minister said that no-one has anything to fear, that those in the labour hire industry will have nothing to fear from the legislation. That is like telling builders in Queensland that they have nothing to fear from the CFMEU being involved in the building industry in Queensland. Those in the labour hire industry have everything to fear. They have everything to fear from this bill, the CFMEU and the ETU in Queensland.

It is no secret why this bill is being introduced. The minister's job was to negotiate in good faith with the Commonwealth government to work out and solve the issues of exploitation of workers. We now have a bill before the House which no other state and territory is implementing because they recognise that it is a federal responsibility and that the federal government should solve these issues. This bill is about union encouragement before an election. This bill is about donations to the Labor Party. This bill is about preselections. This bill is ensuring that before an election, whenever that may be, this Labor government can tick a box and say the union movement wanted the labour hire legislation to go through and hence it is going through. This exercise is a tick of the box by the Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations.

One only has to look at the committee report that looked into this bill and those stakeholders who submitted and were consulted. There was the Queensland Nurses and Midwives' Union. Surprise, surprise, they support the bill. There was the AMWU; they support the bill. The AMIEU support the bill. United Voice support the bill. The MUA support the bill. All the unions support the bill. Virtually every other stakeholder opposed the bill. Does it not say something that the only supporters of this bill are the union movement and all the other industry stakeholders are opposed to the bill? Does it not say something that the AMWU, which supported this bill in its submissions to the committee, gave \$31,279 to the Labor Party in 2016? Its submission to the committee to support the bill cost \$31,279. It only cost the AMIEU \$16,000, which it donated to the Labor Party in 2016. It cost United Voice a fair amount more to get its support of this bill. It cost United Voice \$245,373 donated to the Labor Party in 2016. It looks like the MUA got it the cheapest. It only had to donate \$11,100 for its support of the ALP in 2016. Is it any wonder the only stakeholders who supported this bill are the union movement that is donating to the Labor Party? That is why the Labor Party wanted this legislation through. With all the speculation of an election around the corner, those opposite have to get this bill ticked off. They are rushing through other bills this week because they need to get the Labour Hire Licensing Bill through. They have done the Industrial Relations Bill. They have ticked that box.

In the minister's diaries there are always meetings and then bills get introduced into parliament. As I have said on numerous occasions, the federal royal commission into union corruption did not go far enough. What a royal commission ought to do in the future in Queensland is look at the union movement and the Queensland Labor Party and the decisions that this government has made over the last three years. That is what a commission of inquiry should look at: the relationship between the decisions the Labor government of Queensland has made and the union movement. Time and time

again we have seen the union movement making donations to the Labor Party and then a week or two later legislation has been dropped into the parliament. Do not tell me and do not fool Queenslanders that those instructions were not given to those Labor ministers at the meeting the two, three or four weeks before. The riding instructions as we all know are issued by the union. There has to be a bigger spotlight on the decisions this Labor government has made, the legislation it has introduced and the influence the union movement has on it. Many people in the media take a big interest when business and Chinese investors donate to political parties. The biggest donors to political parties in Queensland are the union movement and no-one seems to worry or care.

Ms Grace interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection. The minister is about to get the Leader of the House up on a point of order. I will spare the minister the trouble. She is going to say I am not being relevant to the bill. The long title of the bill, to assist the minister, is an act to provide for the licensing and regulation of providers of labour hire services and related matters. The union movement have labour hire services and related matters. They have already submitted to the committee, so union donations to the Labor Party and the submissions they made to the committee are very relevant. The submissions and the support the union movement gave to this bill came at a cost.

Ms Grace: Is that the best you can do?

Mr BLEIJIE: No, it is not the best I can do. The best you will see in the next 54 minutes, I can assure the minister of that. The minister has served in this parliament with me from 2009, although she took a little break, so she ought to know by now that the more she interjects, the more she whines, the longer I will go.

Government members interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: I see the newbie down the back there. I love it when the squawking of the newbies starts down the back and they think they are making very intellectual comments.

Ms PEASE: I rise to a point of order. I take offence at the member's comments and I ask him to withdraw.

Mr BLEIJIE: I did not identify anyone.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Elmes): Order! When I have silence I will continue. I do not know that the member for Kawana identified you, member for Lytton. If there is some degree of offence that you have taken maybe you should mention it and we can get him to withdraw. You have been doing a fair amount of interjecting during the course of his speech to the parliament, so I would caution you on that as well. Do you want to continue?

Ms PEASE: I take offence at him saying that I am squawking.

Mr STEVENS: I rise to a point of order. There was absolutely, and I am happy to check *Hansard*, no personal reflection. The member is unaware of the standing orders. It has to be a personal reflection and there was none. It was the newbie squawkers down the back. If she wants to volunteer for that description, that is up to her.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I made that point and I asked the member for Lytton whether she wanted to continue on that point of order and she did. Just for the sake of procedure, will you withdraw, member for Kawana?

Mr BLEIJIE: I withdraw. The collection of dysfunctional squawkers all over that side of the House, with the drivel that comes out of their mouths, have not learnt yet that the best thing one can do in this place is to take irrelevant interjections. What these new members of parliament ought to understand is that sometimes it is just best to stay quiet. It is best not to open your mouth. I saw that the member for Yeerongpilly was about to jump up. The Leader of the House had to race down the back and tell him to sit down. The member for Yeerongpilly had his microphone on already. The Leader of the House had to tell him to sit down and cut it off.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Whitsunday, I can hear you very, very clearly. Member for Kawana, could you reasonably wander back to the bill.

Mr BLEIJIE: Absolutely. At a slow pace I will wander back to the bill. As I indicated, the only reason this bill is before the House is because of union donations and the influence they have over the Labor Party. This is not about the workers, because if it was the Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations would have picked up the phone to the federal government and talked about how they can resolve these issues.

To justify this legislation the minister mentioned there was a big raid last week and they captured an unscrupulous employer exploiting the workers. If that is the case that is based on the current laws we have in the state, not these laws. They investigated and carried out the raid under the current laws of Queensland which means the current laws are working. If the authorities are capturing people and they are capturing exploitation in the workplace, the current laws are working. Only recently a labour hire company was fined \$100,000—a portion of that was a fine to the farmer and the other portion was to the labour hire company—so the current laws are working. If they want to bolster the current laws, they can work collaboratively with their federal counterpart to do so. Essentially, this is cracking a walnut with a sledgehammer. As the minister said, only last week there was a raid which, as I said, shows that the laws are working.

There is a regulatory compliance body. It is a regime for underpaid workers in Australia. It is called the Fair Work Ombudsman which operates under the Fair Work Act. They squawk about penalty rates, but they need only look back to 2009 when Cameron Dick, the current member for Woodridge and at that time the member for Greenslopes and industrial relations minister, signed away the industrial relations powers in the state of Queensland, giving those powers to Canberra. Cameron Dick, as the member for Greenslopes and the minister at the time, signed the industrial relations powers over to the federal government. Now they say that, because the federal government is not looking after potentially exploited workers in this industry, they have to do it in Queensland. That is ridiculous, because the Fair Work Ombudsman has been set up to look at those issues. The system is in place and, as I said, it is working.

Between July 2014 and June 2016, the Fair Work Ombudsman commenced 100 litigations in relation to complaints raised with it. In 2015-16, a total of \$3.85 million in underpaid wages and entitlements was returned to 2,132 employees as a result of their employers entering into enforceable undertakings with the Fair Work Ombudsman, which was up slightly on the \$3.75 million recovered for 2,507 workers in the previous year. If Labor had concerns, they should have tried to work with the federal government to address those issues, but they are incapable of doing so.

This is a perfect example of unnecessary red tape and regulation, which we know is in Labor's DNA. It just adds more costs and bureaucracy, bloating the Public Service, to solve a problem that already has a solution. It means that Queensland families will pay even higher taxes, higher fees and higher charges at a time when the cost of living is out of control and we have record high electricity prices under this Labor government.

Let us be clear: this is not about ensuring that workers are paid for the work that they do. It is not about standing up for workers' rights or the actual objectives of the bill, as the minister for industrial relations would have Queenslanders believe. This bill is about keeping the greedy union bosses happy and ticking off another promise to union bosses that is in their interests, not in the interests of Queensland workers. This is all because greedy fat-cat corrupt union bosses are worried about losing control and access to workers, which means members and donations to the Labor Party in Queensland.

If we have a look at this issue a little more closely, what is one area that the union movement, that is, the ETU and the CFMEU, do not have their dirty little greedy corrupt hands in at the moment?

An opposition member interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: It is the labour hire industry and the agriculture industry; I take the interjection.

Mr Hinchliffe: You said that they operated them. At least be logically consistent.

Mr BLEIJIE: I can tell you why they operate a few of them: it is because they do not control the other ones, so they have had to set up in competition with the labour hire industry. We have enterprise bargaining agreements where the unions can get their dodgy deals through. On construction sites they can get their dodgy deals through, but they cannot do that in the labour hire industry. We have heard stories, such as the one about an electrician who had a run-in with the ETU many years ago. He walked off construction sites, never to have a job there again, and set up a labour hire company. Ever since he set up that company, the ETU has been gunning for him. They are trying to hound him, but they cannot because they do not know his business practices as it is a private business. This legislation will open up his business practices. This will put a list in the public domain so the union movement can see who runs all the labour hire companies in Queensland. Then where do members think the intimidation and bullying is going to go? It is going to be like a cancer from the construction industry where the ETU and the CFMEU have their dirty grubby corrupt little hands and it will extend to the agriculture industry and the labour hire industry.

As the interjection from the Leader of the House shows, we know that they operate labour hire companies, but they do not control all the other labour hire companies. They have control over the construction industry and the electrical industry, but they do not have control over the labour hire

industry. This is about putting a spotlight on the agriculture industry and the labour hire industry, so that the unions know who they are and then the fear, intimidation, threats and bullying seen on construction sites will happen in the labour hire industry.

Farmers should be shivering at the thought of this bill passing. I suspect it will pass as I suspect that some of the crossbenchers will support it, otherwise the minister would not have brought on the legislation. I hope that the Katter party oppose the legislation on principle, but they do receive quite a substantial amount of money from the CFMEU.

Mr Knuth: Very proud.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take that interjection; they are 'very proud' to receive a substantial sum of money from the CFMEU. As I was talking about the Katter party and the CFMEU, I will refer to the member for Dalrymple. The member for Dalrymple has just interjected to say that the Katter party is proud to receive CFMEU donations, details of which are available on the electronic disclosure regime. I wonder if the member for Dalrymple read yesterday's *Courier-Mail* and an article headed 'CFMEU fined almost \$50,000 by Federal Circuit Court judge, slapped down for thinking it can "usurp Parliament"'. I will table this in a minute for the benefit of the member for Dalrymple. I will ask the attendant to take a copy to him, so that he can read it. The article dated 5 September 2017 states—

A BRISBANE judge has launched a scathing attack on the CFMEU, accusing it of arrogantly thinking it can "set the law in this country" and "usurp Parliament".

The Construction Forestry Mining and Energy Union and Brisbane-based Dig It Landscapes on Tuesday copped more than \$40,000 in fines each after a waterproofing business' contract was terminated ...

Federal Circuit Court Judge Sal Vasta did not mince words when handing down the fines following a successful prosecution by the Australian Building and Construction Commissioner for breaches of the Fair Work Act.

"It beggars belief that the CFMEU believe that they can act in a manner where they are the ones who dictate who can or cannot work on a construction site," Judge Vasta said.

"The Parliament is the only entity that sets the law in this country and the Parliament is directly responsible to the people of this country.

"It seems that the CFMEU feel that they can usurp Parliament and that they can set the law in this country.

"There is no place for such an attitude in Australian society."

That is what the federal circuit court judge said. Apparently, it is that attitude and behaviour that the Katter's Australian Party like to see in Queensland. One would think a party that presents itself as a party of the bush would not allow the CFMEU to enter the agriculture sector. I really question it then—

Mr Knuth: They do a good job representing the farmers.

Mr BLEIJIE: The CFMEU do a good job representing the farmers? I take that interjection. I doubly take that interjection from the deputy leader of Katter's Australian Party. I hope the tweets are already out there, going full bore. If the member for Dalrymple believes that of the CFMEU, I wonder what he thinks about AgForce and other farming industry bodies that are actively supporting the farmers. He reckons the CFMEU is the best friend that the farmers have ever had.

Mr Knuth interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Elmes): Order! The member for Dalrymple will cease interjecting. I suggest to the member for Kawana that he has not quite wandered back far enough, in terms of the bill.

Mr BLEIJIE: That is like saying that the building industry like the support of the CFMEU. It is like saying that the builders love and support the CFMEU. We hear a lot of serious stories. The sad reality is that on a daily basis you can read what federal judges are saying about the CFMEU and the ETU. There are constant breaches of the law by the CFMEU, yet members in this parliament get up and say, 'They're my comrades,' or, 'The CFMEU is a great friend of the farmer.' We will have to see what AgForce says about that.

If the member for Dalrymple, who is from the Katter party, really represents farmers then he ought to read AgForce's submission to this committee. Let me look at AgForce's submission to the committee. For the member for Dalrymple's benefit, AgForce's submission to this committee reads—

AgForce does not consider that a state-based licensing scheme is the right mechanism through which this issue should be addressed, with alternative national approaches likely to be more effective. For the reasons outlined below, AgForce does not support the Bill.

The Katter's Australian Party is supporting this bill because the CFMEU supports the bill, but the Katter's Australian Party will not support the bill because AgForce does not support the bill. They are supporting the bill despite AgForce not supporting the bill and they are relying on the CFMEU as a reliable witness. I am glad the member for Dalrymple is in the chamber tonight. When the member for

Dalrymple speaks on the bill, I think he should put on the record how much the Katter's Australian Party received in donations from the CFMEU. I table a copy of the AgForce submission to the parliamentary inquiry.

Tabled paper: Submission, dated 19 June 2017, by the General President, AgForce Queensland Industrial Union of Employers, Mr Grant Maudsley, to the Finance and Administration Committee, titled 'Labour Hire Licensing Bill 2017' (Submission 018) [1585].

I also table a copy of the article that I referred to titled 'CFMEU fined almost \$50,000 by Federal Circuit court judge'.

Tabled paper: Article from the *Courier-Mail*, dated 5 September 2017, titled 'CFMEU fined almost \$50,000 by Federal Circuit court judge, slapped down for thinking it can 'usurp Parliament' [1586].

These are the stories we can read every two days—that is, either a state based judge or a federal judge in Australia somewhere is slapping down the CFMEU for noncompliance with laws.

We have the newly elected secretary of the Australian Council of Trade Unions, Sally McManus, saying, 'We believe in the rule of law, but if we do not think it is a good law then we think people should break the law.' She said that if they do not believe the law is fair on the unions then it is okay to break it. It is okay if a person does not think a 100 kilometre an hour speed limit on the Bruce Highway is okay, they can do 200 kilometres an hour. That is what Sally McManus says.

We have this Labor bill which is a complete sellout to our agricultural sector and our labour hire industry. The Labor Party also say that they are champions of those in our community who need help the most. I want to raise one particular submission that was sent to the committee. That submission was from Steps Group Australia, based on the Sunshine Coast. I will read a part of their submission into *Hansard* because it sums up how flawed this bill is. The submission states—

This is bad law that will be bad news for jobs in Queensland and, bad for Queensland employers. As a restrictive licensing scheme it over regulates an entire sector and throws up numerous unintended consequences that will further dent the confidence of employers and businesses in Queensland.

At the outset let me state that we strongly support initiatives to protect workers from exploitation—not only by the providers of labour hire services, but by all who seek to profit from worker exploitation. This Bill as it stands will however fail to protect workers from exploitation.

An honourable member: How?

Mr BLEIJIE: I will get to it. It continues—

The following are reasons why we believe this Bill should be withdrawn and reconsidered following genuine consultation with industry and employers.

1. This Bill does nothing to stamp out the poor practices of dodgy Labour Hire firms. It will not for example cover contracting and, as a result will fail in its objectives. So, if a dodgy exploitative relationship already exists between a worker and the user of employment services—that dodgy deal will likely remain.
2. The Government should focus licensing on high risk industries that present the greatest threat to workers and those in which disreputable labour contractors are most prominent.
 - a. Not all labour hire firms are created equal. This Bill will capture labour hire firms that already comply with the law and, fail to capture dodgy operators that fly below the radar and have no intention of applying for a license.
3. There is a complete misalignment with the objects of the Bill, given there is no evidence of exploitation in industries other than horticulture which was the only sector consistently identified in the Finance and Administration Committee's Inquiry Report. Selective licensing of high risk industries was also the recommendation of Professor Anthony Forsyth from his Inquiry into the Labour Hire Industry in Victoria.
4. This Bill is anti-business and will further erode the already shrinking confidence of employers to do business in Queensland.

Ms Grace: It is already on the record. We know what they said. It is already on the record.

Mr BLEIJIE: I am putting it on the record again in parliament because this is from Steps Group that look after thousands and thousands—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Farmer): Minister on my right and member on my left, please direct all your comments through the chair.

Mr BLEIJIE: This is a submission I am reading into *Hansard* from Steps Group which employs thousands of disadvantaged people with disabilities. The minister sits there flippantly saying, 'This is already on the record. We have heard it all. Why are you reading it into *Hansard*?' I am reading it into *Hansard* because it is worth reading into *Hansard*. The minister did not refer to it. When I receive a submission from a disability advocacy group, I am going to champion for them. If the minister is not going to champion for that group, I am going to champion for that group. The submission goes on to state—

5. This licensing scheme is politically motivated, with conditions such as bonds and compulsory insurance left to the discretion of the Chief Executive. This will invite appeals that QCAT is not equipped to handle, third party intervention from 'interested parties', and add to the administrative burden already required of Queensland companies.

6. In addition, reporting obligations are both overly onerous and fail a 'pub test' as to the level of information workers or users of labour hire services would reasonably expect is available about the labour hire firm they are working with.
7. The definition of Labour Hire is extremely broad and will capture a large number of unintended organisations and work arrangements that ignore occupational licensing arrangements in every sector of the economy and in every corner of Queensland. Some examples of organisations that will require a licence will include:
 - *A corporate health service that "supplies" a nurse to deliver 'flu vaccinations;*

I will say that again—

- *A corporate health service that "supplies" a nurse to deliver 'flu vaccinations;*
- *A religious body that "supplies" a chaplain or pastoral care worker under the Australian School Chaplaincy Programme;*
- *A first aid attendant "supplied" by one school to another schools sporting event;*
- *A community organisation that "supplies" a cultural advisor to government or to a business;*
- *Or, a secondary or tertiary educational facility that "supplies" students on work experience or practical placements.*

What an indictment on this bill. That is the assessment from a national non-profit organisation that helps disabled Queenslanders live and work more independently. I have not only read their submission into the record, but for the benefit of the minister who keeps flippantly disregarding Steps Group Australia, I table a copy of their submission dated 19 June and signed by Carmel Crouch, the manager director.

Tabled paper: Submission, dated 19 June 2017, by Ms Carmel Crouch, Managing Director, Steps Group Australia, to the Finance and Administration Committee, titled 'Submission regarding the Labour Hire Licensing Bill 2017' (Submission 019) [\[1587\]](#).

On that note, I thank the work of Steps Group. I know Carmel Crouch and know the amazing work they do. I went to their independent living facility in Caloundra which opened recently. Rather than disabled people being put into nursing homes or aged-care facilities this is actually allowing them to live independently. They learn over a 12-month period how to go back into a normal living environment. It is taking them out of aged care. I thank Steps Group Australia for the work they have done in the disability area and for the great work they do right around Queensland. I thank them for the work they put into this submission and for raising these concerns.

The Chamber of Commerce & Industry also lodged a submission with the committee. Further to that, they wrote to all members on 5 September and issued a press statement yesterday. In their letter to MPs they stated—

To our mind blanket regulation of the labour hire industry will impose a significant additional cost burden on businesses offering and benefitting from labour hire services. The proposed legislation imposes another layer of regulatory compliance on businesses in Queensland and would be a counterproductive measure towards addressing issues with respect to rogue operators.

Legal experts have also labelled elements of the bill as unjust and unfair as well as vague and ambiguous and call into question its standing as good law. The Queensland Law Society also raised significant issues with elements of this bill. So we have AgForce, stakeholders, employer groups, labour hire companies, the Queensland Law Society, disability groups and not-for-profit groups opposed to the bill. The only one that supports this bill is the union movement.

I also met with BHP Billiton yesterday. They are very concerned about the proposed changes and the definition, as outlined in their submission to the committee. BHP employ 10,000 Queenslanders, but because of the broad definition of 'labour hire' they could get caught up in the provisions of this bill. Can you imagine getting to a situation in Queensland where BHP, employing 10,000 people, potentially will have to register as a labour hire company because of their 10,000 employees? This Premier, Anastacia Palaszczuk, says she is all about red-tape reduction for small businesses. Right on! We will see about that one. What a fanciful—

Ms Grace: I don't think BHP is a small business.

Mr BLEIJIE: I am talking about any regulation.

Ms Grace: That's not what you just said.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take that interjection. I will expand on that. The Premier spruiks about regulation reduction for all types of businesses in Queensland including BHP Billiton. It is not just BHP that will be tied up in this. All of these types of businesses, including not-for-profit businesses, will be tied up in this. The CCIQ are saying that. AgForce are saying that. BHP are saying that. Disability groups are saying that. The minister is not listening. She is not listening to any of these groups, despite the Premier saying, 'We are the most consultative government that Queensland has ever seen.' Rubbish! They consulted but they did not listen. If they listened to the consultation undertaken, this bill would not be being debated tonight. It would have been taken out or it would have had more than 200 amendments, as the minister had in her first racing bill in this government.

This bill will drive up the costs of employing Queenslanders at a time when we should be trying to create jobs, particularly in regional Queensland. As I said before, the Minister for Employment has all but given up on fixing youth unemployment in Queensland.

Mr Minnikin: How did that go?

Mr BLEIJIE: I take that interjection about how it went. I will tell the House. In the outback, the rate of youth unemployment is now 57.4 per cent; in Wide Bay, it is 23.6 per cent; in Townsville, it is 22.2 per cent; in Brisbane east, it is 19.2 per cent.

Mr Minnikin: What did she have to say about it?

Mr BLEIJIE: I take that interjection about what the Minister for Employment had to say about those high figures of youth unemployment. She said, 'There is not much you can do about it.' That is what the minister said.

We need to be helping businesses with the costs of employment, not increasing regulation and red tape to make it harder. The LNP will not support these changes and will be opposing the bill. As I said at the outset, we fundamentally support workers being paid what they are entitled to be paid. No worker should be underpaid. Anyone who thinks they are being underpaid should be able to make a complaint to the Fair Work Ombudsman. That is not the question here.

This bill is fundamentally flawed in its objectives, and its design is really just a payback to the union bosses who call the shots in Queensland. It will increase the costs of employment and act as a disincentive for employment and destroy jobs, particularly in regional Australia. What else would you expect from a South-East Queensland-centric government that is run by union bosses and governs in self-interest and not in the interests of Queenslanders?

Madam Deputy Speaker, can you imagine when this bill goes through this sitting week, if it does—and I suspect it will with the crossbench support of the Katter party, funded by the CFMEU—and the first list of companies delivering labour hire services in Queensland goes up online. You do not think Michael Ravbar and the ETU will be looking at the list of all the labour hire companies in Queensland and then making the phone calls—'Boys and girls, we are the ETU,' or 'We are the CFMEU. We want to meet you.'

Mr Stevens: 'How would you like to hold up your licence?'

Mr BLEIJIE: Exactly. 'You are not going to get any work in Queensland unless you sign up your workers to our union.' That is what is going to happen.

Then in this bill we have what is called a 'fit and proper person' test. If a mum-and-dad operator who is operating a labour hire company does not want any involvement with the union movement—the CFMEU or the ETU—their workers are happy and they are getting work but the union movement does not want them to get work, the unions will lodge complaint after complaint about the 'fit and proper person' test of that individual. That person can have their licence suspended for quite some time until such time as it is sorted out.

That is the disruptive nature of the CFMEU. That is how they have become known as the thugs they are in Queensland because of their disruption, their fearmongering, their tactics, their bullying on work sites. Week after week they have been fined in the hundreds of thousands of dollars by judges of the land because the unions are bullying people, breaking the laws—and they do not care. The CFMEU do not care about the laws of this land. We are meant to uphold laws, but the Labor Party take donations from a union movement—and I collectively say the 'movement'—who are continually being fined. The hard-earned money of the workers is being forked out to two places (1) the Queensland Labor Party and (2) court imposed fines. That is where all their membership dues are going. That is where all their money is going. I do not think that is in the interests of Queenslanders.

Mr Stevens: On holidays and dinners.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Farmer): Order! Member for Mermaid Beach, if you wish to interject, please do so from your seat.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection from the member for Mermaid Beach, despite him not being in his seat. I take his interjection with respect to dinners and so forth of the union movement. This was the government that got rid of the expenditure disclosures, so we do not know where the money is spent now. We cannot see the credit card expenses. They used to be disclosed on a website where the public could go and have a look.

Isn't it interesting that in this bill the Labor Party are making public the names in the labour hire industry yet only a month or two ago they hid all the union credit card expenses and the expenses of the union movement? They want the private and not-for-profit sector and the agriculture sector to be held up in the spotlight to let the world see what they do, yet they continually hide what the union movement does.

This bill is all about membership of the union movement. The reason the unions do not like the labour hire industry is that they do not get a membership base from it. What would you expect, Madam Deputy Speaker, when the union movement numbers are on the decline in Queensland? Despite having a Labor government, despite having Bill Shorten as the federal Labor leader—maybe I know why the union numbers are going down. That is probably why.

Ms Grace: Relevance?

Mr BLEIJIE: It is relevant because the union movement are involved in the labour hire industry. The union movement give donations to the Queensland Labor Party. Join the dots, Minister. It is all connected. I do not understand why the Minister for Employment is asking for relevance when I am talking about the unions. If we did not have the unions, this bill would not be in this place. It is because of the unions that we are debating this bill. That is the only reason.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Kawana, nonetheless, I do urge you to ensure that you stick to the long title of the bill.

Mr BLEIJIE: The long title of the bill is 'an act to provide for the licensing and regulation of providers of labour hire services and related matters'. The union movement, which are registered industrial organisations, do provide labour hire services to Queensland.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: I simply give you that warning.

Mr BLEIJIE: As I said, the CCIQ are opposed to this. AgForce are opposed to it. BHP Billiton are opposed to it. The Steps disability charity group are opposed to it. Most stakeholders are opposed to it—

Mr Minnikin: Except?

Mr BLEIJIE:—except the AMWU, which gave \$31,000 to the Labor Party; the AMIEU, which gave \$16,000 to the Labor Party; United Voice, which gave \$245,000 to the Labor Party; and the MUA, which gave \$11,000 to the Labor Party. Madam Deputy Speaker, could you imagine if we debated a bill here tonight which somehow was of benefit to businesses and there was a particular business that benefited or even made a submission to the committee that gave us \$245,000? You do not think the Labor Party would be squawking about the influence that particular business would have? United Voice gave \$245,000 to the Labor Party. If it were from a business and it benefited the business, the Labor Party would be squawking: what influence did that business have over the LNP government who would be introducing or debating that bill?

The reality is that this is not for the worker; it is not for the farmer; it is a bill designed for the union movement, by the union movement. It will have CFMEU and ETU representatives start to go onto farming sites. It will get farmers off tractors. It will have union encouragement and bargaining clauses, but my biggest fear is the bullying that will ensue with labour hire companies that do not play the game of the union movement, that do not want to play the game of the union movement and that say no to the union movement. It is the labour hire companies that say no to the union movement that will be bullied the most. Then we will have the chief executive officer issuing directions as to whether they are a fit and proper person to operate their business.

What will happen, and what the union want to happen, is that these businesses will slowly start to be deregistered because if private enterprise and not-for-profit sector businesses slowly start to get deregistered the union influence prevails. We will do whatever we can on this side of the House to ensure that union-bullying corruption influence does not prevail. We owe it to the people of Queensland to ensure that the influence of the union movement which continually gets court imposed fines by the courts of the land does not prevail. I promise this side of the House that if we have the opportunity to serve in government we will ensure the union influence does not creep back into Queensland. We will ensure that businesses are not bullied by union influence, because union influence should never prevail.