A compilation of official Cain Government documents which blows the lid off the ongoing conspiracy to attack the B.L.F. and the trade union movement in general.
On Friday, 3rd October, 1986, angry rank and file builders labourers and supporters occupied the offices of Steve Crabb, Minister for Labour in the Cain Government. The Department of Labour is the central headquarters of the campaign to 'carve-up' the B.L.F. in Victoria.

Soon after this incident, sympathetic government employees made available to Citizens for Democracy, hundreds of internal government documents and files.

A close study of some of this information, clearly shows the desperate manouevrings of Steve Crabb in his anti-union crusade.

The Government's public face is shown for what it is - an artificial facade. The documents reveal, amongst other things, the Government holding the Supreme Court in contempt, the widening conspiracy to set up B.L.F. General Secretary, N. L. Gallagher, the corrupt use of public money and the obsessive planning that goes into plotting against the B.L.F. and other unions.

Read on . . . . .
SECTION I

THE PAY-OFF RORT

It is well known that the State Government, via the pretence of the Building Industry 'Code of Conduct', is paying out millions of dollars in 'compensation' to the building contractors. This is for their trouble in helping attack the B.L.F. The massive expenditure of public money in this area is a major embarrassment to Messrs. Cain and Cripps.

Recently the Auditor-General exposed a hidden $5.7 million pay-out involving contractors at the Remand Centre site.

Any attempt to uncover the details of the pay-outs is blocked at every turn, as Dept. of Labour documents show. A deliberate undermining of the F.O.I. Act has been put in place by Crabb's office. However, other documents reveal how some of the builders proposed 'under the table' to hide their pay-offs.

Relief has been sought through variations to contracts, the waving of regulations, etc.

- Documents (a) and (b) show how the Jack Chia Group extorted a $10.2 million pay-out from the Government by convincing it to waive the strict statutory requirements on the provision of adequate car parking for the South Yarra project! The residents of the City of Prahran will be very impressed.

- Documents (c), (d) and (e) show how Jennings Constructions approached the Dept. of Labour to assist in standing over the Monington Peninsula & District Water Board to pay up over alleged B.L.F. delays to a Board building project. The assistance was forthcoming.

- Documents (f) and (g) show that Theiss Contractors and L. U. Simons called for immunity after being told by the Dept. of Labour that the B.L.F. and the Age had F.O.I. requests running. These were in relation to all information regarding Government 'financial assistance' to building contractors under the Code of Conduct! Similar appeals from other companies were also solicited by Crabb.

- Documents (h) and (i) illustrate the extent to which the Government will go to cover-up the massive pay out to the builders. The intent and spirit of the Freedom of Information Act is being thwarted by direct political interference.

THE JACK CHIA GROUP OF COMPANIES

Incorporated in Victoria
1 Collins Street, Melbourne, Victoria 3000 Australia
Telephone: (03) 663 5833 Telex: AJ 30728

Hand Delivery

21 March 1986.

The Honourable S. Crabb,
Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs,
Level 23, Nauru House,
80 Collins Street,
MELBOURNE, VIC., 3000.

Dear Steve,

THE SOUTH YARRA PROJECT

At our meeting yesterday, I told you that we had a large number of problems to solve in putting a banking syndicate in place to fund Stage 1 of the South Yarra Project. There are only two major problems, so far as we are aware, still to be solved, and these have only been brought to our attention in the last few days. Unfortunately, Government help will be needed to solve both of these problems. Mr. Chia and I have seen Mr. Rob Jolly about one of them and I believe it probable that, that matter will be solved. The other problem is more difficult to solve.

The position is as follows:

1. You have told me and Mr. Chia that the Government cannot provide financial assistance to the Chia Group, but is prepared to provide other assistance, having regard to the difficulties being suffered by the Group in respecting the Government's wishes on claims made by the Builders' Laborers Federation ("BLF").

2. I believed from our previous meetings and from press statements that the Government would provide assistance in some form to builders and developers who suffered by signing a "Code of Conduct" and refusing to conform with claims from the BLF.

3. The loss suffered by the Chia Group by taking this stand is now in excess of $3 million and the weekly loss is rapidly escalating. This loss amounts to cost-overruns and it appears now that the cost-overruns for Stage 1 of the Project as a result of industrial action will be very substantial.

4. The Chia Group has contributed such equity as our Banks required with an adequate provision for normal cost-overruns, but no provision was made for the cost-overruns of the magnitude we are now facing as a result of industrial action. A banking syndicate has been formed by Bill Acceptance Corporation Limited, and it is proposed that the first drawdown on the banking facility will be next Wednesday, 26 March 1986.
5. We are required by the Government to provide 1,536 car parking spaces for Stage 1. 810 car parking spaces have already been provided on Stage 1 itself, that being the maximum number of spaces we are able to provide on that Stage. The remaining 726 spaces in respect to Stage 1 must therefore be provided somewhere away from the land in that Stage. Although the Chia Group will provide such car parking spaces as are necessary on other parts of the Project, that car parking would naturally be incorporated in the overall mix-use design for the rest of the Project.

Our Bankers have informed us over the last few days that they regard the Government requirement to provide the additional 726 car spaces as a contingent liability on the Chia Group. They have therefore examined the cost of creating a car park in isolation to the rest of the Project and have arrived at a figure of $10.2 million to create that structure.

As a consequence, we have now been informed by our Bankers that we must provide that amount of money now, or provide a Bank or Government guarantee for that sum.

The Chia Group is unable to provide both the additional equity to cover the cost-overruns caused by industrial unrest as well as providing the $10.2 million for a car park.

As you have now told me that the Government will not assist in providing money, I must ask that the Government, as a matter of extreme urgency, amends the statutory requirements to provide these extra car parking spaces so that a letter of that effect could be produced to our Bankers before drawdown.

The Chia Group kept its word in restoring the old buildings at No. 1 Collins Street notwithstanding that it was not legally required to do so. This Group will keep its word and will provide such car parking spaces in the South Yarra development as are necessary. In fact, it would be commercially stupid for it not to provide sufficient car parking spaces to cope with the Project's needs.

Timing is critical, in that your Government is issuing bonds next Thursday, 27 March 1986, this step being an essential ingredient in our funding with the Bankers. Your Government has stated that it will not delay the issuing of these bonds beyond next Thursday.

If the situation is, therefore, that the Project will come to a halt because of lack of funding, unless we can produce either:

a. evidence to our Bankers that there will be no requirement by us or them to build a car park in the event of the Chia Group defaulting; or,

b. the Government provides a guarantee that in the event of the Chia Group defaulting and the Bankers being required to provide the car parking spaces, the Government will provide the funds; or,

c. the Chia Group receives immediate compensation for the losses it has suffered as a result of BLF action.

We have reached the stage whereby we cannot see any alternatives other than to have Government support, or to cease all work and close the development.

Finally, I reiterate that the Group has always kept its word. Provided it can draw funds from its Bankers next week and continue with the Project, it will provide such car parking spaces as are necessary.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
The Chia Group of Companies

Tim Hewison,
Managing Director.

JTH/AL
enc.
Mr. J.T.C. Hewison,
Managing Director,
The Jack Chia Group of Companies,
1 Collins Street,
MELBOURNE, VICT., 3000.

Dear Mr. Hewison,

Re: The South Yarra Project

I refer to your discussions of Thursday, 20 March 1986, with the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs, The Honourable S. Crabb and his advisors, concerning the problems currently being experienced by your Group in connection with the completion of Stage 1 of the South Yarra Project. In particular, he has informed me of the severe difficulties which your Bankers perceive to be associated with the provision of 1,536 car parking spaces in a stage of the Project which cannot physically support such a number, thereby necessitating 726 car spaces being provided elsewhere within the Project.

I accept your statement that the funding of the Project would be so endangered by this requirement that there is a very real possibility that the Project will be forced to come to a halt for an indefinite period with damaging effects upon the continued operations of your Group in Australia.

You will, of course, be aware that the Victorian Government has given strong support to the Project in the past and we would wish to give such other support as is compatible with the welfare and interests of the Victorian public.

Accordingly, I would formally inform you that the Victorian Government is prepared to amend the requirement for 1,536 car spaces for Stage 1 and replace it with one for 810.

I would point out that, in taking this step, the Government has been strongly influenced by your agreement that, notwithstanding the amendment of the statutory requirements your Group will provide the additional 726 spaces on the remaining stages on a voluntary basis. Those 726 spaces will, I understand, be in addition to the normal requirement for car spaces which your development of those further stages would themselves generate.

Yours faithfully,

Minister for Planning and Environment.
17.09.1986

JIM,

MORNINGTON WATER BOARD

ATTACHED IS A COPY OF A LETTER FROM THE BOARD'S SOLICITORS WHICH INDICATES THAT THE BOARD IS STILL PLAYING VERY HARD OVER EXTENSIONS OF TIME IN REGARDS TO THE RECENT B.L.F. PROBLEM.

YOUR HELP IN THIS MATTER WILL ASSIST US GREATLY.

REGARDS

JIM FORSYTH
Dear Sir,

MORNINGTON PENINSULA & DISTRICT WATER BOARD - CENTRAL OFFICE ACCOMMODATION

We act on behalf of the Mornington Peninsula & District Water Board. We have been handed a copy of various correspondence. We refer in particular to your letter of August 6, 1986 addressed to the Superintendent, Lineda, MacFarlane & Marshall.

It appears to us that, with respect to the property registration claim, the dispute arose on March 5, 1986 when the initial claim was rejected. The dispute was referred to the Superintendent by letter dated July 8, 1986. This is outside the 14 day referral provision contained in Clause 45 of the Contract. Nevertheless, the Superintendent’s decision was made on July 24, 1986. Your failure to require the principal to refer the dispute to arbitration within 14 days after July 24, 1986 as required by Clause 45 means that the right to arbitrate is lost.

Our client does not consent to arbitration of the dispute. The dispute therefore must now be resolved by litigation if you choose to pursue it further. In short, your letter dated August 6, 1986 is not, in our view, a proper exercise of the rights conferred by Clause 45.

We understand that the Superintendent is currently dealing with the material raised in your letter of August 6, 1986. Our view is that said letter will be communicated to the Superintendent.

Yours faithfully,

MACPHERSON & KELLEY

RECEIVED
12 SEP 1986

THIES CONTRACTORS PTY. LTD.

30th September, 1986

Department of Labour,
Nauru House,
80 Collins Street,
MELBOURNE VIC. 3000

Attention: Mr. R. Howard

Dear Sir,

REF: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST

This is to confirm that, in accordance with Section 38 of the Freedom of Information Act, Thiess Contractors Pty. Ltd. request that due to the confidentiality of the information requested between ourselves and our client that we are not in a position to disclose the information.

Yours faithfully,

THIES CONTRACTORS PTY. LTD.

R. ALDIS,
AREA MANAGER - VIC./TAS.

VICTORIAN OFFICE:
5417 COWTREE GULLY ROAD,
MOUNT Waverley,
MELBOURNE VIC. 3149

TELEPHONE: 03 5417 5417
FACSIMILE: 03 5417 5477
September 17th, 1986

Department of Labour,
Nauru House,
60 Collins Street,
Melbourne, Vic. 3000

Attention: Ms. Tenia Dickson

Dear Sir,

Re: Freedom of Information Request

We refer to your letter relating to a request from N.L. Gallagher seeking access to certain documentation under the Freedom of Information Act 1982.

It is our view that information supplied by this Company in respect to our claim for assistance under the Victorian Government's Code of Conduct, should not be disclosed.

In support of such view we direct your attention to Section 34 of the Freedom of Information Act 1982 but without prejudice to our rights of reliance upon other provisions of the Freedom of Information Act 1982.

Your faithfully,
L.U. SIMON BUILDERS PTY, LTD.

P. Devitt,
MANAGING DIRECTOR

Phil,

The attached is the latest of a series of communications received from the B.L.F. - Mr. N. Gallagher.

The Minister has issued specific instructions that under NO circumstances is any correspondence or communication of any kind to be entered into with this organisation or any of its representatives.

The Code of Conduct specifically states that there are to be no dealings with B.L.F. subsequent to its deregistration by the Federal Government and in accordance with the Victorian Government's Recogisation Legislation.

All/any F.O.I. requests from the B.L.F. should be referred to the Minister's office for the information and instructions of the Minister.

Can you please, on an urgent priority basis, issue the necessary instructions to all Divisional Heads of D.O.I.

J. Paterson
Industrial Adviser.

cc. Bob Howard.
SECTION II

CONSPIRACY TO GET GALLAGHER NEVER STOPS

It is well accepted now that the General Secretary of the B.L.F., N. L. Gallagher, is the victim of a concerted political frame-up. Starting with former Prime Minister Fraser's Royal Commission and continued by Premier John Cairns, the conspiracy continues to this day. The following are extracts from confidential notes originating from a George Hescu company. Hescu was a principle witness for the prosecution in the Gallagher case, so-called 'secret commissions' trial.

* Document (j) shows that George Hescu considers himself not guilty of providing secret commissions to anyone. He openly states he was 'prompted' to plead 'guilty' back in 1983 as a matter of convenience. Further, he 'honoured' his good behaviour bond and is now free to hold directorships. It is ironic that Hescu reminded the Government 'it is a precept of British justice that no accused person shall be placed in double jeopardy'. Yet, his convenient pleading of guilty in exchange for a bond, put Gallagher in double jeopardy from the very beginning of his own trial! The period of December, 1985, is significant. These discussions occurred prior to the retrial of Gallagher later in 1986. In other words, the Cairns Government was well aware of the fact that Hescu was not serious about considering himself guilty in any way, with respect to the giving of secret commissions. Yet, there was no move to pass this information on to the relevant authorities.

* Document (k) relates to company notes for another meeting two or three years after. Its obsession with the need for absolute secrecy with respect to the meetings, highlights to conspiracy 'to get Gallagher'. The document further shows how deregistration of the B.L.F., financial compensation, the locking in of other developers and fear of public scrutiny, pre-occupied the company.
1. It is a precept of British justice that no accused person shall be placed in double jeopardy.

Mr. George Hescus (sic) pleaded guilty to certain charges arising out of the Royal Commission into the B.L.F., was placed on a good behaviour bond, which was honoured, and has since been discharged, and made a substantial contribution to the Court Poor Box.

Mr. Hescus was prompted to plead guilty for health reasons related to what otherwise would have been a trial anticipated to run for some six months and the consequential costs thereof. Moreover, there would have been a risk that Mr. Hescus would be debarred from holding Directorships.

(He had already been exposed to some very substantial strain during his attendance at the Royal Commission, where he was exposed to matters of which he had no personal knowledge and for which his Construction Manager had been responsible).

Fines were imposed on relevant companies of Mr. Hescus's. The fines were paid.

Arising out of precisely the same matters, Mr. Hescus is now threatened with significant retaliatory measures by the B.L.F. if he accedes to the Government's request to adhere to the "Code of Conduct" - in the alternative, if Mr. Hescus does not accede to the Government request, he is faced with very substantial personal losses, relating in particular, but not solely, to the Government banning of companies and projects with which Hescus is associated.
B.L.F.
Notes for Ministerial Meeting

4. Assurances were given that the Commonwealth would prosecute
    with the utmost urgency and dedication, deregistration of the
    B.L.F. It was the Commonwealth representatives' understanding
    that the Victorian State Government was fully supportive and
    would act accordingly.

5. Subsequent to any undertaking which Mr. Herscu might provide
    to the Commonwealth there was unqualified agreement that the
    Commonwealth would give no publicity thereto, other than by
    agreement with the Hersfield interests. It was arranged that
    at an appropriate time, presumably to be within the next two
    or three days, and given that Mr. Herscu had signed some form
    of undertaking, Mr. Ross would provide a draft of the proposed
    Press Release for Hersfield's approval and amendment with the
    intent that each party should reach agreement on the form of
    the release. It is Hersfield's intent that the release
    referring to Mr. Herscu's undertaking should identify only the
    Hooker Corporation Limited.

6. The purpose of Hersfield representatives meeting with Mr.
    Crabb relates to Hersfield's significant concern for completion
    of construction of the Cranbourne Park Shopping Centre.

    Cranbourne Park Shopping Centre is a $30M development included
    in the Hersfield Property Growth Trust.

    Hersfield Property Growth Trust is one of the Trusts launched
    by Property Trust of Australia Limited, a public company,
    in which there are many millions of dollars of unit holders'
    funds, spread over several thousand unit holders throughout
    Australia.

7. It is our fear that, following any formal undertaking given by
    Mr. Herscu in relation to the B.L.F., that continuing
    construction work on the site, will be severely disrupted and
    perhaps curtailed to the point where the site will have to be
    closed down.

8. To be examined with Mr. Crabb, is the degree to which the
    Victorian Government is both able to and prepared to give
    support to Hersfield to prevent or minimise industrial action
    on the site, resulting from Mr. Herscu's proposed undertaking.
    Failure so to do will, as implied above, result in additional
    costs, potentially running into millions of dollars, which
    will be to the detriment of the Trust and will place at risk,
    the millions of dollars already invested by the public.

    The jobs of peripheral staff, both Hersfield and contractors
    and sub-contractors, will also be at risk and there is a
    distinct possibility that the Contractor, Carnegie Hicks
    Constructions Pty. Ltd. will "walk off the job".

9. Can Mr. Crabb

   a) Influence the Master Builders Association to intervene
      on our behalf, if necessary

   b) Provide any financial compensation resulting from
      industrial unrest
SECTION III

CAIN GOVERNMENT IN
CONTEMPT OF SUPREME COURT RULING ON 'CODE'

In the lead up to the October 1st renewal of union tickets in the building industry period, the State Government openly pushed its 'Code of Conduct' as its major weapon to force contractors' compliance. Building companies were threatened with being put out of business if they didn't force builders labourers to join other unions. This is illustrated by documents (i) and (m).

These actions brought the Cain Government in direct contempt of a recent Supreme Court ruling. The ruling, by Judge Murray, ordered the Cain Government not to publish or assert in any way, that the Code of Conduct requires employers to act against B.L.F. members [See document (n)].

9. cont'd
   c) Assist us financially or otherwise, if staff have to be
      stood down
   d) Advise us on the consequences of Hersfield running the job
      itself, if the Contractor resigns from the site
   e) Provide any alternative advice/assistance

10. The public perception and that of the Unions will doubtless be
    that Herscu alone has, in this context, "capitulated" to the
    Commonwealth Government and perhaps to the Victorian Government,
    and will therefore be singled out by the Unions for industrial
    action.

    This reaction could be diluted to an extent if other
    construction/development groups (e.g. Grollo and Dominion
    Properties) were to similarly and simultaneously enter into
    equivalent agreements. (A list of such companies is attached).

11. It is imperative that at this time there be no publicity in
    relation to Hersfield's meeting with Mr. Crabb and Victorian
    Government cooperation in that regard is requested.

A.R.P.
1 October, 1986

Cyclone Scaffolding Pty. Ltd.,
816 Lorimer Street,
PORT MELBOURNE, VIC. 3207.

Dear Sir,

RE: CODE OF CONDUCT - B.L.F. MEMBERS

The State Government has been informed that your Company
is continuing to employ workers who are B.L.F. members in
direct conflict with the provision of the Code of Conduct.

Your company is requested to show cause in writing by 5.00
pm today, Wednesday 1st October, your intentions in regard
to compliance with the provisions of the Code of Conduct
dealing with the employment of members of the
Deregistered/Derecognised B.L.F.

Failure of your company to comply with this request will
require me to recommend to the Federal and State Ministers
that consideration be given to applying the penalty provisions
of the Code of Conduct.

Yours sincerely,

J.L. Paterson,
Industrial Adviser to
Minister for Labour.

Confidential Copy to: Mr. J. Glason
M.B.A.
Mr. P. Berry,
B.W.I.U.

---

1 October, 1986

Mr. J. Glason,
Master Builders' Association
of Victoria,
332 Albert Road,
EAST MELBOURNE, VIC. 3002.

Dear Mr. Glason,

RE: SUB CONTRACTORS CONTINUING TO EMPLOY B.L.F. MEMBERS.

Several M.B.A. members have advised that Sub-Contractors are
refusing to sack or remove B.L.F. members from project sites.
I have advised your members to direct sub-contractors concerned
to comply or have their contracts determined.

The provisions of the Code of Conduct of the Federal and
State Governments will be applied fully to any contractor
or sub-contractor who refuses to comply.

Yours sincerely,

J.L. Paterson,
Industrial Adviser to
Minister for Labour.
SECTION IV

IF THE B.L.F. IS SUPPOSED TO BE "DEAD"
THEN WHY THE FLURRY OF ACTIVITY?

Six months ago Steve Crabb was boasting that the B.L.F. "was dead". Six months later his Department of Labour is still flat out plotting and implementing the ongoing vendetta against builders' labourers. The public claims of the Government can be exposed for what they are - lies. Immediately prior to the recent 'change of term for union tickets' (1.10.86), the Department of Labour harangued numerous building companies over the presence of the B.L.F. on site.

Documents (o), (p) and (q) illustrate the general theme of the threats. Document (i) is part of the Department's 'company mailout' for the stand over campaign.

Documents (s) and (t), amongst other things, show the continuing fear the government has around the ongoing existence and operations of the B.L.F.
29 September, 1986

Consulate Pty. Ltd.,
799 Dandenong Road,
EAST MALVERN, VIC. 3144.

Dear Sir,

Allegations have been made that your company is prepared to recognise union tickets of the B.L.F. which is Deregistered by the Federal Government and Deregistered by the Victorian Government.

This allegation is serious and prior to action being taken by the Federal and Victorian Governments, in fairness to your Company, we would require you to provide full details surrounding this allegation.

I would remind you that Clause 2.3 of the Code of Conduct states:

"Firms in the Victorian Building Industry are requested under the Code of Conduct to:

(f) Agree to refuse to deal with the B.L.F. where it does not have coverage under the Conciliation and Arbitration Act."

As a signatory to the Code of Conduct, your Company is required to strictly comply with the provisions of the Code of Conduct. This also includes any subcontractors engaged by your company.

Your early reply to these allegations is requested as a matter of urgency prior to my reporting to the Minister on this matter.

Yours sincerely,

J.L. Paterson,
Industrial Adviser to
Steve Crabb, M.P.,
Minister for Labour.
URGENT

1 October, 1986

Mr. G. Quinn,
Jack Chia (Australia) Ltd.,
South Yarra Project.

Dear Mr. Quinn,

RE: LOST TIME CLAIM A/C DISMISSAL/ARREST MR. J. LAWRENCE

The Minister is aware of the background surrounding this matter.

Please note that under the provisions of the Code of Conduct no claim for payment of lost time should be considered.

Also, it should be understood that permitting officials of the deregistered/deregistered B.L.F. to enter the site and address meetings of workers on site is also not permitted under the Code of Conduct.

A predictable pattern of events occur when B.L.F. officials enter sites.
1. Call for a strike of 24 - 48 hours duration.
2. Claim for lost time a/c arrests/Police presence on site.

It is recommended that management on your site follow the established procedures of refusing to permit B.L.F. officials on site, which in turn minimizes the possibility of industrial action.

Yours sincerely,

A.L. Paterson,
Industrial Adviser.
MEMORANDUM

TO DIRECTOR-GENERAL.
FROM JIM PATTERSON.
SUBJECT B.L.F. MATTERS.

ACTION BY
FOR INFORMATION
FILE NOTE ONLY

This note is for your early information on an attempt by the B.L.F. to be able to appear in the AC & AC as agents for members of the B.L.F.

Recently in the AC & AC, at a hearing before Commissioner Coleman in Perth, the B.L.F. was refused such rights on the grounds that the B.L.F. was deregistered under an Act passed by the Federal Parliament. The B.L.F. has appealed against the Commissioners' decision on the ground that part of the legislation preventing the B.L.F. right to appear in the AC & AC is unconstitutional. Hence that State Attorneys have received notice of the appeal which is due to come before the High Court on 15 October, 1986 in Perth.

If this action succeeded it would be a serious setback. One can imagine the effects of J. Cummins appearing by right in the AC & AC. Richard Tracey considers the B.L.F. would not win the case but he has not yet received the relevant papers.

Back in 1974 the B.L.F. persuaded Justice Elizabeth Evatt that N.L. Galleher should have right to act as agent for certain members in the AC&AC and this "back door" method and its consequences helped to turn the deregistration process into a farce.

Richard's view is that we should intervene as strongly as possible but he will place advice before you when he has perused the papers. In the meantime I will take steps to obtain the views of the Federal Government and also of other State Governments.

Bob Howard

MEMORANDUM

TO MINISTER
FROM BOB HOWARD
DATE 24/9/86
SUBJECT B.L.F. LEGAL ACTION

ACTION BY
FOR INFORMATION
FILE NOTE ONLY

J.L. Paterson,
Industrial Adviser.
SECTION V

THE B.L.F. DEREGISTRATION/DE-RECOGNITION
- A LESSON FOR ALL

A study of Department of Labour documents 1985-86 shows the pre-occupation to detail the government indulged in with respect to the attack on the B.L.F.

Documents (a), (v), (w) and (x) show how the so called 'independent' deregistration hearing, conducted by the Arbitration Commission was pressured and manipulated.

They further show the government was never in doubt about 'winning' a guilty verdict!

Similarly Document (y) indicates the ongoing thinking of the departments anti-B.L.F. 'think tank'. As the scribblings show a multitude of oppressive options were continually thrown up: suing John Cummins for damages; the use of the charge of conspiracy; civil law versus criminal law; Builders and government to instigate joint legal actions etc.

The argument that, a whole range of unprecedented processes are now in place, in order to attack the whole trade union movement, is established.

BLF (De-recognition) Bill

No. 12

TABLE OF PROVISIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause</th>
<th>Provision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Short title.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Commencement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Interpretation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Conditions to be implied in certain contracts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Consequences in the event of a breach of implied condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Remedy in the event of a breach of implied condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Removal of B.L.F. and its members from participation in and protection of State industrial system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Power to restrict use of funds or property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Statutory declarations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Immunity of certain persons from suit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Service of documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Cessation of Operation of Act.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

September 10, 1985

ACTING DIRECTOR GENERAL

RE: COMMONWEALTH GOVERNMENT FOR PROPOSAL ON BUILDING INDUSTRY CODE OF CONDUCT

I refer to our earlier discussions in connection with initiatives being taken by the Commonwealth Government to develop a code of practice to be applied to employers in the building industry.

I attach for your information, a document on this matter that was made available by the Commonwealth earlier today. I am told that the approach set out in the attachment was raised in discussions between Mr. Willis and Mr. Crabb at their meeting on 1 July. Furthermore, the attached document was used as a guide to discussions between the Commonwealth and employers on September 2. The status of the attached document is that it has not been finalised and the Commonwealth have advised that our Minister will further be advised when the position reaches finality.

In summary, the proposed code of practice requires employers to follow certain industrial relations practices and in particular, the adherence to awards and agreements, national wage principles, to refuse claims for payment for lost time due to strike action and to not deal in any way with the B.L.F. following its impending de-registration. In return for these practices being followed, the Commonwealth has indicated that it will assist companies who may be subject to industrial disruption by a de-registered B.L.F.

Finally the document notes that the Commonwealth will be approaching both State and Local Government to also adhere to the principles in this document.

DAVID EYTON
Director,
Policy Audit, Special Projects, and Industrial Liaison.

DIRECTOR-GENERAL'S OFFICE
DATE: 12-9-85
AS: ?
TO: MINISTER
FROM: BOB HOWARD
DATE: 19 NOVEMBER 1985
FILE NO. 10
PED064

SUBJECT: BLF MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION

Cc: Acting Director-General

1. De-Registration Proceedings

BLF behaviour requires positive response from Government. Fast track de-registration could be the answer. Parties should now ask ACAC to immediately de-register the Union. If ACAC does not accept that submission, then we could ask them to put a strict timetable on the case, say two weeks, for the BLF reply, ACTU and Victorian Government submissions. Believed that MBAV and AFOC would support. We need to seize the initiative. We would get overwhelming support from the public (and I suspect tacit support from the majority of Unions).

2. Code of Conduct

MBAV has one or two areas of concern e.g. the operative date which is when the BLF (Re-recognition) Act comes into operation. They would prefer a much earlier date. Suggest we hear their views and come back to them. In light of their comments and your instructions, I will review the Code and re-present to you tomorrow.

3. 3.8% NW Increase

BLF has not yet made application. They say they are going to "win it in the field". MBAV will not now oppose 3.8% for other building Unions when matter comes before Alley J on Thursday morning next.

I told the MBAV that Government would not oppose other building Unions being awarded the increase.

At Portland, the 3.8% is due to be paid on Thursday of this week 21 November. The Project Industrial Relations Manager advises that the Project agreements provide for automatic payment of NW increases following Full Bench Decisions. That is the custom and practice. At least the BLF has been told in no uncertain terms that there is no way the 35 hour week will apply at Portland. Gallagher subsequently agreed to exempt Portland from the campaign.

4. Bans Clause BLF Award

MBAV has an opinion from a very good source that the existing bans clause can validly be applied. This was placed in Award in May 1982 for a period of three months.

For your information

TONY QUINN
Special Projects Officer
602 8566

Department of Employment and Industrial Affairs
National Bank House, 200 Bourke Street, Melbourne, 3000, Victoria, Australia. Telephone: (03) 602 8111
Telex No: AA 1348957

TO: MINISTER
FROM: TONY QUINN
DATE: 9 DECEMBER 1985
FILE NO. IL0167

SUBJECT: BLF DEREGISTRATION CASE

For your information I advise that the following has transpired in respect of this matter.

On Thursday 5 December, the Full High Court rejected the BLF's appeal against the refusal by Alley J to disqualify himself from sitting on the ACAC Bench hearing the deregistration case.

Also on 5 December the BLF withdrew its summons to witness served on you, indicating that it would only seek compliance to the extent of the provision of relevant documents.

On Friday, 6 December the presentation of all evidentiary material in support of the Commonwealth's application concluded and the ACAC Full Bench granted an application by our counsel, Mr. Richard Tracey, that the residual aspect of the above summons ought to be struck out.

Today the BLF, in opening its rebuttal, indicated that it would be challenging by way of evidence and argument each and every instance of BLF action particularised in support of the Commonwealth's application.

In respect of the last point, it should be noted that as a consequence, unless some remedial action is taken, the case is very likely to take months to conclude. A conservative estimate at this stage is March or April, 1986.

The practical difficulties associated with such an eventuality were raised this afternoon with the Commonwealth at officer level. It is understood that as a result, consideration will be shortly given to possible means of shortening the ACAC proceedings still further.

It is anticipated that once the Commonwealth has clarified its thinking on the matter, probably in the next few days, this and other aspects of the case will need to be the subject of further discussions between Mr. Richard Tracey and yourself.

For information.

TONY QUINN
Special Projects Officer
602 8566
17 March, 1986

As per attached list.

Dear

I refer to the case before the Consolidation and Arbitration Commission to deregister the Builders Labourers Federation. As you would be aware the application was made to the Commission by the Federal Government and the Victorian Government was given the right to intervene in support.

The case is due to finish on 21 March 1986. During February 1986 the Full Bench hearing the case requested that the Federal Government provide by 11 March a draft Declaration which is the pre-requisite for the Federal Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations to carry out the deregistration process under the Federal Building Industry Act. That request was met.

In these circumstances it now seems appropriate to begin serious discussion on the allocation of B.L.F. work in the post deregistration period.

Consideration has been given to this and a copy of my thoughts on the matter is attached for your perusal.

You will be aware that the responsibility for the allocation of B.L.F. work (with the consent of Unions affected) rests with the Federal Minister. It is my intention to convene a meeting very soon with the relevant unions with the view to placing before the Federal Minister a position for the Victorian building industry.

I would appreciate any comment you may care to make prior to the proposed meeting.

Yours sincerely,

STEVE CRABB
MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT AND INDUSTRIAL AFFAIRS.
SECTION VI

'DIRTY POLITICS' - THE NAME OF THE GAME IN THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOURS' ANTI-BLF DRIVE.

Documents (A) and (B) show how far the government is willing to go to impose its will on the building industry.

Safety on site is only regarded as a side issue in the wider scene.

Document (C) reflects the paranoia of the department. There can be no other explanation!

Document (D) confirms the hiring of Lewis Constructions' ex-Industrial Relations Officer, P. Andropus.

Lewis' is a well known anti-union company.

Document (E) reflects the 'smart-ass' chit-chat of those enjoying power for power's sake; sexist remarks and the bragging about using police against unionists (i.e. the M.C.G. light tower reference), obviously illustrates a highly paid public servant hard at work!

And, document (F) would obviously have 'snappy' Tom Roper grabbing for the phone to call his solicitor.

MEMORANDUM

TO: THE MINISTER.
FROM: JIM PATTERSON.
DATE: 3 JULY 1986
FILE NO:
FILE NOTE ONLY

SUBJECT

- Attached for your information.
- Upshot is that Crane Drivers were among B.L.F. militants as part of Norm's strategy 'No Cranes - No Work' - Cranes critical to B. & E. industry.
- Additional inspectors to be appointed to get up to strength.
- Chasing up follow up report re training and qualification of additional Crane Drivers in response to our advertisements.
- John Van Camp former B.L.F. Organiser is now with F.E.D.F.A. - still 'militant'.
- Obviously F.E.D.F.A. are not prepared to be accused of accepting lower standards than required to avoid B.L.F. and others criticism.
- May be advisable for Bob and Self to meet F.E.D.F.A. and 'drive' the issue to seek to ensure that 1st September threat is 'headed off'.

J.H. Paterson,
Industrial Adviser.
MEMORANDUM

TO: DIRECTOR-GENERAL.
FROM: JIM PATERSO N.

ACTION BY: / / 
FOR INFORMATION: FILE NOTE ONLY

SUBJECT: CRANES, HOISTS.

Phil,

Yesterday 23.7.86, 2 - F.E.D.F.A. Organisers met with Bob Howard and myself to discuss the concerns of their union re the safety of Cranes.

What came through very strongly in that F.E.D.F.A. in having taken the crane drivers and dogmen off the B.L.F. are determined not to be accused of permitting safety and amenity conditions to be lowered.

Pat Preston has been having discussions with Don Robinson's Technical Services people over the last 12 months.

The single common factor coming through is that the inspectorate services in this area are accused of being inadequate.

F.E.D.F.A. are now putting pressure on cranes and excuses are being given why inspectors are not available. The Minister met the 2 organisers in my office and expressed his serious concern at the apparent deficiencies in the area also. I will continue to liaise with the F.E.D.F.A. Organiser on this matter.

This matter will be discussed at the meeting with the Minister, Brian Meir, Bruce Nadenbousch, Bill Hall and myself.

In the interim, could you have a list of Crane Inspectors prepared, including the following details:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>TRAINING QUALIFICATIONS OR EXPERTISE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Full details of the processes of Technical Services responding to calls to inspect new or modified cranes.

The attached report provided to Bill Hall by an inspector reveals serious concerns.

The Minister has been made aware of the report and my concerns arising.

ALL B.O.L. Inspectors and I.L.O.'s are to personally be instructed that they are to refuse to meet with or deal with either in person, telephone or writing, who represent the B.L.F.

Further, they are to be reminded that the B.L.F. has been deregistered by the Federal Government and derecognised by the State Government who is their employer.

A report is to be sought from Ms Pat Young who is not an I.L.O. on her involvement in this matter.

Please confirm the foregoing by providing written copy of D.O.L. directive re this issue.

The other concerns will be dealt with by myself on behalf of the Minister.

Please convey the personal gratitude of the Minister to B.C.I.D. Inspector Mr. S. Benedict for his report.

Yours,

J.M. Paterson,
Industrial Adviser.

ATT: Report B.C.I.D. Inspector Benedict to Mr. Bill Hall.

CC: B. Hall.
    B. Fimm.
    B. Nadenbousch.
Mr. P. Andropus,
26 Fielding Street,
TEMPLESTONE, VIC. 3106.

Dear Paul,

The purpose of this letter is to confirm your appointment to the Department of Labour as an Industrial Liaison Officer.

In due course, Mr. Bill Pinn, Manager of the I.L.O. Unit, will fully explain the duties and functions of this position.

For the immediate future you will be dealing with the broad range of issues relating to the building and construction industry.

On behalf of the Minister I extend to you a personal welcome to the Department of Labour and we are sure that you will enjoy the challenge associated with your new position.

If you have any problems at any time, please contact me personally.

Yours sincerely,

Jim Paterson
Industrial Adviser to
Minister for Labour.

Contact:
Telephone:
Your Ref:
Our Ref:

24th September, 1986

Mr. Keith Thompson,
Deputy Commissioner of Police (Operations),
Police headquarters,
380 William Street,
MELBOURNE, VIC. 3000.

Dear Keith,

After seeing you at the VFL Finals Match (I paid to get in), I fully realised that you are already semi-retired.

As one who had a close personal involvement in the preparation and negotiations on the E.S.S.E. you can forward the cheque to me at Nauru House (say 3%).

I have read with interest your life story in Police Life and to my regret you forgot to mention the time I banned the Clifton Hill rail lines due to one of your Accident Appreciation Squad nabbing my train driver.

You were the Chief Commissioner's 'minder' at the time, keeping the wolves at bay.

As a young 'Nato' I also drank at Barbito's, but never ever met the prostitutes. Nice 'girls' - yes, but not pro's.

I have suggested to Steve that we give you a model of an MCG light tower as an appropriate momento.

The Minister, however, wants to have your big flat boots done in copper.

Seriously, we will miss you and your invaluable assistance.

If you are having a p--- up, don't forget D.O.L.

All the best to you and your good Wife.

Jim Paterson
SUMMARY

The internal and confidential files of the Department of Labour obviously make interesting reading.

Citizens for Democracy believe such information should be made widely available to the public.

Many ordinary people may have understandably believed that an A.L.P. government would be operating in a more open, honest way.

The moral tone of Premier Cains leadership would certainly give such an impression.

However, the above documentation clearly indicates that the corrupt machinations expected of a Liberal Party government are alive and well today in Victoria.

END
SUMMARY

The current work contributes to the understanding of social and economic trends in the region. It highlights the importance of cooperation among countries to address common challenges. An analysis of the economic policies of various nations reveals a significant shift towards increasing international trade and investment. This trend is driven by the need for sustainable development and the desire to enhance economic growth.

Moreover, the integration of technological advancements in the agricultural sector is discussed as a key factor in increasing productivity and efficiency. The report emphasizes the importance of investing in research and development to keep pace with global innovations.

In conclusion, the report advocates for a coordinated approach to policy-making, where nations collaborate to address environmental concerns and promote economic stability. This collaborative effort is essential for achieving long-term developmental goals and fostering a more inclusive global economy.