



***AUSTRALASIAN STUDY OF  
PARLIAMENT GROUP  
(Queensland Chapter)***

**OUTCOME OF THE 2017 ELECTION**

**TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS**

**MONDAY, 5 MARCH 2018**

**Brisbane**

## MONDAY, 5 MARCH 2018

---

**Mr FRASER:** I would like to welcome you all tonight. Three years ago we put on an event discussing the conduct and outcome of the 2015 election. Tonight we are holding a similar event in relation to the 2017 election. The chair tonight is Felicity Caldwell from the *Brisbane Times*. She will be running the show. Our guests tonight are Graham Young from the Australian Institute for Progress, in particular talking about the work he has done on polling before and after the election; we will then hear from representatives of both the ALP and the LNP: Sarah Mawhinney from the Labor Party and Lincoln Folo from the LNP; we will then hear from one of parliament's new members, Sandy Bolton from Noosa; and we will then hear an academic perspective from Chris Salisbury and Paul Williams.

The format will be that each speaker will speak for somewhere between five and 10 minutes. We would prefer you not to interrupt at that stage. After that we will welcome questions and a limited level of comment from the audience. We hope to finish at approximately 7.30. I welcome tonight Minister Hinchliffe. I will not go through all the other members of parliament because if I do I will miss someone and he or she will be mortally offended. Could all members of parliament stand up, please. Your attendance is much appreciated and we hope you enjoy the evening. I will pass over to Felicity and she will kick off proceedings.

**Ms CALDWELL:** Thank you, David. It is great we can have this during a sitting week. It is great we have so many sitting MPs here. Hopefully we can share some information. You can ask some questions about how the parliament is going to run and hopefully we can inform each other. It is a few months after the election and the dust has settled and we can take a step back and examine how the campaign worked and the outcome and what that means for how the 56th parliament will work.

Premier Anastacia Palaszczuk has won herself a second term. Labor has a majority. It will be interesting to see what that means. The next election is two years and eight months away. That is not very far. We will start with Graham Young. Graham is the Executive Director of the Australian Institute for Progress and founder and chief editor of On Line Opinion, which is 19 years old this April. In a former life he was also a state vice president and campaign chairman of the Queensland Liberal Party.

**Mr YOUNG:** Thank you very much, Felicity. I did not really prepare anything too formal; I made a number of notes and some of it is based on my polling. I do not know how many of you are familiar with it, but since 2001—so 17 years—I have been doing qualitative polling online. It first started as a joint project with Mike Kaiser, a former state secretary of the Labor Party. He was outside parliament at the time. We started doing this online. I have developed it since then. I do it for the qual, to find out what is motivating people.

If you ever run an election campaign, and some of you have, you know that knowing what the polling result is going to be in four weeks time is not a really valuable piece of information. It gives you some idea as to the race you are running, but you either want to maintain the figures like that or change them and to do either of those things you need to know why people are doing things. That is why we do the qualitative, but I have discovered that when you get a sample of 400, 500, 600 people, that you actually get some valuable quants out of it as well. They are not as good as you are going to get out of Newspoll, but they are indicative.

The last election was more or less a status quo election. You had two parties, on my polling, and two leaders who were not really well liked, so it was potentially open space for One Nation, the Katters and for candidates who had a little bit of individuality about them and perhaps did not conform to the party template, and I think one of the mysteries is that more of those candidates did not perform better than they did. You can see that it was a status quo election.

If you go to Antony Green's online assessment of things, I have mucked around with it a little bit because he gave some seats to Independents which I regard as really ALP seats to start off with such as Pumicestone, for example. You cannot disendorse a candidate five seconds before an election and say, 'That's really an Independent seat.' It really was Labor versus LNP. You have ALP after the redistribution

## Outcome of the 2017 Election

on 49, LNP on 42 and others on two. You look at those figures and you say, 'The ALP went nowhere, the Liberal Party went backwards slightly and others went up slightly.' One of the others is here, and I would be interested to find out how she did that.

Basically nothing went anywhere and the same sorts of issues that dominated the previous election dominated this election. Campbell Newman was a big factor, and you saw that in the ALP advertising. They ran Campbell. On my polling—and I did one at the beginning and I did one on the day and a couple of days afterwards which we call an exit poll, not strictly speaking one but that was the best word I could come up with for it—Campbell Newman's incidence of being mentioned I think was 42 per cent in the first poll. When you got to the second poll it was down to 20 something per cent, so still significant. You do not get that many things mentioned that often, but he had certainly dropped out of significance compared to where he was at the beginning of the campaign.

I think the Adani factor had something to do with it. From a professional point of view, the ALP campaign seemed to me to be completely disorganised for the first two or maybe three weeks. Part of that was I think they got sideswiped by the Greens coming out with their Adani line and for my money they were the only ones that cut through with their message being 'Greens first, Adani last'. That gave me a reason for maybe changing my vote—playing the role of every man—whereas the lines that were being used by both Liberal and Labor might have kept people where they were, but neither side were really giving voters a reason to change their vote, and I think that was partly to do with the previous three years that the LNP had been trying to run away from with regard to the Newman legacy at a parliamentary level.

They did not want to get caught saying that they would privatise things, so privatisation was ruled out but one of the consequences of that was they could not promise any spending on infrastructure that was terribly different from the government's. So that was not going to be reason to change. The government on the other side really had not done that much in three years to put a program saying, 'You'll risk all these gains if you don't put us in.' They were running on things like, 'The Newman government sacked 14,000 public servants and we've put them all back in,' but again most voters do not see that as a reason to change their vote.

It was an election in a lot of ways without major issues. As I say, Adani I think sideswiped Labor and was a potential wedge. By the time you got to the end, not that many people were worried about it, although I suspect—because I do not get large samples out of seats like Maiwar or South Brisbane or any other seat—if you have 600 and you have 93 electorates, if you do the maths there are four to seven from each electorate, so you cannot tell anything about particular electorates. I think it probably did run there.

With regard to the cuts and chaos Labor ad, I think that worked to some extent that the Liberal Party was wedged and people found their answer on what they would do if they were in a minority not particularly convincing. Again, it is hard to see where that was making too much of a difference. The Liberals did not run a negative campaign at all until the end and then it was twinned with electricity prices, but that was not really coming through in my polling as being something that people were talking about by the time you got to the end of the campaign. They certainly were talking about it six months ago, but things move on.

In summary, from where I sat and I think from where most Queenslanders sat, it was a bit of a nothing campaign. The sticks ended up coming down basically where they were. The LNP went backwards. One Nation do not have anything to pat themselves on the back about, because they were probably the big failure of the election when you are looking at political parties.

**Ms CALDWELL:** Great. Thanks for that, Graham. We will move on to Sarah Mawhinney now, the Assistant State Secretary for Labor. Sarah was born and raised on the Sunshine Coast before moving to Brisbane to attend university. She completed a Bachelor of Arts majoring in politics and the economy at Griffith University. Sarah has many years of campaign experience, having most recently worked at the Transport Workers' Union where she was the Campaigns and Communications Coordinator. Sarah has held numerous internal positions including representing branch members on the national policy forum, the National Labor Women's Network and also as a local branch office-bearer. Sarah has also been the vice-president and secretary of the Queensland Labor Women's Network. Please welcome Sarah Mawhinney.

**Ms MAWHINNEY:** Again, per the email chain, I am going to keep my opening remarks pretty brief. By virtually every measure this election was a success for the Palaszczuk government, achieving majority in the newly expanded chamber. What was really clear to us and what was really clear coming back from voters was that the choice between a stable Labor government that was committed to real jobs was

preferred as opposed to the cuts and chaos that had been seen under the Newman-Nicholls term in the government prior. It is actually worth noting that that message was definitely coming across to us on the doors. The restoration to services—the front-line services that had been cut—did actually resonate very strongly in marginal inner-city Brisbane seats and it was an issue that played out in this election as much as it played out in the last election.

The ground campaign was something that we were incredibly proud of in this election. The number of doors that we doorknocked and the number of phone calls that we made and the direct contact that we made with voters across the state was significant. It was because of that contact that we were able to formulate the message and understand that Queenslanders did very much want a stable government that was investing in infrastructure and real jobs in Brisbane but also in regional Queensland.

It is also worth noting that one of the fantastic outcomes of this election is the significant female representation in this parliament. The Labor Party ends up at 48 per cent versus the LNP's 15 per cent and Premier Palaszczuk continues to, in her very quiet, dignified way, become the most successful female politician in the country's history, breaking down every barrier that is in place before her. I am happy to talk more broadly in comments.

**Ms CALDWELL:** Thanks for that, Sarah. Now we might have a somewhat opposing view. I invite Lincoln Folo from the LNP to tell us his thoughts. Lincoln is the LNP's campaign director. He previously served as an adviser in the Howard government and started with the LNP in mid-2015. Lincoln has been involved in state and federal elections since 1998. Please welcome Lincoln Folo.

**Mr FOLO:** Thanks, Felicity. Good evening, everyone, and thanks very much for coming along. One of the things that I have said quite a bit to our team over the period of time is that we are participants, not commentators. This is a position that we do not do a lot and, to be honest, I do not think we really should be commenting necessarily on an election that we were participants in, other than to say that I agree a lot with the comments of Graham in terms of a status quo election and it was very difficult to engender a mood for change. I think we can say that the Palaszczuk government was quite successful in the first term in running what was effectively what we colloquially call a small target strategy in how they governed and voters responded to not having such an activist government that we saw in the Newman government and they quite liked that.

I saw in the paper today in Steve Wardill's article someone on our side of the tent saying that it is very difficult to put a knife into smoke, and there was an element of that in the campaign. I think one of the things that gets missed in elections is, particularly this election, there was actually quite a bit of change. Tonight I notice how many of the new members we have on our side of the chamber who are in here, and I will single out a couple who won against the punditry and the odds—Sam O'Connor in Bonney and Jim McDonald in Lockyer.

This was an unusual election. While the result was a strong result for the Palaszczuk government—and congratulations to them—we did see a lot of change on our side of the chamber and we saw some significant victories in that nobody gave Jim a chance and he had a very strong result. Lockyer was ground zero against the forces of Hansonism. With that, I am looking forward to taking questions and I will leave it at that.

**Ms CALDWELL:** Thanks, Lincoln. Next we have Sandy Bolton to speak with us. Sandy is the newly elected Independent member for Noosa. She was a Noosa councillor from 2013 to 2016 who narrowly missed out on becoming mayor in the 2016 election. Sandy has worked in management and consultancy in a broad range of industries. Her community involvement included being director of Sunshine Coast Community Financial Services Ltd, which is Bendigo community bank, and the community advisory committee for the Sunshine Coast Primary Health Network. Please welcome Sandy Bolton.

**Ms BOLTON:** Good evening, everybody. Thank you, Felicity, and also to David for the invitation to share a very grassroots point of view of the 2017 elections. As the only Independent candidate to be elected, I am often asked whether I feel alone without the support of a political party. Let me tell you that it is hard to feel alone when you have a whole community alongside you on the journey. Regardless of who they voted for, everyone in your electorate needs you to succeed in delivering the local outcomes they seek.

The other question I am asked is how did I manage to achieve the unachievable. For clarity, I did not achieve this. The people of Noosa did. If you revisit recent history in my electorate you will see that in 2008 the people of Noosa focused on what connected them instead of what separated them, and that was in

## Outcome of the 2017 Election

response to the forced amalgamation of their council. They worked together in collective effort and voice to bring about the change needed to regain their own identity which was achieved in 2013. This, I believe, has led to a broader understanding of the power of collective action, individual responsibility and the importance of informed decision-making.

In the lead-up to the 2017 elections I observed a number of factors in my community that I believe contributed to the result. There was frustration by the lack of progress on a number of historical issues which morphed into a greater number of residents questioning the impact of their vote and actively speaking about the need for change, which I think was brought up earlier. From discussions, this change was not purely about a change in their local member or political party; it was a change in what they saw as an unproductive political environment and culture at home and across Queensland and Australia. They wanted to see a return to productivity and authenticity and a genuine collective effort from government to fix their escalating concerns on a range of issues, including affordable housing, infrastructure, expensive utilities, environmental degradation and poor employment opportunities.

Some of the greatest discontent from voters has surrounded the climate change and cost of power debates, mainly emanating from conflicting information. The message was clear: they want governments to make it easier for people to understand and support transitions to a more sustainable space in multiple realms. I see the election outcomes across the state as a reflection of human emotion, mainly frustration and a lack of trust. There was an escalating urgency for workable solutions, a rejection of previous poor behaviour in the political realm and what is seen as ineffective and partisan management of scarce resources.

We are also seeing an increasing desire of communities to have greater say in customising policies and frameworks to suit their regions rather than the one-size-fits-all approach to governments which prevail. We are a commercialised world and customisation of product for specific segments is big business and proving successful. In my view, voters are consumers and they seek the flexibility in legislation and policy to clearly reflect their and their region's needs and concerns whilst still contributing to the collective advancement of their state.

In general, there is a feeling that our governments have not moved into a progressive, innovative and fleet footed space, whereas our people, businesses and not-for-profit organisations are needing to in order to be viable, pushed by the speed and quantity of information being delivered to their world at an ever increasing rate. I see the roles of major parties and Independents as essential to bring these aspects and emerging trends to the table through a form of representation not hindered by ideology.

To deliver the undiluted and unfiltered message from communities is invaluable, as well to ask the hard but necessary questions of the government on behalf of their voters, as well as the voters themselves. These include what role do voters play in creating the political environments and policy frameworks that they feel are failing them? How is the era of self-entitlement, the devolution of responsibility to others, the seeking of instant gratification and unrealistic expectations contributing to quick fixes versus sustainable solutions?

To finish, there are many changes happening within our people and across Australia and their perceptions and perspectives are defining the results at polling booths. A new political culture and a new way of getting the job done is being sought. To deliver this successfully, we need to listen and be able to translate their needs accurately. To do that, we need to interpret what they are saying from their perspective, not from ours. Maybe it is time for an innovation of our politics. Thank you.

**Ms CALDWELL:** Thanks, Sandy. Next up we have Chris Salisbury. Chris is a sessional lecturer in European and Australian history at the Australian Catholic University and the University of Queensland. He is also a research associate in the School of Political Science and International Studies at the University of Queensland as well as a research associate of Queensland's TJ Ryan Foundation and a member of the ASPG Queensland branch. He researches, writes and comments on Queensland and Australian politics and government policymaking. Please welcome Chris Salisbury.

**Dr SALISBURY:** Thanks, Felicity, and thanks David and the ASPG for the invitation to speak tonight. I agree with most of what has been said already and it is probably the characterisation given by Graham that I will begin with—this election was something of a status quo—at least its outcome. That is not to dismiss several changes and, in some cases, remarkable and notable individual seat results or elections of particular candidates. As an observer, I found that—and, again, Graham pointed out Antony Green's

equation—there was a little break from the pre-election formula to post election. Labor has moved into majority, obviously, but its stocks as a proportion of the entire chamber have not increased markedly from when it entered the election.

The LNP, obviously, suffered some setbacks, but perhaps what is the biggest change, or the most notable difference to this outcome, for me is that it has been the first time since the 2009 election where a government has been returned in Queensland and the first time since 2009 that there has not been a wild, or remarkable swing against the sitting government. This might provide some comfort for both of the major parties and, particularly, of course, the ALP, but I see at this election a diversity, a splintering of the vote that we have not seen for 20 years.

Something like 30-plus per cent of primary votes cast were for the non-major parties in this election. That was at least equal, if not greater, than the primary vote for nonmajors at the 1998 election. Obviously, One Nation had such an impact. Their impact was clearly well short of that election 20 years ago and well short of the party's own expectations, but this is a shift that I think weighs heavily on the major parties and how they deal with this at the next-term government, a fixed term, to a point where they are both going to have to win back a section to try to ensure that they can, at least for the ALP, retain majority government or, for the LNP, to win it back. I think that is the challenge for them.

As Sandy mentioned, there is a diversity in the House now. There is a diverse crossbench, with interests ranging from regional North Queensland through to coastal communities and inland regional communities. The work of this parliament is going to be critical, particularly for the two major parties to get the trust that they can engender in those who have departed the majors in their first preference.

**Ms CALDWELL:** Our final speaker is Dr Paul Williams, who is a senior lecturer in politics and journalism at Griffith University's School of Humanities, Languages, and Social Science. Paul is a weekly columnist with the *Courier-Mail* and a frequent commentator on elections and the media. He has published widely on voter behaviour and political leadership, including in the *Australian journal of political science*, the *Australian journal of politics and history* and many other places. Despite watching Queensland politics closely for 35 years, Paul is still regularly gobsmacked.

**Dr WILLIAMS:** Absolutely. I am indeed. Thanks Felicity and to the ASPG for the kind invitation to speak tonight. The synopsis that I am about to give is the synopsis of a paper that I have coming out in a special edition of the Queensland review. Chris has contributed a paper to that. Frank Mols has contributed a paper to that. It is coming out post election as a special edition post-election issue of the *Queensland review*.

In picking up where Chris left off, I think a lot of voters would think that this election and the campaign result were rather lacklustre, but if you drill down into it you find that it was a very fascinating election. There is lots to uncover and a lot of firsts. Let me recount some of the firsts.

I think that most people would know that Annastacia Palaszczuk is the only woman state Premier to have won two successful elections after being the only woman to win the state premiership from opposition. We have the election of the first Greens MP in Michael Berkman. We have the election of the first Torres Strait Islander in Cynthia Lui. We have the election of the first South Sea Islander in Stephen Andrew, who is also the first Pauline Hanson One Nation MP to be elected since 2009.

This was the first poll since the return of compulsory preferential voting, the first poll since the introduction of electoral donations real-time declaration laws, the first since the repeal of voter ID legislation and—the big one—the first time since 1907 that a minority government has been returned. That was when the Kidstonites were returned more than 100 years ago. So it was truly history making.

This election is the first remarkable election in succession. Of course, 2012 was remarkable in the sense that it yielded the biggest parliamentary majority in Australian history at state, territory or federal level. In 2015 we saw a huge, almost record-breaking swing—14 per cent—away from that government. This election, while not unique, it is still unusual in the sense that we saw a minority government move to majority status despite a litany of mitigating circumstances and problems, which I am about to go through.

This election was interesting, especially for Labor, because it was more or less Labor defying the electoral tide and, for some period, defying public opinion polls. I have met very few people outside the Labor pantheon who were certain that Labor was going to get a majority. Not too many people were willing to put more than a couple of dollars on Labor to get a majority. The view tended to be a minority government with Labor ending up with the most seats in the House.

## Outcome of the 2017 Election

It was a more remarkable outcome, I feel, given that so much was stacked against the Labor Party. Labor's campaign—and we all use 20/20 hindsight—at the time seemed quite confused and it did not seem to be winning a lot of punters on the ground. We also saw a fairly ordinary first term in many respects. We saw ministerial resignations. We saw public policy crises in rail and child safety. We saw ministerial problems over email.

Graham found some really interesting data in his poll, where just 37 per cent of voters believed that the Palaszczuk government deserved re-election and that 53 per cent said that they did not deserve re-election. So support for the Palaszczuk government seemed to be grudging support. Interestingly, 23 per cent of those same respondents and 50 per cent of LNP voters also said that the Nicholls opposition did not deserve election. So it really was a question of the lesser of two evils for a lot of voters.

That same period saw a lot of Labor internal dissent. We saw two MPs resign. We saw one disendorsed. We saw some pretty significant economic challenges—high unemployment in the regions. We saw a relatively united LNP and it ran a textbook campaign. Although it was very dull, it was textbook. Of course, we had a resurgent Pauline Hanson's One Nation Party. To me, it is remarkable that, with all of that stacked against it, Labor suffered only a small primary vote swing of only two per cent, it picked up four seats in the process and attracted a 0.1 per cent after-preference swing to it. I think that is pretty remarkable. That makes this election quite remarkable.

All of this throws up to me four big questions. The first one is: how did the Palaszczuk government do that? How did it remain competitive over the triennium? There is more than one answer, but I think the answer is that Palaszczuk, relative to Nicholls, was still relatively popular among voters. Newspoll found that Nicholls ended the campaign 14 per cent behind Anastacia as the preferred Premier. Why was Palaszczuk so inoffensive? I think the government itself is inoffensive. Many voters would have agreed with the LNP's summation that the Palaszczuk government was an accidental, do-nothing government but, at the same time, it was inoffensive. It did not scare the horses. It was consultative. The LNP tried to make this a problem—that it has had over 200 commissions of inquiries, et cetera—but people like consultation. It was also relatively risk averse. Its de-Newmanisation program, which was lampooned by a lot of people, was also popular. Undoing the Newman years was popular.

Question 2: why did Tim Nicholls, an articulate, intelligent and urbane leader, fail to gain traction? He was the textbook conservative leader in a safe Brisbane seat. He should have been all over this election. Why did the LNP vote decline sharply? I think Graham and others touched upon this. I think Nicholls failed to distance himself adequately from the Newman legacy.

Secondly—and I think this was of even greater salience for voters—Nicholls appeared disingenuous when he talked about being distant from Pauline Hanson's One Nation and not relying on its support in a hung parliament. On the other side of that same coin, the LNP preferencing Pauline lesson of what happened in Western Australia. They did not and the LNP organisation needs to answer for that. In voters' minds, the LNP and Pauline Hanson's One Nation became conflated: a vote for one was a vote for the other and if you vote for either of them, you get instability. I will come back to this point.

Question 3: why did the Greens win Maiwar but not South Brisbane, where they poured in all of their energies and money and all the press was talking about South Brisbane. It is simple mathematics. With the reintroduction of compulsory preference voting, the LNP finished third in South Brisbane and directed its preferences to Labor. The LNP executive was split over this. Some in the LNP wanted to get rid of Jackie Trad. Others said, 'No, we can't. It would be duplicitous, because we have put the Greens last in every other seat.' Conversely, Labor finished third in Maiwar and eight per cent of Labor voters preferenced the Greens over the LNP, despite the fact that the Greens were well behind Scott Emerson.

Question 4: why did One Nation win so few seats? It won one seat. I think the worst case scenario was that One Nation would win three or four seats. At one point I thought they might win 10. In the end, it was not rocket science. Their primary vote was too low. In many seats PHON finished third, so they could not attract major party preferences. One Nation won only 13.73 per cent of the vote across the state, but they won 20.11 per cent in the 61 seats they contested. One Nation says that they would have won something like 20 per cent across the state if they contested all seats. I do not think that is true. They would not have won any votes in places like South Brisbane.

Another point is that even where PHON's primary vote was quite high, you have many voters deserting the LNP, voting 1 One Nation and then preferencing back to Labor completely bypassing the LNP. The big one, of course, is that PHON was its own worst enemy. The PHON campaign was appalling.

## Outcome of the 2017 Election

PHON had a horror 2017. Pauline Hanson is her own worst enemy in that respect. It had a horror public relations year, everything from political donations to antivaccination conspiracies. It was a very tough record for One Nation to defend.

One factor which I think has not really been assessed properly, anecdotally even though it is important but it has not been assessed properly, is One Nation senator Fraser Anning's resignation. This could not have come at a worse time for Hanson. It exploded right at the beginning of week three of the campaign and it really confirmed for a lot of voters the fractious nature of populist parties. It really underscored what the major parties had been saying about One Nation for a long time: if you vote for One Nation today will that person still be a One Nation member tomorrow?

A quick word on Adani, and Graham might have something to say about this also: I suspect that Adani was not the big, big salient issue for voters as we suspected it was, at least in terms of somewhat shoring up Labor seats. Graham might be able to elaborate on this, but I think that the polling found that only 16 per cent of South-East Queensland voters and 17 per cent of regional voters thought Adani was a top level issue. That does not mean to say Adani did not have some sort of behavioural or psychological effect on the campaign and certainly on the news media cycle when Premier Palaszczuk pushed what I call the Adani nuclear button on the Friday of the first week and went the veto. I think what this did is it got the Greens off Labor's back and sent them chasing after the LNP.

In summary, yes, compulsory preferential voting did change the outcome of this campaign but not in the way we suspected. We all thought that the LNP-PHON preference deal would secure more seats for both the LNP and PHON. It did not work out that way. Compulsory preferential voting clearly assisted Labor in Brisbane and the regions and the Greens in Maiwar. I will come back to this point of political stability. There was a Galaxy poll in November that found voters' desire for stable government after having three years of minority government. Minority government is pretty much anathema to Queensland. We are a state that likes big majorities and long-term governments. It was the third top issue for voters in South-East Queensland. The top issue was health on 32 and jobs on 29. In the regions it was the fourth top issue on 28 per cent. Forty per cent believed jobs was the top issue, 31 health, 29 electricity. It was a reasonably salient issue for voters: having majority stable government.

I will leave you with this question to which I do not know the answer: given we have seen the poor showing of PHON in Queensland, given we have seen the absolute debacle of the Jacqui Lambie campaign in Tasmania, are Australians moving away from populists; given that two pretty ordinary governments were re-elected, are we returning to a period of stability?

**Ms CALDWELL:** Thank you for that, Paul. There are quite a lot of points that our panellists might want to respond to. From what I saw there was consistent messaging during the campaign from Labor linking Tim Nicholls to Campbell Newman. Campbell Newman was like a ghost; he was not running but he was there every day. How hard do you think it was to separate your leader from Campbell Newman during that campaign?

**Mr FOLO:** It was obviously difficult. That is why the Labor Party invested so much time and effort and money into that campaign. I think, as Graham said, we saw it start quite strongly the message tying Tim to Campbell and we saw the Premier early on try to also then link asset sales in but that dropped off pretty quickly when asked to provide evidence of the asset sale plan. I think Campbell's name came to represent a level of activity and style of government that the voters had quite clearly said they did not like.

What we learnt over the last term was not that the voters did not necessarily like or they did not dislike everything we did—in fact, a lot of the things that the Newman government did they did support—but it was perhaps the manner in which we did things. Of course, you are trying to change a view and a belief that has been held for a number of years, up to three years over the term plus another couple into it, so for some people up to five years they have held that belief. In a four-week election campaign it is very difficult to shift that belief.

**Ms CALDWELL:** I want to go to you, Sarah, if you have any rebuttal to that. Do you think we will still be talking about Campbell Newman by 2020?

**Ms MAWHINNEY:** I would hope not to be talking about Campbell Newman in 2020. I think, going to your point about the popularity of the message around undoing the damage of Campbell Newman, it was popular because the damage that had been done was so great. For a lot of communities the cuts to services and the cuts to the front line, to jobs, affected not just the person who lost their job, it affected their family and their friends and the broader community. I think the issue around Nicholls, the way in which we were

able to link Nicholls to Newman, was made infinitely easier for us when Campbell Newman tweeted that it was, in fact, Nicholls who was the architect of so many of those really tough decisions and hard decisions that were made under the Newman government. It was very easy to link those two because they were pretty intrinsically linked.

**Ms CALDWELL:** Connected to that, are people disengaged with politics generally and trying to get your leader out there is potentially a hard thing in itself.

**Mr FOLO:** I think for everybody who is involved in the political debate probably the greatest challenge we face is to get people to engage and to participate. I think we all probably had examples over the Christmas break at barbecues and family functions of people asking, 'So, how is it all going?', without being able to necessarily enunciate (a) that there has been an election or (b) what the result was or (c) what some of the issues were. When you started talking about some of the issues during the election campaign my experience was that people were quite surprised but as we all know—everyone in this room—it was not through a lack of effort to communicate a message.

Funding certainly comes into it. The cost of election campaigns certainly comes into it. I think we are all competing with every other product and service in the marketplace. We are all competing for attention spans that have more information than ever being bombarded at people and it is harder for issues to cut through. What is the one issue that has cut through this year? Dare I say it? Barnaby.

When we talk about the difficulty of engagement, whether you are in government or opposition, trying to prosecute a message in the last two weeks was near on impossible because of the level of engagement or disengagement. When people have an issue like that, I do not think it matters what party you support it is very difficult for anyone to (a) engage or (b) not class everybody in the same boat. It makes the whole challenge of how we communicate and cut through that much harder regardless of whether you are the government or the opposition.

**Ms CALDWELL:** Adani was a big issue. I do not think we could get through a panel discussion without mentioning Adani. Graham, how big an impact do you think Adani played in voters' intentions at the ballot box?

**Mr YOUNG:** I cannot be sure, I am just speculating, but I think in some seats it was very high because those seats, and Noosa would be one, are very green so Adani would have been an issue. But it should have been an issue that cut in the regional areas as well. There were three turning points in the campaign, one for each of the parties.

The turning point for the ALP was when Annastacia said she had a conflict of interest and then went directly against the advice she had been given by the Integrity Commissioner and made a decision despite having a conflict of interest on Adani. To me that seemed absurd but the LNP did not seem to be able to capitalise on the absurdity. Somehow she managed to keep regional and city voters sweet on it. Jobs was an issue in the election and for regional voters Adani was a talisman for jobs. In that space from north of Bundaberg up to Townsville, up to a point along the coast, which is an area most prone to be concerned about that, the government managed to hang on as well as managing to win a couple of seats in Brisbane. I think it had a bit of an effect but most people were not thinking about Adani.

One of the problems that the LNP had was that I did not think, and I do not think voters thought, it was credible they could win in their own right. I do not think most voters thought it was credible Labor could win in its own right but they were certainly closer to it and they had them in minority government with the Katter's kind of. They did not really need the Katter's but they kind of did, just to be safe.

Annastacia saying she would not go in government if she had to rely on One Nation, it would have been interesting if she had just fallen short and One Nation had the balance, but that is a counterfactual. Tim just did not quite seem to have the same strength of answer. I think the Red Hill Sky News debate knocked people's confidence in him.

The other thing that happened was that would not have mattered if One Nation had performed better. I think that Fraser Anning knocked the bottom out of One Nation. I printed out before I came here the seats where One Nation did best on a two-party preferred vote. In Maryborough they got 47.54 per cent of the vote. If they had got five per cent more they probably would have won the seat. In Keppel, Lockyer, Thuringowa, Rockhampton—when you get to Rockhampton they are on 44.81 two-party preferred—they were not too far off. Only one of those was an LNP seat, the others were all Labor. If they had won those we would be having an entirely different discussion here tonight.

**Ms CALDWELL:** Chris, you mentioned that there was a splintering of the vote and people not necessarily going to the major parties. There was all this hype about One Nation, they were going to sweep through parliament, and Annastacia Palaszczuk might have to do some sort of a minority government deal. Do you have any insights about what went wrong for them—other than Fraser Anning?

**Dr SALISBURY:** For One Nation?

**Ms CALDWELL:** Yes.

**Dr SALISBURY:** One Nation. That is the straight and simple answer to that. Paul already elaborated on this, that they really had proved over I think the 12 months, from the time that Steve Dickson defected, left the LNP and joined One Nation, there was just one chaotic episode after another. Whether it is a change in the environment from 20 years ago I do not know. Famously, One Nation was even less well organised and more prone to stuff ups 20 years ago and yet that perhaps was part of the initial appeal.

People were wary on this occasion, I think. The bungles, the missteps and misquotes, Steve Dickson talking about Safe Schools in pretty sort of base tones really played against them. I just do not think they put many steps right from the time the campaign began. It is something we had seen before, but it just seemed to all build to a crescendo. Candidates were exposing themselves as very unprofessional or not schooled enough by the party organisation to prove some sort of threat to the incumbents despite, as Graham rightly says, in many seats running very close runner up or at least third place. I think this time around the unprofessionalism of the party counted against them too much.

**Ms CALDWELL:** Sandy, as a new MP how do you see your role in the parliament? Do you think you will support Labor or the LNP, or will you be forming any sort of bloc with the crossbench? How do you see your role?

**Ms BOLTON:** I went into these elections with a commitment to the Noosa community and it is very straightforward: I will represent them very faithfully not only on their issues but on issues across Queensland. It will be on a case-by-case scenario. It would not be yes, I am going this way or that way in the alliances. Every single bill or piece of legislation or issue will be based on not only what is put forward in the debate in terms of information and research. On those big ticket items of a very highly emotive nature such as dying with dignity I will also test the temperature of the community. I see my role as taking their voice and bringing it forth into this parliament.

**Ms CALDWELL:** Paul, I think Sarah mentioned as well there are a lot of women in this parliament. We have a female leader, a female opposition leader and now family friendly hours. I cannot remember what else we are calling them. Normal working hours, I think was the term I heard today. Do you see that changing the way the parliament works?

**Dr WILLIAMS:** Yes, that is a really good question. I have been asked that before. The short answer is no. This is the first occasion on which we have seen a female head of government and a female opposition leader in Australia in state, federal or territory history. There is certainly a thread in political science that says that women do do politics differently, that there is something innate in our gender that governs parliamentary debate and that the parliament is a male bearpit and if we had an all-female legislature, it would behave differently. I suspect the root of the problem with the adversarial system of Westminster politics really boils down to the electoral system and the fact that the electoral system still throws up one major party pitted against another.

A colleague of mine, Dr Niels Kraaier, who Frank knows—he is the co-editor of our special edition—has written about this. In those politics, particularly in Western Europe where there is proportionate representation, that necessitates multiparty systems and the collaboration of crossbenchers to create consensual government. That tends to create what we call feminised political cultures. Where you have first-past-the-post or preferential single-member electorate systems, that tends to create adversarial, one party pitted against another, two-party—or in Australia's case, bipolar—parliamentary systems, and that creates a masculine political culture. Having a woman opposition leader and a woman premier while we still have a confrontational adversarial two-party bipolar system will not change the culture.

**Ms CALDWELL:** Sarah, I think Paul said that the current government was inoffensive. Do you think that is true?

**Ms MAWHINNEY:** I think what is true is that the trust in the Premier is significant. The way in which she engages with the community is received incredibly well. I also think while we were perhaps considered inoffensive, we were quite effective in delivering on our commitments in the 2015 election. I think it was

97 per cent—Stirling may correct me—of the commitments in 2015 were delivered during the course of government. I think that and the way that the Premier is received, which is incredibly well—people do trust her and what she says she is going to do, she does—I think that helped us.

**Ms CALDWELL:** What happens now? The next election is only two years and eight months away. I probably have the same question for Lincoln. Are you going to be campaigning from now up until then now that we know what the date is, or does that happen a few months out?

**Ms MAWHINNEY:** I think the nature of modern politics is that we are increasingly continuously campaigning. I think the set date will be something for Paul, Graham and Chris to talk about. The set date may change the way the next term operates, but the nature of modern politics is that we are continually campaigning all the time.

**Ms CALDWELL:** Would you agree with that, Lincoln?

**Mr FOLO:** It is a continual battle of ideas, surely, and that necessitates a campaign. One of the things I neglected to mention earlier, which I should have, is that we actually had a very detailed plan for Queensland. While I know that the opposition is certainly reviewing the policies of the last election, there are many items and projects and plans there that we had that we will continue to fight for, so that does not stop. We know the date, but we will continue to prosecute our arguments and have the debate with the ideas and who has the best way forward for the state, and we will continue to have that on a vigorous level. One of the great things about our country is that we can do that.

**Ms CALDWELL:** I think we will open it up for questions now.

**Dr WILLIAMS:** There are a couple of points I would like to make. The question of parliament has just been raised, and I think that as the Queensland chapter we need to be fully aware that under the Bligh government the parliament was vastly improved in terms of the way it conducts its business. Finally we have a decent committee system. Finally we have oversight. I know that caused some grief to John Mickel when he was Speaker, but on balance the parliament is unrecognisable compared to how it operated 20 or so years ago.

Of course, while everybody welcomes the increased number of women in the parliament, the parliament itself is an institution which is much greater than the sum of its members, its history, its traditions and the way it conducts its business. It is a sovereign institution that cannot be dictated to by anybody else, and I think to that extent it will be up to the members to make sure that the parliament functions to its absolute utmost capacity. As one who has fought for decades in this state for that to come about, I am very pleased that it has come about and that the current crop of members will be the beneficiaries of the reforms that were made nearly a decade ago.

On a completely different point: the ghost of Campbell Newman. The election before last, which was the last one with voluntary preferential voting, I took the figures out and for the first time since the patent of reforms for the 1992 election came in under EARC, this was the first election under voluntary voting where the incidents of exhausting or plumping, as the Electoral Commission called it, actually fell. There was only one explanation for that, and I will leave you to draw your own conclusion.

**Mr POWER:** I note there were a number of names mentioned from across the political world in this country that were mentioned during the contributions from the panellists. I know there was one name that was not mentioned, and I want to preface this question to the commentators. I will leave it to them. I will not force the others to have to respond to this. While I was out and about during the election campaign the name that I heard most regularly mentioned with the most distain and with the strongest feelings, probably less so in relation to the Premier, less so in relation to the Leader of the Opposition—and not just in my seat, but in a number of seats across Brisbane and other parts of South-East Queensland—was Malcolm Turnbull. It is a common question of what were the federal backers in the election.

**Dr WILLIAMS:** I cannot recollect any poll which reflected any federal factors mentioned, and even anecdotally it did not seem to come up. You can never say a state election is not influenced by outside circumstances. There must be some voters who are voting out of spite out of what has happened in Canberra, or indeed what is happening with the Brisbane City Council or the Gold Coast City Council or what have you. I can only say anecdotally that it was almost exclusively state issues simply because while I certainly talked to a lot of voters and answered a lot of hate emails from voters who just love to share their thoughts with me, Canberra did not really come up. But again it is impossible to say. I did not see any polling on it. Graham, you might have seen some polling. To my mind, it would be overwhelmingly an election fought on state issues.

**Mr YOUNG:** In terms of polling on it, Malcolm Turnbull was not really mentioned in my poll. It cropped up a couple of times. I did stick him into an op piece that I did for the *Australian* because I knew that they would like to see him in there, but the point that I made when I put him in there was that a lot of arguments we are having in politics these days are about culture. If Malcolm Turnbull had an effect on the LNP vote, it would have been from those people in outer suburban and regional areas who do not feel connected to the mainstream inner city culture and who feel that the Liberal Party is not representing them strongly. That should have had the effect of pushing up the One Nation vote a bit, but it does not appear to have.

In terms of him being mentioned, no, it was not coming up in the polling. I think your experience is probably the experience that I had back in 1992 when I ran for the second time for state politics just to see whether I would know the electors have got it wrong. They assured me fairly emphatically that they had not, but that was when Fightback! was on. I became an expert on Fightback! because they were not interested in state politics; they were interested in federal politics. I think your experience says they were not really interested in the state election; they were interested in the federal election.

**Dr SALISBURY:** I think there were a couple of issues at play filtering down from the federal level, not necessarily influencing but present. In the wake of the same sex marriage vote—survey, opinion poll—and in what was just a continuing drama over the High Court and MPs' eligibility to sit in Canberra, that voters were distinguishing those issues from state issues. I think that Paul and everyone is correct that this really was an election fought on state issues. That is not to say that there was not a level of disdain amongst some voters. I think that was the term you used, Stirling. There was a federal government on the nose. I again have not seen any definitive polling or surveys that have suggested that that swayed the voters, but I have no doubt it was on people's minds.

**Mr MICKEL:** This is a really simple question for Sarah and for Lincoln. When you did your polling at the start of the campaign, was the polling different at the end from what it was at the start?

**Dr WILLIAMS:** And by how much?

**Ms MAWHINNEY:** Very simply, I think the message around cuts and chaos and linking Newman and Nicholls and the concern about Pauline Hanson having a say or Pauline having any sort of balance of power in the Queensland parliament was consistent throughout the campaign, and that was what led the campaign for Queensland. That is what guided our approach and it was consistent the whole way through.

**Mr MICKEL:** The campaign from Labor's point of view made no difference?

**Ms MAWHINNEY:** Thank you, John. That was very helpful. No, but it was consistent and it guided how we went out and engaged with voters.

**Mr FOLO:** Thanks, John. Look, no, it is not linear. Of course there is movement. This was an interesting election in terms of how much movement we had around the seats. We have Marty Hunt and Brent Mickelberg at the back who are new members, and we saw movement in seats right across the state throughout. We saw movement between the first and second week and what happened in the third and fourth week. I think the point was touched on earlier about Fraser Anning. I think that reinforced exactly the point that the Labor campaign made around their assertion of cuts and chaos because it showed voters the risk of One Nation.

We saw the One Nation vote fall away on the basis of that risk. Voters went back to Labor. Those voters who were Labor voters moved back to the Labor Party on that basis. Fraser Anning was a real turning point. Even if voters could not necessarily name Fraser Anning they got a sense that he is a bloke who went to Canberra, was a senator for 20 minutes and 20 minutes later was in a different party. That does not look too good and that underlined the message of the Labor Party.

There is another point that I have to quickly touch on because I cannot let it go. I think Paul mentioned a deal before. I need to make it crystal clear that there was no preference deal between the LNP and any other parties. Tim was very clear on that throughout the campaign. The party organisation was very clear on that throughout the campaign. You will not find anyone who could substantiate that because it did not happen. There was no deal. It is important that we have that on the record because it continues to be part of commentary and it is just not right. One Nation preferenced against all sitting members. We saw a bleed of that vote.

I will very quickly touch on Adani. I think Adani did shift votes, but I think Adani shifted votes across all parties when people were getting robocalls suggesting that the government or the LNP would give an Indian billionaire taxpayers' money. That was one of those examples of a message that cuts through.

Whether it was actually correct or not did not matter. The idea of giving an Indian billionaire taxpayers' money was one of those cut through messages. There were third parties also involved in perpetuating that message.

**QUESTIONER** (Inaudible).

**Mr FOLO:** We did not actually end up too far from where we actually started. The issue is that the path was certainly not straight. There was a lot of movement throughout the campaign. We were pretty close.

**Mr YOUNG:** Did you ever think you could win?

**Mr FOLO:** Yes; and we always hoped to win. In terms of the execution of our campaign, it went pretty much as planned—except for winning.

**Mr YOUNG:** I just wanted to say something about One Nation preferences, which is not something I have looked at across the whole segment. If anyone has any sway with the Electoral Commission can I say that their website is a disgrace. I cannot pull down the data and search it properly. There is an XML file up there, but my Excel does not want to talk to it.

What I did was look at the seats where One Nation preferences might have made a difference to who won. In Mansfield One Nation was there, but Ian Walker got just about all their preferences. He had to have, despite the fact they were preferencing against him. Mount Ommaney was not close enough for it to make any difference.

The only seat I could really pick up that was close and where they might have made a difference was Redlands. The other one, arguably because it was so close, was Pumicestone. Anything could have made the difference there. Looking at the seats closely, I could not find where they made much difference. Looking at the preferences and not being able to see on the site how they had been distributed, in a lot of cases they still had to have been going against the recommendation of One Nation. I think that is something everyone would have to take into account if they ever attempted to do a deal with One Nation. Their people are too independent to do what they are told. That is probably the best way of putting it.

**Ms LINARD:** My question is in regard to the effect of local members and their relationships and how effective they are in community. State and federal elections are very presidential in nature. I am particularly interested in the views of Paul, Chris and Graham in terms of how much impact a very hardworking local member or a local member who is really embedded in their local community and known has? Do we have any real impact on the ground in elections?

**Dr WILLIAMS:** It is very difficult to give a definitive answer. It depends on which part of the political cycle we are in. I have talked to a lot of MPs over the years and they usually attribute their success to having doorknocks at least once and possibly twice in a campaign. I think there is some evidence, again it is anecdotal—I am going back to the 2012 defeat of Labor and my discussions with a few defeated Labor MPs—that those MPs who had small and average swings against them were the ones who said they had doorknocked very heavily.

So the short answer is, I suppose, that the personality of the local member tends to be a less potent motivation for voting in heavy urban areas. When you get out into the regions the personality, demeanour and profile of the local candidate tend to take on greater dimensions. That is why we see so many mayors of shires or councils go into state politics because they have that exposure. My mentor, Dr Paul Reynolds, has written widely about connectational politics—the idea that you use political capital.

Regional voters love their local councils and their local politicians are part of the lifeblood. For city voters—I do not know whether there are more distractions or what—it is different. Regional people can name their local MP. They know their family history. Brisbane people are flat out telling you who their local MP is. Having said that, if you get a charismatic, hardworking MP who turns up to all the school fetes, who raffles the school bikes, who is always at the P&C meetings or whatever that tends to make a difference, but then again the old adage is when the swing is on the swing is on.

**Ms CALDWELL:** Sandy, as an independent you do not have a leader as well as the presidential side. How hard is it running? Are you going to all the fetes and knocking on all doors?

**Ms BOLTON:** Are you talking about as an Independent how hard it was? It was very difficult because it was a very short amount of time. It was a last-minute decision. I think it was a 28-day campaign, so there was no time for doorknocking sadly. It was a very small team of three, a campaign manager who has nothing to do with politics and has never been involved in a campaign before, and the smallest budget you have ever seen—it was a shoestring.

## Outcome of the 2017 Election

Yes, it was very difficult. However, I have a 25-year commitment to my community. I work very heavily in a lot of realms. I think that is where you can, with a very tiny amount of money, do it. It is your history. It is also your ethos. Your community knows how hard you work and what you stand for. I think that in regional areas, as you were saying, it becomes synonymous with trust and delivering outcomes. You can do it. If they got rid of all the election materials and advertising, there would be no need for this ongoing debate about donations. I think you could see a return of those that do have that heavy commitment and people's trust emerging more. You would probably see a larger crossbench.

**Ms CALDWELL:** It is an interesting point. Should we get rid of all the election material?

**UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:** No. It would make it impossible for people to start. You are lucky; you were a councillor, weren't you?

**Ms BOLTON:** I started with no—

**UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:** Yes, but you were a councillor. You have all that. For someone to come from ground zero—

**Ms ARCHER:** Sandy, can you paint us a broad picture of your ideal innovative Queensland government?

**Ms BOLTON:** I love those easy questions. I think you can start with the simplicity of changing what you call the adversarial element because it is very difficult. It does not matter how many partnerships you have or the types of relationships you have, when you have that within it is very hard and that is what we are not seeing—those bipartisan agreements in those key areas which our communities are being very strong about and very confused.

A starting point is looking at how you change that. Sometimes it is—and I understand what you are saying—hard to take that culture out, but you have to start somewhere. I think mainly part of the role of females within government is to be able to move into that space. We are spending a lot of money within schools about bullying. We need to be able to lead by example, and that shows that bullying and aggression should no longer be used as tools of negotiation. We need to move beyond this because we cannot set an example for our youngest Queenslanders and say they should not be doing it in the schoolyard when they come home and they are seeing it on the television. That is a mighty fine start in innovating how we move forward.

**Ms CALDWELL:** We probably have time for more one question.

**Ms BALMAIN:** I would like to say two things: one about the deal. You may have thought there was no deal, but people in the community thought there was a deal and that was the problem in my opinion. I just mention that this is Queensland Women's Week. It is also International Women's Day. Anybody else who does not have an International Women's Day ribbon, I have one here for you.

**Mr BERKMAN:** It is incumbent upon me to bring the focus back to the Greens at every opportunity I have. I am mindful that there is only one journalist on the panel, but I am interested in your thoughts on the role that media played in the campaign and its disproportionate focus on One Nation. Even candidates like Malcolm Roberts, who really stood such an outside chance in his seat, could garner media attention routinely at the drop of a hat by doing virtually nothing. Do you have any reflections on whether that sort of imbalance, for example, in the coverage of the Greens versus Malcolm made a substantial difference in the outcome?

**Ms CALDWELL:** I probably can't speak objectively.

**UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:** It does come down to news value. It is the news value of conflict. Malcolm Roberts is a very colourful figure. It sells news space. The Greens can often be an esoteric issue that might go in a lot of people's heads. I think some of the Greens' issues might be geographically isolating. Adani was a huge issue for about a 10-kilometre radius, I would have thought, around the CBD and for different reasons in North Queensland. One Nation tends to resonate. It ticks those news value boxes—provenance, conflict, novelty, proximity. It sells news space. That is pretty much it.

**Mr YOUNG:** I have a couple of observations. Firstly, I have been watching the *Courier-Mail* for about 30 years recommend the Liberal Party or its successors most elections and it has not done us any good. Now that you have so much more electronic media and electronic only broadsheets and so on, I think what the *Courier-Mail* does is less important, in terms of the populous at large has other audiences it gets to.

## Outcome of the 2017 Election

Secondly, I think the Greens do disproportionately well out of the media, so I do not think you guys have anything to complain about. Thirdly, I think the *Four Corners* report on Adani put the legs under the Adani campaign during the election itself. Again, that makes my point that some things actually resonate. Some media resonates. Most of it does not. That is why political parties spend a lot of money just banging away at a couple of simple messages because if you do not people are in this sort of miasma and they are not sure what is happening. Someone said to me that blaming the media for your election result is a bit like a sailor blaming the weather for having trouble like getting from point A to point B. It is just part of what is out there and has to be dealt with.

**Ms CALDWELL:** Does anyone else want to add anything? I think we are out of time anyway.

**Mr FRASER:** I would like to thank you all for coming tonight. I trust that it has been a valuable addition to your intellectual enjoyment for the week. I would like to thank our panellists. We would not have been able to do this without them. They have all done it for basically no payment. We do have some small gifts which I hope are appreciated. We do appreciate your time and effort. We know that you are all busy people. I ask you to all to show your appreciation.

The person we should also thank profusely is Felicity, who chaired tonight. It is always good to get an independent chair because it means none of us have to put our heads on the block. Just by way of nothing in particular, I noticed earlier that someone was talking about the new family friendly meeting hours of the parliament. Many years ago when I was much younger I worked for Malcolm Fraser. A group of backbenchers came to Fraser with a paper which was basically suggesting that there should be more family-friendly working hours in the federal parliament. Fraser took the paper and sent them on their way. When they had left he said, 'Well, they are not getting this because I'm not having those people hanging around the bars and restaurants in Canberra plotting against me.' So they did not get family-friendly hours in Canberra. I trust the state government knows exactly what it is up to.

Ladies and gentlemen, thank you very much for your attendance. We have a range of activities this year, particularly noting our major Australasian conference in July. You should have received some material on that and more will be forthcoming shortly. Keep your email inbox open and you will get much more information on those and other events. Thank you very much.