



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

***REVIEW OF 1995 QUEENSLAND  
ELECTION***

***MONDAY, 15 AUGUST 1995  
Parliament House  
Brisbane***

*Reported by Parliamentary Reporting Staff*

**Dr Reynolds:** I think we will make a start now. As I have said, it was either going to be a cast of thousands, bigger than Ben Hur, or a tutorial. It looks like we might have got the latter. However, I would very much like to welcome you all to this meeting of the Australasian Study of Parliament Group (Queensland Chapter). When we were planning this particular function on this particular topic, we anticipated the election a little later in the year and so we were still in our mode of a meeting at the beginning of the year, the annual general meeting in May and a meeting towards the end of the year. It looks as though that meeting towards the end of the year may have come a little early unless the committee decides subsequently to have another one.

I would like to welcome our speakers tonight. I will introduce them in the order that they will be speaking to you: the Honourable Anne Warner, formerly the member for South Brisbane, who resigned her seat at the last State election, Minister for Family Services and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander affairs. I am sure she needs no introduction. She is in the happy position now of being able to comment on the campaign as an inside—or outside—participant observer. We are very fortunate to have with us Mr Robert Tucker, the President of the Liberal Party in Queensland, who will be the third speaker, as I will speak first. Robert is a businessman and has for many years been involved in Liberal Party politics albeit in the organisational side. Our last speaker is Mr Wayne Sanderson, who has the great distinction of being taught by me some years ago. He is now a roundsman of the *7.30 Report* and has been making some fairly interesting comments and interviews about the election and the wash-up. As I said to him, after my last column in the *Weekend Independent* and his last two weeks, there will not be too many beers bought for us in the Strangers Bar by the staff of the Premier.

I would like to call for apologies. We have one from Mr Bill Hewitt, one of our committee members who cannot be with us tonight because of another function. Are there any other apologies? Judith Lloyd, our Treasurer, who is laid aside, as many are, with this flu. You are lucky if you get half your class turning up these days at university. I have mentioned the order of speakers. We will take each speech seriatim and then call for comments and questions from the floor. That can run for as long as you are comfortable with doing that. That will be followed by a light supper and a cash bar for those who want to avail themselves of that.

So, without further ado, I would like to address a paper that I have written. This is based on an analysis that I did, as published in the *Courier-Mail* a few weeks ago. I emphasise that these are final-for-the-night figures. They are not Electoral Commission figures; they are unofficial figures. So all the swings and all the comments are based on swings and movements in the primary vote, not preferences. When I wrote the paper, I did not have information about what percentage of preferences were exhausted at No 1; what preferences flowed where. All this I will have to do later on, which is why I have titled it "A preliminary analysis", and obviously it had to get out reasonably quickly.

I will not read the paper because that is obviously boring and that is why I have provided everybody with a copy of it. I just want to go through and highlight a number of matters. You will see on the last page that I have resurrected a quote from certainly the most erudite political scientist who ever held a position in Queensland, Professor Colin A. Hughes who, in a previous election—I cannot remember which one it was, but it was one very similar to this and with a result very similar to this—called it, "The case of the arrested pendulum." Those of you who know Colin will know that that is a very typical, Colinish-type of comment. That is what it appeared to me to be, looking at the results; it was the case of the arrested pendulum. If it is true, as conventional and anecdotal wisdom has it, that the swing against Labor really gathered momentum in the last half of the last week of the campaign, it may well be as I speculate in the paper that, had the campaign run another week, that pit stop that many of the disenchanted voters took with minor parties, Independents and Greens and so on, would have, in fact, transformed itself across to the coalition. We will never know because if you look at the table on page 1, you will see that of the swing in the total vote between 1992 and 1995, while about 6 per cent came out of Labor, there was another 2.2 per cent coming out of Independents. Now, the reason for this is that, in 1989 and in 1992, the National Party was on the nose in the bush: they would not vote Labor but they voted for a plethora of league of rights, CAP and other Independents. That vote held to a degree in 1992 but it came back to the National Party in 1995 in its heartland seats. That is why there is a swing out of Independents. When you mix that with the anti-Labor swing, you get a conglomerate, which is very hard to disentangle but, at this stage, it is my analysis—and obviously I am open to challenge—that for every five voters who left Labor, two went to the coalition, depending on which party was running in the particular seat and the other three dispersed themselves over the rocks of Independents, Greens and others. There had been no

Green or Democrats candidate standing as such in 1992 because the Electoral Commission had not registered those parties at that stage. So that is another reason. "Others" is a code name for Independents who might have been unofficial candidates for third parties. In fact, that vote was a recognisable vote in 1995 and, therefore, was dispersed accordingly.

I have done the analysis on the basis that if a global figure is 5.8 against Labor, I have taken the groupings of seats from the most severe swing against Labor to the least severe. So we start with the four tollway seats. There you see a 12.5 per cent swing against Labor but curiously enough on primary votes, although the coalition won each of those four seats, the movement to the coalition there is quite minuscule on primaries. So it was won on preferences. The Democrats did not run in any of those tollway seats. The Greens did, but so did a plethora of Independents and that is where the swing ended up—on primary votes. Of course, a good deal of that swing was a 22.2 per cent swing against Molly Robson in Springwood. She was hammered, but she was between the hammer and the anvil because not only was she a member in a tollway seat but she was the Minister who was perceived to have been inadequate in her defence of that situation. However justified or unjustified, that certainly was the perception in the electorate. A 22.2 per cent swing against her was the biggest in the State. The next highest was in Mount Coot-tha against Wendy Edmond of 17.5 per cent, which ended up with, of course, Drew Hutton. The Liberals got little joy in Mount Coot-tha from that particular swing.

Moving on to the Ipswich seats—the Liberals did not run a candidate in Bundamba in 1992 so that is one of the reasons why there was a fairly big swing to the coalition in that seat. The other factor is that David Hamill in Ipswich crushed the Liberals in 1992. They ended up with about 16 per cent of the vote—and that in Llew Edwards' old seat. So there was a bounce back there on primary votes. Ipswich is the class voting town of all. If you wanted a best case for class voting in Queensland politics, it is Ipswich.

Brisbane north side encompasses all the seats virtually in the north west of the river. I did not take the western suburbs seats out on their own because there is not very much movement in those seats one way or the other, although Dr Watson may wish to make a comment on that. There is no discernible reason that I can figure out why there should have been nearly a 10 per cent swing against Labor in the aggregate north side seats. There were no local issues there, there was no tollway, there were no particular factors which from 1992 v. 1995 should have harmed Labor. But the swing was on across Brisbane, that is really what it amounts to, and the slide was on whichever side of the river you were on, and whether you were inner urban or outer urban it showed up in different complexities and variations.

As to seats contested by the Democrats—I might make the observation that where the Democrats and the Greens went head-to-head, the Democrats were outclassed by the Greens usually by a factor of 2 to 1. Nevertheless, it remains that in those seats contested by the Democrats, there was a fairly hefty swing against Labor and against the coalition as well. So there you have another case of protest voting, which was going every which way, depending on the whim of the voters in any particular seat. I telephoned the Democrats to ask them if their intervention was random or was, in fact, targeted. They did not know, of course. This is the first time the Democrats have intervened in any systematic fashion in a Queensland State election. They basically told me that they were aiming at coastal seats. Well, that is good—that is everything from Currumbin to Cook, so that gives us a lot of help.

The seats contested by the Greens are a sort of mirror image of that, and there you see the Greens really did profit from the anti-Labor slide. Everybody else ended up with minuscule increased support in the Green-contested seats. This, I think ladies and gentlemen, illustrates an important point, which has been increasingly apparent in the last 20 years both at State and Federal level and, indeed, internationally. As I was saying to my students today, the benchmark was when Tor Hundloe stood as an Independent Green candidate for the Senate in 1974. I taught him in the same class in 1975 as Wayne Swan, would you believe. Tor picked up about 1,500 votes across the State as a sort of a joke candidate. How things have changed! Where you now have serious Green intervention, Green will mean tollway, it will mean Kuranda skyrail, it will mean Tully/Millstream, it will mean quality of life somewhere else and so on. That "think globally, act locally" message seems to have got through in a fairly large way. It has arrived in Queensland. Whether this is a permanent configuration for later elections, we do not know but certainly on the evidence here, neither major party gets a lot of joy out of it. The fact that the Greens were brawling among themselves over which of the two major parties to support seems not to have affected their vote one iota.

The outer northern metropolitan seats, as you see, are the ones that are running almost up to the Sunshine Coast. Again, Labor had a crushing victory in those seats in 1989, which was replicated in 1992. So there is some comeback happening there but the coalition vote there is still quite low and those seats remain impregnable at the moment even on those figures. Redcliffe, whilst a Liberal seat once upon a time was, in fact, not held by the Liberal Party; it was held by Terry White on connectional politics. Again, the Greens and the Democrats to a lesser extent do well in the outer fringes of the city where the protest is on, but it is not flowing to the alternative party, or grouping, which is, in itself, a variation on the general theme.

Every party activist I talk to on every side of politics tells me Townsville is a problem. You can never count on a Townsville vote, it seems. All three parties have held Townsville seats over the last decade. Labor scooped the pool in 1989 and 1992 but again, the slide is on. However, Townsville is always soggy for the major parties and cannot be taken for granted because of the illustration in 1992 in the seat of Townsville, a gay alliance activist who runs two sex shops in Townsville collected 20 per cent of the vote—an interesting notion of the closet vote. So the Greens did well in the provincial cities but the coalition was really making up ground here in Townsville and it would not surprise me at all if this trend continues—that Mundingburra, which Labor nearly lost, and Townsville which came reasonably close, will be lost next time and Labor will be left with its only safe seat in the region of Thuringowa.

The north Queensland seats were patchy. Robert and I had a talk about this about two months before the election and your prediction of demographic change really seems to be holding up in these figures. De Lacy came within 2.5 per cent of losing Cairns. This was one of the 11 seats Labor had held in 1974. Barron River has never been represented by a Liberal and was never likely to be represented by a Liberal—rednecked Nationals were its preferred option. Mulgrave, which was a Labor gain 1989, was just as decisively lost in 1995. So there is a swing against Labor in the north. I suspect it is mostly demographic change rather than short-term protest because Cairns is the linchpin for those three seats. As the northern suburbs of Cairns spill into Barron River and the southern suburbs of Cairns spill into Mulgrave and as demographic change affects Cairns with the changed economic order there and the downstreaming of the industries, I think this is where the coalition can be looking at a 4.2 per cent swing and can be thinking that that will maximise as time goes on. I think this is one area where we are now seeing the beginnings of long-term demographic shifts.

Labor heartland seats—I took these ones out because I was interested to see whether there was any replication with the New South Wales heartland seats in the Federal election of 1990 and in the big Greiner victory election. The answer is, "No." The heartland did not swing any more than the State as a whole; it is right on the average there. So you can see again that the swing out of Labor breaks across a number of different rocks. Interestingly enough, in New Zealand and in the United Kingdom—that is to say, voluntary voting areas—where Labor people are sick of Labor or fed up with Labor, they will not vote. Non-voting always rises in Labor heartland seats in those two countries when Labor is on the nose with its heartland supporters. Here, you find that some will vote conservative but most will not; they will take any other option on the card. Indeed, anecdotal evidence from the seat of Woodridge suggests that a lot of Labor people were very angry that they did not have a third party to vote for because they did not want to vote Labor and they did not want to vote coalition but they had no other alternative. So you are seeing a swing out but it is breaking in different directions. Of course, these are rock-solid, safe seats anyway where they could take a punt if they wanted. Southern Queensland seats—these are basically those old south-east zoned seats which were non-metropolitan. Again, they are not Labor territory save Toowoomba North briefly. You see that that is right on average but the coalition is picking up there—or National Party—because the anti-National swing into Independents of 1989 and 1992 is coming back. It is coming back home after a brief sojourn somewhere else.

Sunshine Coast seats—this is interesting because the Labor Party really hammered those seats. There were several on the 1992 figures—Caloundra and Noosa—which Labor really thought it had a chance of picking up. The swing against Labor was lower than aggregate, which may well mean that some of that campaigning had some effect, at least to minimise the swing but not to prevent it, but there was a huge swing out of Independents and that is effectively what distributed it across the other parties with all of those seats being won comfortably by their respective coalition incumbents.

The quota seats were the five seats that caused so much anguish when the Electoral Districts Bill was first passed and Dr Watson gave a memorable speech and the now member for

Everton interjected that I was a Liberal. Just as well he was in Parliament, I would have sued him for every cent he had. There you see there is almost no movement.

In the bush, the voting patterns are pretty well established. Don Aitkin and his surveys in the sixties and seventies showed that whilst rural voters were just as interested in politics as urban voters, were just as committed in their vote as urban voters, were socially more conservative than urban voters, they were much less likely to change their vote across any given election. Thus it shows that when you go out to the real remote seats, two of which are safe Labor, two of which are safe National and one, Charters Towers, which was a knife edge in 1992 but certainly made up its mind with a vengeance as to which way it goes in 1995.

Now we get back to the regional areas. Wide Bay Burnett—this was interesting because the Premier's number-cruncher, John McKell and I spent many a long time behind the Speaker's chair discussing Bill and Ben the flowerpot men in Hervey Bay and in Maryborough, and John was always of the opinion that while these were highly marginal Labor seats, they would hold through connectational politics and hold they did. There was Hervey Bay, which was the most marginal Labor seat on the 1992 figures. It required a swing of 0.5 of a percentage point to be lost. Bill Nunn got a swing of 0.3, so it is the year of living dangerously for him. Hervey Bay is an interesting seat because half of it is Kenmore by the sea and the other half of it is Inala by the sea. So it depends which half outvotes the other half. That is basically what it is. So that is a little bit of an artificial situation because it is just grouped there for regional purposes. Note the swing out of "Others".

Coalition heartland seats—these are basically the National Party's bush seats plus the few seats the Liberals held after 1992 that required a swing of more than 10 per cent to lose. So they are rural seats with a few urban ones chucked in for convenience. There you see again the swing out of "Others" back to the National Party, a minimal swing against Labor because anybody who votes Labor in those seats has got to be absolutely committed and voting for regions which are probably ideological rather than ephemeral. So it distributes itself across the spectrum.

Central Queensland seats—of course, note the high "Other" vote because of Cunningham's vote in Gladstone, although Independents had done quite well in this group of seats in 1992 but, apart from her, did not do so well this time around. There was actually a swing to Labor across these aggregations largely because Labor did not run a candidate in Callide in 1992. So there was a vote there to be tapped and the member for Fitzroy, in fact, achieved a swing to him.

Gold Coast seats—again, there is a little bit of an explanation there. One is that Labor did not run a candidate in Surfers Paradise in 1992 to maximise interconservative party differences with the sitting Liberal running against Rob Borbidge. It might also be that Mick Veivers can give up the politics of homophobia. He got a 4 per cent swing against him in Southport. Greens and Democrats, I think, performed particularly poorly in the Gold Coast seats. One might have thought with the kind of clientele on the Gold Coast and the kind of issues around the Gold Coast that that, in fact, might have been fertile territory for those sort of softer minor parties. However, that did not prove to be the case.

To sum up, the conclusion that I came to—at least in a preliminary way—was that Independents, minor parties and non-major alternatives tend to do badly in most elections. In most given elections, that is where you tend to find the voters not going. The two exceptions for that are in elections where conservative party voters are alienated from their major party, they will always vote for minor parties, hence the way the Liberal Democrats are reaping it in in Britain at the moment and this is the third time they have done that since the 1950s. Every time the conservative party in Britain dives, the Liberal Democrats have another false dawn, and that is happening now. However, Labor, being on the nose this time around, interestingly enough, minor parties are reaping some of the benefit as is the coalition, but the swing against Labor had not crystallised. It was not a Sallyanne Atkinson factor. It had not crystallised because there was no single issue, I suspect, that people wanted to protest against Labor about. There was the advertising campaign—which was as bad as any Labor had run in its worst days in the sixties, seventies and early eighties—there was the issue of the tollway, there was vague disquiet about the style of Government, and there were some local issues which showed up in local seats but nothing that knitted it all together in a comprehensive anti-Labor movement. So it may well be that, had the campaign run another week, in fact, it would have gone the coalition's way. It may be, but there is no guarantee of that. So it then remains to be the case of the arrested pendulum. Thank you. The Honourable Anne Warner.

**Ms Warner:** Thank you, Paul. That was rather depressing news and I suppose from my point of view as a Labor Party person, I do not know that you gave us very much ground for hope for the future in Queensland in terms of that particular analysis. I can see David smiling there, so that is probably correct. I think we would all take exception to a number of things that Paul said and I am sure that there will be a number of people who will wish to take exception to a lot of things that I am going to say.

I want to start off by congratulating the Premier, the Labor Party and the Government for winning the elusive third term. I think in the history of Governments over the last 10 years, getting that third term is actually quite difficult. Two terms people are usually prepared to go along. One is not enough, so they want to see what you are made of in the second term. The third term is usually that much harder. The Premier did keep saying that it was going to be a hard election to win but all the political commentators and soothsayers confidently predicted the return of the Government. That was prior to the election campaign starting. No-one at that stage considered the possibility of a loss or, indeed, the photo finish that we ended up with—not until the election night when the first results started to come in. The Opposition's campaign reflected that perceived wisdom. The Opposition ran a campaign asking voters to send a message to the Government. They never asked anybody to directly vote for them. They said, "Send a message to the Government." There was very little rhetoric from the coalition about how bad Labor was or that we had to get rid of the Government; it was just this, "Give them a small nudge and then you will be doing your duty." I think the phrase was, "You can make a difference", but not, "You can have a National/Liberal Government."

So given those beginnings, what went wrong? I think that when we began the campaign we realised that we had to woo voters, that there was a sense in Labor Party circles that the electorate was uncommitted and had to be persuaded and that the early opinion polls showed that there was a huge undecided vote. Given that voters were undecided, and although I was not privy to the Labor Party research I suspect that they were also picking up that there was a degree of voter disenchantment and a desire for something better, the wisdom in the Labor Party was that we were going to run a grassroots campaign. Basically, the idea was that it was going to be a by-election in every seat and that local issues would dominate. Then later on, it was seen that we needed a more central focus where we needed to have visionary politics with brand new policies. We were not going to simply stand on our record. We were going to say, "Well, there is our record. Everybody knows what it is, but we are going to show you something new, something a little bit visionary and, indeed, exciting." So relying on our record of fiscal restraint and sound economic management, we were going to begin to deliver those new policies that were aimed at improving services and offering that new vision.

The campaign speech, albeit a little bit down the track in the election campaign, like two weeks into the campaign, did contain vision and excitement. The public transport policy was and is inspirational. Queensland's population growth has highlighted our woeful lack of public transport options. The Cape York conservation plan is also breathtaking in its scope and vision. A focus on community values rather than hardline responses to law and order was contained in the campaign speech and there was a general policy of more and better services accompanied by significant promises of extra resources because we had been such sound fiscal managers earlier on that we were now able to deliver the goods—bring home the bacon, as it were.

Unfortunately, in terms of that context of the vision and the excitement, the media made more of the context of the campaign speech at the convention centre than they did of the actual content of the speech. So there we were with this dazzling array of policies and vision that was suddenly dropped on the unsuspecting media and the public. In many ways, it was in a sharp contrast to the "Softly, softly do not scare the horses" policy of the last five and a half years and I think that, because of its suddenness, it was greeted with a degree of cynicism.

I think it would be fair to say that Labor Party people had for a long time given up on the idea that this Government, the Goss Government, would be delivering a major reform agenda along traditional Labor Party lines and it was clear that the policies that we developed had not been canvassed either in the party or among a lot of the relevant interest groups. In short, the policies appeared to come from nowhere and, in many cases, even Government Ministers had not been involved in the development of those new policies. I think that that strategy of visionary policies aimed at getting people's minds off the boring here and now was correct. People did, I think, need to feel that the Government had a capacity to overcome the mundaneness of business as usual, a capacity to overcome the seemingly insurmountable problems such as break and enters, hospital waiting lists, school discipline, etc.

But the new strategy that was developed during the campaign brought with it a fundamental internal inconsistency. It was more properly a reform program for an Opposition rather than a Government because the program contained within it a tacit implication that the Government had failed in this area in the past, and this was not entirely true. The reform agenda of the Goss Government in the last five and a half years has been quite profound. Queensland is a different place from what it was under Bjelke-Petersen. The list of reforms is impressive: anti-discrimination legislation, judicial review, a proper parliamentary committee system, 52.8 per cent increase in education spending, major curriculum reforms in school, similar increases in health funding and a complete reworking of the structure of health service delivery, new environmental legislation putting conservation on the map for the first time, a new Criminal Code, homosexual law reform, strong policies and improved funding aimed at eliminating violence against women, non-confrontationist industrial relations policies, land rights, and the list goes on.

So why did we not get the kudos for all the hard work of the last five and a half years? It is my belief that there has been a failure in the selling of the reform of the last five and a half years and this has been interpreted variously by political commentators as the Government being too conservative, being shy of reform—you may well remember the joke that went around at first, which I am not going to repeat. There has been a feeling that, whilst our reforms were good and necessary to bring Queensland into the twentieth century before it finishes, we were not encouraged to see these reforms as something new and exciting or different. The reforms were sold like, "Well, this reform will not hurt anybody. It will not actually change anything, but we have to do it because it has been done elsewhere." We did not use the reform process in the first five and a half years to educate the public to want a new society, a better deal, a new way of going, a progressive change. Yet when we were elected in 1989, we were elected not only because the National Party had let us all down badly but also because people wanted change and they wanted a new approach. They wanted respite from the dogged narrow-mindedness and political bankruptcy that conservative politics had delivered in this State to that point. We were in a position to provide Australia with state-of-the-art legislation, to break new ground which would set the tone for future debates. We could have created the benchmark for Government elsewhere. Our majority was certainly robust enough. Instead, we chose catch-up reform following what other States had done 10 years before. We rarely blew our own trumpet or entered into a debate with our opponents. While our reforms were needed desperately, we did little to challenge the orthodoxy that Queensland is a conservative State. We were seen to respond to pressure on law and order with similar rhetoric of more imprisonment—agreeing with our opponents that young people were out of control. So a new, visionary policy at the late stage of the campaign had a certain hollow ring to it.

Many have been upset by what has been described as the non-consultative approach adopted by the Government. As I have said, we did deliver reform, but it was not always in a consultative manner. When the Government has been challenged by various members of its own constituency—greenies, feminists, unions, ALP branches—it has invariably attacked the critics, questioning their credentials rather than seeking to persuade or bring on side.

Our Government in many ways suffered the same fate as the first Greiner Government in New South Wales. We shared with them a handsome majority and a Government model which entrenched centralism through the mechanisms of the Office of Cabinet. For a new Government taking the reins after many years of being in Opposition that is not necessarily a bad thing. It is essential that there is a level of coordination and central control but other ideas must also be given consideration. Environmentalists, for instance, I would think would concede that Labor is better for the environment but so many groups and individuals, Drew Hutton being one of the main ones, had found themselves attacked and belittled for raising objection to some aspect of Government policy on the environment that, in the final weeks of the campaign, they found themselves split and unable to deliver a definitive tick. Whilst we cannot ignore the fact that many conservative voters went home at this election, we did also suffer in our own heartland. It went away from us, and some of the highest swings, I think, were in some of our safest seats with some of our strongest performers in the Parliament.

**Dr Reynolds:** Around 10 per cent was not unusual.

**Ms Warner:** Yes, and that was in those real heartland Labor seats. So, whilst there was also the protest vote that has been spoken about, there is also clearly an anti-Labor swing. Whichever way you look at it, people were unhappy. As Paul says, there was some evidence to suggest that the grassroots marginal seats strategy worked well in some areas—in Maryborough and in Hervey Bay, which both had very slender margins—but the strategy did not work at all in

Brisbane. Obviously, the road took its toll. However, while Greenslopes was a non-road seat, it also suffered considerably whilst Mount Gravatt, in a similar old conservative territory, held its ground. But whatever the ins and outs—and I refer to people like Paul to look at the actual ins and outs of the campaign and the voting pattern on the day—the overarching issue is not simply that the Labor Party campaign itself was flawed, and I have no doubt that it was, but rather that the campaign itself was indicative of other issues which should now be considered with an open and inquiring mind.

My principal assertion is that the Government and the party suffered an unexpected setback because of overcentralisation at both the Government and the party levels. This, of course, is not set in cement and there is now a powerful incentive to change. It is similar to what happened to Nick Greiner in New South Wales where they had a knife-edge result and the inquiry which ensued after that revealed that it was simply that Office of Cabinet model—the centralisation, the concentration of decision-making power in very few people's hands—that caused that election to get away from Greiner in New South Wales. Similarly, I think, a similar kind of issue emerged here. A similar setback was also experienced in 1984 by the Federal Government and after that, there were changes that were implemented. Bob Hogg was appointed to the Prime Minister's office to enhance the communication between the party and the Government. Similarly in Victoria in the early 1980s, Moss Cass, a person with impeccable Labor Party credentials, a strong following and good political experience, was brought in to assist the State Government early on in the eighties. The State Government went on to win a number of elections after that. So there are a number of ways that the Labor Party as a political force—I am sorry to say this, Bob—has the capacity to regenerate, to bring in ideas and to harness some of our resources that were not perhaps harnessed in this last election and in the last three years of Labor Government.

Those are just some measures that have been useful elsewhere and we need solutions here in Queensland that will bring the Labor Party back into prominence. We need the support of a range of progressive social interest groups who have traditionally supported Labor—our third-party endorsement—and we need to also bring the Government and the party together. I am confident that a Labor Government in Queensland will survive this test and will succeed for many years into the future providing Queenslanders with the best form of progressive Government that we can have.

**Dr Reynolds:** Thank you, Anne, for that honest and penetrating analysis. Now for something completely different.

**Mr Tucker:** I am not sure whether I am meant to be dishonest and not penetrating but I think my purpose here tonight, Paul, is to deal more with the backroom approach to the election and what went on on the coalition's side of the campaign. Let me start off firstly by saying that any figures I quote tonight are based on the figures released last Friday by the Electoral Commission, so they are all two-party preferred and so on. We have done a little bit of work for you, Paul, to update the numbers. Firstly, let me say that the coalition two-party preferred vote in this election was 53.4 per cent. The figure has been put around over the last few weeks of 52.5. Now we have the actual preference distributions right across the State: 53.4 per cent of the two-party preferred vote and that involved a 7.2 per cent swing to the coalition.

By way of comparison, in the 1992 State election, the Labor two-party preferred vote was 53.8. In 1989, it was 53.9. In the 1983 election, the coalition two-party preferred vote was also 53.4. So that allows you to get some kind of an idea of just how big the swing was and how close the coalition has gone to not just winning by one seat but winning by 10 and how well Labor has, in fact, done by retaining Government in spite of those numbers. So Labor has ended up with 46.6 per cent of the two-party preferred vote and that is the lowest they have had since 1986 when they had 46 per cent. That puts it in some kind of context for you.

It was certainly a good result, and it was a good result for both sides—for the coalition in terms of the vote it scored and for the Government in terms of its being able to survive in spite of a swing of that size. I think you will have to agree with me, although Paul will not, that this was a result not just of a simple protest vote. The magnitude of the swings in this election were evidence to my mind of a genuine desire to punish the Government and to throw out a Government that was seen as being insensitive and out of touch, and a Government that was often described as being arrogant. Some of what Anne was saying about the centralisation of the Government, I think, led to that, and I certainly agree with her about that being part of the difficulty.

I think there is another very important element in this election campaign and that is the effect of optional preferential voting. I will come back to that later. I thought I might go back to where all this began. I was thinking about it this afternoon. Where did the coalition's campaign really commence? When did the planning really commence? I think I have to say that the coalition planning for this election really commenced, I think it was, on 31 March or 1 April last year when the National and Liberal Parties sat down and extended the coalition agreement, which had some very important add-on features to the original coalition agreement. The two parties agreed to form a joint campaign committee, and that proved to be crucial in the way the campaign was structured and managed. Those of you who have been involved in running campaigns would understand how difficult campaigns are. This one was even more difficult because there was another layer of agreement involved in the process, but it was certainly worth the exercise. We agreed as a consequence of that to have a joint advertising campaign. That was as much driven by a need to conserve resources as by a need to have a simple, single message. We agreed to have joint policies and, from that point a year ago, the two parties worked together fairly intensively as organisations developing joint policies which then came up to shadow Cabinet and were ultimately released during the campaign.

As to the joint policy development process—whilst it was said in the lead-up to the election that the coalition did not have any policies and that was a good line, the simple reality was that not only were there policies but also the joint policy development process was probably the one factor in pulling the two parties together so that when it came to campaign time we had been through 12 months of arguing the point over various aspects of policies and reaching agreements. All the way down the line we were reaching agreements. So we had a fair amount of practice at sorting out our differences. The coalition agreement also very importantly agreed that there would be no contests against sitting members. The earlier coalition agreement only dealt with shadow Ministers. We extended that to sitting members and then we said that we would attempt to avoid three-cornered contests. That is where the effect of optional preferential voting was really seen. It took another six months before we really figured out who was going to run in which seat. There was a lot of public brawling and so on and it did not do our vote any good while that was happening but, at the end of the day, we actually got to a point at which we could agree on seats and we had only the one three-cornered contest. Fortunately from a management point of view, it was 1,000 miles away and, surprisingly, it was a lot easier to manage from 1,000 miles away than if it was down the road somewhere. I think that was what you were referring to, Paul, when you talked about our discussions on changing demographics in north Queensland. Our view always was that, up there, the demographics were changing such that the seat of Barron River could be won by only the Liberal Party or the Labor Party, so there was the one three-cornered contest.

The driving force which forced the two parties to reach agreement on three-cornered contests or an elimination of three-cornered contests was the effect of optional preferential voting. In the previous election, we had seen a couple of seats—Hervey Bay and Albert—where the combined primary vote of the Liberal/National parties exceeded 50 per cent of the vote but with the exhaustion factor once preferences were allocated and a drift of preferences, albeit about only 8 per cent, Labor won both seats. It was certainly something that was weighing on us very heavily when we were forcing ourselves to this point of agreement, bearing in mind that, a year ago, we were reversing 25 years of history. The parties had started three-cornered contests—I think it was 1974, was it not?

**Dr Reynolds:** It depends when you date it—a bit earlier.

**Mr Tucker:** It was a long time ago. It was before I was even a student. We were reversing a lot of history between the parties. It was optional preferential voting that was really pushing us towards that because we could see that, if we went into three-cornered contests, we had to get 52 per cent to 53 per cent of the combined primary vote to fall over the line and we could not see why that was really the sort of thing we should be loading ourselves up with. I think it was optional preferential voting that has cost Labor in this election. I have not had a good chance yet to go through and analyse all the figures but, if you think about it, for 20-odd years on our side of politics, we had a three-cornered contest and a fairly aggressive approach to the way in which we contested our seats. This time we did not have that but, on the other side, we still had that functioning with the Democrats and the Greens as, effectively, the splinter parties or the left of centre. On the left side of politics this time around, optional preferential voting just had to do damage to the Government. It was very much something that was forcing us to come together, and we did.

The next step in the process was to plan a campaign together. To start off, we did some market research using qualitative groups. I thought that I would bring it along tonight and I will read a couple of things so that you can find out what it was we discovered as we started planning this campaign. This research was done in February this year on all three parties—the Government, the National Party and the Liberal Party. It was qualitative groups, focus groups, swinging voters and they were all metropolitan men and women. In terms of the Government—and you will not be surprised to hear this—people were saying, "Well, they haven't made any mistakes. They are not too radical. They are balancing the budget. Goss is a good leader; he is decisive, he is honest, he's got policies. The Labor Party is united. They have done nothing really controversial," which I think is probably something that Anne was getting at, and, "They are not in conflict with Canberra," even though he tried from time to time. Generally for the Labor Party, that was all pretty good news. People had a fairly comfortable kind of feel about them.

In terms of the National Party, there was a view that the coalition with the Liberals simply was not working; they were riding on past successes; and they really have not been the same since Joh. In terms of the Liberal Party, we were even worse. People were telling us we did not have any policies; we were constantly fighting with the Nationals; we had an identity crisis; and we were a pretty hopeless outfit. The sort of messages that we were getting out of the research were not terribly encouraging. The key point in all that was that the coalition was perceived to be disunited and to be not working as a coalition. That was in February—some considerable time after we had sorted out the three-cornered contest issue and various other issues. But the message still carried on, and it was the big negative in the research as far as the coalition was concerned. The research focused on the swinging voters because they were the ones whom we had to get to change their vote. The swinging voters were of the view that the coalition really was not a coalition; it was not working. We knew that it was working in the background because we were doing all that policy development, the shadow ministry was working very well at a parliamentary level—there were no difficulties there—the joint party room was working together well, the organisations were working together well, but the public perception was altogether different. That clearly was a major negative that we had to deal with when we came to the campaign. Without that, everything else we would attempt to do in the campaign would fail. That was the key negative that we had to deal with. You can easily deal with things like no policies—you just start releasing policies, and so on. The perceived lack of unity on the coalition's side was seen as the big negative.

When trying to draft a strategy to conduct a campaign and to instruct an advertising agency, we had to work from the research then go to the advertising agency, give them some instructions and, from there, build an advertising campaign. Bear in mind that it is not just an advertising campaign; below that you have a marginal seats campaign and a campaign in terms of the leaders, the shadow Ministers and all the daily activity that goes on. I thought I might read you a bit of a letter that we had written to the advertising agency. In a brief to the advertising agency back in April, we said a couple of things that came off the research. We said—

"The foundation stone of our strategy is, therefore, that we cannot win the next election"—

with the emphasis on the word "win"—

"We cannot win the next election. However, we can help Labor to lose it."

That is a big difference in approach: we can help Labor to lose it. We have all heard time and time again that Oppositions do not win; Governments lose. Our approach had to be to position ourselves versus the Government such that the Government could lose votes.

The key to winning a positive swing is to position the coalition as the only effective way for people to object to the policies of the Government—a Government that the people believe is sure to win. To do this effectively we must manipulate expectations. All throughout the polling that both parties do through elections we are always asking people what they think will happen. If any of you have ever been polled, it is always a question near the end, "Who do you think will win?" That is a very important question in trying to establish what people's expectations are. We said—

"Everybody expects Labor to win and us to lose. We do not want this to change. We must not look like winners but then we do not want to look like losers either."

It was a very fine line that had to be walked in terms of presentation of the leaders, presentation of the advertising and presentation of the whole campaign. We did not want to be seen as winners but could not afford to be seen as losers, and I think we achieved that fairly successfully.

Another key point that we gave to the advertising agency—and a couple of these key points are probably given to all advertising agencies—was, "Never mix up your positive and negative messages in the advertising." Quite often we would run a negative message on television but have the leaders running the positive spin to the same message but never mix them up in the advertising. I think, without wanting to be critical of Labor's advertising—I will leave that to other people—occasionally they did mix up their messages. "At no stage do we want to mention Goss, Borbidge or Sheldon by name", and we did not. They were instructed, "Do not adopt a 'Labor will probably win' line until the last week." Those of you who recall our advertising will recall that the Sunday night prior to the election was when we changed the advertising and we introduced that message. That was to reinforce people's expectations but to also keep them coming our way, which they were doing.

That was the strategy development side of it, if I can put it that way. In terms of advertising, we then went into what was essentially a three-phase television campaign, and bear in mind that the coalition had nowhere near the resources that the Labor Party had. I think that that was a good discipline for us. The Liberal Party is used to campaigning without any resources, but it was a good discipline in terms of planning campaigns: you do not waste any money when you are short of money. You really sit down and think, "Will this ad work? Is it getting to the people you want to get it to?" and so on. We did have a three-phase television campaign and we maintained that television campaign, from memory, all the way through from the Sunday night after the Premier called the election. For the first two or three nights we ran 30-second television ads that showed the shadow Cabinet. We were really attempting to get the message across that we are a credible alternative and we have a team. Our expectation was that Labor would run a campaign based on the Premier and hide the Ministers, and that is the way it turned out. I think the classic example of that was the release of the Government's lands policy, which was done in Townsville, which happened to be the Minister for Lands' electorate, but he was not invited to the launch.

So the first few nights we ran that. That also served a secondary purpose. Those of you who have been involved in political parties know that all your members want to see good, friendly, warm, fuzzy, positive advertising; they do not like negative advertising. So you put that stuff out early, your members feel pretty good about it and then you can get into the serious stuff. So that is essentially what phase one was all about: on the one hand satisfying the party members on both sides and on the other hand positioning the coalition as a credible alternative. It showed the 18, 20 or whatever sitting around the table—familiar faces; more familiar to some of us—a credible alternative. That was part of dealing with the negative.

The second phase of the campaign was to draw attention to the issues, and the issue that our research was showing was one of management. Now, you cannot go out and campaign on management and things economic, but the issue really was one of management. Anne alluded to that when she talked about the centralisation of power within the Premier's Department and that, to our mind, is the source of the problem. There are no votes in that, but the issue was one of management. We did, in fact—and we do still have—a high-taxing, high-spending State Government. We have had budgetary allocations over the last six years increase by about 60 per cent at a time of low inflation. Whilst the substantial increases in spending themselves were not issues, the research was showing that resentment that was out there. There was a lot of dissatisfaction, a lot of resentment. It was all low-grade resentment—people could not necessarily put their finger on what was causing the problem, they just knew that there was something wrong and that, to my mind, was a large part of it. So the issue was one of management and there were no votes in that. The means of demonstrating that was to highlight the issues that people are more familiar with, that is, health, crime and public safety, education, transport to some extent, jobs and development or lack of development, which is a subissue of jobs. Let us not forget that Queensland is a State with a very strong development ethos. Regardless of whether you are in favour of development or not, that just happens to be the history of this State over the last 100-odd years. We have a very strong development ethos. The research was telling us that people out there were saying, "Nothing is happening." They were used to the development; they were used to things happening. The message was coming back from the swinging voters, "There is nothing happening." That comes back into the jobs issue. They saw that as one of the reasons for there being a problem with unemployment. Whilst we have heard a million times in the last

five or six years about 1,000 people a week coming to Queensland from interstate, what we have not heard about is 1,000 people a month being added to the unemployment lists in Queensland. At the moment the number of unemployed in Queensland is about 60,000 or 65,000 more than it was at the end of 1989. So we have had a steady increase in unemployment. People out there really do not care to discern between whether it is a Federal Government responsibility or a State Government responsibility. The simple fact is that jobs are still hard to come by, there are more part-time jobs than full-time jobs and so on.

So under "management", which was the real problem, we had all those various issues. The second phase of our advertising was just drawing people's attention to the problems of crime and public safety, the problems with education, the problems with jobs and the problems in the health system—not that with health, in particular, people needed a lot of reminding. They were the four key issues. Outside of Brisbane the fifth issue that we were running on our television ads—we did not run them in Brisbane—was the issue of country services. Once again, they did not need a lot of reminding out there because in the first term of the Labor Government there had been a substantial cutback—courthouses closed and railway lines—all that sort of stuff. So there was a very clear understanding out there that there had been substantial cutbacks in Government services. Underlying all that, we had two other elements that were not alluded to in the advertising but were very key elements in the campaign. One was the toll road—the eastern tollway. I will disagree with Paul—I think it was Paul who talked about Sallyanne Atkinson. Our view was that the toll road really was the equivalent of the Rochedale dump in terms of a local issue with a number of local people affected by it and very vocal about it—in this instance a lot more than in the Rochedale dump issue—but an issue that could be constantly attacked and worked and used to highlight the insensitivity of the Government and the arrogance of the Government. That is how the Rochedale dump issue was used in the 1991 council election and the toll road was used in a similar way.

As to our polling—one aspect of the polling we were doing was hesitation polling, that is, where you ask people why they are not going to vote a certain way; not why they are going to vote but why they are not going to vote. In hesitation polling, swinging voters previously voted Labor and were indicating a different preference this time. We found right up into Barron River that the toll road was being put forward voluntarily by people as a reason. We did not give them a list to tick, we just said, "You name an issue" and the toll road was there and it was seen in the minds of many people. It was the example of the insensitivity and the degree to which the Government was out of touch with what people were on about. Whether or not you were in favour of the road really was not relevant, but it was very potent. I disagree with all the commentators, in fact, in relation to the toll road; I do not think that it was responsible for four seats at all. I think in its own local area, it was really only responsible for two but it was responsible for the broader crystallisation of dissatisfaction in many ways. For instance, I do not treat Albert as a toll-road seat. In fact, Albert ended up with a swing less than the average, 5.5 per cent. In fact, the further south you go, the more people wanted the road. Similarly, I do not see Mansfield as a toll-road seat. It barely touched the seat in a physical sense.

The other element that was not mentioned in television advertising but was being used in our direct mail was the public service. Very early in the piece our view was that the public service was a very important element in this campaign—a campaign where delivery of services was so much the issue. We have 160,000 or 158,000 voters in Queensland who are public servants. That is 8 per cent of the voting public. Not all of them have wives and husbands and kids, but a lot of them do. They all have families and you can multiply that vote quite substantially. In a broad sense, at the service delivery end of the public service, the public servants could see a lot of these problems. If you talked to the nurses, the firemen, the ambulance drivers and those kinds of people, you found out that they were very unhappy with the kinds of bureaucracy that were being imposed upon them and the paperwork that was being added to them on an almost daily basis. In spite of more money going in at the top, there were less services at the bottom. They knew that. They have a professional pride in their work and they were very, very unhappy about that. I think that, when you add to that the impact over five years or so of the Coaldrake reforms and the upheaval in the public service, there is a great degree of resentment in the middle and upper ranks of the public service. In the second phase, we did a lot of direct mail drops into the public service—where we could find them. We did drops into office blocks and all kinds of things. We saw the public service as a very important element in the campaign. People stand in wonderment and wonder why there were such big swings in Mount Gravatt, Everton—not so much Kedron, but a number of Brisbane seats that are the older established suburbs—and I

think you will find the public service had a lot to do with that. In fact, I think the public service was more instrumental in the swing in Mansfield than the road. In Mansfield, I think we ended up with a swing of about 13 per cent, two-party preferred, but Mansfield just happens to be the seat, according to the bureau of statistics, with the highest proportion of public servants in Queensland. I think that there is a real message in that. I do not think that that swing had much to do with the road at all.

The third phase of the television campaign—and Anne, you obviously were not watching our ads—was when we went out and asked them for their vote. We started that on the last Sunday night of the campaign. We ran it for four nights. In those four nights, Labor spent \$500,000 and I think we spent \$80,000. I have to admit that, when I saw Labor's schedule on the Friday prior to that and had it costed, I said to the man who was reading all our research and generally guiding the campaign, "Well, we might as well pull our ads and save the money because they are going to outspend us 6 to 1 on the last four nights." Then I decided that I would get positive and I said to him, "Well, if you need another \$50,000, just tell me and I'll go and see if I can find it somewhere. I'll go to Sydney and try to raise the money for you and at least we will have a bit more there." He went through the program, he went through the whole lot and he came back and said, "No, you do not need any more. You will waste your money." He said, "Our message is right and anything you spend in excess of that \$80,000 will be wasted." So I am glad that I took his advice. I think that was a very important point, that is, it was a campaign being driven by the research from swinging voters. The people making the decisions had the confidence in the message. The ads had a similarity about them, but it was in the last four nights that we actually asked people for their vote.

Now, the campaign itself—I have spoken about it as I have talked about the television ads, but I still have not talked about how we dealt with our major negative and the major negative was the problem with the coalition. Advertising agencies are great people at spending your money and, a couple of months out, we had lots of fancy proposals about how to go in and advertise and convince people about this new coalition. Because our resources were fairly limited, it was not too hard to say "No" to that. We made the decision that we would use free media, that is, the news bulletins and so on to get this message across. We determined quite deliberately to do it through the visual media. I think all of you who watched the campaign watched the television news every night. You probably cannot remember one thing that Rob Borbidge or Joan Sheldon said every night on television, but you can remember one thing, that is, the two of them standing there together. That was the technique, at no expense, to deal with our major negative. It was done quite deliberately and, after about a week, we had killed it. The research showed that the negative had gone away and people, even the journalists, were commenting on how friendly they were, how well they were getting on and so on. It was a very deliberate thing. Rob and Joan worked very well together. They had been working very well. We knew it would work because they had been doing it for 12 months—probably longer, in fact, but certainly for the previous 12 months. So that was how the negative was dealt with. It was quite deliberate and we thank Channels 7, 9, 10 and 2 for having carried our message for us.

The campaign then started and that was when we got our first lucky break. The Premier started off on day one and said, "I am not going to run on my record." That was pretty good news for us because it opened it up for us to run on his record for him. That is precisely what we had intended to do anyway. We then saw a Government campaign that we found a little surprising, in that, as Anne said, the Government tended to campaign like an Opposition—lots of promises, every day there was another deal for you, and so on. People were fairly sceptical about that, and that was coming through very quickly in the research.

I will put a couple of things to rest in people's minds. There was no late swing in the last couple of days. The research was quite interesting. According to our polling, the swings happened in three quite distinct time frames. In the coalition's marginal seats that we were defending—Liberal seats like Aspley, Caloundra and Noosa—the swing occurred quite suddenly and substantially about two and a half weeks before the election. The polling we picked up two and a half weeks out was pretty much spot-on with polling day. It did not change from that point on. It just happened. The next category of seats that we saw swing were the Labor seats that we subsequently won. They swung about 10 to 14 days out from the election. Once again, that occurred quite suddenly, and then held. The third category of seats were Labor seats that we deemed to be marginal and were targeting and polling but did not win—seats like Sunnybank, Redcliffe and Currumbin. They swung about seven days out—five to seven days out—once again quite suddenly, but they were just lineball and we kept polling them. You really could not pick

which way they were going to go, and that is how they ended up. Sunnybank was a few hundred votes. Redcliffe, I think, was 130-odd and so on. They were tight a week out and they just stayed tight. So the swings did not occur in the last few days after all. They were quite dramatic when they occurred but they were much further out.

The other thing I probably should deal with quickly, Paul, is the issue of a protest vote. Quite clearly, from the size of the swings, this was no protest vote. This was a community that really wanted to toss this lot out on their ear. Everybody had their own reasons, but this was no protest vote. I put to you a few things to consider in support of that: firstly, let us bear in mind that we have preferential voting and whilst people will go to the Greens and go to the Democrats, they still have the opportunity to put down a No 2 vote and when they are voting Greens or Democrats, that is their real vote. With that 7.2 per cent two-party preferred swing, it is quite obvious that a lot of those people quite deliberately either came straight across to the coalition or went via Greens and Democrats.

Secondly, I point out that, if you look at the Green preference distribution, you will see something which to me is interesting but also supports my proposition that this was not a protest vote. The Greens, as you would be aware, had a variety of proposals. You could vote 1 and then stop. You could have voters' choice, which means vote 1 Green and then do what you like. They had others where they actually allocated a preference to the coalition or to Labor. In the case of the Democrats, you did all of those things. They also had a couple of dual how-to-vote cards. You had one out at Mount Ommaney, did you not, Bob? In my mind, the share of vote exhausted is a genuine protest vote. That is the vote 1 and stop of the Greens. In the seats where the Greens nominated that the preference should go to the coalition, about 19 per cent of the vote exhausted. In the seats where the Greens recommended a preference to Labor, about 20 per cent of the vote exhausted. In the seats where the Greens said, "Vote 1 and stop"—and that is the real protest vote—about 18 per cent of the vote exhausted. The high end of the range in that category was Mount Coot-tha where Drew Hutton was running—22 per cent of the vote exhausted. There was the real, genuine protest campaign and only 22 per cent of the people followed the how-to-vote card and registered a genuine protest vote. So I have the very strong view that this was not a protest vote. If you look at Greenslopes and Everton which had only two candidates—you either had to go Labor or Liberal; there was no Green or Democrats candidates—that is where we got even bigger swings. In Greenslopes, I think the swing was 7 or 8 per cent; Everton, over 10 per cent. They were seats, as I think Paul said earlier, that had no local issues, no real reason to change and so on. I have the very strong view that there was not a protest vote working here at all. It was a very genuine desire on the part of the voters to toss the Government out.

To wrap up very quickly—I am sure that I have only a minute to go—the outcomes are different. I have tried to speak here tonight as much as I can about the coalition, but my examples have tended to be Liberal seats because they were the ones we were polling. I did not have access to the National Party polling. I am not even sure whether they were doing any. We had to win 10 seats to win Government. The tenth seat needed a 5.4 per cent swing. Of those 10 seats—and they were the real target seats—the Liberal Party only ran in three. We won all three. The National Party ran in eight of those 10, bearing in mind that we both ran in Barron River. It also won three. Gladstone came in as the seventh seat. Outside of that 10, we had Springwood, which was a special case. Obviously it was being targeted but, from memory, I think 8.7 per cent was needed and, actually, we ended up with 19.1, Paul, not 20 something. Then, of course, there was Greenslopes which, I have to stand here and admit, we were not targeting. We did not poll it and we did not put any resources in there but we still won it, which probably negates most of my arguments. I think, Greenslopes was a bit of a fluke. The campaign that was run out there was certainly different. I think our candidate doorknocked the entire electorate and that was all he did.

That is a little bit on outcomes. Looking at seats won—I think the only seat in which the Green or Democrats preferences played a part was Mulgrave. Springwood, I think, is a special case simply because everybody's preferences were aimed against Molly and she really did not have a chance right from the start. Mulgrave is actually the only seat where the imbalance in the preference distribution against what you would normally expect was greater than the winning margin. I think the only seat in which the Green preferences or Democrats preferences have made a difference is Mulgrave. I hope that puts in context some of the aspects of this campaign in relation to protest votes, minor parties and so on. I have given you a bit of an overview of how campaigns are brought together and conducted. Thanks, Paul.

**Dr Reynolds:** Thanks, Bob, for a most comprehensive and enlightening analysis, which really has brought the story up to date as well as giving it from the coalition perspective—one which I do not think the media has run with as much as they could have in the wrap-up of the election, perhaps because the story of the Government squeaking back was more interesting and perhaps newsworthy than the Opposition that nearly won. However, to give us a final wrap-up as he saw it, as one who has observed elections for many years both here and elsewhere and as a very skilled analyst of matters political, Wayne Sanderson.

**Mr Sanderson:** Thanks Paul. How on earth do I live up to that? One of the hazards of going last, of course, is that you end up like the hapless Mike Moore when he appeared on *World Series Debating* in *Frontline* and just threw the cards away as everybody else made the points that he was going to make.

I would like to say at the outset—before I get on to saying what I knew, what happened, what did not happen and who got it wrong—that I got it wrong. Fortunately, I did not do a Spencer, as we now say in the media, but that was perhaps more good luck than good management. My guesstimate would have been Labor to return with a margin of about five or seven and probably, to be totally frank, I would have leaned more towards seven than five. But I take consolation from the fact—and perhaps so should Spencer—that I was not as wrong as the Minister who told me confidently three times during the campaign that Labor would increase its majority. I will not mention any names but suffice to say I think if he applied the same political judgment to his previous portfolios of Health and Transport, it might explain a lot about where the Minister is today and perhaps, for that matter, the Government.

I will have to adjust my address because I do not want to cover areas that have been covered. Of course, the other difficulty is that, unlike Bob Tucker and to a lesser extent, I suppose, Anne Warner, we get to talk publicly all the time about what we think. So, even before they spoke, the danger was that I would be stating the bleeding obvious, particularly to people who are obviously interested in politics. While I am on the mea culpas, as it were, I was also wrong about the Opposition's campaign. I think the Government was, too, and that turned out to be a critical factor. I think all of us expected a rougher, more vigorous campaign, perhaps even—dare I say it—a nastier campaign, particularly in the area of law and order. That did not happen not only in that area but also in other areas. I know that Labor campaign workers—not to give too much away—were genuinely surprised and they kept expecting it would kick in at some phase. Bob did not really touch on why it did not or what the thinking was. I have to say that I think we are lucky that it did not. While I understand there is an argument that, in democracy, voters can demand and expect to get exactly the policies they want, I think some of the simplistic law and order debates that we have seen in Australia, more particularly in New South Wales in recent times, serve us very poorly. I have never spoken to one expert anywhere who says that "Hang 'em higher", or, "Lock 'em up longer" is anything but an expensive way to create a more brutal society. It may have been that the Opposition had already well established its credentials in that area of providing a tough approach on law and order before the campaign started and did not feel that it needed to get into that. It may have been that in the aftermath of the Matthew Easdale shooting there was a feeling that the community and the media just would not have the stomach, as it were, for more tub-thumping rhetoric in that area. Of course, as Anne alluded to, the Government had already moved to neutralise that area somewhat with the Criminal Code, which included a reasonably hairy-chested approach in that area. I think it is also interesting to speculate on just what the new regime of the *Courier-Mail* may have meant in this whole context. Certainly, some of those simplistic lines may have been guaranteed a better run under the earlier regime. Chris Mitchell, I think, has done wonders with the *Courier-Mail* since he has taken over. So, for whatever reason, that really vigorous campaign did not eventuate and the problem that created particularly for Labor was that it only accentuated the damage—the stupidity, if you like—of its health ads. I think if you have both sides throwing mud at one another, perhaps people will stand by with a bit of morbid fascination to see who might win or something like that. But if there is only one side throwing mud, they end up simply looking like political mud throwers. So, however flawed the reasoning was about that campaign, it was only exacerbated in the overall context of the campaign. I think that is one of the real questions that should be asked. As we speak, the Labor Party is having its first administrative committee meeting tonight and they are talking about what sort of a system they will set up for the post-mortem. One of the real things that they should look at with those hospital ads is why they persisted with it for so long. In the face of the bad publicity it was getting, the adverse response from voters and campaign workers, a court case and everything that went with it, they persisted with it for so long.

I will attempt to give you an insight into some of the thinking that was behind those ads and the people driving them by telling you a story that I am unlikely to be able to share with the *7.30 Report's* viewers for reasons that will become apparent, and I ask you to bear in mind that I am simply the humble conduit for this story. Naturally enough, I asked ALP campaign activists a number of times as to why they were persisting in the face of such flimsy justification for the ads. I was eventually told by a senior campaign official that they had a rather glorious title for the style of campaigning they were adopting. They said that it came under the rancid turd theory. Now, allow me, if you are game, to elaborate. This particular theory goes like this: if you have a problem in a particular area, such as health, then you look for the ugliest, nastiest unmentionable in that same area and you throw it at your opponents—the theory being that by the time they have got the smell off their suits, the campaign is over. Unfortunately for Labor, I think the smell ended up on the wrong suits, so to speak. Even worse for them was the damage it did to Wayne Goss' standing and credibility. It had been their most potent political weapon and, as the coalition's campaign director observed after the campaign, that campaign allowed the coalition for the first time to target Wayne Goss' standing. It will be interesting to see what that means long term for the Government and for Wayne Goss since, as I say, it has been their most potent political weapon to date.

Again, I must own up to thinking that initially it was clever politics. Joh often used to say, "If you've got a problem, if somebody is giving you a problem, you give them a bigger problem." Adopting that view seemed to have some sort of rationale, but I just wonder how much it is an underestimation of the political sophistication of the public in the 'nineties. I think that we are dealing with a much more politically aware and tuned-in electorate.

The other striking aspect of Labor's campaign, obviously, was the magical mystery tour. That has been written about and commented upon but that was the situation in which journalists would turn up at an airport or be told to turn up at an airport at a particular time. You would ask beforehand, of course, "Where are we going?" "Can't tell you." "What will we be doing when we get there?" "Can't tell you." "How long will we be away?" "A couple of nights." "Where will we be the second night?" "Can't tell you." It made it particularly difficult for the *7.30 Report*. With limited resources, obviously we were not going to follow the travelling caravan around for the whole campaign. We would have liked to have been able to choose particular themes and perhaps follow the Opposition when it was campaigning on that theme and then follow the Government, but, of course, we were simply unable to do that. I think that, having placed those handicaps in the way of particularly the visual media—they are not such handicaps for the print media—then it is a bit rough for the Government and the ALP to then complain that the media did not scrutinise the Opposition enough. The other thing about that, though, is that it was only the latest and most blatant example of journalists being patronised, manipulated and generally treated like fools by the Government. However much you think some of that might be deserving, the thing that struck me—I have only been back at the *7.30 Report* for two years—on returning back there and mixing with other journalists again after about four years away from the profession was the low level of loathing that existed among journalists towards the Government—a Labor Government—and I had not expected to find it. I think that what we saw in that magical mystery tour stuff just highlighted the reasons for that. I think eventually those perceptions of the Government got out and I think particularly the stories that were done about the style of the highly presidential, manipulated campaign that the Goss Government was running were very damaging because they were appearing at a time when the market research was really starting to show that, if you scratched beneath the surface of the Premier's high approval rating, you found concerns about aloofness and arrogance. Without wanting to overstate at all the role that the media might have played in that regard, I think perhaps that they had quite a devastating effect.

Another move by Labor, which again at the time seemed politically astute, was the attempt to isolate Drew Hutton—to paint him as a politician first and a conservationist second. Labor refused to talk to him about conservation issues and spoke instead to the peak conservation groups, which came out and endorsed Labor. Theoretically, they were clever tactics. Of course, it blew up in their face because of the infighting in the Greens and because of the attention that was drawn to that area. Naturally, the media went to Drew Hutton for his comments. Again and again that gave him a platform on which to spell out his message, which was that the National Party in 1995 is not the National party of 1985 or 1975; it has changed. Bob did not refer to that, but I have often wondered just how helpful some of that stuff might have been in helping to pick up the protest vote. I have to disagree with Bob on that point. Without having any particular research to go to, I think it stands to reason that if you have a Government that on the

one hand does not have any major scandals, and financial management is reasonably sound—there was no scandal or corruption, no Fitzgerald inquiry, and there did not seem to be a great desire to kick them out. I think it is fair to say that, on the other hand, there was no Neville Wran emerging; there was no obvious reason to bring those people into power. I think that people wanted very much to send a message, to kick them in the shins, to punish them. I think that what Bob really outlined for us was a classic example, a textbook example, of how to run a protest campaign.

One of the things that struck me about Labor's campaign, particularly with that stuff of Drew Hutton and the Greens, was that it was as if you were watching a game of chess being played by a five-year-old where the moves are only thought out one step ahead—"Yes, this looks good; let's do it"—without any thought of what was likely to come back at them. I have to say again that, in light of Labor's recent successes—two State election wins, two City Hall wins and doing reasonably well Federally—I think I was as sucked in as were many other people to the notion that they had all the answers, that these were the bright young things of campaigning, some of the young men in suits. That is just one of the many illusions that have been shattered for all time by this election campaign. Again, I wonder. It would be very interesting to see some research, some sort of sociology studies along the lines that Hugh Mackay is apt to do, to see just what forces are at work socially. I was told again by some of Labor's campaign officials that they were finding that some of the research that they were doing—and this seems obvious enough in hindsight—was not particularly reliable in terms of the outcomes that were seen in the end and other factors like that. I just wonder whether people are getting very cynical about being polled. They know to what use polls are being put and so forth. I am not sure, but I think that there is fertile ground out there for some really interesting studies. I think this election campaign is one of the most interesting that we have seen for a long time.

In fairness to Labor, I think it must be said that this was one of those campaigns where for them Murphy's law ruled and that, in this case, Murphy was an optimist. For example, on day one, the Opposition launched its crime prevention strategy and, on that day, a caller phoned talkback radio to tell about a vacant, recently renovated house that had been trashed. Now, ironically, the call came in too late to get onto the radio program but the producer for that program tipped off a colleague in television, and it is sad but true to say that no connection like that was ever too shallow or too superficial to be passed up by the media and, of course, that night they had suitably outraged Opposition politicians walking through the ruins of the house. That was just one example of how the bounce of the ball seemed to favour the coalition quite often. I do not want to detract at all from what was a very, very clever and very skilful campaign and a very well-conducted campaign. I think the contrast between Rob Borbidge and Wayne Goss could not have been more apparent, particularly the last time that I was in this venue and this was where the great debate was held. I think Wayne Goss lost that debate comprehensively. For example, that moment when Wayne Goss refused to come up to speak, having been asked to, and Rob sort of smiled and said, "Yes, no worries. I'll go and do it." A lot of those things that you cannot plan for, no matter how carefully the campaign is planned, worked very well in the Opposition's favour. Being the underdog in Queensland is never a bad thing, particularly after the sort of State of Origin series that we had seen. Having the guy-next-door image, I think, is particularly helpful in a State that is only just losing its inferiority complex. All of those were factors that really tuned in to the psychology of Queensland. I suspect that, although I do not have any good evidence to point to or even know what the forces are, somehow they tapped also into the social forces that are at work at the moment.

I will just skip a couple of points. Obviously, I was going to make the point about the Rob and Joan show. That was extraordinarily effective. I think coalition infighting has been a feature of Queensland politics since before Russ Hinze lumbered across the joint party meeting at Rosemary Kyburz. No amount of clever spin doctoring could have done the work that those images did.

I made some brief notes on some of the points that Anne and Bob made. I felt it was interesting that Labor went out to woo voters. I think that simply underscores the point that it is a Government that has not sold itself well to date. I think that there does seem to be an overemphasis and perhaps too great a fear among some of the people—Wayne Goss obviously, in particular, but also people around him—about just how conservative Queensland is. I think that Queensland is the obviously quite a conservative electorate. You would underestimate that at your peril. On the other hand, Queenslanders voted Labor, but perhaps it was a little bit like having gone through the seduction and agreed but that the act was not consummated in the end, if you

see what I mean. They have a Labor Government and I know that some of the research even from the coalition was showing up that people did not think he was a genuine Labor man to some extent. It has been a monochrome Government to some extent. Perhaps they could not stand on their record because there was not a great deal of knowledge out there in the electorate about just what their record was. Again, there is that sense of underselling—the factors that Anne spoke about of not wanting to scare the horses. Instead of saying, "This will be a great thing. This is the right thing to do. This will help create a better society," there was much more emphasis on saying, "Don't worry, the land rights legislation will not affect your backyard," or whatever. There was too much of that sort of approach.

Finally, I will raise a couple of points that I have been wondering about since the campaign. I found it interesting that Joan Sheldon was attacked for her remarks about not being an economic rationalist, that it was important to provide services and she would worry about the costing for them later. That is very similar to the message that the Left of the Labor Party has been sending out, as Anne Warner can well attest. Similarly, the Left of the Labor Party and the coalition have a similar reluctance to embracing the Hilmer reforms that the Premier is racing to adopt. Again I am not sure what forces are at play and where they might lead but it is interesting. In this post end of the Cold War and the Berlin wall coming down era, the post ideological era that we are entering into, there is a sort of strange convergence at times between the messages in some areas—obviously not on social policy areas—that were being given out by, on the one hand, the Premier's critics from the Left of his own party and, on the other hand, his critics in the Opposition. I just wonder if the middle ground that he has carved out, that he believes he stands on, is perhaps a bit too narrow to build a Government on. Thank you very much.

**Dr Reynolds:** If that was an essay, Wayne, I would not have any idea how I could mark it, based on the conclusion.

Thank you for your patience and for your attention. We have had some very, very good insights and accounts. I think we should take questions. There will be people who really do want to ask questions. Darrell has a microphone there so that can be used. Could you please keep them short—comments are fine as well—and, if at all possible, direct the questions to a specific person rather than a kind of catch-all question where everybody feels that they have to get up and spend another five minutes each talking about it. Murray?

**Questioner:** I have a question to Bob Tucker. Actually, it is double-barrelled. If your figures are right, and it is 53.4 v. 46.6 what reasons would you actually put down for the coalition losing the election? The second question was a bit more specific on OPV. There is a slight contradiction in your statement. You are saying at the end that it did not seem that the Green preferences made much difference apart from Mulgrave; yet you argue, perhaps on a general point, that OPV is probably hurting Labor. I know all the parties opposed OPV when it was introduced. Will the Liberals change a position on OPV?

**Mr Tucker:** Let me deal with the first bit first. The simple answer is that we did not win enough seats, but why did we not win enough seats? I think the reason was that the swings needed to win seats were so great. We needed 10 seats to win Government. To get all 10 of those, we had to get up to 5.4 per cent. You never get even swings right across-the-board. So we had unders and overs and so on. I think that was really the reason for it. What has come out of it is that we have now 12 Labor seats with margins to lose of under 2 per cent. We did not have that going into the election. We had two or three under 2 per cent. We have another four between 2 per cent and 3 per cent. So for the next election, 16 Labor seats are compressed into the 0 to 3 per cent zone; whereas this election, there were 10 seats in the 0 to 5.5 per cent zone and with all the unders and overs, you have to get more than 5.5. As it turned out, we got 7.2. So there was that imbalance in the swings. I am not sure what to read into it but the Liberal Party got, on average, about a 2 percentage point bigger swing than the National Party got. We ran in 46 seats; I think the Nationals ran in 44 and two of those were Gladstone and Barron River where they were not there at the finish. In the other 42, the swing to the Nationals was about 2 percentage points less. If we dig into those swings a little more, we find something interesting in that the swing to the Liberals in Liberal-held seats was significantly less than the swings to the Liberals in Labor-held seats; whereas the reverse applied with the Nationals. The Nationals did better in their own seats. Just why that is I am not sure—whether it was the on-the-ground campaigns or whether it was because the bulk of the Liberal seats were in Brisbane. There might have been a Brisbane factor there, which comes back maybe to the public service—more concentrated. I am not too sure of the reasons. The general answer is: the lumpy swings.

As for the second part of the question—I will leave that to the elected representatives to sort out. I think it is an issue that I would not be surprised if Labor addresses in the next term. I think it was put in originally to cause trouble on our side because of three-cornered contests. Now we have fixed that, so there is no profit in it for the Government. So I would not be surprised to see them go back the other way.

**Dr Reynolds:** Thanks, Robert. I will just add a quick footnote to that. I asked Colin Hughes about the introduction of OPV. He was of the opinion—Colin virtually did the whole redistribution in EARC's name—that because Queensland had had it in the past there was good reason to have it again, and New South Wales had it, so it kind of seemed like a good idea at the time. Another question?

**Questioner:** I have two questions—one to Wayne Sanderson. He was saying that the Premier is racing to accept the Hilmer report. What were you alluding to there? The second one is to Anne Warner. I would like her to say what has been the Goss Labor Government's record.

**Dr Reynolds:** She did, in fact, mention that before you came in during her speech. Wayne?

**Mr Sanderson:** The reference to Hilmer was simply that the Premier, particularly with the support and encouragement of Kevin Rudd, has wholeheartedly embraced and endorsed the Hilmer process. They have been the key players in Commonwealth/State meetings and negotiations in terms of having Hilmer adopted. The issue arose particularly because of Eastlink. On a number of occasions when Rob Borbidge was saying that they would not go ahead with Eastlink, that it was just throwing a lead over the border to New South Wales for power and we should not have to do that, he was often asked, "But hang on, isn't it part of the whole Hilmer process?" I have never seen Rob go into details on this or seen the whole issue fleshed out, but he said a number of times that he was not in favour of the Hilmer process per se holus-bolus. So that was just simply a reference to that fact and the fact that the various sections of the Labor Party, notably the Left and particularly some of the Left unions—the Socialist Left unions—are running public campaigns strongly against Hilmer.

**Ms Warner:** I just briefly mentioned the Government's record that could have been highlighted during the campaign, and the stuff that I referred to was obviously all the Fitzgerald reforms that have taken place but also anti-discrimination legislation, judicial review, a proper parliamentary committee system, increased funding in education and health, new curriculum programs for schools, restructuring of the health service delivery area, new environmental legislation which puts conservation on the map for the first time, a new Criminal Code, homosexual law reform, strong policies and improved funding aimed at eliminating violence against women, non-confrontationist industrial legislation, land rights, and the list goes on. That is just a brief snapshot of the sort of reforms that have taken place and there has been a lot of hard work over the last five years to make significant and beneficial changes, but I believe it has not been sold properly.

**Dr Reynolds:** Tony?

**Questioner:** Paul to you—another issue: length of campaign. Twenty-six days is the minimum according to legislation. Is that long enough or too long, considering that the long-suffering public do not want a very long campaign and political parties would generally muck around for the first week if it were a 32 or 34-day campaign? That is just a proposition I put forward. They do not get into it until it gets to the end, but it allows the administration of postal votes and those things to get into place a lot quicker. EARC recommended 28 days, the legislation has 26-day campaigns as the minimum. The Premier has gone for the minimum both times he was able to call the elections when, in the past, I think about 30 was the usual. What is the general consensus of opinion? Is 26 days long enough for the general public or do they want 28 from an administrative point of view so that all the votes can get in?

**Dr Reynolds:** I think there is not really a consensus on that, Tony. I think one of the problems about campaigns is that, under the Westminster system, without fixed-term Parliaments and without a proper duration specified in law, there is a tremendous amount of flexibility from the Government's point of view but it is a fairly finely judged argument. I do not think any Government in Australia would ever replicate the 1984 Federal campaign of six weeks. People were bored witless, the parties lost momentum, Hawke nearly blew it despite himself, and all the rest of it. I think there has to be that sort of minimum for the administrative procedures to be done, as you mentioned, particularly as now it is an Electoral Commission, which is a statutory authority instead of a section of the Justice Department as it used to be under the coalition and National Party

Governments. So I think you balance that out against the parties' needs, but I would have thought, from talking to some of the party people this time around and indeed in 1992 that, in fact, there is no real enthusiasm to run more than a four-week campaign and there is quite a lot of enthusiasm to run a three-week campaign and a bit less if you could get away with it. Any further questions or comment? Of course, Dr Watson.

**Questioner:** A comment first, Paul. When I looked at your paper, I was surprised Labor had actually lost nine seats, we had won eight and an Independent won one. The way I read the paper was Labor had done pretty well. So that was just a comment.

**Dr Reynolds:** Of course.

**Questioner:** It surprised me. Wayne, just at the end of your speech you said something about there being nothing wrong with the Government, there were not any major problems or anything like that. If you look at the Federal Government at the moment, they are complaining about the voteless recovery. Perhaps there is a similarity between a voteless, non-controversial Government and a voteless recovery. It may be going much broader than simply what is happening in Queensland. That was all.

**Dr Reynolds:** You may have an extensive reference to the seat of Moggill if you wish.

**Mr Sanderson:** Look, I am not sure exactly what the parallels there would be apart from the obvious one that we are continually told about this angry, white male syndrome that is supposedly out there—that there is just this general mood of discontent, that people are unhappy with their lot. Life has been very difficult for most people with the high interest rates and then high unemployment and a high rate of social change. On top of that, you come home and find your house has been burgled and it is just the straw that breaks the camel's back. I have even heard reference in recent days to simply the fact that, with increased competition, people are having to make more and more choices, more and more decisions—which phone company, which this, which that. A lot of simplicity and certainty has gone out of life. My reference was to the normal indicia you look for in terms of whether the community is likely to want to toss this lot out of office—those normal big things like the State Bank stuff in South Australia, WA Inc, Victoria, Fitzgerald up here. You could not even point to a factor that you can with the Federal Government, that is, the length of time in office. In spite of the fact that it is relatively unusual for State Governments in this modern era to be elected for a third term, it is only just over five years since the Goss Government was elected. So I was pointing to the absence of any of those features, which I think Bob said was also coming up in the qualitative research that they were doing.

**Questioner:** If one listens to the Labor Party rhetoric, there is an absence of features of why the Labor Party was doing poorly—other than Paul Keating, perhaps—and all the things seemed to be going in the Government's favour.

**Dr Reynolds:** That is what I think Anne's paper was about.

**Questioner:** I just wondered whether or not political commentators and journalists have been concentrating on the wrong thing.

**Mr Sanderson:** In what sense?

**Questioner:** Maybe that is not what has motivated voters. Maybe voters are looking for something different. It may be the fact that people are after something more from Governments than what these Governments are delivering and you may not be able to measure it in terms of, if you like, how well your pocketbook looks.

**Mr Sanderson:** I think you are absolutely right and I was alluding to something like that when I suggested that it would be really interesting to see some sort of in-depth sociological analysis of the Hugh Mackay sort of stuff. Given all the expectations—practically everybody got it wrong. I am not telling too many tales out of school when I say that three, four or five months ago I phoned Bob and we had lunch to meet because I had not met him before that. I was just taking over as the full-time political reporter for the *7.30 Report* and I well remember Bob saying at lunch that he did not think they could win. His frank assessment was that they could not win and I remembered it particularly because it is unusual to find that sort of frankness and honesty from a practitioner. It was obviously off the record in terms of my using that professionally, but I think that indicates the climate. I think in the light of that and Goss' standing at the election and so forth that it would be really interesting to see some in-depth research, and hopefully Dr Reynolds has a team of PhD students pouring over the results as we speak.

**Dr Reynolds:** I know Anne wants to come in on this.

**Ms Warner:** I just wanted to say that one of the things that I think has been lacking has been that sense of excitement and that was somehow picked up by the Labor Party in terms of the beginning of the campaign. I believe that was too late. They started talking about vision, they started talking about excitement. They started talking about new, new, new, new, new. So there was a knowledge that that was lacking and we had to deliver it but it came too late in the piece. The other thing I would like to say is that Labor Governments are going to be judged as Labor Governments. We are not going to be judged as if we are conservative Governments. We will be judged most harshly by our own. That was just skidded over because the fear of conservatism and accommodating conservatism began to dominate, I think, the Government so tried to be like you lot and, of course, that could never be possible.

**Dr Reynolds:** Ten more questions along those lines. John Wanna?

**Questioner:** I have a couple of questions to Bob. It is very interesting after the event to put the jigsaw back together and everything sort of seems to make sense, but if you look at it early on, there are Liberal stumbles as well. It looks a fairly ramshackle campaign. Joan Sheldon stumbled on a financial question early on when she said she might unhinge the Budget and spend on social welfare and things like that. So in the context of the last five or six years, you could also highlight a case to say that two weeks into the campaign, Labor seemed to be travelling well. They just announced their Cape York initiative. Things could be ticking over, so I just wonder to what extent there is a lot of rationalisation put back into the Joan and Rob campaign.

The second question to Anne is about the Premier. I think the Premier was crucial to the campaign and, in a sense, faltered and that was one of the reasons for the huge swing. I do not think that it is just an arrested pendulum. I do not think the pendulum concept is really relevant in this case at all; it is just jumping all over the place. Do you think what I call the Peel Street campaign overturned the Premier, or do you think the Premier in this sense inflicted the wounds on himself?

**Mr Tucker:** I do not think that there is any post-election rationalisation. You have picked on a couple. All pollies make mistakes but the important thing is to not make them during a campaign and Borbidge and Sheldon really did not make mistakes during the campaign. We had a campaign that was being very rigorously managed—managed in such a way that we were determined not to be the issue on any given day. In my case, I was probably more sensitive to that than say my counterpart in the Nats because I remembered three years ago where the Liberal Party was the issue through almost the entire campaign because of its advertising. So my view was very strong that we must not be the issue and we were not—at no stage. The hospital privatisation thing—perhaps for a day, the first day, we looked like we were going to become the issue but we were able to deal with that issue and turn it around and then turn it into a positive after about a week. So we were not the issue at any stage throughout the campaign. It was also one of the reasons why Wayne was probably disappointed. We did not have an all-singing, all-dancing, wham-bam-thank-you-ma'am campaign. It was very important that we not be the issue. So I do not think that there is any post-election rationalisation. It was very much a definite day-by-day management procedure throughout the campaign and they just did not make mistakes. Borbidge, especially, is a good campaigner. We designed a campaign that was designed to play to his strengths. He is a very good campaigner. We learned that three years ago. He did it again. He did not make a mistake all the way through. Wayne talked about the day they were in here. He did very well. Sheldon did very well on the *7.30 Report* the night before and that probably helped set it up a bit for him, but they just did not make mistakes.

The Government made some mistakes with its advertising. I do not think Goss made any mistakes either. He was the only player on the team. We were using two plus we were bringing our shadow Ministers in and out doing things. Goss was out there on his own. They turned Tom Burns loose one day to pour a bucket on Joan in his fishing outfit, but it was just the way the whole thing was done. So no there is post-election rationalisation in that regard.

**Ms Warner:** As I said before, I believe the campaign was overly centralised but it was not centralised in Peel Street. I think the admin committee is voting or has already voted on a process to try to find out who made those decisions and what the process for making a lot of the campaign decisions. I do not have all the answers there because it was behind closed doors and I do not know exactly who was involved.

**Mr Sanderson:** Just very briefly on that, John, in the campaign for Labor there was very much the A team and the B team, and they were quite openly referred to as that. The A team were ensconced on the fifteenth floor of the Executive Building. They would meet every morning. I picked up some of the pattern not because I was being told but simply because every morning I was trying to contact some of the key players and after a couple of weeks I kind of put the jigsaw together a little bit—to use your analogy. They were meeting over here, I gather, some time around sort of 8.00, 8.30, nineish, then Mike Kaiser would make his way back to Peel Street where the collected wisdom from the A team would be put into practice. I know it is one of the complaints of Anne's group in the party and others that it was too centralised and that campaign workers, party officials and local people on the ground were pushed aside to make way for this small, inner circle. I have a reasonable idea who was on that team but feel constrained by certain professional constraints not to talk about that. But, hopefully, at some time I will be able to put together a piece spelling out a little bit better how it all worked and who in particular was involved.

**Dr Reynolds:** Thanks Wayne. I think that is probably a good point on which to draw it to a close. Before we break, I want to thank the speakers very much for their frank disclosures, for their willingness to talk to those of us who are interested in the dynamics of this and to spell it out.

I would like very much to thank the catering staff for putting on the refreshments for us and for staying back to supervise that. It is very good of them to do that and I know that it is a bit above and beyond the call of duty. Also to the Hansard staff who will be recording this and transcribing it for us so that we will have a permanent and accurate record.

I would urge you to join the study of Parliament group's Queensland chapter. The cost is \$25, \$5 of which we retain to fund local activities and \$20 goes to Canberra and is largely the subscription for *Legislative Studies*, the biannual journal of the national body. Darrell or Ross will be happy to relieve you of \$25 and give you a receipt, which is tax deductible. That will take the membership through until May of next year for our annual general meeting.

Thank you for your patience and your interest and for the way that you have been prepared to support the meeting and our speakers. They will be staying to mingle for a while, too. So anybody who did not get a chance to ask a question in the round can certainly buttonhole any or all of the speakers afterwards. Ladies and gentlemen, supper is served.