



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

GENERAL MEETING

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

**MONDAY, 28 NOVEMBER 2016
Brisbane**

MONDAY, 28 NOVEMBER 2016

Mr GIBSON: Ladies and gentlemen, for those of you who do not know me, my name is David Gibson. I am the Chair of the Australasian Study of Parliament Group (Queensland Chapter). It is my great honour to welcome you here tonight. This is our end-of-year function and it is a great night to be able to be in a very special place here in the refurbished area of the Green Deck. I welcome you all and thank you for making the time.

I would like to commence by acknowledging the traditional owners of the land on which we meet today and their elders, past and present, and recognise all elders who are custodians of knowledge who bring that knowledge to younger generations. I would also like to recognise that we have some serving MPs with us today: the member for Mermaid Beach and the member for Noosa. Gentlemen, thank you for coming along. We also have former MPs and a former Speaker. Thank you for also making the time to be here today.

At this point I would like to acknowledge the passing of a former member who was also very involved in the Australasian Study of Parliament Group: Mr Bill Hewitt. Bill passed away only last week. Noni and I were talking about how we might invite him and assist with his travel to be here only to find that the previous day parliament had advised the ASPG secretariat of his passing. We will be contacting Bill's family to pass on our condolences and to recognise the great work that he has done with his involvement in the ASPG.

It is wonderful to see so many of the former staff of the ASPG. We have those who have been with us from the beginning and through the years, and we thank you. I would quite openly like to say that you guys are the glue that has kept the ASPG together. Queensland has achieved what it has because of the great staff that the parliament has provided and the support of the parliament. I would like to acknowledge the support of this Speaker—who has provided his apologies tonight; he is unable to be here—and Speakers past. Again, the ASPG-Q relies upon the support of parliament, its staff and the good graces of the Speaker to be able to do its work, and that has been of great assistance over the years.

I will not read verbatim its charter, but, as many of you know, the Australasian Study of Parliament Group Queensland exists to look into the study of parliament. It is bipartisan in its nature. Its role over the years has been to examine questions that some might view as a little nerdy, I will be so bold as to say, but also questions that are a little difficult and which people do not always want to discuss, but it has always been willing to engage in those questions. It has been able to do that from a position of having people involved—people who have given of their time, their knowledge and their expertise.

This year we are losing two people from the ASPG executive that will have a big impact upon us, and they are Dr Paul Reynolds and Emeritus Professor Roger Scott. We have the great opportunity tonight to hear from both of those gentlemen. Before we do, I would like to read a letter from the President of the Australasian Study of Parliament Group, Adjunct Professor Colleen Lewis, which states—

The Australasian Study of Parliament Group is only as strong as its committed members. This evening two very committed and long-standing members of the Queensland Chapter, Dr Paul Reynolds and Emeritus Professor Roger Scott are retiring their membership of the ASPG. The Queensland Chapter and the Group as a whole are richer for their contributions to the study of parliament and associated matters.

I would like to note just some of their many accomplishments.

Dr Reynolds was a founding member of the Queensland Chapter of the ASPG and its Chair from 1993 to 2003. He generously served as a member of the executive committee every year until 2016.

Dr Reynolds was the Queensland Parliament's first Honorary Research Fellow and was a member of the Political Science Faculty at the University of Queensland for many years. His knowledge of Parliament, and in particular the Queensland Parliament—

the unique beast that it is—

is extensive and Dr Reynolds has contributed to debates on parliamentary-related matters for decades.

Emeritus Professor Roger Scott has been a long-time and committed member of the ASPG's Queensland Chapter. He began his academic career as a Rhodes Scholar at the University of Oxford and then held teaching appointments at the University of Sydney, Queen's University Belfast and the Canberra College of Advanced Education. These roles were followed by his appointment as JD Storey Professor of Public Administration at the University of Queensland.

General Meeting

He was there at the very beginning in Canberra for the ASPG's foundation. The letter continues—

Professor Scott was the Foundation Vice-Chancellor of the University of Canberra and from 1990 to 1994 and was the Director-General of Education, Queensland.

Professor Scott has held various other distinguished positions including being Executive Director of the TJ Ryan Foundation.

From this very abridged account of Dr Reynolds' and Professor Scott's very busy and distinguished careers, one can see that there have been many demands on their time. Despite this, both somehow found time to contribute to the aims of the ASPG, including serving on the editorial board of the Group's journal *Australasian Parliamentary Review*.

On behalf of all members of the ASPG, I extend most sincere thanks to Dr Reynolds and Professor Scott for their valuable and highly valued contribution to the organization over many years. The Group has been strengthened by their membership and their efforts are greatly appreciated by all members.

I would like to close by saying thank you to you both for all you have done for the organization and to let you know that you will be missed. You retire from the ASPG with our very best wishes and warmest regards.

Colleen Lewis

President, ASPG

There is nothing more I can say that Colleen has not covered. At this point, before we invite these gentlemen to speak, I would like us all to give them a round of applause for their service over the years to the ASPG Queensland Chapter.

In seeing the departure of two gentlemen who were there at the very beginning, you can be sure that there are stories to be told. They know where the bodies are buried, and they may or may not share that information with us. I would like now to invite Roger to come forward to speak and perhaps to share his views on what has occurred during his time in the ASPG and maybe to tease out what happened even before the Queensland chapter began in Canberra.

Prof. SCOTT: I think we are being recorded so I shall be careful.

Dr REYNOLDS: No.

Prof. SCOTT: I will be careful; Paul will not. I think we can rely on that. I am speaking first because I know that Paul won't be careful and it will be much more interesting and lively than my nerdish history of the ASPG. It always puzzled me why it was the ASPG—why 'group'? I will try to answer that question today. You would think it would be a federation or an association, but it is a group.

I would like to start by acknowledging the traditional owners and the contribution that Bill Hewitt has made to the building in which we meet over a very long period of time. I am appreciative of the honour of being invited to reflect upon the achievements of the ASPG. I accepted because of the desire to testify about the increasingly vital role played by parliament in the Queensland political system. I am a founding member of the ASPG itself. I will reflect on the historical origins of the ASPG, and I will conclude with some brief remarks about the future of parliamentary studies in Brisbane.

Two parochial locations feature in this ASPG history, both dear to my heart and both central to the origins of ASPG—Tasmania and Canberra. First I need to explain why I am a nerd—why my own engagement with parliamentary studies was established at a very early age. As you know, Tasmania is a peculiar place in all sorts of ways. In my hotchpotch degree in political science, public administration and ancient history, I studied two of Tasmania's most peculiar and significant institutions: the Hydro-Electric Commission, of which I will say no more, and the state parliament. There is a third peculiarity of which I was unaware at the time and it rose up later and bit me, but more of that later.

The University of Tasmania's tiny political science department in 1957 had no courses in international relations, so I was not seduced away from parochial pursuits by sirens promising alien delights. Budding diplomats were located in ancient history or Asian history. This meant meagre choices for an honours thesis topic in the Department of Political Science apart from the celebrated Hare-Clarke parliamentary system. Enter George Howatt, arriving from 'Trumpland', a monomaniacal hyperactive enthusiast for systems of proportional representation. A thesis topic immediately beckoned and I was away.

Under George's guidance, my thesis reviewed the ages and occupations of each of the members of Tasmanian parliaments between 1906 and 1956—gripping stuff. You can ask questions about it later. It is not as stupid as it sounds. I also assisted George with reviewing the impact of the location of names on the ballot paper—heavy stuff. With PR, of course, this was altogether much more complicated than the simple 'donkey vote'. I established in my research that Tasmania had very few donkeys but that locals did remember the names of relatives. George Howatt stayed on after I graduated and he badgered the

somewhat bemused parliamentary and electoral officials into adopting the present complex system which randomises the positions of candidates on the ballot paper. What George actually wanted was the world's first circular ballot paper.

When George was in his pomp, he was joined by Richard Herr—a Canadian. He joined the department in 1973 and he has been there ever since. Richard has a powerful and continuing claim to be the father of ASPG, as is recorded in his history on the national ASPG website. He was not of course the first Australian scholar to be interested in parliament. Apart from Colin Hughes and Rufus Davis, most were in Canberra—most of them became friends. Finn Crisp, Geoffrey Sawer and Bruce Miller were writing textbooks with chapters on parliament. Finn's strong interests were in the party system and ideological issues, Geoffrey's interests were in constitutional and federal issues, and Bruce was interested and became very prominent in international dimensions, but none of them was especially interested in parliament in the way that Gordon Reid was. It was Gordon who added gravitas and credibility to the study of parliament and then to the Study of Parliament Group as its senior patron. He sustained this interest from the ANU all the way to the governorship of Western Australia—another contribution to ASPG from parochial fringes.

Turning to Canberra, you had the progenitor of the ASPG as we now know it, and this was someone who was not even inside a real university at all. David Solomon was managing to publish a book and mountains of scholarly analysis on Australian parliaments, alongside working as a journalist inside and outside government. He also taught part time at the Canberra College of Advanced Education, where I headed political science. David was assisting Jennifer Hutchison from my own department who later played an important role herself in interpreting the national parliament to a wider radio audience with 'This week in parliament'.

It was during the Whitlam years that the study of Australian domestic politics gained ground in scholarly interests. It was replacing the focus for students and many staff on international issues like Vietnam and conscription or in my day the White Australia Policy. Whitlam's Canberra became a magnet for political scientists, and the ANU and the CCAE were able to service the Coombs commission into Australian government administration with names like Hawker, Smith, Weller and Wettenhall.

I have been on the ground floor of the establishment of APSA—which for most of the time meant Australasian Political Studies Association. Paul will explain the significance of the difference between Australia and Australasia. The Kiwis hate it, I am told. As President of APSA in 1975, I took a radical and never repeated step mandating that all conference papers that year would relate to Australian government and public administration, and there were extended sessions at that conference on the role of parliament. The resultant two-volume publication was called the *The first thousand days of labor*. It is in the library here. It is in most libraries because we produced it for nothing. This kept the fires burning for Australian parliamentary studies, even if Gough himself perished in the flames so soon after his thousand days in office—I think he lasted 1,081.

Down in Tasmania, Richard Herr was building on his interest in parliamentary institutions brought from Canada and applied to emerging states of the Pacific as well as places closer to home. He convened an ad hoc 'special interest group' within the APSA conference at the Adelaide conference in 1978. In 1979, as conference organiser of APSA itself, he was able to establish ASPG, as he formed the acronym, with a quasi-permanent identity within APSA. Using the Canadian group as a model, he envisaged the distinctive mix of membership which has so strengthened ASPG and persists to the current day.

In 1980, with the APSA conference in Canberra, major contributions were made by local aficionados. In a seminal contribution, David Solomon drafted an elegant official constitution for ASPG, drawing on his combination of skills in law and political science, and Geoffrey Hawker, then of the Canberra CAE, was writing a newsletter which ultimately morphed into the Australasian Parliamentary Review. Before then, I had left Canberra CAE in 1971 and came to Queensland. I was intended to occupy a chair narrowly circumscribed as the JD Story Chair of Public Administration. There was protracted debate about my qualifications for such a post but an ability to teach about parliaments was not considered one of them. Paul Reynolds is an expert on what was going on. I was sitting outside waiting to be told what was going on.

In any case, the Department—then called Government—was already a leader in this field of parliamentary studies. Its national reputation was based on luminaries such as Colin Hughes, John Western and, in my time, Roy Forward, Margaret Cribb and the redoubtable Paul Reynolds. There was also a bevy of talented junior staff and higher degree students—Brian Costar, Paul Rodan, Rodney Smith and a host of other names. Mentioning Paul is a good point to end this historical narrative, so I will slide over the next 40 years of my relative anonymity and intermittent engagement with the ASPG.

General Meeting

Before I hand over to Paul to ring the bell to invite him into the ring, I would like to make a heartfelt defence of the virtues of parochialism. This is a motivating force for the work that I did with Peter Spearritt on the oral history project 'Queensland Speaks', and Ann and I remember vividly interviewing the former Speaker with in fact somebody else who is here. 'Queensland Speaks' had its funds chopped off, as happened in the Newman era. Ann and I have then continued to work on the TJ Ryan Foundation, which has a similar parochial focus especially on Queensland. We are self-consciously filling a gap in scholarly resources relevant to Queensland.

I left the department of government in 1987 to create mischief elsewhere. The department then was a major force in the city. It was clearly the received wisdom that all our students, whatever their career aspiration, needed a grounding in understanding the Westminster model of parliamentary government. This could best be provided by studying a mandated first-year course on the national system of government. Why national? Canberra, after all, had a federal Constitution, an upper house and, even in 1987, exercised significant power over state aspirations, notwithstanding the contemporary views of Bjelke-Petersen.

In addition, most of those entering students would end up engaged in the public sector working as lawyers, social workers, economists, journalists, teachers, party staff, union staff or, of course, public servants. They would be dealing with state or local as well as national governments. To support them, a vigorous, well-taught, advanced course on Queensland government was offered to significant numbers of Queensland students. It was taught by senior academics committed to teaching careers and often themselves engaged with the local media as commentators. Again, Paul is a classic example. Both students and staff had close links with parliament and with the ASPG, for example, through the UQ internship scheme.

It is a sad contrast to consider the situation 30 years on. Even though the career paths of our local graduates remain little changed, there is now no expectation at all that students need to have an understanding of the Westminster model by studying it in Australia or in Queensland. It is an optional extra and very few take it. A very able but non-tenured part-time staff member is now in charge of a small cohort of first-year students. Most students do not bother because international relations or conflict studies beckon, with their galaxy of superstars in what is now a world-class school of international relations overshadowing the ANU.

There is even less interest in studying about Queensland—a handful of undergraduates enrol when the course is, at best, offered biennially. They are taught by sessional staff battling for an income, often while completing a higher degree. UQ may now be a major international university and the School of Political Science is a worthy standard bearer, but this has had an impact on the ASPG in terms of its attractiveness to students. It has also dried up staff research interests in local political activities. When approached for course advice and research guidance, I sadly report that the field has been vacated to justice studies and journalism at QUT and particularly to Griffith—to Anne Tiernan, Tracey Arklay, AJ Brown and their ilk, successors to Weller, Davis and Wanna.

Let me end on a slightly lighter note, rather than this personal sadness about the inevitability of globalisation—it makes me sound a bit like Trump. No-one should assume that I have idealised the benefits of my own parochial education. My honours work in 1960 required a close analysis of newspaper files and talking to lots of people. There was no official parliamentary record kept and never had been back to 1906—only a clippings collection. *Hansard* did not appear in Tasmania until 1979. Perhaps it was felt that because Tasmania and its parliament were so small and intimate there was no need for something equivalent to Britain's *Hansard*. Word of mouth would suffice among what was really an extended family and the role of town criers was performed by specialist regional readers by the Burnie *Advocate*, the Hobart *Mercury* and the Launceston *Examiner*.

It was another '*Examiner*' who revealed by limitations and parochialism. My dark past includes a plausible claim to be the world's greatest living expert—wait for it—on the development of trade unions in colonial Uganda. It is not a big field. What a great epitaph! I still occasionally get requests from Google for my more esoteric African publications, although thankfully none is as popular as my article on Pericles and imperialism.

My bumpy road to this expert status was an Oxford doctorate completed totally without local supervision in Kampala. This was in an era when modern technology had moved from message sticks only as far as manual typewriters. I used the same research methodology as I had in Tasmania, relying on interviews and the files of the *Uganda Argus*. I made the unquestioning colonial racist assumption that if

General Meeting

Tasmania in 1960 had no *Hansard* then Uganda in 1962 certainly wouldn't have. I was wrong. A disastrous oral examination exposed this weakness. Resubmission of the doctoral thesis was the price to be paid for parochialism, or perhaps my short-sightedness was just crass Tasmanian stupidity caused by inbreeding. A more cosmopolitan Australasian will be better placed to judge, so I hand over to Paul.

Mr GIBSON: I somehow feel the need that *Hansard* will have to strike the record on some of that, but I am sure that our colleagues in Tasmania will support that. Paul, can I call you forward. If that was the nerdy element—and it was certainly entertaining—I wait with bated breath for what Paul will deliver.

Dr REYNOLDS: Roger used to be my boss, so he is always a hard act to follow. We have acknowledged the traditional owners, so I will not do that again, but I do want to make some acknowledgements, too. I want to acknowledge the Speakers of the Queensland parliament since 1993 who, from all sides of the parliament, have been enthusiastic patrons of the chapter. We could scarcely have survived as a chapter for as long as we have without the support of the Speakers.

I became chair of the ASPG in 1993—and there will be a bit more on that as well. I acknowledge the fact that the Clerk of the Parliament and the clerks of the parliament have always supported us with parliamentary staff. Whilst the chairs of the chapter have not been drawn from the parliamentary staff, the executive—the secretaries and treasurers—always have been. That has given us a huge degree of support and credibility. I would also like to acknowledge the financial services of the parliament. They have looked at our finances and audited them. That has kept us pretty good in the sense that there has never been a question mark about our financial situation, and that has been extraordinarily important.

I would also like to acknowledge all the members of the executive from 1993 until 2016. We have had a lot of people who have come through that, including the late Bill Hewitt. I acknowledge him. He was a wonderful support member for the executive in my time. I would also like to acknowledge all members of the ASPG. I will come back to that a bit later.

There is a prologue to this. The prologue happens on 4 December 1989. On 2 December 1989 Labor won for the first time in 32 years. On Monday morning of 4 December I got a furious phone call from Jim Fouras who had been elected as the member for Ashgrove. He had lost his seat of South Brisbane in 1986 because of a most appalling redistribution that had been done in 1985 which collapsed his seat of South Brisbane with Anne Warner's seat of Kurilpa. Don Lane said that they did that deliberately to set the two of them at each other's throats, which they were very successful at doing. Jim lost the preselection and therefore lost the seat.

He had then gone to the Human Rights Commission and done a very good and well-researched report on homelessness in Australia. The Labor Party had prevailed on him to stand for the seat of Ashgrove. Labor had lost Ashgrove in 1986 and they wanted Jim to stand for it, which he did. Because of his work in the Human Rights Commission and his work as a shadow minister prior to 1986 he expected a welfare portfolio. Tom Burns, who was the man to go for in the Labor Party in those days, gave him the speakership.

He was incandescent with Greek rage when he phoned me. I said to him, 'Well look, Jim, the parliament needs terrific reform and needs total reform. If you are Speaker and you can reform the parliament, you will get a chapter and the other guys will get a footnote.' He was sort of mollified, but he took the speakership.

Fast-forward to 1993. Labor has won the 1992 election with the same majority, although it was slightly reconfigured. Jim has a PA named Judith Lloyd, who was a former student of mine. I do not know why I keep saying that, because everybody was a former student! Judith phoned me and said, 'Jim wants to form the Australasian Study of Parliament Group Queensland Chapter.' She said, 'We are the only jurisdiction in Australia that does not have a chapter.' She said, 'Did you know that?' I said, 'Actually, no.' I was focused on all sorts of other things academically and so on at that stage.

Anyway, she said, 'Would you come to a meeting and would you be prepared to put yourself up as the chair of the group?' I said yes to both. It transpired that we had a meeting in the parliament—I think it was in red chamber, I cannot remember—and I was elected as chairman of the chapter. But God never gives you anything nice, does he? That is why he is God. What happened was that Bill Hewitt, a lovely guy, and Don Lane sat together and they nominated each other for the committee. Don Lane had done 10 years for corruption. We had our first year and I managed to get the numbers, using whatever skills I had, to get Don Lane off the committee.

General Meeting

That is the anecdote. What I did was look at the other chapters around Australia, bearing in mind we were the last chapter to be established. What I found was that in most of the other chapters a few academics went up to their local parliament, got on the piss, had lunch and had a chat. That was what they did. I thought, 'This is not how you run things.' I thought, 'We are only going to be a niche market. We are only going to appeal to people as the cheerleader for a parliament, so we will go out and get a membership. We are going to have three meetings a year. We are going to have one in the beginning of the year, one in the middle of the year, which will be our AGM, and one at the end of the year. We will do that on a regular basis and we will find people who interest others—journalists, politicians, academics and the interested others, like Nonie Malone—to come in and be part of this.' Over the 10 years that I did this I calculated that about 200 people went through the doors of the parliament through the ASPG.

2000 was the first time this chapter had ever run the national conference. At that stage I was absolutely committed to a decent parliamentary committee system. PCER had put together, after the Fitzgerald report, a committee system but it is woeful. All it was was an investigative committee system. What I wanted was the New Zealand model, which was a legislative committee system. We had this investigative and research committee system. I was determined that we would kick this along in 2000. I got Wayne Goss and Mike Ahern, one as a current premier and one a former premier—and both were committed to that—and we workshopped it. In 2010, when the committee on committees met under Anna Bligh's government, we actually got a decent committee system which looked like the New Zealand system and was pretty good for that. That was further down the track. I kicked that along as far as I could.

At that stage the parliament was not prepared to yield ministerial investigative research and whatever into a committee system. This had to do with a party that had been out of power for 32 years. The ministers were greedy to get what they needed and what they wanted and to get their agendas through. They were not going to be frustrated by backbench committees. By 2010 that kind of dynamic had finished and it could get back into a parliamentary mode.

The only other thing I want to say before I hand over to Nonie is that when we established ASPG-Q we got a template, and Roger has mentioned that. David Solomon, for whom I have the most tremendous respect—I think he is one of the public intellectuals of this country—had given us a template constitution, but I had to two problems with that. One was that we had to be a bipartisan organisation. What I did was have the constitution changed so that we would have a member of the government and a member of the opposition on the committee as ex officio members. I got a member of the government, nominated by the Leader of the House, now Manager of Government Business, and a member of the opposition, nominated by the Leader of the Opposition, to sit on the committee to give us the bipartisan authority we needed. There were some quite interesting combinations, I can tell you. We have had everybody from Joan Sheldon to Pat Purcell. That was a bit of a challenge.

The other thing was that I wanted the Clerk to have his representative—we have only had a male Clerk in my time—on the committee as an ex officio person so that the Clerk would have a direct relationship to us and so that anything we needed in terms of infrastructure and assistance would go directly to the Clerk. Speakers think they run the parliament; they do not. From the 7½ years working here as an honorary research fellow I know that the Clerk runs everything. He does it in a benign manner—or this particular one, anyway. Neil Laurie has always been wonderful to us and he has always given us an ex officio member from his staff. He has also been the one who has given the executive the secretaries and treasurers.

When I left ASPG as president after 10 years—and this I hope did not violate the bipartisanship—and when Ray Hollis was Speaker, he was determined to fill up the gallery with former premiers of Queensland. There have been quite a lot of them, but there were some significant gaps. He commissioned a very good portrait painter in Brisbane—I cannot recall the guy's name—and this guy went to contemporary photographs—we are talking 19th century, early 20th century—*Hansard* reports and *Courier-Mail* reports to get descriptions of these guys—all guys, of course, as you know, in those days. He painted them from photographs and from descriptions in papers, *Hansard* and other ephemera. Ray Hollis asked me if I would be prepared to sponsor one of the portraits, and I said, 'Yes, I would do Anderson Dawson.' Anderson Dawson was the first Labor leader of government anywhere in the world. This was in 1899. His government lasted one week, but he got his portrait and he is in a homespun brown suit with a moustache. He sat in the first Senate and, because there were no pensions or superannuation, he died an alcoholic at 45 in South Brisbane in a boarding house, and that was rather sad. On the plaque that I gave the parliament for that—the ASPG contributed nothing financial to that—I put 'ASPG', because I thought it was important for us to have on a pictorial record the fact that we had a commitment to the historical record of the parliament. I will hand over to Noni.

General Meeting

Ms MALONE: Thank you, Paul. I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which we stand and pay my respects to their leaders past, present and emerging who may be here present or may be here in spirit. I would like to pass some reflections. First of all, I acknowledge Bill Hewitt and his contribution which continued into my time as chair of the ASPG. I followed Paul as chair. Paul was chair for the first 10 years after the founding of the Queensland chapter of the ASPG. It just came to me tonight how I came along to the ASPG in the first place. I am an element of that 'everybody' who is a past student of Paul's. I was a mature age student at UQ studying the government of Queensland.

In the early stages of the establishment of the estimates committees, about which you might gather Paul was somewhat passionate, in my research I found in the university library a journal called *Legislative Studies* that I found very helpful to give me the foundation I needed to understand the emerging parliamentary committee system in the Queensland parliament. I had a list of questions to take to Paul before I had finished developing the assignment. One of those questions was, 'I have noticed in a journal I have been looking at called *Legislative Studies* that there is a Queensland chapter of a body called the Australasian Study of Parliament Group. Do you know anything about it?' Paul said, 'I do. I am the chair. There is a meeting next Monday night. You should be there.' So I did. I turned up to the meeting. I found myself, I think at the very next AGM, being nominated by the then secretary of the ASPG in Queensland, Mary Seefried, for a position on the executive, and I have served continuously from that moment on. Much to my surprise, when Paul was being elected to the chair for the 10th year he came up to me prior to the election at the AGM and said, 'Darl, I am standing this time but next time it is you!' Fortunately for me, I had a year to get used to the idea. At first I was a little horrified but I warmed to the idea and, indeed, became quite excited by the prospect as time wore on.

Just going back to Bill Hewitt, Bill Hewitt was a part of the executive at the time that I joined as a member, and he was a valued member of the executive. Bill stayed on the executive until 2005, when his mobility would no longer allow him to get to ASPG. I note that he was very sincere, very affable, committed to what was right always and devoted to ASPG Queensland. It was such a privilege to serve with him.

I refer to the legacy that Paul left for me as chair. It was a dream taking over as chair from Paul because of some of the things to which Paul has already alluded. The constitution that Paul developed for this organisation was absolutely inspired. In institutionalising roles for the Speakers, for the Clerks, via their representatives on the executive, and in having a nominee of the Leader of the House and the Leader of the Opposition, he reinforced the nonpartisan nature of the ASPG and developed a trust without which we could not operate.

I repeat that the charter of this organisation is to be a nonpartisan body to foster research, discussion and debate about our Westminster parliamentary system and to bring together parliamentarians, parliamentary staff, academics, members of the media and other interested persons. Paul institutionalised that our decision-makers would reflect the charter to a degree. He formalised those things. Informally, we have recruited people to the executive and had people stand for the executive—and that helps us also to fulfil the charter—who are academics from each of the Brisbane based universities, and media people have also served on the executive. Basically, the executive reflects the charter. In particular, through both that institutionalisation of the nature of the ASPG and the conduct of the ASPG, I found when I took over as chair that the representation of the organisation was stellar. We could brainstorm a topic and say, 'Who do we think would best address this topic?' and decide who we felt were the ideal people. My job was to pick up the phone, and the respect for the organisation was such that it did not matter whether it was the Chief Justice, the Governor, the editor of the *Courier-Mail* or whoever, the answer was, 'Yes, I will gladly address or support the ASPG in Queensland in the way that you are asking.' One could not ask for anything better. It was such an easy thing to do.

If you look back over the transcripts of the ASPG over the past 23 years you will see that we have been able to address topics that were really of interest to everybody at the time—often very hot topics but in a very cool way. I acknowledge that the reputation, the trust and that wonderful foundation in the constitution of the ASPG in Queensland made us the envy of the other chapters for a lot of that period. Indeed, a couple of the other chapters have changed their constitutions to reflect ours because they have struggled to maintain those things—respect and the ability to meet the charter.

I wanted to speak about Roger and Paul. As chair they both provided me wholehearted support, were both proactive thinkers and contributed to the creation of proposals about what we might do and how we might do them, either the creation or the improvement of other people's ideas. For me as chair they were a security blanket, wonderful sounding boards. Both were repositories of tremendous organisational memory

General Meeting

and of course formidable knowledge of parliamentary matters and, in Paul's case, past and current Queensland political events, personalities, characters, contests and the system itself. I hope some of you at least will be privy to his unforgettable extemporising on the genesis of the parliamentary system commencing with the impassioned lines 'wars are expensive'—my favourite. Roger has always been willing to do whatever was needed of him, self-initiated or responding to pleas. He intended to retire from these exertions a very long time ago, but he just kept on obliging and bringing common sense and erudition and great good humour to whatever the task was at hand.

I speak for myself. I also speak for the chair who followed me prior to David, Donna Weeks. Donna is absent in Japan. She is now a professor at a university in Japan. For all who have been associated with the ASPG I say that, through their actions, Roger and Paul, in the creation and the sustenance of the ASPG, have helped us to have this wonderful forum of enlightened discussion, debate and record in Queensland. I acknowledge their invaluable contributions and suggest that they play their part in maintaining the peace, order and good government of the state of Queensland.

Dr WILLIAMS: I do not have anything prepared. I was tapped on the shoulder, but I am very happy to talk about Paul. First, I acknowledge the traditional owners of the land and also the passing of Bill Hewitt. Bill was one of nature's gentlemen and was always a wonderful man, very generous with his time. It is a very sad moment that Bill has passed. I acknowledge Roger as well. Roger and I worked most recently on the TJ Ryan Foundation. I only came to know Roger really in the last few years, but I found him quite inspirational. In learning more about his academic career earlier, I had no idea he was an expert on Ugandan trade unionism. I shall go home and google it tonight! Again, I did know of Roger because when I was a humble schoolteacher more than 20 years ago Roger was my director-general of Education during the Goss years. Roger sort of loomed large.

Speaking of looming large, there is a good segue to Paul. I will talk more largely than ASPG, about my experiences with Paul more roundly. My first exposure to Paul occurred when I was sort of seeing him from afar. When I was a very young, green, 20-year-old undergraduate student in Asian politics and international relations at Griffith University—so not even at UQ—my interest started to turn very quickly away from international relations to domestic Australia, especially Queensland politics, because 1983 we all know is a very seminal year in Queensland politics. That was the year the coalition went up in smoke. That was the year the parliament was shut down and we had an election so the numbers of the minority National Party government would not be tested.

It was a very tumultuous year, and my cohort at Griffith University were all talking about these strange and wonderful and perhaps scary events. My eyes turned to look at Queensland political commentary, and there were two gentlemen who really dominated Queensland political commentary at the time. Peter Coaldrake was one—he is now Vice-Chancellor of QUT—but an even more towering figure was Dr Paul Reynolds of the University of Queensland. I would literally cancel appointments if I knew he was going to be on a talk show. I would not go out with friends; I would stay home and watch him on Sunday talk shows, the ABC or whatever, to catch what this Dr Paul Reynolds was saying. I became a bit of a groupie, I think, in Queensland politics way back in 1983. I remember a couple of years later, in the mid-1980s, I was having dinner with friends at the UQ staff club when Paul Reynolds walked in. I was nudging people and saying, 'That's Paul Reynolds,' and they said, 'Who?' If you were part of the in-crowd, a Queensland politics junkie, then you knew who Paul Reynolds was. Other people did not know, but certainly Paul Reynolds loomed large.

Fast-forward a bit to the mid-1990s, when I quit being a schoolteacher and I enrolled to do a PhD at the University of Queensland in Australian politics. Interestingly, I have never studied Queensland politics. I have picked it up by osmosis as I have gone along. All of my research has been in Australian politics and Australian electoral behaviour, but Paul was assigned as my PhD supervisor. It was a revelatory experience on many levels, let me tell you. Obviously this is about parliament and, again, I have always been interested in parliament, but my real passion was electorate behaviour, and really it still is. Why do people vote the way they do?

Paul really reinforced for me the importance of the parliament and he really switched me on to things like the English Civil War, Oliver Cromwell and the Restoration and the Glorious Revolution. These are things I heard about in history class in high school, but he brought them to life for me. In one breath we would be talking about John Gorton, and in the next breath we would be talking about the Glorious Revolution. They are not so separate, if you think about it. There is a bit of segue here. Paul switched me on to the value of the parliament, and I have taken this on board and I try and remind people that the

General Meeting

parliament belongs to us. It does not belong to political executives. It does not belong to cabinet ministers or premiers or governments: it belongs to us, the people. I always try and remind people of that. I think the ASPG goes a hell of a long way in fulfilling that purpose: to remind people that the parliament is the people's institution more than anything else.

Let me give you a couple of anecdotes to give you an insight into how valuable Paul has been to me these past 20 years. It has been 20 years that I have known Paul. I first met him in 1996 and I was a little bit in awe of him—pretty much in awe of him—because I had known so much about him. I read his newspaper columns and whatnot, so I was a little bit in awe of Paul. I was very happy to be teaching in 1997, so I enrolled in late 1996 and it was organised that I should be tutoring his Queensland politics course—GT206, I think it was called then—so about late January or early February Paul suggested, 'Let's have lunch and we'll talk about your tutoring duties.' I thought, 'Okay, that's fine,' so I rocked up to lunch and, sure enough, it's at the Queensland uni staff club. You know where I am going with this. Paul says, 'Let's order a bottle of wine.' Here I am, this fairly insular Methodist raised boy whose idea of a drink was a shandy after mowing the lawn on a Sunday afternoon. Paul orders a bottle of wine—and then another, and then another, and then another. At that point I lost count. Time dilates. You know, it has been 20 years and I still cannot look at a bottle of chardonnay. I do not think we talked much about the course GT206, but we certainly solved a lot of the world's problems in those four or five hours.

How has Paul helped me and, I am sure, countless thousands of other students? I still model myself on Paul in many ways as an academic. The first way would be as a teacher, as a lecturer. Paul had a very well earned and very wide reputation for being an incredibly engaging speaker. In the classroom, in the days when students used to attend lectures—they used to attend—they would turn up in their droves. Sometimes they would knock on the door and if they were late, woe betide them. It was not good to be late for one of Paul's lectures. He looked upon it fairly grimly. This might be apocryphal, I don't know—Paul will be able to set the story straight—but when he used to teach GT100, which was of course the Australian political institutions foundation bedrock course for all first-semester first-year students, so I got this second-hand—there was a student who knocked at the door late and sort of looked around the corner timidly, stuck his head around the corner and said, 'Excuse me, is this GT100?' to which Paul roared, 'I am GT100!' I am not sure: it could be legend; it could be true. Certainly Paul could hold a class in the palm of his hand. You could hear a pin drop. He spoke without notes. He would intercede his concepts and definitions and historical anecdotes with quotes from Shakespeare and poetry. He was really remarkable to see in full flight, so I have tried to emulate that sort of narrative pedagogy in my own teaching.

Another way he has influenced me, and I am sure thousands of other students, is in writing. By the time I had come to him I thought I was a fairly economical writer, a fairly clear constructor of prose, but Paul would take out my PhD chapters and go through them with the red pen. He would really carve them up again and show me how much tighter my writing could be, so that has always proved invaluable. Why say something in 25 words when you can say it in 20?

The third and perhaps most profound way that he has influenced me professionally would be in the very humble role I seem to have inherited from him as a political commentator in Queensland politics, which is something I never expected. Thirty years ago I was looking up at him adoringly, this great, brilliant orator on Queensland politics, and little did I know that 30 years down the track I would be nowhere near his calibre or in his field but certainly in some small way filling the role and the legacy that he left behind. I model my political commentary on what Paul has said and done over the years and some of the advice he used to give me when I first started doing political commentary 20 years ago—can it be that long?—about how to engage with the media.

Paul, thank you for your support and for your guidance during my PhD. Professionally and personally it has been a real pleasure. Thank you.

Mr GIBSON: Ladies and gentlemen, we have heard from these two wonderful gentlemen and about these two wonderful gentlemen. We have heard stories that have both inspired us and I think made us incredibly grateful for their investment in, and their commitment to, the Australian study of parliament in Queensland over the years. We have a wonderful organisation because of the commitment of these individuals, both to the ASPG at large and to the ASPG-Q locally.

Parochialism is a wonderful thing. I think it extends beyond just our State of Origin results, although I often like to remind my New South Wales relatives of those. I think it extends to the very nature of what it means to be a Queenslander, and for someone who was born in Western Australia I certainly feel a

General Meeting

Queenslander. I have done because of my acceptance in this great state and the opportunity I have had to serve and I think the opportunity that this state gives so many people in so many different areas and in so many different aspects.

The ASPG is truly a bipartisan organisation. I am not sure if any other conservative politician has been on the TJ Ryan Foundation and had a paper published, but, if not, I take that as a great honour. That will be on my epitaph somewhere, I am sure. These two gentlemen sit on the opposite side of the political fence to me, but they have sat on the same side in supporting me in my role coming in as the ASPG-Q chair last year and they have been a wonderful source of support and encouragement in the years before that when I was the ex officio member for the conservative side of politics in Queensland.

Never once did I ever feel that our political party or our political beliefs separated us in our interest and our commitment to the study of parliament, and I want to commend them both for that because I think far too often we view people through the labels upon which we apply, and one of those is our political membership. The ASPG allows you to strip that away and see what is best about the study of parliament and our particular focus on what is the Queensland parliament and all of its peculiarities, be they many. Gentlemen, can I ask you to come forward and receive a small gift on behalf of ASPG-Q for your service over the years.

As you are aware, we suddenly have two vacancies on the executive so if you have not yet signed up your membership, now is the time to do so. We are focusing on our opportunities in 2018 when Queensland will host the ASPG conference for Australia, and we would certainly like to extend to anyone who is interested in being involved the opportunity to become a member and support us with our activities in 2017.

The model that Paul alluded to, having three functions a year, has served us well and we have continued to embrace and support that model because it works so very effectively. In 2017 we will follow with three functions: one in May, one midyear, one around about September, then following up with end-of-year drinks as well. Please renew your membership. If you have not renewed, please sign up. If you know of other interesting people, as Paul did with Noni, tell them that they need to turn up and they need to be here, because I am always about succession planning—not that I am ready to go yet, but we are always looking for others to move through.

Ladies and gentlemen, as I said at the very beginning, the glue that holds the ASPG together has been our staff. Each year the Clerk provides us with willing and competent staff of the Queensland parliament to support us. To those staff today who have done so much to make tonight a wonderful success, thank you very, very much. Can we please have a round of applause for them? I think we may have a bottle or two left that has not been opened, so please enjoy. Take a moment to enjoy each other's company, and thank you very much for supporting the ASPG-Q in 2016.