Parliamentarians are busy people and it is difficult for them to stop and find the time to reflect and exchange views with their colleagues. To allow a small group of parliamentarians to step away from the pressures of their day-to-day lives and to reflect on broader issues of leadership and democracy with colleagues from other democratic nations of the region, the Centre for Democratic Institutions together with the Institute on Governance (of Canada) and King Prajadhipok's Institute of Thailand, hosted a Forum for regional parliamentarians in Bangkok from 16-20 April 2000. Parliamentarians from Australia, Indonesia, the Philippines and Thailand participated.

Attached are the detailed program and the profiles of the participants and presenters. We were privileged to have The Hon Bhichai Rattakul, Deputy Prime Minister of Thailand give the opening address in which he concentrated on Thailand's road to democracy and the many problems that have had to be dealt with along the way leading to the innovative new Constitution adopted by Thailand in 1997.

Another important presentation was made by former Thai Deputy Prime Minister and current leader of the Thai Rak Thai Party, The Hon Thaksin Shinawatra. He also lauded Thailand's embrace of democracy but noted that this was only half the battle as the management of a complex market system was also a great challenge to Thailand. He pointed to the triple challenge facing Thailand of having to adjust to the demands of globalization, liberalization and privatization and the need to manage the tension between tradition and modernity to preserve the best of Thailand's social virtues and maximize the sense of community to avoid a breakdown of social order.

Kathleen Lauder of the IOG provided a snapshot of the meaning of the term Governance from historical and structural perspectives. She pointed to the growing concept of partnership across state institutions, business and civil society including the media noting both their conflictual and cooperative relationships. Kathleen then looked at the challenges facing each of the actors involved in modern governance and how their roles were evolving.

Roland Rich of CDI focused on the ten loyalties of the modern parliamentarian. The parliamentarian is an individual of conscience but he or she is also a family member and usually gained his or her political upbringing as a member of an interest group. There are
ongoing loyalties associated with each of these. Further loyalties are owed to the political party of which he or she is a member and a clear loyalty is owed to the constituents being represented including those that voted for another candidate. Loyalties are owed to the Committees of which he or she is a member as well as to the Parliament as a whole. There is also an important loyalty to the national interest which may not always be in harmony with parochial loyalties and beyond the national interest a loyalty is owed to the international community and to one's spiritual master. Balancing these loyalties is one of the hardest aspects of being a parliamentarian.

Michael Trottier of IOG led the group through a number of leadership and cooperation experiential learning exercises. In discussion of the exercises it became clear that sensitivity needed to be shown towards gender, cultural and national specificities. Different people ad different ways of learning and dealing with issues and the exercises showed the need to understand and make allowances for these differences. Exercises are particularly strong means of adult learning and team building.

Professor Borwornsak Uwanno is one of the scholars who influenced the shape of the new Thai Constitution and he led the group through an exposition of its main features. He argues that the new Constitution has forged a new path without precedent. It has basically established a fourth branch of government beyond the Executive, Legislative and Judicial Branches. The new branch of government is a Regulatory Branch under the control of a depoliticised Senate in a bicameral system. The Regulatory Branch includes such institutions as the Electoral Commission, the Ombudsman, the National Human Rights Commission, the Constitutional Court, the Administrative Court, the national Counter Corruption Commission and the State Audit Commission. Their independence is guaranteed by constitutional provisions relating to tenure and budget and overseen by the Senate which comprises elected individuals of stature not members of any political party.

The presentations and exercises led to very lively exchanges among the participants in which comparisons and contrasts between the various political systems were drawn. One major contrast was the position of the Head of State in the four countries with Thailand having a King who has reigned for over 50 years and who has earned the universal respect and love of his subjects. The Philippines has a directly elected President while Indonesia has an indirectly elected President. Australia has a Governor-General representing a distant Monarch. The unifying link between the four countries was their commitment to liberal electoral democracy and their determination to make the system work. Indonesian participants argued that they had the steepest learning curve and that their system would have to meet the challenges of rising expectations. There were important aspects of the Thai and Philippine systems that they would study closely in helping them guide the evolution of their systems.

The organisers would like to acknowledge with gratitude the considerable assistance provided by the Australian Embassy in Bangkok in the organisation of this Forum.
Detailed Program

Sunday, April 16, 2000

18:45 Meet at the Chinese Restaurant of the Dusit Thani Hotel
19:00 Opening Dinner: Guest speaker - H.E. Mr Bhichai Rattakul MP, Deputy Prime Minister, Royal Thai Government

Monday, April 17, 2000

08:30 Introduction and Objectives
09:10 Leadership: Key Challenges and Competencies for Governing in the 21st Century
10:20 Break
Group photographs
10:45 Governance: What It Is and Why It Matters
Kathleen Lauder, Director, Institute On Governance
12:30 Lunch
14:00 Democracy in Thailand: The Process of Reform: Dr Thaksin Shinawatra, Leader, Thai Rak Thai Party
15:00 Break
15:15 Governance Reform: A Comparative Analysis
16:15 Video: The Power of Vision
17:00 Close
Free Evening

Tuesday, April 18, 2000

09:00 Understanding Team Dynamics and Developing an Effective Team: Experiential Learning Challenge
10:30 Break
10:45 Session continues
12:30 Lunch
13:30 Responsibilities of Parliamentarians
Roland Rich, Director, CDI
15:00 Break
15:15 Ethics and Values
17:00 Close
17:45 Bus departs Dusit Thani for Chao Praya River
18:15 Cruise and Dinner on a private boat on the Chao Praya River
21:15 Return to the Dusit Thani
21:45 Arrive at the Dusit Thani
Wednesday, April 19, 2000

09:00    Video: *Paradigm Pioneers by Joel Barker*
10:30    Break
11:00    Parliamentary Reform in Thailand: *Prof Borwornsak, KPI*
12:30    Lunch
13:30    Bus departs Dusit Thani for Tour of Grand Palace and Vimanmek Palace
18:00    Return to Dusit Thani
         Free Evening

Thursday, April 20, 2000

09:00    Problem Solving and Decision Making: Going for the Summit!
         (case study)
10:30    Break
11:00    Evaluation and Closing
12:00    Lunch
19:00    Book Launch (optional), ‘Losing Control – Freedom of the Press in Asia, edited by Louise Williams and Roland Rich

Friday, April 21, 2000

Participants Depart
Mr Michael Trottier

Mr. Michael Trottier is a teacher, facilitator and course designer who has worked for organizations all over the world. He has over twenty-five years experience in the field of adult education, stemming from his doctoral work in this area. His expertise lies in designing and presenting programs, based on careful research and consultation with the organizations in question. He is currently an Executive Associate of the Institute On Governance (1993-present), and a partner of TTG International, a firm he helped found in 1985.

Michael specializes in courses on leadership and organizational development in both the public and private sectors. He believes that a large part of training consists in linking the issues identified by participants with research findings and academic theories regarding the real world of management, teams, leadership, change, and organizational renewal. He strives to help his clients make practical decisions by giving them the tools as well as the theory.

In conjunction with the Institute On Governance, examples of his work in the area of leadership include: a one-week course hosted by the Singapore Civil Service College and attended by senior public sector leaders from a number of countries in Southeast Asia; a three day course for Under Secretaries and Assistant Under Secretaries of the Government of Brunei; a course offered to young leaders for the government of Malaysia; and a three day course for the Prime Minister, Cabinet and Under-Secretaries of the Latvian Government in conjunction with a consultation process he managed for the United Nations.

Michael teaches the Leadership Development Programs offered by the Department of Transport, the Department of Justice and the Department of Fisheries and Oceans. He also designed and taught “Leadership At The Top”, a program offered to Canadian Deputy Ministers, Assistant Deputy Ministers, and Agency Heads by the Canadian Center for Management Development. As a facilitator, he has chaired many conferences and hearings, most notably the hearings for Environment Canada as part of the process to regulate the Canadian pulp and paper industry, and a Symposium on Affirmative Action and Sexual Harassment for the Canadian Department of Justice.

Michael taught Organizational Development as part of the Masters of Business Administration Program offered by the University of Ottawa.
**Ms Kathleen Lauder**

Ms. Kathleen Lauder is a Director of the Institute On Governance (IOG), a Canadian private, non-profit organization. Since January 1996 Ms Lauder has been based in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, where she created and now manages an Asian office of the IOG. Ms Lauder has held senior management positions in a number of consulting firms, including Hickling Corporation and Synergem Management Inc. where she played a leadership role in developing their international development practices. She joined the IOG at its inception in 1991 and developed and managed their international development programs. Throughout her career Ms Lauder’s work has focused particularly on Asia where she has developed programs with local partners designed to strengthen institutional and governance capacity. Ms Lauder has organized numerous international seminars, conferences and workshops. She has managed large international development projects and research initiatives. Ms Lauder was responsible for the publication of several articles and books, primarily on the topic of governance. Recently she co-authored a book called “Opting for Partnership: Governance Innovations in Southeast Asia”.

**Mr. Roland Rich**

Mr. Roland Rich took up the position of inaugural Director of CDI in July 1998. Roland Rich brings to the position of Director a wealth of experience in the Australian diplomatic service. He has served on diplomatic postings in the Philippines, Burma and France and most recently served as Australia’s Ambassador to Laos. In the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Roland Rich has served as Legal Adviser and, since 1997, as Assistant Secretary of the International Organisations Branch.

He holds Arts and Law degrees from the University of Sydney and a Master’s degree in International Law from the Australian National University. He is the author of a number of articles and recently co-edited the book ‘Losing Control – Freedom of the Press in Asia. He is also author of the book ‘Symbol of the Lao nation – the That Luang of Vientiane’.

**Mr. Borwornsak Uwanno**

Currently Mr. Borwornsak Uwanno is the Secretary General of King Prajadhipok’s Institute and Professor of Public Law.

He graduated from the Chulalongkorn University with LL.B (First Class Honours) degree in 1975. In 1976 he was called to the Thai Bar Association and qualified as a Barrister-at-Law. He received management training from the management of Public Enterprises in France and attended Law and Economics Workshops in Pattaya.
He is a member in several Professional Societies, such as: Deputy Secretary General to the Prime Minister (in General Chatchai’s Government); Policy Advisor to the Prime Minister; Expert of the Committee on the House of Representatives; Advisor to the Parliament; Senator; a member of the Committee on Administrative Reform, Academic positions; Thai Counselor of State and as Dean of the Faculty of Law at Chulalongkorn University.

**H E Mr Bhichai Rattakul**

Mr. Bhichai Rattakul is the Deputy Prime Minister and MP representing Constituency 6 of the Bangkok Democrat Party. He graduated from the Ramkhamhaeng University with an Honorary Doctorate of Laws degree. In 1958 Mr. Bhichai Rattakul joined the Democrat Party and he was elected Member of Parliament for Bangkok with that Party in 1969. He was the Foreign Minister, Seni Pramoij Government from 1975 to 1976. In 1982 he was elected as Leader of the Democrat Party. From 1983 he was appointed Deputy Prime Minister, Prem IV Cabinet and in 1986 as Deputy Prime Minister Prem V Cabinet. He was re-elected Leader of the Democrat Party in Jan 1987. In 1988 he was appointed Deputy Prime Minister, Chatichai Administration until Jan 1991, when he retired from active politics and became Senior Advisor for the Democrat Party. In July 1995 he was re-elected Member of Parliament for Bangkok and again in Nov 1996 he was re-elected MP for Bangkok. From December to November 1997 he was Chairman for the House Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and on 14 November 1997 he was appointed First Deputy Prime Minister in the Coalition Government of Prime Minister Chuan Leekpai.

**Mr Thaksin Shinawatra**

Mr. Thaksin Shinawatra is the Leader of the Thai Rak Thai (Thai Patriot’s) Party and Founder of the Shinawatra Communications Group.

Prior to joining the Thai Patriot’s Party he was the Deputy Prime Minister in the Chavalit Government and Deputy Prime Minister in the Banharn Slipa-Archa Government for a year. Holding a Leader’s position in the Palang Dharma Party (PDP), Mr. Shinwatra was elected Member of Parliament for Bangkok of PDP in July 1995.

In 1975 Mr. Shinawatra obtained a Masters Degree in Criminal Justice from the Eastern Kentucky University and in 1978 he obtained his PhD, in Criminal Justice from the Sam Houston State University. He was awarded a government scholarship to do his Masters Degree in 1974. In 1973 he was graduated top of his class of the Royal Thai Police Academy.

In his spare time Mr. Shinwatra plays golf.
Participant Profiles

Australia

Dr Andrew Southcott
Dr Southcott is a Federal Member of the House of Representatives from the Liberal Party representing the electorate of Boothby in South Australia. He was elected to Parliament in March 1996 and re-elected in 1998. Prior to these positions he was a medical practitioner who qualified with an MBBS degree from the University of Adelaide in 1991.

Mr. Southcott has been a Member of the Liberal Party of South Australia since 1989. From 1989 until 1996 he held positions of: House of Representatives Delegate to State Council; President of Mitchell Branch; President of Boothby Federal Electorate Committee and President of the Brighton-Glenelg Young Liberals; member of the Centre for Democratice Institutions consultative group.

As a committee member his services spans wide in committees such as: Parliamentary Committee, House of Representatives Standing Committees; Government Committees and Delegations. Mr. Southcott’s hobbies are running, cycling, bushwalking as well as rowing.

Besides his MBBS degree from the University of Adelaide, he also holds a B.Econs degree from the Flinders University and is currently studying MBA at the University of Adelaide.

By attending this Leadership Program Mr. Southcott hopes to gain better understanding between parliamentarians in the region.

Ms Nicola Roxon
Ms Nicola Roxon is a Member of the Federal Parliament of Australia. She is the Australian Labor Party (ALP) Member for the electorate Gellibrand. Her work as a parliamentarian currently covers local campaigning, housing, working rights, national issues, legal, human rights, industrial relations and industry policy. Prior to joining the ALP she was Industrial Lawyer for Unions and Workers Unionist, Industrial Officer and Organizer and Associate to the High Court Judge (Research).

Ms Roxon obtained a Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Law degrees from the Melbourne University. She obtained an Honors Law degree. A basketball player she enjoys cooking and reading in her spare time.

Through participating in this Leadership Program Ms Roxon hopes to achieve a better understanding of the region and its politics; a better understanding of leadership styles and of models of democracy plus some narrative ideas to carry home.
Indonesia

Amaruddin Djajasubita
Mr. Amaruddin Djajasubita is a Member of the House of Representatives of Indonesia from the Daulatul Ummat Party (PDU) representing Committee IV at DPR– R1. His work is focused on transportation and infrastructure. He graduated from the Bandung Institute of Technology in 1980 as a Sanitary Engineer and during his spare time he listens to music and has a keen interest on sports. After attending this Leadership Program, he hopes to be a good Legislator.

Mr H Armen Desky
Mr Armen Desky is a Member of the House of Representatives of Indonesia from the Functional Group Party (GOLKAR) in Commission III, which focusses on Forest, SE2. Prior to this appointment he was a businessman, contractor and chief of the Indonesian Chamber of Commerce in ACEH. Interests include shooting and golf. After attending this Leadership Program Mr Desky hopes to have improved his leadership capability especially in building partnership and good relationship among countries.

Mr Ahmad Sumargono
Mr Ahmad Sumargono is a Member of the House of Representatives from the S Crescent Star Party (PBB). He has been elected as Head of the Fraction of Crescent Star Party for the Republic of Indonesia for the period 1999-2004. Prior to becoming a Parliamentarian Mr Sumargono was the Director for the Oil Equipment & Agro Industry Company PT Autonesia Tripama from 1985 to 1990 and in a Business Property Company PT Copyles Indonesia from 1990 to 1998.

He graduated with Strata 1 Economics from the University of Indonesia. He is a sports enthusiast and his interests are in politics. By participating in this Program Mr Sumargono expects to develop his leadership skills and performance.

Mr Hamka Yandhu
Mr Hamka Yandhu is a Member of the House of Representatives of Indonesia from the Functional Group Party, GOLKAR. Being a Member of Committee IX, his interests are focussed on Finances and Development Planning. Prior to this election he was a businessman. Mr Yandhu has a University education. In his spare time he reads, travels, and listens to the daily news. He also plays golf and tennis.

After attending this Leadership Program he hopes to achieve better knowledge in political democracy and its many aspects.
**Mr Laurentius Tedy Susanto**

Mr Susanto is a Member of the House of Representatives of Indonesia and the Chairman of Indonesian Unity in the Diversity Party (PBI). As Chairman, Mr Susanto administers law and order in his party. Prior to this position he was a Pharmacist and a Businessman. Mr Susanto graduated from the Bandung Institute of Technology with a Pharmacist degree. In his leisure time he reads and travels.

Through participating in this Leadership Program Mr Susanto hopes to achieve more knowledge to contribute for his country.

**Mr Mardiono**

Mr Mardiono is a Member of the House of Representatives of Indonesia from the Indonesian Armed Forces Faction. The most interesting aspect of his work is parliament ethics, which include workers' welfare, religion and education. Prior to being a parliamentarian he was a Navy Officer. A High School graduate Mr Mardiono likes reading. In his spare time, he likes outdoor activities such as golf and tennis. After attending this Leadership Program he would share parliamentarian brotherhood and ethics.

**Mr Munawar Sholeh**

Mr Sholeh is a Member of the House of Representatives of Indonesia from the National Mandat Party (PAN). As a member of Committee IX, his work is focussed on Finances and Development Planning. Prior to this position, he was an active member of the same party in the District of Tegal. Mr Sholeh qualified from the Islamic State Institute (IAIN) of Walisongo, Semarang, 1981. With interests in outdoor activities such as politics and sports, Mr Munawar Sholeh expects to increase his leadership skills and develop closer relationship among regional parliamentarians through participating in this Leadership Program.

**Mrs Natercia Osorio Soares**

Mrs Soares is a member of the House of Representatives of Indonesia from the Functional Group Party GOLKAR. She is currently working on Commission for Society Affairs and Welfare, Health and Transmigration. The most interesting aspect of her job is in social affairs and the welfare of refugees.

Prior to this position she was a Teacher, a Member of the House of Representatives of East Timor Province and Chairman of 'Tunas Timor' Foundation of East Timorese widows and orphans. Mrs Soares is a Law graduate from the Satya Waeana University, Indonesia. Her hobbies are sewing, reading, swimming and cooking. She is very interested in Human Rights and Human Resources development.
By attending this Leadership Program Mrs Soares hopes to improve her ability as a member of the House of Representatives especially on Human Rights and Democracy issues.

Ms Susaningtyas Kertopati
Ms Kertopati is a Member of the House of Representatives of Indonesia from the Indonesian Democratic Party of Struggle (PDI-P). As a Member of Commission, Ms Kertopati is deeply involved with political and foreign affairs. The most interesting aspect of her job is to solve serious problems within the government circle and the impact it has on the people.

Prior to becoming a Parliamentarian Ms Kertopati was an active member in the Political Department of the party now named PDIP-Perjuangan (PDI-P). She graduated from the University of Indonesia with a Physics degree in 1990. Her hobbies include reading and painting. Ms Kertopati hopes to gain as much knowledge from this Program to enable her to improve her leadership skills.

Mr Paul S Baut
Mr Baut is a Member of the House of Representatives of Indonesia from the Indonesian Democratic Party of Struggle (PDIP) for Commission VII. His job is focussed specially on sub-commission and transmigration programs. The most interesting aspect of his job is the transmigration program and the impact it has on the rights of local people. Mr Baut was previously an activist for a Human Rights NGO, for the LBH – Jayapura/ Legal Aid Foundation of Jayapura in Irian Jaya and the Vice Chairman of JDJP, Irian Jaya Province. He is a graduate in Sociology from the University of Indonesia. He also has a B A degree in Philosophy from STPT Jakarta. In his leisure time he reads and listens to music.

Through participating in this seminar Mr Paul Baut hopes to acquire and use more effective skills to support people’s rights.

Mr Simela Victor Muhamad
Mr Muhamad is currently a Researcher for international affairs attached to the Centre for Research and Information Service (P31), DPR-RI. He also undertakes secretarial duties for Parliament. Mr Simela Muhamad graduated in International Relations from the University of Parahyangan, Bandung in the year 1986. In his leisure time he reads, travels and plays Badminton.

Through participating in this Seminar he hopes to gain better knowledge to improve his leadership capability.
Mr H Sa’adun Sybromalisi
A Graduate from the Traditional Islamic School, Mr Sybromalist is currently a Member of the House of Representatives of Indonesia from the United Development Party (PPP). He is responsible for contracting and regulating industrial and trade policy. He is also a member of the Propinsi of Benten (Province of Benten). Mr Sybromalist was previously a member and Legislative Chief of Bunity Development Party, Serang and an entrepreneur. By attending this Leadership Program Mr Sybromalist expects to develop his leadership skills and increase his political knowledge.

Mr Sutrisno Sosroprajitno
Mr Sosroprajitno is a Member of the House of Representatives of Indonesia from the Indonesian Democratic Party of Struggle (PDIP). Placed on Commission III he observes the problems of food crops, estate plantation, forestry, fishery and national food reserve and tries to find out solutions. Prior to this he was the Agricultural Extension Specialist with the Department of Agriculture. He also holds memberships with the University of Surabaya and the House of Representatives.

Mr Sosroprajitno has a Ph.D. degree in Agricultural and Resource Economics from the University of Hawaii, USA. In his leisure time he plays chess. Through participating in this Leadership Program he expects to strengthen self-confidence.

Mr K Tunggul Sirait
(Prof Dr) Tunggal Sirait is a Member of the House of Representatives of Indonesia from the Love the Nation Democratic Party (PDKB). He is currently representing Commission VIII and Vice Chairman of the Sub Commission of Environment. In his previous capacity was a Professor at the Bandung Institute of Technology, Rector at the Christian University and Vice Chairman at the Council of Representative of PDKB. In 1966 he graduated as a Doctor-Engineer from the University of Technology Braunschweig. In his spare time, Prof Sirait’s interest focuses on Sustainable Development, Environment Perspective on Development and Energy Development.

Through participating in this Leadership Program the Professor would like to achieve knowledge on how to bring forward the environment perspective on Development in the world including SEA.

Mr Abdul Muhaimin Iskandar
Mr Iskandar from the National Awakening Party is Vice Speaker of the House of Representatives of Indonesia. He is particularly interested in the aspects of social welfare in his job. He is the Secretary-General of the National Awakening Party for the
period 1998-2004. Mr Abdul Iskandar graduated with a degree in Political Science from the Faculty of Social and Political Science of UEM Jogjakarta. In his leisure time he reads, listens to music and likes sports. Through participating in this Leadership Seminar he hopes to better his leadership qualities.

**Mr Arifin Junaidi**

Mr Junaidi is a Member of the House of Representatives of Indonesia from the National Awakening party for Commission III focussing on agriculture. Prior to his current position as a Parliamentarian he was involved in community development work with a Non-Governmental Organisation (NGO). He graduated in Islamic Studies from the Education Faculty of the Islamic State Institute (IAIN) and afterwards pursued a course in Management and Business Administration with MIM. During his spare time Mr Junaidi reads. Through participating in this Leadership Program Mr Junaidi expects to improve his leadership capability and build a network with other parliamentarians.
Philippines

Mr. Michael T Defensor
Mr. Defensor is a Member of the House of Representatives for the Republic of the Philippines. A graduate with a Bachelor of Arts degree he majored in History from the University of Philippines in 1992. He also has his Masters Degree in Public Administration.

Mr. J R Nereus Acosta
Mr. Nereus Acosta is a Congressman for the House of Representatives in the Philippines. The interesting aspect of his job is that he is the principal author of the Clean Air Act 1999. He is also the proponent of various environmental/sustainable development measures as well as related health and educational policy initiatives (ie: clean water, solid waste management, biodiversity, wildlife protection, etc). He has been, and remains, an academician teaching public administration/public policy management in two Universities part-time. He is still involved with non-governmental rural development work. He was a provincial assembly member before his election to the National Congress.

Mr. Acosta graduated from the University of Philippines in Political Science. He has a Masters in International Relations/Political Studies from the Indiana University of Pennsylvania. He has a PhD in Government and Political Science from the University of Hawaii. He also has a special certificate from the Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.

In his spare time he in involved in public affairs programs on local radio and conducts youth-based community/environment programs eg: training, outreach, education. His other interests are horseback riding, swimming, bowling and painting. He expects to learn about varying conceptions of power, authority and leadership, especially in light of the challenges brought about by globalization. He hopes to be able to discuss and understand pressing issues on governance and democracy as they particularly apply to the Asia-Pacific region.

Ms Patricia Sarenas
Ms Patricia Sarenas is a Member of the House of Representatives (11th Congress) for the Republic of the Philippines. Here she is the Chairperson of the Committee on Women. She finds the most interesting aspects of her work to be he efforts in supporting the passage of women’s laws eg: anti-trafficking in women and minors, domestic violence and highlighting the impact on women of other legislative proposals.

Before joining Congress, Ms Sarenas was actively involved in the NGO community in Mindanao and as Executive Director with the Kahayag Foundation, a Chairperson Mindanao Coalition of Development NGO Networks (MINCODE), an NGO Representative for Mindanao, Philippines-Australia Community Assistance Program Advisory Committee, a Member Board of Directors representing
MINCODE and Private Secretary/ NGO Representative, Local Health Board of Davao City.

A graduate with a Bachelor of Science degree in Business Administration (magna cum laude honors) from the Philippine Women’s College Davao, Ms Sarenas also took special courses at the Institute of Development Studies, UK and the Asian Institute of Management.

A mother of four her hobbies are writing, reading, gardening and cooking.

Ms Loretta Ann P Rosales
Ms Rosales is a Party-List Representative for AKBAYAN – Citizen’s Action Party. Her legislative work focuses on functions such as: drafting and filing of bills (lawmaking), oversight functions, appropriations and constituency work. In view of the complexity of the work of a legislator and the demands of AKBAYAN as a party-list organization (representing multi-sectoral concerns in the House of Representatives) her role also focuses in legislative concerns such as: National Patrimony, Economic Sovereignty and Territorial Integrity; Human Rights, Social Justice and Asset Reform; Democratization, Good Governance and Political Reform; Foreign Policy and International Relations.

Prior to joining Congress from the 1970’s up to the present, she was a Political Activist and Humans Rights and Political Reforms Advocate. She was also the Founding Member and former National Chairperson at Alliance of Concerned Teachers (ACT).

Mr Gerry A Salapuddin
Mr Salapuddin is a Congressman with the House of Representatives in the Philippines. He graduated with a Bachelor of Arts degree in Political Science from the Western Mindanao State University and a Bachelor of Law degree from the Basilan State College.

Aspects which he finds the most interesting in his current work include: fiscalizing, delivering privilege speeches, sponsoring bills and resolutions, safeguarding and protecting democracy and human rights. Prior to being a Congressman in 1985 he was Presidential Appointee to the Region IX Autonomous Legislative Assembly where he served for a total of 3 terms or 10 years as elected governor of the Province of Basilan.

His hobbies and interests are in singing, swimming, reading and bowling.

As a result of participation in this Leadership Program Mr Salapuddin desires to broaden his knowledge on leadership and apply and impart it to the youth in his province to prepare them for future leadership.
Ms Prateep Ungsongtham
Ms Prateep is the Secretary General of the Duang Prateep Foundation, which she established in 1973 after receiving the prestigious Magsaysay Award for Public Service. She has made many contributions to urban social development, including establishing the Foundation for Slum Child Care and being appointed as an advisor on urban policy to the Prime Minister in 1989.

She is married to Mr. Tatsuya Hata, the Director of the Japan Sotoshu Relief Committee and has two sons, Issara and Tonklaa.

Mr Pramate Maikland
Mr. Pramate is a Senator in the Thai Parliament after achieving the highest score of votes in the May 4th Senate elections in Bangkok. He received his tertiary education in the United States and a Masters degree in Engineering Irrigation and Water Resources, a qualification that subsequently led to his appointment as the Director-General of the Royal Irrigation Department.

Mr Noppadon Pattama
Mr. Noppadon is currently the Parliamentary Secretary to the Foreign Minister in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and a Member of Parliament for Bangkok since 1996. Prior to that he served as the Principal Secretary to the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Noppadon is a law graduate with degrees from Oxford University (B.A. Laws), London University (LL.M.) and Thammasat University (LL.B.). Earlier in his career, he worked as a lawyer for Baker & Mackenzie from 1982 to 1985.
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Welcome Speech
by
His Excellency Mr Bhichai Rattakul
Deputy Prime Minister and Member of the House of Representatives

Excellencies, Distinguished Participants, Ladies and Gentlemen.

Let me first of all say how delighted I am to be with you this evening. Not only am I welcoming you in my capacity as a member of the Royal Thai government, but also as an elected representative of the people to my brethren – fellow elected representatives of your respective peoples. Also as an MP for Bangkok, it really is tremendous to be able to greet you and offer you all the delights of my constituency! Additionally, since we have started the traditional Thai New Year just a few days ago, I am happy to extend to you Season’s Greetings an all my best wishes.

I highly commend the organisers of this Seminar on Leadership and Democracy for their far-sightedness in bringing together distinguished parliamentarian from the five countries of Australia, Canada, Indonesia, Philippines, and Thailand, thereby affording them a splendid opportunity to network and draw from each other’s experience. I refer, of course, to Australia’s Centre for Democratic Institutions who in collaborating with Thailand’s King Prajadhipok Institute and the Canadian Institute On Governance.

I feel honoured by the invitation “to sing for my supper” tonight, and especially to sing a song best known to me and to you all, which, for lack of a more apposite title, should go by the name of “Plight of Politicians”. As between colleagues or, indeed, soul mates, I shall use plain language in the hope that I can be as clear, candid and informative as possible in getting across to you some of the new and exciting developments on the political front in Thailand.

Let me therefore begin at the very beginning.

What is expected of an MP?

I say, democratically elected representatives are under a great deal of pressure, we all know that very well. Think about all the people that you are responsible to by the time you get elected: your constituents, your party, people who helped finance your campaign, not to mention your personal responsibilities to family and close friends. If
you become a minister there is even more pressure because of the responsibility to your portfolio. Everyone expects something of you! And from you!

At the best of times, balancing all these expectations and responsibilities can be hard. It is even harder if you don’t know the rules.

In Thailand, over the last decade the rules have changed. The 1997 Constitution is the easiest change to point out, but there is more than that: People’s expectations seem to be different from the past, not just the letter of the law. The recent Senate election gives us a taste of some of the differences between the ‘old politics’ and the ‘new politics’.

Today, I am going to talk about some of these changes, and what they might mean to Thai politicians, in particular those in the House of Representatives. I will begin with the changing rules, focussing on the electoral system.

The 1997 Constitution has changed the way people are elected to the House of Representatives. In the past, each electoral district had multiple seats and every voter in the district could cast one vote for each seat. All the seats in the House were filled through constituency election. With the new constitution there is a new system for choosing the 500 members of the House of Representatives. Later this year, this new system will be used for the first time. Seats in the House will be filled in two ways: 400 seats on a constituency basis, and 100 seats from national party lists. More about the ‘party lists’ in a moment, but first I want to talk about the constituency elections.

Under the new system, there are 400 constituency seats in the House. Seats will be divided on a population basis, so that every seat represents the same number of people. Each electoral district will choose one constituency representative. This is a major departure from the old system. In the past, candidates would often form teams or slates in order to work together to get elected. Now, with every candidate on his or her own, some people fear that the increased competition could lead to violence. Some politicians are already hiring guards and buying bullet-proof jackets for fear that their competitors may try to take them out of the election, permanently! Is there really so much danger? In most cases, probably not. But the new system is different from the old, and that difference has made it harder for candidates to form reasonable expectations of how they should behave and how others will behave.

The party list mechanism is an innovation for Thailand. Party lists will be used to fill 100 seats. Each party will prepare a list of up to 100 candidates. Each voter will have one vote to cast for the preferred party. If a party gets more than five percent of the vote, it will be allocated seats proportional to the percentage of the vote it receives. Candidates will gain seats in the order that their names appear on the list, so in practice candidate number one on the list is likely to get a seat, while candidate number 80 probably will not.

Let’s look at another new rule. If an MP is appointed to the position of minister or prime minister, that MP must resign his or her seat in the House of Representatives. Vacancies
will then be filled through by-election – for constituency seats – and by going to the next candidate down the list – for party list seats.

Now, take these ideas together and you get some very uncertain politicians. Current MPs have experience running in constituencies. They know how to get the votes so they may be more comfortable running as constituency MPs, despite the increased competition of single member districts. The party lists, on the other hand, seem to offer guaranteed seats, at least for the people at the tops of the list of major parties. Also, cabinet posts will likely be handed to party list candidates in order to avoid risky by-election. So there is temptation to run on the lists, especially if you want to get a ministry. But then, if all the good people are put on the lists, what happens to the party’s chances of winning enough of the constituency seats it will need to form the government or at least to be head of the governing coalition? There are big decisions for candidates and parties to make, and because nobody has seen this system in action yet, nobody is absolutely sure what to expect.

I mentioned parties. The nature of parties in Thai politics may be changing too. Thai political parties are very much about their leaders and members. Currently, parties form around influential, electable people. To win a constituency, a party will usually try to sign up, as its candidate, the person in that constituency who has the connections with voters that will make him likely to win. As you may expect, this practice leads to a lot of party-switching and power-brokering. Parties have not been very ideological. With the party lists this may change. Party list candidates can not rely on personal connections with voters, because the list is national and it is difficult to have personal connections with voters throughout the country! Parties may be driven to become more ideological – to have policy platforms that distinguish them from other parties so they can attract a large share of the party list votes. For now, this is just speculation, but one should note that a newly-formed political party has gone to great lengths to appear ideological and to present a platform of policies. Our of concern that party platforms might be disliked by voters at the local constituency level, some constituency candidates might prefer to ignore parties altogether and run as independents. They can not do this though because the Constitution clearly states that every candidate must be a member of a political party. And the remaining part of the party will be critical too. The Constitution has provision that prevent candidates from switching parties in mid-election, and from crossing the floor to another party after election. It appears that once you join a party you are with that party until the house dissolves.

This system will bind candidates closer to parties than they have been in the past. In doing so, it adds a dimension of expectations and responsibilities to a candidate’s political life. Formerly, MPs could switch parties more or less at their convenience. Now, party policy and party discipline will take on much greater importance. Candidates who want to appear at the top of the party list will probably work to please their party. Constituency candidates may have to give more thought about the parties’ policies before they decide to join.
So far, I have been talking about deciding how to run for election – the need to connect with a party and to decide to run as a constituency or party list candidate. Once the decision has been made the new constitution’s rules will affect what happens afterwards.

Thailand’s electoral practices have not been perfect. Vote-buying occurs in various forms: cash hand-outs, dinner parties, to name just two of the most common. We condemn vote-buying, but it was a fact of life, and some candidates see it as a routine part of campaigning. Less common were the problems of ballot tampering and cheating in the counting process. The 1997 Constitution takes a strong stand against such electoral malpractices.

The most important new feature on the electoral landscape is probably the Election Commission. This new organisation was established to oversee elections and ensure fair and clean conduct. It is armed with a number of powers including the power to nullify election results if there is evidence of misconduct or irregularity.

The Electoral Commission had its first test during the Senate elections. There has been controversy over a number of its policies and rulings. Restrictions on what the candidates could do to introduce themselves to the public had some candidates afraid to say anything other than their names. A question also came up over the definition of ‘other state offices’ which candidates were not allowed to hold, and led to the disqualification of many candidates because of their positions on university councils and similar posts. Many of these disqualified candidates were in fact viewed as the most desirable people running for the Senate. Eventually, almost all of them were reinstated, but only after a series of legal challenges and a Constitutional Court decision. Regardless of problems, the Election Commission has shown its willingness to bare its teeth by refusing to endorse the victories of several candidates on the grounds of misconduct or irregularities. Now there is a further controversy over whether the Commission is exercising its powers properly, but the fact is that there seems to be widespread support for the Commission’s efforts to stop corrupt electoral practices.

The Constitution and the Electoral Commission impose a new set of expectations on candidates. The Senate election shows that practising old tactics of vote-buying, or even being suspected of practising such tactics, now creates a real and significant risk for candidates. Unfortunately, the Senate election also shows that expectations are still not clear. Election Commission rulings changed so frequently, and individual commissioners sometimes contradict each other. All this created uncertainty for candidates as they struggled to understand the expectations to live up to. The only certainty is that a strong Electoral Commission will change the way elections are conducted in Thailand.

Having talked about some of the formal rules or expectations imposed on candidates and MPs, I will now turn to some of the less formal but nevertheless important expectations. I am talking about the expectations of political commentators including academics and the press, and the expectations of the public, both in general and as voters in constituencies.
Political commentators have an increasingly important role in Thai politics. Academics have for a long time been political commentators. Many have also been active in political reform, especially the so-called democratic period from 1973 to 1976, and the protests leading up to the “Bloody May” demonstration in 1992. Largely, though, academics were not directly involved in government and only a limited audience heard the academics’ views regularly. This situation appears to be changing. The Constitutional Drafting Assembly, which drew up the 1997 Constitution, deliberately included a large number of experts in politics, law and public administration. These experts played an important role in determining the content of the Constitution – a fact evident in the western idealism underlying and expressed in the document. Academics are also becoming more involved in politics in the traditional sense of running for election. Matichon newspaper estimated that 12 percent of the unofficial winners in the March 4 Senate election could be classified as academics. It appears, therefore, that academics will have greater importance in Thai politics in the future. They have already changed the expectations on politicians through the Constitution. They are likely to continue to change expectations by bringing their idealism to the political arena.

The news media has for a long time been active in commenting on the Thai political situation, and has also been rather free to do so, especially in the press. However, its effectiveness at influencing political affairs has been debatable. In the past, the media would break stories of suspected wrong-doing by politicians but after a brief flurry of accusations and denials, the situation would usually remain unchanged. The Constitution provides mechanisms that increase the news media’s effectiveness in influencing political affairs. Though many of the mechanisms are more statements of principle rather than enforceable laws, the fact that the mechanisms are there speaks of their increasing importance. Reporters and news commentators are guaranteed freedom to present news and express opinions. There are new access to information clauses that give the public the right to obtain state information. The press has already used these clauses to obtain information in a number of corruption scandals, including a hospital procurement scandal that saw the resignation of prominent officials. When considered in conjunction with new institutions, such as the National Counter Corruption Commission that have the power to investigate and punish politicians and state officials, the press’ ability and willingness to investigate state activities imposes a set of expectations for transparency and good behaviour on politicians.

Closely tied to commentators’ expectations are the public’s expectations. In the past, the general public often did not have very high expectations for the National Assembly. Revelation of wrong-doing was met with resignation. Civil society groups such as the Farmer’s Unions that tried to pressure the government were few and relatively powerless. Again, this is changing. The Constitution guarantees public hearings and consultation on a variety of issues. There are also mechanisms for allowing the general public to propose bills to the House to initiate local by-laws. There are even provisions to allow the public to launch impeachment proceedings against national and local politicians. All this will probably create an expectation among the general public that their voices should be heard. It is still too early to see how these provisions will work in practice, but already there are people and groups beginning to exercise them. For MPs this may come to mean
having much more of their work exposed to public view. With that will come the need to justify and be accountable for one’s actions. Secrecy in office may become a thing of the past for MPs. Looking at the recent Senate election, there appears to be broad public support for the Election Commission’s efforts to stamp out corruption. It seems that public expectations are leaning towards transparency and accountability in government.

While these pressures function on the broad national level, constituency MPs still have to satisfy the expectations of their constituents. At least in the short term, this may lead to conflicts between the high-minded principles set out in the Constitution and practical considerations at the constituency level. In rural constituencies especially, there is a tradition of give and take between representatives and constituents. Many people who vote for a candidate do so because they expect a direct benefit in return. That benefit could take the form of money as in a bought vote, or it could take the form of favours or improvements for the community. The representative is a patron who must produce visible benefits to maintain the loyalty of the voters. This sort of practice is clearly frowned on by the Constitution. Still, the Senate election suggests that some candidates felt that buying support was necessary to ensure they won office. Such practices will not disappear easily. As long as they continue, politicians will feel caught between the expectations of the constituents and the expectations imposed by the Constitution and the broader general public.

I have touched on some of the major features of Thailand’s new political scene. As you can see, MPs are under a great deal of pressure due to the varied expectations that they have to fulfil. If we strive for good governance, the path of accountability and transparency is best, though difficult to follow, at least at first. MPs must be careful and adapt to the changing situation so they can serve the best interest of the country and their own best interests at the same time.

I hope I have offered enough food for thought for this evening. I am very certain that in the next two days you will meaningfully devote your time to ponder and discuss the multifarious significant developments in the region and the world, which are bound to send repercussions on our national societies, in particular, our political systems. I am also confident that you will emerge from these deliberations all the wiser for having ‘compared notes’ and learnt about each other’s experience.

I wish the Seminar on Leadership and Democracy all the success it duly deserves.
Your Excellencies, friends, colleagues, ladies and gentlemen.

I welcome this opportunity to share my views on Thai Democracy with you this afternoon.

First, I should like to offer my congratulations to the three key institutions, the Centre for Democratic Institutions of Australia, the Institute on Governance from Canada and the King Prajadhipok Institute in Thailand for their support of democracy development in developing countries and for their collaboration in convening this significant and timely Parliamentary Seminar in Bangkok.

Secondly, as one who was an elected member of the Thai House of Representatives, I feel greatly honoured to be asked to give the keynote address to this distinguished gathering.

Let me say that democracy is a modern phenomena in Thailand. Especially for my generation of modern urban Thais, democracy has become an integral part of Thai culture like the new Thai music – tonal language put to modern beat.

I could still remember when the new music broke out everywhere for the first time in Bangkok. The experience was quite magical and exhilarating. It celebrated rhythm, youth, freedom, emancipation, expression, a new image of Thai women. Symbolically it signalled that Thai culture had arrived, had come of age, had become modern. My generation had a new and distinct identity.

I say this because I want to convey to you what it felt like when democracy happened to my generation in Thailand. I believe I can speak for almost everyone of my generation because it is our formative experience.

To most Thais of my generation the Democratic Revolution of 1973 was another heady and exhilarating experience, even more powerful than the advent of the new Thai beat music. I still remember vividly the event of October 14, 1973.
Overnight Bangkok became one huge political convention. Everyone – students, executives, workers, vendors, businessmen, policemen and even soldiers – stayed up late and talked politics till the late hours. Even when they didn’t talk politics they just talked like they never talked before. Suddenly people were free to talk, so they talked and talked till they were exhausted.

If there is one symbol, besides the monarchy, which united all the people of Bangkok, it is our Democracy Monument. Many prominent Thai leaders were initiated into politics on the steps of the Democracy Monument.

Come to think of it, Thailand is perhaps the only country, in the world, which has a Democracy Monument.

Like the Oracle of Delphi in ancient Greece, Thais from all walks of life come together at the steps of the democracy Monument when the nation is in crisis or when the people sense there is grave injustice.

It happened in 1973 and again in 1992. It may happen again.

When our political institutions fail us the people have recourse to the Democracy Monument. It is the embodiment of Rousseau’s General Will.

It is the guardian of our political institutions. It affirms that in essence our political culture is democratic. When everything else fails the Thai people turn to raw democracy.

It is the bottom line of Thai politics. It is the conscience of government. The shadow of the Democracy Monument keeps imperfect governments, political parties, and the military in line.

It is currently very fashionable to speak in praise of democracy. But let me remind everyone that the current enthusiasm for democracy is a relatively recent development.

The West’s faith in the Liberal Democratic State was vindicated only after the collapse of Communism in 1989. Previously, the West paid lip service to the Liberal Democratic State, as a form of political economic organisation, but tolerated authoritarian and military regimes in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

Now, of course it is pious to spout democratic views and institute democratic practices. Formerly, authoritarian regimes are converting to democracy like leopards trying to change their spots.

This is a welcome development but it is not easy to build democratic institutions overnight and overcome economic crisis at the same time.

But in Thailand our democracy is for real. Thailand had enjoyed substantive democracy long before the collapse of Communism in Europe and the consequent vindication of the
Liberal Democratic State as the only viable form of political-economic organisation for modern societies.

We in Thailand have a long history of democratic evolution. In 1932, Pridee Banomyong introduced the first democratic constitution to Thailand. But it took us until 1973 before Thai civil society became substantively democratic.

Today, Thailand enjoys a substantially democratic political order where freedom of the press, freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom to organise politically, freedom to associate and freedom to protest are tolerated to a greater extent than most other Asian countries.

Still, the framers of our new constitution regard Thailand’s Democratic Revolution as an unfinished revolution. The object of political reform, culminating in the new constitution, is to improve the workings of Thai Democracy by giving the people a more direct voice in the selection of senators and Members of Parliament, encourage greater electoral participation, reduce the influence of money politics and promote the principle of the separation of powers between the Judiciary, Legislative and Executive branches of government.

Consequently, the new democratic constitution provides for direct election of senators. Previously, senators were nominated. Interestingly, the voter turnout during last month’s senatorial elections was a hefty 70 percent. A far cry from the average of 40 percent voter turnout during past general elections!

Form a purely moral point of view, the new political reforms are highly commendable. The new political system is certainly more democratic. Whether it will work to bring about a more effective government, which could stimulate the engine of economic growth, to provide greater prosperity and improve living standards for people remains to be seen. We all hope so.

Actually, the political reform movement was born out of political crisis in 1991 when the Prime Minister, General Chartchai Choonhavan, was overthrown by the military. Following Thailand’s second Democratic Revolution in 1992 and the restoration of civilian rule, a panel was set up to identify and correct all the apparent weaknesses of Thai Democracy, which had rendered the system vulnerable.

The Constitutional Drafting Committee, which represented people from all walks of life, produced a new constitution to strengthen and improve the democratic process in Thailand. Ironically, before the ink on the new constitution was dry a new crisis was upon us – the Asian economic crisis. Thus whilst the nation’s energies and imagination were preoccupied with creating the perfect constitution, the Thai economy collapsed and had to be bailed out by the IMF. The rest of the story you already know.

The point I want to make is that although we are proud of our democracy, democracy is only half of the story. Currently there is a tendency to think that if only we take care of
our democracy everything will automatically take care of itself – the more democracy the better. Yes, better in the sense that the country is more democratic – but not necessarily in other respects.

There is no necessary correlation between political liberalism and scientific advance, technological prowess, economic productivity, high living standards or international clout.

The Liberal Democratic State is not just about political liberalism. Whether the Liberal Democratic State can be an effective device for building a just, free and prosperous society depends upon the successful marriage between political liberalism and capitalism.

In my humble view, the management of the capitalist dimension of the Liberal Democratic State is a much more difficult, complex and complicated affair than managing the democratic process. The first is essentially managing the world and the world economy; the second is merely managing out domestic politics.

The management of capitalism requires a thoughtful, comprehensive restructuring of economic relations including property rights, intellectual property, contract, commercial law and the attitudes toward rationality, accountability, transparency, science, innovation, abstraction, privatisation, sovereignty, trade and financial liberalisation.

I stress the word “thoughtful”!

Whilst Thailand needs to adjust to the requirements of global capitalism or perish economically, we must not blindly follow the herd or mindlessly bow down to pressure on these fronts, although the process of economic rationalisation can be an extremely powerful social force that compels societies to modernise along certain uniform lines.

As the world enters the new millennium, there is a worldwide convergence in the basic institutions around liberal democracy and market economics, yet no two democracies are the same even among the Western industrial democracies. Although the US model of the Liberal Democratic State is the dominant model, Thailand need not to follow it if it does not suit her.

How Thailand adjusts to the demands of globalisation, liberalisation and privatisation depends upon our cultural traditions and our need to manage the tension between tradition and modernity to preserve the best of our social virtues and maximise our sense of community to avoid a breakdown of social order.

We must not move until we are prepared. To do so would be to repeat the mistake of the Asian economic crisis where Thailand moved too quickly to dismantle exchange controls and set up the BIBF before we are ready to cope with rapid international capital flows.