

Perth - Isolated Outpost or Australia's Gateway?

Chandran Nair, Founder & Chief Executive, The Global Institute for Tomorrow
Address to CEDA, Perth, 07/08/07

Thank you for your kind words, Tony. The Honourable Minister, distinguished guests and friends, I'm delighted to be Perth, a city I come to very often. I actually have a niece – two nieces, who study in Western Australia. I've got a rather difficult task to do today in 30 minutes. I've got to try and cover the notion of whether Perth is an isolated sort of outpost, or Australia's gateway. At the same time, I've got to try and cover the subject of what does sustainable development mean in the context of where Western Australia is going, and then try and give some specifics, so that you're not left wondering, well he's said all of these things, but where are the specifics? So I'll try and do all of those things. I've got quite a lot of overheads here. I'm going to rush through some of them, but I'm going to leave all of this here; there's no intellectual property here, so please take them away, spread it around, send it to friends, put it on You Tube and all of those things.

So what I'm going to start off with is talk about the tyranny of isolation, and I'm taking that term from the Cedar Report, which I was given in terms of my preparation when it talked about the tyranny of distance, and I want to talk about the tyranny of isolation. I think the thesis is that because of technology today, we have what is called 'the death of distance'. We all can travel, we all can communicate, we all can look at distant places through the electronic media, and feel that we're all close and that distance is no more an impediment to getting things done. We hold access to services and goods etc. My main concern now is the isolation of mindsets, and one of the things I feel we're very concerned about as I travel the world is, as technology has made people feel that they are connecting with everybody else, they're actually getting more distant from people, and one of the things I was asking a good friend of mine the other day, his 18 year old son, I said – who lives – no, a 21 year old son who lives in California. I said "How come all of you are not angry with what's going on?" This is talking about our beloved USA, and I said "Why?" He said to me "Why should I be angry anymore? How can we be angry? We've got ipods and we've got You Tube. We are not angry, we are so distracted. We feel that we are all part of the world. Why care about what's going on nearby?"

And that for me, is actually quite telling and is a trend that I've seen throughout the world, and I think it's something that, as I meet Australians every day of the week and in Hong Kong, China, etc, I see some of this happening as well; people who come from different parts of the world who suddenly think because they have that privilege of travel, that access to technology, suddenly they understand the world. So one of the things I'm really concerned about when we talk about isolation and the tyranny of isolation is that so much of modern human experience, those of us who are privileged, how experience is mediated by electronics; it's devoid of human and any sensory

elements; it's becoming virtual, and it's diluting our humanity. So we think we understand, whereas the danger is we really don't understand. So there's this false dawn, an illusion of connectivity, because we have the technology. And one of the things I picked up in the Cedar Report as well is the indicators that globalisation in Australia are – various sectors are scoring rather poorly, particularly in the service sector and things like that, and I won't elaborate on that, because you've all probably read the report. But with the isolation, beyond the technological fix, becomes the need for having more international view points, and that comes back to my point about whether Perth is an isolated outpost, or has an opportunity to become a gateway for Australia, and I think this is something we all have to confront, the international viewpoints that are so lacking in so many parts of the world, and the further away you are from the rest of the world, the more likely it is that your viewpoints become slightly narrow, but you think you have an international viewpoint because you have all those electronic gadgets that connect you virtually with the rest of the world.

So one of the messages I would say that is out there, and I'm trying to bring an international perspective to this, is that perhaps there's a need to understand the Asian neighbours better. Perhaps there's a need in Australia to think about the refinement of the 'we are on the right side' attitude, which I think is quite an important one, particularly in the post 9/11 era, where perhaps a lot of things go muddled and jumbled, and I think that's quite an important thing that I won't go too deeply into, but I'm happy to answer any questions. And see Asian countries as equal partners, I think that does help as well, and clearly, one of the very important things that I keep saying to students and people I mix with all around the world, and particularly those of us who read the English newspapers, which you know, I predominantly do, to avoid the danger of seeing the world only through the lens of the Anglo Saxon media. I mean how many people here speak another Asian language? Okay, yeah. It's very different if you read Chinese when you go to China and read the Chinese media. It's very different, your view of Indonesia, if you speak Bahasa. It's very different what you understand of Japan if you speak a bit of Japanese. All of those things change, and I know someone like me who for – I speak three languages but I would say that English is perhaps my mother tongue, strangely enough. Because I'm so hooked on the English media, I am sure I have a slightly warped sense of the world, and I must say that I'm considering cancelling my subscription to the FT because I read the op eds, and I think these guys don't understand the world. How can they keep on saying these things? So I think we need to be very careful and to take different perspectives.

So the question therefore, about the isolation of Perth and the gateway for Australia, is Australia really ready to embrace Asia? And I thought I'd start by taking a controversial statement by the Singapore Prime Minister recently. He said "In 50 to 100 years, will Australia be on top of its destiny or will Asia have moved forward, and left Australia out of the game?" And basically, it's a sentiment held by many in Asia. Some say it more awkwardly, some say it more diplomatically. But the view that over the last 50 years, much of Asia, as you probably know, was in still that post colonial era, and I think the last ten years, things have changed, and his view is much will depend on what Australia does to engage Asia. Will it continue to be the Anglo Saxon corner of the Pacific? Or grasp the opportunity given by geography and history? Or is Australia still unsure of itself in the Asian region? I know that is a debate that takes place in your country; it takes place certainly in the rest of Asia too. Can Perth be Australia's gateway to Asia? Of course. You're the proximity to billions of Asians, growing Asian population and business commercial links with the rest of the world – I call it mining for China. But this will not happen by accident.

Clearly you need to decide who wants that and why? There needs to be political understanding and vision; Why? How? And the implications of that embracing of Asia and being that gateway. It goes beyond Bali holidays. It goes beyond going to Phuket, and it goes beyond liking Asian food. It goes beyond cultural exchange, and it goes beyond the occasional bi-lateral trade agreements. Is Australia going to be ethnically part of Asia? And that's a discussion for you all to have internally.

But becoming ethnically part of Asia needs certain recognition. It might actually happen inevitably; it just will happen, and it actually might be a necessity, and it may be perhaps both. If it's going to be something that economically you decide is in your interest, then you will have address the thorny – I was going to say thorny, but I'm not going to use that word – the issue of immigration on the large scale. Currently 90 percent of Australia are of European stock. I believe 5 percent are Asian, a growing part of the community. But are there real economic opportunities for migrants, and what can they bring?

Clearly any sovereign nation is not just going to open its doors to anybody. It does it for various reasons. But can the continent really accept a population of 50 million? I use that 50 million because in several opinion editorials in the last few months in various parts of Asia, and I don't know if these appeared in Australia too, there has been the suggestion that post the boom period in Australia – some have predicted it's 25 years, some have said it's 50 years – what will Australia be like, and what will Australia do economically to retain its comparative advantage? Some of the suggestions have been it will have to grow its population dramatically, and that means adding people. Where will those people come from? They will come predominantly from Asia, from south east Asia, China, Indonesia, etc. The suggestions are that for Australia post the resource boom era, to compete with the rest of Asia, will have to have that size population, and that changes the whole framework of the society you live in. It can be very progressive, very international society, one that might even set the tone internationally for multiculturalism and things like that, a Eurasian Australia.

But how do you get there? That will be a very bold journey. 50 million people would be a very, very different country. You've already heard about the constraints of climate change etc, on Australia, but surely a continent this size can embrace 50 million people, but it will require a major transition. The political realities in Asia are shifting: Asia is getting a lot more confident, and I'm sure a lot of you spend a lot of time in parts of Asia, but if you've spent time in China like I have done over the last 20 years and seen a dramatic transformation. No human society has ever done this. When I first went to China in 1989, across the border from Hong Kong to Guangzhou, there were still bicycles and Mao suits. The train station was an absolute mess. Today, there are no Mao suits. There are Mercedes Benzs, and no society has gone from a bicycle to a Mercedes Benz in 15 years, and if you go into Beijing, even ten years ago, there were no traffic jams. Today Beijing's got traffic jams, etc. So it's a major change, and this is happening all across.

And of course, the current love affairs with India, the transformation that's taking place in India as well, where frankly, you know, five years ago, nobody thought about India. When I was a consultant as recently as five years ago, I was telling many of my clients to go to India, and they said Chandran, those people cannot get their act together, and to some degree they are right; they have too much democracy in India, so they can't fix anything. The Chinese, fortunately, have a communist state, and say "We will do this and get on with it", no planning permissions needed in China. So it also – and I use these words very carefully to just highlight some of the conversations taking place outside Australia about Australia by your friends, "Will Australia be inclusive? Will it hopefully not be labelled 20 years from now as the white man of Asia". I think people like the former Prime Minister Mahathir used much harsher and perhaps cruder terms to have his arguments with Australia, which were not very refined, but I think some of those things are things that you had to reflect on. And Australia should not just be viewed as just an ally of Britain or the US. I think those are, again, political realities which are shaping the relationships with the rest of Asia. And therefore defining that nation of what Australia will look like in 20 to 25 to 50 years will need to be driven by enlightened self interest rather than parochial knowledge; it will need to be defined by people who can see what the future looks like, and I was intrigued in preparing for this trip to be sent an editorial that appeared, I think, in the Western Australia, last week where one of your leading thinkers said "No one in Western Australia is thinking about the post boom era. What will

it look like? What are we planning for? How are we embracing that change?" The problem is when it's good, why think about problems? I mean why fuss? I mean it's so good now, but we do have a little management mantra that says "When it's good, then you need to change", but this is quite often the most difficult time, when things are good, to change, and that will be the challenge for all of you, and I believe having spoken to several people over the last two days, that a couple of people said to me "You know the penny's dropped.

People are beginning to think about these things". But clearly it will need to identify with the world. Immigration will redefine the nation, if you are going to embrace the region as a whole, as it is in many parts of the world. Many of you will know that California will soon be Hispanic; the Hispanic population of California is growing at such a rate that the Hispanic population, I think within ten years, will be the dominant population. Same in Texas and different parts of the world. So that's something that all of us who have defined our nations, by either nationality, race or religious creed, will need accept that the world is changing dramatically. The Japanese have understood that they cannot just stay Japanese, which they have done very successfully for a long time, but they have to change. So my view is – and I want to move on to the next part of the three threads of my discussion - is that Australia can be the best of both worlds. It really can. It can be the best of the west, and the best of the east, both in terms of morals of governance, in terms of tolerance, in terms of entrepreneurship, in terms of reaching out to the world, and that is the opportunity that this particular boom era should be the foundation for; to look into that future and create that future now.

Okay, so are you a quarry economy or are you an economy that's moving towards sustainable prosperity? My understanding is Western Australia contributes something like 40 percent of national GDP. What would be the legacy of this lucky generation? I've been to the Pilberra and had the opportunity to spend eight days there, and frankly I reported back to the Minister here for Aboriginal Affairs, at a meeting with the mining companies, and I said "Some of the things I saw in some of those communities were disgraceful", and he said "You're absolutely right". Yet you are in a period of such prosperity, you should be able to fix these problems, but perhaps it's not because of a lack of willingness, perhaps the methods are wrong, and perhaps the wrong people are being involved in fixing some of these issues. Clearly I understand that tensions between the state and federal government; you feel you're all making the money, and they're all taking it away, which I understand can create certain tensions. But beyond the boom, the plan must be to grow with Asia, and that means having a competitive advantage and a comparative advantage that allows you to compete with Asia, and that will mean a whole different set of skill sets, and a whole different set of people, and as I was arguing before, many more people to compete. And it will be services for the region, create industries and scale up, which means more people. The resource boom might last another 50 years, but some tell me it might be 25 years, but let's be optimistic and say it's 50 years. If you can slow things down a bit now and extend it for 50 years. It's created an unprecedented wealth for many. My understanding is first home buyers in Perth now require four bedrooms, two bathrooms, a swimming pool, a lawn, and an entertainment centre as well.

Okay. I live in Hong Kong and the average Hong Kong person lives in – average Hong Kong family lives in 700 square feet, and that's a family of 4.5 people. The privileged, like me, I live in a place which is about 1000 square feet, and I pay exorbitant rent for that space too, but we – you've all been very hard working and generated a lot of this wealth, but one of my next slides will show that the ecological footprint of the Western Australian lifestyle is the highest in the world. You've created wealth, but an unsustainable lifestyle, and I think many people recognise that. The question is what do you do about it? And clearly there's the issue of the indigenous population too. Attitudes shifting all around, better policies are needed, fairer shares for all, and those are not easy issues, but I want to talk about perhaps some of the tools that could be used for that and then hopefully have a discussion about how one can operationalise these major strategic goals.

So the future beyond the commodities era will be new industries serving Asia, new skills, attracting migrants, education and Asian languages. I am told that in one of the territories now, you have to learn an Asian language. Is that right? I think it's the Northern Territory, you have to. I would suggest Western Australia make it compulsory that in all schools you have to learn one Asian language; Chinese would be a good start, but perhaps even Bahasa would be a good start. It just makes people a lot more international. In the firm that I used to run, which had 20 offices in 12 countries, I made it a point to tell everyone who just could speak one language, that you are not going to succeed here, because if you can only speak one language, I'm sorry, the person who can speak two languages is going to be paid better, because they can do more than you can do, and that's a big issue.

So gone will be the days when people run global companies where they only speak Texas. Those things will have to change. So in the era of abundance and conspicuous lifestyles, unsustainable livelihoods, what do we all need? Because it's quite difficult to tell people they can't have more, and I think that's one of the big tricks about this discussion about sustainability. We need to focus on quality of life. In India, where I've been doing some work recently, everyone's talking about how the wealthy are so conspicuous that even the Prime Minister, two months ago, called the top business leaders in Mumbai and literally scolded them for being bad examples. The average middle class Indian wants to live in a 600 square foot house, where you can't get electricity anyway, you can't get water, and they want to air condition it. Gone are the more frugal ambitions of the Indian Hindu culture, etc, of living within your means. We are creating situations where we can't sustain ourselves. So in terms of the sustainability challenge therefore for Western Australia, are you concerned? And it's not for me to tell you what you should do, but on one hand, only suggests that perhaps you need to be concerned, and what are the drivers for your concern? Are you concerned because there's going to be water scarcity? Are you concerned that perhaps the legacy you leave behind will be of consumption and there will be very little left for others? Are you concerned about the impact on the biosphere etc? Who cares? And what actions do you want to take?

Is the lack of progress due to institutional weakness? My work anywhere in the world has been that we have institutions today which were designed 50 years ago which have no means of coping with the world we live in. They are completely disconnected from the world, but still we want to protect these institutions, and I'm sure many people understand what I mean by saying that the institutions can be reinvented, but you need political will to do this, and that's where the politicians need to play a very important part, but not all politicians really understand the dramatic shift that is taking place. The actions will require strong political leadership, and a move away from principles. I've read your Western Australian Sustainability Report, which has a great lots of lovely words and chapter and verse about sustainability, global ownership, etc. When it comes to the actions, and I think it was written 204, there were two actions that I was struck by: one was the need to establish a Sustainability Act – kind of good kind of regulation. The other one was about creating sustainability assessments for all major policies. I, in preparing for this, asked them questions and said "Has the Act been passed?" "No". "Has the assessment procedure been set up?" "No". Because quite often, people talk about what needs to be done, but not how it can be done, because the how is really back in the political realities that we have to understand as we talk about sustainability.

Far too often, the people who talk about sustainability are those who live in that sort of fringe of the green world, etc, or partially think of it all as being an environmental challenge, and a lot of my focus has been about changing a conversation into a business, and particularly a political conversation. So you need to move on the principles and design new institutions, and that's not easy because a lot of vested interest in the way things are done today. The big sustainability issues, as I understand for you, are climate change, water scarcity. I'm told 85 to 87 percent of all water

used in Western Australia is for agriculture, and then there are others who say “But why are we having an agricultural economy in this part of the world?”

I’ll leave that discussion to you to have. Why are we spending so much water on growing crops in this sort of harsh, non-agricultural terrain. Urban lifestyle is clearly also creating a huge amount of stress in terms of efficiency, quality of life, etc, and I was also told that some of your regulations, you can’t shop after 6, which kind of freaks me out. I come from Hong Kong. I shop at midnight, and that on the Saturdays, the supermarkets are all crowded because everyone’s driving from all over the region to come to a couple of supermarkets. These lifestyle choices without public transport etc, are big issues for all of you, and clearly as you get wealthier, you all want to move out of the inner city, get a place by the beach, you know, park the boat, etc, etc, three cars. It’s all kind of nice but where is it all leading? That’s something that in terms of the sustainability map, you will have to figure out. You all know about the ecological impacts, and everyone talks about it and you have regulations that are attempting to mitigate. Land degradation I understand is a huge problem, because lots of people take water without paying for it, or paying the right price, and I believe that the water pricing issue is becoming a big issue. And clearly the issue of the rural population and the indigenous communities is another big sustainability issue for Western Australia.

I want to close off in the next five minutes by saying I see the process of sustainability as a process just of change; managing technology, managing the way we use resources, and the direction of investments, and could change the conversation from an environmental conversation. The reality is that if you talk about it as an environmental issue, the people who really matter, the people who make the decisions, switch off. So my commitment to the environment has been translated into talking about the reality of sustainability as a political objective, aligned to the socio-economic realities. The outcomes are environmental, and that’s how we made decisions anyway, and making sure we focus on policies. So really it’s shaping economic reality. In Hong Kong, when we talk about sustainability, everyone wanted to talk about it as an environmental issue. I tried to change that conversation by talking about it as an economic issue, and giving the example if we went around the streets of Hong Kong, or China, even here, and we talked about a particular issue, and I’ll take quality in Hong Kong, said to people “Do you want clean air or GDP?” Most people would say “We want GDP, and if you can give us some clean air for free, we’ll have some”, and that’s the reality. Of course everyone says we would like to have a cleaner environment, but who pays how – that seems to be something that everyone thinks someone else should pay. So if you can focus it on the economic issues, and then evolve the arguments about quality of life, and the very important function of governments in creating the policies and plant, then I think we can make some progress.

Quickly, I mean in terms of looking at the facts on Asia – I want to touch on Asia and then come back to the local situation – the bulk of humanity lives in your neighbourhood. 75 percent of the world’s poor- despite what we talk about Africa – live in Asia. Close to two billion Asians live on less than \$2 per day US, which is the price of a muffin in the building complex I work in Hong Kong – a small one by the way. Exceptional diversity, its’ the most polluted and degraded continent. One in three in Asia have no access to safe drinking water. On in two have no access to sanitation. Anyone been to India? Okay, you’ll know what I’m talking about, and I tell my Indian friends, you guys are good at building temples, not toilets. I want to set up a movement called “Toilets before temples”. Okay, but we’re reaching the stage on the technology front, and I’ve heard the data, that in about the next three years, there will be more people in the world who have mobile phones than toilets. Now think about that. We could have a lot of funny pictures depicting that reality, but there will be more people in the world having mobile phones where they can download Brittany Spears and all this nonsense, than having toilets.

So the challenge in Asia will be the rural/urban mix. 300 million Chinese are about to move in the next 20 years to cities. 300 million. That's the entire population of Europe moving to cities in 20 years. Unheard of in human history. Clearly the poverty issue is a big one, the population growth, and how do we manage resources? Water scarcity around Asia is so severe that I think governments haven't even woken up to the realities. Then we have the issue of bio-diversity and clearly public health. I'm trying to rush through this. The three spheres of the Sustainable Development Agenda in Asia, is – and I particularly want to talk about this for a little while, because I think then you can put into context what you're doing in your country, and the issues you're confronted with. There's the urban issue. By 2050, 60 percent of Asia will live in cities. Okay, there are very few Asian cities - those of you who have travelled around Asia – that you would choose to live in. There are very few cities. There's perhaps Hong Kong – but some say at the moment that it's a bit polluted and crowded. Great city really. There's Japanese cities, there's perhaps Singapore. Any Singaporeans here? Okay, I was going to say a bit boring but there's Singapore. So there's the urban cities, and we have huge issues with water supply, sanitation, air quality. Then there's a poverty issue of shelter, food, basic needs, which the poorer countries are confronting, and then there's clearly the issue of the challenge of the commons. And so many of us, because of the climate change, it's become so sexy to talk about climate change, that we forget these urban and poverty issues, and we're focused on the commons.

But one of the biggest commons issues, apart from climate change, is our fisheries, and I keep saying to everyone, if China gets wealthy as it will, and Chinese people start consuming fresh fish like you and I do, the oceans will be empty. Period. No argument. Well who are we to deprive Chinese of fish? What world do we live in, and how do we make that transition? One thing nice about the Indians that quite a few of them are vegetarians, so it restores a bit of balance in all of this. So when the giants awaken, how will they sustain themselves? All I want to say is that China and India's development will pose a major challenge to ourselves and the rest of the world. India hasn't even started. India today has one percent of the world's car fleets, and India is about to join the race, and if India does join the race you know, we will see huge transformations.

So very quickly, all of this leads me back to how do you make decisions? And the thing that I found in the work we've done, you have to get back to decision making the quality decision. One of the things that we've done in a decision making tool that we created in Hong Kong, and we're using in other parts of the world to have a discussion, and I have been privileged to share that today and yesterday with people here, is say you have to define what your principles are, and one of the things that we start off with is defining the economy, is a driving principle for sustainability. People want prosperity. No matter what they say about everything else. And then creating, through a very, very rigorous but very time consuming process, agreement within the community about guiding principles. And then taking that from principle to indicator to accountability, and accountability I think, is the key cornerstone of a sustainability management matrix, and far too often, it's left in the environmental department where there's no accountability for delivering on these major goals, and I will not bore you with all the details, but we used very robust methodology coming to the indicators. And I want to finish up by saying that when we use those indicators as well, we have a very, very refined decision making matrix. We actually designed something called a Computer Aided Sustainability Evaluation tool, that fingerprints the decision making.

So if you want to talk about, you know, creating a Perth that has a certain vibrancy, or reducing, for instance, your ecological impact, then there are tools that you can use by creating indicators that start to measure that. So I would suggest that at the moment, my understanding is the ecological footprint of Perth is 9 hectares per person, the highest in Australia; almost the highest in the world. Maybe an overarching goal over the next ten years would be to say that we would try and get our city to live smartly. It's not about diminishing the quality of life; it's about living smartly and reducing our ecological footprint from 9 to 5. The world average is about 4.5, but all countries

around the world are looking at how do we reduce the footprint without diminishing the quality of life. And so we have this rather well thought through, but rigorous approach to decision making built into a tool to assist the decision makers within the Hong Kong government. Anyway, I'll just give you that example. If you look at the consumption energy per unit, or output, then you're looking at so many different factors and variables that shape that, and you have to have the right source of data to help shape that decision making. If you look at the tonnes of carbon dioxide emitted per person, then you have to look at the aviation industry, you have to look at your supply of domestic gas, you have to look at the industrial and commercial sector, the marine resources, road transport, etc. This becomes quite a complex set of issues to deal with, and I'll bring you back to the issue about institutions. No institutions in current government set up are able to deal with these issues, because they are all in vertically driven silos, and that's one of the things that we're trying to use these instruments to try and change the nature of decision making.

I'll just conclude by saying that the whole topic of whether Perth is a gateway to the rest of Asia, starts off by defining what your country's going to look like over the next 50 years, particularly what it's going to look like post the resource boom period, and that thinking needs to start now. If you wait too long, then I suspect that you might be left behind, as suggested by the Prime Minister of Singapore, because things are moving so fast. I think particularly in Australia, you might have a closer affinity to countries like Indonesia which might have looked like basket cases to you for the last 30 years; they will not be basket cases for long. These things will change. I suspect Indonesia will be a formidable economy within 10 to 15 years. How many of you have been to Vietnam recently? If any of you have been to Vietnam, you will notice that this is one powerful economy on the march. The nice thing for the Vietnamese is no one's paying attention to them at the moment because they're all looking at China and India, but Vietnam is 60 million people, hugely smart, industrious, and really geared towards doing things, and that economy is so powerful. I tell anyone I know from the investment world in Hong Kong, go to Vietnam. That's where things are happening.

So Asia is not what it was ten years ago, and Australia needs to be integrated in to that, take advantage of that, be partners with that part of the world, because Asia will be the engine of growth. The first time I think two months ago, Gorman Sacks put out a report saying "The US is no more the engine of growth of the global economy". It's shifted for the first time ever. Okay. So sustainable prosperity framework need new institutions. You'll have to manage those tensions, and I would suggest that question every institutional set up you have if you want to shift that new future. New decision frameworks have to be invented. We are all in a new paradigm, and we have to confront the political realities of those new decision making frameworks. The risk clearly for Australia, and my concluding remarks would be it's not distance, but it's isolation of the mindset of today's Australians. And I have a lot of respect for all of the Australians I have met, but I detect a little sort of moving away from the realities of what's happening in the rest of the world, and I think that's something you need to address and confront. All of us who are privileged have a tendency to isolate ourselves.

In Hong Kong, the rich and the wealthy tend to isolate themselves from those who live lower down the hill, and so I think we need to really come to grips with that. Climate change clearly is a big issue for you, and how many years have we wasted all arguing because we sideline the scientists. Water scarcity is clearly a priority issue around the world, and the big one for you all as you shape your country over the next 50 years, would be immigration policy. What do you want it to look like? What sort of country values do you want to represent? And that, I think, will shape the future. The decisions clearly need to be taken in the next ten years. So with that I think I've covered a hell of a lot. I've probably over run my time as well, but I'll thank you for your attention. Thank you so much.

End of transcript

Copyright: This transcription is copyright CEDA 2007

Disclaimer: This is a transcript of the speakers and discussion sessions at a CEDA event. Opinions and statements included in the transcript are solely those of the individual persons or participants at the event, and are not necessarily adopted or endorsed or verified as accurate by CEDA. The transcript may have been edited. CEDA does not warrant that this transcript is free of errors and omissions.

Terms of use: Any use of substantial excerpts from this transcript must acknowledge the speaker and CEDA as the source of the material.