POLICY FORUM

POD

Policy Forum Pod

The first 100 days of the next government

Episode 110

16 May 2018

Australian National University

POLICY FORUM.NET

Asia and the Pacific's platform for public policy debate and discussion

Connect with us:
www.policyforum.net
@APPSPolicyForum
policyforumpod.simplecast.fm
Asia and the Pacific Policy Society
podcast@policyforum.net

About us:

Policy Forum Pod is the podcast of Policy Forum.net - Asia and the Pacific's platform for public policy debate, analysis and discussion. Policy Forum is based at Crawford School of Public Policy at the Australian National University.

Our regular podcasts are written for a broad audience of public policy professionals, and those interested in public policy throughout the region.

Policy Forum connects with the Asia and the Pacific Policy Society – a network of thousands of people involved in every level of policy around the region.

Moderator: Catherine McGrath
Prof Gruen: Professor Russell Gruen, Dean of the ANU College of Health and Medicine
Prof Hewson: Professor John Hewson, Chair of the Tax and Transfer Policy Institute
Prof Moore: Professor Anna Moore, Director of the ANU Institute for Space, Director at the Advanced Instrumentation and Technology Centre
Prof Sullivan: Professor Helen Sullivan, Director of Crawford School of Public Policy
Prof Wesley: Professor Michael Wesley, Professor of International Affairs and Dean of the College of Asia and the Pacific, ANU

[intro music 0:00:00-0:00:12]

Presenter: Hello and welcome Policy Forum Pod – the podcast for those who want to dig a little deeper into the policy challenges facing Australia and the Asia-Pacific region. Policy Forum Pod is produced at Crawford School, the region's leading graduate policy school.

This is a special, extra Pod. It is an event that was recorded here, at the ANU, this week and is part of a series of live panel discussions looking at the Australian federal election. It is a live event, so the audio is not our usual studio quality, but it is an outstanding discussion that we did not really want you to miss out on.

First up, you are going to hear from the event's moderator, Catherine McGrath, and she will introduce the panellists: Professor Russell Gruen from the ANU Collage of Health and Medicine, Professor John Hewson from Crawford, Professor Anna Moore who is Director in Space and Director at the Advanced Instrumentation and Technology Centre, Professor Michael Wesley from the ANU College of Asia and the Pacific, and last but certainly not least, Crawford School Director, Professor Helen Sullivan.

If you are hungry for more sizzling election analysis, why not check out our brand-new podcast. It is called Mark Kenny's *Democracy Sausage*. Each Monday, Mark gathers an expert panel to discuss the week's election campaign. You can find links to it in the show notes for this Pod or by visiting our website, policyforum.net.

We will be back with our regular Pod on Friday, in which we will look at the crucial role of energy policies in Australia's federal election, but for now sit back, put the headphones on and enjoy this great event.

[interlude music 0:01:44-0:01:51]

Mod: Well, thank you very much for joining us with this incredible panel. I think we have got the star professors here, quite frankly. We have had a wonderful four weeks, but we really have the star professors with us tonight, at the National Press Club. Now, you might have seen the leaders. Last week the leaders' debate was here — I think a forerun-up to tonight's event, and I think having an ANU panel at the National Press Club is a little bit like the Canberra version, perhaps, of TV Logies Awards, in that we like a little bit of politics in Canberra but I think more than anything we like deep political engagement and discussion that actually makes us think, understand and helps us make sense of the political world that we are in now.

Moderator: Catherine McGrath
Prof Gruen: Professor Russell Gruen, Dean of the ANU College of Health and Medicine
Prof Hewson: Professor John Hewson, Chair of the Tax and Transfer Policy Institute
Prof Moore: Professor Anna Moore, Director of the ANU Institute for Space, Director at the Advanced Instrumentation and Technology Centre
Prof Sullivan: Professor Helen Sullivan, Director of Crawford School of Public Policy
Prof Wesley: Professor Michael Wesley, Professor of International Affairs and Dean of the College of Asia and the Pacific, ANU

The campaign began with the Parties neck and neck but Labor ahead, as it has been consistently in the polls, and it finishes this week, currently with Newspoll with Labor ahead 51-49. It has been close all the way through, but the polls have consistently had Labor ahead. What will happen in the next few days and what will happen on election day, obviously, we shall have to wait and see.

Really, what we have here is the best professors to talk about, as Brian Schmidt said, serious and robust discussion, so we will get it underway. First of all, to introduce the panel, can I introduce Professor Russell Gruen, the Dean of ANU Health and Medicine, Professor Michael Wesley — Professor of International Affairs and Dean of the College of Asia and the Pacific, Professor Hele Sullivan, the Director of Crawford School of Public Policy, Professor John Hewson, who is the Chair of the Tax and Transfer Policy Institute at the Crawford School, and Professor Anna Moore, the Director of the ANU Institute for Space? Can you, please, welcome them all?

[applause]

When you registered, you had a chance to indicate what policy areas with the most interest, and what the statistic showed us were there in this order. Number one, climate change. That reflects public, that reflects all current opinion polls in this area, and it has reflected what people have said at these panel every week. Climate change, followed by economy, environment. Obviously, all three of those are interrelated, too. It is what our audiences have been telling us.

Science research, foreign policy, then, in order, education, health, indigenous affairs, immigration, tax policy — sorry, John Hewson, way down the end there of interest, and final area of interest: national security.

We are going to start with John Hewson. Now, Professor John Hewson is, perhaps, the most media-friendly of all of our panellists. I asked John how many interviews he had this week — and, what, five, six, seven so far and it is only Tuesday, John?

Prof Hewson: Yes.

[laughter]

Moderator: John, as you know, was a former Opposition Leader but, independently of all of that, he is a Professor of Economics and the Chair of the Tax and Transfer Policy Institute at the ANU. You might wonder how he has time to even attend a National Press Club ANU event, but he does, and he loves it, and it is just great to have that insight. John let me start with you. What do you think is going to happen on Saturday?

[laughter]

Prof Hewson: I have to start with the first difficult question, huh? I am not the person to ask, because I lost an election.

[laughter]

I know what losing looks like.

I must say that--; You talk about the polls. I think the Labor Party has been in front in polls for 70 or 80 times, but it was Abbott and Turnbull who made the number of Newspoll losses benchmarks, I guess, of their performance. You would have to say that Labor is likely to win. The question is how much, and it is very difficult to judge because — and I am not ducking the question, just it is difficult because I think the preferences will go all over the place and I think it makes it very difficult to judge.

I mean, the last couple of Newspoll's, for example — being kind to the Murdoch Media, the polls were managed. They changed the way they do the distribution of preferences, to give you 49-51. Is it really 49-51? I suspect it is a little wider than that. That says to me that the Labor Party will win by somewhere between--;

Well, if you look at the numbers, I guess, the Labor Party has got 72 notional seats today, after the redistributions and the Liberal Party has [?? 0:06:25] National Parties have 73, so the Liberal Party, National Party need three or four to govern with a Speaker and the Labor would need four or five to govern with a Speaker. I suspect the worst outcome for Labor will be net four, and I think they could probably easily get eight or 10, or more depending on the distribution of those preferences.

I think preferences are very difficult to judge in this election. I mean, there is a lot of focus on, for example, a deal done with One Nation or a deal done with Palmer. Well, they have not worked too well in the past. I mean, I do remember the Queensland state election where there was a very tight deal between the LNP and One Nation, and One Nation preferences ended up electing about two or three Labor members which gave a government.

If there is a deal with Palmer, for every thousand the [?? 0:07:22] takes off them in primary vote you get back about 500 — not a very sensible thing to deal with them. I just do not think people are influenced by deals and how to vote cards anymore. I have not ran a polling booth for a long time, but in the recent New South Wales state election I manned a polling booth and I was staggered at how many people, very, very significant percentage of people who just said I do not want any paperwork, just went straight in,

"I made up my mind." I think that is indicative of why you have got one in six today who have already pre-polled. It will probably be one if four by Saturday.

Moderator: Thanks, John.

Prof Hewson: It is 25% of people who have made up their mind, so I guess that is what makes it hard to tell but they--; In the old days, we used to say the pre-polled votes will go in favour of the incumbent. I suspect not this time.

Moderator: Thanks, John. Alright, I just wanted to let you know, too, we have got two people on the panel who particularly have a political outlook as well as a policy outlook. One is obviously John Hewson, the other is Michael Wesley, so we are going to finish this [?? 0:08:22] going to ask Michael the same question, but in between we have got some policy experts and a chance to look at the policies that have been making news and are shaping Australian policy going forward.

Now, Professor Anna Moore is the Director of the ANU Institute for Space. You might know that ANU has three key institutes that are new, looking at multidisciplinary ways of looking at big issues. Space is one of them. Anna is the chief of that, and this Institute is the front door to ANU multidisciplinary space capability. This is going to be a huge area of potential economic growth for Australia, but Anna has also been involved in the implementation and development of government policy on this.

Anna, looking at the election campaign how much has something like space featured and is the average voter, do you think, aware of what is going on and what the political party has been saying?

Prof Moore: Hi, everyone. Amazingly, a lot, I think is the short answer. I did not think space would be such a topic for an election campaign, so it has been--; so I am absolutely delighted that people are taking it very--; such gusto behind it.

Just to add a little bit of context, the last two years has been a wonderful time for if you are Australian and interested in space. We now have only by 18 months, so we now have a space agency. Every state has identified capability and where they want to be in the future, and so harnessing this together under one national banner is, really, the most important thing for us to be doing right now.

Both sides of the house have been very supportive so far in this capability for Australia, where we find ourselves now in a new space and a new paradigm for space, which means that it is very exciting for anyone coming in to the market, as it were, so the cheaper access, the fact that we can do lots of constellations which has not been around before.

It has changed the paradigm of what we can do, and so Australia coming in right now with its capability, it has not having to compete with the 50 years of experience that otherwise we would have to do. We can see new opportunities that are relevant to us now, so it is really exciting, and we have found support on both sides.

What would be good to see, though, as I think we are partly here today to talk about what we would like to see, and the first term today is actually both serious investment for the future behind this capability, if we really want to grow the industry from 3.7 to the 12 billion in this-year dollars we actually want to do. That takes a serious investment and I have not heard that from either side, really, how they are going to do that, so I am going to be really interested in that story.

Also, how to do this properly. How do you take all the key capability, the laser communications, the deep-space communications, the medical, the med tech that Russell is doing next to me, the space law — all these capabilities that we have, how do you actually get that out there and create a new industry around it effectively and quickly?

Those two things I am actually going to be really interested in hearing about.

Moderator: That is great. Professor Russell Gruen, welcome to ANU, welcome a newish — very newish. Russell has taken over as the new Dean of ANU at College of Health and Medicine so, again, welcome. Russell is a surgeon and academic, a long history of involvement in medicine and public policy. Your PhD, Russell, was in the specialist medical services in remote indigenous communities, so very involved a long time in those sorts of issues, but also in safe surgery, anaesthesia and, of course, the trauma specialist, as well.

You are recently back from four years in Singapore, helping open and develop new medical and hospital facilities there. Looking at this election, you have spoken in the past about the need for policies to be very much based on goal-orientation rather than resource allocation — not just dollars, thank you very much, but some programs there. What have you seen so far in the election campaign?

Prof Gruen: Well, thanks Catherine. The discourse, of course, has been largely around financing and, particularly, legitimate concerns of out-of-pocket costs for patients which, of course, is all about activity-based funding — that is the cost to people for services, for drugs, for procedures, and so on, but nothing about the quality of services and nothing about bigger picture health goals for the nation.

I think it is hard to have a genuine conversation about that sort of thing in the context of an election campaign, but as a nation we need to have that conversation. We are one of the healthiest nations in the world. We still have some big health problems. Chronic diseases, indigenous health, mental health, asylum seeker health — those are all good examples. Countries around the world are looking at the sorts of policy levers that exist to improve the quality of services that are provided and the appropriateness of services.

Make no mistake, Australians love Medicare. We love our Medicare. It has served us very well as a system of universal health coverage, but just as our population has changed since 1975, all the more chronic disease particularly, our Medicare needs a bit on tinkering to come up to date and, while many of my colleagues and others who are wedded to the fee for service model, there are a lot of GPs that are genuinely struggling under activity-based, fee for service type arrangements.

It is not that the government has not tried. In the last term, we have seen the introduction of Health Care Homes as a policy and that is really what we call a capitation system where the more expensive patients — patients with at least two chronic diseases — have their total funding pooled and a General Practitioner is given the responsibility for working out what they think the best care for those patients is.

The problem was there was no extra investment in that that went with that new policy and, as a result, it was really a policy failure. About a third of the practices that signed up to do it pulled out, and not that it was not a great idea, it is just that it was an implementation failure and not well thought through. This is, I think, where ANU as a university comes in.

We are leading, along with the ACT Health, and Canberra Health Services, and NSW Health, and with University of Canberra, and University of Wollongong a population-based networks that can be used to pilot new policy interventions like this. It involves the communities, the health services, primary care and hospital, emergency and elective, public and private, ambulance services, indigenous health services, and consumer groups all coming together to form a system that spans 220,000km^2, from the beach to west of Wagga.

It includes retirement towns, it includes drought-stricken farms, it includes population centres, it includes indigenous and dessert type communities, all in a network of data sharing, which is an ideal—

Moderator: And using all the academic research to formulate the best way to deliver those sorts of services?

Prof Gruen: Correct, so using all the expertise across the universities, to be able to study genuine policy interventions, and to tweak and tinker with those things--

Moderator: Thanks, Russell.

Prof Gruen: -which desperately need [crosstalk 0:16:19] country.

Moderator: Because it is great--; People want to talk about the election, of course, and election policies are the things that have been considered, but it also a chance to showcase some of the work ANU is doing and see how that relates to the development of policy over time. Of course, that takes me to the Crawford School, which is at the centre of this.

Professor Helen Sullivan, good evening, welcome. Helen is the Director of the Crawford School for Public Policy, which is the home of public sector education and the development of policy experts Australia-wide, and into the Asia-Pacific, and internationally, so right at the centre of policy development is Helen's team, Helen's educators working with Australians on that.

In 2013, Helen founded the Melbourne School of Government, which is a cross-university, multidisciplinary, externally orientated institution focusing on impact. She has brought that skill definitely to ANU and, also, Melbourne. Helen pioneered the Pathway to Politics program, great interest in gender equity.

Helen, looking at the election, what are the main things [?? 0:17:12] public policy, democracy participation perspective? What do you see?

Prof Sullivan: Well, the wonderful thing about Crawford is that we are awash with policy experts on almost everything, from people like John on tax, and transfer, and losing elections, to people who—

[laughter]

Moderator: [0:17:31] because, actually, you are John's boss, are you not?

Prof Sullivan: I am John's boss.

Moderator: The School is part of. This is how you--; John does many, many things. He is Chair of the Tax and Transfer Institute. John, you have to answer to Helen.

Prof Hewson: It's my boss.

[laughter]

Prof Sullivan: No, John is a huge asset to the School and somebody I would not want to lose, but we do have a great diversity of experts and they are not shy of sharing their expertise, and that is fantastic. Many of them have expertise in the kinds of issues that are really key to this election.

How wonderful it is that we are talking about climate change in this election and we have a bunch of people at Crawford who work on that. We have a range of economists. We have economists of all kinds who will talk about all sorts of issues, as well as geographers, and political scientists, and all manner of people.

While that gets me to Catherine's question, though, is that my area of work, state-society relations, is the kind of thing that never gets talked about at elections, and probably quite rightly so because what I study and what I am interested in is the way in which we, as societies, develop the instrumentation and the institutions that we need in order to govern ourselves in the way that we wish to be governed.

That takes us very much to the area of implementation and instrumentation that Russell was talking about, and that can also be terribly dry, terribly dull, and awfully boring, and certainly not something you would want to campaign on, but having said that, we have, for the last 30 years in advanced liberal democracies as well as elsewhere, been in the thrill of a particular approach to public policy and public policy making that has captured us and captured how we think about what policy is, what it should look like, what its foundations are, and who should be involved in it.

That has led us into a particular preoccupation with how we might use markets, how we create markets, how we might focus above all else on things like outsourcing and contracting, and that has meant that we have become very used very quickly to using a particular set of levers to influence policy or even to shape policy. Those things have become the truth very quickly, in Australia and elsewhere.

That is fine as long as it work, except of course that nothing works all the time for everybody, and while these are not things I would expect to be talked about in the election, I do think that in the public policy environment we are now on the cusp of thinking we need to think rather different about the policy instrumentation that we have.

Just again to pick up on one of Russell's examples, we have had numerous attempts to think about how we engage citizens, all of us, as users of services, as people who pay tax, as people who benefit in different ways, as people who care for others. That is an expected both responsibility that we have as active citizens but also it is a way of, perhaps, getting better services that are shaped more appropriately to use and needs.

Those things do not necessarily work terribly well with markets, and so if we are wanting to engage much more in what we might call in the jargon co-production, if we want to involve users much more in thinking about choice and control in services, then we have to think about the existing implementation and policy frameworks that we have and whether they are appropriate.

While the work that I do can be terribly dull, it is also critically important because it is one of the reasons why in Australia voting is compulsory, so you have reasonably high turn-ups. Now, you can also say you do not want to vote for any of the above, and that is fantastic, but Australia is also suffering its own crisis of trust in public institutions, and I would argue that one of the reasons for that is we have become divorced as a society from our governing institutions and that we need to think very differently about how we maintain not just the health of our governmental system.

This is not a question which is about machinery of government changes, or which department belongs to whom, which bit of what political organisations gets influenced where. This is much more about: how do we, as a democratic society, see through our governing institutions that democracy is being enacted every day.

Moderator: Thanks, Helen. It is great, and I think that is one of the key questions, isn't it: engagement, and you are linking there to the visibility and accessibility of our institutions. I think that would be something to really discuss during the evening.

Welcome now to Professor Michael Wesley. Good evening, Michael. Michael is the Professor of International Affairs and Dean of the College of Asia and the Pacific. Michael has a background at Griffith University and UNSW. He was an Assistant Director General of Transnational Issues at the Office of National Assessments and was the Executive Director at the Lowy Institute.

Michael, I know I will ask you as John: what is going to happen on Saturday? Now, you do have a record of writing on international affairs obviously extensively, but also on politics and the way international affairs and politics intersect.

Prof Wesley: So, here goes my attempt to magnificently not answer your question.

[laughter]

I think there is, essentially, two ways of looking and thinking about election outcomes. One this, what I would call, a conventional way concentrating on who is going to win, who gets the most votes, who gets the most seat, how big their mandate is, what their policy platform is, and using that to think about the next three years and beyond, but I

think there is another way, which I always find more fun to think about, and that is to approach an election campaign as a genuine conversation. In fact, the only genuine conversation we have between our political leaders and the electorate, where the politicians are actually listening to people, they are actually appealing directly to people and walking through shopping malls, and down streets, and so on.

And so, I think that each election campaign is not only a celebration of this wonderful thing called democracy that we have, but it is something that shapes a national conversation and a national consciousness for the next three years and beyond. When I look back, I think that there had been several times in the recent past when election campaigns, the nature of the conversation that has been had between the political class and the people they after shaped the politics of the years ahead.

A couple of examples for you. The election of 2001 won by the Howard Government, an incumbent government — it was an election that was defined by national security, by fear of the outside world, by fear of globalisation, and by increased attention to cultural values and cultural differences. A contrasting example, I think, was the election of 2007, won by the Opposition at that stage. This was a switch in the national conversation. It became a conversation about ideas, about creativity, about a return to the big picture for Australia.

I guess, what I would say about this election campaign as I watched it and I have watched the conversation unfold is that there are, I think, lots of signs that this may be one of those defining campaigns that changes the national conversation for the next three years and beyond. I would like to emphasise, I guess, four elements that I think are particularly intriguing for me in terms of switching the national conversation.

Number one, I do not think national security is as potent as it has been for the past 20 years or so. I think that the Government has tried to run hard on national security, and border protection, and all of those issues, and I think it has been a damp squib for the Government. I do not think it has resonated with the electorate, which tells us something really interesting about how the national conversation in the future is being shaped.

Secondly, I think the power of dog whistling has been much decreased. We have had plenty of attempts at dog whistling, be it a racial dog whistling, be it a homophobic dog whistling, and what we found is that it has become a self-harming thing, that the candidates that have tried it had been called out, they have been repudiated by their own parties — even Pauline Hanson, my God, and they have had to step down from their campaign.

The third issue is that generational issues are starting to become really prominent in this election campaign and really defining this election campaign in a way they have not been in previous campaigns. What do I mean by that? Climate change, housing affordability, intergenerational equity, have become really important issues and this, to me, is setting up a national conversation and a national political contest in the future in, really, important ways.

The fourth issue is really concerning to me, and that is the inability of either side of politics in this election campaign, to my mind, to deal with the gorilla in the room — the really big issue, the major issue that this country faces, which is how Australia positions itself in the burgeoning rivalry between the United States and China. The downturn in our relationship with our major trading partner, the increasing fraud relationship we have got with our major alliance partner — neither side of politics is wanting to go anywhere near that.

I can, kind of, understand the electoral logic of why they have not, but it means that, I think, we are setting ourselves up for a blundering approach to dealing with this major challenge in the years ahead.

Moderator: Michael, thank you. Alright. Well, that is a great start. I should mention that this evening is being recorded and it will be uploaded to the website. You will be able to catch at the ANU election website, and you can follow us on social media using the hashtags #AUjoin and #OZvotes, follow us on Twitter @ANUevents.

We will be asking your questions shortly, so do thing about what they might be, and we have also got some of the questions that were put in via the online poll when you registered.

So, first 100 days — what will it look like? What will the government, whichever persuasion it is, be doing in the first 100 days? Well, Bill Shorten has said that if he wins the election one focus will be on moving quickly towards wage rises. The government — current Government — says it will be moving towards implementing the plan announced on Sunday, to provide mortgage support for first-home owners, who could not otherwise do so.

Let look at that first of all. John Hewson, the announcement of that on Sunday, was it as out-left field as it appeared to be? Have you heard of this being discussed? Obviously, you are in New Zealand, but have you heard it discussed around economic levers in Australia seriously? Do you think it was decided on an envelope on Friday evening, or what?

[laughter]

Prof Hewson: I think the first thing will never happen in the first 100 days [?? 0:29:23]. Suddenly, they will be struck by reality. There is a lot of what has been said and done and promised actually cannot or will not be delivered because of the position of the Senate and the outcome in the Lower House, well, because they really did not think through the detail of a lot of what they promised.

I think you are right about the housing issue initiative. It was definitely one of Morrison's own. He obviously did not take it to Cabinet. His excuse is, of course, Cabinet does not meet during an election campaign, but are telephones and the are other ways of communicating that. He just announced it. It had not been thought through in its detail or he did not expect that the Labor Party would immediately say, "Yes, we will do that, too."

[laughter]

Sort of neutered it as having it [?? 0:30:11] a particular advantage. I do not think it has been thought through. There were so many of these schemes being introduced over the years to help first-home owners. It usually does not have the impact that is desired. Quite often these developers of homes just put the price up and take advantage of what [?? 0:30:27] implicit subsidy one way or another.

At a time when a household debt is a major problem in this country — I talk about reality, but we have the second highest level of household debt in the world. Nearly 200% of household disposable income, 120% of GDP and you are encouraging people to take even more debt, and the individual will be responsible for the debt, even though part of it will be underwritten by the government.

We just had a Royal Commission which has exposed the fact that the banks — the big four in particular — had lent a lot of people a lot of money that they could not afford. This is another example of encouraging people to take out a lot of money that they cannot afford and, I guess, if you look at the hard numbers, a lot of people will not — excuse me — qualify for it, so it will be a relatively small number of people who will qualify to make a marginal difference, if indeed, that matters at all.

I mean, his background, I see Morrison as an advertising guy. He has got a pocket full of slogans. You ask him a question he will give you a slogan. Do not ask him a second question if you expect any detail, because you will not get it. That, to me, has been a feature of this campaign — that neither side has been prepared to provide much detail about their key initiatives. In fact, they have gone to great lengths, whether it is in

debates, or press conferences, or whatever, not to talk about the detail, so that all is going to be done in the first 100 days.

Moderator: Hmm. At each event, we have asked people what interested them, so just a show of hands. How many people do we have here you would be voters under the age of 35? That is a good number. Keep your hand up if you think that the Liberal policy that Labor has now matched is interesting to you.

[laughter]

By interesting I meant if it would be [?? 0:32:18]. Okay, and how many of the group here, of the under-35s, think that climate change is the most important issue in the election? Great, and where are the rest of the audience, too? Climate change? How does that rate? How many think [?? 0:32:29]? Yes. We have asked people at each event, and it has been pretty similar.

Helen, in terms of you and public policy and the election campaign, how well, do you think, the issues that have been discussed of things like independent commission against corruption, federal ICAC, in the first 100 days what kinds of things, do you think, either side of politics will be dealing with?

Prof Sullivan: Okay, well the--; I was thinking about this earlier and I thought, you know, the first 100 days, it is a pretty artificial construct but, anyway, let's go with it. How about if we said in the first 100 days the government did not do anything, but just waited, and thought, and listened rather than running in and trying to develop very quickly projects, which either will not work because of the very good rationale that John has given for why some of these policies just are not well thought through, and do not add up, and could never happen, or because immediately people will get stuck into trying to reorganise the machinery of government — and however much people tell you they will not, they cannot help themselves.

They just cannot see a set of government departments without thinking that would look better over there, and we could put that over there, and before you know it four months has gone, so I am strongly of the view with that 'doing nothing for 100 days' might actually be good for everybody.

In the same way that if the sixth of people can vote without really listening to the end of the campaign — is it sixth of people?

Male voice: One is six, [crosstalk 0:34:09].

Prof Sullivan: One is six.

Moderator: Yes.

Prof Sullivan: Yes, so--

Male voice: Probably one in four.

Prof Sullivan: -the, if those people can make up their mind without listening to the campaign, then I am sure we can wait while the government, whoever it is, figures out maybe that what we want or what we say we want, is not exactly the same thing — and that what they can do and what they say they can do are never the same thing, so that would be my [?? 0:34:37] proposition, which I know is not answering your question.

If you push me to what I think the government should do within the first 100 days, then I absolutely think more action on integrity is absolutely required. It is going to be the coming issue for all governments around the world — if it is not already, that the challenge of populism from both the left and the right is really focusing on undermining institutions, and so integrity and having clear ideas of what public service ethics look like and how that practice is absolutely vital.

Another small thing I would really like the government to do, which nobody has talked about because who care, is that in 1983 Australia led the world introducing gender budgeting. Would it not be lovely to have that back?

Moderator: Helen, thank you. Health was arguably the defining issue at the last election, Russell, and this time it has not featured so much. In the runup to the election, the Health Minister has been very busy giving away a lot of money over the last year or two and maybe that is why the sting has come out of it, but Labor has promised a Health Reform Commission. Can you tell us if Labor gets in what that might look like, and there has been some commentary there has been no talk about rural and regional health policy, and that is greatly needed, so what are your thought on both of those?

Prof Gruen: Yes, so I think we all welcome, for the reasons I outlined before, a Health Reform Commission. I do not think we have any detail around what that is going to cover apart from the fact that it will look at quality of services and that it will look at access to service, and it necessarily has rural and remote component to it. I think the Labor Party has had a view on a policy around expanding and improving rural and remote health. I think it has been a bit of a policy vacuum for the Coalition in this election campaign.

It really depends on how much, I think, they are willing to listen, as Helen had said, and really look, and really ask people within the department, and take reference from the

experts in the community. There has been a tendency for some governments to actually make a lot of policy and give out money on the run without referring to their department experts, and working with the Department of Health I know what quality people there are in those departments and how much they have given to understanding and working out how to improve Australia's health, to make the most of those resources.

Moderator: So, what do you think? What would you be--; If the new health minister called you in, what would you be saying you would like to see them do as their start of work?

Prof Gruen: Spend 100 days listening, exploring the department, asking us his or her experts, and then coming, of course, to ANU to continue that discourse.

Moderator: Excellent.

[laughter]

Now, that is a good idea.

[laughter]

We can hear about the new way you are looking at regional health delivery, with New South Wales and ACT, and what you are learning.

Prof Gruen: Yes, I mean there is one thing that has been absent in the campaign period, which featured strongly late last year, and that has asylum seeker health and wellbeing — the mental and physical health. It has been quite interesting to see that disappear. It is not that the problem has gone away. It is just that Labor has made themselves a small target in this area and the Coalition is genuinely concerned that raising it will bring Peter Dutton back into the fault, and has left it to the Greens to be the ones that are talking about asylum seeker health, but I still think it is a crucial issue for us to deal with.

Then, more broadly than mental health and wellbeing of the nation, is still [crosstalk 0:38:18].

Moderator: You were talking about Health Care Homes. The government introduced — I think the term before last, a new, wholly inter-related mental health program, but they have problems with rolling that out, too. There has been less than [crosstalk 0:38:33].

Prof Gruen: I think mental health in Australia has been characterised by what has been called by some of the missing middle. There is the general practice-based stuff and then

there is the involuntary institutional base for the very severely affected, and really a very missing set of services in between.

Moderator: But there was a promise that that would be there, when they announced that, and it did not happen.

Prof Gruen: It has not happened. I mean, it is a huge group of people that could fit into that. There is a lot of morbidity, of time off work, of lost productivity for that group of people, and we desperately need to find good solutions. The problem with that is that it has fallen between the Commonwealth and State arguing as to whose responsibility it is, and this is drastically [?? 0:39:19] the dual level system and we need to find ways that patients do not fall between those gaps.

Moderator: Oh, thank you. Anna, you were talking earlier about the world of Space in Australia. Just going back to the kinds of work that is going to need to start in that first 100 days, within the last few months the Government has announced that Adelaide is the headquarters of the new space centre for Australia, but there is a lot of connections that are going to have to be made in all sorts of government and private enterprise, small business, large business, et cetera.

Can you outline how were you involved in the development of the Space plan from the ANU perspective and what kinds of things, do you think, you are going to have to happen the minute that election is over?

Prof Moore: Two years ago, I was one of seven people who formed, what was called, Space Expo Reference Group, of which Megan Clark was the Chair of that panel, which was a wonderful experience for me having just been poached in the nicest possible way — looking at Brian — from Caltech to ANU, so run the largest astronomy and space group in the country, so it was a really good experience for me.

And so, as part of that group, we received something like 600 submissions from the whole country — anyone who from industry, from R&D, from public, schools. It was just a really interesting--; It was a really wonderful experience for me to go through, and just seeing the swathe of capability that was there, and it just was not coordinated, though, because there was no agency to do it. And so, everyone was just let off on their own and doing their brilliant thing but at a small level, so it was clearly untapped.

And so, out of this process we wrote a report which outlined the capability, the leap-frog technologies, not just in the techie side but also in the legal side: the law—

Moderator: Because it is a big number, isn't it?

Prof Moore: -the medicine.

Moderator: share with us what kind of budget we are talking about.

Prof Moore: I am sorry?

Moderator: What kind of budget? What group potential is the size of the economy related to Space for Australia?

Prof Moore: The global economy has currently run about 400 billion per year and growing at more than 10% a year, and it is assessed to something like, I don't know, a few trillion by 2030. That is the market we are going into. Australia in 2016, the revenue from Space, which was mostly TV — TV commercial services, has run at about 3.7 billion, which was .8% of its GDP.

And so, it was highlighted that, at the very minimum, we would need to get to the 1.8%, basically. It is just a starting point. Then, the capabilities that were highlighted were come from both the geographically where Australia is, the uniqueness of Australia — it is a huge landmass, covers many time zones, many latitudes, so you have got great potential for launch, for communications, you have great potential for the next generation communications, which will all be based around lasers because you have a higher bandwidth, transmission capability and you can make it secure. If you use radio beams, they spread very quickly. If you use laser beams, they're pointed and so it is much harder to intercept these.

In X years — I do not know how many decades that will be, the whole world would have moved to laser communications. That is how we will communicate, and we want Australia to be right there, in the centre of that.

Moderator: As an astronomer originally, this is not really astronomy, is it? I mean, but it connects with astronomy.

Prof Moore: Yes, absolutely, and so astronomy and Space go hand-in-hand here. Absolutely. Again, astronomy — I mean, [?? 0:43:20] as a Nobel Prize winning astronomist, I feel like I have to stay this, as well, but Australia leads the world in astronomy — there is no doubt about it, and it does so for many reasons. It has a very talented scientific community.

It is the McGiverness — I am not sure if the under-35 understands what I am talking about, but it is that level of intuitiveness, it is inventiveness of its people. It means that we own the technology and we are able to reinvent ourselves over and over again. That

is really important because it keeps us after 50 years still leading the world in radio- and optical- and infrared astronomy.

Moderator: Thanks, Anna.

Prof Moore: We want to do the same in Space. Thank you.

Moderator: Bringing you back to the first 100 days, what kind of interlocking structures that are going to need to be a big focus for the new government?

Prof Moore: Interlocking?

Moderator: Structures for the Space industry, as it sets up this new business model.

Prof Moore: While everyone is thinking about what to do, which is awesome, we are ready to go, so day one I really do think everyone should really think about they are doing, because we already know what we want to do because we started this process two years ago. And so, the agency itself is part of the Department of Industry, Innovation and Science, so it is mandated to answer some of those questions itself: how that is unite government, defence, the states behind a national growth story for Space.

If I could wish for something — I do not want to get too political here; or I should be, shouldn't I? I suppose I am supposed to be, but I have to say it recently it got a little state versus state in the Space area, which did not help. In case you did not follow it Australia-wide [crosstalk 0:45:07- 0:45:09], because it is a really national story. If you want to grow the industry then you need to tap into the capability across the whole country, and that is the only way it is going to work

The community itself, really, is sort of regretful about how that went, and so if I could wish for something it would be that we get back to what we are supposed to be doing,--

Moderator: Great. Anna, thank you.

Prof Moore: -which is to, really, do the national story.

Moderator: We are going to come to your questions next, but we are going to go back to Michael Wesley. Mark, you talked about the elephant in the room. What either prime minister, either Prime Minister Morrison or Shorten, are going to have to deal with Chinese leader and the US leader? What do you see as the main features of those interactions? From what we see now, how is each going to approach that?

Prof Wesley: If there is a Labor victory on the weekend, just imagine the delicious prospect of the first meeting between Bill Shorten and Donald Trump in Osaka--

[laughter]

-at the G20 meeting.

Moderator: The G20 is next month.

Prof Wesley: Yes, so Bill Shorten, a former trade union leader, meeting the great capitalist. That is going to be great fun.

[laughter]

A couple of things. Firstly, there is going to be a test coming out of China for any new government. The Chinese tend to see democratic changes of government — or non-democratic changes of government when we get rid of one prime minister and put another one in that place — as opportunities, so there are often opportunities to reset the relationship, but there are often also opportunities to test the new government. And so, I think one of the things that we need to be mindful of is that there is going to be a test coming from Beijing for a new prime minister — or a relatively new prime minister, in the first 100 days.

The second thing is that the first 100 days is going to see the onset of, what we refer to, a summit season: the G20 in Osaka, it is going to be followed by APEC in the East Asia Summit, the UN General Assembly is going to be in there, the Pacific Island Forum is going to be in there. This is a time usually and often an uncomfortable time when prime ministers are put in the glare of the media spotlight, interacting with really experienced foreign policy leaders, and quite often looking awkward in relation to that. That is going to be a really big challenge for a new prime minister — or a relatively new prime minister.

The third issue that is going to be really starting to come home and having to be dealt with is the fallout from the US-China trade war — the escalating trade war between the US and China. I am relatively pessimistic about where this is going. I think both sides are starting to escalate demands. I was in the US a few weeks ago. There is serious talk within Washington DC about the de-capping of the economies, particularly the hi-tech end of the economies. I think there is a long way to go here before any sort of solution is reached.

Australia, I think, has escaped the fallout of the trade war so far, due to a piece of luck which was the Tailings dam collapse in Brazil in February, which has elevated the iron ore price. It has meant that 40 million tonnes of Brazilian iron ore is *[sic.]* not going to China every year. That means that it is really good for the Australian iron ore industry, the Australian mining industry and, therefore, the Australian economy. That cannot

last, and I think there are some really difficult headwinds coming to the Australian economy and having to be dealt with.

I think that, actually, the first 100 days in the foreign policy sense for either side of politics is going to be a real challenge to deal with.

Moderator: Thank you very much. Great. Alright, we are going to questions.

[crosstalk 0:49:19-0:49:21]

Prof Sullivan: (...)no really [?? 0:49:23] your questions, but it just seems to me that what we have heard from Anna and from Michael, you have, if you like, the sort of--; the gorilla in the room and the gorilla in Space.

On the one hand we have a conversation which is about the US-China and where Australia sees itself — and, in a way, that conversation, Michael, has been going on for generations, and some of that is about economics and how Australia benefits from digging stuff out the ground.

On the other hand, we have this amazing story about Space and whether it is or is not the final frontier but, Anna, you are talking about that as a growth opportunity. You use that language. As a political sociologist, I sit here and I think around the room people identified climate change as the thing they care most about or the thing they do care about and yet we are still talking about these issues in a particular paradigm, which is about the economics of growth, and when we have exhausted the growth that we get from the ground we are now going to do in Space.

I think that is a profoundly important questions for us, as a democracy, to be thinking about why are we talking about Space in a general election? Go to Michael's idea of a national conversation: why are we not, as a society, thinking what are the possibilities? Do we want to monetise Space and, if we do, what is that going to look like?

It seems to me that Anna has offered just a really great talent for thinking about not just what we should be talking about at elections but how we should be having the conversation so that we can engage with some of the more longer-standing gorillas that Michael has been talking about.

Moderator: Great. Thank you, Helen. Alright, let's get to some questions. I will just get you to put your hands up high so we can see who would like to ask questions. We will try and get around the room as much as we can. Let's start with the back, there, if we can. We will come from the back to the front, here, and then we will get this one, over there.

[0:51:21-0:51:24]

Thanks very much. Just tell us your first name and off you go.

Question 1: Thank you. I am Fiona, and my question is about rural and regional. I was really pleased to hear a number of you talk about the lack of policy, the policy void in rural and regional, and I am wondering to what extent we are seeing that play out in the rise of Independents in those areas and the possible decimation of the National Party and because of its lack of engagement with the actual issues of the people.

Moderator: Great. Thank you for that. We will bring the microphone down here. Now, who wants to--; John? [crosstalk 0:52:01].

Prof Hewson: Look, you were asking about the National Party, I guess. I do not think the National Party really has maintained touch with its electorate at all. You saw that most conspicuously in the postal survey on same-sex marriage, where they confidently predicted they would have a substantial number of their seat voting 'no', and 15 of 16 seats voted 'yes', and some overwhelmingly.

Secondly, they do not have a water strategy that is resonating with the electorate. You are seeing that in the New South Wales state election where some of their key seats got 20% swing against them.

Thirdly, they do not have a regional development strategy, and I find that staggering. We talk about opportunities. We have a national waste problem, with waste building up all over this country as our neighbours will not now import our waste: Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, China, and that is regional — that is a regional challenge, but is a regional opportunity to have recycling in key regional centres right across the country.

We do not have fuel security in this country. You can turn a lot of that waste into diesel or ethanol, some sort of biofuel, which is a massive possibility. As it is today, we import all our fuel: 44 ships come from Singapore — if they do not come we are in strife; what about 21 days of fuel security, yet you could have refineries spread across this country — small refineries that would turn a lot of that waste, everything from any form of waste right to the plastics and other things which are a particular problem, into biodiesel, or diesel, or diesel alternatives, or ethanol, or whatever.

I think the National Party has missed a great opportunity.

One final comment: in the area of responding to climate change, one of the most important things is to improve the carbon content of the soil, and farmers can easily do that by changing the nature of their farming techniques: shallow tilling, organic rather

than chemical fertilisers, and so on. That would give a farmer the opportunity — any individual farmer — to earn a new income stream every year from selling the carbon credits that that generates into a market system.

That in itself can almost offset most of the emission we have in this country if we did it properly, and I am staggered that the National Party has no answers in any of those three areas, as an example. That is why they are not resonating. That is why you will get a large protest vote on Saturday in key National Party seats and, although One Nation and Clive Palmer go in there and will pull a protest vote, they are not offering any solutions either.

Moderator: Thanks, John. [inaudible 0:54:46]

Question 2: My name is Paul. One of the things that neither parties have been talking about in the election is that they are actually aiming to govern a federation. There are eight other governments in Australia, and it will not be the first 100 day — it will be the first week that they will be having a conversation with the leaders of each of our states and territories.

Paradoxically, it was only Anna Moore, our Space Professor, that mentioned the states in her talk, but I would be very interested [crosstalk 0:55:20] to hear on federation government.

Moderator: Yes. Russell, you mentioned that, as well. Anna, in relation to state-federal? Russell, do you want to jump in there about—

Prof Gruen: I have raised some of the challenges that that poses for effective health policy and, Paul, I would actually refer people to your publications around the difficulties with multilevel government,--

Moderator: There you go.

[laughter]

Prof Gruen: -so I know you are asking me a tough question.

[laughter]

It is no more polarised anywhere than, I think, in health, and the buck passing is a fundamental problem within our Constitution and the way we are set up. No government has demonstrated they can effectively work with the states and territories in the health

arena for a whole of country solution, and I think that is a tragedy and I would love to see that being a stretched goal for us as a community.

Can I pick up on the discourse — and I am really glad that Michael raised the generational aspects here, because the conversation around growth, economic growth in a narrow frame, which has been what our political discourse has been and continues to be, I think, in a generational construct may be a tipping point for a change for a different type of conversation around perhaps community wellbeing.

In an era where the younger voters now are facing an uncertain employment future, not knowing whether they can own their own homes, they focus on wellbeing, and I think if we went around the room and we said, "Who feels like their wellbeing is better now than it was 20 years ago," I bet you would find few hands going up.

To that regard, I think there are some shining lights — and it is not just because the Minister and the Director General of ACT Health are in the room, but ACT Health is leading with a conversation around wellbeing as a major social policy, as developing a wellbeing index as a measure of societal success, and I think we have to find the point — there will be a point — where that conversation tips away from economic growth that has been the only thing that matters to a conversation about wellbeing and, actually, climate change, the future of our existence on this planet.

Moderator: I think probably voters would probably say they thought that for a while, it is just taking the politicians a while to realise that.

John, [?? 0:58:04] two questions.

Prof Hewson: Could I add just one point on federation? I think one of the big challenges of government in this country, which was not addressed at all in this campaign, is restructuring federation. The point that has been made about point-scoring and blame-shifting between different levels of government, we need to rationalise the structure of government, allocate responsibility specifically, if you like, to one level of government.

That is fundamental to the efficiency of government, but it is also fundamental to issues like tax and welfare reform, where you would [?? 0:58:35] reform's [?? 0:58:35] and, in the end, the problems do not get addressed. I am surprised that--; And there is a mood, I think, to actually do something about it, but you soon degenerate into just point-scoring and blame-shifting rather than dealing with the essence of the issue.

Moderator: Right. Thank you. We get two questions back-to-back, so can the--; Thank you.

Question 3: Yes, thank you. My name is Wendy. My question is mainly addressed to Dr Helen Sullivan, please, because it is a policy one that came out of the intergovernmental science platform policy on *Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services* report that has just come out, and most people would see it as, oh, it said something about a million species might go, but it is much, much more than that. I have just written a report on it.

Why I am directing it and it segues beautifully with what you just said before, that one of the parts of that report at the end, the global assessment said, "What should we do?" and the first point is we need to redefine human wellbeing beyond its narrow basis of economic growth.

They are actually talking about a really big shift and change, because this particular report that might seem not very relevant to anything, *Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services*, is actually so relevant that what all life depends and what is happening is a declining globally at an unprecedented rate in human history, "we are eroding the very foundations of our economies, livelihoods, food security, health, and quality of life worldwide" — that is a quote.

Moderator: Thank you, perfect.

Question 3: That is why I am directing it to Dr Helen Sullivan in terms of the shift in policy about our wellbeing.

Moderator: Thank you very much, and we will just quickly. Helen, while you are thinking about that, we will just have two questions back-to-back for a few people to comment. Thanks.

Question 4: I am hoping that this quite a useful follow-up question. I am a local cardiologist and, in terms of health policy for the election, I think the two major health issues are inequality — and we know that by improving our social security, Safety Net, we can improve the health and wellbeing of our community and that is much more effective, I think, than investing in new hospitals or more doctors, but the major health challenge has to be climate change, and it is the elephant in the room in the discussions tonight — it is great to hear some of the ideas coming through.

I have been involved in quite a lot of conversations over the last month, I guess, particularly focused on the election. One of my staff members said, "So, if we were going to take this seriously, we could do one thing. What would you do to actually address climate change? What would you ask the government to do? What can we do which will make a difference? We spent a lot of time talking about energy, and energy is part of the problem, agriculture and transportation, so how do we address all three issues?"

I guess my question to the panel — and I am probably particularly interested in John Hewson's view on this, but everybody might have a view. Have we developed sufficient political momentum to come up with adequate economic mechanisms to address climate change? Could we, for example, bring back in the idea of a carbon tax?

Moderator: Okay, thanks very much. We will start with the biodiversity report and, Helen, if you can start then we will go through the table.

Prof Sullivan: That is a great question. It was staggering that that report — and, in your words you said, only a million species--; This is a report that effectively talks about the end game for us all, and it was a report that barely got a headline in the press. It is staggering just how clear it is that, if we continue to do what we are doing, we are in serious trouble.

But the problem with it is, of course, that this is not the first we have heard this. Scientists are giving us these messages regularly. This is just the latest one, and it is almost as if you get to think, "Well, how critical, how many species? What will it take? What is the tipping point for us as a species to decide enough is enough?" I am not sure that we are there yet.

It sort of ties with your question about: well, what can we do? I think before we get to what we can, we really do need to get to a political platform, a shared political platform that acknowledges the science, that respects the expertise and that is prepared to take some pretty serious action. Now, we do not have that — and I am not telling anybody in this room anything that I do not know.

You ask what do we do as a public policy school, well, we launched our new strategy a couple of weeks ago and one of the key themes for us — we have three key themes now in our strategy and the academics, as you know, do what they like. They research what they like, they teach what they like, they do not--; Nobody becomes an academic to do what they are told.

Nonetheless, we have, as a community, identified three things that we really need to all focus on in our different ways. One of them is capability: how do we build the skills that are needed to engage in this extraordinary new world we are living in. One of them is integrity: how do we ensure that we have got the institutions and the behaviours that are going to enable us to have confidence in each other, and the third one is sustainability.

That is not just about environmental sustainability, important though that is. It takes in this broader sense of how we construct sustainable societies that have markets or

other mechanisms that are used in the service of creating sustainable societies rather than us operating in societies that appear to be in the service of market mechanisms.

Moderator: Helen, thank you. John Hewson, there are voters away ahead of both sides of politics on this, aren't they, and economic levers are going to be possible post the election.

Prof Hewson: Well, I think to answer that question, I mean, we need first and foremost leadership on the issue of climate, and the first stage is that it is actually move beyond the point-scoring and blame-shifting that has taking place in climate wars over the past couple of decades, and embrace the concept that we need to make a transition to a low-carbon society and provide the leadership in terms of how that is to be achieved.

I was fascinated in the campaign that, when the government looked at Shorten in climate strategy. The focus was just on growth. What is the impact on growth? How much growth that we are going to have to give up? The fact is that you probably do not have to give up any of it if you do it properly. It is a question of focusing on the nature of the transition, and leading the debate, and building bipartisan support for that.

I mean, you have got electoral support — I think 70 to 80 percent of those polled or surveyed in the last several years have said, "We want decisive government-led action on climate and we want a much greater concentration on renewables," and yet government is not listening. I find that absolutely staggering that that opportunity is being let go.

Just on the point about putting a price on carbon. I mean, if you were a genuine liberal — a conservative liberal, who believes in small government, and low levels of regulation, and reliance on market forces wherever possible, you would start with the most cost effective way of delivering an effective transition, that is to put a price on carbon. If we had done that, dare I say, at a policy in the early 90s which I know nobody read — they were destructed by GST, but we call for 20 percent—

[laughter]

-cut in emission by the end of 2000 off a 1990-base, we were nowhere near that yet. If we had done it then, we would have a carbon price, and nobody would be paying any attention to today. We would be so far down the transition path it would not matter.

Those opportunities are there yet we have a so-called conservative rump in the government that does not believe in small government and low levels of regulation and

market forces. They prefer socialist responses of big sticks, belting energy companies, and so on.

Moderator: And do you think this election is—

Prof Hewson: That is what has got to change.

Moderator: -think this election is going to bring electoral change to that core of people who feel strongly, who are against climate change policy?

Prof Hewson: I think if the new prime minister were to make a statement along those lines on day one, and say that we are going to focus on transition, we are not going to debate it anymore, it would be just about how fast we can do it, what is the most cost effective way of doing it. Okay, it is going to involve transition, it is going to involve some people losing jobs and being retrained and supported in a transition to other activities. At the same time, you are going to capitalise on a lot of the industries that have been sitting there for decades.

When we have the best resources in wind, and solar, and graphite, and lithium, and everything that is fundamental to the process of developing the cheapest base-load electricity, for example, in the world, and we are able to store it cost effectively, and we just burn those opportunities year in year out, that staggers me that we just let them go. This is not just a growth question. It is a broader question about the wellness of society as a whole.

If you do it and you move decisivly, you'll be working on the species as much as you are working on the economic growth factor.

Moderator: John, thank you. Let us have a look at the hands up of the first-time voters in this election. Hands up those who are going to be voting in their first election — at the back. Hands up so we can actually see, because we are going to move the microphone over.

[laughter]

We want to hear from you. We really do. We really do. Hands up. [?? 1:08:34] there is a couple over here. I would like you to tell us what issues are important to you and the question you would like to ask the panel. Let us hear from the young voters. Thanks very much. Just first name, thanks, issues that are important and something for the panel.

Question 5: I am not sure if this is ac--; [?? 1:08:51] Hi, my name is [name sp? 1:08:52]. For me, probably climate change and, also to be honest, constitutional change. For example, indigenous representation in our Constitution.

Moderator: Right, and a question for the panel? That is great. Do you have a question for the panel?

Question 5: Well, actually my question was around that constitutional change dimension, so when the panel was talking about that national story going forward, at least one of the major parties have come out strongly backing constitutional change in terms of indigenous representation, in terms of changing Australia from a constitutional monarchy into a Republic, and I just wanted to ask what would that mean for our national story and our national identity going forward, and our place in the world, as well.

Moderator: Great question. Who wants to take that?

Prof Hewson: I think the most significant constitutional challenge right now is to give proper recognition to our indigenous heritage. I know we are falling to a bit of a habit of acknowledging country, which I think is important — do not get me wrong, but it is not enough. We have got to acknowledge the significance of the First Australians in our Constitution and legitimately solve the problem of indigenous disadvantage.

I am staggered that this, in this election campaign, has barely got a mention. Okay, though I notice that the Labor Party at one stage said that we wanted to focus on giving indigenous community a voice, yet when I look at their costing for the next four years, there is zero in four years — not a penny to be spent on it. That is not a serious embracing of the challenge.

More broadly, the issue of republic, I have been a republican since the beginning. I have watched it come and go. My wife is an arch monarchist. She reckons all these young kids being born in the royal family are going to delay that process for decades--

[laughter]

-and it is probably true, but we do not have this sense of national purpose and national identity that we should have. Most of the debate you see in the election campaign has been about the interests of — personal interests or special interests. I mean, a lot of forgetting of the national interests, and I think when we legitimately start at that debate there is a lot of fronts we would open up as a consequence of just thinking in those terms.

Moderator: [inaudible in the background 1:11:12]

Prof Wesley: Just very quickly. I think these issues about identity are important for where we stand in the world. I think that you do not have to go very deep into a conversation where decision makers of countries in our region before you hit a perception that Australia generally is a country that follows the lead of its American and European allies and partners. It does not--;

The sorts of evidence are martialled around this go to things like the fact that there is a Union Jack on our flag, the fact that we have a British monarch as our head of state, and a variety of other things. It does not help, for example, that the prime minister lobs out an idea of shifting our embassy in Israel to Jerusalem shortly after Donald Trump has done exactly that — this matters.

It is actually deeply important to where we stand in the world and whether we are able to make our way in the world in an era post-American primacy. Whether we are taken seriously by countries that have established an independent foreign policy as a corner stone of how they deal with the rest of the world. This is going to become much more important, so these issues of identify, of how we recognise not only our indigenous population but the multicultural nature of our population and independent way of looking at the world is going to matter more and more in the years ahead.

Moderator: Michael, thank you. I am going to stay with our young voters. I think we have got a question here, have we, from a young voter?

Question 6: Unfortunately, not a young voter.

[laughter]

I mean, thank you, that is very generous. [?? 1:13:10] When you poll people on the policy issues that matter to them the most, for as long as I can remember health will be in the top three, along with education and economy. Why do you not see health policy being more of an active battleground in elections.

Other than funding and Medicare, I cannot remember an election where health has been really [?? 1:13:32]. Why do you not think we see the parties litigating things like co-payments, the availability of bulk-billing clinics, prescription drug process — that kind of thing? Why is it like this, do you think?

Moderator: We will come to that in a second, Russell. I will just get these questions [1:13:46] to add to it, thanks. Is there someone else at the table? Yes?

Question 7: Hi, I was just wondering whether you thought that either party had any--; is really able to adequately address youth concerns, such as tertiary education, cost and funding, asylum seekers and immigration, and income inequality with real short-term and long-term solutions?

Moderator: Good questions. They are both good questions. So, health policy — let us start with you, Russell, and then we will look at the broader policies involving cost, funding, tertiary education, et cetera, et cetera.

Prof Gruen: Thanks for that question. Those are important discussions in government, and I know the governments do have those discussions. It is a difficult conversation because of the complexity of the issues to have at the door stop type campaign, and so I think things risk getting taken out of context, being misunderstood and the whole discussion coming down to the lowest common denominator.

I was struck by how Lower House was on the priority list in this election, too, but I guess, probably assume somewhat into this primacy of climate change, and let me just say that I agree with [name? 1:14:58] that the number health issue that we all face is climate change, which is global warming and the possible demise of us, humans, as a species.

Let me be quite clear about that. I think we have got so many resources that, in a country that what we have is a longer coastline than any other country in the world, and what that means is there is more sand to burry our collective [?? 1:15:21].

[laughter]

Moderator: So, what do you see a changing role for medicine in this question of climate change?

Prof Gruen: Health is one of the things that should motivate us to change, and it has not been part of the discourse. Purely, the word 'climate change' is a sanitised version of global warming. What we are talking about is a hotter world and we cannot live in it.

Moderator: Thanks very much, Russell. [1:15:52] other question there about issue affecting young people, the cost of tertiary education, inequality, et cetera, and the ability of parties to deal with that. Let us start with Michael and move down the table, just to get closing comments, as well, as people think about the time between now, being Tuesday, Saturday being voting day — and if you have not voted already, what they might be thinking about the next few days.

Prof Wesley: Look, I do think that there is a curious paradox about this election campaign, and this is an indirect way of answering your question — that issues, such

as intergenerational inequality and climate change, are obviously key in voters' minds. They are resonating, to some extent, with the political parties, as well, but what really worries me about each successive election campaign is that is becomes an exercise in collective selfishness, that the parties line up to appeal to narrow self-interest as much as they can, to really try and hit voters' hip-pocket nerves. What it does is it takes the attention away from the largest systemic issues that you are talking about.

The two issues that you raised, which was intergenerational inequality, education and inequality, are real issues about the future of our country, and the future of our society, and the ability of us as a society to stand tall on the world stage and to prosper into the future.

We know that. At some level, I think, our political parties know that, but there is something about the electoral process that leads it back to this 'what's in it for me' kind of mentality. I think, as long as that mentality dominates politics and public policy, we are not going to see much action on these sorts of issues.

Moderator: Thanks, Michael. Also, are there any closing comments? Oh, go ahead, please do. [?? 1:17:54] Also, I am going to ask you, the panellists, too, just to give a little idea — very briefly, we do not have enough time: what goals do you have for your institute or colleges going forward in this term to engage in politics and policy.

Michael, just before we move, what do you have? What is your goal for your college?

Prof Wesley: We are in the College of Asia and Pacific. This is the most dynamic region of the world. This is region of the world that will shape the world's future. What I hope is to engage — whatever side of politics wins government — in a much deeper consideration of what that means and how Australia positions itself in this particular part of the world, both accounting for the risks that are coming our way but also taking advantage of the opportunities.

Moderator: Okay, thanks. Helen, can you address the final question about intergenerational inequality and the cost of education in terms of policy going forward, and from goals for the Crawford Centre as the centre for policy research in Australia?

Prof Sullivan: Well, I think I have talked about what Crawford is about and what is outlined in our strategy. I think the questions posed around intergenerational inequality, I mean we have not had a decent higher education policy in this country for as long as I have been in this country, and that is coming up eight years. We do not appear to be able to have a sensible conversation about tertiary education and we certainly do not

seem to be able to have a sensible conversation about whole of life education, which is really what we need to be doing.

I think part of the questions that you are raising are--; What it points, is all of those things that are not being discussed: the huge impact of the digital revolution on everything that we do, the fact that world of work as we know it is going to transform completely — hardly anybody in this election is talking about the gig economy and precarious work of what that means.

I think there is these certainly issues that we do not know enough about and we do not pay enough attention to, probably because not enough of the vested interests are affected by them, and if I can just poke Russell a little bit here, one of the things he did not say — and I am sure he will disagree with me, one of the things he did not say about why we do not get anywhere on house debate is that, you know, doctors and medics, generally, that pretty big lobbyists for not changing.

Nobody loves a hospital more than a doctor, so there is something profoundly important about [?? 1:20:36] If we are really serious about health and thinking about health differently, then we have to work with doctors to get them to reduce their attachment to big kits and operating theatres, because that is not when--; That is when the House policy failed. If we did not need that, that would be when we would have some good health policy.

If I can just say finally — and I know I am taking up too much time, I think if we do not address questions of First Nation's Peoples and what that--; how Australia is going to acknowledge that in a meaningful way, and we do not address the appalling situation that we have in terms of those asylum seekers who are still stuck on Manus and Nauru, then we do not have a right to have a sense of a national identity because those things are shameful, and that is--;

If that inhibits us at having a much clearer sense of what we might be as a society going forward — and I speak as somebody who does not get to vote; I am not a citizen, so I speak as an outsider who thinks these things are extremely important and are just obvious to me as obstacles in the way of progress.

Moderator: Thank you. Russell, going forward towards this election, anyway, what message do you have for people as they are thinking about issues to do with health between now and Saturday?

Prof Gruen: First of all, I have to respond to Helen, to say [laughter 1:21:58] that one on [?? 1:21:59].

[laughter]

Secondly, as the most recent member of the panel to join ANU, let me just say I am immensely proud to be part of an organisation that takes so seriously the national discourse and the national wellbeing. The College of Health and Medicine, which encompasses the Nobel Prize-winning John Curtin School of Medical Research, the ANU Medical School, the Research School of Population Health, and the Research School of Psychology, is distinguished by the fact we have got everything from cutting-edge medical research, through to mental health and social psychology, and everything in between, which is key to understanding and moving forward as a health of the nation.

We take our national mission very seriously. We train people to be leaders in the health discourse, and in the research side it is not just research excellence but its impact and engagement that are key to our future, and we look forward to being part of the solution, whichever side of government we work with.

Moderator: That is great, thank you. Anna, what are your closing thoughts, given the approach of election day? People are thinking right now about all these issues we have been discussing. From your perspective, a science perspective, astronomy perspective, a Space perspective, what are your closing thoughts tonight?

Prof Moore: Okay, that is a lot, so I will try and keep it short. I have not said much about my own Institute, so I will take these few minutes to do so. In Space, we are focused on game-changing programs, things that put Australia ahead not in five years but in 30, 40, 100 years.

It is to do with laser communications to do with Space, med-tech, health of future generation of Space travellers who may not be the fittest people in the world, because they will be ones that can afford it. It is to do with new technologies, setting the regulation side of the Space law, as well, so it is a fascinating institute to be at.

I am very fortunate to be at ANU because this kind of institute, which is multidisciplinary, it is very difficult to do anywhere else, the depth of capability at the University is quite remarkable, and so it maybe wants to step up and really do this role.

We have really supported hugely by the ACT Government, who is a state government who see the benefit of translating quickly what we have at the University's interlocal industry, and that has been really fascinating and I thank them for their support.

And so, now I am looking forward to really setting the national agenda, as well, and working with the Federal Government again, after two years of doing so, to make sure that the rest of Australia, as well, is going to step up, too.

Moderator: Thank you very much. Anna, thanks for that. John Hewson, you have obviously got your own general thoughts you would like to put to the audience, but I would like to ask to comment in the finals moments as well as you can: the media in this campaign — what are your thoughts on the media, Murdoch Press particularly, over the last few weeks, and can you rate the performances of the two leaders and, perhaps, what they might have learnt from—

[laughter]

-this period? Thanks.

Prof Hewson: Just let me say one thing about intergenerational inequality. I think it is a fundamental challenge in this country, and the fact that this election campaign has not provided solutions to issues like housing affordability, and climate, and tax, and the transfer reform, and even national identity — it is intergenerational theft.

We are making it much harder for the next generation and future generations to deal with any of these issues, and the longer that drift, the longer we play short-term politics and just score points rather than solve problems, the more we are stealing from the next generation. That frustrates me enormously in terms of this.

To rate the two leaders, I mean, it was a race to the bottom. They have done down the entire election process, in my view, so that they both set out not to take too many risks — not to say anything that might come back and bite them in the course of the campaign, so the bottom line of that is they say very little. The debates have been very much on slogans and messages, not substance of any of the policies that have been raised in those debates, so they do not score well. It is not my view — it is the electorate's view.

Both have got negative net satisfaction ratings. The electorate does not like either of them, and it is the choice of the lesser of two evils. Unfortunately, in this democratic system that we have once we have made that choice we then have to live with the evil of [?? 1:26:40]—

[laughter]

-we do not have the policies to carry this country forward, and that really is, I think, a major problem.

I think, in terms of my area, which is tax and transfer, I would like to see broad-based tax and welfare reform. It is a fundamentally important element of what needs to be done. Unfortunately, the tax changes that were announced in this campaign by both sides just make that harder. Take a few concessions and you deal with those, when there are a couple of hundred-billion-dollars-worth of concessions in annual terms. I mean, you are only doing a little bit of the problem.

Within that, you take areas that are obviously neglected, like Newstart, which has stayed in real terms of the same way for at least 20 years, and neither side can actually say we should be increasing that. It is way below the poverty level on any measure of the poverty line that you want to use in this country. That is a glaring inequity, if you like, in the present system. That can be fixed by broad-based tax and welfare reform. I know I am an expert in this, because I did lose the election on precisely that point.

[laughter]

We will not be able to turn that around very easily, but it makes me wonder whether some of these big issues, the elephant in the room type issues, are just too important to be left to day-to-day politics. The idea of a health commission, or a climate commission, or budget repair commission, whatever, maybe the way it has got to go. Take it away from the day-to-day--; If they will not take it out and show leadership, then institutionally we might have to address how that should be done.

Moderator: Thanks for that, and just finally, because you are in the media more than anyone else in the room, John, just going back to the other question, what is your final take on the media in this [crosstalk 1:28:28]?

Prof Hewson: I did not duck. I just did not want to talk about it.

[laughter]

Look, the media have not distinguished themselves in this campaign. Certain elements of the media have run very hard in support of the government — News Limited papers in particular. The Australian and Telegraph [?? 1:28:44] bias, [?? 1:28:46], front-page stories, and so on. I guess, in the world where the print media is suffering, they have decided to just identify their constituencies the hard line and we will just feed that.

That carried through to Sky News, particularly Sky After Dark — as they say, the monsters after dark. That has been constantly biased in its coverage, supported by some shock jocks in the radio area, particularly in New South Wales, but more broadly.

I do not think the media have generally distinguished themselves in this campaign. There has not been too much investigative reporting. There has not been too much focus on the detail.

I think, back to my time in politics, I can remember having to deal with, maybe, 30 consecutive questions on some element of the tax system in a press conference. Today, you will get one question and you will move to somebody else with another subject, so there is no scrutiny coming from the media, and in that sense I do not think they have generally done the job they should be doing in this campaign.

Moderator: Alright, great point to finish on. Thank you very much. Please, thank our panel.

[applause]

Female speaker: Thanks, Catherine, and everyone for a really thoughtful and weighty discussion — with some decent substance, too, which I gather from the number of people who have come tonight is something we have probably all been missing a little in this election.

I have to say, John, as someone who first worked on election campaign in 1990 and has been a [?? 1:30:23] ever since, I think you are right that we are lacking a capacity to have really substantial discussions and conversations on really substantial issues. Seeing climate change as a clear issue that the population is concerned about but one that is really struggling to have been a discussion of any substance in this campaign, has been fascinating.

I have to say, after listening to you and reading your endless [?? 1:30:51], I think, if I could go back now, I would probably vote for you, but I was campaigning on the other side so that is way too late.

[laughter]

30 years [1:31:00] — 20 years, it is not quite 30 yet. To everyone on the panel, thank you. It is one of the joys working at ANU that we have so many people of substance who bring real thought to what they do and help bring to all of us interesting ideas and questions that we should be thinking about when we go and vote on Saturday. I want to say thank you to you all.

For those of you who have not had enough of ANU discussions and thinking about policy matters and political matters over the course of the campaign at the election series or tonight, it is alright, you can hop on our website, where you will find the podcasts from

the series of election discussions we have had — a whole series of podcasts, with Mark Kenny who is in the room, and also a series of video discussions on weighty policy issues, so if you need more before Saturday, please go to our website and get more, and make an informed decision.

I would like to thank everyone on the panel, so to John, to Anna, Russell, Helen, and Michael and, of course, thank you very much, Cath. Thank you all for coming tonight.

[applause]

[closing music 1:32:15]

[audio ends 1:32:35]