

**POWER Inquiry Witness Session – Glasgow**

**Witness Session  
10am-4pm, 28 January 2005**

**Centre for Contemporary Arts  
350 Sauchiehall Street, Glasgow, G2 3JD**

**Constitutional Reform**

**Witnesses:**

Peter Kelly – Director, Poverty Alliance

Joyce McMillan – Convenor, Scottish Civic Forum

Canon Kenyon Wright – Chair of Trust, People and Parliament

**Abbreviations**

AM	Audience Member [individual names indicated]	
BF	Ben Freeman	Commissioner
BM	Bano Murtuja	Commissioner
EB	Emma B	Commissioner
FM	Ferdinand Mount	Commissioner
HK	Helena Kennedy	Commissioner
PB	Paul Boakye	Commissioner
PC	Phil Carey	Commissioner
JM	Joyce McMillan	Witness
KW	Canon Kenyon Wright	Witness
PK	Peter Kelly	Witness

HK: ... going up and we're keen to have people come in. Great, okay let's start at the back. Please tell us who you are.

AM: [Dylan Jeffrey] Dylan Jeffrey from the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister. One of the things which I have been interested in, in terms of what's happened in Scotland is the citizens engaging directly with the statutory political process and one of the things was petitioning which has been mentioned.

One of the things which we particularly focussed on... learning from, not least because it's been shown around Europe as a way forward, is the e-petition model developed by Ann McKintosh at Napier which is now part of the process and indeed we're now looking to roll that out with local authorities in England and

Wales. But I was somewhat disheartened as well by just to paraphrase Joyce, the successes measured by one and a half fingers on one hand...

*[Laughter]*

AM: [Dylan Jeffrey]... I wonder how that process could be improved. And secondly, how else do you think the technology can play a part in terms of engaging people in the system directly and playing a part within the whole process?

HK: I'm going to take a few questions and then direct them towards our panel. Sir?

AM: [David Woods] Yes, David Woods from Your Party. I'm basically involved in setting up a new political party and the entire premise of it is that the people actually take the decisions and representatives implement those decisions. Obviously it's quite a radical idea, but I was wondering if the panel thought about that as an idea or even some way of moving towards that as a solution to these problems?

JM: You mean a kind of mandating?

AM: [David Woods] Yeah, I mean basically using new technology, using the Internet, we could... I mean if and I do accept this is a very big 'if', we get a representative elected and their constituents would, using the Internet and possibly telephone voting and possibly TV, interactive TV, would be able to actually propose policies and vote on policies. A lot of policies would still be led by the representative, but the public would have a veto on policies they didn't like and would also be able to propose policies and if they got enough backing, would go to a formal vote. I'm just wondering whether that's...?

HK: Okay, a revisit of a representative democracy. Sorry, the woman there, the woman here...

AM: [Sharon Davidson] Sharon Davidson of Govan Initiative. There's a lot of talk about consultation but the impression I get is the people that will get involved with the consultation are the people that are actually voting. I wondered if there was actually evidence behind it to say that people do want a lot more and what are the ages of people that take part in it? And where do they live? And do they actually target the people that wouldn't take part in it?

HK: So who are the people who actually participate in consultations? The gentleman in the back corner.

AM: [Andy Thompson] Andy Thompson from the University of Edinburgh. I was interested in the issues that people talk about, the problems of this handing over power and one of the questions which it raises in my mind is this balance between representative democracy and participatory democracy. Now I don't actually think voting is participation, I think it's a very minimal form of involvement. Participation to me is about sharing power, sharing decisions, and there has to come a decision point where you say how much balance or which one makes the decision. So I think if you're serious about handing over power, then it does threaten the representative democracy system, so therefore why

should people vote to support a system which is against their interests? I just wanted to raise that issue.

HK: Okay those tensions between representative and participatory. The gentleman there with the spectacles?

AM: [Willie Sullivan] Willie Sullivan from the Electoral Reform Society. I've been thinking for a while now why it is we've had a set of theories of issues around community development and community education, probably for decades now, and we can still be on the same issues and problems and I hope you can think the same thing, having heard the discussion this morning, that people never really give away power, they hold onto it and that's from government ministers down to junior council officials.

I think something that wasn't discussed here was... one of the great successes in the parliament is because there's not been a single kind of block within it. They've been forced to share power and been forced to do things like introduce STV for local government which is something that we campaigned for but that would never have happened if there'd been one block of power, and I think that's quite an interesting thing to look at.

Picking up on your point about big sweeping ideologies. I think that's another issue and I think there's a debate here about where power lies in culture, in the society and I think that's a big ideological debate. So who sets the sort of cultural norms and values? And how important that is, because we look at... New Labour is reacting to a new Liberal agenda. Who set that agenda? Who has the power to set that agenda?

HK: Right. And there was a gentleman over here, yes please?

AM: [Terry Myers] Terry Myers, Charter 88. I'm interested in the way in which we can connect people with politics locally. People live and work in their localities, in their communities. How can we enable those communities to initiate policy? A mechanism that occurs to some of us is that we need to set up some kind of constitutional forum that would be answerable to people at these local community levels. One of the processes, one of the campaigns that might initiate this would be to take on board the very difficult issue of writing a citizens' constitution. How possibly would ordinary individuals get involved in writing a constitution – a proposal for a forum to be set up that has direct access to communities and their community councils, community associations to provide then the information they need to participate in the process of writing a citizens constitution?

HK: Okay. Well we've got a whole lot there and I can still see more hands coming up so we'll come back to you in the second round. Right, can technology play a part?

JM: I think that it's a kind of embryonic thing and I think in every network and organisation I'm involved in, there's a kind of learning curve about what we can do with the new technology and what we can't – where its limitations are. It's particularly interesting the Trade Unions were mentioned actually, I'm involved in

the NUJ and discussing what we can achieve in that kind of networking through new technology and all that.

What I do think and I don't know if the members have had a chance to just go quickly onto the Scottish Parliament website but it is extremely good. And one of the striking things about it is that it has a kind of international fan club *[laughs]*, it has this kind of global reach which I think tells us something about the nature of new technology, that it creates communities that are not the traditional type of national communities. You know in a way it's not people in Scotland who get the biggest bang for the buck out of the quality of the Scottish Parliament's website, its people who care about Scotland or who care about constitutional matters across the planet, and who can actually watch live debates in the Scottish Parliament on screen and then contribute to them. I think the question of how you increase that take-up within the community that an institution is actually addressing itself to is a really interesting one but we probably need to get much more detailed thinking about that from the Scottish Parliament's own information service.

HK: Now one of the things that John Prescott's office, which our friend is here from, is looking at, is this whole business of should we be looking at Big Brother-type voting for elections and things. It goes from that, from the sublime to the ridiculous. Should we have it that people can vote using their mobile phones rather than having to go to a polling booth and so on, or would that in some ways reduce the engagement and the quality of the engagement and in fact is it likely to be destructive rather than productive?

JM: Well this is purely anecdotal but I know someone who was discussing this with a group of young people in a kind of consultation process... they thought it was really cool to go to a little box and have this stubby pencil because they text all the time, what's special about that! And I do think that it comes to kind of mediums of democracy, like if you're talking about television debates, people voting with a push button on their own in a room, there is something about that that is very thin. I mean the ghastly result of that celebrity politician thingy that was on television last month where everybody just voted for some guy with taxi driver politics that were totally racist and all the rest of it because he was like the biggest personality. I mean that kind of populist politics on...

HK: We even had him on Newsnight the other week!

JM: Exactly, I mean legitimising just the most idiotic views through a complete lack of real debate, real civic process. I mean the point about power is that it also entails responsibility and one of the luxuries that people have sitting at home on their sofas at the moment is that they can treat the whole thing as a beauty contest in a voyeuristic way because they don't have the power but they also don't have to share the actual real dilemmas of resource allocations and all the rest of it. And I think that kind of politics where you're voting by text just invites that – it's treating it as though it were show business. Bored with Tony Blair's face, let's have Michael Howard for a while: that's not good enough.

PD: This is either a very long or a very short answer. The truth is in the late eighteenth century a lot of the things you just said against electronic voting were

said against the secret ballot, so these are just partly generational issues, you know as if somehow this... you sound like the person who really thought that cinema was the beginning of the end of civilisation when you speak that way. There is nothing more or less participatory than having to get on a bus, do you know what I mean, to go and make your mark than there is a with a mobile phone message, there's nothing intrinsically more or less participatory just by getting on the bus.

HK: The short version here. Is that shared by anyone in the audience, that view of Phil's? Or do you feel that the voting has to have a sense of...when you look at the queues of people in South Africa or wherever, that somehow there should be a moment attached to your civic duty, the idea that you're thinking... a public moment.

AM: [Hugh Bain] There should be an opportunity to be aware that other people are doing this as well and if you could simply do it by texting, you have no awareness that other people are actually... other real people are involved in it.

HK: A public moment rather than a private moment.

AM: [Angela Wrapson] But it can be physically difficult to vote, I mean where I vote is a long way to walk, if you take your car it's difficult to park it, you can't find the polling station, it's in the middle of a college campus, there are no decent signs – I ended up at the swimming pool at one point *[laughter]*! I didn't know it was behind the Coca-Cola machine and through there! Why would it be?

PK: Just on that point I think we may be... we're not confusing the issue of voter turnout and participation but they are I think in the conception that some of us have here, they are slightly different and I think we can use new technology quite fruitfully to increase voter turnout. But in terms of addressing maybe some of the other questions that came up about who is setting the agenda, how do people become involved in the development of policies, those new forms of technology will only continue with problems I think that Kenyon has identified about people actually being actively engaged in the way the policy is developed. I don't think the new technology is a response to that, it's perhaps in response to people not having the desire to get up off the couch more than once every four years.

HK: There was a question in there which was about setting up a new political party, the idea of people being if you like implementers of what an electorate may want of them and that because of new technology you could actually make that happen. So here is another area in terms of democracy where interactive technology could be functional. What do we think about that?

JM: Yes, I thought that sounded more interesting, because it's not the method, I mean obviously you could improve voting methods through electronics and everything else, it's whether the process of voting is surrounded by some kind of relatively rich process of debate. I mean if you had a political party that was actually using a kind of rolling process of consultation, electronic consultation of its members to generate a new kind of debate, I think that would be a really interesting innovation. It's not that I'm against people doing things electronically *[laughs]* but its how you then generate the...

- HK: The quality of it.
- JM: ... that supports that, yes the quality of process around the electronic decision making or voting.
- HK: There was a question that came up then which was about... from the woman at the back, that it's all very well that we talk about consultation but who is it that's consulted with and do we actually end up consulting with people who are already engaged anyway and we don't really go to the people that are currently not being reached.
- JM: Well I will say this for the Scottish Executive, that they are definitely on the case as regard to that. I mean how well they do it, one can discuss but it really is one of their headline things, to reach what they call *unpowered voices* and the Scottish Civic Forum is quite heavily involved in that work. We have a network of 8 regional co-ordinators who only work one day a week, but what they do and almost spend all of their time doing is trying to get in touch with people in communities who have no previous experience of taking part in any political process and actually getting to them, discussing what the problems are, bringing them together, finding out from each individual perspective what the barriers are and trying to remove those barriers. So there is a kind of base-level work going on around that now in Scotland but I'm not in a position to assess how successful it's been at this stage.
- HK: Now another question that came up was around the tension between participatory democracy and representative democracy – the idea that we're expecting to draw more and more people in the business of it and yet that that can actually set up tensions with those who are elected in the traditional ways and I suppose it feeds back to the idea of this new party which would do things differently. So is there that tension do you see, are you conscious of that, yes Kenyon?
- KW: Yes I think it's potentially so. I mean there's no doubt at all that explicitly in the work of the constitutional commission and of the consultative steering group, there is a commitment to be moving towards participative democracy. The words are all there but I have always made a distinction between decision making and decision taking; by decision making I mean forming the decision, shaping the decision, the policy. Ultimately if you have any kind of representative body, even in a participative democracy, that has to take the final decision in appropriate areas, the Scottish Parliament for example. But it's the decision making... I know that may be a rather false distinction but you understand the distinction of each and the decision shaping if you like in which people should be much, much more involved in the shaping of policies, the development of policies and the argument around them.

And in fact I was also a member of the sub group which drew up the code of conduct for the parliament and I put in a minority report which like many of my other ideas was dually consigned, not quite to the waste bin, but to a little paragraph and my minority report argued... I argued that the job of a representative in a participative democracy is qualitatively different from the job of

a representative in a representative democracy. In a representative democracy you appoint your representative to take the decisions on your behalf, you have a manifesto etc, in a participative democracy... and I argued for a code of conduct which was much, much stricter and much, much more open and talked about that which was not just about the legal limits to what you had to declare, any gifts you get and you have to declare any interests you have and so on, well it wouldn't be just about these things, it would actually be spelling out what was expected and in the course of it, just one more point, in the course of it I also made a recommendation that such a code of conduct or code of practice might be separate or even job description. I mean who writes the job descriptions for MPs? They write it themselves: no thank you! Even a job description but that job description would make a distinction between the role of the Constituency MSP and the role of the List MSP, because every Scottish voter has 8 MSPs, I don't know whether we all realise that – every Scottish voter has got 8 members of Scottish parliament, one for the constituency and 7 for the larger region. Is there job exactly the same? Without making second-class citizens of any of them, proper definition might go some way to defending us, Joyce, from the possibility of the system being changed in the future because of not liking those in power. For example what I suggested was in a rather simplistic way that the role of the constituency MSP might be that of a GP for example, a General Practitioner, and the role of the 7 for the region might be specialists, each of them would be expected to specialise in a particular area – education, health, whatever it was and become more knowledgeable in the hope that the constituency MSP would say to somebody 'Oh your problem's a bit complex, go and see Mr Bloggs'. I was told by the political parties that that was absolute pie in the sky because how could a Labour MSP in the constituency possibly recommend somebody to go to an SNP man, okay it would all come under the party... the point I'm making is a very simple one really and it is that participative democracy demands different behavioural patterns...

HK: From the politicians.

KW: From its politicians.

FM: And also from these parties, that they would do something more like what the gentleman in the middle there says which is that they would canvas for membership and perhaps attract members by having this more participatory approach where people are asked their views. Do the Scottish parties do anything like that at the moment?

KW: Only through the conferences, not anything directly.

JM: The Greens are the ones that are most innovative in their internal structures and in fact the Scottish Civic Forum sponsored a meeting at which Mark Ballard, a Green MSP, promised to vote, to take the mandate from a kind of consultative meeting of residents on the issue of prostitution tolerance votes and he did, they came to a collective decision in the meeting and he voted according to that decision and that was a kind of little experiment.

HK: We had a question about who sets the cultural norms and values, who sets the agenda. Do we have executive democracy where folk up there set it for us or can

you create something else where others are able to impact on the norms and values and so forth. In seeking to have more engagement and to find new forms of participative democracy, of going out and asking people for their opinions – how different is that from Philip Gould from the Labour Party running his polling groups and his focus groups. Many are concerned that you end up having... it's rather like selling commodities, that you actually make policy based on what the folks out there are saying they want and without enough debate. If you don't have those very careful subtle debates and aren't involved in that, you could go for a very crude form of politics and how do you iron that one out? In our attempts to have more engagement and the folks being involved more, you crudify it and you end up with a populism.

JM: Well I think the last thing that the Scottish Civic Forum has ever been accused of is crudifying things, confusing things, smoothing things over, caring too much about consensus but I think everyone who's been involved in the civic process in Scotland is interested in the kind of enriching and making the political debate more complex. That is in conflict with a media-driven culture which obviously prefers things simple, big headlines and appealing, the idea which is very appealing to some politicians in the Scottish Executive and elsewhere of appealing over the heads of all the people who get involved in this kind of civic debate who almost by definition are not typical to the wider public.

The question is... what happens then though is that the views of the wider public become a kind of projection of the worst prejudices that you can get the public to utter if you look for a knee-jerk response. So overcoming that, getting the wider public drawn into a process of discussion which actually shares responsibility and requires people to think about the balances of judgment that are involved in political decision making, that really does involve the giving away of power. But the paradox of that and Kenyon's the man who's articulated this best, is that power is exactly like love: in order to strengthen the political process, in order to draw people into the political process, in order to give it more legitimacy, politicians really have to get clever and wise about giving away power. They have to say share this responsibility of this really tough decision with us and we will give you a real chance of influencing it and that's the only way the political process can be kind of re-strengthened and reborn – you have to have politicians with the imagination to give power away.

Somebody up there said that people never give power away unless you force them and there are two narratives of what happened in the Scottish Constitutional Reform: one is the Labour party were terrified of the SNP, they gave the Scottish Parliament because they had to; but that's not the whole story, there was an element of statesmanship there, there was an element of saying if we're going to have a Scottish parliament, let's not have it on a Westminster, adversarial model, let's go for a more concessional model that might be more attractive to twenty-first century voters. Donald Dewar thought that way and the parliament is to some extent a legacy of that thinking.

HK: And then the last thing before I take the next group was this thing about localism, how can local people initiate policy and we've had this suggestion which is that you would have petitioning or that you'd find other forms or that you'd have access to committees which in turn might be able to initiate policy and legislation.

A suggestion has been made there about could there not be a citizens constitution. Should there be a written constitution? Can we have a quick answer, are you in favour, does it...?

KW: Well in a sense Scotland already has two written constitutions, it has the Treaty of Union which was a treaty between two nations and not an act for Westminster parliament, it might be relevant whether you agree with that, and it has the Scotland act that sets up the Scottish parliament so I mean a lot of these... although a lot of these are capable of being theoretically overturned by Westminster's [idolasis?] claim to ask for group sovereignty, in practice we know that they can't be...

HK: But the Treaty couldn't possibly be considered a citizens constitution.

KW: No, no.

HK: And some people would say that the Scotland Act wasn't...

KW: One sentence, I have to come back to my central thesis which is that we really... and I can't identify what I mean in detail but we do have a major debate in the next period to identify the processes, the mechanism, the institutions by which that can happen, that kind of thing by which citizens really can participate without falling into populism on the one hand. I mean I face it in the NHS, I'm a Consultant for an NHS group in Teesside and there you've got the problem of how you get patient public involvement without just the pressure groups who want to keep this hospital open or that particular unit and so on, it's a question to which I have no easy answer but I think it is a major question.

PD: Can I just say quickly, there is a kind of schism running through this conversation, there is a love of the people and a real fear of the people, the couch potatoes, the people who don't debate or just subject to media popular demand, I'd like for people in this room to put their hands up who think they're like that because nobody in this room thinks they're like that, it's always somebody else. It's the old argument about the masses, the masses are always subject to populism but the masses are always somebody other than us and it does seem to me that there's a big problem here and it's a problem that we won't iron out today but it needs to be put on the table very clearly.

HK: Now the woman there with the grey suit, you had your hand up in the last round.

AM: [Angela Wrapson]... I'm Angela Wrapson from the Hansard Society in Scotland, what I wanted to say was this is a very young parliament, it's six years old, do you think the fact that it has tried to be so friendly to the public, that it actually has a visitor centre, it has a participation service as key, it has a team which goes out to deal with young people in schools throughout Scotland, do you think that all those factors say within the next 10 years will encourage a higher percentage of voting?

JM: They might, I mean certainly a huge number of school children through the Scottish Parliament are seeing their building and getting... I think it is universally

acknowledged that the staff at the Scottish Parliament, whatever people think of MSPs, are a really classy act, they're a very, very fine bunch of people and tremendously committed to the idea of building some kind of new democracy in Scotland and they do a wonderful educational job for everyone who goes there and is shown around the building, taking them through the procedures of the parliament and they really come out very inspired and enthused and I think Lord Puttnam's Hansard Group who were up, were very inspired by that just a few weeks ago. So there's a tremendous idealism there and it could have an impact but I think there are still anxieties that even the geographical spread of school children coming into the parliament is not very even and it's down to resources and getting people there and all the rest of it. But just on the question of citizens constitution, I do think having been through a whole thing of The Scottish Constitutional Convention of the 1990's, it was a remarkable moment, I mean you can't sustain that sort of thing for very long, most citizens have other things to do than to take part in constitutional affairs mercifully but you know there are these moments when some element of civil society and I don't... I mean I absolutely agree with what's been said about it, a certain kind of people get involved and an awful lot of them are professional groups or church groups or women's groups or something but there was this moment when it was a strange and interesting and remarkable thing to be involved in, when civil society just stood up and said enough and the feeling of it was remarkable and it had kind of echoes in other countries at the time and I think what happened in that despite the kind of huge inertia for the British constitution was a shift, there is a Scottish Parliament and what's more the Scottish Parliament is based on these four founding principles which are a little embryo constitution and which came out of that process and that is a shift. Heaven knows, things are always so stable in British constitutional politics and if they weren't we would have much more violence and much more conflict than we do but there was a moment when the citizens actually drafted a little mini constitution or at least a section of the citizens...

KW: Sorry, can I just come in on that, I think there is an important point to be added to what has just been said, I think that the watershed moment was the signing of the Claim of Right for Scotland. At the first meeting of the Constitutional Convention on March 30<sup>th</sup> 1989 everybody lined up to sign, Donald Dewar was the first and then all the rest to sign and all the representatives of the Scottish society, not just politicians, to sign that and it's on permanent display in the Donald Dewar Room, if you go to the Scottish Parliament and ask to see the Claim of Right, the original document and the Claim of Right is a simple... and that's almost a confusion because it's a simple statement that we acknowledge the right of the Scottish people to determine how they will be governed. That was the key point, how many of those Labour MPs realised what they were signing...

*[Laughter]*

KW: But the point is that document is there. Now the point I really want to make out of that is that because of that, the constitutional change was actually... home rule was home-made, it was made in Scotland, it wasn't made in smoke-filled rooms in Westminster. But what happens, particularly if you get a change of government, so that you have a different government and they try to make

changes in the Scotland's act, basic changes maybe to the electoral system, maybe to the numbers, well it's been tried already...

HK: The citizens might rise up again.

KW: They might but there ought to be some body in Scotland, some sort of constitutional commission or something which would debate these matters and not leave the debate to Westminster, as happened in the past, the Claim of Right demands that I think.

HK: Kenyon, thank you. The two final ones because you had your hand up in the last round and there's a chap up at the back.

AM: [Hugh Blair] I wanted to see what the panel think on the issue of great power because it's very noticeable that the most deprived constituencies in Scotland have about the lowest voting record of any and yet most of these people are not in the political parties or exercising great power. My hunch is that two things very cleverly have been introduced, I'm strongly in favour of both of them, one is free travel for the over 60's which is a massive success throughout Scotland, anyone who tries to use public transport between say 9.30 and 4.00 is well aware of that, nearly everybody is on everything, pensioners and the other is improving the loss of people in care homes and nursing homes and these are two excellent things but can things like that if they're cleverly introduced by the politicians, can they militate against democratic participation because people have been given something very concrete to hold onto?

HK: Grey power, the chap there and then this one and then we'll finish.

AM: [Willie Sullivan] Thanks for giving me two shots but the reason I want to come back is I didn't think that I made that point very clear about how the shaped culture was and it comes back to the point made here, you know I'm saying do politicians really have the power to shape the value system and population and if they don't, who does have that power and what's happening? We have another thing, a set of consumer values here in the way that these television votes happen, we have a schism because we don't want to give people power because we're not sharing a value system because they're not engaging in the debate in that and who's setting that value system and the politicians aren't reacting to that I think.

HK: And of course the media has a very powerful voice.

AM: [Willie Sullivan] And where's the media in that? I dare say a product, are they there to communicate or are they there to sell a product? We might ask that question.

AM: [?] To be honest I think it's kind of moved on, I mean we've...

HK: Well if it has because really we're over time, okay thanks. No I'm not bringing anybody else in again, finally just anything on the grey power?

*[Talking across each other]*

- HK: Yes okay, so young power, grey power...
- KW: There is one MSP who represents a senior citizen community party who was elected in one of the regions and he certainly believes that next time there'll be more of them and the experience of Tommy Sheridan and Habber is that...
- PK: I think to focus on a more optimistic view, I don't think older people will be put off by free travel, if anything optimistically we may be naïve, maybe it will encourage greater political participation, greater mobilisation and there are signs of that I think.
- HK: Okay and just this final one about our culture, about where our values, societal value is coming from.
- JM: Obviously at the moment they're coming very much from media and I think we do have a generation of politicians, both Westminster and Hollywood who are very, very frightened of the media, they run scared, they take too much of their agenda from the media and they don't give the media a good run for its money in terms of trying to at least argue with them about what the agenda should be and of course the agenda of the media tends to come from a particular place which is to do with conferring power of politics, kind of role power and also just preferring simplicities to complexities. But I do think that politicians could do more to shift that kind of debate and I think we really do have to think harder about the kind of narratives that capture public imagination. I mean I think quite a lot of the issues around the Scottish Parliament are just to do with people who are all typical of a generation of politicians who lack kind of courage and imagination and eloquence in actually stating visuals of society and really engaging people with that and I think politicians should really stop running scared of the media, it's part of their job to at least suggest ways of setting the agenda and the better they are at doing that, the better the quality of the debate that we ought to have in public.

***END OF MORNING SESSION***