

Thankyou for receiving my submission.. I have read the Consultation Paper.Let's initially reflect on the opening paragraph , referring to our Tasmanian Aboriginal people as First People, living on this island for some 2,000 generations. If one takes a generation to equate to 20 years, then our island has been populated for a minimum of 40,000 years.

Estimates of the population of Tasmanian Aboriginal first people are variable , but a generally acceptable figure seems to lie between 4,000 and 10,000. It is sobering to consider that this population lived , as the Consultation Paper recognises , with a connection to “ family, land , sea and community “. I'd suggest there are lessons to be learned here, particularly when a projected population goal for Tasmania now hopes to exceed 650,000 within a few decades. Realistically, can such a population live with a sustainable connection to family, land, sea and community ?

The Consultation Paper failed to mention the current global Climate Emergency. This omission surely must devalue any of the recommendations made, or goals set , by the Department of State Growth. How can the Department realistically discuss “ wellbeing” and “ sustainable population growth” without considering the large body of international scientific data, much of it now validated , peer reviewed, and evidence based? Reports from the IPCC, the World Economic Forum, the World Bank, to mention a few.

I'd suggest the Department of State Growth consider some of the following , internationally recognised , issues, when planning for the future of our State:

- # the concept of a circular economy

- # the concept of “ degrowth “ (viz Treasurer Jim Chalmers recent paper)

- # the concept of regenerative agriculture (ref: Farmers for Climate Change)

- # the concept of population management (Zero Population Growth , not financially rewarding families for having more children)

Our planet is currently struggling with major critical environmental issues , such as habitat destruction, species extinctions, environmental degradation, ocean acidification, air and fresh water pollution with chemicals and micro plastics . Why do I need to mention these issues? The information is in the public domain, yet apparently not recognised, nor factored in to the Consultation Paper by the Department of State Growth.

I suggest if we are taking a wholistic future view of our state, and where we want it to be in the next 3 decades, then we need to pay serious attention to the issues I've drawn attention to above. Fine tuning the strategy might include:

- A) facilitate migration, rather than breeding

- B) recognise that for a society to achieve the proposed state of “ wellbeing” aspired to in the Consultation Paper, then fundamental building blocks such as access to primary health care, education, housing and community safety are a given. Further on, goals such as Tax reformation, equitable income distribution etc are required.

- C) protecting and restoring habitat. From a human perspective this essentially equates to healthy cities initially, and again there is ample data available to achieve such an outcome. This will

obviously require collaboration between planners, developers , funders/ investors and of course the community itself. A demonstrated method of achieving community input is via the Citizens Assembly or Participatory Democracy approach.

On a broader scale, habitat has to include the natural environment.

It is simplistic to consider population growth alone, and set a future target or figure. The Consultation Paper rightfully recognises challenges such as our ageing population , the need for migration, the challenge of employment for our young folk. I hope I have broadened the scope of thought by drawing attention to some of the interrelated and complex issues identified above.

Thankyou for your consideration.

Sincerely, Scott Bell