

To Senators on the Senate Select Committee on Climate Policy

I believe that climate change is already having a catastrophic effect on our planet and millions of people have already lost their lives through flood, drought, heatwaves etc. We also know that change is happening far faster than initially predicted. For example the melting of the icecaps. CAN WE AFFORD TO PUSSYFOOT AROUND WHILE WESTERN GOVERNMENTS AND BIG BUSINESS TRY TO HAVE THEIR CAKE AND EAT IT TOO? I DON'T THINK SO! David Spratt, co-author of the book "Climate Code Red: the case for emergency action" has said " I think the sad truth is that Western governments view of the climate is largely delusional.. They don't understand the evidence. And they don't understand that they don't understand. Many climate scientists say that at 2 degrees (of temperature rise), we'll actually go over the dangerous tipping point. If as many policy makers suggest we allow warming to 4 degrees, we won't recognize our planet: no rainforests, no ice sheets, most species dead. Scientist

James Lovelock says once you get to 4 degrees you'll go up to 6 degrees or 7 degrees because you'll lose the algae in the upper layers of the ocean which draws down carbon. The only parts of this planet which will be habitable will be south of Melbourne and north of London".

THE PROPOSED RUDD GOVERNMENT EMISSIONS TRADING SCHEME IS WORSE THAN USELESS with a pathetic emissions reduction target of 5 to 15 percent by 2020. It would be laughable if it were not so deadly serious. Most climate scientists agree that we need to reduce emissions by 25 to 40% minimum by 2020. The UN's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change concluded last year that the world needed to reduce its carbon emissions by 80% by 2050. This was based on the assumption that Arctic summer ice may be gone by the end of the century. IT IS NOW PREDICTED TO BE GONE WITHIN THE NEXT 5 YEARS! David Spratt again " ..our political process can't get to grips with solving fundamental problems anymore. It's about getting to the next election, the next news cycle. If there's a deep-seated problem its about solving 10% of it, putting it off or blaming the opposition. We've seen it in the UK Stern Report and the Australian Garnaut Report where both said : Here's the science. It's real

ly severe. Here's what we should do but that's too economically difficult so let's do something really weak and won't work. And that contradiction is accepted. It's as if these people have had a lobotomy!". Global warming has already caused a temperature increase of 1 degree centigrade. According to the current science, if we can limit temperature rise to below 2 degrees we have a hope of avoiding the worst calamities of climate change. BUT THIS REQUIRES IMMEDIATE AND DRASTIC ACTION.

WESTERN COUNTRIES HAVE BEEN LARGELY RESPONSIBLE FOR CLIMATE CHANGE IN THE FIRST PLACE THROUGH THE BURNING OF FOSSIL FUEL SO IT IS UP TO THEM TO TAKE MAJOR RESPONSIBILITY IN AVERTING A CATAclysmic PLANETARY DISASTER.

FIRSTLY THIS MEANS THAT POLLUTERS MUST PAY. Currently this is not the case. CARBON TRADING BENEFITS THE HEAVY POLLUTERS through free permits to pollute and the trading of permits. It does nothing to really reduce pollution. Carbon offsetting through for example the creation of plantations often has dire consequences for indigenous people with loss of land and means of survival. There have been huge protests around the world. Carbon offsetting can mean that polluters make even more money at the expense of others. Moreover for all the effort and saving that ordinary people contribute through energy efficient appliances and so on, this just takes more heat off the big polluters as the overall % reduction target is capped.

The affluent nations put forward small answers to big problems tinkering a little here and there to look as though they're doing something. But this issue will not go away. Biofuels for example are often touted as one solution but biofuels compete for land with crops grown for food. They cause the cost of food to skyrocket which can be catastrophic in the majority world. And clean coal is a joke! The technology isn't there and it would take far too long to develop it. Plus even then there are grave doubts that it would work.

WE NEED REALISTIC EMISSIONS REDUCTION TARGETS AND WE NEED TO FIND THE MOST EFFECTIVE WAYS TOWARDS THIS WITHOUT PENALISING THE MOST VULNERABLE WHO DID NOT CREATE THE PROBLEM. WHILE AT THE SAME TIME MAKING THOSE WHO DID, RESPONSIBLE.

Climate change cannot be considered without climate change justice. It has been suggested that transition to a zero-carbon economy would need to include:

- \* MASSIVE INVESTMENT IN RENEWABLES.
- \* THE SYSTEMATIC CLOSING DOWN OF COAL-FIRED POWER STATIONS
- \* THE REVITALISATION OF CHEAP PUBLIC TRANSPORT
- \* RAPID CURBING OF AVIATION
- \* A SHIFT AWAY FROM THE PURSUIT OF MASS PRODUCTION AND CONSUMPTION.

These are very tall orders and it will take an aware, determined and courageous government to seriously attempt to address them. It will demand monumental adjustments from everyone. But the alternative is a trashed planet for future generations to inherit and possibly the end of life as we know it.

Name: Maggie Poole-Johnson