

To Senators on the Senate Select Committee on Climate Policy,

Any Emissions Trading Scheme [ETS] intended as a means to slow or reverse climate change is premature: there are significant numbers of well-qualified scientists around the world who disagree that climate change is caused by man-made emissions. Until the scientific world gets its act together, we should disconnect emissions reduction strategies from climate change. That doesn't negate the need to reduce emissions, and it is clear that we should proceed with an effective scheme to do exactly that. However, an ETS is not proven to be the most effective method for reducing emissions, and a badly designed ETS, such as the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme [CPRS] proposed by the Government, will be worse than useless. Most people agree it has an unacceptably weak target, and a design which over-compensates polluters at the expense of the community and environment.

#### OBJECTIVES

We have TWO major objectives, and they are not necessarily linked:-

- (1) We need to address the effects of climate change -- this applies regardless of whether we are causing it, and whether we can do anything at all to minimise these effects.
- (2) We must reduce carbon pollution, because whether or not it contributes to climate change, it certainly has a negative effect on our health and that of the planet, and we certainly are going to run out of mineral oil.

#### ADDRESSING EFFECTS OF CLIMATE CHANGE

There must be strategies developed and implemented to enable us to live with the probable effects of climate change, regardless of anything we may or may not be able to do to slow or reverse the onset of these effects. These strategies must be aimed at living with these effects with the least loss of health, life and economic well-being, and should consider:-

- (a) water availability to drier regions, incl piping water long distances
- (b) regulation of agriculture to eliminate inappropriate crops & processes
- (c) relocation of residents and industries, and
- (d) limiting population growth.

#### EMISSIONS REDUCTION STRATEGIES

Although an ETS is one possible strategy, there must be a better way than the CPRS. After considering all the options, if the CPRS is still considered necessary, we must redesign it to overcome the major objections listed above. Other strategies for reducing emissions, such as a mandatory renewable energy targets, a renewable energy feed-in tariff, energy efficiency standards for homes and commercial buildings, fuel efficiency standards, investment in energy-efficient public transport and ending the logging of Australia's native forests must all be included in the Federal Government's holistic emissions reduction plan.

#### APPROACH

Please listen to all the scientists, not just those toeing the IPRS line, and certainly not just the politicians. Listen to the experts who offer their advice to you during this inquiry, listen to the people of Australia and make the right decision in your recommendations.

Climate Change Minister Penny Wong has described the CPRS as 'better than nothing', but she is wrong. It is worse than useless, and quite possibly will not address either objective -- the emissions reduction objective or the climate change objective.

Australia needs a comprehensive strategic plan which addresses both carbon emissions reduction and living with the effects of climate change. This must include a strong, ambitious and fair emissions reduction plan, not a plan that protects polluters and stands in the way of the change we need. It must also include a holistic climate change plan, focused on living with the effects of climate change regardless on whether we, and the rest of the world, are able to make any significant reduction in these effects.

Name: Robert Burke