

311 GLENLUSK ROAD  
GLENLUSK TAS 7012 (phone 03 62 390 312)  
25 August 2000.

[jsct@aph.gov.au](mailto:jsct@aph.gov.au). Phone 02 62777 4002, fax 02 6277 4827.

Dear Sir/Madame,

**RE; INQUIRY INTO THE KYOTO PROTOCOL.**

Thank you for the opportunity to contribute to the above inquiry. I wish to comment on the following aspects:

I understand that we have already slipped behind in our targets to date, so I suspect that the whole exercise is pretty pointless. People in their individual lifestyles may be trying to live as 'lightly' as possible, but if we don't get a positive lead from the government and industry, we are doomed! All the glossy brochures of the Greenhouse Office don't give much hope as they reveal more gaps in what should be an all-embracing full out effort. Leasing one CNG car and the poor take-up of the Greenhouse Challenge will not even begin to set us on the right path.

I also notice the dreaded word "flexibility" in the Protocol. Now you know how adept industry is at exploiting this word: remember benzene in our petrol to maximise their profits, etc.

Firstly, I would like to present to you a picture of the ideal:

All the main emitters of Greenhouse Gases get together through their industry groups and talk over how to reduce these emissions **without carbon trading**, etc, but through the wise use of sustainable, appropriate technology and the greater use of public transport and car-pooling, etc. It will require a superhuman effort and a paradigm shift, much sacrifice and heaps of government money (which we have in the form of the surplus) and encouragement. This is the ideal and we can do it if we want to.

**1. The implications for Australia proceeding or not to ratifying and meeting its target emissions by 2008.**

It would be unthinkable for Australia NOT to ratify this very lenient impost of limiting our Greenhouse Gases to 108% of 1990 emissions (we negotiated the highest permissible limit and are now viewed as the best polluter per capita in the world, good on us!). It is the least we can do for the future of the earth, as now we know for sure that the temperature of the earth is rising! It is at best a hopeless compromise and depends on so many things happening soon. It's like us all being on a raft heading towards a waterfall, talking about trading various bits and pieces of the boat and boating apparatus while the yawning chasm comes towards us! I can't believe that such a sapient creature can be so stupid.

## 2. Conflicting theories on global warming and solutions.

I think that there is now a fair amount of agreement by believable researchers that global warming is taking place, although there may be disagreement on the extent of increase. Otherwise why would our very parsimonious PM agree to part with \$180M of our taxes to measures to reducing greenhouse gases?

The big problem is that the **average** increase is used: most people don't understand that the temperature will increase by more than 6-8 degrees C at middle latitudes!

## 3. Definitions and criteria on:

- **Grandfathering.** I don't like this one as it permits those filthy irresponsible polluters to continue their nefarious activities regardless. There should be punitive/persuasive measures to force them to meet minimum conditions as soon as possible or face the chop. There is already a change developing in that more shareholders are demanding that their companies adopt more environmentally-kind policies and procedures, so they might as well get used to the idea!
- **Trading credits.** This system is another method to avoid the inevitable need to reduce our emissions and will lead to rich countries lording it over poorer countries by buying up their lands and resources for "emission reduction units". This would be disastrous and would exacerbate the already perilous situation of poorer countries. A similar situation could result within a country as regards regional differences, either climatic or economic.
- **Carbon credits.** This will be a useful way for emitters and polluter countries and firms to 'buy' their way out of tackling the problem in an holistic way AT THE SOURCE. I don't like the idea of carbon trading in view of the inherent difficulties of the system and the fact that it permits the continued emission of greenhouse gases, etc. Surely with the development of sustainable methods and the continued refinement of processes and products, it should be possible to clean up our act and reduce our profligate use of resources.
- **Sequestration.** Seeking to total up the forests, etc, which are saving or putting aside carbon, etc, may seem like a good idea. However, it treats the riches of the earth like entries in a cashbook! We are stewards, not bookkeepers, and should be reducing the bloody mess at source rather than totting up figures on a balance sheet!
- **Revegetation.** I think it is cheating for Australia to want to include trees planted under Bush- and Land-care to be included, as these were funded by the public and not by the main polluters i.e. the coal-burning electric plants and the big transport companies. Also, it will be difficult to quantify the carbon saved in a forest as its nature changes so much over its life span. There would also be a temptation for marginal land to be bought up for use by large companies to plant out to save themselves having to

alter their polluting ways: this would lead to more monoculture, less farms, more drift of rural people to the towns and cities, etc.

- **Land management.** I am against the Australia Clause in the Protocol, and feel that we are being given an unfair advantage through it.

**4. Economic, environmental and social implications of a punitive approach to domestic regulation of industry (carbon tax and incentive-based approach)**

I like the idea of a persuasive approach to the regulation of industry. As we move from a product-based to service-based economy, surely it will be possible to change our energy and other policies and procedures from polluting to reducing, reusing, etc, and to use sustainable forms of energy. Carbon trading is fraught with difficulty as it will be an artificial system, subject to distortion and 'flexibility', and therefore unsatisfactory.

**CONCLUSION**

When we respond to Kyoto, let it be with greater emphasis on and effort devoted to reducing the poison at source, rather than the elaborate man-made (therefore flawed) system of sequestration, carbon and emission trading, wheeling and dealing, etc, which will not work. We could be a golden example to the rest of the world as one country that tackled it the right way!

Please contact me if you require further clarification, as these are an outline only of my concerns. I am happy for you to release my submission for public scrutiny.

Yours sincerely

Rick Calitz

Global heating 25 august