

Dear Professor Garnaut and your committee,

I make the following points for consideration by your committee:

1. greenhouse targets

I urge you to encourage the government - with the evidence of course – to commit itself to the highest possible greenhouse targets at the earliest possible date, ie to set targets based on the evidence. ACF reports that a report by McKinsey & Company has found Australia could reduce emissions to 30 per cent below 1990 levels by 2020, and it would cost Australian families less than \$1 a day. I believe a similar finding was released late last year. The ACF also reports that the 2002-03 drought cost Australia \$A10 billion and the total cost of a 30 per cent cut in emissions by 2020 would be less than a third of this. While Australian reduction in greenhouse gas emissions will not save future droughts without the world following suit, Australia must also be in the vanguard - act more like western European countries than the USA.

2. mandatory green energy use in factories and houses

Although this cannot be done all at once, due to the necessary infrastructure, instead of (or as well as) price signals to move to green energy, mandatory and increasing percentages of green energy each year to be used in electricity generation and use, and ideally fuels like petrol, are more equitable than price signals. These allow richer people to continue to drive SUVs, leave lights on all night and so on - which indeed might become an even more significant sign of conspicuous consumption. Pricing electricity from various sources according to its externalities AND determining mandatory percentages of renewable sources as the infrastructure can support it, and as the new technologies that Australia can participate in pioneering (if we can get more young people to do science degrees) produce alternatives to oil and so on should be combined strategies.

3. factoring in preserving old growth and other forests

From all that I have read, the proposed huge pulp mill in Tasmania appears to be environmental madness - destroying Tasmanian forests at a rapid rate, producing pollution that will threaten fishing, agriculture and other industries and all to move one step up the processing chain. Gunns uses bullying standover tactics and there are sufficient ALP government members willing to go along with them. I urge your enquiry to include mechanisms by which industries that will add to greenhouse emissions must pay a levy that will cover the cost to other industries, people's health and the environment.

4. taxation rather than carbon trading

Levies paid by polluting industries should be spent on reversing the damage of global warming - ie a taxation system rather than carbon trading would allow more direction by government. I have heard reports that the carbon trading schemes are not reducing carbon emissions as much as the trading suggests, while the profits go into private hands rather than (at least also) the public purse for large scale interventions that will clearly be necessary to shift a whole economy from reliance on coal and oil to reliance on wind, sun, and so on.

I look forward to the report - and an Australian economy that is not suffering because of its blindness concerning environmental problems,

Professor Chilla Bulbeck
Professor of Women's Studies, School of Social Sciences,
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences,
ADELAIDE UNIVERSITY SA
AUSTRALIA