

\$48,000

*David Z Hughes
Crowded Planet*

THANK YOU for the chance to have a say and hopefully contribute.

The Garnaut Interim Report shows every indication of meekly accepting unbridled compound interest growth in human numbers.

Australia – like all the other anglo-economies, USA, Canada, UK, NZ – has always needed the drug of population growth to stimulate the national obsession with private real estate speculation. In all cases this pathetic drug addiction is financed by the savings of others, notably the Yen carry trade. In all cases the anglo-economies rejoice in open free markets, and all have repetitive and deepening foreign debts.

This population-property drug trade has been worshipped as “growth” by 20th century ANU growth-niks. But ignoring the population elephant in the global warming room will lead to flawed and costly public policy for the 21st century. The interim report notes that to equal 30% emission reductions in Europe, Australia must cut emissions by 40-45% because of our record high birth numbers and our record high immigrant numbers. But then leaves the root cause of that tougher reduction task hanging in mid-air, with no further thoughts or plans of action.

Pretending population growth doesn't exist is a foolish and blinkered approach. It ignores the cheapest way to reduce emissions long into the future. Immigration must be reduced to nil net, with annual intakes set by Treasury and not the rent-seekers in Immigration. Births must be reduced to nil net births-deaths. For the federal government to spend \$1.4 billion per year on the baby bonus (*\$5000 x 280,000 births from July 08*) to encourage yet more babies is madness when facing \$10 billion pa costs of a climate change ETS.

A baby born today will live for 80 years. Our average per capita carbon (ie carbon dioxide equivalent) emissions now exceed 25 tonnes per annum. But say 20 tpa optimistically assuming some eventual success climbing the vertical twin peaks of car-love and geo-sequestration. $80 \text{ yr} \times 20 \text{ tpa} = 1,600$ tonnes of carbon emissions from the life of every Australian baby born today. One thousand six hundred tonnes per cutesy bubba.

The lifetime climate change emission cost of each baby is \$48,000. Using a carbon price of \$30 per tonne, $1,600 \text{ t} \times \$30 = \$48,000$. Before breeding, will each mother be required to purchase \$48,000 worth of ETS credits as some AMA members are suggesting? Alternatively, by using family planning and spacing, will each child foregone lead to a \$48,000 bonus from government, or a \$48,000 profit by selling one of the one-child or two-child quota ETS permits back to the Carbon Reserve Bank? Any more than two planned children and the parents are either extremist religious nuts, or welfare class multi-father single mothers, or aborigines living north of the Sydney-Perth line.

Family planning is dirt cheap. There are a number of newer lower dose oral contraceptives not submitted to the PBS – Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme. However using older “trusted” brands listed on the PBS, efficient family planning can cost about 75 cents per day, or \$275 per year. Take 30 years as a woman’s fertile time of 16-45 years, so a maximum lifetime family planning cost is: $\$275 \times 30 \text{ yr} = \8250 . Competition with high margin doctor/pharmacy cartels could lower this cost if the oral contraceptive pill was available in corner stores and supermarkets – as in most of our east and south-east Asian neighbours.

Australia’s appalling population growth can be looked at another way. Quoting from the February 2008 newsletter of *Sustainable Population Australia*, the nation’s overall population increase is one additional person every 1 min 42 sec. Made up of

- one birth every 1 min 56 sec;
- one death every 3 min 58 sec;
- one net international migrant every 3 min 5 sec
- (figures derived from ABS 3101.0 and 3222.0).
- www.population.org.au

No nation will find the discipline to stabilise its greenhouse emissions without the discipline to first stabilise its population. No nation can make giant, formidable cuts to its greenhouse emissions:– 50 - 70 - 90% - without giant, formidable cuts in its population. This means substantial and sustained public campaigns to reduce population by blanket education and providing universal family planning. More women's sexual health clinics than there are Starbucks Coffees. Then also flipping the mass immigration coin to emigration and cajoling, paying people to leave and stay away.

Not that many years ago, in 1990, the first year of the UN Kyoto decades, Australia's population was only 16 million. A population reduction target to something like 16 million, must be part of any costly, disruptive, national plan to combat climate change. If the poor can't afford high priced electricity, they certainly can't afford more than one or two children.

Briefly some other issues:

Peak Oil.

Peak oil is ignored by the Interim Report. The metronomic decline of Australia's oil fields, will go hand-in-hand with ever worsening balance-of-payments and foreign debt, and ever increasing cost of petrol and diesel. Excessive food miles, outer suburbs, bogans, freeways, and inner-city road tunnels will be stone dead. Perhaps some lowering of petroleum emissions.

Forests.

Third world de- and re-forestation. The interim report implies that developing countries chop down trees for fun. Implies that it will be easy to stop the logging, and create carbon credits that can be traded (cheaply) by Australia. Perhaps it's the relentless economic growth in the BRICs creating the demand for timber and paper products. Demand hard to blithely switch off.

Feed-In Tariffs.

One of the public mechanisms that resulted in the boom in renewable energy in Denmark, Germany and Holland was and is legislated feed-in tariffs. This is a guaranteed, all comers price, for households and villages generating grid

electricity from small solar, wind, and mini-hydro. It overcomes the asymmetry of little people negotiating with giant utilities over price and access. Only South Australia is about to introduce a feed-in tariff and then only for solar PV of 44 cents per kWh. We need a national feed-in-tariff for small (say less than 5 MW) renewable generators. Perhaps like Europe, with a tapered run-down after 10 or 15 years from the installation of each plant. Mini generators can then raise bank project finance on guaranteed income streams without additional mortgages on houses and farms.

Recoverable R&D.

Early R&D – Wind Prospecting. From personal experience as a give-it-away wind prospector on Kangaroo Island SA, Flinders Island Tas, and Lake Tilba NSW. I was financing and erecting weather masts and data loggers for potential community and private mini wind farms. Its a long 2 – 4 year process, and difficult to recover any costs let alone full costs from drought stressed farmers. This might be an area covered by the interim report where early mover R&D benefits a wider community than the individual firm and client. Before committing to a wind turbine on a site, Europeans insist on monitoring wind for at least two years. Broad brush state wind atlases are beginning to appear. Yet CSIRO recommends monitoring on each and every proposed wind farm site for a full El Nino cycle, possibly 7 to 10 years, in Australia's highly variable climate.

Letter One.

This is a letter sent to The Age 25/3 and unpublished.

Titled: GARNAUT FAILURE

Garnaut's proposed international emissions system rewards failure.

From UNPP figures, in 1950 The Philippines on 20-million and Thailand on 20.6-mil had equal numbers and roughly equal levels of development.

Over the next 55 years, Thailand has committed to raising living standards through education, industrial development, and innovative family planning campaigns (Mechai "Mr Condom"). In 2005 Thailand's population reached 63-mil.

The Philippines, by contrast, was mired in poverty, unemployment, crime and catholicism, and in 2005 reached 84.5-mil.

Under per-capita carbon quotas, The Philippines will be given 21.5+ million more quotas than Thailand. This penalises effort and economic efficiency.

For the same reason per capita carbon quotas disadvantage China against India. India's government targets for family planning have failed every year since 1952. India - once with half the population of China - will reach and then vastly surpass China's strictly controlled numbers in the 50 - 100 year timeframe of carbon emissions trading.

Garnaut was once a friend of China.

Letter Two.

This was a letter sent to The Australian 27/3 and unpublished.

Titled: ADMIRAL GARNAUT

Like Nelson, Admiral Garnaut can put a telescope to his blind eye when it suits him. (Garnaut has faith in market forces, 27/3).

Australia's rapid population growth, according to his Interim Climate Change report, means if we are to equal Europe's 30% carbon cuts, Australia has to make cuts of 45-50%.

The report suggests bending the rules for high immigration countries like Canada and Australia,

"A simple and transparent system with minimal intervention from government" is at odds with a legacy of pro-natalist policies. Just one - Costello's baby bonus - is a \$1.35-billion intervention designed to increase carbon emissions for the next 80 years. Shadow Treasurer Malcolm Turnbull estimates of the ETS system in total will raise \$10-billion in new "taxes" in 2010 (Cut tax, carbon to green economy, 27/3). Big powerful departments pulling in opposite directions.

Will Garnaut consider the cost of partly reducing emissions by pro-actively reducing the birth rate and putting a moratorium on immigration? Would population control be cheaper than an ETS with billion dollar handouts to aluminium, cement and steel, and imposing billion dollar costs on the electricity and welfare industries? Does the Admiral have the courage to survey - let alone navigate - such dangerous shoals?

Letter Three .

This letter (as yet unpublished) was sent to The Sunday Age on 6/4 in response to a good letter that day to the editor titled "Mothers shouldn't bear

the cost of growth” arguing for more generous maternity leave. My rejoinder was titled: COST OF MOTHERHOOD

Mothers of five from East Brighton are globally irresponsible in wanting yet more money for breeding in the shape of paid maternity leave (The Sunday Age, 6/4).

They are as ignorant as most that Australia's population is rocketing upwards - record births, and record immigrants. Birth numbers - thanks to the village idiot \$5000 baby bonus - are now nearly three times death numbers.

Each baby born today will create a carbon emissions footprint of 1,600 tonnes - 80yrs x 20 tpy. Nothing Janice Tyquin can do to change her lifestyle from now till she dies can go close to reducing her own carbon footprint by this much.

The interim Garnaut report notes with dismay, that because of Australia's unsustainable population growth, cuts in greenhouse emissions of 30% in stable Europe, will require cuts of 45-50% in rapid growth Australia.

Paid maternity leave will increase breeders' smugness, increase their demands on the public purse, increase the birth rate, and will speed climate change.

* _ * _ *

What follows is a reprint of a relevant newspaper column from some months ago. How colonialist though, to urge family planning on third world countries without leading by example in the first world of high births USA and high births Australia?

Family planning to reduce emissions

The Australian p3 18 Sept 2007
Matthew Warren Environment writer

EXPANDING family planning programs in developing countries has been identified as one of the cheapest ways of reducing global greenhouse emissions this century while helping to alleviate poverty.

Heather D'Agnes, head of the population-health-environment program in the US Agency for International Development, said a rapid reduction in population growth in developing countries would play a critical role in reducing demand for energy and pressure on other environmental systems such as fisheries and land clearing.

Visiting Australia for a series of meetings and forums this week, Ms D'Agnes said aggressive programs to keep the global population to the low end of growth ranges – between 7 billion and 11 billion by 2050 – was often overlooked as a relatively inexpensive and effective response to managing climate change.

The world's population is growing by about 80 million people each year, with almost all of this occurring in less developed countries, led by India, China, Pakistan, Nigeria, Ethiopia and Indonesia.

In 1994, the International Conference on Population and Development in Cairo estimated it would cost \$17 billion a year to roll out comprehensive family planning strategies in developing countries, excluding China and the Eastern Bloc countries.

Ms D'Agnes said slowing population growth would also alleviate poverty and improve health standards.

"If you look at the history of family planning, it's not expensive, it's using our development assistance in a way that we are just not treating people's illnesses but we are giving them the ability to make decisions about family sizes," she said.

"It's not just about giving people contraceptives, it's about changing their minds about their family size."

* _ * _ *

David Hughes gained a B.Sc from Melb Uni and did postgrad studies at various Unis on chemical oceanography, renewable energy and demography. He has worked for Mt Isa Mines, the ACF, ANSTO, FOE Aust, QCC and FOE UK and was a NGO delegate to the UN IMO London.

He manufactured rare earth magnets for 17 years, until killed by cheap knock-off copy Chinese imports. He has helped to build and race solar cars and solar boats.

He was jailed by the ACCC and State authorities from 2001 to 2007 for selling oral contraceptive pills over the Internet. The charges were "Being a corporation engaged in deceptive conduct". Quite a feat when Crowded Planet operated as a non-profit unincorporated sole trader. Links between Big Pharmas and the US FDA, and the power of the anti-contraceptives Religious Right all grew strongly in the Bush-Howard era.

He is now homeless, and mostly lives in an energy efficient but unregistered hatchback.

* _ * _ *