

The Climate Change (State Action) 2008 Act appropriately provided formal legislative mechanisms for independent review and adaptive government management. These were removed following repeals of sections of the Act, including the abolition of the Tasmanian Climate Action Council.

I agree with the Independent Review that Tasmania needs guided, specific climate change mitigation from the Gutwein Liberal Government in order to deliver holistic, effective and informed action aimed at building climate resilience and reducing emissions in Tasmania. This is essential in my opinion.

The following statement of a former and current Liberal Minister Roger Jaensch : *"Native forest harvesting has been part of the Tasmanian landscape for generations... It is a testament to how long-term sustainable those industries can be and that land use can be"* is a wishful statement - not based on science or careful, regulated collection of data. It was printed in The Advocate newspaper on 30.4.21 the day before the 2021 State election. That election was called and conducted a full year earlier than required.

This unsubstantiated statement, quoted in the previous paragraph, was made during a rushed release of an **Opportunities Paper 2021 (*Developing a new Climate Change Action Plan for Tasmania*)** which sought public submissions, yet was poorly publicised. Submissions closed two days before that State election took place, **and** during the short **5 week** caretaker phase when Premier Gutwein was supposed to continue to act responsibly for the sake of good interim governance.

However, it was impossible to speak to any Government politicians seeking re-election at that time, as all appeared to be too busy even to attend key statewide local election forums during the caretaker period. Labor, Green and Independent candidates made themselves available but inevitably struggled with discussion of this **Climate Opportunities Paper 2021**, thrown so quickly into the public sphere.

This unseemly, rushed and unfair policy release coincided with the release of a much looked for Environment policy from Minister Jaensch. Despite all of this, 34 organisations and 17 individuals (I was one) determinedly struggled to comply with the government's unrealistic and unfair time frame of **not just** the election but also responding to this long-awaited **Climate Change Action Plan for Tasmania**.

This current **Independent Review - delivered by consulting firm Jacobs Group** - recommends a complementary set of principles to deliver appropriately and effectively, the provisions of an improved Climate Change Act, including improved communication. However voters could be forgiven for doubting both the previous and current Gutwein State governments' sincerity with regard to offering "opportunities" for **"consultation with the Tasmanian community"**. This was despite the clear majority concern of its citizens.

The earlier repeals of sections of the 2008 Act - including the abolition of the Tasmanian Climate Action Council - seemed to indicate a leniency towards emissions growth and of deferring, rather than pursuing "planning" for and "action" on Climate Change. This appears to be evident from statements such as the **Review Recommendation #2** of the **Independent Review** delivered by the Jacobs Group Australia (page 4).

A State-wide decreased emissions target would **maintain** our currently much vaunted zero-emissions status, to this point almost solely due to a moratorium on land clearing in the period following the 2013 signing of the **"Tasmanian Forest Agreement"**. Tasmania's zero-emissions status formed a key part of **"A Message from the Minister"** which appeared at the beginning of the **Opportunities Paper 2021 (*Developing a new Climate Change Action Plan for Tasmania*)** issued by Minister for Climate Change - prior to the 2021 State Election, Peter Gutwein.

Premier Gutwein (premier at the time and premier still) did not, however, in his Message attribute the prior lower emissions in the Forestry sector to a previous Liberal State government's temporary moratorium on logging some high conservation listed native forests. This temporary moratorium had occurred after the shocking and immediate tearing up of the long and painfully negotiation of the **"Tasmanian Forest Agreement"** by Liberal Premier Hodgman. Its signing was significant during the Gillard Federal Government .

Logging in those high conservation areas was later permitted under Peter Gutwein's pre 2021 government with zero emissions dating from **prior** to his ending the valued and valuable moratorium.

As Premier since May 2021 - albeit with a slim majority of **one member** in the House of Assembly – Peter Gutwein still has to face the approaching fallout from the anticipated January 2022 Queensland trial of Adam Brooks. This former Liberal Minister had left Parliament only to later be offered 2021 re-entry as a Liberal candidate in the electorate of Braddon. Following the 1.5.21 election, Adam Brooks admitted to facing police charges, causing him to phone Premier Gutwein to inform him that he had to resign the 5th seat in Braddon on the eve of that poll being declared.

This now disgraced recent Liberal candidate faces court, after six months of delay. However, due to Premier Gutwein's vocal support for him (frequently questioned during the campaign) Adam Brooks managed to survive the 2021 campaign long enough to enable a re-set of the recount for the fifth Braddon seat. This changed it from a Hare-Clark distribution to a Casual Vacancy distribution, favouring remaining unsuccessful Liberal candidates for Braddon. In 2021, Braddon was an electorate in which six, rather than the usual five candidates, had been pre-selected by the State Liberals. Both events were unprecedented, in my memory as a Braddon voter for 47 years.

The Tasmanian Liberal government, led by Peter Gutwein, will soon put in place a Climate Policy for Tasmania to remain until its next five year review. However, the government itself may have a very **short** future. It is ironic and worth noting that, with support similar to that which he gave Adam Brooks, a Tasmanian football team may soon win a place in the Australian Football League (AFL) and possibly will itself win a Premier-ship in coming years.

Such uncertainty in the future of the current Tasmanian Liberal government, evident by its desperation going to the polls a year earlier than needed, is key to why I **support ALL recommendations of the Independent Review of the Climate Change (State Action) Act 2008, delivered by the Jacobs Group (Australia)**. I believe that - in order to ensure an improved Act - improved communication is essential. I am suspicious of the wishful thinking of Ministers, such as Roger Jaensch, reported in The Advocate on 30.4.21 and the very day before that rushed election.

I believe that, during his previous term, Premier Gutwein failed to achieve his grave responsibility to undertake his promise of "*Tasmania's action on climate change (as) guided by Climate Action 21: Tasmania's Climate Change Action Plan 2017-2021.*" (to quote his "**A Message from the Minister**" in the Opportunities Paper 2021) and which was apparently "*developed in consultation with the community*".

In my previous 2021 submission ("**Individuals 4. Rosemary Farrell PDF 2.82MB**") I expressed my serious concern with regard to the Forestry sector – ie. industrial forestry processes and their effect on our unique natural habitats, water resources, air quality, our soil carbon retention and our biodiversity.

In **this** submission I am also focused on the essential safe guarding of our democracy. I had previously expressed concern that the **Opportunities Paper 2021 (Developing a new Climate Change Action Plan for Tasmania)** appeared more focused on the actions and outcomes of that particular sector of our State economy and of pursuing "business as usual" with regard to it. The Opportunities Paper appeared to favour that particular GBE (Government Business Enterprise) - that is STT (Sustainable Timber Tasmania), previously known as FT (Forestry Tasmania), also to seem to be prepared to ignore its contribution to future emissions.

In the section "Reducing Our Greenhouse Gas Emissions" there was frequent use of the acronym **LU.LUC.F** which I found far from transparent. In addition there appeared a questionably graph, clearly favourable to LU.LUC.F and then, on the page following, the phrase "**excluding LU.LUC.F**" appeared 5 times - though the definition of that acronym (Land Use, Land Use Change) was absent.

In March this year, also prior to the election, The Advocate published the following (Friday 19.3.21) :- "*Unable to make their industrial destruction of the forests and wildlife pay for itself, the industry has sucked more than*

a billion dollars from taxpayers in recent decades. With the money have gone thousands of jobs. Since the woodchip industry was set up by big Tasmanian logging 'family' operators, including McKays in 1972, more than 100 small sawmills have been shut down" I witnessed this while living on the NW coast of Tasmania in the 1970s and thereafter.

"The profiteers made millions rushing our wild forests, including countless tonnes of sawlogs, to woodchip piles on export wharves around the island. Their latest and biggest export woodchip ship out of Tasmania is aptly called the 'China Express'. The promotion of clearfell incineration of ancient forests in a world desperate to experience nature – but with less nature than ever before in history – is irresponsible employment and economic policy".....

*"FT/STT has failed for years to get the authoritative Forest Stewardship certification it has sought.... Pointing out that the 1% of biggest trees in the world's forests hold nearly half of the stored carbon, two American professors wrote (in February 2021) that '**protecting forests is an essential strategy in the fight against climate change that has not received the attention it deserves**'..... (and) ... doesn't require costly and complicated technology.....*

"New Zealand ended the logging of its native forests in 2002. It has ample plantations and no shortage of wood and that's where more and more of the industry's jobs are these days." (page 20 The Advocate COMMENT II Bob Brown)

I quote this piece to contrast it with that "wishful" statement quoted in my third paragraph. The latest findings of the International Climate Conference COP26 in Glasgow appear clearly and unreservedly to support Bob Brown's comment over Roger Jaensch's comment.

This is why holistic, effective and informed action aimed at building climate resilience and reducing emissions in Tasmania must be undertaken by this Tasmanian State government and by those governments which will inevitably follow this one between now and 2030.

This is why a complementary set of principles to deliver, appropriately and effectively, the provisions of an **improved** Climate Change Act, must include improved communication and must consult with the community when setting any new and ambitious net zero greenhouse gas emissions target for Tasmania.

This submission was written by Mrs Rosemary Farrell on 11.11.21

Written in response to the recommendations of the latest Independent Review delivered by consulting firm Jacobs Group and in response to the Tasmanian Government's draft Bill to amend the Climate Change (State Action) Act 2008