

TRANSCRIPT

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING COMMITTEE

Inquiry into Tackling Climate Change in Victorian Communities

Melbourne—Thursday, 5 December 2019

MEMBERS

Mr Darren Cheeseman—Chair

Mr David Morris—Deputy Chair

Mr Will Fowles

Ms Danielle Green

Mr Paul Hamer

Mr Tim McCurdy

Mr Tim Smith

WITNESS

Dr Charles Le Feuvre, Vice-President, Psychology for a Safe Climate.

The CHAIR: Welcome, Charles. Thank you for joining us today for this public hearing for the Inquiry into Tackling Climate Change in Victorian Communities. On behalf of the Committee I acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which we meet and pay respects to them; their culture; their elders past, present and future; and elders from other communities who may be here today. I also extend a welcome to any members of the public and the media present today. This is one of a number of public hearings that the Environment and Planning Committee is conducting in Melbourne and around Victoria to inform itself about the issues relevant to the Inquiry.

I will just run through some important formalities before we begin. All evidence taken today will be recorded by Hansard and is protected by parliamentary privilege. This means you can speak freely without the fear of legal action in relation to the evidence that you give. However, it is important to remember that parliamentary privilege does not apply to comments made outside of the hearing, even if you are repeating what you said during the hearing. You will receive a draft transcript of your evidence in the next week or so for you to check and approve. Corrected transcripts are published on the Committee's website and may be quoted from in our final report.

Thank you for making the time to meet with the Committee today. If you could just state your name and your title before beginning your presentation.

Dr Le FEUVRE: My name is Charles Le Feuvre and I am the Vice-President of Psychology for a Safe Climate.

The CHAIR: Fantastic. Over to you.

Dr Le FEUVRE: Thanks very much. I just want to say a bit about Psychology for a Safe Climate. We were formed nine years ago with the purpose of fostering emotional engagement in the community with climate change. We began our work writing, publishing and speaking on the difficult emotional task of engaging with climate change. In the last few years our overall focus has shifted to offering emotional support to those who are engaged with climate change in their work, for example researchers, policy makers, community activists and community groups, farmers, university departments and local councils. We have developed a series of workshops that create space for the expression of the emotional impact of their climate work as well as for sharing skills to manage the ongoing stress of working on this issue. These workshops have been found to be helpful to participants, giving relief and expression of their deepest feelings, fostering acceptance of their own feelings and a connection with others as they realise they are not alone in their often troubled emotional state.

The experience of confronting difficult feelings—paradoxically, we have found—gives strength to people's engagement with climate change in whatever capacity they are contributing. The workshops always include a segment to foster more capacity to care for themselves and prevent burnout. The workshops are conducted for groups of 20 to 30 people working in small groups, each led by one of our team of volunteer psychologists, psychiatrists or trained facilitators.

In October this year we conducted a longer workshop, a weekend workshop, with a community affected by a bushfire 18 months ago in Tathra, New South Wales, which allowed the participants to talk deeply for the first time as a large group about their grief about the bushfire. Many in the group very much link the fire with climate change, and so the workshop was similar to previous workshops but allowed more depth of feeling and discussion, helped to deepen connections in the community and created more support for climate action. It created more resilience—what has been called transformational resilience—for the community.

We believe a successful adaptation to climate change requires that we build a culture of emotional resilience within communities, supporting people to respond to their changing environment in ways that support social connection and mental health. We are interested in continuing to offer the support we already offer and we support it becoming more widely available, especially at the local government level, as communities begin to

grapple with the effects of climate change, which are now becoming increasingly obvious, and the necessary changes involved in mitigating and adapting to climate change.

There is tremendous scope for offering secondary consultation and education to other mental health workers. We plan to have an Australia-wide conference to engage other mental health workers in our work and to share skills and ideas, particularly the importance of recognising the need to prepare for large-scale trauma and toxic stress with escalating climate impacts. We have heard many stories of people going to see psychologists and other workers only to have their climate or environmental concerns brushed off. It is vitally important that psychologists and others are more aware of the psychological effects of climate change—not just the effects of acute and chronic weather-related effects but also what has been called ‘ecological grief’ and ‘anxiety’, which are terms which have come into popular use recently. I will just briefly define ‘ecological grief’ from a recent *Nature Climate Change* article as:

The grief felt in relation to experienced or anticipated ecological losses, including the loss of species, ecosystems, and meaningful landscapes due to acute or chronic environmental change.

‘Eco-anxiety’ has been described in an American Psychological Association report of 2017 as a source of stress caused by:

... watching the slow and seemingly irrevocable impacts of climate change unfold, and worrying about the future for oneself, children, and later generations ...

These phenomena have been known for some time but are now being more recognised as climate change as its effects are becoming more obvious. There has been considerable research on ecological grief but less on eco-anxiety. As you are probably aware, it has emerged as a phenomenon really in the last year or so. Our experience, really being on the front line of hearing about such experiences, has certainly shown the validity of these phenomena. One thing, for example, we have noted is the increasing number of young people considering or not planning to have children. Indeed a survey has shown that a third of women under 30 are considering this. There has also been evidence that the fear of climate change has increased over recent times—the last year or two—and that it is especially high in children. There is a need to offer workshops and consultations to those working with climate change-affected communities, such as threatened coastal communities, for example. There is a need to help schoolteachers and counsellors respond to their students’ concerns about climate change.

Another important aspect of climate change which needs attention and support is the idea of relinquishing. Increasingly we think that communities are going to have to consider relinquishing either their work—for example, farmers—or indeed relinquishing places; for example, some coastal areas will become uninhabitable with rising sea levels. Though physical adaptation can be helpful, it may not be sustainable. The same, I believe, is true of some inland areas—very bushfire-prone places and places where drought may become the norm with a lack of available water.

Overall, then, we believe our work provides a model for ways in which communities throughout the state can be helped with: firstly, acknowledging and facing the feelings involved in climate change and in offering self-care to allow them to be more resilient and more engaged with climate change; secondly, supporting others who are dealing with communities to be able to understand the feelings and mental health issues related to climate change, either mental health workers or others involved with community; and, thirdly, facing the very painful process of relinquishment by allowing people to talk about their feelings in that situation.

Since the federal election in May 2019 demand for our work has increased considerably. There was much grief, sadness and frustration at that time, and our offering support in general can help people stay, or become, engaged. Our workshops have been done on a voluntary basis, though we do charge fees for some of our work so that we are now able to employ a casual administrator one day a week. We are planning to expand the scope of our work and are considering the need for a more substantial structure and financing. We have interstate requests for our work, and our work is acknowledged outside Australia. Our president, Carol, was featured in the most recent *All in the Mind* program on Radio National, discussing our work. The program was called ‘Climate change anxiety’.

We believe that the Victorian Government could support the development of similar services to those we offer, and we would be pleased to support such a process. We think our work is innovative and provides a model for how to help Victorian communities engage with and adapt to climate change. We believe that our work models how to support individuals and communities and prevent more serious mental illness. We also think that such work is inevitably of economic benefit to the community.

The CHAIR: Fantastic. Congratulations for your work and the work of your group. Just in reflecting on what you were saying as you were speaking it occurs to me that there seems to be two dominant cohorts, but I am sure there is a spectrum of people in terms of climate change. Firstly, you have got those that are hardened believers, for want of a better word, and want to participate in various climate change actions to spread the word that it is a significant global threat, and then you have got those that are hardened in the other way—they fundamentally do not accept the science of climate change. I suspect those that are in that camp often are those that are greatest affected by climate change. I am thinking of—

Mr FOWLES: Psychologically you mean?

The CHAIR: Well, also in terms of their livelihoods, their lifestyles and where they might live. I am thinking of rural conservative farming communities as an example. My experience has been when I engage with that lot that they accept drought, they accept the consequences of drought and they accept the climate is different to how they remember it growing up, but they do not actually accept the challenges of climate change. Is that group a hard group to work with because they have not yet taken that sea change, for want of a better term, in accepting that challenge so that they can then start, in their own mind and in their own communities, taking meaningful measures? Is that a fair observation?

Dr Le FEUVRE: Look, I think that is a very fair observation. I would slightly argue with what you said at the beginning about ‘believers’ because I think it is not really a question of belief. I mean, I think there is climate science, and climate science clearly does show that we are in a serious situation—

The CHAIR: That is true. Not everyone—

Dr Le FEUVRE: I put the other end as being people who are denying that science.

The CHAIR: That is true. When I say ‘believers’, there is a bunch people who accept the science, they accept what scientists are saying and they accept some fundamental, simple, understood facts about climate change. They are not scientists, so they do not have that kind of scientific understanding, but they accept what the experts in that area are telling them. So they are believers in that—they are believing what the sciences and the scientists are telling them.

Dr Le FEUVRE: Yes, but getting back to the question—

The CHAIR: Yes. Terminology is important in this debate.

Dr Le FEUVRE: It is important. Look, I think it is a real problem. One thing is that I do think increasingly farmers and people in those communities are actually accepting the reality. I think there are groups who are working to try and help them accept that reality. We have some contact with an organisation called Farmers for Climate Action, who you might have heard of, because they on the one hand are trying to support farmers but also trying to educate them about climate change. But it is a very difficult problem; there is a lot of denial because to accept the implications of non-denial is really threatening of course their whole way of life.

The CHAIR: And the life of their parents and their grandparents, who may have farmed the same parcel of land for generations.

Dr Le FEUVRE: Yes, so it is a tragic sense of loss, really. It is not surprising how desperate at times farmers feel, and of course we know that they really get depressed and there is a lot of suicide amongst farmers.

The CHAIR: Yes—and correct me if I am wrong; I am clearly not a psychologist—I would imagine those farming families who accept the science of climate change, when they have taken that leap and that step, that

then with good support potentially they can then start structuring their farms in other ways to be more climate resilient—

Dr Le FEUVRE: Exactly.

The CHAIR: So hope can come from that once they have taken that step, I assume. Encouraging people and supporting people to take that first leap of faith that the science is the science, I presume, then enables them to then start to take some action in their communities and on their farms to develop their enterprises to be more climate resilient and more capable of adapting to a change in climate.

Dr Le FEUVRE: Yes, absolutely.

The CHAIR: It is a journey, isn't it, taking that step?

Dr Le FEUVRE: Yes, absolutely. I think a number of farmers are definitely following that path. It is more difficult for those who perhaps are older and have been very established in their practices over many years.

The CHAIR: Okay, and just one further point before I throw to my colleagues. There are a whole bunch of workers—I am thinking of firefighters, ecologists, environmental scientists, Parks Victoria rangers and all of those kinds of people that one way or another have a role in protecting our properties, our landscapes and the like—and they obviously occupationally get exposed to the consequences of climate change and they see more intense bushfires and those things. Do we have any evidence or do you have any thoughts about whether those departments—a large number of the people working in those spaces are public servants—and those agencies are putting in place appropriate support mechanisms for the people that they employ to protect their psychological health in terms of some of the stuff that they might see around more intense bushfires and the fact that our landscapes are drying out and the ecology in those landscapes is therefore changing? Do you think government agencies are across that to the extent that they should be?

Dr Le FEUVRE: Look, I honestly do not know the answer to that question. I mean, in terms of firefighters, I really do not know, to be honest. I know often for disasters that the Victorian community does employ psychologists. Dr Rob Gordon is particularly well known in that area.

The CHAIR: Because there is the critical incident type of response where someone was well, they went to a critical incident and they now have grief and trauma to deal with, but there is also that sort of post-traumatic process, which can be a long accumulation of experiences and anxieties. I am wondering whether workplaces are typically good at dealing with that.

Dr Le FEUVRE: Yes. Look, I do not know about firefighters. As I say, we have worked with a number of organisations and people who are not exactly in that position but nevertheless are very involved with climate solutions.

The CHAIR: Well, they could be a CFA volunteer, or they could be—

Dr Le FEUVRE: Yes, so people like ecologists, researchers, people in local councils. We have been asked to do a number of workshops. In fact now we are sort of being rather flooded with requests from the sort of people you are talking about who are very involved with the climate. They are obviously much more prone—I was talking about ecological grief and eco-anxiety as well—because they are closer to the reality. Even though they are not living it in a direct way, they are hearing about it all the time. The firefighters obviously are having to deal with it.

The CHAIR: Thank you, Charles.

Mr HAMER: I am going to start off just by going back to the question of the farmers, and you mentioned that there is quite a high prevalence of depression and suicide. I am just wondering what other mechanisms either your organisation has or you might be able to suggest could be looked at in the future if there was funding or other government support to actually broaden that network. A number of the submissions that we have taken and evidence that we have heard previously have been from Landcare groups or talking about local neighbourhood houses, for example, which obviously have a much greater penetration and network into the

regional and rural areas. I was just wondering if you had given some thought to what that might look like in terms of being able to penetrate that market a bit better.

Dr Le FEUVRE: Well, as I say, we have had some connection with farmers through the Farmers for Climate Action group. The other thing I would suggest for some of those groups is that we might be able to provide workshops or secondary consultations for those groups who are closer to the ground, if you like, or government may be able to provide people to do similar work to us to provide that. Because I do think it is very important work to be done. In particular farmers are probably some of the people who are in the most difficult situation. Some of them indeed are going to have to and some of them already have relinquished doing farming and have moved out. I think that is going to be an increasing problem.

Mr HAMER: As the Chair mentioned, the challenge, I suppose, is for them to recognise that.

Dr Le FEUVRE: Yes, that is right.

Mr HAMER: It is an issue, and it is an issue for them that they need to—both maybe physically from what is happening to their farm but also mentally—actually then bring themselves to a workshop or have their friends encourage them to come to a workshop.

Dr Le FEUVRE: Yes. Well, something we started out thinking about quite a lot was actually how to have conversations with people—who are the sort of people you talked about—who are sort of more on the denying side. Of course that is very, very difficult. It requires a particular skill as well, listening to see where the person is really at rather than ramming down climate science and expecting them to just sort of get it because it is logically correct. So I think that that also is the sort of thing which is a very simple sort of thing. But education in conversations which are actually going to really help people to change their minds is something significant as well.

The CHAIR: It is very hard to change someone's mind once they are fixed and closed on it, isn't it?

Dr Le FEUVRE: Absolutely.

The CHAIR: And language can be really important—the sort of language—which can be very threatening to them or very encouraging.

Dr Le FEUVRE: Exactly. I think that is why you have got to try to get to people on their own wavelength and to kind of talk to them in terms which they really will understand: I cannot exactly think of an example, but their own families, for example, or values that are particularly important to them.

Mr HAMER: That is why I was thinking using some of those existing local support networks—

Dr Le FEUVRE: Indeed.

Mr HAMER: that people may already trust can then, if you have got a few champions within those networks, bring these people along. It does not have to be about, 'We're going to do a slideshow presentation on climate change'. It is more about what their response is in dealing with some of the issues from a mental health point of view.

Dr Le FEUVRE: Yes. Look, I think that is an excellent idea which I would fully support, because as I say, I think we could potentially, or others could, help with that. We actually have got a pamphlet on our website called—I cannot remember what it is—about difficult conversations about climate change, and I do think that obviously an expert going in and talking about climate change is going to be far less effective than somebody that they do know and trust. Trusting somebody is probably the key to having good communication and trying to be able to actually change someone's mind.

The CHAIR: In some farming spaces—Landcare is an example Paul has used, and there is agroforestry—you have got peer-on-peer mentoring where they are working together. It is someone who does the same thing in the same community effectively, a farmer talking to a farmer. Is there any worth in developing—and perhaps this is what your work does do—workshops that train farmers to have conversations with other farmers about

the challenges of responding to climate change and what can be done (a) to their properties but (b) in terms of looking after their own mental health? Is that a good idea in a psychological space? It might well be in an agroforestry space or a farming practice space, but is that generally a good idea in a psychological context?

Dr Le FEUVRE: I think it is an excellent idea. I do not know exactly what happens in the farming space. I know that the Farmers for Climate Action group, for example, do have a space for people to really talk about how they are feeling to some degree, and I think one of the reasons for the helpfulness of our workshop is to allow people to actually talk about how they feel, whether that is to one other person—and one other person is a hell of a lot better than nobody, and a group of people is sometimes that much more helpful.

Mr FOWLES: A few questions for you, thank you, Dr Le Feuvre. You are a psychiatrist by trade.

Dr Le FEUVRE: I am a psychiatrist, yes. I am a psychotherapist. I basically listen and talk rather than prescribe.

Mr FOWLES: Rather than prescribe; okay. That is good to know. I am interested to know: there are various cohorts, as the Chair has indicated, particularly in the farming community—there are those who believe that the climate is changing for human-induced reasons, there are those who accept that the climate is changing and either do not care why or do not think it is human caused and there are those who just think that we have always had droughts because we had one in 1894. Do you think the psychological treatment or the approach to managing the mental health of those cohorts needs to be different or that there is substantively any difference when the lived experience is just drought and bushfire as opposed to global warming?

Dr Le FEUVRE: I suppose, yes, the treatment would have to be different in the sense that their whole world views would be different. With those who acknowledge global warming, that would be part of the conversation. With those who do not, I guess one would be trying to introduce it if possible, but on the other hand I think one just has to take the problem at face value. So I guess as a psychiatrist or as a counsellor involved in the situation you just have to deal with the problem and see how you can help the person.

Mr FOWLES: I guess what I am asking is: in terms of the tailoring of the support services, do you think the premise of why they think the climate is changing, or if they think the climate is changing, do you think that actually matters when they are just dealing with ‘I haven’t got feed for the cows’ sort of thing?

Dr Le FEUVRE: Well, as I was saying earlier, I think in a way you just have to approach the situation from where the person is. If you can try to get them to change their mind, so much the better, because it does allow them to adapt to reality more, but if you cannot, then I think you just have to take things on face value and try and just talk about the realities of the situation without using the words ‘global warming’. I mean, I think one can talk about the difficulties of the weather situation, if you like, or climate situation.

The CHAIR: Or the drought.

Dr Le FEUVRE: The drought—but unfortunately ‘the drought’ is becoming something perhaps more than a drought; it is becoming the norm.

The CHAIR: In terms of the sources of anxiety, to get a bit more granular about it, or the psychological triggers if you like, for the people who are experiencing these anxieties and working in this space particularly, how much of it is, ‘I’m totally overwhelmed by everything that’s happening. There is so much going on. We’re seeing changes around’. How much is it sort of in that basket of anxiety, and how much is the complete helplessness about changing it, that you know that there is an existing power structure worldwide that has not responded adequately? How much is in that kind of basket, and to what extent does that distinction matter, if at all?

Dr Le FEUVRE: I think that is a very good question. I think those issues sort of interact really. I think there are a lot of people who just feel—I think the word for that is probably ‘burnt out’, really—burn out by feeling so overwhelmed by stuff. But I think the helplessness also contributes a lot to the anxiety about the whole situation. Personally, I think anybody who does not feel some fear about the current situation is in a level of denial themselves. Well, I think it is an overwhelming situation; I think that is the reality.

The CHAIR: And do you think as the change accelerates, and we have already seen some evidence of that—as in the physical changes—are you expecting to see an acceleration then of the psychological impacts in either particular cohorts or more generally?

Dr Le FEUVRE: I think absolutely. I think obviously specific cohorts are going to be impacted that much more as the climate changes. It would appear that we are on track for worsening, and even if we decarbonise immediately, we will be, but—

The CHAIR: We have still got baked into the climate system now 1.5 per cent even if we completely stop putting carbon into the atmosphere.

Dr Le FEUVRE: Yes, but I think obviously there are going to be particular cohorts, and I was alluding to that. Obviously people living on the land, farmers, people in bushfire-prone areas and people in coastal areas are really are going to have to seriously consider relinquishing. I think people, obviously, with their mental health, there are going to be an awful lot of mental problems over time, because there will be a lot of other problems. There is going to be a lot of, for example, migration—climate refugees. That is already happening.

The CHAIR: So in terms of the support model, your model is sort of assisting with the leaders in the space and the groups that are doing things, running the workshops and the like, and probably education for psychologists who will be dealing with more of this dispersed right throughout the community. What do you see is the best support model for the education around dealing with climate grief or eco-anxiety, whatever you want to call it, and what are the ways that government could potentially support that? Do you see your model, sort of dealing with the groups, as being the best way of managing the mental health issues more generally, or do you think it is actually got to be more granular than that—that we have got to enable every psychotherapist to have the specific tools, the education, around this category of anxiety?

Dr Le FEUVRE: Well, yes, I do think that is important, and it will become increasingly important. I do think our model is a helpful one. I think it is useful for various different groups of people, whether it is communities who are directly impacted or other communities who are working closely to the area or other communities who are not, because I think all communities are going to need to become more emotionally resilient, really, because they are going to have to look after themselves more, because their mental changes—

The CHAIR: So what are the things that government can do to improve that resilience, do you think—and it is fine if you do not have a suggestion—in terms of our recommendation back to government?

Dr Le FEUVRE: Well, I would like see government supporting our work, but I would also like to see government offering similar type of work, really. The emotional issues connected to climate change, I think, are very considerable, and I think also they are going to cause a considerable burden in the future. So yes, I would like to see government taking more action really in terms of supporting people and communities. I think within Victoria there is more of a sense of working on climate change. I think that is another issue: I do think government leadership is very important in terms of how people feel about climate change. I mean, I think it adds to the feeling of helplessness and anxiety when—as you were sort of saying earlier—governments around the world do not seem to be really taking adequate action. I think the Government—even the Victorian Government—could show that it is very serious about taking action and even, for example, declaring a climate emergency, which I do not think it has done yet, and offering support. Quite how that would be, I mean, would be something we would be very interested in working with government departments to think about, for example.

The CHAIR: I might just pick you up on that point. So there is the climate emergency movement that has been out there promoting that governments and communities need to take much more decisive action in terms of responding to climate change, and—I am interested—there have been a lot of people, particularly young people, that have got involved in that movement and they are clearly very passionate, they are clearly activists. Often politicians complain that young people are not engaged in the civic affairs of a state or a country or a council. We have finally got this group of young people who are doing that, which is great, though I am concerned that I think a large number of them will develop potentially some anxiety-type illnesses as a consequence of participating in that type of activity. We have got someone on the steps of Parliament now who is up to, I think, 14 days of a hunger strike.

Dr Le FEUVRE: Yes, I understand that.

The CHAIR: So I am wondering what role your body is playing in terms of those young people who are trying to push governments and society along the journey of responding to climate change? How can their psychological health be looked after so that they can continue to do that? That is not necessarily to say that I agree with everything they are doing, but they are our young people and they are potentially our next group of leaders down the track. How do we support them? Is there a way in which that can happen from a psychological health perspective?

Dr Le FEUVRE: Yes. Well, it is a very good question. I do think one thing is that actually there is evidence that taking action and protesting is good for your mental health when you are feeling anxious and helpless about it.

The CHAIR: As a trade unionist, I agree.

Dr Le FEUVRE: But at the same time—

Mr FOWLES: A good rally will lift the spirit.

Dr Le FEUVRE: obviously on the one hand the young people are going to be anxious in that they go in the first place, and they are probably going to become more anxious and probably as time goes on and things are not done become—

The CHAIR: Bitter.

Dr Le FEUVRE: Bitter and perhaps even more anxious and depressed, and we think that those people do particularly need to be supported. We have had contact with the Australian Youth Climate Coalition, and we do have a number of people we are connected with who are particularly interested in that area. There are a couple of people in Victoria who are very involved with the effects of climate change on young people, and I think that is an area which we really need to look at supporting both in the community with people who are activists, if you like, but also in the school situation, because I think it is very much going to become an increasing issue. I think that is a key issue, perhaps, as well for the government to really look into. I guess it is a crossover area with education, but I think it is a vitally important area.

The CHAIR: Just thinking it through in a public policy context, perhaps in part when climate change science is being taught in schools and the impacts, there needs to be appropriate consideration of what sort of support services might be available for those young people so that they can learn the science and understand the challenges without taking on unnecessary anxieties. I think anxiety for all of us in parts of our lives is often good, it motivates us and all those sorts of things, but we do not want people to come out of school anxious, do we?

Dr Le FEUVRE: No, we do not want their mental health to be—I mean, there is one thing having a fear, I suppose, knowing the reality, and there is another when they are really kind of functionally impaired by that. So I totally agree—

The CHAIR: They have got to have a bit of hope that we can do things to take action to respond to the challenges of climate change.

Dr Le FEUVRE: Yes. Well, hope is a very difficult issue in this area.

The CHAIR: With government inaction around the place globally, I agree.

Mr FOWLES: The point about functional impairment, I think, is the important bit. You can be feeling deeply fearful about the future of the planet in a way that does impair you, and there will be people who will deal with that fear differently and not be impaired. I guess it is about what supports we put in place for those. I think young people, like farmers, are a special cohort because they are beautifully idealistic, but largely also they know that within their lifetimes things are going to look radically different whereas that might not be the case with other cohorts.

Dr Le FEUVRE: Yes, I absolutely agree. I am not an expert in this area, but it just seems to me common sense that when there is education about climate change that it is done very sensitively and that there is space for people to be looked after and talk about how they feel and for it to be tailored to the age of the children. But the reality is if they are going to be educated that it is going to create an element of fear, but I think if people can share that together and support each other that will perhaps help them to deal with it.

The CHAIR: Fantastic. Thank you for your time. If you would like to make any parting comments, you are welcome to, otherwise I think we had a very insightful conversation.

Dr Le FEUVRE: Thank you very much. No, I do not really think I have got any parting comments other than what I have already discussed.

The CHAIR: Terrific. Thanks, Charles; appreciate it.

Dr Le FEUVRE: Thank you very much.

Witness withdrew.