

To Senators on the Senate Select Committee on Climate Policy,

I believe that the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) proposed by the Government is a badly designed scheme will prevent the economic transformation Australia needs, at a cost to both the economy and the environment. We need a well designed scheme that sets a strong target and send a strong price signal to the market. As it stands, we have an unacceptably weak target, and a design which over-compensates polluters at the expense of the community and environment.

The CPRS target range of 5-15% is unacceptably low and must be urgently reviewed. Scientists agree that developed countries like Australia need to reduce their emissions by at least 25 and 40 per cent by 2020 if we are to avoid triggering unstoppable feed-back loops and runaway climate change.

The way the CPRS is designed at present, pays-the-polluters, whereas what we really need is a polluter-pays scheme. If we provide Australia's worst polluters with billions of dollars of compensation in cash and free permits to pollute, we will be protecting the profits of Australia's worst climate offenders at the expense of clean industries.

It is not right that we transfer the cost of reducing emissions to industries with less lobbying power and to the community at large. Every dollar of compensation that goes to polluters is one dollar less that we could use to assist householders and clean industries.

In addition it is important that we take into account voluntary emission reductions from the community. The efforts of everyone from householders to State Governments to reduce emissions will be helpful only in reducing the price pressure on polluters. This must be fixed by taking account of community action and all the policies already in place when setting the scheme caps, and using the scheme to drive more ambitious efforts.

There are other tools that we can use, in addition to an emissions trading scheme, to reduce Australia's greenhouse gas emissions, such as a mandatory renewable energy target, a renewable energy feed-in tariff, energy efficiency standards for homes and commercial buildings, fuel efficiency standards and investment in trains, buses and trams. If we were to end the logging of Australia's native forests we would reduce Australia's emissions by substantially more than 5%. We should be pursuing these policies in any event.

Business desperately needs certainty, so rather than setting a target that will invariably have to be increased down the track anyway, we should set an ambitious, science-based target at the outset. This way we can avoid the costly mistakes that will occur from making bad investment decisions that are based on target that will only have to go up in the future.

It is ludicrous to suggest that any action to reduce emissions, even by as little as 5%, will reduce the risk of climate change. The fact is, is that we know that there are tipping points in Earth's systems which, if breached, will send our climate spinning out of control with catastrophic consequences for all of us.

If we are to have a reasonable chance of preventing runaway climate change, we must make every effort to avoid these tipping points. That means high-polluting countries like Australia moving towards carbon neutrality as fast as possible, with cuts of at least 40% by 2020.

It is crucial that you look at the science of this situation rather than the politics. Please listen to the experts who offer their advice to you during this inquiry, listen to the people of Australia and make the right decision in your recommendations.

I would rather that we didn't have a CPRS if it isn't going to help us avoid climate tipping points. Please don't allow the intentions of the emissions trading scheme to be perverted by protecting the

profits of Australia's worst polluters. We need a strong, ambitious and fair emissions trading scheme, not a plan that protects polluters and stands in the way of the change we need.

Thank you for taking the time to read my submission

Dawn Jecks