

Dear Secretary of Senate Select Committee,

Thank for this opportunity to submit to the Senate Inquiry.

Given the "greenhouse mafia" it is hard to believe that my input will make any difference.

Given the current targets and timelines it is hard to believe they will make any difference to greenhouse gas emissions.

Given that my own contributions via payments for my solar panels (and thanks to the tax payer for the \$8000) and solar hotwater service, and my extra payments for green energy, will not actually reduce emissions, it is hard to see what was the point of spending that money - both mine and the tax payers. Unfortunately it is too late for me to take my permits back.

So why do I persist? Because the alternative is too awful to contemplate. Over the lifetime of my grandchildren the majority of scientists are now predicting unacceptable increases in temperature. The new normal is here: the fires in Victoria are consistent with the predictions for global warming, and the Wilkins Ice Shelf is the latest in a series of literally enormous changes in ice extent in Antarctica.

What type of risk is it that this government is, in our name, is undertaking? What negligence in the face of the knowledge from our experts? Even if it was only 10% risk we should be acting - would you fly in an aeroplane that had 10% chance of crashing?

Let alone the risk to the very basis of our existence: our biodiversity and "natural infrastructure". Deserts are in the making in my lifetime (I'm not that old in spite of being a grandmother) and the predicted collapse of our foodbowl in the Murray Darling Basin is just that.

Being a grandmother I should be allowed to bang together the heads of those boys in Canberra to wake them up. How dare they put our future at such risk?

And of course it's not just us, it's people far less able to cope with the change than us. What would you be feeling if you lived on the Ganges Delta right now?

An effective CPRS must include:

Emission reduction targets of at least 40% below 1990 levels by 2020

Permits must be auctioned instead of being handed free to big polluters. Auctioning permits provides an effective market-based price signal to big polluters to reduce their greenhouse pollution.

There should be no price ceiling, and penalty rates should be set at a limit to encourage compliance and to reflect the true cost of carbon. Sir Nicholas Stern has estimated this at AUD\$120 a tonne.

Revenue generated from these auctions must be used to restructure our economy and meet our international obligations including assisting developing countries to adapt to climate change.

And for goodness sake keep the carbon in the ground and in the forests and other native vegetation. At least it's safe there and won't add to the carbon in the atmosphere provided we don't cut it down and send it off to woodchips/landfill in Japan

Thank you

Yours sincerely,
Karen Alexander