

5% is really pathetic! There is a critical mass we need to address before any appreciative level of impact is reached. Otherwise we are wasting our time. I am sick of pussyfooting by the government. We know we have to make changes, and it IS going to have to hurt, so let's get away from the idea we can do it "softly". We can't. We need to do it properly. In a big way. Its time we paid the price for our years of abuse of the planet's energy resouces. Politics and empty double-speak promises don't fool me. Julie Pearse

I am deeply concerned with the Government's proposed 5 - 15% target for an Australian emissions trading scheme.

This is an issue that requires immediate attention. We cannot afford a wait and see approach. We must also stop seeing our economic security as our only security. The unpredictability and risk associated with climate change will cost us much more than price shocks, share market falls and GDP downturns.

We should instead commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels).

The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) currently proposed by the Government is a badly designed scheme that will do more harm than good. The scheme design over-compensates polluters at the expense of the community and environment.

Setting a strong target with a well-designed scheme will ensure Australia does its fair share to avoid dangerous climate change, and it will also help refocus our economy to take advantage of new growth industries in renewable energy.

A strong response will display leadership in efforts to form crucial international agreement. We must make a strong commitment for the important UN Conference on Climate Change in Copenhagen in December.

Yours sincerely

Anne Stephens

The Australian continent is among the most vulnerable environments in the world, subject to desertification and already plagued with introduced hoofed animals, close to unmanageable populations which increasingly use the most fertile areas for housing and with inefficient guards against environmental pollution. A target of 5-15% reduction in greenhouse gasses is ridiculously inept, given the increasing indications of world climate change. Over-compensating polluters via the CPRS will do more harm than good, while costing the community more than it can currently afford, as will schemes to increase production over sustainability. For the sake of the country and its people, it is essential that the government take a much tougher stance, preferably committing to a 50% reduction by 2020.

Yours sincerely

Dr.Heleanor Beth Feltham

Dear Prime Minister,

Please live up to your pre-election rhetoric and take a strong stance on climate change that makes our nation world leaders:

Commit to a 50% greenhouse pollution reduction target by 2020

Make voluntary greenhouse emission reductions count under the CPRS by awarding carbon permits to these activities

Don't let our most polluting industries off the hook through a long phase in period under the CPRS

Invest in proven and emerging renewable energy technologies such as wind, solar and hot rocks, not risky gambits such as 'clean' coal and carbon sequestration

Yours Sincerely,

Alan Reid and family

Alarming recent examples of the unexpected speed and ferocity of climate change - Arctic ice melt, ferocious fires and devastating floods - highlight the imperative need for Australia to commit to reducing our greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020.

The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) currently proposed by the Government is a badly designed scheme that will do more harm than good. The scheme design over-compensates polluters at the expense of the community and environment.

By setting a stronger target we help to avoid dangerous climate change, and it will also help refocus our economy to take advantage of new growth industries in renewable energy.

Let's show real leadership in this and not be cowed by the message of fear and caution promoted by the last government.

Kim Torney

Dear Senate Select Committee on Climate Policy,

I am fed-up with not being listened to. It is clear that Australia wants to take responsibility for our greenhouse gas emissions and that we truly do care for the people who will be affected by climate change. I am only 20 years old and will see more of the effects than any of you in the Senate will. I'll see my own children suffering, I'll see all the people being drowned on island nations and in coastal areas, I'll see the droughts, the floods, the cyclones. I have a relative who has been through a cyclone and I know what it does to people. He will never be the same again. Don't let this happen to more people unnecessarily.

As someone living in a democracy, I demand that:

- the government change Australia's 2020 emissions targets to at least 40-50% by 2020.
- Keep Australia's 2020 emissions reduction targets out of the CPRS legislation until after the Copenhagen climate deal has been finalised.
- Ensure that individual, community, and all government emissions reduction efforts contribute to additional emissions abatement. Such actions should lower emissions, not lower carbon prices.
- Legislate a ban on all new coal-fired power stations in Australia and a moratorium on all new coal exploration and mining.
- Plan to phase out existing coal-fired power plants over the next ten years. - Change the requirements for assistance to coal-fired generators under the CPRS to be conditional upon the 10-year phase-out plan.
- Suspend all subsidies, tax incentives and financial support to the fossil fuel industry, including compensation measures proposed.
- Redirect the \$500 million Clean Coal Fund into promoting and advancing renewable energy technology, growth and infrastructure.
- Establish third party rights under the CPRS Act, to ensure that the CPRS remains transparent and accountable.
- Direct all money raised through the CPRS into lower emissions technologies including renewable energy.

Emma McIntyre

Preindustrial levels of Co2 were 280 ppm, they are now 387 ppm and increasing quickly. Carbon levels above 350 are incompatible with this planet. The scientists say we have only about 10 years to prevent levels exceeding the 350ppm. So please do something responsible and increase the stupid 5% target. Bob Duncan, Ballina.

I would once again urge the government to reconsider its proposed limited actions for addressing climate change. While stronger targets may well lead to declines in industries that are most polluting, such as the coal industry, I feel this is a price that must be accepted for the longer term good of our nation and world. However commitment to greater reductions in greenhouse emissions, with a concomitant increase in commitment to lower polluting energy sources such as wind and solar will surely offset these losses by leading to significant new investment and employment opportunities.

Joe Annetts

Firstly, I have always been a strong supporter of Kevin Rudd, even before he was the Labour party leader. I believe he is doing an amazing job with the government and should be commended for his progress (well done to the rest of you too!).

But the race to fix this country has only just begun, and the clock is ticking faster than ever!

While the Government's 5-15% CO2 reduction target is far from adequate to even slow down climate change, it is a start. But it is critical that the Government understands that far more needs to be done as soon as possible.

The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS), in my opinion, is a good start but the reviews of carbon credit allocation must be annual, or biannual, to allow for the rapidly changing science of climate change. Evidence is showing that climate change is happening far quicker than previously thought. The Arctic summer sea ice is now expected to melt entirely within the next 5 years.

The CPRS must not be compensating polluters so much. Polluters need to clean up their industries or suffer. The Government must help provide alternatives. The coal industry must not continue! The Government must help fund large scale solar thermal power plants, or other clean technologies, to provide an alternative to coal power plants immediately. Re-train coal workers for the new technologies. It will improve their physical health and reduce medical bills too.

Clean coal is a joke. Put the funds towards proven technologies which are far cleaner than the fabled clean coal could be. Export clean technologies, especially to China. Convince them that giant solar power plants will be far better than coal plants for both their people and the rest of the world.

The Government set up our current power system. It needs to take responsibility for changing it. Do not try to modify the coal industry, replace it with a better one.

Jobs do not need to be lost, just changed.

Without a healthy planet, we will never have healthy economies. Those who lead the way with clean technologies will also reap the profits as others follow.

Australia has much to lose. While some may not be concerned about losing the Great Barrier Reef, they will start to worry when our food bowl, the Murray Darling, stops producing any more food and food prices sky rocket (and quality and quantity decreases dramatically).

Everyone must wake up and see the impending storm. It's coming fast.

Yours sincerely,

Paul Collins (and family)

The diluted target of 5-15% is totally inadequate and Australia should be a leader and a shining example in Copenhagen later this year and not an illustration of how vested interests can so easily sway government policy. The current world economic conditions should be seen as an opportunity to change rather than a red light for polluting companies to threaten job losses and economic disaster unless they are allowed to continue current emissions with impunity. The fires and floods this year, together with the terrible condition of the Murray Darling Basin keep being called 'once in a hundred year events'. Unfortunately, we're likely to see repeats of these disasters in much less than a hundred years and the time is coming when it will be too late to stop all of this. Stop the \$900 payments to taxpayers which will probably be spent on junk and instead commit real funds to research and development into sustainable forms of energy. Commit to 50% reduction of emissions by 202

0 NOW!

L Upton

To the my elected government,

I think 48 billion for super fast communication could be spent developing renewable energy & sustainable industries.

A steady stream of new scientific findings is showing that the Arctic summer sea ice is now expected to melt entirely within the next five years.

The Government's 5-15% target is not at all adequate. We could instead commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution by 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels).

Setting a strong target with a well-designed scheme will help refocus our economy to take advantage of new growth industries in renewable energy.

So stand up, create a document and channel funds, that will assist in the development of environmentally sustainable and renewable energy industries... That's what I want to see green trees & silent cars buildings that blend with the environment.

I want to be associated with a government and a country that took up the lead ground, at probably the most crucial point in human history.

The topic of carbon reduction overrides all others and should dictate courses of action for all other policy in the future.

If we don't get this right the future will start to look very bleak for our children and we as parents will be around just long enough to see what we have created and I don't want to die with that cloud over me.

Scott Cunningham

Australia needs to lead the way in fighting climate change. Stop listening to industry and stop letting their bottom-line agendas decide how we Australians will live in 10, 20, 30 years time.

Australia's poor commitment to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution is embarrassing. Why does Australia fight so hard to resist the rest of the world's diseases but won't fight greenhouse pollution. Australia needs to set a greenhouse reduction target that is actually meaningful and useful, not a useless concession to international pressure. We need to stand up and be noted for our deep, uncompromising commitment to repairing the damage humans have done to this world.

Start listening to us please. John Howard is long gone, thank good. Maybe politicians will listen to us now.

Remember: good planets are hard to find.

Kelly Spaulding

I wish to register my opposition to the Government's inadequate 5-15% target on climate change. With scientific evidence of accelerated climate change, a 50% reduction by 2020 should be our aim.

I strongly believe that Australia should take a greater role in developing and implementing renewable energy schemes reducing our reliance on coal.

The Government must make realistic and committed changes if the effort of individuals and small businesses is to have any effect on emissions. An effective CPRS should not allow industry to increase their emissions which the current proposal will do.

Signed,

Pam Everson

The problem is more cultural/political than technical; each person will be affected, and so each person has to feel they can play a part, and if there is no personal conviction that small individual sacrifices matter, the scheme will fail. If it fails, western democracy will collapse.

Rob Bickford

Our Government's 5-15% reduction (by 2020) target is grossly inadequate. We MUST demonstrate leadership in this area (as a major polluter) and bite the bullet! It is pathetic to hide behind the bogies of 'job losses'. If we don't save our environment, we won't have ANY jobs!! Also, forget pinning our hope on so called 'clean coal'. This is a pipe dream developed by US conservative forces to create the impression that the Bush Administration was doing something.

Sincerely

John Addley

The Australian government needs to make a stronger scheme in order to combat the very real threat of climate change. As an Australian citizen I am concerned with the effects that climate change may have on Australia and the rest of the world - the government needs to make a strong action towards climate change and act as a rolemodel for other countries around the world. The 5 - 15% target is not sufficient to combat dangerous climate change and we need to make more of a stand. Please reassess this inadequate target and make a strong stand.

- Olivia Porgand

I know that economically it seems detrimental to aim for high carbon reduction targets, but I am thinking of my children and their children. We have to take a long term view and realise that we have to in fact be prepared to suffer now to avoid catastrophe - including economic catastrophe - in the future.

I for one am prepared to suffer - to reduce my standard of living, to take hard measures, to have less money to live on, to sweat and shiver more - to preserve my grandchildren's future.

I will not have my efforts simply absorbed by industry, as will happen with the current CPRS scheme. You know the targets that really need to be met; you know that global warming is progressing even faster than predicted; you know Australia can be instrumental in supporting tougher international agreements.

Please prove you can govern as we - the ones who voted you in - expected you to, and still hope to see.

Florence Thomson

As a teacher working with young children in Early Childhood have a sustainability program with parents and staff committed to making sure our environmental footprint is lessened. Government really needs to commit to reducing our green house gases as quickly as possible. No less than 50% by 2020.

Maria Pender

Scientific evidence is showing that Climate Change is happening far more quickly than previously thought. Therefore it is imperative that Australia should commit itself to reducing greenhouse pollution by 50% by 2020. We talk big but are now promising little. The present scheme overcompensates polluters at the expense of the environment and the community. If we can manage to set a stronger target with a well-designed scheme, it will refocus our economy and take advantage of new growth industries to renewable energy and be ready for the U.N. Conference on Climate Change in Copenhagen. Yours sincerely, Mary T. Hennessy.

To whom it may concern,

I, as a concerned individual and voting Australian citizen, am greatly concerned by the proposed Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRD) by the current government. That such a scheme, under which the action I take to decrease the impact and hopefully one day prevent severe climate change becomes no more than an offset for high carbon emitters is shameful. Regardless of how high a target is set, that the government is currently planning to enforce the belief that individuals and communities cannot change their circumstances, in this case towards climate change, is horrific.

I ask that the current CPRS is changed so that the changes that I and all other Australian make on individual and community levels are properly acknowledged, encouraged and do not become offsets for high polluters.

There are many other issues that I think and feel that need to be changed in regards to the Governments stated position towards climate change, such as the disturbingly low targets set, the lack of concern for new scientific research showing the predicted impacts of climate change on the Australian environment and the international reputation of Australia - especially leading up to the UN Conference in Copenhagen. However it is the disregard for what the voting public have so clearly asked for that worries me the most.

Thank you for your time and consideration of my concerns. I hope that the outcomes of your inquiries reflect the significant change needed if we are to maintain our quality of life in the next 10-20 years.

Andrew Goodwin

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to voice my concern about the need for greater political action on climate change.

I am taking personal action on climate change by purchasing 100% renewable power for my home, offsetting the emissions from my car, using public transport where possible, and supporting several environmental charities. However, while individual actions are vital in addressing climate change, a global solution requires government action.

It's time for the government to set Australia and the globe on the right course. A 5-15% reduction on 1990 levels of Carbon emissions by 2020 is absolutely unacceptable. The Government has disregarded the advice of the IPCC – which states that developed countries, as a group, must reduce their carbon pollution by 25–40% by 2020. Australia must step up and increase the 2020 target to be in line with what science demands. In addition, I expect Australia to attend and take a leadership role at the UN climate negotiations in Copenhagen this December. For the sake of our future, the only acceptable outcome from the Copenhagen conference is a unanimous global action plan that meets all the requirements dictated by the IPCC: a Carbon emissions reduction of 25-40% on 1990 levels by 2020 and 80% below 1990 levels by 2050.

Regards, Jerome Dolphin

Dear Mr Rudd,

Whilst I fully appreciate that the government must be under tremendous pressure from big business and the corporate sector not to implement strong carbon reduction implementation, I implore you to take a much stronger stance than you currently propose.

The Rudd government was elected in the belief that you guys had the balls and the determination to actually make some of the hard decisions the Howard government would not. The labour Government has been give a mandate by the people to take brave and long lasting steps to address the issues regarding climate change. I am quite sure the reports, facts and figures you have already seen clearly indicate that climate change is on a knives edge. If YOU do not act now, you are helping to condemn your children's, children's, children to GOD only knows what> The planet is set to bight us all in the bum if we do not act very fast. The time has come to take this issue by the balls and give it one almighty shake and truly try to make a difference and to set an example to the rest of the world. Australia is but a medium sized fish in a global sense; however I believe we have the opportunity to demonstrate to the world that we can affect significant change with regard to carbon immions.

Please don't sit on the fence with this. Make a stance and if you need to, take it to the people of Australia and ask them to vote in a referendum. Provide them with the knowledge and the alternatives. Let the Australian people make the choice if you can't.

Forever hopeful and concerned parent.

Regards

Mitch Swann

An emissions trading scheme without strong targets of at least 40% by 2020 is not enough.

Jacinta Stephenson

Dear Kevin Rudd,

I dont have time today to write a lengthy and detailed submission, however my message is simple and clear.

1. Australia's proposed short-term/interim targets are too small. To reach the 80% target by 2050, we need to head for 20 to 30% by 2020.

2. Obama in the US looking like going for 30% by 2020, why cant we do the same?

3. Australia needs political strength in this uncertain area of energy policy. We need balls in Canberra, not a bunch of watered down compromised bullshit.

4. Business interests should never control our nations policy direction. Think about it.

5. Australians will respond to a strong position. We will rally nehind a strong leadership. Be that leader.

Good luck,

Euan Williamson

Please, to those in the position of influencing, creating, and implementing the Greenhouse emission targets for Australia, could we ensure that they are stronger, and thus more (essentially) effective than the 5% I see currently suggested. I think we as Australians are prepared to take on this issue in a very proactive manner and realise that the increase in target measure is certainly an insurance policy for future generations. We must realise our responsibility to the conditions we seem to have created (at least in significant part) and the positive contributions we must make to the future, especially when it is not our future, but without our contribution the future will seem a less inviting place to be.

There is no alternative future to the one we create, so please support us in this acknowledgment, and endeavour, and increase the targets. We can handle it, and we will handle it, and I feel we must handle it.

regards,

Des Smith.

To Whom It May Concern:

Australia's target of 5-15%, which has been admitted by the government's own climate advisor Ross Garnaut as being inadequate to prevent dangerous climate change is unacceptable. As a citizen of this nation, I do not believe it is acceptable to do less just because other nations are not pulling their weight.

As a wealthier country, Australia has an ethical obligation to enact stronger climate change prevention legislation before less developed countries. It is not reasonable to hold off until they match ours, as we are in a different position and better placed to withstand the changes required.

Additionally, as a wealthier country Australia should lead by example and assist other nations, rather than following the crowd. In this global world, and economy its important that we act in ways that are beneficial for all the current inhabitants of the planet as well as future generations.

Finally the arguments put forward that we cannot afford the change are patently untrue, as it is well proven that developing green technologies and refocusing our economy to be low carbon, or carbon free will generate significant economic opportunities.

I look forward to reading about a new, stronger policy developed to combat the increasing carbon emissions, and assist poorer countries in developing more sustainably.

Kind Regards,

Dan Gooden

The Government's 5-15% target is not at all adequate to avoid dangerous climate change. We should instead commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels).

Australia's weak target is undermining efforts to form crucial international agreement and must be improved before December's important UN Conference on Climate Change in Copenhagen.

Climate change is not just a complex policy challenge - it is an urgent threat to humanity, and requires urgent political leadership to act in the best interests of the whole planet (not just Australian business constituents).

I hope that the visionary leadership advertised in the lead-up to the Rudd government's election can materialise on this (if nothing else) issue.

Thanks, and in hope,

Jacqui Boreham

Please take climate change seriously, many Austrians, are concerned about our future and their childrens future, but most of us are not in any position to make significant changes, you as the government of today are, the rest of our nations future is in your hands.

All the jobs in the world will mean nothing if we don't have clean water and enough food for our population in the future.

Very concerned voter

Briony Goldsmith

TO ALL GOVERNMENT MEMBERS

Please improve on your present plans for greenhouse gas reduction by 2020.

At the rate the environment is disintegrating around us, with droughts, fires, floods, fierce winds and hot days (and this is only the beginning), humanity cannot afford to muck around. Australia needs to pull her weight and make drastic reductions in emissions of carbon dioxide and methane .

The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme currently proposed by the Government will probably do more harm than good. It looks like it will over-compensate polluters at the expense of the community and environment.

- Roger French,

I am writing to express my disappointment with the Government's proposed targets for reducing greenhouse emissions. Given that by setting any target the Government recognises there is a problem to be addressed, it is important that the problem be resolved effectively and efficiently. The low targets so far proposed will not go far enough to counter the serious impacts of climate change. Australia should commit to a higher, but still realistic target of at least 50% reduction in greenhouse emissions by 2020. Otherwise the distinct impression is conveyed that the Government wishes to be seen to have 'done something' without actually changing business as usual in any way. As we have seen recently it is often those businesses and activities that contribute the most to greenhouse emissions, such as car manufacturers and some mining concerns, that are the most brittle in an economic downturn. We need to reconfigure the Australian economy to become much more flexible, innovative and

resilient, profiting from a post-carbon world. Higher greenhouse emissions targets will act as a strong signal to achieve this. The alternative, what the Government currently seems to find acceptable, is an Australia that the rest of the world leaves behind - a carbon dinosaur in terminal decline.

Further, I am strongly opposed to the emissions floor built into the CPRS, which will prevent Australians from making better progress on emissions reduction than that mandated by Government. This should be adjusted so as to avoid compensating polluters at the expense of individuals and the community, who are taking active steps to reduce our greenhouse emissions. The scientific evidence is leading towards the conclusion that climate change is happening faster than earlier predicted and that the impacts are more extreme. This means the Government should not lock Australia into a scheme that does little to address emission reduction, but should build a flexible scheme that can in the near future move rapidly towards greater reductions than are presently politically feasible.

One way of doing this is proposed by the Australia Institute:

"to develop a 'secondary market' in audited and verified emissions reductions at the household level, and to create a formal exchange mechanism between this secondary market and the CPRS" (Denniss, Nov 2008).

Yours, Richard Griffiths, PhD, MA, MSc, MPlan, MPIA

We need a much more stringent, and sector specific target. Residential savings should not be offset against industrial or transport targets --> each sector should have its own target to ensure that overall we reduce our emissions.

As an engineer and an innovator I believe that the harder we try now the more we will develop the technologies, efficiencies and intellectual property to make Australia a world leader in clean energy (and ultimately cheap energy). Why is this not a challenge we embrace with the same vigour as a broadband rollout or new roads? The opportunities and possibilities for job creation and economic prosperity are at least as great.

Regards

Greg Dickason

Dear mr Rudd,

As I see it we have a senario where we have two possibilities, each with two options.

one, There is climate change and two there is not.

Now with possibillity one we can do two things one, We take action and two we don't.

we can now do the same with possibillity two where we take action or we don't.

what hapens now is we have a little diagram to fill out for each of these 4 outcomes.

- 1) climate change with no action
- 2) climate change with action
- 3) No climate change with no action
- 4) No climate change with action

I would urge you to do this little exersise (or get one of your staff to do it and explain it to you later)_
and I would like to suggest to take the worst case cenarion for every outcome, the sort of total
distruction and total finacial loss.

I hope that you will come to see that taking action on climate change and not just fiddeling around
the edges with a totally inaducate 5% is realy the only way forward. Don't be responsible for the
death and distruction of my grand childrens grand children.

regards,

Kurt van Wijck.

The government's 5-15% target (really 5%) is inadequate to prevent catastrophic climate change and to allow the development of new low-emissions industries in Australia. A cap and trade system only makes sense if the cap is tight enough to drive genuine change. A weak cap will undermine the efforts of others to reduce emissions.

The recent moves in the US Congress amply demonstrate the cowardice of the Australian Government's response. Locking in a minimum reduction will prevent the kind of re-engineering of the Australian economy that will be necessary for future generations of Australians to prosper in a low carbon world.

With observed climate change exceeding the worst predictions of climate scientists, this is not the time for the Australian Government to cave in to the demands of the politically powerful high-emissions industries.

And without the industrial world accepting its responsibility to make the first and deepest cuts to emissions, there is no hope that the developing world will take the steps it too must take for our civilisation to have a future.

Chris Maltby

I voted in this election with the environment at the top of my list of priorities. To hear the Government respond with a menial 5% target comes as a slap in the face to many Australians.

If there is so much more than just targets that will affect a positive contribution towards a greener Australia, then what do we have to lose by setting a 20% target?

Use the high target to stimulate new industry initiatives in green energy. Set the bar and industry will have no choice but to follow the lead!

How can we as a country honestly apply pressure or valid opinions to other countries if we don't take our own responsibilities seriously to begin with?

I hope that the Labor Government will reconsider this target before it's too late.

Sincerely,

Jason Deacon

As an older person who voted for Labour in the last election because of the supposed strong views on reducing greenhouse emissions, I am most upset and disappointed at the miserable 5-15% target that the Government has proposed.

Surely we can improve on this target and in particular encourage the use of solar power to a much greater extent.

Geoffrey Lord

Dear Madam/Sir

Firstly, the target of 5-15% is absurdly low and can have absolutely no meaningful effect on emissions. It must be raised immediately.

Secondly, the disincentive to individuals to make significant changes in their lives via the ridiculous compensations to big polluters is an astonishing act of cowardice. The lack of preparedness and political will to take on the fossil fuel industry is depressing in the extreme.

Thirdly, the government should understand and harness the determinedness and motivation of the Community in the area of climate change. It is an opportunity to show consultative leadership in an environment where we have been used to being led by the nose by cynical governments doing the bidding of the rich and powerful vested interests who lobby so hard behind the scenes. Use your current electoral popularity for good not evil. At the demise of this government it is unlikely that many will say, "what a bummer they didn't help out big business a bit more"

Yours sincerely,

Jennifer Menzies

Dear Inquiry Panel,

Australians need our government to take a strong stand against climate change. A 5% reduction target is an ineffectual opening position before the climate talks in Copenhagen, and will only serve to weaken any commitments our international partners might make.

There are alternative means of generating baseload electricity that will be competitive with coal-fired generation (Solar thermal power stations) and Australia is well positioned to harness this energy source and export energy to the world.

Our government must listen to the science, not industry lobby groups who see only costs and not opportunities in making a change to a carbon free economy.

Ben Higgins

Members of communities all over Australia are realising more and more the danger posed to our world with Climate Change. Evidence is pouring in each day of the impacts happening NOW and its time our government led the way with more positive action than the 5-15% target for emissions.

Please be strong. If our world is to survive the impacts of climate change and global warming each and every government in the world needs to make tough decisions to ensure businesses will still be around in the years to come. What are economics if there is no world.

How much funding will be required to mitigate the devastating impacts set to occur in the years ahead.

Australia has started some processes but the targets need to be higher to set an example to the rest of the world.

Please raise the 5-15% proposed reduction and commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution to 50% by 2020.

I have one great grandchild and 11 grandchildren. They need to grow in a world that is safe, not threatened as it is today with no hope for the future.

Again, please raise the emissions target NOW and set a target of 50% by 2020.

Maureen Webb

The Government's 5-15% target is not at all adequate to avoid dangerous climate change. We should instead commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels).

Luke Gartrell

We need to be leading the world on this issue and developing the technology and exporting it to other countries. It is an excellent opportunity to foster research in green alternatives, solar energy, giving substantial tax incentives/rebates for sustainable futures industries.

We also need to wean ourselves off coal as this only exacerbates the problem-there is no such thing as clean coal.

Dr Peter Wilson

We did not elect Labor to pussyfoot around the Global warming crisis! Had Howard been re-elected he could hardly have responded more shortsightedly than you guys, and that's saying something!

Forget 'clean coal' - that's a dangerous cop-out.

Institute a carbon tax - don't reward polluters with exemptions in an ill-conceived Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme. A carbon tax is easy to comprehend and administer, and, most importantly, provides a powerful incentive for polluting industries to clean up their act. Your scheme does not, and actually penalises those who try to do the right thing.

For whom are you governing? The fossil fuel industry, or the community as a whole?

Yours, almost despairingly,

Ted Nixon

To Australia's policy makers,

The Limits to Growth report was published at about the time that I was born, in 1970. For my entire life, we have known that we cannot continue to take from the Earth without reaching the point where the Earth can no longer function in the ways we are used to. And yet we continue to take more than the Earth can provide.

I have no doubts that to continue to increase atmospheric carbon concentrations above the levels that we have evolved with is a very foolish course of action. I am (I hope) less than halfway through my life; I have two beloved children, (I hope) at the very beginnings of their lives. I am not particularly concerned about our economic future - we have so much stuff, that our lives would probably improve by having less, not more, material wealth. But I am concerned that in our future, we may not have enough to drink, enough to eat, a secure place to live unworried by other starving people.

In affluent Australia, we must reign in our use of the Earth's resources to a level that would be possible for all the Earth's people to share. Australians value egalitarianism, but we must now see it in a global context.

We must, as soon as we can, implement a carbon restraint policy that rewards every real, large or small reduction in carbon emissions, and converts some of the environmental cost of such emissions into economic costs to punish those who continue to operate as in the irresponsible, unsustainable past. To propose to compensate - PAY! - those who continue to pollute, and to allow polluters to purchase reductions that others have made, and present them as their own, is to attempt to appear to act, without actually making any real changes at all. We may fool others and we may fool ourselves, but the Earth which provides our life and living will not be affected by "improvements" that are merely virtual.

Please, redesign Australia's carbon policy. Make one that will work to reduce carbon emissions, not one that will merely appear to. Science says we need deep cuts, as soon as possible (a 50-60% decrease between my 20th birthday and my 50th - which is fast approaching). It is a big change, but I am confident that the quality of my life and of that of humanity will be better for making it. My future, my children's future, is in your hands.

In expectation that you, my elected representatives, will do what I need you to do,

Heather Merran

6

I want to see Australia reduce to much larger targets for climate change. We should be committing to 50% by 2020.

I agree with a Carbon Trading Scheme for industry, but only if it rewards industries who make greater efforts and reduce their emissions by more than the targets. NOT having an emissions cap.

Individuals and the community need to be able to make a difference and be seen to make a difference; NOT create an environment where the big polluters can continue to pollute.

I would like to see greater incentives to households, community groups and business to install solar power. I will not install solar power and then trade that credit to someone who is going to pollute. Why not have a solar power scheme like in Germany where you are paid well for putting electricity back into the grid. That way we all contribute to the capital cost of creating the power, and get good dividends for our investment.

We need a strong target and a well-designed scheme that will help re-focus our economy and give credit to individuals who make a contribution.

Regards,

Sue Williamson

I am following the debate and I support the inquiry and will be waiting for a response from the Government that doesn't undermine in any way the work we need to do in Australia about reducing greenhouse pollution.

The GFC must not be used as an excuse or a block to taking action now and doing it with robust courage.

Margie Abbott

The Government, if necessary with the encouragement of the Senate, must stop its wishy-washy approach to making the changes necessary to reduce the likelihood of catastrophic climate change. The challenge of climate change dwarfs in significance the short-term impacts of the GFC which is currently so preoccupying our political and media elites. The huge preponderance of scientific work on climate over the past decade has confirmed the disastrous trend of climate change and outcomes at the worst end of the spectrum envisaged at Kyoto are now highly probable in the absence of swift and radical counteraction.

Australians generally accept this and are prepared to see substantial change over the short to medium term in our patterns of energy and resource use in ways which will diminish the climate threat.

The Government's 5-15% target is not at all adequate to avoid dangerous climate change. We should instead commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels). Garnaut made it clear that Australia is disproportionately and almost uniquely vulnerable to the effects of global warming. Apart from our responsibilities as rich global citizens with a strong humanitarian and internationalist tradition and a commitment to a fair go, this national interest makes it absurd and criminally negligent on the government's part to go to Copenhagen with a position which strongly projects a minimalist, lowest-common-denominator approach. If we as a rich, highly-vulnerable country are not prepared to face the seriousness of the threat and take decisive steps, who will?

The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) currently proposed by the Government is a badly designed scheme that will do more harm than good. The scheme as designed over-compensates polluters at the expense of the community and environment.

Setting a strong target with a better-designed scheme will be a step towards Australia doing what is needed to avoid dangerous climate change, and it will also help refocus our economy to take advantage of new growth industries in renewable energy.

Given the readiness of Australian citizens to tackle this problem and the wish of many to contribute, it is particularly perverse that because the CPRS imposes a floor beyond which emissions cannot fall, the action individuals and small businesses take to reduce energy will not reduce Australia's total greenhouse emissions further than the Government's weak target of 5-15%. In fact their action will only make room for industry to increase their emissions under that cap. For many people that will engender cynicism and act as a disincentive for them to start on the radical re-alignment of our approaches to energy generation and use which are vital to our collective future.

Joe Thwaites

The need for strong government-driven action on global warming becomes more urgent by the day. This week's new data on melt-rates of ice-floats in the Antarctic is most alarming. These events will be inevitably followed by movement of ice-shelves and glaciers from their terrestrial base to the ocean. The circumstances of the economic crisis are appreciated but they can no longer be allowed to interfere with the more pressing need to stabilise the climate crisis.

Geoff Bates.

6th April 2009

Dear Senate Committee,

Please listen to the scientists as you consider the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme. The evidence seems to be that the target of 5-15% by 2020 is far too weak to address the significant problem of climate change. We have only a few years to stop runaway climate change. Please consider this.

Scientists predict more catastrophic weather conditions such as that which produced Black Saturday's bushfire deaths. Please consider this.

If the Carbon Reduction Pollution Scheme is introduced, as it is proposed, then it gives the big polluters license to keep on polluting as they have been. There should be no free permits.

Strong action on climate change will create jobs in areas such as renewable energy. Please consider this.

It will also give a message of leadership that Australia is prepared to take the action that is needed to seriously bring down CO2 emissions. Please consider this.

My understanding is that with the proposed CPRS system that any voluntary efforts to reduce emissions by householders and by communities that these reductions actually just give more scope for the big polluters to increase their CO2 outputs. Nothing Penny Wong has said has reassured me or others I work with that this is not the fact.

Thank you for considering the future of our children in this.

Yours sincerely

Heather Barrett

3

The Government is more worried about the coal industry's threat of job losses rather than seeing the employment opportunities that will be created by alternative energies and modernising our economy to reduce greenhouse emissions.

In doing so they put our economy at risk and our children's future at risk.

Malcolm Macdonald

I am writing in support of the comments on the Australian Conservation Foundation website:

The Rudd Government's targets to cut greenhouse pollution by just 5-15% by 2020 are far too weak. If the rest of the world was to adopt similar targets Australia would face a future of more frequent and extreme weather events. If we fail to tackle the climate crisis now, we will suffer more deadly bushfires[1], costly floods and cyclones.

Everyone needs to do their fair share on climate change, including big polluting companies. The proposed Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme will see Australian taxpayers funding the activities of companies that are fuelling climate change to the tune of \$9 billion in the next three years. That's over \$1000 for every household in Australia. The scheme must be fixed by the Senate this year to stop big business from loading the problem of climate change onto everyone else.

Strong action on climate change will create millions of new Green collar jobs, and drive investment into renewable energy, not destroy jobs as the big polluters claim.[2]

For more information on how the weak CPRS can be fixed please see ACF's media brief.

Thanks

Philippa

[1] A joint CSIRO/Bureau of Meteorology study of the impact of climate change in bushfires found parts of Victoria faced up to 65% more days of extreme fire risk by 2020 and 230% more by mid-century.

[2] According to CSIRO economic modelling, 2.7 million new jobs will be created in Australia by 2025 if we set course to become carbon neutral by 2050.

I'm horrified by what our government is aiming for as a carbon emissions target. 5% is not a cut that will have any impact globally, and to enforce a 15% maximum is ludicrous. I am proud to be Australian as we have always been on the cutting edge of scientific and social progress, I consider this climate change policy to be as flawed as a new "White Australia" policy.

I do not want my emissions reducing efforts to allow industry to pollute more.

I hope this can change

Cam Pattrick

5% is not enough. Who are you pandering to?

Why are you determining a negative future for our world and our children and hopefully - grandchildren.

Please revise up the Climate Change legislation.

Respectfully

B Stone

I know that the government is worried about the economic climate and probably getting pressure from oil, gas and coal companys not to act. The earth is telling us something is wrong and we need to act now, no more excuses. If we dont act their will be less opportunity for the economy.

The reality is at best we will need huge injection of money into emergency services and relocate thousands of people from coastal towns. At worst many many lives will be lost.

Please we need to act now and strong.

There is always opportunity in adversity.

We can do this together.

Susan Mayer

The latest scientific findings are showing that climate change is happening much more quickly than previously thought.

The Government's 5-15% target is not at all adequate to avoid dangerous climate change. We should instead commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels).

Australia's weak target is undermining efforts to form crucial international agreement and must be improved before December's important UN Conference on Climate Change in Copenhagen.

The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) currently proposed by the Government is a badly designed scheme that will do more harm than good. The scheme design over-compensates polluters at the expense of the community and environment.

Because the CPRS imposes a floor beyond which emissions cannot fall, the action individuals and small businesses take to reduce energy will not reduce Australia's total greenhouse emissions further than the Government's weak target of 5-15%. In fact their action will only make room for industry to increase their emissions under that cap.

Please let Australia act as an international leader rather than continue the Howard governments panering to big polluters. A weak climate change policy will come at the expense of great small Australian businesses, such as toruism opperators who depend on the great barrie reef and farmers.

Act decisively now, please.

Emma Jacobs

The proposed scheme is far too conservative in its targets and it would appear that it will simply compensate heavy polluters at the expense of ordinary citizens. I am installing photovoltaic panels in the hope that I can do my bit to reduce our dependence on coal fired power stations. But I fear that the more I and others do at this level the more the heavy polluters will be compensated. We need strong and visionary policies. If it is to be a CPRS then the targets must be much higher. But I wonder if given the failure of markets to regulate greed and provide stable and equitable environments, that a carbon tax would be preferable. We must act now! Nature will not wait for us to compensate those who continue to drag their feet.

Dr. Edward Hills

To Whom It May Concern

I urge you to take strong action on Climate Change. I was enormously disappointed by the announcements of conservative action on climate change. We need STRONG well-thought-out action... not action that is short-sighted and designed to please. I am a 25 year old female and I want to see an Australia that makes me proud, that shows initiative, that sets an international precedent of change towards sustainability. Above all, i want to have the opportunity to bring children into a world with a future.

Sincerely

Vaiya Fermanis

I acknowledge that juggling the economy and the cost of climate change policy is unenviable for the government. However, the cost to our future if we fail to reverse the causes of global warming outweighs personal financial comfort.

Please ensure that the outcome to your inquiry provides both the whole of government and the people of Australia with the best options for achieving a realistic outcome.

For once, could we have transparent evidence-supported policy based on the global needs rather than political point scoring from ALL parties. Our children of the future would thank you.

Wendy Marsh

Dear Inquiry Panel

The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme proposed by the Government over-compensates polluters at the expense of the community and environment. The Government's target to reduce Australia's greenhouse pollution is inadequate and should be more like 50% by 2020 (based on 1990 levels).

Australia's weak target must be improved before December's important UN Conference on Climate Change so that efforts to form a crucial international agreement are not undermined.

Australia needs to commit to its fair share of undertakings to avoid dangerous climate change and renewable energy industries must be strongly supported.

I am extremely concerned that the Arctic summer ice is now expected to melt entirely within the next five years. What sort of a world are we creating for my five and three year old children.

Yours sincerely

Vanessa Sultmann

We are not doing enough quickly enough! Climate change is happening we need to cut CO2 emissions by at least 50% by 2015 and 100% 2020, we are a rich nation and even it ends up costing us in the short term our lifestyle would still be far higher than for those in the developing world.

Should we not adopt the above cuts then provision needs to be included in any proposed targets to be increased as evidence is further evidence is provided confirming that action should be taken more quickly.

We need to do this for our children, I am already ashamed that we as a society have not done more to address the problem. How much of the antartica has to disappear for us to get the message?

please act now.

regards

Pete Malavisi

Dear Secretary of Senate Select Committee,

The current Government target of 5-15% is not adequate to avoid dangerous climate change. We should instead commit to a broader target range of reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution by 10-40% by 2020 depending on the strength of the international response.

Please base your decision on the science not politics

I'm also troubled by the central and often overlooked injustice at the heart of climate change: that while the world's poorest and most vulnerable communities are the ones most impacted by climate change, they are the people least responsible for releasing the greenhouse emissions that cause it.

I appreciate the opportunity to have a say in the Senate Inquiry. Australia must do its fair share to prevent catastrophic climate change.

Yours sincerely,

Brad Pettitt

Dear Feds

Please, please set a target of at least 50% by 2020, based on 1990 levels, because the 5-15% emissions reduction target will achieve too little.

Then, there would be some chance of slowing or arresting climate change before it reaches the point where it is unstoppable, if we haven't reached that point already.

There are so many current and future threats from climate change - to water and food security, to terrestrial and marine habitat and species loss, to liveability, damage to property, financial loss, land loss, increase in extreme weather - to name a few.

We all must consider ourselves temporary custodians of this earth. This means that we have to see this earth as something that we nurture for all and not as a resource that we plunder or use in harmful ways. Every one of us has to put our selfish interests and consumption aside - yes, even pollies sacrificing re-election - if we are to pass a habitable earth on to future generations.

Please hear this plea.

Good wishes, Nina and Brian Earl,

The 5-15% target is not adequate to avoid dangerous climate change. We should be committing to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020, on 1990 levels.

Australia's weak target is undermining efforts to form crucial international agreement and must be improved before the Copenhagen UN Conference on Climate Change.

Setting a strong target with a well-designed scheme will ensure Australia does its share to avoid dangerous climate change, and will help refocus our economy to take advantage of new growth industries in renewable energy.

Bruce McKelvie

To our representatives,

I ask that you immediately re-evaluate your priorities.

We need you to ensure policies are in place that will enforce significant reductions of Australia's greenhouse pollution. As a nation, we need to take action now.

We must reduce carbon emissions to 50% (1990s levels), at the least, by 2020.

I know of many people who are extremely concerned about our environmental future. SO MANY PEOPLE ARE TRYING TO MAKE A DIFFERENCE BUT THIS WILL NOT HAPPEN IF YOU DO NOT ENSURE THAT INDUSTRY DO THE SAME.

Sincerely,

Lucy Cahill

To Whom It May Concern,

I believe the proposed climate policy, especially regarding the planned reduction in carbon emissions by 5% to 15% is extremely inadequate. Instead of "watching and waiting" to see how the rest of the world is going to react and enact carbon pollution reduction measures, we should be setting the standard for all others to compare to.

I want to be proud of our stance, and to be able to look back and say that my country was among the world leaders in setting the world's future in good stead.

Regards,

Lawrence Agars

The CPRS must be one of the most expensive and time wasting exercises in greenwashing. How can our leaders, the ones who were elected on a platform of promising to take significant steps towards reversing climate change claim that this legislation is anything other than protection for our polluting industries?

I hold a PhD in microbiology, but the consensus from the IPCC and scientists worldwide is clear enough for non-scientists to understand. Continuing with current greenhouse gas levels at 386 ppmv will promote an ice-free Arctic ocean and launch an irreversible cascade of events, the melting of Greenland and Antarctic ice sheets, thawing of the permafrost precipitating sea level rises with massive consequences to life on this planet. All this at the current levels of CO₂, yet this government proposes to go for a much more dangerous target, based on old data, of between 450-550 ppmv!

I am angry that our government thinks it can barter with mother nature. The 5-15% target falls far short of where the current science shows we need to aim, which is a minimum of 50% cuts by 2020. Given the rapid changes we are already observing due to climate change, we cannot dismiss the possibility that this target may need to be rapidly increased in the future. So, to be blunt it's very stupid that the CPRS is set up in such a way that tax payers will have to pay millions of dollars in to polluting industries to compensate for cuts above the 5-15% target.

Another daft aspect of this legislation is the fact that it will completely erase any benefits of individual action. My family has taken many steps to cut our energy use but under this scheme, any savings we make will simply make it easier and cheaper for polluting industries to pollute.

Then, there's that illogical loophole that allows the polluters to buy carbon credits overseas. So those overseas countries get the benefits of having green industries stimulated by Australian dollars, while Australia remains just a firmly entrenched in the dark ages of coal and other antiquated technologies.

Should the CPRS become law, it would have devastating effects on the critical negotiations that will take place at the December summit in Copenhagen.

Really, I thought we had elected a smarter and more conscientious government in 2007, but it appears that they are lead by the nose-rings by the same powerful greenhouse gas thugs that ruled the Howard government.

As a citizen that voted for the Rudd government. I have one simple message that I would like to impart - Stop trading my children and grandchildren's future for your short term political gains.

Sincerely,

Dr Tassia Kolesnikow

Kevin and Julia and my government,

Rudd Broadband is wonderful. Make Rudd climate action wonderful too.

Elizabeth

I am concerned at the low level of targets.

- The Government's 5-15% target is not at all adequate to avoid dangerous climate change. We should instead commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels).
- Australia's weak target is undermining efforts to form crucial international agreement and must be improved before December's important UN Conference on Climate Change in Copenhagen.

Thank you

Bob Cullen

A stronger target to reduce greenhouse gases is needed to be set by the Government - 5-15% is not sufficient.

We should be aiming for a stretch goal like %100 percent renewables by 2020 (even if this is not achieved) because:

- Credible scientific authorities say that the problem is that urgent.
- It will create many many green jobs.
- It will set an example to the rest of the world.
- It will motivate Australia's great thinkers and movers to try and achieve this goal.
- When there is political will resources become available to meet big visions.

Yours sincerely

Peter C Hobbs

I am concerned at the current emission reduction targets for Australia for 2020 as they are too low.

The coal industries' bleating against the current Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme sounds like we will all be using candles and riding horses, and is obvious nonsense. We must start with a price on carbon, and soon, but the current scheme over-compensates polluters at the expense of the community and environment..

The Government's 5-15% target is not at all adequate to avoid dangerous climate change. We should instead commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels).

Setting a strong target with a well-designed scheme will ensure Australia does its fair share to avoid dangerous climate change, and it will also help refocus our economy to take advantage of new growth industries in renewable energy. Australia must not squander the chance to be a major player in the emerging "green" global economy.

Climate change is a most serious threat to our future and strong targets need to be set that demonstrate commitment to a sustainable future.

Thanking you for your attention

Pamela S Jones.

To Whom it may concern,

I am very concerned about the lack of strong action on climate change. Climate change is real, happening right now and will have profound effects on every person in Australia and all over the world. It is clear from scientific evidence that the changing climate is closely correlated to greenhouse pollution, and therefore we as polluters have a direct responsibility to reduce carbon pollution.

It is simply not acceptable to commit to weak targets when the most reputable scientific evidence predicts catastrophic social, economic and environmental results. All countries must act together to become accountable for and reduce carbon pollution, and Australia's weak targets will undermine the efforts of other countries to reduce pollution.

We need to shift our economy into a sustainable future. Whilst the shift to sustainable energy and production will be difficult in the short term, the alternative will ultimately damage Australia's economy, agriculture, security and society far more than being proactive and taking responsibility for our carbon pollution.

Please, on behalf of the future of all Australians and the people all over the world, take **STRONG** action on climate change. Commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution by 50% by 2020. Rethink the CPRS so that becomes a tool to solve this problem, rather than a token gesture that in reality will allow industries to continue their archaic polluting practices. It is time to commit to the future. This is not just about politics or protecting the economy in the short term. This is a far far bigger decision, which will have implications for all of humanity.

Sujata Allan

Dear Mr Rudd,

As elected Prime Minister please bring us into the 21st Century in a way that future generations will look back on and be proud of the Labour Government's commitment to reducing greenhouse emissions. The target you have set of 5-15 % is only an environmental gesture and not tough action. I am deeply disturbed by the Labour government's lack of tough action to stop greenhouse pollution. Do not over-compensate polluters at the expense of the environment.

If jobs and economic growth are of deep concern to you and the Government...than you need to consider that we need a planet that sustains us as well, otherwise humanity is doomed. You need to listen to your citizens and stop making empty environmental gestures that do nothing to really halt global warming. Please be remembered as a politician who actually listened to his citizens and acted upon our concerns.

Sincerely,

Misbah Khokhar.

As a professional engineer I am deeply disappointed by the governments deeply conservative and weak response to the critical issue of climate change.

We have the confluence of crises with climate change and the GFC. Our government is behaving as if the latter trumps the former and that climate change action can be shelved. Unfortunately for all of us the laws of physics and chemistry can not be shelved and this delay, this denial, will cost us dearly in the near and long term future. Instead the government should be treating this confluence as serendipitous and be rising to both challenges simultaneously.

The appropriately bold response would be to embrace the public support for action that exists in this time of uncertainty and forge a new and progressive future for Australia. It is time to unshackle this nation from dependence on polluting extractive industries like coal and provide the legislative platform and infrastructure stimulus for the rapid expansion for renewable energy and energy conservation technologies. This means bold targets for CO2 emissions reductions, tough tax or carbon credit penalties for emitters and generous support to zero emission energy technologies.

The government must also remove the blindfold placed on it by the polluting sector in the guise of 'Carbon Capture' methods (CCS and expansion of Plantation Forestry). The real solution is not to emit the CO2 in the first place.

Put this nation on the road to a truly low emissions future by setting bold emissions reduction targets and backing them up with support for technologies that will keep carbon in the ground and in the native forests where it belongs.

5%-15% barely scratches the surface of what needs to be done.

Mike Scott CEng MIMechE

Please. Just open the eyes. Open your nostrils. Wake up. Smell the smog. See the dwindling Murray. Blink. Tear the blinkers off. Pull the foot from your mouth and your nose from the curved buttocks of the coal industry and see we need climate change action. Bigger targets. Binding targets. 40% reduction at least.

International action must start on a national level. Let's take it seriously. Set up a scheme to trade carbon that will work. Jobs can be created whilst helping the environment. The Planet. You know the one. It's where we live. Where we share. Where we grow.

You get what we're saying.

Cheers and cheerio

Tom Gardner

Dear Federal Government,

You need to increase the carbon emissions reduction target, it is fair below what's required.

Even America is setting higher reduction levels, what a joke this makes Australia look.

Big emitters are the ones that need to change their actions, the community will also do their bit but cannot bear the expense of big industry.

Please revise your scheme, it is not working for the good of our environment, climate or community.

Cheers,

Rachelle Willis

I believe that my children would be disappointed if I did not demand higher targets to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from our government. If no change is made after the submission of this Senate Inquiry, I vow to demonstrate in Canberra until our representatives take a stronger position and provide real leadership on this global issue.

Ande Foster

It is VITAL that you the government of Australia take URGENT and MUCH STRONGER action to reduce carbon emissions.

PLEASE get on with the job.... your current initiatives are not adequate and there is no way your government can justify such a pathetic response to what boils down to the survival of thousands of species on the planet. Please please please be bold in your policies so that there will be a reasonable future for our kids. Thank you. Maxine Cowie

This has to be written in haste.

I endorse the comments made that the reduction of carbon emissions is not going far enough - that 5-15% target is inadequate in order to avoid climate change which is now upon us to the extreme in all parts of the world. The Government target is too weak and the ordinary householder and small business(doing their bit) are up against big industry which is contributing the major part of pollution. This is far from helping to reduce emissions but instead has been making room for an increase in emissions from industry large and small. J.R.Boddy

Dear Environment Minister,

I am writing to urge you to re-consider the weak 5-15% target for reducing greenhouse emissions.

I voted for Labour partly based on your promises to help the environment (an area in which the Liberals failed).

However, your targets fall radically short of my hopes; they are simply not good enough. The Australian people are embracing proactive solutions to climate change now more than ever, and so should you. It is imperative we act on this, especially when we live in one of the most fragile ecologies in the world. This does not seem believable when you reside in a city of concrete and steel, but a quick look over the statistics of salination, species extinction and drought, and you will surely find it impossible to argue against the urgency of this problem.

Let's change now - aim for no less than 50%

Yours kindly,

Louisa

Enquiry Into Australian Climate Policy

I, among many others, voted the current government into office because it espoused strong beliefs and predicated strong policies to combat climate change. To us the new government was a breath of fresh air after the Howard government. However what disappointment. The government's proposed Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme is shamefully weak. In particular emission targets should be much closer to that of the EU (say 15-30%) and it sends the message that big polluters are the big winners.

Australian climate policy does not reflect the current crisis situation of Global Climate Change. This is now an emergency. We know the climate is changing much more rapidly than predicted by the IPCC report; much, much faster. Scientists regard the Arctic Sea Ice as the 'canary in the mine shaft' for GCC. It looks like the canary is dead. The Arctic is on the edge of a major tipping point and even scientists fear predicting the major climate destabilisation that will result.

I am a grandfather and want my grandchildren to have a habitable planet, not a withered and dead one. Isn't this a moral obligation we have to those who come after us? To right it is! Strong climate change policy is the only thing that can achieve that.

Australia, well known for 'punching above its weight', needs to take a leadership role in the upcoming Copenhagen conference. Setting strong pollution targets is a good start. We need to remember that Copenhagen could well be our last chance to get it right.

We need a reduction to 300 ppm CO₂e and we need it fast. Strong policy is the only way. If this government is not willing to commit to that let them get out of the way and let somebody who will commit govern.

Ron McGrath

8

It is already too late to prevent massive financial and environmental losses due to climate change.

Signs of this are all too clear in the web of natural disasters around the globe.

The best we can now do is to pull out all stops to:

1. Reduce our CO2 by at least 50% asap
2. Install solar and wind technologies on a nationwide and local home basis.
3. Phase out fossil fuel vehicles. Forget about propping up GM and Ford etc who have buried their heads in the sand for 20 years.

Australia has gained international recognition for reversing the Howard stupidity on Climate change but it can't afford to stall now. We must join the likes of Arnie, who stick their necks out to make a difference...to be true leaders.

The current CPRS is a negative step. We must have targets that hurt, otherwise we won't get change.

We also need a gross feed-in tariff for PV panels to keep the momentum going on distributed electricity production, which is a big CO2 saver as well as a government infrastructure bargain.

Climate change is the biggest problem the current suite of humans has ever faced. To dither now will be seen as stupidity by our descendants as they curse our failure to act when we still had relatively easy options. The longer we leave strong action, the fewer and more difficult the choices become.

Stuart McCallum

The government's proposed 5-15% target is totally inadequate if we wish to attain a "safe-climate future" for our children and grand children. I don't want them saying in 20 years time "What were they thinking?"

Achieving a 100% renewable energy target by 2020 is ambitious, but, according to Al Gore it is attainable. Anything less than aiming for 50% reduction by 2020 (on 1990 levels) is useless.

Climate change is happening more quickly than even the most pessimistic scientists projected 10 years ago. When the summer sea ice melts completely, perhaps as soon as 5 years from now, climate change will speed up due to positive feedbacks. We will quickly pass tipping points which will be extremely difficult to recover from.

Australia has more sun than many other countries. We are expected to take a lead, especially as the Copenhagen conference is looming.

The government's proposed carbon pollution reduction scheme is little more than a licence for the big polluters to continue polluting. (I am keeping my solar hot water RECs so that the offset can't be used by polluters.)

Please keep the government on track.

Regards - John de Figueiredo

The Government's 5-15% target is not at all adequate to avoid dangerous climate change. We should instead commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels).

Australia's weak target is undermining efforts to form crucial international agreement and must be improved before December's important UN Conference on Climate Change in Copenhagen.

The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) currently proposed by the Government is a badly designed scheme that will do more harm than good. The scheme design over-compensates polluters at the expense of the community and environment.

Setting a strong target with a well-designed scheme will ensure Australia does its fair share to avoid dangerous climate change, and it will also help refocus our economy to take advantage of new growth industries in renewable energy.

Tania Kromoloff

I am writing in response to Climate action the government is working toward.

I am very supportive of the green incentive of Solar rebate the government has been offering, (It is a shame these will be reduced in June), and I'm concerned that the action the government is taking is not sufficient enough to create a REAL change, fast enough to reduce the impact of the damage.

I would like to add my voice to the many other, in the hope this government which I chose, will have a stronger stand on this important issue (in my view, the most important issue!). I believe the government can do more in the areas of small self sustainability projects in rural and non rural communities, to reduce the need for long distance freight, and to encourage local produced support, like many Transition Towns sprouting around UK...

Elenor Sapir

To the Members of Parliament

I am again bewildered by the lack of leadership shown by our present government regarding greenhouse pollution.

There is the opportunity to set realistic and meaningful targets in this critical area and yet the continuation of 'Howard-like' mentality ensues.

Despite overwhelming evidence that suggests more needs to be done, Australia is yet again choosing to do little.

The compensation of polluters will do little to help our economy in the long term, as is evidenced by the moving offshore of many vital industries once the 'subsidies' run their term. The pattern of the past seems to be take the profits and run once money needs to be injected into capital works.

As an Australian I find it disappointing to see our elected representatives choosing to play party politics and point scoring, rather than tackling the hard decisions that need to be made in this issue.

The damage being done to the environment can not be easily repaired if at all. So I would like to put my voice forward to those of you who are prepared to stand as part of the world community working towards stronger targets.

I have not mentioned direct targets but would encourage Australia to err on the side of the countries choosing to do more rather than be at the bottom of the pile.

Given our climate I would expect to see extensive funding for solar, but somehow that is not the case.

Teresa Bernacki

I Will strongly support a decisive stance by the government on climate change. We need to drastically reduce Australia's greenhouse pollution by 50% by 2020.

Climate change is clearly here and we must act decisively now.

The CPRS, as currently drafted, over compensates polluters and de-incentivises individual behavior change. Please rethink it.

We need hope and to believe that the government will do what is required to save the world.

You said you would. We believed you and voted for you. NOW DO IT! We can't do it without you.

Sincerely,

Judith Lees

The Government's 5-15% target is not at all adequate to avoid dangerous climate change. We should instead commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels).

Sincerely,

Kate Tucker

Dear Government Members,

I implore you to take dramatic action regarding climate change now. We need to see realistic and powerful plans to significantly reduce carbon change, particularly that produced by industry. The technology and knowhow to make effective changes in our energy production is within our grasp, and the public and industry need strong incentives to change the way we use and manage our resources.

Please ensure that protecting corporate profit does not get in the way of protecting the future of our children.

Sincerely

Sun Hyland

The Government's weak 5% greenhouse reduction target is unacceptable.

It will lock us out of the deep carbon cuts we need to avoid dangerous climate change.

Australia's weak stance will also undermine efforts to build meaningful international agreements to tackle climate change.

Yours sincerely

Jonathon Carle

Dear Prime Minister,

On behalf of Australians, I respectfully ask you to lead the way on climate change policies for the world to follow. You can lead the world. Australians support you and are hoping you make the tough decisions, as does the world.

Sincerely,

Grant Richardson

Past Howard's governments were neglecting the above issues. Now even in economic downturn and because of it we need to apply all available forces to slow down "man made climate change". Changes are happening much more quickly and it is impossible to turn away from scientific facts. You/we need to act accordingly - quickly and decisively. For UN Conference in Copenhagen (December this year) Australia should lead the World instead of hindering processes by setting low targets.

First: increase greenhouse pollution target to 50% by 2020 as previously planned and

Second: redesign CPRS so it can deliver new, just scheme. New system will also help to develop renewable industries to benefit of industries, communities and environment instead of over compensating the polluters.

Your sincerelly

Kamilla Borzeta

I am extremely concerned with the inordinantly low target set by this policy .It must be higher ,at least 20% otherwise it will be essentially meaningless .I feel it overcompensates polluters removing much of the incentive for change .

I am very concerned that the Australian government has been unduly influence by industry while ignoring the science .

sincerely ,

Peter Sibley

Hello,

I would urge the government to greatly increase the reduction target for carbon emissions.

I realise that this could impact on the economy but am prepared for the possible consequences to my lifestyle. And it's up to the government to impose these upon us from above. Without government leadership on this, your average punter will find it hard to make big changes to their lifestyles. Even if, like me, they would be willing to do so.

It would be good, though, if there was some way of ensuring that people whose jobs will be the first to go, are given some guarantee that they will be supported and retrained... if this were to require more taxes then again I, and I suspect many others, would accept that. The alternative, of totally screwing up the planet for my kids is not an option.

best wishes,

Mike Murray

Hi,

I would like to you to please consider a larger program to reduce pollution than the 5% target. Let's go for at least ten to fifteen.

Could you make ways for us common people, you know the endusers to have our contributions count? such as allow for electric vechiles to be subsidised when available, how about better electric pushbikes with more powerful motors than the 200 watt toy-limit as set now. People will do the right thing with Grid and off Grid Photovoltiac as well.

A bit more wind from the roaring 40 group than even mentioned this week would be better. most of all we need to reduce our usage, just like we needed to with water during the drought.

If big business are the polluters, well then make their businesses expensive. What is the real price of burning coal? more than it costs to buy, that's for sure.

Please contribute to a better and cleaner world.

All the best,

Peter Macpherson

Please reconsider your targets. We as an affluent and socially responsible country must be an example. Let's have more investment into bio fuels that are made from Algae a renewable and minimal carbon output source. Please ensure all old growth forests are retained to keep the carbon in the ground.

Setting a strong target with a well-designed scheme will ensure Australia does its fair share to avoid dangerous climate change, and it will also help refocus our economy to take advantage of new growth industries in renewable energy.

Because the CPRS imposes a floor beyond which emissions cannot fall, the action individuals and small businesses take to reduce energy will not reduce Australia's total greenhouse emissions further than the Government's weak target of 5-15%. In fact their action will only make room for industry to increase their emissions under that cap.

Very sincerely

Christine Olsen

Kavin! I think you are the greatest thing since sliced bread appeared in Aus. I whole heartedly support you on all your initiatives to date, Go Kevin Go-BUT on the issue of climate change I feel you are lagging behind, offering a weak, useless, poor, non beneficial outcome, not being on the strong straight and narrow path, as you have been on other issues.

Turnbull and his cohorts are such twits--DONT BE AFRAID!

Regards

Jackie Elliott

I vigorously oppose the CPRS in its current form:

By compensating polluters and setting a ceiling on carbon prices, the CPRS will not result in needed price signals, and will therefore be ineffective.

The CPRS does not directly recognise voluntary community efforts, it therefore offers no incentive to become more energy efficiency, and is a disincentive invest in home panels etc.

Carbon neutrality by 2020 should be the aim. The 5-15% target is totally inadequate in the face of current scientific findings.

A strong target with a well-designed CPRS might help, however other mechanisms, including:

- a GHG tax, and

- regulation directly limiting emissions,

should also be considered.

Michael Nugent

Dear Parliamentarians.

I am writing to you to encourage you to recommend a much stronger target for carbon emission reduction. All credible scientists are recommending a target of at least 25% reduction. Already there are reports of climate change occurring at a more rapid rate than previously predicted. Australia is a wealthy country and a high emitting country and should be setting a high standard on reducing carbon emissions. A 5% target is woefully inadequate.

The CPRS is a flawed scheme that should be scrapped. It is highly unlikely to result in a reduction in carbon emissions and ridiculously compensates high emitters.

Yours sincerely,

Paul Hyam.

If the intention of the CPRS is to limit emissions to some predetermined target, it is flawed. The setup of the trading scheme means that emission levels will be stabilised rather than reduced. Attempts by a polluter to reduce emissions and will be balanced by another polluter increasing emissions by trading certificates.

I recommend that certificates be available to the Australian electorate for purchase so that the citizens can truly play a role in reducing carbon emissions.

Peter Horan

Mr Rudd,

I strongly believe the Government should have a higher target than the 5-15% greenhouse reduction target. There is ample evidence of climate change, notably the melting Arctic summer ice. Stronger action is needed. We need to lead the world, even if our emissions are on a percentage basis relatively small in world terms. LOOK AT THE PER HEAD OF POPULATION RATIO TO GAS EMISSIONS instead.

Myself and millions of Australians voted for this Government in the belief there would be REAL ACTION on climate change. The people are behind you Mr Rudd, don't fail us and future generations on this matter.

Also for heaven's sake WE NEED ACTION ON THE MURRAY/ DARLING AND SOUTH AUSTRALIAN LAKES PROBLEM. A centralised program to deal with this is the only way this will be resolved. Please think FOR THE FUTURE, not short term. You will gain more credibility with strong, decisive and practical ACTION than you will by offering platitudes to vested interests, particularly in Queensland, and therefore doing next to nothing to fix this problem.

Geoff Edwards

Current Australian climate change targets truly do not reflect the gravity of the situation.

- 1) Human-induced change would be more catastrophic than any in history;
- 2) Upfront economic costs alone are trifling compared to later costs - verified by international reports;
- 3) Requisite change calls for economic upheaval; it is currently an ideal time to introduce change, for governments to back economic and industry restructure - at no other time will there be such opportunity and willingness for governments to invest - so this investment can be made in meeting both challenges at once;
- 4) Governments need to display leadership; show the electorate that long-term stability and prosperity is the aim, rather than short-term attempts at propping up dying industries.

It is clear to all that the government's climate change map is both weak and insufficient to effect the necessary change.

Why are we not taking action at the very best point where change can be achieved?

Economic stimulus can achieve both the long-term and short-term goals if it is specifically and entirely directed at initiatives - and industry-adjustment incentives - that protect the environment, species, and biodiversity that we currently have stewardship over.

Generations will otherwise remember this time as a pivotal moment of lost opportunity.

Regards

Stephen Simmonds

Hi,

It is disturbing to note that Australia, a country of wealth in so many ways seems to have a regressive attitude to climate change and it's effects.

As an Australian I am constantly flabbergasted as to why we are not the progressive nation leading the way in adopting renewable energy as our primary source. Why has our magnificent solar technology been taken abroad and not used here?

I use to say "Well it's because Howard's government were completely ignorant to this issue and we suffer as a consequence". But I can't use this excuse for our embarrassing stance on the environment. With someone like Peter Garrett in Parliament, there's got to be some hope right?

Australia should set serious emissions targets like Europe. Why are we always the followers? We should be leading the way.

I think supporting the idea of reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels) is not unreasonable. What's the point in stimulating an economy that uses outdated methods of producing energy or ways that are detrimental to the future of this vast land?

The CPRS is ineffective, it seems like a pointless exercise unless other measures that are more drastic are taken. Such as heavily polluting companies being taxed fairly and not given free permits. What is the point of giving companies who makes billions in profit, free range to do whatever they like? It becomes the companies who control what the government decides. When I vote I don't want to be voting for a company, I want to be voting for politicians WHO WILL DO SOMETHING, not just roll over for the fat man.

These heavily polluting companies SHOULD have to pay a HIGH CARBON TAX.

Taxpayers should not have to pay for heavily polluting company's emissions. And really be given incentives to go renewable energy options. Every household should be given subsidies or some incentive to install renewable energy options such as solar energy.

I want to see 100% of Australia's electricity to come from renewable energy sources. It's not an impossibility. If Governments stopped panicking and looked at the long term then perhaps they could step back and see the benefits, economically and environmentally. Strong emission targets will help refocus our economy to take advantage of new growth industries in renewable energy.

The CPRS emissions floor is inappropriate as whatever I do to decrease emissions means that heavily polluting companies will be able to pollute more. Where's the fairness or justice in that? Really, let's be realistic about all of this. Whose pockets should we be lining here? Companies who are the main culprits? Or improving overall conditions for every Australian?

You tell me...

Larissa Gadza

Dear Senate Inquiry

The Government's proposed CPRS is a disgrace. It puts our money into the pockets of multi-nationals while achieving nothing to shift our economy into a zero emissions future.

In Melbourne this summer we experienced an unprecedented heat wave coupled with record low rainfall. During this heat wave, the city nearly shut down. Established trees dropped their leaves in protest - we feared it might be a death throe. The train system groaned to a halt. The electricity suppliers ran rolling blackouts to meet demand.

As the sun rose each day, its relentless, unstoppable power was frightening.

I learnt (again) that we are at the mercy of the climate. It is a force far far beyond human capacity.

Australia must not allow the interests of the powerful coal and car maker lobby to stop us from changing course. Acting decisively and acting now will mean we can take advantage of the opportunities in the new real economy where emissions are CUT not abated or sequestered.

There is no more time to waste. Please, please call the government to account and force them to fulfil their mandate.

Australians have said loud and clear that we want action.

It is time to leave the coal in the ground for future generations who might be able to use it safely.

Thank you.

Hellene Gronda

I would like to congratulate the Australian Government on actually committing to a Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme. However, I have a number of concerns with the CPRS as it currently stands, and urge the Australian Government to make a number of changes to ensure it actually delivers a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions and sends a strong message to other countries in the lead up to the UN Conference on Climate Change in Copenhagen.

The urgency of taking strong action on climate change is only increasing, and there is now clear scientific evidence that shows that climate change is happening far more quickly than previously thought. The breaking apart of the Wilkins Ice Shelf that has been reported in the media in recent days is just one example of the escalating impact of climate change.

I do not believe that the CPRS will achieve the necessary reductions in Australia's greenhouse gas emissions to avoid dangerous climate change. The target of 5 to 15% is not at all adequate, and we should instead be committing to reduce Australia's greenhouse pollution by 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels). At very least, we should be leaving the option open for a target higher than 15% if the rest of the world signs on to a strong agreement on climate change.

There are also problems with the compensation provisions of the CPRS. As it stands, the CPRS is overly generous to polluting industries, and with different categories of assistance, may even provide an incentive for companies to increase their emissions.

In addition, because the CPRS imposes a floor beyond which emissions cannot fall, the action that individuals and small businesses take to reduce energy will not reduce Australia's total greenhouse emissions further than the already weak target of 5 to 15%.

While the business and industry lobbies appear to have been extremely effective at securing an emissions trading scheme that meets their needs, this is at the expense of a new green economy. The CPRS as it stands is delaying the necessary structural adjustments to our economy that must inevitably be made if we are to be serious about avoiding dangerous climate change. Australia is so well placed to be a world leader in renewable energy technologies that we are doing ourselves a disservice by continuing to prop up those industries that make such a large contribution to climate change, and at the same time providing only minimal assistance to the renewable energy industry.

I urge the Australian Government to be a world leader in tackling climate change in the lead up to the Copenhagen Conference. I do not believe that the CPRS as it stands will send the right message to the rest of the world.

Yours sincerely, Nicole Hodgson

The latest news from the Antarctic ice cap means urgent action is needed now

Ron Newbold

I've been following the climate change debate intimately for the past 10 years, looking at both sides of the debate and attempting to formulate the most objective viewpoint possible.

Frankly it's insulting to see Labor's climate change response. In the face of the overwhelming evidence that is mounting and now the huge ice mass that has separated from Antarctica, I fail to see in any way how Labor is fulfilling its federal election promise to seriously tackle climate change.

Many people that I know have voted for Labor based on their commitment to tackle this issue seriously.

The CPRS is ridiculous. How can you expect that anyone who understands the issues to take you seriously when you produce a scheme such as this. My emission reductions and anyone in Australia for that matter will count for nothing in the proposed scheme. Surely empowering the community to part of the solution has to be a part of the mix to tackle climate change. Whilst individual reduction will equate to very little in the scheme of things, the sense of moving forward, personal satisfaction and community momentum is absolutely necessary if we are to oversee a shift in community attitude toward our planet.

Setting a strong target with a well-designed scheme will ensure Australia does its fair share to avoid dangerous climate change, it will also help to refocus our economy to take advantage of new growth industries in renewable energy.

Take climate change seriously, if we don't invest in sound renewable technology now by building a green revolution, we leave that necessary workload for our children. The question that remains is, will this be too late? More pointedly, are we arrogant and selfish enough to take the risk?

Mark Davis

To whom it may concern

I'm writing to voice my concern with the Rudd Governments inadequate commitments to the reduction of the greenhouse effect. I highly believe that the current policy needs to be reviewed in favour of more stringent schemes that reduce our carbon footprint, moreso than the one currently drafted. I believe that for our nation to uphold some regard within our region we need to lead by example and set a strong target (more than the 5- 15%). I believe more attention should be directed towards renewable energy and also to industry.

sincerely,

Fabian Claveria

Dear Senator Coulter,

I have a Master's Degree in Ecology and am very alarmed about climate change. I am appaled that the Prime Minister has seen fit to just introduce such a miserable reduction in carbon emmissions. I hope you will stand up for a genuine reduction demonstrating you do understand the threat to our planet. I am not saying t is an easy problem to solve but we must be realists and make sure our children will have a world worth inheriting.

Yours sincerely,

Joy Thomson

1. Everyone is seeing the results of climate change as weather patterns continue to change and drought continues to afflict this country. The only way to encourage us to act is by strong leadership. A goal of 50% reduction on 1990 levels by 2020 is truly such a goal.
2. I am appalled at the discrimination between individuals/small businesses and industry.
3. If industry is addressed properly and strives to make greater changes, we can begin to truly understand the changes we all need to make in our personal lives. Until we see the way forward that changes our thinking and behaviour towards consumption and product selection and industry processes we will be not change.
4. I voted Labor to see good decisions made when the issues are at their toughest. IN terms of climate change this has not happened.
5. I believe that lobby groups for industry have their hands tight around the throats of both Labor and the Liberal parties, so I hope the senate enquiry can be truly effective and work for the people not for the interests of industry alone, but encourage industry to come on board with us, redefine their businesses and contribute positively to our futures.

Barbara McConchie

The Australian Government needs to get serious about climate change. Their current target of 5-15% isn't enough to save my children and grandchildren from extinction. Help us now. Just this week the Wilkins glacier separated from the iceshelf on Antarctica, an occurrence that wasn't expected for 5 more years. Families can't do it on their own, but need clear leadership that thinks further than the next election.

Sincerely,

Karen Gurton

To whom it may concern,

I voted for this new government because Rudd said he would do a lot more for our country regarding climate change so far he is a liar and if he doesn't change his ridiculous policy I will never vote for the Labour government again.

We are sick of coal fuel it is outdated as a form of energy we need to get on board and set up more alternative forms of fuel instead of coal etc.

The dramatic change in our climate is hard not to miss especially where I live with the constant rain, storms and floods if you can't see the dramatic change then what planet are you on?

I fear for my children as do most people of Australia what will become of their future living on a planet without clean, air vicious storms, unclean water, disease and food that isn't worth eating(no nutrients left in the soil or GE crops).

Wake up Rudd and smell the roses do something more dramatic and stop being scared of the fuel companies pushing you to ignore what is happening around this beautiful country and planet.

Regards

Joanne Foster

We demand stronger climate action than that proposed by the Government. It is a badly designed scheme that experts tell us will do more harm than good. Additionally the scheme over-compensates polluters at the expense of the community and environment.

Australia's weak target is undermining efforts to form crucial international agreement and must be improved before December's important UN Conference on Climate Change in Copenhagen.

Fay and Brian Gregory

In order to assist urgent global action on climate change, as well as reduce our high per capita emissions, Australia needs to show strong leadership by adopting higher national emission reduction targets that reflect the latest climate science and limiting industry assistance solely to restructuring purposes. The Australian Government should urgently educate the Australian public on the seriousness and urgency of the problem to combat the lack of coverage and misinformation in the mainstream media, in order to build political support for the government to take action on the scale and timeline required.

Lorraine Irwin

Dear hon. sir/madam,

The Government's 5-15% target is not at all adequate to avoid dangerous climate change. Since Australians are wealthy and have the highest carbon footprint per capita than any other country, there are many easy low-cost reductions in our emissions that can be made. This is why we can aim for at least a 25% target by 2020 (on 2000 levels) and help the world to save our precious natural ecosystems such as Australia's own Great Barrier Reef and Kakadu. The Government's expanded MRET target will meet at least 5% of the target alone and it is understood that this is NOT additional to the CPRS target.

A steady stream of new scientific findings is showing that climate change is happening much more quickly than previously thought. I urgently ask that we aim for more - at least 25%.

Yours,

Nicholas Cutler

The government's own white paper on Climate Change noted that 'Taking responsible and decisive action on climate change is crucial to our economic prosperity now and for the future.' However, the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme in its current form fails to do this.

- Giving away free permits to certain industries means that the rest of the economy has to make up the difference, while the price signal for the biggest polluters is eliminated. An alternative would be to offer adjustment assistance trade exposed energy-intensive industries which is separate from the permit scheme, only exists until an international scheme is in place, and is contingent on industry participation in a low-carbon transition plan.

- The 5% absolute target is utterly inadequate and likely to harm international efforts for stronger targets. The government's reasoning is that with a growing population this absolute target translates to a much larger per capita target of 34-41% below 1990 levels, comparable to EU targets. As the second-largest largest per capita emitters of carbon, it is only fair that we make a greater per capita reduction. With evidence accumulating that climate change is happening far faster than we thought it would, we simply do not have time to slowly ramp up from weak targets.

- The target is not only a cap: it is a floor. Preventing individual and small business actions from further reducing emissions is counterproductive and must be fixed.

I am deeply concerned about this issue and hope that the legislation can be improved.

Please set targets that will actually make a difference, instead of useless token gestures.

Yours sincerely,

Jacqui

5 to 15%??? What a joke.

Listen to the scientists, the studies, the experts, but most importantly, listen to the Australian people. We are ready and willing to act. Ask us to jump and we will say "How high?".

We are begging you to lead. The CPRS currently favours big industry polluters to high, and the message is spreading around the globe, 'Profit Before Planet' talk about embarrassing. Australia needs to get back on board, inspire, innovate, and lead the way. We want to be proud Aussies again.

Bring on green jobs to stimulate the economy while being environmentally savvy. Encourage the public to act locally and raise awareness in schools. Implement green technology- at home and at work.

Lets look at how and what we consume and start putting the pieces together.

We love our environment, we love our reef and our climate. We are ready and willing to fight for it.

Lets aim for 50% by 2020.

Kate Broad

The old cliché that goes something like 'you only have one Look after it, once it's gone you don't get another one' can also be applied to our planet. It has been used many times to fight for the survival of wildlife with governments taking a strong stand to ensure the future of endangered species. I think that it is better to err on the side of caution than to neglect something and watch it deteriorate or die because you didn't do enough to care for it.

There has been a lot said over recent months, with the floods, bushfires and other natural disasters, about saving people's homes or lives and the great effort people have put in to helping others do this. Earth is our home, don't leave the battle to others, be a significant part of it. That is what Australians pride themselves on being - doers, battlers and helping those in need.

Give our children and their children a fighting chance, give our future generations a chance. Please reconsider and bring the Australian effort into line with other countries around the world who are using higher targets.

sincerely

Kaylene Domanski

Dear Mr. Rudd,

I am disappointed in the 5 to 15% target for CPRS. I would like to see a bigger target.

Also it is unacceptable that polluters are over compensated. We are in a world of user pays and these companies are providing big salaries for their executives.

They can always afford this but do not make reducing pollution a priority. It is simple, they pollute so they pay. It should be always part of their costs.

Green solutions will always be at a disadvantage unless the full cost of other industries production is paid for by the co.

Your sincerely, Maureen whetton.

Thankyou so much for beginning this emission reduction process - a much better improvement from the previous government!!

Please increase the reduction target - be the government who made a difference. It will stimulate new industries, a new green economy and will show Australia's maturity and leadership on the world stage, and it will put us in front of others who lag behind.

Please help heavy polluters to adjust to the new, higher targets, but don't compensate heavily - there are ample, proven methods to achieve the reductions required, in most cases, and increasing their technologies to do this only puts them ahead of their competitors in a changing future market. Govt help in this area will strengthen our economy as well as helping fight against catastrophic climate change.

Please view this as the triple-bottom-line sustainability issue that it is - it is not a case of environment vs economy, but a clear link between the two.

Thanks,

Ewan Buckley

The government's approach to climate change is very disappointing. Having signed the Kyoto Protocol finally, Australia has once again decided to drag its feet and because a laggard.

There is a golden opportunity now, in the midst of the worst financial crisis in four generations, to restructure the economy to be sustainable. Instead of seizing this opportunity, the ALP is simply trying to get vast quantities of money into the system as fast as possible without any meaningful effort to ensure that the money is spent on sustainable infrastructure.

The overarching ideology of neoliberalism and market fundamentalism got us in to the current economic mess. But the overarching ideology of industrialism that the ALP subscribes to is not going to get us out.

Mindless industrialism--whether via the market or the state--may secure our short term future. But that security comes at the expense of our longer term wellbeing.

The ALP's CPRS will mean it cannot be a major player at December's UN Conference on Climate Change. And the weakness of its approach will justify the slow action of other states too.

As our country warms, bushfires become more frequent, the Great Barrier Reef dies, and species decline, we must not settle for a mere 5-15% reduction. We must move aggressively to cut GHGs in a much shorter time frame--by 50% by 2020.

And we must do so by placing responsibility on those doing the polluting to cut their emissions; and by developing a system where those who do the right thing and reduce their carbon footprint voluntarily do not simply create more polluting capacity for those doing the polluting.

Fred Gale

Dear Senate Member,

I wish to express my dismay at the government's proposed Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme. Ordinary Australians are really making an efforts to reduce their carbon footprint and we want these efforts to count - we don't want a scheme that over-compensates polluters at the expense of the community and environment.

Australia needs a strong carbon emissions target and should commit to a reduction of 50% on 1990 levels by 2020. Everyone I talk to is prepared to make changes to decrease their impact on the environment and wants to support new growth industries in renewable energy. We need you, our representatives, to make strong decisions on our behalf.

Please don't let the Rudd Government continue to make weak decisions on the environment - they are losing our trust.

Kind Regards,

Wendy Christie

Dear Senators of the Senate Select Inquiry on Climate Policy.

I believe the targets set by the current government are far too soft and we as a nation must face the reality of climate change by doing as much as possible to minimize Australia's carbon dioxide output by investing in alternative energy generation, investing in public transport and focussing on green infrastructure programmes that benefit our environment and therefore lifestyle. Time to forget our obsession growth. If there is to be growth let it be in Green industries that benefit us and future generations.

Regards,

Johan de Bree

Dear senate

I beg you to put all politics and lobbying by the big emitters of green house gasses aside and please listen to the latest scientific findings.

We need to act and think big not bury our heads in the sand and hope that all will continue as before.

The Government's 5-15% target is not at all adequate to avoid dangerous climate change. We should instead commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels).

Look around Australia and the world and realise it is happening. Act strongly for the sake of us all.

Kind regards

Julie D'Bras

To Senators on the Senate Select Committee on Climate Policy,

The nature of climate change is that it requires a proper commitment to a wide solution from developing nations. The nature of emissions trading is to provide an economic incentive for businesses to change their conduct to reduce their emissions; especially away from the type of 'eternal growth' capitalism that Kevin Rudd has waxed lyrical about being at its end.

Unfortunately, to the aforementioned purposes the current emissions trading scheme is weak and the Australian public - which I would like to remind the Senate it is required to represent - is intelligent enough to view it as such.

It is true that the public is all too aware of the political realities of certain parties, that limit a stronger trading scheme from easily passing into actual legislation. However, a Senate that ignores the science of climate change in order to pass such a weak target as 5% is not proving itself worthy of the power the people have given it. Proposing at least twice that would have been more realistic, so the bill must be changed to do that (or preferably more) against other pressure.

Furthermore, the change in Australia concerning emissions must happen in significant steps or it will not reverse Australia's recent embarrassing problem of being the highest per capita, per person emitter of carbon into the atmosphere. If the current weak bill is passed into legislation, the 5% mark will prevent a significant enough step for the current Labour Government's term, leaving bigger steps for later, when another party could potentially make them impossible. And the later that these steps are left, the more danger there is to the currently ailing economy and our contributions to the world economy consecutively as the steps are implemented.

The current scheme proposes a cut of 15% of emissions by 2020. But if there is not a cut of 40% of our current emissions by 2020 in Australia (in spite of our predicted population growth), the Senate will prove that Australia is now the most excessively capitalist nation. And speaking as a member of the public, I think that we have enough to be ashamed of thanks to past political actions.

When our current government said "sorry" concerning the past, that was real progress for our country, especially in the eyes of the rest of the world. My request is that you do not make it necessary for future Senate members to apologise for you. Amend the bill and create something far stronger, which allows for wider solutions like powerful renewable energy growth, aiding the economy and protecting the environment in one sweep. Science will salute you, and the Australian people will have another reason to be proud.

Name: Sylvan Reynolds

In the light of the latest scientific evidence that climate change is happening much more rapidly than previously predicted, I strongly urge the Government to commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution to 50% of 1990 levels by 2020.

The proposed reduction of 5-15% is just not good enough. It is vital for the future of this country that we be part of a global solution to climate change, that we be part of any international agreement negotiated at the UN Climate Change conference in Copenhagen. The proposed target will undermine global efforts to negotiate a meaningful agreement at Copenhagen.

It is essential that Australia set a much stronger target. There will be demonstrable social and economic benefits as we will be able to develop green jobs and industries as part of a focus on renewable energy.

This government was given an overwhelming mandate at the last election to act upon climate change. It is ever more urgent, for our children and the following generations, that this government honour that mandate.

Zoe Baker

Why not lead the way for other nations Australia?

Set strong targets; as a nation we rise to meet challenges.

Let us re-tool our legacy economy by a well-designed carbon reduction scheme and invest in new technologies to give future generations a fighting chance. Preferably without heavily subsidising the incumbent industries - if they are forced to face the reality of their impact they will get very innovative very quickly.

Regards

Dennis Cooper

To whom it may concern;

I am especially disappointed with the announcement of these weak targets for carbon emission reduction. I understand the pressures the Government is under and the balancing of interests but selling the future to the present is thoroughly unacceptable. We all have one common interest, whether we realise it or not, and that is prevent catastrophic climate change from happening.

These targets cannot help achieve that and may in fact undermine those genuinely trying to make a difference.

Grow some spine and stand up properly.

David Mould

Dear Australian Senators,

This is my submission to the inquiry regarding the Federal Government's climate policy. I am an Australian citizen living in Sydney, NSW. I kept myself informed about climate change with a longstanding membership of the environment organisation, the 'Australian Conservation Foundation'.

I demand strong climate action to reduce Australia's greenhouse pollution by 50% (on 1990 levels) by the year 2020.

Scientific findings show that climate change is happening even faster than previously thought. This information forms the basis for my call for strong action against climate change.

I reject the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme that is currently proposed by the Government because the scheme over-compensates polluters.

I believe Australia's current weak target is undermining efforts to form a crucial, international agreement on the matter. I want very strong targets decided on before December 2009's United Nations Conference on Climate Change in Copenhagen.

Because the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme imposes a floor beyond which emissions cannot fall, any action that individuals and small business take to reduce energy will not reduce Australia's total greenhouse emissions further than the Government's weak target of 5 - 15%. In fact, the action that individuals and small business take to reduce their energy will only make room for industry to INCREASE their emissions under that cap. This anomaly needs to be fixed.

I submit that setting a strong target with a well-designed scheme will ensure Australia does its fair share to avoid dangerous climate change. A strong target will help focus on our economy to take advantage of new growth industries in renewable energy.

Setting a strong greenhouse pollution reduction level in 2009 will be the Government's biggest, most

Yours faithfully,

Alison McKeown.

thank you for the opportunity to made a submission:

the current global economic situation is such a great opportunity to make important changes to the way we generate and use power - governments' infrastructure building programs can be focussed both on a greener and safer future as the same time as providing jobs in the present.

Mr Rudd has already likened the govt's provision of national broadband to the road building etc of earlier years - Creating green infrastructure is a similar opportunity to provide for the present and the future

Yours sincerely,

Kate Makowiecka

I voted for the Greens because I believe in Australia being a world leader, not a country that pretends to be an international power; talking up its environmental credentials on the world stage, whilst actually committing to less than adequate standards in environmental policy. This is not what I teach my secondary school students about leadership.

I am bitterly disappointed in labour's policy and believe that a 50% reduction on 1990 levels is absolutely necessary. I am also disgusted by the fact that the badly designed CPRS will remove all my individual efforts to reduce carbon emissions. Australia is currently sending the wrong message to other countries on this issue.

I applaud the senators who were able to set up this review and plead with the government to reconsider their emission targets and the design of the CPRS so that individual green house gas reduction efforts are made over and beyond any government targets.

Sincerely,

Andrew Vance

Climate change is upon us already. It can no longer be ignored. Governments are spending enormous amounts of money in repair of violent weather. Australia's weak target is not worthy of us. We are one of the well-off countries of the world, so 5-15% is very much a "we're alright, Jack" response. But we are not. This year alone we have witnessed violent fires and floods.

How about shouldering a bit of responsibility, not only for ourselves but also for the world and coming generations and set a worthwhile target.

Virginia McGill

The proposed carbon pollution reduction scheme is a totally inadequate response to the challenge of climate change. The impacts of the current global economic crisis will be irrelevant compared to the effects of climate change unless high polluting, developed countries like Australia demonstrate real leadership and take unequivocal action to drastically cut carbon emissions. A minimum target emissions reduction of 50 percent based on 1990 levels is needed immediately to avoid a catastrophe of unimaginable proportions. The CPRS must not grant high polluting industries free or cheap credits to carry on polluting in an unabated manner.

Sincerely

Dr Terry Clark

Dear Sirs and Madams,

I firmly believe that your proposed targets for Climate Change Policy go nowhere near what is needed to avert catastrophic change to the world as we know it. I would much rather see you decide to go a little overboard, than to leave us dangling in an uninhabitable world. Our world is changing much faster than our scientists ever predicted, and we need to act equally as fast to prove to the world that we mean business and hopefully to encourage other nations to follow our path.

Please make Australia's commitment to reducing greenhouse pollution a further 35 - 45% on 1990 levels, rather than your current, weak, proposed 5 - 15%.

Our economy can be made to bloom under the right sort of vision and leadership: a vision that sees new and massive growth in renewable energy. Setting strong targets (and ensuring large Australian businesses are NOT compensated for pollution emissions at the expense of the community and the environment, which is the current position,) and encouraging smaller businesses and the public at large to become more involved in the renewable technologies field, is the way to start.

It seems to me that the more individuals do to reduce their impact on our world, the more our governments let big business get away with doing the wrong thing.

We've had enough! The time has come to DEMAND that our government does what we, the public - the electors, want, and to stop pandering to big business that has got us into this mess in the first place.

Thank you for taking the time to read my submission.

Kaye Proudley

Climate Change is the biggest issue we will have to face in our lifetimes that will directly effect the quality of life of the future generations.

I am very disappointed in the governments targets, 5-15%, apart from being totally inadequate at preventing dangerous climate change, these targets will send a bad message to the rest of the developing world about their roles in combating climate change. I believe that Australians as the largest per capita emitter have the most responsibility for changing their emissions. We need strong leadership from the Rudd government to be able to do this. We need to tax carbon pollution, without offsets, without free permits, how will industry change if the responsibility for polluting can be passed on to others or bought out?

The current CPRS is insulting to the good people who have made real changes in their lives to reduce emissions. Industry and the population should not be thrown in the one bag here, if we reduce our emissions, industry should not be able to fill the gap!

As the driest and warmest continent on earth, we stand to lose the most from climate change.

Please take this issue seriously, for the sake of the youth and future people who will inherit the pollution we leave behind.

Regards,

Rebecca Herron

Dear Senators,

The Rudd Government's targets to cut greenhouse pollution by 5-15% by 2020 is not adequate.

Everyone needs to do their fair share on climate change, including big polluting companies. The proposed Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme will see Australian taxpayers funding the activities of companies that are fuelling climate change. Please, the scheme must be fixed by the Senate this year to stop big business from loading the problem of climate change onto everyone else.

Strong action on climate change will create millions of new Green collar jobs, and drive investment into renewable energy, not destroy jobs as the big polluters claim.

Please consider the long term implications of these issues. I, for one, would rather have a simplified lifestyle that brought our country's carbon footprint into line with a realistic use of global and local resources.

In particular, I am alarmed that forested areas is still being cleared at a time when the planet's forests, our planet's lungs, should be protected above all else (not to mention their role in protecting valuable plant and animal diversity). Can you do what you can to stop this madness please?

Sincerely

Cathy Bredemeyer

To whom it may concern

I am writing to express my disillusionment with the government's current climate change target efforts. The 5 - 15% target allocated is not adequate to avoid dangerous consequences and I support a target of a 50% reduction by 2020, on 1990 levels. Australia's poor effort undermines international efforts to form global agreement and the CPRS is a badly designed scheme that will do more harm than good. Setting higher targets will ensure our country does its fair share on climate change and is able to take advantage of new growth industries in renewable energy.

Yours faithfully,

James May

Handing our money willy nilly is no way to help the economy or save the planet from global warming. There are no strings on how the money given out will be spent. It will very likely be spent on buying imported goods whose manufacture contributes to Greenhouse emissions.

Government money spent on training for the many new green jobs we need and will need in the future and then supporting the needed green industries with government legislation and finance is a much better way to go

And a 5% to 15% carbon emissions by 2020!!! Come on!!

Peg Walsh

I am incredibly disappointed at the Government's environmental record to date especially in relation to cutting greenhouse emissions. A 5-15% target is pathetic. We might as well not bother at all. Please commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels) AT LEAST.

Why should the world and future lives be jeopardised by narrow minded self centred old people? They don't have the right to force their outdated selfish views on the rest of the world. Why do you let them? PLEASE ACT AS LEADERS.

regards

Debbie

Dear Government representatives,

It is alarming that as a country we can't seem to take the situation with catastrophic climate change more seriously and do more to slow down and stop the effects of carbon emissions on the earth's climate. Moves so far are not sufficient to make significant change and we must do more. Please take stronger action to avert the dangerous effects on our climate that will eventually bring all commerce and other currently valued activities to an end.

Yours sincerely, Julie Martello.

A reduction of 5% to 15% in carbon emissions isn't what we voted this government in for. The warnings by scientists are being seen as valid every day.

GET MOVING!!

And stop wastefully handing out money to "fix" the economy. Direct it into green jobs and green education and support for green industry

Peg Walsh

For God's sake people , WAKE UP !!

WE DON'T HAVE ANY OPTIONS . We must make far higher targets for reduction of greenhouse emissions. The figure - percentage should be based on hard environmental science not politics or economics.

As when natural disaster strikes and people are galvanised into cooperative action to save the situation , now is the time for action on a large scale to try to restore the biosphere of our planet-EARTH.

Even conservative science agrees that Planet Earth is warming at an alarming rate . Our very survival is at stake

Unless we work diligently over the next decades to rapidly reduce greenhouse emissions , we and future generations of humanity will inherit an uninhabitable planet .

Yours sincerely

Rhys Jones

5% reduction is pathetic. This needs to be our countries major priority.

We have a responsibility to future generations to start fixing things now, it can no longer be just about putting more money in our pockets.

We only have one planet, we need to listen to it and learn to coexist with it.

Kerry Wilson

I am concerned that the greenhouse targets set by Govnt are too low and will not go far enough in preventing dangerous climate change, which scientific findings seem to suggest is happening alot faster than previously thought. We need to act now before it becomes too late and there is irreversible change.

The current Carbon Pollution Reduction scheme(CPRS) overcompensates polluters at the expense of the community and the environment. Similar schemes in Europe have not resulted in lowering of green house emmissions. We need to look at constructing a better scheme, one that encourages the growth of industries in renewable energies, and with that will come new jobs.

Also at this critical time we should not be allowing old growth forests to be cut down. Why is the Gunns mill going ahead? The forests, especially old growth forests are our lungs. We need them more now than ever before.

Plse set stronger targets and let the world know that we mean business and are going to do our bit to save the planet.

The focus at the moment is on saving the financial sector and minimising the damage caused by the global recession. However if we do no look out for planet Earth NOW and do our bit to prevent climate change we will not have an economy to save! Yours sincerely, Georgina Kategiannis

Honourable members, I urge you to reconsider the need for strong and urgent action to reduce carbon emissions before our environment is adversely affected beyond recall.

Now is the time to take strong action, tomorrow may be too late. For 11 years we had John Howard bleating about the adverse effect any action would have on the economy and actually doing nothing. If he had had the courage to act we would be in a better position than we are now.

I fear that if really strong action is not taken very soon the world as we know it could be a thing of the past.

How do we explain to our children and grand children that we were responsible for destroying the world and did nothing because we thought money was more important than their future?

I urge you to be strong, be determined, and you may even be popular for actually having the guts to do something.

John Feakes

Dear Sir,

The proposed 5 -15% target for greenhouse emissions reductions is not adequate to avoid dangerous climate change.

The Australian carbon reduction scheme must commit to a much higher target in order to provide sufficient reductions and stimulate new green technologies and development of green industries.

This target should be in the order of 50% by 2020. The Australian people have clearly demonstrated that this is a key issue of concern and many are making large individual efforts to reduce their own carbon 'footprint', but this must be supported by changes to our industrial focus and reliance on coal and oil to power our society.

I do not agree with the schemes compensation approach to big polluters or the ability to offset Australian emissions in the third world by buying forests. Saving rainforest is extremely important but must not be an easy and cheap alternative to social and industrial change here in Australia. The GFC gives us an opportunity to transform our industries and create new types of employment and sustainable societies. We must change our way of life as a result of the GFC, lets make it a change to a sustainable low emissions economy.

yours sincerely

Maggie May

The Government's weak target to reduce greenhouse pollution by 5-15% is completely inadequate to avoid climate change and is undermining efforts to reach an international agreement at the UN Conference on Climate Change in Copenhagen at the end of this year. The proposed Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme is badly targeted and will over-compensate polluters at the expense of the community and environment.

The government should commit to reducing greenhouse pollution by 50%(on 1990 levels) by 2020 and encourage action by individuals and business to reduce energy use and take advantage of new growth industries in renewable energy.

Alison Glinski

The Government's 5-15% target is not at all adequate to avoid dangerous climate change. We should instead commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020.

The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) currently proposed by the Government is a badly designed scheme that will do more harm than good. The scheme design over-compensates polluters at the expense of the community and environment.

I strongly urge you to reconsider the Policy and address these considerations urgently, for the sake of your and my grand-children.

Yours sincerely
Greg Rochlin

The Government's 5-15% target is not at all adequate to avoid dangerous climate change, which is happening much more quickly than previously thought.

Please - for the sake of future generations - set a much stronger target. Soon it will be too late.

Michael and Wendy Williamson.

I am a very environmentally concerned parent of an 8 month old baby, as well as a voting Australian citizen. What this Government decides regarding climate change targets for Australia will directly influence my vote at the next Federal and State elections.

I strongly insist that a 5-15% target is totally inadequate to avoid dangerous climate change. We should instead commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels).

I (and the scientific community) believe climate change is accelerating and will soon reach a 'critical mass' scenario, whereby the climate systems which create the stable world we currently enjoy will 'toggle over', leading to catastrophic effects of a totally unpredictable nature.

We are running out of time, many leading scientists believe we have approximately 5 years to act effectively, before it is literally too late. How do you think that makes me feel, as the parent of a baby? What kind of future will she have in this world? These thoughts terrify me.

Issues such as the Arctic summer sea ice melting and loss of our precious coral reefs are merely two of the thousands of serious issues which haunt me and people like me, daily.

High wind and flood events, drought, fires, cyclones and hurricanes will be some of the regular and increasing results of an unstable climate.

I feel the new Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) over-compensates polluters at the expense of the community and environment.

One very annoying point regarding the CPRS is that it imposes a floor beyond which emissions cannot fall, so actions that people like me and my family take to reduce energy use will not reduce Australia's total greenhouse emissions further than the Government's weak target of 5-15%. We have recently installed a new solar hot water and solar electricity panel system on our home, and this action will only make room for industry to increase their emissions under the CPRS cap.

I insist that you as my Governmental representative act now and act strongly, and create a climate change target of 50% by 2020. I repeat my previous comment: I will not be voting for a Government who has failed me and my children in this crucial area.

Sincerely,
Liz Brown

We need courageous action by our government in tackling climate change. The current target to reduce our greenhouse pollution to 5-15% by 2020 is inadequate to avoid climatic disaster. Climate change is already happening faster than scientists originally predicted. Please increase our target reduction to 50% by 2020 and improve the design of the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme to ensure that Australia does its fair share to avoid dangerous climate change. Please make a serious effort to refocus our economy to take advantage of new growing industries in renewable energy.

Yours sincerely
Anne McCarthy

My concern is that current accredited Green Power does not seem to be included in the scheme. I believe that under the new system the appropriate number of CPRS credits should be retired when an individual or business buys accredited green power.

Thank you,

Sarah Spurrett

There is nothing, NOTHING, more important or more urgent than this. Even my children's life! For without the problem of global warming being healed there is no point in our children living, for they will be doomed. Come on, this is that dramatic - so take extreme action - get real!

Peta Bethell

I am writing to voice my disgust at the lack of action by the Government regarding climate change.

The Government's 5-15% target is not at all adequate to avoid dangerous climate change. We should instead commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020. Australia's weak target is undermining efforts to form crucial international agreement and must be improved before December's important UN Conference on Climate Change in Copenhagen.

The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) currently proposed by the Government is a badly designed scheme that will do more harm than good. The scheme design over-compensates polluters at the expense of the community and environment.

I believe that by setting a strong target with a well-designed scheme will ensure Australia does its fair share to avoid dangerous climate change, and it will also help refocus our economy to take advantage of new growth industries in renewable energy.

What will I be able to tell my 15 month old daughter when she grows up..we did nothing to stop killing the planet or that finally the people and governments worked together to stop the catastrophe. I hope it's the latter.

regards
Linda Bennett

Dear Sir/Madam

The Government's 5-15% target is not at all adequate to avoid dangerous climate change. We should instead commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution to a more realistic level, 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels).

Regards

S. Billington

People like me, who voted the Rudd government in because we believed it was a genuine alternative to the Howard government's shameful record on tackling climate change, are horrified that all the lofty rhetoric has resulted only in a miserable 5-15% target for carbon emissions. Is that progress? Does that send a signal to other major polluters? This urgent problem, perhaps the defining challenge of our age, needs to be tackled with courage and decisiveness. We believed that you were the party who could do that - please do not let us down.

Thanks, Andy Fawcett

Dear Mr Rudd

Please set much higher targets for reducing greenhouse pollution. A 40 km long ice shelf just broke off of Antarctica and there will be much more to come.

This is the time to commit to serious action and set an example to the world of a country who is taking the necessary steps to realistically deal with this issue.

For the planet!

Lorna Walsh

We have just seen the huge break up of ice in Antarctica some 50 years before it was predicted ,massive floods , storm surges, bush fires and droughts all occurring in greated numbers.All are indicative of the changes .

We HAVE to respond with new laws regarding polluting tighter legislation with industry,no more logging of old growth forests, banning of the Tamar valley woodchip factory ,plus more helpful laws for people and companies that are trying (like buy-back of electricty ,use of rain water, recycling).

WHAT ARE WE WAITING FOR? Targets of 15% are of no use .We have to set the standards rather than be dragged into them.

Please act now,

Peny Rivlin

To whom this may concern: (Penny Wong/Kevin Rudd)

Current scientifically based findings show that climate change is happening much more quickly than first anticipated. The Arctic sea ice is melting very fast and is now expected to disappear entirely within the next few years! Current scientific explorations in the Antarctic, closer to home, also indicate a drastic change to this land mass, due to rising temperatures.

The proposed 5 - 15% target is totally inadequate and undermines international efforts to reach realistic agreements with other nations. Setting a strong target will ensure Australia does its fair share to avoid drastic global warming, which will hugely affect the lives of our children and grandchildren. We must work together with other nations and if necessary, set a strong precedent for others to follow. We must commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020.

I believe Australia is in a strong position to make major changes - with huge wind farm potential all along the Southern continental coast and opportunities for solar installations in the huge empty spaces of the centre of our continent. Let's do it - and quickly. We must refocus our economy to take advantage of new growth industries in renewable energy.

Chris Gormley

To act boldly is what is required by this government and all future governments to prevent greater impacts on life on this planet. The consequences of which will be borne for generations.

Climate change or as I prefer to say "Global disfunction" is happening now. We in Australia have just began to feel the impacts of flood, fire, heat. Our animal and fish species are in rapid decline. As the ice melts at the poles and from the glaciers, sea levels will rise impacting upon the majority of our population that lives on the edges of the sea.

The governments current targets are inadequate - We should as a minimum, commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels.

This weak target is undermining efforts on the global stage. UN Conference on Climate Change in Copenhagen is our deadline to commit to real change for the sake of our planet.

The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) currently proposed by the Government is deeply flawed. It has no integrity. Those who pollute must not be compensated in any way. The increased cost to consumers will drive deep change towards sustainability.

It is time to stand strong and set a strong target with a well-designed scheme. This will not impede the economy but rather drive it to new growth in all industries committed to global protection. Indeed, Australia needs its industries to be committed to this end.

And of course, any scheme MUST provide incentive to all Australians to reduce greenhouse emissions whether through the market mechanism or personal commitment.

With respect and hope,

Susanna Carpi

Dear senators of the Select Inquiry

I am proud Australian and Global Citizen. The news from our world scientific communities is almost unanimous in declaring the dangers to economies and ecologies posed by climate change and almost unanimous in apportioning blame to the current, long-standing and flawed economic and environmental philosophies of unchecked capitalism. Causes aside, the fact remains that human activity is a major contributor to greenhouse gas production and hence global warming. When I last voted in a federal election, my main concern, above even the usual care for education and health issues, was the environmental catastrophes facing us, particularly that danger posed to the life of the biosphere (and by default my own, my children's and everybody else's) that is human induced climate change. I am disappointed by the soft targets set by the Rudd Government and believe that such reticence on behalf of our nation can only undermine global efforts to procure a solution. The CPRS scheme seems I

ikewise to be obviously flawed in that it undermines individual efforts to mitigate their impact on the environment by letting big business pollute more. This is not what I voted for. As for targets, credible sources have suggested anywhere from 25% (a bare minimum) to 50% over 1990 levels. This is a serious situation. I will not stand idly by and let this most precious jewel of a planet be destroyed in the names of big business and government spinelessness. Is there a voice of reason in government today or will the best scientific evidence be ignored while our political parties vie for power. Nero fiddles while Rome burns!

Yours faithfully

Nathan Sidney

Dear Senators,

Please be advised as a tax paying, voting, citizen of Australia, I strongly challenge the Government's 5-15% greenhouse reduction target.

We are now living in the 21st Century in the most industrious, scientific, and technological age man has ever witnessed. It is high-time we started engaging in real solutions and preventions instead of coming up with short-term band-aid solutions that will achieve no long term benefit.

As a member of the community I am appealing to your better judgment in making a more heart-felt and intelligent decision concerning greenhouse reduction targets. Specifically, a realistic target of 50% or greater should be sought.

No longer will the citizenry of this country stand by and watch our trees be cut down, our waterways polluted, and our air filled with dangerous toxins.

Remember, the Government is for the People, of the People, and by the People. When you are no longer serving the interests of the voting public then you are a Government serving vested interests.

Please put short-term profits aside and consider the longer term projects that our actions will have on the environment. You know the right thing to do.

Yours sincerely,
Wade McLaren Williams

You (the Govt), obviously do not understand the significance and impact of Man-made Global warming. This is not a "Drought", you can not "drought proof" Aust. Do not continue the pretence. The Murray-Darling is effectively gone due to the stupidity and greed of the likes of "Cubby Station" . How Immoral!
Wake up, time is limited.

Ian Cooper

The climate target of 5% to 15% is as weak as water. If only we had enough in the right places and less where we have flooding.

We should all be ashamed of this target. Whilst the world is burning with wildfires, drought and earthquakes we stick our head in the sand on Climate change. Enough is enough, Reality is Karma. We voted for a greener Australia and this is not what we had in mind. We need a strong government dedicated to reducing climate change and not offering permits to pollute with any advances made by ordinary people who care about climate change.

I watch with interest in this governments environmental sad attempts.

Mary Madigan

Dear Senators,

The Australian people deserve to be lead by a bold and confident government that has assessed the current will of the public in regard to climate change. I am in a position within my community to be able to check on the way people are thinking and I can tell you that average members of the public are taking action and changing behaviours to limit their carbon outputs.

It is incumbent upon the Federal Government to follow their lead and make serius and meaningful cuts. To make favours for big industry to the detriment of the common folk is not going to win any hearts. Please support and encourage all tiers of our community and set much higher targets. You owe it to the future generations and people around the world less able than us to make these changes.

Please be bold, have courage and use your hearts to do the right thing.

Sincerely,

Merri Harris

The science of climate change tells us that we are dangerously close to setting in train changes in our climate that we will be unable to reverse. Once these natural mechanisms start and start to feed back on themselves, even 99% reductions in human emissions will not stop them. It is critical that we aim for an environmentally rational target in the short term. At least a 20% cut in Australia's emissions by the year 2020 is needed. Every year that this isn't pursued (our emissions are currently still rising) mean that the cut must be even greater.

The CPRS as it stands is a lemon. It will deliver an unstable market mechanism to already unstable markets. A direct carbon tax on all emissions of carbon--including transporting goods shipped from the far ends of the earth--needs to be implemented immediately, and increased regularly to drive further cuts every year. Highly polluting industries need to curb their emissions. If the system doesn't do that it has failed. A tax is a less volatile and easier to understand mechanism than anything the government has so far proposed.

Yours faithfully,
Dr Matthew Gray
BSc(Hons) GradDipSci PhD

Every day is day closer to disaster if we don't get an act. Please build large scale renewable energy projects around Australia. Tidal, Wind, Geothermal, Solar Thermal, and force the car companies to produce fully electric cars as electric motors 90% are far more efficient than petrol motors 25%. We all know they have the know how. Thanks

Shane Drew

The current proposed government target of 5-15% reduction in greenhouse pollution will not help Australia contribute towards avoiding dangerous climate change. It is essential that the Rudd Government act courageously against big polluters and set a strong target of at least a 50% reduction by 2020 compared to 1990 levels.

It is also essential that the carbon pollution reduction scheme (CPRS) is redesigned so that it does not over compensate polluters at the expense of the community and the environment. The current proposed scheme means that action which individuals and small businesses take to reduce energy will not reduce Australia's total greenhouse emissions further than the current weak target of 5-15%. It will instead make room for industry to increase their emissions.

I implore the government to redesign the CPRS so that changes which everyday people make to reduce their carbon footprint do not help big polluters to do nothing.

For our children and the future of the planet and life as we know it

Catherine Shaw

It is imperative that the Australian Government and the peoples of Australia, make the decision to reduce green house gases as much as necessary. This has become an ethical issue and one which requires immediate action.

As all the mounting evidence continues to support, weak targets will be tantamount to doing nothing. Government can enact effective legislation in relation, for instance, to wind and solar power by committing money to such power resources and as two Green ways of ensuring that future generations have a planet to live on.

sincerely
Liz Dean

Now should be a time for leadership on an issue which will ultimately define the fate of the human race. Half-hearted conservative measures will not suffice, especially when the poisonous influence of the fossil fuel lobby continues to taint government policy, and phrases such as "job protection" and "economic viability" creep into a debate which should be focused on far more wide-reaching concerns.

The senate now needs to succeed where the government failed, and I urge the senate members to think of more than just votes and short-sighted political point-scoring when they debate this world-shaping issue.

Specifically - we must commit to at least a 50% reduction in emissions by 2020 (on 1990 levels). The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme is a spineless effort that ultimately rewards polluters, negating emission-lowering efforts from individuals and must therefore be drastically overhauled. Our efforts may not have an enormous direct impact on global emissions but the world will take note and our developing neighbours in particular will look to our example - we therefore cannot afford to fail in this task.

Finally, since when did mindless cash handouts of billions of dollars so the average Australian can buy another plasma TV assume greater importance than government investment in renewable energy projects? - surely a more worthwhile means of boosting the economy and promoting employment.

Signed,
A concerned citizen of the Planet Earth.

Dr Cameron Shaw

To whom it may concern,

I wish to add my voice to the growing crowd of australians who want better targets on climate change than the proposed scheme. When federal labour was voted in, one of the major points of difference between the parties was the attitude towards action on climate change. It now appears as though major polluters will be better off financially under the proposed CPRS and green jobs will be hampered in the process. If the government will just legislate mandatory reductions, then as carbon becomes more expensive the market will recorrect itself in favour of more sustainable energy use. Finally, it appears that as more science about our situation is uncovered we realize that there is simply no time to soon to take meaningful action on reducing carbon emmissions.

Regards, Oliver Gee

Dear Sir/Madame

The governments recent targets of 5-15% reduction on 1990 levels, although a step in the right direction, are simply too small.

This target is both less than the initial Kyoto protocol average (in which Australia acted disgracefully to give itself "exception" to its' global responsibilities) and well under current scientific guidelines of what must be achieved to avoid dangerous climate change.

To hold to this kind of line while Australia is currently experiencing one of the most dramatic climactic fluctuations in histor is either baltant pandying to commercial interest, or a sign of a government which has significantly distanced itself from reality.

If Australia commits only to mild and ineffectual targets, how can we expect our nation to be international leaders? Australia has a real opportunity, by creating stong targets, to create a business environment where tomorrows technologies are being actively developped and exported to a world hungry for change. If we commit to avoiding changing ourselves, we commit to missing this opportunity.

Dr. Matthew Bailey

To whom it may concern. Please note that the current 5-15% carbon emission cuts is totally inadequate . We are lagging hopelessly behind Europe and by all recent accounts of future plans the USA. A sincere measure to halt greenhouse emissions from the heavy polluters , mainly industry must be tackled. A comprehensive green scheme must be put in place for the development of green transport, green industry and green power. The current legislations are far from enough. As a country which was built by our forbearers to not take a step backwards and only step forward we seem terribly stagnant.

Yours sincerely

Douglas Clarke

As a mother of four, I want to be able to relax knowing that their future is going to be OK. with this weak response to climate change I see a bleak future.

Please be strong international leaders that shake up the world say this is what we have to do and we are going to do it even if it will be painful in the beginning.

We are at a point in global history when every decision made will have a profound effect on the future of this planet. Please make the hard choices. commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution by at least 50% by 2020. The Australian public is ready, big business is not. But please listen to the Australian people not businesses.

Regards
Karen

How disappointing it is to think of the future. As part of the generation who can take charge and make a change to the path our planet it is devastating to hear the news that it is business as usual on climate change. Yes, we are a small country and our impact as individuals is a drop in the ocean but if Australia does not stand up and lead the way to join with other nations we will be failing in our duty as global citizens.

I do not want my efforts to be swallowed up in an inadequate carbon reduction scheme that compensates too highly the polluting industries. I want strong support for new technologies and innovations to find alternative ways of supplying energy and modifying damaging practices not band aid solutions that keep the status quo of growth at all costs. W

We are a creative and community minded nation. We do not want to keep our heads in the sand and hope other nations will shoulder the responsibility enough to make the changes needed to ensure that our planet remains viable into the future. We need a much stronger target with quick cut. 5% to 15% is pitiful. I strongly urge you to take seriously this debate.

If we act and it didn't matter there is nothing lost but if we don't act and it did matter how shameful will that be?

Keren Holmes

To all who hold the future of the planet we live on, you need to go a long way beyond the trifling efforts that are being done so far.

This does not mean taking our lives and the economies of our nations back to the stone age. The exact opposite in fact.

Some backbone now when it matters will result in high-tech industries to make use of the only thermonuclear reactor we have at our disposal; the sun.

Due to our climate, Australia stands to benefit more than most as we invest and take up this new and absolutely necessary industrial base, so why are we waiting to become the world beater we can be? (As we have so often in past scientific eandevours when our national talents are allowed to shine.)

Let's all get to it now and do it for ourselves and our children and grandchildren's sake.

John East

The current policy needs to be drastically changed for the future of our children our grandchildren and our country.

* 5-15% carbon reduction is nowhere near strong enough.

* The trading scheme is almost worthless as it allows too much trading instead of reduction, which results in minimal lowering of pollutants.

* The community has indicated from their small actions (home water tanks, solar panels, using less power) that they are prepared to try to help our environment, so surely the Government should be acknowledging and joining their efforts.

* We need to focus more on developing alternative sources of energy - wind, solar, wave or any new non or low polluting sources.

* If new "economic packages" are to be expended to help the current economy, they should be focused on alternative energy and creating and developing new alternative energy industries. These could be used to employ workers from polluting industries that may close.

* The rise in the vote for The Greens surely shows the community wishes. There will be a lot of people considering the Climate Policy when they vote.

Mrs Judy Buhagiar

Please stop pandering to the big polluters. Your CPRs scheme is not well designed and tax payers should not have to support and reward unprincipled companies who continue to produce greenhouse gases.

The Arctic summer sea ice is melting and will disappear in a very short time . The carbon released by this catastrophic event will affect all life on earth.

If Australia takes a strong stand at home and in the international arena we will be doing our fair share to avoid more dangerous climate change.

The current opposition is weak and divided and their previous climate change policies were based on denial of reality. I voted for the Rudd government because I hoped that you were sincere and would develop effective, climate friendly policies.

Please don't be swayed by the big polluters who only care about about short term goals and profit.

Helen Hackett

The great use of life is to spend it on something that will outlast it. James Truslow Adams

Mr Rudd,

Stop listening to the "Delay" Lobby, they are as short sighted as they are greedy. Make Copenhagen a moment of pride for Australia by showing some leadership on renewable targets and emissions reduction targets. Transforming Australia's economy to one that exports know-how (in wind and solar and geothermal power) instead of raw materials will have a benefit to Australia well after you are gone. The opportunity is yours to spend your life on something that will outlast it.

Sincerely,

Charlie Perry

We are most upset that the government is taking such a hopelessly weak stance on climate change. The people of Australia are ready and willing to do much more because we can see what the government seems to be burying its head in the sand about ... climate change is happening, and we need to act strongly NOW so its effects are limited as much as possible.

In Victoria in particular we need to stop producing electricity from such a polluting source. Money such as the \$900 given to 7 million taxpayers would be much better spent building up solar and other clean energy sources, and improving public transport (again, that people are ready to use in greater numbers if it ran more efficiently!).

We implore the government to do something stronger NOW. Financial crisis is not an excuse - large scale increases in alternative energy production will create jobs.

Evelyn Flitman

Surely it is time to think about much stronger targets than 5% reduction. Let's look at targetting the stimulus packages at renewable energy sources, let's look at re-training workers to work in areas of sustainable energy.

Let's stop being afraid of the economic conditions and start viewing them as a great opportunity to change the way the world does things. It is time to stop thinking about vested interests and start viewing investment in wholistic care. Care for people, care for the environment and care for social inclusion. We can do it all at the same time. It just takes some imagination.

Regards

Glynis Whitfield

Dear Sirs/Madams,

As organic farmers on the NSW Northcoast, we understand and live the consequence of accelerating change.

Less and less can we depend on predicatability.

Less and less are we able to adapt to rainfall events which hamper planting & mulching at the appropriate times...so important for sustainable results ie. productive harvests.

More and more we are working in adverse conditions either, rainfall or heat related.

We take change seriously. It is our livelihood and our capacity to sustain which is effected.

This year we planted 800 rainforest trees with the help of Rainforest Rescue.

We look to achievable solutions and believe that the time is right to give economic stimuli to the future of green technology.

With every respect our children need positive directions to identify with.

Yours truly

Bob & Liz Gray.

Australia as a dry, hot continent with neighbours in the Pacific who could suffer with a rise in the sea level causing pressure on Australia to take them in should be setting and committing to a strong target to reduce greenhouse pollution.

I note that the Artic summer sea ice is now expected to melt entirely within the next five years. A well-designed Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme is required.

Michael Rose

I believe it is vital that all future spending be green-technology supportive and request that the Government I helped to elect remember the way they sold themselves to me during the last election. I had great hopes for you.

Yours sincerely,

K.H.Robson

Mr Rudd and government ministers,

Simply, if you want to be remembered as the government that cared, and that seems to be a direction that you began to head in...then it is upon you to do something radical about climate change. A 5% target on emissions is not enough. Get the people involved...they want to be involved. Lead the world...Challenge Europe. We are capable of this and there are enough people willing to get on board with this.

Get serious...stop being a politician for a minute and be human and look at the global warming situation from a different perspective.

Regards,

Nick Tolliday

To whom it may concern,

I'm a concerned Australian and consider it vital that the following points be given serious thought and then acted upon, for the future of not only Australia and Australians, but the world at large.

The first point is that the Government's 5-15% target is not at all adequate to avoid dangerous climate change. We should instead commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels).

Secondly, a steady stream of new scientific findings is showing that climate change is happening much more rapidly than previously thought.

Thirdly, Australia's weak target is undermining efforts to form crucial international agreement and must be improved before December's important UN Conference on Climate Change.

Fourthly, the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) currently proposed by the Government is a badly designed scheme that will do more harm than good. The scheme design over-compensates polluters at the expense of the community and environment.

Setting a strong target with a well-designed scheme will ensure Australia does its fair share to avoid dangerous climate change, and it will also help refocus our economy to take advantage of new growth industries in renewable energy.

Because the CPRS imposes a floor beyond which emissions cannot fall, the action individuals and small businesses take to reduce energy will not reduce Australia's total greenhouse emissions further than the Government's weak target of 5-15%. In fact their action will only make room for industry to increase their emissions under that cap.

Doing nothing to strengthen action on climate change is irresponsible and cannot be tolerated. As the aforementioned points aim to illustrate, it is both our environment, and ultimately our lives and those of our children that are at stake if we do not demand that more be done.

Yours faithfully,

Kylie Hough

The government's proposed 5% reduction in carbon emissions is unacceptable! We need much more significant reductions to rescue the earth's climate! The people of Australia are ready to follow through, if you would lead.

Regards,

Elizabeth R. Maasen

I have only time for a short submission.

I believe that the major problem is the power of entrenched fossil fuel lobby and the lack of any counterbalancing lobby for the sustainable energy sector. It is also difficult to see where such a lobby will come from as the sun, wind or earth (in the case of hydrothermal) do not have wealthy vested interests to create and support them. Hence we need leaders who can see beyond the short term views of the existing powerful players and look to the planet's long term interest.

I am sure that the Prime Minister, the Minister for Climate Change and the Minister for Conservation conservation all know that the scientific evidence for a need to cut CO2 emissions urgently is correct, but they do not have the political skills or moral strength to do it.

As a result, we will not be able to argue forcefully enough at Copenhagen, and civilisation as we know it is likely to be wiped out in the lifetimes of our children or grandchildren. Meanwhile national behaviours will all fall into brutish self interest and it will not be a pretty place to be.

I know this sounds like the gloomy prognostications of an old man, but if you have a scientific background and a lifetime's experience in big business it is the only rational conclusion one can draw.

Our only hope is for the Senate to put some spine into the Government and put Australia in a position at Copenhagen where we can argue convincingly and credibly that all nations must cut back on CO2 emissions right now - difficult and uncomfortable as that may be.

Good luck and God speed.

Brian Snape AM

Temporarily saving Asian forests (although a good permanent arrangement in itself) will do nothing to save AUSTRALIA'S carbon onslaught, nor Australia's old Growth Forests. This arrangement is a total cop-out, a CON!!!

Paying Big Polluters and giving them Free Permits to Pollute will do absolutely nothing to wean them/us off dangerous carbon production, and will do nothing for the world's MAJOR problem, Global Warming!

We in Australia, our Government, needs to have courage and tell the Big Polluters to go and change their modus operandi, to bring in more realistic Carbon Reduction Targets, something like 50% (at least) by 2020 (on 1990 levels). Stop Grovelling to these Big Money people, and think of ordinary human beings, for once!

Unless we, all of us, and that includes OUR Government, act swiftly and strongly to reduce Carbon build up in our atmosphere, and stop the warming and the melting of our oceans, half the world's viable land surfaces will be under water from melting ice caps and glaciers, some will be under attack from wild storms, and some will be so dry and arid that it will be useless for any known purpose, including survival of human beings, or our animal and bird life.

The Carbon Pollution Targets presently mooted by OUR Government are SO WEAK as to be not worth looking at, and present a very poor target for other Nations heading into the December UN Conference on Climate Change in Copenhagen.

And in reality, this Conference is much more important than the recently failed conference of the G20 on Finance in London, because it is involved in the survival of humanity and life on our Planet.

I would much prefer if the present scheme mooted and submitted to parliament by OUR Government was ditched totally, than be brought into Law as is. IT TOTALLY FAILS in every aspect, other than as an example of a major CON job on the Australian people and the World.

A good strong CRT with a focus on Renewable Energy, both in energy saved and produced, will do a tremendous amount to raise our Economic levels, and solve the world's financial problems...and that includes Australia's. It would make for millions of new and sustainable and interesting jobs in the Renewables industries and all other industries associated. Coal miners (and Coal Unions with influence on Labor) and others presently involved in the large Polluting Industries could be retrained and slotted into these new industries very easily and well. Troglodytes in Business and in Organised labour will only lead us all to an early death.

Because the CPRS imposes a floor beyond which emissions cannot fall, the action individuals and small businesses take to reduce energy will not reduce Australia's total greenhouse emissions further than the Government's weak target of 5-15%. In fact their action will only make room for industry to increase their emissions under that cap.

The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) currently proposed by the Government is a badly designed scheme that will do more harm than good. The scheme design over-compensates polluters at the expense of the community and environment.

Darryl Perrett.

The Government's CPRS is badly designed and inadequate. It does not reflect the ambitions of the Australian population who strongly supported the ALP at the last Federal election in large part because of the strong differentiation with the incumbent Government that the ALP presented on matters of climate change and other environmental issues. The voters do not want their elected representatives to go to water in the face of concerted lobbying from vested interests. Whichever way this issue is tackled, the inevitable consequence is that the members of the public will end up with higher costs of living as the real price of pollution and resource consumption is built in to the economy. So there is no need to structure the scheme in a manner that funnels money to large polluters, thereby prolonging the damaging activities that they are pursuing. A better designed scheme would attempt to soften the financial impact upon society's most vulnerable members, and to remove active disincentives for the development and wide deployment of better alternatives than the current technology.

Furthermore, these alternatives must be real and readily achievable well within the very short timeframes that the global problem presents. If the coal industry wishes to survive, and truly believes that so-called clean coal is one of the viable, affordable and timely solutions, then the members of the industry with the most to gain should push forward with the development of the necessary technology on their own, not with the injection of massive taxpayer funding.

Finally, the Australian people has been (rightly) embarrassed by the long-standing position of climate change denial held by the previous Government. There can be no doubt that the last election was an overwhelming vote for change, and that this included a demand for international leadership on Australia's part. So let us have the Government step up to the plate and provide that leadership.

Paul Byrne

Dear Mr Rudd

I hope that supporting forests to remain are going to be a major part of your climate change formula. They are a necessary part of creating rainfall - not to mention habitat for birds and animals.

When I read what Denmark is doing with wind power and small countries - like Portugal - are doing with solar energy - we are very far behind indeed.

Penny Wong (does she ever smile) - is not a good candidate for articulating your policy on climate change. The Environment Minister - well, most Labour voting friends that I know - have written him off as being "gagged: by the Labour Party a long time ago. Your "climate change" credentials are weak - my guess is at the next election, you'll be sharing the lower house and upper house with the Greens.

Regards,
Bron Duncan

PS

Another point - why can't South Australia use the Nullarbor Plains basin water - instead of the diminishing Murray River and desalination - all water rights to this by mining companies should be cancelled - the highest good for all rule applies here.

I know that the political challenge of making big change with a hostile Senate is a big one. However this is really getting urgent - polar icecap melting, droughts, floods, and the widespread extinction of animal species. Our Government (including all elected members) MUST ACT to save our planet for our children and their children. 5% - 15% is not enough.
Please act wisely on behalf of us all.

Regards,

Margo Hobba

1 The weak carbon reduction target is not good enough we need to have a much higher target maybe 50% but if that is not possible then at least 30%.people on the ground are really enthusiastically putting in solar panels and reducing their carbon foot print only to allow industry to increase theirs.

2 Why are the government not speeding up the development of new technologies such as thermal rocks wave and wind technology instead of propping up the coal industry surely those who loose their jobs due to the shut down of the coal industry could be redeployed in areas where workers were needed for new technologies.

3 Why are we not making more effort to capture storm water . If the storm water was captured in south australia we would save more water each year that we currently take from the river murray and salibury has already proved to us that this can be done. it would t5hen restore those flows to the river which would be helpful in restoring the health of the Lower Murray

jlittleton

I am writing in support of our environment and the world in which we are raising our young son. I am mortified at the statistics which show that, per capita, Australia has the highest greenhouse gas emissions of any country on Earth. That is staggering for a country that prides itself on its outdoor lifestyle, and the beauty of its beaches and the outback. Already, for hours at a time it is too hot and too dangerous in the summer to take my son outside. We are suffering extreme weather - droughts, flooding rains, damaging storms. Without drastic changes to the greenhouse pollution from our country, business and ordinary citizens alike, our lives in this "sunburnt country" will become intolerable as the temperatures increase and the weather becomes more volatile. If we are prepared to be leaders in pollution, why can we not be leaders in the solution as well? Somebody must take the initiative and risk being the first to make the changes required and I would be very proud if Australia was at the forefront of this list instead.

Thankyou
Sophia Jackson

Dear Sirs

I really do think we need to ramp up policy beyond the current hopelessly inadequate and irresponsible level of lip-service.

Frankly it is an embarrassment to our nation.

We all see the images of climate change impacts (polar ice caps and glaciers melting at an alarming and accelerating rate; droughts, extreme temperatures, bushfires, flooding and cyclones) and all the expert evidence points to the urgent need for action before it is too late.

And yet we continue to see new investment in coal mining and power generation. This will come back to haunt all of us.

Please address the need for a CPRS urgently - beyond the current proposals.

Setting a strong target with a well-designed scheme will ensure Australia does its fair share to avoid dangerous climate change, and it will also help refocus our economy to take advantage of new growth industries in renewable energy

Best regards

Keith Scott

With the global financial crisis it is understandable that the governments focus is on economy not ecology.

But whatever the decisions will be, in the long run climate-change will be greatly effecting our economy and lifes on the planet.

Short fixes will not solve the problem.

This is an opportunity to set our focus on new technologies and studies, that open up pathways for different kinds of businesses and job-creations.

Jump the train now we are in for a bumpy ride anyway....

Jenny Rauch

The Governemnts target of 5-15% is certainly not enough of a reduction of greenhouse pollution. We must do more, I am a grandmother with a 10year old grandchild and I am very concerned about the world that she will grow up in. I may have even more grandchildren one day and what are we to tell them. We did not care enough to make their world safe for not old them but future generations. why must money always be the most important factor. Big business has the world by the throat and it is time now to stop the pollution that will destroy us all. What about wind, sea or sun, there is plenty of energy out there just asking to be used.

Please do the hard thing and help future generations by increasing the level of reduction to 50% by 2020.

most sincerely
Ann Trenoweth

What part of "catastrophic" does the Government not understand?

I look at my children aged between 3 weeks and 5 years and feel true despair when I think of the consequences of the inactivity to combat climate change that is currently being displayed around the world.

The conference in Copenhagen is Australia's chance to show the world that although we have a relatively small population, we can show leadership, take responsibility and above all, consider the vast majority of the rest of humanity who are going to suffer much more than Australians initially when food shortages, water shortages and flooding from rising sea levels occurs. (Some are already suffering - think of Darfur, the Tiwi islands for example, while we continue to lead our irresponsible overconsuming lives.) Please don't let The Lucky Country gain a reputation as "The Selfish Country." I was astounded to read recently that desperately poor countries like Malawi are taking stronger action on climate change than we currently are.

This is no time for Australia to resort to the kindergarten logic of saying "we won't do the right thing if no one else does." Australia has the reputation of being a gutsy country (think of our Anzac reputation, Olympic heroics etc.) It's time for us to show true leadership that will equate us with those countries that have already set responsible targets and inspire countries who (as the Australian government is currently doing) have set hopelessly weak targets for carbon emissions. I understand that the Government may think that this is not a big enough issue for voters but I truly think that most intelligent, educated Australians already see it as THE biggest issue and that with a bit of "fireside chat" (Franklin D Roosevelt style) information sessions on television, radio, talk shows, blogs, websites, billboards advertising websites etc, the Government could bring all Australians in line to consider it the most pressing issue facing us today.

You've heard it before but 5% - 15% targets is just a joke! If all the expert medical experts told me I had terminal cancer and had to stop smoking, even if I didn't want to believe any of them I doubt that my response would be, "well how about I cut down to 95% of the cigarettes I was smoking? Or, if really pushed, I'll cut down to 85%" Anyone who heard that would think I was a complete idiot! These are experts in the field. And even if 10% of those experts were doubtful that the cigarettes were the key to the problem, you wouldn't continue smoking if you wanted to survive would you? Yet that is the same response the Australian government is taking. The world has a terminal illness. All the experts are saying so and have told us the minimum reductions we need to achieve in order to prevent death. Yet we have said we'll continue to smoke!! I understand it's not easy for us to simply cease burning and exporting coal and other fossil fuels but we should be SLASHING budgets in non-essential areas to fund huge infrastructure spending on renewable energy. (Creating numerous Green Jobs and stimulating the economy on the way.)

"NOTHING matters more" should be the mantra on this issue. If the Government takes this up, the people of Australia WILL get behind them. It will go down in history as a government we are proud of and (so long as the Government keeps informing Australians that we are taking real action) I think that you will find Australians will put up with a whole lot of budget cuts in other (desirable but not crucial to human survival) areas in order to fund climate change action.

If the government does not take a much gutsier stance than its current one, then it will have reneged on one of the key election promises that won voters like me across from the Liberal Party. That will be how the Australian people remember the current Rudd Government if a big change in attitude is not achieved before the December Copenhagen conference.

Yours sincerely,

Kate Hook

I cannot believe that the current economic situation is not being used as a opportunity to invest strongly in alternative technologies and sustainable infrastructure initiatives.

Please, provide us with some real leadership and action in this area - don't pander to vested interests - invest in our sustainable future.

Think laterally and don't penny-pinch now - it will always cost more later on. Please, do not put fibre above ground - use the broadband initiative to put all power, phone etc utilities underground.

Heavily invest in solar energy and allow us to make a difference instead of allowing large scale polluters to "use up" domestic savings.

Change building codes to mandate water recycling and at least solar supplementation of energy. Mandate that every public building collects and uses rainwater. Remove the GST on solar panels and water tanks. Mandate no new suburbs without public transport.

Invest in R&D. Fund research into a system that will allow air-conditioners to be run directly off solar energy.

Vicki Jordan

To say I am disappointed in your climate policy is an understatement. I voted for your party because I thought you had the courage to push us beyond the pathetic effort that the liberals achieved but you have folded just like your predecessors. Anything below a %30 reduction by 2020 is just a waste of time. Please stand up and be the leader that is remembered for helping our country become a factor in saving the world not just another cog in its destruction.

Deon Farrell

What's the point of preserving Australia's economy if we lose our environment? Quality of life is surely about more than economics. If, in the end, we do lose some material comforts along the way to saving the planet, Australians might even find that their nation's "happiness index" has risen - life might be simpler but more meaningful. Please be bold in setting targets sufficiently high to actually work.

Sincerely
Libby Turnock

I am writing to ask you to be more proactive on climate change. I am disappointed and scared by the low level of action. This is too serious to be treated so lightly.

Many scientists are calling for more action and many groups are seeing the economic crisis as an opportunity to fund more green energy projects.

I am disappointed by your weak (in my eyes) approach to climate change and strongly urge you to hear the people telling you what we want and need.

Chantal Jackson

Hollywood has started giving us some nightmare scenarios. When will our governments take serious notice? It is nearly too late to make significant changes to inescapable climate change! We live on the driest continent on earth, but continue to develop and breed as if there is no tomorrow. When will we really 'bite the bullet' and start placing serious restrictions on the number of children in families? Don't give people money to have babies. Give them money to have less and use less resources as a consequence. Yes, I've heard the argument about how important capitalism is, but we can't eat money!!!

Glenda Darville

I am extremely concerned about the Australian government reaction to climate change, the 5 - 15% target is not adequate to avoid dangerous climate change - we need to commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020.

Australia's weak target is undermining efforts to form crucial international agreement and must be improved before December's UN Conference on Climate Change in Copenhagen.

The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme currently proposed by the Government is a badly designed scheme that will do more harm than good. It overcompensates polluters at the expense of the community and environment.

We have too much to lose not to take action now.

Sincerely

barbara ashby

The current government was elected with a clear mandate to take strong action on climate change, yet appears to have watered down the initiatives it is taking to address the problems. The 5-15% target is not sufficient and should be increased substantially.

Likewise the CPRS seems to have been drawn up with a view to placating the polluters. As I understand it many of these businesses, especially the mining industry, saw the writing on the wall regarding climate change some time ago and would be expecting stronger action even if they do not say so.

I consider the government is moving too slowly on climate change and feel my support for them at the election has been somewhat betrayed.

Chris Simmons

It is clear that Australia's response to the problem of climate change is totally inadequate. We do have the opportunity to indicate to the rest of the developed world that we do not have to destroy the economy by setting higher targets to reduce greenhouse pollution. In fact the reverse could be true - there are new business and industries that will appear in response to significantly increased targets.

Jan Kosky

Re: The Senate enquiry into the Government's climate policy. Can I urge you, in the strongest possible way, to consider the stream of new scientific studies that demonstrate that climate change is happening more quickly than anticipated. It is essential that the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme is re-designed to better encourage polluters to decrease emissions and reward those "do the right thing".

We need to do set a strong target with reducing greenhouse pollution, somewhere around 40 - 50% decrease by 2020.

please, I urge you, to do the right thing by the environment,

Peter Wall

As a member of the generation who will have to bear the brunt of inadequate action against climate change I am writing to urge all Senators involved in the inquiry to call on the government to move beyond the measures proposed so far- namely the weak emissions targets and the CPRS.

The target of 5-15% is grossly insufficient in light of the recommendations of the Garnaut report and a wealth of scientific research. Adopting such a weak target not only puts Australia behind many other nations, it shows a lack of commitment to what must necessarily be a global effort.

Secondly while it is commendable that some action has been taken, the CPRS is a step in the wrong direction. I was horrified to learn that under the scheme, polluters will be able to free-ride on the good efforts of others. The lack of incentive to reduce emissions is a serious flaw in the scheme and a complete over-haul is required.

I hope that the Senate Inquiry will consider the opportunities of renewable energy and the potential for Australia to become a world leader in a battle that humanity can't afford to lose.

Frankly, I would like to live in a world where the devastating consequences of dangerous climate change are not ones that I and my children will have to reckon with. I implore the senators in to keep in mind the future generations, with whose livelihood they are entrusted.

Sincerely,
Lisa Caripis

The CPRS is fundamentally flawed because it completely disempowers ordinary Australians. The greenhouse emission reductions made by Australian working families, e.g. by installing solar, improving energy efficiency, riding a bike etc., will make no difference to Australia's overall carbon emissions. The savings made by Australian households will simply free up more permits to be sold to polluters. This flaw in the CPRS needs to be fixed.

Ben Taylor,

I live in Coffs Harbour, which was recently declared a natural disaster area due to a flood that thankfully happened at low tide, as it would have been so much worse if it was high tide. The NSW Government has introduced a standard prediction of 0.91m sea level rise by 2100, which our local Council has adopted for it's planning guidelines.

However, one gets the feeling that this predicted sea level rise will only increase with time, as we learn more about ice shelves in Antarctica collapsing and other frightening news. A town like mine is going to absolutely stuffed by 2100 if we experience sea level rises greater than 1m, not to mention due to the increased flooding, storm surges and tropical diseases associated with climate change.

This grim prediction for our town will be a certainty if the Australian government only commits to a target of 5-15% reduction in greenhouse pollution by 2020. We need a stronger target of 50% by 2020!

A weak target of 5- 15% will also give other countries the permission to set equally low targets. We are reaching a critical point "of no return" when it comes to climate change, so if we (the global community) do not significantly reduce emissions by 50% in the next few years, we will be stuffed. I really don't want to have to explain to my grandchildren in 2050 why we knowingly allowed this all to happen.

Yours sincerely,
Erika Van Schellebeck

Signing up to Kyoto will be an empty gesture if Australia does not set emission targets that lead the world rather than tag along behind. What is proposed, if adopted world wide, will not make the kind of impact on global emissions needed to be effective in mitigating global warming. There should be no pandering to the big polluters who have ignored the scientific evidence about the effects of their activities for the past 20 years or so. They should pay a substantial part of the cost of remedying their neglect.

Henry Wardlaw

I understand that our emissions targets are far too low and that it is already almost too late to act. Australia is one of the luckiest nations in the world. We need to be leading the way instead of wriggling out on the grounds that we are dependant on coal as we have in the past. Industrial lobbies should not sway government decision. Please stand up and be counted. This is about the future of the globe.

We need to develop alternative sources of power - light, wind, geothermal etc. We can reduce our energy consumption hugely simply by switching off, leaving the car at home, grabbing a jumper even here in Tassie. Let's bite the bullet and aim for a 50% reduction by 2020. We can reduce our use of carbon considerably if the Government gets behind with policy eg affordable solar panels on every roof and generous buy back prices from energy suppliers, affordable hybrid motor vehicles.

I am in the process of installing a solar panel on my house. My understanding of the proposed scheme offsets is that some corporate polluter who applies for exemption or worse, increases emissions, will benefit from my carbon saving. The CPRS MUST make it worth my while to make these savings!

Gill Murdoch

Dear friends

I am very disappointed to see that our government cares so little about the number one issue of our time - climate change. If we don't act promptly and sufficiently we will not have a future for governments to speak of. Please let's get this right, let's take responsibility for the damage we have done to this precious earth and commit to cutting Australia's greenhouse pollution by at least 50% by 2020 (based on 1990 levels). We can do this together!

This needs to be agreed to before the UN's December Conference on Climate Change so we can encourage strong targets change around the world.

Also, the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme needs to go. It rewards polluters while taking away the power of individuals and communities to make a difference.

Let's focus on positive change, invest our money in renewable energies, and encourage all members of our country to be responsible around climate change.

Sincerely
Rachel Cohen

The targets suggested are far too low and will not make any significant contribution to lowering the world's greenhouse gas emissions.

I suggest that 50% is a far more realistic target and may have some impact (which 5% will not!). In addition, the incentives need to target business, including government, and private individuals. The current proposal will mean that individual contributions are ignored and incentives for government and business to cut their emissions will be minimal.

Lastly, Australia has the opportunity to set itself up as a leader in the industrial side of dealing with climate change eg solar power, clean coal technology. We need to seize these opportunities and run with them!

Regards
Toni Adams

Dear Prime Minister

Please revise your 5-15% emissions target and please do so well before the UN Conference in December.

The statistics are increasingly alarming and the current target does little to help and sends the wrong message to Australians and the rest of the world.

Please use the economic crisis to take measures that benefit both the economy and the environment.

Thank you

Norma Watson

It is with great sadness and concern that I watch the Rudd government do one backflip after another, especially when it comes to the reduction of greenhouse pollution. I voted for this government and I expect them to honour their promises. Australia needs to commit to a reduction of greenhouse pollution by 50% by 2020 now! The scheme must provide for absolute reduction and not some weak, poorly designed, scheme full of loopholes for the big polluters. Please do this now - we all owe it to future Earth generations. Thank you.

kind regards,

Horst Walter

To Whom It May Concern

We are ordinary Australians who are very concerned by the state of our local environment right through to the global environment. At the last election we voted Labor because we believed that it had a strong policy on climate change, and understood the nature of the crisis the world is facing.

However, the Government's 5-15% target is not at all adequate to avoid dangerous climate change. We should instead commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020 (on 1990 levels). We believe that Australia should take a leadership role on this issue - instead our weak target is actually undermining efforts to form crucial international agreements.

The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) currently proposed by the Government is a badly designed scheme that will do more harm than good. The scheme design over-compensates polluters at the expense of the community and environment.

Because the CPRS imposes a floor beyond which emissions cannot fall, the action individuals and small businesses take to reduce energy will not reduce Australia's total greenhouse emissions further than the Government's weak target of 5-15%. In fact their action will only make room for industry to increase their emissions under that cap.

Please reconsider your policy, taking into account the long term ramifications of your decisions.

Yours sincerely

Margaret and Melanie Williams

I am very concerned at the Governments weak stance on climate change targets. We need to set a strong target to ensure we contribute our fair share to fighting climate change. I elected this Government, as did many others, on it's promises to tackle climate change and feel let down by it's inadequate response in setting low targets and designing a Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme that will over-compensate polluters. We need to get serious about this issue as climate change is happening much quicker than was first thought. We also need to set an example to other countries on tackling this problem. We need to aim for a 50% reduction by 2020 if we are to make a difference. Please consider our future in all your decision making. Time is running out!

Kerry James

I am really concerned about the impact that the carbon emissions of our current lifestyle will have on the future habitability of this planet. This is not something that can be thought about in 5 year packages of terms of office (plus a year or two) but in terms of what life might be like for our kids and grandkids, and their offspring.

I am disturbed by predictions that the Arctic summer sea ice is expected to melt within the next 5 years. If this radical change in the reflectivity of the earth's surface, as well as impacts on sea levels, etc is caused by increases in greenhouse gases emitted by our current (unexaminedly-evolved out of the industrial revolution) lifestyle, then it is beholden on us as humans to reverse this, and on polluting companies to make radical changes to practices that arose out of ignorance, and that were embraced and subsequently enshrined due to past history rather than any rational thought process about what was sustainable.

We should commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution to 50% of 1990 levels by 2020, so we can:

Make a stand as a progressive, leading nation with educated and concerned citizens;

Refocus our economy to take full advantage of new growth industries in renewable energy;

Do our fair share to avoid dangerous climate change from human based causes;

Stop overcompensating polluters (who have options they aren't being forced to consider and exercise, by the current Scheme); and

Start considering the needs of other important elements of our nation - the people who live in Australia, and the environment (both of whom are relatively disenfranchised because their voice is either not as well packaged, or indeed speaks a language that can be conveniently downplayed).

Thank you for making this opportunity for ordinary, concerned citizens to submit their views...

Susan Bilton

I am extremely disappointed that the Rudd Government have gone back on their promise on climate change and has set a target of 5 to 15% in greenhouse pollution. Why is Rudd supporting large companies? Does he have any morals???

What's more important a future or economics?

Stand up for yourselves and do something moral and progressive for Australia and the world.

Karolina Horn

Dear Senate enquiry,we are living in a time of impending crisis with the environment.We need direct intervention not just carbon 'rewarding schemes'.We need higher carbon reduction targets of at least 50% by 2020, and renewable energy support from the government.

Dr Jenne Perlstein

I strongly support a detailed inquiry into the Government's climate policy. The current target is inadequate and deeply disappointing. Climate change is the number one issue affecting the entire world, and it is well known that we need urgent, drastic action.

We need an aspirational target that we know will make a difference, not one that we know will not make a significant positive change. This is also an opportunity for Australia to be world leaders; we are well placed to utilise renewable energy. At the very least we should be doing our fair share to clean up our own act, given we have to date been one of the worst carbon polluters per capita. I would readily commit to reducing Australia's greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020.

The Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme currently proposed is worrying, in that it over-compensates polluters at the expense of the community and environment, and acts as a major disincentive for community members and individuals to do their bit. We need incentives, we need education, we need fast action, and we need very strong leadership!

Thanks for listening,

Vanessa Toy

I wish to bring to your attention my objection to the Government's current target of 5 - 15% reduction of greenhouse emissions by 2020.

A steady stream of Scientific findings show this is nowhere near adequate enough, to avert dangerous climate change. It is important not just to make energy conserving a priority for householders only!

I am convinced that the CPRS over-compensates polluters at the expense of the community and environment.

We need strong targets and a well-designed scheme that sets tough limits for industry as well.

Australia needs to commit to reduce greenhouse pollution 50% by 2020 - for our children's sakes and for the future and continuing prosperity of our nation.

Sharmila Nezovic